

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

Mohammed Abdullahi Umar

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study addresses an important issue of dichotomy between NESTs and NNESTs. The study was also well conducted. Unfortunately, the quality of writing needs to be greatly improved. I will give some helpful comments below:

Abstract

The last sentence of the abstract is not coherent. There is need to disentangle the sentence for better understanding of the readers.

The abstract could be better restructured to highlight the exact challenge/s faced by NNESTs. It is not a good thing to leave readers guessing from the abstract.

Introduction

In the first paragraph of the introduction, line 5, "central to the acquisition of English" English language is learned, not acquired.

In the last sentence of the introduction section, "in sum" is not a correct writing.

Literature review

The literature review has unnecessarily fragmented headings.

Defining NESTs and NNESTs

Advantages of NESTs

Advantages of NNESTs

Etc

It portrays the paper as written by inexperienced writers. Even without subheadings, a literature review can be presented. You may have subheadings if there are a lot of information to include in them. It does not look professional to have too many subheadings, some have only one paragraphs!

Research methodology/research questions

I have never seen a paper creating a special heading only to explain the research question. It could be merged with the research methodology. Some research discusses the research questions in advance, in the introduction.

Hypothesis 1 is too long and confusing. Hypotheses are direct propositions that do not need unnecessary long and confusing words. Using “consequently” in the hypothesis is not necessary.

In the research question, show clearly which question is main and which ones are subs.

Section 4, the methodology should be merged with section 3.

The authors described the research method under participants. Participants is a subsection that only involve describing those who participated in the research and why they were selected.

Don't use the word “probed”, use “investigated” instead.

Interview findings were not well presented. I advise the authors to read interview papers in high ranked journals and learn from how interview findings are presented.

The discussion is not well-written. Discussion should be restating your study's findings, their significance relative to existing studies.

The write up under limitation is not much. Why should it have a separate subheading. Why not just discuss your study's limitation under the conclusion section?

Overall, it is a very good paper on an important and interesting topic. Unfortunately, much work required is required to ensure that the paper is up to standard. I advise the authors to seek for professional writing assistance. I wish them best of luck.