

The Effectiveness of the Reading Progress in Microsoft Teams in Improving the Reading Fluency among Grade 8 Students

Gladys Mae D. Buenaagua
Cebu Technological University-Main Campus
gladysmae.buenaagua@deped.gov.ph

Date Submitted:

March 17, 2026

Date Accepted:

July 29, 2026

Date Published:

September 22, 2026

DOI:

10.5281/zenodo.22902019

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the reading progress to improve the reading fluency among grade 8 struggling students. Using the Quasi-Experimental One-Sample Design method, 11 students participated in this study in 9 weeks using the Microsoft Reading Progress tool. This was conducted at Marigondon National High School, Marigondon, Lapu-Lapu City, during the 2nd quarter of the academic year 2025-2026. To gather the relevant data, the researcher utilized the pre-test and post test scores of oral reading assessments of the respondents. There were two groups created: the one-on-one reading session with a teacher and the buddy reading session. The findings of the study indicated a significant result in the improvement of the reading fluency with the learners both in one-on-one reading sessions and the

buddy reading sessions. However, the one-on-one group performed more consistently than the buddy reading group. The one-on-one group obtained stronger evidence that the individualized teacher support with the Reading Progress was a powerful and effective application to improve reading fluency. Meanwhile, the buddy reading group also exhibited higher gains from the reading activity. The result was also statistically significant in a peer-assisted setting. Taken together, both were effective approaches to improve reading fluency. It is recommended to use the Microsoft Reading Progress in reading remediation as it has been effective in improving reading fluency.

Keywords: *Microsoft Reading Progress, reading fluency, struggling readers, one-on-one reading, buddy reading, reading remediation*

INTRODUCTION

Reading is considered the fundamental learning competence and regarded as the cornerstone of every learner's achievement. In the global standard, it is considered one of the four core skills that need to be learned aside from listening, speaking, and writing (Maxom, 2019). Indeed, the capacity of the learners to grasp other levels of competencies is premised on reading.

Reading fluency has always been the core of concerns in teaching reading which spearheads the needs of education experts to provide updated strategies to meet the needs of modern learners. In 2022, the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), conducted by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the Philippines scored in the bottom five among the participating countries, attributed to fluency, as one of the contributing factors along with their level of comprehension.

Countless factors affect the reading fluency of the students. One of which is the onslaught of the pandemic, which created a sharp decline in the reading achievement (Ludewig et al., 2022). Due to this disruption, the oral reading fluency lowered to 30%, counting in the low-achieving schools which performed even less than

the usual (Policy Analysis for California Education, 2021). During the resumption of classes, it is the responsibility of the schools to promptly address and apply effective reading skill strategies (Domingue et al., 2022) to bridge the reading difficulty among learners. The solution to this problem lies in the reading interventions provided by the schools if there are any. The need to ensure effective teaching reading has always been a foremost concern among teachers as it may affect the academic achievement of the learners as indicated by many researchers, such as Keskin (2013), Yıldız (2013), and Kerubo (2014).

In cases where students pass their classes despite the poor reading ability, the expectation to perform at the proper grade level brought anxiety and depression throughout their schooling. These students are tagged as unsuccessful, showing adoption problems in their classes (Bender, 2012). Research indicates that secondary students who struggle with reading fluency have the difficulty to keep pace with the complexity of the academic texts since much of their cognitive levels focus on word recognition than comprehension (Kim et al., 2021). As their grade level progresses, the need for the reading fluency skill increases, making it essential to the learning content areas (Petscher et al., 2020).

In the recent survey of Functional Literacy, Education, and Mass Media Survey (FLEMMS) by the Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA), 18.9 million Filipinos with a broad age range are functionally illiterate. This means that they can read and write but still struggle with comprehension. This poses a huge challenge to the education sector on how to address and provide clear and concrete solutions. In return, language teachers carry a significant responsibility as they are the primary anchors in teaching reading fluency and comprehension. As indicated in the review of reading instruction research in the Philippines, it was discovered that there was an absence of reading instruction integrating digital technology. Despite the strong support of international literature to digital interventions for reading literacy, this deficiency builds a wide disparity of technological integration among local teaching reading practices (David et al., 2023).

Meanwhile, in the context of Marigondon National High School, the significant number of struggling readers is evident in the annual conduct of the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory or Phil-IRI. This aims to assess students from Grade 7 to Grade 10, classifying their reading levels from independent, instructional to frustration levels. From its annual administration, there were 459 Grade 8 students out of 2,110 who qualified for reading remediation and were still identified as instructional and frustration levels at the end of the school year. These levels indicate the need for a teacher to guide them in their reading. At some point, this also illustrates that other students entered the secondary level with weak literacy skills. Surprisingly, at this rate, we can conclude that even high school students are also going through a reading skill crisis consistently.

In general, struggling readers' academic performance is closely linked to difficulties in reading fluency due to the limited ability to process and understand texts effectively (Spear-Swerling, 2016). Other issues found are limited availability of reading materials, poor foundational fluency skills, lack of motivation among students, and instructional support (AERO, 2024; Consortia Academia, 2025; SCIRP, 2021; Idul, 2023; PhilArchive, 2023).

