

Enrichment Programs for the Gifted: Problems and Prospects

Khiemnick A. Bialen¹, Renz Jervy A. Book², Raponzel B. Manalo³, Mervyn A. Garingo⁴

College of Teacher Education, Western Mindanao State University¹²³⁴

Abstract

The emerging growth in the educational system in the Philippines covers the area of special education. Specifically, in addressing the diverse learning needs of the identified gifted learners in society. Enrichment programs are adopted by different educational institutions across all regions to supplement and cater to the advanced learning skills and innate talents of the learners in the Gifted and Talented Program. This study aimed to investigate the extent of the implementation and the problems and prospects of the enrichment programs for the gifted in the selected Sped Centers in the Division of Zamboanga City in special programs, strategies, and content areas. Respondents came from the six selected Public Elementary Special Education Centers with the Gifted Education Program in the Division of Zamboanga City. This study used the mixed-method triangulation design wherein the quantitative statistical results were directly compared and contrasted with qualitative findings to validate and expand the quantitative results of this research study. Moreover, the research statistical results were directly compared and contrasted with qualitative findings to validate the study and found out that the extent of implementing the enrichment programs for the gifted in special programs, strategies, and content areas is often implemented by the different Public Elementary Sped Centers in the Division of Zamboanga City and sometimes experienced the problems and prospects.

Keywords – Enrichment Programs, Enrichment in Special Programs, Enrichment Strategies, Enrichment in Content Areas

1. Introduction

The emerging phenomena in serving children with exceptional needs have gained widespread growth in the educational system with the advancement of the curricular offerings for the special education chances in different educational paradigms.

For many decades, the need to educate gifted children has been recognized in the country particularly, since national laws and policies support endeavors about giftedness, educational programs have been provided for gifted children since the late '60s as stated in the study by Gallardo (2012) cited by Villanueva on Giftedness in 2010. [1]

The special education services in our school system were implemented to save and transform the latent potentials of these learners into productivity. Given suitable educational and rehabilitation opportunities, exceptional children in the midst will approximate or attain their optimum development and emerge as useful, productive, contributing, law-abiding and well-adjusted citizens as mentioned in the study by (Gallardo 2012). [2]

With this, Conturno (2014), [3] validates that giftedness cannot be only seen in one aspect but rather in different aspects. That's the main reason why different programs are being implemented just to cater to their possessed gifts in their mental, physical, social, psychological, moral, spiritual, and other areas in the utilization for their good and in society. And for these, gifted and talented learners should be provided with opportunities that will enhance the ability that they are carrying.

The creation of enrichment programs for gifted and talented learners has been the true laboratory of educational institutions because they have presented ideal opportunities for testing

new ideas and experimenting with potential solutions to long-lasting educational problems as cited by (Renzulli and Reis 2012). [4] The study of Gallardo in 2012, stated that programs for high potential learners have been a fertile place for experimentation because such programs are not usually encumbered by prescribed curriculum guides or traditional methods of instruction. It was within the context of these programs that the thinking skills movement first took hold in American education, and the pioneering work of notable theorists such as Benjamin Bloom, Howard Gardner, and Robert Sternberg first gained the attention of the education community.

In the United States, a study conducted by the Commissioner of Education has its general findings indicated that few gifted students who have experienced special programs have shown remarkable improvements in self-understanding and the ability to relate to people as well as in improved academic and creative performance.

Subsequently, this was attested in the study of McCormack (2013), [5] on the effectiveness of an enrichment program for selected, highly gifted, and talented seventh-grade students revealing that several approaches were practiced to educate the gifted learners. They included acceleration, enrichment, special classes, ability grouping, summer programs, and counseling instructional programs.

In the Philippines, enrichment has been used to provide highly abled learners with a variety of learning situations, materials, and activities, and depth and breadth of learning experiences beyond the school's regular program (Gallardo 2012), [6]. It provides a learning environment that promotes individual intellectual opportunities and challenges.

Meanwhile, in the Division of Zamboanga City, different programs are being implemented in enhancing and strengthening the innate cognitive skills and talents of gifted and talented Zamboangueno learners.

Special Programs like the implementation of a Special Science Class Curriculum for both elementary and secondary schools which anchored in the vision and mission of the Department of Education in teaching gifted learners more advanced and rigid scientific instructions. Consequently, in the field of special talents, the Zamboanga City High School-Main has become the Regional Leader School offering programs like the School for the Arts (SPA), which covers different art fields designed to cultivate the learners' skills in music, visual arts, theater arts, media arts, creative writing, and dance. Through these programs, it maximizes the innate potential of gifted learners for both academic and non-academic paradigms as stated in the school's manual.

Moreover, the creation of the Programs for the Gifted (PG) in the Division of Zamboanga City started in Tetuan Central School Sped Center (TCSCS) which offered a Mentally Gifted (MG) Program that provided extensive and advanced academic instructions to the identified gifted learners. On July 04, 1999, the MG class was handled by a highly qualified teacher who was granted a free UP-DECS Integrated Scholarship Program on Non-Traditional/Innovative Approaches for Teachers of the Mentally Gifted at the University of the Philippines (UP) Diliman. Relatively, the Philippine Normal University (PNU) granted also a similar scholarship to another TCSSC faculty, who successfully received a Certificate Program in Special Education for Teachers of Gifted and Talented/Fast Learners last 2010. Later, the MG program was renamed to Gifted and Talented (GT) Program as specified by Howard Gardner in his Multiple Intelligence Theory.

To enhance the PG program, the observance of Chalk Free Day was implemented as an enrichment program in the Division of Zamboanga City in a Division Memorandum number 3 series of 2012. This was proposed by the former Division Sped Coordinator who is now the Chief, SGOD of Zamboanga City Schools Division, this was signed and approved by the former Schools Division Superintendent. It was scheduled every Friday of the week for intensive enrichment instructions and practice of Multiple Intelligences of the learners and to improve them holistically considering their unique intelligence.

On the other hand, Fisher (2001), [7] stated in her study in Gifted Education Press Quarterly that although enrichment programs are widely used as the major strategy for teaching gifted and talented students, the extent to which an enrichment program can be valuable to gifted

learners relies heavily on issues on how the teachers and school administrators implement and carries out the activities appropriate for them.

Enrichment Programs for Gifted Students

De Rosa (2011), [8] stressed that enrichment program is designed to provide challenging, thought-provoking activities for all gifted learners. The program works on many levels that offer various school-wide activities, enrichment projects, and pull-out programs for students who can meet certain criteria. It has the goal of enriching children's creativity with a wide variety of crafts, puzzles, games, and outdoor activities that will help extend any learning. The programs are used to expand and deepen student learning. They are often interactive and are an authentic representation of the learners' ability. De Rosa stated that the program enhances a student's educational experience by bringing new concepts to light or by employing old concepts in new ways and is fun for the student while engaging in real-world experiences and applications.

Similarly, Loveless (2012), [9] added that extra-curricular activities such as sports, chess, music, creative writing, reading, foreign language, or art provide additional intellectual challenges and developmental opportunities outside of the classroom for gifted children are some of the enrichment programs that may help gifted students further enhance their gifted skills.

Davis and Rimm (2014), [10] likewise cited that among the enrichment programs, subject acceleration allows gifted students to reach more depth in a particular content area. Simple instances of differentiation such as the preceding are what gifted students need throughout the day in their gifted content area, not just during the time they spend in the pull-out program.

In addition, the program has modified content with more depth or breadth than generally provided or that has a modified process to develop a students' higher intellectual thinking; thus, providing identified gifted learners with high-level activities and providing them opportunities for creative production (Schiever & Maker, 2010). Enrichment provides richer and more varied content through modification and supplementation of content in addition to standard content in the regular classroom (Schiever & Maker, 2011), [11]

Subsequently, in the study of Heng Swee Keat in 2012 for World Press Singapore, he revealed that many enrichment programs may not prepare students adequately for future challenges. They may be rushing and pushing the students too much to acquire knowledge in academic areas and produce work that is beyond their age or ability. This sort of education may not encourage them to take the risk, make mistakes, and experience failure, thus depriving them of the opportunity to grow, develop and learn. Thus, instead of enrichment program teachers, the parents should spend more time with their child better and know what their child is lacking in aspects apart from academics. The parents may be better able to imbibe them with positive values to guide them in making the right choices and judgment.

Furthermore, some enrichment programs may not be able to cultivate a love for learning in students. They may have a potential clinical classroom setting, resulting in fewer opportunities for exploration and discovery. This may impede the development of their creativity, imagination, curiosity, and sense of wonder, ultimately dousing their love for learning. Instead, parents could bring their children to experience outdoor activities. These activities may encourage students to share more of their feelings, impressions, and experiences encouraging them to be more aware and mindful of their surroundings. The knowledge construction process through such experiential exercises is more relaxing and enjoyable, hence these activities may be able to better cultivate a lifelong love for learning in gifted learners compared to enrichment programs implemented. This agrees with the idea of Loveless (2012) where learning outside the classroom gives a vital self-learning fulfillment to gifted learners.

In addition, Kim (2006), [12] also stressed that educating the gifted can create certain difficulties for schools, particularly regarding how gifted children can best be served. Educating the gifted has begun to pose more of a problem for schools since the advent of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Since Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) demands that all students make progress toward

improvement, those who are very far behind the norm may receive the largest share of academic attention, while those who are already topping out and therefore make title or no AYP may receive far less. At the same time, the movement away from tracking has pushed for an inclusive classroom: one in which students of all abilities reside and must be educated, but this is sometimes to the detriment of certain groups.

Meanwhile, Yu, Kuo, Chen, and Chu (2020), [13] relatively cited challenges in the enrichment program for gifted who are economically disadvantaged gifted, and non-gifted. The gifted and the economically disadvantaged gifted were more satisfied and results show that the earlier the intervention programs were provided, the more positive effects of the intervention program were. It seems necessary to identify the gifted and economically disadvantaged gifted as early as possible to maximize the program effects for enhancing their aspiration and benefits from the program.

Dunn (2011), likewise disclosed that enrichment programs are meant for students who quickly understand class content and, as a result, feel bored at school which agrees with the statement cited in the study of Heng Swee Keat (2012), [14]. These students often need more advanced material to feel excited about and engaged with learning. Characteristics of a student who would benefit from an enrichment program; has a hard time maintaining attention, takes less time to understand concepts than the rest of the class, seems restless during lessons, reads ahead, doesn't seem excited about school, and routinely achieves high grades.

However, Matheis (2011), [15] emphasized that enrichment programs help students understand why they are offered resources to become more engaged during class while helping improve their confidence to be able to see their true potential. Enrichment programs must have adequate time to be able to cater to the needs of the identified gifted learners that teach them proper study skills, including time management and test preparation. Moreover, fast-pacing of the learning contents must be done regularly with the use of proper assessment to better serve their learning needs.

This agrees with the study of Gallardo (2012), [16] that enrichment programs provide opportunities for students to pursue learning in their areas of interest and strengths. This, keeps advanced students engaged and supports their accelerated academic needs. This is clearly emphasized in the study of Davis and Rimm (2014) which supports accelerated academic needs for gifted students to reach more depth in a particular content area.

Moreover, enrichment programs Echo Wu (2014), [17] stated that enrichment programs, such as extra-curricular activities, can provide gifted students with more advanced learning opportunities in different ways.

Subsequently, the study by Zoubi (2014), [18] reiterated that advocates of gifted programs stress that additional enrichment services are required for students with high mental abilities to reach their academic potential. They need educational services that satisfy their needs since they possess abilities that make them different from their peers.

