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It is estimated that 95% of gifted children in Mexico are misdiagnosed and their intelligence gets lost due to the lack of educational attention adequate to their skill. At the same time that there is a great lack of knowledge in the teachers’ side on the necessary factors in the education of these brilliant minds, especially about the educational leadership process, the latter a key factor in the process of gifted education innovation. This project on qualitative educational investigation looked into the relation of Educational Leadership with the implementation of a differentiated educational program (Academic Enrichment) in teachers and students with intellectual giftedness over a 7-month period. Through the use of interviews and field observations we researched the role of a teacher as a leader in the teaching of gifted children, the functions and roles that can be developed in a center designed to apply the “Academic Enrichment Program”, the institutional factor that promotes or inhibits the presence of leadership and finally the benefits the latter brings to educative institutions, students and professors. The findings let us describe a general overview of the innovative teacher in the education of gifted children and in turn to find external and internal factors capable of influencing the development of educational leadership. 
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**Introduction**

How can a teacher or a professional related with teaching play a leadership role in education? There are many opportunities in teaching to do an innovative job: we just need to look into areas where is necessary to modify current paradigms, usually found in the Special Education of Intellectual Giftedness area. (Almazán Anaya, 2011, Lubar and Zenasni, 2010). There are students with different skills and different learning speed, making their academic performance different and thus they need a different psycho pedagogic treatment. They are the intellectual gifted children who present an intelligence quotient (130) above 130 points (Feldman, 2006). This sector of the population comprises a 3% and in spite of being a minority, it is essential that they are given proper attention since those who are in this group will probably be the future scientists, inventors, writers, thinkers and investigators who will let humankind keep on evolving (Calbert, 2012). This part of the population has not been studied with close attention. It is paradoxical that a large part of them are often confused with mentally retarded children. These mistakes are caused largely by the persistence of stereotypes about gifted students as “nerds”, “bookworms”, among others (Almeida, & Oliveira, 2010). And also because of the relative absence of a mexican national training program on physicians, psychologists and educators to identify and address giftedness (Mayoral, 2012). Weismann (2006) points out that over 90% of the confusion in diagnosis occur because of gifted children accelerated learning and social isolation patterns. These are interpreted as if they were symptoms of Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder, autism, attention disorders or mental diseases such as "savants" (children mentally retarded who as a compensation show exceptional development in memory, therefore feigning an intelligence above average).
It has been statistically calculated that there are one million gifted children in Mexico (Dawson & Trapp, 2005) yet, where are they? Most likely they are lost in the educative road and they will remain lost unless they are identified and attended. Approximately 95% of gifted children are lost in Mexico, mainly due to a lack of diagnosis and timely attention. A key factor is the educative center they attend, as it is there where most of times these talented children are misdiagnosed and in doing so they are identified with the Deficit Attention Syndrome (TDAH) or bad students, who are segregated and run the risk of developing low self-confidence in the academic area just by being different from the average (Almazán Anaya, 2010).

Gifted children are characterized by an ability of learning and accelerated problem resolution compared to the mean, as measured with IQ tests their intelligence is located two standard deviations from average (98th percentile or an IQ higher than 130). It is also required that this intelligence fulfill the Caroff (2006) multidimensional criteria; it should be practical (problem solving), not often expressed (rarity) and productive (oriented towards social benefit).

The educational challenge is produced because these students require advanced education due to boredom experienced in traditional classes, their faster learning and their inclination to study previously academic subjects. So at class they express hyperactive behaviors due to a lack of cognitive stimulation. Another problem that teachers experience with gifted children is that they cannot devote their attention and time to their teaching in traditional schools because classrooms contain 30 to 60 children simultaneously. These factors added to bullying experienced by gifted students in the traditional school system produces a decrease in their self-esteem, poor academic performance and high dropout rates (Pérez, 2012; Weismann, 2006).

Everything indicates that when problems arise the victim is to blame. This is unacceptable, especially with gifted children (Woolfolk, 1996). Those who normally “brand” the children are the professors themselves, who sometimes due to ignorance diagnose them as problematic children (Soto Ramírez, 2001). This shows how the professor is an important key in the attention to giftedness and therefore is required to take on an active role in this task. It is quite important to detect these children in basic education as it is the stage when there are more problems with misdiagnosis (Mayoral, 2012; Notimex, 2012).