In a study conducted at Royal Grammar School Newcastle, a group of Grade 9 students participated in an 8-week intervention with Reading Progress. It was found that a significant improvement in reading fluency of the Spanish language was observed within the given span of the intervention. This indicates that the effectiveness of the digital platform is pivotal in improving reading fluency and pronunciation (Microsoft, 2023). In recent times, the use of technology as integrated in the reading instruction provided hands-on educational activities that support the improvement of reading fluency. Digital-enabled tasks were found beneficial for struggling readers (Stetter & Hughes, 2021). A study on Digital Reading Fluency Training for Primary School Students (Durski et al., 2024) presents a digital learning tool based on the Readers' Theatre for individual and personalized reading fluency training to be applied in school and also out of school. The focus of the study is that game-based technology increases learning motivation and engagement.

With the pointers above and driven by the circumstances discussed, the researcher, who is a Grade 8 Public School Teacher, conducted a study that determined how technology could aid in the improvement of reading fluency among students and it could impact the researcher's pursuit in improving their performance. The researcher further noticed that there were several students who faltered in the recent reading competency

assessment, which became very alarming among the Grade 8 students. This intent was also aligned with the pursuit of the public education system to be keener on reading fluency among students as a potent learning competence.

The results of this study addressed the concerns found in the Sustainable Development Goals on Quality Education. This emphasized the importance of the foundational literacy skills as a contributing factor for academic success. The interventions implemented in this study may assist teachers in the conduct of their remediation sessions for improved instructional practices among struggling readers. This study also suggested better ways of teaching reading fluency and helped improve the knowledge needed in both classrooms and in policy making arenas on how to address the growing numbers of students who had problems in reading. Through this undertaking, new strategies for teaching reading fluency were carried out in creative ways to enhance learners' intrinsic motivation that helped them gain more positive attitudes towards reading.

Also, this study provided teachers with the best ways to improve learners' reading fluency using learners' generation-appropriate technology infrastructures. Furthermore, the significance of this study stemmed from the fact that very few studies were conducted and, according to the researchers' knowledge, to look into a new strand of approaches and relevant strategies to improve the reading fluency of the learners. It was hoped that as a result, the findings of this study served as a basis to propose interventions to be used by the teachers which would improve their reading fluency, which was critical in achieving maximum learning potential.

Theoretical Background

This study assumes that the use of Reading Progress in Microsoft Teams improves the reading fluency of Grade 8 students in the frustration level with the consistent use of the tool. It is anchored on Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK), Automaticity Theory by LaBerge & Samuels (1974), and Needham's Theory of Computer-Based Learning (1988).

The TPACK framework highlights the importance of teachers knowing technology, pedagogy, and content, and how these three elements interact to create effective instruction (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). With the concept of TPACK in this study, Reading Progress provides data fundamental to oral reading fluency, enabling teachers to identify learner difficulties, monitor progress, give immediate feedback, and choose appropriate interventions.

Recent studies provide empirical data on the effectiveness of technology-supported reading remediation tools. Quimsing and Ortega-Dela Cruz (2024) exemplified the use of Readtech 1.0, similar to Reading Progress, which improved reading fluency levels of struggling readers. Octavo and Varas (2022) found Reading Progress highly acceptable in terms of content and usefulness, recommending its integration to reach independent reading levels. Jose (2024) showed significant improvement in read-aloud skills, including accuracy and vocabulary. Alsalami and Mohammed (2025) demonstrated notable improvements in reading fluency with interactive features, while Sobretudo & Buenviaje (2024) revealed instructional-level fluency among respondents, highlighting the impact of technological utilization. Collectively, these studies affirm Reading Progress as an effective platform to resolve learning gaps in reading fluency.

Automaticity Theory (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974) explains the gradual transition from laborious decoding to effortless word recognition. Fluent readers analyze words effortlessly, paving the way to comprehension. Automaticity emphasizes repeated practice, exposure, and guided oral reading to develop fluency. In digital learning, Reading Progress supports systematic and interactive exercises that assist students in seamless word recognition. Evidence-based reviews confirm that fluency improves from consistent practice, modeling, error feedback, and guided reading (Collins et al., 2023).

Needham's Theory of Computer-Based Learning (1988) describes how learners acquire new knowledge built on foundations of prior experiences through active engagement of tasks. Instructional support from teachers and peers promotes performance beyond personal competence, advancing to embedded cognition (Erbil, 2020). In the digital era, technology-assisted pedagogy activates student motivation and engagement. Reading Progress aligns with this principle by providing immersive, personalized reading practice.

Aligned with DepEd Order No. 13, s. 2023 on the National Learning Recovery Program and DepEd Order No. 016, s. 2023 on the Computerization Program, Reading Progress supports literacy development and

ICT integration. It offers personalized reading practice with built-in passages, audio and video recordings, and automated feedback on accuracy, mispronunciations, omissions, and correct words per minute (Tholsfen, 2021).

