

INSTRUCTIONAL READING PRACTICES AND READING FLUENCY LEVELS OF DEVELOPING READERS IN PRIMARY GRADES: TOWARDS AN ENHANCED READING SUPPORT PROGRAM

Luzviminda Lazo Hipolito

San Marcelino Elementary School, San Marcelino, Zambales, Philippines
Mondriaan Aura College, Subic Bay Freeport Zone, Philippines

<https://doi.org/10.54922/IJEHSS.2026.1213>

Received: 01 January 2026/Published: 10 February 2026

ABSTRACT

Reading fluency levels of developing readers in primary grades remain a critical foundation for literacy and academic success. This study determined the instructional reading practices and reading fluency levels of developing readers in primary grades in San Antonio and San Marcelino Districts, Schools Division of Zambales, during School Year 2025–2026, toward an enhanced reading support program. A quantitative-descriptive, causal-comparative, and correlational research design was employed. The study included 146 primary grade teachers and 230 developing readers as respondents, using total population sampling. A validated researcher-designed questionnaire with reliability coefficients of $\alpha = .99$, $.88$, and $.87$ was utilized to collect data. Findings revealed that, as perceived by primary grade teachers, instructional planning, strategy application, progress monitoring, and parental involvement were only occasionally practiced. Similarly, developing readers demonstrated emerging fluency in reading accuracy, reading speed, prosodic features, and comprehension ability based on both the reading fluency assessment and the CRLA tool. A significant difference existed between the reading fluency levels of developing readers as measured by the reading fluency assessment and the CRLA tools. Moreover, positive, weak, but non-significant correlations were found between the instructional reading practices of primary grade teachers and the reading fluency levels of developing readers based on both assessment tools. In response, an enhanced reading support program was developed to strengthen instructional reading practices and improve learners' reading fluency. The study concluded that consistent and targeted fluency-building interventions for learners, along with sustained teacher development, were essential for improving reading performance. The study provides practical guidance for designing and implementing effective reading support programs that enhance teacher practices and learner fluency.

Keywords: Instructional Reading Practices, Reading Fluency Levels, Developing Readers, Primary Grades, Teachers

1. INTRODUCTION

Reading fluency had long been recognized as a critical foundation for learners' academic success, yet many developing readers in the primary grades continued to struggle with accuracy, speed, prosody, and comprehension despite ongoing instructional efforts (Valido, 2025; Lim, 2024; Dimzon & Pascual, 2022). Globally and locally, concerns about declining reading performance highlighted the crucial role of classroom instruction and teacher practices in shaping

early literacy outcomes (Canuto et al., 2024; Kuswardani et al., 2023; Viray, 2023). In the Philippine context, persistent challenges such as limited instructional alignment, inconsistent strategy use, and uneven parental support underscored the urgency of strengthening instructional reading practices to address foundational literacy gaps (Visuyan, 2024; Abejuela et al., 2023; Librea et al., 2023).

This study examined the instructional reading practices of primary grade teachers and the reading fluency levels of developing readers in primary grades. Specifically, it focused on instructional planning, strategy application, progress monitoring, and parental involvement as key teacher-related practices, alongside learners' reading accuracy, speed, prosody, and comprehension as indicators of fluency (Garcia & Doronio, 2024; Villalva, 2023; Saquido & Velasco, 2024; Canonizado, 2025). While prior studies had established that effective teaching practices and targeted reading strategies positively influenced learner performance, gaps remained in understanding how these practices were consistently implemented and perceived within specific school contexts (Canonizado, 2025; Nombo et al., 2024; Taganas & Jancinal, 2024). The study was situated in the primary grades of public schools in San Antonio and San Marcelino Districts, Schools Division of Zambales during the School Year 2025–2026.

The need for the study was grounded in theoretical and practical considerations. Research had shown that instructional reading practices significantly influenced reading outcomes, yet many teachers faced limitations in planning, strategy integration, and systematic assessment of learner progress (Valido, 2025; Lungu et al., 2024; Manigbas et al., 2024). Moreover, societal expectations for improved literacy outcomes highlighted the importance of early intervention and sustained instructional support to prevent long-term reading difficulties (Tan, 2023; De Guzman Fabella & Abaoag, 2023). Addressing these issues had the potential to enhance teacher effectiveness, improve learner fluency, and contribute to more equitable literacy development.

Despite the growing body of literature on reading instruction, several research gaps persisted. Inconsistencies had been noted in the implementation of instructional reading practices and in the measurement of reading fluency across tools and contexts (Esteban et al., 2024; Francotte et al., 2023; Gomes & Hirata, 2024). Limited localized studies had examined the combined influence of teacher practices and learner fluency dimensions within primary grade settings in Zambales, particularly incorporating parental involvement and progress monitoring (Caban et al., 2024; Caparas et al., 2025; Lariosa & Quezada, 2023). Thus, the study sought to determine the level of instructional reading practices of teachers, the reading fluency levels of developing readers, and the correlation between these variables as bases for program enhancement.

