IGNATIAN
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH
www.icceph.com
ISSN 2984-9942

READING FLUENCY THROUGH HOME LITERACY ECOLOGY, READING SELF-EFFICACY, AND TEACHERS' MODELING

Jessa Mae E. Sulpico, Ralph Jay M. Magsalay, PhD

Graduate School, Lourdes College, Inc.,
Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Reading fluency supports learners' ability to recognize words accurately, read at an appropriate rate, and use meaningful expression. This study examined home literacy ecology, reading self-efficacy, and teachers' modeling of fluent reading in relation to the reading fluency of Grade 3 pupils in Kalilangan East District, Division of Bukidnon. This study was completed on October, School Year 2026-2027. A quantitative predictive-correlational research design was used with 120 Grade 3 pupils selected through total enumeration. Data were collected using a researcher-developed Home Literacy Ecology, Reading Self-Efficacy, and Teachers' Modeling Questionnaire (HLRSTMQ) and an oral reading assessment adopted from the Department of Education's Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA). Descriptive statistics, canonical correlation, and multiple linear regression were used. Home literacy ecology and reading self-efficacy were both rated High, while teachers' modeling was Very High. Reading fluency results showed moderate accuracy, a very slow reading rate, and less expressive prosody. Canonical correlation analysis indicated a significant but weak relationship between home literacy ecology and reading fluency, whereas reading self-efficacy and teachers' modeling of fluent reading did not demonstrate significant canonical relationships with reading fluency. Multiple regression analysis further revealed that the three predictors, did not significantly predict reading fluency, and none made a statistically significant unique contribution. These findings suggest that the three factors, did not sufficiently explain variations in the pupils' reading fluency within the context of this study. The study recommends sustained and targeted reading instruction focusing on word recognition, accuracy, automaticity, reading rate, and prosody. Future researchers may replicate the study using larger and more diverse samples, investigate additional factors such as phonological awareness, decoding skills, vocabulary, language proficiency, and reading practice, employ longitudinal or experimental research designs, and examine specific components of home

literacy ecology to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the factors associated with reading fluency.

Keywords: *reading fluency, home literacy ecology, reading self-efficacy, teacher modeling, Grade 3*

INTRODUCTION

Reading is the basis of stronger literacy skills in elementary students. It significantly contributes to their critical thinking, communication, and life-long learning. Lexia (2025) said that the National Reading Panel recognized five components of reading, one of which is reading fluency. Reading fluency in its most basic sense, means that students can read texts accurately and quickly, as well as with good expression. It is critical for bridging the gap between decoding and comprehension.

However, the results from Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2022, revealed that only twenty-four percent (24%) of the 15-year-old Filipinos achieved Level 2 or higher proficiency level in reading, and almost none made it to higher reading levels. These findings highlight the urgent need for early intervention in reading fluency (OECD, 2023). Likewise, the Philippines' poorest global performance in reading proficiency indicates that schools were never able to fulfill their mission of developing quality and discerning individuals (Librea et al., 2023).

One important factor associated with children's reading development is the literacy environment at home. Home Literacy ecology encompasses the literacy resources, parent- child reading interactions, and literacy practices that shape children's early reading experiences. Parents who regularly engage in picture-book reading with their children contribute to better parent-child relationships and fewer disruptive behaviors (Ni et al., 2021). These findings demonstrate that supportive home literacy environments provide an important foundation for developing reading fluency.

However, the reading motivation of students – including their sense of efficacy- is equally essential (Caliskan and Ulas, 2022). Reading motivation can be construed as the willingness to read derived from a broad package of an individual's construct of attitudes toward and goals for reading. Researchers claim that teaching reading should not only develop children's skills in this respect, but also a love of reading (Van der Sande et al., 2023). Additionally, the potential of families in promoting reading motivation is huge (Caliskan & Ulas, 2022), yet few intervention programs successfully combine home and school settings, particularly leveraging teachers' modeling alongside home-based support.

Local studies also emphasize the importance of parental involvement and appropriate reading strategies in supporting learners' reading development. Amerol (2025) highlighted the contribution of parental factors to learners' reading proficiency, while Mahusay and Arazo (2024) reported that teachers' reading strategies were associated

with learners' reading performance. Tabamo and Labitad (2025) also examined teachers' self-efficacy and reading comprehension practices. However, these variables have largely been investigated independently rather than as interconnected factors influencing reading fluency. Furthermore, empirical evidence integrating home literacy ecology, self-efficacy, and teachers' modeling within a single predictive framework among Grade 3 learners in Philippine Public Elementary Schools remain limited, particularly in rural districts such as Kalilangan East District. Understanding hoe these three factors collectively influence reading fluency may provide stronger evidence for designing integrated home-school literacy interventions that support the reading development of Filipino learners.

