

To: Melinda Thomas
Current Issues in Education

From: Dr. Naomi Schoenfeld
Rivier University
420 S. Main Street
Nashua, NH 03054

January 18, 2014

Ms. Thomas,

Thank you for your encouraging and thoughtful response to our manuscript, "Teaching Cooking Skills to Adult Girls with Mild Intellectual Disability: The Effectiveness of Internet Websites ". We know that journal editorship takes time and dedication, and appreciate both your service to the field and your attention to our own work.

We also appreciate your working with us through the email difficulties we had in corresponding regarding this manuscript; I am still not sure why the emails did not get through, and hope we have not missed additional ones.

We have submitted our revised manuscript, along with point-by-point responses to the reviewer comments..

While we accepted as many of the reviewer suggestions as possible, we found a number of them difficult to contextualize within our study. In the attached tables, we have noted the status of each suggestion within our document, along with information regarding our decision process.

We are, of course, open to reconsidering our choices if the editors feel we should do so, and look forward to continuing the review process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Naomi Schoenfeld".

Naomi Schoenfeld

Reviewer 1

Area of Concern	Response
<p>The statement on p 3 regarding placing value on a young woman's skill in providing nourishing meals is culturally specific to the culture the study took place and it would seem appropriate to identify that culture within this introduction unless it is the author's opinion which then it should be stated as such.</p>	<p><i>Not Implemented.</i></p> <p>This was an area of indecision to us as we were writing, so we particularly appreciate that it was of importance to the reviewer.</p> <p>Briefly put, we felt that identifying the culture in the introduction would raise the need to provide a rather long explanation of the intricacies of cultural context so as not to fall into the error of generalizing one group's cultural practice to an entire geographic region (since, of course, in any city or location there can be found a wide array of cultural and political beliefs). In this instance this would require a number of additional qualifiers, based on country, geographic region, faith, and ethnic sub-grouping in order to be accurate. Several of these qualifiers would then require further definition that might itself be of arguable accuracy, depending on the cultural lens of the reader. Culture is a complex thing.</p> <p>Given this, we chose to abstain from side-tracking into the quagmire of cultural identity and definitions in the introduction, but to clearly state geographic location in the methods section, where it is relevant to a full description of the participants.</p> <p>Upon rereading, we continue to feel that identifying the culture in the introduction would create these difficulties, so we have left it as is.</p> <p>If the reviewer or editors feel strongly about this item, we are certainly open to expanding the introduction, but would caution that it would likely alter the thread of discourse significantly.</p> <p>Alternatively, we could simply remove the sentence that mentions cultural context. This would perhaps detract an interesting aspect of the article's context, but would directly address the reviewer's suggestion.</p>

Reviewer 2

Area of Concern	Response
<p>The article does have a few writing errors such as p 3 –line 3 Given the increasing ... (love) and p 5 the paragraph starting with In contrast .. (however, for) should be reviewed.</p>	<p><i>Implemented.</i></p> <p>We have corrected these errors.</p>
<p>Also APA errors in the article need to be reviewed and corrected as well.</p>	<p><i>Implemented.</i></p> <p>We have proofread the manuscript to identify and fix any APA errors we might find. This included closing the extra line between the title and introduction text, and changing the bold-italic to bold-only in the Methods section third-level headers.</p>

Reviewer 3

Area of Concern	Response
<p>A pre-post questionnaire was administered that covered some basic questions regarding the skills being taught and the post-intervention questionnaire results were much higher than the pre-intervention questionnaire results. While these data appear relevant the data represent yes/no responses to items such as “Utilizes YouTube for cooking” which does not offer much detail about how the videos were utilized. It would have been interesting to know if the participants were able to type in related search terms, select the most relevant videos, etc.</p>	<p><i>Partially implemented.</i></p> <p>We agree – but unfortunately, cannot gather this information in retrospect. Instead, we have added the following text to the Limitations section:</p> <p><i>“Future research might also gather more specific information about how the videos were found and utilized (e.g., if the participants were able to type in related search terms, if they selected the most relevant videos, and so forth), that might be used to increase the effectiveness of the intervention.”</i></p>

<p>In addition, the data were strictly from parent completed questionnaires which is good to have stakeholder input, but additional data would have been useful such as some direct observation data of the participants completing specific tasks, or having the participants themselves complete the questionnaire. There were staff instructors present who could presumably have collected data on participant performance, but this was not reported.</p>	<p><i>Partially implemented.</i></p> <p>We agree that this would have been optimal. Of course, it is not possible to create this data now.</p> <p>Since this limitation was already included in the Limitations section, to address this concern we reviewed the language already there to verify that it is clearly and strongly stated.</p>
<p>In addition, the type of instruction that the instructors provided was not detailed other than they provided guidance to the participants. This is not enough information for others to replicate the instructional approach utilized.</p>	<p><i>Not implemented.</i></p> <p>The following statement was already included in the manuscript, on pg. 9: <i>“The modeling and support was unscripted, with instructional choices and interactions made based on the expertise of each instructor</i></p> <p>The reviewer is certainly correct that this study is not intended to model scripted teacher intervention content for future replication. We assume that replication in this case would mirror the salient variable – individual choices made by similarly-qualified instructors.</p>
<p>Other concerns included the limited description of the participants such as reporting IQ scores without indicating how the scores were obtained.</p>	<p><i>Implemented.</i></p> <p>Added the following notes to Table 1 (Participant Characteristics): <i>“Note: Participant characteristics were taken from the students’ educational files. ^a Reported IQ scores are as measured by testing conducted by the participants’ school as part of the special education process.”</i></p> <p>Also added “as indicated by their educational files” to the body of the text on pg. 7.</p>

<p>Perhaps coding the survey data would allow for additional statistical analysis.</p>	<p><i>Not implemented.</i></p> <p>While we did conduct some initial coding when looking at the data, the small pool of responses made it somewhat moot as a step towards statistical analysis. We looked again in response to this reviewer, and felt this still to be true. If there is an appropriate statistical test that the reviewer or editors feels we are overlooking, we apologize for not recognizing this, and would be happy to conduct it.</p>