

The Impact of the Picture-Based Activities in Improving the Reading Skills of the Grade 3 Learners in Claveria South District, Division of Masbate Province

Liezie O. Babasa¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026 Keywords: Picture-Based Activities Teacher-Rated Reading Skills Questionnaire Kendall Concordance Claveria South District	The study examined picture-based activities and teacher-rated reading skills in Claveria South District, Division of Masbate Province during School Year 2025–2026. A descriptive-evaluative-correlational design used a researcher-made questionnaire with 67 Grade 3 teachers. Weighted means and ranks described the indicators; Kendall's coefficient of concordance and corresponding chi-square tests assessed agreement at 0.05. The reported indicators of picture-based activity utilization were classified as Very Much Utilized, and those of reading-skill indicators as Very Much Evident. Significant agreement was reported for all five activity domains. For reading-skill indicators, significant agreement was reported for Phonics; Vocabulary Development; Fluency; Reading Comprehension. Phonemic Awareness did not show significant reported agreement. The findings identify local priorities for professional support and implementation review. They concern perceptions and rankings rather than independently verified improvement or causal effects. Incomplete measurement details and unresolved reporting issues constrain interpretation.

1. Introduction

Pictures can provide referents for vocabulary, support discussion of a story, and prompt learners to organize events or explain an interpretation. Their instructional contribution depends on the relationship between the visual information and the reading task. The study examined teachers' reported use of five picture-based activities and their ratings of Grade 3 learners' reading indicators. Its concern with impact is retained, while the reported evidence is interpreted according to the questionnaire design.

The activities were Look and Tell, Picture Story Sequencing, Picture Clues, Match Picture to Sentence, and Draw and Describe. The reading domains were phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary development, fluency, and reading comprehension. These are distinguishable concerns. Pictures may help a learner discuss meaning without demonstrating independent decoding, and accurate recognition of a pictured object does not by itself establish understanding of the accompanying print.

Takacs et al. (2015) reviewed technology-enhanced storybooks and distinguished the benefits and possible distractions of multimedia and interactive features. Their evidence concerns a different medium and population from the study, so it cannot establish the impact of the local picture-based activities. It nevertheless provides a useful reason to attend to the relevance of visual support, rather than assuming that adding pictures invariably improves reading. The practice guide by Foorman et al. (2016) separately addresses foundational reading instruction through Grade 3.

The study contributes a local profile of perceived practice and reading behaviors. It does not report a learner sample completing a before-and-after reading assessment, a control condition, reading-rate records, or an independently scored comprehension test. Consequently, the findings cannot isolate gains attributable to pictures. They can identify instructional questions and support priorities that merit more direct evaluation.

2. Purpose and research questions

The study addressed the extent of picture-based activity utilization across Look and Tell; Picture Story Sequencing; Picture Clues; Match Picture to Sentence; Draw and Describe; agreement on their indicator rankings; the extent of reading-skill indicators across Phonics; Phonemic Awareness; Vocabulary Development; Fluency; Reading Comprehension; agreement on those rankings; and policy recommendations based on the findings. The reported null hypotheses concerned the absence of significant rank agreement. The title and substantive focus are retained while the interpretation is limited to the analyses actually reported.

Examining extent and agreement together separates the magnitude of a rating from the ordering of its components. Respondents may rate every statement favorably while differing in which they prioritize. Conversely, concordant rankings can coexist with less favorable ratings. The study therefore treats descriptive profiles and inferential comparisons as complementary evidence, without using one as a substitute for the other.

3. Methods

3.1 Design and participants

The study used descriptive-evaluative-correlational methods in Claveria South District, Division of Masbate Province for School Year 2025–2026. The reported participant group comprised 67 Grade 3 teachers. The descriptive component assessed the listed practices and outcomes; the evaluative component concerned their rated extent. The reported inferential component assessed

agreement on indicator rankings. No separate participant-level correlation or regression between the two sets of domain scores was presented. Sampling procedures, the eligible population, recruitment, response rate, exact administration dates, and demographic distribution were not reported. References to respondent groups do not provide a documented allocation of the participant total. No subgroup counts are inferred. The findings concern the participating group and do not provide a probability-based estimate for a wider population. The respondents were teachers, while the outcome statements describe learners. No directly assessed learner count, baseline scores, individual assessment protocol, or learner matching was reported. The ratings are therefore treated as teachers' perceptions of learner behaviors rather than independent measures of attainment or change. No control condition or intervention assignment was described.