Studies further substantiate its effectiveness. Tusoy (2024) showed improvement in Grade 9 learners' reading skills through repetitive practice and immediate feedback. Buist and Harman (2023) found students improved by 22.43 words per minute compared with traditional methods. Jose (2025) reported enhanced oral reading performance among ESL students in Oman. Qurashi, Qureshi, and Khattak (2025) noted 65% of respondents credited Reading Progress for improved English proficiency. Taylor et al. (2023) highlighted its usability in Thailand, describing it as a teacher-assistant for personalized instruction.

These findings collectively affirm Reading Progress as the primary digital-assisted reading remediation tool in this research. By employing this platform, the study aims to strengthen competitive learners and provide teachers with efficient, fact-based strategies for reading fluency interventions.

The Problem

This study assessed the effectiveness of Reading Progress in improving the reading fluency of the Grade 8 students of Marigondon National High School in AY 2025–2026 as a basis for designing a reading fluency enhancement learning packet. Specifically, it sought to determine the reading fluency pre-test scores of the respondents taking the one-on-one reading session and the buddy reading session, as well as their post-test scores in both interventions. It further examined whether there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the respondents in the one-on-one and buddy reading sessions.

In addition, the study investigated the factors that influenced the reading fluency of the two groups of respondents in terms of reading motivation and reading engagement. Finally, based on the findings, the study aimed to propose a reading enhancement prototype that could be used to strengthen instructional practices and support struggling readers in their fluency development.

Hypothesis of the Study

There was no significant difference in the Pre-test and Post-test scores of Grades 8 frustration-level students in the use of Reading Progress in Microsoft Teams.

METHODS

Research Design

This study utilized the quasi-experimental design particularly the nonequivalent control group design to determine the effectiveness of the Reading Progress of Microsoft Teams in the reading fluency of the Grade 8 students who fall under the frustration level that resulted from the administration of the Phil-IRI. The two groups received different intervention strategies with the Microsoft Teams Reading Progress as the tool used. This research design was used when the participants were not randomly assigned to the two groups, the buddy reading group and the one-on-one group. The results were compared at the end of the remediation. The purpose of the method was to determine whether there was a significant difference in the results reflected in the posttest when the intervention was applied.

Population and Sampling

The subjects of this study were the Grade 8 students of Marigondon National High School-Junior High School Department whose reading profile fell to the frustration level in the pretest conducted by the Phil-IRI (Philippine Informal Reading Inventory) at the beginning of the school year. Frustration level referred to students who found the test very difficult, as reflected in their scores. They struggled with reading comprehension, fluency and word recognition. These were the preset criteria needed in the study to obtain the relevant data and experiences that answered the objectives. In this manner, purposive sampling was done through the Phil-IRI school reading assessment conducted by the school per Division Memo issued for that effect. The respondents were

selected as the identified frustration level students in Grade 8 considering their proximity in terms of the schedule of shifts of classes the was the same with the researcher. Purposive sampling allowed the researcher to select a sample size from a broader population.

Instruments

The instruments comprised the reading materials and an interview guide. The reading passages used to gather the pretest and posttest scores were the standardized reading materials from the Phil-IRI. The reading progress tool served as the main instrument used for data gathering. The researcher utilized a list of data containing the accuracy rate, mispronunciation, omissions, and reading speed needed to identify the respondents' reading fluency level before and after the use of the Reading Progress. Also, an interview guide was given to the students to identify the factors that influenced their reading motivation and reading engagement. The questions were tailored to how they used Reading Progress that connected their motivation and engagement. As indicated in the Phil-IRI manual of 2018, frustration level gets 89% of the Word Reading Score and 58% of the Comprehension Score. The word reading score was derived by dividing the number of words read correctly by the total number of words in the passage then multiply it by 100 to get the percentage. The comprehension score was also derived from the total number of correct answers from the given questions in the passage. If the student received the frustration level in either word accuracy or reading comprehension, then the student's reading skill was categorized as frustration level. The pretest was administered before the start of the intervention and the post-test was given after the 9 weeks of using the Reading Progress.

Data Gathering

This research started in the 2nd quarter of the school year 2025-2026. The conduct of the study started with a sample population among the target respondents who belong to the frustration reading levels. The researcher administered a pre-test to assess their reading fluency levels before the use of the Reading Progress. The initial results were recorded to identify the present reading fluency based on their reading accuracy rate and correct words per minute. The research was implemented with the two groups under the buddy reading session and the one-on-one reading session. It was implemented on Tuesdays and Thursdays during the students' vacant time to avoid disruption of classes. The reading session took 40 minutes within 9 weeks of the conduct of research. One reading passage per session was provided. Considering their reading levels, rereading of the text was done during each session to create familiarity with the text including the practice of the mispronounced words provided by the tool. The reading fluency levels were recorded every session per reading of the text to monitor the reading fluency rate. After the 9 weeks of the conduct of the study, a post-test was given to the participants, comparing the pre-test and post-test scores. This was also to assess the efficacy of the Reading Progress. A comparative analysis of the data results was done to identify whether or not the students' reading fluency improved. An interview guide was also used to identify the factors influencing the participants' engagement and motivation while doing the study.

