Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Communicative language teaching in Georgia : from theory to practice

Edisherashvili, N.

Citation
Edisherashvili, N. (2014, June 3). *Communicative language teaching in Georgia : from theory to practice*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/26165

Version:	Corrected Publisher's Version
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/26165

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page

Universiteit Leiden

The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/26165 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Edisherashvili, Natalia
Title: Communicative language teaching in Georgia : from theory to practice
Issue Date: 2014-06-03

Communicative Language Teaching in Georgia

From Theory to Practice

Published by

LOT
Trans 10
3512 JK Utrecht
The Netherlands

phone: +31 30 253 6111

e-mail: lot@uu.nl
http://www.lotschool.nl

Cover illustration: created specially for this dissertation by a Georgian painter and animator Dato Sikharulidze. The image captures the atmosphere of a communicative language lesson.

ISBN: 978-94-6093-145-1
NUR 616

Copyright © 2014: Natalia Edisherashvili. All rights reserved.

Communicative Language Teaching in Georgia

From Theory to Practice

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op dinsdag 3 juni 2014
klokke 11.15 uur

door

Natalia Edisherashvili

geboren te Tbilisi, Georgië
in 1980

Promotiecommissie

promotor:	Prof. dr. I.M. Tieken-Boon van Ostade
co-promotor:	Dr. D. Smakman
overige leden:	Prof. dr. J. Schaeken
	Dr. S. Unsworth (Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen)
	Prof. dr. K. van Veen (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen)

In loving memory of my brother Eddie

Acknowledgements

There is a whole range of people who helped me in the process of writing this dissertation in different ways, and here I would like to take this opportunity and extend my deepest gratitude and appreciation to all of them.

I would certainly like to start by thanking my supervisor Ingrid Tieken and my co-supervisor Dick Smakman to whom I am greatly indebted for being able to complete my work. Ingrid was the very first person (and by now this list thanks to her is much more extensive) at Leiden University whom I met shortly after my arrival in the Netherlands. Her very positive and helpful manner was a strong incentive for me to believe that accomplishing my aspiration of writing a PhD thesis at Leiden University was realistic. So I got started, and Ingrid has always been there to provide the right direction and supervision as needed. It was her who introduced me to the importance of quality and rigor while doing research, to concepts such as Academic Integrity and Research Ethics; she has always tried to convey the message that it is the quality that matters while doing research. I am not sure how far I have met her expectations, but I did my best, and I believe that her advice will have a long-lasting impact and trace on my future academic activities.

Dick Smakman, my co-supervisor, is a person whose efforts and input in the present project were invaluable. He always found time to provide me with very close and systematic supervision. His advice ranged from such meticulous feedback as where to use and where not the articles in English (I really appreciate his real patience here), to such global decisions as whether to include in the study schools all over Georgia or in its capital only. I also very much appreciate how Dick Smakman tried to involve me in certain academic and research activities as well. Helping me publish an article, which he co-authored, was a big honor for me; also letting me be a guest lecturer on the topic of Communicative Language Teaching in his course on Second Language Acquisition has become a yearly tradition for me already.

I would also like to express my admiration at how well co-ordinated and well-complimented the whole supervision process that Ingrid Tieken and Dick Smakman provided was. They formed a wonderful team, who made the working process very efficient. I would also like to extend my heartfelt appreciation to both of them for being extremely rigorous in reading the manuscript and providing very constructive and insightful feedback. Integrating the changes suggested was a very rewarding learning experience for me. I would also like to thank them both for doing their best, despite their overly busy schedules, to work along with me under time pressure and to keep to the tight time schedule I had to follow, which I am sure was beyond the call of their duty. I regard myself as extremely fortunate to have had them as my supervisors.

As English is not my native language, and structurally very different from Georgian, I wanted to make sure that the quality of the text was free from inaccuracies, the task which is very difficult to accomplish. This is where Alex Thomson, a well-educated British gentleman, with a linguistic academic background and first-hand knowledge of the Georgian context, turned out to be very helpful. I am extremely grateful to him for relieving me from the stress of worrying much about the quality of the language used. Another person to whom I would like to express my gratitude is Vincent van Heuven. He was the one who helped me with the statistics, the area which was a totally 'uncharted territory' for me until I found myself in need of conducting statistical manipulations for analyzing the data for the present study. He was always ready to provide advice and consultation with regard to which statistical analysis methods to use as well as how to technically run them in SPSS. A word of thanks has also to be directed to Klaas van Veen for the time and advice that he provided for coming up with the methodology of data analysis for Chapter 7 of this dissertation.

