Journal of Pedagogy and Education Science
Vol. 5, No. 01, pp. 99-126
journal.iistr.org/index.php/JPES
DOI: 10.56741/IISTR.jpes.001963

Grammatical Competence and Reading Comprehension of Grade 6 Learners

[1]Emmalyn Arcilla Sola*
Corresponding Author: * emmalyn.arcilla@deped.gov.ph
[1] Naga College Foundation Inc., Naga City, Philippines

ARTICLE INFO

Article history
Received XX July 2022
Revised XX August 2022
Accepted XX August 2022

ABSTRACT

This study examined the influence of grammatical competence on the reading comprehension of Grade 6 learners at Olas Elementary School, Lagonoy North District, Division of Camarines Sur, for the school year 2024–2025. Specifically, it determined the learners' levels of grammatical competence and reading comprehension, their correlation, the extent to which grammatical competence influenced reading comprehension, and the design and curricular validity of supplementary materials to improve performance. The study used a descriptive-correlational and research-and-development method, involving 18 Grade 6 learners and 7 master teachers as respondents. Data were gathered using questionnaires and analyzed through Weighted Mean, Standard Deviation, Proficiency Level, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation, and Coefficient of Determination. Findings revealed that learners had a Proficiency Level of 67.08 in grammatical competence and 50.9 in reading comprehension, both under the beginning level. Correlation results showed that noun competence had the strongest and most significant relationship with reading comprehension, while pronouns and prepositions also exhibited weak yet notable correlations. Other grammatical aspects, such as verbs, adverbs, adjectives, and interjections, showed minimal influence. The r^2 values indicated that nouns had the strongest influence on comprehension skills such as identifying main ideas, supporting ideas, and making inferences. The designed supplementary materials obtained a very high validity rating in both design (3.57) and curricular validity (3.51). The study concluded that grammatical competence had little influence on reading

comprehension, though nouns played a modest but meaningful role in learners' reading understanding.

Keywords
Curricular Validity
Grammatical Competence
Learners
Reading Comprehension
Supplementary Materials

This is an open-access article under the CC–BY-SA license.

Introduction

Grammatical competence, which involves the accurate use of syntax, morphology, and sentence structure, is a crucial aspect of language learning. Many students experience persistent difficulties such as incorrect verb tenses, misuse of prepositions, and weak sentence construction. These challenges often result from limited exposure to accurate language models, insufficient practice, and inadequate understanding of grammar rules. Reading comprehension—the ability to understand and interpret written texts—is another essential skill that learners frequently struggle to master. Students often find it difficult to identify main ideas, draw inferences, and interpret vocabulary in context. Limited background knowledge, weak decoding skills, and low reading motivation hinder comprehension. Some learners read fluently yet fail to grasp the overall meaning, revealing a disconnect between word recognition and understanding. Without explicit instruction in reading strategies, students lack the tools to process complex academic texts effectively.

Educational planning plays a vital role in improving literacy outcomes. The Education 2030 Agenda, particularly Sustainable Development Goal 4, emphasizes inclusive and equitable quality education. It calls for ensuring that all learners achieve literacy, implicitly including grammatical competence and reading comprehension as foundational lifelong skills. Goal 4.6 specifically targets youth and adults achieving literacy by 2030, highlighting the importance of developing these competencies early in schooling [1].

In the global era, English proficiency is essential for international collaboration and career advancement. The UNESCO Global Education Monitoring Report (2022) indicates that grammatical errors remain widespread among primary and secondary students. Likewise, PISA 2022 results reveal that many students worldwide perform below expected levels in reading comprehension [2]–[4]. These findings underscore persistent global literacy challenges.

Grammatical competence refers to learners' knowledge and ability to use grammatical structures accurately to construct meaningful sentences. It is closely linked to reading comprehension, as grammar instruction enhances text interpretation and strategy use [5]–[6]. Personalized learning aligned with cognitive preferences further improves grammar

acquisition [7], while mastery of grammatical structures remains fundamental to communication success [8]. Core elements—including nouns [9]–[10], pronouns [11]–[12], verbs [13]–[14], adjectives [15]–[16], prepositions [18]–[19], adverbs [22], [17], and interjections [13], [23]—contribute significantly to overall competence.

However, research shows that Grade 6 learners often demonstrate only beginning to developing proficiency in grammar due to cognitive, linguistic, and pedagogical factors [14], [19], [22]. Uneven grammar performance highlights limitations in instructional methods and the need for comprehensive teaching strategies [24]. Grammatical awareness strongly influences reading comprehension, enabling learners to better understand meaning and tone [25], although different grammatical elements vary in their contribution [26]. Strengthening grammar through contextualized and strategy-based instruction is therefore essential for enhancing reading proficiency.

Reading comprehension is a multifaceted skill involving understanding, processing, and recalling textual information. It requires connecting new information with prior knowledge and interpreting explicit and implicit meanings. Effective readers monitor their understanding and apply cognitive strategies such as attention, memory, inference-making, and critical thinking. Educational research emphasizes vocabulary development, metacognitive awareness, and strategic instruction as key contributors to comprehension growth [27]–[32].

Vocabulary acquisition is particularly critical for middle-grade learners [33]–[34], as a strong vocabulary base supports comprehension of complex academic texts. Teachers play an important role through differentiated instruction and targeted reading programs [35]. Identifying main ideas and supporting details helps students organize and internalize information [36]. Nevertheless, many Grade 6 learners struggle with central themes due to decoding weaknesses, limited linguistic skills, and insufficient instructional approaches [37], [30]. Reading fluency also remains fundamental, as fluent reading frees cognitive resources for comprehension rather than decoding [38].

Effective pedagogical strategies significantly improve comprehension. Structured reading programs and storytelling approaches enhance engagement and retention [39]–[40], while metacognitive strategies support deeper text analysis [41]. Inference-making relies heavily on vocabulary and grammatical awareness [30]. Integrating grammar instruction with reading practice has been shown to strengthen both linguistic and interpretive abilities [42]–[43]. Although some grammatical elements (e.g., pronouns, prepositions) exert minimal influence, others (e.g., verbs, adjectives, conjunctions, adverbs) contribute to comprehension development [26]. Overall, comprehension emerges from the interaction of vocabulary knowledge, grammatical competence, inference skills, and instructional quality [25], [44].

In the Philippines, national data reflect similar concerns. DepEd reports indicate weak grammar skills affecting academic performance. PISA results show that the Philippines scored lowest in reading comprehension (mean score 340) compared to the OECD average of 487, with similarly low performance in science and mathematics. OECD further notes that per-student expenditure in the Philippines is substantially below the OECD average. Additionally, the country's ranking in the EF English Proficiency Index declined in recent years [45]–[47].

Local data from Camarines Sur reinforce these findings. Studies reveal persistent grammar difficulties among elementary and secondary students, while the 2022 National Achievement Test (NAT) results show reading comprehension levels below the national average [48]–[50]. At Olas Elementary School, many Grade 6 learners fall under the frustration level in the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) and show difficulties in decoding and vocabulary, based on Rapid Literacy Assessment (RLA) and Functional Literacy Assessment Tool (FLAT) results.

Given the strong link between grammatical competence and reading comprehension, and the documented challenges at global, national, and local levels, this study aimed to determine the influence of grammatical competence on the reading comprehension of Grade 6 learners at Olas Elementary School, Lagonoy North District, Division of Camarines Sur. Specifically, it sought to: (1) assess grammatical competence across eight parts of speech; (2) determine reading comprehension levels in identifying main ideas, supporting details, and inference; (3) examine the relationship between grammatical competence and reading comprehension; (4) measure the extent of grammatical competence's influence on comprehension; (5) design supplementary materials including objectives, content, activities, and assessment; and (6) evaluate the curricular validity of the developed materials in terms of face, content, and construct validity.

Material and Methods

This study used the descriptive-correlational method of research. The respondents of this study were the grade 6 learners of Olas Elementary School who were enrolled in the academic year 2024 to 2025. The total enumeration of 18 grade 6 learners was included in this study. The total enumeration method is particularly useful when the population size is relatively small and accessible, allowing for the comprehensive collection and analysis of data from all individuals or elements [50]. The data was gathered through the Teacher-Made Test and Evaluation Checklist.

