



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

REFERENCES

- Abrahams, Z. I. (2003). The Effects of Synchronous and Asynchronous CMC on Oral Performance in Germany. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(2), 157-167.
- AbuSeileek, A. (2006). The Use of Word Processor by Saudi EFL Learners. *Journal of King Saud University: Educational and Islamic Sciences*, 19(2), 1-15.
- Albarracin, D., Johnson, B.T., Zanna, M.P., Kumkale, G.T. (2005). Attitudes: Introduction and Scope. In D. Albarracin, B.T. Johnson and M.P. Zanna (eds.), *The Handbook of Attitudes*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 3-20.
- Allen, E. and Seaman, C.A. (2007). Likert Scales and Data Analyses. *Quality Progress*, 40, 64-65.
- Allsopp, D. H. and Doone, E. (2006). Bridging the Gap between Theory and Practice: Connecting Courses with Field Experiences. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(1), 19-35.
- Alzen, I., Fishbein, M. (2005). The Influence of Attitudes on Behaviour. In D. Albarracín, B.T. Johnson and M.P. Zanna (eds.), *The Handbook of Attitudes Mahwah*, NJ: Lawrence ErlbaumAssociates, 173-221.
- Amir Z., Ismail, K., Hussin, S. (2011). Blogs in Language Learning: Maximizing Students' Collaborative Writing. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 18 (1).
- Anderson, J. C. and Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural Equation Modeling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-step Approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 411-423.
- Anderson, J. (1993). Is the Communicative Approach Practical for Teaching English in China? Pros and Cons. *System*, 21(1), 417-480.
- Anderson, T. (2008). Towards a Theory of Online Learning. In T. Anderson (ed.), *Theory and Practice of Online Learning*, Canada: AU Press, 33-60.
- Anderson, T., Rouke, L., Edmonton, A., Randy, G. and Walter, A. (2001). Assessing Teaching Presence in a Computer Conferencing Context. *JALN*, 5(2), 1-17.
- Ansarey, D. (2012). Communicative Language Teaching in EFL Contexts: Teachers Attitude and Perception in Bangladesh. *ASA University Review*, 6(1), 61-78.
- Apple, M. (1979). *The Language Teaching Curriculum and a National Agenda. Ideology and Curriculum*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 70-95.
- Applebee, A. N. (1974). *Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History*. Urbana, Ill: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Archer, J. (1999). Teachers' Beliefs about Successful Teaching and Learning. Paper presented at the AARE-NZARE Conference, Melbourne, November.

- Armstrong, R. (1987). The Midpoint on a Five-Point Likert-Type Scale. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 64, 359-362.
- Asatiani, S. (2011). How New Technology Changed the Modern Education Paradigm. *Matsavlebeli*, 4, 36- 38.
- Asher, J. (1977). *Learning another Language through Actions: the Complete Teacher's Guide Book*. Los Gatos, California: Sky Oaks Productions.
- Asher, J. (1996). *Learning Another Language Through Actions* (5th ed.). Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions.
- Bache, I. And Taylor, A. (2003). The Politics of Policy Resistance: Reconstructing Higher Education in Kosovo. *Journal of Public Policy*, 23(3), 279-300.
- Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bagaric, V. (2007). Defining Communicative Competence. *Metodika*, 8(1), 94-103.
- Bakar, N.A. (2009). E-Learning Environment: Blogging as a Platform for Language Learning. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(4), 594-604.
- Bailly, S., Devit, S., Gremmo, M., Heyworth, F., Hopkins, A., Jones, B., Makosh, M., Riley, Ph., Stocks, G. and Trim, J. (2012). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Strasbourg: Language Policy Division.
- Bal, S. M. (2006). Teachers' Perceptions of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Turkish EFL Setting Theory vs. Practices. PhD diss., Turkey: Cukurova University.
- Bancroft, W. J. (1978). The Lozanov Method and its American Adaptations. *Modern Language Journal*, 62(4), 167-175.
- Bax, S. (2003). The End of CLT: a Context Approach to Language Teaching. *ELT Journal*, 57(3), 278-287.
- Beretta, A., Davies, A. (1985). Evaluation of the Bangalore Project. *ELT Journal*, 39, 121-127.
- Berk, R. A. (2009). Multimedia Teaching with Video Clips: TV, Movies, YouTube, and Mtv in the College Classroom. *International Journal of Technology in Teaching and Learning*, 5(1), 1-21.
- Bernat, E. and Gvozdenko, I. (2005) Beliefs about Language Learning: Current Knowledge, Pedagogical Implications and New Research Directions, *TESL-EJ Top*, 9(1), 1-21.
- Bernat, E., Lloyd, R. (2007). Exploring the Sex Effect on EFL Learners' Beliefs about Language Learning. *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology*, 7(1), 79-91.
- Berns, A., Gonzalez-Pardo, A. and Camacho, D. (2012). Game-like Language Learning in 3-D Virtual Environments. *Computers and Education*, 60(1), 210-220.
- Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, Codes and Control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- Berulava, T. (2001). In R. Tkemeladze (ed.), *Teaching and Learning English in Georgia 2001: A Baseline Study*. Tbilisi: Diogene Publishers, 25-43.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1992). Post-colonial Authority and Post-modern Guilt. In L. Grossberg, P. Nelson and P. Treichler (eds.), *Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge, 56-66.
- Blaisdell, M. (2006). Academic MP3s – Is It Time Yet? Campus Technology. Retrieved from <http://campustechnology.com/articles/40744/> (accessed October 2013).
- Blatter, G. and Fiori, M. (2009). Facebook in the Language Classroom: Promises and Possibilities. *Institutional Technology and Distance Learning (ITDL)*, 6 (1), 17-28.
- Blood, R. (2002). Weblogs: A History and Perspective. In Editors of Perseus Publishing (eds.), *We've Got Blog: How Weblogs are Changing Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing, 7-16.
- Bonk, N. A., Kotii, G. A. and Lukyanova, N. A. (1986). *English Coursebook*, Moscow: DEKONT+: GIS.
- Bonk, N. A., Kotii, G. and Loukianova, N.A. (1994a). *Uchebnik Angliiskogo Yazika*. Tashkent: Pravda Vostoka.
- Borg, S. (2009). Language Teacher Cognition. In A. Burns and J. C. Richards (eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 163-71.
- Bowling, A. (1997). *Research Methods in Health*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Boyd, D. M. and Ellison, N.B. (2007). Social Network Sites: Definition, History and Scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210–230.
- Bradley H. and Devadason R. (2010). Fractured Transitions: Young Adults' Pathways into Contemporary Labour Markets. *Sociology*, 42(1), 119-136.
- Brandl, C. (2007). *Communicative Language Teaching in Action: Putting Principles to Work*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Branon, R. F. and Essex, C. (2001). Synchronous and Asynchronous Communication Tools in Distance Education: A Survey of Instructors. *TechTrends*, 45, 36-42.
- Breen, M.P. (1987). Contemporary Paradigms in Syllabus Design. Parts 1 and 2. *Language Teaching*, 20(2), 81–92; 20(3), 157–74.
- Breen, M. and Candlin, C. (1980). The Essentials of a Communicative Curriculum in Language Teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 89-112.
- Brinton, D.M. and Welsch, M.B. (1989). *Content-Based Second Language Instruction*. New York: Newbury House.
- Brooks, N. (1964). *Language and Language Learning: Theory and Practice*, (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*, (2nd ed.), San Francisco: San Francisco Public University.
- Brown, H.D. (2004). *Language Assessment. Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H.D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. NY: Pearson Education.
- Brown, J.D. (2009). Choosing the Right Type of Rotation in PCA and EFA. *JALT Testing & Evaluation SIG Newsletter*, 13 (3), 20–25.
- Brumfit, C.J. (1985). *Language and Literature Teaching: From Practice to Principle*, Oxford: Pergamon.
- Bruner, J.S. (1973). *The Relevance of Education*. New York: Norton.
- Bryant, F. B. (2000). Assessing the Validity of Measurement. In L. G. Grimm and P. R. Yarnold (eds.), *Reading and Understanding More Multivariate Statistics*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 99-146.
- Bukia, T. And Watson. B. (2000). *Setting out*. Tbilisi Georgia: Otsdameerte Saukune.
- Burns, N. and Grove, S.K. (1997). *The Practice of Nursing Research Conduct, Critique, & Utilization* (3rd ed.), Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders and Co.
- Butler, C. (1985). *Statistics in Linguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Canale, M. and Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Candlin, C. N. and Mercer, N. (2001). *English Language Teaching in Its Social Context: A Reader*, London: Routledge.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning. The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Carless, D. (2004). Issues in Teachers' Reinterpretation of a Task-based Innovation in Primary Schools. *TESOL Quarterly* 38 (4), 639-662.
- Carletta, J. (1996). Assessing Agreement on Classification Tasks: The Kappa Statistic. *Computational Linguistics*, 22(2), 249–254.
- Catell, R. B. (1966). The Scree Plot for the Number of Factors. *Multivariate Behavioural Research*, 1(1), 245-276.
- Chamber, G.N. (1999). *Motivating Language Learners*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Chambers, F. and Richards, B. (1992). Criteria for Oral Assessment. *Language Learning Journal*, 6(1), 5-9.
- Chapman, G. (1998). Digital Nation: Push to Trade Class Textbooks for Laptop PCs Is a Misuse of Technology. *Los Angeles Times*, p.2.
- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing Second Language Skills*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Javanovich.
- Chipouline, D. (2001). Through the Looking Glass: What EST Teachers Can Find in Russian-Published Reference Books. *TESL Canada Journal*, 19(1), 17-32.

- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague, Mouton
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Choo, W. Y., Walsh, K., Chinna, K. and Tey, N.P. (2013). Teacher Reporting Attitudes Scale (TRAS): Confirmatory and Exploratory Factor Analysis With Malaysian Sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(2), 231-253.
- Choy, S. (2001). *Some Principles of Youth Learning*. Brisbane: Queensland University of Technology.
- Clark, C. (1988). Asking the Right Questions about Teacher Preparation: Contributions of Research on Teaching Thinking. *Educational Researcher*, 17(2), 5-12.
- Corder, S. P. (1973). *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Coskun, A. (2011). Investigation of the Application of Communicative Language Teaching in the English Language Classroom – A Case Study on Teachers' Attitudes in Turkey. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 2(1), 85-109.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cowan, R., Choi, H., Kim, D. (2003). Four Questions for Error Diagnosis and Correction in CALL. *CALICO Journal*, 20(3), 451-63.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research Design: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Csepo, B., Nikolov, M. (2002). *The Relationship Between Students' Foreign Language Achievement and General Thinking Skills*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 1-5, New Orleans.
- Cullen, R. (1994). Incorporating a Language Improvement Component in Teacher Training Programs. *ELT Journal*, 48(2), 162-72.
- Cummins, J. (1983). Language Proficiency and Academic Achievement. In J. W. Oller Jr. (ed.). *Issues in Language Testing Research*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Daisy, P. (2012). Communicative Language Teaching – a Comprehensive Approach to English Language Teaching. *Language in India: Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow*, 12 (2), 249-264.
- Davies, G. and Higgins, J. (1982). *Computers, Language and Language Learning*. London: CILT.
- Davies, P. and Pearse, E. (2000). *Success in English Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dart, B., Burnett, P.C., Ruridie, N., Boulton-Lewis, G., Campbell, J. and Smith, D. (2006). Students' Conceptions of Learning, the Classroom Environment, and Approaches to Learning. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 93(4), 262-270.

- Dede, C. and Kremer, A. (1999). Increasing Students' Participation Via Multiple Interactive Media. *Inventio*. Retrieved from [http://www. Doit. gmu. Edy/Ar chive/fe98/dede. htm/](http://www.Doit.gmu.Edu/Archive/fe98/dede.htm/) (accessed September 2012).
- Dermican, O. (1990). *Yabancı dil öğretim Yöntemleri*. Istanbul: Ekin Yayınları.
- DeVellis, R.F. (2003). *Scale Development: Theory and Applications* (2nd eds.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Di Nicuolo, G. (1991). Problems of Testing Communicative Performance. *Rassegna Italiana di Linguistica Applicata*, 23(2), 139-149.
- Diem, R. (2005). Podcasting: a New Way to Reach Students. *The Language Teacher*, 29 (8), 45-46.
- Dincay, T. (2010). A Quick Chronological Review of the ELT Methods along with Their Techniques and Principles: Choosing eclecticism from among Language Teaching Methods. *Dil Dergisi*, 147(1), 40-62.
- Dooly, M., Masats, D. (2011). Closing the Loop Between Theory and Praxis: New Models in EFL Teaching. *ELT Journal*, 65(1), 42-49.
- Dornyei, Z. (1998) Motivation in Second and Foreign Language Learning. *Language Teaching*, 31(3), 177-135.
- Duffy, T.M., Jonassen, D.H. (1991). Constructivism: New Implications For Instructional Technology. *Educational Technology*, 31(5), 7-11.
- Eaton, S. (2010). How to Use Skype in the ESL/EFL Classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 16(11). Retrieved from [http://iteslj.org/ Techniques /Eaton-Using-Skype.html](http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Eaton-Using-Skype.html) (accessed September 2012).
- Edelenbos, P. and Gerard, W. (2006). *Vreemdetalenonderwijs in Nederland: Een Situatieschets*. Nederland: NaB-MVT.
- Edisherashvili, N. and Smakman, D. (2013). Technology as a Tool Towards Educational Reform: Implementing Communicative Language Teaching in Georgia. In D. Smakman and W. Laurent (eds.), *Proceedings van Schools tot Scriptie*, Leiden: Leiden University, 80-98.
- Eerde, V. J. (1954). Language Teaching in the Soviet Union. *Modern Language Journal*, 38(8), 1-40.
- Ellis, G. (1994). The Appropriateness of the Communicative Approach in Vietnam: An Interview Study in Intercultural Communication. *Eric E-Journal*.
- Ellis, G. (1994). The Appropriateness of the Communicative Approach in Vietnam: an Interview Study in Intercultural Communication. La Trobe University, *ERIC E-Journal*. (Access date: June 5, 2011).
- Ellis, G. (1996). How Culturally Appropriate is the Communicative Approach?. *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 213-218.
- Ertmer, A., Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A., Sadil, O., Sendurud, E. and Sendurur, P. (2012). Teacher Beliefs and Technology Integration Practices; a Critical Relationship, *Computers & Education*, 59 (2), 423-435.
- Everitt, B. (1996). *Making Sense of Statistics in Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Eveyik, E. (1999). *Development of an Attitude Scale to Investigate Turkish EFL Teachers' Attitudes*, PhD Thesis, Istanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Faerch, C., Kasper, G. (1983). *Communication Strategies in Interlanguage Production*, London: Longman.
- Fageeh, A. I. (2011). ELF Learners Use of Blogging for Developing Writing Skills and Enhancing Attitudes Towards English Learning: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Language and Literature*. 2(1), 31-48.
- Ferguson, E. and Cox, T. (1993). Exploratory Factor Analysis: a User's guide. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 1, 84-94.
- Fernandez, D.J. (2009). CLIL at the University Level: Relating Language Teaching With and Through Content Teaching. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 2 (2), 10-26.
- Fields, A. P. (2000). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*. Sussex, England: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Fields, A. P. (2005). Intraclass Correlation. In B.S. Everitt and D. C. Howell (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Statistics in Behavioral Science*, Chichester: JohnWiley and Sons, 948-954.
- Fields, A. (2008). Repeated Measures ANOVA. *Research Methods in Psychology*. Retrieved from <http://www.pc.rhul.ac.uk/staff/J.Larsson/teaching/pdfs/repeatedmeasures.pdf> (accessed June 2013).
- Fields, A. (2012a). One-Way Independent ANOVA. *Discovering Statistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.statisticshell.com/docs/onewayanova.pdf>. (accessed June 2013).
- Fields, A. (2012b). Exploring Data: The Beast of Bias. *Discovering Statistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.statisticshell.com/docs/exploringdata.pdf>. (accessed June 2013).
- Fisher L. (2003). Using PowerPoint for ESL Teaching. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 9(4).
- Fodeman, D., Monroe, M. (2009). The Impact of Facebook on Our Students. *Teacher Librarian*, 5(1), 36-40.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The New Meaning of Educational Change* (4theds.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gage, J. (2005). *How to Use Interactive Whiteboard Really Effectively in Your Primary Classroom*. London: David Fulton Publishers Ltd.
- Garrard, J.G. (1962). The Teaching of Foreign Languages in the Soviet Union. *Modern Language Journal*, 46(2), 71-74.
- Garrard, J.G. (1962). The Teaching of Foreign Languages in the Soviet Union. *Modern Language Journal*, 46(2), 4-71.
- Gardanov, V. (1969). *Кавказский этнографический Сборник*. Moscow: HAYKA.
- Gardner, R.C. (1968). Attitudes and Motivation: Their Role in Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL*, 2(1), 141-149.

- Gardner, R.C. and Lambert, W.E. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning. The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Garret, N. (1991). Technology in the Service of Language Learning: Trends and Issues. *Modern Language Journal*, 75 (1), 74-101.
- Garris R., Ahlers R. and Driskell E., (2002). Games, Motivation, and Learning: A Research and Practice Model. *Simulation and Gaming*, 33(4), 441-467.
- Gatbon E. and Segalowits, N. (2005). Rethinking Communicative Language Teaching: A Focus on Access to Fluency. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 61 (3), 325-353.
- Giunashvili, Z. (2009). New Technologies in Schools. *Mastsavlebeli*, 3(1), 9-11.
- Giunashvili, Z. (2011). Using Computer Interactive Simulations in the Teaching Process. *Mastsavlebeli*, 3(1), 14-16.
- Godwin-Jones, R. (2008). Mobile Computing Technologies: Lighter, Faster, Smarter. *Language Learning & Technology*, 12(3), 3-9.
- Gokhlerner, M. (1956). O Meste Inostrannogo Yazyka v Sredney Shkole. *Inostrannie Yaziki v Shkole*, Russia, Moscow, 99-100.
- Goksadze, L. and Pagava. T. (2008). *New Wave*. Tbilisi, Georgia: Publishing Otsdameerte.
- Goldsby, D. And Fazal, M. (2000). Technology's Answer to Portfolios for Teachers. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 36 (3), 121-123.
- Gonzalez-Bueno, M. and Perez, L. C. (2000). Electronic Mail in Foreign Language Writing: a Study of Grammatical and Lexical Accuracy, and Quantity of Language. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(2), 189-197.
- Goodson, I., Moore, Sh. and Hargreaves, A. (2006). Teacher Nostalgia and the Sustainability of Reform: The Generation and Degeneration of Teachers' Missions, Memory, and Meaning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 4(1), 42-61.
- Graham, W. R. (1990). *Sex Differences In Intelligence Personality and Primary Mental Abilities Among Irish Children*, PhD thesis, Londonderry, United Kingdom: University of Ulster.
- Granito, M. and Chernobilsk, E. (2012). The Effect of Technology on a Student's Motivation and Knowledge Retention. *NERA Conference Proceedings*, University of Connecticut: Northeastern Educational Research Association.
- Gregg, K. (1989). Second Language Acquisition Theory: the Case for a Generative perspective. In S. Gass and J. Schachter (eds.), *Linguistic Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 15-40.
- Grenoble, L. (2003). *Language Policy in the Soviet Union*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Griffiths, D. (1984). Reflections on the Teaching of Foreign Languages and Literature in the Soviet Union. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 41 (1), 22-31.
- Gurthrie, E. (1984). Intake, Communication and Second Language Teaching. In S. J. Svignon and M.S. Berns (eds.) *Initiatives in Communicative Language Teaching*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. 35-54.
- Guy, G. (1996). Post-Saussurean Linguistics: Toward an Integrated Theory of Language. *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics*, 3(1), 1-24.
- Gwet, K. L. (2010). *Handbook of Inter-Rater Reliability* (2nd eds.). Gaithersburg, MD: Advanced Analytics, LLC.
- Hair, J.F., Nicholson, J. M. and Black, W.C. (2005). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (6th eds.). New York, NY: Prentice Hall.
- Haladyna, T. M., Nolen, S. B. and Haas, N. S. (1991). Raising Standardized Achievement Test Scores and the Origins of Test Score pollution. *Educational Researcher*, 20(5), 2-7.
- Haley, S. M. and Osberg, J. S. (1989). Kappa Coefficient Calculation Using Multiple Ratings Per Subject: A Special Communication. *Journal of Physical Therapy Association*, 69(11), 970-974.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1970). Language Structure and language Function. In J. Lyons (ed.), *New Horizons in Linguistics*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 140-165.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1975). *The System and Function in language*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hamid, M.O. and Baldauf, R.B. (2008). Will CLT Bail out the Boggled Down ELT in Bangladesh?. *English Today*, 95(3), 201-217.
- Hammerly, H. (1987). The Immersion Approach: Litmus Test of Second-Language Acquisition Through Classroom Communication. *Modern Language Journal*, 71(4), 395-401.
- Hammersley, M. (1993). *Social research: Philosophy, Politics and Practice*. London: Sage.
- Hammond, R.M. (1988). Accuracy versus Communicative Competency: The Acquisition of Grammar in the Second Language Classroom. *Hispania*, 71(2), 408-417.
- Harley, B. (1989). Functional Grammar in French Immersion: a Classroom Experiment. *Applied Linguistics*, 10(3), 331-359.
- Harley, B. and Swain, M. (1984). Interlanguage of Immersion Students and its Implication for Second Language Teaching. In A. Davies, C. Cripser and A.P.R. Howatt (eds.), *Interlanguage*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 291-311.
- Harman, K., Koochang, A. (2005). Discussion Board: A Learning Object. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Knowledge and Learning Objects*, 1(1), 67-77.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. UK: Longman ELT.

