

Reading Fluency Instruction Practices and Oral Reading Facilitation of Key Stage 1 Teachers in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya

Mysten C. Veloso

Graduate School, Northeastern College, Santiago City, Isabela, Philippines

Email of Corresponding Author: mysten.veloso@deped.gov.ph

Publication history:

Received: September 5, 2026

Revised: October 9, 2026

Accepted: October 14, 2026

Published: October 15, 2026

International Journal of Sustainable and Integrated Studies, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 458–471, October 2026.

Abstract

This study examined the relationship between reading fluency instruction practices and oral reading facilitation among Key Stage 1 teachers in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya. Drawing on the Science of Reading, Simple View of Reading, and Active View of Reading, the study employed a quantitative, predictive-explanatory survey design using a researcher-made questionnaire administered to Key Stage 1 teachers. Findings revealed that reading fluency instruction practices were implemented to a great extent ($WM = 3.95$), while oral reading facilitation was demonstrated at a high level ($WM = 4.08$). Explicit modeling and decoding support were prominent instructional practices, while confidence-building and learner encouragement emerged as the strongest facilitation dimension. However, systematic progress monitoring, guided repeated reading, and comprehension checking required improvement. A significant positive relationship was established between reading fluency instruction practices and oral reading facilitation ($r = .687, p < .001$). Regression analysis revealed that the instructional dimensions collectively explained 54.5% of the variance in oral reading facilitation, with fluency progress monitoring emerging as the strongest significant predictor. The findings informed the development of a Fluency-Responsive Oral Reading Support Framework emphasizing systematic monitoring, guided practice, explicit instruction, and comprehension-oriented support. The study recommends targeted teacher professional development, structured reading interventions, and further evaluation of the proposed framework. The study aligns with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education) and has potential relevance to SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities) by informing responsive foundational literacy instruction. Its potential sustainability contribution lies in informing teacher professional development, promoting inclusive reading practices, and supporting continuous improvement in school-based literacy programs.

Keywords: Reading Fluency Instruction, Oral Reading Facilitation, Key Stage 1 Teachers, Fluency Progress Monitoring, Early Literacy Instruction

1. Introduction

Reading fluency is a fundamental component of early literacy development because it enables learners to recognize words accurately, read connected texts smoothly, and construct meaning through appropriate expression. Among Key Stage 1 learners, the transition from basic decoding to meaningful reading requires structured instruction, continuous practice, and responsive teacher guidance. Reading fluency is not limited to reading speed but encompasses accuracy, automaticity, and prosody, which collectively support comprehension. Van der Velde et al. (2024) emphasized the multidimensional nature of oral reading fluency and the importance of appropriate assessment practices in early primary education. Despite continuing educational reforms, reading proficiency remains a significant concern in the Philippines. National and international evidence highlights persistent difficulties in foundational literacy, emphasizing the importance of strengthening early reading

instruction (World Bank, 2022; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2023). These concerns highlight the need for systematic reading instruction that responds to individual learning needs, particularly among Key Stage 1 learners in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya. Specifically, the study investigated instructional practices involving explicit modeling, guided repeated reading, decoding and word recognition support, prosody and expression development, and fluency progress monitoring. It also examined teachers' oral reading facilitation practices involving learner preparation, instructional scaffolding, corrective feedback, encouragement, and comprehension checking. Guided by contemporary reading theories and empirical evidence, the study aimed to identify instructional practices associated with oral reading facilitation and develop a Fluency-Responsive Oral Reading Support Framework.

Reading is essential to academic development because it allows learners to acquire information, understand instructions, and participate meaningfully in classroom activities. During Key Stage 1, learners develop foundational skills that support their progression from recognizing individual words to reading connected texts with increasing accuracy, appropriate pacing, and expression. Weaknesses in these foundational abilities may limit comprehension and affect subsequent learning. Reading fluency involves the coordinated development of word recognition, automaticity, and expressive reading. Van der Velde et al. (2024) found that oral reading fluency assessments commonly emphasize accuracy, speed, and expression, although variations in definitions and assessment practices remain. Their findings highlight the importance of establishing clear instructional expectations and using developmentally appropriate methods to evaluate reading progress. Effective reading fluency instruction requires teachers to provide systematic guidance through modeling, repeated reading, decoding assistance, and formative assessment. Maki and Hammerschmidt-Snidarich (2022), in their meta-analysis of reading fluency interventions, found an overall moderate positive effect, although intervention outcomes varied according to research design and methodological quality. Their findings support the instructional value of structured fluency interventions while emphasizing the need to consider how interventions are implemented. Philippine research likewise provides evidence supporting guided fluency activities. Canuto et al. (2024) examined repeated reading and Big Books among elementary learners in Ifugao and reported improvements in oral reading fluency. Although the study involved Grade 4 learners, its findings provide relevant local evidence concerning structured reading practice and appropriate instructional materials. Oral reading facilitation complements these instructional approaches by focusing on how teachers guide learners before, during, and after reading activities. It involves preparing learners for unfamiliar texts, providing instructional prompts, responding constructively to errors, encouraging participation, and connecting reading performance with comprehension. For Key Stage 1 teachers in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya, examining these practices is important because early reading instruction must respond to differences in learner readiness, language experiences, and reading difficulties. Understanding the relationship between instructional practices and facilitation may provide a basis for strengthening classroom reading instruction and developing responsive literacy support.

Reading fluency develops through structured instruction that strengthens accurate word recognition and supports increasingly automatic reading. Duke and Cartwright (2021) explained that reading involves interconnected processes extending beyond decoding and language comprehension, including cognitive and self-regulatory abilities. This perspective emphasizes that effective instruction must address foundational reading skills while supporting meaningful engagement with text. Explicit modeling enables teachers to demonstrate accurate pronunciation, appropriate pacing, phrasing, and expression. Such demonstrations provide learners with examples of fluent reading that they can observe and reproduce through guided practice. Hudson et al. (2021) emphasized the importance of teachers' knowledge of foundational literacy skills, particularly phonological awareness, phonics, and related instructional processes. Their synthesis highlighted the value of professional preparation that allows teachers to apply evidence-based reading instruction. Guided repeated reading provides learners with structured opportunities to reread appropriate texts while receiving assistance and feedback. Maki and Hammerschmidt-Snidarich (2022) found that fluency interventions produced positive outcomes overall, although the amount and organization of intervention were important considerations. Similarly, Canuto et al. (2024) demonstrated improvements in oral reading fluency through repeated reading supported by accessible instructional materials. Decoding and word recognition support remain necessary because learners who experience difficulty identifying written words may struggle to achieve fluent reading. Hudson et al. (2021) emphasized that teachers require adequate content and pedagogical knowledge to provide effective foundational literacy instruction. Their findings suggest that teachers' understanding of sound-symbol relationships and systematic instruction is essential to supporting beginning readers. These findings indicate that explicit modeling, repeated reading, and decoding support are interconnected instructional practices. The potential benefits of these instructional practices depend on their consistent implementation and the teacher's responsiveness to learners' developing reading abilities.