A thorough data acquisition was established to guarantee the validity and reliability of the study's results. With the use of tablets and personal computers, the sessions were done with the monitoring of progress noted each day.

An orientation was given to explain the use of the Reading Progress in Microsoft Teams. A corresponding Gmail account was created for each student's account in Microsoft Teams. After all were set, the reading sessions began. The reading passages were generated from the application itself. It provided categories such as the topic and age of the learners. While reading, the application automatically recorded on camera as an output. The scores for accuracy, correct words per minute, mispronunciation, repetition, omission, and self-correction were posted on the Reading Progress report.

Statistical Treatment

Simple Percentage was used to determine the number of students in Grade 8 who had achieved a specific level of reading fluency. T-test was also used to determine the significant difference in reading fluency among the

Grade 8 students before and after the use of Microsoft Teams. The Dependent T-test was also applied to determine the significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the one-on-one group and the buddy reading group.

RESULTS

The pretest scores on oral reading based on the Phil-IRI assessment were used as the baseline data. The post-test results were gathered after using Reading Progress in the reading sessions with two approaches: the one-on-one reading session with the teacher and the buddy reading with peers.

Pre-Test Scores of the Respondents Taking the One-On-One Reading Session and Buddy Reading Session

The first statement of the problem was to identify the pre-test scores of the struggling readers in the one-on-one with a teacher and buddy reading. The tool used was the Phil-IRI reading passage pre-test. The Phil-IRI reading levels were classified into Independent, Instructional and Frustration. The independent reading level indicated that the learner could read and comprehend a text independently without the assistance of the teacher, the instructional level signified that the learner could read a text and relied on the instructions of the teacher with minimal assistance, and the frustration level showed the lowest level where the learner was having difficulty in reading and comprehending a text; immediate and intensive assistance from the teacher was required.

Table 1. Oral Reading Levels of Learners on the Pretest

Category	Reading Level	N	%	Mean	SD
One-on-One	Frustration and Instructional Levels	6	100	254.33	7.5
Buddy	Frustration and Instructional Levels	5	100	255.8	6.99

The data revealed that the buddy system intervention yielded slightly better overall performance in this sample, as reflected in both mean and median scores, suggesting that the advantage was not substantial at this point. Both interventions demonstrated good consistency and stability of results, without the extreme fluctuations in learner scores.

According to Vaughn and Fletcher (2020), providing one-on-one reading interventions significantly improved reading fluency and comprehension among frustration level students. Hattie (2023) also stated that individual reading instruction enabled teachers to make necessary corrections on decoding, pronunciation and pacing promptly. Buddy reading was also an effective mechanism as stated by Rasinski (2022), that peer-assisted reading sessions improved fluency, accuracy and expression. This also gave learners a regular opportunity to practice reading aloud with a supportive environment. As stated by UNESCO (2023), engaging with fellow learners helped them take the responsibility to strengthen communicative competence at their own level. Students learned from one another; thus, collaborative learning occurred, resulting in improved learning engagement and participation.

In this regard, both approaches proved to be viable and effective interventions, with the buddy system showing a slight edge that may be explored further for wider classroom application.

Post-Test Scores After the Use of the Reading Progress

Table 2 presented the reading fluency post-test scores after the use of the Reading Progress in the one-on-one and buddy reading. The tool used was the Phil-IRI reading passage in the post-test. The table below presents is the statistical treatment of the data gathered.

Table 2. *Reading Fluency Levels of Learners on the Posttest*

Category	Reading Levels	N	%	Mean	SD
One-on-One	Independent Level	6	100	266.67	1.89
Buddy Reading	Independent Level	5	100	26..2	2.48

The post-test results presented the performance of the two groups of learners who underwent different intervention approaches: one-on-one instruction and buddy system. Both groups achieved 100% participation among enrolled learners taking the test, ensuring that all data were fully accounted for. Both groups obtained the independent level as their oral reading profile in the posttest.

The progress is evident in the results of each indicator with the Reading Progress. The improvement in accuracy is substantial enough ranging from 42%-93% which means that learners read more accurately and decode words well similar to Correct Words Per Minute (CPWM) where automaticity is observable. Mispronunciation errors reduced remarkably with 4-20 errors, although this does not discount learners still having difficulty in pronunciation. Repetition remains relatively low, indicating gained confidence in oral reading similar to insertion with 0-15 which means that learners rarely guess unnecessary words and follow printed text correctly. Meanwhile, omission and self-correction also presented significant gains which implies that learners skipped fewer words and corrected words independently. Thus, the Reading Progress intervention exhibited valuable outcomes in the reading fluency of learners in need.

In addition, one-on-one reading sessions indicated a slightly higher consistency, which means individualized sessions yielded marginal improvements. Buddy reading sessions did not discount the results with nearly identical mean and median scores. This implied the same gains in the improvement of fluency levels.

The structured guided practice along with its monitoring, interaction with peers in buddy reading and personalized guidance in one-on-one sessions were critical factors in improving the performance of the students.

