

Review of: "Lived Experience of School Leaders in Supervising during Remote Teaching"

Beatriz Cabellos¹

¹ Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article focuses on identifying how school leaders dealt with the pandemic period from their working position and how it was managed.

In my opinion, this is an interesting issue to address because it can help to promote the organisation of schools to alleviate the limitations that teachers have when it comes to incorporating ICT into their teaching. However, the article presents theoretical and methodological problems, which makes it difficult to interpret the results and their consequent impact on educational research.

The introduction points out that the pandemic provoked schools to change their teaching to a remote format. This only happened in a certain period, and it should be highlighted. I think the main problem with this section is that it is out of date. It is almost four years into the confinement, and not just one year as stated. Throughout the text is referenced a time before the one we are in now, so the text should be updated.

Regarding the method, it is not clear what procedure was carried out to validate the questionnaire. This should be explained in detail.

The category analysis is also not well specified in the method. It should be pointed out which categories were designed and how they were obtained. The sample used is also not well-detailed.

In addition, the document lacks a section on results, which is key in a work like this. At least the frequency of occurrence of the different categories should have been identified, and an attempt should also have been made to identify how they are related and whether there are variables specific to the teachers or the schools that promote them. I also think that the part of the discussion section explaining the themes identified should appear in the results section. Therefore, I propose to create a results section where the above is included. I also believe that the discussion and conclusions should develop more theoretical justification for the results and limitations of the study.

Finally, there are errors in the references. In particular, there is a lack of italics when highlighting scientific journals, and the DOIs do not appear.