

Teacher Self-Reports of Assessment Practices  
and Top-down Coordination of Assessment  
on English Language courses in Georgian Universities

Paul Anthony Marshall

---

松 山 大 学  
言語文化研究 第39巻第2号（抜刷）  
2020年3月

Matsuyama University  
Studies in Language and Literature  
Vol. 39 No. 2 March 2020

# Teacher Self-Reports of Assessment Practices and Top-down Coordination of Assessment on English Language courses in Georgian Universities

Paul Anthony Marshall

## **Abstract**

This research report describes a small-scale qualitative online survey of 8 educators from EFL programmes in Georgian universities. It probes levels of teacher autonomy and top-down coordination as related to classroom assessment practices in these institutions. Results suggest that levels of top-down coordination and teacher autonomy vary regarding the selection of assessment tasks, assessment criteria, and the distribution of grades. High levels of teacher autonomy in some of these institutions may mean that reliability, validity, consistency, and continuity are seen as less important than practicality, teacher empowerment and job satisfaction.

**Keywords** : Teacher autonomy, assessment, self-reports, perceptions, Georgia, higher education, university, ESOL, reliability, validity.

## **Background**

Georgia is a predominantly Christian country in the South Caucasus, bordering Turkey, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Russia, which has a population of around five million people (CIA Factbook, 2019). Its history and identity have been dominated by repeated invasion, colonisation, and exploitation by Russia. After being annexed by the Russia Empire in around 1891 (Government of Georgia, n.d.), Georgia achieved independence for just four years in 1917. A member of the United Soviet

Socialist Republic (USSR) after a Russian invasion in 1921, the Republic of Georgia was founded when independence was finally regained with the fall of the Soviet Empire in 1991 (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2019). Independence brought with it ‘instability and civil unrest’ (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2019), and ‘civil war’ (Government of Georgia, n.d.) as it has done in so many other cases. As recently as 2008, the South Ossetia region of Georgia was invaded by Russian troops (History.com, 2018).

Despite its location next to Russia and the Middle East, young Georgians identify with Europe and aspire to be European (Personal Conversations with Georgians in Tbilisi, 2019), (Ó Beacháin & Coene, 2014), (Loda, 2019). However, despite the increased personal freedom that has come with independence from the USSR, Georgia appears to be currently less economically and politically stable than in the Soviet era (Asmus, 2010). As the country has limited exploitable natural resources, young Georgians are becoming increasingly reliant on foreign visitors as a source of income (Kotulewicz & Kozłowska, 2016). Presently, tourism is flourishing in Tbilisi and further afield, and one of the keys to exploiting this resource is the learning of foreign languages. Although around 89% of tourists are from neighbouring countries according to some sources (Paresashvili & Chitaladze, 2019), the number of English-speaking tourists is increasing. An additional motivation for English education is that, nations which are more proficient in English are more likely to attract foreign investment and it is beneficial for trade relations (Tabula, 2014).

From personal observations during my visit to Tbilisi, it was clear that tourism is a blooming industry but that this may be limited to certain small areas and that these areas may be owned by a relatively small number of wealthy local or private Russian individuals. The majority of Georgians outside of these areas appeared to be living in accommodation which was both old and broken. This minimum

amount of time or money invested in property around Tbilisi was in stark contrast to the tourist zones I experienced. Public transport and services seemed efficient if not new, clean, or luxurious, which may be attributable to grants from the European Union (despite Georgia not being an EU member).

## **English Language Education in Georgia**

Georgia has 600,000 students of school age who attend 2,313 public and private schools (Georgian Ministry of Education and Science, 2012). From 2014, all teachers in public schools are required to complete a teaching certification course. Children can start attending school at the age of five, and English is part of the curriculum from this age. To graduate with a high school diploma, students need to take summative exams, including in one foreign language, which students can choose (Georgian Ministry of Education and Science, 2012).