- Harmer, J. (2003). Popular Culture, Methods and Context. *ELT Journal*, 57(3), 288-294.
- Harris, R. L. and Brown, T. L. (2010). Mixing Interview and Questionnaire Methods: Practical Problems in Aligning data. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 15(1), 1-19.
- Harvey, P. (1985). A Lesson to Be Learned: Chinese Approaches to Language Learning. *ELT Journal*, 39(3), 183-186.
- Hasluck, C. (2012). *Why Employer Should Recruit Young People*. London: UK Commission for Employment and Skills. Retrieved from: <http://www.ukces.org.uk/assets/ukces/docs/publications> (accessed May 2013).
- Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hattie, J. (2005). The Paradox of Reducing Class Size and Improving Learning Outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 43(6), 387-425.
- Hémard, D. and Cushion, S. (2001). Evaluation of a Web-Based Language Learning Environment: The Importance of a User-Centered Design Approach for CALL. *ReCALL*, 13(1), 15-31.
- Henard, F. (2010). *Learning Our Lesson: Review of Quality Teaching in Higher Education*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Heyn, L. (2011). Teach & Learn with Georgia Produces Results but Faces Obstacles. *NYTimes*, January 25, p.1.
- Heyneman, S. (2010). A Comment on the Changes in Higher Education in the Post-Soviet Union. *European Education*, 42(1), 76-87.
- Heyworth, F. (2003). Introduction - A New Paradigm for Language Teaching. In Depuis et al. (eds.), *Facing the Future -Language Educators Across Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 7-14.
- Hiep, P.H. (2007). Communicative Language Teaching: Unity Within Diversity. *ELT Journal*, 61(3), 193-201.
- Hines, R.A. and Pearl, C.E. (2004). Increasing interaction in Web-based Instruction: Using Synchronous Chats and Asynchronous Discussion. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 23(2), 33-36.
- Ho, W.K. and Wong, R.Y.L. (2004). *English Language Teaching in East Asia Today*. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.
- Hoffman, H. (1996). Computers and Instructional Design in Foreign Language/ESL Instruction. *TESOL Journal*, 5(2), 24-28.
- Horwits, E.K. (1987). Surveying Student Beliefs about Language Teaching. In A.L. Wednden and J. Robon (eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, London: Prentice Hall, 119-132.
- Horwitz, E.K. (1999). Cultural and Situational Influences on Foreign Language Learners' Beliefs about Language Learning. *A Review of BALLI Studies*. 27, 557-576.
- Howatt, A.P.R. (1984). *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Howatt, A. P. R. and Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *A History of English Language Teaching* (2nd eds.), Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hymes, D.H. (1966). Two Types of Linguistic Relativity. In W. Bright (ed.), *Sociolinguistics*, The Hague: Mouton, 114-158.
- Huck, S. W. (2009). *Reading Statistics and Research* (5th eds.). New York: Pearson Education.
- Huck, S. W. (2009). *Reading Statistics and Research* (5th eds.). New York, NY: Pearson Education.
- Hui, L. (1997). New Bottles, Old Wine: Communicative Language Teaching in China. *Forum*, 35(4), 38-47.
- Hymes, D.H. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.), *Sociolinguistics. Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 269-293.
- Ingorokva, N. (2011). The Concept of the Teacher's House in Georgia. *Matsavlebeli*, 1(1), 7- 15.
- Ingram, D. E. (1985). Assessing Proficiency: An Overview of Some Aspects of Testing. In K. Hyltenstam and M. Pienemann (eds.), *Modeling and Assessing Second Language Acquisition*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Janssen, F.J.J.M., Westbroek, H.B., Doyle, W. and Driel, van J.H. (2013). How to Make Innovations Practical. *Teachers College Record*, 115 (7), 1-43.
- Japaridze, Sh. (2008.) *Implementation of Bologna Process in Georgia*. Tbilisi: Educators & Scientists Free Trade Union of Georgia (ESFTUG).
- Jennings, D. (2004). iPods, Podcasting and Learning. Contribution posted on the Edupod Blog. Retrieved from [http:// alchemi.co.uk/ archives /ele /iP ods podcastin.html](http://alchemi.co.uk/archives/ele/iPods_podcastin.html) (accessed September 2012).
- Jhurree, V. (2005). Technology Integration in Education in Developing Countries: Guidelines to Policy Makers. *International Education Journal*, 6 (4), 467-483.
- Johnson, K. And Morrow, K. (1981). *Communication in the Classroom*. Essex: Longman.
- Johnson, K. (1984). Skill Psychology and Communicative Methodology. Paper presented at the RELC seminar, Singapore.
- Johnson, G. M. (2006). Synchronous and Asynchronous Text-based CMC in Educational Contexts: A Review of Recent research. *TechTrends*, 50 (4), 46-53.
- Jones, M. G. and Brader-Araje, L. (2002). The Impact of Constructivism on Education: Language, Discourse and Meaning. *American Communication Journal*, 5(3), 97-101.

- Jones, J., Morales, C. and Knezek, G. A. (2005). 3-Dimensional Online Learning Environments: Examining Attitudes Towards Information Technology Between Students in Internet-based 3-dimensional and Face-to-face Classroom Instruction. *Education Media International*, 42 (3), 219-236.
- Jung, Y. S. (1999). How to Use Internet Resources for EFL Teaching. *English Teaching*, 54(3), 213-235.
- Kabata, K. (2011). Tandem Language Learning Through a Cross-Cultural Keypal Project. *Language Learning & Technology*, 12 (1), 104-121.
- Kabilan, M., Ahman, N. and Abidin, M. (2010). Facebook: An Online Environment for Learning of English in Institutions of Higher Education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 13 (4), 1-9.
- Kahmi-Stein, L.D. (2009). Teacher Preparation and Non-native English-speaking Educators. In A. Burns and J. C. Richards (eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 91-101.
- Kaminska, O. and Foulsham, T. (2013). *Understanding Sources of Social Desirability Bias in Different Modes: Evidence from Eye-Tracking*. Essex, UK: Economic and Social Research Council.
- Karakhanian, S. (2011). *Reforming Higher Education in a Post-Soviet Context. The Case of Armenia*, PhD diss., Nijmegen: Radboud University.
- Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996). Using Attitude Scales to Investigate Teachers' Attitudes to the Communicative Approach. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 50(3), 187-198.
- Kask, B. (2009). Synchronous and Asynchronous Communication: Tools for Collaboration. Retrieved from http://sites.wiki.ubc.ca/etec510/Synchronous_and_AsynchronousCommunication:Toolsfor_Collaboration#Advantages_2 (accessed December 2013).
- Kaur, M. (2011). Using Online Forums in Language Learning and Education. *Student Pulse. Online Academic Journal*, 3(3), 1-4.
- Kavanagh, B. (2012). The Theory and Practice of Communicative Language Teaching in Japan. *Academic Research International*, 2(2), 730-738.
- Kerka, S. (2000). Incidental Learning. Trends and Issues, Alert No.18. *ERIC Clearhouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education*, Columbus: Eric Publications, 2-4.
- Kern, R. G. (1995). Students' and Teachers' Beliefs about Language Learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 28, 71-92.
- Kheimets, N. and Epstein, A. (2001). English as a Central Component of Success in the Professional and Social Integration of Scientists from the Former Soviet Union in Israel. *Language in Society*, 30(2), 187-215.
- Koch, G. (1982). Intraclass Correlation Coefficient. In S. Kotz and Norman L. Johnson (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Statistical Sciences*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 213-217.

- Koohang, A., Riley, L. and Smith, T. (2009). E-Learning and Constructivism: From Theory to Application. *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning and Learning Objects*, 5(1), 91-109.
- Koory, M. A. (2003). Differences in Learning Outcomes for the Online and F2F Versions of "An Introduction to Shakespeare". *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 7 (1), 18-35.
- Kramsch, C., Andersen, R. W. (1999). Teaching Text and Context Through Multimedia. *Language Learning & Technology*, 2(2), 31-42.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. D. And Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. Hayward, CA: The Alemany Press.
- Kroonenberg, N. (1995). Developing Communicative and Thinking Skills via Electronic Mail. *TESOL Journal*, 14(2), 24-27.
- Kukulka-Hulme, A. (2005). Introduction. In A. Kukulka-Hulme and J. Traxler (eds.), *Mobile Learning: A Handbook for Educators and Trainers*, London: Routledge, 1-6.
- Kukulka-Hulme, A. (2006). Mobile Language Learning Now and in the Future. In P. Svensson (ed.), *Från Vision till Praktik: Språkutbildning och Informationsteknik*, Sweden: Swedish Net University (Nätuniversitetet), 119-134.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The Postmethod Condition: (E)merging Strategies for Second/Foreign Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 27-48.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a Postmethod Pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(4), 537-560.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding Language Teaching: From Method to Postmethod*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Publishers.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL Methods: Changing Tracks, Challenging Trends. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 59-81.
- Kupelian, M. (2001). The Use of Email in the L2 Classroom: An Overview. *Second Language Learning & Teaching*, 1(1), 1-1.
- Kuprashvili, V. And Chkonia M. (1999). *Let's Communicate in the Classroom*. Tbilisi: Grigol Robakidze University Press.
- Kuprashvili, V. and Chkonia. M.(2006). *Enjoy Teaching Enjoy Learning*. Tbilisi: Grigol Robakidze University Press.
- Kuprashvili V., Chkonia, M., Kobakhidze, Sh. and Tkavadze, E. (1999). *Let's Communicate in the Classroom*. Tbilisi: Grigol Robakidze University Press.

- Kurihara, Y. and Samimy, K.K. (2007). The Impact of a U.S. Teacher Training Program on Teaching Beliefs and Practices: A Case Study of Secondary School Level Japanese Teachers of English. *Japan Association for Language Teaching*, 29(1), 99-122.
- Labadze, M. (2009). Computer Games in Education. At the Turn of the Modern World. *Mastsavlebeli*, 6(10), 235.
- Labadze, M. (2011). I Need to Be Open to Novelties. *Mastsavlebeli*, 1(1), 18-21.
- Laborda, J. G. (2008). Book Review: Blended learning: Using Technology in and Beyond the Language Classroom. *Educational Technology & Society*, 11(3), 289-291.
- Lafford, B. (1997). On the Teaching and Acquisition of Pronunciation within a Communicative Approach. *Hispania*, 80(1), 95-108.
- La Forge, P.G. (1983). *Counseling and Culture in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Landis, J. R. and Koch, G. G. (1977). The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data. *Biometrics*, 33(1), 159-174.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). On the Appropriateness of Language Teaching Methods. In J. Shaw, D. Lubeska and M. Noullet (eds.). *Language and Development: Partnership and Interaction*. Bangkok: Asian Institute of Technology.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lavender, S. (2002). Towards a Framework for Language Improvement within Short In-Service Teacher Development Programs. In H. Traappes-Lomaz and G. Ferguson (eds.), *Language in Language Teacher Education*, Amsterdam: John Menjamins. 237-250.
- Lebow, D. (1993). Constructivist Values for Instructional Systems Design: Five Principles Towards a New Mindset. *Educational Technology, Research and Development*, 41(3), 4-16.
- Lee, I. (1998). Supporting Greater Autonomy in Language Learning. *ELT Journal*, 52(4), 282-90.
- Lee, S. M. (2005) The Pros and Cons of Task-Based Instruction in Elementary English Classes. *English Teaching*, 60(2), 185-205.
- Leithner, A. (2009). Review of Blended Learning: Using Technology in and Beyond the Language Classroom. *Language Learning & Technology*, 13 (1), 33-39.
- Leuf, B. and Cunningham, W. (2001). *The Wiki Way: Quick Collaboration on the Web*. London: Addison-Wesley Longman.
- Leung, C. (2005). Convivial Communication: Recontextualizing Communicative Competence. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(2), 119-143.

- Lewis, M. (2000). There is Nothing as Practical as a Good Theory. In M. Lewis (ed.), *Teaching Collocation: Further Developments in the Lexical Approach*. London: Language Teaching Publications, 155-184.
- Lewis, M. and McCook, F. (2002). Cultures of Teaching: Voices from Vietnam. *ELT Journal*, 56 (2), 146-153.
- Lexis, M. (1993). *The Lexical Approach*. London: Language Teaching Publications.
- Li, C. Y. (2003). A Study of In-service Teachers' Beliefs, Difficulties and Problems in Current Teacher Development Programs. *HKBU Papers in Applied Language Studies*, 7(1), 64-85.
- Li, D. F. (1998). It's Always More Difficult Than you Plan and Imagine. Teachers' Perceived Difficulties in Introducing the Communicative Approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly* 32(3), 677-703.
- Liao, X. (2000). How Communicative Language Teaching Became Acceptable in Secondary Schools in China. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 6(10). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Liao-CLTinChina.html> (accessed March 2012).
- Lightbrown, P. And Spada, N. (1999). *How Languages are Learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ligorio, M. B. (2001). Integrating Communication Formats: Synchronous versus Asynchronous and Text-based versus Visual. *Computers & Education*, 37(2), 103-125.
- Llurda, E. (2000). On Competence, Proficiency, and Communicative Language Ability. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10 (1), 85- 95.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1984). *Foreign and Second Language Learning: Language Acquisition Research and its Implications for the Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and Task-based Language Teaching in East Asian Classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 40(3), 243-249.
- Littlewood, W. (2008). Classic Book' Review: Thirty Years Later: Henry Widdowson's Teaching Language as Communication. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18(2), 212-218.
- Lobanova, T. and Shunin, Y. (2008). Computer-Based Education – a Common European Strategy. *Computer Modeling and New Technologies*, 12 (2) 45–65.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (2009), 5th ed., UK: Pearson Longman
- Long, M.H. (1991). Focus on Form: A Design feature in Language Teaching Methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg and Kramsch, C. (eds.). *Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 39-52.

- Luttenberg, J., van Veen, K. and Imants, J. (2011). Looking for Cohesion: the Role of Search for Meaning in the Interaction between Teacher and Reform. *Research Papers in Education*, 1-20.
- Lyster, R. And Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66.
- Maclellan, E. and Soden, R. (2003). Expertise, Expert and Experienced Teachers' Knowledge of Learning Theory. *Scottish Educational Review*, 35(2), 110-120.
- McBride, R. and Schostak, J. (1995) Chapter 4 Action Research. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. <http://www.enquirylearning.net/ELU/Issues/Research/Res1Ch1.html> (accessed October 2012).
- Macnamara, J. (1973). Attitudes and Learning a Second Language. In R. W. Shuy and R. W. Fasold (eds.), *Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects*, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 36-40.
- Maes, K. (2012). Language Proficiency and CEFR: To Measure is to Know?. In D. Smakman and W. Laurent (eds.), *Proceedings van Schools tot Scriptie*, Leiden: Leiden University, 112-116.
- Mangubhai, F., Marland, P., Dashwood, A. and Son, J.B. (2004). Teaching a Foreign Language: One Teacher's Practical Theory. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(3), 291-311.
- Mangubhai, F., Marland, P., Dashwood, A. and Son, J. (2005). Similarities and Differences in Teachers' and Researchers' Conceptions of Communicative Language Teaching: Does the Use of an Educational Model Cast a Better Light?. *Language Teaching Research*, 9(1) 31-66.
- Markee, N. (1997). *Managing Curriculum Innovation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Markova, L. (1972). *Kratkii Grammaticheskii Spravochnik. Angliiskii Iazyk*. Russia, Moscow: Voennoe Izdatel'stvo Ministerstva Oborony SSSR.
- Mathews, B. (2012). Using Facebook and Other Social Media as a Teaching Tool. *How Science Communicates*. California: Design Science.
- Mazer, J., Murphy, P., Richard, E. and Simonds, C. (2007). I'll See You on Facebook: The Effects of Computer-Mediated Teacher Self-disclosure on Student Motivation, Affective Learning and Classroom Climate. *Communication Education*, 56(1), 1-17.
- Medgyes, P. (2001). When a Teacher is a Non-Native Speaker. In M. Celcie-Murcia (ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 415-27.
- Menzies, D. (2005). Duke University iPod First-Year Experience Final Evaluation Report. *Duke Center for Instructional Technology*. Retrieved from http://cit.duke.edu/pdf/iPod_initiative_04_05pdf (accessed October 2013).

- Miller, L. and Aldred, D. (2000). Student Teachers' Perceptions about Communicative Language Teaching Methods. *RELC Journal*, 31(1), 1-22.
- Mirren, H. (2011). American Voices, Far From Home. *New York Times*. January 23.
- Mishra, P. and Koehler, M. (2006). Technological Pedagogical and Content Knowledge: a Framework for Teacher Knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108 (6), 1017-1054.
- Mitchell, R. and Lee, J.H.W. (2003). Sameness and Difference in Classroom Learning Cultures: Interpretations of Communicative Pedagogy in the UK and Korea. *Language Teaching Research*, 7(1), 35-63.
- Mitchell, R. (1994). Communicative Approach to Language Teaching. In A. Swarbrick (ed.), *Teaching Modern Languages*. London: Routledge, 33-42.
- Montgomery C. and Einstein, M. (1985). Reality Revisited: an Experimental Communicative Course in ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(2), 317-334.
- Morrow, K. (2004). *Insights from the Common European Framework*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morse, J., Edmonton, A., Barrett, M., Edmonton, A., Mayan, M. and Spiers, J. (2002). Verification Strategies for Establishing Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1(2), 13-22.
- Moskowitz, G. (1978). *Caring and Sharing in the Foreign Language Class*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Mulligan, C. (2005). No English Educational Reforms Will Be Effective Unless Japanese English Teachers Can Speak and Will Speak English in the Classroom. *The Language Teacher*, 29(5), 33-35.
- Munoz, C. (2009). Opening Facebook: How to Use Facebook in the College Classroom. Paper presented at *Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education* conference, Charleston, South Carolina.
- Musumeci, D. (2002). The Use of Technology in High-enrollment Courses: Implications for Teacher Education and Communicative Language Teaching. In S. J. Savignon (ed.), *Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching: Contexts and Concerns in Teacher Education*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 154-164.
- Nafetvaridze, N. (2012). Social Media for Learning Purposes. *Sastsavlo Socialuri Qseli Mastsavlebeli*, 2, 53-56.
- Naismith, L., Lonsdale, P., Vavoula, G. and Sharples, M. (2005). Literature Review in Mobile Technologies and Learning. A Report for NESTA Futurelab. Retrieved from http://www.futurelab.org.uk/download/pdfs/research/litreviews/futurelab_review_11.pdf (accessed December 2013).
- Nassaji, H. (1999). Towards Integrating Form-focused Instruction and Communicative Interaction in the Second Language Classroom: Some Pedagogical Possibilities. *Modern Language Journal*, 84(2), 241-250.

- National Curriculum for Foreign Languages*. (2011). Retrieved from [http://hrd.apec.org/index.php/Language Curriculum and Instruction Language Curriculum and Instruction](http://hrd.apec.org/index.php/Language_Curriculum_and_Instruction_Language_Curriculum_and_Instruction) (accessed December 2013).
- National Curriculum for Foreign Languages (NCFL)*. (2009). Ministry of Education of Georgia. Tbilisi, Georgia: National Curriculum and Assessment Center.
- Newby, D. (2010). Competence and Performance. *Applied Linguistics for Language Teacher*. Retrieved from http://www.uni-graz.at/angl3www_competence_performance.pdf (accessed October 2013).
- Ngoc, K.M. and Iwashita, N. (2012). A Comparison of Learners' and Teachers' Attitudes Towards Communicative Language Teaching at Two Universities in Vietnam. *TESOL*, 7(1), 25-49.
- Northcote, M. and Kendle, A. (2001,). Informal Online Networks for Learning: Making Use of Incidental Learning Through Recreation. Paper presented at the AARE (Australian Association for Research in Education) International Education Research Conference, Fremantle, Western Australia, 2-6 December.
- Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative Language Teaching: Making It Work. *ELT Journal*, 41(2), 136-145.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Nunnally, J.O. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Obanya, P. (1987). *A Curriculum Developer's Manual*. Switzerland: WCOTP.
- Olaofe, I. A. (1992). A Communicative Model for Assessing Second Language Performance. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 207-222.
- Oliver, M. and Trigwell, K. (2006). *CALL Dimensions: Options and Issues in Computer-Assisted Language Learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Olson, S., Pappas, B. and Pappas, C. (1994). *An Ethnohistorical Dictionary of the Russian and Soviet Empires*, Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Oravec, J. (2002). Bookmarking the world: Weblog applications in education. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 45(7), 616-621.
- Ornstein, J. (1958). Foreign Language Teaching in the Soviet Union – Qualitative View. *Modern Language Journal*, 42(8), 382-392.
- Orwin, R. G. (1994). Evaluating Coding Decisions. In H. Cooper and L. V. Hedges (eds.). *The Handbook of Research Synthesis*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 139-162
- Osborne, J. and Costello, A. (2005). Best Practices in Exploratory factor Analysis: Four Recommendations for Getting the Most From Your Analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10(7), 1- 9.
- O'Sullivan, P.B., Hunt, S.K. and Lippert, L.R. (2004). Mediated Immediacy: A Language of Affiliation in a Technological Age. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 23(4), 464-490.
- Palmer, H. E. (1921). *The Principles of Language Study*. London: Harrap.