A. Teacher-Made Test

The primary data gathering tool used in this study was a Teacher-Made Test designed to assess the grammatical competence and reading comprehension of Grade 6 learners. The test consisted of two parts:

- Part I focused on grammatical competence, covering nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, prepositions, conjunctions, adverbs, and interjections;
- Part II measured reading comprehension through tasks on identifying main ideas, supporting details, and making inferences.

A Table of Specifications (TOS) was prepared to ensure that the test items were aligned with the targeted learning competencies. The instrument underwent validation by language experts to assess its clarity, content relevance, and appropriateness. A dry run was conducted with a group of non-participant learners, and item analysis followed to determine the difficulty level and discrimination power of each item. The test's reliability and validity were confirmed through expert judgment and analysis, ensuring that the instrument was both consistent and appropriate for measuring the intended skills.

B. Evaluation Checklist

This tool was used as a key data-gathering tool to assess the design and curricular validity of the supplementary materials. It consisted of two parts: the first focused on evaluating the objectives, content, activities, and assessment design, while the second examined the curricular validity in terms of face, content, and construct validity. The checklist was validated by experts to ensure clarity, relevance, and comprehensiveness, followed by a dry run with non-participating educators to identify needed improvements. Responses were collected using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Least Valid" to "Very High Valid," allowing for systematic and quantitative feedback. This process ensured the materials were both instructionally sound and aligned with curriculum standards before final implementation.

C. Procedure and Ethical Guidelines

The researcher meticulously adhered to ethical guidelines, ensuring the utmost respect for all respondents throughout the research endeavor, in compliance with RA 10173, also known as the Data Privacy Act of 2012. Before conducting the survey, each learner will receive a detailed informed consent form outlining the research's purpose and the voluntary nature of participation, with the option to withdraw at any time without repercussions. Learners were assured of the confidentiality and exclusive academic use of their information. Strict measures will be implemented to safeguard personally identifiable data, maintaining anonymity. Moreover, learners will be furnished with the researcher's contact details for any inquiries or apprehensions regarding the study's outcomes.

The researcher used Jenni Artificial Intelligence to help in searching for related literature and studies. The tool served only as an aid in finding relevant sources. The researcher ensured that all materials selected were valid, credible, and properly cited. No part of the AI-generated text was copied or used as the researcher's own writing.

To facilitate analysis and interpretation of data, this study used the Mean, Proficiency Level, Standard Deviation, Weighted Mean, Pearson Product - Moment Correlation of Coefficient, and Coefficient of Determination.

Results and Discussions

A. Level of Grammatical Competence of Grade 6 Learners

The level of grammatical competence of grade 6 learners along noun, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, prepositions, conjunctions, adverbs, and interjection was shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Level of Grammatical Competence of Grade 6 Learners

Aspects	NI	Mean	SD	PL	Int.
Noun	10	8	1.64	80	AP
Pronoun	10	7.94	2.24	79.4	D
Conjunction	10	7.89	1.71	78.9	D
Adverb	10	6.33	1.46	63.3	B
Interjection	10	6.33	3.01	63.3	B
Adjectives	10	6.22	1.63	62.2	B
Preposition	10	5.67	2.33	56.7	B
Verb	10	5.28	1.13	52.8	B
Average	80	6.7075		67.075	B

Note. NI = Number of items; M = Mean; SD = Standard deviation; PL = Proficiency level; Int. = Interpretation. Proficiency levels are interpreted as follows: 90–100 = Advanced (A); 85–89 = Proficient (P); 80–84 = Approaching Proficiency (AP); 75–79 = Developing (D); Below 74 = Beginning (B).

1. Noun

Nouns are fundamental building blocks of language, enabling learners to identify and label people, places, things, and ideas. For Grade 6 learners, noun competence is essential for constructing meaningful sentences and expressing ideas clearly. Assessing noun usage provides insight into learners' foundational grammatical competence and overall language development.

The data show that noun competence obtained the highest mean score among the eight grammatical aspects, with a mean of 8.00 out of 10 and a standard deviation of 1.64. The 80% proficiency level places it at the Approaching Proficiency (AP) level—the highest classification in the assessment and the only aspect surpassing the 80% threshold. Other grammatical aspects fell within the Beginning (B) or Developing (D) levels. The relatively low standard deviation suggests generally consistent performance among learners.

This stronger performance may be attributed to early and frequent exposure to nouns in instruction and daily communication. As concrete linguistic elements, nouns are easier to comprehend than abstract grammatical categories. However, despite achieving AP level, learners have not yet reached full mastery. Advanced areas such as abstract and collective nouns, capitalization, noun-pronoun agreement, and countability require further reinforcement. As noted in Tuấn [10], achieving grammatical proficiency is a multifaceted

challenge, while Edelman [51] suggests that innate linguistic structures may support early noun acquisition.

2. Pronoun

Pronouns function as substitutes for nouns, preventing repetition and promoting cohesion in spoken and written discourse. Unlike nouns, pronouns require understanding of reference, agreement, and grammatical case, making them conceptually more complex. For Grade 6 learners, pronoun competence reflects growing grammatical sophistication and the ability to construct connected, coherent sentences. Assessing pronoun proficiency, therefore, offers insight into learners' developing control of language structure.

The findings show that pronoun competence obtained the second-highest mean score of 7.94 out of 10, equivalent to 79.4% proficiency and categorized as Developing (D). Although this score closely approaches the 80% threshold for Approaching Proficiency (AP), it remains within the Developing level. The standard deviation of 2.24—the second-highest among all aspects—indicates notable variability in performance. This suggests that while some learners demonstrate a strong command of pronouns, others struggle with specific forms or rules.

Difficulties may involve pronoun–antecedent agreement, correct case usage (subjective, objective, possessive), and complex types such as reflexive, demonstrative, relative, and indefinite pronouns. The near-threshold mean implies readiness for advancement, but inconsistent mastery prevents overall progression. Targeted and differentiated instruction is therefore necessary. As emphasized in Letsholo and Saul [12], accurate pronoun use is a critical developmental milestone, while Edelman [51] affirms that innate grammatical knowledge can be strengthened through guided practice and consistent exposure.

3. Conjunction

Conjunctions serve as connectors that link words, phrases, and clauses, enabling learners to construct compound and complex sentences. Mastery of conjunctions allows students to express relationships such as addition, contrast, cause and effect, and sequence. For Grade 6 learners, conjunction competence is essential for producing cohesive and logically organized discourse. Evaluating this aspect provides insight into their ability to move beyond simple sentence patterns toward more sophisticated expression.

The findings show that conjunction competence obtained a mean score of 7.89 out of 10, equivalent to 78.9% proficiency and classified as Developing (D). The standard deviation of 1.71 indicates moderate variability, suggesting generally consistent performance among learners. Ranked third among the grammatical aspects, conjunction usage falls just below the 80% threshold for Approaching Proficiency, indicating relative strength but not full consolidation.

The Developing level suggests that most learners have mastered basic coordinating conjunctions (e.g., and, but, or) and are beginning to use subordinating conjunctions (e.g., because, although, when). However, difficulties likely remain in using correlative conjunctions and applying correct punctuation. As noted in Mohammed [21], Grade 6 learners typically demonstrate developing proficiency in conjunction usage due to cognitive and instructional factors. This aligns with Edelman [51], which posits that grammatical competence evolves through exposure and practice as learners refine their syntactic knowledge.

4. Adverb

Adverbs are versatile grammatical elements that modify verbs, adjectives, and other adverbs, adding detail about manner, time, place, frequency, and degree. Mastery of adverbs enables learners to communicate with greater precision and nuance. For Grade 6 students, developing adverb competence marks progress toward more sophisticated and expressive language use. Assessing their performance in this area provides insight into their ability to elaborate and refine ideas across contexts.

The findings indicate that adverb competence achieved a mean score of 6.33 out of 10, equivalent to 63.3% proficiency and classified at the Beginning (B) level. The standard deviation of 1.46 suggests moderate consistency, meaning most learners experience similar levels of difficulty. Although tied with interjections in ranking, adverbs fall well below the 75% threshold for developing proficiency, showing limited mastery.

This Beginning classification suggests that adverbs present notable challenges. Learners may recognize common adverbs of manner (e.g., quickly, slowly) but struggle with frequency, degree, or sentence-level adverbs. As noted in Krumsick [22], Grade 6 learners often exhibit beginning-level proficiency in adverb usage due to cognitive and instructional factors. Consistent with Edelman [51], while learners possess innate language capacity, improved proficiency depends on systematic exposure, explicit instruction, and meaningful practice opportunities.