There are also other groups of people who have been instrumental in making this study possible. Special thanks should go to my dear colleagues and friends, Dodo Gvineria, Nino Berishvili, Nino Qantaria, Keti Vatiashvili and Ken Goff for co-evaluating the numerous learners' speech recordings. Further, I would like to thank in particular Dodo Gvineria and Nino Berishvili. Dodo is actually my husband's aunt, and by a very lucky coincidence, of the same profession, and a person who shares many of my professional interests and aspirations; she has taken much time to discuss things with me and provide advice and encouragement. Nino Berishvili is another person to whom I would also like to extend special thanks. As mentioned above, Nino helped with evaluating learners' speech, as well as with co-observing the lessons, recording the teachers' interviews and learners' speech; so, her role has been crucial and without her, the fieldwork conducted within this study would have been much more difficult to accomplish.

I would also like to thank all the participating school administrations, as well as the 96 teacher and 698 learner participants, who were willing to help and take their time completing the questionnaires, for letting me observe their classes and for being very friendly and open in the whole process of the interviews.

I wish to thank Mr. Scott Thornbury as well, a very prominent figure in the field of English Language Teaching, whose work, both practical as well as theoretical, has been a great inspiration for me throughout my academic and professional career. He has been very responsive to all the questions/comments I directed to him while writing this dissertation. The poem *The Grammar Lesson* – by Mr. Thornbury, written with humor, and well capturing the situation in Foreign Language Teaching currently witnessed in Georgia is, with his permission, provided below.

The picture on the cover has been created specially for this dissertation by my favorite uncle Dato Sikharulidze (even though I have no other uncles except him, I am sure even if I did, he still would be my favorite). So, I would like to extend my warmest thanks to him, as well as to my cousin Mariam Sikharulidze, who has also been very involved in coordinating the whole communication and detail negotiation process between Dato and myself. My heartfelt thanks to them.

And finally, on a more personal basis, I would like to thank my parents, one of the staunchest supporters of my work, who did their best to encourage and motivate me from Georgia. My parents-in-law, who supported, encouraged and cheered me throughout the whole process; to Nunuka, who helped me with taking care of my children, so that I had to worry less about them and could take more time and better concentrate on my work. However, while completely immersed in PhD work, making myself available for the children still turned out to be more challenging than I had imagined. "Mummy, how many more days do you have to go," Anastasia and Aka started asking me impatiently soon after my work took an intensive turn. After realizing that the completion of my work was a longer term perspective, they started asking "Mummy, how many more months exactly do we still have to wait till the things are the way they used to be", and then they gave up. Seeing their messages, written with humor on scraps of paper, and discreetly left on my table in my study, saying "we love you Dr. Edisherashvili", amused me a lot and made me realize they were not that angry and unhappy about what I had been doing after all.

And last, but surely not least, I would like to thank my husband, Shota Gvineria; firstly, for giving me an opportunity to come over to the Netherlands and spend an absolutely wonderful four years in this country. Despite his own stressful and extremely busy schedule of an Ambassador of Georgia to the Netherlands, I could always turn to him for his support and he has always been able to help, listen, comment on and provide his valuable opinion on many issues discussed in the dissertation. He has been wonderful at providing me with much needed confidence and much welcome distraction, which often came in a form of a surprise. Without him, neither the start of this project, nor the ending of it would have been possible.

x

The Grammar Lesson

By Scott Thornbury (2013)

The teacher enters briskly, taps the board:
'Now pay attention, class, and not a word.'
Her steely gaze subdues the general clamour.
'I'm going to teach the rules of English grammar.'

'I'll start by explicating all the tenses,
Their forms, a few examples, and their senses.
We'll finish, as is usual with a test.
A prize for which of you can answer best.'

He always takes the bus (she writes). 'The present
(Though present, as we speak, it clearly isn't).
We call this timeless present "present simple"
.*My tailor's very rich* is an example.'

'Now look at me,' she orders, as she paces
Between the rows of startled little faces.
'I'm walking to the door. Now I am turning.
I'm teaching you the grammar. You are learning.'

Intending that her actions be the stimulus,
She demonstrates the present tense (continuous). 'For acts that are in progress, it's expressive, and so it's sometimes classified "progressive".'

'Now, who is this?' She shows a pic of Caesar.
'An ancient Roman?' someone says, to please her. She draws a Roman galley, oars and mast.
'*He came, he saw, he conquered*: simple past'.

'And when he came, the weather – it was pouring'. She adds this detail to her simple drawing. And with a gesture eloquently sinuous, she illustrates what means the past continuous.

