Dyskusje / polemiki / recenzje

Janina Uszyńska-Jarmoc* (iD)

Beata Kunat* (iD)

"Gifted, But What's Next?" A Proprietary Program of Recognizing Students' Personal Resources and Ways of Using Them to Choose Their Further Educational and Life Path

Abstract

The paper presents a proprietary program of recognizing students' personal resources and ways of using them at the end of their elementary education and during further secondary school education. It refers to the researcher's own theoretical and scholarly experiences associated with the construction of tools that assist in recognizing students' abilities and giftedness, as well as possible external and intrinsic factors determining their development (Uszyńska-Jarmoc, Kunat, Tarasiuk 2014; Uszyńska-Jarmoc, Kunat, Mantur 2015; Uszyńska-Jarmoc, Kunat 2018). The paper also emphasizes that during the process of diagnosing, the relation between assumed theories and pedagogical practice is respected. Based on applied theoretical assumptions that stem from positive psychology, the author draws on practical experience gained during the course of a four year-long project titled "Akademia Talentów Białostockiej Szkoły Realnej" [Talent Academy of the Real School in Bialystok]. The proprietary program of recognizing students' personal resources, elaborated during this project, has been verified based on cooperation with a group of over 200 students, aged 13–16, as well as their parents. The program was implemented by the author of this paper together with the students and their parents, however, it can also be used in educational practice by other educators, school psychologists, or career advisors.

Keywords: positive psychology, personal resources, giftedness, strengths, student, diagnosing, proprietary program.

„Uzdolniony, a co dalej?" Autorski program rozpoznawania zasobów osobistych ucznia oraz korzystania z nich w wyborze dalszej drogi edukacyjnej i życiowej

Abstrakt

W tekście przedstawiono zarys autorskiego programu rozpoznawania zasobów osobistych ucznia kończącego edukację w szkole podstawowej oraz możliwości ich wykorzystania w dalszej edukacji i w wyborze zawodu. Odwołano się w nim do własnych doświadczeń teoretyczno-badawczych związanych z procedurą konstruowania narzędzi do rozpoznawania zdolności i uzdolnień uczniów oraz możliwych zewnętrznych i wewnętrznych czynników warunkujących ich rozwój (Uszyńska-Jarmoc, Kunat, Tarasiuk 2014; Uszyńska-Jarmoc, Kunat, Mantur 2015; Uszyńska-Jarmoc, Kunat 2018). W artykule zaakcentowano także konieczność respektowania w procesie diagnozowania związku pomiędzy przyjętą teorią a praktyką pedagogiczną. Na podstawie założeń teoretycznych, wywodzących się z psychologii pozytywnej, odwołano się do doświadczeń praktycznych, zdobytych w ramach realizowanego od czterech lat projektu „Akademia Talentów Białostockiej Szkoły Realnej". Wypracowany w ramach tego projektu autorski program rozpoznawania zasobów osobistych uczniów został zweryfikowany na podstawie kilkuletniej współpracy z grupą ponad 200 uczniów od 13. do 16. roku życia oraz ich rodzicami. Opisywany tu program realizowany był przez autorki niniejszego tekstu z uczniami i dla uczniów oraz ich rodziców, ale może być także wykorzystywany w praktyce edukacyjnej przez pedagogów, psychologów szkolnych lub doradców zawodowych.

Słowa kluczowe: psychologia pozytywna, zasoby osobiste, uzdolnienia, mocne strony ucznia, diagnozowanie.

Introduction

Early and, above all, accurate recognition of the various abilities and personality traits in children and adolescents that make up the broadly understood gifts[1], and the successive stimulating of their development are among the basic objectives of contemporary education (Gralewski 2022; Limont 2010; Mönks 2008; Szmidt 2017a; Turska 2012; Zimmerman, Bonner, Kovach 2008; Uszyńska-Jarmoc, Kunat 2018; Wiśniewska 2021). The discourse on the process of assisting developmental possibilities of students emphasizes that the pedagogues' main goal is to consider such an organization of the diagnostic process in school that would allow to recognize even the yet uncrystallized potential of each student, so that he or she can consciously and

---

[1] In the article, the concept of "abilities" is understood as an intellectual attribute, an individual feature, possibility, potential for achieving accomplishments in certain areas of human activity. However, the concept of "gifts" refers to a set of abilities, knowledge and skills as well as personality traits. Giftedness is an achievement attribute, identified on the basis of real achievements of a person in his or her life so far, observed in their natural environment and revealed in everyday activities (Uszyńska-Jarmoc, Kunat, Tarasiuk 2014).

appropriately use their predispositions not only in the learning process, but also in while functioning in various cognitive and/or social situations both in and outside of school (Gralewski 2022). An accurate diagnosis[2] of different personal resources,[3] first and foremost a student's strengths, can allow a teacher not only to individualize their work, but also to build relations so that they not only become an authority figure, someone who knows how to encourage the development of their students' abilities, their interests and passions, but more importantly someone who can be an educational partner, planning and co-organizing individual (based on diagnoses) paths of learning, and, as a result, also unique paths of development, understood as being the effect of students' own creative accomplishments. Based on an extensive analysis of a very diverse set of both Polish and English-language literature, Jacek Gralewski (2022) notices that there are very few publications which present the problem of accuracy in recognizing the scope and level of students' creativity by their teachers in a holistic, comprehensive and reliable way. Gralewski, as well as other authors, emphasizes the low level of diagnostic competences among teachers when it comes to recognizing the abilities and gifts of their students. We believe that the same can be said about studies of accuracy in recognizing other abilities, talents, interests and passions of students who are living in a constantly changing modern world. It is a result of, among other factors, a less-than-perfect professional preparation of teachers in the field of educational diagnostics; lack of access to standardized diagnostical tools; lack of professional support in identifying students' abilities by psychologists and school pedagogues, as well as by employees of psychological and pedagogical counseling centers or experts in a given field (see: Dyrda 2012; Giza 2006; Gralewski 2022). According to Gralewski, numerous studies demonstrate that teachers are not always able to recognize students' abilities or make many mistakes while doing it, and they rarely use standardized methods in the process of diagnosis. Additionally, teachers too often evaluate students' abilities based on their academic results or achievements in artistic and sports competitions, or other extra-curricular activities (see: Dyrda 2012; Giza 2006; Gralewski 2022; Jabłonowska 2008; Karwowski 2005; Karwowski, Ciak, Grubek 2009; Uszyńska-Jarmoc 2005).