- Palomaki E. and Nordback, E. (2012). Bringing Playfulness and Engagement to Language Training Using Virtual Worlds: Students Experiences, Results, and Best Practices from a Virtual Language Course. Conference paper: *Language Learning in Virtual Worlds*. Prague, Czech Republic. March 12-14, 1-14.
- Papadima-Sophocleous, S. (2012). CALL (Computer Assisted Language Learning) Wiki. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 34(1), 174-180.
- Papert, S. (1980). *Mindstorms: Children, Computers, and Powerful Ideas*, New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc.
- Parajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers Beliefs and Educational Research: Cleaning up a Messy Construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332.
- Park, Y. and Bonk, C. (2007). Synchronous Learning Experiences: Distance and Residential Learners' Perspectives in a Blended Graduate Course. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 6(4), 245-255.
- Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Pavlenko, A. (1964). Language of the Enemy: Foreign Language teaching and National Identity. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 6(5), 313-332.
- Peacock, M. (2001). Pre-service ESL Teachers' Beliefs about Second Language Learning: a Longitudinal Study, *System*, 29(2), 177-195.
- Pennycook, A. (1989). The Concept of Method, Interested Knowledge, and the Politics of Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(4), 589-618.
- Pérez, L.C. (2003). Foreign Language Productivity in Synchronous Versus Asynchronous Computer-mediated Communication. *CALICO Journal*, 21 (1), 89-104.
- Petrakou, A. (2010). Interacting through Avatars: Virtual Worlds as a Context for Online Education. *Computers & Education*, 54(4), 1020-1027.
- Piaget, J. (1971). *Science of Education and the Psychology of the Child*. London, Longman.
- Pillar G. W. (2011). A Framework for Testing Communicative Competence. *The Round Table: Partium Journal of English Studies*, 2(1), 24-37.
- Pitler, H. J. (2006). Viewing Technology Through Three Lenses. *Principal*, 85 (5), 38-42.
- Polgar, S. and Thomas, S. (1995). *Introduction to Research in the Health Sciences*. Melbourne: Churchill Livingstone.
- Porter, A.C. and Brophy, J. (1988). Synthesis of Research on Good Teaching: Insights from the Work of the Institute for Research Teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 45(8), 74-85.
- Prahbu, N.S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1990). There is no Best Method – Why?. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(2), 161-76.

- Prenksy, M. (2001). Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1-6.
- Prensky, M. (2008). The Role of Technology in Teaching and the Classroom. *Educational Technology*, 48(1), 1-3.
- Prosser, M. and Trigwell, K. (1997). Relationship Between Perceptions of the Teaching Environment and approaches to teaching. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 67, 25-35.
- Rattray, J. and Jones, M. (2007). Essential Elements of Questionnaire Design and Development. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 16, 234-243.
- Rao, Zh. (1996). Reconciling Communicative Approaches to the Teaching of English with Traditional Chinese Methods. Research in the teaching of English, 30(4), 458-471.
- Razmjoo, S. A. and Riazi, A. M. (2006). Is Communicative Language Teaching Practical in the Expanding Circle?. *Journal of Language and Learning*, 4(2), 144-171.
- Rea, P. M. (1985). *Language Testing and Communicative Language Teaching Curriculum*. In Y. P. Lee, A. C. Y. Y. Fok, R. Lord and G. Low (eds.), *New Directions in Language Testing*, Oxford: Pergamon Press, 15-32.
- Richards, J.C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C. (2011). *Competence and Performance in Language Teaching*. NY, US: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, T.S. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rifkin, B. (2000). Revising Beliefs about Foreign Language Learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(4), 394-420.
- Ringstaff, C. and Kelley, L. (2002). *The Learning Return on Our Educational Technology Investment: A Review of Findings from Research*. San Francisco: WestEd RTEC.
- Rimšāne, I. (2008). Main Trends in Foreign Languages Teacher Education in Latvia and Europe. *TEPE Conference*. Ljubljana. Retrieved from <http://www.pef.u-ni-lj.si/tepe2008/papers/Rimsane.pdf> (access on September 2013).
- Rollman, M. (1995). Communicative Language Teaching “Revolution” Tested: A Comparison of Two Classroom Studies: 1976 and 1993. *Foreign Language Annals*, 27(2), 221-239.
- Romiszowski, A. and Mason, R. (2004). Computer-mediated Communication. *Handbook of Research on Education Communications and Technology*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 397-432.

- Rosell-Aguilar, F. (2007). Top of the Pods – In Search of a Podcasting “Pedagogy” for Language. *Computer- Assisted Language Learning*, 20(5), 471-492.
- Rossner, R. (1988). Materials for Communicative Language Teaching and Learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 140-163.
- Roth, A. (2009). Following Plato’s Advice: Pedagogy and Technology for the Facebook Generation. *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education*, 59(1), 125–128.
- Russo, T. and Benson, S. (2005). Learning with Invisible Others: Perceptions of Online Presence and Their Relationship to Cognitive and Affective Learning. *Educational Technology & Society*, 8(1), 54-62.
- Rozgiene, I., Medvedeva, O. And Stakova, Z. (2008). *Integrating ICL into Language Learning and Teaching. Guide for Tutors*. Presov, Slovakia: Johannes Kelper Universitat Linz.
- Sakui, K. (2004). Wearing Two Pairs of Shoes: Language Teaching in Japan. *ELT Journal*, 58(2), 155-163.
- Salehi H. and Salehi Z. (2012). Integration of ICT in Language Teaching: Challenges and Barriers. *IPEDR*, 27(1), 215-219.
- Samimy, K. K. and Kobayashi, C. (2004). Towards the Development of Intercultural Communicative Competence: Theoretical and Pedagogical Implications for Japanese English Teachers. *JALT Journal*, 26(2), 245-261.
- Saracaloğlu, A.S. (2000). *The Relation Between Trainee Teachers’ Attitudes to Foreign Languages and their Academic Success*. Paperpresented at the First International Conference Dokuz Eylül University Buca Faculty of Education, İzmir, 1-3 October, 38-53.
- Sarnoff, I. (1970). *Social Attitudes and the Resolution of Motivational Conflict*. Harmonds worth: Penguin.
- Sato, K. and Kleinsasser, R.C.(1999). Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Practical Understandings. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(4), 494-517.
- Savignon, S. J. (1976). Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice. Paper presented at the Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Detroit, Michigan, April 23, 1-23.
- Savignon, S. (1991). Communicative Language Teaching: State of the Art. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(2), 261-277.
- Savignon, S. (1997). *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Savignon, S. (2002). Communicative Language Teaching: Linguistic Theory and Classroom Practice. In Savignon, S. J. (ed.). *Interpreting Communicative Language: Contexts and Concerns in Teacher Education*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1-27.

- Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schibeci, R. A. and Riley, J. P. (1986). Influence of Students Background and Perceptions on Science Attitudes and Achievement. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 23(3), 177-187.
- Schmidt, R., Boraie, D. and Kassabgy, O. (1996). Foreign Language Motivation: Internal Structure and External Connections. In R. Oxford (ed.), *Language Learning Motivation: Pathways to the New Century*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. 9-70.
- Schwartz, A. (2002). National Standards and the Diffusion of Innovation: Language Teaching on the United States. In Savignon, J.S. (ed.), *Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching, Contexts, and Concerns in Teacher Education*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 112-129.
- Schwienhorst, K. (2003). Learner Autonomy and Tandem Learning: Putting Principles into Practice in Synchronous and Asynchronous Telecommunications Environments. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 16(5), 427-443.
- Scovel, T. (1983). The Impact of Foreign Experts, Methodology and Materials on English Language Study in China. *Language Learning and Communication*, 2(1), 83-91.
- Seidlhofer, B. (1999). Double Standards: Teacher Education in the Expanding Circle. *World Englishes*, 18(2), 233-45.
- Sharma, P. (2009). Controversies in Using Technology in Language Teaching. *Teaching English*. Retrieved from <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk> (accessed December 2013).
- Sharma, P. (2010). Blended Learning. *ELT Journal*, 64 (4), 456-459.
- Sharma, P. and Barrett, B. (2003). *The Internet and Business English*. Oxford, UK: Sommertown Publishing Ltd.
- Sharma, P. and Barrett, B. (2007). *Blended Learning: Using Technology in and Beyond the Language Classroom*, Macmillan Publishers Limited: Oxford.
- Sharma, P. and Barrett, B. (2009). Blended Learning: Using Technology in and Beyond the Language Classroom. *Language Learning & Technology*, 13(1) 1-5.
- Sharma, P. and Barrett, B. (2011). 400 Ideas for Interactive Whiteboards: Four Approaches. *Blended Learning: Using Technology In and Beyond the Language Classroom*. England: Macmillan Education.
- Shim, R.J. and Baik, M.J. (2004). English Education in South Korea. In W.K. Ho and R.Y.L. Wong (eds.). *English Language Teaching in East Asia Today*. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press. 241-261.
- Siebert, L. L. (2003). Student and Teacher Beliefs about Language Learning. *The ORTESOL Journal*, 21(1), 7-39.

- Siniscalco, T. and Auriat, N. (2005). Questionnaire Planning. In K. Ross (eds.). *Qualitative Methods in Educational Planning*, Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning/UNESCO, 49-90.
- Skinner, B.F. (1957). *Verbal Behaviour*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual Differences in Second Language Learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Skehan, P.(1998). *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Slider, D. (1995). Georgia: Language, Religion and Culture. In Curtis, G.E (eds.), *Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia: County Studies*, Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 149- 230.
- Sloan, S. (2005). Podcasting: An Exciting New Technology for Higher Education. Paper presented at CATS 2005, March 25. Retrieved from: <http://www.edupodder.com/conferences/index.html> (accessed December 2013).
- Smadi, O. and Al-Ghazo, A. (2013). Jordanian Teachers' Attitudes Towards Foreign Language Teaching and Their Relationship to These Teachers' Classroom Practices. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(1), 62-86.
- Son, J. (2008). Using Web-Based Language Learning Activities. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 4(4), 34-43.
- Spada, N. (1990). Observing Classroom Behaviours and Learning Outcomes in Different Second Language Programs. *Modern Language Journal*, 89(3), 328-338.
- Spelleri, M. (2002). From Lessons to Life: Authentic Materials Bridge the Gap. *ESL Magazine*, 5(2), 16-18.
- Spolsky, B. (1989). *Conditions for Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spring, R. Y. (2002). Basil Bernstein's Sociolinguistic Theory of Language Codes. Retrieved from <http://zimmer.csufresno.edu/~johnca/spch100/3-3-berns tein.htm> (accessed February 2014).
- State Education Standards in Foreign Languages* (1997). Tbilisi, Georgia: Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia.
- Stepp-Greany, J. (2002). Student Perceptions on Language Learning in a Technological Environment' Implications for the New Millennium. *Language Learning & Technology*, 6(1), 165-180.
- Stern, H. H. (1980). Some Approaches to Communicative Language Teaching in Canada. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 3(1), 1-5.
- Stern, H.H. (1983). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stevick, E. W. (1976). *Memory, Meaning and Method: Some Psychological Perspectives on Language Learning*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

- Stratton, F. (1977). Putting the Communicative Syllabus in its Place. *TESOL Quarterly*, 11(2), 131-141.
- Swan, M. (1985a). A Critical Look at the Communicative Approach (1). *ELT Journal*, 39(1), 2-12.
- Swan, M. (1985b). A Critical Look at the Communicative Approach (2). *ELT Journal*, 39(2), 2-12.
- Swain, M. (1989). Manipulating and Complementing Content Teaching to Maximize Second Language Learning. *TESL Canada Journal*, 6(1), 68-83.
- Swarbrick, A. (1994). Introduction in Teaching Modern Languages. In A. Swarbrick (ed.), *Teaching Modern Languages*, London: Routledge, 1-3.
- Tabula (2012). Eighty-three Functioning “Future Classes”. *Tabula*. Retrieved from <http://www.tabula.ge/article-24904.html> (accessed September 2013).
- Tabula (2012). “Bukis”, for All the Public School First-graders in Georgia. *Tabula*. Retrieved from <http://www.tabula.ge/article-24887.html> (accessed September 2013).
- Taguchi, N. (2002). Implementing Oral Communication Classes in Upper Secondary Schools: A Case study. *The Language Teacher*, 26(12), 3-8.
- Tamhane, C. A. (1979). A Comparison of Procedures for Multiple Comparisons of Means with Unequal Variances. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 74(366), 471- 480.
- Tapscott, D. (2009). *Netting Young Employees*. Retrieved from <http://what.matt.ers.mckinseydigital.com/organization/netting-young-employees> (accessed June 2013).
- Tashakkori, A. and Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed Methodology: Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tavakoli, M., Dastjerdi, H. and Esteki, M. (2011). The Effect of Explicit Strategy Instruction on L2 Oral Production of Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners: Focusing on Accuracy, Fluency and Complexity. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(5), 989-997.
- Tavakol, M. and Dennick (2011). Making Sense of Cronbach’s Alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53-55.
- Taylor, D.S. (1988). The Meaning and Use of the Term ‘Competence’ in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 9(10), 148-168.
- Taylor, L. M. and Fratto, J. M. (2012). *Transforming Learning Through 21st Century Skills*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Teach & Learn with Georgia: Annual Report* (2011). Tbilisi: Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia. Tbilisi, Georgia. Retrieved from: <http://www.tlg.gov.ge/uploads/2010-%202011%20TLG%20Year%20End%20Report.pdf> (accessed April 2013).
- Terantino, J. (2011). Emerging Technologies YouTube for Foreign Languages: You Have to See This Video. *Language Learning & Technology*, 15(1), 10-16.

- Tercanlioglu, L. (2005). Pre-service EFL Teachers' Beliefs about Foreign Language Learning and How They Relate to Sex. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 3(1), 145-162.
- Tevzadze, R. (2001). In R. Tkemeladze et al. (eds.), *Teaching and Learning English in Georgia 2001: A Baseline Study*. Tbilisi: Diogene Publishers, 34-43.
- Thornbury, S. (2011). Language Teaching Methodology. In J. Simpson (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, London: Routledge, 185-199.
- Thornbury, S. (2012). *The Secret History of Methods*. Retrieved from: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sTL6pgUbxyE> (accessed December 2014).
- Thornbury, S. (2013). G is for Grammar Lesson. *An A-Z of ELT*. Retrieved from <http://scottthornbury.wordpress.com/author/scottthornbury> (accessed September 2013).
- Thompson, G. (1996). Some Misconceptions about Communicative Language Teaching. *ELT Journal*, 50(1), 9-15.
- Tkemeladze, R., Tevzadze, M., Tevzaia, M., Tsitsishvili, R. and Berulava, T. (2001). *Teaching and Learning English in Georgia 2001: A Baseline Study*. Tbilisi: Diogene Publishers.
- Toledo, P. (1998). "Howl". Posting on ELT News and Views Listserv. *ELT Journal*, 45(2), 108-18.
- Toyn, M. (2007). Exploiting Interactive Whiteboard Technologies to Support the Development of Mathematical Thinking. In D. Drews and A. Hansen, (eds.), *Using Resources to Support Mathematical Thinking: Primary and Early Years*, Exeter: Sage Publications, 132-152.
- Tribbel, C. (2001). *Report – Teaching and Learning English in Georgia*. Tbilisi: Diogene Publishers.
- Trim, J. (eds.) (2002). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. A Guide for Users*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Language Policy Division.
- Trofimova, M. (2009). *Case Assignment by Prepositions in Russian Aphasia*, PhD diss., Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit.
- Tryfos, P. (1998). *Methods for Business Analysis and Forecasting: Text and Cases*, New Jersey, US: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tsitsishvili, R., Nizharadze, N., Darchia, M., Tevzadze, M. and Tkavashvili, E. (2008). *Becoming an English Teacher: Theory and Practice of Teaching English in Georgia. A Pre-Service Teacher Training Course*. Tbilisi, Georgia: Nekeri.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (2003). *Understanding Expertise in Teaching: Case Studies of Second Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tsui, A. B.M. (2009). Teaching Expertise: Approaches, Perspectives and Characteristics. In A. Burns and J. C. Richards (eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 190-197.
- Turtel, J. (2005). *Public Schools, Public Menace*. Staten Island, NY: Liberty Books.

- Uhlenbeck, M. (2002). *The Development of an Assessment Procedure for Beginning Teachers of English as a Second Language*. Leiden: ICLON Graduate School of Education.
- Umehara, M. and Popovich, E. (1990). Outlines of the Educational Systems of the USSR and Eastern European Countries. *News & Reviews*, 8-19.
- Valentin, A., Mateos, P., Gonzalez-Tablas, M., Perez, L., Lopez, E. and Garcia, I. (2013). Motivation and Learning Strategies in the Use of ICTs Among University Students. *Computers & Education*, 61(1), 52-58.
- Van Ek, J.A. and Alexander, L.G (1980). *Threshold Level English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Meurs, F. (2010). *English Job Advertisements in the Netherlands: Reasons, Use and Effects*, PhD diss., Leiden University: LOT.
- Verhoeven, L. (1992). Assessment of Bilingual Proficiency. In L. Verhoeven and J. H. A. L. de Jong (eds.), *The Construct of Language Proficiency: Applications of Psychological Models of Language Assessment*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 124-136.
- Victori, M. and Lockhart, W. (1995). Enhancing Metacognition in Self-Directed Language Learning. *System*, 23(2), 223-234.
- Vila, C. A. (2010). Skype in the EFL Class. *Humanizing Language Teaching*, 12(4). Retrieved from [http://www.hltmag.co.uk/aug10/\(accessed](http://www.hltmag.co.uk/aug10/(accessed) December 2013).
- Vonderwell, S., Liang, X. and Alderman, K. (2007). Asynchronous Discussions and Assessment in Online Learning. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 39(3), 309-328.
- Wada, M. (2002). Teacher Education for Curricular Innovation in Japan. In Savignon, S. (eds.), *Interpret Communicative Language Teaching*, New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 32-39.
- Wagner, C. (2004). Wiki: A Technology for Conversational Knowledge Management and Group Collaboration. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 13(1), 265-289.
- Warschauer, M. and Meskill, C. (2000). Technology and Second Language Learning. In J. Rosenthal (ed.), *Handbook of Undergraduate Second Language Teaching*, Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 303-318.
- Warschauer, M., Shetzer, H. and Meloni, C. (2000). *Internet for English Teaching*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL Publications.
- Wasko, M. (2011). New Ventures in Virtual Worlds. *MIS Quarterly*, 35 (3), 645-652.
- Wasko, M., Teigland, R., Leidner D. and Jarvenpaa, S. (2011). Stepping into the Internet: New Ventures in Virtual Worlds. *MIS Quarterly*, 35 (3), 645-652.
- Webster, K., Mavies, K., Timothy, B. and Cordial, B. (2012). The Influence of Teachers' and Students' Language Attitudes Towards the Use of Shona as Medium of Instruction in Secondary Schools. *International Journal of English and Literature*, 3(2), 32-39.