Due the scarceness of scientific studies in the field of superior intelligence (statistical synonym of intellectual giftedness) there is hardly any research trying to describe the role of the teacher as a leader in the teaching of intellectually gifted students. In response to such a deficiency the methodology of Enrichment emerged, consisting of a systematic group of specific strategies to increase the effort of the gifted student, his performance and motivation towards studying, integrating an arrange of advanced levels of learning experiences and thinking skills superior to those of any curricular area of study or scholar organizational patterns for average students (Renzulli, 2008). This method is based on the innovative skills of the professor and his potential as leader in education. “He has to do things different from average because his students are different too, which means to go beyond what is pre-established” (Marquez Cabellos & Martinez, 2011).

An Enrichment Program, aside from supplying the knowledge gifted students need it involves a number of strategies to increase the student’s effort and performance. These programs are more demanding for both student and professor, as the latter sees the need to integrate a range of learning experiences of an advanced level together with their skills of synthesis and innovation (Morales, 2008). For such a reason, not any professor ventures into the application of an educative program for which he has not been prepared in his professional job. All because teachers rarely receive a training to attend gifted children (Ghassib, 2010), and therefore it will be necessary that this time the professor “goes back to learn how to teach” a group with special needs.

Some Institutions for superior intelligence, like the Talent Attention Center (CEDAT) the largest in Latin America, try to eliminate as much as possible the obstacles the professors face when they want to apply their leadership. With such actions the professors become innovative and achieve successful results that would not be possible in numerous average schools (Gonzalez, 2011; Staff Sexenio, 2012). Diversity prevails in these centers, an essential factor to generate educative leadership (Hargreaves & Fink, 2006).

It is possible that professors will improve their innovative thought in education and their skills to work with innovative teaching methods for gifted children in class as they get in closer touch with superior intelligence students. This creates the need to realize the study at an institution where it is normal to impart academic enrichment and encourage contact with gifted children for it is possible to find there professors who after years of work have developed a leadership capacity in education. Statistics of national educative results indicates, among numerous factors, a lack of level and preparation of professors in the educational system (Amman & Reinelt, 2007); however, they are not well prepared or haven’t simply exploited their skills because they have limited themselves to play a passive role in education.
It would be appropriate therefore to study what is like a teaching leader who realizes some educative activity different from the standard; these professors do exist (Amman & Reinelt, 2007). A study of this kind could be conducted in a small group of professors who impart psycho pedagogic methodologies different from the ones others use, such as the academic enrichment for gifted children in which the job of the professor is very active as he is required to come out of his conventional paradigms and become innovative (Thoonen & Sleegers, 2012). Scientific literature does not register which factors encourage the generation of leading professors inside these centers for gifted children, so this is an area to explore, for in case they were known it could be repeated in other school centers. Even several teachers and educational institutions in the world do not apply educational leadership because of a belief that this leads to a loss of school organization, because teachers do not follow faithfully a predetermined program but adapt it as being in touch with learners (Levay, 2010).

Thereby the current study tried to describe both the role professors have in the teaching of gifted children and the identification of the predominant factors in the superior intelligence centers that promote the development of teaching leaders as well as the possible benefits that the encouragement of educational leadership in educative centers would bring to the institutions, students and professors.

Research question:
What is the role of the professor as leader in the teaching of gifted children applying an enrichment program?
Secondary questions:
What does a leading professor do in a gifted children’s center?
What aspects of the culture of the centers of superior intelligence encourage the development of leading professors?
What main benefits would bring to students, educative center and professors the fact that professors assume a leadership role in the education of gifted children by using innovative teaching method?

Methodology
The project was conducted over a 7 months period applying interviews, questionnaires and field observation to a population of 16 persons, integrated by 10 professors (5 of them officials and 5 assistants), one Director and 5 gifted children ages 6 to 12 (elementary school students), all members of the same Institution. The task performed by the 10 professors 25 was to implement the academic enrichment educative methodology.

In order not to interfere with the daily activities of the Center and its students, complete groups of gifted children were selected together with their teachers to be observed for seven months. Qualitative procedures (interviews and field work) with students and professors were conducted in parallel.

The investigation was performed at the Talent Attention Center (CEDAT) in its facilities located in Mexico City from September 2012 to March, 2013. Two techniques of the qualitative paradigm were used in this research project: field observation and interviews with their respective tools such as the guide for interviewing and the observer’s daily notations.