Prosody is an essential component of reading fluency because it reflects the learner's ability to use appropriate phrasing, rhythm, intonation, and expression while reading connected text. Expressive reading indicates developing sensitivity to punctuation, sentence structure, and meaning. Wolters et al. (2022), in a meta-analysis, found a moderate relationship between reading prosody and comprehension. Their findings demonstrate that

expressive reading is meaningfully associated with understanding written text, although the strength of the relationship differs according to the prosodic features examined. This supports the importance of incorporating expression and meaningful phrasing into classroom fluency instruction. Reading fluency assessment must also consider multiple dimensions of performance. Van der Velde et al. (2024) identified variations in how oral reading fluency is defined and measured across early primary education studies. These variations reinforce the need for teachers to monitor accuracy, pacing, and expression rather than relying exclusively on reading speed. Fluency progress monitoring allows teachers to observe learner development, identify persistent difficulties, and adjust instructional support. Assessment information becomes more useful when it informs subsequent teaching decisions, including the selection of reading materials, the amount of guided practice, and the type of assistance provided. Together, prosody instruction and progress monitoring support a more comprehensive approach to reading fluency development. They encourage teachers to evaluate not only how quickly learners read but also how accurately, expressively, and meaningfully they engage with written texts.

Oral reading facilitation requires teachers to provide appropriate guidance throughout the reading process. Preparation before reading may involve introducing unfamiliar vocabulary, activating prior knowledge, establishing reading purposes, and creating supportive conditions for participation. The Active View of Reading proposed by Duke and Cartwright (2021) emphasizes that reading involves multiple interacting processes, including attention, self-regulation, word recognition, and language comprehension. This perspective supports instructional scaffolding that responds to learners' needs while encouraging increasingly independent reading. Teacher scaffolding includes modeling, prompting, guided practice, and assistance when learners encounter difficulty. These strategies should support the gradual development of reading independence rather than encourage continued dependence on teacher intervention. Corrective feedback is another essential aspect of oral reading facilitation. Teachers must recognize reading errors and provide guidance that helps learners understand and correct difficulties in word identification, pronunciation, or expression. Effective correction should support skill development while maintaining learners' willingness to participate. Hudson et al. (2021) demonstrated that teachers' knowledge and professional preparation contribute to their capacity to deliver appropriate foundational literacy instruction. Similarly, Rice et al. (2024) found that professional development in reading comprehension positively influenced teachers' knowledge and instructional practices, as well as student comprehension outcomes. Although their review focused on comprehension instruction, it reinforces the broader importance of teacher preparation and instructional support. These findings suggest that oral reading facilitation depends on teachers' ability to translate instructional knowledge into appropriate classroom responses. Preparation, scaffolding, and corrective feedback should therefore function as coordinated practices that promote accurate reading, confidence, and understanding.

Oral reading is both an academic and participatory classroom activity. Learners may experience hesitation or discomfort when reading aloud, particularly when they encounter unfamiliar words or make errors in front of classmates. Teachers must therefore establish supportive reading environments that encourage participation and recognize mistakes as opportunities for improvement. Duke and Cartwright (2021) emphasized the importance of self-regulatory processes in reading development. Their framework recognizes that reading involves active cognitive processes that extend beyond word identification. This supports instruction that encourages learners to monitor their reading, recognize difficulties, and apply appropriate strategies. Teacher encouragement and constructive feedback may help learners participate more confidently in oral reading activities. However, these practices should remain connected to clear instructional objectives and appropriate reading support. Comprehension checking is equally important because accurate oral reading does not automatically demonstrate understanding. Teachers may use questioning, discussion, vocabulary clarification, and retelling to determine whether learners have constructed meaning from the text. Rice et al. (2024) demonstrated that professional development focused on reading comprehension can strengthen teachers' instructional practices and improve learner outcomes. Their findings emphasize the importance of preparing teachers to implement comprehension-oriented instruction effectively. Consequently, effective oral reading facilitation should balance accuracy, expression, confidence, and comprehension. Learners must be supported not only in pronouncing words correctly but also in developing meaningful engagement with written language.

Reading fluency instruction practices and oral reading facilitation are conceptually connected because teachers' instructional knowledge influences how they organize reading activities and respond to learners during actual reading experiences. Hudson et al. (2021) found that teacher preparation and training contribute to improved knowledge of foundational literacy instruction, particularly when teachers have opportunities to apply their learning under expert guidance. These findings emphasize the importance of translating professional knowledge into classroom practice. Instructional practices provide the structure for teaching reading accuracy, automaticity, and expression, while oral reading facilitation reflects how these practices are implemented through modeling, scaffolding, feedback, and assessment. Maki and Hammerschmidt-Snidarich (2022) demonstrated that structured fluency interventions can improve reading performance, suggesting the importance of purposeful implementation and appropriate instructional support. Teacher professional development also contributes to instructional improvement. Rice et al. (2024) identified positive effects of reading comprehension professional development

on teacher knowledge, instructional practices, and student outcomes. More recently, Filderman et al. (2025) reported that professional development in reading had positive effects on teacher outcomes, with active participation producing stronger effects than passive training approaches. These findings suggest that teachers who possess stronger instructional knowledge and apply systematic reading strategies may be better prepared to provide responsive oral reading facilitation. However, the relationship between specific fluency instruction practices and facilitation must be investigated empirically rather than assumed. The present study therefore examines whether reading fluency instruction practices are significantly associated with oral reading facilitation among Key Stage 1 teachers. It also investigates whether particular instructional dimensions statistically predict teachers' facilitation practices.

Recent empirical studies provide evidence concerning structured reading interventions, reading difficulties, assessment practices, and teacher professional development. Maki and Hammerschmidt-Snidarich (2022) synthesized 33 studies on reading fluency interventions and reported an overall moderate positive effect. Their analysis also identified differences in intervention outcomes related to study design and rigor, indicating that the effectiveness of fluency instruction requires careful interpretation. Gedik and Akyol (2022) investigated reading difficulties and the development of fluent reading skills through action research. Their study provides evidence of the importance of identifying reading difficulties and providing targeted instructional support. Domingue et al. (2022) examined changes in oral reading fluency during the COVID-19 pandemic, contributing evidence concerning the educational disruptions affecting reading development. Their research reinforces the importance of monitoring literacy progress and addressing reading difficulties associated with interrupted learning opportunities. Within the Philippine context, Canuto et al. (2024) found improvements in oral reading fluency following repeated reading activities using Big Books among elementary learners in Ifugao. Their findings support the potential usefulness of structured and accessible instructional materials in local reading interventions. Van der Velde et al. (2024) reviewed oral reading fluency assessment in early primary education and identified inconsistencies between definitions and assessment practices. Their findings highlight the need for clear assessment indicators and comprehensive approaches to evaluating fluency development. Research on teacher professional development likewise demonstrates the importance of strengthening instructional competence. Rice et al. (2024) found that reading comprehension professional development improved teacher knowledge or practices and student comprehension outcomes. Filderman et al. (2025) further demonstrated that professional development positively influenced teachers' reading-related knowledge and skills, particularly when training included active application. Collectively, these studies establish the importance of systematic fluency instruction, responsive reading interventions, assessment, and teacher preparation. Nevertheless, they do not directly establish which dimensions of reading fluency instruction are most strongly associated with oral reading facilitation among Key Stage 1 teachers in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya. This provides the empirical rationale for the present investigation.