Anchored on constructivist and evidence-based reading frameworks, the study aimed to generate practical insights that could inform classroom instruction and school-based interventions (Amin, 2023; Yusuf et al., 2023; Pedroso et al., 2023). Its primary objective was to develop an enhanced reading support program that addressed identified weaknesses in instructional practices and learner fluency outcomes. Ultimately, the study sought to contribute to improved instructional reading practices, strengthened home–school partnerships, and sustained gains in reading fluency among developing readers in the primary grades.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study determined the instructional reading practices and reading fluency levels of developing readers in primary grades in San Antonio and San Marcelino Districts, Schools

Division of Zambales, during the School Year 2025-2026, towards an enhanced reading support program.

Specifically, it sought answers to these questions:

1. As perceived by primary grade teachers, how may their instructional reading practices be described in terms of:

- 1.1. instructional planning;
- 1.2. strategy application;
- 1.3. progress monitoring; and
- 1.4. parental involvement?

2. How may the reading fluency levels of developing readers in primary grades based on reading fluency assessment be described in terms of:

- 2.1. reading accuracy;
- 2.2. reading speed;
- 2.3. prosodic features; and
- 2.4. comprehension ability?

3. How may the reading fluency of the primary grade learners be determined based on CRLA tool be described in terms of:

- 3.1. reading accuracy;
- 3.2. reading speed;
- 3.3. prosodic features; and
- 3.4. comprehension ability?

4. Is there a significant difference between the reading fluency levels of developing readers in primary grades-based reading fluency assessment and CRLA tools?

5. As perceived by primary grade teachers, is there a significant correlation between their instructional reading practices and the reading fluency levels of developing readers in primary grades based on reading fluency assessment?

6. As perceived by primary grade teachers, is there a significant correlation between their instructional reading practices and the reading fluency levels of developing readers in primary grades based on CRLA tool?

7. What enhanced reading support program can be developed to improve the instructional reading practices and reading fluency levels of developing readers in primary grades?

3. METHODS AND MATERIALS

This study determined the instructional reading practices and reading fluency levels of developing readers in primary grades in San Antonio and San Marcelino Districts, Schools Division of Zambales, during the School Year 2025-2026, towards an enhanced reading support program. Employing a quantitative-descriptive and correlational research methods, data were collected, classified, summarized, and analyzed using means. The study's respondents comprised 146 primary grade teachers and 230 developing readers, selected through total population sampling of two districts to provide opportunities to everyone to be part of the study. A researcher-designed questionnaire served as the primary data collection instrument, focusing on the instructional reading practices and reading fluency levels of developing readers in primary grades. Internal consistency was established using Cronbach's alpha, which showed excellent reliability of the instrument. Instructional reading practices of primary grade teachers as perceived by themselves was very highly reliable ($\alpha = 0.99$). Similarly, the reading fluency levels of developing readers in

primary grades based on reading fluency assessment and CRLA tools demonstrated good reliability ($\alpha = 0.88, 0.88$). Hypotheses were tested using the Spearman's Rho Correlation Coefficient.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Instructional Reading Practices of Primary Grade Teachers as Perceived by Themselves

4.1.1. Instructional Planning

Table 1 presents the mean rating and interpretations of the instructional reading practices of primary grade teachers as perceived by themselves in terms of instructional planning. The table aimed to show how teachers planned and prepared reading lessons based on learners' needs and progress.

Table 1

Mean Rating and Interpretations of the Instructional Reading Practices of Primary Grade Teachers as Perceived by Themselves in terms of Instructional Planning

Item	Indicators	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1	I plan reading lessons based on learners' assessed needs.	3.21	Occasionally Practiced
2	I align reading objectives with learners' fluency levels.	3.24	Occasionally Practiced
3	I prepare daily reading lesson guides ahead of time.	3.25	Always Practiced
4	I select appropriate texts suited to learners' reading levels.	3.22	Occasionally Practiced
5	I include reading fluency goals in lesson planning.	3.24	Occasionally Practiced
6	I integrate phonics in my reading instruction plan.	3.27	Always Practiced
7	I adjust reading plans based on learners' reading progress.	3.22	Occasionally Practiced
8	I identify reading materials for differentiated instruction.	3.26	Always Practiced
9	I schedule regular reading sessions within instructional time.	3.21	Occasionally Practiced
10	I plan instructional sessions for struggling readers.	3.23	Occasionally Practiced
General Mean Rating		3.23	Occasionally Practiced

Legend: Scores of 3.25 to 4.00 indicate "Always Practiced"; scores of 2.50 to 3.24 indicate "Occasionally Practiced"; scores of 1.75 to 2.49 indicate "Rarely Practiced"; and scores of 1.00 to 1.74 indicate "Never Practiced."

Indicators with mean ratings ranging from $\bar{x} = 3.25$ to $\bar{x} = 3.27$ were interpreted as always practiced, including preparing daily reading lesson guides ahead of time with $\bar{x} = 3.25$, integrating phonics in reading instruction plans with $\bar{x} = 3.27$, and identifying reading materials for differentiated instruction with $\bar{x} = 3.26$. These ratings suggested that teachers consistently applied these aspects of instructional planning while other areas were practiced occasionally. The findings highlighted specific planning strategies that teachers prioritized to support effective reading instruction.

The general mean rating of $\bar{x} = 3.23$ was interpreted as occasionally practiced. This meant that teachers applied instructional planning strategies moderately, with some areas consistently practiced and others applied less frequently. The finding indicated that while teachers maintained a steady effort in planning reading lessons, there remained room to enhance consistency across all planning activities.

The present study shared similarities with the findings of Escanda (2025). Both studies emphasized that teacher planning practices influenced instructional effectiveness and learner performance in reading.