'*I've been to China*. In my life. Just once.
Time not important. Use the perfect tense.
He lost the race since he had started last:
Had started represents the perfect past.'

'Although it seems a little bit excessive,
We also use the perfect with progressive.
Have you been playing badminton? is how
We ask if something's happening to now.'

'The future forms we'll save until … the future. I think by now you have the general picture. So pen and paper out – yes, you have guessed it: I've taught you stuff and now it's time to test it.'

And this is how, as any learner knows,
The English language grammar lesson goes.
And this is why (the moral of my verse)
The English language learner can't converse.

Abbreviations and symbols

ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
CEFR	Common European Framework of Reference
CELTA	Certificate of English Language Teaching to Adults
CLT	Communicative Language Teaching
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ELT	English Language Teaching
ETAG	English Teachers' Association in Georgia
GT	Grammar Translation
ICC	Inter-class correlation
K	Symbol standing for Cohen's Kappa coefficient
F	Symbol used to refer to the effect size of an independent factor on the study outcomes
M	Symbol standing for group mean
MES	Ministry of Education and Science
MI	Multiple Intelligences
N	Number

NA	Natural Approach
NAEC	National Assessment and Exam Centre
NCFL	National Curriculum for Foreign Languages
NCTD	National Centre for Teacher Development
p.	Symbol standing for the statistical significance of the difference between groups
Pub. C.	Public Central (school)
Pub. P.	Public Peripheral (school)
Pri. C.	Private Central (school)
Pri. P.	Private Peripheral (school)
r	Symbol standing for the Pearson's correlation coefficient
SD	Standard Deviation
SPSS	Statistical Package of Social Sciences
T	Symbol standing for the teacher
TBLT	Task-Based Language Teaching
TELL	Technology-Enhanced Language Learning
TLG	Teach and Learn with Georgia

Statistics Reference Page

This page provides definitions of the statistical terms used in this dissertation

Analysis of Variance (**ANOVA)** – is a statistical test concerned with comparing the means of two or more population samples (Butler, 1985:129).

Bonferroni – is a multiple-comparison post-hoc test that assumes equal variances in the data, and is commonly used with ANOVA (Butler, 1985:127-136).

Brown-Forsythe test – is a test for the homogeneity of variance within the groups under investigation. It is a more robust test that is very similar to Levene's test (Fields, 2012a:8).

Cohen's Kappa – is a statistical coefficient of the degree of inter-rater agreement on qualitative items. It is commonly measured when the raters' level of agreement on certain qualitative data has to be estimated (Haley & Osberg, 1989:90).

Intra-class correlation (ICC) – is a descriptive statistic used for measuring data in a quantitative manner. It detects the similarity level between units in the same group. The ICC is considered to be high when there is a low degree of difference between the ratings assigned to each item by the raters – if the raters give a similar assessment to the items (Fields, 2005:948-954).

Cronbach's Alpha – is a coefficient of internal consistency; it is commonly used as an estimate of inter-item reliability. A value of 7.0 or higher is normally considered to be acceptable (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011:53).

Factor Analysis – is a statistical tool used for data reduction and/or grouping purposes. This method investigates whether a number of variables of interest are linearly related to a smaller number of unobservable factors (Osborne & Costello, 2005:1).

Test of homogeneity of variance – is a test which checks how similar the level of variance within the dependent variables is (Butler, 1985:127-128).

Independent-Samples T-Test – is a statistical procedure that compares the means of two groups; this test can provide information with regard to whether the difference of the population sample means is significant (Butler, 1985:83).

Levene's test – is an inferential statistics test used to assess the equality of variances in different samples. It tests the condition that the variances of the samples are equal, indicated by the Levene Statistic. (Fields, 2012b:13)

Paired-Samples T-Test – is a statistical procedure that compares the means of two variables of a single group (Butler, 1984:178- 97).

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (referred to as Pearson's r) – is a measure of the linear correlation (dependence) between two variables X and Y, giving a value between +1 and −1 inclusive (Butler, 1985:137-153).

Repeated Measures ANOVA – is a statistical test which compares how a within-subjects experimental group performs in three or more experimental conditions, or how the group is influenced by various independent factors. As the sample is exposed to each condition in turn, the measurement of the dependent variable is repeated (Fields, 2008:1).

Shapiro–Wilks test – is a statistical test of the hypothesis that sample data have been drawn from a normally distributed population (Fields, 2012b:8-9).

Tamhane's T2 – is a multiple comparison, post-hoc, test which is normally used after ANOVA application to see where exactly the difference between groups lies. Tamhanes' T2 thus does not assume equal variances in the groups (Tamhane, 1979: 471-480).

