IMPORTANCE OF READING FLUENCY FOR TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Davlatalieva Zarina Asqarali qizi
Phd student of Namangan State University
E-mail: zarinadavlataliyeva190@gmail.com

Abstract is to study various features of reading fluency and accuracy, to highlight the most comprehensive existing classifications of reading strategies, description of the technologies and to work out the ways of rendering them in the process of translation.

Keywords: technical, specifically, application, specialized, disciplines, multiple, terminology, mastery, relevant, communicate

Educators and researchers have sought to unlock the mystery of how the human brain processes and comprehends text and how to use this knowledge to help students become proficient readers. However, our students are still not reaching the standards of reading proficiency that we want them to achieve. The literature has established that reading is a complex process, and fluency development is an integral part of this process. Fluency, simplistically defined as a combination of rate, accuracy, and expression, is widely considered not just a foundational component of reading but a necessity if a student is to master comprehension of a text (Frey & Fisher,2006).Research has established that fluency is built by acquiring skills such as phonological awareness and decoding and interacting these skills with knowledge, oral language, and vocabulary. These complex interactions lead the reader to automatic and effortless processing of text that leads to comprehension (Perfetti & Bolger, 2004; Chall, 1996; Scarborough, 2009)[1]. Developments in curriculum and recent education policy raise questions about how recently emphasized practices and programs impact reading fluency and, in turn, reading proficiency. The use of technology in all areas of education has expanded rapidly, and its integration is now a universal mainstay due to the COVID-19 pandemic of 2020. Instruction in foundational skills, such as phonemic awareness and decoding, and rigorous instruction that emphasize complex texts and vocabulary, have been widely implemented in certain states. While independent reading has been shown to have positive correlations with reading proficiency and is still a widely advocated practice, methods that utilize it heavily, such as the reading workshop, have been called into question. Considering the changing landscape of reading instruction in schools, this study used the systematic review method to examine the recent literature and the impact of these instructional practices on reading fluency.

Over the years, theorists have studied the reading process and provided models for acquiring reading skills. Laberge and Samuels' work laid a foundation for the idea of automaticity, the mastery of reading skills to the point of automatic and holistic fluency. Their theory of automatic processing was grounded in the acquisition of words through decoding, beginning with letter-sound processing and blending. Chall's (1996) model also emphasized the importance of decoding and presented reading acquisition in stages. These skills in each stage build on one another, gaining fluency and automaticity in each stage. Perfetti & Marron (1995) reinforced the

---

[1] Perfetti, C. A., & Bolger, D. J. (2004). The brain might read that way. Scientific Studies of Reading, 8(3), 293-304

importance of decoding, proposing that adults could learn to read through phonemic awareness and decoding instruction.

Phonological awareness is correlated with and predictive of reading fluency, while automaticity has also been found to be a predictor of fluency (Roembke et al., 2019; Elhassan et al., 2017; Lipka, 2017)[2]. Word recognition automaticity has also been correlated with ACT reading and composite scores (Rasinski et al., 2006).

Close reading. An instructional routine associated with complex text that engages students with a short passage of text to examine and understand the deep structures. Close reading typically includes repeated readings, limited front-loading, annotation, and text dependent questions

Complex text. Texts that encompass various quantitative and qualitative features and require more instructional support for students to negotiate

Curriculum-based measurement (CBM). An assessment method that uses standardized content that stays consistent over time. It can measure basic skills and provide benchmark data and growth over time.

Decoding. Word reading skills that include phoneme awareness, letter-sound, and phonogram knowledge.

Fluency. A reading component encompassing rate, accuracy, and expression

Oral Reading Fluency (ORF). A type of CBM assessment that measures both accuracy and reading rate, resulting in a Word Correct per Minute (WCPM) score

Phonological awareness/phonemic awareness. Skills involving quick and accurate recognition and manipulation of spoken words and sounds, such as segmenting and blending.

Reading experts have explored the role that fluency plays in proficient reading and its interaction with other components of reading. Some have hypothesized that poor fluency is a symptom of poor reading ability. In contrast, others have stated that fluency is a necessary feature of good reading that must be treated when deficient. Chall (1996) presented a model of reading development rather than a theory, with hopes that further research will prove or disprove her model. Chall proposed a series of stages that readers progress through on the path to proficient reading. Prereading – birth to age six – when children gain control and insights into the nature of language and words. The Decoding stage – is where readers internalize knowledge about the nature of the alphabetic system and how it works. Confirmation and Fluency – most children learn to use decoding knowledge and the redundancies of language and stories. They gain skills in using context and gain fluency and speed. Readers begin the course to acquire new knowledge, information, thoughts, and experiences, involves dealing with multiple viewpoints. Construction and Reconstruction – is reached when one can read texts to the degree and completeness as suits one's purpose (Chall, 1996)[3].Chall (1996) stated that each stage requires some skills acquired in the previous stage, but not to the same degree. A child can still learn to read without the prereading skills.. Chall pointed out that evidence points to a code emphasis instructional approach being most effective for readers at this stage. When students understand letters and sounds and how they work in words, they become more adept at reading new texts. Decoding remains with readers throughout each successive stage. It combines a top-down approach that uses context and story knowledge

---

[2] 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.
[3] Chall Jeanne, S. (1996). Stages of reading development. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

with a bottom-up approach focused on decoding. The transition requires changes in strategies that include growth in general knowledge, vocabulary, and cognitive abilities. Readers also may have difficulty transitioning if they have not acquired automatic recognition of words and phrases through a high volume of independent reading. It is highly dependent on mastery, as the greater complexity of reading requires prior experience reading for a limited purpose.

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.