- Weeks, T. (2010). Russification/ Sovietization. *EGO – European History Online*. Retrieved from <http://ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/models-and-stereo-types/russification-sovietization> (accessed January 2012).
- Wenden, A. (1999). An Introduction to Metacognitive Knowledge and Beliefs in Language Learning, *Beyond the Basics*, 27, 435-441.
- Weinstein, C. E. (1994). A Look to the Future: What We Might Learn from Research on Beliefs. In R. Garner and P. Alexander (eds.), *Beliefs about Text and about Instruction with Text*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 112- 119.
- West, M. (1953). *A General Service List of English Words, with Semantic Frequencies and a Supplementary Word-list for the Writing of Popular Science and Technology*. London: Longman.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1973). Two Typed of Communication Exercise. In A.I.L.A./B.A.A.L. *Seminar papers*. Lancaster, University of Lancaster. Republished *The Communicative Teaching of English*, C.N. Candlin (ed.). London, Longman, (1975).
- Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. London. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1985). Against Dogma. *ELT Journal*, 39(3), 158-160.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H.D. (2005). Interview with Henry G. Widdowson. *Elt News.com*. Retrieved from http://www.eltnews.com/features/interviews/2005/12/interview_with_henry_g_widdows.html (accessed December 2013).
- Widdowson, H. G. (2007). Un-applied Linguistics and Communicative Language Teaching. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17(2), 214-220.
- Wiemann, J.M. and Backlund, P. (1980). Current Theory and Research in Communicative Competence. *Review of Educational Research*, 50 (1), 185-190.
- Wiley, D. (2000) Connecting Learning Objects to Instructional Design Theory: A Definition, a Metaphor, and a Taxonomy. In D. Wiley (ed.). *The Instructional Use of Learning Objects*, Bloomington: Association for Educational Communications and Technology. Retrieved from <http://reusability.org/read/chapters/wiley.doc> (accessed March 2013).
- Wilkins, D.A. (1976). *Notional Syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University press.
- Willia, J. and Easingwood, N. (2004). *ICT and Primary Mathematics: A Teacher's Guide*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Williams, J. (1996). Focus on Form on Communicative Language Teaching: Research Findings and the Classroom Teacher. *TESOL Journal*, 4(4), 12-16.
- Williams, J. and Easingwood, N. (2004). *ICT and Primary Mathematics. A Teacher's Guide*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

- Willis, J. D. (1996). A Flexible Framework for Task-Based Learning. In J. Willis and D. Willis (eds.), *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*, Oxford: Heinemann, 235-256.
- Willis, J.D. (1990). *The Lexical Syllabus*. London: Collins COBUILD.
- Wilson, D. (2011). *Interview with Henry Widdowson*. Retrieved from: http://www.eltnews.com/features/interviews/2005/12/interview_with_henry_widdowson.html (accessed January 2014).
- Yang, A. and Cheung, C. (2003). Adapting Textbook Activities for Communicative Teaching and Cooperative Learning. *Forum*, 41(3), 16-30.
- Yorkston, K.M. and Beukelman, D.R. (1980). An Analysis of Connected Speech Samples of the Aphasia and Normal Speakers. *Journal of Speech and hearing Disorders*, 45(1), 27-36.
- Yunus, M., Salehi, H. And Chenzil, Ch. (2012). Integrating Social Networking Tools into ESL Writing Classroom: Strengths and Weaknesses. *English Language Teaching*, 5(8), 42-48.

APPENDICES¹

APPENDIX 6.1: SPEAKING AND WRITING ASSESSMENT TASK AND SCHEME SAMPLES PROVIDED IN THE NCFL

Sample Task (speaking): Using the picture, make up and tell a story — what happened two hours before the picture was taken? What happened afterwards? Specify who the people in the picture are; characterize them; tell the sequence of events; talk about when and where things happened. Time limit: 2 minutes.

Table 6.1a: A sample assessment scheme for evaluation of learners' speaking skill

Assessment areas:	Assigned point(s)
<i>Task achievement</i>	
Meets the time limit	0-1
Meets the content requirements of the task provided	0-1
<i>Communication skills</i>	
Describes/reports the sequence of events appropriately	0-1
Correctly defines the time of the events	0-1
<i>Language knowledge</i>	
Uses the language forms covered in the course	0-2
Adequately uses the grammatical tense forms	0-1
Uses the vocabulary covered during the course	0-1
<i>Creative language skills</i>	
Demonstrates imaginative skills	0-1
Is not daunted by linguistic challenges	0-1
	Total score: 10

(National Curriculum for Foreign Languages, 2011: 561)

Sample task (writing): Look at the bio-data presented and write a biography of the writer. Use the following constructions: Until..., Before..., from ...to, since.... Use a minimum of 100 words.

Table 6.1b: A sample assessment scheme for evaluation of learners' writing skills

Assessment areas:	Assigned point(s)
<i>Task Achievement</i>	
Meets the word limit	0-1
Meets the content requirements of the task provided	0-1
<i>Communication Skills</i>	
Describes/reports the sequence of events appropriately	0-2
Specifies the exact time of the events	0-2
<i>Language Knowledge</i>	
Uses the grammatical constructions and language forms	0-2
Uses the vocabulary covered in the course	0-2
<i>Creative language skills</i>	
Is not afraid to boldly use more complex language forms	0-1
	Total score: 10

¹ The numbering of these separate Appendices follows that of the chapters to which they relate.

APPENDIX 6.2: SAMPLES OF RECOMMENDED SYLLABUS CONTENTS FOR FUNCTIONAL LANGUAGE AND LEXIS IN ENGLISH

Table 6.1: The samples of the assessment task and scheme provided in the NCFL (Levels 1 and 2/CEFR A0-A1)

Rubrics	Functional language to be covered	
1.1. Social Interactions	Level 1	Level 2
Greeting/Saying Hello	-Hello! -Hi! / Hi Nick! -Good morning / afternoon / evening!	-Morning, mum / dad! -How are you? -Fine, thanks. -I'm fine.
Saying Goodbye/Farewell	-Goodbye! -Bye-bye! -Bye!	-Good night! -See you!
Introduction/meeting	-Hello, I'm Nick. -This is / It's John.	-My name's Jane. -Do you know Kate? -Nice to meet you.
Formal/informal address	-Please... -Honey!	-Sir / Madam... -Mr. / Mrs. / Miss Thomson...
Apologizing	-Sorry! / I'm sorry! -Excuse	-Excuse me, please! -That's / It's OK
Saying Thank you	-Thanks. -Thank you.	-Thank you so much. -Thank you very much.
Congratulating	-Happy Birthday! -Happy New Year! -Merry Christmas!	-The same to you. -Have a good time.
Praising/Encouraging	-Good for you! -Oh! Yes!	- Great! - Fine!

(National Curriculum for Foreign Languages, 2011)

Table 6.2: Recommended syllabus contents for vocabulary (Levels 3 and 4/CEFR A2)

Rubrics	Lexis to be covered	
2.1. Lexis	Level 3	Level 4
Body	Forehead; cheek; chin; wrist; palm; nail; bone; thumb; neck; stomach.	Eyelid; eyebrow; blood; elbow; fist; waist; breast; hip; chest; heart; heels.
Appearance	Good-looking; pleasant-looking; round/oval face; thin fingers; thin/thick brows.	Charming; medium, cute; high forehead; attractive; pale; gracious; wrinkled.
Characteristics	Noisy; scared; brave; polite; devoted; stupid; bright; useful; worried; hard-working.	Gloomy; exciting; delighted; curious; humorous; rude; impressive.
Clothes/accessories	Blouse; slippers; night-gown; sweater; trainers; earrings; sandals; collar; brooch; sunglasses; handbag; bracelet.	Pullover; swimming-suit; waistcoat; suit; fur coat; national clothes; tie; fan; buttons; necklace.
Hygiene	Shampoo; perfume; sponge.	Gel; make-up; nail polish.

APPENDIX 7.1A: TEACHER INTERVIEW (GEORGIAN)

გასაუბრება მასწავლებელთან

პირადი ინფორმაცია

გვარი, სახელი:

ასაკი:

სქესი:

სკოლის დასახელება:

მასწავლებლის აკადემიური კვალიფიკაცია:

უცხო ენის სწავლების გამოცდილება:

გაქვთ თუ არა გავლილი მასწავლებელთა ტრენინგი:

საკონტაქტო ინფორმაცია:

გასაუბრება

1. იცნობთ თუ არა განათლების სამინისტროს მიერ შემუშავებულ უცხოური ენების საგნობრივ პროგრამას და სტანდარტებს?
2. იცით თუ არა უცხო ენის სწავლების რა სახის მეთოდოლოგიური რეკომენდაციები და მიზნებია წარმოდგენილი ამ დოკუმენტში?
3. რამდენად ახერხებთ დოკუმენტში წარმოდგენილი რეკომენდაციების გათვალისწინებას სწავლების პროცესში?
4. როგორ დაახასიათებდით სწავლების კომუნიკაციურ მეთოდს, მის ძირითად პრინციპებს, სწავლების მიზნებსა და აქტივობებს?
5. როგორ გეხმობა, რა არის „კომუნიკაციის უნარი“, და ფორმით შეიძლება განვავითაროთ უცხო ენის მოსწავლეებში ეს კომპეტენცია?
6. რა მეთოდს ეფუძნება სახელმძღვანელო რომელსაც იყენებთ სწავლების პროცესში?
7. სახელმძღვანელოს გარდა, სხვა რა სახის მასალას იყენებთ სწავლების პროცესში?
8. რა სახის აქტივობებს ახორციელებთ სწავლების პროცესში?
9. რა წარმოადგენს თქვენთვის სწავლების პროცესში პრიორიტეტს – მოსწავლეებში ენობრივი უნარების განვითარება თუ უფრო ლინგვისტური ცოდნის მიწოდება?
10. როგორ დაახასიათებდით იმ მეთოდს რომელსაც იყენებთ?
11. რა ფორმით ახდენთ მოსწავლეთა წარმატების შეფასებას ენის სწავლების პროცესში წლის განმავლობაში? რას აქცევთ ყველაზე დიდ ყურადღებას შეფასებისას? (გრამატიკულ ცოდნას, ლექსიკის ცოდნას, ფონეტიკას, თუ მოსმენის, მეტყველების, კითხვის, წერის უნარებს).
12. ფიქრობთ თუ არა რომ მოსწავლის კომუნიკაციის უნარის შემოწმება მეტ სირთულეს უკავშირდება ვიდრე ენის გრამატიკისა და ლექსიკის ცოდნის შემოწმება?
13. რა სახის სირთულეებს აწყდებით სწავლების პროცესში? ფიქრობთ თუ არა რომ საქართველოში სწავლების კომუნიკაციური მეთოდის განხორციელება მეტ სირთულეს უკავშირდება ვიდრე სწავლების ტრადიციული, გრამატიკაზე ორიენტირებული მეთოდის ?

APPENDIX 7.1B TEACHER INTERVIEW (TRANSLATION)

Personal data

Age: ...

Sex: ...

The name of the school ...

What academic qualifications do you have? ...

How long have you been teaching English? ...

Have you had any formal training? ...

Contact information (tel. number, e-mail)...

Interview questions:

1. Is there any document provided by the Ministry of Education which defines the methodology and standards that need to be followed in the language classroom?
2. Are you aware of the foreign language teaching methodology recommendations and the teaching/learning goals that the document (National Curriculum for Foreign Languages) provides?
3. How closely do you follow the official recommendations provided in the National Curriculum for Foreign Languages? If not, what do you use as your methodology guideline instead?
4. How would you describe Communicative Language Teaching? Its main principles, goals, procedures?
5. How would you interpret the concept of Communicative Competence, and what would you say are the best ways of developing Communicative Competence in language learners?
6. What method is the coursebook you are using in the class based upon?
7. What other, if any, teaching materials do you use in the class?
8. What type of activities do you use most often in the lesson?
9. Which language areas do you focus on most in the lesson (skills, grammar, vocabulary, phonetics)?
10. Overall, how would you describe your own classroom teaching – more grammar- or communication-driven?
11. How do you measure students' progress in English throughout the year? What kind of testing tools/system do you adopt? What do you focus upon while assessing learners (speaking, writing abilities, or grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, for instance) ?
12. Do you think testing learners' communicative competence is related to more challenges than testing learners' linguist knowledge is?
13. What difficulties do you encounter in the process of teaching? Would you say communicative language teaching is related to more challenges than grammar-driven type of teaching approach is?

APPENDIX: 7.2: TEACHER INTERVIEW DATA ANALYSIS FORM

School : _____ Teacher : _____

1. Awareness of the official recommendations 1/2/3

2. Understanding 1/2/3

3. Identified challenges

4. Overall Impression

APPENDIX 7.3A: TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (GEORGIAN)

კითხვარი მასწავლებლებისთვის

გვარი, სახელი:
სკოლის დასახელება:
საკონტაქტო ინფორმაცია:
(ტელეფონი, ელ. ფოსტა)

ენის სწავლების კომუნიკაციური მეთოდი: ძირითადი პრინციპები

ხუთქულიანი შეფასების შკალაზე, მიუთითეთ თუ რამდენად ეთანხმებით ან არ ეთანხმებით წარმოდგენილ მოსაზრებებს; (დამატებითი კომენტარისათვის ან პასუხის დასაზუსტებლად, გამოიყენეთ კითხვის ქვემოთ მოცემული ხაზი)²

(1–კატეგორიულად არ ვეთანხმები; 2–არ ვეთანხმები; 3–მაქვს ნეიტრალური პოზიცია; 4–ვეთანხმები; 5–სავსებით ვეთანხმები)

1.ენისა და სწავლის თეორია

1. უცხო ენის სწავლების მთავარი მიზანია მოსწავლეს თავისუფალი მეტყველების უნარის განვითარებაში/ენის პრაქტიკულად გამოყენებაში შეუწყოს ხელი
2. უცხო ენის სწავლების მთავარი მიზანია მოსწავლეს გრამატიკულად გამართული მეტყველების განვითარებაში შეუწყოს ხელი
3. მნიშვნელოვანია მოსწავლეს დავეხმაროთ ისეთი კომუნიკაციური სტრატეგიების დაუფლებაში (ქვსტიკულაცია, პერფორმანსი, ა.შ.), რომელიც მას უცხო ენაზე კომუნიკაციისას წამოჭრილ სირთულეების გადალახვაში დაეხმარება.
4. უცხო ენას უფრო ადვილად ვსწავლობთ, როდესაც ენას ბუნებრივ გარემოში, ბუნებრივი გზით ვეუფლებით (იმ ქვეყანაში, სადაც შესასწავლ უცხო ენაზე მეტყველებენ, ამ ენაზე მოსაუბრე მეგობრებთან ურთიერთობით, ა.შ.)
5. უცხო ენის შესწავლა საკლასო ოთახში უფრო იოლია, როდესაც მასწავლებელი გიხსნის ენის წესებსა და ლექსიკას
6. ძალიან მნიშვნელოვანია მოსწავლეეთათვის ენის ფუნქციების სწავლება (მისაღება, დამშვიდობება, მობოდიშება, ა.შ.)
7. სასურველია, რომ ენის სწავლების პროცესი ინგლისურ ენაზე მიმდინარეობდეს
8. მნიშვნელოვანია, რომ მოსწავლეების მეტყველება *ახრობრივად* იყოს გამართული:
9. მნიშვნელოვანია, რომ მოსწავლეების მეტყველება *გრამატიკულად* იყოს გამართული
10. სწავლების პროცესში თითოეული მოსწავლის ინდივიდუალური სწავლის სტილი (ვიზუალური, სმენითი, კინესთეტიკური) უნდა იყოს გათვალისწინებული.
11. უცხო ენის სწავლისას უმთავრესია ენის უნარების შესწავლა (სმენის, მეტყველების, წერის და კითხვის).
12. უცხო ენის სწავლისას უმთავრესია ამ ენის გრამატიკის, ლექსიკისა და გამოთქმის შესწავლა.

² დანართში წარმოდგენილ კითხვარში არ არის მოცემული ორიგინალში არსებული ხუთქულიანი შკალის ამსახველი გრაფები.

ხუთბალიანი შეფასების შკალაზე, მიუთითეთ, თქვენი აზრით, რამდენად უწყობს ხელს წარმოდგენილი აქტივობები მითითებული უნარის განვითარებას:

4–ძალიან უწყობს ხელს; 3–უწყობს ხელს; 2–საშუალოდ უწყობს ხელს; 1–არ უწყობს ხელს; 0–სავსებით არ უწყობს ხელს.

კითხვის უნარი

- ა. სტუდენტები კითხულობენ სავარჯიშოს წინადადებებს ____ 13
 ბ. სტუდენტები განიხილავენ ტექსტთან დაკავშირებულ საკითხებს, მსჯელობენ; შემდგომ კითხულობენ ტექსტს ზოგადი ინფორმაციის მოსაპოვებლად, აჯამებენ პასუხებს; შემდგომ კითხულობენ იგივე ტექსტს დეტალური ინფორმაციის მოსაპოვებლად; მოსწავლეები მსჯელობენ წაკითხულ ტექსტში წარმოდგენილი ინფორმაციის ირგვლივ ____ 14

სმენის უნარი

- ა. მასწავლებელი კითხულობს ტექსტს სახელმძღვანელოდან, მოსწავლეები უსმენენ ____ 15
 ბ. მოსწავლეები ისმენენ ინფორმაციას ინტერნეტით; შემდგომ მსჯელობენ. ისმენენ ინფორმაციას ხელმეორედ, დეტალების დასაზუსტებლად; გამოთქვამენ პირად აზრს მიღებულ ინფორმაციასთან დაკავშირებით ____ 16

მეტყველების უნარი

- ა. მოსწავლეები ერთმანეთს შეკითხვებს უსვამენ სახელმძღვანელოდან ____ 17
 ბ. სტუდენტები აწვებენ დებატებს მწვავე საკითხის ირგვლივ ____ 18

წერის უნარი

- ა. მოსწავლეები დაფიდან იწერენ წინადადებებს ____ 19
 ბ. მოსწავლეები წერენ ელექტრონულ წერილს ვირტუალურ მეგობარს ინგლისში ____ 20

2.პროგრამის სტრუქტურა და სილაბუსი

21. ენის სწავლების პროგრამა უნდა მიჰყვებოდეს სკოლის ადმინისტრაციის/სამინისტროს მიერ მოწოდებული სახელმძღვანელოს
22. მნიშვნელოვანია კონკრეტული ჯგუფის ინდივიდუალური ინტერესებისა და შესაძლებლობების გათვალისწინება და პროგრამის შესაბამისი ადაპტირება
23. მნიშვნელოვანია კონკრეტული ჯგუფის ინდივიდუალური შესაძლებლობების გათვალისწინება და პროგრამის შესაბამისი ადაპტირება
24. შუალედური და საბოლოო ტესტირებისას, უნდა შემოწმდეს მოსწავლეების ენობრივი უნარები- მოსმენა, კითხვა, წერა, მეტყველება
25. შუალედური და საბოლოო ტესტირებისას უნდა შემოწმდეს მოსწავლეების ლინგვისტური ცოდნა – გრამატიკა, ლექსიკა, ფონეტიკა

3.მასწავლებლისა და მოსწავლის როლი

25. მნიშვნელოვანია მასწავლებელი იყოს კეთილგანწყობილი და მეგობრული სწავლების
26. მასწავლებელი უნდა იყოს საკლასო ოთახში ყურადღების ცენტრში და არა მოსწავლე
27. მოსწავლე უნდა იყოს სწავლების პროცესში ყურადღების ცენტრში და არა მასწავლებელი
28. მასწავლებელი სათანადოდ უნდა რეაგირებდეს სწავლის პროცესში მოსწავლეების მხრიდან სპონტანურად წამოჭრილ საჭიროებებზე

29. მოსწავლეები სწავლის პროცესში უნდა აქტიურობდნენ –სვადნენ შეკითხვებს, ინედნენ ინიციატივას, ცდილობდნენ მათთვის საჭირო ინფორმაციის მოპოვებას
30. მოსწავლეები უნდა გრძნობდნენ სწავლის პროცესში საკუთარ პასუხისმგებლობას

4.საკლასო ოთახში ურთიერთობის ფორმატი

31. სწავლის პროცესში ძირითადად მოსწავლეებს შორის უნდა ხორციელდებოდეს ურთიერთობა
32. სწავლის პროცესში ძირითადად მასწავლებელსა და მოსწავლეებს შორის უნდა ხორციელდებოდეს ინტერაქცია
33. გაკვეთილზე ძირითადად მოსწავლეები უნდა საუბრობდნენ
34. გაკვეთილზე ძირითადად მასწავლებელი უნდა საუბრობდეს
35. წყვილებში/ჯგუფებში მუშაობა მეტად ეფექტურს ხდის ენის სწავლის პროცესს
36. წყვილებში/ჯგუფებში მუშაობა ხელს უწყობს მოსწავლეებს შორის ბუნებრივ ინტერაქციას
37. საკლასო ოთახში სასიამოვნო, არასტრესული ატმოსფერო უნდა იყოს

5.შეცდომების გასწორება

38. აუცილებელია მოსწავლის ყოველი შეცდომის გასწორება
39. მასწავლებელი მოსწავლეებს საშუალებას უნდა აძლევდეს თვითონ სცადონ დაშვებული შეცდომების გასწორება
40. მასწავლებელი მოსწავლეს არ უნდა აწვევტილებდეს საუბარს (დისკუსიისას, დებატებისას), და დაშვებულ შეცდომას მოგვიანებით უსწორებდეს

6. სასწავლო მასალა და აქტივობები

41. სწავლების პროცესში შეძლებისდაგვარად მეტი აუთენტური სასწავლო მასალა (ქურნალები, გაზეთები, წიგნები-ორიგინალში) უნდა გამოიყენებოდეს
42. როდური თამაშები და სიმულაციები ხელს უწყობს ენის კომუნიკაციური გზით შესწავლას
43. აქტივობა ჭეშმარიტად კომუნიკაციური ხასიათისაა, როცა ხდება მოსწავლეებს შორის მათთვის უცნობი ინფორმაციის გაცვლა
44. აქტივობა ჭეშმარიტად კომუნიკაციური ხასიათისაა, როცა მოსწავლეს საუბრისას აქვს თავისუფალი არჩევანი – თვითონ ირჩევს სათქმელის შინაარსსა და ფორმას
45. აქტივობა, რომელიც ტექსტში გამოტოვებული ადგილების შევსებას და წარმოდგენილი პასუხებიდან სწორი ვარიანტის შემოხაზვაში მდგომარეობს, (gap-fill and multiple-choice exercises) მოსწავლის *მხედროდ ლინგვისტიკურ* ცოდნას (და არა უნარებს) ავითარებს
46. ისეთი სახის აქტივობები, როგორიცაა: დებატები, დისკუსიები, პრეზენტაციები – მოსწავლეში თავისუფლად მეტყველების უნარს ავითარებს