Teachers most often identify gifted students based on the markers which are easiest to observe, since they reflect the fact that these students in most cases do not have any significant problems with learning, and function as natural leaders who are often involved in the life of the school, or represent it at various competitions

---

[2] The concept of diagnosis is defined in different ways in academic scholarship (see: Skałbania 2013; Jarosz, Wysocka 2006; Paluchowski 2007; Wysocka 2007, 2013). Pedagogical literature often refers to a definition proposed by Ziemski (1973: 17), according to which "a diagnosis is the recognition of a specific state of affairs and its development trends on the basis of its symptoms and knowledge of general regularities in a given field." In a broader sense, a diagnosis can also mean formulating a plan for changing a given state in order to optimize, develop or correct it. In this sense a diagnosis is understood as a basis for formulating further actions and interventions (Paluchowski 2007; Wysocka 2007). We refer to this understanding in our article.

[3] Personal resources are knowledge and skills, as well as any type of experience connected with positive and negative events, acquired in very different social situations during the entire period of childhood and adolescence (Brzezińska 2008), which in the program discussed in this article means – from the beginning of the diagnosis.

(Gralewski 2022). It is important to emphasize that teachers, if they indeed recognize the abilities and talents of students, prefer to use a diagnostical method that could be characterized as "testing to select," and not "testing to develop" (Babaeva 1999, Uszyńska-Jarmoc 2005). Moreover, teachers rarely undertake diagnostic activities to actually determine how far a student is presently from achieving his or her potential (the developmental aspect of a diagnosis), but instead they are primarily oriented on the educational aspect of diagnosing, trying to determine how far the student is from achieving the curricular requirements and tasks that have been set by the teachers themselves. For these reasons an initiative was introduced in order to construct a new proprietary program in which teachers and students work together to recognize the personal resources and strengths of students that can be then used in the educational process, as well as later, when deciding on which educational path to follow.

Theoretical framework for constructing a program for recognizing personal resources of students

The main goals of the proposed diagnosing program correspond to the definition of education which was formulated by Zbigniew Kwieciński, who wrote that "education should be understood as the entirety of conditions, processes and activities which support a person's development, in such a way so that he or she can face the complex challenges of the modern world" (Kwieciński 1999: 51). If we accept this definition, then recognizing and encouraging the development of internal potentials of children and adolescents, their individual and unique possibilities, becomes the primary goal of education focused on supporting individual development. Especially since, as Maria Tyszkowa argues (2002: 50–51), selected psychological conceptions state that "the aim of an individual's development is to realize his potential, while development is equated with becoming the person one is supposed to be." Such an understanding of the goal of personal development was also assumed in this article, although we are also fond of other definitions proposed in psychological and pedagogical literature, for instance: becoming oneself, becoming who you potentially already are, growing up to act appropriately (see: Niemirowski 2015: 13). We have therefore assumed, following the cited author, that this understanding of the essence of development will most certainly allow to better recognize and utilize the potentials of students, and the developmental change will be whatever gives students a sense that they are using their potential, achieving greater autonomy, consciously trying to become who they are supposed to be (Niemirowski 2015). It was therefore assumed that a significant contribution to this process would be an adequately chosen model of pedagogical support, selected from the five types proposed by Dorota Klus-Stańska (2009). The author lists five significantly different approaches to identifying and giving meaning to the category of "pedagogical support," or – to be more precise – "supporting students in the process of development": a functional-behavioral approach, in which "to

support" means "to direct"; a humanistic-adaptative approach, in which "to support" means "to teach how to be yourself"; a constructivist-developmental approach – in which "to support" means "to organize" (primarily the environment which influences individual education); a constructivist-social approach, in which "supporting" is equated with "helping"; a critical-emancipatory approach, in which "supporting" means "emancipating."

Referring to the above-mentioned way of understanding development and developmental change, we have assumed a humanistic-adaptative approach as the basis for thinking about building original concepts of recognizing and developing the resources of students who are finishing their education in primary school. We have also found inspiration in selected works of positive psychology. It is worth highlighting that the ideas of positive psychology (Seligman 2004, 2005; Seligman et al. 1997; Trzebińska 2008; Kwiatek, Wilczewska 2015) are more and more often emphasized in pedagogy, and their potential applications are gaining more and more recognition in the broadly understood educational practice (Gula, Tucholska 2007; Juńczyk 2019; Kolber 2014; Szmidt 2017b).

The assumption that supporting the development of a student is the main goal of education – both by theoreticians, representatives of positive psychology (Csikszentmihalyi 1996; Peterson 2006; Seligman 2004), and by practitioners – results from the recognition that the potential, resources, possessed dispositions apply to every student without exception, so it is only necessary to discover those that are positive and (according to the authors of this text) convince the students themselves of this fact. Additionally, we have assumed that the goal of education, as viewed from the lens of positive psychology, is to improve the educational processes by a psychological empowerment of not only the student, but also other educational partners (teachers, parents), and then to encourage them to take actions that promote a sense of well-being.

Adopting the assumptions of positive psychology, we have decided that our proprietary model of diagnosing personal resources will strengthen each student's understanding of their own potential, helping them to think about their future – to think about what can happen instead of focusing on what has already happened. We have assumed that analyzing past events, both successes and failures, helps us to draw conclusions for the future, build self-confidence, strengthen optimism, and focus on the positive, constructive aspects of past negative events. It was assumed that the basic task of the person diagnosing the student's resources is to find the place from which he or she is closest to achieving specific learning goals. When planning the proprietary program of diagnosing personal resources of students, we have assumed that the diagnosis will have developmental character (searching for an answer to the question of how far a student is from reaching their own potential), and not educational (determining how far the student is from the curricular requirements and tasks set by the teacher). At the same time, it was important for the person conducting the diagnosis to understand what developmental path the student has followed thus far, and why this path, and not any other.