Reading proficiency remains a significant global educational concern, particularly in countries experiencing persistent foundational learning difficulties. The World Bank (2022) identified high levels of learning poverty in the Philippines, emphasizing that many children experience difficulty reading and understanding age-appropriate texts. Such challenges have implications for continued academic learning because reading serves as a foundation for acquiring knowledge across disciplines. The OECD (2023) reported that only 24 percent of Filipino learners who participated in PISA 2022 attained Level 2 or higher in reading, compared with the OECD average of 74 percent. Although PISA assesses 15-year-old learners rather than beginning readers, these findings highlight broader weaknesses in reading proficiency and reinforce the importance of strengthening foundational literacy instruction. Educational disruptions have also influenced reading development internationally. Domingue et al. (2022) examined oral reading fluency during the COVID-19 pandemic and documented changes associated with disrupted schooling. Their findings highlight the importance of continuously monitoring literacy development and providing appropriate instructional support. In response to foundational learning concerns, the Philippine Department of Education introduced reforms emphasizing literacy development. The MATATAG Curriculum emphasizes foundational literacy competencies, including language development, phonemic awareness, decoding, and word recognition (Department of Education, 2023a, 2023b). The National Reading Program provides policy support for strengthening the evaluation and selection of reading resources for use in public schools (Department of Education, 2023c). Local research demonstrates the potential of targeted fluency interventions. Canuto et al. (2024) examined repeated reading and Big Books in an elementary school in Ifugao and reported improvements in learners' oral reading fluency. Although conducted outside Bayombong and involving older elementary learners, the study offers relevant Philippine evidence concerning the use of structured reading activities. In Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya, Key Stage 1 teachers are responsible for developing learners' foundational reading abilities while responding to differences in readiness and language experiences. However, the extent of their reading fluency instruction practices and the level of their oral reading facilitation require empirical assessment. The present study addressed this need by examining self-reported reading fluency instruction practices and oral reading facilitation among Key Stage 1 teachers in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya. Its findings may provide relevant evidence for strengthening school-based reading programs and teacher support mechanisms.

The study draws on the Science of Reading as a body of research and uses the Simple View of Reading and the Active View of Reading as complementary theoretical perspectives for understanding foundational literacy instruction and oral reading facilitation. Together, these perspectives provide a conceptual basis for examining word recognition, automaticity, language comprehension, and teacher-guided reading development. The Science of Reading provides an evidence-based understanding of how learners acquire foundational reading abilities. It emphasizes the importance of systematic instruction in phonological awareness, decoding, word recognition, and related literacy processes. Hudson et al. (2021) highlighted the importance of elementary teachers' knowledge of foundational reading skills, reinforcing the need for effective instructional preparation and implementation. The Simple View of Reading explains that reading comprehension depends on both word recognition and language comprehension. Duke and Cartwright (2021) recognized the continuing importance of these two components while identifying additional processes that influence successful reading. Within the present study, this perspective explains why fluency instruction must strengthen accurate word recognition while maintaining attention to language understanding. The Active View of Reading, advanced by Duke and Cartwright (2021), expands the understanding of reading by incorporating bridging processes and active self-regulation. It recognizes that successful reading involves coordinated cognitive and linguistic processes, including the ability to monitor performance, maintain attention, and apply strategies. This perspective is particularly relevant to oral reading facilitation because beginning readers require guidance in identifying errors, recognizing meaningful phrases, and developing greater independence. Contemporary fluency research further supports the integration of accuracy, automaticity, and expression. Van der Velde et al. (2024) emphasized these components in oral reading fluency assessment, while Wolters et al. (2022) established a meaningful relationship between prosody and reading comprehension. Maki and Hammerschmidt-Snidarich (2022) also provided evidence supporting structured fluency interventions. Based on these perspectives, the study identifies reading fluency instruction practices as the independent variable, consisting of explicit modeling of fluent reading, guided repeated reading activities, decoding and word recognition support, prosody and expression development, and fluency progress monitoring. Oral reading facilitation serves as the dependent variable and comprises learner preparation before oral reading, teacher scaffolding during oral reading, corrective feedback and error handling, confidence-building and learner encouragement, and post-reading processing and comprehension checking. The conceptual framework assumes that the quality of reading fluency instruction practices may be associated with teachers' oral reading facilitation. Furthermore, the study examines whether the individual dimensions of reading fluency instruction significantly predict oral reading facilitation. The relationships examined in the study provided the empirical basis for developing the proposed Fluency-Responsive Oral Reading Support Framework for Key Stage 1 teachers in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya. The framework is intended to guide instructional improvement through systematic reading instruction, responsive facilitation, and appropriate monitoring of learners' reading development.

Although existing studies have established the importance of systematic fluency instruction, repeated reading, assessment, and teacher professional development, limited evidence directly examines the relationship between specific reading fluency instruction practices and oral reading facilitation among Key Stage 1 teachers in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya. Previous investigations have primarily addressed learner reading outcomes, instructional interventions, and teacher preparation rather than the combined descriptive and predictive relationships examined in the present study. To address this gap, the study determined the extent of teachers' reading fluency instruction practices, assessed their level of oral reading facilitation, examined the relationship between these variables, and identified the instructional dimensions that significantly predicted oral reading facilitation.

The study primarily aligns with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education), which emphasizes inclusive and equitable education and the development of foundational literacy competencies. Reading fluency is important to this goal because learners require accurate word recognition, appropriate pacing, and comprehension to participate effectively in academic learning. The study supports this educational priority by examining instructional practices that may strengthen teachers' delivery of foundational reading instruction. Its focus on modeling, repeated reading, decoding support, progress monitoring, and responsive facilitation is consistent with national efforts to improve literacy through the MATATAG Curriculum and National Reading Program (Department of Education, 2023a, 2023b, 2023c). The study also has potential relevance to Sustainable Development Goal 10 (Reduced Inequalities) through its emphasis on responsive instructional support for learners with different reading abilities. By examining teachers' scaffolding, feedback, and encouragement practices, the research may provide insights into how early literacy instruction can respond more appropriately to varied learning needs. Furthermore, the study has implications for Sustainable Development Goal 17 (Partnerships for the Goals) through the potential use of its findings by teachers, school administrators, reading coordinators, parents, and education officials. The proposed support framework may serve as a reference for coordinated instructional improvement and school-based literacy initiatives. These SDG connections represent the study's potential educational contributions rather than directly measured development outcomes.