3.2 Instrument and operational definitions

The main instrument was a researcher-made questionnaire covering 10 domains. The reconstructed findings below preserve the listed indicator statements, mean values, and interpretation labels. Numerical rankings, overall means, and group-specific values have not been invented where they were not reported. The categories describe the study's operational measure rather than a standardized diagnostic or performance scale.

The complete response anchors, interpretation intervals, instrument-validation process, pilot sample, and reliability coefficients were not supplied. A favorable verbal classification is retained without reconstructing a five-point response scale from the observed means. The number of statements in a summary does not by itself establish the number administered. Any incomplete or repeated entries remain visible rather than being repaired through assumption.

3.3 Procedures and ethical reporting

Questionnaire distribution, administration mode, retrieval, missing-response handling, individual consent, confidentiality safeguards, ethics approval, and data-retention procedures were not specified. These steps are not presumed to have occurred. The study is reported through aggregate findings without adding personal information. Missing documentation is identified separately for author review before further inferential interpretation.

No new fieldwork or reconstruction of individual responses was undertaken. The reporting process preserves aggregate values and distinguishes them from proposed actions. Consequently, the manuscript cannot add standard errors, confidence intervals, missing-data estimates, or participant characteristics that were not provided. The limitations of the available evidence are part of the interpretation of the study, not evidence that an unreported procedure was performed incorrectly.

3.4 Statistical analysis

Weighted means, frequency counts, percentages, ranks, Kendall's coefficient of concordance, W, and corresponding chi-square tests were identified as analytical tools. Significance was set at 0.05. The test tables retain reported W values, chi-square values, probability inequalities, and decisions. Probability inequalities are not exact p values. No unreported probability or corrected calculation has been substituted.

Kendall concordance concerns similarity in the ordering of statements across ranking groups. It does not estimate an association between a practice score and an outcome score, and it does not establish a causal effect. A nonsignificant result means that the reported procedure did not establish significant agreement; it is not proof of no agreement, equivalent groups, or low skill. These distinctions are maintained throughout the results.

The full ranking matrices, degrees of freedom, treatment of ties, and unrounded calculations were not supplied. Three groups are mentioned in some research questions or result summaries, but group composition and counts are insufficiently documented. The inferential results are reproduced as reported and should be verified against the complete statistical output before further inferential interpretation.

The vocabulary list repeats the same unfamiliar-word picture-cue statement with means of 4.65 and 4.63. Both are retained. Some descriptive item counts do not correspond straightforwardly to the reported test pairs. Look and Tell is reported as significant although its $\chi^2 = 15.36$ requires checking against the actual degrees of freedom.

4. Results

4.1 Look and Tell

Table 1. Look and Tell

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher gives constructive feedback to learners during Look and Tell activities	4.97
The teacher uses pictures to encourage learners to observe and describe what they see	4.96
The teacher uses pictures that are appropriate to the learners' age and learning level	4.96
The teacher promotes active participation by allowing learners to share their observations about the pictures	4.96
The teacher uses picture-based activities to develop learners' vocabulary and speaking skills	4.95
The teacher presents clear and engaging pictures during the Look and Tell activity	4.95
The teacher encourages learners to express their ideas and opinions based on the pictures shown	4.94
The teacher asks guiding questions to help learners interpret the pictures	4.93
the teacher provides opportunities for learners to identify objects, people, and actions in the pictures	4.92

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Utilized. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 1 presents look and tell indicators. The displayed means range from 4.92 to 4.97. The reported classification is Very Much Utilized. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Constructive feedback was prominent, while identification of objects and actions was relatively lower. The activity therefore was described through facilitation as well as naming. Feedback can support elaboration, but oral description is not identical to reading printed words. The study did not separately assess whether learners could decode unfamiliar text without picture support.

