To: The Editors and Reviewers of *Current Issues in Education*

Re: Manuscript entitled: “Everyone Has a Story: A Collaborative Inquiry Project by Five Teacher Candidates of Color and One White Professor”

December 1, 2012

Dear Editors and Reviewers,

We thank you for your helpful feedback regarding our manuscript. Based on your comments, we have made multiple changes. Listed below are the reviewers’ comments in italics and our responses in standard font.

***Reviewer Comments #1***

*A discussion dedicated to defining and explaining “the other” is needed, especially as it relates to Said’s “Orientalism”. The addition of one or two paragraphs to explicate the concept of “othering” would assist the reading in understanding Said’s translation as it pertains to “normalizing” white students: if students of color are “the other,” this demonstrates the power of holding a position of “non-other.”*

**Response 1**

We included information related to Said’s and Foucault’s definitions of “other” and “normal” in the context of explaining cooperative inquiry’s capacity to empower marginalized individuals. See page five. We agree with the reviewer that attention to the notions of otherness and deviant vs. normal add to our manuscript.

***Reviewer Comments #2***

*It is recommended that Cooperative Inquiry be explained in the methodology section as it illustrates how the paper was constructed methodologically. In the manuscript, the authors demonstrated a deep understanding of Cooperative Inquiry. A possible improvement could be to address validity through non-traditional or traditional means related to Cooperative Inquiry (e.g., catalytic or transgressive validity).*

**Response 2**

We have included an overview of the four stages of cooperative inquiry at the end of page five. Starting on page 10 and continuing through page 12, we give a detailed description of how we engaged in each stage. Rather than taking on the notion of validity, which we view as more germane to quantitative, generalizable research than to qualitative, transferrable research, we have provided maximum information related to context and authors. Further, we have included a limitations section. We appreciate the reviewer’s encouragement to think about catalytic or transgressive validity, and we hope to do so in a future manuscript dedicated to cooperative inquiry as a methodology. At the same time, we feel that this discussion is beyond the scope of the current manuscript.

***Reviewer Comments #3***

*The manuscript does not provide a theoretical framework. As written, the reader is left questioning which perspective was used in data analysis and interpretation. A discussion of the theoretical perspective utilized by the authors would strengthen the study, as it would frame the analysis and interpretation of the data, and presentation of the findings.*

**Response**

We have clarified our section on cooperative inquiry to explain that cooperative inquiry serves as both our methodology and our theoretical framework. We drew upon Foucault’s notion of distributed power and (as indicated above) Said’s notion of “orientalism” or “otherness” to provide a rationale for cooperative inquiry’s potential to disrupt traditional power dynamics within research. These changes are found on page four of the manuscript. We appreciate the reviewer’s encouragement to more explicitly state a theoretical framework.

***Reviewer Comments #4***

*Providing direct quotes of the participants is powerful in qualitative studies. Structurally, it is beneficial for the authors to present an idea, support the idea with a direct quote, and then explain the quote in the context of the study. It is recommended that the findings section be presented in this way.*

*It is also important that findings be presented in light of existing literature, whether it supports or conflicts with the findings of the current study. As written, the conclusion section repeats the discussion section. It is suggested that a discussion of the findings incorporate the discussion, conclusion, and implication sections together. The final section can provide the limitations of the study.*

**Response #4**

We provided context for all of the quotes within the paper, indicating if the quote was from reflective writing, an autobiography, or a meeting transcript. For quotes from meeting transcripts, we indicated the topic of the meeting. We thank the reviewer for this suggestion, as the context provided will certainly assist the reader in making meaning from our work.

We restructured the discussion section to include connections to the current literature. We also eliminated the conclusion, as we agree with the reviewer that this was simply a repetition of the discussion section.