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I. PREFACE
Preface

Purpose of the Bureau for International Language Co-ordination (BILC)

1. The Bureau was formed in 1966 and has the following responsibilities:
   a. The dissemination to participating countries of information on developments in the field of language training.
   b. The convening of an annual conference of participating nations which reviews the work done in the co-ordination field and in the study of particular language topics.
   In addition, participating countries circulate through BILC reports on projects and research into such matter as instructional techniques, testing and educational technology.

Membership

2. The founding members are France, Italy, Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States. Subsequently, the following joined:

   1975: SHAPE and IMS/NATO as non-voting members
   1978: Portugal
   1983: Turkey
   1984: Denmark and Greece
   1986: Spain

3. The Bureau does not seek to draw distinctions of membership but rather encourages the fullest participation by all. Some nations are able to participate more actively in Bureau affairs; others are kept informed by the Secretariat and where possible are represented at conferences by civilian observers or staff officers engaged in language training.

Organization of the Bureau

4. The Bureau has a standing Secretariat, which is provided by the Federal Republic of Germany's Bundessprachenamt (Federal Language Office), Hürth. Throughout the year, the Secretariat acts as a clearing house for communications between members of the Bureau. It also organizes the annual conference and produces the minutes of the conference and the annual conference report.

5. The Bureau also has a Steering Committee which meets at each conference. This body is an executive committee comprising the delegates of the full member nations. It plans the activities for the following year and tasks the Secretariat.

Association with NATO

6. Since 1978 BILC has been recognized by the Joint Services Subgroup - NATO Training Group (JSSG - NTG) as a consultative and advisory body concerned with language training matters.
Achievements

7. Between 1972 and 1974, BILC developed language proficiency levels for the four skills of Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing. These levels were published as STANAG 6001 in October 1976 and are now in use throughout NATO where they have been assimilated into national language proficiency systems to facilitate job descriptions and the equating of member countries' own internal standards with NATO requirements and other nations' systems.

8. The subject of testing for these proficiency levels was examined in detail by BILC and it was concluded that NATO members should use national tests standardized in their own country and correlated with other tests in NATO use. The Canadian and US tests of English were formally identified to NATO as appropriate measures for use in relation to STANAG 6001. In 1982, Canada made these tests available to NATO members and Belgium, Denmark, Italy, Norway and Portugal have availed themselves of this material. The "Standing Group on Task Analysis and Testing (SGTT)" monitors and co-ordinates developments in this field.

9. Another important field of activity are the continuous exchanges of information, ideas, materials, personnel and students among members, which are too numerous to list here.

Current Study Group Activities

10. The following study groups will convene at the 1994 Conference:

- "Language Training for Special Purposes"
- "Supporting NACC Countries"
- "Quality Control"
- "Educational Technology as Applied by Member States"

The Standing Group on Task Analysis and Testing (SGTT) will be dormant.

1994 Conference

11. The 1994 Conference (to be held in Turin, Italy, from 20 - 24 June 1994) has the theme "Quality Control of all Aspects of Military Language Training."
II. CONFERENCE ORGANIZATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>0830</td>
<td>Pick up at Holiday Inn Express</td>
<td>All delegates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 June</td>
<td>0900</td>
<td>Administrative Briefing</td>
<td>Weckerling Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Captain Conrad Gordon, U.S. Army</td>
<td>Weckerling Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BILC Conference Project Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0930</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0945</td>
<td>Conference Opening Address</td>
<td>Weckerling Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colonel Vladimir Sobichevsky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commandant, DLIFLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Introduction on theme</td>
<td>Weckerling Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Language Training vs Language Education&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Frank Borchardt - CALICO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>Conference Photo</td>
<td>Front of Weckerling Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Russian Village Dining Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>Move to Company F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Barracks Tour</td>
<td>Company F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant Colonel Berry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Captain Oreskovic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>Move to Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>Observe Classes</td>
<td>Middle East School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian School</td>
<td>Russian School 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>Move to Munzer Hall</td>
<td>Munzer Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>DLIFLC Command Briefing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colonel Ronald E. Bergquist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Commandant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Study Group Session #1</td>
<td>Aiso Library (Group 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Munzer Hall (Group 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Munakata Hall (Group 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nakamura Hall (Group 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Return to Holiday Inn Express</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>0730</td>
<td>Pick up at Holiday Inn Express</td>
<td>Steering Committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 June</td>
<td>0800</td>
<td>Steering Committee Session #1</td>
<td>Munakata Hall Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0830</td>
<td>Pick up at Holiday Inn Express</td>
<td>Remaining delegates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0900</td>
<td>Technology Fair Introduction</td>
<td>Weckerling Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Clifford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provost, DLIFLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0915</td>
<td>Technology Fair</td>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Individual preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>DLI History (1941- Present)</td>
<td>Weckerling Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. James McNaughton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DLIFLC Historian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>Technology Fair</td>
<td>Weckerling Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Study Group Session #2</td>
<td>Weckerling Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Return to Holiday Inn Express</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>0730</td>
<td>Pick up at Holiday Inn Express</td>
<td>Steering Committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 June</td>
<td>0800</td>
<td>Steering Committee Session #2</td>
<td>Munakata Hall Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0830</td>
<td>Pick up at Holiday Inn Express</td>
<td>Remaining delegates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0900</td>
<td>English Language Center Presentation</td>
<td>Munakata Hall Auditorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Linda Chambers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0930</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0945</td>
<td>LINGNET Presentation</td>
<td>Munakata Hall Auditorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language Program Coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SGM Clendenen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>Break/Movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>Automated Student Questionaire</td>
<td>Building 631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Movement to Aquarium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Luncheon</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Aquarium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ocean View Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Aquarium Tour</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Aquarium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Scenic Drive</td>
<td>Pacific Grove/17 Mile Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Ecological Presentation</td>
<td>Bird Rock/17 Mile Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Gene Fryberger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Ecologist, Pebble Beach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>17 Mile Drive/Lone Cypress</td>
<td>17 Mile Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Arrive Carmel</td>
<td>Dinner &amp; Shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Return to Holiday Inn Express</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>0730</td>
<td>Pick up at Holiday Inn Express</td>
<td>Steering Committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 June</td>
<td>0800</td>
<td>Steering Committee Session #3</td>
<td>Munakata Hall Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0830</td>
<td>Pick up at Holiday Inn Express</td>
<td>Remaining delegates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0900</td>
<td>Video Tele Training (VTT) Overview</td>
<td>Weckerling Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Pete Lallos, Distance Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0930</td>
<td>Move to VTT Studios</td>
<td>Buildings 418 and 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observe VTT Classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Individual preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>Other Educational Technologies</td>
<td>Weckerling Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Brigitta Ludgate</td>
<td>SCOLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty &amp; Staff Division</td>
<td>Wireless Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Study Group Session #3</td>
<td>Weckerling Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Return to Holiday Inn Express</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Pick up for BILC Dinner</td>
<td>Holiday Inn Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Cocktails</td>
<td>Naval Post Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>La Novia Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Naval Post Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>La Novia Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>Return to Holiday Inn Express</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>0830</td>
<td>Pick up at Holiday Inn Express</td>
<td>All delegates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 June</td>
<td>0900</td>
<td>Finalize Study Group and Steering Committee Reports</td>
<td>Weckerling Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>Presentation of Steering Committee Report and Study Group Reports</td>
<td>Weckerling Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Summation/Open Forum</td>
<td>Weckerling Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Lunch Departure of delegates</td>
<td>Individual preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escort Officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>Conference Chairman</td>
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Language Training vs. Language Education
Frank L. Borchardt

Somewhere on this earth there is a professor in a university department of language and literature who, as we speak, is making the point as forcefully as he can: 'I don't teach language, I teach literature.'

This pompous ass has a direct counterpart in a defensive and very insecure language trainer who is saying, as we speak, 'A classroom filled with refugees who need to know enough of our language to fill out a job application do not need to know' (fill in the blank: Cervantes, Ghelderode, Dante, Goethe, Ibsen, Shakespeare, Voltaire, Vondel, or Hans Christian Andersen).

Between the two of them, they summarize no less than half the obstacles to effective second language learning around the world today. Let them stand for the whole great range of psychological, sociological, and political problems intertwined with the business of language acquisition, problems normally unspoken, largely unaddressed, and, too many of them, in the realm of taboo.

If our pompous ass professor were to tell the truth—for the sake of hospitality to the many international guests in this audience let us make him an American—any course he gives is some sort of language course. Any course, however high its designation, given in a foreign language department is some sort of language course.

When I pointed this out to my colleagues in a recent department meeting I was drowned out by shouts of 'rubbish!' Given the usually sedate, not to say boring course of departmental meetings, this expression of outrage gave me a clue that I had touched on a raw nerve indeed. Our mythical language and literature professor may, of course, get around this reality by teaching in English, which is far too often the case. But even then, if the course is to be any good and teach his students something useful, he had better be teaching—from the realm of language training—listening comprehension and reading strategies, no matter what he may call them.

The alternative is to let his students watch his great ideas float off before them as a wonderful light show. If the teacher does not give his students the tools to connect those ideas with the text, spoken or written, to extract those ideas themselves when the time comes, then the performance remains a light show, 'full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.' He will be engaged in monologue before a deaf audience. That happens often enough, too.

To balance things out with our language trainer, we may point out that sooner or later his class of refugees will not be satisfied with a job cooking hamburgers at MacDonald's. The very inability to access Shakespeare (or Cervantes, Ghelderode, Dante, Goethe, Ibsen, Montaigne, Vondel, or Hans Christian Andersen) will be precisely what closes the avenues of advancement.

It might be asking too much for a language trainer with a very focussed and special mission to open all the routes to high culture. It is, however, not asking too much for the trainer to prepare the learner for everyday culture, culture with a small 'c.' This is what the discipline of Linguistics calls 'Pragmatics.' It is the cultural, environmental aspects of a language which fall out far from the technicalities of formal linguistic interchange. A language trainer is not doing enough simply to convey the correct morphology of familiar and formal second person address, for example. People are sensitive about how they are addressed. A sense of the proper circumstance of either familiar or formal second-person address has to
be conveyed at the same time as the grammar. Teaching when to use 'du,' 'tu,' or 'tu' and when 'Sie,' 'vous,' 'voi' or 'usted' is not simply language training any more. It is tending toward language education. The very native speaker who will forgive a foreigner a mistake in grammar might be positively insulted by a mistake in the form of address. Imagine this case in German. The term for 'Colonel' is 'Oberst'; the term for 'waiter' (in a restaurant) is 'Ober.' A waiter may forgive a tourist for calling him 'Herr Oberst'; but what might a Colonel say if an enlisted man called him 'Herr Ober'? 

The conventions of profanity and cursing, for another example, have general similarities from one language to another when it comes to biology. Most cultures curse by some combination of ingestion, elimination, reproduction, or genealogy. After that, however, both the breadth and classifications for appropriate swearing differ drastically. There are those in northern Spain who maintain that one should not be allowed to drive a car without a mastery of Catalan. Why not? To drive a car, these people maintain, requires 'a mastery of profanity: in Catalan, one can curse for five minutes without repeating oneself. In Latin countries, biology seems to mix with theology for most effective cursing.

German has been accused of a certain poverty in this respect. Invoking the gods of weather ('Kreuzzimmeldonnwerwettenichamal') hardly seems to provide the same release as a well chosen Anglo-Saxon epithet ("expletive deleted"). On the other hand, German does have the whole domain of barnyard vocabulary. It is technically precise and marvelously differentiated. It is without charge when applied to the barnyard, but electrically charged when applied to human beings. Dogs don't eat food in German, they devour fodder. While it would be hardly a compliment, in English, to call your restaurant meal 'fodder' or 'feed,' it would be a grievous insult to call it 'Futter' in German, and 'Fraß' would be grounds for law suit. Apply the same stem to the human face and you have grounds for a duel.

Well, is this language training or is it language education? If language training is chiefly dedicated to practical fluency, then this is language education. If language training omits this information, however, it produces a crippled speaker. What is language education good at? Generally answered 'pragmatics'; precisely answered: culture. What was just discussed was 'culture' with a small "c." When pursuing its higher mission, language education pursues culture with a capital "C". Sometimes, at its loftiest extremes with a capital "K", Kultur.

There is a certain risk involved in speaking publicly about the status and self-esteem of language professionals in the real world. There is a greater risk involved in addressing language taboos. Neither compare with the risk of discussing "high culture." If "high culture" is hard to define, it is not too hard to describe.

As an especially European phenomenon (with astonishingly close analogues in other civilizations) 'high' culture embraces literacy, literary tradition, history as it is understood in the West, fine arts, and particularly the ability to speak about all the above articulately. Although it embraces literature, history, and the arts, the bearers of 'high culture," the 'Mandarins,' do not themselves have to be novelists, biographers, or flute players. Mandarins speak, read, or write knowledgeably about literature, history, and the arts. What makes them Mandarins is language, "the higher literacy," much discussed in recent years in America's self-criticism of its educational system. In its strictest manifestation, the content of this culture is urban (Bourgeois), Catholic, historical, and aesthetic. Its form is literate and eloquent. It is radically undemocratic, although the roots of democracy rest entirely and without exception in its soil. It is elitist. It is the "language" in which the permanent governing cadres of most European countries communicate with one another and let one another know that they have a common body of reference.

This common body of reference is the "canon". Although the "canon" is exceptionally hard to define, it generally includes the literary and philosophical "classics" of Europe. There are, of course, national differences. French Mandarins would expect other French Mandarins to catch subtle references to Diderot and would be surprised (and delighted) if an Italian Mandarin caught the same reference, but would not demote the Italian out of hand.
for missing it. However, a reference to a Dante would certainly have to be caught by all players regardless of nationality.

There is an inherent snobbism in this convention. Indeed, European Mandarinism may be the ultimate snobbism. All snobbisms which fall short of the unreachably high demands of European Mandarinism can be made ridiculous by it. One thinks of the unfortunate encounter, when there was still a Soviet Union, between two first ladies.

But Mandarin Snobbism is probably the exception and may actually be an internal contradiction. It is probably more often a perception constructed by people with imperfect access to high culture than a weapon employed by the cultured themselves. The reason for this lies in the very nature of Mandarin culture with its predilection for genius. If genius does not instill humility in its admirers, something is very wrong with the admirer. Furthermore, Mandarin culture sets unreachably high standards: one can never have read enough, never have seen enough architecture, visited enough museums, appreciated enough performances, known enough languages, etc. etc.

The height of the standards is certainly what has made Mandarin Culture the brunt of attack for virtually as long as it has been in existence. Student counselors in schools of the arts tell of a common problem. Young people who have been trading on their talent and difference since they were ten, find the bill fall due when they are twenty. They look to themselves and Beethoven or Louis Sullivan or Picasso, and despair. The compensatory reactions cover the spectrum. Likewise, the encounter with Mandarin Culture.

When, in the last century and a half or so, people have thrown off the "Burden of the Past" how often has that been an alibi for getting out from under Mandarin Culture and its impossibly high standards? Its stubborn vitality is signaled by the remarkably frequent declarations of its death and burial. That it remains the living and abiding norm is evidenced by its repudiation, again and again, by one cultural revolution after the other-usually as though nothing had intervened. If scientists followed the same path, they would still be coming to terms with Aristotle and Ptolemy.

The persistent relevance of high culture imposes a responsibility on the educator, in this case, the modern language educator. To speak from the American perspective: to deprive American students of exposure to the high culture of the target language is to handicap them for no good reason. Foreigners generally do not expect Americans to have fluency in the language of the Mandarins. But that expectation is coupled with a greater or lesser degree of condescension. To empower the students with the tools to disappoint that expectation is one of the greatest favors they can get from their teachers. Imagine the first crisp Fall day of the season. Imagine an American visitor meeting a German acquaintance on the stairs. Imagine a passing reference to Rilke's "Autumn Day": Herr es ist Zeit, Lord, it is time! At least as many barriers tumble as would to a bottle of good German wine. Combine the two, and you'll have life long friends!

It is a good thing that language education can claim high culture as an element of its mission, because otherwise it suffers from an array of serious disadvantages. It takes place typically in an environment highly unfavorable to language training. The students may have direct access to a teacher three hours a week, maybe four or five in unusual circumstances, but always in competition with three or four other courses of study. With luck, the students will have a language laboratory, maybe some computer-based drill and practice, and videotapes to sit before like couch potatoes. Altogether, they may have as few as forty contact hours a semester. When someone complains, 'My child has had two years of Spanish and is not yet fluent,' and concludes from that, 'The language teaching profession is not doing its job,' let that person consider what 'two years of Spanish' means. It may very well represent all of 160 contact hours. Small children, those best of language students, don't learn their mother tongue in 160 contact hours!
In the absence of any real hope for achieving fluency in these circumstances, language education leaves language training to the hopes of immersion in the country of the target language with a summer, semester, or year abroad, if the students can afford it.

Failing fluency, what language education can provide its students in that brief time is structure, pragmatics, a taste of high culture, and, may we call it 'language literacy,' the beginnings of an understanding that language has grammar and syntax, even the students' own first language, and that other languages are not merely clever one-for-one encodings of their first language but actually alternative systems for interpreting the world.

Language training, on the other hand, takes place in an environment of perhaps twenty or thirty hours a week contact time. The learning strategies have got to be radically different. A language 'educator,' trained in literature alone, would run out of useful teaching tactics in a week! It is no surprise that the revolution in language teaching that has taken place over the last ten or twelve years has come out of language training, chiefly, ESL (English as a Second Language).

Comprehension strategies such as:
1. Preliminary Activities
   Prediction
   Preview
2. Preliminary Processing
   Skimming
   Scanning
3. Decoding Activities
   Chaining
   Lexicon Recovery
4. Analysis
5. Reconstruction
6. Transcription
7. Total Comprehension
Gisting
Translating
Summarizing

emerge from the experience of language training, not the experience of language education. They make real the abstract advice: 'learn how to skim, don't look up every word.'

Literature professors who assume their students, without explicit training, know how to do this, even in their first language, are deluding themselves. This kind of strategy can and should be incorporated into the language education classroom with ease and as a great service to the students. And this is only one instance of the countless good ideas that have been developed in this decade of intense self-criticism on the part of language teaching professionals, chiefly, language trainers.

By and large, language educators and language trainers manage to stay out of one another's way. They have separate associations or hold separate sessions inside the larger associations. Would that they collided more often. It would make them reconsider what they have to learn from one another, how to make common cause when they are threatened by retrenchment. The outside world is not so subtle as to distinguish between them. Most importantly, it might help them reassess their role in a changing world.

And if they do not reassess their role voluntarily, a changing world will reassess it for them.

The distinguished Provost of this institution, Ray Clifford, has been widely quoted for his wise observation: "Computers will never replace teachers; but teachers who use computers will replace teachers who don't." I have often employed the quote myself. I now no longer believe it to be true.
There was a time when the world of learning was completely or almost completely oral. Writing was a craft reserved for specialists and reading was only slightly more widespread. Pupils gathered at the feet of the speaking master heard the word, processed it, and spoke it back.

Sounds like the notorious 'Audio-Lingual Method' (ALM). Before the full acceptance of print, the 'Audio-Lingual Method' was, indeed, the way teaching and learning took place. As to the advantages of print, it was perhaps three hundred years before the teachers caught on. The students caught on more quickly than the professors did. As early as 1550 students, within one hundred years of the invention of print, compiled their own textbooks from the instructional classics and could supplement listening at the feet of the master with reading when they got home. The textbooks were compact, relatively inexpensive, randomly accessible, portable, usable in private. But the students were still memorizing what they read. This is, however, radically different from memorizing what they heard. They took the step across the abyss to the new technology first.

It is not until the first modern attempts at university reform in the eighteenth century, under Pietist leadership, that published research became the measure of academic achievement. By the middle of the eighteenth century, academic publishing is big business. Professors begin routinely to publish their courses, no doubt encouraging their students to buy the 'hard copy' version to be assured a complete understanding of the professor's wisdom (and to supplement his meager salary). 'Publish or perish' was installed and has remained enthroned from then until now, some two hundred or two hundred and fifty years.

The lecture-demonstration, although it has its roots in an oral culture became 'literate,' or 'typographic,' when it became one station in the cycle of academic learning, where all other stations were in print.

The question one needs to ask today is just how permanent, inevitable, and unchanging are the conventions of formal instruction in the time in which we live. The dominant mode of formal instruction world-wide is still the lecture-demonstration. The seminar, in normal circumstances, is little more than a variant of the lecture-demonstration, where the students may be permitted occasionally to play the same role as the teacher. In ideal circumstances, the variant may move over to the disputation, a bit less formal now than the medieval and Renaissance predecessor, but a disputation nonetheless, where new knowledge can be achieved through dialogue, through dialectic. But any new knowledge thus achieved, or achieved any other way, is only 'virtual' until it reaches print. Then it turns into a kind of potential reality, until it is read, when it is something that can be talked about, written about, read, talked about, etc.

To be ruthlessly honest with ourselves, how much of our new knowledge is acquired through print nowadays? And if we are incapable of this extreme of self-criticism, how much of the new knowledge of the young is acquired through print, as opposed to electronic media? Whether this is a happy development or not is entirely beside the point. It is wholly possible to argue that manuscript is superior to print, even to be right in that argument. It is still wholly beside the point. The art of printing superseded manuscript. Electronic media appear to be doing something similar to print. [A colleague of mine, baffled at what the students know and do not know, says: 'Well, the Gutenberg Blip appears to be over.]

If the 'Gutenberg Blip' is over or at least passing quietly into history what does that mean for those of us who depend on lecture-demonstrations for a living? Those may be in the right who fear new technology as a competitor who threatens their very livelihoods. As was suggested earlier, examination of one's professional role in society never hurts. It may be that we are near the point of having to do so for our own survival.

For those of you who feel unthreatened, have a look tomorrow at the technology fair and see what tomorrow's tomorrow holds in store for you.
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Ray Clifford

Significant Differences
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   KEY WORDS AND
   RESPOND WITH DATA
   OR ACTION

Computer-Assisted
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INTENT AND RESPOND
APPROPRIATELY

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

WHAT KIND OF STIMULUS IS PRESENTED?

HOW DOES THE STUDENT RESPOND?

WHAT KIND OF FEEDBACK IS PROVIDED?

INSTRUCTIONAL LEVEL

PRESENT
Textbook

PRACTICE
Workbook
Lab

APPLY
Tutor

STRUCTURED
USE
Facilitator
Teacher

REAL
COMMUNICATION
Colleagues
Associate
Attorney
Boss
Family
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EXAMPLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPUTER STIMULUS</th>
<th>LEARNER TASK</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>READING LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEWSPAPER ARTICLE</td>
<td>RECOGNIZE MAIN IDEA</td>
<td>MULTIPLE CHOICE</td>
<td>0+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATE MAIN IDEA</td>
<td>GUIDED RESPONSE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUMMARIZE/GIST</td>
<td>FREE RESPONSE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXAMPLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPUTER STIMULUS</th>
<th>LEARNER TASK</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PROFICIENCY LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRAMMAR OR VOCABULARY DRILLS</td>
<td>RECOGNIZE CORRECT ANSWER</td>
<td>MULTIPLE CHOICE</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUPPLY CORRECT FORM OR LEXICAL ITEM</td>
<td>FILL IN THE BLANK</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ACTIVITIES ARE NOT LINKED TO A FUNCTIONAL COMMUNICATION TASK

EXAMPLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPUTER STIMULUS</th>
<th>LEARNER TASK</th>
<th>SAMPLE ACTIVITY</th>
<th>WRITING LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PURPOSEFUL COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>REQUEST INFORMATION,</td>
<td>WRITE NOTES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DESCRIBE, NARRATE,</td>
<td>WRITE A REPORT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATE HYPOTHESES, AND SUPPORT OPINIONS</td>
<td>WRITE AN ESSAY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEGOTIATE, PERSUADE</td>
<td>WRITE AN EDITORIAL</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE,
YES...BUT I'M NOT SO
SURE ABOUT ARTIFICIAL
INSIGHT AND INTUITION.
STATION  TITLE AND PRESENTER

1  Chinese Computer Assisted Study (CAS)  Nu. William Yui
2  Korean Multi-Media Language Work Station  TSgt Ponzi
3  Electronic Information Display System-Video disc "GO"  Ms. Giselle Yonekura
4  Spanish Multi-Media Listening Comprehension Program  SSgt Eric Robledo
5  Foreign Language Teacher Training - Strategies and Lesson Design  Mr. Kiril Boyadjieff
6  On-line help - German Pronunciation  Ms. Brigitta Geltrich - Ludgate
7  Teacher Training - Reading Comprehension (English)  Ms. Monique Naveler
8  Templates and Ideas for Professional Looking Courseware  Ms. Brigitta Geltrich - Ludgate
9  USAF Academy Multi-Media Foreign Language Courseware  Lt. Col Jill M. Crotty (USAFA)
10  Computer Assisted Listening/Reading Exercise Book  Mr. Jon V. Varosh
11  Foreign Language Educational Technology (FLEDTECH) Database Program  Dr. Gordon Jackson
12  Computer Assisted Study (CAS) Program for Special Forces (German)  Mr. George Benigni
13  Special Forces Computer Test Program Demonstration  Mr. Le-Ba Nhon
14  Computer Assisted Study for Russian Basic Course  SSgt Jeff Roberts
15  Toolkit Applications for Russian Multi-media Instruction (ACE and LAPREP)  TSgt Jeffrey Fields
16  U.S.A. Research Institute Natural Language Processing (NLP) Language Program  Dr. Michelle Sams (USARI)
17  Computer Assisted Study for the Application of English as a Second Language  Ms. Linda Chambers (DLIELC)
18  Satellite Video (SCOLA) in Foreign Language Classrooms  Ms. Krystyna Wachowicz
STATION NAME: Chinese Computer Assisted Study (CAS)

PRESENTER: Mr. William Yui

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: Computer assisted study in an integrated reading and listening format. Designed to enhance student retention in a self-paced format.

INTENDED USER: Chinese-Mandarin basic course students.

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: Macintosh 2CX

SOFTWARE: Chinese operating system 6.0.7, and DLI courseware

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: Mrs. Genevieve Ho

ADDRESS: DLIFLC ATFL-DAS
           Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

PHONE: (408) 647-5178
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STATION NAME: Korean Multi-Media Language Work Station

PRESENTER: TSgt Robert Ponzi

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: Through a multi-media (audio-video-text with flashcard capability) computer assisted combination, this learner-focused, self-paced program for language enhancement allows students to best interact with a Computer Assisted Study (CAS) based program. Bottom line: Maintenance through motivation and memory.

INTENDED USER: Presently, Basic Course students with a limited working knowledge of Korean.

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: EVEREX 486, Sony Laserinax, SVGA monitor, Keyboard, Mouse, and Headset.

SOFTWARE: Laser discs and Korean lessons on floppy

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: Capt Zizik

ADDRESS: DLIFLC ATFL-DKO
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

PHONE: (408) 647-5109

NOTES
BILC 1993
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STATION NAME: Electronics Information Display System- Video disc "GO"

PRESENTER: Ms. Giselle Yonekura

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: Computer Assisted Study program designed to enhance student listening comprehension. Allows student to listen to a short spoken piece, then answer questions. Text is displayed for further practice while listening again.

INTENDED USER: Basic level students with no or a basic working knowledge of the language.

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: a 386/ 486 computer, with a soundblaster, headset or speakers.

SOFTWARE: DLI software for reading exercises, and mock DLPT IV

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: Giselle Yonekura

ADDRESS: DLIFLC ATFL-DME
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

PHONE: (408) 647-5150

NOTES
STATION NAME: Multi-Media Spanish Listening Comprehension Program

PRESENTER: SSgt Eric Robledo

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: Computer Assisted Study program designed to enhance student listening comprehension. Allows student to listen to a short spoken piece, then answer questions. Text is displayed for further practice while listening again.

INTENDED USER: Advanced level students with a good working knowledge of the language.

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: a 386/486 computer, with a soundblaster, headset or speakers.

SOFTWARE: Toolbook based DLI software

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: Ani Frazier

ADDRESS: DLIFLC ATFL-DRO
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

PHONE: (408) 647-5656

NOTES
BILC 1993
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STATION NAME: Multi-Media Windows/Toolbook Materials for Foreign Language Teacher Training: Strategies and Lesson Design

PRESENTER: Mr. Kiril Boyadjieff

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: Sample computer based foreign language strategies have a multiple purpose: acquainting teachers with a new teaching or training environment; using well-defined methodology as a foundation; and integrating interactive computer-based activities into the curriculum.

INTENDED USER: Foreign Language Educators (DLI Faculty and Staff)

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: IBM Compatible 386 PC, 25 MHz or up, 4 MB RAM or up, 80 MB hard disc or up: 1.44 MB floppy drive: VGA non-interlaced monitor: CD-ROM drive: Pro Auto Spectrum 16 bit sound card: mouse and keyboard: one pair of external speakers with microphone: one color/grayscale scanner.

SOFTWARE: DOS 5.0, Windows 3.1, Toolbook 1.52, applicable fonts, DLI Instructional Technologies software.

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: Mr. Kiril Boyadjieff

ADDRESS: DLIFLC ATFL-DCI-FS
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

PHONE: (408) 647-5380

NOTES
STATION NAME: On-Line help: German Pronunciation

PRESENTER: Ms. Brigitta Geltrich-Ludgate

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: Sample computer based foreign language strategies have a multiple purpose: acquainting teachers with a new teaching or training environment; using well-defined methodology as a foundation; and integrating interactive computer-based activities into the curriculum.

INTENDED USER: Foreign Language Students (in Teacher Training) and Teachers

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: IBM Compatible 386 PC, 25 MHz or up, 4 MB RAM or up, 80 MB hard disc or up: 1.44 MB floppy drive: VGA non-interlaced monitor: CD-ROM drive: Pro Autio Spectrum 16 bit sound card: mouse and keyboard: one pair of external speakers with microphone: one color/grayscale scanner.

SOFTWARE: DOS 5.0, Windows 3.1, Toolbook 1.52, applicable fonts, DLI Instructional Technologies software.

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: Ms. Brigitta Geltrich-Ludgate

ADDRESS: DLIFLC ATFL-DCI-FS
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

PHONE: (408) 647-5533

NOTES
BILC 1993
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STATION NAME: Teacher Training: Reading Comprehension (English)

PRESENTER: Ms. Monique Navelet

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: Presentation focuses on an approach to reading higher level
texts and to the teaching of critical thinking in a foreign language.

INTENDED USER: English as a second language students and teachers.

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: IBM Compatible 386 PC, 25 MHz or up, 4 MB RAM or up,
80 MB hard disc or up: 1.44 MB floppy drive: VGA non-
interlaced monitor: CD-ROM drive: Pro Audio Spectrum 16 bit
sound card: mouse and keyboard: one pair of external speakers
with microphone: one color/grayscale scanner.

SOFTWARE: DOS 5.0, Windows 3.1, Toolbook 1.52, all applicable fonts

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: Ms. Monique Navelet

ADDRESS: DLIFLC ATFL-DCI-FS
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

PHONE: (408) 647-5659

NOTES
STATION NAME: Templates and Ideas for Professional Looking Courseware

PRESENTER: Ms. Brigitta Geltrich-Ludgate

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: The use of predesigned templates for interactive curriculum-integrated courseware strategies and for designing a professional looking program during the training process, will lower the affective filter and motivate teachers in computer awareness training.

INTENDED USER: Foreign Language Educators (DLI Faculty and Staff)

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: IBM Compatible 386 PC, 25 MHz or up, 4 MB RAM or up, 80 MB hard disc or up: 1.44 MB floppy drive: VGA non-interlaced monitor: CD-ROM drive: Pro Autio Spectrum 16 bit sound card: mouse and keyboard: one pair of external speakers with microphone: one color/grayscale scanner.

SOFTWARE: DOS 5.0, Windows 3.1, Toolbook 1.52, applicable fonts, DLI Instructional Technologies software.

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: Ms. Brigitta Geltrich-Ludgate

ADDRESS: DLIFLC ATFL-DCI-FS
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

PHONE: (408) 647-5533

NOTES
STATION NAME: USAF Academy Multi-Media Foreign Language Courseware

PRESENTER: Lt Col Jill M. Crotty

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: Beginning language instruction can be significantly enhanced by providing students simulated real-world language experiences via an interactive videodisc (IVD) system. Our students spend 50% of their instructional contact time interacting with IVD lessons. The other 50% of their time is spent in small group interactions in the classroom. Instructors facilitate use of the language in communicative activities.

INTENDED USER: Beginning language courses in French, Spanish, Russian, and German

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: IBM Compatible 386 or up, 8MB RAM in 1 or 4MB SIMMS and 128K cashe, 1.44MB-3.5", 1.2MB-5.25" floppy drives, DB9, DB25 serial port, 1 ea parallel port, 8 bit, and 6-16 bit slots, SVGA card, DVA 4000 overlay card, SVGA monitor, Mouse, Sony LDP 1550 videodisc player, Sony CDU-535-01 CD-ROM player w/CDB X1O controller 3COM 3C505B network card.

SOFTWARE: MS-DOS 5.0, Windows 3.1, Language Tool courseware by USAFA, and IconAuthor 4.01.

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: Lt Col Jill M. Crotty

ADDRESS: USAF Academy
Department of Foreign Languages
Colorado Springs, CO 80940-5000

PHONE: (719) 472-3820

NOTES
STATION NAME: Computer assisted Listening/Reading Exercise Book

PRESENTER: Mr. Jon V. Varosh

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: To enable Foreign Language (FL) teachers to develop meaningful listening and reading exercises in an easy to use template: for FL students to practice listening and reading strategies with meaningful input.

INTENDED USER: FL Teachers and Students of most languages.

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: EVEREX 386, or IBM Compatible PC with 8 bit soundboard (Soundblaster)

SOFTWARE: L/R Book Template developed in Toolbook for WINDOWS

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: Jon V. Varosh

ADDRESS: DLIFLC ATFL-DCE
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

PHONE: (408) 647-5331

NOTES
STATION NAME: Foreign Language Educational Technology (FLEDTECH) Database Program

PRESENTER: Dr. Gordon Jackson

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: Automated Database program developed as a job aid for researching related works in progress for the application of technology in foreign language courseware development.

INTENDED USER: Researchers and courseware developers in a foreign language program.

TECHNICAL DATA:

    HARDWARE: IBM compatible (DOS based) 286 or better, Keyboard, Monitor

    SOFTWARE: MS-DOS 5.0, and related DLI developed program.

POINT OF CONTACT:

    NAME: Dr. Gordon Jackson

    ADDRESS: DLIFLC ATFL-DES-R
              Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

    PHONE: (408) 647-5675

NOTES
STATION NAME: Computer Assisted Study (CAS) Program for Special Forces (German)

PRESENTER: Mr. George Benigni

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: Through a multi-media, computer assisted combination, focuses, effort of the student in a time-critical training program for increased efficiency. (Multiple language applications- currently 13 models developed) Developed for fast paced instruction.

INTENDED USER: Basic Course Special Forces students with limited, or no, working knowledge of Language

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: 386 or better IBM compatible PC, CD-ROM for delivery, SVGA monitor, Keyboard, Mouse, and Soundblaster.

SOFTWARE: MS-DOS 5.0, Windows for DOS, Toolbook, and DLI Instructional Technologies software.

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: Mr. George Benigni

ADDRESS: DLIFLC ATFL-DCE
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

PHONE: (408) 647-5349

NOTES
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STATION NAME: Special Forces Computer Test Program Demonstration

PRESENTER: Mr. Nhon Le-Ba

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: A demonstration of a Multi-media test program developed by the DLIFLC for the U. S. Army's Special Forces training center.

INTENDED USER: Special Forces Basic Course students with a limited working knowledge of several languages. (prototype: German)

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: EVEREX 386, 33 MHz, w/ 4MB RAM SVGA monitor, 3.5" floppy drive, 80 MB hard drive, CD drive or CD tray, 8 bit soundcard, Keyboard, Mouse, and Headset, and external speakers.

SOFTWARE: MS-DOS 5.0, Windows 3.1, Toolbook Runtime, DLI software program

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: Mr. Nhon Le-Ba

ADDRESS: DLIFLC ATFL-DES-T
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

PHONE: (408) 647-5391

NOTES
STATION NAME: Toolbook Applications for Russian Multi-media Instruction (ACE and LAPREP)

PRESENTER: TSgt Jeffrey Fields

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: Through a multi-media (audio-video-text with flashcard capability) computer assisted combination, this learner-focused, self-paced program for language enhancement allows students to best interact with a Computer Assisted Study (CAS) based program. Bottom line: Maintenance through motivation and memory.

INTENDED USER: Presently, Basic Course students with a limited working knowledge of Russian

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: EIDS 486, SVGA monitor, Keyboard, Mouse

SOFTWARE: MS DOS 5.0, Windows 3.1, ACE, LAPREP

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: TSgt Jeffrey Fields

ADDRESS: DLIFLC ATFL-DRI
          Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

PHONE: (408) 647-5631

NOTES
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STATION NAME: Computer Assisted Study for Russian Basic Course

PRESENTER: SSgt Jeff Roberts

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: Computer Assisted Study program designed to enhance student listening comprehension. Allows student to listen to a short spoken piece, then answer questions. Text is displayed for further practice while listening again.

INTENDED USER: Presently, Basic Course students with a limited working knowledge of Russian

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: a 386/ 486 computer, with a soundblaster, headset or speakers.

SOFTWARE: MS DOS 5.0, Windows 3.1, Toolbook Applications

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: SSgt Jeff Roberts

ADDRESS: DLIFLC ATFL-DR2
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

PHONE: (408) 647-5702

NOTES
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STATION NAME: US Army Research Institute, Natural Language Processing (NLP) Language Program

PRESENTER: Dr. Michelle Sams

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: Utilizing NLP to support language production and individualized instruction.

INTENDED USER: Intermediate language students

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: IBM compatible 486 or up, with display monitor.

SOFTWARE: MS-DOS 5.0, USARI developed software.

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: Dr. Michelle Sams

ADDRESS: USARI
5001 Eisenhower Ave (Attn: PERI II)
Alexandria, VA 22333-5600

PHONE: (703) 274-5540

NOTES
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STATION NAME: Computer Assisted Study for The Application of English as a Second Language

PRESENTER: Ms. Linda Chambers (DLIELC)

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: To incorporate up-to-date technology into the application of English Language training.

INTENDED USER: Those studying the American Language Course (ALC) - currently available only for resident use.

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: IBM compatible PC 386 or up, with DVA 4000 overlay card, Sony videodisc player (LDP 1550, TO series)

SOFTWARE: MS-DOS 5.0, Windows 3.1, IconAuthor 4.01

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: Ms. Linda Chambers / Mr. Gary Twogood

ADDRESS: DLIELC LEACD
2235 Andrews Ave.
Lackland AFB, TX 78236-5259

PHONE: (210) 671-2991

NOTES
STATION NAME: Satellite Video (SCOLA) in Foreign Language Classrooms

PRESENTER: Ms. Krystyna Wachowicz

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: Participants examine a range of video sources, including satellite tapes, break down individual videos into short training segments, (maximum length: three minutes), and develop student-centered, interactive foreign language classroom activities for each segment.

INTENDED USER: Foreign Language Educators (DLI Faculty and Staff)

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: Satellite membership, satellite downlink dish, VCR (VHS) recorder and playback unit, recording cables and video tapes.

SOFTWARE: None needed

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: Ms. Krystyna Wachowicz

ADDRESS: DLIFLC ATFL-DCI-FS
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

PHONE: (408) 647-5380

NOTES
STATION NAME: Listening/Reading Comprehension programs for Japanese

PRESENTER: Ms. Yoshimi Allard

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: Kanji Town program, and Nihongo Master program designed as an integrated study format to enhance learning comprehension through a creative and entertaining program which enables student to interact with the technology.

INTENDED USER: Basic to intermediate Japanese students.

TECHNICAL DATA:

HARDWARE: Macintosh 2CX,

SOFTWARE: Hypercard by Macintosh, Kanji Town, and Nihongo Master

POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME: Ms. Yoshimi Allard

ADDRESS: DLIFLC ATFL-DAS-JA
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

PHONE: (408) 647-5540

NOTES
The Early Years:
Meeting Foreign Language Requirements to 1945

- Requirements: limited
- Immigrant population
- Contract linguists
- Attaché language training
- US Military Academy & US Naval Academy
- World War II: combat & signals intelligence

Military Intelligence Service Language School

Laying the Foundations:

US Army Language School, 1946-1963

- Requirements: early Cold War, NATO & Korea
- Students: first-term enlisted soldiers
- Instructors: civilian native-speakers
- Classes: small, intensive and eclectic
- Educational technology: tape recorders
- Results:

Met the requirements
Established the pattern
Alternative history: USAF contract programs
Fixing the System and the Process:

Defense Language Institute, 1963-74
- Requirements: Cold War + Vietnam
- Fixing the system: Defense Language Institute
- Fixing the process: academic changes
- Educational technology: language laboratories
- Results:
  - Met the requirements
  - System & process harder to fix

 Turning It Around:

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, 1974-1985
- Requirements: renewed Cold War tensions
- Changing students
- Fixing the system: DoD management changes
- Fixing the process: academic changes
- Educational technology: language laboratories
- Results:
  - Met the requirements
  - Limited academic improvements
Getting It Right:

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, 1985-1993

- Requirements: end of the Cold War
- Starting at the end: testing
- Teaching: new approaches
- Distance education: supporting the field
- Educational technology: computers & video teletraining
- Results:

  O Met the requirements better -- rising proficiency
  O Potential for further improvements

Meeting New Challenges:

After 1993

- Requirements: will need fewer, but better linguists
- New national security environment
- Teachers: New Personnel System
- Distance Education
- Educational technology: coming computer revolution
- Results:

  ● Will meet tomorrow's requirements better than ever
  ● Self-renewal
  ● Alternative futures: ???
Rasch-Ionalizing- Converting to Latent Trait Item Banking

Linda Chambers

- This presentation is a summary of a more detailed one given at the 1993 Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) Conference in Atlanta last April.

-- Dr. Grant Hennina, Pennsylvania State University, and two DLIELC testing specialists detailed the technical steps involved in converting an existing item bank from classical statistics to item Response Theory-based statistics.

- DLIELC has not yet decided to convert the English Comprehension Level (ECL) test to a computer adaptive test but has not closed the door either.

-- As many or all of you already know, DLIELC produces the ECL test for use worldwide. It is an English language proficiency test used to evaluate military students coming to the United States for training.

-- Because of the requirement for a large number of equated forms, machine generation was the only way to go, and we have used a computer-generated test system for test development for more than 20 years.

--- We originally planned to modernize the system we were using (which resided on a mainframe computer at Randolph AFB) but soon found that a more radical approach was needed.

--- Dr. Henning was consulted because our own testing section lacked the expertise.

- Our testing specialists wanted to complete the project as economically as possible--and learned early on about the cost differences between custom-designed programs and those you can buy off the shelf.

-- They were able to use the BIGSTEPS statistical program from MESA Press and obtain hardware to support our special needs (such as Bernoulli boxes for enhanced storage capacity).

-- Armed with initial guidance from Dr. Henning, their new computers, and some reference books, the testing section set off to change the "world"--or at least theirs.

- Actual progress began in March 1992, with training conducted by Dr. Henning. We received the test assembly design in July, and the DLIELC computer support personnel began to write the programs. By October the first batches of new tests were ready to try out in November.

- We began to use the new tests on a regular basis on the resident campus in February 1993, and they are working well.

-- The correlations with both old and new ECL tests have been good.

- Although I'm no testing specialist, I want to briefly summarize the validation or quality-control stage of the ECL Modernization Project.

-- As I've already mentioned, the planning began in the summer of 1992 with the validation itself conducted in November.

-- The purpose of the validation was to confirm the statistical equatedness of the ECL test forms that were simultaneously generated with the new system.
THREE MAIN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1: SELECTION OF STUDENT SUBJECTS

2. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN TO BE USED

3. PRE-VALIDATION PREPARATION

--- As you can see, there were three main planning considerations: the selection of students as subjects; the experimental design to be used; and the preparation of the validation (including operational test form kits, coordination activities, briefings for administrators, instructors and students, forms and lists, lab maintenance checks), and the minimizing of the effects of the validation on normal academic activities.

[chart #2] (see next page)

- With respect to the first consideration, the selection of students as subjects, this chart illustrates the selection method. As proposed by Dr. Henning, we used a stratified random sampling of all 572 students on the campus across the entire range of proficiency normally represented by the student population. We devised a method in which 362 students were assigned to one of 16 sub-ranges on the entire score range or continuum and then randomly assigned to one of four groups. This created four matched groups of either 90 or 91 students.

- Dr. Henning proposed two possible alternatives for the experimental design, and we selected the method in which four randomly-selected test forms from a total of 14 simultaneously generated forms were administered to a stratified random sample of students[chart #3]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AA</th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>AG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>AJ</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>AN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This chart illustrates the random selection of the four ECL test forms from the possible 141 while the following one illustrates the counte-balanced sequencing of the test administrations. As you can see, the four randomly selected forms were administered to four groups of students. Each group took all four test forms over a three-day period in a different sequence: [chart #4, see page 64]
## Chart #4: COUNTERBALANCED SEQUENCING OF TEST ADMINISTRATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MON 1300</th>
<th>TUES 0900</th>
<th>TUES 1300</th>
<th>WED 0900</th>
<th>LABS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 1</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>SEB 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEB 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEB 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 2</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>SEB 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEB 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEB 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 3</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>MG 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MG 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MG 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEB 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 4</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>MG 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MG 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MG 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEB 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-- The first test was administered on Monday afternoons giving the testing specialists time to take care of last-minute preparation and equipment checks, with the remaining administrations on Tuesday morning, Tuesday afternoon, and Wednesday morning.