When we were considering different ideas about the new program of recognizing personal resources of students, we understood diagnosing as a long-term, complex process of data collection, evaluation and interpretation, which employs various sources of information, diagnostical procedures and tools (Wysocka 2013). It was recognized that the previously developed tools for identifying and self-assessing a student's talents (Uszyńska-Jarmoc, Kunat 2018) are just one element of the process of identifying personal resources, so in order to obtain a broader picture of a student's abilities and achievements, it is not enough to use various tools for quantitative research, omitting other ways of getting to know the student, because in quantitative diagnostic tests, due to the imperfection of single research methods, it is suggested to use several measurement methods at the same time (Porter 1999; Uszyńska-Jarmoc 2005).

In the process of recognizing a gifted student, in addition to quantitative studies, we have also referred to a dynamic model of diagnosing gifts (Babaeva 1999), which accentuates "testing for development" instead of "testing for selection." We also pursued qualitative studies, and by concentrating on identifying barriers and developmental obstacles, we were able to designate qualitatively different paths of individual development of students' abilities (Uszyńska-Jarmoc 2000). As a result, quantitative analyzes were supplemented with qualitative research, e.g. interviews, analysis of effects, participant observation during student workshops. The adoption of qualitative methods enabled us to expose the interactive character of the process of developing students' abilities and to show diverse developmental paths embedded in different situational conditions (Uszyńska-Jarmoc, Kunat, Tarasiuk 2014). Thanks to the use of the proposed strategy of recognizing the student's personal resources, individual learning programs can be designed with their cooperation, because in the process of diagnosing it is worth taking into account the ideas of Martin Seligman (2004) and paying attention to how students construct practical knowledge about themselves (procedural and not declarative), which may in turn: enable them to deal with negative emotions both now and in the future; help them to learn how to forgive what has happened in the past; suggest how the optimizing strengths discovered can improve the quality of life; show them how to create optimistic visions of one's own future (which does not mean looking at it through "rose-colored" glasses).

"Gifted, But What's Next?" Characterizing the proprietary program of recognizing personal resources of students

The program of recognizing personal resources of students was created as part of the "Academy of Talents" project of the Bialystok Real School[4], whose recipients were students aged 13–16, as well as their parents. A comprehensive system of advisory

---

[4] The „Talent Academy" projects are realized by the PRO Foundation in Bialystok every years since 2019 as "Talent Academy – Youth University of Real Education." Its successive editions (2019, 2020, 2021, 2022) were financed by the National Institute of Freedom – Center for the Development of Civil Society.

support in identifying students' talents was one of the developed tools in the project. Based on a four years-long cooperation with students (approx. 200 pupils) and their parents, and realizing the functions of talent advisor[5], the authors of this article have created a proprietary program titled "Gifted, But What's Next?" which refers to identifying personal resources of students and their use in choosing a further path in education and life.

The program of recognizing and developing personal resources of students finishing education in primary schools consisted of several goals: identifying each student's potential in terms of preferences, the pace and ways of learning, through recognizing the different types and configurations of his/her abilities and gifts, different profiles of intelligence, different types of learning, selected internal and external conditions for the development of abilities and gifts; identifying the factors that favor or block the process of developing gifts in the course of learning at school and beyond; identifying the possibilities of optimal, alternative, individualized and self-directed learning; assistance in deciding about the further direction of school education (selection of the type of secondary school and education profile), and as a result – the possibility of choosing a profession in the future.

The process of identifying the personal resources of each student was divided into two stages: qualitative research; quantitative research, which was realized on an individual level, as well as in teams and groups. Integration workshops were carried out before individual meetings with students, for the purpose of collecting data on the needs, interests, and passions of students. Participant observation was also carried out during workshops, focusing on how students function in a group and how they approach the task of solving creative problems. 3–4 lesson hours were devoted to solving individual tasks. Observation of the work and cooperation of students was carried out by 2–3 observers so that it is possible to obtain reliable information about the entire group (usually 20–25 people) as well as individual members. Qualitative and quantitative research on the students' personal resources was carried out during two individual meetings with the talent advisors (each meeting lasted approx. 1–1,5 hour).

An individual report about each student was prepared after the diagnostical stage was completed. Titled *Profile of internal personal resources of a student,* it characterized their strengths in school and beyond, and consisted of 20–40 pages. The form of the report was designed as an individualized "book on a student's resources," written in "the student's language," and their content was discussed together with each student and their parents/guardians during an advisory meeting which lasted approx. 1–1,5 hours.

What follows is a detailed description of the process of identifying and developing personal resources of students, including the successive stages of both qualitative and quantitative research.

---

5 Talent advisor – a person responsible for identifying a student's personal resources as part of the "Talent Academy – Youth University of Real Education." In the article we use the shortened form of "advisors," which refers to the authors of the article.

First stage – qualitative research

The first set of preliminary information about the personal resources of students and their functioning in a group was gathered during "creative workshops." Students were assigned with creative and practical (diagnostical) assignments that were suitable for observing how they work in groups. Due to the limitations of this article, the workshop scenario, which covers several pages, is not presented here at length – instead, we have decided to only characterize the essence of the subsequent open tasks, and the diagnostic goals that were achieved. The aim of the first assignment, titled "No one but me!", was to discover similarities and differences in individual life experiences of students – their passions and interests, successes and failures, positive and negative personality traits. It was also aimed at strengthening each student's belief in the uniqueness of his or her personality and the need to cultivate individual differences or strengthen their sense of originality. The task enabled to discover one's own preferences in communicating the Self, as well as the degree of openness and readiness to "share yourself" with others. We also wanted to build students' confidence in their uniqueness, value, originality, since everyone has their own small or big achievements, successes and failures.