In 2010 English became a mandatory subject in Georgian schools, replacing Russian as the principal language taught across the country (Tabula, 2014). This was part of an educational reform package introduced by the Georgian Ministry of Education and Science, in order to bring the education system more in line with that of Europe, and which was approved of by 69% of the Georgian population according to an independently conducted Gallup survey (Georgian Ministry of Education and Science, 2012). The government even sends English teachers to England for intensive language courses.

The government of Georgia, via the Georgian Ministry of Education and Science, has introduced a programme through which native English (as well as French, Italian, and German) speakers are invited to the country on short contracts “... to co-teach alongside local teachers in public schools throughout the beautiful and historic country of Georgia” (Teach and Learn with Georgia, 2019).

## Higher Education and English Language Learning in Georgia

The Georgian higher education system has undergone rapid transformation since independence in 1991. In 2004 there were around 250 universities which were mostly small and lacking in resources (Garibashvili, 2015). Due to a newly introduced government accreditation policy, the number of institutions fell rapidly but those remaining or established from the combination of existing institutions were much better resourced than previously (Garibashvili, 2015).

When Georgia escaped official dominance by Russia, the desire for internationalisation and westernisation in particular, encouraged a drive towards competence in the English language. Many of the approximately one hundred universities in Georgia (Garibashvili, 2015) have some sort of established English language degree program. These include programs which train teachers of English for schools in the country. In fact, more degrees in Georgia are taught in English than in any other language (Jakhiaia & Holmes, 2018).

This research project surveyed teachers specifically on programs of English language at Georgian universities; not those merely taught in English. It aimed to elicit teachers' self-reports of practices and decision-making related to assessment. Assessment practices and decision-making can be strong indicators of levels of top-down coordination, teacher autonomy, and curricular alignment, as well as assessment quality. It was hoped that the results of this research would provide an insight into common practice and standards, and provide recommendations for English language education at universities in Georgia.

## **Literature Review**

### **Top-Down Coordination and Teacher Autonomy**

In a paper which deals with organizational learning quite generally, March (1991) sees the balance of employee autonomy and top-down coordination as an important philosophical decision for an organization to make. According to March, limited resources mean that organizations, including schools, universities and educational authorities, must decide between focusing on exploiting certainties and exploring new possibilities. The first of these requires less risk and is best executed by top-down coordination. The second involves more risk and autonomy but is the only way to encourage such essential qualities as experimentation and innovation. Clearly these are qualities that should be thought of as desirable in education by all stakeholders as they lead to the advancement and evolution of the field. One non-educational example of the benefits of such organisational management is provided by Burgelman (2003). The existence of an autonomous work group at Intel led to the development of the processor chip at a time when the management were focusing a large amount of its attention and resources on an unrelated project. Such an important development would not have been possible, had Intel been focused solely on exploiting certainties and not left open the avenue of exploring new possibilities by allowing autonomy within the organisation.

Teacher autonomy has been empirically derived as one dimension of teacher empowerment (Klecker & Loadman, 1996 ; Short & Rinehart, 1992). Klecker & Loadman (1996) measured the correlation between six aspects of teacher empowerment and seven aspects of job satisfaction during a national process of organisational restructuring. They used a 38-item Likert scale questionnaire to obtain quantitative data from 10,544 classroom teachers. Teacher autonomy was considered one aspect of teacher empowerment in the questionnaire. A positive

correlation was found, implying that increased teacher empowerment leads to increased job satisfaction.

Perhaps the most important argument in the literature is that allowing teachers higher levels of autonomy means respecting them as professionals on a par with doctors and lawyers, but externally controlling what teachers do in the classroom denies them this professional esteem (Ingersoll, 1994 ; Pearson & Moomaw, 2005). Furthermore, denying teachers a reasonable amount of autonomy may lead to an increase in the number of teachers quitting the profession and seeking alternative vocations. In fact, it has been identified as a ‘critical component’ (Pearson & Moomaw, 2006).