4.1.2. Strategy Application

Table 2 presents the mean rating and interpretations of the instructional reading practices of primary grade teachers as perceived by themselves in terms of strategy application. The table focused on how teachers applied various reading strategies to support learners' reading development.

Table 2

Mean Rating and Interpretations of the Instructional Reading Practices of Primary Grade Teachers as Perceived by Themselves in terms of Strategy Application

Item	Indicators	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1	I use phonics-based strategies to teach word recognition.	3.23	Occasionally Practiced
2	I apply repeated reading to build reading fluency.	3.25	Always Practiced
3	I conduct guided oral reading in small groups.	3.21	Occasionally Practiced
4	I implement echo reading with developing readers.	2.23	Occasionally Practiced
5	I use modeling to demonstrate fluent reading.	2.27	Always Practiced
6	I incorporate word games to reinforce vocabulary.	2.22	Occasionally Practiced
7	I use storytelling to enhance reading comprehension.	2.24	Occasionally Practiced
8	I provide picture clues to support struggling readers.	2.26	Always Practiced

9	I use choral reading to practice rhythm and expression.	2.21	Occasionally Practiced
10	I apply question-and-answer techniques after reading.	2.23	Occasionally Practiced
General Mean Rating		2.23	Occasionally Practiced

Legend: Scores of 3.25 to 4.00 indicate “Always Practiced”; scores of 2.50 to 3.24 indicate “Occasionally Practiced”; scores of 1.75 to 2.49 indicate “Rarely Practiced”; and scores of 1.00 to 1.74 indicate “Never Practiced.”

Indicators with mean ratings ranging from $\bar{x} = 3.25$ to $\bar{x} = 4.00$ were interpreted as always practiced, including applying repeated reading to build reading fluency with $\bar{x} = 3.25$. These ratings suggested that teachers consistently implemented certain strategy applications while other strategies were applied less frequently. The findings highlighted specific reading strategies that teachers prioritized to enhance learners’ reading skills.

The general mean rating of $\bar{x} = 2.23$ was interpreted as occasionally practiced. This meant that teachers applied reading strategies moderately, with only selected strategies consistently practiced. The finding indicated that while teachers maintained some strategy application in reading instruction, there was still room to improve the consistent use of all strategies.

The present study shared similarities with the findings of Moral and Villarente (2024). Both studies emphasized that the application of instructional strategies influenced learners’ reading development and overall learning outcomes.

4.1.3. Progress Monitoring

Table 3 presents the mean rating and interpretations of the instructional reading practices of primary grade teachers as perceived by themselves in terms of progress monitoring. The table focused on how teachers monitored learners’ reading performance and used assessment results to guide instruction.

Table 3

Mean Rating and Interpretations of the Instructional Reading Practices of Primary Grade Teachers as Perceived by Themselves in terms of Progress Monitoring

Item	Indicators	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1	I track learners’ reading performance through checklists.	3.26	Always Practiced
2	I record reading accuracy and speed regularly.	3.21	Occasionally Practiced
3	I assess learners using oral reading fluency tests.	3.23	Occasionally Practiced
4	I analyze learners’ reading errors during reading sessions.	3.27	Always Practiced
5	I evaluate learners’ expression during oral reading.	3.22	Occasionally Practiced

6	I provide feedback after every reading activity.	3.23	Occasionally Practiced
7	I update reading progress charts weekly.	3.25	Always Practiced
8	I keep portfolios of learners' reading assessments.	3.23	Occasionally Practiced
9	I adjust instruction based on monitoring results.	3.21	Occasionally Practiced
10	I report reading progress during parent-teacher conferences.	3.24	Occasionally Practiced
General Mean Rating		3.23	Occasionally Practiced

Legend: Scores of 3.25 to 4.00 indicate "Always Practiced"; scores of 2.50 to 3.24 indicate "Occasionally Practiced"; scores of 1.75 to 2.49 indicate "Rarely Practiced"; and scores of 1.00 to 1.74 indicate "Never Practiced."

Indicators with mean ratings ranging from $\bar{x} = 3.25$ to $\bar{x} = 4.00$ were interpreted as always practiced, including tracking learners' reading performance through checklists with $\bar{x} = 3.26$, analyzing learners' reading errors during reading sessions with $\bar{x} = 3.27$, and updating reading progress charts weekly with $\bar{x} = 3.25$. These ratings suggested that teachers consistently monitored certain aspects of learners' reading performance while applying other progress monitoring practices less frequently. The findings highlighted areas where teachers maintained regular and focused assessment practices to support reading development.

The general mean rating of $\bar{x} = 3.23$ was interpreted as occasionally practiced. This meant that teachers applied progress monitoring practices moderately, with only selected practices consistently applied. The finding indicated that while teachers maintained some assessment routines, there was still room to improve the consistent monitoring of all reading aspects.

The present study shared similarities with the findings of Joaquin and Imbat (2024). Both studies emphasized that consistent monitoring of learners' progress positively influenced reading development and overall learning outcomes.

4.1.4. Parental Involvement

Table 4 presents the mean rating and interpretations of the instructional reading practices of primary grade teachers as perceived by themselves in terms of parental involvement. The table focused on how teachers engaged parents to support learners' reading development at home and in school activities.