In contrast, many gifted learners do not receive suitable services as one of the reoccurring problems in the program (Reis 2015). The objective of the educational programs is to enable them to become autonomous, creative, and productive learners in society (Diezmann & Watters, 2016). Some of the enrichment programs don't characterize several qualities of gifted learners, such as flexibility, so it can be altered now and then to suit their needs, to develop their physical, mental, and affective aspects, to develop leadership skills, and fails to provide gifted learners with educational experiences (Brigandi, Gilson, and Miller 2019), [19].

Enrichment programs for the gifted have to present educational contents that suit their capabilities and interests; it should also broaden their horizon, provide learning opportunities, and provide them with enough space to practice thinking about any project they may think about. (Diezmann & Watters, 2016), [20].

Consequently, enrichment programs must provide an educational environment rich with varied resources, enrichment, and enough time to explore and train on the skills of creativity and

research (Phillipson, Phillipson, & Eyre, 2016), [21]. The justification for the existence of the gifted enrichment program is that the regular programs are incapable of satisfying their needs; therefore, they need a special enrichment program. It is necessary to find a good quality of education by designing special enrichment programs to develop personal, cognitive, and social aspects. Teachers, on the other hand, must have adequate training to explore providing better and improved activities for gifted learners. (Phillipson, Phillipson, & Eyre, 2016), [22].

Enrichment Strategies for Gifted Students

Mihyeon (2011), [23] cited that differentiated instructions must be given to identified gifted learners that will address the complex needs of their high-ability students in the heterogeneous classroom. Offer the most difficult first, pre-test for volunteers, prepare to take it up, speak to student interests, enable gifted students to work together, and plan for tiered learning.

It provides enrichment opportunities, such as assessment opportunities for enrichment embedded in classroom instruction and with varied types of assessments for units of study and classroom summative evaluations. Assessment should be designed to include opportunities for students to exceed the standards for a unit of study by demonstrating a more in-depth understanding or application of the standard. Learners are allowed to assess their progress after each activity.

The study by Gallardo (2012), [24]. stated that enrichment strategies include: independent study where the student selects a topic of interest in any academic area where he shows strength. The student and teacher work out parameters for the process (how much time each day, where research will take place, what materials will be needed, what other persons will be involved, etc.) and product (how will the student demonstrate what was learned, will the product be shared, will it serve a real-life purpose, etc.) The independent study suits students who have task commitment and who tend to finish regular work quickly and correctly.

In addition, Gallardo (2012), [25] added that the study contract may be used by teachers to keep the gifted learner working alongside his/her peers most of the time while allowing him/her to make choices about what or how to learn.

Gallardo (2012), [26] added that the teacher may allow the student to complete a learning log or journals of his/her experiences to show what he/she has learned and how it connects to classroom outcomes. This may free up time for the student to pursue other interests during the school day or provide evidence of learning for his/her to move on to the next unit or level in a particular subject.

As cited by Mihyeon (2011), [27] teachers handling gifted learners need to create an interest center where students with intense interest areas may be willing to share their knowledge with their peers through an interest center in the classroom or school. The student can use earned time during the school day or create the center as a result of independent study. Others would be invited to use materials collected and/or created by the student to learn about a special topic that can be embedded in or tangential to the curriculum.

Mihyeon (2011) added that tiered assignments as one of the strategies in teaching gifted learners may work well in skill areas where the student has not yet met the outcomes but can do so easily and requires additional challenge. For example, in math class, the student may be performing similar operations as his peers but using more challenging numbers or completing more steps. In language arts, the student may read more challenging texts, write in a more sophisticated genre, or use more complex words in word study. Specialized grading criteria where some students are ready for a greater challenge even when completing similar assignments. For example, when assigning a piece of writing, a teacher may only be looking for ideas, organization, and correctness from the class, but a gifted student may also be assessed on voice or word choice. Likewise, the parameters of the assignment may be changed to suit the student's strengths. A science experiment may become a video or PowerPoint presentation; a social studies essay may require three sources from the class and more than five from the gifted student.

In the study by Gallardo (2012), [28] cited that extension activities must be given to the identified gifted learners wherein many textbooks and other learning materials and teachers' guides provide follow-up or extension activities as time allows. When gifted students finish early, these may be suitable ways for them to get the challenge and depth of understanding they require. Open-ended, real-world problems are excellent ways to extend students' learning.

In addition, Gallardo (2012), [29] emphasized that enrichment clusters of gifted learners must be executed in the school for learners with similar interests and aptitudes. They may be brought together for a set period time each week to pursue a topic of study under the guidance of a teacher or mentor. The topic may change frequently or develop into a long-term exploration, but it should be open-ended and have real-world application. Enrichment clusters may be worked into the schedule of a committed teacher as contact time.

Enrichment by Content Area

Brown (2017), [30] stated in his blog on *Serving Gifted Students in General Education Classrooms* that a gifted learner is expected to be gifted in every content or subject area. Thus, emerging research and new definitions of giftedness speak to gifted learners having an area or domain of high ability that generally is not across all areas. For example, even though a student is a gifted reader, he might not be a good writer -- reading and writing are different skill sets. Just because a student is highly precocious in math does not mean that he/she will be just as high in science.

There is a need of figuring out in what areas students are gifted. It can acquire this information through formal and informal assessments that will help educators provide extension, enrichment, acceleration, and complexity in that student's specific area of strength. This may mean a different lesson plan or finding additional resources related to an area of study. Educators could collaborate with the technology specialist, explore related arts, or work with other teachers to find appropriate extensions. Often this can mean linking the assignment to the student's area of interest or giving them authentic problems.

In addition, an article by Oak Crest Academy (2017), [31] stated that enrichment programs can include a combination of subject areas like reading, writing, art, drama, or other creative skills. These programs reflect real-life experiences where multiple disciplines come together to form complex situations needing different perspectives.

In a nutshell, this research study primarily used and cited the study of Gallardo (2012) specifically discussed enrichment programs for the gifted, strategies, and content areas. It also discussed the emerging challenges and opportunities of the identified gifted learners along with the implementers of the program (teachers and administrators).

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to investigate the problems and prospects in the implementation of the enrichment programs for the gifted in the selected Public Elementary Sped Centers in the Division of Zamboanga City.

This study also sought to find the extent of the implementation in the Enrichment Programs for the Gifted in terms of the Enrichment in Special Programs, Enrichment Strategies, and Enrichment in the Content Areas.

Lastly, it sought to find the significant relationship and significant difference in the Programs for the Gifted and the Problems and Prospects when data are grouped in terms of the Enrichment in Special Programs, Enrichment Strategies, and Enrichment in the Content Areas.

Methods

This study used the research and development or R and D methodology which consists of identified enrichment in special programs, enrichment strategies, and enrichment in content areas

for the gifted learners with the problems and prospects. These statements are subject to content validation. The revised statements were pilot tested in Catalina Vda. De Jalon Memorial Elementary School.

The researcher made an intensive reading on the enrichment programs, which focused on the strategies and content areas and marked some red flags that occurred in the implementation of the Chalk Free day specifically for Gifted Classes in the Division of Zamboanga City.

In the development of the statements, the researcher took into account the involvement of the school principals in the identified Sped Centers included in the study and identified grade level taught by the teachers. Thus, the school principals and teachers are the primary respondents, and some identified gifted learners are considered secondary respondents of the study. The statements were subjected to content validation by experts in special education particularly in the Gifted and Talented program. An evaluated checklist was utilized for this purpose. The result of the evaluation determined the validity of the enrichment in special programs, enrichment strategies, and enrichment in content areas along with its problems and prospects. The comments and suggestions of the evaluators were incorporated to improve the statements in the checklists. To determine the usefulness of the statements, these were tried at one of the identified special education centers in the Division of Zamboanga City, the Catalina Vda. De Jalon Memorial Elementary School where teachers were handling the Programs for the Gifted.

With this, this research study used a Triangulation Design to bring together the differing strengths and non-overlapping weaknesses of the quantitative method with those of the qualitative method. This method directly compared and contrasted the quantitative statistical results with qualitative findings or validate or expand quantitative results with qualitative data. The Triangulation Design is a one-phase design in which researchers implement the quantitative and qualitative methods during the same time frame and with equal weight. The single-phase timing of this design was the reason it has also been referred to as the “concurrent triangulation design” (Creswell, Plano Clark, et al.,2012).

Total enumeration sampling method where the researcher chose to examine the entire population that has a particular set of characteristics where teachers handling gifted and talented learners were part of the study.

A normative survey instrument through a validation questionnaire checklist was utilized to determine the content validity of the statements. The framing of questions was stipulated in the planning stage of this research study. The researcher made an intensive reading on the enrichment programs, strategies, and content areas and marked some red flags that occurred in the implementation of the Chalk Free Day which was considered to be one of the existing enrichment programs specifically made for the Gifted Classes in the Division of Zamboanga City.

The research instrument was then validated by the validators and checked by the panel members. The validation checklist consisted of research questions 1, and 2 intended for the primary respondents (PG Teachers and School Heads) consists of Part I-Extent of the Enrichment Programs for the gifted in terms of Enrichment in Special Programs, Enrichment Strategies, and Enrichment in Content Areas, and Part II-Problems and Prospects in Enrichment in Special Program, Enrichment Strategies, and Enrichment in Content Areas.

A qualitative research instrument through an interview was used to validate the quantitative results for questions number 1 and 2. The interview was intended for the secondary respondents which are the 6 to 8 identified PG pupils. It was done much like conversations but with no pre-determined response categories where the respondent can just answer in his or her own words. The interview questions were also contextualized in a manner that the secondary respondents can elaborate his/her ideas and can give appropriate responses. The secondary respondents justified possible outcomes of the quantitative results provided by the primary respondents of the study.

Validity and Reliability of the Research Instrument

There were two main validity procedures facilitated by the researcher, Quantitative and Qualitative research instruments (Mixed-Method) for triangulation.

For the quantitative research instrument, the researcher through the help of his adviser prepared a draft questionnaire checklist which was presented to the panel of experts and evaluated the validity and reliability of the research instrument. The panel was composed of a chairman and two members who know special education programs for the gifted.

After the research instrument was checked for validity and reliability, a dry-run was facilitated by the researcher to a group of teachers handling gifted learners from a non-sampled school which was Catalina Vda. De Jalon Memorial Elementary School. The final draft was rechecked by the panel of validators and the panel members. After the comprehensive checking of the research instrument. The gathering of data from the respondents of the study took place. For the qualitative research, the researcher facilitated the internal validity technique through the use of an Interview as a Triangulation strategy to ensure the validity of this study. The researcher used the methods of triangulation or the across-method (within-method triangulation) that provided richer findings.

Data Gathering Procedure

Data gathering was conducted after the approval of the research proposal and after acquiring ethics review clearance. A letter of permission was then submitted to the Schools Division Superintendent to seek approval to administer the questionnaire checklist to the identified respondents in the selected special education centers or schools for the gifted program in the Division of Zamboanga City.

Upon approval, the researcher paid a courtesy visit to the school heads of the selected special education centers or schools for the gifted program and presented the approved letter of permission to conduct the study in the special education for the gifted program considering the health protocol at this time of the pandemic.

After the gathering of data through a questionnaire checklist for the primary respondents, the researcher contacted the parents of the chosen secondary respondents. Send the approved informed consent by the Ethics committee through Facebook messenger. This was done courtesy of the IATF protocol due to the pandemic.

After the approval letter by the parents, a scheduled interview for the secondary respondents took place on a virtual Zoom platform.