### **Language Assessment Systems and Policies**

‘In most societies tests have been constructed as symbols of success, achievement and mobility, and reinforced by dominant social and educational institutions as major criteria of worth, quality and value’ (Shohamy, 2001 ; Spolsky 1995, in McNamara & Shohamy, 2008 : 89).

Lynch (2001 : 358) states that assessment has been used as a ‘synonym for testing, a synonym for evaluation, or has signalled a broader collection of measurement techniques’. Assessment on university English language courses can sometimes range from using external testing systems, using assessment systems devised internally within faculties and departments, and using alternative assessment methods devised by individual teachers. Within any assessment system, standardization is essential in ensuring standards of qualities such as reliability, validity, consistency and continuity. *Reliability* has been defined simply as ‘if the assessment were to be repeated, would the second result agree with the first?’ (Harlen, 2000 : 111). *Validity* is complex but is essentially a measure of how well

a test measures what it is purporting to measure (Harlen, 2005 : 247), such as whether direct or indirect testing methods are used. For the purpose of this study, *consistency* is the maintenance of standards and method of testing between concurrent courses, and *continuity* is the maintenance of standards and method of testing between consecutive courses.

Assessment in which none of these factors are ensured can be assumed to be somewhat lacking. It also follows that in order to establish, maintain and monitor these factors of assessment in a context where a unifying standard is required over assessments in several courses or classrooms, a certain amount of top-down coordination must be present. This has wide-ranging implications for both government and institutional assessment policy. The effects of an assessment system which is lacking in the aforementioned qualities can be indirect testing methods, misalignment between assessment and curriculum, negative washback, falling standards, and a resulting lack of motivation among students and teachers.

### **Measuring Teacher Perceptions**

Perceptions can be measured in several different ways ; for example, through questionnaires, interviews, and focus groups. Within research communities recently, Google Forms (No date) has become the most common way of distributing questionnaires online and has been used to measure university EFL teacher perceptions of assessment (Collins & Miller, 2018). This is a desirable method of survey distribution for several reasons. The current study surveyed teachers from multiple universities in multiple geographical locations. Google Forms is an efficient way to distribute questionnaires via email to multiple locations instantaneously. In addition to this, the questionnaire designer has the option of a wide variety of question types, for example, multiple choice, comments boxes,



and Likert Scale responses. This allows for the efficient collection of both quantitative and qualitative data. The data can then be easily collated, analyzed, and interpreted.

### **Research Questions**

How do teachers assess their students' English language productive skills on English Language courses in Georgian universities ?

To what extent is the assessment of English Language coordinated from the top-down in Georgian universities ?

### **Rationale**

Due to the geographical dispersion of potential participants, an internet-based form of data collection was deemed to be the most pragmatic method. The questionnaire was designed by the researcher and written using the Google Forms website. It was designed to be concise and not time-consuming for respondents to complete. The questionnaire was identical to the one that I had used in two previous research projects (Marshall, 2018a), (Marshall, 2018b), (Marshall, 2019). In this sense, it was known that it would be a reliable and insightful instrument because it had been trialled and tested twice before.

Mixed-methods research was considered but was unfortunately impractical due to the geographical distribution of the respondents. Qualitative research methods were used in order to collect data of richness and depth from a small number of respondents rather than the surface-level results that come from quantitative surveys. This was thought to be more suitable to the research questions which require the collection of participants' opinions and reasons to be fully answered. This data can

then be entered into a thematic chart and can be compared between participants (cases) and between questions (variables) (De Vaus, 2013), and patterns can be identified. Thematic charts are a tool for analyzing qualitative data, which some researchers believe should be categorized as a research method in its own right (Leininger, 1992; Thorne, 2000; King, 2004; Braun & Clarke, 2006). This method is ideal for use with rich, qualitative data.