5. Interjection

Interjections are grammatical elements that express sudden emotions or reactions and often function independently from the main sentence structure. Although less central to syntactic construction than other parts of speech, they enrich communication by conveying tone, emphasis, and affective meaning. For Grade 6 learners, competence in using interjections reflects awareness of language's expressive and pragmatic dimensions. Assessing this aspect provides insight into learners' ability to interpret and apply emotional markers appropriately in context.

The results show that interjection competence obtained a mean score of 6.33 out of 10, equivalent to 63.3% proficiency and classified at the Beginning (B) level. Notably, it recorded the highest standard deviation (3.01) among all grammatical aspects, indicating substantial variability in learner performance. While the mean ties with adverbs, the wide dispersion suggests uneven understanding—some learners demonstrate familiarity with common interjections (e.g., oh, wow, ouch), whereas others show minimal mastery.

This variability may stem from inconsistent instructional emphasis and differing exposure to expressive language forms. As noted in Teemant and Pinnegar [23], learners often struggle with interjections due to their abstract and pragmatic nature. Consistent with Edelman [51], although learners possess innate linguistic capacity, mastering context-dependent elements like interjections depends heavily on meaningful exposure and guided practice.

6. Adjective

Adjectives function as descriptive modifiers that provide details about nouns and pronouns, indicating qualities such as size, color, shape, age, and other attributes. Competence in adjective usage enables learners to produce precise and vivid descriptions, thereby enhancing both written and oral communication. For Grade 6 learners, adjective proficiency supports the development of engaging narratives and detailed explanations. Assessing this aspect offers insight into learners' ability to elaborate ideas and enrich their linguistic expression.

The findings reveal that adjective competence achieved a mean score of 6.22 out of 10, equivalent to 62.2% proficiency and classified at the Beginning (B) level. The standard deviation of 1.63 indicates moderate consistency among learners. Ranking sixth among the eight grammatical categories, adjective performance falls well below the Developing (75%) and Approaching Proficiency (80%) thresholds.

Despite early exposure to adjectives in instruction, learners may struggle with comparative and superlative forms, adjective order, and distinctions between descriptive and limiting adjectives. As noted in Morzycki [17], mastery of adjectives is a critical milestone in learners' language development, shaping their ability to express nuanced ideas. Consistent with Edelman [51], while learners possess innate linguistic capacity, achieving proficiency in specific components such as adjectives depends on sustained exposure and structured practice.

7. Preposition

Prepositions express spatial, temporal, directional, and abstract relationships within sentences. Mastery of prepositions requires understanding both their meanings and conventional usage patterns in fluent communication. For Grade 6 learners, preposition

competence is essential for constructing grammatically complete sentences and conveying precise relationships between ideas. Assessing this aspect provides insight into learners' control of relational elements that contribute to coherence and clarity.

The findings show that preposition competence obtained a mean score of 5.67 out of 10, equivalent to 56.7% proficiency and classified at the Beginning (B) level. The standard deviation of 2.33—the third-highest among all aspects—indicates considerable variability in performance. Ranked seventh among eight grammatical categories, prepositions fall well below the Developing threshold, suggesting widespread difficulty.

Prepositions are challenging due to their abstract meanings, idiomatic usage, and subtle distinctions (e.g., in/on/at). Learners may struggle with prepositional phrases or verb–preposition combinations. As emphasized in Wene and Putri [19], preposition usage remains a significant hurdle for Grade 6 students. Consistent with Edelman [51], although learners possess innate linguistic capacity, mastery of abstract structures like prepositions depends heavily on sustained exposure, explicit instruction, and meaningful contextual practice.

8. Verb

Verbs form the core of sentences, expressing actions, states, and events that shape meaning and structure. Mastery of verbs involves complex features such as tense, aspect, mood, voice, and subject–verb agreement, making them one of the most challenging grammatical categories. For Grade 6 learners, verb competence is essential for constructing grammatically accurate and temporally precise sentences. Assessing this aspect provides critical insight into learners' overall grammatical foundation.

The findings indicate that verb competence obtained the lowest mean score of 5.28 out of 10, equivalent to 52.8% proficiency and classified at the Beginning (B) level. The standard deviation of 1.13—the lowest among all aspects—shows consistent but uniformly low performance across learners. This result is particularly significant given the central role of verbs in sentence construction.

The low mean and minimal variability suggest systematic challenges affecting the entire group. Learners may struggle with tense formation, irregular verbs, auxiliary usage, agreement rules, and voice distinctions. As noted in Mohideen [14], Grade 6 learners often demonstrate beginning-level verb proficiency due to cognitive and instructional factors. Consistent with Edelman [51], although learners possess innate linguistic capacity, mastery of complex grammatical features such as verbs requires sustained exposure, structured practice, and explicit instruction.

B. Level of Reading Comprehension of Grade 6 Learners

The level of reading comprehension of Grade 6 learners is a key indicator of their overall literacy development. Assessing their performance provides insights into how effectively they understand and analyze written texts. This section evaluates their ability to identify main ideas, recognize supporting details, and draw logical inferences. The results in Table 2 serve as a basis for determining areas that may require further instructional support.

Table 2. Level of Reading Comprehension of Grade 6 Learners

Competencies	NI	Mean	SD	PL	Int.
Identifying the Main idea	10	5.72	3.03	57.2	B
Identifying the Supporting Idea	10	5.11	2.74	51.1	B
Inference	10	4.44	1.69	44.4	B
Average	30	5.09	2.47	50.9	B

Note. NI refers to the number of items, M represents the mean, SD indicates the standard deviation, PL denotes the proficiency level, and Int. stands for interpretation. The proficiency levels are interpreted as follows: a score of 90–100 is considered Advanced (A), 85–89 is Proficient (P), 80–84 is Approaching Proficiency (AP), 75–79 is Developing (D), and any score below 74 is classified as Beginning (B).

1. Identifying the Main Idea.

Identifying the main idea is a foundational reading comprehension skill requiring learners to determine a text's central message while distinguishing it from supporting details. This competency involves synthesizing information across sentences or paragraphs and articulating the unifying theme. For Grade 6 learners, main idea identification is essential for academic success, as it enables engagement with increasingly complex texts. Assessing this skill provides insight into learners' higher-order thinking and readiness for grade-level materials.

The findings show that main idea identification obtained the highest mean among the three comprehension competencies, scoring 5.72 out of 10 (57.2%), yet it remains within the Beginning (B) level. The standard deviation of 3.03—the highest among the reading variables—indicates substantial variability in performance. Although relatively stronger than other comprehension skills, the overall proficiency remains low.

The Beginning classification and wide variability suggest inconsistent mastery. Learners may struggle to separate central ideas from minor details or lack effective synthesis strategies. As noted in Spencer and Wagner [37], deficiencies in identifying main ideas reflect broader comprehension challenges. Furthermore, Loveless [52] emphasizes that comprehension depends on connecting new information to prior knowledge; without activated schemas, learners experience difficulty extracting central themes.

2. Identifying supporting ideas

Identifying supporting ideas is a vital reading comprehension skill that enables learners to recognize details, examples, and explanations that elaborate on a text's main

idea. This competency requires understanding the hierarchical organization of information and distinguishing primary concepts from secondary details. For Grade 6 learners, the ability to identify supporting ideas strengthens analytical reading and deepens overall comprehension. Assessing this skill provides insight into learners' understanding of how texts are structured to convey meaning.

The results indicate that identifying supporting ideas achieved a mean score of 5.11 out of 10 (51.1%), classified at the Beginning (B) level. Although it ranks second among the three comprehension aspects, it remains substantially below the Developing threshold of 75%. The standard deviation of 2.74 suggests considerable variability in performance. Learners may recognize details but struggle to determine their relevance or connection to central themes.

As noted in Elleman and Oslund [30], reading comprehension difficulties among Grade 6 learners stem from intertwined linguistic and cognitive factors, including unresolved decoding deficits. Consistent with Loveless [52], comprehension depends on integrating new information with existing schemas; weak decoding and limited background knowledge hinder learners' ability to connect supporting ideas into coherent understanding.