7. უცხო ენის სწავლების კომუნიკაციური მეთოდის გამოყენებასთან დაკავშირებული სირთულეები

47. იმისათვის, რომ ენის სწავლების კომუნიკაციური მეთოდის გამოყენება შეძლოს, მასწავლებელი სრულყოფილად უნდა ფლობდეს იმ უცხო ენას, რომელსაც ასწავლის
48. მასწავლებელს კარგად უნდა ესმოდეს ენის სწავლების კომუნიკაციური მეთოდის ძირითადი პრინციპები და თეორია
49. იმისათვის, რომ კომუნიკაციური მეთოდის გამოყენება შეძლოს, მასწავლებელმა უნდა გაიაროს სპეციალური ტრენინგი
50. არსებობს გარკვეული შიშის ფაქტორი მასწავლებლების მხრიდან სიახლეების პრაქტიკაში დანერგვასთან დაკავშირებით – გრამატიკაზე ორიენტირებული სწავლების ნაცვლად, ახალი, კომუნიკაციაზე ორიენტირებული მეთოდის გამოყენება.
51. მასწავლებლებს ხშირად უჭირთ ტრადიციული მეთოდის გავლენისგან თავის დაღწევა, რადგან თვითონ ასეთი მეთოდით აქვთ ნასწავლი უცხო ენა, რაც მათ კომინუკაციური მეთოდის გამოყენებაში უშლით ხელს

სტუდენტებთან დაკავშირებული სირთულეები

52. ენის სწავლების კომუნიკაციური მეთოდი საჭიროზე მეტ დამოუკიდებლობასა და ავტონომიას ანიჭებს მოსწავლეს სწავლის პროცესში
53. კომუნიკაციური აქტივობების წარმართვისას რთულია მოსწავლეების ჩართვა საუბარში (ზოგი მოსწავლე მორცხვია, ზოგს ლაპარაკი ეზარება, ა.შ.)
54. ძნელია აიძულო ქართველი მოსწავლეები ერთმანეთში უცხო ენაზე ისაუბრონ უცხო ენის გაკვეთილზე, როცა იციან, რომ თანამოსაუბრეს ქართული ენა უკეთ ესმის
55. კომუნიკაციური მეთოდის გამოყენება ენის ცოდნის სხვადასხვა დონის მქონე მოსწავლეებთან დიდ სირთულეებს უკავშირდება

სხვა სირთულეები

56. მოსწავლეთა დიდ ჯგუფთან კომუნიკაციური მეთოდის გამოყენება სირთულეებს უკავშირდება (ხმაური, დისციპლინის პრობლემები, მასწავლებლის ყურადღების თანაბრად გადანაწილება, საკმარისი სივრცე საკლასო ოთახში)
57. საგამოცდო სისტემა, რომელიც მოსწავლეების გრამატიკისა და ლექსიკის ცოდნას ამოწმებს, ნეგატიურ გავლენას ახდენს ენის სწავლების კომუნიკაციურ ხასიათზე
58. იმისათვის, რომ ენის სწავლების კომუნიკაციური მეთოდი იქნას გამოყენებული საჭიროა გარკვეული აღჭურვილობა (კომპიუტერი, ინტერნეტი, დღე პლეიერი, ა.შ.), რისი უქონლობაც ართულებს ამ მეთოდის გამოყენებას
59. ენის სწავლების კომუნიკაციური მეთოდის გამოყენებას წინასწარ განსაზღვრული სავალდებულო სასწავლო გეგმა ართულებს (მასწავლებელი ვერ ერგება მოსწავლეების ინდივიდუალურ საჭიროებებს და ინტერესებს)
60. კომუნიკაციურ აქტივობების ჩატარებას დიდი დრო სჭირდება, რაც ხშირად დროის უკმარისობის პრობლემას ქმნის
61. მოსწავლეების კომუნიკაციური უნარების შემოწმება მასწავლებლის მხრიდან მეტ ძალისხმევასა და გამოცდილებას მოითხოვს, ვიდრე ტრადიციულ, გრამატიკულ სავარჯიშოებსა და ლექსიკაზე დაფუძნებული გამოცდის ფორმა

APPENDIX 7.3B: TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (TRANSLATION)**Personal data**

Full name: ...

School name: ...

Age: ...

Sex: ...

Specialization Academic degree: ...

Language teaching experience: ...

Contact information: ...

On a five point scale, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the below presented statements (1—strongly disagree; 2—disagree; 3—have a neutral position; 4—agree; 5—strongly agree)³

1. Language and learning theory

1. Developing students' fluency is very important
2. Developing students' accuracy is very important
3. It is important to develop in learners the ability to avoid communication break-down - coping strategies, which can keep communication going when language knowledge is still imperfect (gestures, paraphrasing, etc)
4. Languages are learned better when they are acquired (picked up without much formal information input) rather than learned (in a formal way)

³ The questionnaire presented in this appendix does not include five-scale boxes presented in the original questionnaire.

5. Languages are better learned in a formal setting (classroom) when the rules of the language are explained by the teacher
6. It is very important that students are taught language functions, such as greeting, apologizing, etc
7. It is desirable that the target foreign language is spoken in the classroom
8. It is more important that the target foreign language that the learner uses *was meaningful* than grammatically correct
9. It is more important that the target foreign language that the learner uses *was grammatically correct* than meaningful
10. In the process of teaching, individual learners' needs should be considered
11. It is very important to teach learners language skills (speaking, listening, reading, writing)
12. It is very important to teach learners grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation

In a five-point scale, mark how much you think the below presented activities help develop the indicated language skill

4—helps greatly; **3**—helps; **2**—helps to some extent; **1**—does not help much; **0**—does not help at all

Reading skill

- a. Students read out sentences of the exercise _____13.
- b. Students discuss the issues related to the reading passage, make predictions; after reading the text, students check their guesses and answer comprehension questions and discuss _____14.

Listening

- a. Teacher reads out a text from the coursebook, students listen and answer questions teacher asks about the text _____15.
- b. Students listen to the BBC episode; they discuss the information they got. They listen the second time for more details _____16.

Speaking

- a. Students ask each other questions from the coursebook _____17.
- b. Students hold a debate about a controversial issue _____18.

Writing

- a. Students write down sentences from the board/coursebook _____19.
- b. Students write an e-mail to a virtual friend in England _____20.

2. Course design and syllabus

On a five point scale, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the below presented statements (1—strongly disagree; 2—disagree; 3—have a neutral position; 4—agree; 5—strongly agree)⁴

21. It is important to cater to the individual interest of a group and adapt the syllabus accordingly
22. It is important to take into account the abilities of individual group members and adapt the syllabus accordingly
23. In the mid-term and final language tests, learners' language skills (speaking, reading, writing, listening) should be tested
24. In the mid-term and final language tests, learners' grammar, vocabulary or phonology should be tested.

3. Teacher's and learner's roles and characteristics

25. It is extremely important that the teacher is friendly and encouraging in the lesson
26. The teacher should be the center of attention in the lesson, not the learner
27. The learner should be the center of attention in the lesson, not the teacher

⁴ The questionnaire presented in this appendix does not include five-scale boxes presented in the original questionnaire.

28. Teacher should be reactive to students' spontaneous needs
29. Students should be active in the lesson – taking initiative, asking for information, seeking clarification, expressing opinions, debating
30. Students should be responsible for their own learning
31. There should be mostly student-student interaction in the language classroom
32. There should be mostly teacher-student interaction in the language classroom
33. There should be mostly student talking (ST) in the language classroom
34. There should be mostly teacher talking (TT) in the language classroom
35. By working in pairs/groups learners learn from one another
36. Working in pairs/groups contributes to natural interaction and meaningful language production among learners in the language classroom
37. The atmosphere in the classroom should be fun, stimulating and stress-free

5. Error correction

38. It is important to correct learners' every error immediately
39. It is a good idea to encourage learners to self-correct/peer-correct
40. The teacher should not interrupt and should provide the delayed feedback/correction when pupils are engaged in a free speaking activity (debate, discussion, presentation)

6. Materials and activities

41. As many authentic materials should be used as possible
42. Role-playing and simulations are a very good way to practice the language communicatively
43. A truly communicative activity is characterized by information gap and freedom of choice
44. A truly communicative activity is characterized by freedom of expression – learners' can choose the contents as well as the form of the message they want to deliver
45. Activities, like fill in the gaps, multiple choice tests, question and answer, do not promote fluency in the language learner
46. Debates, discussions, presentations promote the Communicative Competence in the language learner

7. CLT-related challenges

Teacher-related difficulties

47. Unless the teacher is proficient in the target foreign language, she/he will not be able to teach communicatively
48. Unless the teacher is well aware what exactly Communicative Competence means, she/he will not be able to efficiently apply CLT
49. Unless the teacher has had enough professional training it is difficult to efficiently apply CLT in the classroom
50. There is the fear of applying a new method on the part of the teacher
51. It is often difficult for a teacher to overcome the influence of the traditional way of teaching that she/he was herself/himself exposed to

Learner-related difficulties

52. CLT delegates too much independence and autonomy to the learner in the process of learning
53. It is difficult to involve all students in communicative activities (some are shy, reserved, are lazy to speak out and be active, etc)
54. It is difficult to make Georgian learners speak in the target foreign language among themselves
55. Learners with mixed levels and abilities are especially difficult to deal with in the CLT classroom.

Other difficulties

56. Applying CLT with large groups of students often results in difficulties (noise, discipline problems, lack of individual attention, not enough space)

57. The examination system, which focuses of testing learners' knowledge of language forms (grammar and vocabulary), negatively affects teachers'/learners' motivation to use CLT
58. Special teaching equipment is needed to apply CLT in the language classroom (a computer, a CD player, the Internet, etc)
59. The officially pre-defined language curriculum to which language teachers have to adhere does not contribute to CLT application in the classroom (teachers cannot adapt teaching materials or cater to students' individual needs and interests)
60. CLT activities can be time consuming, which often result in lack of teaching time
61. It is much more difficult to assess learners' communicative skills than grammar or vocabulary

APPENDIX: 7.4: INTERVIEW RESULTS: CLT-RELATED DIFFICULTIES

Low language proficiency makes it difficult for teachers to practice CLT

	Frequency	Percentage
I am not facing this problem	16	76.2
I am facing this problem	5	23.8
Total	21	100

There is an influence of the older methods

	Frequency	Percentage
I am not facing this problem	19	90.5
I am facing this problem	2	9.5
Total	21	100

The fear of applying a novel method of teaching

	Frequency	Percentage
I am not facing this problem	11	52.4
I am facing this problem	10	47.6
Total	21	100

A better theoretical understanding of CLT

	Frequency	Percentage
I am not facing this problem	17	81.0
I am facing this problem	4	19.0
Total	21	100

Learners are given too much independence in the learning process

	Frequency	Percentage
I am not facing this problem	21	100

It is difficult to involve all learners in the study process

	Frequency	Percentage
I am not facing this problem	9	42.9
I am facing this problem	12	57.1
Total	21	100

Learners with mixed levels and abilities are difficult to deal with

	Frequency	Percentage
I am not facing this problem	12	57.1
I am facing this problem	9	42.9
Total	21	100

There are not enough methodology trainings

	Frequency	Percentage
I am not facing this problem	11	52.4
I am facing this problem	10	47.6
Total	21	100

Lack of teaching resources

	Frequency	Percentage
I am not facing this problem	3	14.3
I am facing this problem	18	85.7
Total	21	100

Little time to cover the course

	Frequency	Percentage
I am not facing this problem	11	52.4
I am facing this problem	10	47.6
Total	21	100

Examination system which focuses on testing knowledge about language forms

	Frequency	Percentage
I am not facing this problem	20	95.2
I am facing this problem	1	4.8
Total	21	100

Pre-determined syllabus which makes CLT application difficult

	Frequency	Percentage
I am not facing this problem	21	100

It is difficult to apply CLT with large classes

	Frequency	Percentage
I am not facing this problem	4	19.0
I am facing this problem	17	81.0
Total	21	100

CLT takes much preparation time

	Frequency	Percentage
I am not facing this problem	15	71.4
I am facing this problem	6	28.6
Total	21	100

CLT-related classroom management problems

	Frequency	Percentage
I am not facing this problem	3	14.3
I am facing this problem	18	85.7
Total	21	100

APPENDIX 7.5: QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS: TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS CLT⁵

1. Developing students' fluency is very important

	Frequency	Percentage
Neutral	3	3.1
Agree	22	22.9
Strongly Agree	71	74.0
Total	96	100.0

2. Developing students' accuracy is very important

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	3	3.1
Disagree	15	15.6
Neutral	22	22.9
Agree	35	36.5
Strongly Agree	21	21.9
Total	96	100.0

3. It is important to develop in learners the ability to avoid communication break-down – coping strategies which can keep communication going when language knowledge is still imperfect (gestures, paraphrasing, etc)

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0
Disagree	2	2.1
Neutral	5	5.2
Agree	32	33.3
Strongly Agree	56	58.3
Total	96	100.0

4. Languages are learned better when they are acquired (picked up without much formal information input) rather than learned (in a formal way)

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	2	2.1
Neutral	3	3.1
Agree	16	16.7
Strongly Agree	75	78.1
Total	96	100.0

5. Languages are better learned in a formal setting (classroom) when the rules of the language are explained by the teacher

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0
Disagree	22	22.9
Neutral	24	25.0
Agree	35	36.5
Strongly Agree	14	14.6
Total	96	100.0

⁵ The numbering of the items in this appendix follow that of the original questionnaire (see Appendix 7.3).

6. It is very important that students are taught language functions, such as, greeting, apologizing

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	2	2.1
Neutral	8	8.3
Agree	28	29.2
Strongly Agree	58	60.4
Total	96	100.0

7. It is desirable that the target foreign language is spoken in the classroom

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0
Disagree	4	4.2
Neutral	4	4.2
Agree	26	27.1
Strongly Agree	61	63.5
Total	96	100.0

8. It is important that the target foreign language that the learner uses is meaningful

	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	51	53.1
Strongly Agree	45	46.9
Total	96	100.0

9. It is important that the target foreign language that the learner uses is grammatically correct

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	2	2.1
Neutral	9	9.4
Agree	61	63.5
Strongly Agree	24	25.0
Total	96	100.0

10. In the process of teaching, individual needs of learners should be considered

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0
Disagree	4	4.2
Neutral	7	7.3
Agree	39	40.6
Strongly Agree	45	46.9
Total	96	100.0

11. It is very important to teach learners language skills (speaking, listening, reading, writing)

	Frequency	Percentage
Neutral	1	1.0
Agree	14	14.6
Strongly Agree	81	84.4
Total	96	100.0

12. It is very important to teach learners grammar, lexis and pronunciation⁶

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	1	1.0
Neutral	4	4.2
Agree	27	28.1
Strongly Agree	64	66.7
Total	96	100.0

⁶Items 13 – 20, dealing with CLT activities, are presented separately in Appendix 7.6.

21. It is important to cater to individual interests of a group and adapt the syllabus accordingly

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	4	4.2
Neutral	9	9.4
Agree	33	34.4
Strongly Agree	50	52.1
Total	96	100.0

22. It is important to cater to individual abilities of a group and adapt the syllabus accordingly

	Frequency	Percentage
Neutral	13	13.5
Agree	39	40.6
Strongly Agree	44	45.8
Total	96	100.0

23. In the mid-term and final language tests, learners' language skills should be tested – speaking, writing, reading and listening

	Frequency	Percentage
Useful	3	3.1
Very useful	93.1	96.9
Total	96	100.0

24. In the mid-term and final language tests, learners' linguistic knowledge should be tested – grammar, vocabulary or phonology

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0
Disagree	2	2.1
Neutral	16	16.7
Agree	33	34.4
Strongly Agree	44	45.8
Total	96	100.0

25. It is extremely important that the teacher is friendly and encouraging in the lesson

	Frequency	Percentage
Neutral	1	1.0
Agree	11	11.5
Strongly Agree	84	87.5
Total	96	100.0

26. The teacher should be the center of attention in the lesson, not the learner

	Frequency	Percentage
Very little use	11	11.5
Useful to some extent	55	57.3
Useful	18	18.8
Very useful	15	12.5
Total	96	100.0

27. The learner should be the centre of attention in the lesson, not the teacher

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	1	1.0
Neutral	7	7.3
Agree	30	31.3
Strongly Agree	58	60.4
Total	96	100.0

28. Teacher should be reactive to students' spontaneous needs

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	2	2.1
Disagree	12	12.5
Neutral	33	34.4
Agree	24	25.0
Strongly Agree	25	26.0
Total	96	100.0

29. Learners should be active in the lesson – showing initiative, asking for information and expressing one's own opinions

	Frequency	Percentage
Neutral	3	3.1
Agree	12	12.5
Strongly Agree	81	84.4
Total	96	100.0

30. Students should be responsible for their own learning

	Frequency	Percentage
Neutral	1	1.0
Agree	7	7.3
Strongly Agree	88	91.7
Total	96	100.0

31. There should be mostly student-student interaction in the language classroom

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	15	15.6
Neutral	34	35.4
Agree	22	22.9
Strongly Agree	25	26.0
Total	96	100.0

32. There should be mostly student-student interaction in the language classroom

	Frequency	Percentage
Very little use	4	4.2
Useful to some extent	10	10.4
Useful	21	21.9
Very useful	61	63.3
Total	96	100.0

33. There should be mostly student talking (ST) in the language classroom

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0
Disagree	4	4.2
Neutral	6	6.3
Agree	43	44.8
Strongly Agree	42	43.8
Total	96	100.0

34. There should be mostly teacher talking (TT) in the language classroom

	Frequency	Percentage
Very little use	12	12.5
Useful to some extent	47	49.0
Useful	26	27.1
Very useful	11	11.5
Total	96	100.0

35. By working in pairs/groups learners learn from one another

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	1	1.0
Neutral	1	1.0
Agree	48	50.0
Strongly Agree	46	47.9
Total	96	100.0

36. Working in pairs/groups contributes to natural interaction and meaningful language production among learners in the language classroom

	Frequency	Percentage
Neutral	1	1.0
Agree	33	34.4
Strongly Agree	62	64.6
Total	96	100.0

37. The atmosphere in the classroom should be fun, stimulating and stress-free

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	1	1.0
Neutral	2	2.1
Agree	12	12.5
Strongly Agree	81	84.4
Total	96	100.0

38. It is important to correct learners' every error immediately

	Frequency	Percentage
Very little use	7	7.3
Useful to some extent	33	34.4
Useful	18	18.8
Very useful	38	39.5
Total	96	100.0

39. It is a good idea to encourage learners to self-correct/peer-correct

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	2	2.1
Neutral	2	2.1
Agree	48	50.0
Strongly Agree	44	45.8
Total	96	100.0

40. The teacher should not interrupt and should provide the delayed feedback/correction when pupils are engaged in a free speaking activity (debate, discussion, presentation)

	Frequency	Percentage
Neutral	1	1.0
Agree	39	40.6
Strongly Agree	56	58.3
Total	96	100.0

41. As many authentic materials should be used as possible

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	3	3.1
Neutral	14	14.6
Agree	46	47.9
Strongly Agree	33	34.4
Total	96	100.0

42. Role-playing and simulations are a very good way to practice the language communicatively

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	2	2.1
Neutral	4	4.1
Agree	36	37.5
Strongly Agree	54	56.3
Total	96	100.0

43. Truly communicative activity is characterized by information gap

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	7	7.3
Neutral	14	14.6
Agree	43	44.8
Strongly Agree	32	33.3
Total	96	100.0

44. A truly communicative activity is characterized by freedom of expression –learners choose what to say themselves

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	7	7.3
Neutral	21	21.9
Agree	42	43.8
Strongly Agree	26	27.1
Total	96	100.0

45. Activities, like fill in the gaps, multiple choice tests, question and answer, do not promote fluency in the language learner

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	4	4.2
Disagree	30	31.3
Neutral	18	18.8
Agree	29	30.2
Strongly Agree	15	15.6
Total	96	100.0

46. Debates, discussions, presentations promote the communicative competence in the language learner

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	1	1.0
Neutral	1	1.0
Agree	26	27.1
Strongly Agree	68	70.8
Total	96	100.0

APPENDIX 7.6: QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS: TEACHERS' EVALUATIONS OF LANGUAGE ACTIVITIES⁷

13. Students read out the sentences of an exercise

	Frequency	Percentage
Not useful at all	10	10.4
Very little use	18	18.8
Useful to some extent	36	37.5
Useful	30	31.3
Very useful	2	2.1
Total	96	100.0

14. Students discuss the issues related to the reading passage, make predictions; after reading the text, students check their guesses and answer comprehension questions

	Frequency	Percentage
Useful to some extent	4	4.2
Useful	8	8.3
Very useful	84	87.5
Total	96	100.0

15. Teacher reads out a text from the course book, students listen and answer questions, teacher asks about the text

	Frequency	Percentage
Not useful at all	7	7.3
Very little use	11	11.5
Useful to some extent	47	49.0
Useful	17	17.7
Very useful	14	14.6
Total	96	100.0

16. Students listen to the BBC episode; they discuss the information they got, they listen the second time for more details

	Frequency	Percentage
Not useful at all	2	2.1
Very little use	2	2.1
Useful to some extent	5	5.2
Useful	19	19.8
Very useful	68	70.8
Total	96	100.0

17. Students ask each other questions from the course book

	Frequency	Percentage
Not useful at all	4	4.2
Very little use	9	9.4
Useful to some extent	32	33.3
Useful	27	28.1
Very useful	24	25.0
Total	96	100.0

⁷The numbering of the items in this appendix follows that of the original questionnaire (see Appendix 7.3).