### **Participants and Data Collection**

Forty people holding English language teaching and managerial positions ranging from lecturer to professor in Georgian universities were contacted with a request to complete an online survey. Those contacted were not known to the researcher and were chosen only because their contact email address was publicly available on their university website. A maximum of three educators were contacted from each institution. Responses were collected from eight English language teachers. This low response-rate was expected due to the nature of contacting participants which were not known to the researcher. It is not known which of the professionals contacted responded, because the survey was deliberately designed to maintain the anonymity of respondents.

Respondents had multiple choice answer options and an additional ‘Other. Please Specify’ option, followed by a comments box. This was in order to allow respondents to explain their answers.

The survey was comprised of the following questions :

What is your current position ?
What kinds of tasks do you use to assess students’ speaking ?

What kinds of tasks do you use to assess students' writing ?
Who decides what tasks are used to assess students ?
If specific criteria are used to assess students, who decides these ?
How are grades distributed in your classes ?

## Results

Regarding the first question about the respondents' current position, responses showed that three assistant professors, three full-time lecturers, one associate professor and one part-time lecturer completed the survey.

Questions two and three were mostly related to the first research question, 'How do teachers assess their students' English language productive skills on English Language courses in Georgian universities ?'

The second question, focused on speaking assessment methods, elicited a range of answers. Five of the respondents said that they use *group discussions*, five use *presentations*, three use *interviews*, two use *reading dialogues*, and one uses *monologue on a set topic*.

The third question, about writing assessment methods, yielded some interesting responses. All eight respondents said that they use *essays* to assess their students' writing. Four use *timed tests*, and three use *emails*.

Questions four, five, and six related to the second research question 'To what extent is the assessment of English Language coordinated from the top-down in Georgian universities ?'

The fourth question asked respondents who decides assessment tasks in their universities. Six responses said that *a combination of the teacher and the faculty* decide. One said *teacher* only. One said *faculty* only.

The fifth question, about whether specific assessment criteria are used and who

decides these yielded the following responses. Five people said that *a combination of the teacher and the faculty* decide assessment criteria. Two people said *teacher*. One person said *faculty*. No respondents said that criteria are not used for assessment.

Finally, question six, which probed grade distribution systems, showed that six respondents *divide grades equally (equal number of As, Bs, Cs, etc.)*. One uses *a bell curve*, and one *grades students to an external, unchanging standard*.

## Discussion & Conclusions

The results of this study reveal what may be some positive and some negative aspects of the English language assessment systems in Georgian universities. This is based partly on the assumption that to some extent, and for some question items, levels of top-down coordination can be deciphered from the amount of agreement among participants' responses.

Although some of the universities represented by respondents in this study gave similar answers about assessment measures for spoken and written English, not all of them gave the same ones. It is possible to deduce from this pattern in the results described above that there is probably no top-down coordination of English speaking or writing language assessment on a national level. This signifies that while universities may have their own internally coordinated assessment systems, students at different universities may be receiving different standards of English language education. What is more, without top-down coordination of assessment, there is no way for the government or its ministry of education to establish, monitor, or maintain standards.

The responses about assessment criteria and grading revealed that perhaps most participants are working at universities which have internally coordinated systems.

It is reassuring that criteria are used and that most teachers are grading in the same way, but the divergent responses show that this is most likely not coordinated at a national level. The danger of using institutionally internal assessment criteria and grading systems is that the standard of teaching and learning that the university is achieving cannot be compared with other institutions. This may be acceptable for a university which serves students within a certain town or city, but without external accreditation or unchanging external standards such as those possible with the use of criterion-referenced tests such as IELTS, there is no way for outsiders to judge the quality of a university's education.

The ramifications of these results are that assessment in Georgian universities may be lacking in reliability, validity, consistency or continuity. In a situation where a teacher is assessing students using direct testing measures, such as assessing their writing by asking them to write an essay, it is likely that reliability, consistency, and continuity are low, but validity is high. This is because another teacher would probably judge the same essay to be of a different standard, with separate criteria, but the test is directly testing what it purports to test.