4.2 Picture Story Sequencing

Table 2. Picture Story Sequencing

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher provides picture sequences that help learners arrange events in their proper order	4.95
The teacher facilitates discussions that help learners connect events presented in the pictures	4.94
The teacher uses age-appropriate and engaging picture sequences to support learning objectives	4.94
The teacher encourages learners to create and narrate stories based on the arranged pictures	4.93
The teacher provides feedback on learners' ability to sequence and interpret the story presented in the pictures	4.93
The teacher guides learners in identifying the beginning, middle, and ending of a story using pictures	4.93
The teacher encourages learners to explain the sequence of events shown in the pictures	4.93
The teacher uses picture story sequencing activities to develop learners' reading skills	4.92
the teacher allows learners to predict what happens next based on the picture sequence	4.86

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Utilized. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 2 presents picture story sequencing indicators. The displayed means range from 4.86 to 4.95. The reported classification is Very Much Utilized. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Providing ordered-event materials was rated above predicting what happens next. Sequencing supplied information and generating a justified prediction require different forms of reasoning. The profile supports including both in reading discussion. It does not show that correct picture ordering transferred to comprehension of an unfamiliar written passage.

4.3 Picture Clues

Table 3. Picture Clues

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher uses pictures as clues to help learners determine the meaning of words and concepts	4.93
The teacher encourages learners to use picture clues to understand the meaning of a text	4.93
The teacher uses picture clues to help learners make predictions about a story or text	4.93
The teacher encourages learners to connect picture clues with their prior knowledge and experiences	4.93
The teacher facilitates discussions that allow learners to explain the meanings they derived from picture clues	4.92
The teacher provides feedback on learners' interpretations and use of picture clues during learning activities	4.92
The teacher uses clear, relevant, and engaging pictures to strengthen learners' reading skills	4.91
The teacher provides picture clues that help learners answer comprehension questions	4.91
the teacher guides learners in making inferences based on the pictures presented	4.88

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Utilized. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 3 presents picture clues indicators. The displayed means range from 4.88 to 4.93. The reported classification is Very Much Utilized. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Meaning-making and prediction were more prominent than inference. Pictures may supply useful context, but a learner can identify a visual referent without resolving the linguistic demands of the text. The relatively lower inference statement suggests reviewing the connection between image evidence and written information. Independent comprehension was not tested.

4.4 Match Picture to Sentence

Table 4. Match Picture to Sentence

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher encourages learners to explain why a picture matches a particular sentence	4.95
The teacher provides feedback on learners' responses during picture-to-sentence matching activities	4.95
The teacher encourages learners to analyze pictures carefully before selecting the corresponding sentence	4.94
The teacher uses clear and relevant pictures that accurately represent the meaning of the sentences	4.93
The teacher varies the difficulty level of picture-to-sentence matching activities according to the learners' abilities	4.93
The teacher guides learners in identifying key details in pictures and sentences to make correct matches	4.92
The teacher uses match picture to sentence activities to enhance learners' vocabulary development	4.92
The teacher provides activities that require learners to match pictures with the correct sentences	4.92
the teacher uses picture-to-sentence matching activities to develop learners' reading skills	4.91

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Utilized. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 4 presents match picture to sentence indicators. The displayed means range from 4.91 to 4.95. The reported classification is Very Much Utilized. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently

tested differences between items.

Explaining and receiving feedback were rated prominently, while the broad statement about developing reading was relatively lower. This gives more detail about facilitation than a global activity label. Matching can involve understanding both pictures and sentences, but correct selection alone does not reveal the strategy used. Observation would be needed to distinguish reading from visual guessing.

4.5 Draw and Describe

Table 5. Draw and Describe

Indicator	Weighted mean
The teacher encourages learners to draw pictures based on their understanding of a topic, story, or concept	4.98
The teacher asks learners to describe their drawings using words, phrases, or complete sentences	4.96
The teacher uses Draw and Describe activities to develop learners' vocabulary skills	4.96
The teacher guides learners in including important details in their drawings before describing them	4.96
The teacher encourages learners to express their ideas and creativity through drawing and description activities	4.96
The teacher provides opportunities for learners to share and explain their drawings with the class	4.96
The teacher uses age-appropriate and engaging Draw and Describe activities to support learning objectives	4.95
The teacher uses Draw and Describe activities to enhance learners' communication skills	4.94
the teacher provides constructive feedback on learners' drawings and descriptions	4.94

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Utilized. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 5 presents draw and describe indicators. The displayed means range from 4.94 to 4.98. The reported classification is Very Much Utilized. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Drawing from understanding was prominent, with feedback relatively lower. Producing an image and explaining it offer different evidence about a learner's interpretation. The findings support connecting visual production with language and discussion rather than treating drawing completion as reading attainment. Neither the quality of drawings nor reading gains were independently scored.