Qualitative tools were applied to the sample formed by 16 people; data obtained was gathered and analyzed. Each interview and field information was transcribed. Answers from the persons interviewed were organized in tables, depending on the groups (professors, students, Directors) and respective themes (leader’s impact, institutional factors that encourage leadership, among others). This information was checked against the findings observed in the field by the investigator. During this process general conclusions were obtained for each question which were used to form categories according to the main research question and the secondary three. Reliability and validity of the results obtained was assured through the triangulation method, consisting on the observation of a single event from different individual points of view including the investigator’s with his observation data (Osses, Sánchez & Marina, 2006).

Each question in this study was answered from 5 different perspectives (professor, assistant professor, managers, gifted children and the investigator) making sure to obtain a broader point of view about the objectives of the study by realizing an analysis of convergences, divergences and contradictions on the different data. Ethical standards were observed: authorization of the Institution to realize the project within its premises, permits from parents allowing their children to participate in the study and a letter of consent from the students interviewed.

Results
The data obtained from the interviews and field observation by the investigator under “The Professor’s role as Leader in the teaching of gifted children” category (Table 1) brought to attention the fact that official professors in their role as educational leaders are the ones who let the “Academic Enrichment Program” be applied to gifted children based on their innovative ability and the empathy generated on children which is essential to the Institution in the attention of gifted children.
### Table 1. Findings and impressions of the interviewer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Summary of findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role of the leading professor in the education of gifted children</strong></td>
<td>It was observed that the leading teacher functions as coordinator and guide for the gifted children groups looking for new ways to innovate and apply the Academic Enrichment Program. A relevant fact was that this professor functioned as motivator to his students and a close student-professor bond was observed and confirmed in the interviews with teachers and Directors. Additionally, it was found that the Assistant teachers, as professors in formation, followed indications from their Head professors and their main task was to act as a support in the discipline and teaching when the Head professor was not in the class room or was focused on attending one single student. The Assistant professors studied showed great desire to become future leaders and even some of them could find during the class session, together with the students, the solutions to problems in teaching and fulfill the needs of their educative program. These observations were verified in the interviews with the students who mentioned that their professors established a closer empathy that in their previous schools in addition to avoid boredom with monotonous educative activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Educational leadership roles and activities at the gifted center** | The investigator identified through the interviews and observation that the Head professors (leaders) performed several functions simultaneously in the teaching of gifted students such as:  
- Adapt the differentiated educative model of the "Academic Enrichment Program" to individual educative needs of gifted children based on innovative teaching techniques and the use of technology.  
- Generate new ideas to adapt the educational programs into every student group's needs.  
- Teach the students advanced subjects, make classes entertaining and listen to their problems with no judgments.  
- Supervise and teach gifted children in effective ways acting as "breeders" of new ideas and generate modifications to the "Academic Enrichment Program" based on their experiences with the group. |
| **Organizational culture that promotes teaching leadership** | The organizational culture identified in the gifted students Center considers the teaching leaders as elements to foster group identity. The Institution does not penalize them for being innovative; there is an atmosphere of competitiveness in which the professors have challenges to beat. A supporting frame to the leaders is identified through openness to the suggestions, rewards to motivation, intelligence and their own initiative. In turn, there is an incentive program for leaders, they are given more authority over a group than an average professor under the premise of working abiding by the institutional policies and applying the Enrichment Program. Changes or innovations proposed by the teachers are duly attended and evaluated yet under an administrative control of a Pedagogy Department that seldom interferes with their teaching functions. Teachers inform the Institution on the changes they want to make; their proposals are evaluated and finally approved or rejected. |
| **Impact and benefits of the educational leader in an educative Institution** | Educational leadership at the gifted students Institution under study brought up effects referred to by the persons interviewed and confirmed with field observation such as the international recognition by the World Council for Gifted and Talented Children in August 2013 referred as a sample of institutional success, placing this educative Center as a pioneer in intellectual giftedness. In turn, as part of the benefits identified there was an improvement of the organizational image and the performance of several graduate students applying to national and foreign universities. Other benefits of educational leadership were identified: increase on emotional stability and improvement in the behavior of gifted students that according to their professors is a proof of satisfaction and motivation on the part of the students. Likewise the so-called cases of exceptional success of students were found with those graduates from this teaching center attending University at an early age (10, 12 and 14 years old) who are the evidence of an educational success experienced in the Institution. |
These findings reinforce the statement by Hargreaves and Fink (2006) who mentioned that the professor in the area of superior intelligence has assumed a passive role in the education of students with special educational needs and therefore to be effective requires a change of mentality, to be different from the average professor. The fact that a professor teaches an academic enrichment program is an action that breaks the traditional educational model as it implies the creation of educational strategies and work in a totally different way from what professors are used to (Almaraz, 2010). In the current project it was observed that professors, in applying this program on gifted children, used innovative educational tools (computer programs, use of laptops, projection of videos directed to university levels) and assumed a leadership role.