While there are numerous benefits of teacher autonomy that have been supported by research, too much autonomy must necessitate a low level of top-down coordination. A government that has a stated desire to increase the standard of English language education in their nation, would do well to establish a coordinated system of assessment through which standards of teaching and learning can be monitored and maintained.

It is also important to stress that any negative criticism that is included in this paper is firstly cautious, and secondly related only to management systems and styles rather than educators.

## **Comparisons with Previous Studies**

I have previously used the same questionnaire to survey educators in both Japan (Marshall, 2018a) and in the U. K. (Marshall, 2018b). In addition to this, I have conducted a study which utilised Pearson and Hall's (1993) Teacher Autonomy Scale (Marshall, 2019). Although the number of respondents in these studies was also small (Japan : 11, UK : 7, TAS Japan : 18), the resulting data allows for tentative comparisons in levels of top-down coordination and teacher autonomy regarding summative classroom assessment between the three countries.

Eleven university educators in Japan responded that they use a variety of assessment tasks for both writing and speaking on their ESOL courses. The implication of this is that the validity of assessment in those contexts is high, in the sense that direct testing measures are used. Responses from all seven universities showed that teachers are choosing assessment tasks and criteria mostly independently of each other. This implied that top-down coordination is low and teacher autonomy is high, which may mean that reliability, consistency, and continuity are lacking, even if practicality is high. A similar lack of agreement on grading methods signified that students' results are decided differently by different teachers, and on different courses within the same institution, and in different institutions. The same assessment performance would likely elicit a very different grade, thus assessment reliability seems to be being overlooked. This means that there may be very little fairness in the way that students are treated.

Data collected from seven respondents in the U. K. indicated that a range of suitable assessment tasks are used for both writing and speaking. In most cases (71%) a combination of the teacher and the faculty decides on assessment tasks. Similarly, assessment criteria are decided by a combination of teacher and faculty in 58% of cases. With regard to the distribution of grades, a straight 33% split was

recorded between ‘Bell Curve’, ‘External standard’, and ‘other’. These results supported the conclusion that that assessment on ESOL courses in the U. K. is more coordinated than that in Japan. This probably means more established, measurable, and monitorable standards, resulting in a higher level of reliability, consistency, and continuity, but perhaps with less validity and practicality. However, this may also result in increased stress (Davis & Wilson, 2000), (Pearson & Hall, 1993), and decreased teacher motivation (Davis & Wilson, 2000), (Pearson & Hall, 1993), empowerment and job satisfaction (Klecker & Loadman, 1996 ; Short & Rinehart, 1992) among educators.

The Teacher Autonomy Scale (TAS) study which also took place in Japan (Marshall, 2019), collected eighteen teachers’ self-reports about general and curricular autonomy. The research instrument is a previously validated (Pearson & Hall, 1993) Likert response format questionnaire. The results implied that most teachers perceived that they have a high level of both general and curricular autonomy. Along with this go the aforementioned benefits and drawbacks for students, teachers, and institutions.

After having reviewed the results from these previous studies, it is possible to put the results from this study in Georgia into some sort of international context. It would appear that in terms of teacher autonomy, which is high in Japan and relatively lower in the U. K., teachers in universities in Georgia experience mid-level autonomy somewhere between the two extremes. Moving on to top-down coordination, Georgia again seems to be between the high levels recorded in the U. K. and the low levels in Japan. This of course implies mid-level benefits for teachers in terms of motivation, empowerment, and job satisfaction, and the drawback of stress. As far as student fairness, and established, measurable and monitorable standards, Georgia is also enjoying mid-level advantages. This mid-ground is in many ways preferable to the two extremes which seem to exist in

Japan and the U. K.

## **Suggestions for Further Studies**

Any study which could replicate the ones already completed here and in the cited previous studies would be beneficial. It would be preferable to conduct studies which are able to survey a greater number of respondents and / or in alternative higher education settings. Of particular interest would be any research into the connection between autonomy and quality in assessment; especially how top-down coordination and teacher autonomy affects the reliability and validity of ESOL summative assessment in universities.

