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| Dear Reviewers,Thank you for taking the time to review our paper. Please find details below of how the paper has been changed to reflect your suggestions. I have also attached a version of the paper with track changes in order to see how these changes have been implemented in the context of the paper overall. |
| Reviewer comments  | Way addressed in paper |
| Reviewer comments #1The purpose of this study was to illustrate the experiences of internationalstudents who have a disability. This study is important and relevant toacross the discipline of education.I suggest that this manuscript be resubmit for review. The authors providein-depth analysis of their findings throughout the paper. However, there aregaps within the methodology section that need to be strengthened to provideclarity for the reader. For example, in the methodology section the authorsbriefly discuss their data collection methods, but this section needs to beexpanded. How many participants completed the interviews? What wassignificant about the interviews highlighted in this manuscript? How was theinterview protocol generated? The authors make a great critique describingthe limitations of quantitative research, however this point could be madestronger through illustrating current studies that could benefit fromqualitative research methods.This manuscript contributes noteworthy scholarship to the field ofeducation. Strengthening the methodology section will provide a betterpicture of how the authors conducted their research. | Methodology section has been refined and requested details added regarding significance of interviewees and interview protocol. Had difficulty finding any studies which use quantitative approaches to critique. Instead I referred to qualitative studies and used these as an argument to say that our study is in alignment with contemporary approaches.  |
| Reviewer Comments #2The author addresses an import topic regarding international students withdisabilities. The manuscript is well written and could be strengthened byincluding how ableism (Hehir) (e.g. internalized ableism) in how suchnotions also limit the educational and life experiences of individuals.Incorporating a discussion about disabilities studies (e.g. Albrecht) couldalso add to the substance of the manuscript. Additionally, although minor, Iwould recommend using a pseudonym in place of the actual name of universitywhere the study took place. Also, the conclusion section is under developedand lengthened it, could strengthen the piece. The title suggests that thereis only one experience of international students, and that should beaddressed or changed. Lastly, the term disability in the title is singular;and again is there only one “dis/ability.” | Literature about ableism added.Pseudonym added (McKenzie University)Some lengthening of conclusionTitle changed |
| Reviewer Comments #3Reframing the Self is a manuscript that takes an important look at theexperience of college students who study away from their home campus. Inparticular, it continues and broadens the discussion of college studentswith disabilities. The author pays important attention to student voice andagency through the use of a Bourdieuian framework.I have some concerns about the methodological approach to the paper thatstem, only in part, to its organization. The discussion of Bourdieu thatintroduces the methodological section is in the paper's conceptualframework, and may frame the methodology but is not a part of it. As aresult, the author tells the reader about the nuts and bolts of the researchprocess, but does not describe the qualitative methodological theory, orspeak at length about their positionality in the work--something that would(or not) come out of taking on a particular methodological approach.In addition, I am concerned about the lack of interview time spent with thetwo students, or the data that is provided to draw the conclusions stated inthe paper. One hour of interviewing can unearth good data; however, it oftenrequires follow up. This is especially true if the interviews were part ofanother study and following a particular protocol. Again, the methodssection raises questions that require answers in order for the reader tohave confidence in the author's findings.As a side note, "symbolic violence" was not defined in the discussion ofBourdieu's concepts. Consequently it made it more difficult for a reader tounderstand its use in the discussion section of the piece.It is often difficult to interpret a quote without appropriate context. Forexample, on page 10 the reader is told following Mary's quote that herfamily clearly assumed that university study would be an option for her.Statements such as those need to be either toned down (for how is it reallyclear) or contextualized (In Asian countries when families use the term"brilliant" it is meant to symbolize college readiness.The same problem seems to appear with Anna's quote that follows. Again, someof this is about understating, or contextualizing. However, I wonder howmuch of it is about not having the opportunity to conduct follow-upinterviews to gain more clarification regarding the quotes and theirmeanings.Finally, in the Capital and Field section on page 12 the authors allude to"the systems" a mention which is made earlier in the piece (regarding blame)but never gets fleshed out. As it is raised again to interpret the data, therole of the system (which I understand to be the university but is notclearly defined) needs to be fleshed out. In addition, I think the argumentabout the role of the counselor in Anna's life is weakened as the authorsframe the argument as one of acculturation rather than explaining the linkhere to disability. This is nuanced; but there must be a tie-in. Finally thequote to support differences in therapy approaches talks about AsianAmericans--this hardly seems like an appropriate comparison. A betterexample would be one that comes from an Asian country--not the UnitedStates.My concerns about data interpretation continue with the discussion of theword "rubbish" on page 14. I had no idea what the participant intended here. | Section about positionality added to frame the methodology and theory.Details about follow ups with students were added which hadn’t been mentioned in original script. Definition added. Both of these statements regarding Mary and Anna were changed (toned down as suggested by the reviewer). ‘Systems’ has been changed and reworked throughout the paper for clarification. Removed acculturation – good point reviewer – thanks for pointing out! Reading this section again it made little sense so removed it. Fleshed out.  |