The study contributes primarily to educational, institutional, and social sustainability by examining instructional practices that may strengthen foundational literacy and improve the quality of early reading instruction. From an

educational sustainability perspective, systematic fluency instruction helps establish reading competencies necessary for continued learning. The importance of teacher preparation in developing these skills is supported by Hudson et al. (2021), who emphasized teachers' foundational literacy knowledge, and Filderman et al. (2025), who demonstrated the positive effects of reading-focused professional development on teacher outcomes. In terms of institutional sustainability, the findings may help schools improve instructional supervision, professional development, and school-based reading programs. Rice et al. (2024) established that professional development in reading comprehension can improve teacher knowledge and instructional practice, providing evidence for the value of sustained instructional support. By identifying fluency instruction practices associated with stronger oral reading facilitation, the present study may guide more focused teacher development initiatives. The study also contributes to social sustainability by emphasizing supportive reading environments that respond to differences in learner readiness and instructional needs. Teacher scaffolding, constructive feedback, and encouragement may help promote participation and meaningful learning experiences among beginning readers. From a policy and governance perspective, the findings may inform the implementation of literacy initiatives consistent with Department of Education priorities. Evidence concerning teachers' reading fluency instruction practices may support decisions related to professional training, instructional materials, monitoring, and reading intervention planning. The proposed Fluency-Responsive Oral Reading Support Framework represents the study's principal practical contribution. Although its effectiveness will require future implementation and evaluation, the framework may provide a foundation for strengthening instructional consistency, responsive teaching, and early literacy support in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya. Overall, the study offers evidence that may inform sustainable educational improvement through teacher professional development, foundational literacy support, and more responsive school-based reading practices.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Research Design

The study employed a quantitative, predictive-explanatory survey design to examine the relationship between reading fluency instruction practices and oral reading facilitation among Key Stage 1 teachers in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya. Descriptive statistical procedures were used to determine the extent of instructional practices and the level of oral reading facilitation, while correlation and multiple regression analyses examined the relationships among the variables and the predictive contributions of specific instructional dimensions. According to Creswell and Creswell (2023), quantitative research designs allow researchers to examine relationships among measurable variables through structured data collection and statistical analysis. Reading fluency instruction practices were assessed in terms of explicit modeling of fluent reading, guided repeated reading activities, decoding and word recognition support, prosody and expression development, and fluency progress monitoring. Oral reading facilitation was examined through learner preparation, teacher scaffolding, corrective feedback and error handling, confidence-building and learner encouragement, and post-reading processing and comprehension checking. The findings provided the empirical basis for developing the proposed instructional support framework.

2.2 Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in public elementary schools in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya, focusing on the reading fluency instruction practices and oral reading facilitation of Key Stage 1 teachers. These schools provided the setting for examining teachers' self-reported instructional practices related to foundational literacy competencies, particularly word recognition, reading accuracy, fluency, expression, and comprehension. The investigation focused on the reported instructional practices of Key Stage 1 teachers within the municipality, providing a localized assessment of reading fluency instruction and oral reading facilitation.

2.3 Respondents of the Study

The respondents were Key Stage 1 teachers from public elementary schools in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya. Their direct involvement in foundational literacy instruction and oral reading activities made them appropriate respondents for assessing the study variables. The investigation focused exclusively on teachers' reading fluency instruction practices and oral reading facilitation, without examining learner, teacher, or school demographic characteristics. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire describing respondents' self-reported classroom practices.

2.4 Sample and Sampling Procedure

The study involved Key Stage 1 teachers from public elementary schools in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya. Respondents were eligible based on their direct involvement in foundational reading instruction and oral reading facilitation. Their participation provided data for assessing reading fluency instruction practices and their relationship with oral reading facilitation.

2.5 Research Instrument

The study utilized a researcher-made questionnaire consisting of two major parts. The first measured reading fluency instruction practices through explicit modeling of fluent reading, guided repeated reading activities,

decoding and word recognition support, prosody and expression development, and fluency progress monitoring. The second assessed oral reading facilitation through learner preparation before oral reading, teacher scaffolding during oral reading, corrective feedback and error handling, confidence-building and learner encouragement, and post-reading processing and comprehension checking. The questionnaire contained statements describing teachers' reported instructional practices and employed a five-point Likert-type response scale. For reading fluency instruction practices, mean scores ranging from 4.21 to 5.00 indicated Very Great Extent; 3.41 to 4.20, Great Extent; 2.61 to 3.40, Moderate Extent; 1.81 to 2.60, Low Extent; and 1.00 to 1.80, Very Low Extent. For oral reading facilitation, the corresponding interpretations were Very High, High, Moderate, Low, and Very Low. The instrument underwent expert validation by specialists in reading education, educational research, and language or literacy instruction to evaluate item clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study variables. DeVellis and Thorpe (2021) emphasized that sound scale development requires careful item construction and systematic evaluation of validity and reliability to ensure that instruments appropriately measure their intended constructs. Pilot testing was conducted among teachers who did not participate in the main study to assess the clarity, sequence, and suitability of the questionnaire items. Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. The study adopted a minimum acceptable coefficient of .80. The reliability results for the questionnaire and its dimensions were examined to determine whether the instrument met this criterion. Items that weakened reliability were reviewed, revised, or removed as necessary. DeVellis and Thorpe (2021) highlighted the importance of examining internal consistency and refining questionnaire items during instrument development.

2.6 Data Gathering Procedure

Before data collection, the researcher obtained the necessary permissions from the appropriate school authorities and concerned offices through formal requests. After securing the necessary permissions, the researcher coordinated with school heads or designated reading coordinators regarding questionnaire administration. Respondents were informed about the study's purpose, participation requirements, confidentiality measures, and their right to decline or withdraw. Informed consent was obtained before questionnaire administration. The procedures were guided by the ethical principles outlined by the British Educational Research Association (2024). The questionnaire was administered according to the approved arrangements, and respondents were given clear instructions and sufficient time to complete it. Retrieved questionnaires were reviewed for completeness and consistency. Valid responses were subsequently encoded, organized, and subjected to descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. The findings provided the basis for identifying significant relationships, determining instructional predictors, and developing the proposed support framework.

2.7 Data Analysis Techniques

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical procedures. Initial frequency checking and data screening were conducted to assess the completeness, consistency, and suitability of responses. Weighted means were calculated to determine the extent of reading fluency instruction practices and the level of oral reading facilitation across their respective dimensions, while standard deviations were used to describe response variability. The Shapiro-Wilk test was employed to examine normality. Pearson product-moment correlation was used to determine the relationship between reading fluency instruction practices and oral reading facilitation, subject to the relevant statistical assumptions. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the predictive contributions of the dimensions of reading fluency instruction practices to oral reading facilitation. The predictors were entered according to their specified sequence, beginning with explicit modeling and guided repeated reading, followed by decoding and word recognition support, prosody and expression development, and fluency progress monitoring. Relative weight analysis was used to estimate the proportional contribution of each instructional dimension to the variance explained by the regression model, particularly in the presence of correlated predictors. Garver and Williams (2024) explained that relative weight analysis provides a useful approach to assessing the comparative importance of predictors in multiple regression models. Mizumoto (2023) further discussed statistical approaches for evaluating the relative importance of multiple regression predictors, emphasizing the need to distinguish predictive contributions when interpreting relationships among variables. These principles supported the study's use of relative weight analysis to identify instructional dimensions that warranted emphasis in the proposed framework. All inferential statistical tests were evaluated at a .05 level of significance. The results provided an empirical basis for identifying instructional priorities and developing the Fluency-Responsive Oral Reading Support Framework for Key Stage 1 teachers in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya.

