March 11th, 2014

**Subject: Changes made to “A/political Education: A survey of young voters' perceptions of their citizenship education”**

Dear Editorial Board of the Canadian Journal of Education,

Please find the following comments (in italics) that were made by my reviewers with regards to the recommended changes to my article. These comments are followed by a description of how I addressed their concerns.

*Reviewer A: “the conclusion falls flat and lacks substance;”*

*Reviewer B: “ the paper ends abruptly, and the author can considerably expand his/her analysis of the implications for further research.The author lists a number of recommendations for improvement, including:“a greater emphasis on how to participate, a more student-centred approach to the teaching of civics, more opportunities to participate in decision-making processes within schools, and, most importantly, the provision of positive examples of*

*the consequences of political action” (p. 15).I suggest adding to each of those suggestions a sentence or two as to why they would necessitate “improvement.””*

*Reviewer B: “Under the section “School as a Model of Democratic Society,” the author suggests that only 13% of students felt that their student government had any power, and that “this may be another area worth exploring,” but does not suggest how.The author can go a bit deeper here, and help the reader understand some sort of model for student engagement.*

*Reviewer B:“The author states: “By asking students about what and how they were taught, as well as the environment they were taught in, teachers and policy makers may be better equipped to meet the goals of these courses as well as better meet the needs of students.”However, the author does not say how this can better equip teachers and policy makers. How can each use the results of this study in their own job, and how can it better meet the goals?”*

* I re-wrote the conclusion entirely and developed my recommendations considerably, with examples. Recommendations address policy, teaching practices and school functioning.

*Reviewer A: “ I worry about the lack of a more substantial take on the issue of students' interest in politics. It would be an asset to add some discussions in contemporary political theory (examples: Charles Taylor, Jacques Rancière) to the cold data.”*

*Reviewer B: “No information about the QEP curriculum is given. Something should be given to the reader outside of Quebec in order to understand how citizenship education is structured in Quebec,”*

* I integrated three additional sources (including the Quebec Education Program and Charles Taylor) into the “Canada and Quebec in Context” section of the literature review and included a description of “interculturalism”.

Finally, Reviewer A stated that he could see the tracked changes in my document and Reviewer B suggested I remove a sentence. I addressed both of these issues. Please let me know if you have any additional changes that you would like me to make, questions or comments.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Nicole Fournier-Sylvester