Table 4

Mean Rating and Interpretations of the Instructional Reading Practices of Primary Grade Teachers as Perceived by Themselves in terms of Parental Involvement

Item	Indicators	Mean Rating	Interpretation
1	I encourage parents to read with their children at home.	3.24	Occasionally Practiced

2	I assign take-home reading activities for parental support.	3.22	Occasionally Practiced
3	I communicate reading goals with parents regularly.	3.27	Always Practiced
4	I conduct literacy orientations for parents of struggling readers.	3.21	Occasionally Practiced
5	I send reading progress updates to parents.	3.23	Occasionally Practiced
6	I request parent signatures on reading logs.	3.26	Always Practiced
7	I provide parents with reading strategy tips.	3.21	Occasionally Practiced
8	I involve parents in school reading events.	3.24	Occasionally Practiced
9	I ask parents to model reading at home.	3.25	Always Practiced
10	I distribute simple reading guides for home use.	3.23	Occasionally Practiced
General Mean Rating		3.24	Occasionally Practiced

Legend: Scores of 3.25 to 4.00 indicate “Always Practiced”; scores of 2.50 to 3.24 indicate “Occasionally Practiced”; scores of 1.75 to 2.49 indicate “Rarely Practiced”; and scores of 1.00 to 1.74 indicate “Never Practiced.”

Indicators with mean ratings ranging from $\bar{x} = 3.25$ to $\bar{x} = 4.00$ were interpreted as always practiced, including communicating reading goals with parents regularly with $\bar{x} = 3.27$, requesting parent signatures on reading logs with $\bar{x} = 3.26$, and asking parents to model reading at home with $\bar{x} = 3.25$. These ratings suggested that teachers consistently applied specific strategies to involve parents, while other practices were applied less frequently. The findings highlighted that teachers emphasized certain parental involvement activities to strengthen learners’ reading support.

The general mean rating of $\bar{x} = 3.24$ was interpreted as occasionally practiced. This meant that teachers applied parental involvement practices moderately, with only selected strategies consistently implemented. The finding indicated that while teachers maintained some engagement with parents, further efforts could enhance overall parental participation in supporting learners’ reading.

The present study shared similarities with the findings of Escudra et al. (2023). Both studies emphasized that active parental involvement contributed positively to learners’ reading performance and overall learning outcomes.

4.2. Reading Fluency Levels of Developing Readers in Primary Grades Based on Reading Fluency Assessment

Table 5 presents the mean rating and interpretations of the reading fluency levels of developing readers in primary grades based on the Reading Fluency Assessment. The table focused on learners’ performance in accuracy, speed, prosody, and comprehension during reading tasks.

Table 5

Mean Rating and Interpretations of the Reading Fluency Levels of Developing Readers in Primary Grades Based on Reading Fluency Assessment

Indicator	Mean Rating	Interpretation
Reading Accuracy	2.36	Emerging Fluency
Reading Speed	2.37	Emerging Fluency
Prosodic Features	2.33	Emerging Fluency
Comprehension Ability	2.29	Emerging Fluency
Overall	2.33	Emerging Fluency

Legend: Scores of 3.25 to 4.00 indicate “Fluent”; scores of 2.50 to 3.24 indicate “Developing Fluency”; scores of 1.75 to 2.49 indicate “Emerging Fluency”; and scores of 1.00 to 1.74 indicate “Non-Fluent.”

Indicators with mean ratings ranging from $\bar{x} = 2.29$ to $\bar{x} = 2.37$ were interpreted as emerging fluency, including reading accuracy with $\bar{x} = 2.36$, reading speed with $\bar{x} = 2.37$, prosodic features with $\bar{x} = 2.33$, and comprehension ability with $\bar{x} = 2.29$. These ratings suggested that learners were developing basic fluency skills, though their performance required further support. The findings highlighted that primary grade learners were still acquiring foundational reading fluency across multiple dimensions.

The general mean rating of $\bar{x} = 2.33$ was interpreted as emerging fluency. This meant that learners generally demonstrated initial stages of fluency development across all indicators. The finding indicated that teachers needed to provide continuous guidance and practice to strengthen learners’ reading skills and build confidence.

The present study aligned with the findings of Santos et al. (2025). Both studies emphasized that early-stage reading interventions were crucial in developing fluency and literacy skills among primary grade learners.

4.3. Reading Fluency Levels of Developing Readers in Primary Grades Based on CRLA Tool

Table 6 presents the mean rating and interpretations of the reading fluency levels of developing readers in primary grades based on the CRLA tool. The table focused on learners’ performance in accuracy, speed, prosody, and comprehension during reading activities.

Table 6

Mean Rating and Interpretations of the Reading Fluency Levels of Developing Readers in Primary Grades Based on CRLA Tool

Indicator	Mean Rating	Interpretation
Reading Accuracy	2.24	Emerging Fluency
Reading Speed	2.27	Emerging Fluency
Prosodic Features	2.21	Emerging Fluency
Comprehension Ability	2.18	Emerging Fluency
Overall	2.23	Emerging Fluency

Legend: Scores of 3.25 to 4.00 indicate “Fluent”; scores of 2.50 to 3.24 indicate “Developing Fluency”; scores of 1.75 to 2.49 indicate “Emerging Fluency”; and scores of 1.00 to 1.74 indicate “Non-Fluent.”