Anchored on these gaps, this study sought to determine the influence of home literacy ecology, self-efficacy, and teachers; modeling on the reading fluency skills of Grade 3 Pupils in Kalilangan East District. By determining these variables within a unified framework, the study aimed to generate empirical evidence that can inform literacy instruction, strengthen home-school partnerships, and support evidence-based interventions for improving reading fluency among Grade 3 pupils.

In addition, this research contributed to Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4: Quality Education, which sought to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promoted lifelong learning opportunities for all. Specifically, it supported Target 4.1, which emphasized free, equitable, and quality primary and secondary education with effective learning outcomes, and Target 4.6, which focused on developing literacy and numeracy skills among youth and a substantial proportion of adults. By examining home literacy ecology, reading self-efficacy, and teachers' modeling in relation to Grade 3 pupils' reading fluency, this study supported efforts to improve reading proficiency and promoted quality learning outcomes in primary education.

The study was guided by Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (1978) and Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (1986). Sociocultural theory explains how parents and teachers provide interaction, modeling, and scaffolding. Social cognitive theory explains how self-efficacy may affect effort and persistence during reading. The conceptual model positioned Home Literacy Ecology, Reading Self-Efficacy, and Teachers' modeling of Fluent Reading as predictor variables and Reading Fluency—accuracy, speed, and prosody—as the outcome.

Research Questions

The study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the participants' assessment of their home literacy ecology?
2. What is the participants' self-report of their reading self-efficacy?
3. What is the participants' assessment of their teachers' modeling of fluent reading?
4. What is the participants' level of reading fluency in terms of:
    4.1 Accuracy;

4.2 Speed; and
4.3 Prosody?

5. Are home literacy ecology, reading self-efficacy, and teachers' modeling of fluent reading significantly associated with or predictive of reading fluency, individually and collectively?

METHODOLOGY

A quantitative predictive-correlational research design was used in this study. The design enabled the researcher to describe participants' responses and reading performance and examine whether the three predictor variables statistically explained variation in reading fluency. No variable was manipulated, and data were collected within a defined period.

The participants were 120 Grade 3 pupils enrolled in selected public elementary schools in Kalilangan East District, Division of Bukidnon, during School Year 2026–2027. Total enumeration sampling was used: all eligible pupils in the target population were invited rather than selecting a smaller sample.

Inclusion criteria were official Grade 3 enrolment in the selected schools, regular attendance during data collection, and the ability to participate in the assessment and questionnaire with appropriate guidance. Pupils absent during scheduled collection or without parental/guardian consent were excluded. A separate pilot test involved 30 Grade 3 pupils from a public elementary school outside the study area; these pupils were not included in the final sample.

The researcher-developed HLRSTMQ contained three 10-item sections: (1) Home Literacy Ecology, (2) Reading Self-Efficacy, and (3) Teachers' Modeling of Fluent Reading. Each item used a five-point response scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, and 5 = Always. Domain means were interpreted as Very Low (1.00–1.50), Low (1.51–2.50), Moderate (2.51–3.50), High (3.51–4.50), and Very High (4.51–5.00).

Reading fluency was measured through an individual oral reading assessment adopted from the Department of Education's Comprehensive Rapid Literacy Assessment (CRLA). Performance was assessed in accuracy, speed, and prosody. The questionnaire was reviewed by three experts for content validity and pilot-tested with 30 pupils. McDonald's omega was specified as the reliability measure; the thesis methods section describes the procedure but does not provide the coefficient in the summarized results.

Permission was sought from the Schools Division Superintendent and District Supervisor, with coordination from school principals and Grade 3 advisers. Pupils received an age-appropriate orientation. The researcher administered the oral reading assessment and guided pupils through the questionnaire to ensure they understood the items.

Participation was voluntary. Written informed consent was obtained from parents or legal guardians, and age-appropriate assent was obtained from pupils. Participants were told they could refuse, pause, or withdraw without penalty. The reading task was not presented as a graded activity, and a supportive, non-judgmental environment was maintained.

Participant codes were used instead of names. Electronic files were password-protected, and printed records were stored securely with access limited to the researcher and authorized personnel. The researcher planned to document and report any suspected data breach to the research adviser and appropriate authority and follow applicable data privacy and child-protection procedures.

