June 16, 2018

Dear Dr. Sarah Chinn and Reviewers,

Thank you very much for the opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript “On Belonging: Children Respond to Trump through Play and the Imagination.” I have resubmitted it to the online portal and used track changes so that the revisions are easy to see. Additionally, in this letter, I have included both the revision requests and a short explanation of how we responded to them in the article itself.

1. Please describe and spell out the full name of EPIC the first time you mention it. You raise it early on but without any identification or description.

*To address this, we made a few changes, the first and most substantial being that we moved the section introducing the context of the study to come before the section which explains our approach to using play as a means of organizing more equitable futures. We have relabeled this new section on the context of the site as ‘Introducing the Players and the Play,’ and it comes between the introduction and the section ‘Engaging Inequities and Imagining More Equitable Futures through Play.’ Additionally, the first sentence of the new section “Introducing the Players and the Play’, provides a succinct description or definition of EPIC as “an afterschool literacy, arts, and technology design club co-facilitated by the University of Colorado at Boulder’s School of Education and Alicia Sanchez International Elementary School.”*

*EPIC is actually the club’s full name; I realize that the capitalization makes it seem as though it is an acronym, but it is not an abbreviation for a longer name. If it would be helpful for us to include a footnote to clarify this, we certainly can.*

2. You argue that children are able to deal with political material around issues of equity even at a young age, but not that they should. Do you think that all young children need to have discussions and activities about racism, sexism, xenophobia, etc?

*A slight clarification: my (emily’s) argument surrounding children and childhood is not simply that children are capable of contending with issues of equity (though I agree that they are!), but that they already are contending with issues of equity. I have yet to work with a child that is not working to make sense of some social structure, norm, or hierarchy related to gender, class, race, religion, sexuality, ability or other social construct, depending on the context they are in. In the article, I describe this as one of the primary tasks of childhood - making sense of the (often unspoken) norms, hierarchies, and structures that characterize the adult world they have come to inhabit. I do not argue that we should be introducing these concepts in the abstract to our youngest students without invitation. Instead, I argue that we should be listening for, taking seriously, and attending to the issues of equity that children are contending with – and this will vary greatly depending on the local community and context.*

*To address this in the text, we added three sentences to the third paragraph of the introduction, where we discuss our framing of children and childhood. Following the sentence, “We draw from childhood studies, feminist theories, and queer theories in contending that children are not only affected by inequalities in our larger society, but are actively working to make sense of them”, we added the following “ We argue that this is one of the primary tasks of childhood – making sense of the often unspoken norms, hierarchies, and structures that characterize the adult world they have come to inhabit. In this regard, our argument goes beyond the contention that children are simply capable of attending to issues of equity. Though we agree that they are absolutely capable, we take the argument a step further in asserting that children already are contending with issues of equity, relative to their local community and context.” Following the next sentence “to ignore this fact is to do a disservice to both students themselves and to our larger society,” we added the sentence “As educators, we argue that we should be listening for, taking seriously, and attending to issues of equity that children are contending with, which will vary greatly depending on the local community and context.”*

3. You don't need a separate section on methods. Radical Teacher’s readers come from a variety of backgrounds, and don’t necessarily need to know the theorized details of your methodology as much as what you did and why you did it that way.

*Awesome. We have removed the section on methodology in its entirety, and moved the contents of the subsection on context, which included both the description of the site and the authors’ roles at the site, to the new section described in response to point 1 above, ‘Introducing the Players and the Play.’ We also added a sentence about how we chose to analyze the scenes that we did in the introduction to our two examples in the section ‘Who Belongs, and Who Gets to Decide?’*

4. A larger revision: In your conclusion, could you bring us back to the insights you gained in these activities with the children? And could you put the two activities – drawing and dramatic play – into conversation with each other? How are they related in the logic of the children’s imaginations? Did you see a significant change from before to after the election among your students? Do any students resist the equity education you’re offering?

*Absolutely. We have extensively edited and expanded on the original discussion section to attend to each of these issues, being:*

* *What did we learn from the children’s play and art?*
* *How are these two activities related to one another? In what ways did they accomplish the same goals, and in what ways did they provide unique insights? How do they support one another?*
* *How did students’ emotional responses change over time?*
* *What does resistance look like at EPIC, and how is it used as a tool for teacher learning?*

5. Could you explain why this is a \*radical\* teaching practice rather than a liberal/multicultural one.

*There are several elements which makes this approach to teaching radical, as opposed to a branch of the progressive (liberal) tradition, such as multicultural education. While a progressive approach focuses on the whole child and embraces holistic, collaborative approaches, it does not require examinations of power or the inclusion of transformative practice, which are central to radical approaches such as critical pedagogy. We consider our approach radical in two ways: (1) the redistribution of power in our framing of children as agentic knowledge-makers, as opposed to the common framing of children as passive recipients of knowledge, and (2) our use of play as a means of equity-oriented teaching and learning, which both centers investigations of power as central to the learning process, and facilitates the transformation of institutional practices over adaption to them.*

*To address this, we added one sentence to the third paragraph of the introduction, which addresses our positioning of children as radical, and two sentences to the fourth paragraph of the introduction, which speak to our focus on investigations of power and privilege and transformative action.*

Thank you so much for your time and attention. Please don’t hesitate to follow up if you have any additional questions, concerns, or revisions.

Best wishes and many thanks,

Emily Claire Price