- The four test administrations resulted in 338 subjects whose test scores provided data for analysis.

- Conclusion

-- Although the ECL test looks the same, a paper-and-pencil test with an audio taped portion, there are major differences now and in the future.
--- We can now analyze statistics and learn more about the test and the examinees using Item Response theory than we ever could before.

--- IRT-designed tests are sample-free and test free, so the same "yardstick" will apply regardless of the test form.

--- IRT identifies 'deviant responders"—those who are guessing or trying to compromise the test.

--- IRT retains the advantages of norm-referenced (previous ECL) and criterion-referenced testing.

--- IRT improves the facility of equating tests (making conversion charts unnecessary), tailoring tests (greater strength in discrimination), and banking test items.

--- IRT is a necessary prerequisite for computer adaptive testing, or CAT, the next logical step in ECL modernization.

-- To quote Dr. Henning, the results of the DLIELC study indicated that a high level of test-form equivalence and uniformly high internal consistency evidence exist across ECL test forms exceeding the levels present in any known commercially available language tests.

--- The bottom line is that we have been able to modernize and improve the ECL test and prepare for the future without compromising in any way.
LINGNET: The Defense Language Institute's (DLI) Electronic Bulletin Board

Charles Clendenen

1. Purpose. The DLI electronic bulletin board is designed to facilitate increased communication between all echelons of the Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP). The objective is to increase awareness of DLI's role in distance education, and computer assisted study initiatives and to keep all interested parties up to date on the traditional resident training of foreign languages at DLI. This electronic bulletin board represents a 24-hour forum which supports sharing of views and comment from a wide cross section of personnel involved in foreign language training issues. In addition to providing a communications forum this bulletin board also provides DLI produced language training materials, including materials developed in support of Operation RESTORE HOPE, as well as public domain and shareware files. These files may be downloaded and used by DOD personnel after a verification of their status is obtained.

2. Points of major interest and facts.

a. Background. LINGNET was originally established as a subnet under the Army's FORUM net in November 1989. Budget shortfalls required termination of the FORUM subnet in February 1990. However, DLI used available equipment and manpower to reestablish the bulletin board. Currently there are subscribers from as far away as Hawaii, Alaska and the East Coast. Personnel may join the net via modem by calling DSN 878-5333 or commercial 408-647-5333.

b. Recent Changes. We are now running a registered version of Wildcat as requested by a consensus of subscribers. We have posted key documents of interest to Command Language Program managers such as the DLI Instructional Catalog of available language training materials and the resident class schedules. These documents have been loaded on the bulletin board for on-line viewing or downloading and subsequent viewing or printing. Additionally, we acquired a large amount of DLI-produced instructional materials and have uploaded these materials to expedite their dissemination to personnel at field units.

c. Future. We are examining the possibility of adding a 1-800 number to enable easy access by personnel in the Reserve Component. This would add a second phone line and, therefore, a second node which would broaden our subscriber base.
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Planning for Future Linguistic Contingencies


Since the mission of each of the 24-week Arabic programs was to teach as much Modern Standard Arabic as possible in six months while at the same time providing an introduction to the Iraqi dialect, all programs met that criterion de facto\textsuperscript{45} - what each program taught is what was possible for it to teach under its particular circumstances. It has also been seen, however, that, if 1/1/1 is taken as the unstated but de facto objective for the program as a whole, then the program was not successful, since only 18% reached level 1 in all three skills.

Of greater concern, however, is the question of how valuable level 1 skills would have been even if the majority had attained them and had then been deployed to use them in a hostile environment. The answer to that question depends in large part on whether the students would have been assigned as military intelligence linguists or to other duty specialties which are not language-requiring specialties but whose performance in-country is enhanced by survival-level language skills and cultural information. In the latter case, the skills attained in these short courses would undoubtedly have been useful, although short courses more targeted to specific applications might have been even more useful. In the case of assignment in language-coded military intelligence specialties, however, the likely value of these courses is more problematic.

Although many military linguist jobs tasks can be and are performed by level 1 linguists, particularly in peacetime assignments, - the minimum desired language proficiency for entry-level military intelligence personnel has been established as at least 2/2/1 (SIGINT) or 2/2/2 (HUMINT); furthermore, it is understood that on-the-job training must raise language skills to level 3 in order for the most critical, albeit less frequent, tasks to be performed adequately, especially in a war-time environment.

The obvious and inescapable conclusion is that fully functional linguists cannot be created quickly on an as-needed basis. This conclusion and its corollaries can be further stated as follows:

1. Capable military intelligence linguistic resources cannot be produced instantly, and emergency programs, no matter how laudable, should not be relied upon to meet future intelligence needs in languages not presently being taught in the DFLP.

2. Short courses can meet certain emergency needs for non-linguist personnel; such courses can be and should be designed so as to focus on the content areas and language functions of greatest interest to selected groups of personnel.

3. Short courses can be designed in such a way as to provide a quick-response jump start for military linguists as well. However, such courses must be designed so that participation in them will not impede the subsequent development of language proficiencies to professional levels, but rather will lay the necessary language foundation upon which subsequent proficiency development can be built. Furthermore, linguist life-cycle management plans must be made and followed to ensure proper utilization - including follow-on, proficiency-oriented language training - of military intelligence graduates of short courses.

4. Adequate advanced planning is essential to ensure the development of appropriate quick response capabilities in the face of newly emerging linguistic requirements - ad hoc, piecemeal approaches simply do not work.

\textsuperscript{45} Except that Ft. Lewis did very little with Iraqi.
If DESERT SHIELD/DESERT STORM (DS/DS) and Somalia are any indication, many future requirements may not be fully recognized in advance, and flexibility will be required in anticipating areas of potential language needs and being able to respond quickly. Thus, this report concludes with a set of recommendations regarding optimal contingency planning for future linguistic requirements which are currently unknown.

It should be emphasized that these suggestions are not offered as criticisms of the 24-week programs that were the subject of this study, nor of the decisions that led to their use. Rather, the remaining section is offered with the clarity of hindsight, and in the sincere hope that it may be of value to those charged with establishing and executing language training policy throughout the military services, the Department of Defense, and at national strategic levels.

**Action Plan for Linguistic Contingencies**

This section is presented as a point of departure for an Action Plan to develop the capability to respond quickly and effectively to the future language needs of the U.S. Army and the Defense Foreign Language Program in the face of a changing world. This capability is to be developed by designing and implementing plans and programs in advance so that mobilization needs can be met as needed.

The Action Plan has three components: (1) the development and implementation of a long-range strategic plan at national levels, (2) planning and building a quick-response capability at DLIFLC, and (3) a prototype three-tiered mobilization plan which draws on the capabilities described in the first two components. The first component calls for the participation of a wide range of entities and echelons; the second two address actions which could and should be taken by DLIFLC on behalf of the DFLP.

**Component I: Development of a Long-Range Plan**

A national-level plan is needed to accomplish four purposes: (1) to identify and prioritize in advance the languages used in areas which could become flash points for low-intensity conflict or other kinds of missions requiring the use of U.S. military personnel; (2) to identify and develop existing and future methods to quickly inventory and access national capabilities by language; (3) to set forth a series of actions which, if undertaken and resourced, can lead to the development of a quick-response capability (QRC) both in pre-selected languages and in other languages that emerge as instant needs; and (4) to provide for the development and maintenance of a small "contingency corps" of linguists in a number of low-density languages for which needs might arise. Actions associated with each of these purposes are discussed in turn.

a. Identify languages.

It is not a matter of conjecture to identify and categorize the world's probable hot spots. To the contrary, substantial numbers of personnel in various federal agencies devote their professional careers to this task. Nevertheless, the military linguist training pipeline is often caught short when needs arise. The challenge is to identify methods of pooling and sharing information more efficiently across departments and agencies, so that the DFLP can be prepared to meet military language needs long before the requirements system has recognized them and turned them into programmed training billets.

The Intelligence Community Staff should take the lead in creating or improving methods and means to facilitate such information exchange, possibly assisted by the newly formed Center for the Advancement of Language Learning (CALL). Created at the behest of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI), CALL would seem to be a very logical candidate to play a clearinghouse function. It is appropriately connected to the major intelligence functions at the national level, and has already identified a project to be known as the "Language and Area Resource Center" (LARC), for whom the proponent agency is the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA). The LARC, at the discretion of the
Intelligence Community Staff and in close coordination with the other agencies represented in CALL, could and should develop regularly updated lists of languages in which military language capability may be required in the near, medium, and long terms. Acknowledging the need for operational security concerns, ways should be found to provide this information on a need-to-know basis to those in key leadership positions throughout the DFLP, so that appropriate agencies can proceed with appropriate steps of the Action Plan.

b. Inventory personnel and material capabilities.

Inventories of national assets in all languages identified as areas of possible need should be developed and updated so that they are available for consultation as needed. Several sources are already known, such as the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC), whose West Coast Branch is located in Monterey, CA, near DLIFLC, and is routinely consulted by DLIFLC for data relating to military personnel. Similarly, arrays of college catalogs at major libraries exist, as do mailing lists of major foreign language associations such as ACTFL and MLA, and many computerized databases are accessible via DIALOG. However, no source known to the writers exists where, at a single location, data can be retrieved, or where lists of all reasonable data sources can be consulted, to address a series of informational requirements such as the following:

(1) Personnel qualified in a particular language, including level of proficiency if available:
   -- Military (active duty, reserve component, national guard, retired, etc.);
   -- DoD civilians (civilian personnel working in language schools and in other DoD locations across the USA and internationally);
   -- Non-DoD civilians (staff at non-DoD government language schools and at other government locations across the USA and internationally);
   -- Non-government civilians (e.g., university professors, Peace Corps veterans, employees of private language schools, employees of corporations and businesses that operate in the international context, etc.).

(2) Places where the language is or has been taught, e.g.:
   -- Government schools;
   -- Colleges and universities;
   -- Private language schools, serving both government and non-government clients;

(3) Sources of materials in or related to the language, e.g.:
   -- Textbooks, phrase books, dictionaries, and other materials developed for learners of the language including computer software;
   -- Grammars and other information developed by descriptive linguists, anthropologists, etc.;
   -- Authentic materials produced in the language for use by speakers of the language, such as newspapers, magazines, comics, literature, telephone books, etc.
   -- Non-print materials that fit any and all of the above categories, e.g., films and videotapes, radio and television programs, etc.

Note that "sources" should be defined to include personnel as well as organizational resources – ideally, for example, a user of this data base would find not only lists of materials for sale by academic publishers, but also information about U.S. offices in or near the area in which the language is spoken, whose staff could obtain readily available materials and ship them back to the U.S. This observation suggests the use of "intelligent data base" technology to facilitate cross-walks among related data bases.

It is acknowledged that inventories and data sources such as those listed above can be listed and consulted for any and all known languages, without consulting the list of national priorities discussed under identify languages above. However, the number of world languages is so great, and the amount of possible information to be arrayed is so large, that as a practical necessity, efforts for the foreseeable future should be concentrated on the languages thought most likely to be needed over the next several years.
c. Develop quick-response capability (ROC).
Given a knowledge of the languages which are most likely to be needed but which are not presently being taught in the DFLP, and given at least a beginning inventory of national capabilities as indicated above, a number of actions can and should be taken in key languages, some of which are clearly more easily accomplished than others. These include such actions as accumulating and stockpiling already-available materials, developing new materials of various kinds, and maintaining the capability to deliver training where needed, e.g., via video teletraining. 46 Although multiple agencies would have QRC roles to play the majority of the tasks involved in this component would probably be performed at DLIFLC; therefore, this section is more fully described under Component I-a.

d. Develop and maintain a small cadre of fully trained linguists.
In addition to the above plans, it would very much in the national interest to train small numbers of personnel to DLIFLC basic course proficiency levels in languages for which there is now no coded billet but which appear in appropriate categories on the lists of languages as described at Component I-a.

Military personnel included in this cadre should include some number of initial-entry trainees, if possible, to allow for subsequent language proficiency enhancement over the years, and a larger number of career linguists, already qualified in their military specialty, for whom the new language would constitute a second or third language. Logistically, the latter would probably be the easier option to implement. Training candidates should be selected carefully, with due consideration given to the earlier discussions of selection criteria. The numbers of candidates for each language, not being requirements-driven, would have to be established either arbitrarily or based on estimates of future requirements.

This approach, of course, would also provide for the development and maintenance at DLIFLC of an expanded array of linguistic capabilities. That is, a baseline teaching and course-development staff would be maintained in a number of languages for which there are--at present--no operational training requirements.

It is acknowledged that the development and maintenance of such a cadre of military linguists against contingencies that have not made their way into the training doctrine and consequently into the training pipeline will require new or creative assigning and funding procedures. 47 However, the writers-believe that only this approach will guarantee the instant availability of at least a core group of adequately trained military linguists when the need arises.

It should be noted in this regard that the cost of building and maintaining this language contingency capability is directly related to the extent to which trained military linguists choose to remain in uniform. Renewed efforts on the part of high-level planners to address linguist life-cycle issues that relate to the currently low retention rates of military linguists would pay handsome dividends in reduced training costs, both in the development of the proposed "language contingency corps" (LCC) and in reducing the costs of maintaining the current requirements-driven levels of linguistic preparedness. 48

Component II: Develop a Quick-Response Capability at DLIFLC

Although access to a fully trained language contingency corps would provide the best quick-response capability, it is likely that emergency needs will develop from time to time in

---

46 Video teletraining is an excellent way of providing 'cross-training' in other languages. This approach has already been used very successfully at DLIFLC to cross-train Russian linguists in Ukrainian, and, for languages like Arabic, it could be used to teach new dialects to already qualified linguists.

47 For example, if this cadre were made up of cross-trained linguists, they could be assigned in their' primary language.

48 These efforts should include such obvious activities as making sure that linguists, like other military personnel, have the opportunity to exercise their skills in realistic simulations, e.g., through in-language participation in war games.
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languages which are not included in the LCC, or for numbers of personnel that exceed LCC assets. Thus, DLIFLC should undertake a series of actions aimed at developing in advance the ability to respond quickly to unexpected linguistic needs, and should be funded to develop this ability.

Ideally, DLIFLC would be assisted in these actions by the information developed under Component I-a; however, the majority of the steps described below can and should be undertaken by DLIFLC even without such assistance. Many of these steps (e.g., stockpiling materials) must be carried out for specific languages, whereas the products of others (e.g., developing and field-testing several short-course programs of instruction) can be utilized to some extent in developing capabilities in other languages.

Steps in developing this quick-response capability are presented below in order of increasing level of effort required. The suggestions made in each step presume prior accomplishment of the previous steps.

a. Accumulate and stockpile a reasonable set of materials presently available, such as phrase books, dictionaries, grammars, cultural information, telephone books, computer software, and non-print items. Maintaining even a single set of camera-ready originals at a single location, along with advance agreements with advance agreements any copyright holders who might be involved, would enable the DFIP to respond literally overnight to requests for multiple sets of materials to meet emergency deployment needs. In the very highest priority languages, the case could be made for stockpiling a limited number of sets ready to be addressed, packaged, and shipped. Where possible, computerized copies of materials could be maintained, ready to be sent by modem to remote locations where they could be printed out and reproduced on site.

b. Develop orientation materials containing lexical and cultural aids for high-priority languages and areas where no suitable ones are available. The materials known as Cultural Orientation Program - Egypt (COPE), developed by DLIFLC for use by the Third U.S. Army, offer a model which has been received well and could be followed for other areas.

c. Develop programs of instruction (POI)49 for short courses aimed at specific occupational groups, including both linguists and non-linguists. To be optimally useful, short courses must be designed to meet the needs of specific target groups. However, experience suggests that short courses will often have to be built under serious time constraints for use in pre-deployment circumstances. The prior development of POI aimed at specific groups can make a critical difference in whether such courses can and will be produced to an acceptable standard within available times.

A critical distinction must be made between short courses intended for non-linguist groups and those that are designed for emergency use by personnel assigned in language-requiring specialties. Therefore, POI requirements for each of these course types are discussed separately.

(1) Short courses for non-linguist groups. Two options are available in designing POI for non-linguist courses. On the one hand, a POI for a generic, one-size-fits-all familiarization course could be designed for use with those for whom familiarization training is the only goal. Such groups might range from infantry personnel to pilots at risk of becoming hostages or prisoners of war. A POI for this kind of course would be based on the assumption that students in a given course would come from a variety of non-linguist

49 By 'POI' the writers mean a course syllabus that would specify the language or dialect to be taught and that would provide a detailed list/description of (a) course prerequisites, (b) course objectives (in terms of language skills, proficiency levels, language context and tasks, etc.); (c) instructional materials, methods, and techniques; (d) homework policy; (e) in-course and end-of-course means of assessing student progress and attainment of course objectives; (f) course length (in terms of number of weeks, days per week, and hours of instruction per day); (g) class size (maximum, optimum, and minimum); (h) overall course organization; and (i) a tentative schedule of content and topic of instruction, which would be subject to adjustment according to student needs.
groups, all of whom would need a basic orientation to the language and culture in question, and none of whom would be likely to need additional language study in the future.

On the other hand, POI could be developed to support the development of short courses aimed at specific occupational groups, such as military police, medical personnel, engineers, or special forces. Although not holding language-requiring specialties, members of such groups may need to develop greater levels of language ability than those for whom a generic course is sufficient. Furthermore, this limited fluency needs to be developed while focusing on job-relevant linguistic material and language tasks.

However, it is equally important that any and all short courses lay an adequate foundation for subsequent language development. Although this requirement is less critical for non-linguist groups than for linguists, it can and should be addressed in POI design — some of these non-language-requiring specialties, e.g., civil affairs, psychological operations, and counter intelligence, have language proficiency requirements which equal or exceed those of language-requiring specialties.

The Basic Military Language Course (BMLC) being developed by DLIFLC in 13 languages for U.S. Army Special Operations Forces is one example of this kind of short course. Although the specific syllabus design and pedagogical approaches used in the BMLC courses will not be optimal for all applications, they illustrate three important design criteria: They offer SOF soldiers the opportunity to develop limited ability in a foreign language in a relatively short period of time; they contain language content and tasks which are directly focused on the most likely mission requirements of SOF personnel; and they have been designed to accomplish these objectives while simultaneously laying the foundation for subsequent language proficiency development by those who are ultimately assigned to do so.

(2) Emergency short courses for linguists groups. Short-course POI could also be developed for linguist groups such as SIGINT and HUMINT military intelligence specialists with the understanding that they will need to further develop professional proficiency levels after the immediate crisis has passed if they are to be considered qualified in the short-course language. In general, such POI should be designed to meet the criteria described above, including job-relevant emphases in the selection of language content and tasks. Pre-deployment short courses for military linguists have a more compelling need than full-length DLIFLC basic courses to utilize language content and language task examples that are related to and compatible with SIGINT and HUMINT job requirements. However, as indicated previously, it will be especially critical in these POI to ensure that an adequate foundation is laid in general language proficiency to enable the student to proceed to professional levels later.

(3) Summary and cautionary notes. Although the availability of various POI already on the shelf could lead to the development of short courses for specific groups and purposes in less time and with better results than will otherwise be the case, several cautionary comments are in order.

First, great care should be taken in applying a POI developed for one language to the development of course materials for another. Although a generic curriculum model can be written, the application of that model to particular foreign languages must be accomplished independently in each case.

Second, it should be emphasized that pre-deployment short courses are no substitute for full-length basic courses, and that their use with military intelligence linguist groups should be as a last resort, not a first option. Furthermore, commanders who rely solely on the language skills of short-course MI graduates will be jeopardizing their unit's mission accomplishment and perhaps even its survival. However, graduates of well-designed short courses can at least assist more advanced MI linguists, and well-designed short courses can also meet the immediate contingency needs of some non-MI personnel.
Thus, the intent of this section is to urge that adequate attention be paid in advance to the design of POI for emergency short courses of various kinds, so as to maximize the value and minimize the disadvantages of the courses that may ultimately be developed and used.

d. Field-test several POI. In order for the various POI described above to be demonstrably ready for use under mobilization conditions, at least one example of each POI type (i.e. generic non-linguist; specific non-linguist; and linguist) should be field tested. That is, a complete short course in at least one language should be developed and taught using each POI model; the process and product should be evaluated; and the lessons learned should be captured.\textsuperscript{50}

e. Maintain and expand the capability to deliver instruction via video teletraining (VTT), mobile training teams (MTT), contract, or in residence at DLIFLC. DLIFLC’s VTT/MTT capability should be maintained and expanded, particularly in terms of the number and distribution of VTT training sites (in both CONUS and OCONUS locations) and the ability to quickly access teaching personnel. In addition to maintaining VTT capability by meeting current operational needs, DLIFLC should identify by language probable sites and personnel for delivering instruction via VTT, MTT, or by contract. The most likely sites where language training could be conducted via VTT and/or MTT should be listed and the list periodically updated as situations change. Regularly updated lists of potential VTT/MTT instructors in a wide variety of languages should be maintained by consulting the personnel inventory described above.

Note in this regard that maintaining a core resident language-training capability at DLIFLC in the highest priority contingency languages would be the very best way to ensure the instant availability VTT instructors when needed suddenly. In addition, regularly updated lists should be maintained of organizations which have repeatedly delivered high-quality language training by contract, even in languages other than those on the critical contingency list.

Component III. Develop and Implement a Mobilization Plan

This Action Plan culminates with a plan for a three-tiered DFLP response option designed to be responsive to three scenarios. These scenarios are, of course, only arbitrary points along a dual continuum of readiness and advance warning on the one hand, and duration and level of involvement on the other. Furthermore, these actions are illustrative, and do not purport to be an exhaustive list of activities required under mobilization conditions.

Tier 1 response: An immediate response to a crisis situation, which may or may not be prolonged. In this scenario there is little or no advance warning -- the DFLP is caught almost completely unaware. In this instance, there is no choice but to draw immediately upon the quick-response capabilities developed as described above. Examples:

- Ship any available pre-packaged sets of materials to forward units; engage in high-speed reproduction of additional sets, using the stockpiled originals; transmit any available computerized materials for local reproduction at remote sites.
- Consult personnel data bases and identify all active and reserve component military assets with the required language capability, to be used in whatever ways are appropriate.
- Deliver immediate VTT/MTT instruction to selected groups where it is most critically needed.
- Go into immediate production of COPE-like materials and/or short courses if they have not been previously prepared.
- Launch one or more iterations of any short courses that have been previously prepared in the target language. If none is available, launch immediate course development using appropriate previously developed POI models (see the QRC component).

\textsuperscript{50} Among the extremely important lessons learned would be the proficiency that could be attained in short courses of varying lengths.
It should be noted that DLIFLC's ability to respond to a crisis situation would be greatly enhanced if procedures were established to ensure the earliest possible notification to DLIFLC that mobilization efforts in general are being planned and conducted. For example, adding a requirement that those planning military operations involving foreign language components contact appropriate personnel at DLIFLC at a specified point in their planning process would not only provide DLIFLC with more lead time in which to respond, but would also ensure that operational planners are aware of the support available through DLIFLC in time to request it. Similarly, language requirements and constraints should be included in the planning and conduct of joint-service and Army war games at the division, corps, and CINC levels.

Tier 2 response: Larger-scale training for more extensive involvement with more advance warning. The second scenario may be an evolution of a Tier 1 situation or essentially a pre-mobilization scenario, in that it assumes that there is ample evidence that needs will increase in a specific language. As an evolution of a Tier 1 situation, Tier 2 presumes that the need which precipitated the Tier 1 response will continue for some time. As a pre-mobilization scenario, Tier 2 differs from the previously described development of QRC only in the degree of certainty with which a specified area of need is targeted—DEsert SHIELD/DESERT STORM offers an example.

In either version of this scenario, a variety of steps should take place, some of which did in fact happen in DS/DS and others of which did not. Examples:

- If the language needed is currently being taught at DLIFLC, the services should increase their flow-through in resident courses at DLIFLC as soon as possible, to increase the numbers of fully trained personnel available for assignment. This activity clearly sends shock waves throughout the training pipeline, requiring that students be reassigned to the priority language(s), that additional instructors be located and hired, etc. Nevertheless, it is obviously prudent and face-valid, and it was done to some extent in DS/DS.

- If the language is not currently being taught at DLIFLC, then as soon as the need seems likely, and to the extent possible by means of creative management of staff assets at DLIFLC and elsewhere, courses in the target language should be fully developed and field tested. These courses should include both basic courses and one or more short courses, using as a point of departure the POI developed as described above in the QRC planning phase. This step should be taken with as much lead time as possible—well in advance, for example, of the time when services might increase their seats at DLIFLC, and well in advance of the need to place short courses into operational use.\(^{51}\)

- In addition to the above, computer-assisted study (CAS) software should be fully developed and packaged for use as self-instructional materials,\(^{52}\) either in lieu of formal instruction or as an adjunct thereto. In the latter instance, the CAS materials should be carefully designed to complement the instructor-mediated portions of the course, whether delivered by VTT, MTT, or contract instructors. In both the former and latter instances, just as recommended for course development, CAS development should be undertaken in advance, and CAS materials, especially self-instructional ones, should be field-tested and evaluated.

- As language needs increase, continue and step up Tier 1 activities: increase the volume of VTT and MTT training; launch multiple iterations of short courses, with

---

\(^{51}\) Note the contrast with DS/DS: Although the language was already being taught at DLIFLC, and there was time for DLIFLC to develop a short-course POI for use by the second wave of 24-week programs, there was not enough time to pilot test the POI/course and refine it prior to its use in multiple iterations. The result was uneven program execution with uneven training outcomes across sites. Furthermore, the short-course POI in MSA was essentially a subset of an old DLIFLC basic course, and therefore lacked face validity to the experienced military linguists who expected post-training deployment to a hostile theater of operations.

\(^{52}\) It is important to note that a great deal more time is required to develop CAS courseware than to produce printed materials. However, self-instruction will often repay that investment.
clear training objectives, to homogeneous groups of trainees; continue efforts to ramp up full-length resident training at DLIFLC and other appropriate sites; etc.

Tier 3 response: In cases of obvious long-term commitment. The Tier 3 scenario assumes that the need will continue for a period of months or even years. Although the DFLP may never again have to support such prolonged requirements as those generated by the Cold War or the Vietnam conflict, it may be called upon to support operations that last considerably longer than DS/DS. Such longer-term needs are, ironically, the easiest to meet, since they allow more time for adjusting the recruiting/training pipeline. However, Tier 3 activities in this Plan presume the prior execution of Tiers 1 and 2, which includes the notion that a sizeable group of military intelligence linguists would have received short-course language training which was necessary as an emergency measure but was not sufficient for their job requirements as military linguists. This assumption has implications for Tier 3 activities. Examples:

- Develop and teach a follow-on course at DLIFLC to take short-course graduates to full 2/2/2 proficiency and beyond. Note that this approach would require changes in linguist life-cycle planning and management, in order to ensure that short-course graduates would, in fact, be assigned to such follow-on courses.

- Initiate or continue steps to ramp up full-length resident training at DLIFLC and other appropriate sites.

- Services ensure a continuous supply of adequately trained linguists by increasing the pipeline flow-through for normal DLIFLC basic courses, and/or continuing to support multiple short courses which feed the DLIFLC follow-on courses after an initial utilization tour.

- Continue VIT for a variety of needs, such as:
  -- Refresher/Maintenance training
  -- Enhancement training
  -- Cross-training of linguists in other languages or dialects
  -- Familiarization training to non-linguist groups

- Ensure a feedback loop exists from the field for observations and recommendations from both linguists and non-linguists concerning areas of the language needing more focused coverage.

Summary

In summary, the lessons learned during the conduct of this evaluation study and its implications suggest that a three-pronged approach to increased language readiness is necessary: First, a long-range strategic plan for anticipating future linguistic needs is required. This plan should include an awareness of the need to maintain an ongoing capability at DLIFLC to train regularly a small number of personnel in languages that lie outside the current requirements system. Second, DLIFLC should be encouraged -- and resourced -- to plan ahead, and to develop a quick-response capability by engaging in preparatory activities such as those described above. Third, a phased DLIFLC/DFLP mobilization plan should be established now to guide responses to future linguistic contingencies.
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INTRODUCTION

Phases of Development

There are five phases of courseware development: analysis, course design, development, implementation, and evaluation/validation. During the analysis phase, you must determine if all or part of the course curriculum is appropriate for conversion to interactive courseware (ICW) and the size of the ICW team. The size of the team depends on a number of factors:

1. Scope of the CBT project
2. Complexity of lessons to be presented
3. Availability of personnel (team members)
4. Availability of courseware development workstations
5. Time limits for completion

The initial analysis will determine an approximation of the number of hours of curriculum that will be converted to ICW lessons.

As the size of the courseware development effort becomes fixed, two additional things must be accomplished. Establishment of short-term (30-, 60-, and 90-day) and long-term (1-, 3-, 5-year, and out year) milestones which must be relayed to the development team and supervisors and management, and then tracked to ensure the development effort remains on schedule. The second task that must be accomplished is the assigning of personnel to the courseware development teams to facilitate meeting established milestones, and to broaden the scope of system familiarity throughout the organization.

Every phase of ICW development must be documented to define and track milestones, and record daily progress. Milestone charts must be prepared and maintained as instructional material is identified for ICW lesson conversion. Information gathered while tracking actual time spent in development can be used to support revision of remaining milestones, justification for additional manpower, or to identify strengths/weaknesses in team member assignments.

Courseware Development Team Leader

The Team Leader will usually be the ranking and/or most knowledgeable on the subject/course to be developed, providing coordination and direction of the overall development effort and tracking each activity. The Team Leader must ensure that personnel and material resources are available to meet project milestones and must be knowledgeable regarding ICW development procedures as well as the authoring system/language.

Subject Matter Expert (SME)

The SME defines training tasks, researches and provides lesson content, assists in sequencing course material for most effective learning, provides in-depth knowledge and/or skill relating to course content, ensures technical accuracy of the training material content, provides reference and verification of final products, and works with the Instructional Designer and Technical writer during the lesson/course design and validation phases. At DLI/ELC, the tasks of the SME can often be combined with those of the technical writer; however, technical materials should be reviewed by follow-on-training installations just as regular Specialized English Training (SET) materials are.
Instructional Designer

This position may be handled by the Team Leader or a development section chief. Instructional designer duties include managing the overall development process, providing instruction strategy decisions, assessing progress to keep the effort on schedule, establishing and interpreting course training requirements, developing learning objectives, developing tests, sequencing course content, and setting up flow chart interactions.

Technical Writer/Courseware Developer

This individual will develop storyboards and lesson scripts; develop and write supplemental training material (student handouts, workbooks, study guides, etc.); write teaching/learning activities; work with the instructional designer during the course design phase; and develop an interactive videodisc (IVD) shot sheet (if necessary).

Other Skills Support

Professionals with specialized skills should be considered for support to the design team, as required. Although these professionals are not full-time members of a particular design team (they should be supporting more than one design team at a time), they must work closely with the team throughout the design and development phases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graphics Artist</th>
<th>Animator, artist, and design illustrator.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video Production</td>
<td>Filming, development, editing, narration, animation, pressing and reproducing interactive videodiscs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmer</td>
<td>Available for consultation on coding/language problems, and courseware development support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SME should be instructor qualified and determines the presentation of instructional materials to students.

Computer Based Instruction (CBI) Designer's Course

This course is highly recommended for all courseware developers, instructors, instructor-supervisors, and selected support staff personnel. All personnel will gain flow chart and storyboard hands-on experience to aid development and evaluation efforts.

Student Indoctrination

Student indoctrination must be planned for during initial courseware development. Students will need to be taught the basic functions of the ICW delivery system to include presentations/instructions on the keyboard layout, use of special function keys, screen design, log-on/log-off procedures, user identification and passwords, and all necessary functions and procedures to operate the ICW system and to take the lesson.

ICW DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

ICW Lesson Floor Plan

Different lessons may have somewhat different floor plans simply because the objectives are different and need different activities to accomplish them. Where one module/lesson will have nothing but practice and feedback, another lesson may have guided presentations with information, examples, and demonstrations. Where one lesson may be self-paced, another may be group lock-step. Regardless of the type of lesson to be presented, the chart below shows general guidelines that should be followed:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIG PICTURE</th>
<th>Remind or show students where they are in the larger scheme of the course. (Always included)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RELEVANCE</td>
<td>Explain and/or demonstrate why the accomplishment of this objective is important to the students. (Always included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMONSTRATION</td>
<td>Show what students will be doing when performing the objective. (As needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>Teach students what they need to know before they can practice the objective. (As needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACTICE</td>
<td>Provide practice in the objective. (Always included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEDBACK</td>
<td>Provide timely information about performance and progress. (Always included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-CHECK</td>
<td>Provide a way to check whether students are ready to demonstrate their ability to perform as the objective requires. (As needed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before beginning to construct a course, a complete and detailed course plan should be accomplished to include the following:

- Purpose, goals, and lesson objectives
- Testing requirements and specific procedures
- Proposed method of presentation
- Audio-visual needs by lesson
- Number of lessons/segments/instructional units
- Graphics, text, audio, and video requirements
- To/from branching locations
- Linkage between units of instruction

ICW Lesson Presentation Overview

Lesson presentation refers to how the computer displays the lesson to the student. The strength of an ICW system is that it involves the student in the learning process.

An ICW lesson development project requires the creation and organization of a large number of elements: audio, graphics, text, and video images.

Authoring systems have traditionally traded control and flexibility for ease of use. An authoring system should impose as few constraints as possible on the project and author.

Templates provide easy methods of interaction between the author and the lesson. A template specifies the structure and default data for an instructional unit in a lesson segment. Templates display a series of standard prompts and default answers. It is up to the courseware developer to fill in the blanks, as necessary, to obtain the responses needed for an application within a specific instructional unit.

ICW systems classify the basic building blocks that make up a lesson. A lesson segment is a collection, or grouping, of instructional units. It is similar to a header in an outline in that it groups subunits. A lesson segment may be made up of one or more instructional units.
1. An instructional unit is the most basic part of a lesson.

2. Templates have generalized functions and they may be used for screen displays, menu building, or student record keeping.

3. Courseware developers must plan for everything the student could possibly do once they begin to take the lesson. Each possible response must have a resulting action. Construction of flow diagrams and flow charts will depict the course outline.

4. Flow charts show what instruction is next, to be repeated, (remediated), skipped, etc. The more intricate a lesson, the more valuable a flow chart becomes. In addition, flow charts provide a visual path to clarify what the lesson is teaching.

The following are some guidelines for preparing an instructional flow chart:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The teaching sequence for each objective must be established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Branching and looping should be set up first for a student completing the lesson successfully, then for incorrect responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>There must be indications of where and what kind of help is available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Standard flow charting symbols must be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Each lesson activity and each student decision point must be indicated for branching and looping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Student interaction points must be noted, at least every 3-5 frames.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Indication must be provided to show testing and feedback points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Following the design of the flow chart, the development team must evaluate and critique the flow chart, carefully thinking through each step to ensure content, branching, and testing points are in the correct locations, and there is a logical flow through the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>A storyboard is necessary to describe how the content of the lesson should appear to the student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>When format, color, animation, special effects, and other screen design features are consistent and predictable, learners can focus on content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are guidelines for developing storyboards:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A rough depiction of the screen layouts must be drawn for each activity or step of the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Menus must be consistent in layout, the use of color, and placement on the screen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Similar types of screens must be designed alike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The following types of student instructions, if intended to be included on the screen, must be specified on the storyboards:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. The lesson activity
b. Any self-directed (student) branching
c. Instructions to continue to the next screen
d. Options to exit or return to a menu
e. A standard set of key pass options and instructions to the student must be set up.

5. Lesson content must be written out exactly as it will appear on the computer screen to the student, one screen at a time.

6. The amount of text on a single screen must be kept to a minimum. Use no more than 40 percent of the screen to display text.

7. Graphics, color, and animation should be used in moderate amounts, and only as required by the objectives, not merely as an attention getter.

8. Evaluation of storyboards is critical and must be performed by each courseware development team member involved in the lesson development phase. Following a critique by each member, any necessary changes must be incorporated into the storyboards at this time. The instructional developer must constantly monitor the screen designs. The following guidelines must be followed:

a. Allow sufficient time for courseware authors to develop the entire screen before making routine changes.

b. Examine the screen layout for design flaws, such as not enough room for text and menu; difficult to read text because of lack of color contrast between text and background; poor placement of text, graphics, or menu; and confusion in understanding directions written on the screen.

c. Catch design flaws early before they are incorporated into every screen.

d. Storyboards are not carved in granite. The storyboards must reflect any changes made during the data entry phase.

Quality Control of Lessons

The Courseware Development Plan must include quality control procedures to be used with each step of development, and include the estimated man-hours required to conduct the quality control reviews. Team members must continually check screen displays, lesson logic, storyboards, and other courseware materials during development to ensure, as much as possible, an error-free product.

Throughout the development process, the developer and other team members will be checking the screen displays for adherence to the storyboards, spelling, grammar, and general appearance. They must make sure the graphics are drawn correctly and are properly positioned on the screen. Screen designs, as laid out on a storyboard, do not always make attractive displays when shown on the monitor. Special attention must be paid to spacing and the use of color and sound. Sounds out of synchronization, as well as harsh or crowded displays, will be distracting to the student.

Each lesson module must be debugged. Test runs must be conducted as many times as necessary to determine if there are any errors in the logic or lesson design, dead ends, or loops that leave the student endlessly trapped. A record of quality control performed must
be kept and must include at least the subject, date, initials of person performing the quality control, and pertinent comments.

After courseware is entered into the system, a formative evaluation must be performed. A formative evaluation is the comprehensive dynamic evaluation done during development and prototype testing of the courseware. Plans must include provisions for continuous internal review during each phase of courseware development. Objectives, test items, storyboards, and lesson logic (sequencing, branching, and looping) all must be reviewed and revised as they are being developed. When the development team has completed the review and revision processes, the prototype courseware should be tested in a variety of settings (individual, small group, and operational).

This evaluation process must address the issues of how well the computer and the student interact, and how well the lesson objectives are met. First, the courseware developer must complete the lesson as a student and correct any major flaws with the instructional material. Then a minimum of 10, maximum of 25, students or developers acting as students should complete the lesson, either individually or in small groups. They must identify areas where content, instruction, or directions are faulty or misleading.

After students have completed the lesson, developers should talk with them and get their opinions of the lesson and associated computer functions.

The development team members should critique the lesson and evaluate the test results. They should be aware that poor test performance could result from poor instruction, poor test items, or human error. Sufficient evaluation and lesson modification time should be allowed to avoid implementing an inferior product. This entire evaluation process must be well documented and maintained as courseware development lessons learned.

The Computer Lab Classroom

Instructors must successfully transition from stand-up lecture methodology to the ICW environment.

1. The instructor must first become a student and be taught to handle new requirements within the computer lab classroom via on-the-job training (OJT) or through formal training courses. This will serve two purposes:

   a. The instructor will become familiar with computer capabilities, functions, and operations as he/she goes through the courseware.

   b. The instructor will be able to aid the validation of courseware prior to implementation to actual students.

2. Instructors must be ready to teach before they are required to manage and educate new students in the classrooms of the future.

The computer lab classroom will be made up of individual student cubicles with a CPU, a monitor, a CD player, a mouse, a keyboard, work space, headphones, and other peripheral devices, such as an interactive videodisc player, etc. The instructor will be free to move about the lab and provide quality, individual help (one-on-one) without disturbing or interrupting the training of others. Students will move from being a "sponge" soaking up new information to being an active participant in the learning process. The student controls the rate and repetitiveness of an ICW lesson.

Courseware Psychology

Designers of ICW usually opt for the most authenticity in their products because it seems logical that the more like the actual situation the training environment becomes, the better trained the student will be. This assumption is not necessarily true. There are times when realism may prove counterproductive to cost-effective development of training, as well as to
the true value of the training itself. There is a need to reinforce particular behaviors or steps, highlight cognitive aspects of performance rather than psychomotor skills, provide for instructor intervention, and keep the cost of training down. Instructional requirements and training effectiveness must be the first things considered in the design of the presentation.

Most complex tasks cannot be learned in one session. They are usually broken into discreet chunks that are presented to the student as individual, smaller tasks. When these separate tasks are mastered individually, they may be combined with one or more separate tasks until mastery of the complete procedure is demonstrated. If equipment is complex in its interactions, the developmental programming will be costly. Designing, creating, and debugging complex models are time-consuming jobs.

When a student is given freedom of movement through a simulation there may be no way to ensure that any training or learning is taking place. There may be a need to allow instructors to monitor the simulation or to allow some guidance or intervention over the student's actions. This intervention may be provided by an instructor or procedure built into the training system itself.

Interactive Videodisc (IVD) is a unique instructional medium which links microprocessor responding and evaluating devices with a videodisc player. This interface provides lesson designers with unparalleled resources for blending still and motion pictures, sound, text, and graphics for instructional purposes. By controlling a videodisc player with an external computer, sophisticated instructional strategies can be applied to education and training. The combination of visual, audio, and computer software technology requires a multi-disciplined team to develop a useful training tool.

Design Considerations

The following guidelines are to be followed during the design phase for an ICW development project.

1. Guide student skills and knowledge acquisition through carefully constructed instructional sequences, progressing from easily understood concepts to relatively complex applications.
2. Provide students with cues, prompts, and practice to allow maximum transfer of skills and knowledge from the training environment to the work environment.
3. Complete an accurate evaluation of student performance through careful testing and ample feedback.
4. Design logical and well sequenced presentations using adequate visuals to explain and demonstrate concepts presented in the lesson.

Courseware development teams must identify ICW development techniques and schedule enough time to complete the development task before arrival of students. The process flow is as follows:

Courseware must be developed in such a manner that an instructor may intervene (pause or stop training) at any point within a lesson. Specific instructor functions will be delineated within positional operator handbooks delivered with the ICW System, taught during an in-house developed instructor system-operation course, and presented via the system as developed by the courseware author.

Student Lesson Control

Developers will design course materials to ensure that, regardless of any student action, the entire lesson will be delivered to the student. Most lessons are designed for students to
complete instruction in a prescribed order with students having limited control of the lesson presentation order. Students control pace and direction of the lesson through their selection of branching options designed by the courseware developer. Students will complete all phases of a lesson before being allowed to proceed to the next. Depending upon performance, students may be branched backwards to repeat certain lesson material for remediation or review, branched to supplemental material for additional information (either for remedial or advanced study), or branched to an evaluation, full lesson review, or subsequent lesson.

Developers should design features within each lesson that let students feel they control their progress through the instructional material. Designing student interaction for lessons and for testing requires a separate set of guidelines:

1. As a rule, no more than three full text displays should be used between interactions.
2. Student responses to questions should be used during the lesson to generate interest or to reinforce a point being made.
3. Student interactions must match the intent of the objective.
4. Students must have clear instructions for completion of the interaction.

Specific management capabilities for interaction during testing are determined by the courseware developer, depending upon the Computer-managed Instruction (CMI) capabilities of the ICW system. The following are guidelines for interaction during testing:

1. Instructions for use of specific keys must be provided at the first interaction of the lesson.
2. If a student must press a key before answering the question again, that must be stated as part of the feedback.
3. Helpful feedback for incorrect answers must be given if another chance to answer is allowed.
4. If a keyboard is used for interaction, lower case or upper case keys must be allowed unless capitalization is required by the objective.

It is important that students achieve and maintain a positive attitude toward ICW. Even in today's expanding, technological environment, some students will arrive for the first day of class with little or no previous exposure to computer systems. To overcome this, and to familiarize all students with the basic functions necessary to receive and complete courseware, each lesson should begin with an introductory presentation. This introductory lesson must contain the following:

- Course and lesson structure
- Basic system operations instructions
- Common symbols and terminology
- Keyboard and Special Function Key usage
- Use of mouse, joystick, light pen, touch screen, etc., as appropriate

Students control their progress by accurately responding and interacting with courseware without direct instructor intervention. Each student will progress at his/her own rate and will have equal access to a qualified instructor for assistance. Students may be required to communicate with one another during training. During unrestricted periods, students will be able to communicate with other students.
Course/Lesson Selection

Before students can select a lesson, they must first be registered on the system. Courseware will be downloaded and resident at student workstations prior to student log-on. Once logged on, the student will follow the instructions presented and begin the introductory lesson from the main menu screen.

Some lessons may have prerequisites. Once a lesson has been selected, the student is ready to start training.

Lessons may be designed so that all lesson segments must be completed in a specified sequence or may be free selection. Students may also be given the option to bypass a specific lesson based on previous experience, training, criticality, or pretesting.

Lesson Start-Up

Upon successful log-on, a main Menu display will be presented. The student may have the option to select a lesson segment from this menu; or, if no option is given, the student may be branched directly into a specific lesson.

Depending upon the course, the student may select any item shown or may be required to proceed in a predefined sequence.

The main objective of the lesson start-up is to ensure that each student is comfortable and ready to actively participate in the learning process. If desired, courses may start with a pretest.

