

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

Zenzele Weda<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of South Africa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

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

A Review by Z Weda.

## Topic

The authors tackle very topical research at a time when discrimination in Israel is under the spotlight. This makes their topic current, relevant, and eye-catching. However, as one reads into the paper it becomes apparent that the word discrimination is rather too strong for what is being reported upon. Instead, what was actually explored in this research is probably just the perceptions of Non-Native English-speaking teachers and Native-English speaking teachers and a comparison of the two groups.

## Background

The background to the study is adequate. It links the pervasiveness of the global lingua franca; English, to the need to have many well-prepared teachers for this language. The brief literature review provides further background to the study. The literature review, however, could benefit from a more rigorous and critical analysis since it sounds descriptive in its present form.

## Research Questions

The authors need to clarify for the readers which one is the main research question and which ones are sub-questions; as things stand it is not very clear. The research questions are the drivers of the research and hence need to be clearly stated. Assuming the first question; *How do English teachers perceive the NEST/NNEST distinction?* is the main research question, then the research is not about discrimination but about English teachers' perceptions of NESTs/NNESTs. I therefore suggest that the authors do their best to align the topic of the research with the research questions.

In this section may I suggest that the last hypothesis be reworded to exclude words "American or British accent" and stick to NEST and NNEST. This will make the hypothesis less confusing.

## Methodology

Under this topic the authors talk about the “Participant”. It would be more meaningful if they described the participants under the subtopic “Sampling” and hence described the sampling methods adopted and gave the population too eg  $n=500$ . I suspect the choice of the teachers was random. Please tell us how you randomized the selection of this sample from the population. Was the choice of the Principals and coordinators purposive? What criteria of sampling did you use? Please clarify.

Although there is mention of the research approach in the topic and abstract nothing is mentioned under Methodology. It is here under methodology that you explain your research approach and justify its choice. If you are using the mixed method approach, then you will have to tell us which type of mixed methods you are using and why.

Still, under Methodology we expect you to give an indication of your research paradigm and assumptions.

Although you describe adequately your research procedure your ethical considerations are too brief and I would like to suggest that you flesh it out a bit.

## Results

The presentation of the results is quite comprehensive, but it is the discussion of the results that is a bit lacking in rigor. It is expected that this discussion be more critical and brings in literature to analyze the findings. However, you only brought in one reference. The lack of a theoretical framework for the study makes it difficult to discuss the findings in any depth at all.

Other issues: A structural problem exists with this research in that it sought the perception of teachers from the teachers. The main instrument which was the survey of 105 teachers yielded teachers' self-reported data. Would it not have been more worthwhile to check how teachers are perceived by other stakeholders like learners or parents?

## References

A good mix of references was given even though it would have been good to have more up-to-date references.

## General Comment

This is quite a promising paper despite all this. I urge the authors to take the suggestions made here to heart and thus they will realize the potential of this paper.