18. Students hold a debate about a controversial issue

	Frequency	Percentage
Not useful at all	1	1.0
Useful to some extent	5	5.2
Useful	10	10.4
Very useful	80	83.3
Total	96	100.0

19. Students write down sentences from the board/course book

	Frequency	Percentage
Not useful at all	9	9.4
Very little use	20	20.8
Useful to some extent	42	43.8
Useful	17	17.7
Very useful	8	8.3
Total	96	100.0

20. Students write an e-mail to a virtual friend

	Frequency	Percentage
Not useful at all	1	1.0
Very little use	1	1.0
Useful to some extent	5	5.2
Useful	29	30.2
Very useful	60	62.5
Total	96	100.0

APPENDIX 7.7: QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS: TEACHERS' EVALUATIONS OF CLT-RELATED DIFFICULTIES

47. Unless the teacher is proficient in the target foreign language, she/he will not be able to teach communicatively

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	1	1.0
Neutral	2	2.1
Agree	15	15.6
Strongly Agree	78	81.3
Total	96	100.0

48. Unless the teacher is well aware what exactly Communicative Competence means, she/he will not be able to efficiently apply CLT

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	2	2.1
Neutral	2	2.1
Agree	38	39.6
Strongly Agree	54	56.3
Total	96	100.0

49. Unless the teacher has had a professional teachers' training in methodology, she/he will not be able to teach communicatively

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	6	6.3
Neutral	14	14.6
Agree	41	42.7
Strongly Agree	35	36.5
Total	96	100.0

50. There is fear of applying a new method on the part of the teacher

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	3	3.1
Disagree	9	9.4
Neutral	18	18.8
Agree	31	32.3
Strongly Agree	35	36.5
Total	96	100.0

51. It is often difficult for a teacher to overcome the influence of the traditional way of teaching that she/he was herself/himself exposed to

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	8	8.3
Disagree	18	18.8
Neutral	21	21.9
Agree	31	32.3
Strongly Agree	18	18.8
Total	96	100.0

52. CLT delegates too much independence and autonomy to the learner in the process of learning

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	4	4.2
Disagree	33	34.4
Neutral	30	31.3
Agree	17	17.7
Strongly Agree	12	12.5
Total	96	100.0

53. It is difficult to involve all students in communicative activities (some are shy, reserved, are lazy to speak out and be active, etc)

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0
Disagree	24	25.0
Neutral	12	12.5
Agree	42	43.8
Strongly Agree	17	17.7
Total	96	100.0

54. It is difficult to make Georgian learners speak in the target foreign language among themselves

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	2	2.1
Disagree	19	19.8
Neutral	23	24.0
Agree	35	36.5
Strongly Agree	17	17.7
Total	96	100.0

55. Learners with mixed levels and abilities are especially difficult to deal with in CLT Lesson

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	5	5.2
Neutral	10	10.4
Agree	49	51.0
Strongly Agree	32	33.3
Total	96	100.0

56. Applying CLT with large groups of students often results in difficulties (noise, discipline problems, lack of individual attention, not enough space)

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	5	5.2
Neutral	10	10.4
Agree	50	52.1
Strongly Agree	31	32.3
Total	96	100.0

57. The examination system, which focuses of testing learners' knowledge of language forms negatively affects teachers/learners motivation to use CLT

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	8	8.3
Disagree	52	54.2
Neutral	20	20.8
Agree	10	10.4
Strongly Agree	6	6.3
Total	96	100.0

58. Special teaching equipment is needed to apply CLT in the language classroom (a computer, a CD player, the Internet, etc)

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0
Disagree	5	5.2
Neutral	8	8.3
Agree	32	33.3
Strongly Agree	50	52.1
Total	96	100.0

59. Officially pre-defined language curriculum to which language teachers have to adhere does not contribute to CLT application in the classroom (teachers cannot adapt teaching materials or cater to students' individual needs and interests)

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	3	3.1
Disagree	23	24.0
Neutral	30	31.3
Agree	31	32.3
Strongly Agree	9	9.4
Total	96	100.0

60. CLT activities can be time consuming, which often results in lack of teaching time

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0
Disagree	29	30.2
Neutral	19	19.8
Agree	35	36.5
Strongly Agree	12	12.5
Total	96	100.0

61. It is much more difficult to assess learners' communicative skills than grammar or vocabulary

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	2	2.1
Disagree	6	6.3
Neutral	7	7.3
Agree	42	43.8
Strongly Agree	39	40.6
Total	96	100.0

APPENDIX 8.1A: LEARNER QUESTIONNAIRE (GEORGIAN)

კითხვარი მოსწავლეებისთვის

ნაწილი I

1. სახელი და გვარი
2. სკოლა
3. ასაკი რამდენი წელია ამ სკოლაში სწავლობთ? სად სწავლობდით მანამდე?
4. რამდენი წელია უცხო ენას სწავლობთ სკოლაში?
5. სკოლის გარეთ თუ გისწავლიათ უცხო ენა? (კერძო სკოლაში, კერძო მასწავლებელთან?) სად? რამდენი წელი?

შემოხაზეთ ა. ან ბ. ან ორივე ვარიანტი

- ა. უკეთესად ვსწავლობ მაშინ, როდესაც უცხო ენის გაკვეთილზე ქართულად ვსაუბრობ.
- ბ. უკეთესად ვსწავლობ მაშინ, როდესაც უცხო ენის გაკვეთილზე უცხო ენაზე ვსაუბრობ.
- ა. უკეთესად მესმის ტექსტი, როდესაც ტექსტის ირგვლივ ვმსჯელობთ, და მერე ვკითხულობთ და ახალი სიტყვების მნიშვნელობის გამოცნობას თავად ვცდილობ და შემდეგ მასწავლებელთან ერთად განვიხილავ.
- ბ. უკეთესად მესმის ტექსტი, როდესაც ტექსტს და უცხო სიტყვებს ვიზუალიზირებ.
- ა. გაკვეთილზე საუბრისას, მეტ ყურადღებას ვაქცევ იმას, თუ რაზე ვსაუბრობ.
- ბ. გაკვეთილზე საუბრისას, მეტ ყურადღებას ვაქცევ იმას, თუ რამდენად სწორად ვამბობ სათქმელს.
- ა. მირჩევნია მასწავლებელი არ მაწვევტინებდეს საუბარს და შეცდომებს მოგვიანებით მისწორებდეს.
- ბ. მირჩევნია მასწავლებელი ყველა ჩემ შეცდომას საუბრის დროსვე მისწორებდეს.
- ა. უკეთესია, როდესაც მასწავლებელი მაძლევს შესაძლებლობას და მეხმარება დაშვებული შეცდომა თვითონ გავასწორო.
- ბ. უკეთესია, როდესაც მასწავლებელი თვითონ მისწორებს შეცდომებს.
- ა. გაკვეთილზე მეტწილად მოსწავლეები უნდა ურთიერთობდნენ ერთმანეთში.
- ბ. გაკვეთილზე მასწავლებელი უნდა იყოს ყურადღების ცენტრში და იგი უნდა წარმართავდეს გაკვეთილს.
- ა. გაკვეთილზე ძირითადად მასწავლებელი უნდა საუბრობდეს.
- ბ. გაკვეთილზე მეტწილად მოსწავლეები უნდა საუბრობდნენ.
- ა. უკეთესად ვსწავლობ და ნაკლებად დაძაბული ვარ, როდესაც დავალებებს კლასში წვეილებში/ჯგუფებში ვასრულებთ.
- ბ. უკეთესად ვსწავლობ, როდესაც დავალებებს კლასში მარტო ვასრულებ.
- ა. უკეთესად ვსწავლობ, როდესაც გაკვეთილზე ვვაქტიურობ: ვსვამ შეკითხვებს, ვითხოვ განმარტებას, განვმარტავ საკუთარ აზრს.
- ბ. უკეთესად ვსწავლობ, როდესაც გაკვეთილზე ჩემთვის, ჩუმი და გზივარ და მარტო ვმუშაობ; ვსაუბრობ მხოლოდ მაშინ, როდესაც მასწავლებელი მოითხოვს ამას.
- ა. მასწავლებელი ბავშვებს უნდა აძლევდეს საშუალებას თავითონ მიხედნენ კონტექსტიდან თუ როგორ მოქმედებს ესა თუ ის წესი.
- ბ. მასწავლებელმა წესი მოსწავლეებს თვითონ უნდა აუხსნას.

- ა. მასწავლებელი მეგობრული და კეთილგანწყობილი უნდა იყოს.
 ბ. მასწავლებელი უნდა იყოს მკაცრი და მომთხოვნი.
- ა. მასწავლებელი თითოეულ მოსწავლეს ინდივიდუალურ ყურადღებას უნდა აქცევდეს.
 ბ. მასწავლებელი მთლიანობაში კლასს უნდა ასწავლიდეს და თითოეული მოსწავლის პრობლემაზე გაკვეთილზე დროს არ უნდა კარგავდეს.
- ა. გაკვეთილზე მეტი ყურადღება ენის უნარების (საუბარი, მოსმენა, წერა, კითხვა) განვითარებას უნდა ეთმობოდეს.
 ბ. გაკვეთილზე მეტი დრო გრამატიკის, ლექსიკისა და ფონეტიკის შესწავლას უნდა ეთმობოდეს.
- ა. უკეთესი გამოცდაზე ენის უნარები (საუბარი, მოსმენა, წერა, კითხვა) მოწმდებოდეს.
 ბ. უკეთესი გამოცდაზე გრამატიკის, ლექსიკისა და ფონეტიკის ცოდნა მოწმდებოდეს.
- ა. სწავლის პროცესს სასიამოვნოს ხდის ისეთი სასწავლო მასალის გამოყენება, როგორიცაა ჟურნალი უცხო ენაზე, გაზეთი, სტატია ინტერნეტიდან.
 ბ. სწავლება მხოლოდ სახელმძღვანელოს მიხედვით უნდა ხორციელდებოდეს.
- ა. გაკვეთილზე მინდა ვსწავლობდე იმას, რასაც ვიცი რომ გამოცდაზე მომთხოვენ
 ბ. გაკვეთილზე მინდა მასწავლიდნენ იმას, რაც ვიცი, რომ რეალურ ცხოვრებაში გამოიადგება
- ა. ისეთი აქტივობა, რომელიც რეალურ ცხოვრებაში არსებულ სიტუაციას ჰგავს, სწავლის პროცესს მეტად სასიამოვნოს და სასარგებლოს ხდის. (მაგ. სასურველი ინფორმაციის მოპოვება, არსებული პრობლემის გადაჭრა, დებატები, ა.შ.)
 ბ. მარტივი, აქტივობები, როგორიცაა, კითხვა-პასუხი, დიალოგის დაზეპირება და შემდეგ გათამაშება, სავარჯიშოს შევსება, უფრო მარტივია და სწავლას მიაღწევს.

ხუთქულიანი შეფასების შკალაზე, მიუთითეთ თუ რამდენად მოგწონთ წარმოდგენილი აქტივობა:

(5–ძალიან მომწონს; 4–მომწონს; 3–მაქვს ნეიტრალური პოზიცია; 2–არ მომწონს; 1–ძალიან არ მომწონს)

დებატები და დისკუსიები ——— წერილობითი გრამატიკული სავარჯიშოები ———
 წერილობითი ლექსიკური სავარჯიშოები ——— პრეზენტაციები ———
 დაზეპირებული ტექსტის ჩაბარება ——— ენობრივი თამაშები ———
 როლური თამაშები ——— კარნახი ———

ნაწილი 2

გაკვეთილზე უცხო ენაზე საუბარი რთულია

ვეთანხმები	არ ვეთანხმები	მიჭირს პასუხის გაცემა
------------	---------------	-----------------------

ქართველ თანაკლასელთან უცხო ენაზე საუბარი უხერხულობას მიქმნის

ვეთანხმები	არ ვეთანხმები	მიჭირს პასუხის გაცემა
------------	---------------	-----------------------

როდესაც ჯგუფში ბევრი ბავშვია, ეს სწავლაში მიშლის ხელს

ვეთანხმები	არ ვეთანხმები	მიჭირს პასუხის გაცემა
------------	---------------	-----------------------

არ მაინტერესებს ისეთი სასწავლო მასალა, რომელიც ჩემთვის უცნობ სიტუაციებს და გარემოს ეხება

ვეთანხმები	არ ვეთანხმები	მიჭირს პასუხის გაცემა
------------	---------------	-----------------------

წყვილებში/ჯგუფებში მუშაობა ხმაურს იწვევს, რაც სწავლაში მიშლის ხელს.

ვეთანხმები	არ ვეთანხმები	მიჭირს პასუხის გაცემა
------------	---------------	-----------------------

APPENDIX 8.1B: LEARNER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name:
2. School:
3. Grade:
4. Age:
5. When did you start studying a foreign language in school?
6. Had you studied the language before that elsewhere?
7. Do you have any exposure to foreign language teaching outside the school? Where?

Section 1: CLT conceptions

Circle the letter (a. or b. or both) which corresponds to your preference

1. Learning theory

- (1)
 - a. I learn better when Georgian is spoken in the class
 - b. I learn better when a foreign language is spoken in the class
- (2)
 - a. While working on the text, I learn better when I discuss the text and analyze the vocabulary
 - b. While working on a text, I learn better when I memorize the text and list of vocabulary
- (3).
 - a. It is more important to pay attention to the meaning of what you are saying
 - b. It is more important to pay attention to the correct form of what you are saying
- (4).
 - a. I learn better when the teacher makes us guess/deduce the meaning of language forms ourselves
 - b. I learn better when the teacher explains rules herself/himself

2. Error correction

- (5)
 - a. I would rather the teacher did not interrupt me and corrected mistakes afterwards
 - b. I would rather the teacher corrected all my mistakes while I am speaking
- (6)
 - a. It is more useful when the teacher makes us to selfcorrect
 - b. It is more useful when the teacher corrects our mistakes herself/himself

4. Classroom interaction

- (7).
 - a. There should be more student-student interaction
 - b. There should be more teacher-student interaction
- (8)
 - a. There should be more teacher talking time
 - b. There should be more student talking time
- (9)
 - a. I learn better and feel more relaxed when I work in pairs/groups
 - b. I learn better and feel more relaxed when I work on my own

4. Teachers' and learners roles

- (10)
 - a. I learn better when I am active: when I take the initiative, express my opinion
 - b. I learn better when I sit quietly, working on my own and speak out when the teacher calls on me.
- (11)
 - a. The teacher should be friendly and encouraging
 - b. The teacher should be strict and demanding

(12)

- a. The teacher should pay individual attention to each student
- b. The teacher should teach the class as a whole, and not worry about needs of each student

5. Syllabus and course design

(13)

- a. In the lesson, more time has to be dedicated to developing language skills
- b. In the lesson, more time has to be dedicated to teaching grammar, vocabulary and phonology

(14)

- a. It would be better if language skills were tested at the exam
- b. It would be better if grammar, vocabulary and phonology were tested at the exam

(15)

- a. I would like to be taught the language and skills that I will need in real life
- b. I would like to be taught the language and skills that will be tested at final exams

6. Teaching material and language activities:

(16)

- a. I like when the material is authentic – the Internet resources, magazines, newspapers, etc.
- b. I like when the material comes from the coursebooks or other academic source.

(17)

- a. Activities which resemble real life task help me more in the learning process
- b. Activities which are structured, straightforward, like asking and answering the questions from the coursebook, memorizing the dialogues, filling in the gaps, help me more in the learning process

Section 2**7. CLT versus Non-CLT activities**

On a four-point evaluation scale, please indicate how much you like/do not like the below presented language activities:

(4–like very much; 3–like; 2–have neutral attitude; 1–do not like it; 0–do not like it at all)

- 18. Debates and discussions_____
- 19. Presentations_____
- 20. Language games _____
- 21. Dialogues and role plays_____
- 22. Fill-in the gaps exercises_____
- 23. Reciting a memorized text _____
- 24. Written grammar/vocabulary exercises_____
- 25. Dictations_____

Section 3**8. CLT-related Challenges**

Circle one of the options: 'agree', 'disagree', 'not sure'.

- 26. Learning in a foreign language is difficult for me

agree	disagree	not sure
-------	----------	----------
- 27. I feel uncomfortable when I have to speak in a foreign language with a Georgian classmate

agree	disagree	not sure
-------	----------	----------
- 28. Having many students in the group makes it difficult to learn a foreign language

agree	disagree	not sure
-------	----------	----------
- 29. It is difficult for me to get interested in the material which is not related to my

agree	disagree	not sure
-------	----------	----------
- 30. Speaking activities and pair/group work results in much noise, which makes it difficult for me to learn a language

agree	disagree	not sure
-------	----------	----------

APPENDIX 8.2: FREQUENCY ANALYSIS OF THE LEARNER QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

SECTION 1

Items 1–17: General CLT conceptions

1. It is better to have the foreign language spoken in the class than Georgian.

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	143	20.6
Not sure	105	15.2
Agree	445	64.2
Total	693	100

2. While working on the text, I learn better when I discuss the text and analyze the vocabulary afterwards rather than when I memorize the text and lists of vocabulary.

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	39	5.6
Not sure	28	4.0
Agree	626	90.3
Total	693	100

3. It is more important to pay attention to the meaning of what you are saying than to the correct form.

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	321	46.3
Not sure	182	26.3
Agree	190	27.4
Total	693	100

4. I learn better when the teacher makes us guess/deduce the meaning of language forms ourselves than when teacher explains rules.

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	406	58.6
Not sure	88	12.7
Agree	199	28.7
Total	693	100

5. I would rather the teacher corrected the mistakes I make after I finish speaking rather than during speaking.

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	349	50.4
Not sure	16	2.3
Agree	327	47.2
Total	693	100

6. It is more useful when the teacher makes us to selfcorrect than when the teacher corrects our mistakes herself/himself.

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	95	13.7
Not sure	38	5.5
Agree	560	80.8
Total	693	100

7. There should be more student-student interaction than teacher-student interaction.

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	461	66.5
Not sure	80	11.5
Agree	152	21.9
Total	693	100

8. There should be more student talking time than teacher talking time.

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	307	44.3
Not sure	146	21.1
Agree	240	34.6
Total	693	100

9. I learn better and feel more relaxed when I work in pairs/groups than when I work on my own.

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	218	31.5
Not sure	64	9.2
Agree	411	59.3
Total	693	100

10. I learn better when I am active in the lesson: take initiative, express my opinion, than when I sit quietly working on my own and only speak out when the teacher calls on me.

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	12	17.6
Not sure	42	6.1
Agree	529	76.3
Total	693	100

11. The teacher should be friendly and encouraging rather than strict and demanding.

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	85	12.3
Not sure	156	22.5
Agree	452	65.2
Total	693	100

12. The teacher should pay individual attention to each student rather than teach the class as a whole and not worry about needs of each individual student.

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	242	34.9
Not sure	53	7.6
Agree	398	57.4
Total	693	100

13. In the lesson more time has to be dedicated to developing language skills (reading, listening, speaking, and writing) than to teaching grammar, vocabulary and phonology.

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	166	24.0
Not sure	240	34.6
Agree	287	41.4
Total	693	100

14. It would be better if language skills were tested at the exam than grammar, vocabulary and phonology.

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	208	30.0
Not sure	172	24.8
Agree	313	45.2
Total	693	100

15. I would prefer to be taught the language and skills that I will need in real life than the language and skills that will be tested at final exams.

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	364	52.5
Not sure	236	34.1
Agree	93	13.4
Total	693	100

16. I like when the material comes from outside the classroom - the Internet, magazines, newspapers than from the coursebook.