The researcher recognized that oral reading might cause nervousness, embarrassment, frustration, or anxiety. Pupils could request a break or stop at any time. If signs of distress occurred, the assessment would be paused or stopped, with parents/guardians and appropriate school personnel informed when necessary. Data were planned to be retained for five years after completion and then securely destroyed, subject to institutional requirements. Findings were to be reported in aggregate without identifying individual pupils.

Frequencies and percentages described the distribution of participants across levels. Means and standard deviations summarized home literacy ecology, reading self-efficacy, teachers' modeling, and the accuracy, speed, and prosody measures. Canonical correlation analysis was used to examine relationships between each predictor set and the three reading fluency dimensions. Multiple linear regression was used to test the combined predictive contribution of the three independent variables to overall reading fluency.

Regression outputs included R, R^2, adjusted R^2, F, regression coefficients, standardized beta coefficients, t-values, p-values, and confidence intervals. Statistical significance was evaluated at $\alpha = .05$. Regression assumptions, including linearity, independence of errors, homoscedasticity, residual normality, and multicollinearity, were considered in the analysis. Data were processed using Jamovi and SPSS outputs presented in the thesis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Question 1: What is the participants' assessment of their home literacy ecology?

Table 1 presents the frequency distribution and descriptive statistics for Home Literacy Ecology. The overall mean of 3.52, with a standard deviation (*SD*) of 0.83, indicates a High level of Home Literacy Ecology. This interpretation suggests that, in general, the participants experience home environments that provide support for their reading development. Specifically, the high level may be reflected in the availability of

reading materials, parental or family encouragement, shared reading activities, and support for reading at home, as represented by the indicators measured in the study.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for Home Literacy Ecology

Score Range	Description	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
4.51 – 5.00	Always	Very High	12	10.00
3.51 – 4.50	Often	High	51	42.50
2.51 – 3.50	Sometimes	Moderate	40	33.33
1.51 – 2.50	Rarely	Low	16	13.33
1.00 – 1.50	Never	Very Low	1	0.83
	Total		120	100.00
	Mean			3.52
	SD			0.83
	Interpretation			High

The frequency distribution further shows that 51 participants (42.50%) reported a High level, while 40 (33.33%) reported a Moderate level. Meanwhile, 12 participants (10.00%) reported a Very High level, 16 (13.33%) reported a Low level, and one participant (0.83%) reported a Very Low level. Overall, the findings indicate that home literacy support is generally present among the participants, although the distribution across the five levels suggests that the extent of this support varies among households.

The findings indicate that Home Literacy Ecology is generally supportive among the participants, but the support appears stronger in providing encouragement and basic reading opportunities than in creating varied and enjoyable literacy activities. The relatively large *SD* values across the indicators also show that the home experiences of the learners differ considerably. Thus, some learners may receive regular reading support, while others may have fewer opportunities for shared reading, discussion, and reading for enjoyment.

Research Question 2: What is the participants' self-report of their reading self-efficacy?

Table 2 presents the frequency distribution and descriptive statistics for Reading Self-efficacy. The results show that 45 participants, or 37.50 percent, reported a High level of Reading Self-efficacy, while 39 participants, or 32.50 percent, reported a Moderate level. Eighteen participants, or 15.00 percent, reported a Very High level, while 15 participants, or 12.50 percent, reported a Low level, and three participants, or 2.50 percent, reported a Very Low level. The mean of 3.55 with an SD of 0.84 indicates a High level of Reading Self-efficacy. This result shows that the learners generally believe that they can perform reading tasks successfully, although the distribution also shows that a considerable number of learners still have only moderate or lower confidence in their reading ability.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for Reading Self-efficacy

Score Range	Description	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
4.51 – 5.00	Always	Very High	18	15.00
3.51 – 4.50	Often	High	45	37.50
2.51 – 3.50	Sometimes	Moderate	39	32.50
1.51 – 2.50	Rarely	Low	15	12.50
1.00 – 1.50	Never	Very Low	3	2.50
	Total		120	100.00
	Mean			3.55
	SD			0.84
	Interpretation			High

The findings indicate that Reading Self-efficacy is generally high among the participants, although the responses show clear differences across particular reading situations. The relatively large SD values, which ranged from 1.06 to 1.37, also show that the learners differ considerably in how confident they feel when reading. Their confidence appears stronger when tasks involve practice and completion, while more difficult reading, comprehension, correct oral reading, and reading in front of others remain areas where some learners may need additional support.