3. Inference

Inference represents the most advanced reading comprehension skill assessed, requiring learners to derive meanings that are implied rather than explicitly stated. This competency involves integrating textual information with prior knowledge, recognizing contextual cues, interpreting figurative language, and drawing logical conclusions from evidence. For Grade 6 learners, inference skills are essential for engaging with increasingly complex literary and informational texts that demand interpretation beyond surface-level understanding. Evaluating inference competence thus provides important insight into learners' critical thinking abilities and readiness for the analytical expectations of secondary education.

Inference yielded the lowest mean score at 4.44 out of 10 items (44.4%), placing it within the Beginning (B) level and well below the 75% Developing threshold. The standard deviation of 1.69, lower than in other competencies, indicates relatively uniform performance, albeit at a consistently low level. This pattern suggests that inferential comprehension poses widespread difficulty rather than isolated challenges among specific learners.

The uniformly low performance highlights persistent struggles with higher-order cognitive processes such as synthesizing information, applying background knowledge, and recognizing implicit relationships. Many learners appear to approach texts literally,

lacking strategies for "reading between the lines" or identifying when inference is required. The gap between inference and other competencies indicates that while students may handle explicit information, interpretive thinking remains underdeveloped.

The findings underscore the need for explicit, systematic instruction in inferential reasoning. Strategies such as question-answer-relationship (QAR), think-aloud modeling, guided close reading, and collaborative justification of inferences can strengthen this skill. As emphasized in Spencer and Wagner [37], reading comprehension reflects a complex integration of decoding, linguistic competence, and higher-order cognition necessary for constructing meaning. Likewise, Loveless [52] highlights the role of schema activation in connecting prior knowledge with textual information. Strengthening these foundational processes is crucial to improving learners' inferential comprehension and overall academic literacy.

C. Relationship Between the Grammatical Competence and Reading Comprehension of the Learners

This section examines the relationship between learners' grammatical competence and their reading comprehension. Understanding this relationship helps determine how well mastery of grammar contributes to their ability to understand and interpret texts. Analyzing this connection provides insights into areas where language skills may influence overall literacy development. The findings serve as a basis for improving instructional strategies that integrate grammar and reading skills. Moreover, exploring this relationship can highlight specific grammatical areas that directly impact comprehension. Identifying these links can guide teachers in designing targeted interventions to enhance both grammar proficiency and reading performance.

Table 3. Relationship between the Grammatical Competence and Reading Comprehension of the Learners

Grammatical Competence	Reading Comprehension	r-value	Int.	p-value	Int.
Noun	Main Idea	0.59	MPC	0.01	S
	Supporting Idea	0.51	MPC	0.03	S
	Inference	0.64	HPC	0.01	S
Pronoun	Main Idea	0.51	MPC	0.03	S
Preposition	Supporting Idea	0.53	MPC	0.02	S

Note. In the table, * indicates a p-value below 0.01, and ** indicates a p-value below 0.001. A p-value ≥ 0.05 is considered Not Significant (NS), while a p-value < 0.05 is considered Significant (S). The interpretation of correlation coefficients is as follows: 1.0 indicates a Perfect Correlation; ±0.81 to ±0.99 indicates a Very High Positive Correlation (VHPC); ±0.61 to ±0.80 indicates a High Positive Correlation (HPC); ±0.41 to ±0.60 indicates a Moderate Positive Correlation (MPC); ±0.21 to ±0.40 indicates a Low Positive Correlation (LPC); ±0.01 to ±0.20 indicates Negligible Correlation (NC); and 0 indicates No Correlation.

The findings demonstrate a consistent and statistically significant relationship between grammatical competence and reading comprehension among the learners. Correlations

between specific grammatical components—nouns, pronouns, and prepositions—and key aspects of reading comprehension range from moderate to high positive levels, with all p-values below 0.05. Noun competence shows a moderate correlation with identifying main ideas (r = 0.59) and supporting ideas (r = 0.51), and a high correlation with making inferences (r = 0.64). This indicates that learners with stronger mastery of nouns are better equipped to extract central information and construct implied meanings. Pronoun competence exhibits a moderate significant correlation with main idea identification (r = 0.51), underscoring the importance of referent tracking in maintaining textual coherence. Likewise, preposition competence correlates moderately with identifying supporting details (r = 0.53), suggesting that understanding relational markers strengthens comprehension of logical connections within texts.

These results affirm that grammatical competence functions as a foundational contributor to reading performance. The strong association between nouns and inferential comprehension implies that accurate identification of entities and concepts facilitates higher-order meaning construction. Meanwhile, the correlations involving pronouns and prepositions highlight the critical role of cohesive and relational devices in organizing textual information.

Pedagogically, the findings support integrating grammar instruction within reading activities rather than teaching it in isolation. Instructional strategies may include emphasizing noun functions in inferential tasks, incorporating pronoun-referent tracking to reinforce cohesion, and designing preposition-focused exercises to clarify supporting relationships. Such integration aligns with Suleymanova [25], which emphasizes that grammatical sensitivity enhances nuanced text processing beyond mere word recognition. The results are also consistent with Edelman [51], which posits that core grammatical principles underpin language comprehension, and Loveless [52], which highlights schema activation in constructing meaning. Together, these perspectives reinforce the conclusion that strengthening grammatical competence enhances both linguistic accuracy and deeper reading comprehension.

D. Extent of Influence of Grammatical Competence on the Reading Comprehension of the Learners

The extent of influence of grammatical competence on the reading comprehension of Grade 6 learners is presented in Table 4. It presents the results, showing the extent of this influence through correlation and determination values for different grammatical components in relation to the learners' ability to understand the main idea, supporting idea, and make inferences.

The analysis reveals differentiated levels of influence among grammatical components on reading comprehension. Nouns demonstrate a weak influence on identifying the main idea (r

= 0.59; R^2 = 35%) and supporting ideas (r = 0.51; R^2 = 26%), yet show a moderate influence on making inferences (r = 0.64; R^2 = 40%). Although the correlations with literal comprehension aspects are modest, the stronger association with inference suggests that nouns—carrying core semantic content—play a more substantial role in higher-order meaning construction.

Pronouns exhibit weak relationships with identifying the main idea (r = 0.51; R^2 = 26%) and supporting ideas (r = 0.45; R^2 = 20%), and a very weak influence on inference (r = 0.35; R^2 = 12%). Verbs show very weak correlations across all comprehension aspects (r = 0.02–0.17), with negligible determination values, indicating minimal predictive contribution. Similarly, adjectives (r = 0.13–0.31), conjunctions (r = 0.36–0.42), adverbs, and interjections demonstrate very weak or near-zero relationships with comprehension outcomes. Prepositions present a weak influence on main idea identification (r = 0.40; R^2 = 16%) and a somewhat stronger link with supporting ideas (r = 0.53; R^2 = 29%), but only a very weak association with inference (r = 0.43; R^2 = 18%).

Table 4. Extent of Influence of Grammatical Competence on Reading Comprehension of the Learners

Grammatical Competence	Reading Comprehension	r-value	r^2-value	Int.
Noun	Main Idea	0.59	35%	Weak
	Supporting Idea	0.51	26%	Weak
	Inference	0.64	40%	Moderate
Pronoun	Main Idea	0.51	26%	Weak
	Supporting Idea	0.45	20%	Weak
	Inference	0.35	12%	Very Weak
Verb	Main Idea	0.04	0%	Very Weak
	Supporting Idea	0.17	3%	Very Weak
	Inference	0.02	0%	Very Weak
Adjectives	Main Idea	0.15	2%	Very Weak
	Supporting Idea	0.31	10%	Very Weak
	Inference	0.13	2%	Very Weak
Preposition	Main Idea	0.40	16%	Very Weak
	Supporting Idea	0.53	29%	Weak
	Inference	0.43	18%	Very Weak
Conjunction	Main Idea	0.37	14%	Very Weak
	Supporting Idea	0.42	17%	Very Weak
	Inference	0.36	13%	Very Weak
Adverb	Main Idea	0.05	0%	Very Weak
	Supporting Idea	0.23	5%	Very Weak
	Inference	0.27	7%	Very Weak
Interjection	Main Idea	0.35	12%	Very Weak
	Supporting Idea	0.44	19%	Very Weak
	Inference	0.35	12%	Very Weak

Note. The r^2-value ranges are interpreted as follows: 0.80–1.00 indicates a Very Strong relationship, 0.60–0.799 indicates a Strong relationship, 0.40–0.599 indicates a Moderate relationship, 0.20–0.399 indicates a Weak relationship, and 0.00–0.199 indicates a Very Weak relationship.