Pretests

A pretest can be given at the start of a lesson before any training takes place.

One may develop courseware so that if a pretest is mastered, lesson completion credit is automatically entered in the student’s records.

Pretest questions may be randomly selected to present each student with a different set of questions. Comprehensiveness and validity are assured by developing a sufficient number of questions within a test pool. This technique reduces unwanted student interactivity (potential for cheating/collaboration).

The lesson objective and an overview should first be presented on a separate screen.

Lesson Presentation

Developers should organize ICW presentations using a variety of instructional techniques. If the ICW lesson duplicates a course text, then just give the student the book and forget ICW altogether.

Try to make ICW presentations interesting and challenging, and stay on the theme of the objective. As material is presented, discuss only one concept or idea at a time. Verify student understanding via progress checks, appraisals, embedded questions, or end of unit/lesson/block evaluations before proceeding to the next lesson.

1. Demonstration Lessons (Guided Tutorials): A lesson requiring a student to perform a task may be preceded by a Guided Tutorial lesson, leading the student step-by-step through a procedure (or task) and showing exactly what is to be done, how it is to be performed, and why it is necessary. Failing to follow directions may eventually lead to a lesson halt. The instructor will then be required to provide individual, one-on-one assistance and restart the lesson.
a. Demonstrations are linear segments (usually motion video but can be computer graphics with audio narration) used to show and explain the complex portions of instruction. It is not necessary to demonstrate all aspects of a task.

b. Developers must give the student the options to pause, end, skip, or repeat the demonstration. SMEs and courseware developers must plan for these functions when shooting and editing video, and throughout the development process. This can be done by designing demonstrations in segments that cover "bite size" increments of instruction and requiring student interaction at the end of each segment.

C. An even better technique is to use review questions embedded in the demonstration to focus attention and provide immediate remediation. A modular course design will allow a student to:

1. Repeat a small segment that is unclear.
2. Interact during a demonstration and focus attention.
3. Review only the segment of interest or that not understood.
4. Stop in the middle of a demonstration, then return at a later time to continue the lesson.
5. Review only the segments required, based on pretest scores. If this is done, courseware developers must provide adequate transition material to ensure a smooth flow of instruction.
6. Review a small demonstration segment as remediation or help.

Courseware developers may include demonstration segments in the simulation immediately prior to the student performing a task or operation. This is especially appropriate for lengthy tasks since it embeds demonstrations in the simulation module instead of making them a separate menu option.

These small demonstration segments can easily be linked using the authoring system.

2. PRACTICE LESSONS: After completing a Guided Tutorial, the student progresses to a Practice Lesson, identical in procedure to the Guided Tutorial but students are not shown where to or when to perform a specific task. The student must remember what was accomplished in the Guided Tutorial. If the student cannot remember and makes a mistake, an author-developed error message appears and directs the student to the correct step. If the student errs a second time, highlighted text or graphics focus the student's attention on a specific step or graphics area. Should the student fail to perform the correct task a third time, he/she could be locked out of courseware requiring the instructor to provide individualized assistance and restart the lesson. Practice lessons can be followed by an evaluation with student responses automatically scored and recorded.

Practice allows the student to master the information being provided in a non-threatening environment, i.e., it isn't a test. The amount of practice required to master a subject/task/skill varies greatly from student to student.

Practice may be embedded in the main instructional flow in the form of review questions or procedures. For this technique to work, developers must provide detailed remediation and subsequent verification of learning for each question or step that the student misses. Just as in testing, the practice must be relevant to the training objective in both content and the type of learning desired.

The criticality of a skill or knowledge (in terms of safety, potential damage to the system, or personal injury) will also be a factor in determining how much practice must be provided.
It is recommended to use varied examples for practice of concepts or problem solving skills to promote a general understanding and transfer back to the job for the student. Sequence practice questions or exercises from easy to difficult to help build student self-confidence and task understanding.

Regardless of the technique used, courseware development teams should design the course so that the criteria can be easily changed. These criteria must be validated during small group tryouts and then modified accordingly. Successful completion of a series of increasingly difficult scenarios should indicate readiness for the progress check. There are several techniques that can be used to assess the student's readiness for the progress check.

a. Embed review questions and evaluate results.
b. Monitor the number of incorrect actions in a procedure. Branch students to a mandatory lesson review if too many mistakes are made.
c. Monitor student use of the HELP routines. If they are excessive, branch students to a directed demonstration.
d. Monitor the time delay between when a student is prompted to do something and when the student responds.

3. PROGRESS CHECKS: One way to measure student progress is to use progress checks.

The progress check is a test administered after the student completes all other directed lessons or modules and may be either knowledge- or performance-based.

Some lessons have embedded questions which may be scored and automatically recorded. Some lessons have a quiz section with randomized questions so that the student will not get the same questions asked previously.

Students may take the Progress Check as many times as they deem necessary, using the same or similar questions. Do not use the same test questions in the Progress Check that are used in the pretest or (final) post test. After a progress check, provide feedback outlining recommended study references or additional practice. Reiterate that students can practice and try again.

4. REVIEW LESSONS: Another way student behavior is enforced is through review. Each student is afforded an opportunity to review any particular lesson segment. If students just barely pass a segment, they may go through it again to clear up any misconceptions. This is left up to the individual student, instructor, and appropriate training element. This capability will need to be developed by the courseware author as an option from the main menu.

5. POST TESTS: The Post Test or scored evaluation provides the students with an official score for a lesson or module. The Post Test will be administered in a controlled environment to prevent compromise. It is a test of the course material and may be performance-based and/or knowledge-based. Inform the students what is expected of them in order to pass the test.

Create Post Tests as entirely stand-alone, distinctly separate from course modules/instructional lessons. Use either randomly generated questions and performance exercises or create multiple (minimum two) versions of the test. A student will not be allowed to take the Post Test more than twice (original and one retake) while in the same class. (Washback students may eventually take a Post Test up to four times). Feedback during the Post Test should be minimal, either positive or negative. At the end of the test, provide the students with their score and ensure they receive guidance for further study if necessary.

6. POST TEST CRITIQUE: The Post Test score will be recorded by the Computer Managed Instruction (CMI) feature and become a permanent entry in the student's official
course record. A Post Test critique allows students to do a subjective on-line evaluation of a lesson module immediately after completing it.

**Alternate Paths/Flows**

Research has shown that different people learn in different ways. Therefore, a properly designed course for ICW needs to provide alternative instructional methods/media to account for those people who don't adapt well to ICW. Several modes of presentation for each lesson are ideal in lesson design. Providing alternate paths through courseware allows the student more control over the training, which helps accommodate different learning styles and levels of experience or knowledge.

1. Reduce redundancy in simulations/practice by offering the option to bypass repetitive steps the student has performed in other lessons/modules.
2. Offer the student the option to review only key points of a lesson/module vice the entire unit(s) of instruction.
3. Link demonstration segments to HELP files in simulation practice.
4. Link practice and simulation routines so that, if a student encounters problems in the practice, the higher level of prompting available in the simulation can be used either for HELP or for remediation.
5. Link the student's performance or practice to the applicable segments within the demonstration or simulation to provide remediation.
6. Use Review exercises as interim summaries by having the student select from a list which steps have been completed. Then, use remediation in one of the forms described above.
7. Rather than having an independent option for a comprehensive demonstration, embed the demonstration segments in the simulation immediately prior to performing that step. This allows the demonstration and performance of a task or operation in close succession. This is especially advantageous if the task or operation is complex and/or requires many steps.
8. In general, provide the student options for as much lateral movement in a course as feasible. Allow the student to easily move back and forth between demonstrations.
9. Normal student exit occurs after the student completes a lesson, or series of lessons. Once exited, the student must log on again before re-entering training.

**Computer Managed Instruction (CMI)**

CMI is the term used in ICW for gathering and computing student management and evaluation data. With ICW, the computer will relieve the instructor of most of the student management and evaluation administrative tasks. The computer has the potential of keeping more accurate and detailed records than previously possible. The courseware developer has the option of generating lessons with or without using the CMI function.

CMI performs the paperwork and administrative duties for instructors and course managers. It registers students and keeps track of their performance throughout the course. CMI does this more efficiently than traditional methods. The computer may record each keystroke or screen touch that a student makes, plus the times for all interactions and events. It can also summarize and prepare reports for selective data.

CMI functions include student and course administration not related to lesson delivery such as registrar functions, record keeping, student data and instructor qualification data, test storage and test results, as well as allocation of resources and scheduling.
Documentation

The development phase of ICW will transform design specifications into a learning media product; i.e., prepare the new system and its courseware for implementation. In addition to administrative record keeping, most ICW courses require various types of documentation.

1. Curriculum Directory: The curriculum directory will act as a record keeper for course information. The recommended curriculum directory contains:

* A description of the lesson or series of lessons
* Names of any associated files
* Curriculum specifications, such as the number of lessons, lesson objectives, and lesson time table
* Names of any graphics picture files used for the course
* Student requirements for taking the course

2. Technical Documentation: Technical documentation is intended to provide a record of how each lesson was constructed and how it was modified. This record of development is very important. If modifications to the course are required at some future time, it is likely that the original developer will be unavailable for making these modifications.

a. Documentation should include names of program files, data files, and graphics files, flow charts, and data file layouts (storyboards) along with any other items that might be helpful in future lesson modifications.

b. Worksheets showing the authoring system menu options, if applicable, used in producing the lesson should be part of the documentation also. If an authoring language is used, each program should contain numerous comment lines to explain what is happening in each section of code.

c. User documentation is directed towards two audiences: instructors and students. The student's guide or workbook should include anything that will assist the student in understanding the instructional material in the course, as well as the functions of the CBT function. The instructor's guide should include:

(1) Evaluation Form
(2) Developer Identification
(3) Detailed Lesson Overview
(4) Program Operating Instructions
(5) A contact point in case of problems
(6) Specific Instructor Functions/Computer Requirements
(7) Any other material that would aid the instructor in presenting the course.

Courseware Development

Courseware development begins with a review of the design phase. The development team members should be in agreement as to the course objectives developed in the design phase. The developer must obtain a basic understanding of what technological features (graphics, animation, audio, sound, IVD, or touch screen) and CBT instructional strategies (tutorial, drill and practice, simulation, gaming, or team training) can be incorporated into the lesson
format. As developers proceed, they must also be developing or identifying supplemental training materials such as workbooks, study guides, and other required publications. ICW courseware development includes the following steps:

1. Construction of tests
2. Flow charting course outline and narrative scripting
3. Storyboarding all content
4. Identifying and acquiring video and graphics requirements
5. SME technical Quality Control
6. Entry of Courseware into the CBT system
7. Development of Team Quality Control evaluation of sequencing
8. Training Development Branch Quality Control
9. Tryout, revision, and finalization by development team, SMEs, TDBs, and instructors
10. Production of workbooks, study guides, etc., as necessary

There are three products that need to be developed for an ICW lesson: a lesson outline and narrative script, flow charts, and storyboards.

1. **Lesson Outline/Narrative**: The lesson outline and narrative script will specify the major components of the intended ICW lesson. Each component is a distinct part having a unique purpose, function, and set of characteristics. The completed outline or narrative should be evaluated first by SME to ensure that there is no incorrect or inaccurate information in the lesson. The initial evaluation will indicate the degree of revisions required.

2. **The Instructional Flow Chart**: This document expands the data about the lesson into a complete outline from which storyboards can be developed. It can be viewed as a blueprint for the ICW lesson. The first type of path, branching, provides alternative paths depending upon the response of the student. Looping, the second type of path, allows the student to review or practice a screen or sequence of screens previously encountered. It can also be used to automatically return a student to a lesson area when they perform poorly. The result of completing all steps in this phase will be a complete course of instruction which meets the specified training objectives in an efficient and effective manner. Development must be carefully controlled and courseware must be tested and validated for accuracy and instructional effectiveness as well as evaluated at select stages of ICW lesson development (formative evaluation). Courseware developers, SMEs, and Instructors must constantly interface to ensure that the intended design is reflected in the development of ICW courseware.
INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN

Learning comes from adequate instructional design, theory, and practice, not from the medium used to deliver instruction. ICW is only as effective as the instructional design put into it. Topics discussed here include basic lesson planning, lesson flow charting, and instructional unit design conventions.

The ICW lesson requires the same basic preplanning as a conventional lesson. Teaching requirements must be determined.

Prior to starting any ICW development, all course control documents must go through an in-depth review. The decision to use ICW should be made prior to further development.

At this time, the course (what is to be taught) is known, as is the level of training, the amount of time allocated for the course, and how the students will be evaluated. Now, we are ready for the next stage, an in-depth review of the subject matter content. Conventional lesson planning strategies must still be accomplished, in a parallel effort to ICW.

1. The developer and the SME will review all available technical data for each objective to be taught. They will outline each objective main point, as well as each enabling (support) objective. The outline will serve as a guideline for sequencing the instructional activities and as the basis for developing flow charts and storyboards.

2. The next step is to do a preliminary flow chart for each objective. During this process, the developer and SME must consider what graphics and/or video will be required and determine if CMI will be included. Just as in conventional lesson planning, the questions should be created first. Good preparation before creating the first page of text storyboarding will help ensure success.

Preparing Flow Charts And Storyboards

Planning is a key link in this phase of development. First-rate planning and research is vital in producing a professional ICW lesson. The next phase of development is preparing the course flow chart. Flow charts show the logical sequence of each ICW lesson, thus enabling you to estimate the overall lesson (and course) length. If a lesson appears to be too long, the flow chart will indicate the logical place to separate the lesson into multiple segments.

The initial draft flow chart is normally handwritten; however, computer software programs can be used. This draft is used for basic ICW lesson layout using the instructional unit numbers to verify lesson sequencing. However, the draft may also contain all the information that would be included in the final. Keep in mind that no matter how the draft is designed, it must be updated as lesson changes are made.

The final draft should be developed using computer based flow chart software. Flow charts should be as standard as possible so that all developers will understand each other’s regardless of the original author. The following guidelines will help in constructing flow charts:

1. Within each shape of the flow chart, enter the instructional unit number, template name (if applicable), and a short description.

2. When additional text is needed to clarify the flow chart, use a null space (text without a shape) or use a text editor.

3. Experience recommends the flow chart be copied to disk (hard drive or floppy) to facilitate print routines.
Storyboards (sometimes called flow boards) are a vital part of lesson development. Development of storyboards actually begins with the research for course content materials. Storyboards represent each and every display that will be shown to students during the delivery of instructional materials. It is recommended that each ICW system use standard storyboard forms for consistency. All data may not be readily available during the initial drafting of the storyboards. Also, storyboard content may change due to developers using a different template, the technical data itself changing, or the developer coming up with a better idea to present the same material. If this occurs, then the storyboard must be rewritten to reflect these changes.

Scripting

Once the research is complete and the storyboards are drafted, the courseware development team should determine if video images will be required to complete the lesson. Storyboards will also be required to create a video "shot list" and script. The script is the narrative dialogue (audio) that will accompany the video during the delivery to the students. If additional footage taken during shooting is used, additional storyboards must be generated to reflect actual instructional materials. This will aid future course updates or modifications as they become necessary.

Text Conventions

There are as many different forms of syntax as there are courseware developers. No matter how one organizes the language in a lesson, the most important thing to remember is to write to the level of the end user, the students. The following basic Lesson Text Guidelines are offered:

1. All text must be written in non-sexist terms. If there is no alternative, use "he/she". Whichever pronoun is used, it needs to be consistent.

2. All text and numbers need to be clear and easily read. A font that is too small has a tendency to flicker. Select the largest font possible without being too large. Both are distracting to the students.

3. Use the minimum text possible. If considerable text is required, separate the ideas with spaces or use more than one screen to display the information.

4. If large (multiple digit) numbers are used, the figures must all be on the same line.

5. Keep sentences short.

6. Consistency is probably the most important thing to keep in mind when writing text. Don’t change font sizes and colors from one instructional unit to another within the same lesson. Continual change only creates a distraction and produces an unprofessional product. The times when font sizes and color need to be changed include:

a. Conflicting video background colors

b. Textual space limitations (i.e., within a window)

c. Deliberate changes for emphasis of an item or idea

d. Differentiation between lesson text and system prompts and error messages

7. Use words that the users are expected to understand. If technical terms, jargon, and acronyms must be used, provide the user with a glossary or other explanatory handout.
Testing Conventions

When testing is to be administered by the computer, question types include multiple choice, matching, and performance. True/False or yes/no questions are acceptable for simulations, practice, or branching decisions. True/False questions can be effective and valid if used properly. They should not, however, be used extensively due to their high chance of a successful guess. Write the questions as clearly as possible. Use language similar to that used in the lesson text. Make a separate instructional unit for the exercise questions.

General testing conventions are:

1. Response methods will be consistent throughout any given test.

2. When a student selects an item as an answer, give an indication to identify his/her selection (i.e., check mark, circle, box, color change, etc.)

3. Provide the student the capability to change his/her answer before it is scored.

4. Develop enough questions per learning objective, dependent on objective breadth and complexity, to ensure comprehensive evaluation of the subject matter.

5. Inform the students of the number of questions to be presented, the number of questions and percentage needed to successfully complete the test, the approximate amount of time needed to complete the test, and any other special instructions.

6. Prior to beginning each test, either give the student a sample question for practice automatically, or provide the option to see a practice question. Label it clearly as "PRACTICE QUESTION" and DO NOT count it in the scoring.

7. Following each test, show students their results, and then branch them to the appropriate menu to select another lesson, additional practice, exit, etc., as applicable.

8. Provide the capability for students to review missed questions.

9. Calculate all scores on a 100 point scale for display to the student on the screen or printed reports.

Test Construction Conventions

1. Each question must be directly related to a training objective.

2. Create more than one question per objective, for use in random tests or other test versions.

3. The questions must be concise and clear with no irrelevant words.

4. Do NOT put more than one question on a screen at a time, unless it is a matching exercise.

5. Each question should be totally independent.

6. Create questions appropriate to the type of learning desired for that objective.

7. Questions should address key points. Do NOT test trivial items just to see how much students know.

8. Test all safety related items.

9. Test student's level of understanding. The "why" is just as important as the "how" if not more so.
10. Ask some difficult questions that go beyond simple recall of information or recognition.

11. Develop questions that discriminate correct, close, and incorrect responses.

12. Sequence test questions so that the more difficult questions are toward the end of the test.

Test Delivery Conventions For Multiple Choice Questions

1. Present multiple choice questions with a minimum of four possible answers.

   The landing gear CANNOT be retracted when...
   
a. Weight is on the gear.
b. The left AMAD has failed.
c. The utility B circuit has failed.
d. Armament override has been selected.

2. Do NOT number the test questions.

3. Use parallel grammatical construction for the answers.

4. Use answers that are similar in length, if possible.

5. Use short answers as much as possible.

6. Include repetitive phrases in the stem rather than in each answer.

7. Avoid negatives in the stem if possible. If they must be used, highlight them by using all capitals or a different color.

8. Try to avoid options such as "all of the above", "none of the above", or "both b and c", as much as possible. These options, however, are not prohibited and may be used if all other options have been attempted.

9. If automatic test generation from a test item pool is not used, vary the position of the correct answer. Do NOT establish patterns for responses.

Performance Exercise

Performance exercises are used to determine if a student can perform a certain task or action. Most lessons that follow technical data should contain performance exercises. Wording must be crisp and precise. There must be no doubt in the student's mind as to what action is required.

Multiple Choice

Multiple choice is probably the most common type of test question. It is recommended that a template be selected that will allow students to change answers without penalty. Templates are designed for up to five multiple choice answers. The question text and the response text should be the same color and all other text on the screen should be of a contrasting color.
Fill In The Blank

Fill in the blank questions are a quick check on the student's alertness and understanding. These questions are especially beneficial for training task procedures following technical data presentations. Care must be taken to word the question phrases correctly since the required answer and system CMI judging will be based upon a key word. Try to limit these answers to no more than four words.

True/False (Yes/No)

This type of question provides an instant indication of the student's understanding of what is being taught within an instructional unit. It is best asked using a video or graphics background. Select a font size and color for the question that will provide maximum definition. If needed, place a box around the question and response area.

Feedback And Remediation Conventions

Feedback and remediation serve three purposes:

1. To provide students with knowledge of results;
2. To provide information related to correcting or extending their work; and
3. To provide support or encouragement based on effort as well as accomplishment.

The distinctions between feedback and remediation are slight, and the terms are often used interchangeably. For our purposes, the distinction is based on intent and value. Remediation has instructional value; it relates specifically to the course content and is provided only after an incorrect response. Feedback should be clearly written to indicate the result of the student's response.

When students perform a correct action, developers should make this feedback strong and positive, giving the student a warm feeling of accomplishment. The feedback text should be a different color from the regular lesson/question and, when possible, in a pleasant color such as green or light blue.

Feedback informing students that their action(s) was/were not the anticipated response should be in BOLD print. It is recommended the color red NOT be used. The text should stand out so students clearly understand they did not make the correct response. Feedback varies from a brief statement to highly informative.

Feedback and Remediation Conventions are as follows:

1. Do NOT use negative feedback in the form of abuse or ridicule.
2. Whenever possible, feedback and remediation should be specific to the action the student is trying to perform. Do NOT use "generic" feedback.
3. Personalized feedback or remediation using slang may make the lessons more "friendly" and less clinical. However, be careful!
4. The level of feedback and remediation will correlate to the difficulty of the action or question. If questionable, provide more rather than less.
5. An incorrect response to a simple question, such as identify or recall, may require only an indication of the correct answer.
6. The incorrect response to a theory, conceptual or decision question may require more remediation (i.e., the correct answer along with an explanation why).

7. Do NOT erode the value of positive feedback by giving it too frequently or for trivial accomplishments.

8. In tests, generally the lower the score the greater the depth of feedback and remediation that is appropriate.

9. Feedback and remediation will be provided to incorrect responses or actions that involve safety in terms of consequences.

10. Students having considerable difficulty with the material may be provided delayed remediation. Delayed remediation helps highly confident students and facilitates their learning and retention of more abstract or conceptual material.

11. Delayed positive feedback at the end of tests should correlate to the test score. (Ex: Do NOT "congratulate" someone who has just barely passed a test. Instead, tell them they've completed the test with a score of XX.)

12. Generally, the level of feedback, just as the level of instruction or HELP, should be greater in the beginning of a module than toward the end. Remediation will be provided throughout the lesson/module and course.

13. Simple repetition of the original information will not provide adequate remediation in many cases. The only time simple repetition works reliably is when the student was not paying attention the first time. Reword or rephrase the information you are trying to convey, instead, or use another media technique such as audio, graphics, video, etc.

**Prompt Text Guidelines**

Prompt text is directional information to the student to aid progress through the courseware, and should be clearly written in bullet statements. It includes instructions such as: "Touch the screen to continue" or "Press RETURN to go on", etc.

---

**EXAMPLES OF FEEDBACK RESPONSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRECT ANSWER FEEDBACK</th>
<th>INCORRECT ANSWER FEEDBACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORRECT</td>
<td>SORRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOU'VE GOT IT</td>
<td>YOUR ANSWER IS WRONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>YOUR ANSWER IS IN ERROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICE GOING</td>
<td>BE CAREFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAT'S RIGHT</td>
<td>YOUR THIRD ANSWER IS INCORRECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENT</td>
<td>THAT'S NOT RIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSolutely</td>
<td>THAT'S NOT IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF COURSE</td>
<td>NOT QUITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOU BET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Icon Text Guidelines

These are the 1- to 3-word messages on various symbols (icons) within a lesson. Examples are: "NEXT", "BACK", "BREAK", "HALT", "STOP", "CONTINUE", "FORWARD", etc. Write text with a large, bold font and keep the wording short. If more than three words are needed, include the information as part of the lesson text or in a prompt.

Balloon Text Guidelines

This is one of the most effective methods to show conversation within a lesson. As in a cartoon strip, the developer could use a white balloon with the neck pointing to the source of the communication. Write the message in black using a conversational syntax. Students find this a useful technique in maintenance procedure training.

Designing Graphics

Computer generated graphics will play a major role in ICW lessons. Graphics will be created to support textual data, (ICW academic lessons, equipment familiarization, testing, team training, scenarios, etc.) throughout the learning process. Students must be able to manipulate graphics within a lesson, without exiting courseware, within system limitation and courseware developer restrictions. GRAPHICS THAT ARE SALACIOUS, OBSCENE, OR DEMEAN THE AIR FORCE, OTHER GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, OR AN INDIVIDUAL PERSON ARE STRICTLY PROHIBITED.

Graphics should be designed to meet instructional goals. For example, show cutaways of equipment that is not readily available or accessible for videotaping. Whatever the reason for the graphics, they must be prepared so they are in balance with the display screen. Creating graphics takes time. Prior to creating a new graphic, first check the graphics library to see if that graphic already exists or another graphic could be used with some modification. New graphics must be added to the library. Graphics libraries should be maintained on the system. Just a few things to consider when creating a graphic follow:

Perspective

Keeping your graphic in perspective means the graphic should look natural. Perspective drawing is the technique of representing 3-dimensional objects and depth relationships on a 2-dimensional surface, using the proper angles and lines to show the natural differences between objects.

Graphic Overlays

Graphics presentations may be superimposed over video images, other graphics displays, or textual data for special effects, outlining, attention getting, or to place an icon on the screen. Use of a graphic overlay is effective in descriptive and maintenance procedure lessons to show changes in status, especially when little or no video is available. Prompts, correct/incorrect feedback, and remediation may also be presented using graphic overlays.

Special Characters

In addition to several text fonts, special characters or symbols standard within the military may be required. These include, but are not limited to, standard airborne, ground based, and seaborne military symbols and unit notations, sizes, types, and subordination of the same; direction of movement; lines of communications and network structuring; and selected terrain identifying symbols. Graphics symbols will also be used to create block and logic diagrams, and circuitry-related drawings.
GRAPHICS SYMBOLS: Graphics symbols and their uses will have unique requirements within specific applications. The ability to define, draw, edit, and manipulate graphics must be resident within delivered graphics packages.

ALIGNMENT: When laying one graphic on top of another, it is important to ensure the overlay is in the proper position. CBT system managers and maintainers must ensure that all student workstation monitors are aligned the same way. If monitors are out of alignment, they can play havoc—especially with the graphics overlays.

SIZE: Graphics may be virtually any shape or size; however, they must represent clear and distinct objects. There should be no guesswork involved by the viewer to figure out what you have drawn. Again, remember perspective. Graphics which are too small or too large should not be used. If the graphic is too small, the student may not be able to distinguish what the object is, have difficulty locating it, and the image may appear to flicker and look fuzzy. If the graphic is too large, there may not be any room left for instructional information. Large and complex graphics are often difficult to understand. Avoid attempting to draw complex schematics. If a schematic is needed, try to use simple circuit schematics. These are effective in teaching basic make-up, component location, and troubleshooting.

GRAPHIC SCREEN CONVENTIONS

1. Color coordination and balance are essential.
2. Colors of equipment should reflect the color of the actual equipment as closely as possible.
3. The student must be in control of initiating animation sequences or at least able to repeat them.
4. Limit graphics to those areas where they are essential. (Examples: showing complex relationships; mental models, missing or incorrect video, menus that are manipulated, etc.)
5. Use colors conservatively to avoid a cluttered appearance. Use enough color to show discriminations or distinctions. But, avoid unnecessary use of color.
6. Use contrasting colors to convey distinctions between objects.
7. Use similar, but distinctive, colors to convey similarity.
8. Avoid unnecessary ornamentation, patterns, or special effects.
10. Use spacing between graphics objects to separate objects into logical groups and achieve balance.
11. Avoid animation if other techniques will work. It may not be worth the work involved. Also consider the amount of student control over the animation sequence that is necessary.
12. Try to avoid horizontal lines one pixel in width; these lines have a tendency to "jitter" on the screen. Use wider lines or less sharply contrasting colors.
13. Treat labels on a graphic as part of the graphic, but display them on the screen last.
14. Graphics should always "draw on the screen", before any text or captions. Background colors should appear first, then the graphic, then any labels, captions, and text. If audio is used, it should begin after the text has appeared.
15. Be aware that colors stimulate feelings and mental images.
RED = FIRE, HOT, LOVE, ACTIVE, EXCITING, DANGER, WARNING
ORANGE = WARM, AUTUMN, JOVIAL, ENERGETIC, LIVELY, HALLOWEEN, THANKSGIVING
YELLOW = SUNLIGHT, VITAL, CHEERFUL, INSPIRING, CAUTION, COWARD
GREEN = COOL, NATURE, RESTFUL, QUIET, PEACE, SAFE
BLUE = SKY, WATER, ICE, COLD, SOBER, SUBDUED
PURPLE = COOL, DARKNESS, MOURNING, MYSTIC, DIGNIFIED, ROYAL
WHITE = COOL, SNOW, GOOD, CLEAN, PURE
BLACK = NIGHT, EMPTY, DEAD, MOURNING, DEPRESSING, EVIL

16. In a training session, use red sparingly. Save yellow for important information that you want assimilated in a positive way. Use pink if you simply want to present a message and then get away with an absolute minimum of hassle. Pale blue can make people think a room is 3-4 degrees cooler than it actually is. Use violet to bring out creative interaction, flights of fancy; it's popular with adolescents and those who love romance novels. Too much violet creates a meditative state; a little goes a long way. Use bright colors to highlight important data or smaller objects. Follow a color theme within a given sequence: blue to soothe, red to alert, green to show speed, yellow to call attention or highlight.

SCREEN DESIGN CONVENTIONS: This section of the style guide will only briefly touch on some general conventions of screen design. We will follow the guidance as written in 3480 TCHTWR 50-2, Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) Screen Design Standards. Screen design is a critical factor in effectively presenting information to the student. Readability, aesthetic appeal, consistency, and student motivation are all components of effective screen design. Rigid standardization is difficult due to the unique characteristics of text, graphics, and video. However, to ensure quality and a common student interface, (and without stifling individual developer or unit creativity) use the following conventions:

1. Probably the most important thing to avoid is a cluttered screen. Too much of anything is never any good; and the hardest thing to do is avoid putting too much data on one screen. Give the students a little information at a time.

2. Provide instructions to the student at the top of the screen.

3. Provide transitional or supplemental information in the center of the screen.

4. Provide feedback to the student where appropriate—horizontally and toward the bottom of the screen where possible.

5. Focus attention on the center of the screen, whether for text, video, or graphics. (Exception: Vary the location of the correct touch points on touch screens during testing.)

6. The important items should always be in the foreground of a display, not hidden away or hard to find.

7. Use systematic, logically organized screens. The order of information is important, such as cause-effect, before-after, or sequential relationships.
8. Each screen will present one main point, idea, concept, step, or action. It may also contain the supporting facts necessary to clarify or reinforce the main point.

9. Visuals are better remembered than words, and the combination of the two is even better. So, use text to emphasize the visuals where needed.

10. Use headings whenever necessary to clarify the visual displayed or the content being covered. Headings will generally appear at the top of the screen, and will call attention to themselves by use of capitalization, font size, and/or color.

11. Initial screens in a module should provide more attention-getting emphasis than screens near the end of a module. However, a "sprinkling" of attention-getting techniques throughout the module can be effective to maintain student interest.

12. Similarly, initial screens should provide more detailed instructions to the students. These should gradually taper off to minimal guidance as the student progresses. The same holds true for HELP routines.

13. The first and last screens of a lesson/module will be to introduce and then reinforce the key points of what will be/has been presented. These screens have the greatest impact on the student and deserve special design consideration. These advance organizer and summary screens follow these general guidelines:

   a. Use short statements written at a more general and abstract level than the actual training objectives for that lesson. Do not use the specific content of the lesson in these screens.

   b. Use terms that are familiar to the student.

   c. Relate the lesson’s content to the student’s job requirements to establish relevance, motivate the student, and enhance training transfer.

   d. Relate this lesson (or module) to other lessons in the course to reinforce the course structure and organization.

   e. You may use visuals, audio, and/or text/graphics to establish these relationships.

COLOR: The total effectiveness of a computer based lesson can be severely hampered by poor color coordination. Avoid striking colors that clash and thus override the instruction getting through to the student. As a courseware developer, good color selection is a key factor in screen design.

SELECTION: Selecting the proper color combination for the screen is sometimes a difficult decision. Try to use the same colors throughout an entire lesson, from screen to screen. Selecting the proper colors may reduce screen flicker and present a more professional product. Stay away from using colors that are in direct contrast to one another, such as black on white. Courseware developers should remember that when choosing screen colors, if it doesn’t look good to you, it probably won’t look good to the student either. One important factor to consider is color blindness, either on the part of the developer or the student. The best thing to do is to have other developers check your color selections.

BACKGROUND COLOR: Selecting the proper background color goes hand in hand with the previous paragraph on color selection. Consistency is again the key. Once a color is selected for the background, stick with it throughout the lesson. Changing background colors causes a distraction to student learning. However, there is always the exception to the rule: sometimes it may be beneficial to change background colors, especially when the student makes an error. This will catch the student’s attention and he/she may better remember not to repeat the same mistake again.
HIGHLIGHTING: Highlighting is the special treatment of an object to call attention to it. This may consist of a simple box around an item or text, or placing the item of interest in a different color. Use of a screening effect can be very effective for highlighting. The screening effect, or tinting feature, blocks out all the area of the screen except the item or area to be emphasized. By shading the majority of the screen, the unshaded area appears to stand out. This method can be used for any graphic, textual, or video display. Some highlighting conventions follow:

1. When using color for highlighting, use standard color conventions. (Examples: Red for danger, yellow for caution, etc.)
2. Nonstandard color conventions should be identified and consistent in their use.
3. When using size for highlighting, the minimum size differential is 1.5 times normal size.
4. Minimize the highlighting of key words in text information other than captions, names, or positions. Overuse loses impact, and makes the text more difficult to read.
5. Flashing text should be used sparingly, if at all.

TEXT: Text is the most vital aspect of an effective ICW lesson and is used to guide the student to the desired behavior. The instructional designer is largely on his/her own when it comes to designing text screens. When several designers are developing one course, standards and conventions become critical. Otherwise, the separate lessons or modules cannot be integrated into the course without considerable "clean-up".

1. Use background colors and text color combinations that cause the least amount of eye fatigue. Remember that students will be viewing the screen much closer and longer than individuals receiving a presentation or viewing television.
2. Use upper and lower case letters for readability.
3. Overlay all textual overlays on a contrasting color bar or box. Use a border around this color bar/box to make it stand out from the rest of the screen.
4. Use consistent text format (font, spacing, color, etc.). Use an "internal" style (conventions guide) so that consistency can be maintained between multiple authors.
5. Use consistent text and background colors to differentiate types of screens (instructions to students on color, feedback screens a different color, transition/informational screens a third color, etc.)
6. Place text that labels or points out an object near that object.
7. Use windowing techniques when overlaying one text screen over another.
8. Indicate the active window, when using windows. A common and effective technique is to stack them, slightly offset, so the one underneath is visible, but not readable.
9. Make text appear left justified with ragged right margins.
10. Do NOT underline text if the underline touches the bottom of the characters and decreases legibility.
11. Remember that reading text on a screen is 20-30 percent slower than reading from the printed page. Avoid scrolling text or timed screens of information. Sequential screens of text should require a "Touch to continue" action from the student to change the page.
12. No more than approximately half the screen should display text at one time.
13. The screen eill NOT be crowded, too busy, or cluttered.
14. Effective text pages should contain approximately 8-10 words per line, 4 lines per paragraph, with paragraphs separated by at least one blank line.
15. Put no more than ten lines of text on the screens at one time.

16. The text should appear in wide columns, 40-50 characters wide. Do NOT use thin news type columns. Do NOT use 80 column text screens.

17. Do NOT overlay a full text screen over another text screen unless it is a HELP overlay. Clear the screen instead, either by branching or erasing, then display the second screen of text.

18. Placement of text is very important. Whenever possible, do not place text where it interferes with the background graphic or video. On text only screens, text should be centered on the screen away from the edges. Student prompts should appear in the same screen location throughout the lesson, as should the placement of icons, feedback, and classification markings (as appropriate).

19. Using a predetermined screen erasure for text is NOT recommended. All system users have different reading rates. Timed erasures will cause slower students to miss vital information. Allow the students to determine for themselves when they are ready to proceed and advance the screens manually.

20. Selecting the proper font is necessary for a nice clear screen. Use larger fonts for titles for them to stand out. Try to stay away from the smaller fonts as they tend to flicker. Fonts can also be created for specific purposes to represent numbers on a meter, a foreign language, etc.

ICONS: Icons are a visual area that the student (system user) touches (or selects via a mouse or other cursor control device) to receive courseware, either forward or backward, into or out of, etc. Icons should be large enough to read and access without difficulty. Most icons have the text written in a bold white font with black edging and placed within a multi-shaded gray box. Whenever possible, place the icons near the bottom of the screen with single icons placed in the lower right-hand corner. Try to be as consistent as possible in the placement and order of presentation of these icons from screen to screen throughout an entire course. Only display "armed" icons; icons that students can use. Don't have icons that students cannot access at this particular time.

COMPUTER TEXT COLOR CONVENTIONS: The colors listed here are the standards to be adopted by the 3480 TCHTW for ICW courseware development. The purpose of color conventions is to ensure legibility, consistency, and to add visual cues. Some suggestions follow:

1. Student instructions should be in yellow text on a blue bar at the top of the screen. Place a contrasting outline around the bar.

2. Feedback and remediation should be towards the bottom of the screen.
   a. All highlighting (pointing out via arrow or boxes) used in feedback should be in a contrasting color to the object highlighted.
   b. Feedback for correct student responses should be in dark green on a light green bar with a dark green border around the bar.
   c. Feedback for incorrect responses, as well as remediation, should be red text on a blue bar with a red border around the bar.

3. Warnings should be red text on a white bar with a red border around the bar. The caption "WARNING" will appear in all capitals, centered, and on the top line.

4. Cautions should be yellow text on a salmon bar with a yellow border around the bar. The caption "CAUTION" should appear in all capitals, centered, and on the top line.
5. Technical data notes should be in yellow text on a blue bar at the top of the screen. Place a contrasting border around the bar. The caption "NOTE" should be in all capitals, centered, and on the top line and cyan in color.

6. Transition screens and/or phrases should be blue text on a cyan bar with a blue border around the bar.

7. Text menus should use green as the predominate color with a contrasting text color. Communication is the key. These menus must clearly and effectively communicate the options to the student. Note that computer graphics menus are more "eye appealing" and communicate better if they are reinforced with captions.

8. Test questions should be white or gray text on a light blue background. Use boxes or bullets to differentiate the answers.

9. Critiques may use a color bar similar to a palette, as the rating scale. Each color block should correspond to a rating value and may also be a touch point. Show the numerical value of each block (example: Red = 0, Gray = 1, Light Green = 2, etc.)

10. Consider the use of drop shadows on text for things like titles, headings, etc. They look much better. Extensive use of drop shadows is discouraged, due to the additional authoring time required.

11. COLOR CODING: If wiring or pipe diagrams are used, try to use the real colors. If oxygen lines are supposed to be green, then in creating the diagram graphic, these lines should also be in green. Proper colors are important to reduce confusion and possibly safety problems, especially when the student starts looking for black oxygen lines on actual equipment. When in doubt, check the technical data and use the color coding as stated in these equipment documents.

GRAPHIC POSITIONING: once a graphic is designed, you must consider where it will be positioned on the screen. Position the graphic for maximum efficiency so that space is available for all needed icons and related text.

USER FRIENDLY SYSTEMS: Research consistently shows three key elements of "user friendly" training systems. Those are student control of the training, the use of menus to make selections, and the availability of additional help when needed.

1. STUDENT CONTROL: Students must feel they have some control of their instruction. To that end, certain features should be implemented during courseware development:

   a. The course should not require the student to use outside (system) documentation other than simple "start-up" instructional checklists.

   b. The course should be consistent in appearance and operation, i.e., similar formats and colors for similar screens; icons appearing in consistent locations; icons producing the same type of result each time they are used; terms mean the same thing at all times (their definitions do not change).

   c. The student can cleanly exit the courseware with minimal keystrokes. Exit points will be "authored in", if necessary, as frequently as possible. It is recommended that students be able to exit at no more than five minute intervals.

   d. The student can skip, pause, and/or restart courseware, to include video (timed series of stills or motion) if applicable.
e. The student can review previous course material, where possible and appropriate.

f. The student can bypass repetitive segments of instruction when they have already demonstrated proficiency on that segment.

g. The student can control when the next screen is presented. Do NOT use timed overlays of textual information or instructions, due to students having different reading rates. The only acceptable use of a timed overlay will be for feedback or short transitions (system high classification screens), and their use should be carefully scrutinized.

h. Students can take as much time as they desire to complete any interaction UNLESS there is a safety factor involved with actual or simulated equipment procedures.

i. The student should be aware of the time required to complete a lesson or test, but shouldn’t be pressured to “beat the clock”. Always inform the student how long a test is estimated to take prior to beginning it. The student CANNOT exit a test until it is completed (unless for an emergency situation).

j. The student should be able to see an advance organizer screen for each module to prepare them for the instruction to follow. Similarly, the student should see a summary screen at the end of each module to reinforce the material just covered and prepare them for the next module of instruction.

k. Provide control lockout feedback to the student. That is, display an appropriate message when computer processing is underway and no input will be accepted. (For example: Please wait, calculating test scores, or Loading new lesson).

2. MENUS: Menu screens are the primary point of reference for the student. They communicate both the course content and the course structure. Using menus gives students the feeling of controlling their own training. When using menus, reflect only those options a student may access for training. These "action options" should be clearly represented via color coding, arrows, boxes, check marks, or other graphics overlays. These conventions apply:

a. The student sees a list (menu) of options (text or graphic) and selects from it.

b. Menus will be concise, logical, and easy to use.

c. Submenus will allow students to return to the previous higher level menu. Use a Menu icon on each submenu. Require the student to "back out", through each intermediate menu via touch screen or keyboard controls.

d. All menu selections must be options accessible by the student, or a color coding scheme will be used (and explained) to identify the options available. Provide confirmation and feedback of which option the student selected.

e. Use titles on all menu screens to provide the student immediate information about their "location" within the course.

f. Provide status indicators to show a student the lessons, modules, etc., which have been completed; any optional or mandatory modules; pretest scores; and a recommended path or sequence to follow.

g. When possible, design the course with no more than three or four menu levels. Otherwise, the course structure may not be obvious.
3. HELP ROUTINES: HELP routines are created by the author, as necessary, to provide additional information, instructions, hints, procedures, and/or a dictionary type of listing where additional information may be found. Courseware developers and SMEs will decide what and how much HELP should be provided throughout a course. Usually, students will require more HELP at the beginning of a lesson than they would near the end. The following HELP conventions apply:

a. The student will be able to obtain assistance by selecting the HELP function at any time throughout the course of instruction.

b. Types of HELP include fixed format, context sensitive, and adaptive.

(1) The fixed format type is the simplest to design. This type is independent of the student's location in the course. It provides the same information to the student each time it is activated.

(2) The context sensitive type provides information to the students based upon the content of the course and what the user is currently doing. It provides information that is relevant to the students current activity. Limited context sensitive HELP is relatively easy to develop.

(3) Adaptive HELP keeps track of how much the student knows and adjusts the presentation of information accordingly. The level of HELP provided is based on module/lesson pretest scores or the number of times the student asks for HELP. Adaptive HELP is the most difficult to design, though it can be the most effective.

c. In general, provide more help at the beginning of a lesson/module.

d. HELPs must be complete, easy to access, and easy to understand.

e. Both a function key (F1 or F2) and the HELP icon are available to provide HELP to the student. Do NOT alternate between the two.

f. Exiting a HELP routine must return the student to the exact point in the lesson/course from which they initiated the request.

g. Where possible, use a screen overlay or window to provide textual HELP information.

h. HELPs will be relevant, correct, and complete to instill confidence.

i. One common application of the HELP function is to display a HELP menu from the first activation of the HELP icon or special function key.

j. It is optional, though desirable, to track usage data about HELP routines. This includes the number of times HELP was requested and which choices were made.

MOTIVATION: Further, research also indicates that increasing the students' motivation, i.e., gaining and maintaining their interest, will also increase their learning.

MOTIVATION FACTORS:

1. Courses should be designed in small enough increments or modules that the students can perceive that they are making progress in completing the course. If the students cannot sense they are making progress, they will quickly become discouraged and "demotivated."
2. Also, with small enough increments or modules of instruction, students can easily leave the training session for breaks, meals, or emergencies. As a general rule, design the increments or modules to be no longer than 20 minutes (run time) if possible. Developers should design logical break points", if not automatically provided by the system, for longer sessions. Be sure to include interim summaries so students can easily pick up where they left off.

3. Courses must be challenging, not boring or repetitive. Analyze the subject matter and the target audience and fine-tune the presentations accordingly.

4. Design the course so that a "typical student" from the correct target audience, while challenged, can successfully complete the course. If the course is too easy or too difficult, the student will not be motivated to pay attention or complete it.

5. Training should be clearly relevant to the student, or it will be perceived as a waste of time.

6. Use varying touch points and interactions to focus the student's attention. Do NOT use frequent "TOUCH TO CONTINUE" or "NEXT" interactions. These types of interactions sometimes cannot be avoided for instructions, explanatory notes, cautions, warnings, etc., but don't use them as a primary means of student interaction. Have the student interact with the material being presented, not with the training system. "Page-turners" ARE NOT acceptable.

