

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

Francesca Dagnino<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Italian National Research Council

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper addresses the role of management and support of remote education in emergencies by principals. The study provides an interesting perspective, as the focus is usually on teachers and students, however it has some weaknesses that need to be addressed.

The methodology section needs improvements:

1. Reading the article, it is not clear whether the author administered a questionnaire followed by an interview or whether he used questionnaires and interviews alternatively or whether there was only one instrument that was administered via Google form and Zoom. The author should better clarify the procedure. Furthermore, the author should describe both instruments (if there are two, of course): how many questions did the questionnaire include? What were the questions about? Was the interview semi-structured or unstructured? How was the topic introduced?
2. The validation process of a questionnaire is complex and the different steps were not undertaken by the author (also considering the type of questionnaire). The author asked the experts to check whether the questions were related to the topic under investigation, which is one possible way to address content validity. I suggest the author revise statements about validation.
3. The data analysis needs to be better described. The simple reference to thematic analysis does not allow to understand the process. Who carried out the analysis (one or more researchers)? Did they tag the interviews/questionnaire? If more than one person tagged the interviews how they reached consensus?
4. A portion of the introduction is reported also in the methodology section. I suggest the author revise the text accurately, considering also that the text is not related to methodological aspects.

The 'Results and Discussion' section needs to be enriched:

1. Since in thematic analysis themes derive from the aggregation of codes emerged during the analysis, codes shouldn't be disregarded. I suggest the author refer also to codes. Furthermore, I suggest the author add excerpts from the participants (of which there are now few) to support the claims.
2. Often the discussion within the theme is a bit detached from the content of the theme (see for example theme 1). I suggest the author try to discuss the theme and not in general the research.
3. In theme 4 the author seems to discuss the results of the literature, as after a very short paragraph with an extract, the rest are references to existing publications. If the author intended to discuss the answers of the principals, he should

have reported excerpts and then referred to the literature.

4. The numerical reference at the end of the excerpts is not always clear, why are there sometimes two numbers at the end (e.g. P12; 16)? Has the author integrated excerpts from two principals? I suggest the author make the reference clearer

Minor issue: in the introduction the author talk about 'post conference'. This term is not easily understandable in the context. Does the author refer to videoconference?