Divided into several groups of 4–5 people, the students carried out four group tasks, connected by one theme: thinking of non-stereotypical ways of surviving, individually and in a group, for a year on an imagined desert island. The "Year on a desert island" assignment created a situation which offered students a chance to recognize ways of dealing with problems, testing abilities to overcome obstacles, agreeing on common solutions, strategies for role division, degree of involvement in finding solutions to open problems, ways of resolving conflict in groups. When observing the way students dealt with the next task, titled "How to turn an enemy into an ally?", we diagnosed the students' abilities to work together as a group, asking them to first agree on, and then edit a text together (involving the use of linguistic, literary, creative, social, and innovative abilities), as well as their sense of humor, non-stereotypical thinking and acting. The third proposed task, "From accordion to… Machine – atypical invention on a desert island," created a situation for collecting data on their way of thinking and imagining, their ability to write down "shared thoughts" on paper. Based on an analysis of the process and effects of group work, we were able to observe students' technical, innovative, leadership, social, creative, artistic and acting skills. The fourth task (also intended for a group), titled "Everything I/we have…", gave us a chance to create a map of individual and collective creative potential. It allowed students (as well as us – their advisors) to discover what they consider in themselves as being the most important, interesting, valuable parts, and then to negotiate collectively what is most important, interesting, valuable for the entire team. The result was a graphic map of the strengths (values, skills, interests, personality traits) of each individual person and each team. The last part of the workshop consisted of two individual tasks. The first – "Map of the sky" – enabled the advisors to learn about how students act in class and about their social position. The last task,

titled "Hurrah! I got the Nobel Prize!", offered a chance to build students' confidence, see their own potential, manifest their future professional success (which is very important from the perspective of positive psychology adopted by the authors of this article), build optimism and self-reliance.

In the next stage of qualitative research we conducted individual interviews with students – open, unstructured, lasting for approx. 60 minutes. The information collected from students was supposed to help in creating an interesting text – a description of the student's self-image – based on their personality strengths. It was essential that during the interview students feel casual and are aware that the advisor wants to understand them better and thus help them in discovering their strengths, so that they can plan their possible educational path, and also their professional future. Each student was given a chance to construct an open narrative about themselves, and after finishing it, the advisor would ask supplementary questions (e.g. about their passions, interests, values, dreams, ways of spending free time, functioning in school, social relations with their teachers and other students, their successes and failures, educational and professional plans). After the interview each student was asked to complete the *Questionnaire of Unfinished Sentences*: "I think, therefore I am" (see: Uszyńska-Jamoc, Kunat, Tarasiuk 2014), containing a request for them to complete a dozen or so sentences (e.g. "I am…"; "My goal is…"; "I'm responsible for…"; "I feel free when…"; "My greatest success…"; "I'm happy when…"; "I succeeded in…"; "I'm open to…"; "I cross boundaries when I…"; "I'm interested in…"; "In the future I want to be…").

Second stage – quantitative research

For this part of the diagnostical stage, we used a proprietary diagnostic tool to identify and self-evaluate skills and gifts, as well as other well-known and standardized tools used all over the world. As a result, each advisor could create a complex description of a student's strengths. Joseph S. Renzulli's *Three-Ring Conception of Giftedness* (Renzulli 1999; 2002; 2003; 2005), Franz J. Mönks' *Multifactor Model of Ability* (Mönks, Katzko 2005), and Stanisław Popek's *Model of Outstanding Abilities* (Popek 1996; 2001; 2004) were used as theoretical frameworks for establishing the proprietary tools used to recognize the level of abilities, their self-evaluation and conditioning.

Another proprietary tool called *Scales for Identifying Student's Abilities* – SIUU (Uszyńska-Jarmoc, Kunat 2018) was used to build an abilities profile for each student, and to determine their stage of development, which in turn enabled us to establish the level of development of each of the thirteen types of abilities: mathematical, technological and IT, regarding nature, scientific-analytical, creative, entrepreneurial and innovative, leadership, language, literary, artistic, musical, acting and sports abilities. Students would respond to each of the scales, containing from 5 to 7 items (statements), thus marking their own assessment of the extent to which it reflects

their own self-evaluation. Furthermore, the *Scales for Student's Self-Evaluation of Abilities* – SSUU (Uszyńska-Jarmoc, Kunat 2018) were used to compare each student's abilities profile with their self-evaluation. This tool includes self-assessment of the same thirteen types of abilities, analogously named and marked with the same numbers. The students were asked to self-evaluate the level of individual talents on the scale of school grades, taking into account the half marks: 1+, 2+, 3+, 4+, 5+, 6. The grades assigned by the student were given a specific number of points ranging from 0 to 10. The results are given in stens (Uszyńska-Jarmoc, Kunat 2018). The next tool, called the Scale of Evaluating the Conditioning of Abilities and Talents – OUZiU (Uszyńska-Jarmoc, Kunat, Mantur 2015) enables to recognize internal conditionings of the development of skills and gifts for each group: the need to know; the type and level of motivation in the learning process; the ability to learn and the meta-learning competence; self-image and self-worth. It also helps to discover complex groups of contextual factors (social and physical context) which can help to explain the level and history of each ability and talent development. This scale consists of 54 statements that a student can respond to by selecting the answer on a 5-degree scale. All of the original scales were previously subjected to the procedure of standardization and normalization. Their accuracy and reliability were determined. The necessary data illustrating the psychometric properties of the scales, a full package of tools with a key to assessing the level of individual talents, sten standards, as well as matrices for developing individual identification profiles, self-assessment of student's abilities and their determinants are discussed in separate articles (Uszyńska-Jarmoc, Kunat, Mantur 2015; Uszyńska-Jarmoc, Kunat 2018).