Overall, nouns emerge as the most influential grammatical category, particularly in inferential comprehension, while pronouns and prepositions contribute modestly. Other word

classes show limited impact. These findings support Shea and Ceprano [26], which suggests a hierarchical contribution of grammatical elements to comprehension. From the perspective of Andreev [53], nouns, pronouns, and prepositions may function as cognitive anchors within learners' schemas, facilitating information organization and inferential reasoning. This interpretation aligns with Edelman [51], which posits that certain grammatical categories are prioritized in language processing. Consequently, instruction should emphasize semantically central elements—especially nouns—while integrating schema activation and inferencing strategies to strengthen meaningful reading comprehension.

E. Design of Supplementary Material

1. Objectives

Table 5 presents data on the design of the supplementary material in terms of its learning objectives, evaluated using specific indicators such as clarity, alignment with curriculum standards and learners' needs, and whether the objectives are specific and measurable. It shows that all three indicators—clear learning objectives, alignment with curriculum standards and learners' needs, and specificity and measurability of objectives—received an average weighted mean of 3.71.

Table 5. Design of the Supplementary Material in terms of Objective

Indicators	WM	Int
The learning objectives are clearly stated	3.71	VHV
Objectives align with curriculum standards and learners' needs	3.71	VHV
Objectives are specific and measurable	3.71	VHV
Average Weighted Mean	3.71	VHV

Note. The mean ranges are interpreted as follows: a mean of 3.26–4.00 is considered Very High Valid (VHV), 2.51–3.25 is High Valid (HV), 1.76–2.50 is Valid (V), and 1.00–1.75 is Least Valid (LV).

According to the verbal interpretation scale, this corresponds to a "Very High Valid" rating. All three indicators share the same rank of 2, reflecting equal evaluation scores. The mean scores of 3.71, which fall within the range of 3.26 to 4.00, indicate a very high level of validity in the design of the supplementary material's objectives. This suggests that the objectives are well-crafted, meeting essential criteria expected in educational materials. Qualitatively, this means the objectives are clearly stated, relevant to both curriculum standards and learner needs, and precisely defined to guide measurable learning outcomes. The equal ranking among the indicators implies consistent performance across these key areas.

The data demonstrate that the supplementary material's learning objectives are thoughtfully designed, providing clear guidance for both teachers and learners. The strong alignment with curriculum standards ensures that the material remains relevant and appropriate for the learners' educational context. The specificity and measurability of the

objectives enhance the material's effectiveness by allowing for clear assessment of learning progress.

According to Manggasang [54], the design of supplementary materials holds substantial importance in facilitating effective learning, particularly in the realms of grammatical competence and reading comprehension, as well-crafted materials can significantly enhance a learner's educational trajectory. The cornerstone of such materials lies in their capacity to provide clearly defined, relevant, and assessable objectives that align with the learners' needs and the curriculum's goals, ensuring that students not only understand what they are expected to learn but also how their progress will be measured.

This approach closely aligns with the Adeoye et al. [55] —particularly the Design and Development phases—which emphasize the creation of structured, goal-oriented learning materials that are tailored to learners' needs and continuously evaluated for effectiveness throughout the instructional process.

2. Content

Table 6 presents the design of supplementary material in terms of its content, evaluating three key indicators. The first two indicators indicate that the information is factually correct and up-to-date, and the content aligns with learning objectives and is appropriate for the target audience; both received a weighted mean (WM) of 3.57, categorized as Very High Valid (VHV).

These ratings suggest that the material is not only accurate and current but also effectively aligned with the learning objectives and suitable for the learners' needs. The third indicator, the material is logically structured and easy to follow, received a slightly lower WM of 3.29, still within the Very High Valid (VHV) category, indicating that while the structure is effective and easy to follow, it is ranked slightly lower than the first two indicators. The Average Weighted Mean of 3.48 reinforces that the overall content of the supplementary material is highly effective and well-designed.

Table 6. Design of the Supplementary Material in terms of Content

Indicators	WM	Int
Information is factually correct and up-to-date	3.57	VHV
Content aligns with learning objectives and is appropriate for the target audience	3.57	VHV
Material is logically structured and easy to follow	3.29	VHV
Average Weighted Mean	3.48	VHV

The rankings show that the content is primarily focused on accuracy, relevance to the learning objectives, and logical structure, ensuring the material is both informative and user-friendly. In conclusion, the content of the supplementary material is well-suited to support learners, with strong emphasis on correctness, relevance, and ease of use.

According to Angeles et al. [56], comprehensive supplementary materials are indispensable assets in modern educational paradigms, serving to augment the primary curriculum and facilitate a more profound comprehension of intricate subjects. The judicious selection and deployment of these resources are paramount in guaranteeing their efficacy and pertinence to the learner's specific requirements. The degree to which supplementary materials are accurate, relevant, and user-friendly exerts a substantial influence on their capacity to bolster the learning process.

This underscores the importance of systematic instructional planning, as embodied in Adeoye et al. [55]—particularly the Analysis and Design phases—which emphasize identifying learners' needs and carefully crafting materials that align with instructional goals, content requirements, and usability standards.

3. Activities

Table 7 presents the design of the supplementary material in terms of its activities, evaluating three key indicators. The first two indicators, the activities are directly related to learning objectives and the activities encourage active participation and critical thinking, both received a weighted mean (WM) of 3.57, falling under the Very High Valid (VHV) category.

Table 7. Design of the Supplementary Material in terms of Activities

Indicators	WM	Int
Activities are directly related to learning objectives.	3.57	VHV
Activities encourage active participation and critical thinking	3.57	VHV
A diverse range of activities caters to different learning styles	3.43	VHV
Average Weighted Mean	3.52	VHV

This suggests that the activities are not only aligned with the learning objectives but also effectively foster engagement and critical thinking, encouraging active learner involvement. The third indicator, the diverse range of activities that caters to different learning styles, received a slightly lower WM of 3.43, still classified as VHV, indicating that the material provides a variety of activities that cater to different learners but is ranked slightly lower than the first two indicators. The Average Weighted Mean of 3.52 further supports the conclusion that the activities within the supplementary material are well-designed, promoting active participation and addressing diverse learning needs. The rankings show that the activities are focused on ensuring direct relevance to learning goals, fostering critical thinking, and providing variety, which ensures that learners are actively engaged in the learning process.

According to Karki [57], a well-structured supplementary resource should directly align with the established learning objectives, ensuring that each activity contributes to the attainment of specific grammatical or reading skills. This direct relevance helps learners

perceive the value of the activities and motivates them to actively participate in the learning process. Furthermore, supplementary materials should encourage learners to think critically about the language they are learning and the texts they are reading.

This approach aligns with Adeoye et al. [55], particularly the Design and Development phases, where materials are purposefully created to support targeted learning outcomes and foster deeper cognitive engagement among learners.

4. Assessment

The design of the supplementary material in terms of assessment, evaluating three key indicators, is presented in Table 8. Data revealed that the first indicator, a range of assessment types used to evaluate different skills and knowledge, received the highest weighted mean (WM) of 3.86, categorized. This suggests that the material employs a diverse array of assessments, ensuring a comprehensive evaluation of various skills and knowledge. The second indicator, assessment effectively measures the stated learning objectives, received a WM of 3.57, also classified as VHV, indicating that the assessments are well-aligned with the learning goals and accurately measure the intended outcomes.

The third indicator, assessments are unbiased and appropriate for the diverse needs of learners, received a WM of 3.29, still within the VHV category but ranked slightly lower. This suggests that the assessments are generally fair and suitable for learners' diverse needs, although there may be slight room for improvement. The Average Weighted Mean of 3.57 confirms that, overall, the assessment design is highly effective. The rankings show that the material excels in providing varied assessment types and ensuring alignment with learning objectives, while continuing to offer assessments that cater to the diverse needs of students.