2.8 Ethical Considerations

The study was guided by established ethical principles concerning voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, and responsible research reporting. Necessary permissions were obtained from the appropriate school authorities before data collection. Respondents received information regarding the study's purpose, procedures, and intended use of their responses. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained before questionnaire administration. The British Educational Research Association (2024) emphasized that educational research must respect participants' autonomy, protect their rights, and ensure responsible research conduct. Respondents were informed of their right to decline or withdraw without negative consequences. Privacy

and confidentiality were protected by excluding identifying information from the research report and presenting findings in summarized form. Individual responses were not used to evaluate teacher performance or compare teachers, schools, or classrooms. Collected data were securely stored and used exclusively for academic and research purposes. The researcher maintained objectivity and transparency throughout data analysis and reporting. Findings were presented accurately without manipulation or selective reporting. The results were interpreted responsibly and used to develop the proposed Fluency-Responsive Oral Reading Support Framework.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Extent of Reading Fluency Instruction Practices Among Key Stage 1 Teachers

3.1.1 Explicit Modeling of Fluent Reading

The findings revealed that explicit modeling of fluent reading was practiced to a great extent, with an overall weighted mean of 4.13 and a standard deviation of 0.50. Reading aloud with correct pauses based on punctuation received the highest mean of 4.32, followed by demonstrating proper pronunciation at 4.28 and rereading difficult lines aloud at 4.22. Conversely, explaining why particular tones or pauses are necessary obtained the lowest mean of 3.83. These results suggest that respondents reported more frequent demonstration of fluent reading than explicit explanations of appropriate phrasing and expression. The findings suggest that respondents reported giving greater emphasis to pronunciation, pacing, and punctuation-based pauses than to explicit explanations of these reading behaviors. However, explicit explanations of these behaviors may help learners understand their purpose and apply them independently. Hudson et al. (2021) emphasized the importance of teachers' foundational literacy knowledge and appropriate instructional preparation. Similarly, Filderman et al. (2025) found that reading-focused professional development positively influences teachers' knowledge and instructional skills, particularly when it includes active opportunities to apply instructional strategies. These findings support the importance of strengthening both teacher modeling and explicit instructional guidance.

3.1.2 Guided Repeated Reading Activities

Guided repeated reading activities were implemented to a great extent, obtaining an overall weighted mean of 3.87 and a standard deviation of 0.62. Using familiar texts to develop learner confidence received the highest mean of 4.16, followed by providing opportunities to reread short passages at 4.08. However, allowing learners to compare their initial and subsequent reading attempts obtained the lowest mean of 3.39, interpreted as moderate extent. Integrating repeated reading into regular instruction received a mean of 3.71, indicating differences in implementation consistency. These findings suggest that repeated reading is an established instructional practice, although reflective monitoring of improvement remains less consistent. Maki and Hammerschmidt-Snidarich (2022), in their meta-analysis, found that structured reading fluency interventions generally produced positive outcomes, although effectiveness varied according to intervention characteristics and methodological quality. In the Philippine context, Canuto et al. (2024) reported improvements in oral reading fluency through repeated reading and Big Books among elementary learners in Ifugao. These studies support the instructional value of repeated reading while highlighting the importance of structured guidance, appropriate materials, and opportunities to monitor progress.

3.1.3 Decoding and Word Recognition Support

Decoding and word recognition support was practiced to a great extent, with an overall weighted mean of 4.05 and a standard deviation of 0.52. Teaching learners to divide difficult words into smaller parts or syllables received the highest mean of 4.26, followed by helping learners sound out unfamiliar words at 4.24. Meanwhile, providing activities that strengthen automatic recognition of common words obtained the lowest mean of 3.72, followed by helping learners distinguish similar-looking words at 3.78. The results suggest that respondents reported providing immediate decoding assistance more frequently than structured activities designed to strengthen automatic word recognition. Hudson et al. (2021) emphasized that effective foundational literacy instruction requires teachers to understand phonological awareness, phonics, and related reading processes. Duke and Cartwright (2021) further explained that word recognition and language comprehension are interconnected components of reading development. These findings suggest that systematic decoding instruction should be complemented by opportunities to develop automatic word recognition, allowing learners to devote greater attention to comprehension.

3.1.4 Prosody and Expression Development

Prosody and expression development obtained an overall weighted mean of 3.91 and a standard deviation of 0.61, indicating a great extent of implementation. Teaching learners to observe punctuation marks received the highest mean of 4.21, followed by guiding appropriate pauses at 4.18. Conversely, encouraging learners to listen to their own oral reading received the lowest mean of 3.56, while helping learners avoid monotone reading obtained 3.71. The findings indicate that respondents reported greater emphasis on punctuation-based expression than on activities that encourage learners to monitor their own oral reading. Wolters et al. (2022) found a moderate relationship between reading prosody and comprehension, emphasizing the importance of expressive reading in processing written language. Van der Velde et al. (2024) likewise identified expression as an important component

of oral reading fluency assessment. These findings suggest that instruction should extend beyond teacher-directed phrasing and pausing to include opportunities for learners to evaluate their own expression, rhythm, and intonation.

3.1.5 Fluency Progress Monitoring

Fluency progress monitoring was practiced to a great extent, with an overall weighted mean of 3.78 and a standard deviation of 0.69. Identifying learners who require additional reading support received the highest mean of 4.16, followed by regularly observing oral reading performance at 4.09. However, using records or checklists to document fluency behaviors obtained the lowest mean of 3.27, interpreted as moderate extent. Comparing current and previous reading performance also received a relatively low mean of 3.49. These findings suggest that respondents reported identifying reading difficulties through classroom observation more consistently than documenting learners' fluency development through systematic monitoring records. Van der Velde et al. (2024) emphasized the importance of clear and comprehensive oral reading fluency assessment, particularly because existing assessment approaches differ in their definitions and measurement practices. Their findings support the need for appropriate monitoring procedures that consider accuracy, automaticity, and expression. Strengthening the use of manageable progress records may therefore help teachers evaluate reading development and make more informed instructional decisions.

3.1.6 Overall Reading Fluency Instruction Practices

The overall extent of reading fluency instruction practices obtained a weighted mean of 3.95 and a standard deviation of 0.59, indicating a great extent of implementation. Explicit modeling received the highest mean of 4.13, followed by decoding and word recognition support at 4.05, prosody and expression development at 3.91, guided repeated reading at 3.87, and fluency progress monitoring at 3.78. All five dimensions were practiced to a great extent, although implementation differed across instructional areas. The findings indicate that respondents reported more extensive use of explicit modeling and decoding support than guided repeated reading and systematic fluency monitoring. Hudson et al. (2021) emphasized the importance of adequate instructional knowledge in delivering effective foundational literacy instruction, while Maki and Hammerschmidt-Snidarich (2022) demonstrated the potential benefits of organized fluency interventions. The results suggest that strengthening consistency in repeated reading and progress monitoring may help establish a more comprehensive approach to reading fluency instruction.