The Multiple Intelligences Questionnaire was used in order to identify a student's intelligence profile (Gardner 1999; 2009; Gardner, Kornhaber, Wake 2001; Suświłło 2004, Czaja-Chudyba 2005), which allows to determine the level of eight types of intelligence: linguistic, logical-mathematical, concerning nature, visual and spatial, musical, kinesthetic, interpersonal (or: social), intrapersonal (or: intuitive). The idea for constructing the questionnaire came from the Multiple Intelligences Theory (MI) introduced by Howard Gardner (1999; 2002). According to the theory, there are many different and independent types of intelligence, therefore challenging the assumption that intelligence is a uniform construct entirely determining our thinking (Gardner 2009; Gardner, Kornhaber, Wake 2001). When applying this theory to our diagnosis of a student's strengths, one of Gardner's statements was particularly important for us – the idea that each person is characterized by a few dominating abilities and that almost every role or task in any field of knowledge requires the combination of a few types of intelligence, and most importantly, that even outstanding accomplishments in one field do not guarantee that a person is gifted in another field (see: Czaja-Chudyba 2005; Kopik, Zatorska 2010). Thanks to the use of this tool it was possible not only to identify a multiple intelligence profile, but also to compare it with a student's self-evaluation and their abilities identification profile.

The next tool used in the diagnostical process was the *Test for Creative Thinking – Drawing Production* (TCT-DP) created by Urban and Jellen. The theoretical basis of

the test is the concept of creativity proposed by Urban (1990; 2003), on the basis of which several important characteristics of a student were determined, influencing creativity: fluidity of creative thinking; originality; ability to elaborate; ability to synthetize; non-conformity and risk-taking; sense of humor and emotional investment in solving creative tasks. The results of standardized research (normalizing and validating: theoretical and diagnostic accuracy) are presented in the Polish version of the textbook (Matczak, Jaworowska, Stańczak 2000). The key to assessing the graphic solutions of the test and the standard was taken from the publication mentioned above.

The Questionnaire of Learning Styles (Honey, Mumford 1986) was also used in the diagnostical process, which allows to identify four learning styles (a pragmatic, an empiricist, a theoretician, a contemplator/reflexive person). According to Peter Honey's and Alan Mumford's concept (1992), most people have a tendency to use one or two learning styles. The authors provide detailed guidelines on how to use them in school education. Indications relevant to the student's identified style were described in the study report and discussed during the last meeting with the advisor.

"Gifted, But What's Next?" – profile of a student's internal personal resources – bundle for students and parents

The last stage of the project was dedicated to writing a report. It was constructed on the basis of data acquired during preliminary observations from the workshops and individual meetings between students and the advisors. In order to construct a preliminary map of a student's interests, passions and strengths, we conducted a qualitative analysis of the data. *The profile of a student's internal developmental resources* (bundle for the student) consisted of five parts which presented a detailed assessment of the following: a map of a student's interests, passions, and educational and professional plans; an identification profile, self-evaluation of talents and their conditioning, as well as proposed possibilities and ways of developing internal resources; a description of a student's level of creativity; a student's multiple intelligence profile, along with a proposal for development as well as its use in the learning process and for selecting a further education profile and possible direction of professional development; styles of learning along with suggestions on how to use them in school education and beyond.

In the study report, each narrative about a student was always constructed in a personalized manner, so that it was addressed individually to particular students (e.g. "Dear Tomasz…", "Dear Marysia…", "Tomek, please consider…"). Following the premises of positive psychology, the report was written in such a way as to make each student feel special, important and unique. Furthermore, the language used in the report was adjusted to each age group. For that purpose, each student also received a detailed key listing the scientific information necessary to understand the results of the study. To facilitate the student's understanding, individual data was presented

in visual form. The results of the identification and self-assessment of thirteen types of talents and the conditions of their development were applied to graphic matrices. Three graphically developed talent profiles were put together, and were extensively discussed and compared with each other during a meeting with the student and his parents.

Conclusions

In pedagogy, as well as in educational legal acts, it is required from teachers and school pedagogues to conduct diagnoses of students' abilities (*Rozporządzenie Ministra Edukacji Narodowej...*). Gralewski (2022) writes that according to many authors, the first stage of working with a student in school should begin with a possibly holistic, multifaceted diagnosis of his or her abilities, with a preliminary recognition of potential and actual possibilities for development.

The proprietary program was constructed in order to search for strengths of both individuals and their immediate surroundings, therefore it is supposed to offer assistance in the development of a student's personal resources in the learning process. Indeed, setting up a meeting with a student and their parents after the study report is completed, which lasts for at least an hour, can prove instrumental in predicting each student's possible accomplishments in different areas of activity in the future.

The limitations of the diagnostical process characterized in this article are connected with the conclusions presented by social psychologists, who have often demonstrated that the assessments done by outside assessors are strongly dependent on the context in which the process of evaluating the behavior of others is made (Mądrzycki 1986; Tyszka 1999; Wojciszke 1991). It can be therefore assumed that the proposed program of recognizing a student's personal resources has its inherent limitations and requires further development. However, based on an analysis of the results of the project's evaluation (evaluation surveys, interviews),[6] it can be stated that its recipients – primary and secondary school students and their parents – recognize many of its benefits. Students emphasize the cognitive value of participating in a complex process of identifying abilities. They also point to the advantages of advisory support and counseling in the development of resources, as they have been established in the course of "Talent Academies." According to both students and their educational partners, the identification of individual developmental resources (types and configurations of abilities, gifts and talents, intelligence profiles, ways of learning) allows students to broaden their knowledge about themselves, their internal developmental resources or strengths, through a process of recognizing and analyzing their abilities in the context of individual potential, as well as possibilities for development in different areas of life. Students and parents especially appreciated

---

[6] The evaluation studies were conducted in 2019, 2020, 2021, as part of the project "Talent Academy" in the Real School of Bialystok.

the additional support materials that were prepared for them. Each student received a report about his or her abilities, gifts and talents – titled "Individual profile of internal developmental resources," it offered plenty of information about the students and their strengths. Those who participated in counseling were also satisfied because the proposed activities offered them a chance to strengthen the already existing personal competences, and discover new areas for development.

