Review of: "Exploring Discrimination Faced by Non-Native English Teachers in the Israeli School System: A Mixed-Methods Study"

Richard Watson Todd[1]

1 King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Although fraught with definitional problems, the issue of NESTs and NNESTs is still a major social concern. This research should add to the existing literature, but I'm afraid I really don't understand the data collection well enough to judge its value.

The questionnaire which is the source of the vast majority of the results relies largely on 5-point Likert scales ((5) SA = Strongly Agree (4) A = Agree (3) N = Neutral (2) D = Disagree (1) SD = Strongly Disagree). The analysis relies on means and t-tests, but these statistics assume the points on the Likert scale are equidistant [i.e. SA is the same distance away from A as A is from N] which is problematic. Even if this assumption is accepted, the use of a large number of t-tests (with no Bonferroni correction) is highly problematic, especially given that such significance testing assumes the existence of multiple hypotheses. Using effect size statistics would probably be a better approach.

What concerns me even more is how these results are interpreted. The meaning of the results seems to be overlooked. For instance, "Significant findings include: Students Feel More Comfortable in Class with A native English language speaker (p = 0.000)". The findings really show that NESTs and NNESTs have very different beliefs about students' feelings of comfort, and say nothing about what students really feel. If the results were interpreted correctly, the article would be much more interesting than it currently is.

The discussion becomes even more problematic as it is based on these erroneous interpretations. There are no findings related to the claim that "strengths and weaknesses seemed to complement each other between NESTs and NNESTs" as all the data is about how the 2 groups hold similar/different beliefs. The idea that "Mixing both types of teachers within a school can help mitigate potential weaknesses and provide students with diverse experiences" appears to come from the literature review, not the results. The only relevant data comes from the administrator interviews who, in effect, say that they don't care whether someone is a NEST or a NNEST as long as they are a good teacher, suggesting they want to employ lots of good teachers, not a mix of L1 teachers.

If the results could be properly treated as showing how beliefs of NESTs and NNESTs differ, this could be a valuable article.