3.2 Level of Oral Reading Facilitation Among Key Stage 1 Teachers

3.2.1 Learner Preparation Before Oral Reading

Learner preparation before oral reading obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.11 and a standard deviation of 0.48, indicating a high level of facilitation. Introducing the reading text received the highest mean of 4.31, followed by previewing unfamiliar words at 4.25 and ensuring that learners understand the reading task at 4.22. Preparing learners emotionally to reduce fear of reading aloud received the lowest mean of 3.72. The findings suggest that teachers emphasize cognitive and linguistic preparation more consistently than emotional readiness. Duke and Cartwright (2021) emphasized that reading involves interconnected cognitive and self-regulatory processes, including motivation and active engagement. These considerations support the importance of preparing learners not only for the linguistic demands of oral reading but also for confident participation. Integrating emotional preparation into reading activities may help hesitant learners engage more comfortably in classroom reading.

3.2.2 Teacher Scaffolding During Oral Reading

Teacher scaffolding during oral reading registered an overall weighted mean of 3.99 and a standard deviation of 0.55, indicating a high level of implementation. Guiding learners without causing embarrassment obtained the highest mean of 4.28, while providing sufficient wait time before correction received 3.76. Gradually reducing support as learners become more confident obtained the lowest mean of 3.58, suggesting that respondents reported providing immediate assistance more frequently than gradually withdrawing instructional support. The findings suggest that teachers are responsive to learners' difficulties but may need to strengthen strategies that promote independence. Duke and Cartwright (2021) highlighted the importance of active self-regulation in reading development, emphasizing learners' capacity to monitor and coordinate reading processes. Filderman et al. (2025) further demonstrated that professional development can improve teachers' instructional knowledge and skills. These findings support the importance of strengthening scaffolding practices that gradually transfer responsibility from the teacher to the learner.

3.2.3 Corrective Feedback and Error Handling

Corrective feedback and error handling obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.14 and a standard deviation of 0.49, indicating a high level of facilitation. Avoiding harsh correction received the highest mean of 4.41, followed by correcting errors respectfully at 4.34 and ensuring that correction promotes improvement rather than discouragement at 4.29. Helping learners understand why an error occurred obtained the lowest mean of 3.82, while using errors to teach decoding or word recognition strategies received 3.87. These results suggest that

respondents reported greater emphasis on respectful correction than on diagnostic feedback intended to help learners understand and address reading errors. Hudson et al. (2021) emphasized that teachers require sufficient foundational literacy knowledge to recognize reading difficulties and provide appropriate instructional support. Similarly, Rice et al. (2024) found that professional development in reading comprehension positively influenced teacher knowledge and instructional practices. These findings highlight the importance of connecting corrective feedback with specific reading strategies while maintaining a supportive classroom environment.

3.2.4 Confidence-Building and Learner Encouragement

Confidence-building and learner encouragement emerged as the strongest dimension of oral reading facilitation, with an overall weighted mean of 4.32 and a standard deviation of 0.43, interpreted as very high. Creating a supportive reading atmosphere received the highest mean of 4.44, followed by providing positive reinforcement for improvement at 4.39 and avoiding comparisons among learners at 4.36. Praising specific reading behaviors such as pacing, accuracy, and expression received the lowest mean of 4.18, although it remained within the high category. These findings indicate that respondents reported a high level of learner encouragement, although behavior-specific reinforcement received a comparatively lower rating than other practices within this dimension. Duke and Cartwright (2021) identified motivation, engagement, and self-regulation as important contributors to successful reading. Their perspective supports classroom practices that promote learner confidence while developing independent reading skills. Providing specific recognition of improvements in accuracy, expression, and fluency may help connect encouragement with measurable reading development.

3.2.5 Post-Reading Processing and Comprehension Checking

Post-reading processing and comprehension checking obtained an overall weighted mean of 3.82 and a standard deviation of 0.61, indicating a high level of implementation. Asking questions after oral reading received the highest mean of 4.13, followed by connecting reading activities with comprehension discussions at 4.06. However, asking follow-up questions when learners demonstrate misunderstanding received the lowest mean of 3.55, while using learner responses to plan further reading support obtained 3.62. The findings suggest that respondents reported more frequent use of comprehension questions than the use of learner responses to guide subsequent instructional planning. Duke and Cartwright (2021) emphasized the interconnected processes involved in reading comprehension, while Rice et al. (2024) demonstrated the positive effects of professional development on comprehension instruction and learner outcomes. These findings highlight the importance of strengthening follow-up questioning, vocabulary clarification, retelling, and instructional adjustments based on learners' demonstrated understanding.

3.2.6 Overall Level of Oral Reading Facilitation

The overall level of oral reading facilitation obtained a weighted mean of 4.08 and a standard deviation of 0.51, indicating a high level of implementation. Confidence-building and learner encouragement received the highest mean of 4.32, followed by corrective feedback and error handling at 4.14, learner preparation at 4.11, teacher scaffolding at 3.99, and post-reading processing and comprehension checking at 3.82. The findings suggest that respondents perceived themselves as particularly consistent in maintaining supportive reading environments and providing respectful corrective feedback. However, comparatively lower ratings in scaffolding and comprehension checking highlight areas requiring stronger instructional attention. Duke and Cartwright (2021) emphasized the importance of connecting reading processes with comprehension and self-regulation, while Rice et al. (2024) demonstrated that professional development can strengthen comprehension-related instructional practices. These findings support an integrated approach to oral reading facilitation that combines preparation, assistance, constructive correction, encouragement, and meaning-focused activities.

3.3 Relationship Between Reading Fluency Instruction Practices and Oral Reading Facilitation

The correlation analysis revealed a statistically significant positive relationship between overall reading fluency instruction practices and oral reading facilitation ($r = .687, p < .001$). Fluency progress monitoring demonstrated the strongest relationship with oral reading facilitation ($r = .659, p < .001$), followed by guided repeated reading ($r = .621, p < .001$), prosody and expression development ($r = .594, p < .001$), explicit modeling ($r = .583, p < .001$), and decoding and word recognition support ($r = .468, p < .001$). All relationships were significant at the 0.05 level, resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between the major variables. These findings indicate that respondents who reported more extensive reading fluency instruction practices also tended to report higher levels of oral reading facilitation, with fluency progress monitoring demonstrating the strongest individual association. Van der Velde et al. (2024) emphasized the importance of comprehensive assessment in understanding oral reading fluency, while Hudson et al. (2021) highlighted the significance of teachers' foundational literacy knowledge in supporting effective instruction. Similarly, Maki and Hammerschmidt-Snidarich (2022) demonstrated the importance of structured fluency interventions. These findings provide support for the conceptual relationship between systematic instructional practices and responsive oral reading facilitation, although the observed associations do not establish causation.