Hence, the responses of the primary respondents were analyzed and interpreted quantitatively by the use of the SPSS tool, and the secondary respondents' interviews were transcribed.

Results

Table 1.1. Extent of Implementation in Enrichment in Special Program (Principals)

Statements ENRICHMENT PROGRAM The school.....	Weighted Mean	Degree of Implementation	Rank
1. Uses MI tools to identify gifted learners.	3.5033	Oftentimes	1
2. Utilizes chalk-free day for school activities and programs.	3.2072	Oftentimes	5
3. Provides outdoor activities for identified gifted learners.	3.3392	Oftentimes	3
4. Assesses activities after the Chalk-Free Day.	2.8943	Sometimes	9
5. Identifies the level of challenges to gifted learners.	3.0944	Sometimes	6
6. Initiates fast-pacing of learning contents for gifted students.	2.9444	Sometimes	8
7. Invites teachers with specialized skills to enrich gifted learners.	2.5722	Sometimes	10
8. Prorates enrichment activities in the teacher's program/schedule.	3.2582	Oftentimes	4
9. Allows gifted learners to participate academic and other extra-curricular activities.	3.4461	Oftentimes	2
10. Provides sufficient time to conduct activities to cater the needs of identified gifted learners.	3.0502	Sometimes	7
GROUP MEAN	3.1309	Oftentimes	
Indicators: 0.01-1.0-Never 1.1-2.0-Once 2.1-3.0-Sometimes 3.1-4.0-Oftentimes			

The extent of Enrichment in Special Program as gleaned in table 1.1 for school principals, they rated item number 1 “Uses MI tools to identify gifted learners.” ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.5033 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). This goes to show that the school used MI tools in the identification of the multiple intelligences of their clientele.

Item number 9, rated rank 2 that says, “Allows gifted learners to participate academic and other extra-curricular activities.,” with a weighted mean of 3.4461, interpreted as Oftentimes (O). Revealed that school principals allowed their PG learners to participate in both academic and extra-curricular activities. They rated rank 3 for item number 3, which says, “Provides outdoor activities for identified gifted learners.” with the weighted mean of 3.3392, interpreted as Oftentimes (O). Item number 8, ranked 4 by the school principals, says, “Prorates enrichment activities in the teacher’s program/schedule.,” with the weighted mean of 3.2582 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). Item number 2, ranked 5, says, “Utilizes Chalk-Free day for school activities and programs.,” with the weighted mean of 3.2072 interpreted as Oftentimes (O).

In contrast, items 5, 10, 6, 4, and 7 resulted in an interpretation of Sometimes (S) by the school principals with the weighted means of 3.0944, 3.0502, 2.9444, 2.8943, and 2.5722 respectively. These statements are, “Identifies the level of challenges to gifted learners, provides sufficient time to conduct activities to cater to the needs of identified gifted learners, initiates fast-pacing of learning-contents for gifted students, assesses activities after the Chalk-Free Day, and invites teachers with specialized skills to enrich gifted learners.” These revealed, that these statements or activities for the identified gifted learners were Sometimes (S) done during the implementation of the enrichment program in their schools.

The obtained group mean score of 3.1309 revealed that the extent of the implementation in the enrichment in a special program for the gifted is implemented Oftentimes (O) by the school as responded by the school principals in the identified Sped Centers in the Division of Zamboanga City.

Table 1.2. Extent of Implementation in Enrichment in Special Program (Teachers for the Gifted)

Statements ENRICHMENT PROGRAM	Weighted Mean	Degree of Implementation	Rank
The school.....			
1. Uses MI tools to identify gifted learners.	3.4333	Oftentimes	1
2. Utilizes chalk-Free day for school activities and programs.	3.1892	Oftentimes	5
3. Provides outdoor activities for identified gifted learners.	3.3081	Oftentimes	3
4. Assesses activities after the Chalk-Free Day.	2.8704	Sometimes	9
5. Identifies the level of challenges to gifted learners.	3.0741	Sometimes	6
6. Initiates fast-pacing of learning-contents for gifted students.	2.9259	Sometimes	8
7. Invites teachers with specialized skills to enrich gifted learners.	2.5926	Sometimes	10
8. Prorates enrichment activities in the teacher's program/schedule.	3.2096	Oftentimes	4
9. Allows gifted learners to participate academic and other extra-curricular activities.	3.4063	Oftentimes	2
10. Provides sufficient time to conduct activities to cater the needs of identified gifted learners.	3.0000	Sometimes	7
GROUP MEAN	3.1009	Oftentimes	
Indicators: 0.01-1.0-Never 1.1-2.0-Once 2.1-3.0-Sometimes			
3.1-4.0-Oftentimes			

The extent of Enrichment in the Special Program as gleaned in this table showed an overwhelming result parallel to the responses given by the school principals in table 1.2. For which, the teachers for the gifted also rated item number 1 “Uses MI tools to identify gifted learners.” ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.4333 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). This goes to show that teachers for the gifted used MI tools in the identification of the multiple intelligences of the identified gifted learners. Proved, that Sped Centers in the Division of Zamboanga City used the MI tool made by Howard Gardner.

Relatively, they also rated rank 2 for item number 9 which says, “Allows gifted learners to participate academic and other extra-curricular activities.,” with a weighted mean of 3.4063, interpreted as Oftentimes (O). This means that they let their identified gifted learners participate in academic and extra-curricular activities. The teacher respondents also rated rank 3 for item number 3, which says, “Provides outdoor activities for identified gifted learners.” with the weighted mean of 3.3081, interpreted as Oftentimes (O). Item number 8, also ranked 4 by the teacher respondents, says, “Prorates enrichment activities in the teacher’s program/schedule.,” with the weighted mean of 3.2096 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). Item number 2, also ranked 5 by the teacher respondents, says, “Utilizes Chalk-Free day for school activities and programs.,” with the weighted mean of 3.1892 interpreted as Oftentimes (O).

However, parallel to the responses of the school principals in table 1.1, items 5, 10, 6, 4, and 7 resulted in an interpretation of Sometimes (S) by the teacher respondents of the study with the weighted means of 3.0741, 3.0000, 2.9259, 2.8704 and 2.5926 respectively. These statements are, “Identifies the level of challenges to gifted learners, provides sufficient time to conduct activities to cater the to the needs of identified gifted learners, initiates fast-pacing of learning-contents for gifted students, assesses activities after the Chalk-Free Day, and invites teachers with specialized skills to enrich gifted learners.” This clearly shows that these activities were sometimes done in the implementation of the enrichment program in their educational institutions.

The obtained group mean of 3.1009 revealed that the extent of the implementation in the enrichment special programs for the gifted is implemented Oftentimes (O) by the teachers for the gifted in the identified Sped Centers in the Division of Zamboanga City with the end in view of confirming De Rosa (2011) idea on the enrichment program on many levels that offers various school-wide activities, enrichment projects, and programs to expand and deepen student learning, and enhances student’s educational experience to further enhance gifted skills of students.

On the other hand, the responses of the secondary respondents in the interview agreed with the statement that their school used MI tools to identify gifted learners. As transcribed, “before nag-conduct ng chalk-free day, pinapa-answer kame nila teacher ng parang checklist kung ano-ano ang mga hilig naming gawin o gustong gawin, icheck lang po namin sir.,” “Tapos kung saan madaming check, dun kame ilalagay na club, like sa Visual-Spatial group or sa Mathematical-Logical group.” These statements were commonly responded to by 8 out of 8 secondary respondents or 100% of them. These justified that before conducting the Chalk-Free Day activity scheduled every Friday of the school week in the different Sped Centers, the school used MI tools in identifying the multiple intelligences of the identified gifted learners.

In addition, 6 out of 8 pupils, or 75% of the secondary respondents stated in the interview that they are allowed by their school to participate in academic and other extra-curricular activities. As transcribed, “Parating may contest, Pinapasali kame since grade 3 until ngayon grade 6 na kame. “Mga quiz bee, Science Investigatory Project, journalism, DSPC, RSPC, sa Math din yung Math Olympiad parati sa Chong-Hua at yung China in the Classroom. “May mga camping din sir sa girl scout at sa boy scout madami talaga sir camping makamis nga sir”. “May grades din kapag magsali kame.”. These justified that the school allowed these identified gifted learners to participate and unleash their multiple intelligences in various academic and non-academic activities thus providing them the opportunity in outdoor activities across grade levels which ranked 2 and 3 respectively in the responses of the primary respondents in the quantitative table (1.1 and 1.2) of this research study.

5 out of 8 pupils or 62.50% of the secondary respondents justified in the interview with the common theme as transcribed, “Pagminsang hindi na kame binibigyan ng test sa mga clubs namin, activity lang tapos icheck ni teacher. “Wala ng short quiz or test na binibigay kasi may games na after.”. Proved that teachers don’t consistently assess activities after the conduct of Chalk-Free Day as manifested in the statements provided by the pupils for another activity like games for recreational activities will be executed right away. Hence, 100% of the secondary respondents or 8

out of 8 pupils commonly responded as transcribed, “Sometimes po nag-iinvite ng ibang teachers or yung mga visitor para turuan kame lalo na pag journalism or may school-based bsp or gsp camping. “Pero parati sila teacher lang ang nagtuturo sa amin.” These statements justify the result of the quantitative table of the primary respondents which ranked 10 that they sometimes invite teachers with specialized skills to enrich gifted learners.

The responses of the secondary respondents proved that the activities in the extent of the enrichment in the special program given Oftentimes (O) solely to the identified gifted learners vary in their multiple intelligences as anchored in the theory of Howard Gardner on MI approach which is one of the anchored theories of this research study.

Table 2.1. Extent of Implementation in Enrichment Strategies (Principals)

Statements ENRICHMENT STRATEGIES The school.....	Weighted Mean	Degree of Implementation	Rank
1. Aligns teacher-made activities to the needs of the identified gifted learners.	3.4502	Oftentimes	4
2. Uses appropriate cluster grouping.	3.6120	Oftentimes	2
3. Provides advanced learning materials to support their learning needs.	2.8888	Sometimes	9
4. Uses differentiated instruction.	3.8021	Oftentimes	1
5. Monitors teachers' self-made activities.	3.4481	Oftentimes	5
6. Gives self-assessment.	3.4212	Oftentimes	6
7. Allows learning experiences in a journal or anecdotal record.	1.9290	Once	10
8. Assesses learners' progress after the given activities.	3.2024	Oftentimes	7
9. Provides opportunity in selecting a topic of their interests.	3.5807	Oftentimes	3
10. Initiates enrichment clusters group.	2.9862	Sometimes	8
GROUP MEAN	3.2320	Oftentimes	

Indicators: 0.01-1.0-**Never** 1.1-2.0-**Once** 2.1-3.0-**Sometimes**
3.1-4.0-**Oftentimes**

The extent of Enrichment in Special Program as gleaned in table 2.1 for school principals, they rated item number 4 “Uses differentiated instruction.” ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.8021 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). This goes to show that the teachers in their school used differentiated instruction in teaching the identified gifted learners.

Item number 2, rated rank 2 that says, “Uses appropriate cluster grouping.,” with a weighted mean of 3.6120, interpreted as Oftentimes (O). This means that the school appropriately used cluster grouping. They rated rank 3 for item number 9, which says, “Provides opportunity in selecting a topic of their interests.” with the weighted mean of 3.5807, interpreted as Oftentimes (O). Item number 1, ranked 4 by the school principals, says, “Aligns teacher-made activities to the needs of the identified gifted learners.,” with the weighted mean of 3.4502 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). Item number 5, ranked 5, says, “Monitors teachers' self-made activities.,” with the weighted mean of 3.4481 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). Items number 6 and 8, ranked 6 and 7 by the respondents, say, “Gives self-assessment” and “Assesses learner's progress after the given activities.,” with the weighted mean of 3.4212 and 3.2024 respectively interpreted as Oftentimes (O).

