|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Editor - Critique** | **Author’s response** |
| Reviewer A notes that your article is 3,800 words - while you certainly have room to add more in addressing the comments, I wanted to stress that it is not my expectation that the paper needs to extend to 6000 words for the sake of it. | Please also see response to point 3.  “The revised article has resulted in an increased word count to 4841 words excluding the abstract and references.  However we have also taken on board the editors comments that we have not deliberately worked to extend it to 6,000 words. The article is not a traditional article (see discussion response point 1) thus the authors believe that the current increased word count addresses the unique narrative nature of the research study.” |
| Both reviewers have suggested engaging with the literature further in the analysis/discussion section of the article, so I would ask that you pay particular attention to this in addressing the reviewers’ comments | Please see author responses to points 2 and 6. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer One - Critique** | **Author’s response** |
| 1. I would feel more comfortable with a slightly more traditional structure/headings – e.g. methods, findings, discussions, as I feel it would help sign posting more clearly what to expect in your different sections. I realise, however, that this is a personal preference and so I will leave it up to you to consider and make or not those changes. | Thank you for this feedback which we have given a great deal of thought to.  The article was conceptualised within a narrative – collective story-telling framework. The authors were keen to create an unfolding understanding for the reader leading to creation of an ‘ah ha’ moment of general yet complete understanding. So in many respects the structure of the article is consistent with the research process in that storying is central to the process of gathering, sharing, analysing and presenting the research project.  We believe that the more traditional academic structure negates this incremental building of knowledge and understanding within a uniquely narrative framework. Thus we undertook the writing process with a specific focus on using a less traditional academic writing structure – in order to convey the deeply personal experiences and insights that emerged during the research process.  More specifically we wanted to engage in a process to explore our individual and shared vulnerabilities in the unique context of the pandemic lockdown. We discussed the importance of trusting ourselves and each other in a collaborative research process. The four authors have a strong bond developed through engagement in teaching, service and research activities over a number of years bringing to this engagement a common critical and gendered research framework.  Thus we wanted to write about our lockdown experiences differently. As discussed by Kiriakos and Tienari (2018, P. 263) we wanted to move away from the ”rational and predictable activity that targets publications in the right journals” . In our article we wanted to be free to challenge the hegemonic structures that were at the heart of our experiences and reflections as women in academia. In this sense our research process including the final writing process was carried out as “an embodied, sensuous, emotional, social, and identity-related activity” (Kiriakos and Tienari (2018, P. 263)  In some respects the current headings of literature, research process etc do mirror some aspects of a traditional academic article. While the section on reflections could be changed to Findings and Discussion we believe this would undermine the personal and collective/collaborative nature of the research project and also our commitment as researchers to look at more innovative ways to gather, analysis and present data. In this respect IPED was chosen as a journal that encourages innovative theoretical and empirical perspectives in the research process.  While we fully appreciate the reviewer’s suggestion, after some discussion among the authors we have kept the same headings as otherwise we believe that we would lose the unique narrative flavour of the article and undermine our commitment to write differently.  Please refer to the revised article, page 3, a new section with the subheading:  ***Challenging academic hegemony and writing from the heart.*** (two paragraphs that explain /justify our article structure) |
| 2.The only thing I would like to ask is for some literature to be brought in at the end your manuscript to support your discussion a little bit more. You have started doing that in your ‘reflections’ section – which, due to the methods you have used appears to be a mix of a more traditional ‘findings’ and ‘discussion’ section, is that right? With the ‘Locked out and locked up in ‘Lockdown’’ section an outcome of the story production process you have gone through and so potentially a ‘pre-findings’ section or context (?). | We have worked to weave in literature through the reflections/discussion. These additions are highlighted throughout in yellow, but an example of these changes is found in the following excerpt:  The one aspect which Lisa was not dislocated from was the sense of obligation and caring responsibilities, most well captured in the statement ‘a good girl’. Kass (2015) describes the gendered social requirements which encompass being ‘good’. Lisa’s caring and concern for family added additional emotional work to already overloaded personal and professional roles. Her sense of responsibility to students, coming from a ‘real’ commitment to teaching-as-vocation was stretched not only by the unusual online classroom context, but also by the circumstances facing her students; as rapport-building is such an important part of her teaching approach. Lisa’s personal experience story suggests at an implicit level that the sense of compliance, care and responsibility is acutely gendered. For Kass (2015) in addition to the obligation felt, the notion of being ‘good’ is also associated with self-silencing, which we also see reflected in Lisa’s quiet acceptance of her situation, and seeming unwillingness to ‘rock the boat’. |