7. Humor can add to the student's interest, but it must be selective and used judiciously.

8. Positive feedback can also be a useful motivational factor if it is relevant to the content and difficulty of the material.

MISCELLANEOUS:

1. SPECIAL FUNCTION KEYS: Preset function keys may be added or deleted as necessary to conduct training. Arm only those function keys the student will need to use in the lesson. Courseware developers must tell the students, in each module's introductory lesson, which function keys are armed and their usage.

2. NAVIGATION: It is important that students be able to navigate and locate themselves within a lesson and throughout a course. This requires a logical and apparent course structure. Well-designed menus, course maps, and/or status screens are essential. Another effective technique is to place a "reminder" in an upper corner of the screen. This can be text or a small graphic that corresponds to the last menu option selected. This technique helps reduce student confusion.

3. LESSON CLOSURE: Each lesson should contain a closure page to let the students know they are finished with a particular lesson. This page should be done with some flare--making the screen come alive with a series of brightly colored nested boxes, etc. In the center box, inform the students they have completed the lesson and provide additional information such as "See your instructor for further instructions", "Do you wish to review the lesson?", or "To proceed to Lesson X, press NEXT".

SUPPLEMENTARY COURSE MATERIALS: Just as in conventional training, supplemental materials may be required for some ICW lessons. Any study guides or workbooks the student will need must also be prepared and used following traditional established procedures. Other materials used with ICW lessons include technical data documents, worksheets, questionnaires, surveys, workstation checklists, etc.
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AUDIO/VISUAL PRODUCTION

Introduction: This chapter presents established controls to ensure quality audio-visual products are included in ICW lessons. It provides information on audio-visual production controls, preproduction planning, production, and post production.

As with all CBT tasks, audio-video production requires extensive planning. Courseware developers must have a plan of exactly what audio-visual products are needed to support the lesson. Careful preproduction planning is a key element to a quality IVD presentation.

Once a need for IVD has been established, the instructional, technical data must be reviewed. The courseware developer must coordinate with the SME and plan how each lesson should be presented, and list all potential audio and video inputs that will be needed.

The developer must then start preparing flow charts, storyboards, and format sheets to provide an overall picture of all requirements. One option is to combine this effort with another courseware developer's requirements on the same location shoot. In preparing the shooting script, developers must take into consideration different angles and close-ups. Always keep in mind that it may take several shots to perform one small step in an instructional procedure. Prepare the audio needs along the same lines as for video.

For videodisc productions, each organization must develop a complete shooting script which contains detailed explanations to include the following: camera angle, distance from the subject (close, medium, long), background, lighting, etc. The more information provided, the better the chance of obtaining the exact picture needed for the lesson.

Developers should review existing Video and Graphics Library files if they exist and videotape footage in the technical libraries. There is no need to take the same picture twice, but don't use just anything to get by. Make sure the material, either on-hand or produced, really fulfills the instructional lesson's needs.

Laserfilm Program Material Types And Disc Capacity: LASERFILM (or videodisc) can reproduce the following types of program material:

1. Motion Video with Audio: Continuous motion sequences are recorded on videodisc. One frame of video on the master tape becomes one frame on the videodisc. During a motion video sequence, the videodisc player displays continuous video and two channel audio.

2. Video Still: A video still is a single video frame recorded onto a single revolution sector of the spiral track on the videodisc. When the LASERFILM player encounters video stills while in play mode, it plays each still frame at the rate of one-half second, one second, or two seconds per frame as commanded, or if not in play mode, until commanded to advance to another frame.

3. Compressed Audio only: In the compressed audio only mode, each disc frame can contain up to 4.77 seconds of real time audio. In this case, the audio can be played by itself or with display of any video on the LASERFILM disc.

4. Compressed Audio with Video Stills: This is the so-called slide show format (sound over stills). A single video frame on the videodisc is followed by up to six compressed audio frames that can contain a total of approximately 28 seconds of real time audio. While the videodisc player is showing a single video frame, it is simultaneously decompressing and playing the compressed audio frames.

5. Digital Data: Digital data can be recorded onto the disc for recovery and use by an internal host computer or for downloading through the RS-232 player communication port or the optional IEEE 488. Substitution options are features of the delivery system.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIDEODISC CAPACITY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTION VIDEO</td>
<td>30 MINUTES (54,000 FRAMES AT 30 FRAMES PER SECOND)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPRESSED AUDIO ONLY (NO VIDEO)</td>
<td>150 HOURS (54,000 FRAMES AT 4.77 SECONDS PER FRAME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STILL VIDEO WITH COMPRESSED AUDIO</td>
<td>ANY DESIRED COMBINATION OF VIDEO AND COMPRESSED AUDIO FRAMES CAN BE SELECTED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXAMPLES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 VIDEO STILLS AND 41.6 HOURS OF COMPRESSED AUDIO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 VIDEO STILLS AND 36.3 HOURS OF COMPRESSED AUDIO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 VIDEO STILLS AND 29.7 HOURS OF COMPRESSED AUDIO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIGITAL DATA</td>
<td>2380 BYTES OF ERROR DETECTED UNCORRECTED DATA PER VIDEO FRAME 221 MBYTES PER DISC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pretaping Planning and Coordination:** The first thing to consider when planning the desired video and audio requirements is to determine if they can be done locally. If not, you must identify a location. Courseware developers must coordinate the taping trip and remain informed throughout all phases of the taping. Coordinate the following audio-visual requirements:

1. The location of taping (whether local, CONUS, OCONUS, indoor studio, outdoor, etc.)
2. The time frame required (projected dates to include travel time, whether filming will be done during days, swings, or mids, etc.)
3. The number of individuals needed for taping.
4. Equipment personnel will need to bring on the trip.
5. Equipment that will need to be onsite.
6. Travel, billeting, and funding considerations (as specified in the Memorandum of Agreement/Understanding).

Time is always a major consideration. The time required to videotape a task will almost always be several times the normal time to actually perform the task. The tasks may have to
be performed a number of times for different angles and close ups. Before taping, ensure that all personnel involved are fully aware of the task and the videotaping requirements. During taping, add to the shooting script as necessary and update the storyboards to reflect any changes. Keep a detailed account of the taping for future reference.

Throughout the taping process, the SME will be the technical advisor. Together, the tech advisor and the director have the responsibility of ensuring the videotape fills the needs of the lesson.

Another consideration is whether people are needed in the videotaping. The type of task will be the determining factor. If you are videotaping a demonstration lesson, then you would probably want people in the shots. In most other cases, people will not be needed because the student will be performing the task. When you have people take part, consider the need for talent releases since anyone who is recognizable generally requires one.

Production Techniques: There are a few considerations that must be kept in mind when determining what and how to tape.

1. **Angles:** Whenever taping a piece of equipment, select the best angle that meets the needs of the lesson. Try to tape the task head-on or from a side view. Head-on is the best position but not always possible. If in doubt as to which view is best, tape both. Sometimes an angled view is best due to lighting or equipment configuration. Whatever the situation, the positioning must be consistent throughout the taping. Try not to move the camera until the task is complete and the director has quickly reviewed the tape. If the taping was inadequate, camera angles will not be lost for the retaping.

2. **Close Ups:** Close ups are an important part of taping. After an entire task is taped from full view, you then may record close ups of different action places, or spots where things are happening. Once positioned for a close up, keep this position until all that can be seen is recorded. The smallest camera movement is noticeable during the running of a lesson, so DO NOT MOVE THE CAMERA BETWEEN SHOTS.

3. **Motion:** A full motion sequence can be very effective during a lesson, especially if there is accompanying audio. A word of caution: use motion sequences sparingly since they use up disc space rapidly. Most of the motion sequences will not be transferred as such to videodisc nor used in a lesson. Therefore, when taping motion, stop the equipment in several places to get a good, steady, still picture. A still frame from a motion sequence that is moving too quickly will appear fuzzy and shaky.

4. **Stills:** Keep in mind that most of what you are taping will be used as still frames within a lesson. First film a bolt installed, then film the same scene with the bolt removed. This is why you don't want to move the camera. During a lesson, if the student touches a bolt to remove it, the bolt should disappear without anything else on the screen moving. Remember that you will probably need to videotape every object related to a specific task. Be sure to obtain both a close-up and long or medium range picture of each.

5. **Scene Control:** During taping, try to keep people away from the camera. If someone bumps the tripod or camera, the picture will need to be squared up again and it may not match what you had before. Once you have taped the entire task from the initial view, consider taping from a different angle. If different angles are not needed, move the camera for close-up or use the camera zoom. Again, perform all the steps that are seen from each view without moving the camera.

6. **Audio Taping:** Audio is recorded directly to the videotape. Keep in mind that the less background noise there is, the better you can capture the sounds for your lesson. Get the full range of sound from start to finish.

7. **Studio Taping:** Studio taping requires all the preparation and planning that field taping requires. The camera set up is the same and all the preliminary steps still apply. Studio
taping does require less outside support and allows for better environmental control, alleviates the worry of getting equipment moved around, and negates any outside weather problems. The most important advantage of studio videotaping, however, is that proper lighting is easier to establish and maintain.

**Premastering Videodiscs:** The process of premastering is directed towards providing a one-inch magnetic videotape that has a recorded image of the program material to be recorded on the videodisc. This is known as a Disc Image Tape. The videodisc system accepts video and audio inputs and generates a formatted video signal to deliver information from the videodisc to the user. In addition to motion video with dual channel audio, still frame video, still frame video with compressed audio, compressed audio only, and digital data, each frame of the video signal contains a unique frame number used by the videodisc player to identify, locate, and control presentation of the program material.

The first step in the authoring process is the planning stage. The output is an overall videodisc production plan. Once the overall plan is created, the preproduction phase begins. This phase contains some or all of the elements of classical audio-video preproduction (e.g., scripting, storyboarding, detailed production, post production planning, source material, and talent acquisition). Outputs of the preproduction phase are:

1. The interactive program flow chart.
2. The end product (disc) acceptance criteria.
3. A detailed production/post production plan.
5. The source material to be used.

The next phase, **audio-video production**, is required if the final program contains material which is in any of the forms listed below:

1. Does not currently exist on videotape.
2. Does not exist on audio-visual media nor electronically convertible to videotape (e.g., film slides).
3. Does not consist of textual or graphics information which can be electronically generated in video format.

The premastering process for producing a videodisc is identical to that of producing a program on videotape, except that final autoassembly during the post production process includes processing of the video signal by a Formatter. The Formatter provides the unique frame identification and, when applicable, compresses the audio for insertion into a video frame. It also provides for the formatting and insertion of digital data into video frames when this function is desired. The outputs of the audio-video production phase are audio and video magnetic tapes, plus text and graphics that can be electronically generated.

The final phase of the authoring process encompasses all aspects of the typical video post production process (e.g., editing linear segments with fades and dissolves, keying in titles, using a character generator to make up menus and indexes, etc.) The inputs are audio and videotape from the production phase, material which is to be electronically generated or converted, and the detailed post production plan. The output is a videotape which contains the program material for the videodisc.

**Post Production/Mastering and Replication:** The reason video tapes are made is to supply images required for the videodisc. The best of tapes are valueless unless a good image is transferred to the disc. As with everything else, plan your actions before doing them. Putting images onto the videodisc requires but a push of a button. The difficult part is selecting the most appropriate image and ensuring the image is of the highest possible quality.
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DOCUMENTATION

Certain procedures should be followed to document the development of ICW lessons and courses. Good record keeping is essential to track development decisions. This section covers maintaining time and material production records, completing a visual index, and cataloging graphics and videos. Also, this section will present guidelines for ICW course implementation and personnel preparations.

Production Time Records: it is important to maintain an accurate record of time spent on all phases of courseware development: tasks and skills analysis, technical research, flow charting, storyboarding, data entry into the CBT system, courseware verification and validation, and when the courseware is locally certified ready for delivery to students in the classroom. Evaluate each task to arrive at a comprehensive level of effort for completion of courseware development projects. By tracking the overall development effort on a time expenditure log, management will have a more accurate indication of how long it takes to create an ICW lesson for every phase of development. Timekeeping records will be a critical part of the Lesson Production Folder. The folder will provide the required audit trail for development decisions as well as potential aid to justification for requests for additional manpower, tour length extensions, and/or civilian contractor support.

Time Expenditure Log: However important this data collection may be, courseware developers cannot afford to spend a great deal of time and effort documenting the time they spend developing, and management cannot ignore the need to collect data for the sake of doing actual courseware development. AF Form 3126, General Purpose Form, may be adapted to create a time accounting log or a computer-generated data base or spreadsheet may be used. Therefore, courseware development team leaders should track the efforts of individual team members as they proceed through the development process. This would do two things:

1. Unburden the courseware developers from the time-consuming task of tracking their time spent developing; and

2. Keep the team leader abreast of the efforts of the team, to recognize outstanding individual performance, keep track of milestones, and to make necessary scheduling and manning adjustments based on the team's overall level of effort.

The Time Expenditure Log should contain the following:

1. Lesson Title/Segment as it applies to the data base.
2. Course Number assigned to the lesson
3. Course Title that corresponds to the course number.
4. Action performed in lesson development.
5. Date of report.
6. Hours and minutes spent on a particular action.
7. Total time spent performing each action.

Start a new accounting log each day; this enables team leaders to accurately reflect the overall effort expended over a given period of time. This data should be collected and logged on a daily basis and filed in the Lesson Production Folder.

Once the lesson is completed, make a final tabulation of each task performed.
Material Expenditures: For resident courses, tracking materials used for a specific lesson development may be difficult. Often more than one lesson is recorded on the same videodisc, and the scenes on a videotape may provide inputs for two or more discs.

Production Folders: The Production Folder contains information critical to ISD documentation. All the lessons for a given course must be grouped together. This then becomes the "LESSONS LEARNED" package. It will help reduce duplicate efforts and prevent reinventing the wheel during subsequent courseware development projects. Prior to starting a new effort, these files should be reviewed. A lesson may have already been created that will meet the needs of the new lesson. More frequently, there is a lesson that needs only minor rewrite to satisfy the new objective(s).

Course Folder: This folder should contain a copy of the course Statement of Requirements (SOR) tasking letter, course chart, Plan of Instruction (POI), and training standard (CTS/STS). Other documents should include the rationale of why ICW was selected, time and material accounting logs, the Courseware Development and Implementation Plans.

Lesson Production Folder: Each lesson requires a separate folder. Sometimes a lesson is initially developed for one course, and then used in others. Items in the Production Folder include:

1. Lesson Abstract: The lesson abstract is a brief summary of the lesson that includes the title, number of segments, file names used in construction and delivery, average time to complete the lesson, a listing of the courseware developers, the date development was completed, the date the lesson was validated, a list of technical data references, and a brief description of the lesson; for example:

   "The in-Flight Missile Repair lesson is a self-paced performance lesson that allows the student to practice the procedures required for the in-flight repair of a missile. The lesson allows the student to follow the technical order and step through the repair procedures. This lesson features motion and still pictures of malfunctioning in-flight missiles with cartoon balloons to simulate launch control dialog and observations of the missile's flight. Students interact with the touch screen as they go through the in-flight repair procedures. All portions of the task are simulated. Questions are asked throughout the lesson. Incorrect responses lead to immediate missile destruction and automatic remediation. Students must provide correct responses before the lesson will continue. A standard progress check is given at the conclusion to ensure training goals are met."

2. DD Form 1995-1, Visual Information Production Request, Evaluation, and Approval. A completed, signed form is mandatory for each lesson containing Interactive Videodisc (IVD) simulations.

3. Flow Charts: Flow charting is valuable in planning ICW lessons. They act as a communications tool, clarify thought processes, present logic, and allow for easy reading.

4. Storyboards: A storyboard contains identifying information about a screen display. It allows an author to visualize how a lesson will look to a student. It is extremely important to ensure storyboards remain current. Once a lesson is developed, the development team must compare the actual lesson with the storyboards, verify the text is the same, and the videodisc start and stop frames are correct. As a lesson is updated or changed, storyboards must also be changed. They are the most important tool in the development of a successful ICW lesson.

5. Developmental Notes: Any special or unique instructions on how the lesson was created or how to run the lesson should be a part of the folder. This helps clarify the data trail. Also make sure that any unique operating instructions are forwarded to the instructors. Include any published supplemental material used for the lesson. If questions are asked on
the published material, include a completed document with correct answers clearly marked. This will eliminate possible future controversy.

6. **Time Expenditure Forms**: File the completed lesson development time charts and forms in the lesson folder.

7. **Validation Data**: All lesson validation data should be stored in the lesson folders. Once the lesson has been validated, summarize the preliminary data and file this summary sheet. Similarly, all printouts of CMI reports should be stored with the validation data.

**Graphics Library**: In developing ICW lessons, developers will create graphics, possibly thousands of them. Each developer will know what he/she created, but other developers may not be aware that certain graphics exist. To minimize redundancy, a Graphics Library must be established. This would be nothing more than a list of each individual developer's created graphics in a shared, common, consolidated file accessible by all system developers.

Establishing a Graphics Library expands the graphics development capability for all individual developers. The library eliminates repetition, and may reduce development time on new graphics and ICW lessons. Graphics are entered into this library listing as they are created, and should be maintained in an alphanumeric sequence.

Prior to starting lesson development, the courseware author can review the Graphics Library for completed graphics that may be used in the new lesson. If a graphic is found in the library, the author must COPY the library graphic and place it within the new lesson. There may also be library graphics that require some modification to meet the specific needs of the new lesson. The original graphic will serve as a foundation for making the necessary changes. Considerable time can be saved using this technique.

**ATCR 52-10 Requirements (Lessons Learned)**: ATCR 52-10, Computer Based Instruction for Technical Training, requires that all ICW lessons be developed using the ISD process. Following the guidelines of this style guide ensures this criterion is met.

**ICW Course Implementation**: Implementation of a new or revised course requires detailed planning. An Implementation Plan is essential to ensure that all of the complex factors involved in producing and delivering a course come together to present instructional material to the students. During validation tryouts of the course, developers will have an opportunity to ensure that everything is accounted for that is required for the course. Do not hesitate to make changes that will improve the course at this time. However, changes that will impede the implementation of the course on time should be made at a later date.

**Rework**: Course managers must be fully informed regarding the necessity for each significant lesson/course revision. This revision process will be classified as REWORK and must be fully documented to ensure the initial development time keeping charts do not become inflated. REWORK will be accomplished AFTER completion of an entire ICW lesson's development effort. No REWORK will be accomplished without prior approval of the course managers and TDB personnel. In case of conflicts regarding whether ICW lessons require REWORK, the Division Chief and/or the Operations and Training Division chief will make the final determination. The bottom line will be the impact on student training. Will the REWORK delay course delivery to students? Will students receive erroneous data? Can instructors use conventional instructional techniques to clarify the lesson and thus avoid delays in training?

**Personnel Resources**: Some of the courseware development team will require training and guidance, especially if they have no previous CBT course development experience. Identification of personnel for courseware development must be made in sufficient time to allow for training and system familiarization. Accomplishment of this task will ensure that the right people are in the right place at the right time to ensure course implementation will go smoothly.
The preparation of instructors and other school personnel for implementation of new or revised courses can make or break the course. Instructor preparation should begin long before course implementation. In order for all personnel to feel involved in the decisions affecting the course, they should be kept informed of progress throughout the development process. If instructors are not currently involved in the transition to ICW courseware, steps should be taken immediately to ensure their complete support for the course development and media presentation. This may involve helping them adjust to the changes being made, developing special briefings and training sessions to indoctrinate them to their new roles, or developing manuals and job aids that instructors will need to conduct the course properly and without embarrassment. While much of the training and indoctrination can apply to both instructor and other support personnel, instructors will require a more comprehensive preparatory effort.

A recommended approach to adequately prepare CBT instructors and other personnel for CBT classroom instruction is to conduct a workshop shortly before course implementation. A workshop offers the following advantages:

1. Intensive training environment
2. Group cohesiveness
3. Problem solving

The workshop should address the following areas:

1. Specific CBT System capabilities
2. Specific roles and responsibilities
3. Review of instructor and student manuals
4. Instructional procedures
5. Potential problem areas
6. Administrative procedures
7. Policy concerning equipment and facilities
8. Short and long range goals of the CBT Program

INSTRUCTOR'S MANUAL: An Instructor's Manual can take many different forms (e.g., a series of lesson guides, programmed text and instructions, associated course documents, or ICW courseware on the delivery system), but all have a single purpose: adequately prepare the instructor to teach in a CBT classroom environment. The Instructor's Manual (as well as the Student's Manual) may be initially delivered with the CBT system. If no manuals are delivered with the system, then they will have to be created. In either case, manuals must be maintained to reflect local operating procedures and system operation. The System Operations Manager (SOM) should be responsible for all user manuals, whether they have to be created from scratch, or just modified to reflect local conditions, policy, and/or procedures. Components of an Instructor Manual include:

1. Course Description
   a. Rationale for computer aided instruction presentation
   b. Overview of the course
   c. Plan of Instruction (POI) to include:
      (1) Learning objectives for each block/unit
      (2) STS/CTS element and training level
(3) Length of activities for each block/unit
(4) Instructor requirements for each unit
(5) Instructor activities for each unit
(6) media for each objective
(7) Equipment for each unit
(8) Facility requirements for each unit

2. Safety/Security
   a. System and course classification levels
   b. Security awareness measures
   c. Student abuse of equipment
   d. Emergency power cutoff switch locations
   e. Fire extinguisher locations
   f. Classroom and facility evacuation routes

3. Testing Information
   a. Number, type, and location of tests/examinations/progress checks/quizzes, etc.
   b. Instructions for administration
   c. Evaluation and critique procedures
   d. CMI analysis and documentation

4. Course Administration Directions
   a. Scheduling
   b. Student records
   c. Monitoring student progress
   d. Procedures for handling fast/slow students
   e. Teaching tips

5. Computer Operation Procedures
   a. Keyboard and special function keys
   b. Intercom/Interphone usage
   c. HELP Routines
   d. Special Features

Student's Manual: This document does not prepare instructors to conduct the course, but it is an essential ingredient for a course's success. The Student Manual goes hand in hand with the Instructor Manual. It provides the information needed to operate the CBT system and receive training. The instructor should also be aware of the Student Manual's content. Therefore, either provide the instructor a copy or summarize student information in the Instructor's Manual. The following are some questions the Student Manual should answer:

1. What do I do in this course?
2. What materials should I have/get for the course?
3. How do I operate the computer? How do I start?
4. How will I know how well I am doing? How will I know what I did wrong?
5. What should I do if I don't understand the lesson material? How do I get HELP? How do I take notes?

6. When can I use the computer for the course by myself? What do I do if I need to do extra studying? What about study hall?

7. What will I be able to do when I complete the course?

VALIDATION

Introduction: Procedures for validating the lessons/courses must be developed. Validation is that most important fourth step. Managers must verify and document that courseware created meets established instructional goals and objectives. This section also contains guidance to ensure courseware remains valid.

Course Validation: Validation is systematic and takes time. There is no rapid magical way to determine if material developed allows students to meet the specified instructional goals. Overall validation of a course is the responsibility of courseware developers and curriculum personnel to adhere to governing regulations and ensure that each completed ICW lesson is valid. Validation provides the means for courseware developers to guarantee specified instructional results.

Validation is the process of verifying developmental testing and revision of instruction to achieve the instructional intent on the basis of learning objectives for each unit.

ISD Requirements: Prior to starting the validation process, review AFP 50-58 for the validation requirements. For the graduate to be able to meet the criteria of the training standard, the following training conditions must be checked in the course of the evaluation process:

1. Was the lesson designed to contain only information appropriate for the education and training of the student?
2. Was the lesson objective constructed to focus instruction on the training standard element?
3. Was instruction conducted at a level commensurate with the proficiency code established by the training standard?
4. Was the training conducted equal to the goals of the stated objective?
5. Did each student have the opportunity to achieve the instructional goal?
6. Did each instructional unit (lesson subset) aid in reaching the instructional goal?
7. Did each word of text aid in helping students understand the lesson?
8. Was the lesson text clearly written?
9. Did each audio/visual input directly support the instructional unit for which it was prepared?
10. Were there instances when instruction was hampered due to inadequate audio/visual support?
11. After completing the lesson, could the student be expected to perform at the level specified by the training standard?
These are but a few of the questions that need to be asked of the lesson prior to declaring it valid. Any negative response requires immediate attention. The effective quality of a lesson is measured by the proficiency achievement of the student, not by the length or beauty of a lesson. The most successful method for validating ICW lessons is to start with a single SME, followed by other courseware developers, course instructors, and finally a test group of (staff personnel) students. Each group should attempt to pinpoint potential lesson problems and critique the instructional material.

Quality Assurance (QA) is the plan for conducting checks, reviews, and testing of developed courseware. The QA plan is intended to provide the mechanisms to monitor development of courseware so that discrepancies and problems can be corrected as early as possible in the development process. Review criteria should be preestablished and forms provided for noting discrepancies in content and design. For CBI, this review should include a paper test of branching and practice strategies elaborated in the fully scripted storyboards. Quality Control (QC) is the act of physically performing these checks, reviews, and tests. QC occurs at those identified points in the development process when a product is ready to be compared with the standards and specifications used in this style guide. Managers should establish the following QC objectives:

1. Establish a QC testing program that verifies the quality of products throughout the courseware development process.

2. Describe the checks, reviews, and tests that should occur within the courseware development process, showing critical relationships and stating the sequence of activities required for QC.

3. Describe the testing procedures necessary to determine whether products meet or exceed the standards and requirements set forth in specifications, course outlines, and other governing documents.

4. Describe the management strategies needed to review and test completed courseware.

5. Describe the criteria for review and testing.

6. Identify the personnel and technical support necessary to conduct reviews and tests of completed courseware.

7. Describe the process used to report and remedy discrepancies.

In the production of courseware at the lesson and component levels, the focal point of QC is the author of a product. It is the author's responsibility to assure compliance with specifications, maintain design integrity, present content accurately and effectively, and revise materials in accordance with the review process. It is the author who initiates self-checks and on-going peer reviews. Also, it is the author's task to incorporate corrections and comments into a second draft. The second draft is formally reviewed by the development team leader, an instructional designer, a visual design specialist, and an SME.

One of the most critical phases of instructional courseware development is the evaluation of course materials. The process of developing satisfactory courseware involves both formative and summative evaluations.

1. The formative evaluation is done during the development and prototype testing of the product. A summative evaluation is performed after installing the courseware in the system for classroom delivery. Both types of evaluation are essential. Time lines or milestone charts should be prepared during planning and provide for completion of courseware evaluations.

2. Formative evaluation is an internal process by which courseware developers review their product for technical accuracy and educational soundness upon its installation into
the CBT system and immediately prior to its introduction into the classroom. It is called formative because the materials are being developed and improved while the process is going on. Formative evaluation equals course validation.

3. The formative evaluation process is not static but on-going. The evolution of a course is a gradual process, with many components being assembled to form a coherent whole. Throughout the courseware development process, managers must ensure the quality of these various components is maintained at a high level. Materials should be reviewed as they become available. Objectives, test items, storyboard, and final ICW lessons should be reviewed as they are developed. By reviewing each component as it is produced, developers will avoid the possibility of having to make major changes late in the development process. Rather, several specific revisions can be made to each component as it is developed.

INTERNAL REVIEW: The formative evaluation is a continuous, internal process. It is conducted within the organization using developers and instructors with course subject matter expertise and understanding of instructional design. As a rule of thumb, students should never see course materials that haven't first been through an internal review. First draft (and some final) lessons are likely to contain technical inaccuracies and flaws which can be spotted by other developers and SMEs during this review process.

1. The internal review is an excellent way to begin the formal validation process. Using individuals with expertise on the subject and instructional techniques can often uncover lesson flaws. The original author and all evaluators must remain impersonal and forgo pride in authorship. Any changes made to the original lesson must be based upon educational weakness or technical errors. To be a competent internal reviewer, one must be concise, have a firm background in development principles, and offer nothing but constructive criticism. Individuals used as SMEs must fully understand all technical aspects of the task covered in the lesson.

2. A productive internal review process starts with the SME going through the completed lesson/course as a student. To be valid, the lesson must be accurate. The SME will verify this. The lesson author should be at the SME's side throughout this lesson/course review. Once the technical accuracy of the lesson has been established the educational merit can then be assessed.

3. Use other courseware developers and educational and training specialists to review the lesson. Constructive criticism is beneficial. Document all problems noted. The reviewer should determine if the ICW lesson follows all the same requirements of a conventional lesson. Remember, IVD is an instructional delivery technique and must be used toward meeting student mastery of instructional training objectives.

4. Correct those portions of the lesson that have been identified as needing correction. After making the adjustments, the reviewers must go through the lesson again. There is no need to make a change without first establishing that the change is critical to the learning objective, that the change made corrected the identified problem, and no new problem was initiated. The result of the internal evaluations does not provide conclusive proof of the adequacy or inadequacy of the ICW lesson. But, these evaluations do identify and eliminate some of the problem areas before the lesson is ready for a small group trial.

In general, the QC issues that guide the courseware development process consistently center on the following areas:

1. CONTENT - All courseware accurately and consistently answers content requirements.

2. EDITORIAL - All courseware contains correct spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, and syntax, while avoiding jargon, language bias, and the overuse or inadequate explanation of technical terms.
3. DESIGN/TESTING - All courseware follows sound principles of instructional design. Objectives serve as the guidelines for developing the instruction and for designing assessment measures to determine if objectives have been mastered. Instructional sequences are based on a foundation of learning hierarchy requirements. Events of instructions are taken into account to support the internal processing of learning. Test items measure mastery of the behavior or cognition called for in their corresponding objectives. Test item results identify and diagnose points of failure in student learning and provide information for making improvements in the instruction.

4. AUDIO/VISUAL - All audio and video sequences meet standards of technical acceptability, with no static or distortion. Audio elements are clear and comprehensive. Visuals are technically accurate, legible, supportive of instruction and/or motivation, numbered, and located appropriately.

Conducting Tryouts: Before implementing a course, all materials must be tried out. If any step in the courseware development process is neglected, it is this one. Many courses are rushed directly from the internal review to the classroom for implementation. This causes the development team extra work in revising final or published versions of the courseware. Tryouts should be done in three sizes: individual, small group, and large group/operational.

1. Develop Plan for Tryout: A plan will need to be developed that specifies the activities that will take place as well as the requirements of equipment, personnel, and classroom. All of the management concerns should be included in both an overall plan for all tryouts, and a specific plan for each type of tryout.

2. Try the Materials Out: There are several steps to be taken by the courseware developers prior to trying out the course materials. What form the tryout will take must be determined and described in the tryout plan. Decide whether the ICW lesson will be tried out in storyboard form or on the actual equipment. Determine the availability of the media to be used in the tryout.

3. Once the preliminary planning for the tryout is complete, brief the faculty and tryout participants on the conduct of the tryout. The following steps are the normal processes that should be followed when conducting tryouts:
   a. Brief the instructors
   b. Explain the student’s role
   c. Gather student data
   d. Pretest the students (optional)
   e. Conduct the lesson
   f. Gather all in-class data as specified in the plan
   g. Administer end of lesson test
   h. Gather post-class data as specified in the plan
   i. Debrief all participants
   j. Analyze data gathered

4. Data Collection Process: No data has any value unless it is in a usable form and used for some purpose. The analysis of the results of a tryout will only be as successful as the data collected and the subsequent use of that data. There are four distinct preliminary steps to perform prior to collecting and analyzing evaluation data.
a. Determine the type of data to collect. A first step toward determining the kind of data to collect is to list all the decisions that need to be made regarding the course materials; then list the specific information needed to make those decisions. This list will form the basis for determining what to collect during tryouts and actual classroom operations. Some of the data collected will be useful for several different purposes and some will only apply to one decision. Collect all data that is needed; but avoid collecting data there is no use for, or that you don’t know what to do with.

b. Determine the method of collecting the data. Some data may have to be collected in tests, via questionnaires, or through interviews. As a rule, avoid collecting data during the actual lesson delivery unless it is automatically being compiled by the computer, or is being collected by someone other than the active participants. If the data will have a wide degree of variation, it is probably best collected in an open ended questionnaire or interview. Data that needs to be highly structured can best be formulated into a brief questionnaire. Knowledge or performance data which forms a set of baseline characteristics is often best collected by a test.

c. Structure the data collection instrument(s). Whatever method is selected for data collection, format the collection so that it is easy to administer, provides the right data, and has clear instructions and unambiguous items without extraneous data.

d. Determine data analysis methodology. The next step is to determine the methodology for data analysis. This methodology may have an impact on the type and form of data to be collected, so it should be determined in conjunction with the data requirements. When methodology has been determined, construct some sample data and run it through the system to ensure it works and gives the anticipated results.

Analyzing the Data: The final step in this process is to analyze the data obtained from the tryouts. Worksheets can be used to compile and summarize the data beforehand to avoid wasting time during the tryouts. The most critical point in data analysis is to know what is being analyzed and why it is being analyzed. The whole purpose in collecting and analyzing data is to:

a. Validate that the courseware does what it is supposed to do for the student; i.e., the objectives can be accomplished and the tests determine the mastery of objectives.

b. Determine the actual learning condition requirements; i.e., how long the lesson will take; how many instructors, tests, and student materials are required; what equipment is required; etc.

c. Improve the course materials.

d. Find out what is right and wrong with the courseware.

Tryout data will indicate where transitions, concept development, or explanatory materials are inadequate. Also, testing problems may pinpoint either poor test item construction or poor instructional development.

Instructors

The classroom instructors are key players toward a meaningful validation program. It is inconceivable to truly validate a lesson unless the instructors remain fully active throughout the validation process.
Instructors should initially go through the entire lesson as students. This instructor review achieves two benefits: First, the instructors become familiar with the system, keyboard controls, lesson sequencing, and course content; and secondly, aid the validation process. The instructors can also play the devil’s advocate by answering questions incorrectly. In this fashion, branching can be checked. Similarly, the instructors should go through the correct path to ensure the lesson leads the student to the logical conclusion. A detailed critique should be made listing all problem areas. When possible, instructors should offer suggestions on how to correct problems noted within the lesson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>FORMAT</th>
<th>TYPE OF DATA</th>
<th>USES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRE</td>
<td>1) PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>TARGET POPULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) EXPERIENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) TRAINING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WRITTEN</td>
<td>1) ENTRY KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>1) BASELINE KNOWLEDGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) OBJECTIVE MASTERY</td>
<td>2) POST TEST, MEASURE GAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERFORMANCE</td>
<td>1) ENTRY SKILLS</td>
<td>1) BASELINE KNOWLEDGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) OBJECTIVE MASTERY</td>
<td>2) POST TEST, MEASURE GAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERVIEW</td>
<td>1) OPINION</td>
<td>1) RATE COURSEWARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) PREFERENCE</td>
<td>2) COMPARE COURSEWARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBSERVATION</td>
<td>ATTITUDES</td>
<td>EFFECT OF INSTRUCTION ON STUDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTORS</td>
<td>INTERVIEW</td>
<td>1) OPINION</td>
<td>1) RATE COURSEWARE AND STUDENT PERFORMANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) PREFERENCE</td>
<td>2) COMPARE COURSEWARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) REPORT STUDENT PROBLEMS</td>
<td>3) CLARIFY DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRE</td>
<td>1) OPINION</td>
<td>1) RATE COURSEWARE AND STUDENT PERFORMANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) PREFERENCE</td>
<td>2) COMPARE COURSEWARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBSERVATION</td>
<td>ATTITUDES ON INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>EFFECT OF LESSON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During small group trials, the instructor closely monitors students as they progress through the lesson. What may be perfectly clear to the instructor may be quite confusing to the student. Instructors and course observers must document each area where students requested HELP or became lost in the courseware. It is imperative that the courseware developer learns where these problem areas are within the lesson. Note the time it takes for each student to complete the lesson. Once again, this information is valuable to the courseware developer. What was scheduled for 30 minutes may be way too short or too long. This will have an effect on classroom and workstation scheduling.
Have the students complete individual critiques of the lesson throughout the entire validation process. After each lesson, the courseware developer(s) should meet with system administrators to extract pertinent student data, to include results of formal progress checks, tests, or appraisals, to analyze student performance during the lesson. It is the classroom instructor’s and SME’s comments that are the first critical key toward a successful validation program.

Small Group Trials

Use a series of small groups (3-6 people) to test each developed lesson. These groups will help establish but not finalize lesson validity.

These small groups should take the courseware as a class in a classroom environment. The classroom configuration is necessary for tryout of team training scenarios and provides a realistic atmosphere for instructor familiarization and training. At least two groups should go through the courseware before any significant revisions are made. Look for consistent trouble spots. Make needed corrections and start over again. Try the revised unit on additional students. Any difficulties they have become the basis for further revisions. This process should continue as long as improvements are still warranted and time and money considerations allow. As a reminder, revisions made to courseware, after these trial runs, are to be considered REWORK and not figured into the basic conversion computers.

Throughout this testing period, keep accurate records and document all events: number of trial runs conducted, number of people involved, problem areas noted, changes and revisions recommended and made, average time to complete the courseware, test analysis, etc. Using entire classes helps determine effectiveness in teaching students with varied educational abilities. Have each student complete a critique of the courseware.
# TRYOUT PLAN FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. How many will be required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Where do they come from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Who will be in charge of them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What will they do after lesson completion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTORS</td>
<td>1. How many will be required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Will they need to be briefed? By whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Will they be active or passive participants?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIALS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. What course material will be validated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How many lessons a day?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. How much time between tryouts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What data should be collected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Are instructors required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Is equipment required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Is a classroom or laboratory needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. How many copies of course materials are needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. How is the data to be collected? (Forms, how many?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# EFFECT ON RESULTS OF TRYOUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF STUDENT</th>
<th>EFFECT ON RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>1. Make fewer errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Can usually tell what caused an error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Can give suggestions to improve the lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Higher reading grade level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Not confused by validation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>1. Make more mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Produce more error data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Often don't know why an error occurred, or what they did</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Lower reading grade level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Potential of confusion by validation process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Automated Student Questionnaire

1. Fully automated, administered on computer. Fast, efficient, & expandable.

2. Program and instructor evaluation questionnaire completed in 60-90 minutes.

3. Instructor questionnaire can include up to 8 instructors evaluated at one time.

4. Instructor performance profiles and full team profiles can be developed. Relationship of individual teacher performance within team can be demonstrated.

5. Administered after DLPT - student knows final academic results.

6. Program evaluation, individual and team evaluation feedback reported back within days after student graduates.

7. Questionnaire can compile narrative comments linked to specific issues or questions. Student can write comments at any time during the administration.

8. Student evaluation of program and instructor linked to student's academic performance and demographic information.

9. ASQ allows school administrators to ask students program specific questions or opinions on specific survey areas as needed.
Automated Student Questionnaire

ASQ System

Program Questions
Instructional Effectiveness
Program Effectiveness
List of Questions in Order of Appearance on ASQ

I put my very best efforts into language learning at DLI.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

I set high expectations for myself at the start of my DLI instructional program.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

The overall instructional program for my language was well organized.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

The main emphasis in the program was on developing the ability to understand and use the language properly in a variety of real-life situations.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

The overall instructional program goals were explained to us.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

In general, the learning materials included topics and situations which seemed up-to-date.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

I was taught how to use the language dictionary.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

The "official course tapes" had good sound quality.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

Class handouts were useful.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable
The official text materials were useful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning activities during a typical day were varied enough to hold my interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The program supplementary reading materials were useful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplemental (instructor-prepared) language tapes had good sound quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, my teaching team was effective in teaching the language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My teaching team appeared to have a systematic plan for who would teach what and when.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Military Language Instructor (MLI) was involved in my language instruction.

| R1: Yes | R2: No        |

The MLI participated in the full range of teaching activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MLI was a good role model of a military linguist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MLI was an effective language instructor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The MLI made us familiar with the types of jobs military linguists perform.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain       R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree R6: Not applicable

The original membership of my teaching team remained largely intact throughout the course.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain       R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree R6: Not applicable

The cultural information I received seemed to be up-to-date.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain       R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree R6: Not applicable

Homework assignments were coordinated well with classroom learning activities.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain       R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree R6: Not applicable

Homework was tailored to my individual needs.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain       R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree R6: Not applicable

In addition to the language, I learned about the culture of the country(ies) and the people.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain       R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree R6: Not applicable

Individual learning activities (for example, enrichment, special assistance, practice and application) were well-structured.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain       R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree R6: Not applicable

When my section was split into two or more groups, the small-group work was helpful for language learning.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain       R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree R6: Not applicable

Counseling and special assistance with language learning were readily available to us.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain       R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree R6: Not applicable
I could easily get additional instruction or other assistance in learning when I needed it.

R1: Strongly agree  
R3: Uncertain  
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree  
R4: Disagree  
R6: Not applicable

The grading system was explained early in the program.

R1: Strongly agree  
R2: Uncertain  
R3: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree  
R4: Disagree  
R6: Not applicable

Quizzes and tests (if given) did a good job of measuring my progress in the language.

R1: Strongly agree  
R3: Uncertain  
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree  
R4: Disagree  
R6: Not applicable

I received feedback on my classroom test results in a timely manner.

R1: Strongly agree  
R3: Uncertain  
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree  
R4: Disagree  
R6: Not applicable

Overall, I was satisfied with the amount of language proficiency I gained from the program.

R1: Strongly agree  
R3: Uncertain  
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree  
R4: Disagree  
R6: Not applicable

In general, the military duties and training I received at DLI helped me increase my military knowledge and skill.

R1: Strongly agree  
R3: Uncertain  
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree  
R4: Disagree  
R6: Not applicable

In general, the military duties and training I received at DLI did not interfere with my language training.

R1: Strongly agree  
R3: Uncertain  
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree  
R4: Disagree  
R6: Not applicable

Did you use a full-size (at least 20 positions) language laboratory outside your classroom?

R1: Yes  
R2: No

Across the entire course, approximately HOW MANY TOTAL HOURS did you spend in the full size listening comprehension laboratory outside of your classroom?

R1: Very little  
R3: 101 - 150 hours  
R5: Over 200 hours

R2: Less than 100 hours  
R4: 151 - 200 hours
Listening comprehension activities were useful in developing my listening ability.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

The listening comprehension lab booths were typically in good working order.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

Did you have computer-based learning activities in your language training program?

R1: Yes
R2: No

Approximately how many total hours during the program did you spend doing computer-based learning?

R1: Very little
R3: 26 - 50 hours
R5: Over 100 hours

R2: Less than 25 hours
R4: 51 - 100 hours

Computer-based learning activities helped me learn the language.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

Over the entire course, about HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK did you spend on outside-of-class language study, including assigned homework and any additional study on your own?

R1: 0 - 5 hours
R3: 11 - 15 hours
R5: 21 or more hours

R2: 6 - 10 hours
R4: 16 - 20 hours

During typical school day, about how much of the time was your section broken into subgroups for small-group instruction and practice?

R1: 30 minutes or less
R3: 61 - 90 minutes
R5: More than 2 hours

R2: 31 - 60 minutes
R4: 91 - 120 minutes

How often did you receive individual, "one-on-one" feedback from your instructor on your progress in the program, your areas of strength and weakness, etc.?

R1: Every week of so
R3: About once every 3 months
R5: I never received individual feedback

R2: About once a month
R4: Once during the course

Teaching materials (including textbooks, tapes, teacher-supplied materials, etc.) are an important factor in language learning. In this regard, the instructional program had:

R1: Far too few materials
R3: About the right amount of materials
R5: Far too many materials

R2: Somewhat too few materials
R4: Somewhat too many materials
Length of program is an important factor in developing language proficiency. Considering my success in meeting the DLI level "2/2/2" course objective, the course was:

R1: Far too short  
R3: About the right length  
R5: Far too long  

R2: Somewhat short  
R4: Somewhat long

Quizzes and tests provide useful feedback to both teachers and students, but they also take time. In this regard, the number of quizzes and tests during the program was:

R1: 1 - 3  
R3: 6 - 8  
R5: Over 10  

R2: 4 - 5  
R4: 9 - 10

Quizzes and tests provide useful feedback to both teachers and students, but they also take time. In this regard, the number of quizzes and tests during the program was:

R1: Far too few  
R3: About right  
R5: Far too many  

R2: Somewhat too few  
R4: Somewhat too many

Have you taken the DLPT?

R1: Yes  
R3: No

The amount of time spent training to take the DLPT (i.e., working with DLPT-like test questions and exercises, as distinct from general language practice) was:

R1: Far too little  
R3: Just about right  
R5: Far too much  

R2: Somewhat too little  
R4: Somewhat too much

My DLPT score (proficiency level rating) in READING was:

R1: Considerably lower than I expected  
R3: About the same as I expected  
R5: Considerably higher than I expected  

R2: Somewhat lower than I expected  
R4: Somewhat higher than I expected

My DLPT score (proficiency level rating) in LISTENING was:

R1: Considerably lower than I expected  
R3: About the same as I expected  
R5: Considerably higher than I expected  

R2: Somewhat lower than I expected  
R4: Somewhat higher than I expected

My DLPT SPEAKING proficiency rating (from the oral interview) was:

R1: Considerably lower than I expected  
R3: About the same as I expected  
R5: Considerably higher than I expected  

R2: Somewhat lower than I expected  
R4: Somewhat higher than I expected

The DLPT oral proficiency interviewers allowed me to demonstrate my best ability in speaking.