However, items 10 and 3 resulted in an interpretation of Sometimes (S) by the school principals with the weighted means of 2.9862 and 2.8888 respectively. These statements are, “Initiates enrichment clusters group” and “Provides advanced learning materials to support their learning needs.” These manifested, that these activities were sometimes done in the implementation of the enrichment strategies in their schools.

Meanwhile, item number 7 ranked 10 which says, “Allows learning experiences in a journal or anecdotal record.,” with the weighted mean of 1.7593 interpreted as Once (O). This means, that this item is less implemented as an enrichment strategy given to the identified gifted learners.

The obtained group mean of 3.2320 revealed that the extent of the implementation of the enrichment strategies for the gifted is implemented Oftentimes (O) as revealed by the school principals in the identified Sped Centers in the Division of Zamboanga City.

Table 2.2. Extent of Implementation in Enrichment Strategies (Teachers for the Gifted)

Statements ENRICHMENT STRATEGIES The school.....	Weighted Mean	Degree of Implementation	Rank
1. Aligns teacher-made activities to the needs of the identified gifted learners.	3.3704	Oftentimes	5
2. Uses appropriate cluster grouping.	3.5926	Oftentimes	2.5
3. Provides advanced learning materials to support their learning needs.	2.6481	Sometimes	9
4. Uses differentiated instruction.	3.7222	Oftentimes	1
5. Monitors teachers' self-made activities.	3.1481	Oftentimes	6
6. Gives self-assessment	3.4815	Oftentimes	4
7. Allows learning experiences in a journal or anecdotal record.	1.7593	Once	10
8. Assesses learners' progress after the given activities.	3.0926	Oftentimes	7
9. Provides opportunity in selecting a topic of their interests.	3.5926	Oftentimes	2.5
10. Initiates enrichment clusters group.	2.6667	Sometimes	8
GROUP MEAN	3.1074	Oftentimes	

Indicators: 0.01-1.0-**Never** 1.1-2.0-**Once** 2.1-3.0-**Sometimes**
3.1-4.0-**Oftentimes**

The extent of Enrichment Strategies as gleaned in this table 2.2 showed an overwhelming result similar to the responses given by the school principals in table 2.1. Thus, the teacher respondents also rated item number 4 “Uses differentiated instruction.” ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.7222 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). This goes to show that the teachers for the gifted and talented used differentiated instruction incorporated in their classroom instructions. This testified in the study of Gallardo (2012) that differentiated instructions must be given to identified gifted learners that will address the complex needs of their high-ability learners.

Relatively, the respondents rated the same rank 2.5 for items number 3 and 9 which says, “Uses appropriate cluster grouping” and “Provides opportunity in selecting a topic of their interests.” The weighted means of 3.5926 and 3.5926 respectively, interpreted as Oftentimes (O). This means that teachers appropriately grouped their identified gifted learners in their class and allows them to select their activities that suit their interests. The respondents rated rank 4 for item number 6, which says, “Gives self-assessment.” with the weighted mean of 3.4815, interpreted as Oftentimes (O). Item number 1, ranked 5 by the respondents, that says, “Aligns teacher-made activities to the needs of the identified gifted learners.”, with the weighted mean of 3.3704 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). Items number 5 and 8, ranked 6 and 7 by the teachers, that says, “Monitors teachers' self-made activities” and “Assesses learner’s progress after the given activities.”, with the weighted mean of 3.1481 and 3.0926 respectively interpreted as Oftentimes (O).

However, items 10 and 3 resulted in an interpretation of Sometimes (S) by the teachers which are parallel to the responses revealed by the school principals in table 3.1. These statements are with the weighted means of 2.6667 and 2.6481 respectively, that says, “Initiates enrichment clusters group” and “Provides advanced learning materials to support their learning needs.” These manifested, that these activities were sometimes done in the implementation of the enrichment strategies in their schools.

Meanwhile, item number 7 ranked 10 by the teachers which say, “Allows learning experiences in a journal or anecdotal record.”, with the weighted mean of 1.7593 interpreted as Once (O). This result was also parallel to the revealed result of the school principals in table 3.1. It only means that this item is truly less implemented as an enrichment strategy.

On the other hand, the obtained group mean of 3.1074 revealed that the extent of the implementation in the enrichment strategies for the gifted is implemented Oftentimes (O) by the teachers similar to the results revealed by the school principals in the identified sped centers in the division of Zamboanga City.

The end confirms, that teachers for the gifted and talented learners consistently applied enrichment strategies to provide opportunities for students to pursue learning in their areas of interest and strengths. Thus, the study of Gallardo (2012) says that to keep advanced students they need to reach more depth in a particular complex needs of their ability. It also affirmed in the statement of Janine McAulay (2012) as stated in the study of Gallardo (2012) that enrichment strategies include independent study where the student selects a topic of interest in any area where

he/she shows strength. The teacher and student work out parameters for process and product. The independent study suits students who have task commitment and who tend to finish regular work quickly and correctly.

Meanwhile, the responses of the secondary respondents in the interview affirmed on statement number 1 in the quantitative table that their teachers used differentiated instruction in their lesson. As transcribed, “Kapag sa activity proper na ng lesson, si teacher parating nagbibigay ng activities. Iba-iba siya, iba sa Group 1 like gawa sila ng poem about the lesson, Group 2 they will be singing or Group 3 will be answering a worksheet.” These statements were commonly responded to by 5 out of 8 secondary respondents or 62.50% of them. This manifested, that the teachers were using differentiated instruction on their lesson as a helping-tool in their subject matter which agreed in the statement of Davis and Rimm (2014) that differentiation are what gifted students need throughout the day in their gifted area.

In addition, 7 out of 8 pupils or 87.50% of the secondary respondents stated in the interview that they were allowed to select their topic of interest or choose the activity that they want to do during the Chalk-Free Day activities, which affirmed in statement 9 ranked 2.5 in the quantitative table that “Provides opportunity in selecting a topic of their interests.” As transcribed, “Kapag Friday, pinanapili kame minsan nila teacher kung anong activity ang gusto naming gawin or gawin next week. “Maganda sir especially sa dance club, mga tiktok dances usually ginagawa; sinasayaw namin pero dati pa yun sir.. wala pang pandemic....masaya talaga.” These affirmed in the study of Gallardo (2012) which McAulay (2012) stated that enrichment strategies include the student selecting a topic of their interest in any area.

Hence, 100% of the secondary respondents or 8 out of 8 pupils commonly responded as transcribed, “After ng activity sa Chalk-free Day, hindi na nagpapasulat pa ng journal sir. Hindi na po.. Wala ng ganun po...More on ibang output lang po, pero hindi na magsulat at wala ding journal notebook dinadala pag Friday.” These statements justified the result of the quantitative table of the primary respondents which ranked 10 that they Once (O) “Allows learning experiences in a journal or anecdotal record.” This only proved, that the teachers don’t anymore let the identified learners do writing journals or such after the conduct of Chalk-free day activities. This simply contradicted the study of Gallardo (2012) as cited by Heng Swee Keat (2012), that students often need more advanced material such as writing activities for them to feel excited about and engaged with learning.

The responses of the secondary respondents proved that the activities in the extent of the enrichment strategies given oftentimes solely to the identified gifted learners affirmed in the study of Gallardo (2012) that enrichment strategies provided opportunities for students to pursue learning at their own pace or even in groups considering their interests and strengths.

Table 3.1. Extent of Implementation in Content Areas (School Principals)

Statements ENRICHMENT IN CONTENT AREAS The school.....	Weighted Mean	Degree of Implementation	Rank
1. Provides open-ended problem-solving tasks.	3.7424	Oftentimes	2
2. Provides low-level activities in different academic content areas.	2.3089	Sometimes	10
3. Uses various writing strategies.	2.9034	Sometimes	7
4. Prepares additional resources.	2.6123	Sometimes	9
5. Reflects real-life experiences.	3.5550	Oftentimes	5
6. Provide the appropriate learning materials across content areas.	3.6594	Oftentimes	4
7. Allows to choose their own activities.	2.5921	Sometimes	8
8. Contextualizes learning materials.	3.8020	Oftentimes	1
9. Provides additional reading materials.	3.4357	Oftentimes	6
10. Conceptualizes activities across content areas.	3.6830	Oftentimes	3
GROUP MEAN	3.2294	Oftentimes	
Indicators: 0.01-1.0-Never 1.1-2.0-Once 2.1-3.0-Sometimes 3.1-4.0-Oftentimes			

The extent of Enrichment in Content Areas as interpreted in this table 3.1, the school principals rated item number 8 “Contextualizes learning materials.” ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.8020 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). This goes to show that they used the contextualization of the learning materials to be given to the identified gifted learners.

In the same manner, they rated rank 2 for item number 1 which says, “Provides open-ended problem-solving tasks.”, with a weighted mean of 3.7424, interpreted as Oftentimes (O). The school principals rated rank 3, 4, 5, and 6 for items number 10, 6, 5, and 9 which says, “Conceptualizes activities across content areas, “Provide the appropriate learning materials across content areas, “Reflects real-life experiences” and “Prepares additional reading materials”, with the weighted means of 3.6830, 3.6594, 3.5550 and 3.4357 interpreted as Oftentimes (O) respectively.

However, items 3, 7, 4, and 2 resulted in an interpretation of Sometimes (S) with the weighted means of 2.9034, 2.5921, 2.6123, and 2.3089 respectively. These statements are, “Uses various writing strategies, “Allows to choose their own activities, “Prepares additional resources, and “Provides low-level activities in different academic content areas.” This clearly shows that these activities were sometimes implemented in the enrichment of content areas in their respective schools.

The obtained group mean of 3.2294 revealed that the extent of the implementation in the enrichment in content areas for the gifted is implemented Oftentimes (O) by the school principals in the identified Sped Centers in the Division of Zamboanga City.

Table 3.2. Extent of Implementation in Content Areas (Teachers for the Gifted)

Statements ENRICHMENT IN CONTENT AREAS The school.....	Weighted Mean	Degree of Implementation	Rank
1. Provides open-ended problem-solving tasks.	3.7037	Oftentimes	2
2. Provides low-level activities in different academic content areas.	2.2963	Sometimes	10
3. Uses various writing strategies.	2.7037	Sometimes	7
4. Prepares additional resources.	2.5370	Sometimes	9
5. Reflects real-life experiences.	3.5370	Oftentimes	5
6. Provide the appropriate learning materials across content areas.	3.6296	Oftentimes	4
7. Allows to choose their own activities.	2.5741	Sometimes	8
8. Contextualizes learning materials.	3.7220	Oftentimes	1
9. Provides additional reading materials.	3.2037	Oftentimes	6
10. Conceptualizes activities across content areas.	3.6481	Oftentimes	3
GROUP MEAN	3.1555	Oftentimes	
Indicators: 0.01-1.0-Never 1.1-2.0-Once 2.1-3.0-Sometimes 3.1-4.0-Oftentimes			

The extent of Enrichment in Content Areas as interpreted in this table 3.2 showed an overwhelming result parallel to the responses given by the school principals in table 4.1., the teachers also rated item number 8 “Contextualizes learning materials.” ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.7220 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). This goes to show that teachers for the gifted and talented used the contextualization of the learning materials to be given to the identified gifted learners.