Research Question 3: What is the participants' assessment in their teachers' modeling of fluent reading?

Table 3 presents the frequency distribution and descriptive statistics for Teachers' Modeling of Fluent Reading. The results show that 88 participants, or 73.33 percent, rated Teachers' Modeling of Fluent Reading at a Very High level, while 23 participants, or 19.17 percent, rated it at a High level. Six participants, or 5.00 percent, reported a Moderate level, while three participants, or 2.50 percent, reported a Low level. No participant reported a Very Low level. The mean of 4.63 with an *SD* of 0.64 indicates a Very High level of Teachers' Modeling of Fluent Reading. This result shows that the learners commonly observe their teachers demonstrating fluent reading through clear pronunciation, expression, suitable pacing, correct pauses, and other practices that show how fluent reading should sound.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics for Teachers' Modeling of Fluent Reading

Score Range	Description	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
4.51 – 5.00	Always	Very High	88	73.33
3.51 – 4.50	Often	High	23	19.17
2.51 – 3.50	Sometimes	Moderate	6	5.00
1.51 – 2.50	Rarely	Low	3	2.50
1.00 – 1.50	Never	Very Low	0	0.00
	Total		120	100.00
	Mean			4.63
	SD			0.64

Score Range	Description	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
	Interpretation		Very High	

The findings indicate that Teachers' Modeling of Fluent Reading is strongly evident among the participants, as most learners reported regularly hearing and observing fluent reading from their teachers. The SD values, which ranged from 0.61 to 1.04, show that the learners generally reported similar experiences, although some variation was present in practices related to reading speed and feedback. The Very High level suggests that teachers frequently provide learners with examples of how accurate, expressive, and well-paced reading should be demonstrated, helping learners develop their own reading fluency skills.

Research Question 4: What is the participants' level of reading fluency in terms of:

4.1 Accuracy;
4.2 Speed; and
4.3 Prosody?

Table 4 presents the frequency distribution and descriptive statistics for Accuracy. The results show that 36 participants, or 30.00 percent, were classified as Less Accurate, while 31 participants, or 25.83 percent, were classified as Inaccurate. Eighteen participants, or 15.00 percent, were Moderately Accurate, another 18 participants, or 15.00 percent, were Accurate, and 17 participants, or 14.17 percent, were Very Accurate. The mean score of 41.11 with an SD of 28.42 indicates a Moderately Accurate level. This result shows that many learners still experience difficulty in reading words correctly, while only a smaller part of the sample reached the Accurate and Very Accurate levels.

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics for Accuracy

Score Range	Description	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
80.00 – 100.00	Always	Very Accurate	17	14.17
60.00 – 79.99	Often	Accurate	18	15.00
40.00 – 59.99	Sometimes	Moderately Accurate	18	15.00
20.00 – 39.99	Rarely	Less Accurate	36	30.00
0.00 – 19.99	Never	Inaccurate	31	25.83
	Total		120	100.00
	Mean		41.11	
	SD		28.42	
	Interpretation		Moderately Accurate	

The findings indicate that Accuracy is only moderately developed among the participants, while the large number of learners under the Less Accurate and Inaccurate categories shows the need for continued support in word recognition and decoding. The wide variation in scores further suggests that reading instruction may need to consider

individual differences, giving more focused practice to learners who still struggle to read words correctly.

Table 5 presents the frequency distribution and descriptive statistics for Speed. The results show that 77 participants, or 64.17 percent, were classified under the Very Slow Rate, while 28 participants, or 23.33 percent, were classified under the Slow Rate. Ten participants, or 8.33 percent, showed a Moderate Rate, four participants, or 3.33 percent, reached the Fluent Rate, and only one participant, or 0.83 percent, reached the Very Fluent Rate. The mean score of 19.77 with an SD of 17.56 indicates a Very Slow Rate. This result shows that most learners still read at a slow pace and that only a small number have reached a fluent reading speed.