Indicators with mean ratings ranging from $\bar{x} = 2.18$ to $\bar{x} = 2.27$ were interpreted as emerging fluency, including reading accuracy with $\bar{x} = 2.24$, reading speed with $\bar{x} = 2.27$, prosodic features with $\bar{x} = 2.21$, and comprehension ability with $\bar{x} = 2.18$. These ratings suggested that learners were developing basic fluency skills, though their performance required further improvement. The findings highlighted that primary grade learners were still acquiring fundamental reading skills in multiple aspects of fluency.

The general mean rating of $\bar{x} = 2.23$ was interpreted as emerging fluency. This meant that learners generally exhibited initial stages of fluency development across all reading indicators. The finding indicated that teachers needed to provide continuous support and practice to strengthen learners’ reading skills and build confidence.

The present study aligned with the findings of Avergonzado and Polinar (2025). Both studies emphasized that early-stage reading interventions were crucial in developing fluency and overall literacy skills among primary grade learners.

4.4. Difference Between the Reading Fluency Levels of Developing Readers in Primary Grades Based on Reading Fluency Assessment and CRLA Tools

Table 7 presents the differences in the reading fluency levels of developing readers. It showed the results based on the fluency reading assessment and CLRA tools.

Table 7

Difference Between the Reading Fluency Levels of Developing Readers in Primary Grades Based on Reading Fluency Assessment and CRLA Tools

Groups	MR	Eta squared (η^2)	H	df	p	Decision
Reading Fluency Levels of Developing Readers in Primary Grades Based on *Fluency Reading Assessment	52.52	.918 (Large)	54.00	1	.000	Reject H_{01} (Significant)
*CLRA Tools	125.33					

The fluency reading assessment obtained an $MR = 52.52$, $\eta^2 = .918$, $H = 54.00$, $df = 1$, $p = .000$, which indicated a significant difference and led to the decision to reject H_{01} . The CLRA tools recorded an $MR = 125.33$, showing a higher mean ranking among the groups. Both tools revealed variations in reading fluency levels as supported by their respective statistical values.

The result aligned with the findings of Purcia et al. (2023), who also reported significant differences when multiple tools assessed learners’ performance. Both studies showed that assessment instruments contributed to varying outcomes in learners’ reading measures.

4.5. Correlation Between the Instructional Reading Practices of Primary Grade Teachers as Perceived by Themselves and the Reading Fluency Levels of Developing Readers on Reading Fluency Assessment

Table 8 presents the correlation between the instructional reading practices of primary grade teachers as perceived by themselves and the reading frequency levels of developing readers based on the reading fluency assessment. The table aimed to determine whether teachers' instructional practices were related to learners' reading performance.

Table 8

Correlation Between the Instructional Reading Practices of Primary Grade Teachers as Perceived by Themselves and the Reading Frequency Levels of Developing Readers on Reading Fluency Assessment

Dependent Variables	r	p	Interpretation	Decision
Reading Accuracy	.12	.161	Positive Weak Correlation	Accept H ₀₂ (Not Significant)
Reading Speed	.13	.109	Positive Weak Correlation	Accept H ₀₂ (Not Significant)
Prosodic Features	.12	.143	Positive Weak Correlation	Accept H ₀₂ (Not Significant)
Comprehension Ability	.12	.142	Positive Weak Correlation	Accept H ₀₂ (Not Significant)
Overall	.13	.110	Positive Weak Correlation	Accept H₀₂ (Not Significant)

Legend: Scores of ± 0.70 to ± 1.00 indicate "Positive/Negative Strong Correlation," scores of ± 0.30 to ± 0.69 indicate "Positive/Negative Moderate Correlation," and scores of ± 0.00 to ± 0.29 indicate "Positive/Negative Weak Correlation."

The values of the correlation coefficients showed $r = .12$, $p = .161$ for reading accuracy, $r = .13$, $p = .109$ for reading speed, $r = .12$, $p = .143$ for prosodic features, and $r = .12$, $p = .142$ for comprehension ability. Each of these indicators was interpreted as a positive weak correlation and not statistically significant. These findings suggested that there was only a slight association between teachers' instructional reading practices and the specific reading performance of learners.

The overall correlation was $r = .13$ with $p = .110$, which was interpreted as a positive weak correlation and not significant. This meant that, in general, as teachers' instructional reading practices increased, learners' reading frequency levels showed only a minimal increase. The finding indicated that teachers' self-perceived reading practices did not strongly influence the reading fluency of developing readers. It also implied that other factors, such as home reading habits or learner motivation, may have played a more substantial role in learners' reading performance.

The present study aligned with the findings of Ho and Gan (2023), who emphasized that teacher instructional practices alone may not strongly determine learners' reading performance. However, the results also complemented the study of Valido (2025), which reported that teaching practices in reading skills strongly correlated with primary grade learners' reading performance in the Philippines. Together, these studies suggested that while instructional practices are important,

learners' reading performance is shaped by a combination of instructional and other contextual factors.

4.6. Correlation Between the Instructional Reading Practices of Primary Grade Teachers as Perceived by Themselves and the Reading Fluency Levels of Developing Readers in Primary Grades Based on CRLA Tool

Table 9 presents the correlation between the instructional reading practices of primary grade teachers as perceived by themselves and the reading frequency levels of developing readers using the CRLA tool. The table aimed to determine how teachers' reading practices related to learners' reading performance.

