

Manuscript Title

The Letter: Fidelity in Researcher Positionality to Exhume Dispossessed Voices for Leavy's Concept of Coherence in Feminist Narrative Research

Author(s)

Robin Throne

School of Education, Northcentral University, USA

Summary

The manuscript was received on August 14, 2018 and was peer reviewed by two reviewers and an editor.

The initial recommendation of Accept Pending Minor Revision was made on September 26, 2018.

The first revision was submitted on October 2, 2018 and was re-evaluated by a reviewer and an editor.

The manuscript was accepted for publication on October 12, 2018.

Consolidated Peer Review Comments

Overall I think this article makes contributions to the literature and is appropriate for publication in your journal. I do have a few suggestions for minor revisions as follows:

The title: I suggest changing Leavy's Coherence to Leavy's Concept of Coherence which I think is clearer. My suggested revised title is thus: "The Letter: Fidelity in Researcher Positionality to Exhume Dispossessed Voices for Leavy's Concept of Coherence in Feminist Narrative Research"

The author(s) may want to add narrative research and qualitative inquiry to the list of keywords to help interested readers find the article.

p. 4: Lines 9-17: While much has also been written in recent years about appropriation of others' 9 experiences and culture (Brown & Kanouse, 2015), researchers cannot ignore when drawn to a 10 research focus of a woman who lived in the past and one whereby researcher reflexivity is 11 necessary to bring forward archival narrative data of a contemporaneous voice recorded in a past 12 lived history (Byrne, 2017; Foley, 2002; Nencel, 2014). This continued observation of another's 13 experiences with dispossession to better inform and understand our own, and must engage 14 responsibility for fidelity of observation, like rigorous fidelity of analysis, can only be achieved 15 by clarity and disclosure of researcher positionality as lens, inference, and interpretation of what 16 is observed will always be informed by positionality—whether subtle or overt.

There is a lot to unpack in these sentences. I think each sentence is too long and contains too much information. It's confusing. I suggest shortening the sentences and unpacking the content (flesh each idea out, individually).

pp. 4-5: bottom of 4 and top of 5: This study utilized an ongoing 31 definition for researcher positionality honed by Bourke (2014), Throne (2012, 2018a, 2018b), 1 and Bowlin, Buckner, and Throne (2016) over the past two years informed the inquiry to 2 consider an

authentic other narrative voice and to assess the fidelity of self as researcher and self-3 identified researcher positionality throughout the inquiry to dissect another's language to recount 4 narrative voice as remnant of dispossession (Throne et al., 2018).

This is important to the thesis of the article but as it's written is very confusing. Again I suggest the author(s) shorten each sentence and unpack the ideas more. Bear in mind readers may not even be familiar with the idea of positionality, let alone the specifics of the scholars cited.

p. 6: In the discussion of Leavy's concept of coherence the author(s) may want to also reference Leavy's chapter on fiction in the Handbook of Arts-Based Research (Guilford Press) which provides Leavy's most recent published comments on coherence.

In the Conclusions sections I was surprised the author(s) didn't include a discussion of the usefulness of the coherence concept in their research. I suggest adding paragraph on that topic given the prominence of the coherence topic in the project, which is even referenced in the article title.

I noticed a small typo in the reference list. For Leavy's 2015 book Guilford is misspelled (there's an extra d).