In like manner, teachers also rated rank 2 for item number 1 which says, “Provides open-ended problem-solving tasks.”, with a weighted mean of 3.7037, interpreted as Oftentimes (O). They also rated rank 3, 4, 5, and 6 for items number 10, 6, 5, and 9 which say, “Conceptualizes activities across content areas, “Provide the appropriate learning materials across content areas, “Reflects real-life experiences” and “Prepares additional reading materials”, with the weighted means of 3.6481, 3.6296, 3.5370 and 3.2037 interpreted as Oftentimes (O) respectively.

However, items 3, 7, 4, and 2 resulted also in an interpretation of Sometimes (S) by the teacher respondents parallel to the revealed responses of the school principals. These statements are with the weighted means of 2.7037, 2.5741, 2.5370, and 2.2963 respectively. These statements are, “Uses various writing strategies, “Allows to choose their own activities, “Prepares additional resources, and “Provides low-level activities in different academic content areas.” These manifested, that these activities were sometimes implemented in the enrichment in content areas in their schools.

The obtained group mean of 3.1555 revealed that the extent of the implementation in the enrichment in content areas for the gifted is implemented Oftentimes (O) by the teachers in the identified Sped Centers in the Division of Zamboanga City with the end given confirming De Rosa

(2011) stated in the study of Gallardo (2012) that the content areas enhances a student's educational experience by bringing new concepts to light or by employing old concepts in new ways and are fun for the student while engaging in real-world experiences and applications.

Subsequently, the responses of the secondary respondents in the interview agreed with the statement that their teachers provided open-ended problem-solving tasks as stated in item 2 in the quantitative table, as transcribed, "Sa Mathematics sir parati talagang may problem-solving activity binibigay si Teacher (A)." "Parati ring may board work activity na ginagawa yung drill ba yun sir." "Si teacher (B) din sir sa Science parati may stimulus ginamit sa periodical test." These statements were commonly responded by 8 out of 8 secondary respondents or 100% of them. These affirmed that open-ended problem-solving were provided by the teachers to these identified gifted learners especially in Mathematics and Science content areas which are justified in the study of Gallardo (2012) as cited by Loveless (2012) that content areas help gifted learners further enhance problem-solving and reasoning skills.

Moreover, 7 out of 8 pupils or 87.50% of the secondary respondents justified in the interview with the common response as transcribed, "Mahihirap ang binibigay nila teacher na activities sir lalo na kapag sa individual output." "Kaya minsan..parating group activity para masagot namin ang activity lalo na sa Math at sa experiment sa Science." "Minsan lang magbigay ng madaling activity..karamihan average activities or difficult always lalo na kapag Grade 6 na." These proved that item number 2, ranked 10 in the quantitative table that teachers sometimes provided low-level activities in different content areas which signified those high-level activities were executed by the teachers to suit the learning needs of the identified gifted learners. This is simply affirmed in the study of Gallardo (2012) as cited by (Schiever & Maker, 2010) that teachers have to provide the identified gifted learners with high-level activities and provide them opportunities for creative production.

The responses of the secondary respondents proved that the activities in the extent of the enrichment in content areas were given Oftentimes (O) solely to the identified gifted learners it affirmed in the statement of De Rosa (2011) that gifted learners must be provided with higher-level contents or lessons to stimulate their intellectual capacity and interests.

Table 4. Over-All Group Mean of Responses on the Extent of Enrichment Programs for the Gifted

Enrichment	School Principals			Teachers for the Gifted		
	Group Mean	Resp.	Interp.	Group Mean	Resp.	Interp.
Enrichment in Special Programs	3.1309	0	Oftentimes	3.1009	0	Oftentimes
Enrichment Strategies	3.2320	0	Oftentimes	3.1074	0	Oftentimes
Enrichment in Content Areas	3.2294	0	Oftentimes	3.1555	0	Oftentimes
AGM	3.1974	0	Oftentimes	3.1197	0	Oftentimes

Indicators: 0.01-1.0-Never 1.1-2.0-Once 2.1-3.0-Sometimes
3.1-4.0-Oftentimes

As gleaned from this table 4, the Average Group Mean (AGM) of 3.1974 for school principals and the Average Group Mean (AGM) of 3.1197 for teachers for the gifted on the Extent of the Implementation in the Enrichment in Special Programs, Enrichment Strategies, and Enrichment in the Content Areas revealed as Oftentimes (O) implemented.

It is, therefore evident that teachers and school principals for the gifted program regularly use enrichment options to extend and deepen the learning opportunities within and outside of the school setting. This simply justified, the theories of the study (MI approach and Enrichment Triad Model) and agreed on the statements of different proponents and Sped educators stated in this study.

Thus, these enrichment options cover areas in special programs, strategies, and content areas.

Table 5.1. Problems and Prospects of Enrichment in Special Programs (School Principals)

Statements ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS	Weighted Mean	Degree of Responses	Rank
The school.....			
1. No tools available to identify gifted learners.	1.0650	Never	9
2. Chalk-Free day is not utilized for enrichment.	1.0486	Never	10
3. No outdoor activities for identified gifted learners are provided.	2.9232	Sometimes	5
4. No assessment conducted after the Chalk-Free Day.	3.5024	Oftentimes	2
5. Poor mechanism to determine the level of challenges.	2.9480	Sometimes	4
6. No Initiated fast-pacing of learning-contents for gifted students.	3.3045	Oftentimes	3
7. No invitation of teachers with specialized skills to enrich gifted learners.	3.9520	Oftentimes	1
8. Poor scheduling on the Enrichment activities.	1.0920	Never	7
9. Limited participation of learners in the academic and other extra-curricular activities.	1.0720	Never	8
10. Insufficient time to conduct activities to cater the needs of identified gifted learners.	2.8420	Sometimes	6
GROUP MEAN	2.3749	Sometimes	

Indicators: 0.01-1.0-**Never** 1.1-2.0-**Once** 2.1-3.0-**Sometimes**
3.1-4.0-**Oftentimes**

The problems and prospects of the Enrichment in Special Program as gleaned in table 5.1, the school principals rated item number 7 “No invitation of teachers with specialized skills to enrich gifted learners.” ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.9520 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). This goes to show that this item is one of the problems that occurred.

In addition, item 4, ranked 2 with the weighted mean of 3.5024 that says, “No assessment conducted after the Chalk-Free Day.”, revealed as one of the problems also encountered as it is interpreted as Oftentimes (O) in the quantitative table.

Moreover, items 6, 5, 3, and 10 ranked 3, 4, 5, and 6 with weighted means of 3.3045, 2.9480, 2.9232, and 2.8420 says, “No Initiated fast-pacing of learning-contents for gifted students”, “Poor mechanism to determine the level of challenges”, “No outdoor activities for identified gifted learners are provided” and “Insufficient time to conduct activities to cater the needs of identified gifted learners.”, respectively. These statements were interpreted as Sometimes (S) which revealed by the school principals that these were also additional problems encountered by the school.

Subsequently, items 8, 9, 1, and 2 ranked 7, 8, 9, and 10 with weighted means of 1.0920, 1.0720, 1.0650, and 1.0370 that says, “Poor scheduling on the Enrichment activities”, “Limited participation of learners in the academic and other extra-curricular activities”, “No tools available to identify gifted learners.” and “Chalk-Free day is not utilized for enrichment.”, respectively. These statements were interpreted as Never (N) which revealed that these were the prospects encountered by the school as revealed by the responses of the school principals.

The obtained group mean of 2.3749 revealed that Sometimes (S) the school encountered problems and prospects in the implementation of the enrichment special programs in the identified Sped Centers in the Division of Zamboanga City.

Table 5.2. Problems and Prospects of Enrichment in Special Programs (Teachers for the Gifted)

Statements ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS	Weighted Mean	Degree of Responses	Rank
The school.....			
1. No tools available to identify gifted learners.	1.0556	Never	8.5
2. Chalk-Free day is not utilized for enrichment.	1.0370	Never	10
3. No outdoor activities for identified gifted learners are provided.	2.9074	Sometimes	5
4. No assessment conducted after the Chalk-Free Day.	3.1667	Oftentimes	2
5. Poor mechanism to determine the level of challenges.	2.9259	Sometimes	4
6. No Initiated fast-pacing of learning-contents for gifted students.	3.0185	Sometimes	3
7. No invitation of teachers with specialized skills to enrich gifted learners.	3.9259	Oftentimes	1
8. Poor scheduling on the Enrichment activities.	1.0741	Never	7
9. Limited participation of learners in the academic and other extra-curricular activities.	1.0556	Never	8.5
10. Insufficient time to conduct activities to cater the needs of identified gifted learners.	2.8148	Sometimes	6
GROUP MEAN	2.2981	Sometimes	

Indicators: 0.01-1.0-**Never** 1.1-2.0-**Once** 2.1-3.0-**Sometimes**
3.1-4.0-**Oftentimes**

The problems and prospects of the Enrichment in Special Program as gleaned in table 5.2 showed an overwhelming result parallel to the responses given by the school principals in table 6.1, the teacher respondents also rated item number 7 “No invitation of teachers with specialized skills to enrich gifted learners.” ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.9259 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). This goes to show that this item is one of the problems encountered by the respondents of the study which revealed in parallel in Table 2.1 and 2.2 statement 7 ranked 10 that the school sometimes invites teachers with specialized skills to enrich the gifted learners.

In addition, item 4, also ranked 2 that says, “No assessment conducted after the Chalk-Free Day.”, revealed as one of the problems encountered by the teachers as it interpreted as Oftentimes (O) in the quantitative table. This is in parallel in Tables 2.1 and 2.2, statement 4, ranked 9 that sometimes teachers assess activities after the Chalk-Free Day. This only proved, that teachers must assess the Chalk-Free Day.

Moreover, items 6, 5, 3, and 10 ranked 3, 4, 5, and 6 with weighted means of 3.0185, 2.9259, 2.9074, and 2.8148 that says, “No Initiated fast-pacing of learning-contents for gifted students, “Poor mechanism to determine the level of challenges”, “No outdoor activities for identified gifted learners are provided” and “Insufficient time to conduct activities to cater the needs of identified gifted learners.”, respectively. These statements were interpreted as Sometimes (S) which also revealed that these were also additional problems encountered by the teachers.

Subsequently, items 8, 1, 9, and 2 ranked 7, 8.5, and 10 with weighted means of 1.0741, 1.0556, 1.0556, and 1.0370 that says, “Poor scheduling on the Enrichment activities, “No tools available to identify gifted learners.”, “Limited participation of learners in the academic and other extra-curricular activities” and “Chalk-Free day is not utilized for enrichment.”, respectively. These statements were interpreted as Never (N) which revealed that these were the proven prospects encountered by the teacher respondents of the study. These were in parallel in the result found in Tables 2.1 and 2.2 in the quantitative table especially for items 1, 2, and 9 as interpreted in the result that the school used MI tools to identify gifted learners, utilized Chalk-Free Day for school activities, and programs and they allowed the gifted learners to participate in academic and other extra-curricular activities.

The obtained group mean of 2.2981 revealed that Sometimes (S) teachers do encounter problems and prospects in the implementation of the enrichment special programs in the identified Sped Centers in the Division of Zamboanga City.