This project was funded by the 2018 Matsuyama University special research fund.

## **References**

- Asmus, R. (2010). *A little war that shook the world: Georgia, Russia, and the future of the West*. St. Martin's Press.
- Braun, V., Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- Burgelman, R. A. (2003). 'Strategy Making and Evolutionary Organization Theory: Insights from Longitudinal Process Research'. *Research Paper Series*.
- CIA Factbook (2019). Retrieved from : <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/gg.html> [Accessed October 13th, 2019]
- Davis, J., & Wilson, S. M. (2000). Principals' efforts to empower teachers: Effects on teacher motivation and job satisfaction and stress. *The Clearing House*, 73, 349-357.
- De Vaus, D., & de Vaus, D. (2013). *Surveys in social research*. Routledge.
- Encyclopedia Britannica (2019). Retrieved from : <https://www.britannica.com/place/Georgia> [Accessed November 2nd, 2019]
- Garibashvili, I. (2015). Libraries in Georgia in 2004-2015. *Journal of Library Administration*,



55(7), 549-561.

Georgian Ministry of Education and Science, (2012). Retrieved from : <http://elibrary.emis.ge/uploads/other/124.pdf> [Accessed November 8th, 2019]

Google Forms. (No date). Retrieved from : <http://docs.google.com/forms> [Accessed October 13th, 2019]

Government of Georgia (No date). Retrieved from : [http://www.gov.ge/index.php?lang\\_id=ENG&sec\\_id=193](http://www.gov.ge/index.php?lang_id=ENG&sec_id=193) [Accessed November 2nd, 2019]

Harlen, W. (2000). *Teaching, learning and assessing science*. 5-12 (London, Paul Chapman).

Harlen, W. (2005). Trusting teachers' judgement : research evidence of the reliability and validity of teachers' assessment used for summative purposes, *Research Papers in Education*, 20 : 3, 245-270.

History.com (2018). Retrieved from : <https://www.history.com/news/russia-georgia-war-military-nato> [Accessed November 2nd, 2019]

Ingersoll, R. (1994). 'Organizational control in secondary schools'. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64(2), 150-173.

Jakhaia, N., & Holmes, K. (2018). Teaching Composition in Schools : Challenges of EFL Teachers in Post-Soviet Georgia. *Beyond Words*, 6(1), 16-25.

King, N. (2004). Using templates in the thematic analysis of text. In Cassell, C., Symon, G. (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research* (257-270). London, UK : Sage.

Klecker, B. J., & Loadman, W. (1996). 'Exploring the relationship between teacher empowerment and teacher job satisfaction.' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED400254)

Kotulewicz, K., & Kozłowska, M. (2016). Tourism as the Priority for the Economic Development of Modern Georgia. *Argumenta Oeconomica Cracoviensia*, (13), 83-102.

Leininger, M. (1992). Current issues, problems, and trends to advance qualitative paradigmatic research methods for the future. *Qualitative Health Research*, 2, 392-415.

Loda, C. (2019). Georgia, the European Union, and the Visa-Free Travel Regime : Between European Identity and Strategic Pragmatism. *Nationalities Papers*, 47(1), 72-86.

Lynch, B. K. (2001). 'Rethinking assessment from a critical perspective'. *Language Testing*, 18 (4), 351-372.

March, J. G. (1991). 'Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning'. *Organization science*, 2(1), 71-87.

Marshall, P. A. (2018a). Teacher Autonomy and Assessment in Japanese University EFL Programs, *KOTESOL 2017 Conference Proceedings* (Korea Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages), 109-118.