Table 5
Descriptive Statistics for Speed

Score Range	Description	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
80.00 – 100.00	Always	Very Fluent Rate	1	0.83
60.00 – 79.99	Often	Fluent Rate	4	3.33
40.00 – 59.99	Sometimes	Moderate Rate	10	8.33
20.00 – 39.99	Rarely	Slow Rate	28	23.33
0.00 – 19.99	Never	Very Slow Rate	77	64.17
	Total		120	100.00
	Mean		19.77	
	SD		17.56	
	Interpretation		Very Slow Rate	

The findings indicate that Speed is the weakest area of reading fluency among many of the participants, as most learners remain under the Very Slow Rate and Slow Rate categories. The SD of 17.56 also shows considerable variation in reading speed, which means that some learners read much faster than others. This pattern suggests the need for differentiated reading support, particularly for learners who require more practice in automatic word recognition and continuous oral reading.

Table 6
Descriptive Statistics for Prosody

Score Range	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
3.40 – 4.00	Very Expressive	30	25.00
2.80 – 3.39	Expressive	12	10.00
2.20 – 2.79	Moderately Expressive	0	0.00
1.60 – 2.19	Less Expressive	19	15.83
1.00 – 1.59	Monotonous	59	49.17
	Total	120	100.00
	Mean	2.11	
	SD	1.26	
	Interpretation	Less Expressive	

Table 6 presents the frequency distribution and descriptive statistics for Prosody. The results show that 59 participants, or 49.17 percent, were classified as Monotonous, while 19 participants, or 15.83 percent, were classified as Less Expressive. Thirty participants, or 25.00 percent, reached the Very Expressive level, while 12 participants, or 10.00 percent, reached the Expressive level. No participant was classified as Moderately Expressive. The mean of 2.11 with an SD of 1.26 indicates a Less Expressive level of Prosody. This result shows that many learners still experience difficulty in reading with suitable expression, phrasing, pauses, stress, and intonation.

The findings indicate that Prosody is still weak among many participants, particularly since nearly half of the learners were classified as Monotonous. The results suggest the need for more opportunities to hear model reading, practice repeated oral reading, and receive feedback on phrasing, expression, pauses, and intonation so that learners can develop more natural and meaningful oral reading.

Table 7 presents the frequency distribution and descriptive statistics for Reading Fluency. The results show that 50 participants, or 41.67 percent, were classified as Low Emerging Readers, while 35 participants, or 29.17 percent, were classified as High Emerging Readers. Twenty participants, or 16.67 percent, were Developing Readers, while 10 participants, or 8.33 percent, were Transitioning Readers. Only five participants, or 4.17 percent, were classified as Reading at Grade Level. The mean score of 62.99 with an SD of 45.28 indicates that the participants were generally High Emerging Readers. This result shows that most learners have not yet reached the expected level of fluent reading and still require support in developing more accurate, faster, and more expressive oral reading.

Table 7
Descriptive Statistics for Reading Fluency

Score Range	Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
163.40 – 204.00	Reading at Grade Level	5	4.17
122.80 – 163.39	Transitioning Reader	10	8.33
82.20 – 122.79	Developing Reader	20	16.67
41.60 – 82.19	High Emerging Reader	35	29.17
1.00 – 41.59	Low Emerging Reader	50	41.67
	Total	120	100.00
	Mean	62.99	
	SD	45.28	
	Interpretation	High Emerging Reader	

The findings indicate that Reading Fluency is still developing among most participants, as only a small number have reached the grade-level category. The pattern suggests the need for differentiated reading activities that provide more intensive support to emerging readers while giving developing and transitioning readers opportunities to strengthen automatic word recognition, reading rate, accuracy, and expressive reading.

Table 8 presents the summary of Reading Fluency in terms of Accuracy, Speed, and Prosody. The results show that the participants obtained a mean of 41.11 with an SD of 28.42 in Accuracy, which was interpreted as Moderately Accurate. Speed obtained a mean of 19.77 with an SD of 17.56, which was interpreted as Very Slow Rate, while Prosody obtained a mean of 2.11 with an SD of 1.26, which was interpreted as Less Expressive. The overall Reading Fluency mean of 62.99 with an SD of 45.28 classified the participants as High Emerging Readers. These results show that the learners demonstrate some development in oral reading, but their fluency remains below grade-level expectations, particularly in reading speed and expression.

Table 8
Summary Table of Reading Fluency

Reading Fluency	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Accuracy	41.11	28.42	Moderately Accurate
Speed	19.77	17.56	Very Slow Rate
Prosody	2.11	1.26	Less Expressive
Overall	62.99	45.28	High Emerging Reader

The overall High Emerging Reader classification further indicates that many participants are still developing the combined skills required for fluent reading. Karageorgos et al. (2023) showed that struggling readers differed from more skilled readers not only in reading rate but also in prosodic features such as pauses and pitch patterns. The present findings support this multidimensional view of Reading Fluency since weakness in one component, particularly speed or prosody, may limit the overall fluency level even when some accuracy has already developed.