In the synthesis of 16 empirical studies by Hudson, Koh, Moore, & Binks-Cantrell (2020) on oral reading fluency, it was found out that repeated reading was most widely applied instructional approach (86.5%). Also, Cooper, et al. (2022) strongly supported the theory of Automaticity in their study where repeated reading practices strengthened word decoding. Their findings also align with the findings in the Correct Words Per Minute (CWPM) observed after the Reading Progress intervention. Digitally-assisted repeated reading sessions notably progressed the learners' decoding proficiency. Furthermore, Yi (2024) highlights these as systematic reading intervention strategies with constant monitoring that significantly increased students' overall reading performance. Regular reading drills enable learners to acquire an effortless word decoding which also corresponds to the concept of Automaticity.

The success of both sessions demonstrated the effectiveness of the Reading Progress across participants. It scaffolded reading remediation to reaching independent fluency levels.

Significant Difference Between the Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores of the Respondents in One-On-One Reading Session and Buddy Reading Session

The table presented below was the third statement of the problem which sought to find out whether there was a significant difference of the scores on both one-on-one reading and buddy reading using the pre-test and post-test scores.

Table 3

	One-on-One		Buddy System		Observation
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Pre-Test	Post-Test	
Mean	254.33	266.67	255.8	266.2	Both groups improved significantly
Median	256	267	262	265	One-on-One overtook Buddy I final median
Standard Deviation	7.5	1.89	6.99	2.48	Both became more consistent after the intervention
Standard error	3.06	0.77	3.13	1.11	Mean estimates became more precise
Score gain	+12.34 points		+10.40 points		One-on-One recorded slightly higher improvement

The results confirm that both intervention approaches contributed in enhancing learner oral reading proficiency. While the buddy system showed a minor advantage in baseline performance, the one-on-one method yielded a slightly larger improvement and attained marginally higher final scores. Nevertheless, the difference in post-test performance between the two groups was very small, indicating that both strategies were capable of bringing learners to almost the same level of mastery. The choice of intervention may therefore be based on specific learner needs, instructional goals, and available resources, as both had proven to be viable and impactful instructional practices.

Factors That Influence the Reading Fluency of the Two Groups of Respondents in Terms of Reading Motivation and Reading Engagement

The following themes were supported and generated using the content analysis method on the recorded transcript of conversations.

Table 4

Emerging Themes	Factors
Theme 1- Reading Motivation	1. Emotional Engagement 2. Intrinsic Motivation 3. Drive for long-term academic success
Theme 2- Reading Engagement	1. Self-discipline and determination 2. Rereading of the texts 3. Teacher support and socio-emotional context

Theme 1: Reading Motivation

Students felt joy and excitement when the unconventional reading remediation was applied, regardless of the strategy used, as they began the reading sessions. This showed the importance of emotional engagement in learning, a significant factor of reading remediation.

They stated similar lines, showing their interest in learning and improving. Their emotional responses indicated an entry point for deeper motivation as it reduced resistance and created a positive environment for learning. As stated by Guthrie and Klauda (2024), learners who exhibited positive emotions likely obtained reading behaviors needed to develop reading proficiency. Emotional engagement encouraged students' participation especially among struggling learners. Also, Schiefele and Schaffner (2023) stated that, learners who enjoyed the activity-built persistence and enhanced intellectual effort accompanied by positive learning experiences. With this, learners developed the willingness to practice reading often. Higher reading proficiency was obtained by students who had positive emotions than those who regarded it as boring and stressful according to OECD (2023).

Moreover, the desire to learn and improve was the most common reason for participating. Motivation was driven by aiming to improve their reading skills and gain their confidence. Others also highlighted success in school, where learning and improving how to read were closely tied.

This intrinsic motivation is also a contributing factor that determined the pathway to achieve meaningful progress. In this manner, the students were consciously making an effort to address the learning gaps themselves, acknowledging their own needs for growth. As supported by Ryan and Deci (2020), through Self-Determination Theory, personal connection to the task enables learners to perform better rather than looking after external rewards. Academic achievement was attainable with them as struggling readers because they believed that improvement was possible with their intrinsic motivation as discussed by Toste et al. (2022). Afflerbach and Harrison (2022) also state that intrinsic motivation allows learners to become focused on self-improvement rather than merely completing academic requirements.

Meanwhile, most informants uttered similar answers when asked about what interested them in continuing the reading activity.

"Para makapasar ko sa next grade level kay gusto ko magteacher ma'am...", "Para makahibaw bitaw mi sa words ng awa mi kahibaw...", "Para makagraduate ko.."

This showed that literacy interventions were essential to future career motivation. The importance of education was clearly connected to their interest in learning at present. The way they learned was linked to their dreams and aspirations in life. The drive for long-term academic success piqued students' interest in continuing the reading activity. Wigfield et al. (2021) explained that students who have academic aspirations substantially identified reading as significant to future career achievement. Their determination to succeed superseded the challenges they encountered. Kim (2023) emphasizes that students who employ stronger commitment to improve who view reading competence as fundamental. The novelty of Reading Progress as a means to improve reading fluency was a great contributor, considering their generation as digital natives. Evidently, they valued education as much as they valued their reading sessions with Microsoft Reading Progress.