Bibliography

Babaeva J. D. (1999) *A Dynamic Approach to Giftedness: Theory and Practice*, "High Ability Studies", no. 10(1), pp. 51–68, https://doi.org/10.1080/1359813990100105.

Brzezińska A. (2008) *Nauczyciel jako organizator społecznego środowiska uczenia się* in: *Rozwijanie zdolności uczenia się. Wybrane konteksty i problemy*, E. Filipiak (ed.), Bydgoszcz, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kazimierza Wielkiego, pp. 35–50.

Csikszentmihalyi M. (1996) *Przepływ. Jak poprawić jakość życia. Psychologia optymalnego doświadczenia*, trans. M. Wajda, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Studio Emka.

Czaja-Chudyba I. (2005) *Odkrywanie zdolności dziecka. Koncepcja wielorakich inteligencji w praktyce przedszkolnej i wczesnoszkolnej*, Kraków, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pedagogicznej.

Dyrda B. (2012) *Edukacyjne wspieranie rozwoju uczniów zdolnych*, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak".

Gardner H. (1999) *Intelligence Reframed: Multiple Intelligences for the 21st Century*, New York, Basic Books.

Gardner H. (2002) *Inteligencje wielorakie. Teoria w praktyce*, trans. A. Jankowski, Poznań, Media Rodzina.

Gardner H. (2009) *Pięć umysłów przyszłości*, trans. D. Bakalarz, Warszawa, MT Biznes.

Gardner H., Kornhaber M. L., Wake W. (ed.) (2001) *Inteligencja. Wielorakie perspektywy*, tłum. M. Groborz, M. Śmieja, Warszawa, Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.

Giza T. (2006) *Socjopedagogiczne uwarunkowania procesów identyfikowania oraz rozwoju zdolności uczniów w szkole*, Kielce, Wydawnictwo Akademii Świętokrzyskiej.

Gralewski J. (2022) *Ocena kreatywności uczniów. Trafność ocen kreatywności uczniów przez nauczycieli liceów i jej uwarunkowania*, [in print].

Gula B., Tucholska K. (2007) *Psychologia pozytywna. Cele naukowo-badawcze i aplikacyjne oraz sposób ich realizacji*, „Studia z Psychologii w KUL", vol. 14, Lublin, Wydawnictwo KUL, pp. 133–152.

Honey P., Mumford A. (1986) *Learning Styles Questionnaire,* Berkshire, Peter Honey Publications.

Honey P., Mumford A. (1992) *The Manual of Learning Styles*, Berkshire, Peter Honey Publications.

Jabłonowska M. (2008) *Identyfikacja uczniów zdolnych w opiniach nauczycieli. Doniesienia z badań* in: *Uczeń zdolny wyzwaniem dla współczesnej edukacji*, J. Łaszczyk, M. Jabłonowska (eds.), Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Akademii Pedagogiki Specjalnej, pp. 48–56.

Jarosz E., Wysocka E. (2006) *Diagnoza psychopedagogiczna podstawowe problemy i rozwiązania*, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak".

Juńczyk T. (2019) *Edukacyjne konteksty psychologii pozytywnej. Studium teoretyczno-empiryczne*, Poznań, Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

Karwowski M. (2005) *Rezultaty w nauce i kreatywność uczniów różniących się zdolnościami w percepcji nauczycieli*, „Annales", no. 18, pp. 93–107.

Karwowski M., Ciak R., Grubek M. (2009) *Patrzy ale nie widzi? Trafność nominacji nauczycielskich w rozpoznaniu kreatywności uczniów* in: *Identyfikacja potencjału twórczego*, M. Karwowski (ed.), Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Akademii Pedagogiki Specjalnej, pp. 241–254.

Klus-Stańska D. (2009) *Dyskursy pedagogiki wczesnoszkolnej* in: *Pedagogika wczesnoszkolna – dyskursy, problemy, rozwiązania*, D. Klus-Stańska, M. Szczepska-Pustkowska (ed.), Warszawa, Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne, pp. 25–78.

Kolber M. (2014) *Zastosowanie psychologii pozytywnej w edukacji*, „Przegląd Pedagogiczny", no. 2, pp. 156–165.

Kopik A., Zatorska M. (2010) *Wielorakie podróże – edukacja dla dziecka*, Kielce, Europejska Agencja Rozwoju Sp. J.

Kwiatek P., Wilczewska K. (2015) *Czym jest, a czym nie jest psychologia pozytywna? Poszukiwanie paradygmatu*, „Seminare. Poszukiwania Naukowe", no. 4(36), pp. 135–145, https://doi.org/10.21852/sem.2015.4.10.

Kwieciński Z. (1999) *Edukacja wobec nadziei i zagrożeń współczesności* in: *Humanistyka przełomu wieków*, J. Kozielecki (ed.), Warszawa, Wydawnictwo „Żak", pp. 51–77.

Limont W. (2010) *Uczeń zdolny, Jak go rozpoznać i jak z nim pracować*, Gdańsk, Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.

Matczak A., Jaworowska A., Stańczak J. (2000) *Rysunkowy Test Twórczego Myślenia TCT-DP K. K. Urbana i H. G. Jellena. Podręcznik*, Warszawa, Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych PTP.

Mądrzycki T. (1986) *Deformacje w spostrzeganiu ludzi*, Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Mönks F. J. (2008) *Identification and Education of the Gifted Learner* in: *Uczeń zdolny wyzwaniem dla współczesnej edukacji*, J. Łaszczyk, M. Jabłonowska (eds.), Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Akademii Pedagogiki Specjalnej im. Marii Grzegorzewskiej, pp. 79–86.

Mönks F. J., Katzko M. W. (2005) *Giftedness and Gifted Education* in: *Conceptions of Giftedness*, R. J. Stenberg, J. E. Davidson (eds.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511610455.012.