On the other hand, the responses of the secondary respondents in the interview revealed in parallel on the result of Tables 2.1 and 2.2 ranked 10 in the quantitative table where 100% of the secondary respondents or 8 out of 8 pupils commonly responded as transcribed, “Sometimes po nag-iinvite ng ibang teachers or yung mga visitor para turuan kame lalo na pag journalism or may school-based BSP or GSP camping. “Pero parati sila teacher lang ang nagtuturo sa amin.”

Again, these statements justified the result of the quantitative table of the primary respondents which ranked 1 among the problems encountered by the primary respondents in Tables 6.1 and 6.2 interpreted that oftentimes there are no invitation of teachers with specialized skills to enrich gifted learners as revealed in this statement, “Pero parati sila teacher lang ang nagtuturo sa amin.”

In addition, the secondary respondents also revealed in the interview in parallel in Tables 2.1 and 2.2, item 4 ranked 9 that 5 out of 8 pupils or 62.50% of the secondary respondents justified in the interview with the common response as transcribed, “Pagminsang hindi na kame binibigyan ng test sa mga clubs namin, activity lang tapos tingnan ni teacher. “Wala ng short quiz or test na binibigay kasi may games na after.”. These shows that teachers don’t consistently assess activities after the conduct of Chalk-Free Day as manifested in the statements provided by the pupils for which Tables 6.1 and 6.2 affirmed in item 4 interpreted as oftentimes there are “No assessment conducted after the Chalk-Free Day”.

Hence, the responses made by the primary respondents were affirmed by the secondary respondents of the study. They revealed in the group weighted mean that Sometimes (S) there were

problems and prospects that happened during the implementation of the enrichment in a special program which was given solely to the identified gifted learners.

In a nutshell, the problems that were sometimes encountered by the respondents on enrichment in special programs: no invitation of teachers with specialized skills to enrich gifted learners, no assessment conducted after the Chalk-Free Day, no Initiated fast-pacing of learning contents for gifted students, a poor mechanism to determine the level of challenges, no outdoor activities for identified gifted learners are provided and insufficient time to conduct activities to cater the needs of identified gifted learners.

In addition, the prospects that were sometimes encountered by the respondents on enrichment in special programs: poor scheduling of the enrichment activities, no tools available to identify gifted learners, limited participation of learners in the academic and other extra-curricular activities, and the chalk-free day is not utilized for enrichment.

The revealed problems and prospects duly affect the extent of implementation in the enrichment in special programs. Thus, in the study of Gallardo (2012) cited by Dunn (2011), he disclosed that enrichment programs are meant for gifted learners who quickly understand class content and, as a result, if not catered properly with appropriate programs might feel bored at school.

They often need more advanced material like engaging them in advanced learning trained by experts like teachers or specialists so that they will have to feel excited about and engaged with learning as cited in the study of Heng Swee Keat (2012).

Table 6.1. Problems and Prospects in Enrichment Strategies (School Principals)

Statements ENRICHMENT STRATEGIES	Weighted Mean	Degree of Responses	Rank
The school.....			
1. Teacher-made activities are not aligned.	1.0947	Never	9
2. No appropriate cluster grouping.	1.8420	Once	8
3. No advanced learning materials to support their learning needs.	2.6721	Sometimes	3
4. Differentiated instruction is not utilized.	1.0588	Never	10
5. No monitoring of teachers-made activities.	1.9020	Once	7
6. No self-assessment is conducted.	2.3424	Sometimes	4
7. Learning experiences in a journal or anecdotal record is not provided.	3.4403	Oftentimes	1
8. No monitoring on learners' progress after the given activities.	2.2578	Sometimes	6
9. Limited opportunity in selecting a topic of their interests.	3.3444	Oftentimes	2
10. Lack of Initiated enrichment clusters group.	2.2878	Sometimes	5
GROUP MEAN	2.2242	Sometimes	
Indicators: 0.01-1.0- Never 1.1-2.0- Once 2.1-3.0- Sometimes 3.1-4.0- Oftentimes			

The problems and prospects of the Enrichment Strategies as revealed in table 6.1, the school principals rated item number 7 “Learning experiences in a journal or anecdotal record is not provided.” ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.4403 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). This goes to show that this item is one of the problems encountered by the school. Item number 9, ranked 2 with a weighted mean of 3.3444 revealed that the school oftentimes gives a limited opportunity to the identified gifted learners in selecting a topic of their interests which is seemingly in contrast to the result that appeared in table 3.1 and 3.2. However, this statement is considered to be one of the problems currently occurring in the implementation of the enrichment strategies that need to be addressed.

Moreover, items 3, 6, 10, 8, and 5 ranked 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 with weighted means of 2.6721, 2.3424, 2.2878, 2.2578, and 1.9020 that say, “No advanced learning materials to support their learning needs., “No self-assessment is conducted”, “No outdoor activities for identified gifted learners are provided”, “Lack of Initiated enrichment clusters group” and “No monitoring of teachers-made activities, respectively. These statements were interpreted as Sometimes (S) which revealed that these were also additional problems encountered by the school.

Item number 2, ranked 8 with the weighted average of 1.8420 interpreted as Once (O) that says, “No appropriate cluster grouping” revealed that it is one of the prospects in the enrichment strategies. This is in parallel with the result stipulated in tables 3.1 and 3.2 that they use appropriate

cluster grouping.

Subsequently, items 1 and 4 ranked 9, and 10 with a weighted means of 1.0947 and 1.0588 that say, “Teacher-made activities are not aligned” and “Differentiated instruction is not utilized.”, respectively. These statements were interpreted as Never (N) which revealed that these were also the prospects encountered by the school principals in the implementation of the enrichment strategies. These were in parallel with the result found in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 in the quantitative table, especially for items 1 and 4.

The obtained group mean of 2.2242 revealed that Sometimes (S) the school principals encountered problems and prospects in the implementation of the enrichment strategies in the identified Sped Centers in the Division of Zamboanga City

Table 6.2. Problems and Prospects in Enrichment Strategies (Teachers for the Gifted)

Statements ENRICHMENT STRATEGIES	Weighted Mean	Degree of Responses	Rank
The school.....			
1. Teacher-made activities are not aligned.	1.0741	Never	9
2. No appropriate cluster grouping.	1.7037	Once	8
3. No advanced learning materials to support their learning needs.	2.3519	Sometimes	3
4. Differentiated instruction is not utilized.	1.0370	Never	10
5. No monitoring of teachers-made activities.	2.1296	Sometimes	7
6. No self-assessment is conducted.	2.2963	Sometimes	4
7. Learning experiences in a journal or anecdotal record is not provided.	3.2407	Oftentimes	1
8. No monitoring on learners' progress after the given activities.	2.2037	Sometimes	6
9. Limited opportunity in selecting a topic of their interests.	3.1852	Oftentimes	2
10. Lack of Initiated enrichment clusters group.	2.2593	Sometimes	5
GROUP MEAN	2.1481	Sometimes	
Indicators: 0.01-1.0- Never 1.1-2.0- Once 2.1-3.0- Sometimes 3.1-4.0- Oftentimes			

The problems and prospects of the Enrichment Strategies as gleaned in table 6.2 showed an overwhelming result similar to the responses given by the school principals. The teachers rated also item number 7 “Learning experiences in a journal or anecdotal record is not provided.” ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.2407 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). This goes to show that this item is one of the problems encountered by the teachers which is revealed in parallel in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 statement 7 ranked 10 interpreted that the school Once (O) allows learning experiences in a journal or anecdotal records. Item number 9, also ranked 2 with a weighted mean of 3.1852 which revealed that some teachers oftentimes give a limited opportunity to the identified gifted learners in selecting a topic of their interests which is seemingly in contrast to the result that appeared in Tables 3.1 and 3.2. However, this statement is considered to be one of the problems currently occurring in the implementation of the enrichment strategies that need to be addressed.

Moreover, items 3, 6, 10, 8, and 5 ranked 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 with weighted means of 2.3519, 2.2963, 2.2593, 2.2037, and 2.1296 that says, “No advanced learning materials to support their learning needs., “No self-assessment is conducted”, “No outdoor activities for identified gifted learners are provided”, “Lack of Initiated enrichment clusters group” and “No monitoring of teachers-made activities, respectively. These statements were interpreted as Sometimes (S) which revealed that these were also additional problems encountered by the teachers.

Item number 2, ranked 8 with the weighted average of 1.7037 interpreted as Once (O) that says, “No appropriate cluster grouping” revealed that it is one of the prospects in the enrichment strategies. This is in parallel with the result stipulated in Tables 3.1 and 3.2, ranked 2.5 those teachers use appropriate cluster grouping.

Subsequently, items 1 and 4 ranked 9 and 10 with weighted means of 1.0741 and 1.0370 that says, “Teacher-made activities are not aligned” and “Differentiated instruction is not utilized.”, respectively. These statements were interpreted as Never (N) which revealed that these were also the prospects encountered by the teachers. These were in parallel in the result found in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 in the quantitative table especially for items 1 and 4 as interpreted in the result that the teachers align their activities to the needs of the identified gifted learners and used differentiated instruction.

The obtained group mean of 2.1481 revealed that Sometimes (S) the teachers encountered

problems and prospects in the implementation of the enrichment strategies in the identified Sped Centers in the Division of Zamboanga City.

On the other hand, the responses of the secondary respondents in the interview revealed in parallel on the result of Tables 2.1 and 2.2 ranked 10 in the quantitative table were 87.50% of the secondary respondents or 7 out of 8 pupils commonly responded as transcribed, “Hindi na kame sir pinapasulat ng journal about sa activity na binigay.” “Wala nang time siguro po.” “Sometimes siguro sir pag may ESP na subject pero hindi na kasi wala nang mga journal notebook.” Again, these statements justified the result of the quantitative table of the primary respondents which ranked 1 among the problems encountered by the primary respondents in Tables 7.1 and 7.2 interpreted that oftentimes learning experiences in a journal or anecdotal record is not provided.

In addition, the secondary respondents also revealed in the interview in parallel in Tables 7.1 and 7.2, item 3 ranked 3 that 5 out of 8 pupils or 62.50% of the secondary respondents justified in the interview with the common response as transcribed, “Hindi na po nagbibigay sila teacher sa amin ng mga materials or gadgets para sa mga needs namin o kapag may assignment na gagawin. Pero kapag may training kame sa mga contest sir like sa MTAP or sa Journalism pinapahiram kame ng learning materials at laptops nila Teacher (A) at Teacher (B).”. These affirmed in statement 3 that Sometimes (S) “No advanced learning materials to support their learning needs.”, which means that teachers don’t usually regularly do this instead of doing this if necessary, like on training for upcoming competitions as a supplementary tool for learning which revealed as one of the problems encountered in enrichment strategies.

Hence, the responses made by the primary respondents were affirmed by the secondary respondents of the study. They revealed that Sometimes (S) there were problems and prospects that happened during the implementation of the enrichment in strategies that were given solely to the identified gifted learners.

In summary, the problems were sometimes encountered by the respondents on enrichment strategies: learning experiences in a journal or anecdotal record are not provided, limited opportunity in selecting a topic of their interests, no advanced learning materials to support their learning needs, and no self-assessment is conducted, no outdoor activities for identified gifted learners are provided, lack of Initiated enrichment clusters group and no monitoring of teachers-made activities.

In addition, the prospects were sometimes encountered by the respondents on enrichment strategies: no appropriate cluster grouping, teacher-made activities are not aligned and differentiated instruction is not utilized.

Thus, the study of (Rotigel & Fello, 2012) revealed that most of the available educational institutions do not satisfy the needs of the gifted learners, and what the teachers do in the class, changing and adapting to satisfy their needs is not enough; consequently, the enrichment strategies play a significant role in satisfying of the gifted learners’ need.