Table 6. Reported concordance for picture-based activity utilization

Domain	W	χ^2	Reported p	Decision
Look and Tell	0.64	15.36	p<0.05	Rejected
Picture Story Sequencing	0.85	20.40	p<0.01	Rejected
Picture Clues	0.68	16.32	p<0.05	Rejected
Match Picture to Sentence	0.87	20.88	p<0.01	Rejected
Draw and Describe	0.71	17.04	p<0.05	Rejected

Note. All statistics and probability inequalities are retained as reported. Not rejected expresses a stated exception to rejection; it does not establish equivalence.

Table 6 reports significant agreement for all five activity domains. No domain was reported as nonsignificant. The test concerns indicator ordering. It does not determine which domain was most effective, establish the magnitude of improvement, or demonstrate an association between the two sets of constructs.

Comparisons of chi-square magnitudes require attention to the number of indicators and degrees of freedom; they are not a common scale of educational or organizational value. The practical interpretation is therefore to examine the content of the ratings alongside the reported agreement. Any unresolved calculation or transcription issue limits confidence in the inferential classification until the underlying output is checked.

4.6 Phonics

Table 7. Phonics

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learner distinguishes between similar sounds using picture cues	4.76
The learner blends letter sounds to read words represented by pictures	4.74
The learner correctly identifies the letter sounds presented in picture-based activities	4.73
The learner recognizes and pronounces phonemes associated with pictured objects	4.73
The learner accurately matches pictures with their corresponding beginning sounds	4.72
The learner applies phonics knowledge learned from picture-based activities when reading unfamiliar words	4.68
The learner shows increased engagement and participation in phonics lessons using picture-based activities	4.68
The learner reads picture-associated words with greater accuracy and confidence	4.67
the learner demonstrates improved decoding skills through picture-supported phonics exercises	4.66

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 7 presents phonics indicators. The displayed means range from 4.66 to 4.76. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items. The indicators combine picture-supported sound recognition, letter-sound connections, and decoding-related statements. These contents require careful distinction because identifying a picture or initial sound does not establish independent word reading. The favorable profile supports examining how visual assistance is withdrawn when appropriate. The study did not compare supported and unsupported decoding.

4.7 Phonemic Awareness

Table 8. Phonemic Awareness

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learner can blend individual sounds to form words represented by pictures	4.96
The learner can manipulate phonemes (add, delete, or substitute sounds) in words represented by pictures	4.95
The learner can identify the ending sounds of words associated with pictures	4.95
The learner can segment spoken words into individual sounds with the aid of picture-based activities	4.95
The learner can identify the beginning sounds of words using picture cues	4.95
The learner can recognize and distinguish similar and different sounds in words presented through pictures	4.95
The learner can match pictures with their corresponding initial phonemes	4.94
The learner can identify rhyming words through picture-supported exercises	4.94
the learner demonstrates increased confidence and accuracy in recognizing sounds and decoding words through picture-based phonemic awareness activities	4.93

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 8 presents phonemic awareness indicators. The displayed means range from 4.93 to 4.96. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Blending was comparatively prominent, while the broad confidence-and-accuracy statement was lower. Phonemic awareness concerns sounds in spoken language; picture prompts may support a task without defining the skill itself. High ratings coexisted with nonsignificant agreement in the reported test. That contrast concerns measurement and ranking, not evidence that sound-awareness activities failed.

4.8 Vocabulary Development

Table 9. Vocabulary Development

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learner can demonstrate increased vocabulary retention through repeated engagement in picture-based learning tasks	4.66
The learner demonstrates improved confidence in understanding, recognizing, and using new vocabulary words through picture-based activities	4.66
The learner can use newly learned vocabulary words appropriately in oral and written activities after exposure to picture-based materials	4.65
The learner can infer the meaning of words from pictures and contextual clues presented in learning activities	4.65
The learner can identify the meaning of new words through picture clues and visual representations	4.65
The learner can match pictures with their corresponding vocabulary words accurately	4.65
The learner can use picture cues to understand unfamiliar words encountered in reading materials	4.65
The learner can classify and group words according to the pictures that represent their meanings	4.64
The learner can use picture cues to understand unfamiliar words encountered in reading materials	4.63
the learner can recall and recognize previously learned vocabulary words through picture-based activities	4.62

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred. A repeated statement has two different reported means and remains in both rows.