Theme 2: Reading Engagement

Reading Engagement remained a challenge for the students, including sustaining their interest, issues with connectivity, and the time they allotted, along with the academic pressures they faced daily.

However, the following factors bridged solutions for a meaningful journey in improving reading fluency. Maintaining the value of discipline and determination while improving with the end in mind sustained the interest. Self-awareness of their reading capacity kept them focused on attaining their goal. They kept track of their progress through the monitoring log found in the app.

Students gladly uttered these lines:

"Ganahan man sd ko mobasa ma'am to improve gyud...", "Murag mawad-an kog problema, malingaw ko ug basa..."

These were indicators that, despite the idea of them belonging to readers with frustration levels, they maintained a positive outlook- what one must have in life. Zimmerman (2022) stresses self-discipline as vital in achieving long-term mastery. This helps learners sustain the challenges of repeated reading sessions, connectivity distractions and academic problems. This keeps them focused on reaching their goals that align with their future

aspirations. In addition, Panadero (2023) also explained that monitoring one's daily progress keeps them engaged and cultivates motivation.

Rereading the text, they found interesting was also expressed by the students. This guided them to revisit the errors they committed in their first reading. This enabled them to improve their self-confidence by being familiar with the texts. Whenever this became a habit, that was where mastery was achieved.

Apart from the interesting text, having peers read with them also kept their focus. Peer influences also engaged them during the conduct in the reading remediation, suggesting a collective motivation. Anxieties were reduced, which acclimated them to routines of the activity, and the feeling of belongingness strengthened their determination to continue. Samuels (2020) mentioned the Repeated Reading Theory where familiarity with the text reduces cognitive load and encourages automatic decoding, increases reading speed and improves reading expression. This also supports Rasinski's (2022) idea that repeated reading is one of the most effective evidence-based strategies for oral reading fluency.

Moreover, ten of the respondents preferred the teacher support over a buddy for reasons such as feeling more comfortable with the teacher support, fear of being judged as a struggling reader, less distraction than being with peers, and teacher guidance and clarity of inputs. Similar lines were uttered by them such as: *"Teacher kay mas ma-focus ko kaysa akong mga classmates..."*, *"Akong teacher kay gitudlo-an ug tarong sa basa..."*, *Dili ko comfortable with a buddy ma'am kay maulaw ko..."*

Feelings of hesitancy and shyness were also noted during the interview. This revealed the socio-emotional context as critical to improving confidence and focus. Respect for high authority, which was a cultural norm for Filipinos, confirmed the critical role of teacher effectiveness, other than buddy collaboration. While peer tutoring has been widely used for literacy remediation, strong teacher involvement for monitoring and support remains significant. This is strengthened by Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development, where learners gain more from the knowledgeable other than a person of similar ability (Vygotsky, 1978). Teachers are indispensable, especially for struggling readers with low self-esteem and a fear of peer evaluation. Pianta, Hamre, and Allen (2022) mention the importance of teacher-support in the academic journey in particular for low-esteem learners. The participants believed that teachers could explain their errors clearly and patiently without judgment. Wentzel (2022) explains that teacher-support fosters a better classroom environment open to emotional security which reduces anxiety and stimulates active participation in the reading sessions.

DISCUSSION

Summary Of Findings

The pre-test scores established comparable baseline reading fluency levels in both groups prior to the reading intervention.

After using the Microsoft Teams Reading Progress, the post-test scores from one-on-one reading and buddy reading indicated a very good performance. Their reading fluency improved consistently based on the reading report reflected in their respective Microsoft accounts. The findings suggest that the use of the Microsoft Teams Reading Progress contributed to the improvement of the reading fluency among the respondents.

There was a significant improvement in both approaches from pre-test to post-test. However, the one-on-one group obtained stronger evidence that the individualized teacher support with the Reading Progress was a powerful and effective application to improve reading fluency among struggling readers in Grade 8. Meanwhile, the buddy reading group also exhibited higher gains from the reading activity. The result was also statistically significant in a peer-assisted setting. Taken together, the one-on-one reading and the buddy reading were both effective approaches with the one-on-one reading session having slightly better statistical outcomes. This showed that these individualized approaches provided substantial benefits in reading remediation.

Intrinsic motivation leading to future career gains was seen as a significant factor for reading motivation. The students were self-driven to learn and improve their reading fluency, apart from merely improving for academic purposes. Emotional engagement was a vital entry point for literacy remediation. Obtaining positive

attributes had a big impact on students' motivation. The novel use of technology as a means to connect the types of learners sparked their interest to participate in the reading activity.

Ten of the respondents preferred the one-on-one reading session for reasons such as shyness and the fear of being peer-evaluated. The socio-emotional context was dominant in the results. They expressed the effectiveness of teacher instruction on the clarity of delivery and the comfort of teacher support while learning. This also showed the cultural norm of Filipino values which was the respect to authority figures. The need to perform better was higher than in the buddy reading sessions due to comfort and familiarity.