3.4 Predictive Contributions of Reading Fluency Instruction Practices to Oral Reading Facilitation

3.4.1 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis

Hierarchical multiple regression revealed that the five dimensions of reading fluency instruction practices collectively explained 54.5% of the variance in oral reading facilitation ($R = .738$, $R^2 = .545$, adjusted $R^2 = .517$). Explicit modeling and guided repeated reading initially explained 39.7% of the variance ($p < .001$). Adding decoding and word recognition support increased explained variance by 2.4 percentage points, although the change was not statistically significant ($p = .071$). Prosody and expression development contributed an additional 6.1 percentage points ($p = .006$), while fluency progress monitoring added 6.3 percentage points ($p = .001$). The final model supported the rejection of the general null hypothesis concerning the predictive contribution of reading fluency instruction practices. The findings indicate that explicit modeling and guided repeated reading accounted for a substantial proportion of the variance explained in the initial regression model. The subsequent inclusion of prosody development and fluency progress monitoring significantly increased the model's explained variance. Maki and Hammerschmidt-Snidarich (2022) demonstrated the instructional relevance of structured fluency interventions, while Wolters et al. (2022) established a meaningful relationship between expressive reading and comprehension. Van der Velde et al. (2024) likewise emphasized the importance of comprehensive fluency assessment. These studies support the instructional relevance of integrating modeling, repeated practice, expression, and monitoring, although the regression findings represent statistical prediction rather than causal effects.

3.4.2 Significant Predictors of Oral Reading Facilitation

Fluency progress monitoring demonstrated the largest statistically significant standardized regression coefficient ($\beta = .301$, $p = .001$). Relative weight analysis attributed 30.8% of the model's explained variance to this dimension, representing the largest proportional relative weight among the five predictors. Guided repeated reading followed ($\beta = .219$, $p = .009$), contributing 22.4%, while prosody and expression development ($\beta = .194$, $p = .019$) contributed 19.1%. Explicit modeling also significantly predicted facilitation ($\beta = .172$, $p = .035$), accounting for 17.4%. Decoding and word recognition support showed a positive but statistically nonsignificant standardized regression coefficient ($\beta = .101$, $p = .219$). Nevertheless, relative weight analysis assigned this dimension 10.3% of the total explained variance, reflecting its contribution within the combined predictor set rather than evidence of a statistically significant unique effect. These findings indicate that progress monitoring has the strongest predictive contribution when the five instructional dimensions are considered simultaneously. Van der Velde et al. (2024) highlighted the importance of accurate and comprehensive oral reading fluency assessment, while Maki and Hammerschmidt-Snidarich (2022) demonstrated the value of systematic fluency interventions. Wolters et al. (2022) further established the relevance of prosody to reading comprehension. Although decoding and word recognition support did not emerge as a significant unique predictor, Duke and Cartwright (2021) emphasized that word recognition remains a fundamental component of reading. Accordingly, the null hypotheses concerning progress monitoring, guided repeated reading, prosody development, and explicit modeling are rejected, while the hypothesis concerning decoding and word recognition support is not rejected. These predictive relationships should not be interpreted as causal effects because the study employed a nonexperimental, cross-sectional design based on teachers' self-reported practices.

3.5 Proposed Fluency-Responsive Oral Reading Support Framework for Key Stage 1 Teachers

3.5.1 Evidence-Responsive Monitoring and Guided Repeated Reading

The proposed framework prioritizes evidence-responsive fluency monitoring and guided repeated reading based on their statistical contributions. Fluency progress monitoring emerged as the strongest predictor ($\beta = .301$), accounting for 30.8% of explained variance, although the use of monitoring records or checklists received a moderate weighted mean of 3.27. Guided repeated reading accounted for 22.4% of explained variance ($\beta = .219$), while allowing learners to compare their reading attempts obtained a moderate mean of 3.39. These findings support prioritizing systematic progress monitoring and structured repeated reading activities within the proposed instructional framework. Van der Velde et al. (2024) emphasized the importance of appropriate oral reading fluency assessment, while Maki and Hammerschmidt-Snidarich (2022) identified positive outcomes associated with structured fluency interventions. Canuto et al. (2024) likewise reported improvements in oral reading fluency through repeated reading and accessible instructional materials. The proposed framework therefore emphasizes manageable progress records, targeted feedback, guided rereading, and learner reflection to support more responsive instructional decisions.

3.5.2 Prosody Development, Explicit Modeling, and Decoding Support

Prosody and expression development contributed 19.1% of explained variance ($\beta = .194$), while explicit modeling contributed 17.4% ($\beta = .172$). Both significantly predicted oral reading facilitation. Decoding and word recognition support accounted for 10.3% of explained variance but did not demonstrate a statistically significant unique regression coefficient ($\beta = .101$, $p = .219$). Descriptive findings also revealed that learner self-monitoring of expression obtained a comparatively low mean of 3.56, while explicit modeling received an overall mean of 4.13. The findings support maintaining teacher demonstrations while strengthening explanations of phrasing, pauses, intonation, and expression. Wolters et al. (2022) established a meaningful relationship between reading prosody and comprehension, highlighting the importance of expressive reading. Hudson et al. (2021) emphasized

the need for sufficient teacher knowledge of foundational literacy processes, while Duke and Cartwright (2021) explained that reading involves interconnected word recognition, language comprehension, and self-regulatory abilities. These perspectives support integrating decoding assistance, explicit modeling, and opportunities for learners to evaluate their own reading performance.

3.5.3 Supportive Scaffolding, Confidence-Building, and Comprehension-Oriented Reading

The findings showed high levels of teacher scaffolding ($WM = 3.99$) and corrective feedback ($WM = 4.14$), while confidence-building and learner encouragement obtained the highest facilitation mean of 4.32. Post-reading processing and comprehension checking received the lowest mean of 3.82. These results indicate strong learner-sensitive support but comparatively weaker practices involving the gradual withdrawal of assistance and the diagnostic use of comprehension responses. The proposed framework therefore emphasizes maintaining supportive classroom interactions while strengthening learner independence and comprehension-oriented activities. Duke and Cartwright (2021) emphasized the role of active self-regulation and comprehension processes in reading development. Rice et al. (2024) demonstrated that professional development in reading comprehension positively influences teacher instructional practices and student outcomes, while Filderman et al. (2025) highlighted the value of active professional learning experiences in strengthening reading instruction. These findings support the proposed emphasis on adequate wait time, guided self-correction, gradual reduction of assistance, comprehension questioning, retelling, and instructional adjustments based on learner responses. Overall, the proposed Fluency-Responsive Oral Reading Support Framework organizes the study's instructional priorities into interconnected components: systematic fluency progress monitoring, guided repeated reading, explicit modeling and decoding support, prosody development, responsive scaffolding, learner encouragement, and comprehension-oriented reading activities. The framework translates the study's descriptive, correlational, and predictive findings into instructional priorities that may guide teachers, school heads, and reading coordinators in strengthening early literacy instruction in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya. Its effectiveness, however, remains to be established through future implementation and evaluation.