Table 9 presents vocabulary development indicators. The displayed means range from 4.62 to 4.66. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

The list emphasizes retention, use, inference, and recognition. One unfamiliar-word picture-cue statement appears twice with different means, so both entries are retained rather than combined. The duplication limits confidence in the indicator set. The findings do not establish vocabulary growth from a standardized assessment or resolve whether the two entries were intended to describe different tasks.

4.9 Fluency

Table 10. Fluency

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learner can read words associated with pictures accurately and with minimal hesitation	4.74
The learner can read simple sentences accompanied by pictures smoothly and at an appropriate pace	4.73
The learner can observe proper pronunciation of words through repeated picture-based reading activities	4.73
The learner can reduce word-by-word reading and read phrases more naturally through picture-based activities	4.73
The learner can use picture clues to read unfamiliar words more fluently	4.72
The learner can demonstrate improved speed in reading passages supported by pictures	4.72
The learner can read aloud with increased confidence when using picture-supported reading materials	4.69
The learner demonstrates improved overall reading fluency through consistent engagement in picture-based reading activities	4.68
the learner can maintain appropriate expression and intonation while reading texts with picture cues	4.64

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 10 presents fluency indicators. The displayed means range from 4.64 to 4.74. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Accurate word reading was rated above expression and intonation. Fluency encompasses more than speed, and the lower prosody-related rating helps identify a distinct instructional concern. The study did not supply words-correct-per-minute, error counts, or prosody rubrics. Its results should therefore remain teacher judgments about listed behaviors rather than measured changes in fluency.

4.10 Reading Comprehension

Table 11. Reading Comprehension

Indicator	Weighted mean
The learner can identify important details from a text through picture-based reading activities	4.65
The learner can summarize the content of a story or passage using picture prompts and textual evidence	4.65
The learner demonstrates improved understanding of reading materials through consistent engagement in picture-based comprehension activities	4.64
The learner can make connections between pictures and the details presented in the reading selection	4.64
The learner can sequence events correctly based on pictures and the accompanying text	4.64
The learner can answer comprehension questions accurately after reading picture-supported texts	4.63
The learner can predict outcomes of a story using picture clues and prior knowledge	4.63
The learner can infer the meaning of events, characters, or situations using pictures and textual information	4.62
the learner can identify the main idea of a passage with the help of picture cues	4.55

Note. All listed statements were classified as Very Much Evident. Values and order are retained; no numerical ranks or category average have been inferred.

Table 11 presents reading comprehension indicators. The displayed means range from 4.55 to 4.65. The reported classification is Very Much Evident. These figures describe the rated extent of the statements; differences of a few hundredths are not independently tested differences between items.

Important details and summarizing were rated above identifying the main idea. Retrieving information and integrating it into a central meaning are different demands. The profile supports examining how pictures and text are connected in discussion. It does not establish comprehension independently of pictures or distinguish the contribution of visual support from prior knowledge.

Table 12. Reported concordance for reading-skill indicators

Domain	W	χ^2	Reported p	Decision
Phonics	0.91	21.84	$p < 0.01$	Rejected
Phonemic Awareness	0.35	8.40	$p > 0.05$	Not rejected
Vocabulary Development	0.78	18.72	$p < 0.025$	Rejected
Fluency	0.67	16.08	$p < 0.05$	Rejected
Reading Comprehension	0.65	15.60	$p < 0.05$	Rejected

Note. All statistics and probability inequalities are retained as reported. Not rejected expresses a stated exception to rejection; it does not establish equivalence.

Table 12 reports significant agreement for Phonics; Vocabulary Development; Fluency; Reading Comprehension. The exceptions were Phonemic Awareness. The test concerns indicator ordering. It does not determine which domain was most effective, establish the magnitude of improvement, or demonstrate an association between the two sets of constructs.