Table 9

Correlation Between the Instructional Reading Practices of Primary Grade Teachers as Perceived by Themselves and the Reading Frequency Levels of Developing Readers on CRLA Tool

Dependent Variables	r	p	Interpretation	Decision
Reading Accuracy	.14	.089	Positive Weak Correlation	Accept H ₀₃ (Not Significant)
Reading Speed	.14	.087	Positive Weak Correlation	Accept H ₀₃ (Not Significant)
Prosodic Features	.12	.154	Positive Weak Correlation	Accept H ₀₃ (Not Significant)
Comprehension Ability	.14	.105	Positive Weak Correlation	Accept H ₀₃ (Not Significant)
Overall	.16	.055	Positive Weak Correlation	Accept H₀₃ (Not Significant)

Legend: Scores of ± 0.70 to ± 1.00 indicate "Positive/Negative Strong Correlation," scores of ± 0.30 to ± 0.69 indicate "Positive/Negative Moderate Correlation," and scores of ± 0.00 to ± 0.29 indicate "Positive/Negative Weak Correlation."

The values of the correlation coefficients showed $r = .14$, $p = .089$ for reading accuracy, $r = .14$, $p = .087$ for reading speed, $r = .12$, $p = .154$ for prosodic features, and $r = .14$, $p = .105$ for comprehension ability. Each of these indicators was interpreted as a positive weak correlation and was not statistically significant. These findings indicated that no strong correlation was observed between teachers' instructional reading practices and the individual reading frequency levels of learners.

The overall correlation was $r = .16$ with $p = .055$, which was interpreted as a positive weak correlation and not significant. This meant that, generally, as teachers' instructional reading practices increased, learners' reading frequency levels showed only a slight increase. The finding suggested that teachers' self-perceived practices did not strongly influence the reading performance of developing readers. It also implied that other factors beyond teacher practices might have affected learners' reading frequency.

The present study aligned with the findings of Gamboa and Quicho (2025), who emphasized that teacher instructional practices alone may not strongly determine learners' reading

performance. However, the results also complemented Canonizado (2024), who reported that teacher instructional practices significantly correlated with learners' reading comprehension levels. Taken together, these studies suggested that while instructional practices play an important role, learners' reading outcomes are influenced by multiple interacting factors.

4.7. An Enhanced Reading Support Program to Improve the Instructional Reading Practices and Reading Fluency Levels of Developing Readers in Primary Grades

The Enhanced Reading Support Program is a comprehensive initiative designed to strengthen instructional reading practices of primary grade teachers and improve learners' reading fluency, comprehension, and confidence by addressing foundational literacy skills essential for academic success. It responds to key issues such as inconsistent teaching practices, weak instructional planning, irregular use of reading strategies, and insufficient progress monitoring through targeted interventions including workshops, coaching, standardized assessments, and structured planning support. The program also emphasizes collaboration among teachers, school leaders, literacy coordinators, and assessment teams to ensure consistent, effective, and data-driven reading instruction. Parental involvement is strengthened through workshops and home reading activities to reinforce learners' reading skills beyond the classroom. Overall, the program aims to produce sustainable improvements in teacher effectiveness and learners' reading fluency outcomes through enhanced support systems and continuous professional development.

5. CONCLUSIONS

1. Primary grade teachers demonstrated that their instructional planning, strategy application, progress monitoring, and parental involvement were only occasionally practiced.
2. Developing readers in primary grades, who showed emerging fluency based on the reading fluency assessment, demonstrated that consistent and targeted fluency-building interventions remained essential for improving their overall reading performance.
3. Developing readers in primary grades, who likewise exhibited emerging fluency as measured by the CRLA tool, demonstrated that sustained and targeted fluency support remained essential for strengthening their overall reading performance.
4. A significant difference existed in the reading fluency levels of developing readers based on the reading fluency assessment and CRLA tools.
5. A positive, weak, but not significant correlation existed between the instructional reading practices of primary grade teachers and the reading fluency levels of developing readers.
6. A positive, weak, but not significant correlation existed between the instructional reading practices of primary grade teachers and the reading fluency levels of developing readers based on the CRLA Tool.
7. An enhanced reading support program was developed to improve the instructional reading practices and reading fluency levels of developing readers in primary grades.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Primary grade teachers can increase the consistency of their instructional planning, strategy application, progress monitoring, and parental involvement to better support learners' reading development.
2. Developing readers in primary grades can receive more consistent and targeted fluency-building interventions to improve their overall reading performance.

3. Developing readers in primary grades can be provided sustained and focused fluency support to strengthen their overall reading performance.
4. Schools and teachers can use both the Reading Fluency Assessment and CRLA tools to identify differences in learners' reading fluency and tailor interventions accordingly.
5. Teachers' instructional reading practices can be enhanced alongside other strategies to positively influence learners' reading fluency despite the weak correlation.
6. Instructional reading practices can be improved in combination with additional interventions to support learners' reading fluency as measured by the CRLA Tool.
7. The enhanced reading support program can be implemented to improve both the instructional reading practices of teachers and the reading fluency levels of developing readers in primary grades.
8. Further studies can be conducted to explore additional factors influencing the reading fluency levels of developing readers in primary grades.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Heartfelt thanks and sincere appreciation are extended to Dr. Virginia Paula V. Fulgueras, EdD, for her generous financial support, encouragement, and inspiration that enabled the researcher to persevere and successfully complete her master's degree. The researcher is also deeply grateful to her parents, Virgilio Alvarez Lazo and Mildred Roy De Asis, and her siblings, Arlene, Vernie, and Sharon, for their unwavering love, guidance, encouragement, and countless sacrifices throughout this academic journey. Moreover, she acknowledges with profound gratitude her husband, Arnold M. Hipolito, and her children, Ana Marie, Arvin, Aldrwin, and Luisa Mae, whose patience, understanding, and constant support served as a source of strength and motivation during the entire academic endeavor.