Table 8. Design of the Supplementary Material in terms of Assessment

Indicators	WM	Int
A range of assessment types is used to evaluate different skills and knowledge	3.86	VHV
Assessment effectively measures the stated learning objectives	3.57	VHV
Assessments are unbiased and appropriate for the diverse needs of learners	3.29	VHV
Average Weighted Mean	3.57	VHV

According to Hu and Ying [58], Supplementary materials play a pivotal role in offering a spectrum of assessment modalities, thereby fortifying the congruence between pedagogical objectives and evaluative measures, while concurrently addressing the multifaceted requirements of a heterogeneous student demographic. Assessment is not merely an evaluative tool but an intrinsic component of the educational process, serving as a crucial mechanism that fosters student learning, validates the attainment of specified learning outcomes, and provides valuable insights to guide instructional practices and curriculum development. This perspective aligns closely with the Implementation and

Evaluation phases of Adeoye et al. [55], which emphasize the continuous monitoring of learning effectiveness and the refinement of instructional materials based on learner performance and feedback.

5. Summary

Table 9 provides a summary of the design of the supplementary material in terms of four key components: assessment, activities, objectives, and content.

Table 9. Summary of the Design of the Supplementary Material

Aspects	WM	Int
Objectives	3.71	VHV
Assessment	3.57	VHV
Activities	3.51	VHV
Content	3.48	VHV
Overall Average Weighted Mean	3.57	VHV

The learning objectives received the highest rating with a weighted mean (WM) of 3.71, categorized as Very High Valid (VHV) and ranked first. This indicates that the objectives are exceptionally clear, specific, and measurable, effectively guiding the design of the supplementary material. Following closely are the assessment and activities, both receiving a WM of 3.57 and ranked second and third, respectively. These areas are also classified as VHV, demonstrating their strong alignment with the learning objectives and their capacity to engage learners and assess their progress effectively. The content, while still rated as VHV with a WM of 3.48, ranked fourth, showing it is highly effective but slightly less emphasized compared to the other components.

The overall average of 3.57, also categorized as VHV, further emphasizes the overall strength of the supplementary material. The rankings reveal that the material excels in providing clear, specific objectives and robust assessments that align well with learning goals. The activities and content are also well-designed and contribute to the overall effectiveness of the material, though they are slightly ranked lower. This balanced approach ensures that the supplementary material is comprehensive and engaging, meeting the needs of learners while effectively supporting their educational development.

According to Aquino [59], the supplementary educational material demonstrates notable strengths in articulating precise and measurable learning objectives, coupled with the implementation of rigorous assessment methodologies that are meticulously aligned with these predefined learning goals, thereby fostering a cohesive and purposeful educational experience. The design and execution of activities and content within the material further contribute to its overall efficacy, albeit to a slightly lesser extent, suggesting areas for potential refinement and enhancement to maximize their impact on student learning outcomes.

These observations reflect the core principles of Adeoye et al. [55], particularly the Design, Development, and Evaluation phases, which emphasize the importance of aligning objectives, assessments, and instructional strategies to ensure both coherence and effectiveness in learning.

F. Curricular Validity of Supplementary Material

This section presents the curricular validity of the supplementary materials used in the study. It examines how well these materials align with the prescribed curriculum and learning objectives. Assessing their validity ensures that the resources effectively support the intended instructional goals. The findings provide insights into the suitability and effectiveness of the materials in enhancing student learning.

1. Face

Table 10 presents the curricular validity of the supplementary material in terms of its face validity, evaluating three key indicators. The first indicator, the layout and design enhance understanding and engagement; graphics and illustrations are relevant and supportive of the content received the highest weighted mean (WM) of 3.86, categorized as Very High Validity (VHV) and ranked first. This indicates that the layout and design of the material, along with its graphics and illustrations, effectively support learner engagement and understanding.

Table 10. Curricular Validity of the Supplementary Material in terms of Face

Indicators	WM	Int
The layout and design enhance understanding and engagement; graphics and illustrations are relevant and supportive of the content	3.86	VHV
The language is appropriate for the target audience's reading level, and the instructions are unambiguous.	3.57	VHV
The material appears pertinent to the course objectives and is recognized by students as beneficial to their learning	3.43	VHV
Average Weighted Mean	3.50	VHV

Note. The mean ranges are interpreted as follows: a mean of 3.26–4.00 indicates Very High Valid (VHV), 2.51–3.25 indicates High Valid (HV), 1.76–2.50 indicates Valid (V), and 1.00–1.75 indicates Least Valid (LV).

The second indicator, the language is appropriate for the target audience's reading level, and instructions are unambiguous, obtained a WM of 3.57, also classified as VHV, and ranked second. This suggests that the language used in the material is well-suited to the learners' reading level, and the instructions are clear, ensuring students can easily follow the material. The third indicator the material appears pertinent to the course objectives and is recognized by students as beneficial to their learning, got a WM of 3.43, also classified as VHV, and ranked third. This shows that the material is relevant to the course objectives and is seen as helpful by students, though slightly less emphasized compared to the other indicators.

The Average Weighted Mean of 3.50, classified as VHV, further highlights that the supplementary material is highly valid in terms of its face validity. The rankings show that the material excels in layout and design, language clarity, and alignment with course objectives, ensuring that it is both engaging and effective for learners. Overall, the supplementary material is well-designed to meet the needs of the learners, providing clear, relevant, and supportive content that is seen as beneficial to their educational experience.

According to Karki [57], the intrinsic value of supplementary material in augmenting educational experiences lies in its capacity to enhance face validity, a crucial element in fostering learner engagement and optimizing educational outcomes. Face validity, in this context, alludes to the extent to which the supplementary material appears relevant, credible, and applicable to the intended learning objectives from the perspective of the learners themselves.

This emphasis on perceived relevance and appropriateness aligns with the Analysis and Design phases of Adeoye et al. [55], which prioritize understanding learners' needs and developing instructional materials that are not only pedagogically sound but also motivating and meaningful to the target audience.

2. Content

Table 11 presents the curricular validity of the supplementary material in terms of its content, evaluating three key indicators. The first indicator, the material provides a thorough exploration of the subject matter, balancing comprehensive coverage with conciseness, got the highest weighted mean (WM)of 3.71, classified as Very High Valid (VHV) and ranked first.

This suggests that the material effectively covers the subject matter in depth while maintaining clarity and brevity. The second indicator, the material, addresses the specific competencies and goals outlined in the curriculum, obtained a WM of 3.57, also categorized as VHV, and ranked second. This indicates that the material is well-aligned with the curriculum, addressing the necessary competencies and learning goals. The third indicator, that the information is factually correct, up-to-date, and sourced from credible references, had a WM of 3.43, also rated VHV, and ranked third. This shows that the material is accurate, current, and supported by credible sources, although it is slightly less emphasized than the other two indicators.

Table 11. Curricular Validity of the Supplementary Material in terms of Content

Indicators	WM	Int
The material provides a thorough exploration of the subject matter, balancing comprehensive coverage with conciseness	3.71	VHV
The material addresses the specific competencies and goals outlined in the curriculum	3.57	VHV
The information is factually correct, up-to-date, and sourced from credible references	3.43	VHV
Average Weighted Mean	3.50	VHV

The Average Weighted Mean of 3.50, categorized as VHV, confirms that the content of the supplementary material is very highly valid. The rankings indicate that the material is particularly strong in its comprehensive exploration of the subject, its alignment with curriculum goals, and its factual accuracy. Overall, the content is well-designed to meet curricular standards, offering in-depth and relevant information that supports the learning objectives and is based on credible sources.

The meticulously designed content effectively adheres to curricular benchmarks, delivering comprehensive and pertinent insights that bolster learning objectives and are substantiated by dependable sources. The supplementary material provides an in-depth exploration of the subject matter, carefully aligning with established curriculum goals and ensuring the information presented is accurate and factually sound. This well-crafted content supports the intended learning objectives and draws upon credible, reliable sources to enhance the educational experience [60].

Such thoughtful development and execution align with the Development and Implementation phases of Adeoye et al. [55], which emphasize creating content that is instructionally effective, curriculum-aligned, and ready for successful classroom application.

3. Construct

Table 12 highlights the curricular validity of the supplementary material in terms of its construct validity, with particular emphasis on the highest and lowest-ranked indicators. The highest-ranked indicator is the included assessments that effectively measure the intended constructs, with clear criteria for evaluating student performance, which received a weighted mean (WM) of 3.86, categorized as Very High Valid (VHV) and ranked first. This suggests that the assessments are highly effective in measuring the intended learning constructs and provide clear criteria for evaluating student performance, ensuring that they align well with the learning objectives.