Comparisons of chi-square magnitudes require attention to the number of indicators and degrees of freedom; they are not a common scale of educational or organizational value. The practical interpretation is therefore to examine the content of the ratings alongside the reported agreement. Any unresolved calculation or transcription issue limits confidence in the inferential classification until the underlying output is checked.

5. Discussion

5.1 Meaning of the descriptive profile

The study reported favorable ratings across picture-based activity utilization and reading-skill indicators. The detailed tables nevertheless distinguish specific practices and behaviors rather than establishing a uniformly successful process. The most useful application is to examine what the relatively lower statements require in everyday practice. A high category rating does not establish that every participant had the same experience or that all implementation conditions were equally supportive.

The within-domain patterns are exploratory and descriptive. The displayed precision allows exact transcription but should not be confused with evidence that small mean differences are practically important. Without response distributions and variability estimates, it is not possible to determine whether a narrow range reflects genuinely similar experience, restricted response options, or a tendency to endorse favorable statements. The interpretation therefore remains tied to the content and type of measurement.

Foorman et al. (2016) distinguish foundational reading processes that require explicit attention. Takacs et al. (2015) also make the relevance of visual and interactive support important to interpretation. For the study, this means that a helpful illustration and successful print reading should be assessed separately. The local ratings cannot determine whether picture support facilitated decoding or allowed a response without it.

5.2 Agreement and the research questions

The reported agreement results address a narrower question than the title's practical purpose. For picture-based activity utilization,

significant agreement was reported for all five activity domains. For reading-skill indicators, it was reported for Phonics; Vocabulary Development; Fluency; Reading Comprehension. These findings describe the ordering of indicators under the reported procedure. They do not establish which practice explains individual differences in outcomes, nor do they demonstrate that changing one domain would improve another.

Nonsignificant domains should not automatically become deficit labels. They may reflect differences in relative emphasis even when ratings are uniformly high. Similarly, significant domains are not necessarily the strongest priorities for intervention. Priority setting should consider the importance of the behavior, actual implementation conditions, and the evidence needed to understand a problem. The test classification alone does not supply those judgments.

5.3 Implications for practice and policy

The study proposed contextualized visual materials, teacher development, support for home reading, attention to phonemic awareness, and monitoring of picture-based reading activities. These proposals require age-appropriate materials and assessment of print-based reading; they are not evaluated interventions within the study.

A defensible next step is to review the findings with relevant stakeholders and compare the questionnaire statements with actual examples of practice. Such review can clarify what respondents understood, identify usable resources, and distinguish shared priorities from context-specific needs. This would extend the study rather than represent data already collected. Proposed actions should have explicit objectives and indicators before their effectiveness is evaluated.

Implementation should also include attention to access, workload, and the quality of support. Standardizing a form or activity does not by itself establish that participants can use it meaningfully. The findings provide a basis for discussing those conditions, but not for prescribing an identical response to every school or stakeholder group. The study did not compare alternative policy packages or estimate their costs and benefits.

6. Conclusion

The study reported favorable extent ratings for picture-based activity utilization and reading-skill indicators among 67 Grade 3 teachers in Claveria South District, Division of Masbate Province. Significant agreement was reported for all five activity domains in the first set and Phonics; Vocabulary Development; Fluency; Reading Comprehension in the second. The nonsignificant exceptions in the second set were Phonemic Awareness. These conclusions concern reported extent and rank concordance.

The findings support consideration of the proposed professional and implementation priorities. They do not establish causal effectiveness, individual mastery, or verified improvement. Completing the missing methodological details and resolving the identified reporting issues are necessary before stronger explanatory claims. The title and study purpose are retained without expanding the evidence beyond the reported design.

References

- [1] Foorman, B., Beyler, N., Borradaile, K., Coyne, M., Denton, C. A., Dimino, J., Furgeson, J., Hayes, L., Henke, J., Justice, L., Keating, B., Lewis, W., Sattar, S., Streke, A., Wagner, R., & Wissel, S. (2016). Foundational skills to support reading for understanding in kindergarten through 3rd grade (NCEE 2016-4008). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/PracticeGuide/21>
- [2] Takacs, Z. K., Swart, E. K., & Bus, A. G. (2015). Benefits and pitfalls of multimedia and interactive features in technology-enhanced storybooks: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 85(4), 698–739. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654314566989>