

Author's Note

In response to the note from Louisa Moats, and having also read the Editor's Note from Kevin Welner, I believe that the current review should be modified to more clearly inform the reader as to which SoprisWest products Moats' paper did and did not promote. As briefly set forth below and for the reasons also set forth by Welner, I do not believe that the other concerns raised by Moats are valid.

Accordingly, my review has been modified to drop the final sentence in section VI, which had read, "Moreover, several key recommendations in the report suggest the purchase of services or products provided by or authored by Moats." We also deleted the reference to LETRS in the parenthetical list in the final paragraph of Section VI, since that product is not mentioned by name. Finally, we edited the final sentence of the review's summary, changing "by Moats and her employer" to "by Moats' employer."

We also modified the paragraph discussing LETRS in Section IV, clarifying the sentence, "The LETRS program is marketed by her employer, SoprisWest, apparently giving Moats a financial stake in many of this report's recommendations." The sentence now reads, "The LETRS program as well as Moats' co-authored, 'Colleague in the Classroom: Interventions for DIBELS users' video series —neither of which Moats directly promotes in this paper, but both of which provide the type of professional development called for in *Whole Language High Jinks* — are marketed by her employer, SoprisWest, apparently giving Moats an indirect financial stake in many of this report's recommendations."

Among the remaining contentions in Moats, I can not find any merit. The review clearly states that SoprisWest products are "roughly half" the products offered. No claim is made that only SoprisWest products are recommended.

As for the research on the products mentioned, the review does not state that no research supports the products, just that the available research fails to meet the standard provided in the guide to evidence-based products and services available from the U.S. Dept. of Education (cited and with a weblink in the review): multiple, independent, randomized field trials published in peer reviewed journals. The primary failing of the research on all commercial products is that most of the available studies were conducted by the authors of those programs.

Finally, my review provides citations for key studies, meta-analyses, or research reviews. These provide the research base Moats ignored in developing her listing of features of programs based on scientific evidence (p. 18 of *Whole Language High Jinks*). Contrary to Moats' characterization, features such as student choice, collaboration, access to interesting texts, post-reading conversation, and teacher modeling are all research-based features of effective reading lessons.

Dick Allington
University of Tennessee