In the category “Roles and functions of the Leading Teacher in a gifted children Center” it was observed both in the interviews and field work a constant in the activities conducted by the educational leaders in the Institution such as teaching and adapt the “Academic Enrichment Program”, to propose changes on the teaching methods, train other professors and motivate their students in an empathic way.
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The head and assistant professors reported some specific activities that characterize their educational work with these students. In the following excerpt from an interview hold with one of the teachers these activities are described:

“It is difficult to summarize what I do, but I can describe how we work. For instance, within my activities I have performed for five in this area is to supervise that the professors are well-qualified educators. While in my work as a teacher I prepare my classes with greater use of time and resources, we must remember that these students cannot tolerate downtime because they get bored in class. So we must try to erase any doubts about by classes with them. But above all we give students an opportunity to express their concerns and doubts of private or group form without allowing anyone make fun of them. It would be easier to educate students as cathedra but they do not believe everything they are told and question us very often. So I think that the classes with them are of much responsibility and require an accelerated learning pace for both students and us”.

In the following investigator field note they are described concisely the specific educational activities observed during classes:

“During classes there are used frequently psychological dynamics of motivation, once every two or three hours. In those they are continually mentioned the theme of group and national identity also remarking the union that should exist between students.

The professor widely uses presentations, videos and software. However it is observed that the predominant strategy in classroom is to discuss advanced scientific issues in relation to their age. For example the themes of astronomy and radiation taught to 6 years old children, themes in which students do not have depth knowledge so they listen carefully. In turn it is observed that both the teacher and the auxiliary one contribute to a strict control of the group endorsed by a discipline applied by the students themselves to those who during the explanation of a topic are distracted or even annoy others. But in turn the senior lecturer seeks to avoid staying away from their students, is noteworthy that he does not have a desk in classroom, and often walks among his group chairs.”

This finding coincides with Márquez Cabello y Martínez (2011) in the sense that the professor, to be able to teach gifted students with the “Academic Enrichment Program”, must make use of innovation and potential as a leader, stepping off the average activities realized by an average professor considering that his students are also different from the ones commonly observed in schools. The educational system is demanding, so much for the students as for the teacher, according to Morales (2008) this is mainly because the professor participates actively and does not follow a “manual” to the letter.

The director in the interview mentioned that teacher leaders “are coordinators of departments and simultaneously professors of gifted children groups. Though having a teaching assistant that supports them, they are responsible of implementing the Academic Enrichment program, and may modify it based on innovation.”

Even one of the assistant teachers interviewed identifies three activities that have been observed in the educational leaders, which are underlined as out of the ordinary: “They listen carefully to each of their students, guide the group as a whole but at the same time
adapting teaching to individual needs. And always in a process of error identification and assessment of academic or extracurricular problem affecting student performance."

In regard to the category of the "Organizational Culture that encourages educational leadership", according to the opinion of the interviewed and by the field observations, several institutional factors were identified at the gifted children Center that promote leadership in teachers. Among them is the administrative regulation of innovations (leadership is allowed but in a controlled environment), an incentive’s program for innovative and creative teachers, the presence of a Pedagogy department that acknowledges the professors’ proposals for improvements and a rather broad authority of leaders within their groups.

The following extract of the interview with the directive of the institutional describe this organizational model:

"There is a policy of incentives to leader teachers, to name a few, there is the rise in the institutional hierarchy. The innovative teacher who is acting as a leader is who gets a starting spot or even a management role as supervisor of a department or division. Because, when being in contact with students they are the ones who finally have enough information to propose changes based on school reality. For the administrative level it is important that their activities are reported and notified to the institutional Department of Pedagogy when they want to make a change".

Moreover, one of the five head teachers (identified anonymously) describes that this policy of changes is regulated while also considers personal and environmental factors that contribute in educational work:

"There is a certain freedom in management of groups, so that the ways and means of addressing children vary, mutate and evolve, as does the same group at the same speed or close to it. This gives us the possibility to adapt in a semi-individual way to the needs of our small groups. However we believe that other factors also contribute to this, such as freedom of action in the management of students, the type of population we face, the previous studies required in psychology, all in addition to monthly leadership skill updating courses".