REFERENCES

- Abejuela, H. J., Akut, K., Del Rosario, A. S., & Balane, C. (2023). Assessment of the reading curriculum in basic Education in the Philippines context. *International Journal of Language Education*, 1(1), 26. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v1i1.23641>
- Amin, F. M. (2023). Teacher Strategies in Teaching Reading Comprehension. *English Education English Journal for Teaching and Learning*, 11(02), 148–158. <https://doi.org/10.24952/ee.v11i02.10294>
- Avergonzado, R. M., & Polinar, C. C. (2025). Reading Performance of Grade I Learners through Targeted Early Reading Interventions. *International Social Sciences and Education Journal*, 3(3), 43–52. <https://doi.org/10.61424/issey.v3i3.349>
- Caban, N., Velayo, J., Tampus, G. J., Padillo, G., Manguilimotan, R., Capuno, R., Espina, R., Calasang, V., Opingo, K. M., & Etcuban, J. (2024). Parental Involvement in Reading Among Grade 1 Learners. *British Journal of Teacher Education and Pedagogy*, 3(3), 41–53. <https://doi.org/10.32996/bjtep.2024.3.3.3>
- Canonizado, I. C. PhD (2024). Reading instruction practices of intermediate teachers and comprehension levels of learners: Basis for an enhanced reading instruction program. *International Journal of Education Humanities and Social Science*, 07(06), 649–671. <https://doi.org/10.54922/ijehss.2024.0869>

- Canonizado, I. C. PhD (2025). Home learning activities, reading levels in English, and numeracy performance of grade 6 learners. *International Journal of Education Humanities and Social Science*, 08(05), 398–410. <https://doi.org/10.54922/ijehss.2025.1106>
- Canonizado, I. C. PhD (2025). Reading instructional practices, home reading support, reading activities, and reading skill levels of intermediate learners. *International Journal of Education Humanities and Social Science*, 08(06), 519–556. <https://doi.org/10.54922/ijehss.2025.1155>
- Canuto, P. P., Lumidao, Y., Ballagan, A., Calya-En, P. J., Laoyan, R. K., & Oplas, A. (2024). Enhancing elementary students' oral reading fluency through repeated reading and big books. *International Journal of Learning Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(4), 376–393. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.4.20>
- Caparas, N. L. J. T., Pitogo, N. J. B., Crebillo, N. C. M. R., De Castro Martin, N. P. P., Cunanan, N. G. B., Enriquez, N. A. M. C., Santos, N. J. M., Domingo, N. E. G., & Robles, N. R. R. (2025). Familial catalysts: How parental involvement relates to the comprehension level of the primary grade learners. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 26(3), 2068–2080. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2025.26.3.2278>
- De Guzman Fabella, N. M., & Abaoag, N. N. M. (2023). Intermediate grade school learners' sex, word recognition, and reading comprehension. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 20(3), 1346–1356. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2023.20.3.2270>
- Dimzon, F. D., & Pascual, R. M. (2022). Prosodic characterisation of children's Filipino read speech for oral reading fluency assessment. *International Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning*, 15(1), 74. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijtel.2023.127939>
- Escanda, M. (2025). Research-Based instructional strategies, professional competence, and pedagogical approaches. *International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.54476/ioer-imrj/636674>
- Escuadra, D. S., Francisco, J. P. A., & Rivera, R. P. (2023). Home Involvement and Reading Achievement on Drop Everything and Read (DEAR) at-Home Activities of Selected Students in a Technical-Vocational School. *Journal of English and Applied Linguistics*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.59588/2961-3094.1046>
- Esteban, A. J., Calang, K., & Pagador, P. M. E. (2024). A review of practices and digital technology integration in reading instruction and suggestions for the Philippines. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 13(6), 3663. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v13i6.29856>
- Francotte, E., Colognesi, S., & Coertjens, L. (2023). Co-creating tools to monitor first graders' progress in reading: a balancing act between perceived usefulness, flexibility, and workload. *Frontiers in Education*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1111420>
- Gamboa, M. M., & Quicho, R. (2025). Instructional practices, professional qualities, and teaching strategies in Enhancing reading Comprehension: A correlational analysis. *International Journal of Learning Teaching and Educational Research*, 24(6), 160–189. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.24.6.8>
- Garcia, N. R. N., & Doronio, N. R. G. (2024). Best practices in teaching reading: A phenomenological study. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 23(1), 293–301. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.23.1.2042>
- Gomes, M., & Hirata, G. (2024). Developing reading fluency in primary school: evidence from an RCT. *Education Economics*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09645292.2024.2322535>