Table 12. Curricular Validity of the Supplementary Material in terms of Construct

Indicators	WM	Int
The included assessments effectively measure the intended constructs, with clear criteria for evaluating student performance	3.86	VHV
The teaching methods and activities are aligned with the constructs being taught, employing appropriate pedagogical strategies to facilitate understanding.	3.57	VHV
The material is based on established theories and principles relevant to the subject, clearly defining and explaining key concepts	3.14	HV
Average Weighted Mean	3.52	VHV

This slightly lower ranking reflects the opportunity for improvement in ensuring that the theoretical foundations are clearly communicated to enhance learner understanding. Despite this, the Average Weighted Mean of 3.52, classified as VHV, demonstrates that

overall, the construct validity of the supplementary material is strong, with particular strength in assessments and teaching alignment.

According to Sweller [61], construct validity is critical in educational settings, as it ensures that assessments and teaching methodologies are aligned with the underlying concepts they aim to evaluate or impart. A robust construct validity implies that the supplementary material effectively captures the essence of the construct, providing a veridical and meaningful representation of the knowledge or skills being assessed.

This emphasis on validity aligns with the Evaluation phase of Adeoye et al. [55], which focuses on measuring the effectiveness and integrity of instructional materials in achieving intended learning outcomes.

4. Summary

Table 13 summarizes the curricular validity of the supplementary material, showing high validity across all aspects. The Construct aspect received the highest mean of 3.52, categorized as Very High Valid (VHV) and ranked first, indicating strong alignment of assessments and teaching methods with the intended learning outcomes. Both Face and Content aspects received a mean of 3.50, also classified as VHV, and were tied in rank for second place.

This highlights the material's effective design, clarity, and alignment with curricular goals and subject matter. The Overall Average Weighted Mean of 3.51, categorized as VHV, confirms the supplementary material's strong curricular validity, ensuring it is well-aligned and highly effective across all evaluated aspects.

Table 13. Summary of Curricular Validity of the Supplementary Material

Aspects	Mean	Int
Construct	3.52	VHV
Face	3.50	VHV
Content	3.50	VHV
Overall Average Weighted Mean	3.51	VHV

According to Kendeou et al. [62], a supplementary material demonstrates strong curricular validity when it effectively complements, reinforces, and extends the core content and competencies outlined in the primary curriculum, thereby enhancing and enriching the overall learning experience for students. This alignment reflects the Design and Development phases of Adeoye et al. [55], which emphasize creating instructional materials that are coherent with curriculum standards and tailored to support and deepen learners' understanding of essential concepts.

Conclusion

The findings of the study reveal that Grade 6 learners of Olas Elementary School demonstrate Beginning-level proficiency in both grammatical competence and reading

comprehension, indicating limited mastery of fundamental grammatical structures and difficulty in understanding and interpreting texts. Despite these low proficiency levels, the study establishes a significant positive relationship between grammatical competence and reading comprehension, confirming that improved grammatical skills contribute to better comprehension performance. Specifically, mastery of key grammatical components—particularly nouns, and to a lesser extent, pronouns and prepositions—supports learners' ability to identify main and supporting ideas and make inferences, while other grammatical elements show minimal influence. These results validate the alternative hypotheses that grammatical competence is significantly related to, and that certain grammatical components influence, reading comprehension. Furthermore, the supplementary materials developed in response to these needs were found to be very highly valid and strongly aligned with curricular objectives, indicating their appropriateness and potential effectiveness in enhancing learners' grammatical competence and reading comprehension skills.

Recommendation

Based on the findings of the study, it is recommended that teachers adopt an integrated and learner-centered approach to instruction that combines targeted grammatical support with explicit reading comprehension strategies. Grammar instruction should be contextualized within meaningful reading activities, with particular attention given to key grammatical components while prioritizing comprehension skills such as identifying main ideas, making inferences, summarizing, and using context clues. To address learners' diverse needs, teachers may provide remedial and individualized support, utilize interactive and engaging teaching tools, and participate in continuous professional development to strengthen instructional practices. Furthermore, the consistent use and implementation of the developed supplementary materials—validated as highly appropriate and strongly aligned with the curriculum—are strongly encouraged to enhance both grammatical competence and reading comprehension among Grade 6 learners.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1] United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, *Education for Sustainable Development Goals: Learning Objectives*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000247444

[2] K. Ariska, S. Syamsurrijal, and W. K. Syarifaturrahman, "An analysis of figurative language in Harmony's song lyrics," *Humanities: Journal of Language and Literature*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 155–166, 2021, doi: 10.30812/humanitatis.v8i1.1562.

[3] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, *Global Education Monitoring Report 2022: Gender Report—Deepening the Debate on Those Still Left Behind*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2022.

[4] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *PISA 2022 Results: What Students Know and Can Do*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing, 2022.
[5] W. Liu, Y. Zhang, and J. Wang, "The interplay between grammatical competence and reading strategies," *Language Teaching Research*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 123–145, 2024, doi: 10.1177/1362168821999999.
[6] K. Wijekumar and A. Riswanto, "Integrating grammar into reading comprehension instruction: A study with sixth graders," *Language Teaching Research*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 65–82, 2023, doi: 10.1177/1362168822108131.
[7] T. M. Lim *et al.*, "Year 6 pupils' language learning strategies in learning English grammar," *Int. J. Acad. Res. Bus. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 1196–1209, 2021, doi: 10.6007/IJARBSS/v11-i4/9690.
[8] D. M. Alikhonova and K. B. Grigoryans, "Features of the formation of grammatical competence," *Int. J. Progressive Sci. Technol.*, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://ijpsat.org
[9] S. M. A. Zahrani and A. Chaudhary, "Vocabulary learning strategies in ESP context: Knowledge and implication," *Arab World English J.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 382–393, 2022, doi: 10.24093/awej/vol13no1.25.
[10] V. V. Tuấn, "Communicative competence of the fourth-year students: Basis for proposed English language program," *English Language Teaching*, vol. 10, no. 7, p. 104, 2017, doi: 10.5539/elt.v10n7p104.
[11] F. Fitriana, W. Wennyta, and S. Aisyah, "Students' problems in using English pronouns at junior high school number 15 Jambi," *J. English Lang. Teaching*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 149–159, 2022, doi: 10.33087/jelt.v6i2.118.
[12] R. Letsholo and I. Saul, "A comparison of the interaction of pronominals and word order in Naro and Gǁana," *Language Matters*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 222–244, 2015, doi: 10.1080/10228195.2015.1045012.
[13] M. Dingemanse, "Interjections at the heart of language," *Annu. Rev. Linguistics*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 257–277, 2024, doi: 10.1146/annurev-linguistics-031422-124743.
[14] S. Mohideen, "Error analysis of a sample of Kuala Kangsar University students' English placement writing test," *SALTeL J.*, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 27, 2023, doi: 10.35307/saltel.v6i1.100.
[15] K. Mahowald *et al.*, "Dissociating language and thought in large language models," *arXiv preprint*, 2023, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2301.
[16] M. Islam, "The special causes of weakness behind learning English language in the secondary schools," *Bangladesh J. Arts Humanities*, pp. 209–227, 2023, doi: 10.34104/bjah.02302090227.
[17] M. Morzycki, "Structure and ontology in nonlocal readings of adjectives," in *Language, Cognition and Mind*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2021, p. 65, doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-50200-3_4.
[18] Y. Fang, S. Cao, and J. Huang, "The semantic analysis of the preposition 'through' from the perspective of cognitive linguistics," *Theory Pract. Lang. Stud.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 400–406, 2022, doi: 10.17507/tpls.1202.25.
[19] I. W. W. Wene and A. R. D. Putri, "Challenges in implementing prepositions of time, place, and direction," *ELTR J.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 80–88, 2018, doi: 10.37147/eltr.v2i2.97.
[20] W.-J. Ko and J. J. Li, "Assessing discourse relations in language generation from GPT-2," in *Proc. INLG*, 2020, doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.inlg-1.8.
[21] A. S. Mohammed, "Conjunctions as cohesive devices in the writings of ESL learners," *Procedia – Soc. Behav. Sci.*, vol. 208, pp. 74–81, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.182.
[22] K. Krumsick, "Adverbs," Johnson County Community College, 2021. [Online]. Available: https://www.jccc.edu
[23] A. Teemant and S. E. Pinnegar, "Proficiency levels defined," 2019. [Online]. Available: https://edtechbooks.org
[24] Y. C. G. Mali, "Writing grammatical sentences: Voices of Indonesian undergraduates in EFL classrooms," *J. Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, vol. 16, no. 1, p. 14, 2016, doi: 10.17509/bs_jpbsp.v16i1.3058.
[25] K. Suleymanova, "Structural, semantic, and pragmatic aspects of a sentence in modern English," *Periodyk Naukowy Akademii Polonijnej*, vol. 54, no. 5, p. 95, 2022, doi: 10.23856/5413.
[26] M. Shea and M. Ceprano, "Reading with understanding: A global expectation," *J. Inquiry Action Educ.*, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 4, 2017.
[27] S. O. Labo-Popoola, "Reading habits amongst university undergraduates: Implications for academic performance," *Int. J. Learn. Dev.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 114–124, 2018, doi: 10.5296/ijld.v8i2.13102.