| 3.The journal provides 5 categories of manuscripts that you can submit: Yours seem to fall in the ‘original research’ category and should thus include between 6,000 to 8,000 words (plus references and a 200 word abstract) – at the moment you are at 3,800 words. Developing your discussion section by bringing in some literature to further support your conclusions could help with that. It would also help you further articulate your contributions and so the new knowledge you are presenting in this paper. | Thank you for these comments.  The revised article has resulted in an increased word count.  However we have also taken on board the editors comments that we have not deliberately worked to extend it to 6,000 words. The article is not a traditional article (see discussion response point 1) thus the authors believe that the current increased word count addresses the unique narrative nature of the research study. |
| 4.This is also bringing me to ask: did you have an abstract in your submission? | Yes an abstract was submitted. Another abstract will also be submitted in this revision process. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer Two - Critique** | **Author’s response** |
| 5.Please define "lockdown" in the NZ context - restrictions have differed nationally. | Thank you for your comment re lockdown. It is an important point that you make as thresholds and language differ between countries.  Please see page 1, first paragraph for our revisions. The paragraph is also copied below and the changes are highlighted in yellow.  On the 24th March 2020, the New Zealand Prime Minister, Jacinda Ardern, announced that the country would go into a Covid-19 related level four lockdown in 48 hours. Level four is the highest of four alert levels in the NZ context reflecting the belief that community transmission is widespread. On the following day a national state of emergency was declared and, on the 26th March a new level four reality dawned with all businesses, organisations and educational institutions closed except those deemed ‘essential’ (Jamieson, 2020). |
| 6.At present the analysis (reflections) section of the article does not engage sufficiently with existing literature. It would be helpful if the authors could situate this new knowledge the context of what is already known about gendered experiences and gendered identities. | Please refer to our response to point 2 above.  There is additional engagement with the literature in this section on reflections/discussion. These changes are highlighted in yellow in the article. |
| 7.Ethical considerations and research design.  I would like to see more information around the ethical considerations for the project - how was participation secured? Was institutional ethical approval sought and obtained? | Institutional ethical support was not required.  At the start of the process one of the authors investigated the ethical issues. Working through an ethics decision making tree, available through the University ethics committee, it was deemed that formal ethical approval was not necessary.  Subsequent to receiving this review, the same author visited a faculty ethical expert who had been on the ethics committee and chaired it for a number of years, and discussed whether formal ethics approval was required. The expert confirmed that it was not a requirement.  However it is important to note that the four authors are familiar with the requirements of the University ethics committee having been engaged in many research projects over the past few years that have required ethics approval and are familiar with codes of ethical conduct and related ethical matters and practices.  At the beginning of the research process we also discussed the issue of ethics and were comfortable with the decision that it was not needed based on the decision making tree exercise and our own knowledge and experiences of the ethics process.  Please refer to page 3, the first two paragraphs under the subheading ‘ethics’. These two paragraphs address the issue of formal ethical approval as raised by the reviewer and responded to above.  “At the start of the process one of the authors investigated the ethical issues. Working through an ethics decision making tree, available through the University ethics committee, it was deemed that formal ethical approval was not necessary. As part of the peer review process, the authors sought additional confirmation that institutional ethical approval was not required. A faculty ethical expert who had been on the ethics committee and chaired it for a number of years was consulted to determine whether formal ethics approval was required. The expert confirmed that it was not a requirement.  However it is important to note that the four authors are familiar with the requirements of the University ethics committee having been engaged in many research projects over the past few years that have required ethics approval and are familiar with codes of ethical conduct and related ethical matters and practices. In addition one of the authors has been a lay member on a medical ethics committee for several years and is very experienced in issues relating to ethical research.” |