The findings indicate that Reading Fluency remains an area that needs continued instructional support. The results particularly point to the need for activities that strengthen automatic word recognition, repeated oral reading, appropriate pacing, and expressive reading while maintaining accuracy.

Research Question 5: Are the participants' home literacy ecology, reading self-efficacy and teachers' modeling of fluent reading significantly associate their reading fluency?

Table 9 presents the canonical correlation analysis between Reading Fluency and Home Literacy Ecology. The analysis revealed a significant but weak canonical relationship between the two sets of variables, $Rc = 0.25$, $Rc^2 = 0.06$, $F(3, 116) = 2.560$, $p = .048$. The squared canonical correlation indicates that approximately 6 percent of the variance was shared between the canonical variates of Reading Fluency and Home Literacy Ecology. This finding shows that differences in the learners' home literacy experiences are statistically related to differences in their Reading Fluency, although the relationship is limited in strength.

Table 9
Canonical Correlation Analysis Between Reading Fluency and Home Literacy Ecology

Variable	Cross loading	R_c	R_c^2	F(3,116)	p
Home Literacy Ecology	-0.25				
Reading Fluency					
Accuracy	-0.02	0.25	0.06	2.560*	0.048
Speed	-0.08				
Prosody	0.18				

**Significant at 0.05 two-tailed alpha level.*

The findings therefore indicate that Home Literacy Ecology has a significant but limited relationship with Reading Fluency. The result suggests that providing reading materials, encouraging reading, engaging in shared reading, and supporting literacy activities at home may contribute to learners' reading development, but these home experiences alone do not account for much of the variation in Accuracy, Speed, and Prosody.

Table 10 presents the canonical correlation analysis between Reading Fluency and Reading Self-efficacy. The analysis revealed no significant canonical relationship between the two sets of variables, $Rc = 0.15$, $Rc^2 = 0.02$, $F(3, 116) = 0.919$, $p = .434$. The squared canonical correlation indicates that only about 2 percent of the variance was shared between the canonical variates of Reading Self-efficacy and Reading Fluency. This finding shows that the learners' confidence in their reading ability was not significantly associated with their combined performance in Accuracy, Speed, and Prosody in the present sample.

Table 10
Canonical Correlation Analysis Between Reading Fluency and Reading Self-efficacy

Variable	Cross loading	R_c	R_c^2	F(3,116)	p
Reading Self-efficacy	-0.15				
Reading Fluency					
Accuracy	-0.08	0.15	0.02	0.919	0.434
Speed	-0.13				
Prosody	-0.08				

**Significant at 0.05 two-tailed alpha level.*

The present findings therefore indicate that having confidence in reading does not necessarily correspond with stronger Accuracy, Speed, and Prosody among these learners. Reading Self-efficacy may remain important for learners' willingness and persistence in reading, but the nonsignificant result suggests that differences in their

actual Reading Fluency may be more closely connected with other factors, including reading skills, practice, instruction, and opportunities for repeated reading.

Table 11 presents the canonical correlation analysis between Reading Fluency and Teachers' Modeling of Fluent Reading. The analysis revealed no significant canonical relationship between the two sets of variables, $Rc = 0.23$, $Rc^2 = 0.05$, $F(3, 116) = 2.162$, $p = .096$. The squared canonical correlation indicates that approximately 5 percent of the variance was shared between the canonical variates of Teachers' modeling of Fluent Reading and Reading Fluency. This finding shows that the learners' exposure to teacher modeling was not significantly associated with their combined performance in Accuracy, Speed, and Prosody in the present sample.

Table 11
Canonical Correlation Analysis Between Reading Fluency and Teachers' Modeling of Fluent Reading

Variable	Cross loading	R_c	R_c^2	F(3,116)	p
Teachers' Modeling of Fluent Reading	-0.23				
Reading Fluency					
Accuracy	-0.09	0.23	0.05	2.162	0.096
Speed	-0.15				
Prosody	0.08				

**Significant at 0.05 two-tailed alpha level.*

The present result therefore indicates that Teachers' modeling of Fluent Reading alone did not show sufficient statistical evidence of association with the learners' overall Reading Fluency. Other factors, such as the amount of guided practice, repeated reading, feedback, learner participation, and individual reading difficulties, may also be important in developing Accuracy, Speed, and Prosody.