[28] T. V. Mariage, C. S. Englert, and M. F. Mariage, "Comprehension instruction for Tier 2 early learners: A scaffolded apprenticeship for close reading of informational text," *Reading & Writing Q.*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 29–42, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0731948719861106.
[29] M. Rehman, "English language reading comprehension of Pakistani HSSC/HSC level students: Perceptions and performance," *Pakistan Lang. Humanit. Rev.*, vol. 6, no. II, 2022, doi: 10.47205/plhr.2022(6-ii)99.
[30] A. M. Elleman and E. L. Oslund, "Reading comprehension research: Implications for practice and policy," *Policy Insights Behav. Brain Sci.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 3–11, 2019, doi: 10.1177/2372732218816339.
[31] A. M. De Belen, "Effects of ABRC module utilization in improving the reading comprehension of Grade 5 pupils," *Int. J. Res. Stud. Educ.*, vol. 10, no. 3, 2021, doi: 10.5861/ijrse.2021.5036.
[32] N. K. Duke, A. E. Ward, and P. D. Pearson, "The science of reading comprehension instruction," *Reading Teacher*, vol. 74, no. 6, pp. 663–672, 2021, doi: 10.1002/trtr.1993.
[33] M. McKeown and I. Beck, "Teaching vocabulary: A focus on academic words," *Educ. Leadership*, vol. 74, no. 4, pp. 62–66, 2017.
[34] S. M. A. Zahrani and A. Chaudhary, "Vocabulary learning strategies in ESP context: Knowledge and implication," *Arab World English J.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 382–393, 2022, doi: 10.24093/awej/vol13no1.25.
[35] D. Reutzel and R. Cooter, *The Essentials of Teaching Children to Read*, 6th ed. Pearson Education, 2019.
[36] F. M. Oguntade, "Content analysis of levels and aspects of comprehension in West African senior secondary school examination," *Reading & Writing*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2021, doi: 10.4102/rw.v12i1.293.
[37] M. Spencer and R. K. Wagner, "Comprehension problems for second-language learners with poor reading comprehension," *J. Res. Reading*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 199–217, 2016, doi: 10.1111/1467-9817.12080.
[38] W. Zhang and Y. Wu, "Understanding the role of reading fluency in reading comprehension among sixth graders," *Reading Psychol.*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 385–405, 2018, doi: 10.1080/02702711.2017.1408737.
[39] H. Khadijah and I. Ismail, "The effectiveness of a reading comprehension program on the academic performance of sixth-grade students," *J. Educ. Pract.*, vol. 8, no. 23, pp. 54–61, 2017.
[40] S. M. Sihombing, "The effect of storytelling on the reading comprehension of sixth-grade students," *J. Lang. Linguist. Stud.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 102–113, 2020.
[41] J.-J. Luo, "Innovative outlook on metacognition in second language reading," *Adv. Soc. Sci. Educ. Res.*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 297–305, 2019, doi: 10.22158/asir.v3n4p297.
[42] W. Liu, Y. Zhang, and J. Wang, "An investigation of grammatical competence and reading strategies among sixth-grade students in diverse contexts," *J. Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 116, no. 1, pp. 45–60, 2024, doi: 10.1037/edu0000678.
[43] Z. Fang, "Investigating the effectiveness of different grammar instruction methods on grammatical comprehension among sixth graders," *J. Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 112, no. 4, pp. 659–670, 2020, doi: 10.1037/edu0000392.
[44] A. Shah and A. Samad, "Assessing grammatical competence among sixth graders," *J. Lang. Teach. Res.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 320–328, 2021, doi: 10.17507/jltr.1202.10.
[45] Department of Education, *Philippine Education Sector Performance Report*. 2020.
[46] A. P. B. Conoza, "Addressing the Philippines' learning crisis," *BusinessWorld Online*, 2022.
[47] C. A. R. Alova and I. M. C. Alova, "Grammatical and academic writing competence of special science class students," *Puissant*, vol. 4, pp. 747–763, 2023.
[48] D. L. Malonzo and P. G. Reyes, "Challenges in language proficiency: Grammatical competence and reading comprehension among students in Camarines Sur," *Bicol Reg. J. Educ.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 55–72, 2022.
[49] Department of Education, Camarines Sur Division, *National Achievement Test 2022: Camarines Sur Results Overview*. 2022.
[50] "Pros and cons of using purposive sampling method," *Essay Digest Blog*, 2022.
[51] S. Edelman, "Verbal behavior without syntactic structures: Beyond Skinner and Chomsky," *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:2303.08080, 2023.
[52] B. Loveless, "A complete guide to schema theory and its role in education," *Education Corner*, 2023.
[53] I. Andreev, "Cognitive learning theory: Benefits, strategies and examples," *Valamis*, 2024.

[54] J. T. Manggasang, "Level of reading comprehension among Grade 11 learners: Basis for instructional material development," *Int. J. Soc. Sci. Human Res.*, vol. 4, no. 9, 2021, doi: 10.47191/ijsshr/v4-i9-09.
[55] M. A. Adeoye, K. A. S. I. Wirawan, M. S. S. Pradnyani, and N. I. K. Septiarini, "Revolutionizing education: Unleashing the power of the ADDIE model," *J. Pendidik. Indones.*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 202, 2024, doi: 10.23887/jpiundiksha.v13i1.68624.
[56] J. A. P. R. Angeles *et al.*, "Effectiveness of localized reading activity sheets in enhancing the reading skills of Grade 1 learners," *Int. J. Theory Appl. Elem. Second. Sch. Educ.*, vol. 4, no. 2, p. 125, 2022, doi: 10.31098/ijtaese.v4i2.1087.
[57] T. M. Karki, "Supplementary resource materials in English language classrooms," *Tribhuvan Univ. J.*, vol. 32, no. 1, p. 251, 2018, doi: 10.3126/tuj.v32i1.24791.
[58] J. Hu and L. Ying, "The scientific basis of authentic assessment," *SHS Web Conf.*, vol. 174, p. 01023, 2023, doi: 10.1051/shsconf/202317401023.
[59] E. S. Aquino, "Developing an evaluation scale for assessing the effective implementation of Matatag curriculum," *J. Interdiscip. Perspect.*, vol. 2, no. 5, 2024, doi: 10.69569/jip.2024.0074.
[60] National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, *A New Vision for High-Quality Preschool Curriculum*. Washington, DC, USA: National Academies Press, 2024, doi: 10.17226/27429.
[61] J. Sweller, "Cognitive load theory and educational technology," *Educational Technology Research and Development*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 1–16, 2020.
[62] M. Kendeou, P. van den Broek, A. Helder, and K. Karlsson, "A cognitive view of reading comprehension: Implications for reading difficulties," *Learning and Individual Differences*, vol. 40, pp. 1–10, 2020.

Author



Emmalyn Arcilla Sola is a Filipino public school teacher assigned at Olas Elementary School in Olas, Lagonoy, Camarines Sur, where she has served for twelve years as a Teacher I. She was born on January 15, 1991, in Naga City, Camarines Sur, and is currently 34 years old. She is married to Edison Cado Sola and is a mother to Madison Khate Arcilla Sola and Zild Kyler Arcilla Sola. Residing at Deca Homes Langon Vista, Cararayan, Naga City, she balances her roles as a teacher and a mother while remaining committed to providing quality education and supporting the academic development of her learners. (email: emmalyn.arcilla@deped.gov.ph).