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	134	19.3
Not sure	59	8.5
Agree	500	72.2
Total	693	100

17. I prefer activities which prepare me for real life communication than activities which are more structured and academic in nature

	Frequency	Percentage
Disagree	469	23.5
Not sure	60	8.7
Agree	163	67.7
Total	693	100

Section 2**Items 18-25: CLT and non-CLT language activities****18. Debates and discussions**

	Frequency	Percentage
I do not like it at all	30	4.3
I do not like it	18	2.6
have a neutral position	121	17.5
I like it	232	33.5
I like it very much	292	42.1
Total	693	100

19. Presentations

	Frequency	Percentage
I do not like it at all	15	2.2
I do not like it	26	3.8
have a neutral position	69	10.0
I like it	161	23.2
I like it very much	422	60.9
Total	693	100

20. Language games

	Frequency	Percentage
I do not like it at all	18	2.6
I do not like it	31	4.5
have a neutral position	100	14.4
I like it	198	28.6
I like it very much	346	49.9
Total	693	100

21. Dialogues and role plays

	Frequency	Percentage
I do not like it at all	33	4.8
I do not like it	57	8.2
have a neutral position	145	20.9
I like it	179	25.8
I like it very much	279	40.3
Total	693	100

22. Fill-in the gaps exercises

	Frequency	Percentage
I do not like it at all	30	4.3
I do not like it	58	8.4
have a neutral position	187	27.0
I like it	269	38.8
I like it very much	149	21.5
Total	693	100

23. Reciting a memorized text

	Frequency	Percentage
I do not like it at all	197	28.4
I do not like it	132	19.0
have a neutral position	178	25.7
I like it	114	16.5
I like it very much	72	10.4
Total	693	100

24. Grammar/vocabulary exercises

	Frequency	Percentage
I do not like it at all	29	4.2
I do not like it	44	6.3
have a neutral position	164	23.7
I like it	242	34.9
I like it very much	214	30.9
Total	693	100

25. Dictations

	Frequency	Percentage
I do not like it at all	165	23.8
I do not like it	121	17.5
have a neutral position	03	29.3
I like it	95	13.7
I like it very much	108	15.6
Total	693	100

Section 3**Items 26-30: CLT-related difficulties****26. It is difficult for me to study in a foreign language.**

	Frequency	Percentage
I disagree	387	55.8
I am not sure	147	21.2
I agree	159	22.9
Total	693	100

27. I feel uncomfortable when I have to speak in a foreign language with a Georgian classmate.

	Frequency	Percentage
I disagree	485	70.0
I am not sure	84	12.1
I agree	124	17.9
Total	693	100

28. Having many students in the group makes it difficult to learn a foreign language.

	Frequency	Percentage
I disagree	280	40.4
I am not sure	100	14.4
I agree	313	45.2
Total	693	100

29. It is difficult for me to get interested in the material which is not related to my context (culture, everyday life).

	Frequency	Percentage
I disagree	362	52.2
I am not sure	118	17.0
I agree	213	30.7
Total	693	100

30. Speaking activities and pair/group work results in much noise, which makes it difficult for me to learn a language.

	Frequency	Percentage
I disagree	431	62.2
I am not sure	98	14.1
I agree	164	23.7
Total	693	100

APPENDIX 8.3: THE EFFECT OF 'SCHOOL TYPE' ON LEARNERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS CLT

Questionnaire Section 1

Questionnaire items: thematic groups 1–6		Mean	SD	Sig.
1. Language and Learning Theory	Public Central	3.53 ⁸	.667	.009
	Public Peripheral	3.54	.647	
	Private Central	4.00	.840	
	Private Peripheral	3.98	.751	
	Total	3.60	.696	
2. Error Correction	Public Central	3.57	1.180	
	Public Peripheral	3.62	1.234	
	Private Central	3.98	1.097	
	Private Peripheral	3.85	1.228	
	Total	3.64	1.205	
3. Classroom Interaction	Public Central	2.75	1.138	
	Public Peripheral	2.89	1.123	
	Private Central	2.92	1.080	
	Private Peripheral	2.84	1.118	
	Total	2.82	1.127	
4. Learner and Teacher Roles	Public Central	3.79	1.039	
	Public Peripheral	3.94	1.058	
	Private Central	4.10	.887	
	Private Peripheral	4.06	.992	
	Total	3.89	1.037	
5. Syllabus and Course Design	Public Central	2.91	1.033	
	Public Peripheral	2.98	1.004	
	Private Central	2.98	1.051	
	Private Peripheral	3.05	1.204	
	Total	2.96	1.039	
6. Teaching Materials and Activities	Public Central	4.01	1.264	
	Public Peripheral	3.86	1.362	
	Private Central	4.28	1.086	
	Private Peripheral	4.14	1.285	
	Total	3.98	1.300	

⁸As a result of post hoc analysis, statistically significant differences were detected between the public and private school learners' attitudes towards CLT conceptions; the significance level is indicated in the right-hand column

Questionnaire Section 2

Composite mean scores of learners' attitudes towards CLT and non-CLT activities across various school types

Questionnaire items: thematic group 7		Mean	SD	Sig.
CLT activities ⁹	public central	4.09	.622	.005
	Public Peripheral	4.27	.567	.000
	private central	4.32	.625	.000
	private peripheral	3.60	1.072	
	Total	4.13	.682	
Non-CLT activities ¹⁰	public central	3.30	.715	.001
	Public Peripheral	3.34	.659	.000
	Private Central	2.84	.676	
	Private Peripheral	2.55	.839	
	Total	3.22	.743	

Questionnaire Section 3

Learners' assessments of CLT-related challenges across different school types

Questionnaire items: thematic group 8		Mean	SD	Sig.
26. ¹¹ It is difficult for me to study in a foreign language	Public Central	2.69	1.979	.027
	Public Peripheral	3.16	1.997	
	Private Central	2.20	1.856	.023
	Private Peripheral	1.80	1.612	.000
	Total	2.77	1.988	
27. I feel uncomfortable when I have to speak in a foreign language with a Georgian classmate	Public Central	2.17	1.824	
	Public Peripheral	2.19	1.834	
	Private Central	2.00	1.754	
	Private Peripheral	2.23	1.861	
	Total	2.18	1.824	
28. Having many students in the group makes it difficult to learn a foreign language	Public Central	3.34	1.974	
	Public Peripheral	3.45	1.953	
	Private Central	3.20	2.015	
	Private Peripheral	3.52	1.945	
	Total	3.39	1.962	
29. It is difficult for me to get interested in the material which is not related to my context (culture, everyday life)	Public Central	2.95	2.003	
	Public Peripheral	2.96	2.003	
	Private Central	2.60	1.985	
	Private Peripheral	2.78	2.004	
	Total	2.92	2.000	
30. ¹² Speaking activities and pair/group work results in much noise, which makes it difficult for me to learn a language	Public Central	2.46	1.928	.001
	Public Peripheral	2.71	1.983	
	Private Central	1.50	1.340	.000
	Private Peripheral	2.54	1.961	
	Total	2.51	1.941	

⁹ As a result of a post hoc analysis, a significant difference was revealed between Private Peripheral school and all other school type learners' attitudes towards CLT activities. The significance level is indicated in the right column.

¹⁰ Private school learners were found to be significantly less in favor of non-CLT activities than public school learners; the significance level is indicated in the right column.

¹¹ A statistically significant difference was revealed between Public Peripheral and all other school types: public, central: $p=.027$; Private Central: $p=.023$; Private Peripheral: $p=.000$.

¹² A statistically significant difference was revealed between Public Peripheral and Public Central ($p=.001$) and Private Central ($p=.000$) school types. With no other items was any statistically significant difference detected.

APPENDIX 9.1: OBSERVATION FORM USED IN THE STUDY

School: ...		Grade: ...		Course book used: ...		
Date: ...		Level: ...		Length of lesson: ...		
				Number of students: ...		
Lesson focus: ...		Method used: ...				
Classroom Behavior				Yes	No	Partly
1. Language and learning theory						
1. There is more focus on meaning than form of the language						
2. Natural situation for meaningful language use is provided						
3. Language functions are dealt with						
4. Discourse and strategic competencies are dealt with						
5. Target language is spoken in the lesson						
6. There is more fluency than accuracy work done in the lesson						
7. An inductive rather than deductive approach is used while explaining language concepts						

2. Course design and syllabus			
8. The course is primarily aimed at teaching learners			
9. Besides the course book, other teaching resources, more adapted to learners' needs and interests, are			
10. The lesson is aimed at preparing learners for real life communication			
3. Teacher and learner roles			
11. The teacher is a facilitator, monitor, a guide, feedback provider, needs analyst, co-communicator			
12. The teacher provides a relaxed and pleasant atmosphere in the class			
13. The teacher is friendly and encouraging			
14. The teacher is reactive to students' spontaneous needs			
15. The learner is independent in the study process			
4. Classroom interaction			
16. There is more student-student than teacher-student interaction			
17. There is more student talking time (STT) than teacher talking time (TTT)			
18. There is pair/group work conducted in the lesson			
19. The individual attention is paid to learners' needs and interests			
20. Teaching process is student-centered			

5. Error correction			
21. Error correction is provided in the form of a delayed feedback during free speaking activities			
22. The learners are encouraged to peer-correct			
23. The learners are encouraged to self-correct			
6. Teaching materials and activities			
24. Some authentic materials are used			
25. Material seems to be interesting and matching to the learners' needs			
26. Many CLT activities are conducted in the lesson, such as discussions, debates, role plays, presentations			
27. The activities have truly communicative character			
7. Challenges			
28. Teachers are not proficient in the target foreign language			
29. Teachers do not seem to be aware of CLT principles			
30. Teachers do not seem to be trained in using CLT			
31. There is the influence of traditional way of teaching felt in the class			
32. Students do not seem willing to speak out and be active in the lesson			
33. Students seem uncomfortable speaking in a foreign language with each other			
34. Learners of various level of language proficiency seem to be causing difficulties			
35. Learners are having difficulties learning in the foreign language			
36. Large group of students seem to be complicating the study process			
37. There are classroom management problems (noise, chaos, not enough space) related to CLT practices			

APPENDIX 9.2: CLT PRINCIPLES OBSERVED IN THE ENGLISH LESSONS IN TBILISI**1. There is more focus on meaning than form of the language**

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	18	69.2
Partly True	3	11.5
True	5	19.2
Total	26	100

2. Natural situation for meaningful language use is provided

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	18	69.2
Partly True	4	15.4
True	4	15.4
Total	26	100

3. Language functions are dealt with

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	22	84.6
Partly True	2	7.7
True	2	7.7
Total	26	100

4. Discourse and strategic competences are dealt with

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	22	84.6
Partly True	2	7.7
True	2	7.7
Total	26	100

5. The target language is spoken in the lesson

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	4	15.4
Partly True	10	38.5
True	12	46.2
Total	26	100

6. There is more fluency than accuracy work done in the lesson

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	15	57.7
Partly True	6	23.1
True	5	19.2
Total	26	100

7. Attention is paid to learners' individual needs and interests

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	17	65.4
Partly True	4	15.4
True	5	19.2
Total	26	100

8. An inductive rather than deductive approach is used while explaining language concepts

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	18	69.2
Partly True	5	19.2
True	3	11.5
Total	26	100

9. Besides the coursebook, other teaching resources, more adapted to learners' needs and interests, are also used in the lesson

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	18	69.2
Partly True	7	26.9
True	1	3.8
Total	26	100

10. There is enough skills work provided in the lesson

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	17	65.4
Partly True	5	19.2
True	4	15.4
Total	26	100

11. The lesson is aimed at preparing learners for real life communication

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	18	69.2
Partly True	6	23.1
True	2	7.7
Total	26	100

12. The teacher is friendly and encouraging

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	3	11.5
Partly True	10	38.5
True	13	50.0
Total	26	100

13. The teaching process is student-centered

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	16	61.5
Partly True	6	23.1
True	4	15.4
Total	26	100

14. The teacher is a facilitator and guide in the lesson

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	13	50.0
Partly True	7	26.9
True	6	23.1
Total	26	100

15. The teacher is reactive to students' spontaneous needs

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	16	61.5
Partly True	5	19.2
True	5	19.2
Total	26	100

16. There is more student-student interaction than teacher-student interaction

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	18	69.2
Partly True	4	15.4
True	4	15.4
Total	26	100

17. There is more students talking time (STT) than teacher talking time (TTT)

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	20	76.9
Partly True	3	11.5
True	3	11.5
Total	26	100

18. There is pair/group work conducted in the lesson

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	19	73.1
Partly True	2	7.7
True	5	19.2
Total	26	100

19. There is a relaxed, pleasant atmosphere in the lesson

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	8	30.8
Partly True	9	34.6
True	9	34.6
Total	26	100

20. Error correction is provided in the form of a delayed feedback during free speaking activities

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	18	69.2
Partly True	4	15.4
True	4	15.4
Total	26	100

21. Learners are encouraged to peercorrect

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	15	57.7
Partly True	6	23.1
True	5	19.2
Total	26	100

22. Learners are encouraged to selfcorrect

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	15	57.7
Partly True	5	19.2
True	6	23.1
Total	26	100

23. Some authentic materials are used in the lesson

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	18	69.2
Partly True	3	11.5
True	5	19.2
Total	26	100

24. Materials seem to be interesting and matching learners' abilities and needs

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	12	46.2
Partly True	9	34.6
True	5	19.2
Total	26	100

25. Many CLT activities are conducted in the lesson, such as discussions, debates, role plays, presentations

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	15	57.7
Partly True	8	30.8
True	3	11.5
Total	26	100

26. Activities have a truly communicative character

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	17	65.4
Partly True	6	23.1
True	3	11.5
Total	26	100

27. Teachers are not proficient in the target foreign language

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	10	38.5
Partly True	7	26.9
True	9	34.6
Total	26	100

28. Teachers do not seem to be aware of CLT principles

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	6	23.1
Partly True	6	23.1
True	14	53.8
Total	26	100

29. Teachers do not seem to be trained in using CLT

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	12	46.2
Partly True	6	23.1
True	8	30.8
Total	26	100

30. There is an influence of the old- fashioned way of teaching

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	5	19.2
Partly True	7	26.9
True	14	53.8
Total	26	100

31. Students do not seem willing to speak out and be active in the lesson

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	25	96.2
Partly True	1	3.8
Total	26	100

32. Students seem uncomfortable speaking in a foreign language

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	22	84.6
Partly True	4	15.4
Total	26	100

33. Learners of various levels of language proficiency seem to be causing difficulties

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	16	61.5
Partly True	10	38.5
Total	26	100

34. Learners are having difficulties learning in a foreign language

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	14	53.8
Partly True	10	38.5
True	2	7.7
Total	26	100

35. Large groups of students seem to be complicating the learning process

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	9	34.6
Partly True	10	38.5
True	7	26.9
Total	26	100

36. There are classroom management problems (noise, chaos, not enough space) related to CLT practices

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	9	34.6
Partly True	13	50.0
True	4	15.4
Total	26	100

37. There are not enough facilities to support CLT

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	7	26.9
Partly True	4	15.4
True	15	57.7
Total	26	100

38. The classroom is arranged in such a way that it does not support CLT

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	7	26.9
Partly True	15	57.7
True	4	15.4
Total	26	100

39. The pre-determined and imposed language curriculum seems to be impeding CLT application

	Frequency	Percentage
Not True	5	19.2
Partly True	5	19.2
True	16	61.5
Total	26	100

PPENDIX 9.3: INTER-ITEM CORRELATION ANALYSIS: OBSERVATION THEMATIC GROUPS 1-7

			1. Language and Learning Theory	2. Course Design and Syllabus	3. Teacher's and Learner's Roles	4. Classroom Interaction	5. Error Correction	6. Teaching Materials and Activities	7. CLT-related Challenges
1. Language and learning theory	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.846** .000	1						
2. Course design and syllabus	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.637** .000	.775** .000	1					
3. Teachers' and learners' roles	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.832** .000	.895** .000	.796** .000	1				
4. Classroom interaction	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.777** .000	.918** .000	.807** .000	.895** .000	1			
5. Error correction	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.787** .000	.800** .000	.552** .003	.812** .000	.803** .000	1		
6. Teaching materials and activities	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.844** .000	.924** .000	.693** .000	.839** .000	.850** .000	.783** .000	1	
7. CLT-related challenges	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	-.793** .000	-.933** .000	-.814** .000	-.839** .000	-.869** .000	-.673** .000	.900** .000	1

APPENDIX 9.4: THE EFFECTS OF CERTAIN TEACHER-RELATED FACTORS ON TEACHERS' CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE

9.4A: Teachers' classroom performance across different school types:

Observation item thematic groups	Four school types	Mean	Sig.
1. Language and learning theory ¹	Public Central	1.47	.006
	Public Peripheral	1.44	.003
	Private Central	<u>3.80</u>	
	Private Peripheral	2.56	
	Total	2.08	
2. Course design and syllabus	Public Central	1.37	.000
	Public Peripheral	1.25	.000
	Private Central	<u>3.53</u>	
	Private Peripheral	1.83	
	Total	1.82	
3. Teacher's and learner's roles	Public Central	1.94	.000
	Public Peripheral	1.94	.000
	Private Central	<u>4.70</u>	
	Private Peripheral	2.88	
	Total	2.62	
4. Classroom interaction	Public Central	1.44	.005
	Public Peripheral	1.44	.006
	Private Central	<u>4.30</u>	
	Private Peripheral	2.50	
	Total	2.15	
5. Error correction	Public Central	1.96	
	Public Peripheral	1.33	
	Private Central	<u>3.67</u>	
	Private Peripheral	2.33	
	Total	2.15	
6. Teaching materials and activities	Public Central	1.50	.000
	Public Peripheral	1.56	.000
	Private Central	<u>3.90</u>	
	Private Peripheral	2.38	
	Total	2.12	

Note: The mean scores are presented on a scale of 1-5 (1=not communicative at all; 5=highly communicative).

Note: The highest scores among the groups are underlined.

¹ A statistically significant difference was detected between Private Central and both public school types in Thematic groups 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6. There was no statistical difference revealed in Thematic Group 5. The significance levels are indicated in the right-hand column in the table, next to the mean score.

9.4B: Effect of teachers' age on their classroom performance

Thematic groups:	Age group	Mean
1. Language and learning theory²	Between 25-35	<u>3.63</u>
	Between 35-45	2.58
	Between 45-55	1.60
	Between 55-65	1.42
	Total	2.08
2.³ Course design and syllabus	Between 25-35	<u>3.33</u>
	Between 35-45	2.19
	Between 45-55	1.33
	Between 55-65	1.67
	Total	1.82
3. Teachers' and learners' roles⁴	Between 25-35	<u>5.00</u>
	Between 35-45	3.11
	Between 45-55	1.96
	Between 55-65	2.17
	Total	2.62
4. Classroom interaction	Between 25-35	<u>4.50</u>
	Between 35-45	2.50
	Between 45-55	1.67
	Between 55-65	1.50
	Total	2.15
5. Error correction	Between 25-35	<u>4.33</u>
	Between 35-45	2.56
	Between 45-55	1.67
	Between 55-65	1.44
	Total	2.15
6. Teaching materials and activities	Between 25-35	<u>4.00</u>
	Between 35-45	2.56
	Between 45-55	1.67
	Between 55-65	1.33
	Total	2.12

Note: The mean scores are presented on a scale of 1-5 (1=not communicative at all; 5=highly communicative).

Note: The highest scores among the groups are underlined.

² For Thematic Groups 1, 3, 5 and 6, statistically significant difference was detected between the age group '25-35', on the one hand, and age groups '44-45' and '55-65', on the other ($p=.000$ for all groups); also, between the age group '35-34' and '55-65' ($p=0.33$ (1), $p=0.27$ (3), $p=.043$ (5); $p=.023$ (6).

³ No statistically significant difference was detected among the groups 2 and 4.

9.5C: Effect of teaching experience on the teachers' classroom performance

Thematic groups	Teaching experience	Mean	Sig.
1. Language and⁵ learning theory	over 5 years	<u>2.88</u>	
	over 10 years	1.61	.037
	over 20 years	1.38	.011
	Total	2.08	
2. Course design and syllabus⁶	over 5 years	<u>2.67</u>	
	over 10 years	1.24	.015
	over 20 years	1.67	
	Total	1.82	
3. Teachers' and learners' roles	over 5 years	<u>3.55</u>	
	over 10 years	2.11	.049
	over 20 years	1.50	.005
	Total	2.62	
4. Classroom interaction	over 5 years	<u>3.05</u>	
	over 10 years	1.61	
	over 20 years	1.50	.039
	Total	2.15	
5. Error correction	over 5 years	<u>2.87</u>	
	over 10 years	1.81	
	over 20 years	1.00	.004
	Total	2.15	
6. Teaching materials and activities	over 5 years	<u>2.85</u>	
	over 10 years	1.71	
	over 20 years	1.25	.030
	Total	2.12	

Note: The mean scores are presented on a scale of 1-5 (1=not communicative at all; 5=highly communicative).

Note: The highest scores among the groups are underlined.

⁵ In Thematic Groups 1 and 3, statistically significant differences were detected between the group of teachers with 'over 5 years', on the one hand, and 'over ten years' and 'over twenty year' of teaching experience groups, on the other. The significance levels are indicated in the right-hand column in the table, next to the mean scores.

⁶ For Thematic Groups 2, 4, 5, 6, statistically significant differences were detected between the group of teachers with 'over 5 years' and 'over twenty year' of teaching experience. The significance levels are indicated in the right-hand column of the table.