Table 7.1. Problems and Prospects in Enrichment in Content Areas (School Principals)

Statements ENRICHMENT IN CONTENT AREAS The school.....	Weighted Mean	Degree of Responses	Rank
1. Poor open-ended problem-solving tasks is provided.	1.0621	Never	10
2. Limited low-level activities in different academic content areas is given.	1.3022	Once	7
3. Limited writing strategies are employed.	2.6021	Sometimes	6
4. Limited learning resources.	3.2780	Oftentimes	3
5. Real-life experiences are not utilized.	1.0980	Never	8
6. No appropriate learning materials across content areas.	1.0833	Never	9
7. Lacks learners choose in the activities.	3.4020	Oftentimes	2
8. No contextualizes learning materials.	2.9222	Sometimes	4
9. Limited reading materials.	3.6250	Oftentimes	1
10. No conceptualizes limited activities across content areas.	2.7052	Sometimes	5
GROUP MEAN	2.3080	Sometimes	

Indicators: 0.01-1.0-**Never** 1.1-2.0-**Once** 2.1-3.0-**Sometimes**
3.1-4.0-**Oftentimes**

The problems and prospects of the Enrichment in Content Areas as shown in table 7.1, the school principals rated item number 9 “Limited reading materials.” ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.6250 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). It revealed that this item is one of the problems encountered by the school. Items 7 and 4, ranked 2 and 3 with weighted means of 3.4020 and 3.2780 respectively that says, “Lacks learners to choose in the activities” and “Limited learning resources”, revealed as additional problems encountered by the school with an interpretation of Oftentimes (O) in the quantitative table. This is in parallel in Tables 4.1 and 4.2, statements 7 and 4, ranked 8 and 9, that sometimes teachers “Allows to choose their activities” and “Prepares additional resources.”

Moreover, items 8, 10, and 3 ranked 4, 5, and 6 with weighted means of 2.9222, 2.7052, and 2.6021 that say, “No contextualizes learning materials, “No conceptualizes limited activities across content areas” and “Limited writing strategies are employed.”, respectively. These statements were interpreted as Sometimes (S) which revealed that these were also additional problems encountered by the school as responded to by the school principals.

In contrast, one of the prospects revealed in item 2, ranked 7, with the weighted mean of 1.3022 that says, “Limited low-level activities in different academic content areas are given”, interpreted as Once (O).

In addition, items 5, 6, and 1 ranked 8, 9, and 10 with weighted means of 1.0980, 1.0833, and 1.0621 that says, “Real-life experiences are not utilized.”, “No appropriate learning materials across content areas” and “Poor open-ended problem-solving tasks is provided.”, respectively. These statements were interpreted as Never (N) which revealed that these were additional prospects encountered by the school principals. These were in parallel in the result found in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 in the quantitative table especially for items 1, 5, and 6 with an interpretation of Oftentimes (O) in the result that these statements are utilized and being done in the extent of enrichment in content areas.

The obtained group mean of 2.3080 revealed that Sometimes (S) the school revealed by the school principals encountered problems and prospects in the implementation of the enrichment in content areas in the identified Sped Centers in the Division of Zamboanga City.

Table 7.2. Problems and Prospects in Enrichment in Content Areas (Teachers for the Gifted)

Statements ENRICHMENT IN CONTENT AREAS The school.....	Weighted Mean	Degree of Responses	Rank
1. Poor open-ended problem-solving tasks is provided.	1.0556	Never	10
2. Limited low-level activities in different academic content areas is given.	1.2778	Once	7
3. Limited writing strategies are employed.	2.5926	Sometimes	6
4. Limited learning resources.	3.2593	Oftentimes	3
5. Real-life experiences are not utilized.	1.0926	Never	8
6. No appropriate learning materials across content areas.	1.0741	Never	9
7. Lacks learners choose in the activities.	3.3333	Oftentimes	2
8. No contextualizes learning materials.	2.8519	Sometimes	4
9. Limited reading materials.	3.4259	Oftentimes	1
10. No conceptualizes limited activities across content areas.	2.6852	Sometimes	5
GROUP MEAN	2.2648	Sometimes	

Indicators: 0.01-1.0-**Never** 1.1-2.0-**Once** 2.1-3.0-**Sometimes**
3.1-4.0-**Oftentimes**

The problems and prospects of the Enrichment in Content Areas as shown in table 7.2 showed an overwhelming result similar to the responses given by the school principals. With this, the teacher respondents also rated item number 9 “Limited reading materials.” ranked 1 with a weighted mean of 3.4259 interpreted as Oftentimes (O). This goes to show that this item is one of the problems encountered by the teachers which revealed in parallel in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 statement 9 ranked 6 that the school oftentimes provides additional reading materials. However, this was justified in the statement of the 62.50% or 5 out of 8 secondary respondents, as transcribed, “Nagbibigay si teacher ng mga reading assignments or mga articles sir na babasahin especially sa Arpan, tapos sa Science kay Teacher (C).” “Pero mga reading materials like books sir wala..kasi

wala naman tayong book sa PG konti lang.” “Sa internet na lang po kame magbabasa o magsearch yun parati ang ginagawa.” These statements proved that the teachers oftentimes provide reading materials to the gifted learners to read through an online platform especially in the higher grades since the secondary respondents are in the intermediate level. However, reading materials like books were not provided due to a limited number of reading resources given to the PG program. This goes to show that even though teachers gave reading materials but it resulted in limited reading materials provided in terms of tangible reading resources which is occurred to be a problem in the implementation of enrichment in content areas.

In addition, items 7 and 4, ranked 2 and 3 that says, “Lacks learners to choose in the activities” and “Limited learning resources”, revealed additional problems encountered by the primary respondents as interpreted as Oftentimes (O) in the quantitative table. This is in parallel to Tables 4.1 and 4.2, statements 7 and 4, ranked 8 and 9, that sometimes teachers “Allows to choose their activities” and “Prepares additional resources.” This only shows that these problems won’t occur, teachers must give these learning opportunities oftentimes and not only sometimes for the gifted learners to address their learning needs and explore their innate skills and talents.

Moreover, items 8, 10, and 3 ranked 4, 5, and 6 with weighted means of 2.8519, 2.6852, and 2.5926 that says, “No contextualizes learning materials, “No conceptualizes limited activities across content areas” and “Limited writing strategies are employed.”, respectively. These statements were interpreted as Sometimes (S) which revealed that these were also additional problems encountered by the teachers.

In contrast, one of the prospects revealed in item 2, ranked 7, with the weighted mean of 1.2778 that says, “Limited low-level activities in different academic content areas is given”, interpreted as Once (O).

In addition, items 5, 6, and 1 ranked 8, 9, and 10 with weighted means of 1.0926, 1.0741, and 1.0556 that says, “Real-life experiences are not utilized.”, “No appropriate learning materials across content areas” and “Poor open-ended problem-solving tasks is provided.”, respectively. These statements were interpreted as Never (N) which revealed that these were additional prospects encountered by the teachers. These were in parallel in the result found in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 in the quantitative table especially for items 1, 5, and 6 with an interpretation of Oftentimes (O) in the result that these statements are utilized and being done to the extent of enrichment in content areas.

The obtained group mean of 2.2648 revealed that Sometimes (S) teachers encountered problems and prospects in the implementation of the enrichment in content areas in the identified Sped Centers in the Division of Zamboanga City.

Hence, the responses made by the primary respondents were affirmed by the secondary respondents of the study. They revealed that Sometimes (S) there were problems and prospects that happened during the implementation of the enrichment in content areas that were given solely to the identified gifted learners. The revealed problems and prospects duly affect the extent of implementation in the enrichment in content areas.

In a nutshell, the problems were sometimes encountered by the respondents on enrichment in content areas: limited reading materials, lacks of learners choose in the activities, limited learning resources, no contextualized learning materials, no conceptualized limited activities across content areas and limited writing strategies are employed.

In addition, the prospects were sometimes encountered by the respondents on enrichment strategies: limited low-level activities in different academic content areas are given, real-life experiences are not utilized, no appropriate learning materials across content areas, and poor open-ended problem-solving tasks are provided.

Table 8. Over-All Group Mean of Responses on the Problems and Prospects of Enrichment Programs

Enrichment	School Principals			Teachers for the Gifted		
	Group Mean	Resp.	Interp.	Group Mean	Resp.	Interp.
Enrichment in Special Programs	2.3749	S	Sometimes	2.2981	S	Sometimes
Enrichment Strategies	2.2242	S	Sometimes	2.1481	S	Sometimes
Enrichment in Content Areas	2.3080	S	Sometimes	2.2648	S	Sometimes
AGM	2.3023	S	Sometimes	2.2370	S	Sometimes

Indicators: 0.01-1.0-Never 1.1-2.0-Once 2.1-3.0-Sometimes
3.1-4.0-Oftentimes

As gleaned on this table, the Average Group Mean (AGM) of 2.3023 for school principals and the Average Group Mean (AGM) of 2.2370 for teachers for the gifted on the Extent of the Implementation in the Enrichment in Special Programs, Enrichment Strategies, and Enrichment in the Content Areas revealed as Sometimes (S). This revealed that teachers and school principals encountered problems and prospects in the implementation of the Programs for the gifted.

For the Enrichment in Special Programs, the following prospects revealed are: chalk-free day is not utilized for enrichment, no tools available to identify gifted learners, limited participation of learners in the academic and other extra-curricular activities, poor scheduling of the enrichment activities, and insufficient time to conduct activities to cater the needs of identified gifted learners

Meanwhile, for the Enrichment in Special Programs, the following problems revealed are: no invitation of teachers with specialized skills to enrich gifted students, no assessment conducted after the Chalk-free Day, no initiated fast-pacing of learning contents for gifted students, and no outdoor activities for identified gifted learners are provided

For the Enrichment Strategies, the following prospects revealed are: differentiated instruction is not utilized, teacher-made activities are not aligned and no appropriate cluster grouping.

Meanwhile, for the Enrichment Strategies, the following problems revealed are: learning experiences in a journal or anecdotal record is not provided, limited opportunity in selecting a topic of their interests, no advanced learning materials to support learning needs, no self-assessment is conducted, lack of initiated enrichment activities group, no monitoring on learners' progress after the given activities and no monitoring of teachers-made activities.

For the Enrichment in Content Areas, the following prospects revealed are: poor open-ended problem-solving tasks are provided, no appropriate learning materials across content areas, real-life experiences are not utilized and limited low-level activities in different academic content areas are given.

Meanwhile, for the Enrichment in Content Areas, the following problems revealed are: limited reading materials, lack of learners' choices in the activities, limited learning resources, no contextualized learning materials, no conceptualizes limited activities across content areas and limited writing strategies are employed.

Hence, the problems and prospects continuously shape the curriculum and instructional practices for the identified gifted learners of which the challenges and opportunities enabled them to realize the desired results of successful enrichment and continued progress in learning for gifted learners by utilizing enrichment options to extend and deepen learning opportunities within and outside of the school setting.

Problems and prospects are relatively entwining in areas of the enrichment programs, strategies, and content areas.

Table 9. Problems and Prospects and Extent of Enrichment in Special Programs

Pearson r		Correlations	
		Extent in Enrichment Program	Problems and Prospects in Enrichment Program
Extent in Enrichment Program	Pearson Correlation	1	.812**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.004
	N	10	10
Problems and Prospects in Enrichment Program	Pearson Correlation	.812**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	
	N	10	10

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As shown in Table 9, the Pearson r of (.812) with a significant value of (.004) between problems and prospects of enrichment in special program and extent of enrichment in the special program is greater than the correlation at alpha level 0.01 which revealed that the mean difference is Significant.

