International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics

ISSN: 2835-1924
Volume 2 | No 4 | April -2023

The Interaction between Fluency, Vocabulary, and Comprehension for Improving Reading Skill

Davlatalieva Zarina Asqarali qizi

A PhD Student of Namangan State University

Abstract: Is to study various features of reading's main parts such as fluency, vocabulary and comprehension, to highlight the most comprehensive existing classifications of reading, description of the modern technologies and to work out the ways of rendering them in the process of translation.

Key words: technical, communicate, fluency, disciplines,, accuracy, specialized, specifically, application, multiple, terminology, mastery, relevant.

Fluency is often thought of as an elementary skill, but research points to the importance of fluency development for older students' reading proficiency. Identifying printed words and reading accurately and effortlessly can be considered the most potent literacy skill and critical to reading comprehension. When students must devote most of their cognitive energy to accuracy, they have less capacity to commit to comprehension. The development of oral reading fluency shows the most significant growth in the primary years, tapering off into the intermediate and middle grades. Without the skill of fluency, students become word callers, unable to decipher how a word is related to or influenced by the words read previously, and comprehension is compromised. If students struggle with fluency and other reading competencies in the early grades, they will likely continue to struggle with reading proficiency as they progress through school. In the study of fluency, it is crucial to consider the mechanics or skills in the complex reading process that enables reading with accuracy, appropriate rate, expression, and comprehension. The idea of automaticity is often attached to reading fluency, the idea of information being processed with little effort or attention. Automaticity also involves processing complex information that requires extensive training or experience, making reading fluency a process that could fall into the concept.

Fluency assessment is often based on two specific aspects of fluency: accuracy and automaticity. Accuracy is reflected in the reader's decoding ability, while automaticity is reflected by reading rate. For decades, accuracy has been measured using various informal reading inventories, providing levels of performance (independent, instructional, frustration) based on accuracy percentages from leveled reading passages and accompanying comprehension questions. Analyzing results allows the teacher to determine a student's approximate instructional reading level. However, due to the in-depth nature of these assessments, they are not always feasible for teachers needing to assess an entire class of students.

Curriculum-based measurement (CBM) falls into a class of assessment methods called general outcome measurement, where measurement is standardized, the focus is long-term, and the testing methods and content remain consistent over long periods. It was developed to decrease the separation between measurement and instruction and assist teachers in instructional decision-making. It combines the advantages of commercial standardized tests and informal observation, and CBM

data shows that basic skills achievement can be reliable and validly measured using a school's existing curriculum (Deno, 1985)[1]. CBM assessment gives the teacher two types of data: the total score, which is graphed and shows student growth over time, and the ability to analyze students' skills and strategies for diagnostic purposes.

Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) assessments are a part of the CBM category and usually involve a student reading from an unpracticed passage for 60 seconds. The examiner counts the errors and subtracts the number of errors from the total number of words read, resulting in a word correct per minute (WCPM) score. Examples of widely used CBM/ORF assessments include DIBELS, AIMSWEB, and CBM reading. CBM and Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) assessments that include both accuracy and rate allow teachers to get a quick and valid snapshot of students' reading performance in a short amount of time and on an ongoing basis to determine progress.

In 1992, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) attempted for the first time to assess oral reading proficiency. This investigation was a part of the Integrated Reading Performance Record (IRPR), which involved individual interviews with a subgroup of fourth graders as part of the NAEP test and was the first to assess fluency for American students large-scale basis. For the IRPR, students were tested by a trained administrator and were asked questions about their instructional and recreational reading habits and attitudes. They were also given fluency and comprehension measures. For the fluency measure, students were given a passage to read silently, followed by questions to answer orally, then read the passage aloud. The reading was analyzed for accuracy, reading rate, and overall fluency according to an oral reading fluency scale developed for the assessment. The fluency scale focused on the elements of phrasing, adherence to syntax, and expression. The results showed that 55 percent of students were considered fluent, but only 13 percent consistently read with appropriate phrasing and expressiveness. The information obtained from the IRPR was linked to the primary.

Fluency's relationship to reading comprehension has been studied in multiple contexts to determine how the skills affect one another. The complexity of early reading skills and their interaction provides a challenge to researchers in isolating this relationship. The conceptual model of reading fluency provided by Hudson suggests a reciprocal relationship between fluency and comprehension and that comprehension skills are the mechanics of reading fluency. This model proposes that comprehension fluency includes the mechanics of metacognition, knowledge, vocabulary, passage context, and social context. Comprehension helps to facilitate the quick and accurate reading of a text, suggesting that these two components of reading are intertwined and reciprocal. The fluency-comprehension relationship in a longitudinal study with twins, concluding that while both skills affect one another, fluency had a more substantial effect on comprehension than the reverse.