Niemirowski T. (2015) *Pojęcie rozwoju w psychologii rozwojowej*, „Horyzonty Psychologii", vol. V, pp. 13–28.

Paluchowski W. J. (2007) *Diagnoza psychologiczna. Proces – narzędzia – standardy*, Warszawa, Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.

Peterson C. (2006) *A Primer in Positive Psychology*, New York, Oxford University Press.

Popek S. (1996) *Zdolności i uzdolnienia – ujęcie systemowe problemu* in: *Zdolności i uzdolnienia jako osobowościowe właściwości człowieka*, S. Popek (ed.), Lublin, Wydawnictwo UMCS, pp. 9–31.

Popek S. (2001) *Człowiek jako jednostka twórcza,* Lublin, Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Popek S. (2004) *Zdolności i uzdolnienia w świetle współczesnych teorii psychologicznych* in: *Uczeń o zróżnicowanych zdolnościach i uzdolnieniach we współczesnej szkole*, S. Popek (ed.), Zamość, Wyższa Szkoła Humanistyczno-Ekonomiczna im. Jana Zamoyskiego, pp. 9–29.

Porter L. (1999) *Gifted Young Children, A Guide for Teachers and Parents*, Buckingham, Open University Press.

Renzulli J. S. (1999) *What is This Thing Called Giftedness, and How Do We Develop It? A Twenty-Five Year Perspective*, "Journal for the Education of the Gifted", no. 23, pp. 3–54, https://doi.org/10.1177/016235329902300102.

Renzulli J. S. (2002) *Emerging Conceptions of Giftedness: Building a Bridge to the New Century*, "Exceptionality", no. 10(2), pp. 67–75, https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327035EX1002_2.

Renzulli J. S. (2003) *Conception of Giftedness and its Relationship to the Development of Social Capital* in: *Handbook of Gifted Education*, N. Colangelo, G. A. Davis (eds.), Boston, Pearson Education, pp. 75–87.

Renzulli J. S. (2005) *The Three-Ring Conception of Giftedness. A Development Model for Promoting Creative Productivity* in: *Conceptions of Giftedness*, R. J. Sternberg, J. E. Davidson (eds.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 246–279, https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511610455.015.

Rozporządzenie Ministra Edukacji Narodowej z dnia 9 sierpnia 2017 r., z późn. zm., w sprawie zasad organizacji i udzielania pomocy psychologiczno-pedagogicznej w publicznych przedszkolach, szkołach i placówkach (Dz.U., 2017, poz. 1591).

Seligman M. (2004) *Psychologia pozytywna* in: *Psychologia pozytywna. Nauka o szczęściu, zdrowiu, sile i cnotach człowieka*, trans. J. Kowalczewska, J. Czapiński (ed.), Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Seligman M. (2005) *Prawdziwe szczęście*, trans. A. Jankowski, Poznań, Media Rodzina.

Seligman M., Reivich K., Jaycox L., Gillham J. (1997) *Optymistyczne dziecko. Jak wychowywać dzieci, aby nauczyć je optymizmu i dawania sobie ze wszystkim rady*, trans. A. Jankowski, Poznań, Media Rodzina.

Skałbania B. (2013) *Diagnostyka pedagogiczna. Wybrane obszary i rozwiązania praktyczne*, Kraków, Oficyna Wydawnicza "Impuls".

Suświłło M. (2004) *Inteligencje wielorakie w nowoczesnym kształceniu*, Olsztyn, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego.

Szmidt K. J. (2017a) *Edukacyjne uwarunkowania rozwoju kreatywności*, Łódź, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, https://doi.org/10.18778/8088-703-9.

Szmidt K. J. (2017b) *Pedagogika pozytywna: twórczość – zdolności – mądrość zespolone* in: *Zasoby twórcze człowieka. Wprowadzenie do pedagogiki pozytywnej*, K. J. Szmidt, M. Modrzejewska-Świgulska (eds.), Łódź, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Trzebińska E. (2008) *Psychologia pozytywna*, Warszawa, Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.

Turska D. (2012) *"Teorie" inteligencji Carol Dweck i ich edukacyjne implikacje*, "Psychologia Wychowawcza", no. 44(1–2), p. 44–54, [online:] https://e-psychologiawychowawcza.pl/resources/html/article/details?id=139113 (dostęp: 11.04.23).

Tyszka T. (1999) *Psychologiczne pułapki oceniania i podejmowania decyzji*, Gdańsk, Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.

Tyszkowa M. (2002) *Pojęcie rozwoju i zmiany rozwojowej* in: *Psychologia rozwoju człowieka*, t. 1.: *Zagadnienia ogólne*, M. Przetacznik-Gierowska, M. Tyszkowa (eds.), Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, pp. 45–56.

Urban K. K. (1990) *Recent Trends in Creativity Research and Theory in Western Europe*, "European Journal of High Ability", no. 1, pp. 99–113, https://doi.org/10.1080/0937445900010114.

Urban K. K. (2003) *Toward a Componential Model of Creativity*, in: D. Ambrose, L. M. Cohen, A. J. Tannenbaum (eds.), *Creative Intelligence: Toward Theoretic Integration,* Cresskill N. J., Hampton Press, pp. 81–112.

Uszyńska-Jarmoc J. (2000) *Problemy diagnozowania zdolności i uzdolnień kreatywnych dzieci we wczesnym dzieciństwie*, "Edukacja", no. 4(72), pp. 83–92.

Uszyńska-Jarmoc J. (2005) *Sposoby identyfikacji rozwojowego potencjału intelektualnego a modele stymulowania rozwoju uzdolnień dzieci we wczesnym dzieciństwie* in: *Wybrane zagadnienia edukacji uczniów zdolnych*, vol. 1.: *Zdolności i stymulowanie ich rozwoju*, W. Limont, J. Cieślikowska (eds.), Kraków, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls", pp. 117–140.