R1: Strongly agree  
R3: Uncertain  
R5: Strongly disagree  

R2: Agree  
R4: Disagree  
R6: Not applicable
What particular language learning activity was the most useful in helping you to develop your language proficiency, and why:

If you could change one thing to improve the overall language program at DLI, what would you change, and why?

(Instructor)

Explained the official "O" to "5", language proficiency level descriptions and corresponding language tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was motivated and interested in teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attempted to make me feel at ease in class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenged me to do my best.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was routinely well-organized and prepared for class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seemed comfortable with using computer equipment for teaching purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Had sufficient English speaking skills to communicate effectively when use of English was needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paced the instruction so that most of the class could follow what was being taught.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explained difficult language concepts in a way I could understand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was effective when working with small sub-groups of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Made good use of available class time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Encouraged all students to respond and participate in class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Could tell when students were not understanding something in class, and adjusted his or her teaching approach accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrected my classroom language mistakes without embarrassing me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Used a wide variety of teaching techniques.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Usually managed to keep us "actively engaged" in classroom activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Used in the target language as much as possible during class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1: Strongly agree</th>
<th>R2: Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3: Uncertain</td>
<td>R4: Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: Strongly disagree</td>
<td>R6: Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Routinely discussed and explained quiz/test questions and answers with the class.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

Had good rapport with the class.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

Was receptive and open-minded in dealing with student suggestions.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

Took action on the basis of student suggestions, or explained why no action was taken.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

Treated me as an individual, rather than just another face in the classroom.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

Appeared genuinely interested in my overall progress in the language.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

Showed obvious interest in and commitment to teaching.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

Conducted himself/herself in a professional manner with the students.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

Treated students equally regardless of whether they were male or female.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable
Treated students equally regardless of their race or ethnic origin.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain   R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree  R6: Not applicable

Did not waste time by arriving late or dismissing the class early.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain   R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree  R6: Not applicable

Avoided bringing "gripes" or other personal issues into the classroom.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain   R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree  R6: Not applicable

Did not use class time criticizing DLI management, school policies, staff members, or other colleagues.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain   R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree  R6: Not applicable

Provided helpful supplementary materials.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain   R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree  R6: Not applicable

Went out of his or her way to help me learn the language.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain   R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree  R6: Not applicable

Gave me helpful, individual feedback when I needed it.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain   R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree  R6: Not applicable

Was readily approachable for counseling or assistance when I needed it.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain   R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree  R6: Not applicable

Was an effective foreign language teacher.

R1: Strongly agree  R2: Agree
R3: Uncertain   R4: Disagree
R5: Strongly disagree  R6: Not applicable
Please enter any additional comments you would like to make about the course of instruction, DLI facilities, student life, or any other observations.

I enjoyed completing this questionnaire.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

I had little difficulty completing this questionnaire.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

Overall, the questions were straightforward and easy to understand.

R1: Strongly agree
R3: Uncertain
R5: Strongly disagree

R2: Agree
R4: Disagree
R6: Not applicable

Consistent with the need to provide specific information concerning a lengthy and wide-ranging program, this questionnaire is:

R1: Far too short
R3: Just about right
R5: Far too long

R2: Somewhat too short
R4: Somewhat too long

Do you have any suggestions for improving the usability of this questionnaire?

Are there any additional areas that this questionnaire should have asked about?
### ASQ INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

**Instructor:**

**School:**

**Dept:**

**Class:**

**Team:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>SA(+20)</th>
<th>A(+10)</th>
<th>N(0)</th>
<th>D(-10)</th>
<th>SD(-20)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Question Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category:</strong></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Counselling and Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Went out of his or her way to help me learn the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Gave me helpful, individual feedback when I needed it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Was readily approachable for counseling or assistance when I needed it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FOR CATEGORY (Weighted Mean)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category:</strong></td>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>Instructor Qualities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Explained the official &quot;O&quot; to &quot;S&quot; language proficiency level descriptions and corresponding language tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Was motivated and interested in teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Attempted to make me feel at ease in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>Challenged me to do my best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Was routinely well-organized and prepared for class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Seemed comfortable with using computer equipment for teaching purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Had sufficient English speaking skills to communicate effectively when use of English was needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FOR CATEGORY (Weighted Mean)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category:</strong></td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Interaction with Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Had good rapport with the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>Was receptive and open-minded in dealing with student suggestions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>Took action on the basis of student suggestions, or explained why no action was taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Treated me as an individual, rather than just another face in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>Appeared genuinely interested in my overall progress in the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FOR CATEGORY (Weighted Mean)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category:</strong></td>
<td>OV</td>
<td>Overall Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ASQ INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

**Instructor:**

**School:**

**Dept:**

**Class:**

**Team:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>SA(+20) A(+10) N(0) D(-10) SD(-20)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Question Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category: OV</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overall Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Was an effective foreign language teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>TOTAL FOR CATEGORY (Weighted Mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category: PF</strong></td>
<td><strong>Professionalism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Provided helpful supplementary materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Showed obvious interest in and commitment to teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>Conducted himself/herself in a professional manner with the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Treated students equally regardless of whether they were male or female.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Treated students equally regardless of their race or ethnic origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Did not waste time by arriving late or dismissing the class early.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Avoided bringing &quot;gripes&quot; or other personal issues into the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Did not use class time criticizing DLI management, school policies, staff members, or other colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>TOTAL FOR CATEGORY (Weighted Mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category: TM</strong></td>
<td><strong>Teaching Methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Paced the instruction so that most of the class could follow what was being taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Explained difficult language concepts in a way I could understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Was effective when working with small sub-groups of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Made good use of available class time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Encouraged all students to respond and participate in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>Could tell when students were not understanding something in class, and adjusted his or her teaching approach accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Corrected my classroom language mistakes without embarrassing me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>Used a wide variety of teaching techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Usually managed to keep us &quot;actively engaged&quot; in classroom activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHOOLHOUSE WITHOUT WALLS
(VIDEO TELETRAINING IN FL TRAINING)

PRESENTATION OUTLINE
* DEFENSE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAM (DFLP) AND COMMAND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS (CLP)
* ROLE OF DLI DISTANCE EDUCATION DIVISION
* VIDEO TELETRAINING (VTT) AND "THE GLOBAL VILLAGE"
* BACKGROUND TO VTT
* STATUS
* VTT OPERATION CONCEPTS
* VARIED TECHNOLOGIES
* FUTURE
* CONCLUSION

DFLP and CLP
* DFLP AND CLP MANDATED BY DOD DIRECTIVE
* DFLP - RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT PROGRAMS
* CLP - NONRESIDENT PROGRAMS (DISTANCE EDUCATION)
* CLPs ESTABLISHED AT MOST LINGUIST UNITS - ALL SERVICES
* DLI CLP SUPPORT - SEVERAL FORMS:
  MATERIALS - BOOKS, AUDIO/VIDEO TAPES, COMPUTER ASSISTED STUDY (CAS)
  ON SITE ASSISTANCE VISITS
  MOBILE TRAINING TEAMS (MTT)
  VIDEO TELETRAINING (VTT)
* CLP MANAGED BY DISTANCE EDUCATION DIVISION (DE)
DISTANCE EDUCATION MISSION

TO EXERCISE TECHNICAL SUPERVISION OF ALL NONRESIDENT FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAMS THROUGHOUT DoD

DISTANCE EDUCATION MISSION

THIS MISSION IS EXECUTED THROUGH THE FOLLOWING FUNCTIONS:

* APPROVE ESTABLISHMENT & CHANGES TO UNIT LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

* FORMULATE TRAINING STANDARDS, POLICIES, PROCEDURES & GUIDELINES IN SUPPORT OF UNIT LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

* CONDUCT ON-SITE ASSISTANCE IN UNIT LANGUAGE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

* COORDINATE DEVELOPMENT, PUBLICATION & DISTRIBUTION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS
DISTANCE EDUCATION MISSION

* DISSEMINATE INFORMATION ABOUT FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRAINING MATERIALS, SERVICES, PROGRAMS AND POLICIES

* PUBLISH A CATALOG OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

* PROVIDE ON-SITE INSTRUCTOR TRAINING & FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

* FACILITATE DISTANCE LEARNING & DISTRIBUTED TRAINING PROGRAMS

* CONDUCT ANNUAL NONRESIDENT PROGRAM REVIEW

UNIT CLP'S SUPPORTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A/0 FY89</th>
<th>FY90</th>
<th>FY91</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAR</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USN/USCG</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMC</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>+ 90</td>
<td>+ 75</td>
<td>= 792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHOOL WITHOUT WALLS
THE WAVE OF THE FUTURE
VIDEO TELETRAINING
(VTT)

WHAT WILL VTT DO?

EXPAND IMPACT ON LINGUIST LIFE CYCLE
ENABLE ORAL PROFICIENCY TESTING
EXPORT QUALITY NON RESIDENT INSTRUCTION FROM DLI
PROVIDE TAILORED TRAINING TO USERS
INTEGRATE LANGUAGE AND INTELLIGENCE TRAINING

* WE HAVE TRIED:
* NONRESIDENT MATERIALS (TEXTS AND TAPES)
* TRAINING ASSISTANCE VISITS
* CONTRACT TRAINING
* MOBILE TRAINING TEAMS
* WE HAVE HAD SUCCESS, BUT NOT ENOUGH
THE GLOBAL VILLAGE

ARTHUR C. CLARK, THE SCIENCE FICTION WRITER AND FUTURIST WROTE IN THE LATE 1940s THAT THERE WOULD BE A WORLD WHERE ELECTRONIC APPARATUS WOULD BE PLACED 24000 MILES ABOVE THE EQUATOR, WHICH WOULD ENABLE HUMANKIND TO COMMUNICATE WITH EACH OTHER FROM ANY PART OF THE GLOBE AT ANY TIME. THIS HE CALLED THE "GLOBAL VILLAGE"

THAT TIME IS HERE NOW - SATELLITES AND VIDEO TELECONFERENCING

VIDEO-TELETRAINING (VTT)
HISTORY

1990

Desert Storm
Pilot Program
(Ft. Lewis)

1991

CLP

1992

Project
Restore Hope
(Ft. Bragg)
(Ft. Campbell)
(Ft. Hood)

1993

FUTURE
**DESERt SHIELD/STORM**

* AUGUST/SEPTEMBER 1990:
  - DLI - FT ORD
  - DLI - FT STEWART
  - DLI - FT CAMPBELL

* OCTOBER 1990:
  - DLI - FT HOOD

* DECEMBER 1990:
  - DLI - FT RILEY

---

**VTT GROWTH**

**PHENOMENAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY91</th>
<th>600 HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY92</td>
<td>4500 HOURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY93 1ST Q</td>
<td>2331 HOURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY93 2ND Q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAN</td>
<td>1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB</td>
<td>1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY93 PROJECTED</td>
<td>12000 HOURS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIDEO-TELETRAINING (VTT)

EXPLOSIVE GROWTH

**receive sites**

- FY92
- FY91
- FY90

**languages taught**

- FY92
- FY91
- FY90

**hours of instruction**

- FY92
- FY91
- FY90
VIDEO-TELETRAINING (VTT)

TECHNICAL SPECS - CAPABILITIES

1. Compressed Digitized Video and Audio
2. Multi-Point/two-way capability
3. Satellite/Landline

DLI

NCC

(ATSC)

OSU

CLI/ HUGHES

USERS

DLIFLC - 03
SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

* VTT PROVIDES COMPRESSED DIGITIZED VIDEO TWO WAY VIDEO AND AUDIO VIA SATELLITE LINK (256kb) - ECONOMICAL

* FULL SYSTEM - 1 SENDING STATION - UP TO 7 RECEIVERS

* MULTIPROIN SYSTEM - TALK TO ONE OR ALL 7 AT SAME TIME

* LARGE CONSOLE HOUSING CODEC AND INDOOR UNIT PLUS 35 INCH TV SCREENS

* CONTROL BETWEEN SITES CAN BE SWITCHED- ALL ACTIVITIES CONTROLLED BY SIMPLE PANEL ON DESK

* NETWORK CONTROL CENTER (NCC) - FORT EUSTIS, VA

* CONTROL BETWEEN SITES CAN BE SWITCHED

* CAN ALSO PASS DATA AND GRAPHICS AT SAME TIME AS VIDEO

VTT CAPABILITY

* PROVIDES REAL TIME INTERACTIVE TWO WAY INSTRUCTION

* LIMITED IN EFFECTIVENESSES ONLY BY LIMITATIONS IMPOSED BY INSTRUCTOR AND STUDENT MOTIVATION

* VTT IS CLASS ROOM INSTRUCTION DELIVERED TO MANY DISTANT LOCATIONS FROM ONE LOCATION

* BASIS OF QUALITY CONTROL OVER DISTANCE EDUCATION SPECTRUM - WE KNOW WHAT IS TAUGHT AND HOW AND DEGREE PARTICIPATION BY USERS

* FLEXIBILITY- CAN PRESENT INSTRUCTION ON SHORT NOTICE - ARABIC, SERBO CROATIAN, SOMALI, UKRANIAN
VTT STATUS

* 61 VTT SITES IN U.S. - TRYING FOR OVERSEAS
* 30 SITES IDENTIFIED PRIMARILY FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE
* 7 SITES AT DLI- MONTEREY
  4 SITES AT FORT MEADE - NSA
  2 SITES AT FORT BRAGG - SPECIAL FORCES AND MI
  13 SITES AT ARMY INSTALLATIONS
  1 SITE AT HAWAII (USE LAND LINES)
* BROADCAST 16 HOURS DAILY - 6 DAYS WEEK-AVERAGE
* AVERAGE OF 200 PERSONNEL EACH WEEK
  AVERAGE OF 2000 YEARLY
* 18 FULL TIME INSTRUCTORS - ALL LANGUAGES
* PROVIDING 14000 HOURS OF INSTRUCTION - FY93

VTT SYSTEM COSTS

* EACH SYSTEM (SITE) COSTS ANNUALLY $74000
  OF WHICH       - EQUIPMENT LEASE IS $ 20000
  - SATELLITE COST IS $54000
* ALL COSTS ARE BASED ON 365 DAYS A YEAR - 24 H DAILY
* TRANSLATES INTO A DAILY COST OF:
  EQUIPMENT       $ 52.00
  SATELLITE TIME  $149.00
VTT INSTRUCTOR TRAINING

* EQUIPMENT
  - INITIAL (4 - 5 HOURS)
  - FOLLOW-UP (1 - 2 HOURS)
  - REFRESHER (2 - 3 HOURS)

* INSTRUCTION
  - INITIAL (4 - 5 HOURS)
  - FOLLOW-UP (1 - 2 HOURS)
  - REFRESHER (2 - 3 HOURS)

* CURRICULUM

* EVALUATION

VTT INSTRUCTOR TRAINING
EQUIPMENT TRAINING

* OVERVIEW

* HARDWARE
  - MONITORS
  - ELMO PROJECTOR
  - CONTROL PANEL
  - AUXILIARY/PERIPHERAL EQUIPMENT
  - MULTIMEDIA
  - SOUND CONTROL
  - TROUBLESHOOTING

* DELIVERY
  - GRAPHICS - LIVE
               - STILL
  - VIDEO
  - AUDIO
  - COMPUTER PROGRAMS
VTT INSTRUCTOR TRAINING
INSTRUCTION

* INITIAL
  - METHODOLOGY
  - USE OF MEDIA
  - LEARNING STYLES
  - LESSON PLANNING/HARMER'S MODEL
  - ERROR CORRECTION
  - MATERIALS ADAPTATION
  - SKILL LEVELS
  - TEACHER/STUDENT ROLES
  - TIME MANAGEMENT
  - ELEMENTS OF TEACHING FOR PROFICIENCY

* FOLLOW-UP
  - CRITIQUE/STUDENT FEEDBACK

* REFRESHER (AS NEEDED)

VTT INSTRUCTOR TRAINING
CURRICULUM AND EVALUATION

* CURRICULUM
  - ARCHIVE BUILDING
  - NEEDS ANALYSIS
  - RESEARCH
  - SKILL LEVEL DESCRIPTION
  - MATCHING REAL-LIFE TASKS WITH CLASS ROOM ACTIVITIES

* EVALUATION
  - STUDENT
    - WEEKLY STUDENT PERFORMANCE
    - ACHIEVEMENT vs PROFICIENCY TESTING
    - PREPARE FOR DLPT
    - DLPT
  - PROGRAM AND INSTRUCTOR
    - MID POINT AND FINAL ORAL FEEDBACK
    - FINAL WRITTEN FEEDBACK
SUCCESES

* DESERT SHIELD:
  - IMMEDIATE RESPONSE
  - ORIENTATION/ACQUISITION
  - SUSTAINMENT/ENHANCEMENT

* FT LEWIS PILOT:
  - ACTIVE/GUARD/RESERVES

* 1991
  - 300 STUDENTS
  - 30 UNIQUE PROGRAMS
  - 7 LANGUAGES

VIDEO-TELETRAINING (VTT)
SUCCESES
[EXAMPLE]

Cross-training Russian Linguists Ukrainian

8 students who at one time were 3/3 linguists in Russian accomplished the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>LISTENING</th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>SPEAKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>1+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MORE EVIDENCE

ARABIC, KOREAN, SPANISH TRAINING FOR THE 741ST MI BN (FORT MEADE) INCREASED PROFICIENCY LEVELS FOR L/R BY OVERALL AVERAGE OF 0.5

DLI RECEIVED THE INTERNATIONAL TELECONFERENCING INDUSTRY AWARD FOR "MOST SIGNIFICANT ADVANCES IN DISTANCE EDUCATION" FOR 1992
* Video Segments, Final Learning Objectives (FLOs), Active Lab--Conventional and Wireless

* Requires Change

* Explanation
  --Video/SCOLA (Satellite Communication for Learning)
  --FLOs (Final Learning Objectives)
  --Active Lab (Conventional or Wireless)

* Purpose of Faculty and Staff (FS) - Instructional Technology (IT) Trainer

* Training for change

* Different Type of Convincing for:
  --Video/SCOLA
  --FLOs
  --Active Lab

* Each Looked at Separately:
  --Video
  --FLOs
  --Active Lab

* Recipe for Success

* Change will not take place unless the teachers help to implement it
SCOLA

SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS FOR LEARNING

-- Is nonprofit
-- Provides language spoken by natives (real-life applications)
-- Provides news programming from about 35 countries
  - in original form
-- Provides transcript, translation and comprehension checks for approximately the first five minutes
  - for a few languages
  - arrives within a few days after broadcast
-- Broadcasts 24 hours a day
-- Is available on satellite for
  - all schools (North America, Central America and parts of South America)
-- Is available to cable systems, individuals and special interest groups
-- Requires a C Band satellite receiving system
-- Affiliation with SCOLA is required (contract and affiliation fee)
-- Fee is based on the full-time equivalent number of students on a physical campus and the number of other schools affiliated with SCOLA in same state
-- Government?
  - SCOLA benefits from an NSA "Research Grant" through the National Cryptologic School
  - As long as grant is in effect/renewed, grant should count for the required fee for any language training center under DoD
  - Grant not renewed, SCOLA requires fees from each DoD user site
-- More information?
  Francis Lajba, SCOLA Marketing, P.O. Box 619
  McClelland, IA 51548-0619

Scola news broadcasts can be recorded and archived indefinitely (unlike the maximum of 45 days allowed by copyright law)
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FINAL LEARNING OBJECTIVES

-- For cryptologic students
-- For general intelligence students (with the addition of specific speaking requirements—
  interviews, clarifying information)
-- Integrated into most basic language courses at DLI (no separate FLO programs, no
  separate tracks)
-- Are the basis of the entire course
-- FLOs base on
  - authentic current texts
  - authentic language (practice with a variety of native accents and speech patterns)
  - use of reference material
  - target language culture
  - accuracy
  - expanding knowledge

When students graduate and go to work as linguists, they will be like investigative
reporters. They will listen to what people are saying, or read what they have written,
understand it, write it down and pass the information along to someone else. Sometimes
they will actually ask people for information...

-- Students must have knowledge (general, basic, sufficient) in a variety of areas:
  - Military Security (general)
  - Economic-Political (basic)
  - Scientific and Technological (basic)
  - Cultural and Social (sufficient)
  - Geography: Physical, Political, Economic (general)
  - Numbers Comprehension (recording single and multidigits, alone or within a larger
text)
  - Speaking (practice)
  - Writing (practice contextual transcription)
  - Conversation (routine)
  - Broadcast (extract and summarize; transcribe)
  - Written Texts (scanning, summarizing, translating)
1. MILITARY-SECURITY. General knowledge and vocabulary of military force structure, ranks, equipment and operations. Paramilitary, police, terrorist or emergency events may supplement, but not replace, military material.

2. ECONOMIC-POLITICAL. Basic knowledge and terminology of the target nation's present currency, government, internal politics, labor, industry, resources, products, trade, cultural exchanges, and international relations.

3. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL. Basic concepts and vocabulary of arithmetic (including fractions and decimals), time zones and 24 hour clock time, health, medicine, aerospace, climate, weather, oceanography, mechanics, transportation, physical sciences, geography, topography, and map-reading.

4. CULTURAL AND SOCIAL. Sufficient cultural, social, and historical knowledge to understand sports, holidays, customs, cultural observances or events as well as significant expressions of inter-cultural or intra-societal relations and conditions.

5. GEOGRAPHY: PHYSICAL, POLITICAL, ECONOMIC. General knowledge of the geographic areas where the target language is mainly spoken, including significant areas to which the language has spread (e.g. French-speaking areas of Africa should be introduced in the French course): location, climate, major geopolitical divisions, mountains, rivers, coasts and bordering seas and countries, agricultural and industrial areas, cities, ports, transportation links, etc. The emphasis here is on general knowledge of the major elements or features in each category, not specialized or exhaustive knowledge.

D. NUMBERS COMPREHENSION SKILL REQUIREMENTS. The CTS student must be able to record on paper numbers that are spoken in single and multi-digit form to as many as seven places, whether standing alone, in random sequences, in lists, or in sentence context.

E. PRODUCTION SKILL REQUIREMENT. CTS students should practice speaking and writing to the extent that this practice aids in the development of listening or reading skills. The ability to read a variety of standard, contemporary, clear, reasonably legible native handwriting is required.

B. Contextual transcription. Given 2- to 3-minute recordings of conversational and broadcast texts in the target language on subjects described in enclosure 1, part C, produce semantically accurate transcripts in the target language which contain a minimum of 80% of the essential elements of information. Lexical aids may be used. Recordings may be replayed at desired.

1. CONVERSATIONAL: routine conversations between two or more people, to be transcribed within 30 minutes.

2. BROADCAST: contemporary - broadcast with several news items, to be transcribed within 45 minutes.

C. Extract and summarize. Given a brief orientation to the context of the passages, but without replay or use of lexical aids, summarize in English both spoken conversational and broadcast texts on topics of the sort described in section C of enclosure 1. The student should be able to take notes and should both provide English answers to content questions asked in English and prepare a gist in English of the essential elements of a text. The student should be told in advance what sort of information to listen for. Questions, which should not be provided to the students until after the recording has been played, should be answered with at least 70% accuracy. Summaries must contain at least 70% of the essential elements of the text.
1. CONVERSATION: a recording of a conversation about 25 short sentences in length, spoken clearly and distinctly only once at a normal unhurried rate, with typical conversational pacing and pause lengths.

2. BROADCAST: a recording, about one minute in length, of a contemporary news broadcast.

II. WRITTEN TEXTS: Using lexical aide, scan, summarize, and translate written texts into English.

A. In 60 minutes give correct short answers in English to 70% of English questions covering the important points (who, what, whers, when, and why) of the text or provide an English gist that contains at least 70% of those essential elements. The length of the passage should be such that a full English translation would be about 500 words long.

B. Translate a passage into idiomatic English in 60 minutes, with a minimum of 80% accuracy in translating language elements which substantially affect the essential meaning of the text. The length of the passage should be such that an adequate English translation will be about 200 words long.

C. Translate transcripts of spoken material of the types described in part IB, above, in 60 minutes with a minimum of 80% accuracy in translating language elements which substantially affect the meaning of the text.
TEACHING MODEL for AUDIOTAPE OR VIDEOTAPE PROGRAMS

any topic

Example: HOTEL RESERVATION

* CLASSROOM --preparation for listening to audio tapes; viewing video tapes

* CLASSROOM → * LANGUAGE LAB

* CLAB

* HOMEWORK --task performance

--students put to use what they listened to or viewed and demonstrate their proficiency in the topic within a real-world setting

↑

↑

↑

LEAD-IN

TASK

FOLLOW-UP
VIDEO VIEWING TIPS

Ads

1. View an ad and compare and contrast it with how ads are presented in the U.S.
2. Determine to whom the ad is directed and why (who is the audience, client?).
3. Take notes on the language used in the ad (how does it differ from language used in U.S. ads?).
4. Rewrite the ad.

Cultural Comparison and Contrast

1. Watch a video segment, list cultural similarities.
2. Watch a video segment, list cultural differences.
3. Retell the content from your cultural perspective.
4. View a video segment, determine how people interact with one another (what are greeting formalities, what is the proximity to one another, etc.)
5. Watch a video segment in English and in the target language on the same topic. Compare the styles, content, people, etc.

Debate

1. View a video and debate its content with a friend.
2. Work out the pros and cons of a video segment.

Decision-Making

1. View a video segment and decide on how you would handle the situation (e.g. a new shopping mall is opening up (content); now decide on a plan for your shopping mall).
2. View a video segment, decide on a different ending (different beginning, etc.)

Description

1. View a video segment, describe its content, the problem/situation.
2. View a video segment, describe the people.
3. View a video segment, describe the city, countryside, country.
4. View a video, select one item and describe it.

Pre-Listening Activities

1. Look at the topic, read up on it before viewing the video, then take notes while viewing video on items that are similar to or the same in the video as in the written text.
2. Do an advance organizer on vocabulary, grammar, phrases you expect to encounter in the video.
3. Write down the number of questions you might want to ask regarding the content of the video, then view video to see whether questions were answered.

Prediction

1. Look at the title/topic. List the kind of people who might be involved, then view video for verification of prediction.
2. Turn down the sound, watch the video and predict what it is all about, what language is being used, then view video for verification.
Reaction

1. Watch a video segment and react to its content positively, negatively, genuinely.
2. Watch a video segment and determine how others would react to it (your family, your friends, your local community, your local government, etc.).
3. What would you, others, do to change the situation portrayed in the video.

Role Play

1. Watch a video segment together with friends, take on roles and act out the content.
2. Watch a video segment on a news item, weather forecast, sports report, etc., take the role of the news anchor, forcaster, etc. and act it out.
3. Produce a new video, you and your friends star in it and act out the roles.

Tenses

1. View a video and then retell it in the past or present or as a future event.

Titling

1. Look at the title, predict what you will see in the video; or
2. Look at the title, look up the vocabulary and grammar you feel you need to work with the content (advance organizer); then view the video.
3. Give the video a different title and support your decision or explain why you gave the different title.

Who said What?

1. Write down what was said and who said it.
2. Write down a different way of saying the same thing.

Who, What, When, Where, How? (see page 180,181)

1. Draw up a column for each, develop a grid, or use a grid prepared for you (see samples attached); as you view a video take down notes as to who, what, when, where, how, etc.
2. Design a form to include who, what, when, where, how? (or any combination thereof).
3. Explain where you were when the event you saw in the video took place.
4. Explain how the event has an impact on your life or the lives of others you know.

Why

1. View a video and explain
   - "Why some one said what he did," or
   - "Why the content was presented as it was," or
   - "Why the content was different from what you expected it to be," or
   - "Why the item/event is important to be video taped or broadcast," or
   - " Why the item/event is or is not important to you," etc.

Discussion

1. View a video segment, discuss it with friends; discuss its production, its effectiveness, the words used, etc.
2. View a video segment, discuss its content, its purpose.
Expansion

1. Look at a video segment, determine what went on before, after?
2. Look at a video segment, determine whether there should be a sequel and why.
3. Retell the video from a different perspective from a woman's point of view, a man's point of view, your own point of view.
4. Apply the content of the video to your hometown community or the community you are living in and tell how the situation would be dealt with, the problem solved, etc.
5. Explain why things happened in the video as they did (what could have avoided them to happen? What would have made them worse, better?).

Familiarity versus Unfamiliarity

1. List what you already know about a specific topic, watch video to see whether references are made to what you already know.
2. List what you would like to know about a specific topic, prepare advance organizers for vocabulary and grammar needed to understand the expected unfamiliar in the video, watch video and see whether references are made to what you would like to know.
3. Make a list of unfamiliar items discussed in a video segment, read up on them after viewing the video.
4. Make a list of cognates. Use cognates in sentences after viewing the video.

Interaction with Video

1. Stop the tape after a question has been asked, answer the question, then verify your response with the one given in the video.
2. Listen to an exchange between two or more people, stop the tape and ask yourself "how would I handle this?" "How would I ask this?" "How would I respond to this?"
3. Listen to a command, stop the tape and act it out, then continue viewing the video to see whether you did it right.
4. Listen in on a one-sided telephone conversation, reconstruct what the other person says and asks, then act out the entire conversation with someone else.
5. Repeat what a person says.
6. View a video segment then offer advice to the person or persons in the video as if they were present in the room.

Gist, Paraphrase, Summarize

Numbers

1. If a video makes references to several numbers, write them down and reconstruct sentences that contain the numbers.
2. Substitute numbers with numbers that pertain to your real-life (e.g. Substitute a weather forecast temperatures of a far-off place with weather forecast temperatures of your hometown or of the town/area you are living in).
3. Take a number dictation. In a second viewing, take down phrases that go along with the numbers; based on phrases and numbers reconstruct the text.

Picture Description

1. Describe a video segment literally (just the facts).
2. Describe a video segment interpretively (use facts and interpret the same).
3. Describe a video segment imaginatively (what if...?).
4. Gist (summarize) the content factually, interpretively and imaginatively.
Post-Listening Activities

1. Write down a number of questions on the video segment and ask a friend to answer them.
2. Write a letter to the editor about the video segment.
3. Rewrite the content of the video segment.
4. Tell a friend about the video, its content and its impact on you.
DESCRIBE FROM TWO (OR MORE) DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES:

- YOUR OWN

- SOMEONE YOU KNOW OR ARE FAMILIAR WITH

THREE-LEVEL (PICTURE) DESCRIPTION

- LITERAL (THE FACTS)

- INTERPRETIVE (BASED ON FACTS)

- IMAGINATIVE (FACTS AND INTERPRETATIONS SERVE AS BASIS)
WHO?, WHAT?, WHEN?, WHERE?, HOW?

Topic: __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WHO?, WHAT?, WHEN?, WHERE?, HOW?

**Topic:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What happened?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where did it happen?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When did it happen?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How did it happen?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anything else?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

181
RECIPE FOR SUCCESS

- Curriculum-integrated multi-media
- Lesson-integrated with
  - Links through topics
  - Links through activities (for basis of discussion, comparison, contrasting, debating, etc.)
  - Links to real world

- Short topic-related segments (for different perspective on the topic)
- Segments that focus on language (for highlighting language items, structure, use; for presentation, elicitation purposes)
- Segments that focus on culture (for cross-cultural comparisons)
- Segments that do not focus on stereotypes
- Segments with strong storyline
- Segments that are intrinsically interesting
- Segments that present students with
  - a problem, a controversy, a cause for wonder
- Variety of interactive tasks (for interest and motivation)
- Tasks edited, not the texts (for keeping authenticity)
- Integration of skills (real-world)
- Functional goals (why/how students would use all types of media in the real world)
- No striving for total comprehension (realistic vs. unrealistic)
- Student involvement (motivation, possible long-term retention)
  - interaction
  - initiation
  - real-world application
  - job-related application
  - general personalization

GOAL: Audio-, video, FLO-inspired objectives extended throughout curriculum from day one hour one on...presented in a multi-media learning center and not in isolation of one another.
IV. NATIONAL REPORTS
The previous two National Reports have concentrated on the structure of the Australian Defence Force School of Languages (LANGS), followed by changes that have occurred in recent years. Perhaps the biggest change that has taken place was in February this year when the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) School of Languages became the Australian Defence Force (ADF) School of Languages. This was more of a cosmetic change than anything else and now truly reflects the role of the School which is to train personnel from all three Services and the Department of Defence. I propose, in this report, to give an overview of some of the innovations outlined in the 1992 Australian National Report and to outline current developments.

Unlike the "... Mother of all Language Institutions" (Walinsky, circa June 93!), LANGS is a relatively small language institution but has some advantages as a result. This year there are some 53 students undertaking long courses in Indonesian, Chinese, Vietnamese, Thai, French and Japanese. Other colloquial courses programmed for 1993 are Malay, Pidgin (PNG), Bislama (Vanuatu), Solomon Islands Pidgin, Indonesian and Khmer. Requalifier courses are also programmed for all languages with the addition of German and Arabic, for which consultants will be contracted to conduct the courses.

Development. LANGS is in the process of rewriting the Australian Defence Language Proficiency Rating Scale (ADLPRS) descriptors to better reflect each of the levels. This should give users of linguists a better idea of the standard of linguist they need and therefore user requirements should be better defined as a result. In addition, a Defence Language Consultative Committee (DLCC) has been established to coordinate language training in the ADF and determine long term language requirements. The Committee is made up of representatives from each of the Services and is chaired by the Director of Individual Training and Education Policy who answers to the Chief of the Defence Force. The establishment of this Committee has given more direction to language training requirements.

Curriculum Development. 1992 was the first year in which the Indonesian Department used one week modules of thematically arranged materials. Module #2 ("Suku Bangsa" or "Ethnic Groups") is still in draft form and the Department is making refinements in 1993 to some modules. The use of the modules is described as follows:

- Students commence using the modules at approximately Week 20 of the 47 week course. Most students are at 1+ on our proficiency scale (approximates the FSI scale) at this time. All material in the modules, except for a few structural exercises, are authentic texts (both written and spoken).

At the beginning of each module, students are given a list of vocabulary items which they must identify in the material and learn. This is the basis of vocabulary expansion in the second phase of the course. When students hear or read those words they must write down the sentence in which the words are located in order to learn everything in context.

Proficiency testing is used as the key indicator of the level students are at and also to determine whether they are achieving the required rate of progress.
Requalification. The ADF currently has the luxury of being small enough to be able to hold two week requalifiers at LANGS. Students actually come back to the school for two weeks to requalify in their particular language. As language requirements increase, particularly in the Asian languages, there will eventually be too many linguists for the School to be able to provide on-site requalifier courses for everyone. Distance language support is being developed to cope with this situation when it eventuates. To that end, DLI is obviously a good model on which to base our development, even it necessitates an arduous trip or two back to sunny Monterey!

Ad Hoc Training. Australia is continuing to provide support to peace-keeping operations, particularly in Cambodia. Our Khmer Department has been kept busy with colloquial Khmer training. The Pacific languages Department has also conducted a number of courses in Melanesian Pidgin as well as Solomon Islands Pidgin, these being mainly for contingency support or exercises. We also have continuing Special Services language support by providing on-site training in some languages. This entails sending a group of instructors to the Regiment rather than have the students all come to LANGS. The instruction is just as effective but more cost efficient. However, when our distance language support program is developed, most of the instruction should be able to be conducted from the School.

Assessments. The 1992 National Report mentioned the move to new assessment procedures in lieu of the old 'A' and 'B' gradings. Now, students are assessed on the ADLPRS which better indicates the standard of the student to the user. In addition, if a student does not make it through to the end of the course, he or she does not leave LANGS without a qualification. With the new scale, we can now send that student away with a certificate stating "...... has completed X weeks of intensive language training and has achieved the following proficiency in each of the Macro skills...". This gives the student a sense of achievement rather than one of failure and, at the same time, indicates to the system the level of competence achieved. The transition from the old system to the new is progressing well.

Future Developments. National policy is starting to encourage and even direct second language acquisition. This policy is flowing on to the ADF and we are waiting to see what implications it will have on the conduct of language training by LANGS. We are confident there will be a positive result and that we will be looking to increase our training in some Asian languages.

Perhaps one of the more significant developments at the School is the impending closure of the present facility and the move to a new, possibly purpose-built school. The future location and composition of LANGS is currently being reviewed and a decision should be forth coming by the end of this year. The decision will take into account, optimum location, ADF training requirement, facilities and the location of ethnic communities and other language institutions necessary for interaction by language students. The move, while unsettling for some staff members should prove to be most beneficial, particularly from a facilities and technical support perspective. This can only increase the effectiveness of our language training.

In 1994 the School celebrates its 50th anniversary. Planning has commenced on a variety of activities including official dinners, reunions, the sale of memorabilia and language competitions. Through all that, however, the business of training language students will go on in the spirit of the School's motto, "Festina Lente" - "fasten slowly"!

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate LANGS' offer to member nations to provide assistance and advice, and to consider the School the 'centre of excellence' for those Asian, South-East Asian and Pacific languages which we have been teaching for so long.
RAPPORT NATIONAL/NATIONAL REPORT - CANADA

Introduction

Ce rapport est un résumé des principaux développements qui sont survenus en formation et évaluation linguistiques au sein des Forces canadiennes au cours de 1992/1993. Comme par le passé, l'enseignement des langues dans les FC visait principalement l'enseignement de l'anglais et du français, les deux langues officielles du Canada, tout en consacrant un pourcentage plus restreint des ressources enseignement/classes pour l'enseignement des langues étrangères. Cette année le testing a occupé le premier rang de nos activités autant pour l'administration que pour l'élaboration.

Second Language Training Programme

Language training policy in the CF is based on policies and regulations set out in the Government of Canada's Official Languages Act (OLA). In keeping with the OLA, the CF implemented its Language of Instruction policy in 1992, allowing members of the CF to choose in which of Canada's official languages they wish to undertake their trade training. In most cases, this will be in their First Official Language (FOL). This change has had major effects on language training in the CF so that training in the second official language has been shifted from the beginning of a member's career to after the completion of trade training. Language training is now dependent upon career development and postings. It is projected that the large enrolments in the Basic French Course and the Basic English Course, which were typical in former years, will no longer be the norm.

In October of 1992, a Ministerial Committee on Official Languages submitted its report to the Minister of National Defence. This report has served as the catalyst for a review of all aspects of language training in the CF. Any changes which may be forthcoming will be reported in later accounts.

Cours de français des Forces canadiennes

Depuis 1991, dans les FC, on utilise le Cours de français des Forces canadiennes(CFFC) pour les officiers et militaires du rang anglophones. Le but du cours est de développer la compétence communicative des membres dans un contexte militaire. Le CFFC vise une clientèle de débutants (niveau zéro) pour leur permettre d'atteindre le niveau fonctionnel (3333) en 1250 heures de formation.

Les modifications apportées à la politique de l'instruction dans la langue de choix a pour conséquence de hauser le niveau de compétence langagière du niveau fonctionnel au niveau intégral des instructeurs et autres spécialistes. On devra donc ajouter une formation de niveau intégral au CFFC.

Canadian Forces English Course

The Canadian Forces English Course (CFEC) is based on the same principles as the CFFC. A curriculum project to develop Phases One, Two and Three according to CF standards was begun in the fall of 1991. Phases One and Two are complete and Phase Three will be completed by September of this year. The CFEC is expected to become the official English programme of the CF at that time. A follow-on project, to develop a Level Four curriculum, parallelling that of the CFFC, is also expected in the near future.
Canadian Military Training Assistance Programme

In consonance with the mechanisms of the North Atlantic Alliance, Canada has broadened its foreign Military Training Assistance Programme (MTAP) to encompass and assist countries of Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) in reorganizing their militaries into democratically controlled and oriented institutions. This programme applies existing CF resources to help CEE members attain national policy goals as well as those agreed within NATO. Prior to beginning specialized training, members of CEE forces will undertake English language training. Sixty CEE nationals from Hungary, Poland, Czech Republic and Slovak Republic have been selected to fill two 22 week training serials at Canadian Forces Base Borden. Following language training, a number of students will be enrolled in courses at Canadian Forces Staff School, Toronto, Ontario. Others may follow different specialty courses at various bases throughout the country.

The new countries emerging in Central and Eastern Europe are increasingly interested in participating in new activities and taking advantage of western training, and are cognizant of the need for language training. The involvement of Poland in peacekeeping training operations, and their establishment of a peacekeeping training centre which includes English language training, are prime examples of this development. As Canada is committed to assisting in the development of English language training in Poland, the CF is currently forming a small team to travel to Poland in order to carry out a needs analysis.

Decentralized Military Second Language Training Programme

The Decentralized Military Second Language Training Programme (DMSLTP) serves close to 5000 CF members per year on bases from all commands throughout the country and overseas. The DMSLTP is not centrally controlled but comes under the jurisdiction of the major commands and is administered by command coordinators. Thus, the differences between commands and their operational needs are respected and budgeting has become the responsibility of each command.

DMSLTP contracts private language schools or para-public institutions (eg: universities or community colleges) to teach the courses. Over 80% of the suppliers use the CFFC/CFEC and are able to offer a variety of scheduling formats on site. The DMSLTP requires approximately 140 hours of training to complete half a Phase and most courses run from 90 to 120 hours. This is in contrast to the Military Second Language Training Programme (MSLTP) which offers full time, intensive training (ranging from 250 to 1000 hours) to CF members at specific language training centres throughout Canada.

The administrative procedures for the performance checks and achievement tests used within the full-time MSLTP programme are currently being adapted for use with the DMSLTP. The aim of this adaptation is to establish a measure of student progress compatible with CF specifications and to enhance programme accountability.

Enseignement des langues étrangères

Les FC continuent d'offrir des cours de langues étrangères à l'Ecole des langues des Forces canadiennes (ELFC) Ottawa. Pour la première fois en 1992, on y a dispensé plusieurs cours spéciaux. Des cours d'espagnol ont été donnés à un contingent d'officiers appelé à participer à des missions de paix au Salvador dans le cadre de l'ONUSAL. On y a aussi organisé de courtes sessions d'enseignement des langues et de formation socio-culturelle pour les militaires qui partaient au Cambodge. En plus, des cours de plusieurs langues tel l'arabe, l'allemand, l'italien, le portugais (pour le Brésil), le russe et l'espagnol, furent dispensés à des civils travaillant dans divers services gouvernementaux.
Conformément à la politique des FC sur l'ins:duction dans la langue de choix on utilise la langue première des stagiaires, soit l'anglais ou le français, comme langue de référence pour l'enseignement des langues étrangères. Cette pratique a donné des résultats très positifs dans l'apprentissage de la langue étrangère.

Cours de langues étrangères: élaboration et adaptation

Plusieurs projets d'élaboration de curriculums sont en cours. Le cours de base d'espagnol (Amérique latine) sera terminé en juin 93; le cours de chinois, dont 9 modules sont déjà disponibles, est en voie d'édition; alors que l'on commencera l'élaboration des cours de polonais et d'arabe en août 93. Pour leur part, les niveaux un et deux du cours serbo-croate sont terminés.

Special Testing Campaign

CF policy on language testing requires updated test results on all CF members with language profiles every four years. Members with 4444 integral profiles are exempt. In order to keep language profiles current and to avoid the necessity of a large permanent testing staff, the majority of testing is done during a quadrennial, forces-wide, special testing campaign known as the "Blitz". For the latest special testing campaign which began in October 1992 and ended in May 1993, the CF hired an accredited contractor to handle the increased workload for the nine month period. Using the CF Language Proficiency Examination (LPE), the standardized CF language test, it was anticipated that 55,000 batteries of tests would be administered. Tabulation to date has shown that this target will be realized.

Selection Test Development

The CF is currently developing a selection test, to be administered at Canadian Forces Recruiting Centres, to determine language training requirements for all military personnel on enrolment. The test will focus on listening and reading skills and will use a multiple choice format for ease of administration. The selection test is being developed according to CF testing specifications.

Examen de compétence langagière

Les FC projettent l'élaboration d'une nouvelle version de l'Examen de compétence langagière (ECL) ou l'on ajoutera le niveau deux aux niveaux présentement mesurés à la compréhension auditive et à la compréhension de l'écrit. L'ECL ne mesure actuellement que les niveaux trois et quatre de ces habiletés tandis que les niveaux deux, trois et quatre sont mesurés par le test d'expression orale et le test d'expression écrite. On vise la mise en oeuvre de ce nouveau test d'ici la prochaine campagne spéciale de testing en 1996.
1. INTRODUCTION

The present report is an overview of foreign language education in the Royal Danish Defense Forces.

2. PRELIMINARY LINGUISTIC QUALIFICATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL AND DRAFTED MILITARY PERSONNEL

Over the last 100 years and particularly since World War II as a consequence of the development of international relations the foreign language training component of the Danish National Education System has been characterized by a constant growth.

In the obligatory 10 year public school English is taught from 5th class and German from 7th class. French may be chosen on an optional basis only in 10th class.

In the 3 year high school, which gives admission to university and other institutions of higher education, English has a predominant role both in the branch of arts and in the branch of science, but German, French, Spanish, Russian and other modern languages are equally taught on high level on an optional basis.

