

Responding to Critics

Background on Reading Recovery Criticism

Reading Recovery is a scientifically based early literacy intervention used in the United States since 1984. Because it is widely studied and well known, Reading Recovery has drawn criticism from a small but vocal minority who hold differing views about the beginning reading process. Although critics often quote research, advocates can be confident that the vast majority of research evidence supports Reading Recovery. The following links provide needed detail to respond to Reading Recovery critics.

Allington, Richard (February 14, 2007).
Think Tank Review of Whole Language High Jinks
Education Policy Studies Laboratory. Published online.

Response to:

Moats, Louisa (2007). Whole–Language High Jinks: How to Tell When "Scientifically–Based Reading Instruction" Isn't. Thomas B. Fordham Institute.

A Review of What Research Really Says About Reading Recovery (2006).
Reading Recovery Council of North America.

Response to:

Farrall, M. (2006, February 7). Reading Recovery: What do school districts get for their money? A review of the research. Wrightslaw Website newsletter posting.

Jones, N. (2006)

One to One vs. Two-to-One Instruction: A Response to Iversen, Tunmer, and Chapman.

Response to:

Iversen, S., Tunmer, W., & Chapman, J. (2005). The effects of varying group size on the Reading Recovery approach to preventive early intervention. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 38(5), 256–272.

Schwartz, R. M. (2005)

Research Findings and Recommendations: A Response to Elbaum et al. (2000) Meta–Analysis of One–to–One Interventions

Response to:

Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S. M. T., & Moody, S. W. (2000). How effective are one-to-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? A meta-analysis of the intervention research. *Journal of*

Educational Psychology, 92(4) 605–619.

Schwartz, R. M. (2005)

The Effectiveness of Early–Intervention Tutoring Programs—When is a Research Brief Too Brief?

Response to:

The effectiveness of early–intervention tutoring programs on student reading achievement. (2005, April 26). ASCD Research Brief.

What Evidence Says About Reading Recovery (2002). Reading Recovery Council of North America.

Response to:

Internet letter distributed to members of Congress in Spring 2002.

Letter Says Evidence Distorts Research (2002)

Signed by 200 academics and literacy scholars

Response to:

Internet letter distributed to members of Congress in Spring 2002.

Signed

by 31 academics.

Pinnell, G. S. (1999)

Comments in Response to Critics

Response to:

Grossen, B., & Coulter, G. "Reading Recovery: An evaluation of benefits and costs: The claims versus the facts". Published online.

Pinnell, G. S., & Moriarty, D. J. (1999)

Open letters to the editor of Investors Business Daily

Response to:

When education theories go bad. (1999, April 1). Investors Business Daily.