

Review of: "“A totally new situation that put us into uncharted waters”: Preschool teachers negotiate their professional identity in respect to online learning during the Covid-19 lockdowns in Greece."

Tal Vaizman

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper deals with a truly important topic – teachers' professional identity, following COVID-19 implications. It is well-framed and addresses current work. Hereby are a few comments.

Introduction

I would suggest changing the order of the core claims in the first paragraph: initially explaining the term and only then expanding on it through its relationship to other personal characteristics. If needed, push it back even more and discuss possible interpretations of the term and only then its correlations. Starting the "introduction" the way it currently begins weakens a bit the significance of the study's key characteristic.

"The need to resist change can be better understood if...": better than what? There is no reference to a weaker way of understanding it. I suggest changing the phrasing and omitting the word.

1.1.1

"This may be due to the fact that they come from different educational and training backgrounds (Osgood & Stone, 2002)...": the statement, especially since it is brought as a possible explanation to what was written earlier, raises questions. Is it true everywhere? Where was the cited study executed? Perhaps in other countries backgrounds are quite similar. Either way, it should be addressed –by limiting the claim or by stressing the worldwide similarity of preschool teachers (I doubt it's the same everywhere).

1.1.2

The second par. Is highly important, informative, and well-written. It addresses directly the practical changes along with the characteristics of the pandemic era. Citing Rodriguez et al., (2022), I wonder – was there no challenge for those teachers that coping with it strengthened them and/or boosted their professional identity despite mourning the lost connections? I think it should be mentioned if there was even a small positive effect.

1.1.3

The last sentence might be too complicated and it could be understood in different ways. Perhaps adding the word "by"

between the words "and modernist", if that's the original intention.

1.1.4

The first par. Is too long and should be split up according to key statements.

1.1.5

"that was imposed because of the schools' closure". I suggest: that was imposed due to schools' shut-down (and perhaps adding that it was a governmental decision). "closure" means something else.

"More specifically, it would be of interest to explore how the emergence of Online Learning (OL) in the Greek...": are you suggesting further follow-up studies (like in a "discussion" section) or explaining what you did in the current one? If the latter – state it that way.

The second per. Should be under the "method" chapter, since it explains why you chose the qualitative method and not the interest in the topic. So is the first sentence of the third par. Additionally, it eclipses what's truly important – the research questions.

Method

2.1.1

"Qualitative studies usually engage a smaller number of participants. However, in cases in which the research topic is new and/or underrepresented and there is a need for better clarification of the prevailing experiences and patterns of thought, researchers seek to ensure bigger numbers of participants (Coyle, 2007).": again, you use the word "smaller" without any comparison. Are you comparing it to a quantitative study? It needs to be stated if so. Either way – you should not mention it. It comes off as apologetic and anyone familiar with qualitative studies knows that. I also believe that the second sentence cited here is not needed. What is it you're saying here? That your study has a "bigger" (again, a comparative phrasing) sample, or not? Unclear and unnecessary, especially if it is only meant to explain the nature of the qualitative study.

"Of course, the collected data cannot be considered representative of the whole population of Greek preschool teachers.": this should be stated in the discussion, not here while addressing the study limitation and further suggestions.

Table 1 should also indicate the mean (age, experience...) and SD.

2.1.2

"The second researcher, who conducted..." – just say that before the interview, participants were informed.... similarly in other occasions in the paper. Avoid addressing yourselves as the subject of the sentence.

I wonder why you did not use Zoom or a video chat since it was already becoming popular during the pandemic. Addressing the fact that there was only audio for the interviews should come at the end as a study limitation.

I suggest splitting up the par.

Findings

This section could be better edited in my opinion. It should not be split into so many sub-divisions and instead offer a flow reading. There is no real connection between one impact or statement to the next and it seems to be arranged as a pool of citations from interviews with insights into them. Also, there is one statement from one interview which is being addressed at a certain point. Any similarities between the participants' claims should be offered, to stress the strength of the statement, or even point to a consensus.

Every now and then, open with your insights and only then support it with (some) citations.

Discussion

4.1.1. Limitations

The limitations should address the scope of the study sample; the audio being somewhat insufficient, not allowing exploration of body language and so on; and the pros and cons of using a diverse sample in terms of experience and age.

When discussing the implications, you address the field and possible directions to be taken, which is important. You should also address the academic field, stating in what way you feel your work had a contribution and what could be possible future studies, leaning on your findings.