For the military education system this means that candidates for NCO schools (admitted on basis of 10 years of public school education) have SLP 2222 in English and 2121 in German. Candidates for military academies (admitted on basis of 3 years of high school education) have SLP 3333 in English and 3232 in German.

3. THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE COMPONENT OF MILITARY PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

As for the NCO school, language training has a purely technical character. In the curricula of the Military Academies of the three Services of the Defence Forces (officers basic education: 4-6 years) language training is aimed at attaining a level of military terminology which corresponds to the above mentioned level of common language, already attained in the National Education System.

After 4 years service in units the officer continues his military education in the RD Defense College (1 year). In this phase the language training (common and military) is aimed at SLP 4343 (English) and 4342 (German).

4. MILITARY LINGUISTS

So far military linguists as such have been trained only in Russian and Polish and exclusively for intelligence purposes.

During the past year the training of such linguists, conducted at the Royal Danish Army Specialists Training School (ASPETS) has not yet been directly influenced by the ongoing process of adjusting the Royal Danish Defence Forces to the new pattern of European (and World) security politics. On the one hand this process consists of major budget cuts, on the other hand it implies the creation of new organizational structures needed for the increased Danish participation in UN, CSCE and NATO peacekeeping and peacemaking operations in Europe as well as in other parts of the world.

It has already been decided to create a special motorized infantry brigade for that sort of operations. This brigade should reach operational status at the beginning of 1995.

So far no directives have been given as to the linguistic requirements of such a formation, but in the good military tradition ASPETS has already on its own started analyzing the possible scope of these requirements.
In this process the BILC Conference Reports of the latest years as well as the Presentation paper of Mr. Walinsky to the JSSG of 15 February 1993 play a major role. A draft concept has already been produced, the main points of which are the following:

- The future Danish military linguist (professional or reserve officer) would no longer exclusively be an intelligence specialist, but would be an all-purpose Foreign area expert.

- Regardless of her/his main language she/he would be given supplementary training in English military terminology.

- The main languages taught would be Russian, Arabic or Spanish (mentioned in order of priority). But in addition to the chosen main language the curriculum would comprise an extensive study of the whole area in which this language plays a major role (e.g. Eastern Europe, Middle East, Latin America).

- Should a unit to which a linguist is attached be deployed in a part of the area, where the local language is different from, but related to her/his main language, the linguist would be able within a relatively short term to familiarize with this local language either by a "crash course", or by self-study (e.g. from Russian to Serbo-Croat in 3-6 weeks) provided the necessary study materials be available.

The nearest future will show whether this concept of Danish military linguist training will be adopted by the Chief of Defense.

5. CONCLUSION

From the contents of this report it might seem that language education in the RD Defense Forces has reached a sufficient level. We are, however, aware that the growing emphasis on multinational military operations will further add to the demands of linguistic skills with all personnel, and consequently our whole language training system is in a state of permanent revision.
GENERAL

1992-93 has been a significant academic year for the French forces in the field of language training. Such training has become one of the topics that are emphasized by France's DOD and, hence, appears as a milestone for EIREL (Ecole Interarmées du Renseignement et des Etudes Linguistiques/Joint School for Intelligence and Language Training) as far as language training is concerned. Some important aspects can be stressed:

- language training is an intrinsic part of the professional education of any officer;
- English, even though it is a foreign language, should no longer be an unfamiliar one to any French officer;
- the assistance of computer technology in language training is a necessity and this is the reason why EIREL embarked on an ambitious program called "Langues 2000" (Year 2000 languages).

Among its missions, EIREL is responsible for basic and advanced language training of all the officers and NCOs of the French forces. Such training applies to a very heterogeneous military population whose members come for training sessions that will last from 3 days to 2 years.

Such variety, added to a clear increase in the number of training sessions has led the School to look for solutions that will optimize the teachers' activity so they could be employed where their effective presence in the teaching process is compulsory.

To achieve such objective, EIREL intends to supplement all existing resources with an interactive computerized system supporting language training. This system, entitled "Langues 2000", should be operational by the end of the century.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AS A REQUISITE

The French DOD insists that all officers must have a sufficient practical and operational knowledge of the English language. That is why the Anglo-American Studies Section of EIREL has developed a variety of "training packages" adapted to the various requirements of French military personnel in accordance with their respective missions:

- one-week sessions for officers and NCOs assigned to the French components of a particular UN mission and adapted to such mission;
- two-week sessions for officers and NCOs dealing with English speaking military personnel;
- specialized sessions (normally of one week) for military personnel with a particular assignment;
- one-week sessions for:
  * Officers and NCOs scheduled for an observer/controller slot with the French battalion that will be evaluated at CMTC at HOHENFELS;
  * Officers and NCOs, staff members of the French division, whose CP takes part in the exercise "REFORGER".

Besides these new sessions, the Anglo-American Studies Section has conducted its traditional two-month sessions for young pilots of the Army Aviation who now attend this, training before, going to flight school as well as a new special two-week course of "English for Science-Oriented Officers".

As a whole, English language training has involved some 500 trainees in 26 sessions of 17 different types.
OTHER LANGUAGES

The German language has experienced a significant increase in the number of classes taught due to the growing importance of Germany's role in the geopolitical balance in Europe and to the build-up of EuroCorps. The following sessions are currently conducted:

- Specialized German language for "Gendarmes" assigned as military policemen to the French units stationed in Germany;
- Basic and/or advanced German for French officers and NCOs assigned to the EuroCorps, its HQ Bn and the Franco-German brigade.

Generally speaking, German has been taught on a sustained tempo during this academic year.

Romantic languages, which do not belong to the "operational" ones (English, German, Russian and Arabic) have been taught on an "answer-to-a-request" basis. For example, officers and/or NCOs of the French Army selected to attend Brazil's Jungle Warfare School at Manaus are now offered a three-week intensive course of basic Portuguese.

Russian and other Slavic languages are taught on a four-fold basis:

- resident courses for officers and NCOs that may last up to two years and range from basic to advanced level;
- introductory and/or refreshment courses for military personnel selected to attend college training in such languages;
- special residential courses in languages of current interest such as Serbo-Croatian;
- non-resident courses at basic, intermediate and advanced levels;

As a conclusion, we can say the activity of the Russian/Slavic Section is sustained.

Arabic is taught in a section that encompasses the entire spectrum of languages that are spoken in the Middle-East, South-West Asia and Africa as a whole, not withstanding their linguistic differences. This section can be compared to the Russian/Slavic Section in its total activity as well as in its operating modes: resident and non-resident courses of various durations and at various levels. Its activity is sustained.

The Chinese Section of EIREL deals not only with this language but also with all those that are spoken in Asia, roughly East of Pakistan. It globally functions in the same manner as the two above mentioned sections and has a sustained activity. A special focus is made on Khmer, due to the involvement of France in Cambodia through UNTAC.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

EIREL is responsible for the training of all interpreters of the Army, most of whom are reserve officers. To that effect, non-resident courses and short sessions (one week twice a year) are conducted.

EIREL is also responsible for all language training and language examinations of the Army.

For such reasons, EIREL has to deal each year, either directly or assisted by reservists or civilian personnel under contract, with some 26 languages. In short, the School is more than busy.
NATIONAL REPORT - GERMANY

1. Language Training

The current political developments in Europe and elsewhere have had the following significant effects on language training:

1. A greater demand for German as a foreign language

Due to increased military training cooperation between Germany and her Eastern Central European and Southeastern European neighbors, a number of new tasks has evolved on the Bundessprachenamt:

- Professional development courses of four to six weeks for teachers of German employed with the Armed Forces of these countries.
- Task-oriented language training for verification officers from these countries.
- Retraining of experienced Czech and Russian teachers of the Bundessprachenamt to teachers of German.
- This has resulted in a more explicit description of teaching methods and a revision of the curriculum, topic areas and teaching units. Work on a "minimal grammar" and on new military self-study material is also in progress.

2. A sharp decline in Russian language training

While numbers are declining, quality is increasing, since the demand now is for training senior personnel for exchange, liaison and verification work. As opposed to the traditional clientele of electronic surveillance personnel, these students require the active skills for face-to-face contacts.

3. A shift of clientele for Czech and Polish language training

The considerable decrease of military students in these languages has been more than compensated for by Federal Border Guard, police and customs personnel.

4. The introduction of Ukrainian and Croatian

An initial course in Ukrainian has been conducted and there appears to be a continuing demand. Material is scarce and we are grateful for the help provided by DLIFLC in this respect. Due to political developments, the Serbo-Croatian course has been split into a Serbian and Croatian course.

5. A greater demand for English Language Interoperability Training

The increasing emphasis on interoperability in multinational formations has resulted in a pilot course for staff personnel of a German armoured division preparing for multinational exercises. The planning and preparation of a course for German UN-Personnel is under way.
6. A greater demand for French

The formation of the French-German EUROCORPS resulted in an increased demand for French language training with additional courses being conducted at the School for Personnel designated for Integrated Employment.

7. An increasing demand for the "less commonly taught" languages

The number of students of Arabic, Chinese and Dutch increased significantly and a special course "Turkish for Customs Officers" with appropriate accompanying material was developed.

II. Materials Development

1. Self-study material

New listening and reading materials for English and French have been developed for those unable to attend full-time courses. Significant effort went into the production of an MS-DOS based CALL-programme for English. The latter comprises an MC test version and a two-version interactive self-study package.

2. Military Glossaries

- The comprehensive English-German/German-English "Glossary of Military Terms" and the pocket-size glossary on "Tactical Terms and Acronyms for the Combat Maneuver Training Center" have been completely revised and significantly expanded.

- An Indonesian-German-English / English-German-Indonesian military glossary has been produced.

III. Testing and Evaluation

1. Study Group on Testing and Evaluation

This group was formed at the end of 1992 and has the following mandate: "To re-evaluate the current test system for German as a foreign language, English, French, Russian and Spanish with emphasis on the procedures for test development, production, marking, evaluation and validation. Particular consideration is to be given to making test development and evaluation more efficient and to reducing the probability of test compromise." The group hopes to benefit from the experiences of other BILC members in this area.

2. Language Test for Job Applicants

A test in several languages was developed within the framework of inter-agency co-operation to examine job applicants of a non-military institution.

3. Item and Topic Banks for English Tests

These data banks allow the production of four tests per skill and level every 12 to 18 months.
1. INTRODUCTION

This report has the aim of examining, as in previous years, the activities of the Scuola Lingue Estere dell’Esercito with specific reference to significant innovations made in the last year.

In particular, this report aims to give a brief outline of activity relating to the introduction of the teaching of Military Terminology, considered indispensable for the technical-professional preparation of the students and their greater command of the language.

Italy, in effect, through the operations of its Armed Forces, participates in missions carried out under the aegis of the international community; the recent roles being played in Somalia and Mozambique are just two examples. This, of course, leads to a greater need to improve linguistic abilities, especially with regard to the field of military activity.

The second purpose of this report is to outline the objectives which the Scuola Lingue Estere has established with the introduction of the course in Military Terminology. These are represented by the technical-military knowledge which the students must acquire before the conclusion of their language courses.

In order to give concrete examples of our aims we will also examine the results obtained by the SLEE in the last year, which represent the completion of the new cycle of studies introduced a few years ago and which has been described in previous national reports.

To conclude, future plans aimed at increasing the didactic activity of the school will be outlined.

2. MILITARY TERMINOLOGY

In previous years the study of languages was principally concerned with purely linguistic aspects. Military concepts were covered briefly and in a generalized manner by mother-tongue teachers without specific training in the military field. The result was that a student had a good level of knowledge of the language but a limited command of Military Terminology.

In 1992 the SLEE introduced into its programme of English and Arabic courses, parallel courses in Military Terminology for officers and NCOs. These courses, parallel to and followed during the same period as the English and Arabic courses, were carried out by qualified teachers who, as far as the English language is concerned, had been selected on the basis of their experience, including activity in the NATO field.

3. TECHNICAL-MILITARY PREPARATION

The diversity of roles that military personnel can be required to perform abroad necessitates a different structure and organisation of the courses of Military Terminology. While the principal aim of the Arabic language course is that of furnishing the student with a global knowledge of military terminology, with reference to specific procedures, the technical-professional preparation for the English course is adapted according to the category of student and the international field in which he may be employed e.g. NATO and the UN.

Let us, then, examine the course of military terminology for each language and the means of furnishing this technical-military preparation:

a. English language courses

The English language courses form the nucleus of the SLEE.

The aims of the technical-military teaching are, as already stated, diversified and the level of linguistic knowledge required at the start of a course (not lower than SLP 2-2-2-2) has contributed greatly to the fulfilment of such aims. The objectives to be attained are as follows:
- Correspondence Course - 2nd intensive phase

The course of Military Terminology, inserted in the Correspondence Course, lasts 14 weeks and consists of 30 hours (intermediate level) or 50 hours (advanced level) with the aim of differentiating between the technical-military preparation necessary for officers and that required by NCOs. At the end of the course the officers must be capable of presenting a "briefing" whilst the NCOs must give a "presentation" on a specific subject of military interest (Annex A). This specific training is carried out by means of close collaboration between the language teacher and the teacher of Military Terminology.

- Course for the Acquisition of Higher Levels (CALS)

The Course of Military Terminology inserted into the CALS (Annex B) lasts 14 weeks and is of approximately 50 hours but, unlike the previous case, it is followed by officers and NCOs already in possession of a level of linguistic knowledge equal to SLP 3-3-3-2. These students are already candidates for posts in NATO or the UN and, therefore, need to improve their technical-professional knowledge with specific reference to the two possible sectors in which they may be employed.

- Refresher Course Aimed at Requalification (CAFR) and Refresher Course Aimed at Employment (CAFI)

These courses, which are much shorter and more intensive than the others, last only 30 days and are reserved to students in possession of an SLP 4-3-3-3/ 4-3-4-3 and destined to posts in NATO or the UN. It follows that the teaching of Military Terminology (Annex C) inserted in such courses, although similar to that carried out in the CALS classes, shows better results even with fewer hours available, given the excellent linguistic grounding of the students. It should be pointed out that the activities carried out on the CAFI course are aimed specifically at the acquisition of military terminology. The course is for personnel already assigned to NATO or UN posts and shortly to be employed in those same posts. The activity is, therefore, strictly linked to specific preparation as outlined in the "Job Descriptions".

- Course for Officers of the Staff College Course

Lasting 14 weeks, this is the course which requires greatest effort on the part of the school. The students receive teaching in Military Terminology and notions on military doctrine in the language studied. These elements are necessary since the officers must give briefings at the end of the course on professional subjects, e.g. global strategy. This represents useful preparation for the officers who will be called to fill posts at the Army General Staff in their future careers.

b. Arabic language course

Since the month of November, a parallel course in Military Terminology has been introduced, consisting of at least 100 teaching hours. The aim of this course is to furnish the students with basic military terminology, with particular reference to specific procedural terms.

3. CONCLUSIONS

To conclude, this brief report will look at the results obtained so far and plans for the future.
a. Results obtained

In recent years the SLEE has worked to renew its didactic methodology by the use of a more communicative approach in line with the introduction of the new Unified Test for the English and French languages, which are designed on the basis of the levels established by STANAG 6001. This has led to a more specific training which has given excellent results (Annex D). This positive picture gives an impetus to the school in continuing and perfecting the work carried out so far. We wish to stress that the SLEE has benefited greatly from the BILC conferences in this respect, in particular the study groups, the exchange of ideas with the various language bodies of NATO having helped to perfect the course programmes and the preparation of tests.

b. Future plans

In the near future, the SLEE intends to continue in its efforts to update and renew itself with the aim of satisfying the ever-increasing requirements of the Armed Forces in the field of languages. As regards the language courses, aspects currently being studied include:
- improving the 1st phase of the Correspondence Course, that is the "Self-Study" phase;
- extending the teaching of Military Terminology to courses in French, Serbo-Croatian and Slovene;
- the standardization at NATO levels of the German exams in line with those already introduced for the English and French languages.
1. The officer/NCO chooses a military topic. He suggests the title of his briefing.

Example:
Topic: Air defence
Title: The Air Defence School in Sabaudia.

The teacher coordinates the choice of topic with the other students' proposals and then communicates the final decision.

2. The briefing will last 15 minutes with the aim of making it really 15 minutes. It should be followed by a discussion period (duration to be determined; normally 20 minutes).

The briefing should contain the following points:

- Salutation
- Introduction of speaker
- Introduction of topic
- Presentation
- Summary

Example:
General/Commandant!
Ladies and Gentlemen!
I am Captain .......
The title of my presentation is....
The aim of my presentation is...
I intend to .......
The aim of my presentation has been to...
Thank You!

3. Discussion
ENGLISH LANGUAGE COURSE
MILITARY TERMINOLOGY
PROGRAMS

WEEK I-IV:
The Italian Army

- "My Military career"
- Organization of the Army
- Line of command
- What changes are affecting the Army?
- Other Armed Services
  (Air Force, Navy, Guardia di Finanza)

WEEK V-VII
Italy as member of NATO:

- Political organisation of the Alliance
- Military organization
- NATO Commands in Italy
- Working in an International Staff

WEEK IX-X:
Italy and the United Nations

- UN Forces and Peace Keeping Operations
- Training for UN missions

WEEK XI-XV:
Combat Operations
- Field Exercises and CPX
- The Command Post
- Military and tactical symbols
- Defensive, offensive, withdrawal operations
- Environmental factors in combat
- Air-Ground Operations
MILITARY TERMINOLOGY
DIDACTIC TOOLS

NATO:
- GLOSSARIO DI TERMINOLOGIA MILITARE
- CORRESPONDENCE
- OPERATIONAL TERMS and GRAPHICS
- NATO HANDBOOKS
- .................................

ONU:
- NOTES FOR THE GUIDANCE OF MILITARY OBSERVERS ON APPOINTMENT.
- BRIEFINGS of FIELD STATIONS.
- LIBRO INFORMAZIONI GENERALI
- .................................
ENGLISH LANGUAGE COURSE RESULTS 1992

CALS (ADVANCED)

50% LEVELS 3-4

50% LEVEL 3

CAFR:

40% LEVELS 3-4

60% LEVEL 3

CORRESPONDENCE:

20% LEVELS 3-4

30% LEVEL 3

50% LEVEL 2

STAFF COLLEGE COURSE

15% LEVELS 3-4

50% LEVEL 3

35% LEVEL 2
1. Introduction

The changed political situation in Europe has resulted in an orientation shift from plain intelligence languages towards "communication languages" (operational and target languages), indispensable for peace missions and military operations in conflict areas. Within the Dutch Armed Forces the only language being taught at present is Russian. Senior commanders, however, begin to realize that focusing entirely on Russian language is no longer sufficient. The cooperation of Dutch units with troops from other countries necessitates an increasing attention to operational languages (e.g. English, French, German and Spanish) and to new target languages (e.g. Arabic, Farsi, Serbo-Croatian).

2. Russian Language Wing (RLW)

All Russian training programs take place at the School of Military Intelligence Service of the Dutch Army, primarily at the Russian Language Wing. At RLW four executive and support personnel and nine teachers of Russian (two of whom are native speakers) are in charge of several different language courses, intended for interrogators, translators, inspectors for Arms Control, and other military personnel. The main language training programs at RLW are:

* Russian Interrogation Course, consisting of a Russian Basic Course and a special Military Course of both 19 weeks. Twice a year approximately 10 conscript interrogators attend this course, which gives them an SLP of 3322.

* Russian Translators' Course, consisting of a Russian Basic Course of 19 weeks and a special Military Translator's Course of 15 weeks. Yearly 2 conscript translators attend this course, which has an SLP of 2233.

* Russian Arms Control Course, consisting of a Russian Basic Course of 36 weeks and a special CFE-Treaty Course of 31 weeks. Halfway through the training program the students attend a trainee program of one month in Moscow. The Arms Control Course is concluded with a CFE-course of 2 weeks at the Marshall Center in Garmisch-Partenkirchen. Since the very beginning of the Russian Arms Control Course 8 officers and NCOs of the Army, Navy and Air Force have successfully completed this course. In October of this year another 3 officers and NCOs will finish their training, and in March of this year 2 military have begun the course. As from August 1993 RLW will also take care of the language training of two Belgian inspectors.

* Language training programs for other military personnel (e.g. Military attaches, monitors, interpreters) are given on an ad hoc basis, if necessary with private lessons.

3. Projects 1992/93

* The last 12 months a great deal of time and effort has been devoted to complete an entirely new Russian course for Arms Control. By now RLW offers a Verification Course which gives the prospective inspector a solid knowledge of the Treaty and its specific terminology and other job oriented skills with an SLP of at least $2^7 2^7 2^7 2^7$. The matching DLPTs are expected to be ready in September of this year.

* A skill level test has been created (not related to a specific SLP), in order to measure the retention of students who learned Russian some time ago. The test is also suitable to define
in what stage a student with foreknowledge of Russian can be fitted in a running language course.

* The biggest challenge of the previous months was to find a solution for the problem of maintaining the acquired language proficiency of inspectors who completed the training program. It became clear that the role of the Russian language during on site inspections was too insignificant to enlarge, or even to maintain their knowledge of the language. Therefore it was decided to allow them to maintain their proficiency skills 2 hours a day by self-instruction. In addition, RLW would give them lessons one day every two weeks. But for several reasons (for one thing, during the baseline validation period the inspectors were too busy to spend any time at all on Russian) this approach did not work. Now a different approach has been chosen: the inspectors are offered every three months an intensive maintenance course of two weeks, twice a year at RLW, and twice a year at the Marshall Center in Garmisch-Partenkirchen. All lessons concentrate on job oriented skills. Next year, when a whole cycle has been completed, an evaluation will show whether this approach will be continued in the future.

4. New projects 1993/94

* The largest forthcoming project will be the rewriting of the Russian Basic Course. Since the Netherlands have decided to abolish the system of compulsory military service by 1998, RLW can no longer rely on the academically schooled conscripts for the interrogation training. The intake level will be lower in the future, and on the whole probably less high demands can be made on the future students.

* In addition, the specific interrogation course has to be rewritten. Instead of pure interrogators, the future students will become more all round foreign area specialists, functioning as liaison officers.

All new courses will be written with the required SLPs in mind, and be concluded with DLPTs.

* In the second half of this year a start will be made to "convert" two of the RLW instructors into teachers of Serbo-Croatian. Before the end of this year RLW will create a survival kit of Serbo-Croatian, similar to that of DLIFLC. The benefits and shortcomings of this set in the field will be carefully supervised by RLW, in order to acquire more expertise for possible survival kits in other (target) languages.

* So far, all language training programs, except for Russian, are contracted out to civilian language institutes. At the moment the Ministry of Defense investigates under what conditions these languages could be taught in a (to be developed) Defense Language School.

5. Conclusion

The sudden disappearing of the established training needs has accelerated the plans to create a Defense Language School. Although the importance of foreign language proficiency for military personnel is more and more acknowledged by senior commanders, the reduction of troops and financial means with some 40-50% in the coming years, however, delays a definite decision in this matter.

On the other hand, the situation for RLW is not nearly as bad as for most of the ordinary military units - languages have never had such a high priority in the Dutch Armed Forces as nowadays.
This year a lot of changes have occurred in this school, especially as to teaching staff.

Our last director Colonel Francisco Peña Montoro is working now in another military unit. LT Colonel Alberto Tirados Nuñez took over command of the school in July 1992.

In a similar way other changes have occurred as to the teachers of this school, above of all in the Russian section, in which our two military teachers have changed and now two new military people are working in this section.

In the Arabian section we have enjoyed the incorporation of a new military teacher.

At the end of last year a new course was begun in the three languages, that we now teach in this school: German, Russian and Arabic.

The duration of these courses will be one year in the first phase (initiation) and another year in the second phase.

The number of hours for each course will be, approximately, 1080 hours for the first one and for all students who pass it, 1080 more for the second.

Our students are young officers and sergeants, both male and female, twelve in each course.

Apart from military teacher we have native teachers in each section. The level we reached last year was good and all the students passed their final exam and obtained level SLP 3.3.3.3. or a higher one.

In addition to these theoretic classes students receive a practical course. These courses took place in June-July of last year, with a duration of some three weeks, so as to practise each language in its proper country: Russia, Germany and an Arabian one.

These practical courses we hold are a very important back up, students there can listen and practise all the skills that they have acquired during the year.

Finally it must be said that the Spanish army still is carrying through its goodwill mission as a UN peacekeeping force in Croatia and in other countries. Also we are going on with our teams of the Spanish verification unit, who operate in Eastern Europe.

In all of these missions the Spanish army is working in English, French, Russian and of course in our own language, especially in America.

Now, in this school, we are also teaching military attachés with a compact basic knowledge course, that will serve them for their new jobs.

Last of all I have to say that nowadays the Spanish language is one of the most important languages in the world, as so many people do speak Spanish. Nevertheless not all the schools of languages teach Spanish and it is not as yet an official language at some conferences.
Ladies and Gentlemen,

The Army Language School has the privilege and the honor to participate in its 10th BILC Conference. Since 1983 this school remained an active participant of BILC chiefly representing the Turkish Armed Forces.

In the forgoing papers, which were presented to you, we made an attempt to give an indepth knowledge of the Turkish Armed Forces in general and the Army Language School in particular. They encompassed our present and future activities also focussing on foreign language curriculum in the military field. Meanwhile, the reports released by allied member nations have educted us as well. I consider this has enlightened us to a great extent to brainstorm and revise our present curriculum. I also appreciate the efforts BILC has made over 10 years in terms of exchanging knowledge, materials, documents and experience through mutual cooperation. Today I stand here as a witness to all these developments because of my intimate involvement and frequent attendance. In our turn we have taken due benefit of BILC. The resultant effect is, we took a great leap over the 10 years and were greatly educated. I can proudly proclaim that today the Turkish Army Language School is established amongst the leading language institutions not only in the Turkish Armed Forces but within NATO and outside. In this year's report I intend to highlight the ongoing activities, recently developed schedules and future planning of our Army Language School.

1. ONGOING ACTIVITIES

A. ENGLISH TRAINING

So far, the Army Language School has been teaching an old edition of ALC (American Language Course) serials. However, we procured the revised version of ALC. This has marked differences from the older version. We intend to introduce the new ALC from 1993-94 training session on. However, there are a few impediments to be addressed, before we start the programme. I hope some concrete steps will be taken to define this problem. The first problem is the reproduction facility of ALC books. We need to plan for the next 5 years with an average of 200 students, more than 30 teachers per calendar year. This involves enormous financial implications. Secondly, teachers need to be sent for the orientation course to equip themselves with the new ALC programme. Our initiative relating to this matter is going on affirmatively.

B. CORRESPONDENCE COURSE

The need to teach English to Turkish Armed Forces members has been growing steadily. Yet, professional commitments, job demands and ancillary involvements do not allow the service personnel to attend any formal course readily. As an alternative, the need to educate Turkish Armed Forces members through 'correspondence courses' are felt. At present this programme is extended to gendarmerie force only. We intend to introduce this programme widely. The details will be discussed in Study Group 4. We experienced such collaboration could be useful with those countries which are already involved in this field. The study on the gendarmerie force was developed in the following sequences:

(1) An indepth study was made for one year on the project to see the feasibility and detailed syllabus/schedules were chalked out.

(2) The aim of the course: to teach persons having no knowledge in English. It was designed to improve their conversational speaking ability with foreigners and handling of the diurnal affairs.
(3) In this course basically volunteers were accepted. The prerequisites were officers who were minimum 1st lieutenants, and senior sergeants.

(4) The course was planned in two packages. Each package had three levels. The total duration was 24 months.

(5) Students were asked to sit for examination at the end of each package. The first examination was considered mid term and the last final.

(6) The minimum qualification level was fixed at 70% marks. The performance level of a student was judged based on the sum total aggregate covering 30% of midterm and 70% of final term examination.

(7) Successful candidates were given a diploma.

(8) Before preparing the package latest developments on widely used course materials available on the market were minutely scrutinized and latest adaptation incorporated.

(9) Syllabus:

(a) The syllabus included books relating to easy and effective ways of learning English. Also kept in mind were the requirements of students and the difficulties of self study.

(b) It had exercises designed for students to improve their learning skills.

(c) A Turkish to English guide book was made available as ready reference.

(d) Recorded cassettes by native speakers were made available to enhance the students fluency, learning, easy understanding and listening abilities.

(10) The entire cost of reading and stationary materials were born by the students.

2. IMPROVED ACTIVITIES:

CALL [Computer-assisted Language Learning] Centre:

The CALL [Computer-Assisted Language Learning] Centre at the Turkish Army Language School was established in August 1992 as a small network consisting of 8 work stations [each an IBM compatible PC 286] and a server [a PC 386] operating on Novell OS.

The centre at that time was used for day to day learning, teaching purposes (but no software to be used for the purposes). The centre was reorganised to make it more efficient in CALL as it was planned earlier. The present capabilities can be stated as such:

A. English language teaching at the Army Language School is supported by some text processing computer programmes obtained from other civilian or military schools and loaded in our centre where our students can now enjoy and explore the fantastic world of computers. They can do various types of reading and writing exercises on the computer such as filling-in-the-blanks, cryogram, jumbled sentences, jumbled paragraphs and cloze test activities on the texts covered in their coursebooks. This is developed through a computer aided test programme. Each class has one hour of computer activity per week. [Because we have neither the hardware nor the software to use for listening and speaking activities, our students are bound to practice only in reading, writing, grammar and vocabulary skills, for the time being].

B. We have several English testing programmes that can be used for placement, achievement and proficiency purposes. They are presently being used by our students to test
their achievement [since we have no hard/software system covering listening/speaking abilities].

C. We also have a test development and administration program which was projected and developed by one of our officers [Captain Ayhan Akbas]. This can be used for feedback purposes. With the help of this programme teachers can prepare timed multiple-choice language tests [in any language using the latin alphabet] and give them to the students on the computer. The computer itself administers the test from the beginning to the end. If requested it explains the mistakes made by the testee, and in the end it gives an overall score and an inventory of the areas for further practice.

D. We also developed some other programmes which contribute to foreign language education directly or indirectly. They are various word-processors which are used for composition writing, graphic programmes, geography programmes, dictionary programmes and so forth. These programmes are normally used by English language learners because most of them are originally written for English speaking users.

E. Moreover, some other programmes covering grammar, vocabulary and reading exercises have already been planned. This will soon be ready for the use of our students.

In conclusion the CALL centre is developing day by day and our students are very pleased with what they are doing in the centre, because computers are always interacting, innovative, motivating and interesting. Another interesting part is they can communicate with the computer actively whereas it is not so with coursebooks, tapes or VTR.

We are quite aware and devoted to share the latest technological developments. The use of the computer as audio-aural aid can pave ways for making learning more interesting.

8. FUTURE PROJECTS

Turkish Courses

Presently we have a Turkish Language Department, but we look forward to bringing about a drastic change to refurbish it as a Turkish Training Centre. Keeping this aim in view we intend to bring in more military oriented subject materials. This will directly benefit allied and friendly countries with whom we have defence collaboration.

Besides we intend to re-train Turkish instructors in teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language since most of them have a general university degree/background.
NATIONAL REPORT - UNITED KINGDOM

INTRODUCTION

1. It has been an interesting year for UK language policy staff. Languages have suddenly been given higher priority in planning for operations, the Language Training Rationalisation Study has been produced and has resulted in a further study into language policy organisation within the Ministry of Defence (MOD) with the aim of creating a central staff focus. The Army Language Scholarship Scheme has been introduced, English Language Training increased and the new format of task-based examinations has begun to validate the new task-based service language courses. In the midst of this, the Army language policy staff were moved out of Eltham Palace in London to Worthy Down, near Winchester as part of the plan to "rusticate" MOD. RN and RAF policy staff are also due to move out of London in the next year. This disruption was increased by the retirement of our UK Secretary of BILC, Mr George Worrall, who has for 21 years been our resident expert and guide. He was given his farewell in style at a lunch organised by the Director of Education and Training Services (Army), Brigadier John MacFarlane, and we were delighted that the Chairman of the BILC Secretariat, Mr Herbert Walinsky, was also able to combine business with pleasure to attend. Mr Worrall is still assisting from time to time on a consultancy basis.

LANGUAGES FOR OPERATIONS

2. There has been a welcome rise in interest in languages on the part of senior British commanders as a result of the changing political climate and military structures across Europe. Where in the past the main concentration has been on German, Russian and Arabic to match the fixed politics of the Cold War years, there is now a growing recognition of the need to have military linguists in support of multi-national forces and of peacekeeping and humanitarian operations.

3. The most pressing requirement has obviously been for effective communication in the former Yugoslavia. Familiar but false arguments that everyone speaks English have been largely defeated by the demand from our in-theatre commanders for British Serbo-Croat, French, Russian and German speakers to act as liaison officers at force and unit levels. At the outset, the British forces produced only 4-5 speakers of Serbo-Croat above SLP 3333. This by no means met the demand and left us with a training requirement.

4. The military courses which are available in predictable languages to traditionally accepted standards (3333 or 4343) are too long and not flexible enough in their design to meet the new requirements. The requirement is for speakers at a minimum of SLP 3321 to act as liaison officers. Until now, none of our courses has trained specifically to such SLPs. Off-the-shelf training materials were purchased to fill the gap but were known to be largely inappropriate for officers and NCOs about to deploy to former Yugoslavia. At this point in our planning our Canadian friends in BILC came to our rescue, providing us with a military Serbo-Croat course which we put to immediate use. We take this opportunity to record our thanks.

5. Since then numerous courses have been run in the UK and Germany to meet differing needs and more are being planned. Some of these are outlined below with comments:

a. Survival Courses. These have been organised over 1 or 2 days for personnel about to deploy. They have involved employing a native-speaker for a number of hours to cover greetings and some specialist vocabulary. Medical units were particularly interested in this training.
b. Specialist Courses. Courses have been run for many specialist personnel. In particular, our Defence Debriefing Teams have run 4-8 week courses (reaching about SLP 2320). These debriefers were mostly excellent Russian speakers who were "converting". The course was designed specifically to help them ask questions about events and conditions. They were trained to ask closed questions which, of course, limit the scale of response and make the task of understanding/listening easier. This course was led by an officer of the Royal Navy. UK delegates have some sample material from this course and other material can be made available on request.

c. Colloquial Courses. In particular, 2 courses have been requested by operational staff which are worth mentioning. In order to meet the requirement for liaison officers, operations staff trawled for volunteers with some proven language ability to train for 16 weeks in Serbo-Croat and then to be deployed to theatre to act as language speakers. Language policy staff advised both operations staff and theatre commanders that those emerging from this course could not be used as interpreters (they were approximately SLP 2210) and that, where operationally possible, some should be allowed to continue their training. Reports after their deployment showed that, despite advice as to their low level of ability in the language, expectations were too high when they arrived. Most were subsequently employed in other specialist capacities and those who were competent in another language, notably Russian, were employed as liaison officers with the Russian contingent.

d. Liaison Officers' Course. The limitations of the 2 Colloquial courses in producing effective language speakers for liaison purposes has since been recognised by operations staff and a 4-5 month course is commencing on 14 Jun 93 to train 10 officers, already competent speakers of at least one foreign language, to a minimum of SLP 3321. The need for written skills has been calculated as small and the training time required can therefore be reduced. This course will be held at the Defence School of Languages and will be supervised and partly taught by a British Army captain of the Education and Training Services (ETS) Branch who has just returned from 8 months duty interpreting in-theatre.

6. As regards the work in-theatre, the 4-5 Serbo-Croat interpreters have been employed in negotiations between commanders and local leaders and been hardpressed to meet all the requirements. On occasions they have been employed alongside the local native speaking interpreters to oversee negotiations and specific events such as body counts. This has proved effective as the rustier British interpreters were easily able to use their passive skills while absorbing and revising the vocabulary and idioms of the locals in the current conflict.

7. The next roulement of teeth arm troops is expected in December and by then there will be 10 officers newly trained to a minimum of SLP 3321. This will make a significant difference to the ability of our troops to communicate. Further training is being considered.

RATIONALISATION STUDY

8. The Rationalisation Study was presented to the Defence Training Committee in Sep 92 after many months of hard work by the RAF, RN and Army language staffs. The final document outlined the history of language training in the forces, described current procedure and differences in procedure between the 3 services and the consequent problems and made comprehensive recommendations as to the way forward in rationalising language training. Since then, we have been asked to quantify more precisely the language training that was taking place across the whole of MOD. This request at last allowed a comprehensive survey which included the intelligence community and MOD civilians which previously had been excluded. Annual capitation and tuition costs of over £37m were estimated. Courses ranged from those provided by the Defence School of Languages at Beaconsfield to individual courses in tutors'
homes. The overriding message that was passed to the Central Staffs was that there was a need for centralised direction and funding.

9. The Defence Training Committee has now commissioned a study into the future organisation and structure of language training policy. Colonel Education and Training Services 2, Colonel David Harrison, will chair this study.

THE ARMY LANGUAGE SCHOLARSHIP SCHEME

10. The Army Language Scholarship Scheme was approved in November 1992 with the hope that it would begin as early as September 1993. The high level interest which the Scheme has generated seems to mark a change in attitude towards language training.

11. The Army Language Scholarship Scheme is in essence a one-year exchange programme with a foreign army for junior officers with the aim that he/she learns the language in country and also becomes au fait with the modus operandi of the host country. It is felt that, in this way, our pool of language competent officers to fill posts with multinational forces and, later, attaché appointments will increase. The opportunity to carry out language training at such a relatively early age was felt to be advantageous.

12. Feedback on the Scheme was invited at the early planning stages and several suggestions were made that the Scheme should include NCOs. These suggestions are being considered but it is stressed that the aim of this particular Scheme was to train officers who would be available for operations and exercises, proceed to multinational staff work in Europe and later, perhaps, fulfil Defence Attaché appointments in countries speaking that language. They might in any case be more receptive at a later date to learning a second or third foreign language.

13. It was decided to attempt language exchanges with allied forces in Europe in the first year, reflecting our need to communicate effectively with, for example, allies administering humanitarian aid in Bosnia and with fellow staff officers in the new Allied Command Europe Rapid Reaction Corps (ARRC). Exchanges are currently being sought with France, Germany, Italy and Spain for 1993. Negotiations are underway to find suitable exchanges and candidates are being shortlisted and interviewed.

14. We are looking for officers with at least 2 years service and under 30 years of age. Candidates are expected to have some proven language ability, preferably in the language of the country concerned, and will be given training to ensure they commence the exchange with an minimum SLP of 2221. It is believed that SLP 2221 is an adequate springboard for their individual study in-country. They will be monitored by correspondence by the Defence School of Languages which will offer resources and advice. On their return they will receive training for an examination which is at SLP 3333 and this is regarded as the minimum level that they should achieve after one year in-country.

15. After about 35 enquiries on the Scheme, 7 candidates are to be interviewed in June. The number of applications was less than had been anticipated. It is impossible to say, at this stage, whether this was due to officers feeling that a year away might jeopardise their traditional patterns of career training or whether they believed that the demand would be so high that it was not worth applying. All feedback received is that the Scheme is regarded as exciting by junior officers. It is probable that female officers will in future be applying for exchanges to countries whose language they wish to speak but whose armed forces do not admit women. Fortunately this hurdle has not been met in the first year of the Scheme.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING

16. Over the last year a number of visits have been made to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe by the commanding officer of the Defence School of Languages. Through the Defence Attache and British Council he has been asked to assess the requirements for ELT training for local teachers. A particularly strong case is being made for assistance by Poland.

17. As a result, a tiered system of training is being considered, mostly funded by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. In-country, the British Council both teaches and tests students of English. In the UK, extra funding is proposed for the Defence School of Languages, which includes an English Language Training Wing, to provide 3 x 12 week courses for 10 students each.

18. In the meantime, the well-established courses provided at the Defence School of Languages continue. These include standard courses for Gurkhas and English for, eg, Arabs and Turks proceeding on flying, engineering and staff college courses.

19. As discussed at last year's conference, one of the problems encountered when allowing foreign service personnel access to the UK training courses is that they arrive with variable and sometimes inadequate standards of English. Work continues to apply SLPs to the entry standards for English for all the key UK military training courses that overseas personnel attend. BILC has also previously commented on the difficulty of non-linguists applying SLPs to courses1 . There is a tendency to overstate the requirement. In the case of the student bidding for training there is a wish not to fall short of the mark so he/she increases the target to increase the available training time. In the case of the course supervisor, there is a tendency to overstate the English requirement because the better the knowledge of English, the fewer the problems which are likely to occur during the course.

20. The main courses that foreign students attend have already been identified. A study is being carried out to determine the best means of pretesting all foreign students before they arrive in the UK by using a test designed by the Ministry of Defence and administered by courtesy of the British Council or by a British Council test. Obviously such testing must be carefully controlled. The results of the tests could, of course, also give rise to political and diplomatic embarrassment on some occasions. Decisions will be made on the way forward by Mar 94.

EXTERNAL LANGUAGE EXAMINATIONS

21. Previous UK delegations have reported on the development of our external language examinations. In 1987 a report concluded that the MOD language training and examination systems contained much that was irrelevant to the service student and his future postings. A review was carried out and task-based training introduced to meet the actual requirement. MOD has now awarded a contract to the Institute of Linguisists in London to provided language examinations to SLPs 3333 (Advanced Certificate) and 4343 (Diploma). Both examinations are of similar format consisting of 7 papers, 3 written and 4 oral. They are task-based and are designed for the external validation of the new service language courses.

22. The first examination, at Advanced Certificate level took place in Oct 92 and the Diploma took place in Mar 93. There have been some problems in defining definitions and standards. These were not stated clearly enough in the contract document and there was some tension between the wish to achieve accreditation or certification from the Institute, thus providing service personnel with civilian qualifications, and the need to maintain our pass rates. However, these problems have now been resolved.

1 BILC Working Paper No 1, January 1988, produced by the SHAPE Language Centre.
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MAJOR INITIATIVES

During the past year, DLIFLC continued to successfully implement its long-range Master Plan objectives, to improve overall linguist proficiency, and to respond to the language needs arising from Operation Restore Hope.

The Video Teletraining system (VTT) expanded dramatically from nearly 500 hours in nine languages during Calendar Year (CY) 91 to more than 4,500 hours in 19 languages and dialects during CY 1992. In preparing troops for Operation Restore Hope, Somali language materials were developed, and 84 hours of VTT instruction were given. DLIFLC also provided 350 hours of VTT instruction in cross-training level 3/3 Russian linguists to Ukrainian, resulting in 7 of 8 students graduating with level 3/3 in Ukrainian. Coordination began for Serbo-Croatian instruction. Four new VTT studios were added, using multimedia computer interfaces, and 34 more distant locations were installed. More than 100 teachers were trained in VTT teaching techniques and the use of VTT hardware, including 18 full-time VTT instructors.

DLI continued to expand its language training support to a variety of government agencies such as the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), the US Customs Service, US Marshal Service and others. Recently introduced courses for the DEA and the On-Site Inspection Agency (OSIA) are ongoing. In addition, the course development effort in the Curriculum Division of Special Operations Forces (SOF) introductory courses in 13 languages has progressed, with a scheduled completion date of December 1993.

In a continuing effort to improve linguist proficiency, curriculum reviews were conducted in Russian and Persian, and Staff Assistance Visits (SAV) to examine the Learner Focused Instructional Day were completed in four schools. Faculty training included a great variety of workshops in areas of adult Foreign Language Teaching and Multimedia use. Proficiency Improvement Courses (PIC) in Russian, Polish and Czech were completed, and development continued in French and Spanish. A generic Multi-Media program is being developed to provide computer courseware for several languages.

An Automated Student Questionnaire (ASQ) was introduced to assess proficiency improvement areas. The Educational Technology Needs Assessment (ETNA), analyzing optimal application of educational technology in foreign language training, was completed. Defense Language Proficiency Tests IV (DLPTs IV) in Chinese, Italian and Korean were produced and the prototype computer-based Final Learning Objectives (FLO) test in Russian was developed.

Pursuant to DLI’s multiple efforts to improve proficiency results, increases during the past five years have been as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
<th>PERCENT OF BASIC COURSE GRADUATES WITH SKILL LEVELS 2/2 OR ABOVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More specific discussion on DLI initiatives during the past year follows, with topics including distance education, faculty professional development, curriculum planning and course development, educational technology, evaluation, research and testing, along with the student load and a list of languages taught.
DISTANCE EDUCATION DIVISION

1. Overview

a. Calendar Year (CY) 1992 saw the continuing effects on DE of budget constraints, changes in the focus of global politics, and personnel changes within DoD. Much of DE's work was focused on preparing troops for Operation Restore Hope and cross-training Russian linguists in Ukrainian.

b. Major Richard J. Savko, USAF, assumed the duties of Associate Dean.

2. Video Teletraining System (VTT)

a. The Video Teletraining system (VTT), now back to its original name, expanded dramatically. With the addition of four new studios in Monterey, using multimedia computer interfaces and the installation of 34 more distant locations, VTT instruction was increased from 486 hours in CY 1991 to more than 4500 hours in 19 languages and dialects in CY 1992. As part of DE's contribution to Operation Restore Hope, 84 hours of VTT instruction were given in Somali. 350 hours of VTT instruction were in cross-training level 3 / 3 Russian linguists to Ukrainian. Seven out of 8 students graduated with level 3 / 3 in Ukrainian.

b. Eight-week courses with six hours of VTT instruction per day in Russian, Arabic, Spanish, Korean, and Chinese produced an average proficiency improvement of almost a half level.

c. More than 100 teachers were trained in VTT teaching techniques and the use of VTT hardware, including 18 full-time VTT instructors.

d. Curriculum development and assistance to units in curriculum development per VTT and on-site visits were expanded.

e. Kitako Henderson joined the DE / VTT staff.