Based on the findings, a learning packet was the reading enhancement prototype to use with embedded in the Reading Progress. It served as a guide for teachers on how to conduct the reading remediation from Day 1 to Day 5.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, it is concluded that Reading Progress of Microsoft Teams contributed to the improvement of the reading fluency of Grade 8 struggling learners of Marigondon National High School. Both the respondents of the one-on-one and the buddy reading groups displayed improvement from the pre-test and post-test results statistically presented after the remediation. The study additionally asserts that reading motivation and reading engagement were significant in the learning process. Factors such as emotional engagement, intrinsic motivation, and the desire for long-term academic success encouraged learners to participate actively while self-discipline, repeated reading, and teacher support motivated students to sustain their participation. These factors supplemented the use of Reading Progress leading to the success of the reading remediation. Given these outcomes, a Reading Fluency Enhancement Learning Packet was produced and embedded in the Reading Progress structurally designed for struggling learners.

Recommendations

From the findings and conclusion, the following recommendations are hereby offered:

1. Teachers are encouraged to use the pretest results as a basis for identifying learners who would qualify for the reading fluency remediation with the Reading Progress. Schools should create an intervention plan individualized or by group to fully address the need of each learner. Being able to provide learners with the appropriate instructional strategies promotes better learning outcomes.
2. English teachers and reading coordinators are advised to shift to digital-assisted interventions such as Reading Progress given the positive results in this study. Consistent monitoring should also be conducted in the targeted areas for improvement. In the same way, school leaders should support the implementation by providing digital resources to sustain it.
3. Both reading interventions produced positive results given the consistent monitoring of progress and performance, attendance of learners, and sustained interest of everyone involved in the reading remediation. Teacher training on monitoring and giving feedback should also be strengthened to properly address the learners in the reading remediation while recognizing the importance of valuing their socio-emotional context.
4. Teachers should reinforce and recognize learner's progress regularly. They should provide positive feedback, certificates of commendation and other similar means to build self-confidence and improve engagement in the reading sessions. A supportive reading environment could also help develop learners' confidence, thus leading to improved motivation and engagement.

The enhanced reading fluency learning packet may be adopted and refined by English teachers and curriculum developers to suit their reading remediation programs. Future researchers are also encouraged to use

this study as the basis for their own research using a larger sample or appropriate modifications within their research context.

References

- Afflerbach, P., & Pearson, P. D. (2020). Toward a model of reading engagement. In *Handbook of reading research*. Routledge.
- Alsalam, A. I., & Mohammed, A. (2025). Enhancing reading fluency in Saudi EFL undergraduates with the Microsoft Teams Reading Progress tool: A mixed-methods approach. *Arab World English Journal, Special Issue on CALL*, 11, 252–270. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/call11.16>
- Chapman, M. (1988). *Constructive evolution: Origins and development of Piaget's thought*. Cambridge University Press.
- Clemens, N. H., Powell, D., & Vadasy, P. F. (2021). Individual differences in response to reading intervention: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 54(6), 1–15.
- Collins, L. W., Cook, S. E. C., Ninci, J., & Weingrad, I. (2023). The effects of repeated reading on fluency for students with and at risk for EBD: An evidence-based review. *Behavioral Disorders*, 49(1), 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01987429231199668>
- Department of Education. (2023a). *DepEd Order No. 13, s. 2023: National learning recovery program*.
- Department of Education. (2023b). *DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2023: Revised guidelines on the implementation of the DepEd computerization program*.
- Department of Education. (2024). *Philippine informal reading inventory (Phil-IRI) for junior high school manual*.
- Domingue, B. W., et al. (2022). *Tracking the COVID-19 pandemic's effects on reading achievement*. Policy Analysis for California Education. †
- Erbil, D. G. (2020). A review of flipped classroom and cooperative learning method within the context of Vygotsky theory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, Article 1157. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01157>
- Feruzi, S. M. (2021). Development of reading fluency from the perspective of automaticity theory. *International Journal of English Language Studies*, 3(9), 23–27.
- Hendricks, E. L., & Fuchs, D. (2020). Are individual differences in response to intervention related to reading outcomes? *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 53(4), 1–14.
- Hudson, R. F., Koh, P. W., Moore, K. A., & Binks-Cantrell, E. (2020). Oral reading fluency assessment and instruction: A synthesis of 16 empirical studies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(S1), S57–S78.
- Joo, S. J., Tavabi, K., Caffarra, S., & Yeatman, J. D. (2021). Automaticity in the reading circuitry. *Brain and Language*, 214, Article 104906. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2020.104906>
- Jose, J. (2025). The impact of integrating Microsoft Teams–Reading Progress as an artificial intelligence (AI) platform for promoting learners' reading aloud skills. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30, 7077–7115. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13074-3>
- Kim, Y. S. G., Park, Y., & Wagner, R. K. (2021). Is oral/text reading fluency a bridge to reading comprehension? *Reading and Writing*, 34(1), 79–99.
- LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S. J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. *Cognitive Psychology*, 6(2), 293–323.
- Lam, S. S.-Y., White-Schwoch, T., Zecker, S. G., Hornickel, J., & Kraus, N. (2017). Neural stability: A reflection of automaticity in reading. *Neuropsychologia*, 103, 162–167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2017.07.023>
- Ludewig, U., et al. (2022). Reading achievement in times of crisis: The impact of COVID-19-related school closures on reading comprehension and fluency. *Reading and Writing*, 35(6), 1397–1424. †
- Maturana, H. (1980). Biology of cognition and language. In G. Globus, G. Maxwell, & I. Savodnik (Eds.), *Consciousness and the brain* (pp. 57–100). Plenum Press.
- Maxom, M. (2019). *Teaching English as a foreign language for dummies*. Wiley.
- Microsoft. (n.d.). *Reading Progress research*. Microsoft Learn. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/training/educator-center/product-guides/reading-progress/research>
- National Reading Panel. (2019). *Teaching children to read: Evidence-based assessment of reading research*. †
- Nguyễn, T. (2020). Opening up the possibilities: A case study on the effects of a paired reading intervention with a struggling reader. *Journal of Classroom Research in Literacy*, 10. †
- Octavo, R., & Varas, F. (2022). Digital reading platforms and reading fluency: An evaluative case of Microsoft Teams Reading Tool. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 3(1), 45–60.

- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *PISA 2022 results (Volume I): The state of learning and equity in education*. OECD Publishing.
- Panadero, E. (2017). A review of self-regulated learning: Six models and four directions for research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, Article 422.
- Petscher, Y., Cabell, S. Q., Catts, H. W., Compton, D. L., Foorman, B. R., Hart, S. A., Lonigan, C. J., Phillips, B. M., Schatschneider, C., Steacy, L. M., Terry, N. P., & Wagner, R. K. (2020). How the science of reading informs 21st-century education. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(S1), S267–S282. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.352>
- Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., & Allen, J. P. (2012). Teacher–student relationships and engagement: Conceptualizing, measuring, and improving the capacity of classroom interactions. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 365–386). Springer.
- Policy Analysis for California Education. (2021). *The impact of COVID-19 on oral reading fluency*.
- Quimsing, D., & Ortega-Dela Cruz, R. (2024). Readtech 1.0: Tailoring digital instruction in reading fluency using Microsoft Teams. *Journal of Digital Education Innovation*, 5(2), 89–104.
- Rasinski, T. V., Yates, R., Foerg, K., Greene, K., Paige, D., Young, C., & Rupley, W. (2020). Impact of classroom-based fluency instruction on Grade One students in an urban elementary school. *Education Sciences*, 10(9), Article 227.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. Guilford Press.
- Sadiki, M. F. (n.d.). *Reading fluency development in Tanzanian primary schools: A study based on automaticity theory* [Unpublished manuscript].
- Samuels, S. J. (1979). The method of repeated readings. *The Reading Teacher*, 32(4), 403–408.
- Schiefele, U., & Schaffner, E. (2016). Dimensions of reading motivation and their relation to reading behavior and competence. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 51(4), 469–495. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.166>
- Silor, A. C., & Silor, F. S. C. (2025). Boosting reading comprehension through AI-based learning tools. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 24(9), 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.24.9.4>
- Souriyavongsa, T., Rany, S., Abidin, M. J. Z., & Mei, L. L. (2013). Factors causes students low English language learning: A case study in the National University of Laos. *International Journal of English Language Education*, 1(1), 179–192. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijelev1i1.3100>
- Spear-Swerling, L. (2016). *Preventing and remediating difficulties with reading fluency*. LD Online. †
- Stetter, M. E., & Hughes, M. T. (2021). Computer-assisted instruction and reading fluency outcomes for struggling readers. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 37(2), 145–160.
- Tholsfen, A. (2021). *Reading Progress in Microsoft Teams: An innovation in reading fluency assessment*. Microsoft Education Blog. †
- Thompson, A. D., & Mishra, P. (2007–2008). Breaking news: TPACK becomes TPACK! *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education*, 24(2), 38–64. †
- UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education—A tool on whose terms?*
- Vaughn, S., Capin, P., Scammacca, N., Roberts, G., Cirino, P., & Fletcher, J. M. (2020). The critical role of word reading as a predictor of response to intervention. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 53(6), 415–427.
- 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.
- Wentzel, K. R. (2017). Teacher–student relationships and adolescent competence at school. In A. J. Elliot, C. S. Dweck, & D. S. Yeager (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation: Theory and application* (2nd ed., pp. 211–229). Guilford Press.
- Wexler, J., Vaughn, S., Edmonds, M., & Reutebuch, C. K. (2008). A synthesis of fluency interventions for secondary struggling readers. *Reading and Writing*, 21(4), 317–347. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-007-9085-7>
- Wolf, M. (2016). *Tales of literacy for the 21st century*. Oxford University Press.
- Yi, Y.-B. (2024). Effect of repeated reading on English reading fluency and affective factors of Korean middle school students. *Studies in Foreign Language Education*, 38(1), 217–234.
- Yıldız, M. (2013). The effect of reading fluency on reading comprehension in fifth-grade students. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 13(4), 2287–2290.
- Young, C., & Rasinski, T. (2018). Readers theatre: Effects on word recognition automaticity and reading prosody. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 41(3), 475–485.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 13–39). Academic Press.