**Appendix 4: EXTRACTION GRID FOR IN-DEPTH REVIEW OF EMI**

**Reviewer 1: (paired with reviewer 2):**

**Reviewed Item:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IN-DEPTH REVIEW ITEM** | **CRITERIA FOR QUALITY** | | **REVIEWER RESPONSE:**  **yes/no/partly/unclear**  **clearly stated/implied**  **and/or brief comment/insertion** |
| **THE ABSTRACT** | Does the abstract provide sufficient information for initial map? | |  |
| **INTRODUCTION/RATIONALE: DOES THE STUDY SAY.** | When the study was carried out? | |  |
| Why it was carried out at this point in time? | |  |
| Why it was carried out with this particular group of people? | |  |
| In which country was the study carried out? | |  |
| If the study was funded, and by whom? | |  |
| **THE LITERATURE REVIEW** | Does the study state an actual recognisable theory/group of theories or constructs to which it is related? Which? | |  |
| How much empirical evidence is presented as part of the review? | |  |
| Is it mainly primary evidence, or mainly secondary evidence? | |  |
| Does it end with a summary? | |  |
| Does the summary clearly invite the research questions that follow? | |  |
| **EMI DEFINITION** | Is there a definition? Is it compared to other classroom types (e.g. CLIL, Immersion)? | |  |
| **THE TOPIC(S) OF THE STUDY** | e.g.: teacher/student perceptions;  materials/curriculum development;  effectiveness of EMI (lang/content) | |  |
| **RESEARCH QUESTIONS** | **RQs are clearly stated or implied?** | | |
| **METHOD** | What, broadly, is the methodology adopted? Quant/Qual/mixed?  Purely descriptive; exploration of relationship among variables; experimental?[[1]](#endnote-1) |  | |
| prospective/longitudinal? |  | |
| **VARIABLES** | Are there variables involved?  (Where appropriate) what are the dependent and independent variable(s)? |  | |
| What other variables are ‘controlled for’? (confounding variables?) |  | |
| **SAMPLING** | Population;  Nationality;  L1; |  | |
| sampling frame provided? |  | |
| Sampling procedure explained? |  | |
| What was the actual sample? |  | |
| **GROUPING** | Are there recognisable groups in the sample? |  | |
| Was the sample divided into groups or did the groups already exist? |  | |
| (Where relevant) did the groups know they were being divided up like this and for this purpose? |  | |
| What treatment if any did each group get? |  | |
| Were the groups aware of the treatment |  | |
| **ETHICS** | Was participant consent sought? |  | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **In-depth review item** | **criteria for quality** | **reviewer response:**  **yes/no/partly**  **or brief comment/insertion** |
| **DATA COLLECTION** | Were the research instruments trialled or validated in some way? |  |
| How/who was the data collected (does this seem a reliable way of collecting the data?) |  |
| Were there sufficient amounts of data collected? |  |
| **DATA ANALYSIS** | Are we told how were the data analysed? |  |
| Does this seem like a valid way of analysing the data? (**how**?) |  |
| Does this seem like a reliable way of analysing the data? (**who**?) |  |
| Does the analysis match the requirements of the research questions? (**sufficient**?) |  |
| **RESULTS; FINDINGS; CONCLUSIONS ETC** | **What are the actual results?** | |
| Are there any shortcomings in the reporting of the results? |  |
| Do their conclusions match your assessment of the findings/results? |  |
| Are limitations of the study discussed? (e.g. confounding variables) |  |
| Are there implications? For teaching and learning? |  |
| Do the implications match the study findings? |  |
|  | Are there suggestions for further research |  |

INITIAL WEIGTHING BY REVIEWER

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Weight of evidence** |  | **High /Medium/Low** |
| WOE:  **Relevance..** | of particular **focus of the study** for addressing the question or sub-questions of this specific systematic review. Please add the number of the Review Question(s) |  |
| WOE: **Appropriateness…** | of research **design and analysis** for addressing the question, or sub-questions, of this specific systematic review. |  |
| WOE: **Trustworthiness**. | Taking account of all quality assessment issues, can the study findings be trusted in answering *the study* question(s)? |  |
| WOE: **Contribution** | of the study to answer the question/s of this specific systematic review |  |

1. **STUDY TYPES**:

   *DESCRIPTIVE*: purely descriptive with no attempt at looking at variables (e.g. just describing class interaction without saying one teacher was like this but another who was older was like this

   *EXPLORATION OF RELATIONSHIPS AMONG VARIABLES*: independent variables and dependent variables explored in some way

   *INTERVENTION NATURALLY OCCURRING*: e.g. when a country introduces a new way of doing something and a research comes along and measures the impact

   *INTERVENTION RESEARCHER MANIPULATED:* this is the truly experimental with degrees of reliability from the gold-standard of the randomised control trial [↑](#endnote-ref-1)