The Interaction Between Fluency, Vocabulary, and Comprehension

Several recent studies have explored the complex interactions between fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Lee and Chen (2019) tested students in grades 2 and 3 concurrently and longitudinally to determine if fluency and vocabulary predicted reading comprehension. In Grade 2, fluency and vocabulary independently predicted reading comprehension, while in Grade 3, an interaction between vocabulary and fluency emerged to predict comprehension. The researchers attributed this result to possible developmental changes in reading skills and the increased demands of comprehension. The effects of oral reading fluency, word recognition, and listening comprehension on reading comprehension were explored They found that all three constructs predicted reading comprehension in both grades.

However, they found that listening comprehension was the strongest predictor of the Three. Another study by Yamac and Sezgin (2018)[2] explored the interrelationship of reading anxiety, motivation, fluency, and comprehension. They found that while intrinsic motivation positively affected reading comprehension, extrinsic motivation positively affected fluency. Fluency also affected decreasing

[1] Deno, S. L. (1985). Curriculum-based measurement: The emerging alternative. Exceptional Children, 52(3), 219-232.
[2] Yamac, A., & Sezgin, Z. C. (2018). Relationships among fourth graders' reading anxiety, reading fluency, reading motivation, and reading comprehension. Egitim Ve Bilim, 43(194), 225-243. 10.15390/EB.2018.7555

reading anxiety and contributed positively to comprehension. Kang and Shin (2019) further explored the inter-relationship of decoding, fluency, and comprehension and the differences across different comprehension measures. Their study included struggling fourth-grade readers with and without disabilities. Like previous researchers, they also found a significant positive relationship between reading fluency and comprehension measures. However, they found variance in fluency's relationship to comprehension between the different comprehension measures. Kim (2015) differentiated between text-reading fluency and word-reading fluency when exploring the relationship between fluency and comprehension. Text-reading fluency was defined as words read in connected texts, while word-reading fluency was defined as words read in isolation. The study found that text-reading fluency and comprehension had a bi-directional relationship, and text-reading fluency's relationship to comprehension was stronger than word-reading fluency, suggesting that the two are separate constructs.

Fluency is an essential component of skilled reading and encompasses rate, accuracy, and prosody. Research has established that proficient readers read with appropriate fluency and that fluency and comprehension are inter-related constructs.

Fluent readers have gained automaticity in word recognition, built through instruction in phonemic awareness, decoding, and sight word recognition. Oral language skills, background knowledge, and vocabulary likely also play a role in fluency development. However, researchers are still exploring the degree to which these constructs affect one another. While independent reading has been linked to reading achievement, questions remain about the amount and type of reading that produces the best results.

Repeated reading is the most established and recommended instructional method for increasing reading fluency, while strategies such as modeled reading and poetry have shown evidence of effectiveness. More recent curricular developments, such as increased technology use and the call for the use of complex texts to meet achievement standards have raised questions as to whether these tools have a positive or negative impact on the development of fluent and proficient reading.

REFERENCES

1. Acosta-Tello, E. (2019). Fluency strategies for beginning readers. Contemporary Issues Education Research, 12(4), 87-90.
2. Allington, R. L. (1980). Poor readers don't get to read much in reading groups. Language Arts, 57(8), 872-876.
3. Allington, R. L., & Gabriel, R. E. (2012a). Every child, every day. Educational Leadership, 69(6), 10-15.
4. Chall Jeanne, S. (1996). Stages of reading development. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
5. Chall, J. S., Bissex, G. L., Conard, S. S., & Harris-Sharples, S. H. (1996). Qualitative assessment of text difficulty: A practical guide for teachers and writers. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books
6. Deno, S. L. (1985). Curriculum-based measurement: The emerging alternative. Exceptional Children, 52(3), 219-232.
7. Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2012). Close reading in elementary schools. The Reading Teacher, 66(3), 179-188.
8. Frey, N., & Fisher, D. (2006). Language arts workshop: Purposeful reading and writing instruction. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill/Prentice Hall
9. Perfetti, C. A., & Bolger, D. J. (2004). The brain might read that way. Scientific Studies of Reading, 8(3), 293-304
10. Roembke, T. C., Hazeltine, E., Reed, D. K., & McMurray, B. (2019). Automaticity of word recognition is a unique predictor of reading fluency in middle-school students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 111(2), 314- 330.
11. Yamac, A., & Sezgin, Z. C. (2018). Relationships among fourth graders' reading anxiety, reading fluency, reading motivation, and reading comprehension. Egitim Ve Bilim, 43(194), 225-243. 10.15390/EB.2018.7555