This finding is relevant as it shows that leading professors can exist at schools, they just require an institutional environment that favors their existence. At average schools all the teaching strategies and the teacher’s training are based on the average and do not consider the possibility of having students with different capacities (Almeida & Oliveira, 2010).

This is accomplished under a strict control that makes the professors sacrifice their initiative to turn into passive followers of pre-established programs. These organizational factors, therefore, promote leadership in the studied Institution and could explain the phenomenon described by Candido (2010) who mentions the existence of teachers who have chosen educational jobs in the gifted children centers because, through the implementation of an emerging enrichment program, they envision the opportunity to grow to be leaders and find themselves free to express their cognitive abilities in benefit of a group of students with special educative needs.

In relation to the category "Impact of the Educational leader in the Institution", several positive effects were found described by the persons interviewed and field observations, such as: an improvement in the image of the Institution; the success of the educative programs as shown in the results attained by graduate students (as children attending University regardless of their young age) and the recognition of the Institution as leader in Latin America presented by the World Council for Gifted Children in August, 2013.

The following extract of the interview with a student of the institution describing their perception of their teacher shows this perception and effects produced by the leader teacher:

"My classes are funny and I consider them better than the ones of my previous school where I had no classes of my interest. Nowadays I do not get bored and I feel that the teacher understands me and listen to my problems".

While one of the leader teachers referred to a series of changes in gifted students, teachers and the institution of differentiated education analyzed considering them as a direct product of leadership:

"We have created in them (the students), a prosocial behavior with group consciousness far from mediocre thinking standards. Even more, they have learned from an early age to follow the rules of their authorities, but with the possibility of negotiating with them. With that, discipline is maintained in classrooms.

The staff in turn is able to solve the problems it faces, identifies areas of opportunity, applies solutions, generates suggestions that anticipate problems, hears solutions, and analyzes proposals, among other skills.

Finally, the CEDAT (the institution) has positioned itself as a pioneer in diagnosis and assessment of gifted children, and has also managed to achieve success at the educational level. As among our graduates we have some children who get admission to college (university) early, at 10, 12, 14 years old. Thus we can assert that the Academic Enrichment Program has been successfully implemented due to the beneficial effects of educational leadership."
It was found that the Head professor developed a task as a leader, overseeing the proper application of the educational programs using innovative teaching techniques (use of technology, computer systems, presentation of university or high school themes to children at elementary school levels, among others) and as responsible to maintain the psychological stability of the group to his charge. Additionally he should train the educational Assistant professor so that in the future the latter may become a leader and be responsible of a whole group as Head professor. The Assistant professor maintained the discipline in the group, mainly to keep the Head professor from being distracted by hyperactive children.

In the sphere of organizational culture factors that promote leadership several interesting aspects were found both for the institutional policy of incentives to educational leaders at the gifted students center (CEDAT) as for the regulations that allowed innovations and modifications on the educational programs under a pre-established order and a control by a special administrative department.

After analyzing the findings it can be affirmed that educational leadership can exist within an educative institution without causing an administrative disorder or the loss of objectivity on the academic programs as long as they are controlled by a special area, in the case of the studied center a Pedagogy department in charge of realizing monthly meetings to suggest innovations on the educative programs implemented, based on the results obtained by each group. The convenience of giving economic incentives to the professors that proposed more innovations and rendered better academic and emotional results with their students was highly appreciated. It was found that those who obtained high posts with greater responsibilities were the educational leaders who showed their skills in an efficient management of their gifted students groups.

Among the causes that inhibit educational leadership there were those related to the bureaucracy and stiffness of the educational system, which in an effort to avoid a loss of control on the education given to children fall into the extreme measure of punishing the teachers that take actions different from the average; and also Institutional, of losing control over its teachers by letting them exercise leadership.

However, not all of the inhibiting factors are the responsibility of an Institution or an organizational policy, there are others of a personal kind. Among them: the apathy in teachers and the culture of the Mexican with the “law of the least intellectual effort” that many professionals have comfortably adopted which causes that many teachers do not evolve into leaders by the simple fact that it is easier to repeat schemes already established. It was found that a strict
surveillance by the special units of the educative institution (CEDAT) did not let the professors waste time supervising the discipline of his students thereby letting them concentrate in teaching their classes and creating new educative strategies or innovations.