- Ho, S. K., & Gan, Z. (2023). Instructional practices and students' reading performance: a comparative study of 10 top performing regions in PISA 2018. *Language Testing in Asia*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-023-00261-1>
- Joaquin, S. R., & Imbat, A. U. (2024). Game-Based Learning in Reading Pedagogy: A Review. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(12), 120–128. <https://doi.org/10.47760/cognizance.2024.v04i12.012>
- Kuswardani, H. P., Suprapti, V., & Paramita, P. P. (2023). The effectiveness of a combined intervention approach for improving reading fluency in elementary school students. *Psikostudia Jurnal Psikologi*, 12(3), 341. <https://doi.org/10.30872/psikostudia.v12i3.11033>
- Lariosa, B. J., & Quezada, R. J. C. (2023). Teaching of reading in the midst of uncertainties: The narrative of elementary school teachers in Digos City. *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 2(1), 36–48. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v2i1.1187>
- Librea, N. K., Luciano, A. M., Sacamay, M. L., Libres, M. D., & Cabanilla, A., Jr. (2023). Low reading Literacy Skills of Elementary Pupils in the Philippines: Systematic review. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*, 11(4), 1978–1985. <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2023.49480>
- Lim, G. B. (2024). The implementation of the National Reading Program and reading levels of primary grade learners: Foundation for an enhanced reading program. *International Journal of Education Humanities and Social Science*, 07(06), 576–605. <https://doi.org/10.54922/ijehss.2024.0866>
- Lungu, E., Tambulukani, G., & Nyimbili, F. (2024). Analysis of Instructional Strategies Teachers use to Teach Reading Comprehension to Grade 3 Learners in Selected Primary Schools of Solwezi District. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*, XI(IX), 1213–1224. <https://doi.org/10.51244/ijrsi.2024.11090101>
- Manigbas, J. I., Ollet, A. L., Noble, M. P. L., Angeles, J. R., Cayetano, N. M., & Fucio, M. P. (2024). Teachers' Competency in Content Knowledge and Pedagogy in Buhi South District, Philippines. *International Education Trend Issues*, 2(1), 21–30. <https://doi.org/10.56442/ietl.v2i1.365>
- Nombo, M. B., Komba, S. C., & Lupeja, T. (2024). Primary school teachers' instructional competence in designing lesson plans that enhances reading and writing skills to learners. *Deleted Journal*, 3(2), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.61646/ijcras.vol.3.issue1.72>
- Moral, R., & Villarente, M. D. (2024). Teaching Strategies and their Effects on reading Comprehension Performance of junior high school students in inclusive classroom setting. *EIKI Journal of Effective Teaching Methods*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.59652/jetm.v2i1.138>
- Pedroso, J. E. P., Tumabotabo, A. M., Alvarez, G. J., China, M. M. D., & Futotana, K. (2023). Contextualized Strategies of Elementary School Teachers in Teaching IP (Indigenous People) Learners. *EIKI Journal of Effective Teaching Methods*, 1(3). <https://doi.org/10.59652/jetm.v1i3.35>
- Purcia, E. L., Matan, L. L., & Sumbise, G. P. (2023). Cross-Sectioning the literacy status of the schools Division of Calbayog City. *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 2(2), 78–86. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v2i2.1354>
- Santos, O. R., Paz, R. M., Roquero, L. B., Del Rosario, E. B., Del Rosario, A. P., Orito, M. O., Medina, A. B., Victorio, P. A., Cabigao, J. P. E., & Caparas, M. E. R. (2025). A proposed Cost-Effective Early Reading Intervention: a tool in improving learners' reading

- performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 6(2), 513–520. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.06.02.07>
- Saquido, J. K., & Velasco, C. (2024). Aligned Local Reading Materials and the Literacy Comprehension Level of Grade 7 Students. *Pedagogy Review*, 3(1), 40–47. <https://doi.org/10.62718/vmca.pr-ijetas.3.1.sc-0624-025>
- Taganas, R. I., & Jancinal, R. A. (2024). Lived experiences of reading coordinators in handling Grade 7 struggling readers: A phenomenological inquiry. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(3), 81–89. <https://doi.org/10.47760/cognizance.2024.v04i03.008>
- Tan, H. S. (2023). Critical Reading skills in English of incoming Grade 10 learners: An analysis and interpretation. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(10), 3766–3776. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.10.27>
- Valido, J. P. R. (2025). Teaching practices in reading skills of primary grade learners and class reading performance in Filipino: Foundation for an enhanced reading instructional program. *International Journal of Education Humanities and Social Science*, 08(02), 259–281. <https://doi.org/10.54922/ijehss.2025.0919>
- Villalva, R. D. (2023). A Critical review of the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI) assessment. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 121(1). <https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp1001211320234560>
- Viray, E. M. (2023). Improving The Reading Performance of Grade 3 Learners Using Multimodal Reading Instruction (School Level. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, VII(III), 368–372. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2023.7304>
- Visuyan, E. B. (2024). Reading Intervention through “Brigada Sa Pagbasa”: Viewpoint of Primary Grade Teachers. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology (IJISRT)*, 556–558. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/ijisrt24may679>
- Yusuf, N. F. A., Hanafi, N. M. S., & Pahamzah, N. J. (2023). Egra on Primary school in Serang City banten; Strategies in teaching reading for early grade. *Journal of Namibian Studies History Politics Culture*, 33. <https://doi.org/10.59670/jns.v33i.557>