| 8.Ethical considerations and research design.  Why did you choose to read own stories aloud and not anonymise. | Thank you for your comments and we agree that it is important to have more discussion around ethics and also explain in more detail why anonymity was not necessary.  Please see the last paragraph on page 3 and start of page 4 where the following explanation is added under the ethics sub heading.  “As stated earlier the authors of this article were drawn together through their mutual engagement in gender and diversity research. Thus they have much in common in the academic context having worked collaboratively in a range of academic research, writing, seminar development and conference convening. All four authors are critical scholars and have established a high level of trust amongst each other over an extended period of time. Earlier in this article the discussion on unmediated co/constructed collaborative narratives, highlights the importance of participants having already established trusted and equal relationships and this was certainly the situation with the four authors. This high level of mutual respect and trust enabled the four authors to focus on exploring their own experiences and perceptions and sharing them openly among each other. Thus anonymity among the four was not required as it was very important that the four authors could openly share their stories, analyse them and create and recreate new understandings and insights together (Minichiello, Aroni, & Hays, 2008). |
| 9.Ethical considerations and research design.  Data security  How was this ensured to minimise risk to women?  How was security of participants ensured? | Thank you for your comments and we agree that it is important to have more discussion around ethics, data security, risk and participant security.  Please note that documents were uploaded to a shared dropbox facility which was password protected. We have not detailed this in the article as we are concerned about containing the section on ethics.  Re risk and security.  Please refer to the highlight paragraph 2 on page 4 where we have addressed these issues. I have included the additional discussion below as well.  Trust was also achieved through the four author’s engagement in feminist research in which issues of power and privilege are examined and critiqued. In the initial discussion around engaging in this collaborative research project, issues around research design, power, risk and security were discussed and it was agreed that although we were all early to mid career researchers, we would take care to ensure at no-one person dominated, that the information that we shared could be withdrawn at any point and that the article writing and content must be approved by all four authors. In developing the research design we worked together and agreed via our virtual discussion medium, that narrative and collaborative frameworks were integral to the research design. As we were keen to write an article for publication when author names would be public, we were also not concerned about anonymising any individual information. Additionally the writing of a personal experience (collaborative) story, which is integral to this article, is not a narrative about a specific author, but rather it is a summative narrative (Myers, 2016). |
| 10.Ethical considerations and research design.  How did researchers deal with any power imbalances in storytelling i.e. were all academics in similar departments/employment status? | Thank you for your comments and we agree that it is important to have more discussion around potential power imbalances in the research process.  Please see our response on the highlighted paragraph 2 on page 4 which addresses matters of power imbalance and the need for mutual researcher trust.  Trust was also achieved through the four author’s engagement in feminist research in which issues of power and privilege are examined and critiqued. In the initial discussion around engaging in this collaborative research project, issues around research design, power, risk and security were discussed and it was agreed that although we were all early to mid career researchers, we would take care to ensure at no-one person dominated, that the information that we shared could be withdrawn at any point and that the article writing and content must be approved by all four authors. In developing the research design we worked together and agreed via our virtual discussion medium, that narrative and collaborative frameworks were integral to the research design. As we were keen to write an article for publication when author names would be public, we were also not concerned about anonymising any individual information. Additionally the writing of a personal experience (collaborative) story, which is integral to this article, is not a narrative about a specific author, but rather it is a summative narrative (Myers, 2016). |
| 11.Ethical decisions and research design.  To what extent does this method, if at all, differ from Frigga Haug's (1987) Memory Work? | Bold (2012) argues that there is no one right way to do narrative research in terms of gathering data, processing data and writing/presenting research.  Thus the authors were agreed on doing a collaborative project that drew on narrative. We acknowledge that the collaborative process of writing individual stories and sharing these stories also draws on memory work, attributed to Frigga Haug (1987). However there are a range of interpretations of Haug’s memory work and for the purposes of this article, we chose to focus on unmediated co/constructed collaborative narratives and the power of the personal experience story to make sense of a phenomenon ie Lockdown. |
| 12. Do authors intend to revisit their experiences at a later date? | At this stage there are no current plans to revisit our experiences in the future.  Please note that lockdown in NZ has been a different experience to some other countries. As a nation we have experienced one national four and a half week lock down at level 4.  Auckland is the only region to experience a subsequent lockdown ie level 3 for another four weeks (3 months later).  An additional intention of our collaborative project was also the importance of reflecting on our experiences – and that these can expose the gendered nature of seemingly ‘universal’ events – therefore, although we hope to not need to revisit this particular experience again!  Please refer to first paragraph in the conclusion (page 9) where the above comment has been integrated into the paragraph.  Part of our learning is the value of reflecting and storying our experiences, which is likely to remain as an ongoing practice in other research projects. |