The findings of the multiple regression analysis in table 12 revealed that Home Literacy Ecology, Reading Self-Efficacy, and Teachers' modeling of Fluent Reading did not significantly predict Reading Fluency among the Grade 3 pupils. The overall regression model was not statistically significant, $F(3, 116) = 0.907$, $p = .440$, with an R^2 of .023 and an adjusted R^2 of −.002. This indicates that the three predictors collectively explained only approximately 2.3% of the observed variance in Reading Fluency.

Table 12
Regression Analysis of Home Literacy Ecology, Reading Self-efficacy and Teachers' Modeling of Fluent Reading on Reading Fluency

Predictor	Unstandardized Coefficients		β	95% CI		t	p
	B	SE		Lower	Upper		
Constant	16.96	29.54		-39.81	77.55	0.512	0.610
Home Literacy Ecology	-4.53	6.22	-0.083	-17.39	7.05	-0.663	0.509
Reading Self-Efficacy	7.37	5.76	0.137	-3.68	18.91	1.116	0.267
Teachers' Modeling Of Fluent Reading	7.72	5.84	0.108	-4.38	18.91	1.141	0.256
Model Summary							
$R=0.151$ $R^2=0.023$ Adj $R^2=-0.002$ $F(3,116)=0.907$ $p=0.440$							

*Note. B = unstandardized beta coefficient, SE = standard error, β = standardized beta coefficient, 95% CI = 95% confidence interval, t = t statistic, p = probability value. *Significant at 0.05 two-tailed alpha level.*

The negative adjusted R^2 further suggests that, after accounting for the number of predictors included in the model, the predictors did not provide meaningful explanatory improvement over a model that simply estimates the outcome using its overall mean. These findings suggest that the measured aspects of the pupils' home literacy experiences, reading-related beliefs, and teachers' modeling practices were insufficient to explain the differences in reading fluency observed among the participants.

Overall, the nonsignificant regression findings indicate that Home Literacy Ecology, Reading Self-Efficacy, and Teachers' modeling of Fluent Reading, when considered simultaneously, did not significantly predict Reading Fluency among the participants. The results do not demonstrate that these factors are irrelevant to reading development. Instead, they indicate that their measured contributions were insufficient to explain the observed differences in reading fluency within the present model. The findings highlight the need to consider additional variables, particularly foundational decoding skills, vocabulary, actual reading practice, and other learner and instructional characteristics, in future investigations. Future studies may also examine whether home literacy experiences, reading self-efficacy, and teachers' modeling relate to fluency indirectly or over time. Such investigations may provide a more comprehensive understanding of the factors associated with the development of accurate, automatic, and expressive reading among Grade 3 pupils.

Conclusions

The study concludes that the Grade 3 pupils generally experience supportive literacy conditions at home, possess positive confidence in their reading abilities, and receive frequent modeling of fluent reading from their teachers. These favorable

conditions, however, are not reflected in an equally developed level of Reading Fluency. The learners generally remained High Emerging Readers, which indicates that having support, confidence, and exposure to fluent reading models does not necessarily mean that the skills needed for fluent oral reading have already been developed.

The Reading Fluency results further show that the difficulty is not the same across its three dimensions. Accuracy was comparatively more developed, while Speed was the most evident area of weakness and Prosody also remained limited. This suggests that many learners may already recognize some words correctly but continue to require considerable effort and time to process connected text. Their limited expression also indicates that reading has not yet become sufficiently automatic for many learners to focus on phrasing, stress, intonation, and meaning while reading aloud.

Home Literacy Ecology demonstrated a weak association with Reading Fluency when analyzed independently, suggesting that learners' experiences at home may be related to their reading development. However, it did not significantly predict Reading Fluency when considered alongside Reading Self-Efficacy and Teachers' Modeling of Fluent Reading. Similarly, the latter two variables did not make significant unique contributions to the regression model. These findings do not diminish the educational value of family support, learners' confidence, or teachers' modeling practices. Rather, they suggest that these factors, as measured in the present study, were insufficient to explain the variations in learners' actual reading performance, highlighting the need to consider other factors that may be associated with the development of reading fluency.