4. Conclusion & Recommendations

The study concluded that Key Stage 1 teachers in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya reported practicing reading fluency instruction to a great extent ($WM = 3.95$) and oral reading facilitation at a high level ($WM = 4.08$). Explicit modeling and decoding support were the strongest instructional practices, whereas fluency progress monitoring and guided repeated reading were comparatively less emphasized. Confidence-building and learner encouragement emerged as the strongest aspects of oral reading facilitation, while post-reading comprehension checking required further improvement. A statistically significant positive relationship was observed between self-reported reading fluency instruction practices and oral reading facilitation ($r = .687$, $p < .001$). The five instructional dimensions collectively accounted for 54.5% of the variance in self-reported oral reading facilitation. Fluency progress monitoring emerged as the strongest significant predictor, followed by guided repeated reading, prosody and expression development, and explicit modeling. Decoding and word recognition support remained positively associated with facilitation but did not demonstrate a significant unique predictive contribution. These findings provided the basis for developing a Fluency-Responsive Oral Reading Support Framework that integrates systematic monitoring, guided practice, explicit instruction, learner encouragement, and comprehension-oriented reading support.

Key Stage 1 teachers are encouraged to sustain effective modeling, decoding support, and learner encouragement while strengthening systematic fluency monitoring, structured repeated reading, prosody instruction, and comprehension-focused activities. Simple monitoring tools, including learner progress records and reading checklists, should be used to identify difficulties, track improvement, and guide instructional adjustments. Repeated reading activities should incorporate modeling, focused feedback, rereading, and learner reflection to promote accuracy, expression, and independence. School heads, reading coordinators, and instructional supervisors should provide targeted professional development on scaffold fading, diagnostic error analysis, appropriate wait time, corrective feedback, and comprehension checking. The proposed Fluency-Responsive Oral Reading Support Framework may serve as a guide for improving school-based literacy programs, teacher coaching, classroom observations, and reading interventions, subject to further review and contextual adaptation. Future researchers are encouraged to implement and evaluate the framework using experimental, quasi-experimental, longitudinal, or mixed-method approaches to determine its effectiveness in improving learners' reading outcomes.

The study was limited to Key Stage 1 teachers in Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya and focused on their reported reading fluency instruction practices and oral reading facilitation. It did not directly assess learners' reading accuracy, rate, prosody, comprehension, or confidence through performance-based measures. Classroom observations, comparisons across schools or grade levels, and additional instructional or contextual variables were not included. Although the regression model accounted for 54.5% of the variance in self-reported oral reading facilitation, 45.5% remained unexplained by the included predictors. The cross-sectional, questionnaire-based

design also limits causal interpretation and may be subject to common-method bias and socially desirable responses. Furthermore, the proposed Fluency-Responsive Oral Reading Support Framework was developed from the study's findings but was not implemented or evaluated. Consequently, its effectiveness in improving actual learner outcomes remains to be established through further research.

5. Compliance with Ethical Standards

The study was conducted in accordance with ethical principles concerning voluntary participation, informed consent, privacy, confidentiality, and responsible reporting of research findings. Necessary permissions were obtained from the appropriate school authorities before data collection. Respondents were informed of the study's purpose, participation requirements, and their right to decline or withdraw without negative consequences. Individual responses were treated confidentially and reported only in summarized form. The collected information was used exclusively for academic and research purposes, and the findings were presented objectively without manipulation or selective reporting.

REFERENCES

- British Educational Research Association. (2024). Ethical guidelines for educational research (5th ed.). <https://www.bera.ac.uk/publication/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-fifth-edition-2024>
- Canuto, P. P., Lumidao, Y., Ballagan, A., Calya-en, P., Jr., 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>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://au.sagepub.com/en-gb/anz/research-design-international-student-edition/book280802>
- Department of Education. (2023a). MATATAG curriculum: Language curriculum guide, Grade 1. Department of Education.
- Department of Education. (2023b). MATATAG curriculum: Reading and literacy curriculum guide, Grade 1. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/matatagcurriculumk147/>
- Department of Education. (2023c). Screening and evaluation tools for the evaluation and selection of reading resources for the National Reading Program (DepEd Memorandum No. 064, s. 2023). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2023/?cat=6>
- DeVellis, R. F., & Thorpe, C. T. (2021). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://us2.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/scale-development/book269114>
- Domingue, B. W., Dell, M., Lang, D., Silverman, R., Yeatman, J., & Hough, H. (2022). The effect of COVID on oral reading fluency during the 2020–2021 academic year. *AERA Open*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584221120254>
- Duke, N. K., & Cartwright, K. B. (2021). The science of reading progresses: Communicating advances beyond the simple view of reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(S1), S25–S44. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.411>
- Filderman, M. J., Didion, L., Austin, C. R., Payne, B., Silvert, C., & Wexler, J. (2025). Teacher professional development for reading: A review of the state of the research. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 60(4), Article e70054. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.70054>
- Garver, M. S., & Williams, Z. (2024). Key driver analysis with relative weight analysis: A two-step approach. *International Journal of Market Research*, 66(6), 711–728. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14707853241251719>
- Gedik, O., & Akyol, H. (2022). Reading difficulty and development of fluent reading skills: An action research. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 18(1), 22–41. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1332254.pdf>
- Hudson, A. K., Moore, K. A., Han, B., Koh, P. W., Binks-Cantrell, E., & Joshi, R. M. (2021). Elementary teachers' knowledge of foundational literacy skills: A critical piece of the puzzle in the science of reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(S1), S287–S315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.408>
- Maki, K. E., & Hammerschmidt-Snidarich, S. (2022). Reading fluency intervention dosage: A novel meta-analysis and research synthesis. *Journal of School Psychology*, 92, 148–165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2022.03.008>
- Mizumoto, A. (2023). Calculating the relative importance of multiple regression predictor variables using dominance analysis and random forests. *Language Learning*, 73(1), 161–196. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12518>

- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). PISA 2022 results (Volume I and II): Country notes, Philippines. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2022-results-volume-i-and-ii-country-notes_ed6fbcc5-en/philippines_a0882a2d-en.html
- Rice, M., Lambright, K., & Wijekumar, K. (2024). Professional development in reading comprehension: A meta-analysis of the effects on teachers and students. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 59(3), 424–447. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.546>
- van der Velde, M., Molenaar, B., Veldkamp, B. P., Feskens, R., & Keuning, J. (2024). What do they say? Assessment of oral reading fluency in early primary school children: A scoping review. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 128, Article 102444. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2024.102444>
- Wolters, A. P., Kim, Y. S. G., & Szura, J. W. (2022). Is reading prosody related to reading comprehension? A meta-analysis. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 26(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2020.1850733>
- World Bank. (2022). Philippines learning poverty brief. <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099000207152223103/pdf/IDU002b5536c0db4104ec3087d809906ec2eae56.pdf>