3. Mobile Training Teams (MTTs)

a. Demand for MTTs remained high, but due to a lack of instructors, not all requests could be filled. 20 MTTs were sent to units to teach two-week introductory and refresher-level courses tailored to unit needs. Twenty-nine teachers gave 281 students a total of 1,770 hours of instruction.

b. DE staff members traveled to Fort Lewis, WA, and Fort Hood, TX, to conduct Train-the-Trainer workshops sponsored by FORSCOM, which paid the TDY expenses. Four teachers provided 32 students with 240 hours of instruction. Two DE staff members traveled to the 747th MI BN in Panama to conduct a Train-the-Trainer workshop, providing 8 students with 60 hours of instruction.

c. One DE staff member accompanied a Somali instructor to Fort Drum, NY, to provide him with on-the-job teacher/curriculum training before he conducted Somali instruction to troops ready to participate in Operation Restore Hope.

4. Other Training Support

a. Support of units with Command Language Programs also increased. 840 units received support, compared to 803 in 1991. Programs and individual linguists received over $990,000 in gratis materials.
b. The third FORSCOM / DLI Seminar for Language Program Managers was held at DLI. One hundred and one managers and coordinators participated.

c. DLIFLC Pamphlet 350-13, "Distance Education Services and Materials," was published and distributed to units.

d. TC 350-16, "Catalogue of Computer Assisted Foreign Language Study Materials," was submitted for publication. It is designed to assist units in finding appropriate commercially-produced materials.

e. Four editions of the DE newsletter were published and distributed to units to inform them of the latest developments in foreign language teaching and materials.

f. DE added interactive Video Disks (IVDS) for four languages (Arabic, Russian, Spanish, and Turkish) to its list of nonresident materials.

g. For the first time in DLI history, correspondence courses were developed by DE and the Curriculum Division, under contract from the Army Institute of Professional Development. Proficiency Improvement Courses for reading and listening are available in Russian, Polish, and Czech.

h. In collaboration with LPC, DE produced Somali language materials for the troops participating in Operation Restore Hope.

i. Radko Trapl joined DE as a service representative.

5. LTD Europe

a. In spite of the continued down-sizing of troops in Europe, USAREUR CLP enrollment in Language Training Detachment (LTD) courses was over 43,000. More than 6,600 students enrolled in the German program for service personnel and their families, which was funded by the German Foreign Office. These figures represent a proportional increase in LTD's language training.

b. LTD planned and coordinated three iterations of four-week intensive intermediate Russian, with six instructors from the German Bundessprachenamt.

c. LTD assisted the 18th MI BN in establishing a language training facility, including coordination of Serbo-Croatian instruction.

d. LTD also assisted V Corps with the procurement of PC workstations for computer-assisted language learning.

6. DE Visitors

Visitors to DE included more than 60 individuals and two groups of conference participants. The visitors represented the U.S. House of Representatives, DoD, TRADOC, INSCOM, West Point, various intelligence agencies and military units, one foreign government, one foreign military organization, and several civilian foreign language groups, schools, and institutions.
FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

1. Areas of Focus

a. Promoting, widening, and strengthening the commitment to the communicative, or proficiency, approach to language teaching amongst the faculty.

b. Increasing the general computer literacy of the institute, and more specifically, providing training in the use of Windows & Toolbook software and encouraging their wider application in the instructional process and administrative support.

2. Instructor Certification Course (ICC)

The Faculty and Staff Training Division continued to conduct the Instructor Certification Course on a monthly basis as enrollment permitted. This two-week workshop orient new teachers to DLI, its history, mission and teaching policy as well as introducing them to the professional field of language teaching. Using a combination of lectures, group discussion, small group work and demonstration, the workshop examines teaching methodologies, skills development, the importance and development of proficiency, and the role of testing and the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT). A number of other topics of more specific interest (e.g. teaching grammar, and student anxiety) are covered by faculty from the DLI and the Monterey Institute of International Studies (MIIS) in guest speaker sessions, so that participants gain a thorough understanding of the language teaching field and new directions now being explored.

3. Military Language Instructors (MLIs)

Particularly pleasing has been the number of newly appointed MLIs with ILR Level III language skills attending the course. The majority have enthusiastically adopted techniques of the communicative approach and learner-centered instruction and introduced them into their classes. Student response to their efforts has been very positive. We also provided a modified version of the ICC to teachers of Special Forces students at Fort Bragg in the month of August, which met with high praise from the participants.

4. Skill Level Familiarization Workshops

The Skill Level Familiarization Workshop, providing faculty with an opportunity to fully comprehend the system of the skill levels, practice Oral Proficiency Interview techniques, and consider what impact these should have upon teaching approach, proved very popular during the year. One-week-long workshops were held for the Korean, Persian, Chinese and Thai departments. Dr. Pardee Lowe returned to DLI in June to participate, with Faculty & Staff trainers, in delivering six one-day workshops on skill levels for a large number of faculty from the Korean and Middle East Schools.

5. Faculty and Staff Training Programs. Christmas 1992

The Christmas break provided faculty with an opportunity to attend a training program sponsored and organized by Faculty & Staff. In all, some 691 people attended 36 workshops covering a wide variety of language teaching and allied topics over the ten-day period from 21-30 December. Other department initiatives involved trainers in providing assistance to VTT instruction in Arabic and French; demonstrating how to use SCOLA TV news, and 4 handed teaching techniques for the Persian and Arabic departments; and sponsoring two workshops in Task Based Instruction for institute faculty.
6. Professional Presentations

Among the department's interactions with the academic community outside DLI were Ms. Monique Navelet's and Dr. Salah-dine Hammoud's presentation on the use of SCOLA in the classroom at the ACTFL annual meeting in Chicago; a presentation to the Monterey Unified School District's teachers on the ACTFL skill levels, and hosting an ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview Workshop in English, French and Spanish in July 1992. The department also sponsored the visits of five guest lecturers, who made presentations during the year which were of great interest and sparked discussion amongst the faculty. The first was Mr. Ed Stoops of the National Cryptological Training School, who returned in January to continue his series of workshops on "Applied Linguistics", and added a new one on "Teaching, Listening and Reading". At the end of the year, Dr. Steven Sternfeld held a one-day language workshop on how to conduct intensive immersion language courses. Other notables included Wilga Rivers ("Principles of Language Learning and Teaching"), Mary Kim ("Enhanced Learning Activities"), and Robert di Donato ("From Task-Based to Project-Based Instruction").

7. Staff Assistance Visits (SAV)

The branch chief participated in the Staff Assistance Visits on the Learner Focused Instructional Day in DRO, DKO, DAS, and DME. Dr. Hammoud also took part.

8. Oral Proficiency Interviews (OPI)

Both Ms. Navelet and Dr. Hammoud continued to support the Testing Division by scoring oral interview tapes and conducting Oral Proficiency Interviews in French and Arabic, respectively.

9. Leadership Education and Development (LEAD)

In January the same two trainers successfully completed the Army "Train-the-Trainer" workshop held by the Army Civilian Leadership Training Division at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. This course, Leadership Education and Development, is now mandatory for all supervisors. We hope to start workshops soon. The organizational development branch provided team building and conflict resolution sessions for Arabic and Chinese groups.

10. IBM Toolbook/Windows

The Instructional Technology Branch (IT) of Faculty and Staff designed, field tested and revised the IBM Toolbook/Windows workshop. Kiril Boyadjieff then presented the workshop twice a month throughout the year. DLI faculty, staff, MLJs, representatives of the Naval Detachment and members of the command group attended the training.

11. Media in the Foreign Language Classroom

The IT branch continued to hold low- and mid-technology courses as the need arose. Among these were the use of media in the foreign language classroom, and the use of a video camera for on-the-spot scenario taping. Interest in the use of video technology as a training tool in the foreign language classroom continued to grow. A "Video Interactive" workshop was designed and facilitated at two of the Russian schools and in one of the Spanish departments at DRO. Krystyna Wachowicz joined the branch at the end of November on loan from one of the Russian schools, RU2, to assist in the video as well as in other technology training.
12. Media Presentations

Kiril Boyadjieff was repeatedly asked by the command group to present teacher training templates on Toolbook/Windows at Educational Technology to visiting generals and other visitors to DLI; and Brigitta Ludgate addressed computer-assisted study (CAS) options during DLI's field assistance via the Defense Teleconference System aired out of Fort Ord. They also presented two joint papers at the 1992 CALICO Conference and represented DLI at the CALICO Technology Fair, demonstrating interactive foreign-language courseware on the Macintosh/Hypercard and the IBM Toolbook/Windows platforms.

13. Media Projects and Recommendations

The branch chief of Instructional Technology was on several occasions invited to review the progress of the SOF project prototype and to serve on the CAS Concept Committee in order to offer joint recommendations with other committee members for the further development and implementation of the SOF BMLC CAS program.

14. Curriculum Development, IT

In November, the branch chief was asked to write the storyboards and to design and produce Russian Language video material and corresponding lesson plans, which are to be integrated into a forty-hour pilot language maintenance program. At the end of November and the beginning of December, the same branch chief participated in the curriculum development of the "SIS Guide: Surviving in Somali #2"; in the storyboard writing and video production of a companion Somali Survival training video; in the teacher training of four Somali instructors at the DLI, and three Somali instructors in Washington, DC, via video teletraining; and in monitoring student teaching of the seven Somali instructors as they taught survival Somali to Ford Ord MPs who had received orders to Somalia to participate in "Operation Restore Hope."

15. Planning, IT

The IT branch continued its involvement in the Technology Coordinating Council (TCC) and served as an active member in its Instructional Program Committee (IPC) branch, whose responsibility was to decide on the development of an information plan (5-year plan for Information Management resources) relevant to desktop publishing. The branch also revised the "VTT Strategies" publication in collaboration with Distance Education VTT staff, bringing it current to DLI needs.

16. Master of Arts in the Teaching of Foreign Languages (MATFL)

As in previous years, DLI continues to support the long term education of our faculty by providing tuition support to permanent, part-time, and military faculty for the graduate level program offered by the Monterey Institute of International Studies. The 33-unit curriculum includes courses in the principles and methods of language teaching, curriculum design, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and language analysis. In CY 92, half a dozen more faculty members gained Master of Arts degrees in the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
CURRICULUM PLANNING AND COURSE DEVELOPMENT

1 Curriculum Development:

a. In-house development of Proficiency Improvement Courses (PIC) for French and Spanish continued until September 1992. Work ceased at that time due to a lack of funding.

b. One hundred and twenty hours of proficiency-oriented French refresher materials in support of the VTT (Video Teletraining) project for Fort Bragg, NC were developed and implemented.

2. Visual Production Branch (DCI-C-V):

The Visual Production branch continued to support all DLI publication efforts such as DLPT IV tests, the Italian course revision, the SOF courses, the Somali booklet and dictionary, the General Catalogue and the DLI journals.

3. Curriculum Review:

Two Curriculum Specialists served on Curriculum Review committees (Russian, Persian). Two Curriculum Specialists also participated in School Assistance Visits to DKO, DRO, and DAS to determine the effectiveness of the Learner Focussed Instructional Day. One of them also participated in the review of the SOF Computer-Assisted Study (CAS) materials.

4. Training provided:

A writers' clinic for 50 DLI employees focussed on writing for academic purposes, preparing teaching materials for publication, and reporting on classroom-oriented research.

5. General Catalogue:

A new catalogue was published and distributed at the end of the year. It is now on disc for rapid electronic revision.

6. POIs, CADs:

a. All CAD (Course Administrative Data) documentation for DLI course offerings was revised to reflect the 35-hour instructional week.

b. After thorough research into the languages of the former Soviet Union (CIS), CADs were prepared for all proposed new offerings.

c. Documentation of a new POI computer system called POIMM (POI Management Module) was begun. All approved CADs have been entered into the system.

7. DLI Journals:

a. Volume 3, Nos. 1 & 2 of Applied Language Learning was published. Articles addressed, among other topics: language learning strategies, teaching the disabled and oral proficiency testing.

b. Volume 8, Nos. 1 & 2 of Dialog on Language Instruction was published.
c. Dr. Woytak held a DLI session for current and potential contributors to Applied Language Learning and Dialog on Language Instruction.

8. Special Operations Forces (SOF) Course Development:

Development of the Special Operations Forces (SOF) Basic Military Language Courses (BMLC) in 13 languages is continuing into its third year. The project will be completed in December, 1993. Work was begun on a staggered basis with the German team of four persons writing materials which served as a general model for the 45 situationally-oriented lessons for the other 12 languages. The German course was completed in November, 1992, and the validation iteration of the course is being taught presently at Ft. Bragg, NC, the first class using the material having graduated the last week of May, 1993. The beta version of the computerized daily homework segment of two hours daily is in use at Ft. Bragg. The alpha version is nearing completion at DLI. In the next few months the Polish, Vietnamese and French courses will be completed, with the remaining courses being completed in November and December. The Special Forces Functional Language Course, a complete military course in the same thirteen languages, was finished in December, 1992.
EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

The philosophy of how students are taught a foreign language here at DLIFLC has evolved from what can be called the "teacher-focused" approach to the "learner-focused" method. With this approach, it is assumed that adult students have varied backgrounds and learning styles; consequently, the means by which they are taught, within practical limitations, must address these individual needs.

Using an open script multi-media authoring program for Windows called "Toolbook", the Educational Technology Division has been working to develop interactive computer programs to be utilized in the various language disciplines to enhance and reinforce the learner-focused philosophy. Multi-media provides the teachers with unlimited potential for assisting students in acquiring a foreign language through interactive exercises which emphasize the four basic language skills; namely, reading comprehension, listening comprehension, speaking and writing.

Because DLI has recently transitioned to the IBM compatible System III and IV computers, almost all application development of software to be used on these new systems is still ongoing. Three single language Interactive Video Projects in Spanish, German, and Korean are being developed for use on these new systems, using laser disk technology for the video material.

The Spanish project is in the final stages of laser disk production with preliminary work having been initiated in the development of the computer courseware itself. The laser disks for the German project have been completed and the computer courseware is being developed under contract by a private firm using Toolbook. The first eight lessons of the Korean project have been completed and were introduced in the Korean School computer lab in April. Work on the remaining 27 lessons is still in progress.

When complete, these projects will significantly enhance their respective language programs. In order to provide computer courseware for several languages at once, the Educational Technology Division has started developing a generic multi-media program. The development is being accomplished using a team approach. When the application is completed and ready to be distributed to the individual language departments, it will not contain language-specific material, but will have the technical and methodological capabilities of the larger single-language projects of the past. The locations for language-specific text and other material will be indicated with English comments and instructions, and the required material will subsequently be collected, organized and entered into the program by language department personnel.

This approach will require a certain level of computer ability and the mastery of the Toolbook authoring program on the part of selected individuals in each language department. Training these people and development of the generic multi-media computer program will be the focus of our efforts for the coming year. We feel that this will ultimately be the most cost-effective and expeditious way to develop computer-assisted study (CAS) courseware while simultaneously addressing the needs of several languages.
EVALUATION DIVISION

Automated Student Questionnaire

A major advance within the Evaluation Division was the development and introduction of a computer-based revision of the Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ), administered over the past several years to graduating students at DLI. Previously, students taking the SOQ were required to read a series of questions in a survey booklet and then grid in their answers on a separate optically-scanned answer sheet. Drawbacks included the inability to easily change or add survey questions to keep up with changing information needs, the laborious response-marking process, which discouraged many students from participating fully in the survey, and the time-consuming and inefficient scanning, tabulation, and reporting procedures.

Under the new survey program, which is known as the Automated Student Questionnaire (ASQ), the student sits in front of a microcomputer screen on which each of the survey questions is sequentially displayed. The student then uses the computer mouse to highlight and click on the selected response. In addition, the student can easily provide optional narrative comments relating to any question, using an on-screen dialogue box that accepts keyboard input and automatically associates it with the question to which it refers. ASQ data reports, automatically generated by the computer on completion of the surveying of a given class, include separate printouts for individual instructors and group reports for use at the teaching team, department, and school level. Using the new system, each graduating student is able to complete both the "program evaluation" and "instructor evaluation" portion of the questionnaire (the latter including individual assessments of each member of the student's teaching team) in under 90 minutes, a considerable improvement over the nearly four hours required to complete the previous SOQ.

Feedforward/Feedback System with Goodfellow Training Center

The 1991 report described the development, in that year, of a feedforward/feedback information exchange program between DLIFLC and the Goodfellow Air Force Base Training Center (GTC), where the majority of DLIFLC graduates undergo subsequent technical training. This system was redesigned in 1992 to include several functional improvements. Both DLIFLC and GTC now utilize a common standardized database program (Paradox 4.0), which allows the Evaluation Division to track DLIFLC graduates through GTC training with 100% accuracy. Due to student recycling at GTC and other factors, not all students from a given DLIFLC class graduate at the same time from the Goodfellow program (although a substantial "core" does so). Taking this into account, the Evaluation Division has revised the procedures for reporting student performance at GTC to the DLIFLC schools, generating a report upon graduation of the core group, rather than waiting for all members of a given DLIFLC class to complete the GTC course. Feedback reports for the great majority of a given DLIFLC class are now routinely provided to the DLIFLC school deans within 48 hours following the "core" group's graduation from Goodfellow, with complete and final data to follow after the last student in the class has left GTC.

School Assistance Visits

At the direction of the DLIFLC Commandant, the Evaluation Division developed plans for and carried out a series of one-week School Assistance Visits (SAV), including the Spanish, French, Chinese, and Korean departments. While the SAV process is primarily aimed at determining the nature and extent of integration of the "learner-focused instructional day" (LFID) concept into the school curriculum and teaching practice, a variety of other issues surfaced during interviews with school management personnel, instructors, and students, and/or through classroom visits by the SAV team members. The results of each SAV are
presented to the School Dean and staff, and a summary is provided the Provost and Command Group. The SAV program is continuing into 1993 and is generating a considerable amount of useful feedback and recommendations for enhancement of the instructional process.

RESEARCH DIVISION

Language Skill Change Project

Data collection was completed during 1992 for the Language Skill Change Project (LSCP), a longitudinal project undertaken in 1986 in cooperation with the Army Research Institute. The primary objectives of the LSCP were to document the nature and extent of changes in post-DLIFLC language proficiency and to investigate the variables associated with such change. In addition, the study was designed to yield information regarding the prediction of initial language learning success at DLIFLC.

The study analyzed an initial pool of 1,903 US Army students of Korean, Russian, German, and Spanish, who were entered into the study over an eighteen-month period, from February 1986 through August 1987. Students completed an extensive set of tests and surveys prior to and during language training, and were tracked from entry into DLIFLC through the third annual language proficiency testing incident following their completion of post-DLIFLC advanced individual training (AIT).

Results showed substantial decreases in language proficiency from the end of DLIFLC training to the end of AIT, with consistent recovery thereafter. Average proficiency levels eventually reached or exceeded exit DLIFLC levels, but average scores in Russian and Korean did not reach ILR level 2. Language skill change over time appeared to be more related to individual student characteristics than to such variables as assignment location, underscoring the persistent importance of careful initial selection of potential linguists. This finding reinforced the value of the Aptitude Assessment Project (see below), which had been launched partly on the basis of early LSCP results.

Study results also underscored the need for improved retention of talented linguists: the study sample was reduced from 1,903 soldiers at the beginning of the study to 368 at the third post-AIT data collection time.

Interim briefings and reports were received and presented throughout the project, including a presentation at BILC-89 in Madrid. During the last quarter of 1992, the draft versions of a series of final report monographs were produced. Each report presents the results of appropriate data analyses and offers interpretations and recommendations. In its entirety, the series addresses the following topics:

(1) project description and methods;

(2) the prediction of language learning success at DLIFLC;

(3) language learning (compensatory approaches, ratings of DLI/AIT/unit language training programs, effects and stability of student learning styles and strategies);

(4) post-training foreign language skill change;

(5) post-training language skill use;
(6) post-DLIFLC refresher/maintenance enhancement training (reported participation in unit language training by language, MOS, location; nature and stability of skill emphasis in training; linguist evaluation of value of OJT and refresher training; nature and extent of off-duty, self-help language study and language usage);

(7) language proficiency and job performance (relationships between the two, to the extent permitted by limitations of study design and data returns).

Aptitude Assessment Project

Work continued during 1992 on the Aptitude Assessment Project (AAP), which was launched partly on the basis of initial LSCP findings regarding predictors of initial language learning success. The overall objective of the AAP is to reduce language training failures by developing improved methods of identifying potential linguists and of assigning linguists more effectively to particular languages or language families.

The current system of selecting and assigning recruits to language study involves two stages. Appropriate composites of scores on the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) are used by services to qualify recruits for most language-coded career fields. Those who pass this screen must then make or exceed specified minimum scores on the Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB).

Although this system operates reasonably well, ongoing research conducted both by DLIFLC and by the military testing community suggests that there is considerable room for improvement. In addition, the current DLAB has only one form and has been in service 15 years; it needs to be reviewed, revalidated, revised, or replaced in light of the current state of the art.

Project goals: The AAP includes both short-term and long-term goals. The long-term goal includes the development, validation, and fielding of additional and/or replacement tests. These tests would include additional measures of general cognitive abilities as well as measures of aptitude for specific language families and/or language skill modalities (e.g., speaking vs. listening). Short-term project goals include more effective utilization of available data, i.e., joint use of ASVAB and DLAB scores, and the fielding of an updated "interim" DLAB to introduce already-known predictive improvements while continuing to address longer-range development.

During 1992, a prototype test of general cognitive abilities was developed on behalf of the project by an outside contractor as a potential add-on to the ASVAB and DLAB data currently available. In addition, the contractor made progress in categorizing linguistic features and other language-related attributes across a variety of DFLP languages that will help to determine optimal prediction models by language type (e.g., tonal vs. highly inflected) and skill modality (e.g., listening vs. reading). Also during the year, extensive item-level analyses of the current DLAB were conducted. These indicated that an appreciable improvement in predictive power may be obtained by revising certain less-well-performing items in the original test, and by somewhat increasing the total working time for the test. It is expected that an interim "DLAB II" will be produced and field tested in CY 93.

Future activities will include field testing and validating the cognitive test, developing and validating one or more subtests for different language families and/or skill modalities, and assessing the practical considerations involved in fielding and implementing these new testing instruments and procedures.
Learning Strategies Project

The Learning Strategies Project (LSP) was a project of the Research Division conducted in cooperation with several DLIFLC schools. The objectives of the LSP were to investigate, through hands-on interaction with participating students and teachers, ways to apply existing knowledge about learning styles and strategies to:

(1) maximize proficiency outcomes of DLIFLC students;

(2) lower academic attrition rates;

(3) support initiatives by DLIFLC schools to disseminate knowledge about learning strategies;

(4) contribute to the research base in the application of knowledge about learning styles and strategies to practical problems associated with classroom-based foreign language learning and teaching.

During 1992, LSP efforts were focused on Chinese and other less-commonly-taught languages (LCTLS), with the two core LSP staff members working closely with and actually being housed at the School of Asian Languages. The project operated there with considerable, and increasing, success until platform teaching requirements forced the recall of both LSP staff members to the classroom, effectively terminating the LSP as of 1 October 1992.

Despite the unfortunate suspension of the LSP due to resource constraints, it can safely be said that over the life of the project, LSP activities assisted many students, both directly and indirectly. The highly visible role played by the LSP in several schools no doubt contributed greatly to the overall growth in awareness among DLIFLC staff and faculty concerning the importance of taking learning styles and strategies into consideration in designing foreign language learning activities and environments to maximize student success.

Educational Technology Needs Assessment

The Educational Technology Needs Assessment (ETNA) was brought to a successful conclusion during 1992. The ETNA, a four-year DLIFLC research initiative, was conducted to obtain and synthesize information regarding optimal applications of educational technology in foreign language education and training. It addressed applications of educational technology to foreign language education from two major perspectives: resident instruction and nonresident instruction. The project also investigated copyright considerations in the use of foreign language broadcasts. In addition, the original scope of the ETNA project was expanded to include formal evaluations of DLIFLC's efforts to assist field units in maintaining and enhancing linguists' foreign language proficiency through the use of computer-assisted study (CAS) and video teletraining (VTT).

The ETNA yielded a total of fourteen informational reports or other products, including needs assessments, reviews of the literature, symposium proceedings, results of site visits, evaluation studies, and an automated microcomputer database of technological resources in foreign language instruction. The project's culminating activity was the preparation, by external specialist reviewers, of two summary reports, each containing specific recommendations for enhancing DLIFLC's effectiveness in applying advanced technology to the resident and nonresident language training missions, respectively.
Curriculum Reviews

Although essentially an external evaluation activity, the Curriculum Review program, which was initiated in 1990, continued for administrative reasons to be housed and implemented within the Research Division. As of the end of 1992, the division had conducted curriculum reviews in five languages: Chinese (site visit June, 1990), Korean (February, 1991), Arabic (August, 1991), Russian (March, 1992), and Persian Farsi (August, 1992). Spanish was reviewed in February-March, 1993.

The methodology used for the reviews was modeled after that of the National Security Agency's Cryptologic Training School, adapted and modified as appropriate. In the DLIFLC model, an internal self-study by the participating school and its associated department(s) is followed by a site visit to DLIFLC by user representatives and an outside academic expert. This committee's site-visit report is reviewed by the Commandant, who assigns tasks to the School based on the recommendations he accepts. Curriculum review recommendations are tracked until completed or otherwise closed out, and regular reports are prepared for command group information.

Curriculum review recommendations are very diverse in topic, scope, impact, and resource implications. Typical recommendations range from such no- or low-cost suggestions as having the instructor speak only the target language in class during the last third of a course, to such broad, resource-intensive recommendations as replacing an entire basic course curriculum. Resourcing implications and relative priorities are considered in developing institutional responses to the review committee recommendations. The five curriculum review reports in hand to date include a total of 222 recommendations for consideration by DLIFLC (40 for Chinese, 66 Korean, 52 Arabic, 33 Russian, and 31 Farsi). Of this number, 131 (59 percent) were considered to have been implemented or otherwise closed out as of the end of 1992.

TESTING DIVISION

DLIFLC Development

DLIFLC's longstanding program of proficiency test development based on the DoD-wide Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) performance standards continued at a high level during 1992. Defense Language Proficiency Test, version 4 (DLPT IV) batteries, consisting of two forms each of listening comprehension and reading tests and four forms of a tape- and booklet-mediated speaking test, were produced in Chinese, Italian, and Korean (total of 24 separate instruments).

Computer-Administered Tests

In addition to DLPT production, the Testing Division completed a major project in the design and development of computer-administered testing procedures. Testing Division staff completed and delivered to the Special Operations Forces (SOF) at Ft. Bragg, NC a multimedia listening comprehension, reading, and speaking test in German. This test addresses the knowledge and use of lexicon and expressions critical to five SOF specialization areas (Communications, Weapons, Engineering, Common Tasks, and Medical). In addition to presenting test questions and reading tasks on the screen, the computer "talks" to the examinee during the listening comprehension portion and "listens" while the examinee responds during the speaking section, with responses recorded on a removable floppy disk. The computer automatically scores the listening and reading sections, as well as sequences and plays back the examinee's spoken responses for evaluation by a human rater, who scores the test by mouse-clicking "correct" or 'incorrect" buttons on the computer screen. The test is administerable in either a "test" or "study"
mode. In the latter, immediately after responding to a given question, the examinee is automatically provided the correct answer as a learning aid. From all evidence, SOF is very pleased with the test which, to DLIFLC's knowledge, is a technical "first" in the language testing field.

Development of a standardized, computer-administered Final Learning Objectives (FLO) listening and reading test in Russian was also carried out. With the exception of the first section of the test, in which the student types numbers into the computer, the test is in multiple-choice format, and involves having the student select and "mouse-click" the intended answer on the computer screen. The FLO test is intended to indicate the extent to which the student would be able to perform such discrete language-use tasks as understanding and transcribing spoken numbers or number-word phrase combinations, gisting heard passages, and translating printed target language texts into English. A statistical validation process is under way, in which student-performance on the computerized FLO test will be compared to the results of an actual "production" test of these same skills. Pending satisfactory validation results, additional tests based on the Russian test model will be developed for the major DLIFLC languages and used as a supplement to the general proficiency information provided by the DLPT.

Other Testing Activities

The Testing Division continued to provide testing support to other government agencies, including the conducting of telephonic tests in 16 languages for personnel from the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), U.S. Customs, and U.S. Secret Service. During this period, DLPT listening comprehension and/or reading tests were used by the U.S. Postal Inspection Service, the Canadian Armed Forces, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The American Council on Education (ACE)-approved "credit-by-examination" program—under which examinees taking the DLPT III or IV on or after 1 October 1990 can receive up to 36 semester hours of college credit at participating institutions, based on the difficulty category of the language and the actual test results—was extensively utilized both by DLIFLC students and by field linguists. During 1992, the Testing Division issued a total of 595 score reports for examinees requesting DLPT-based academic credit. To facilitate implementation of this program for linguists tested away from DLI, the Test Management branch optically scanned and computer-scored 18,870 answer sheets from the field and incorporated the scores into a database from which individual DLPT results can be easily retrieved and reported upon request.
In FY92, the average student load at the Presidio of Monterey was 2,639. The average student load in contract training through the DLIFLC Washington office in the National Capital Region (NCR) was 220. Programmed student load for FY93 is 4,045 for the Presidio of Monterey and 132 for NCR. Languages and dialects taught at the Presidio of Monterey are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian School</th>
<th>Romance School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Mandarin</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian Farsi</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central European School</th>
<th>Russian School I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Korean School</th>
<th>Russian School II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle East School</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic - Modern Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic - Egyptian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic - Iraqi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic - Syrian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE ENGLISH LANGUAGE CENTER

INTRODUCTION

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY STUDENT TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

SUPPORT SERVICES FOR NONRESIDENT ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAM

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

NEW FACILITIES
DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE
ENGLISH LANGUAGE CENTER

INTRODUCTION

1. The Department of Defense English Language Program (DELP) is conducted by the Defense Language Institute English Language Center (DLIELC) in consonance with DoD Directive, Number 5160.41, Subject: Defense Language Program (DLP) and the implementing Joint Service Regulation (OPNAVINST 1550.11 / AFR 50-24/ MCO 1550.24), Subject: Management of the Defense English Language Program. The DoD Directive designates the Secretary of the Air Force as the Executive Agent for the DELP. The Office of the Undersecretary of Defense Policy / Defense Security Assistance Agency currently fulfills the functions and responsibilities of the Primary Functional Sponsor for the DELP.

2. DLIELC supports the DELP which consists of the Resident English Language Program conducted at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas; the Nonresident English Language Program, which provides instruction for United States military personnel as well as for non-native speakers of English employed by DoD; and the host-country English language programs, which are supported by the Security Assistance Training Program (SATP). In addition to the three programs described above, DLIELC also provides English language training materials to other non-DoD government agencies, state agencies, and private enterprise agencies on a reimbursable basis.

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY STUDENT TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

Each fiscal year, the military departments provide DLIELC with the number of international Military Students (IMSS) programmed to attend DLIELC prior to their entry into the US technical/professional training programs, along with the type of training required and the duration of each training line.

1. The English language proficiency skill level required for entry into a technical professional program is determined by each military department and is expressed in terms of an English Comprehension Level (ECL) test score on a scale of 0-100. The majority of the programs which are highly technical or hazardous in nature, require an ECL of 80 or 85. Prerequisites for less technical courses are 65 or 70 ECL.

2. The IMS is given an in-country ECL screening test prior to departure for CONUS. If the IMS does not meet the English language proficiency requirements for direct entry into the technical or professional program or if the IMS requires Specialized English Training (SET) as a course prerequisite, the individual is programmed for additional language training at DLIELC.

3. The American Language Course (ALC) is a proficiency-based course and is variable in duration. It can be programmed under the US Army, Navy, or Air Force Security Assistance Training Program. The ALC includes General and Specialized English courses. Upon entry at DLIELC, the IMS is placed at the appropriate proficiency level in the ALC and receives six hours of instruction daily until he/she attains the required ECL score. During the last nine weeks of scheduled training at DLIELC, provided the minimum ELC score has been achieved, the IMS studies specialized technical terminology, and acquires skills suitable for the scheduled follow-on training program.
4. The Specialized English Training (SET) Phase of the ALC is a fixed nine-week course and is provided to those students who have achieved the ECL required for entry into follow-on US technical or professional training programs. This phase concentrates on the acquisition/expansion of specific language-based skills such as reading, note taking, effective use of dictionaries, training manuals and other references, as well as a limited specialized vocabulary related to the students' military vocational field.

5. The Specialized English Refresher Training may be programmed under the Army, Navy, or Air Force Security Assistance Training Program. The training is restricted to students who have successfully completed SET at DLIELC within the last three years and have currently achieved the required follow-on-training ECL. The length of training is five weeks, including one week of pretechnical training skills and four weeks of language skills and terminology. The training content is individualized and determined on a case-by-case basis in accordance with the scheduled follow-on training.

6. Besides the General and Specialized English Training conducted prior to technical course entry, DLIELC conducts a five-week advanced English language refresher training for previously US-trained pilots.

7. In addition to the ALC conducted for IMSs prior to their entry into technical/professional training, DLIELC conducts the following courses for selected IMSs who are involved with the teaching of English in their own countries:

   a. The Basic American Language Instructor Course (BALIC) is a twenty-seven week course. In this course, instructor trainees work on improving their language proficiency and thoroughly familiarize themselves with General English materials of the ALC. Instructor trainees learn the basics of second language methodology and teaching techniques through numerous peer-teaching activities and observations of General English classes.

   b. The Advanced English Language Instructor Course is a thirteen-week course. It is intended for experienced instructors who can benefit from advanced training in methodology, grammar, speaking, and writing English.

   c. The Advanced Program in the English Language Training Systems Management Course is an eight-week course conducted for IMSs who are acting as managers, administrators, and/or supervisors in the host-country English Language Training Program.

   d. The Advanced Language Proficiency Skills Course is a twelve-week course for experienced instructors that is designed to upgrade their English language proficiency in the skill areas of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

   e. Introduction to the New ALC For Experienced Instructors is an eight-week course designed to familiarize experienced English language instructors with the new General English materials of the ALC.

8. Two additional training programs are also conducted by DLIELC as required for IMSs. These programs are described below:

   a. Language Laboratory Maintenance Training is a six-week course designed to provide hands-on-training in the maintenance and repair of cassette language laboratory equipment. An additional three weeks of training is available for those students desiring both cassette and reel-to-reel laboratory equipment maintenance training.

   b. Observer Professional Training is tailored to cover those areas in the operation and administration of an English Language Training Program (ELTP) which are most appropriate to the observer(s) as defined by the host country. This training is designed
for ELTP managers or key language training staff personnel and is variable in length (maximum three weeks).

9. Other special programs are conducted for US military personnel. These programs are described below:

a. The US Army Officers' Program is a 16-week course designed to meet the needs of officers in the US military; it concentrates on English comprehension, grammar, pronunciation, oral presentations, and writing skills.

b. The English as a Second Language (ESL) program is for US Army recruits. It concentrates on basic English language skills.

SUPPORT SERVICES FOR NONRESIDENT ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAM

1. During FY 92 DLIELC continued to monitor all approved US military Nonresident English Language Programs in CONUS and overseas and to provide ALC materials to US military personnel, DoD employees or family members who are not native speakers of English. TDY teams were deployed to administer Oral Proficiency Interviews (OPIs) for Puerto Rican ROTC programs as required, and an LTD group was also assigned to the US Navy Ship Repair Facility at Yokosuka, Japan.

2. In addition to these programs in support of US military requirements, DLIELC provided LTD and/or MTT assistance to numerous countries under Security Assistance Training Programs.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

1. In addition to the completion of a totally new American Language Course, (ALC), a 34-book series stressing a communicative approach to language skills, several other exciting projects are underway at DLIELC. A new Basic American Language Instructor Course (BÁLC) is being field tested. An Interactive Courseware design project has begun. DLIELC is making videos to accompany the ALC, and segments of these are being incorporated into computer lessons to be used as supplements to the course. Computer-assisted supplements are also planned for specialized English modules.

2. The English Comprehension Level (ECL) Test, used in approximately 600 locations worldwide to evaluate English language proficiency, has been totally revised. The test system was converted to an Item Response Theory (IRT) measurement approach, using a one-parameter Rasch model. New computer programs were developed, providing assurance of the equivalency of all forms of the test. After a successful validation trial in November, 1992, the use of the new test forms was implemented in the DLIELC resident program in February, 1993.

NEW FACILITIES

DLIELC is presently moving into an ultramodern campus. Officers' quarters were completed and occupied in 1992. A new academic and headquarters building was completed in 1993, and staff and students moved in in March and April, 1993. Interactive courseware lessons mentioned earlier will be facilitated by two new computer labs in the new building. Other buildings to be completed during the next two years include a dining facility for international students, a student administration building, and barracks for enlisted students. These improvements are providing a significant boost to student and staff morale, and the DLIELC plans to be a showplace for English language training in the future.
FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE

OVERVIEW

LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

MATERIALS

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT IN 1992 AND 1993

THE CENTER FOR RESEARCH, EVALUATION, AND DEVELOPMENT

EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

NEW CAMPUS
LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

FSI/SLS offers three courses of language study: the BASIC, the FAST, and the EARLY MORNING programs. Students are enrolled in the program that best meets their needs, as warranted by their prospective overseas assignment.

The BASIC course is full-time, intensive training leading to the S-3/R-3 level, and consists of integrated language and area studies throughout. BASIC courses are of various lengths depending on the difficulty of the language and are designed to meet the needs of personnel assigned to Language Designated Positions (LDPs) and others requiring a working or professional proficiency. As noted above, the second year of the BASIC course in Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean takes place overseas at an FSI Field School.

FAST courses (Familiarization and Short Term) are also full-time intensive, with a fixed duration of eight weeks. The FAST program is geared to meet the general orientation and cross-cultural needs of support personnel and others not serving in language-designated positions, and it is also quite effective for officers whose schedules do not permit longer-term training. FSI offers FAST courses in 25 languages at present.

The EARLY MORNING program is FSI's only part-time language training. Meeting from 0730 to 0840, five days a week for two 17-weeks sessions, the program provides employees with an opportunity to develop language skills while assigned to full-time jobs in Washington. The curriculum is a mixture of BASIC and FAST lessons, and is offered in nine languages.

FSI also provides -- as resources permit -- various specially-arranged tutorials, advanced, refresher, enhancement, and conversion training, both in Washington and overseas.

MATERIALS

Approximately 70 percent of the materials used in FSI language training are created in-house. Commercial texts are occasionally used, but they must be supplemented and adapted to meet the highly specialized needs of our student population. Each year, the School of Language Studies sets a goal -- often not met due to the increasing volume of training requests -- of 5-10 percent of its instructors' staff-time devoted to various development projects that range from up-dating existing courses to the creation of completely new programs of study.

Until recently, the major development emphasis was directed toward improving and adding to our courses in Russian and the Eastern European languages. Currently, we have major curriculum renovation projects going in French and Urdu, along with the new and continuing development of full new programs in a large number of languages of newly emerging states, as required by the State Department's system of "language designated positions (LDP's)."

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT IN 1992 AND 1993

New Posts

The U.S. has established diplomatic relations or increased diplomatic contact with posts which require 15 new languages to be taught at FSI. (This does not include Mongolian, which is "old news," having started in August, 1990.) During 1991 we began instruction simultaneously with course development of FAST and BASIC programs for Albanian, Estonian, Khmer, and Lithuanian. By August, 1993, we will have students and program materials for Armenian, Azerbaijani, Georgian, Latvian, Slovak, and Uzbek. First experience with these languages suggests that they are generally Category 3 with respect to
difficulty for English-speakers, although it appears that Georgian and Mongolian may be substantially more difficult than the others.

THE CENTER FOR RESEARCH, EVALUATION, AND DEVELOPMENT

In recognition of the importance of research and development to top-quality language training, the School of Language Studies also includes a Center for Research, Evaluation, and Development (RE&D). The mission of RE&D is to coordinate, assist, and initiate SLS activities in the fields of program evaluation, student assessment, curriculum development, staff development, and research into language learning and teaching.

RE&D works with individual language sections to help them accomplish their goals in the areas of staff training, program development, curriculum development, evaluation, and research. A related function is to advise and assist in matters relating to educational technology.

The bulk of the program development work is carried out by the instructional staff, often in conjunction with on-going classes and in response to them. However, RE&D staff play a leadership role and serve as consultants to the language sections in the design and execution of new curriculum initiatives. Cases in point are the rapid development of materials in the languages of the former Soviet Union and a current effort to enhance U.S. economic effectiveness through training of foreign affairs personnel.

Staff training programs for first year instructors have been consolidated and made part of the routine orientation of new staff. In addition, the orientation program for new training supervisors has been completely revised and updated. A committee of SLS staff, mostly instructors, led by RE&D members, has established an in-service program that takes place one afternoon every other week. Most of the programs are designed by faculty committees, some under the aegis of the individual instructional departments and some under RE&D guidance. Occasionally this time is devoted to presentations by experts from outside SLS.

RE&D has also made considerable progress in its research activities. Enrollment and end-of-training data from the large-volume languages are being put on the PC database R:Base 3.1 so they can be used both for section management purposes and for institutional research. The latter is a new function for SLS, and one that was envisioned at the time of RE&D's founding. It is finally becoming possible to provide quick answers to questions generated both by upper management and all levels within the School of Language Studies.

In the area of academic research, RE&D continues its major project to examine and redefine individual learner differences, including the issue of language "aptitude." The goal of the project is to determine differing sets of characteristics, adjustable through curriculum or teaching modification. In addition, we are interested in exploring the possibility of learner characteristics that may predict success in attaining communicative competence. The findings to date are already being used in teacher training and various forms of student assistance.

Other research has taken place or is beginning on student study strategies without a teacher, statistical characteristics of the FSI/ILR proficiency rating scale, and aspects of reading in various kinds of writing systems.

EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

FSI continues to produce foreign language textbooks and classroom materials created with the help of powerful multilingual computers in nearly all of the 50 + languages taught. Desktop publishing continues, using Xerox, Macintosh, and IBM-compatible computers.

In addition, we continue to integrate computer-assisted learning into our SLS programs. Some rely on interactive videodiscs products which have been developed by other U.S. government agencies; e.g., for Spanish, Korean, and Hebrew. Training programs from
academe and the private sector have been made available to students in these languages as well as Dutch and French. A transfer of technology from other agencies has permitted us to substantially increase the number of students for whom instructional computer technology is available.

During this year, we have increased our capacity to generate our own materials. Staff members are training themselves in RE&D and the Arabic section to use Multimedia Toolbox; training the staff in other languages to use this software is planned for the summer. We hope in the course of the next year to have some sections producing some of their own computer-assisted materials, as well as bringing in the best of what's produced outside.

While awaiting the future installation of a satellite dish on our new campus at Arlington Hall, we are making use of taped international television broadcasts in almost all classes. Plans are underway to implement educational technology in many aspects of our training over the next few years.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

FSI continues to support the development of professional opportunities for staff members. The in-house workshops and seminars described above (under RE&D) are designed to keep language instructors and supervisors apprised of the latest developments in pedagogy, and permit them to share their own innovations and views with one another. Staff members frequently attend professional conferences and are often invited to deliver papers and presentations at meetings such as the MLA (Modern Language Association), GURT (Georgetown Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics), TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages), LSA (Linguistic Society of America), ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages), CALICO (Computer Assisted Language Learning and Instructional Consortium), etc. SLS staff continue to represent FSI in a variety of professional journals and books.

NEW CAMPUS

Plans are underway to relocate all of the FSI from office buildings in Rosslyn, Virginia, to a specially-designed campus for the foreign affairs community in nearby Arlington, Virginia -- The National Foreign Affairs Training Center. The new site is a former military installation known as Arlington Hall. Construction is now complete, and the move into the new quarters is scheduled to be done in phases beginning October, 1993. FSI looks forward to achieving a higher level of excellence in innovative training provided by this state-of-the-art facility.
V. STUDY GROUP REPORT 1
"Task Analysis and Testing"
Study Group Report 1
Standing Group on Task Analysis and Testing

Chairman: RDir G. Gerth - Germany
Members: Dr. J. Clark - US
Dr. D. Hooshmand - US
Dr. G. Jackson - US
Mr. A.P. Pagé - Canada
Sqn Ldr V. Ò'Hagan - UK

1. The study group deliberations concentrated on updates from the US and Canadian members on operational tests as well as tests under development.