The study therefore concludes that Reading Fluency is likely connected with other skills and conditions that were not examined in the present model. The very slow reading rate, limited prosody, and emerging overall fluency point to the need for direct and sustained instruction in the skills involved in oral reading. Home support, learner confidence, and teacher modeling may continue to provide a supportive setting for literacy development, but learners who remain at emerging levels require structured practice that directly strengthens accurate word recognition, automaticity, reading rate, and expressive reading.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

Grade 3 Teachers. Teachers may provide regular and structured oral reading activities, such as repeated, guided, echo, and paired reading, to improve learners' Accuracy, Speed, and Prosody. They may use differentiated reading materials, continue modeling fluent reading, and regularly monitor learners' progress to address individual reading difficulties.

School Administrators and Reading Coordinators. They may strengthen school reading programs by prioritizing learners who need additional support, providing

appropriate reading materials, and organizing professional development and Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions on effective reading instruction, assessment, and intervention strategies.

Parents and Guardians. They may encourage regular reading at home through shared reading, storytelling, and enjoyable literacy activities. They may listen to their children read, provide positive encouragement, use available reading materials, and coordinate with teachers to support their children's reading development.

School and Division Reading Program Implementers. They may improve existing reading programs by providing structured and level-appropriate materials, strengthening home–school partnerships, and using assessment results to plan interventions and evaluate learners' progress in Accuracy, Speed, Prosody, and overall Reading Fluency.

Future Researchers. They may conduct similar studies involving larger and more diverse samples, examine additional factors related to Reading Fluency, and use longitudinal or experimental designs to better understand the relationships among Home Literacy Ecology, Reading Self-Efficacy, Teachers' Modeling of Fluent Reading, and learners' reading performance.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

The researcher observed ethical principles throughout the conduct of the study. Appropriate permission was secured from the concerned education authorities and school administrators before data collection. Informed consent was obtained from the parents or guardians of the participating Grade 3 pupils, together with the pupils' voluntary assent. Participants were informed of their rights, including their freedom to decline or withdraw from the study at any time without consequences. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained through the use of codes instead of personal names, and all collected information was handled securely in accordance with data privacy principles. The well-being of the pupils was given priority during the questionnaire administration and individual reading assessments, ensuring that participation remained voluntary and that breaks could be provided when necessary. The researcher also ensured proper acknowledgment of sources, avoided plagiarism and bias in presenting and interpreting the findings, and used the collected data solely for academic and research purposes. The researcher declares no conflict of interest in the conduct of this study.

REFERENCES

Amerol, A. (2025). Parental perceptions and their contribution to learners' reading proficiency. Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 50(1), 25–36. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.500103

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Prentice-Hall.

Caliskan, E. F., & Ulas, A. H. (2022). The effect of parent-involved reading activities on primary school students' reading comprehension skills, reading motivation, and attitudes towards reading. International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 14(4), 509–524. https://doi.org/10.26822/iejee.2022.252

Karageorgos, P., Wallot, S., Müller, B., Schindler, J., & Richter, T. (2023). Distinguishing between struggling and skilled readers based on their prosodic speech patterns in oral reading: An exploratory study in grades 2 and 4. Acta Psychologica, 235, 103892.

Lexia. (2025). A full breakdown of the science of reading components. Lexia Learning. https://www.lexialearning.com/blog/a-full-breakdown-of-the-science-of-reading-components

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, 12(9), 49480. https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2023.49480

Mahusay, B., & Arazo, V. (2024). Teachers' reading strategies: Its effect on learners' reading performance. Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 26(7), 704–714. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13936011

Ni, S., Lu, S., Lu, K., & Tan, H. (2021). The effects of parental involvement in parent–child reading for migrant and urban families: A comparative mixed-methods study. Children and Youth Services Review, 123, 105941.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). PISA 2022 results (Volume I): The state of learning and equity in education. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/53f23881-en

Tabamo, L. M., & Labitad, G. F. (2025). Self-efficacy in teaching and reading comprehension practices among public elementary school teachers. International Journal on Science and Technology, 16(3). https://doi.org/10.71097/IJSAT.v16.i3.7057

Van der Sande, L., Van Steensel, R., Fikrat-Wevers, S., & Arends, L. R. (2023). Effectiveness of interventions that foster reading motivation: A meta-analysis. Educational Psychology Review, 35(1), Article 21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09719-3[RM1]

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjf9vz4

APA Citation:

Sulpico, J. M. E., & Magsalay, R. J. M. (2026). READING FLUENCY THROUGH HOME LITERACY ECOLOGY, READING SELF-EFFICACY, AND TEACHERS' MODELING. Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 4(11), 574–590. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24157571

Corresponding author: *jessa.sulpico@lccdo.edu.ph*