9.4D: Effect of teachers' understanding level of theoretical underpinning of CLT on their classroom performance

Observation item thematic groups:	Understanding level of CLT theory	Mean	Sig.
1. Language and learning theory⁷	Have no understanding	1.30	.011
	Have partial understanding	2.36	
	Have full understanding	<u>3.85</u>	
	Total	2.08	
2. Course design and syllabus	Have no understanding	1.19	
	Have partial understanding	2.43	
	Have full understanding	<u>2.73</u>	
	Total	1.82	
3. Teachers' and learners' roles	Have no understanding	1.68	.002
	Have partial understanding	3.14	
	Have full understanding	<u>4.50</u>	
	Total	2.62	
4. Classroom interaction⁸	Have no understanding	1.36	.024
	Have partial understanding	2.43	
	<u>Have full understanding</u>	<u>4.00</u>	
	Total	2.15	
5. Error correction⁹	Have no understanding	1.43	.028
	Have partial understanding	2.14	
	Have full understanding	<u>4.20</u>	
	Total	2.15	
6. Teaching materials and activities	Have no understanding	1.32	.012
	Have partial understanding	2.29	
	Have full understanding	<u>4.10</u>	
	Total	2.12	

Note: The mean scores are presented on a scale of 1–5 (1=not communicative at all; 5=highly communicative).

⁷ In Thematic groups 1, 2, and 3, statistically significant differences were detected between the group of teachers with 'full understanding' and 'no understanding' of the theoretical underpinnings of CLT. The significance levels are indicated in the right-hand column in the table, next to the mean scores.

⁸ No statistically significant differences were revealed in Thematic Group 4.

⁹ In Thematic groups 5 and 6, statistically significant differences were detected between the group of teachers with 'full understanding' of the theoretical underpinnings of CLT, on the one hand, and 'partial understanding' and 'no understanding', on the other. The significance levels are indicated in the right-hand column in the table, next to the mean scores.

APPENDIX 9.5: 'SCHOOL TYPE' EFFECT ON THE LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY FACED BY THE TEACHERS

	School	Mean	Sig.
Public Central	Public Peripheral	3.47	1.000
	Private Central	1.29	.000
	Private Peripheral	2.50	.025
Public Peripheral	Public Central	3.42	1.000
	Private Central	1.29	.000
	Private Peripheral	2.50	.020
Private Central	Public Central	3.42	.000
	Public Peripheral	3.47	.000
	Private Peripheral	2.50	.007
Private Peripheral	Public Central	3.43	.025
	Public Peripheral	3.47	.020
	Private Central	3.42	.007

Note: The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

APPENDIX 10.1: CEF DESCRIPTORS – QUALITATIVE ASPECTS OF SPOKEN LANGUAGE USE

	RANGE	ACCURACY	FLUENCY	INTERACTION	COHERENCE
C2	Shows great flexibility reformulating ideas in differing linguistic forms to convey finer shades of meaning precisely, to give emphasis, to differentiate and to eliminate ambiguity. Also has a good command of idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms.	Maintains consistent grammatical control of complex language, even while attention is otherwise engaged (e.g. in forward planning, in monitoring others' reactions).	Can express him/herself spontaneously at length with a natural colloquial flow, avoiding or backtracking around any difficulty so smoothly that the interlocutor is hardly aware of it.	Can interact with ease and skill, picking up and using non-verbal and intonational cues apparently effortlessly. Can interweave his/her contribution into the joint discourse with fully natural turn-taking, referencing, allusion making etc.	Can create coherent and cohesive discourse making full and appropriate use of a variety of organisational patterns and a wide range of connectors and other cohesive devices.
C1	Has a good command of a broad range of language allowing him/her to select a formulation to express him/herself clearly in an appropriate style on a wide range of general, academic, professional or leisure topics without having to restrict what he/she wants to say.	Consistently maintains a high degree of grammatical accuracy; errors are rare, difficult to spot and generally corrected when they do occur.	Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously, almost effortlessly. Only a conceptually difficult subject can hinder a natural, smooth flow of language.	Can select a suitable phrase from a readily available range of discourse functions to preface his remarks in order to get or to keep the floor and to relate his/her own contributions skilfully to those of other speakers.	Can produce clear, smoothly flowing, well-structured speech, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.

B2	Has a sufficient range of language to be able to give clear descriptions, express viewpoints on most general topics, without much conspicuous searching for words, using some complex sentence forms to do so.	Shows a relatively high degree of grammatical control. Does not make errors which cause misunderstanding, and can correct most of his/her mistakes.	Can produce stretches of language with a fairly even tempo; although he/she can be hesitant as he or she searches for patterns and expressions, there are few noticeably long pauses.	Can initiate discourse, take his/her turn when appropriate and end conversation when he / she needs to, though he /she may not always do this elegantly. Can help the discussion along on familiar ground confirming comprehension, inviting others	Can use a limited number of cohesive devices to link his/her utterances into clear, coherent discourse, though there may be some "jumpiness" in a long contribution.
B1	Has enough language to get by, with sufficient vocabulary to express him/herself with some hesitation and circumlocutions on topics such as family, hobbies and interests, work, travel, and current events.	Uses reasonably accurately a repertoire of frequently used "routines" and patterns associated with more predictable situations.	Can keep going comprehensibly, even though pausing for grammatical and lexical planning and repair is very evident, especially in longer stretches of free production.	Can initiate, maintain and close simple face-to-face conversation on topics that are familiar or of personal interest. Can repeat back part of what someone has said to confirm mutual understanding.	Can link a series of shorter, discrete simple elements into a connected, linear sequence of points.
A2	Uses basic sentence patterns with memorised phrases, groups of a few words and formulae in order to communicate limited information in simple everyday situations.	Uses some simple structures correctly, but still systematically makes basic mistakes.	Can make him/herself understood in very short utterances, even though pauses, false starts and reformulation are very evident.	Can answer questions and respond to simple statements. Can indicate when he/she is following but is rarely able to understand enough to keep conversation going of his/her own accord.	Can link groups of words with simple connectors like "and", "but" and "because".
A1	A very basic repertoire of words and simple phrases related to personal details and particular concrete situations.	Shows only limited control of a few simple grammatical structures and sentence patterns in a memorised repertoire.	Can manage very short, isolated, mainly pre-packaged utterances, with much pausing to search for expressions, to articulate less familiar words, and to repair communication.	Can ask and answer questions about personal details. Can interact in a simple way but communication is totally dependent on repetition, rephrasing and repair.	Can link words or groups of words with very basic linear connectors like "and" or "then".

	PRONUNCIATION ¹
C2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has a totally natural, native-like speech, with no accent. - Absolutely no interference of pronunciation with meaning comprehension.
C1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has a natural speech, with only a slight accent noticeable sometimes. - No obvious interference of pronunciation with meaning comprehension.
B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has a relatively natural speech with noticeable Georgian accent. - Almost no interference of pronunciation with meaning comprehension.
B1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintains an acceptable degree of naturalness of the speech, with a considerable Georgian accent - Occasional interference of pronunciation with comprehensibility.
A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very low degree of naturalness of the speech, with a heavy Georgian accent - Frequent interference of pronunciation with comprehensibility of the speech.
A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Almost no naturalness observed in the speech, with a very heavy Georgian accent. - Constant interference of pronunciation with comprehensibility of the speech.
A0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pronunciation problems make the speech almost incomprehensible.

¹ As pronunciation is not included in CEF spoken language descriptors, a separate scheme was evaluated for this aspect of the spoken language in consultation with the experts and specialists.



Universiteit Leiden

APPENDIX 10.2: LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY EVALUATION FORM

School Name: ...

Expected level/Course book:...

Please evaluate students' spoken language proficiency, on the scale 0-6, according to the language proficiency level descriptors presented below

Student Name	Fluency	Accuracy	Coherence / cohesion	Grammatical Range	Lexical Range	Pronunciation	Interaction	Overall level
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								

Overall impression/comments: ...

APPENDIX 10.3: LEARNERS' COMMUNICATIVE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT¹

Language aspects	School types	Mean	SD
Fluency	Public Central	1.17	.633
	Public Peripheral	1.18	.624
	Private Central	<u>2.52</u>	.378
	Private Peripheral	<u>2.00</u>	.418
Accuracy	Public Central	1.17	.591
	Public Peripheral	1.15	.570
	Private Central	<u>2.45</u>	.350
	Private Peripheral	<u>1.73</u>	.518
Coherence/Cohesion	Public Central	1.11	.669
	Public Peripheral	1.13	.565
	Private Central	<u>2.39</u>	.282
	Private Peripheral	<u>1.93</u>	.420
Grammatical range	Public Central	1.09	.587
	Public Peripheral	1.14	.516
	Private Central	<u>2.55</u>	.472
	Private Peripheral	1.82	.549
Lexical range	Public Central	1.23	.665
	Public Peripheral	1.44	.543
	Private Central	<u>2.70</u>	.430
	Private Peripheral	<u>2.16</u>	.594
Pronunciation	Public Central	1.27	.652
	Public Peripheral	1.55	.491
	Private Central	<u>2.84</u>	.516
	Private Peripheral	2.11	.563
Interaction	Public Central	1.21	.660
	Public Peripheral	1.35	.462
	Private Central	<u>2.70</u>	.498
	Private Peripheral	2.05	.292
Overall language proficiency	Public Central	1.18	.641
	Public Peripheral	1.30	.571
	Private Central	<u>2.82</u>	.513
	Private Peripheral	<u>2.09</u>	.478

¹ A statistically significant difference was detected between Private and Public school types across most of the spoken language aspects. In 'fluency' and 'Coherence/Cohesion' areas statistically significant difference was also detected between Private Central and Private Peripheral schools.

APPENDIX 10.4: CORRELATION OF THE LEARNERS' PERFORMANCE

		Fluency	Accuracy	Coherence	Grammar	Lexis	Pronun.	Interaction
Fluency		1						
	Sig.							
Accuracy		.953**	1					
	Sig.	.000						
Coherence/ Cohesion		.952**	.946**	1				
	Sig.	.000	.000					
Grammatical range		.926**	.957**	.919**	1			
	Sig.	.000	.000	.000				
Lexical range		.928**	.930**	.938**	.936**	1		
	Sig.	.000	.000	.000	.000			
Pronunciation		.919**	.929**	.918**	.944**	.946**	1	
	Sig.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		
Interaction		.937**	.903**	.925**	.897**	.926**	.927**	1
	Sig.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	65	65	65	65	65	65	65

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

APPENDIX 10.5: LEARNER SPEECH SAMPLES²: Levels A0–B2

Estimated language proficiency level: A0–Almost no competence

Task 1: Picture description

R³: What can you see in the picture?

L: Family...as...uh...dad...uh...as children..... mum is... “*shvilebi rogor aris inglisurad?* - how is ‘children’ in English?”(prompt), yes, children... (communication breakdown).

R: What do you see in the background? Nature?

L: Mmm...(prompt) – mountain...beautiful...yes...(communication breakdown).

Task 2: Role Play⁴

➤ What’s your name?

➤ *I’m...

➤ What’s your name?

➤ *I am fine...Nika

➤ (Prompt)”*Ara, ra gqvია?* – No, what’s your name?”

➤ ...*Ana

➤ Do you like Italia?

➤ *Yes.

➤ What you see?

➤ *Italy /italia/ and Rome /romi/ (with Georgian pronunciation).....

➤ “*mkitxe rame* – ask me something!”.

(Communication Breakdown)

Estimated language proficiency level: A1–Limited competence

Task 1: Picture Description

L: Uh, these people are...uh...uh...on holiday...they are on seaside...uh...uh.....weather is sunny.....uh.....(communication breakdown)

R: Can you tell me about the family?

L: uh...This is father, mother, daughter and son... I think that this boy can’t swim, so he has got this ...uh..... (communication breakdown).

R: What about the nature?

L: ... Nature?...uh...uh.....uh.here are some hotels, I think...uh...this is castle, maybe...uh.....some mountains there.....(communication breakdown).

R: Well, what about the beach?

² Speech sample notes: 1. ‘...’ indicates a pause. 2. ‘.....’ indicates a very long pause. 3. ‘uh’ indicates mumbling. 4. Speech bounded by a pair of asterisks (* - *) indicates self-correction. 5. A carat (^) indicates an incomplete word. 6. Words produced in Georgian are *italicized* and bound with inverted commas (“-”) which also includes the English translation of the Georgian word presented. 7. Incomprehensible words are marked as “?”. 8. Wrong pronunciation is italicized and phonetic sound are indicated with /-/ next to the word. 9. Additional, meta-linguistic information (e.g. laughing, prompts from the co-speaker or the researcher) about speakers’ speech is provided in brackets (-). 9. The fillers produced in Georgian during the speech are italicized and a GF (Georgian Filler) note is put next to it.

³ R=researcher; L=Learner.

⁴ The speakers under evaluation in this and all subsequent role plays presented in this Appendix will be marked with an asterisk*.

L: Beach is...uh...“*Qvishiani* – sandy” (prompt), of yes, the sandy beach; I think people like sandy beach because the stones don’t...uh...“*erchoba* - prickle”...uh.....uh.....(communication breakdown).

R: Ok, what else? How do you think they are spending their holidays?

L: Uh...uh...in the morning they go to the beach, swim...uh.....uh.....they play something...uh..... (communication breakdown)

Task 2: Role Play

- Hello, what is your name?
- *My name is Nutsa and...how...
- And my name is Dimitry. How old are you?
- *I am fine... /auhaiu/ (laughs)
- How old are you? (repeats)
- *Ah, how old are you? I am thirteen years old.
- Where do you live?
- *I live in Tbilisi, and I was...I was in England.
- I was in Spain.....uh...how did you spend your ...holiday time?
- *.....”*Rogor? Gamimeore* –What did you say? Can you repeat?”
- How did you spend your holiday time?
- *Holiday time? Uh.....
- (prompts) “*Rogor gaatarar ardadegebi?* – how did you spend your holidays?”
- *I...uh...I was in England and I...I was in England with my friend.
- I was in Spain and I visit a lot of good places – like a parks and museums, and ...uh...good places.
- *...uh.....good places...uh...(communication breakdown)

Estimated language proficiency level: A2–Basic competence

Task 1: Picture description

Learner: Here is a little family: there are mother, father, sister and brother. They’re in beach, they have fun day, I think. There are some guys in the...uh...I forgot it...in beautiful *boat/bou0/*... Here are some beautiful houses, and here are *some – many* people, I can say; and they are swimming in water, playing in water, it’s...and... uh...then ...uh...they... are doing.....doing some things...uh...we do this...uh... with the ground of beach; and they have fun here, I can say. They are together, and...uh... oh, yes...they are playing with this....this is some... *One hun...- this game*, you need to ...uh...*ro^ – throw* this ...uh.....*isa* (GF)’...what is this grey thing...(prompt)... ring, yes, throw and get to it, so, it’s ...uh...I know this game; It’s too good to be in the beach, to play, *fa^ - run* and so...uh... it’s very good, I think. There are some houses, and, oh yes, its’ like castle, but I don’t think so, it’s big house; there can be rich men, who have many...uh...many...uh...many money, yes, so it’s beautiful. So, it’s the holiday of the family,...uh... one family.

Task 2: Role Play

- *How are you and what’s your name?
- My name is Mariam and your?
- *My name is Nika. Where did you spend your holidays?
- Uh...In Paris.
- *Uh...it’s fine.
- Uh...and you?
- *Uh...I was in Mexico.

- ...Wow! Excellent!
- *Yes, it very nice and...exciting.
- Uh...how did you spend ...uh... your time?
- *It was very good...uh...me and *our friend – my friends* were together, and we were...uh...laughing...and playing.
- Uh.....uh...were your parents with you?
- *No, my parents were in Tbilisi...in Georgia...and I want to see them... very fast. And yours?
- Uh...yes, my parents were... with me, and my sisters too.
- *Oh, it's great. Uh... ok, nice to meet you.
- ...*Nice. Good-bye!*

Estimated language proficiency level: B1–Sufficient Competence

Task 1: Picture Description

Learner: This family went to Greece...in...island, it's summer, it's already August, and they're having fun, and there's whole family: mother, father and children; *their- they're* uh...they are having much fun...they are on a beach and one hour ago they came here. There is also pool and they will like it, but their mother and father told them that sea is better for them, like for everyone, but it's not available to swim too far, because there are sharks and everything... They are having fun together because they are brother and sisters. They are making some...some things with sand and everything...they ...they don't know how to swim yet, and, and also, they don't know how to have fun on the beach, because they are too little, and their mother and father are teaching them about everything, *they taught them that...they taught them how* to play volleyball and also football on the beach ... and they really want to *tease - teach* them how to swim.

Task 2: Role Play

- *How are you?
- Fine, and you?
- *Yes, fine. Where are you from?
- I am from Georgia and you?
- *Me, too. And where do you live?
- I live in Abashidze Street.
- *And I am on Petriashvili Street. Nice to meet you!
- Me too. Where were you on a holiday?
- *I was in New York, in USA, and how about you?>
- I was in Germany.
- *That's great! In what...in what ...uh...city?
- I was in Baxba.
- *That's great, and now you're going back to Georgia, right?
- Yes, you too, yes?
- *Ja, of course, this train goes back to Georgia.
- Did you like...uh
- *New York? Oh, ja, of course! I went there with my family, we had fun; we went to amusement parks, and also the best part was shopping. Uh, we like shopping. And you?
- Yes, I was with my friends and I liked it very much, because we went on a shopping too, and also, we went to school for one month.
- *And are your friends here?
- Uh...no, they *went – they're ...uh...going* to Georgia next week...by plane.

- *By plane? I also wanted to go by plane, but my mum told me that it's better to travel with a train.
- Yes, I agree with her
- *Well, I don't, I like plane better.
- Uh...what...you said you were shopping there. What did you bought there?
- *I bought *a – many* things like, clothes, T-shirt, pants, everything. And you?
- Uh...I bought some gift for my friends, too.
- *That's great. How...and...your friends, they're going in one week, right?
- Yes.
- *That's too bad, I wanted to meet them.
- Hmm, we can meet each other next week.
- *Yes, of course we can! Can you ...uh...tell me your number? Phone number?
- Yes, 595 472147.
- *I'll call you then. Do you want to know my number?
- Ok
- *557 207 207. I think that I have the greatest number in Georgia. Well, they told me they call this number is called a golden number?
- That's cool!
- * Do you have a boyfriend?
- No, and you girlfriend?
- *No.
- Bad.
- *Well, I had it at least one month ago.
- And you broke up?
- *Yes.
- Ok, I think the train...uh...went to Georgia now. Bye
- *Ok. Bye.

Estimated language proficiency level: B2–Good competence

Task 1: Picture description

- So, I can see a happy family in this picture. There are two children, *a man and a...a husband and a* wife; their marriage is very happy, the children are very happy too. The boy is wearing a green sunglasses...uh...and *there is – and around* the boy there is something like the sun, *which helps him not to – which helps him to* swim in the sea. In the background, I can definitely say that there is a mountain...*there is not much... the sky is not really* cloudy and I can see people playing volleyball and...and they are trying to ride the boat in the sea, I think. It is funny weather and everybody's faces are happy, and also in the back I can see umbrellas, which are protecting the people from the sun. Yes...uh...I can also see sand and a very big house in the mountains, yes...uh...what else can I say... I think, uh, in the...in the sand there is a big blue building, I think it's a café, because usually in the places like this, there always is a café. Uh...*the – a* husband and a boy are holding things, like...circular things – a husband is holding a red thing and the boy green...uh...*they – I think they* have not swum yet, but they have certainly *build – built* the castles from the sand, because there you can see in this picture something which helps the boy and the girl to help the castles from the sand, I think. I also can say, that the half of the beach is empty, which I don't definitely know why, people who are still on the beach are very happy because they all are having fun, and on the boat I can see two boys or guys; one is sitting and having rest and the other is definitely not having fun, because he's...the boat and it's really hard for him. Yes, so it's a really happy family, everything's nice in this picture, yes, everything's fine.

*Task 2: Role Play*⁵

- *Hi, you are going to Georgia, yes?
- Well, yes, it's...it has been a very, very long day and... but I think it'll be good to see my country again.
- * Well, my name is David, and yours?
- Well, my George, George, well I haven't seen you...
- *I haven't seen you too, but...
- No, no I remember you in New York;
- *No, it seems it wasn't me. And from which country are you coming to Georgia? I am coming from Switzerland.
- Oh, was in England
- * Oh, you were in England, I was in England too. You know, England, then Switzerland and then Georgia. It was a really nice holiday. I really had some fun, and you?
- Yes, it was pretty fun for me too. I was there with my mother, and I can say that it was very, very, very... stressful for me.
- *Yes, it was stressful. I was with my family, so it was harder, but right now I am coming back to Georgia and my school is starting, and that's really bad for me because I ...well, that's not bad but that's really hard for me; and what...what would you say about the school? Do you like it or not?
- My personal thoughts, well, I think school is very *nice* /nis/.
- *Oh, yes, school is nice, but it's very hard, yes. What sports to you play?
- Football, basketball, but I most... karate.
- *Karate? So, you're the future Bruce Lee, yes?!
- So, I was interesting in...in your life...so, when I look at you... I think that you...have been... taking some art classes.
- *Yes, I have been taking some art classes, and whole my life I've dedicated to learn to unlock the Da Vinci Code
- Oh, you are one funny man.
- *Oh, thank you. So, the train has just stopped. It was really nice to meet you. Bye!
- Bye!

⁵ The speaker under evaluation is marked with an asterisk*.