- Marshall, P. A. (2018b). Teacher Autonomy and Assessment in University ESOL Programmes in Japan and the U. K. (Presentation). *Poland International Congress of Educational Research, Krakow, Poland*.
- Marshall, P. A. (2019). Teacher Autonomy on English Communication courses in Japanese Universities. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 11(2), 87-99.
- McNamara, T. & Shohamy, E. (2008). Viewpoint: Language tests and human rights. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18(1).
- Ó Beacháin, D., & Coene, F. (2014). Go West: Georgia's European identity and its role in domestic politics and foreign policy objectives. *Nationalities Papers*, 42(6), 923-941.
- Paresashvili, N., & Chitaladze, K. (2019). Main Challenges of tourism Development in Management in Georgia. *Economic and Social Development: Book of Proceedings*, 1426-1432.
- Pearson, L. C., & Hall, B. W. (1993). 'Initial construct validation of the teaching autonomy scale'. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 86(3), 172-178.
- Pearson, L. C., & Moomaw, W. (2005). 'The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment, and professionalism.' *Educational research quarterly*, 29(1), 38-54.
- Pearson, L. C., & Moomaw, W. (2006). 'Continuing validation of the teaching autonomy scale.' *The Journal of Educational Research*, 100(1), 44-51.
- Shohamy, E. (2001). *The Power of Tests: A Critical Perspective on the Uses of Language Tests*. London: Pearson.
- Shohamy, E. (2003). 'Implications of Language Education Policies for Language Study in Schools and Universities'. *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 87(2), 278-286.
- Short, P. M., & Rinehart, J. S. (1992). School participant empowerment scale: Assessment of level of empowerment within the school environment. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52, 951-961.
- Spolsky, B. (1995). *Measured Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Survey Monkey, (No Date). Retrieved from : <https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk> [Accessed November 8th, 2019]
- Tabula, (2014). Retrieved from : <http://www.tabula.ge/en/story/83557-language-policy-in-georgia-and-the-global-role-of-the-english-language> [Accessed November 8th, 2019]
- Teach and Learn with Georgia, (2019). Retrieved from : <http://www.tlg.gov.ge/> [Accessed November 8th, 2019]
- Thorne, S. (2000). Data analysis in qualitative research. *Evidence Based Nursing*, 3, 68-70.

## Appendix 1 :

## English Assessment Questionnaire and Responses

Questions	1. What is your current position ?	2. What kinds of tasks do you use to assess students' speaking ?	3. What kinds of tasks do you use to assess students' writing ?	4. Who decides what tasks are used to assess students ?	5. If specific criteria are used to assess students, who decides these ?	6. How are grades distributed in your classes ?
Respondent 1	Assistant Professor	Group discussions Reading dialogues Presentations	Essays Emails	Teacher	Teacher	Evenly (equal numbers of As, Bs, Cs, etc.)
Respondent 2	Part-time Lecturer	Group discussions	Essays	Faculty	Faculty	Evenly (equal numbers of As, Bs, Cs, etc.)
Respondent 3	Associate Professor	Group discussions Reading dialogues Presentations	Timed tests Essays	Combination (teacher & faculty)	Combination (teacher & faculty)	Evenly (equal numbers of As, Bs, Cs, etc.)
Respondent 4	Full-time Lecturer	Interviews Presentations Other (please specify) : monologues on a set topic	Timed tests Essays Emails	Combination (teacher & faculty)	Combination (teacher & faculty)	Bell curve
Respondent 5	Full-time Lecturer	Group discussions	Essays	Combination (teacher & faculty)	Combination (teacher & faculty)	To an external, unchangeable standard
Respondent 6	Assistant Professor	Group discussions Presentations	Timed tests Essays Emails	Combination (teacher & faculty)	Combination (teacher & faculty)	Evenly (equal numbers of As, Bs, Cs, etc.)
Respondent 7	Assistant Professor	Interviews Presentations	Timed tests Essays	teacher and the department	teacher and the department	Evenly (equal numbers of As, Bs, Cs, etc.)
Respondent 8	Full-time Lecturer	Interviews	Essays	Combination (teacher & faculty)	Teacher	Evenly (equal numbers of As, Bs, Cs, etc.)