

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

Aleksandra Huić¹

¹ University of Zagreb

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I think this is an interesting study. I always find qualitative research rich in findings, and helpful to understand the investigated processes in more depth. The data from this paper can be helpful for other scholars interested in school leaders' experiences during Covid. The paper has all the necessary parts, however I suggest the author rethink the introduction and results and discussion and add to them significantly.

Unfortunately, the whole paper is completely atheoretical and a vast literature on teachers' well-being is ignored in the paper. Not only is this missing from the introduction (which would frame the research questions, identify research gaps, and provide the rationale for the research hypothesis), the findings are not compared to similar research in the field. This makes the paper relatively weak with a completely unclear scientific contribution.

I suggest authors organize the method section into subsections – participants, instruments, procedure, analytical strategy and then give detailed information about each part. At the moment this part of text is very confusing for the reader. Additionally, it would be helpful to have more details on the participants (years of experience as teachers and leaders; from which levels of schools (elementary? High-school?), how big the schools are etc.)

Resilience is part of emotional well-being so I find the author's division of these into two topics very questionable. In addition, the example given for supporting emotional well-being reads more as social support. Given a vast literature on the importance of principal's social support as a buffer in teacher stress in general, and during COVID in particular, I suggest authors do a more thorough lit review and rethink their interpretation of data.

The paper is missing a section describing the study limitations, and critical stance toward the study.

For transparency, I would suggest authors include their interview protocol, or at least describe this in much more detail in the method section.