

Review of: "Square peg in a round hole: Migration and romantic relationship troubles in the UK Zimbabwean diaspora"

Luděk Jirka¹

¹ University of Hradec Králové

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for inviting me as a reviewer.

Article is about gender related topic and migration and I would like to provide some critical insights:

1. Introduction section provides general notices for tensions between couples, but it should be more related to Zimbabwean diaspora. For me – who does not know so much about the Zimbabwean traditional cultural values – is hard to catch the differences between British and Zimbabwean society because authors wrote only a little about the traditional values of Zimbabweans. This information should be more implemented in the article. For example – what does it exactly mean Zimbabwean patriarchal system? There are a plenty of possible explanations and meanings, but I am not able to find this issue properly described in the article.
2. Authors conducted online interviews through Skype and in the analysis section is mentioned field diary and observation. These methods are possible – I suppose – only face-to-face in the fieldwork, in specific location. Therefore, where, how and in what way were notices from observations conducted if the research was completed by interviews?
3. In the analysis and results authors refer to couples, but me as a reader is almost impossible to reveal who is male and who is female. Citations are made upon division of number – respondent n.5, respondent n. 14 – but for clarifying should be added the division upon male/female. This could be added as short notice.
4. In the methodology should authors wrote some details about respondents – age, social background (if possible), locality of origin (depends if someone is from Harare and someone from village – I could imagine that rural environment is even more traditional), year of divorcing and some other details which could more the whole context clear.
5. It is not readable from the article how gendered positions relate to migration. Respondents are members of diaspora, but how the migration experience involved them?
6. In the conclusion is not clear how many couples were divorced.
7. Authors should characterize more their participants in the whole text. Authors mostly aimed at the intimacy relationships of couples and their enculturation (or adaptation?) processes, but they provide less insight into the characteristics of participants.
8. Citations should be added directly into the text. They are now extracted and apart from the context.
9. In the conclusion authors mentioned language and its role, but analysis section and results are more about intimacy,

culture or system and less about language. This is the point what should be more elaborated in the text.