Finally, another aspect studied was the impact Educational Leadership produced in the educative institution that sponsored it, on the students and other professors. It was found that in motivating the existence of leading teachers, both professors and directives showed an increase in the learning process of their students, an improvement in the image of the Institution and especially on the successful educative preparation. It was pointed as an example of such a success the presence of students graduated from the Institution, who started their university studies at a very early age (10, 12 and 14 years old) or who obtained academic degrees at unusual ages, like earning a junior high certificate at 11 years old. The professors and Directive considered these achievements an example of the success of their educative programs and how the Educational Leadership Program has permitted to obtain students of excellence.

It must be noted that another finding was observed such as the perception the students held about their teachers and how they considered them being different from their previous professors. The students were satisfied with their classes and considered their teachers (the leaders) as persons who listened to them, understood their problems and were not dedicated just to teach in the classroom. These traits are not common on average schools teachers where the barrier student-professor prevails and produces an estrangement between both parts with an adverse effect on education (Robinson & Lloyd, 2008).

In this research, it was resolved the dilemma faced by professors of teaching in innovative ways but also to maintain an orderly structure of knowledge. We proved to be false the assumption that educational leadership technique use to disrupt the content of classes, making them less ordered and finally results in a loss of organizational control by the school. As described by Levay (2010), many teachers and educational institutions resist change and educational leadership by the belief that they will lead to a lack of adhered to a lack of adherence to established educational programs. So time will come when a school will not know if their students meet a standard level of knowledge because of the teachers freedom to adapt teaching to their particular group.

As we observed in the present article, educational leadership was not equivalent to a series of changes without supervision by school authorities. But was based on a relationship of control under which teachers were free to modify the content and teaching techniques that always follow a predetermined school plan. The latter, had the possibility of being modified by teachers together with the pedagogues in regular meetings. This is what was observed with the same pedagogical monitoring in the gifted school approached, in which teachers reported their plans to a Department of Pedagogy that compiled the changes made and regulated when and how teacher could take their own initiative in their classrooms. But also when the change was no longer acceptable because it altered the educational objectives of the institution based on the differentiated model. For example, during the months in which this study was conducted a denied proposal was to eliminate teaching art (painting) and theater classes in a group, to replace them with more hour of mathematics. But this disagrees with the scheme of differentiated education that promotes full development in gifted students not only in logical sciences but allowing exposure to scientific, artistic and sport facets without margining any of them (Weismann, 2006).

As previously discussed, a challenge faced by gifted student education is to avoid producing them that their classes turn bored and they lose motivation to study because of the use of teaching techniques designed for the average. Those mean strategies are unable to provide them with sufficient incentives and goals to achieve. Teacher leadership provided a solution in this field, by applying within differentiated education of gifted students a model of continuous innovation based on order and discipline, but in turn considering emotional empathy with students. The latter, referred by the students themselves, generated greater confidence in their teachers. Therefore showing easily their concerns and extracurricular factors that may be affecting their school performance.

Other professors could identify that Educational Leadership brought more competiveness, a better handling of groups and an exceptional capacity of the Institution to adapt their educative programs to the needs of its students. Mainly they referred to the fact that they could apply the “Academic Enrichment Program” satisfactorily on gifted children, a challenge that had been very complicated to overcome by the Institutions given the complexity and difficulty its application entailed. With all these results and valuable contributions obtained it can be concluded that the investigation accomplished the planned objectives and solved the questions formulated during the planning stages of the project.

**Recommendations for future lines of investigation**

There are several aspects still to analyze, among them the influence of students on the educational leader. It was observed that the organizational culture and the existence of students different from the media (the gifted ones) were a favorable factor to educational
leadership. Among the elements that promoted the development of educational leaders were: the fact that an educational program different from the media had to be applied (Academic Enrichment); the absence of “teaching guides” for the professors and the demand produced by the fact of counting on children with an intelligence superior to average. Can these factors be reproduced in educational centers for average students or they can only appear in the centers for gifted children?

These and other questions on the same theme could be laid aside for a future investigation that seizes these educational concerns. Future studies can be conducted not only in the center for gifted children where the Academic Enrichment Program would be applied but in average schools as well. It would be quite revolutionary to find a way to turn professors into leaders and have their students respond favorably before the innovations and new educational programs. The positive effect that the expression of educational leadership would cause, across all schools, could help solve some of the greatest problems of the national educational system.
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