This implies that the problems and prospects of enrichment in a special program and the extent of enrichment program are related and show a strong relationship in shaping the curriculum and instructional practices of the school for their identified gifted learners.

Therefore, the Null Hypothesis of No Significant Relationship between problems and prospects of enrichment programs and the extent of enrichment programs is Rejected.

Table 10. Problems and Prospects and Extent of Enrichment Strategies

Pearson r		Correlations	
		Extent in Enrichment Program	Problems and Prospects in Enrichment Program
Extent in Enrichment Program	Pearson Correlation	1	.506**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.136
	N	10	10
Problems and Prospects in Enrichment Program	Pearson Correlation	.506**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.136	
	N	10	10

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The problems and prospects of enrichment strategies and extent of enrichment strategies as shown in Table 10, revealed the Pearson r value is .506 with a significant value of .136 is greater than alpha level 0.01 revealed that the mean difference is Significant.

This shows that the problems and prospects of enrichment strategies and the extent of enrichment strategies are still related and shows strong evidence in shaping the curriculum and instructional strategies used by the school for their identified gifted learners.

Therefore, the Null Hypothesis of No Significant Relationship between the Problems and Prospects of Enrichment Strategies and the Extent of the Enrichment Strategies advanced in this study is Rejected.

Table 11. Problems and Prospects and Extent of Enrichment in Content Areas

Pearson r		Correlations	
		Extent in Content Areas	Problems and Prospects in Content Areas
Extent in Content Areas	Pearson Correlation	1	.310
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.383
	N	10	10
Problems and Prospects in Content Areas	Pearson Correlation	.310	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.383	
	N	10	10

As gleaned in Table 11, the Pearson r value is .310 with a significant value of .383 is greater than the Pearson r at alpha level 0.01 revealing that the mean difference is Significant.

This shows that the problems and prospects of enrichment in content areas and the extent of enrichment in content areas are still related and gives a strong impact on shaping the curriculum and content areas of the school for their identified gifted learners.

Therefore, the Null Hypothesis advanced in this study of no significant relationship between the Problems and Prospects of Enrichment Content Areas and the Extent of Enrichment Content Areas is hereby Rejected.

Table 12. Programs for the Gifted and the Problems and Prospects According to Enrichment in Special Program

Enrichment in Special Program

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	5.000a	1	5.000	.545	.470
Intercept	46080.000	1	46080.000	5026.909	.000
Teachers-Principals	5.000	1	5.000	.545	.470
Error	165.000	18	9.167		
Total	46250.000	20			
Corrected Total	170.000	19			

a. R Squared = .029 (Adjusted R Squared = -.025)

As shown in this table, the F-value of .545 at the degree of freedom (df) 1 with a significant value of .470 is greater than the F-critical at alpha 0.05 level revealed that the mean difference is Significant.

It implies that there is a significant difference in the Programs for Gifted and the Problems and Prospects when data is grouped according to Enrichment in Special Program.

Therefore, the Null Hypothesis advanced in this study of no significant difference between Programs for Gifted and the Problems and Prospects according to Enrichment in Special Program is Rejected.

Table 13. Programs for Gifted and the Problems and Prospects According to Enrichment Strategies

Enrichment Strategies

Source	Type III Sum Of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	5.000a	1	5.000	.545	.470
Intercept	46080.000	1	46080.000	5026.909	.000
Teachers-Principals	5.000	1	5.000	.545	.470
Error	165.000	18	9.167		
Total	46250.000	20			
Corrected Total	170.000	19			

a. R Squared = .029 (Adjusted R Squared = -.025)

As revealed in Table 13, the F-value of .545 at df 1, with a significant value of .470 is greater than the F-critical at the alpha 0.05 level, which revealed that the mean difference is Significant.

It implies that there is a significant difference in the Programs for Gifted and the Problems and Prospects when data is grouped according to Enrichment Strategies.

Therefore, the Null Hypothesis advanced in this study of No Significant Difference between Programs for Gifted and the Problems and Prospects categorized according to Enrichment Strategies is therefore Rejected.

Table 15. Programs for Gifted and the Problems and Prospects According to Enrichment in Content Areas

Enrichment in Content Areas

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	5.000a	1	5.000	1.807	.196
Total	6088.000	72			
Corrected Total	54.800	71			

a. R Squared = .091 (Adjusted R Squared = .041)

As shown in this table, the F-value of 1.807 at df 1, with a significant value of .196 is greater than the F-critical at alpha 0.05 level, which revealed that the mean difference is Significant.

It implies that there is a significant difference in the Programs for Gifted and the Problems and Prospects when data is grouped according to Enrichment in Content Areas.

This can be deduced in the conceptual framework of the study that the school reform shapes the curriculum and instructional practices of teachers and therefore of their students, gifted and otherwise.

Therefore, the Null Hypothesis advanced in this study of No Significant Difference between Programs for Gifted and the Problems and Prospects in Enrichment in Content Areas is therefore Rejected.

CONCLUSION

The following conclusions are drawn:

1. The Extent of the Implementation in the Enrichment Programs for the Gifted in terms of Enrichment in Special Programs, Enrichment Strategies, and Enrichment in the Content Areas is oftentimes (O) implemented by the different Sped Centers in the Programs for the Gifted (PG) in the Division of Zamboanga City.
2. The Problems and Prospects of the Enrichment Programs in terms of Enrichment in Special Programs, Enrichment Strategies, and Enrichment in Content Areas were both considered and encountered by the primary and secondary respondents of the study taken as challenges and opportunities in implementing the Enrichment Programs for the Gifted (PG) in the Division of Zamboanga City as revealed by their sometimes (S) manifestation.
3. The Programs for the Gifted and the Problems and Prospects in the Enrichment Programs were dealt with a significant relationship in terms of concern and attention by the teachers and school principals.
4. The Programs for Gifted and the Problems and Prospects have a significant difference in the curriculum implementation for the Programs for the Gifted (PG).

REFERENCES

- [1] Gallardo, Ana Lorraine. (2012). Enrichment Activities for Gifted/Talented Kindergarten Pupils (Unpublished master's thesis), University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines. (pp.33-39)
- [2] Gallardo, Ana Lorraine. (2012). Enrichment Activities for Gifted/Talented Kindergarten Pupils (Unpublished master's thesis), University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines. (pp.33-39)
- [3] Conturno, Jr. Rosalio B. (2014). Competencies of Principals Towards Special Education Program Implementation in Identified Special Education Centers in Region IX (Unpublished doctorate dissertation), University of Makati, Makati City, Philippines. (pp. 27-31)
- [4] Joseph S. Renzulli and Sally M. Reis. (2012). A virtual learning application of the schoolwide enrichment model and high-end learning theory, Gifted Education International, Volume (28), pp. (3-6)
- [5] Brendan McCormack. (2013). A realist review of interventions and strategies to promote evidence-informed healthcare: a focus on change agency, Implementation Science, Volume (8), pp. (16-21)

- [6] Gallardo, Ana Lorraine. (2012). Enrichment Activities for Gifted/Talented Kindergarten Pupils (Unpublished master's thesis), University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines. (pp.40-44)
- [7] Maurice D. Fisher. (2001). Gifted Education Press Quarterly, ERIC Institute of Education Sciences, Volume (15), pp. (6-15)
- [8] De Rosa, A. (2002). Readington Township Schools K-3 Enrichment Program Whitehouse Station, N.J. 08889
- [9] Loveless, B. (2012). Forms of Gifted Education. Education Corner – Education – That Matters
- [10] Davis, G. and Rimm, S. (2004). Education of the Gifted and Talented, Fifth Edition. (pp. 534)
- [11] June Maker, Shirley W. Schiever. (2010). Curriculum Development and Teaching Strategies for Gifted Learners, (pp. 45-47)
- [12] Sally Kim. (2006). Australian Primary Mathematics Classroom, Meeting the Needs of Gifted Mathematics Students, (pp. 27-32)
- [13] Chien-Hong Yu, Ching-Chih Kuo, Yen-Wei Chen and Chien-Chi Chu. (2020). A retrospective Survey on Evaluating an Enrichment Program for Socio Economically Disadvantaged Gifted Student, Volume (36), pp. (172-174)
- [14] Heng Swee Keat, Minister For Education, At The 6th Teacher's Conference. (2012), Ministry of Education
- [15] Matheis, S. (2018). Threat or Challenge? Teacher Beliefs About Gifted Students and Their Relationship to Teacher Motivation. Journal Gifted and Talented International, (pp.34-39)
- [16] Gallardo, Ana Lorraine. (2012). Enrichment Activities for Gifted/Talented Kindergarten Pupils (Unpublished master's thesis), University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines. (pp.33-39)
- [17] Echo Wu. (2014). Enrichment and Acceleration: Best Practice for the Gifted and Talented, (pp. 2)
- [18] Dalal Al-Zoubi. (2014). Improving Teaching and Learning at Universities - The Use of Knowledge Management, International Journal of Advanced Corporate Learning. (pp. 35-37).
- [19] Carla B. Brigandi, Cindy M. Gilson, Myriah Miller. (2019). Professional Development and Differentiated Instruction in an Elementary School Pullout Program: A Gifted Education Case Study, (pp. 20-21)
- [20] Carmel Mary Diezmann and James J. Watters. (2016). An enrichment philosophy and strategy for empowering young gifted children to become autonomous learners, Gifted and Talented International, (pp. 3-7)
- [21] Shane N. Phillipson, Sivanes Phillipson, and Deborah M. Eyre. (2011), Being Gifted in Hong Kong: An Examination of the Region's Policy for Gifted Education, Gifted Child Quarterly. Volume (55), (pp. 235-239)
- [22] Shane N. Phillipson, Sivanes Phillipson, and Deborah M. Eyre. (2011), Being Gifted in Hong Kong: An Examination of the Region's Policy for Gifted Education, Gifted Child Quarterly. Volume (55), (pp. 235-239)
- [23] Mihyeon, K. (2016). A Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Enrichment Programs on Gifted Students, (pp. 3)
- [24] Gallardo, Ana Lorraine. (2012). Enrichment Activities for Gifted/Talented Kindergarten Pupils (Unpublished master's thesis), University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines. (pp.40-42)
- [25] Gallardo, Ana Lorraine. (2012). Enrichment Activities for Gifted/Talented Kindergarten Pupils (Unpublished master's thesis), University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines. (pp.44-45)

-
- [26] Gallardo, Ana Lorraine. (2012). Enrichment Activities for Gifted/Talented Kindergarten Pupils (Unpublished master's thesis), University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines. (pp.47-50)
- [27] Mihyeon, K. (2016). A Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Enrichment Programs on Gifted Students, (pp. 7)
- [28] Gallardo, Ana Lorraine. (2012). Enrichment Activities for Gifted/Talented Kindergarten Pupils (Unpublished master's thesis), University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines. (pp.47-50)
- [29] Gallardo, Ana Lorraine. (2012). Enrichment Activities for Gifted/Talented Kindergarten Pupils (Unpublished master's thesis), University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines. (pp.47-50)
- [30] Elissa F. Brown. (2017). Serving Gifted Students in General Ed Classroom, <https://www.nagc.org/blog/serving-gifted-students-general-ed-classrooms>
- [31] Oak Crest Academy (2017), Why Educational Programs for the Gifted Are So Important. <https://oakcrestacademy.org/why-educational-programs-important/>