Varimax Rotation – is an orthogonal rotation method of variable axes used in Factor Analysis. It helps maximize the variance of the squared loadings of a factor on the variables, which helps to group different variables under a single extracted factor (Brown, 2009:21).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....vii
GRAMMAR LESSON.....x
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....xi
STATISTICS REFERENCE PAGE.....xiii

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Changing foreign language teaching in Georgia 1
1.2 Aims of the present study and the research questions.....4
1.3 Research questions 6
1.4 General approach to the presents study 7
1.5 Previous research and the sigfnificance of the present study.....9
1.6 Dissertation overview.....11

2. HISTORY OF LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODS

2.1 Introduction.....13
2.2 Major methods in foreign language teaching 17
2.3 Alternative methods in foreign language teaching.....18
2.4 The Communicative Approaches in language teaching.....22
2.4.1 Communicative Language Teaching.....23
2.4.2 Content-Based Instruction.....24
2.4.3 Task-Based Language Teaching.....25
2.5 Summary and post method perspectives 27
2.5.1 Summary of the teaching methods 27
2.5.2 The post-method perspectives 28

3. COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING

3.1 Introduction..... 31
3.2 General background to CLT 32
3.3 Theoretical basis of CLT.....33
3.3.1 Language theories 33
3.3.2 Learning theories 36
3.3.3 The concept of Communicative Competence 37
3.4 Course design and syllabus 40
3.5 Teacher roles.....41
3.6 Learner roles 43
3.7 Communicative activities and classroom interaction 43
3.8 Teaching material 44
3.9 A critical look at CLT 45
3.9.1 Aimed at developing language fluency, not accuracy 45
3.9.2 Focus on oral aspect of the language 46

3.9.3 Unnecessary focus on some meta-linguistic skills 46
3.9.4 CLT and local contexts 47
3.9.5 Too demanding towards teachers as well as learners 49
3.9.6 CLT-related ambiguity 49
3.10 Potential challenges related to CLT.....50
3.10.1 Lack of teaching skills and knowledge of CLT theory.....50
3.10.2 Language proficiency factor.....50
3.10.3 Classroom management-related problems.....51
3.10.4 Communicative Competence assessment-related difficulties.....52
3.10.5 Pre-determined curriculum 52
3.10.6 Negative effect of the previous exposure to grammar-driven teaching.....52
3.10.7 Teaching material 53
3.10.8 Lack of time and expertise to prepare for CLT lessons 54
3.11 Conclusion.....54

4. TECHNOLOGY-ENHANCED COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING

4.1 Introduction….....55
4.2 Importance of technology integration in CLT.....56
4.3 Various forms of technology resources and CLT.....57
4.3.1 Online communication opportunities and CLT.....58
4.3.2 Other web-based resources and CLT 65
4.3.3 Other digital tools and CLT–Interactive white board 70
4.4 Summary of pros and cons of technology integration in CLT 73
4.4.1 Advantages of technology use in CLT.....73
4.4.2 Challenges of technology use in CLT 76
4.5 Recommendations.....79
4.6 Conclusion 82

5. FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING IN GEORGIA: FROM SOVIET TIMES TO THE PRESENT DAY

5.1 Introduction.....85
5.2 The Soviet era and language teaching 86
5.2.1 Socio-historic background 86
5.2.2 Language teaching methods and aims in Soviet times 87
5.2.3 Language teaching material in Soviet times 91
5.3 The post-Sovier period and the move towards CLT in Georgia.....92
5.4 Governmental and non-governmental institution efforts.....95
5.4.1 The National Curriculum for Foreign Languages.....95
5.4.2 New teaching material.....96
5.4.3 Priorities in teaching foreign languages.....97
5.4.4 Project: Teach & Learn with Georgia..... 97
5.4.5 Professional development of language teachers.....100
5.4.6 Efforts of the non-governmental organizations in Georgia.....101

5.5 Technology-enhanced language teaching in Georgia....102
5.5.1 Developments in Technology-Enhanced Language Teaching....102
5.5.2 Proliferation of computer literacy in Georgia....105
5.6 Conclusion....106

6. FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING POLICY IN GEORGIA

6.1 Introduction....107
6.2 A way towards current communicative curriculum for foreign languages....107
6.3 The Current National Curriculum for Foreign Languages....109
6.3.1 The National Curriculum for Foreign Languages in Georgia....110
6.3.2 Standards for foreign languages....113
6.3.3 Recommended contents of the syllabus for foreign languages....115
6.4 Conclusions and discussion....115
6.4.1 Communicative basis of the NCFL of Georgia....115
6.4.2 Recommended assessment format for foreign languages in Georgia....116
6.4.3 Some inconsistencies and issues observed in the NCFL....116
6.4.4 Final remarks....118

7. ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS PERCEPTIONS OF CLT

7.1 Introduction....119
7.1.1 The aim of the study....120
7.1.2 The theoretical background and the research questions....121
7.2 Methodology....121
7.2.1 Study design....121
7.2.2 Study participants....124
7.2.3 Data collection tools....126
7.2.4 Data collection procedure and obtained material....129
7.2.5 Data analysis....130
7.3 Study results....134
7.3.1 Interview results....134
7.3.2 Questionnaire results....144
7.4 Summary and conclusions....148

8. LEARNERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING

8.1 Introduction....153
8.1.1 The aim of the study....153
8.1.2 The theoretical background and the research questions....154
8.2 Methodology....156
8.2.1 Research design....156
8.2.2 Study participants....157
8.2.3 Data collection tools....158
8.2.4 Data collection procedure and obtained material....159
8.2.5 Data analysis....160

8.3 Study results 161
8.4 Conclusions 170

9. LESSON OBSERVATION

9.1 Introduction 175
9.1.1 The aim of the study.....175
9.1.2 The research questions.....176
9.2 Methodology 177
9.2.1 Research design 177
9.2.2 Study participants 177
9.2.3 Data collection tools 179
9.2.4 Data collection procedure and obtained material.....179
9.2.5 Data analysis 180
9.3 Study results 182
9.4 Conclusions 193

10. LEARNERS' COMMUNICATIVE PROFICIENCY IN ENGLISH

10.1 Introduction.....197
10.1.1 Discussion of the linguistic terminology used in the present study.....197
10.1.2 Research question.....199
10.2 Methodology.....199
10.2.1 Research design.....199
10.2.2 Study participants.....201
10.2.3 Data collection tools.....202
10.2.4 Data collection procedure and obtained material 207
10.2.5 Data analysis.....207
10.3 Study results.....209
10.3.1 The results of learners' communicative proficiency analysis.....209
10.3.2 The comparison of the main results of the four studies.....221
10.4 Conclusions.....223

11. CONCLUSIONS

11.1 Introduction.....227
11.2 Summary of findings.....228
11.3 Identified challenges and practical recommendations.....241
11.4 Research strength and limitations.....250
11.5 Suggestions for future research.....251
11.6 Final conclusions.....252

REFERENCES.....**253**
APPENDICES **281**

Chapter 6
Appendix 6.1: The samples of the assessment task provided in the NCFL..... 281
Appendix 6.2: Recommended syllabus contentsvocabulary.....282

Chapter 7
Appendix 7.1a: Teacher interview (Georgian).....283
Appendix 7.1b: Teacher interview (Translation) 284
Appendix 7.2: Teacher interview data analysis form 285
Appendix 7.3a: Teacher questionnaire (Georgian) 286
Appendix 7.3b: Teacher questionnaire (Translation) 289
Appendix 7.4: Interview results: CLT-related difficulties 292
Appendix 7.5: Teachers' attitudes towards CLT.....294
Appendix 7.6: Teachers' evaluations of language activities 300
Appendix 7.7: Teachers' evaluations of CLT-related difficulties 302

Chapter 8
Appendix 8.1a: Learners questionnaire (Georgian).....305
Appendix 8.1b: Learner questionnaire (English).....307
Appendix 8.2: Frequency analysis of the learner questionnaire data 309
Appendix 8.3: The effect of 'school type' on learners' attitudes towards CLT 314

Chapter 9
Appendix 9.1: Observation form used in the study 316
Appendix 9.2: CLT principles observed in the English lessons in Tbilisi 319
Appendix 9.3: Inter-item correlation analysis: observation groups 1–7 324
Appendix 9.4: The effect of the independent variables on teachers' performance.....325
Appendix 9.5: 'School type' effect on the level of difficulty faced by the teachers 329

Chapter 10
Appendix 10.1: CEFR descriptors: qualitative aspects of spoken language use 330
Appendix 10.2: Language evaluation form 333
Appendix 10.3: Learners' communicative proficiency assessment scores.....334
Appendix 10.4: Correlation of the learners' prerformance scores.....335
Appendix 10.5: Learner speech samples – Levels A0-B2.....336

SUMMARY IN DUTCH ……..……..**341**
CURRICULUM VITAE ……..…..**349**