Uszyńska-Jarmoc J., Kunat B. (2018) *Debiutant czy Ekspert? Identyfikacja i samoocena uzdolnień uczniów,* Kraków, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls".

Uszyńska-Jarmoc J., Kunat B., Mantur J. (2015) *Zdolny, ale jak? (Auto)diagnoza zdolności i uzdolnień uczniów*, Białystok, Centrum Kształcenia Ustawicznego.

Uszyńska-Jarmoc J., Kunat B., Tarasiuk M. (2014) *Sukcesy uczniów zdolnych. Fakty – Narracje – Interpretacje*, Białystok, Centrum Kształcenia Ustawicznego.

Wiśniewska E. (2021) *Efektywność treningu kreatywności dzieci i młodzieży*, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Akademii Pedagogiki Specjalnej im. Marii Grzegorzewskiej.

Wojciszke B. (1991) *Procesy oceniania ludzi*, Poznań, Wydawnictwo Nakom.

Wysocka E. (2007) *Człowiek a środowisko życia. Podstawy teoretyczno-metodologiczne diagnozy*, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak".

Wysocka E. (2013) *Diagnostyka pedagogiczna. Nowe obszary i rozwiązania*, Kraków, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls".

Ziemski S. (1973) *Problemy dobrej diagnozy*, Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Zimmerman B. J., Bonner S., Kovach R. (2008) *Zdolny uczeń. Metody planowania samodzielnej nauki*, trans. M. Polaszewska-Nicke, Gdańsk, Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.

About the Authors

Janina Uszyńska-Jarmoc is a habilitated doctor, professor at the University of Bialystok. Her research interests concern the creative abilities of children, adolescents and adults. The second area of research is the issue of meta-learning competences of students. She is the author of over 120 scientific publications, including three books: *Twórcza aktywność dziecka: Teoria – rzeczywistość – perspektywy rozwoju* (2003)*; Podróże, skarby, przygoda. Podręcznik i program rozwijania twórczości, samoświadomości oraz dyspozycji autokreacyjnych dzieci z klas I–III* (2005)*, Od twórczości potencjalnej do autokreacji w szkole* (2007), as well as three co-authored books: *Sukcesy uczniów zdolnych. Fakty – narracje – interpretacje* (2014); *Zdolny, ale jak? (Auto)diagnoza zdolności i uzdolnień uczniów* (2015); *Debiutant czy ekspert? Identyfikacja i samoocena zdolności ucznia* (2018). Member of the Polish Creativity Society. She is editor-in-chief of the international journal "Creativity: Theories – Research – Applications" (ISSN: 2354-0036; https://sciendo.com/journal/CTRA).

Beata Kunat is an assistant professor at the Faculty of Education at the University of Bialystok. Her research interests concern the following issues: pedagogy of creativity (the creative development of human potential); pedeutology (the professional development of teachers; the passion in professional life of teachers); qualitative research methods. Author of several articles published in Poland and abroad. She published the monograph „*Spełnieni, ale niedoceniani". Rozwój zawodowy nauczycieli plastyki* (2016), and has co-authored three books: *Sukcesy uczniów zdolnych. Fakty-narracje-interpretacje* (2014); *Zdolny ale jak? (Auto)diagnoza zdolności i uzdolnień uczniów* (2015); *Debiutant czy ekspert? Identyfikacja i samoocena zdolności ucznia* (2018). Vice-chairman of the Polish Creativity Society. She is an associate editor of the international journal "Creativity: Theories – Research – Applications" (ISSN: 2354-0036 https://sciendo.com/journal/CTRA).

Janina Uszyńska-Jarmoc – dr hab. prof. Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku. Jej zainteresowania naukowe dotyczą zdolności oraz postaw twórczych dzieci, młodzieży oraz dorosłych. Drugim obszarem badań jest problematyka kompetencji metauczenia się uczniów. Jest autorką ponad 120 publikacji, w tym trzech autorskich książek: *Twórcza aktywność dziecka: Teoria – rzeczywistość – perspektywy rozwoju* (2003); *Podróże, skarby, przygoda. Podręcznik i program rozwijania twórczości, samoświadomości oraz dyspozycji autokreacyjnych dzieci z klas I–III* (2005); *Od twórczości potencjalnej do autokreacji w szkole* (2007) oraz trzech książek współautorskich: *Sukcesy uczniów zdolnych. Fakty – narracje – interpretacje* (2014); *Zdolny, ale jak. (Auto)diagnoza zdolności i uzdolnień uczniów* (2015); *Debiutant czy ekspert? Identyfikacja i samoocena zdolności ucznia* (2018). Należy do Polskiego Stowarzyszenia Kreatywności. Jest redaktorem naczelnym międzynarodowego czasopisma naukowego „Creativity. Theories – Research – Applications" (ISSN: 2354-0036; https://sciendo.com/journal/CTRA).

Beata Kunat – adiunkt na Wydziale Nauk o Edukacji Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku. Jej zainteresowania naukowe koncentrują się wokół pedagogiki kreatywności (*creativity of students*), pedeutologii (rozwoju zawodowego nauczycieli, pasji zawodowej nauczycieli) i metodologii badań jakościowych. Autorka kilkudziesięciu artykułów naukowych opublikowanych w Polsce i za granicą. Wydała jedną książkę autorską – *„Spełnieni, ale niedoceniani". Rozwój zawodowy nauczycieli plastyki* (2016) oraz trzy książki współautorskie: *Sukcesy uczniów zdolnych. Fakty-narracje-interpretacje* (2014); *Zdolny ale jak? (Auto)diagnoza zdolności i uzdolnień uczniów* (2015); *Debiutant czy ekspert? Identyfikacja i samoocena zdolności ucznia* (2018). Wiceprezes Polskiego Stowarzyszenia Kreatywności. Jest redaktorem międzynarodowego czasopisma naukowego „Creativity. Theories – Research – Applications" (ISSN: 2354-0036; https://sciendo.com/journal/CTRA).

To cite this article