

**Dispelling Misrepresentations and Misconceptions About Reading Recovery:
Response to *Perspectives on Language and Literacy*, Fall 2011**

Abstract

This White Paper is a response to the Fall 2011 issue of the International Dyslexia Association's quarterly publication, *Perspectives on Language and Literacy*. The themed issue used a nonscientific approach without external review to discount various aspects of Reading Recovery.

The White Paper response focuses on three areas of concern.

- First is faulty reporting of the effectiveness of Reading Recovery. The journal authors' lack of understanding of the standards met by the What Works Clearinghouse and their dependence on flawed reviews led to selective and inaccurate claims.
- A second area of concern is the authors' misrepresentations about the theoretical foundations of Reading Recovery. In their attempt to open a debate on code-based vs. meaning-based instruction, they revealed their lack of understanding of the literacy processing theory on which Reading Recovery is based. By trying to align Reading Recovery with whole language, they showed their misconception of the complex processes involved in a literacy processing theory on which the intervention is based.
- Finally, the journal authors revealed many misconceptions about Reading Recovery practices. They confused their code-based agenda with empirical outcomes of interventions like Reading Recovery. They offered no empirical evidence of outcomes from well-defined interventions serving the same population. Other confusions included the understanding of a 'complete' program in Reading Recovery, conflicting comments about one-to-one teaching, the commitment to serving the lowest literacy achievers, and information gathered when taking running records of text reading.

Reading Recovery Council of North America – February 2, 2012
Full Report Available online. <http://rrcna.org/research/analysis/index.asp>