2. The US side provided an overview of available tests and of the use of technology for testing different language skills. The tests discussed were:

a. "Defense Language Proficiency Test" (DLPT). This program has been in operation for over 30 years. The latest generation of this test, known as DLPT IV, has been developed in 14 languages. Work is in progress on tests in other languages. For any given language a DLPT IV Battery includes two forms of listening comprehension test, two forms of reading test, four forms of a semi-direct tape and booklet mediated speaking test. At present, DLI has in its inventory DLPT batteries (including tests in earlier generations) in 43 languages.

b. "The Special Operations Forces Test (SOF)". This recently completed test measures listening and speaking in contexts related to five military occupation specialties: engineering, communication, weapons, medical, and common tasks. Also included in this test is a reading component which is based on a basic military language course. Particularly noteworthy is that the test is computer-based and has been developed and is delivered in a multi-media environment using multi-media software called "Toolbook". This test uses graphics and sound as well as text stimuli. It also captures examinee's oral responses which are later rated by a scorer using a scoring protocol that appears on the screen. The other two test components are scored by computer. For further information on the computer configurations for this test, see Annex 1.

c. "The Final Learning Objectives Test (FLO)". This test, also developed in a multi-media computer environment, addresses final learning objectives of the Cryptologic Training System. The FLO test measures such skills as transcribing numbers, translation and gisting. It is delivered and scored on computer and it is still going through the validation process.

d. "Screen-to-Screen Testing". DLI measures speaking ability via several media: face-to-face oral interview, telephone testing, and most recently using screen-to-screen technology already in use for teletraining. This technology, through using satellite and receiving/sending stations installed in different geographical regions allows testers to conduct oral interview tests for individuals located at remote sites. For more detailed information see the study report by Dr. Clark and Dr. Hooshmand at Annex 2.

3. Finally the US delegates reported on the development of a new language aptitude test that will eventually replace the "Defense Language Aptitude Battery" (DLAB) being used currently. An attempt is being made to identify variables that would predict foreign
language learning success by family of languages, e.g. inflective or tonal, as well as by language skills.

4. The Canadian side reported on four tests used for the specific needs of the Canadian Forces in the two official languages, English and French.

a. "The Language Proficiency Exam" (LPE) is used in all four skills at STANAG levels 3 and 4 to test the language proficiency of both anglophones and francophones in their second language. Since 1992 speaking and writing components have been added to this battery of tests to measure at level 2 for career management purposes. Tests in the receptive skills are also being developed at level 2.

b. "Performance Checks", given to students taking part in formal language training, include separate tests for STANAG levels 1, 2 and 3. Each test is administered after a specified interval in the course. The development of tests at level 4 is under way.

c. "Selection Tests" are being developed to be given to all candidates for language training, irrespective of rank, to place them at an appropriate level in the language training program. At the moment, the French version is in use while the English is still under development.

5. Conclusion. The group agreed that while it had benefited from these discussions that the Steering Committee should consider leaving the "Standing Group on Task Analysis and Testing" dormant until specific needs arise. This proposal reinforces the suggestion made by the 1992 study group.
SOF

Multimedia

COMPUTER ADAPTIVE TEST

SYSTEM REQUIREMENT:
1. 386 DX 25/33 Mhz computer, 4 MB RAM with 40MB free HD space and 1 FD (3.5")
2. Pro-Audio-8 or Better Sound Card & Drivers
3. MPC Capable CD-Drive & Driver
4. Earphone/Mike Combination Headset
5. DOS 5.0 Windows 3.1
The SOF Multimedia Computer Adaptive Test battery was developed by the Test and Standards Division of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) for the Special Operations Forces.

The SOF test battery is organized into modules dealing with five military occupation categories taught in the Special Forces Functional Language Course (SFFLC):

1. Communications
2. Weapons
3. Engineering
4. Medical
5. Common Tasks

In addition to the five specialty modules, there is a reading module based on the Basic Military Language (BMLC) course content. Each of the modules consists of four test forms, A, B, C, and D.

The tests assess test-takers' ability in listening, reading and speaking.

The tests use a combination of computer generated audio playback, graphic and text display as stimuli, and multiple-choice questions. Test takers use the computer mouse to clock on on-screen buttons to provide answers, or in the case of speaking test items, provide spoken answers into a microphone which, with the aid of the sound card, allows audio capture in the form of digital audio files that are then saved on floppy disks to be assessed later.

The SOF test battery comes in the form of a CD-ROM (Compact Disk Read Only Memory) which stores a multi-media database of over 1400 test items combining digital sound, computer graphics, and foreign language texts. The CD-Rom includes a setup program which allows quick installation of the test on a personal computer complying with the MPC standards.

Recommended base system configuration includes a 386 IBM-AT type computer with MPC (multi-media PC) capability, DOS 5 and MS Windows 3.1 or better, and a headset/mike combination. MPC add-ons used by the test development team at the Tests and Standards Division, Defense Language Institute, consists of Media-Vision 8/8+/16 Pro Audio Sound board, Sony CD-ROM drive, and associated MCI sound and CD drivers. The Test construction and administration engine was developed with Asymmetries Toolbox, a Microsoft Windows multi-media authoring tool.
SCREEN-TO-SCREEN-TESTING: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF ORAL PROFICIENCY INTERVIEWING USING VIDEO TELECONFERENCING

JOHN L. D. CLARK and DARIUSH HOOSHMAND

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center

In many oral testing situations a direct meeting is arranged of an examiner and an examinee. This type of face-to-face testing requires the physical presence of both participants at the same location. Because this requirement cannot always be met in practice, alternative oral testing procedures using audio recordings have been developed in the past. These semi-direct procedures, however, preclude direct linguistic interaction. This paper reports and discusses a study on the use of modern media techniques in long-distance oral testing that preserve the possibility of interaction by using video teleconferencing. Two test administration modes, face-to-face and screen-to-screen are compared in an experimental design. It is shown that based on quantitative analyses high agreement between both modalities of test administration can be achieved. Qualitative evaluation seems to indicate that the screen-to-screen modality is acceptable although there is a general preference for the face-to-face modality. It is concluded that long-distance oral testing offers a viable alternative if the high costs involved can be justified.

In the course of some 35 years which have elapsed since the development and introduction into the foreign/second language testing arena of the Foreign Service Institute's "absolute proficiency scale" and associated interview-based testing approach (Sollenberger, 1978; Wilds, 1975), other testing researchers and developers have undertaken, on numerous occasions, to design and implement alternative procedures for assessing speaking performance. While maintaining the oral proficiency interview's essential focus on assessing the examinee's overall functional competence in this skill modality, these alternatives make use of testing procedures that are less highly labor-intensive in administration and/or scoring and, consequently, are more amenable to effective utilization in a variety of settings for which the direct interview procedure is not administratively practicable or cost-effective.

These alternative approaches, usually referred to as "semi-direct" techniques in recognition of the fact that they do not involve real-time direct communicative exchanges (Clark, 1975), have characteristically made use of audiotape recordings, both to present the speaking test stimuli and to capture examinee responses, which are later played back for evaluation by trained raters. A pioneering effort in semi-direct testing was the Recorded Oral Proficiency Examination (ROPE) developed by Lowe and Clifford (1980), in which the examinee listened to, and tape-recorded spoken answers to, a series of recorded target-language questions, each progressively more challenging in terms of the linguistic requirements for an adequate response. The taped responses were later evaluated by trained interview testers on a global (across-questions) basis, with results reported as a single score on the 0-5 level proficiency scale. In the late 1970s, the Educational Testing Service developed and placed in operation a Test of Spoken English (TSE) (Clark and Swinton, 1979) which used both an audiotape and printed test booklet - the latter making possible the presentation of a variety of pictorial and written cues to which the examinee was asked to respond orally, in addition to answering spoken questions delivered by the stimulus tape. Unlike the ROPE, the TSE was not holistically scored on a general proficiency scale but on the basis of cumulated points awarded for performance on each of the several subcomponents of the test. The resultant total score, although not conceptually or operationally commensurate with the FSI-type level rating, was found to correlate quite
highly \((r = 0.80)\) with the live oral interviews in a validation study conducted and reported by the TSE developers (Clark and Swinton; 1980).

From 1984 to 1986, the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), with the support of a Department of Education grant, designed and developed a third testing procedure, using Chinese as a prototype, which was intended to take advantage of the increased flexibility in stimulus presentation represented by the tape- and booklet-based TSE, but at the same time maintain the holistic, overall proficiency-level based rating and reporting procedure used in the original ROPE. The resulting \textit{Chinese Speaking Test} (CST) (Clark, 1986, 1988; Clark and Li, 1986) exhibited high correlations with concurrently administered direct proficiency interviews \((rs\ of\ 0.90-0.98,\ depending\ on\ the\ CST\ form\ and\ rater)\) and, as indicated, had the additional advantage of directly reporting the obtained scores in terms of an overall FSI-type proficiency level. Subsequent to the introduction of the CST, CAL has developed and made available similar speaking tests in Portuguese, Hebrew, Hausa and Indonesian (Milleret \textit{et al.}, 1991; Stansfield, 1991). See also the Stansfield and Kenyon article in this issue.

Although each of the semi-direct tests described above incorporates the considerable practical advantage over live interviews of automatizing (as well as completely standardizing) the test administration process, this automation brings with it the considerable disadvantage of not being able to provide in any way for the instantaneous modification of the content and/or sequencing of the spoken exchanges between the two "interlocutors" (tape/booklet and examinee) in the testing process. As a consequence, this fundamental aspect of real-time, dyadic speech in authentic communication settings is not reflected in the operation of the tests themselves, with a corresponding reduction in face, content and operational validity by comparison to the live interview approach.

Within the past two years, the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) has been fortunate to obtain both the equipment and administrative support needed to initiate a number of pilot language teaching projects which make use of satellite-based video teletraining (VTT) technology to broadcast and receive, on an essentially real-time basis, both audio and video signals transmitted between DLIFLC and each of several remote sites. Although by far the largest proportion of the available broadcast time has been devoted to language instruction, the DLIFLC Testing Division has had the opportunity, with strong organizational support, to explore the use of VTT as a potentially highly efficient and effective medium for language proficiency testing on a "distance" basis, by making it possible, in effect, to administer, evaluate and report the results of a close operational equivalent of the interactive, face-to-face interview, even in situations where the interviewee/tester interlocutors are widely separated geographically. To date, the Testing Division has administered VTT-based interviews to a group of examinees in Arabic at Ft Lewis, Washington, as well as carried out a small-scale comparison study of VTT-based (or less formally, "screen-to-screen") testing procedures vs live ("face-to-face") interviews concurrently administered to two student language groups at DLIFLC. The nature and results of this initial study are described below.

**PROCEDURE**

Arabic and Russian, two of the highest-enrollment DLIFLC languages, were chosen as test languages for this study. For each, 16 experienced instructors, previously trained and certified in oral interview testing and rating procedures by the DLIFLC Testing Division and currently serving as operational testers in the regular end-of-course proficiency testing program at DLIFLC, were selected at random from a larger group of testers (23 Arabic, 29 Russian) who had expressed interest in participating in the study. For Russian, selection was stratified proportional to the number of testers serving in each of the three DLIFLC Russian schools. Thirty-two examinees per language were also selected randomly from among those currently enrolled students who volunteered to participate in the study (total of 88 Arabic, 82 Russian) when it was described to them by Testing Division staff. The interviewers' motivation to participate in the study was reinforced by the opportunity to
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receive overtime pay for the additional (weekend) testing involved; volunteering students, for their part, welcomed this opportunity for advance practice in taking an oral interview similar to the one they would later undergo "for record" near the end of their language course.

To control possible order-of-administration effects, a Latin square design was adopted, with testers and examinees randomly assigned to the testing sequence conditions shown in Table 1. Prior to test administration, the chief of the DLIFLC test administration and quality control branch, a highly experienced oral interview tester trainer assisting in the study, met in by-language groups with the examinees and briefed them at some length on the background and purpose of the study and the procedures to be used, including a description of both the "face-to-face" and "screen-to-screen" testing processes they would undergo. Similar briefings were conducted with all of the testers, emphasizing test administration procedures and, in particular, stressing the importance of carrying out, to the greatest extent possible, the "same" type of test in both the face-to-face and screen-to-screen modes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examinee group</th>
<th>First test</th>
<th>Second test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (N = 16)</td>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>STS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (N = 16)</td>
<td>STS</td>
<td>FTF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FTF = face-to-face.
STS = screen-to-screen.
* Final A and B group N = 16 (see text)

In separate sessions, all testers were in addition introduced to and familiarized with the physical layout of the VTT studio as configured for the screen-to-screen testing. Specifically, the testers, in two-person teams, were seated behind a small table on which were placed (1) a directional microphone (Shure STM 30-W) especially designed for VTT use; (2) a small auxiliary video camera and projection stand, comparable in size and operation to a conventional overhead projector, which the testers used in presenting printed "role-play" instructions to the examinee in a manner analogous to physically handing role-play cards or other materials to the examinee in a face-to-face interview; and (3) a cassette tape recorder to capture the audio component of the interview for potential later analysis. On the other side of the table, about 6 ft away and directly facing the testers, were (1) the video camera transmitting the image of the testers to the examinee's location; (2) a 35 in. color monitor showing the image of the "distant" examinee, face-on and from about the waist up; and (3) a second 35 in. monitor reproducing the image being transmitted to the examinee, i.e. that of the two testers themselves. For this study the examinee's actual location was in a second DLIFLC studio about 75 ft away from the "base" studio; nonetheless, the video and audio signals between the two locations were transmitted to and relayed by satellite as in the regular VTT broadcasting process, with exactly the same operational effect as if the sites were widely separated geographically. At the examinee's location, the examinee was also seated behind a small table and faced, at about a 6 ft distance, a video camera and two side-by-side 35 in. monitors, one showing the two testers and the other reproducing the image of the examinee exactly as transmitted to the testers' location. (When a role-play instruction was to be shown to the examinee, this was projected onto the same screen used to show the testers' faces and temporarily replaced the latter image.) In summary, the regular, real-time "view" of the two testers was of the examinee, from the waist up behind a small table; and, in a separate monitor, of themselves in the exact format being transmitted to the examinee. The examinee's view, in one monitor, was of the two testers (or printed role-play information as and when presented) and, in the other, his or her image as transmitted to the testers.
The audio and video transmissions from and to the tester and examinee stations were of high acoustic and visual quality. However, due to technical limitations in the audio transmission process, a brief "drop-out" (no sound) condition was produced whenever speech was simultaneously attempted at both locations, as would occur, for example, whenever one interlocutor started to talk before the person at the other location had finished speaking. Although the duration of the drop-out was quite brief (less than 2 s per event), it was clearly discernible and led to at least some communicative adjustments/adaptations by the interlocutors in the course of the interview. With respect to the video signal, bandwidth limitations associated with the particular transmission technique and equipment used (Compression Labs Gallery 235 Room System with Rembrandt II/VP CODEC) produced, particularly in the case of abrupt movement, some discontinuity or "jerkiness" of the image similar to but considerably less pronounced that that in typical news broadcasts of space shuttle crews carrying out in-cabin assignments. Although this effect was barely noticeable when the interlocutors were quietly sitting and talking, a sudden arm gesture or other quick, extensive movement would result in a somewhat imperfect and slightly delayed reproduction of the original smooth, real-time motion.

All testing, both face-to-face and VTT-based, was carried out over a period of approximately 4 weeks during September-October 1991. The assignment of testers and examinees and the sequence of testing were in strict accordance with the originally specified Latin square design, except for the dropping of two examinees in each language (two "no-shows" and two administrative dismissals for reasons unrelated to the study). Immediately after completing each interview (i.e. separately for both face-to-face and VTT-based testing modes), each examinee was asked to fill out a short questionnaire on his or her experiences during, and opinions concerning, the testing process in that particular delivery mode. In addition, following completion of both of the interviews and the associated interview-specific questionnaires, examinees were asked to respond to a single, three-option question in which they indicated and overall preference for face-to-face testing or screen-to-screen testing, or responded that they had "no real preference" between the two testing modes.

Participating testees were also asked to respond to three questionnaires, generally parallel to the examinee questionnaires, in which they were asked to comment on their experiences with and opinions about the two testing modes and to indicate in which of the two modes they would regularly prefer to test. The examinee and tester questions are reproduced verbatim in Tables 4 and 5, together with the corresponding response data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For both the Arabic and Russian examinee groups, cross-tabulations of the proficiency level ratings assigned by the testers under each of the two test administration modes (face-to-face and VTT-based) are shown in tables 2 and 3, respectively, together with the mean and standard deviation of scores for each mode. The mean level score of 1.72 for the Arabic face-to-face tests (coded and calculated as level 1 = 1.0, level 1+ = 1.6, level 2 = 2.0, etc.) is slightly higher than the screen-to-screen mean score of 1.64 for the same examinees, but this difference is not statistically significant (two tailed t of 0.74, corresponding to a chance probability of 0.47) The face-to-face and screen-to-screen means for the Russian examinees were virtually identical (1.84 and 1.83), with a nonsignificant t value of -0.07 (p = 0.94).
Table 2. Cross-tabulations of face-to-face (FTF) and screen-to-screen (STS) interview ratings: Arabic \( N = 30 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0+</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>FTF 1+</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2+</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t = 0.74 )</td>
<td>( p = 0.47 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Cross-tabulations of face-to-face (FTF) and screen-to-screen (STS) interview ratings: Russian \( N = 30 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0+</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>FTF 1+</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2+</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t = -0.07 )</td>
<td>( p = 0.94 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nonsignificant mean differences between face-to-face and screen-to-screen interview scores as obtained in the present study may be considered to lend a reasonable amount of support to the operational assumption of no overall statistical difference in testing outcomes as a function of these two administration modes. However, the spread of scores shown in the Arabic and Russian cross-tabulations, and the associated modest VTT vs face-to-face score correlations of 0.37 and 0.71, respectively, warrant further scrutiny from a scoring reliability perspective. Although the Arabic correlation may reflect, at least in part, a greater restriction in range than was the case for the Russian correlation, the latter does not itself approach the 0.80-0.90 intercorrelations that have typically been reported for the oral proficiency interview vs other semi-direct tests (see, for example, Clark 1988; Stansfield and Kenyon, this issue). Notwithstanding the absolute value of the overall correlations, a more operationally important consideration is the extent of congruence between the absolute values of the assigned VTT-based and face-to-face scores. In this regard, the data obtained in the present study appear generally to be equivalent to those reported by Stansfield and
Kenyon in their comparison of the face-to-face interview with semi-direct tests developed at the Center for Applied Linguistics. Specifically, in the present study, a total of 90% of the face-to-face and screen-to-screen scores of the Russian examinees were either in complete agreement (33%) or showed only a single "plus" point difference (57%). For Arabic, the total figure was 86%, corresponding to 23% identical scores and 63% plus-point deviations. In any event, detailed empirical investigation of both the inter- and intra-rater reliability of VTT-based interview ratings should be carried out as a near-term follow-on to the present study.

With respect to the examinee and tester feedback on the testing process, all examinees were, as previously indicated, asked to fill out a series of three short questionnaires - one after each of the interviews (face-to-face and screen-to-screen) and a third summary questionnaire after both types of interview had been conducted. The two mode-specific questionnaires, parallel in format and content, asked three basic questions: (1) "How well were you able to concentrate during the interview?", rated on a 5-point scale ranging from "poorly" (1 point) to "very well" (5 points); (2) "How would you evaluate your performance during the (face-to-face interview/video tele-testing) interview as compared to your day-to-day performance in speaking (Arabic/Russian)?", rated on a 5-point scale from "much worse" (1 point) to "much better" (5 points); and (3) "Did anything distract you during the interview", rated on a "yes"/"no" basis, with space provided for any written comments. Table 4 summarizes the examinee responses to each of these questions, as well as to the summary question on the preferred testing mode.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Examinee questions and response data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. How well were you able to concentrate during the interview? 
("Poorly" = 1 to "very well" = 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Face-to-Face</th>
<th>VTT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How would you evaluate your performance during the (face-to-face/screen-to-screen) interview as compared with your day-to-day performance in speaking (Arabic/Russian)? 
("Much worse" = 1 to "much better" = 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Face-to-Face</th>
<th>VTT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Did anything distract you during the interview?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Face-to-Face</th>
<th></th>
<th>VTT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Imagine that sometime in the future you again have to take a speaking test in (Arabic/Russian) either through a face-to-face oral interview or a video tele-testing interview. Assuming that you would receive the same score through either testing technique, would you personally rather take a face-to-face test or a video tele-testing interview?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Face-to-Face</th>
<th>VTT</th>
<th>No preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Few distractions were reported by any of the examinees in the course of the face-to-face interviews. Only two (7%) of the Arabic students noted any problems in this regard - one mentioning a bit of nervousness about "talking to the tape recorder" used to capture the audio portion of the interviews; and the other indicating a generalized nervousness "exacerbated by the presence of two interviewers" in the testing process. A somewhat greater proportion (17%) of the Russian examinees indicated that they had been distracted in the course of the face-to-face interview. Various factors were cited, including lack of knowledge about particular current events broached in the interview, interviewers' "laughing about a poster in the room", and general anxiety about being tested. By far the largest proportion of examinees in both the Arabic and Russian groups (93% and 83%, respectively) indicated that they did not encounter any situation or event during the face-to-face interview that they considered to be "distracting". The general lack of distracting elements in the course of the face-to-face interview was reinforced by the examinee responses to the "how well were you able to concentrate...?" question, with mean ratings of 3.9 (Arabic) and 3.8 (Russian) both closely approaching the next-to-highest possible value on the 5-point scale.

A considerably larger number of distracting elements were, however, reported with respect to the VTT-based interviews. Almost without exception, the Russian examinees indicated that they had been distracted in one way or another in the course of the VTT interview (93% "yes" responses). Predominantly cited (total of 20 written comments) were the audio "cut-outs" brought about through simultaneous tester-examinee speech attempts, and the occasional jerkiness in video motion. Also noted in a few instances were other technical problems, including a temporarily "frozen" picture (three mentions), a noisy equipment fan (one mention), and problems with properly framing the role-play cards on the auxiliary monitor (one mention). Although the overall percentage of Arabic examinees (59%) reporting some type of distraction during the VTT-based interviews was appreciably smaller than for Russian, the write-in comments also predominately mentioned audio cut-outs and/or video motion discontinuities as having been, to at least some extent, distracting elements in the VTT setting. Notwithstanding the technical problems cited in regard to the VTT-based testing mode, the mean examinee ratings of 3.4 (Arabic) and 3.1 (Russian) on
the "How well were you able to concentrate during the interview?" question suggest that, on the whole, examinees were able to devote reasonably close attention to their speaking tasks in the course of the screen-to-screen interview, despite the cited distractions.

With respect to examinees' opinions as to the quality of their speaking performance in each of the two interview settings by comparison to their day-to-day speaking ability in the test language, respondents on the whole rated their face-to-face interview performance as essentially on a par with their daily speaking capability, with mean ratings of 2.8 (Arabic) and 2.9 (Russian) approaching the 3.0 question mid-point (which was also verbally labeled as "same" on the questionnaire). For the VTT-mode testing, mean comparability ratings of 2.5 for both Arabic and Russian suggest that on the whole, the examinees felt they had performed somewhat less well on the VTT-based test than was typical of their daily speaking performance.

To the "bottom-line" question, "Assuming that you would receive the same score through either testing technique, would you personally rather take a face-to-face test or a video teletesting interview?", over half of the Arabic students (57%) and virtually three-quarters of the Russian students (74%) indicated that they would prefer to be tested on a face-to-face basis. Predominantly cited as negative factors in the VTT mode were the lack of absolute synchronization of video sound and motion, the occasional audio drop-outs, and other technical problems. Advantages mentioned for the face-to-face mode included a more natural conversational setting, as reflected in comments such as "It is nicer to talk to a person than a camera" and "It is easier to build a rapport with the interviewer when you have nothing separating you". One respondent noted that in the face-to-face mode "You can feel if you are making grammatical mistakes by [the testers'] look", and two others felt that the testers' "body language" could be more easily and more advantageously perceived in the live testing mode than through video transmission.

Notwithstanding the substantial overall preference for face-to-face testing on a total group basis, five examinees (four Arabic and one Russian) indicated that they preferred to be tested via VTT. One examinee stated that the VTT process "allows me more time to think between questions and it forces the teacher to sometimes repeat the questions", and four indicated that they felt more "relaxed" or "at ease" in the video setting than in the presence of live testers, with one respondent adding that "I usually feel at home with electronic equipment around me". Almost a quarter (23%) of the Russian examinees and one-third (30%) of the Arabic examinees indicated that they had "no real preference" between the face-to-face and the VTT-based testing modes.

As previously indicated, the participating interviewers were also asked to complete a similar series of three questionnaires, one after having administered all of the face-to-face interviews, one following completion of the screen-to-screen interviews, and a summary questionnaire asking for their testing mode preference overall (see Table 5).

Table 5. Interviewer questions and response data

1. How well were you able to concentrate during the interviews?
   ("Poorly" = 1 to "very well" = 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Face-to-Face</th>
<th>VTT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  Mean  S.D.</td>
<td>N  Mean  S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>16  5.0  0.0</td>
<td>16  4.4  0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>14  5.0  0.0</td>
<td>16  4.7  0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. How would you evaluate your performance during these (face-to-face/screen-to-screen) interviews as compared to your usual performance in giving oral interviews in (Arabic/Russian)?
("Much worse" = 1 to "much better" = 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Face-to-Face</th>
<th>VTT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Did anything distract you during the interviews?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Face-to-Face</th>
<th>VTT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Imagine that sometime in the future you again have to give a speaking test in (Arabic/Russian) either through a face-to-face oral interview or a video tele-testing interview. Would you personally rather give a face-to-face test of a video tele-testing interview?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Face-to-Face</th>
<th>VTT</th>
<th>No preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the most part, the interviewers' responses reflected a somewhat higher level of ease and confidence in the test setting, both face-to-face and screen-to-screen, than reported by the examinees. For the face-to-face testing mode, all of the responding interviewers in both Arabic and Russian marked the highest possible value, 5 ("very well") to the "How well were you able to concentrate...?" question; the corresponding mean values for the screen-to-screen mode - 4.4 and 4.7 for Arabic and Russian, respectively - were also appreciably higher than those of the examinee group (3.3 for both languages). The interviewers also reported few or no "distracting" occurrences during the face-to-face interviews (94% "no" responses for Arabic, 100% for Russian); the one Arabic interviewer answering "yes" reported only the minor distractions of "changing the tape" and "when someone changes his sitting position [this] produces a little noise". An appreciably greater number of interviewers - 25% in Russian and 63% in Arabic - reported distractions in the course of giving their screen-to-screen interviews. Most frequently cited were technical difficulties with the equipment, including an occasional "frozen screen" resulting from temporary deterioration in the video signal and the brief audio drop-outs produced by simultaneous speech attempts.

Whereas the mean examinee responses to the question, "How would you evaluate your performance during the interview...?" by comparison to daily speaking performance were below the midpoint value of 3.0 ("same") for both languages and both testing modes, the corresponding interviewer means were somewhat above this value for the VTT mode (3.3 for both languages) and even higher for the face-to-face mode (3.9 Arabic, 3.7 Russian). Although the interviewers may have felt some pressure to respond positively to a question involving self-evaluation of performance in a highly "visible" testing situation, to the extent their responses can be taken at face value, it would appear that the interviewers did not consider themselves to have been hampered or disadvantaged in their conduct of either the
face-to-face or VTT-based interviews during the study by comparison to their typical performance in operational testing.

The summary preference-as-to-mode question on the third and final interviewer questionnaire showed rather interesting response differences between the Arabic and Russian testers. Although for both languages, the majority of testers indicated that they had "no real preference" of testing mode (57% Arabic, 69% Russian), the remaining respondents were diametrically split by language, with none of the Russian interviewers preferring the face-to-face mode (31% marking a preference for VTT) and none of the Arabic testers indicating a preference for the VTT technique (43% preferring face-to-face). Written comments by the Arabic testers in favour of the face-to-face interview referred predominantly to such factors as "closeness to the candidate", "closer to being a living real communication", and "better interaction". Comments of the Russian testers in support of VTT-based testing cited its greater novelty ("new and interesting") as well as its ability to allow for the testing of examinees regardless of geographical location. One interviewer mentioned feeling "more relaxed" when conducting a VTT-based test, but did not further explain this observation.

SUMMARY

Several general observations may be advanced on the basis of this initial study of video teleconferencing as a potential delivery medium for speaking proficiency interviews. First - despite certain technical limitations of the currently-used equipment, as manifested in some amount of visual discontinuity in reproducing sudden movements and in brief audio drop-outs during simultaneous speech attempts - it has proved possible to quite closely simulate the "live interview" testing format and administration process in a VTT-based test setting. In particular, the VTT mode, even within the technical shortcomings noted, does permit real-time, course-of-interview modification of the content and sequencing of the conversational exchanges, a capability that cannot be provided by semi-direct techniques involving necessarily pre-determined and operationally "fixed" speech stimuli. Based on clinical observation during the study, it should be possible immediately to incorporate a number of procedural improvements to further increase the authenticity of the VTT testing approach, including the use of a single video monitor showing only the image of the distant interlocutor(s), rather than the additional (self-)monitor as regularly used in VTT-based instruction. Various improvements in the tester training process, including increased attention to minimizing the occurrence of audio drop-outs by reducing the number of interviewer-initiated interruptions of the examinee's speech, would also be recommended. Eventual upgrading of the VTT equipment would make it possible to eliminate both the motion discontinuity and audio drop-out phenomena and provide virtually instantaneous and essentially full analog transmission and reproduction in both video and audio modes.

When faced with a choice between screen-to-screen and face-to-face interviews, the examinees' overall preference for the latter is not particularly surprising, and parallels the preference expressed by examinees for the live interview over a semi-direct procedure in an earlier validation study of the Chinese Speaking Test (Clark, 1988). However, notwithstanding the "majority vote" in favor of the face-to-face interview, the reasonably large percentage of both Arabic (30%) and Russian (23%) examinees who indicated that they had "no real preference" between live and VTT-administered interviews, together with a number of written examinee comments to the effect that "if I were on the other side of the country or world, I could probably get used to VTT"; or "I would prefer face-to-face but video could suffice just as easily", would suggest that the screen-to-screen approach could obtain a reasonable level of examinee acceptance, particularly if the technical shortcomings of the video system could be reduced or eliminated.

Although the current study was not designed or intended to empirically address the inter- and intra-rater reliabilities of either the face-to-face or screen-to-screen interview (beyond the general degree of scoring consistency that may be inferred from the "percentage-of-agreement" results previously discussed), a reasonable operational assumption is that their
general order of magnitude would be comparable to that associated with the face-to-face interview. In any event, a formal and more detailed reliability study is certainly in order, possibly following the source-of-variance estimate approach used by Stansfield and Kenyon as reported in this issue.

With regard to the administrative practicality and cost effectiveness of VTT-based testing, it is undeniably the case that use of this technology involves very substantial initial equipment investment, as well as significant ongoing communication (satellite-use) charges. As a consequence, the likelihood that a typical academic institution or other language testing site would find it economically feasible to initiate VTT-based testing as the sole or primary use of such facilities may be considered extremely remote. However, for schools or other locations in which a functioning VTT capability is already in place for distributed instruction, multi-site conferencing, or other purposes, making additional use of this system for the rapid and efficient "distance" testing of speaking proficiency may indeed be a viable option. The present authors, as well as other language testing staff at DLIFLC, have been encouraged by the overall results of this exploratory study, and hope to proceed further, both with qualitative improvements in the "screen-to-screen" interviewing process and in the further empirical examination of the statistical and other operational characteristics of this testing approach.
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1. As a preamble it must be pointed out that members attending BILC can only address matters involving NATO member Nations in their contributions to UN operations.

2. Eleven nations were represented on this committee. Each member introduced himself and described the type of work and responsibilities of his/her position.

LANGUAGE TRAINING FOR ARMS CONTROL

3. Discussion took place on the Arms Control Inspection Teams and the language training of those teams. The availability of appropriate materials of the various nations is somewhat limited with the exception of the DLIFLC. DLIFLC generously offered to provide materials to any member nation who requested them.

4. Programmes of member nations are individualized and include a variety of authentic materials, which are used extensively to support textbooks chosen for specific purposes by each country. All agreed that training for this mission is sufficient to meet present demands and offered little of future value. Therefore, material gathered by BILC in response to recommendations from last year’s conference was of insufficient value to warrant publicity.

UNITED NATIONS OPERATIONS

5. The general problems of common language communication between UN Forces was discussed. The Austrian representative pointed out that their emphasis is on English language training for UN Troops. Other national representatives share this view. Proficiency up to level 3 is essential for HQ staffs.

6. The primary effort of all non-English speaking member nations is to train soldiers in the English language to facilitate communication between the UN allies. The complexity of speaking and coordinating with UN Forces of different nationalities with limited English available tends to lead to communication obstacles which cause misunderstandings. This is both an inter-theatre and inter-contingent problem.

7. Language demands differ under four main categories of UN operation. Those categories are:
a. Peace-keeping (Universally used term): Peaceful third-party intervention for the containment of hostilities between or within states.

b. Peace-making: Effort to settle conflict through mediation, negotiation, arbitration.

c. Peace-building: Effort to avoid violence through social and economic development.

d. Peace-enforcement: Effort to bring about the cessation of hostilities by the use of armed force (UN operations under Chapter VII).

The committee agreed for the sake of clarity that when referring to various language demand areas reference to 'Departure' language means the native language of the UN component, 'Operating' language is usually English, and the 'Target' language is the language or languages of the country of involvement. According to specific theatres of operation English language knowledge is considered to be essential as information i.e., observers report information both through their contingent or directly for Force Headquarters. The military are primarily concerned with 'Peace-keeping' and 'Peace-enforcement' Diplomats and politicians are responsible for 'Peace-making' and 'Peace-building'. Nevertheless in certain circumstances military personnel will be involved with peace-making and building. Preservation of the status quo is the ultimate extent of military influence in any peace keeping mission.

8. Success in achieving any language training objective for specific purposes is dependent on the amount of time available for build-up of a UN component prior to UN involvement. That build-up involves:

   a. Military training
   b. Special training
   c. Language training (General language)
   d. Special UN language training

Clear distinction must be made between survival level for everybody in the in-country target language and level 2/3 proficiency for military intelligence purposes.

PEACE KEEPING:

9. Two main topics for discussion were:

   a. The awareness of all participants, both English and non-English speaking, to communicate in a simplified understandable 'International English'.

   b. To differentiate second language acquisition to the type and urgency of the operation.

10. Peace keeping was more accurately defined by the Austrian representative as the prevention, containment, moderation, and termination of hostilities between or within states through the medium of third-party intervention, organized and directed internationally, using multi-national military, police, and civilian personnel to restore and maintain peace. Even by using this as a basis to discuss language requirement, history shows that the nature of peace keeping is now in a second generation of activity which is more dangerous for participants. Therefore, in considering language requirements it was felt important to establish and list the nature of the tasks to be encountered. Both of the following list are concerned with peace-keeping duties:
11. First Generation involvement (low-level threat, consent of parties)
   a. Observation, fact finding and reporting of
      - firing,
      - aircraft over flights,
      - ground infringements,
      - any other breach of a cease-fire.
   b. Supervision of Agreements (truce/armistice/cease-fire/withdrawal).
   c. Supervision of POW exchange.
   d. Investigation of incidents.
   e. Body recovery and handovers.
   f. Maintaining UN presence.
   g. Monitoring Force deployment and activities.
   h. Separation of Forces by inter positioning.
   i. Creation of buffer zones, areas of separation, demilitarized zones.
   j. Verification of limited forces/arms in areas of limitation.
   k. Mine clearing.

12. Second Generation involvement (more dangerous, consent of both parties reduced).
   a. Preventive operations/deployment.
   b. Monitoring of complex cease-fires (a number of opposing factions present.
   c. Monitoring elections.
   d. Law and order assistance.
   e. Protection of minority groups.
   f. Economic assistance.
   g. Humanitarian/disaster relief.
   h. Guaranteeing rights of passage.
   i. Transitional administration of regions.
   j. Minimum use of force.
   k. Sanctions.
   l. Enforcement under Chapter VII, UN Charter.

Language levels required for all of the above range from survival level to level 3/3 depending on the mission and level of responsibility. This is both applicable for English language proficiency, usually selected as the operational language and foreign language proficiency in the target language.
13. UN operations sometimes happen relatively quickly. Therefore it is an obvious and inescapable fact that fully functional linguists cannot be created quickly on a need basis. As an alternative very short courses can meet certain emergency needs for non-linguist personnel; such courses should be designed to focus on content areas and language functions of greatest interest to selected groups.

14. Experience from UN operations indicate that many future requirements may not be fully recognized in advance, and flexibility will be required in anticipating areas of potential language needs and being able to respond quickly.

15. The following categories of components will have to be considered:

a. Component I

   (1) Development of a long range plan

   (2) Identify languages (probable trouble spots)

   (3) Inventory of personnel and materials

   (4) Develop quick-response capability

   (5) Develop and maintain a small cadre of fully trained linguists

b. Component II

   (1) Develop quick-response capability at national schools

   (2) Accumulate reasonable sets of material such as phrase books, dictionaries, grammars, culture information, etc.

   (3) Develop culture/orientation program materials

   (4) Develop short courses aimed at specific groups for both linguists and non linguists. Non-linguists would only need survival level information whereas linguists would need emergency short courses designed primarily for cross-training from one language into another.

16. Work done by the DLIFLC, following Gulf War and Somalia experience and in planning for future linguistic contingencies leads them to recommend a three tiered approach:

a. **Tier I:** An immediate response to a crisis situation, which may or may not be prolonged. In this scenario, there is little or no advance warning. In this instance, there is no choice but to draw immediately upon the quick-response capabilities already mentioned.

b. **Tier II:** Larger-scale training for more extensive involvement with more advanced warning. Tier II presumes that the need which precipitated the Tier I response will continue for some time.

c. **Tier III:** Obvious long term commitment assumes that the need will continue for a period of months or even years. Tier III activities presume the prior execution of Tiers I and II which includes the action that a large group of linguists would have received short-course training which was necessary as an emergency but was insufficient for their job requirements as military linguists.

Language proficiency objectives for the three tiers of language should be as follows:
Tier I: Survival Level 0+
Tier II: Quick-fix linguist 1/1+, 2
Tier III: Fully qualified linguist 2/2, 3/3

17. To some extent each country represented conducts language training which prepares for some or all of these tiers in a variety of languages. The development of courses for the fully qualified linguist are generally well established, however the response needed to meet tiers I and II have been tested by recent UN requirements and would benefit from closer scrutiny. Also in some represented countries only English language training was provided for forces placed in theatre emphasis for UN operations and only certain officers receive target language training where available from longer term programmes.

18. UN Staff Training and Job Level Descriptions. The Austrian representative extended an invitation to their UN staff officers courses held at the UN training center in Vienna. The prerequisite for application is a level 2 in English. The course lasts 3 weeks and takes place twice yearly in April and November. Austria has also developed job level language descriptors (proficiency levels for various UN positions). The BILC Secretariat will be supplied with a copy. Presently the descriptors are in German.

19. RECOMMENDATIONS

A series of recommendations emerged from discussion:

Recommendation 1:

BILC member countries seek to achieve the broad levels of language proficiency when English is used as the operational language for UN operations as follows:

- Soldiers level 1
- Officers/NCOs level 2
- Selected Positions level 3

Recommendation 2:

Member countries who have detailed language proficiency levels assigned to UN appointments should forward them to the BILC Secretariat who would in turn compare/consolidate and issue them to all member nations as a guide.

Recommendation 3:

Member countries should submit course material/information concerning survival language training packages and future intentions for development to the BILC Secretariat who would produce a directory and make it available to all member nations.

Recommendation 4:

BILC Secretariat to produce a consolidated list of BILC publications for circulation to member nations.

Recommendation 5:

Continuance of the discussion group under a revised title of "Language Training for Special Military Purposes".
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V. STUDY GROUP REPORT 3
"Educational Technology"
Study Group Report 3

Educational Technology

Chairman: Dr. Ray Clifford - US

Members:
- LTC Ollivier - France
- LTC Lamarché - France
- LTC Ligerot - France
- Maj. Nichols - UK
- LRD Dir Leben - Germany
- Mr. Schwarz - Germany
- Ms. Chambers - US
- Dr Herzog - US
- LTC McGhee - US

Observers:
- Col. De Bonnieres - France
- Dr. Borchart - US
- Col. Mueller - US
- Lt Col Crotty - US
- Dr. Sams - US

This new committee had its first meeting under the chairmanship of Dr. Clifford.

It was determined that the following topics were of interest to those delegations just beginning to consider technology for use in foreign language training.

1. The necessity of justifying technology purchase and use to managers.

2. The learning tasks that can benefit from computer exercises.

3. A checklist of considerations for the procurement process.

4. A process for sharing computer materials as well as ideas and techniques through BILC.

During a brainstorming session, the following points were agreed upon concerning justification to managers.

1. The computer allows training in remote locations.

2. It can meet job-specific or other special needs for individuals.

3. Experience has shown that it motivates students.

4. The computer provides flexibility in terms of content and time.


6. It can help satisfy different learning styles or needs.

7. The younger generation is orientated toward computers.

8. It frees the teacher to work on personal interaction, which enhances training.

9. It may provide a means of providing instruction in the seldom taught languages.

10. It can provide simple familiarization training rapidly.
11. A computer lab can do everything the traditional language lab does and more.
12. It allows the quick checking of homework.
13. It can save time on test development, administration, and scoring.
14. It can help slower students learn at their own pace without affecting others.
15. The student can set his or her own schedule for computer activities.
16. The computer can be programmed to collect data, which can be used for many purposes including diagnostic information.

As the group discussed the skills that can best be taught by computer, it was pointed out that another justification can be made concerning the listening skill. Listening is an important part of language acquisition and, in addition, many students have a specific job requirement for listening. However, we are rarely taught how to listen in our native language. Most students need to be guided through listening activities at the appropriate level in order to acquire the skills they need. With well-designed exercises, the computer can do that quite effectively.

The study group members agreed that in both listening comprehension and reading comprehension, the computer can be effectively used for the following skills:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANAG LEVEL</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0+</td>
<td>Recognize key words and phrases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grasp the main idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Understand facts in a narration or description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Recognize the implications of more complex or abstract ideas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this time, the computer can best address the speaking skill by assisting with pronunciation practice. Exercises can be designed that allow the student to compare pronunciation with that of native speakers and that provide suggestions for improving pronunciation.

Concerning checklists that would assist with procurement, the DLIFLC representatives handed out some material; representatives from the U.S. Air Force Academy also promised to forward such material later.

Lt Col. Mathias from Canada visited with the study group briefly to describe the use of computers in that country's program. He also offered to share information in the future.

Many representatives agreed that it would be useful to share materials and ideas for computer use through BILC. There may be copyright and other proprietary right issues. However, a simple listing of computer exercises in a data-base format could be useful.

It is strongly recommended that this topic continues to be discussed in the future. When possible, material could be shared informally before the next BILC Conference.
V. STUDY GROUP REPORT 4
"Defining Military Language Requirements"
I. Introduction

Clients of military language training often are either unable to specify the aims, contents, duration and standards of military language training or are too optimistic about the time requirements. This has largely been compensated for by the language training organizations which have increasingly initiated or insisted upon needs assessments/occupation analysis before commencing training.

With the "downsizing" of military establishments in most member countries, a trend towards "market testing," i.e. determining whether the need can be met by military language training establishments or by civilian contractors has set in. This makes it mandatory that requirements are defined at an early stage. Experience in several member countries (Australia, USA) has shown that civilian contractors - when faced with meeting clearly defined standards - often cannot meet these as cost-effectively as military language training organizations.

The expanding international commitments of many member countries (Germany, Turkey) reinforce the need for a definition of military language training requirements.

II. BILC's Opportunity to Develop a Military Language Requirements Decision Aid

The BILC brochure "The World's Languages. A quick reference guide" lists and classifies the world's languages and indicates learning times. It is intended to assist clients in defining the requirement.

It portrays the estimated weeks of training required for a speaker of German to achieve STANAG 6001 - defined proficiency levels in a second language. Subsequent addenda to this matrix which portray the estimated weeks of training required for native speakers of the national language of each BILC member would be a comprehensive decision aid available to military leaders in each BILC country through which they could make meaningful planning assessments as new language requirements become apparent. The addenda would also permit national decision makers to quickly assess whether facility in a second language would speed the process in acquiring proficiency in a third language.

III. Cross-training Opportunities Among BILC Members

A conceptual outgrowth of the aforementioned decision aid would be a statement by each BILC member of their individual capability to perform cross-training into a second or third language for personnel from other BILC member countries. A mix of the matrix which describes estimated training duration to achieve varying proficiency levels with a listing of opportunities to achieve such training would offer the possibility of enhanced inter-BILC
cooperative cross-training. One must recognize that financial and political considerations will have a very strong influence on any final inter-BILC cross-training opportunities but the possibility exists for BILC members to rely on one another for specialized training in languages not commonly taught in one's own country.

IV. Exchange of Lessons Learned in order to better define future requirements

All BILC member nations will have had some experience in the period 1990-1994 in committing military forces to contingency/multinational/unconventional operations in unfamiliar language areas (Northern Iraq, the Horn of Africa, Southeast Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, the former Yugoslavia stand as examples). National reports on lessons learned about the "real" language proficiency requirement which has surfaced as a result of these activities will provide the BILC members with additional information with which to further refine their individual language training goals and procedures.

V. BILC as a Forum for Exchange of Ideas

Technology improvements afford BILC the opportunity to act as a clearing house of ideas among BILC members. Issues which could be discussed in a BILC forum could include:

- changing national military language requirements and their effect on national training establishments/programs
- availability of authentic language materials, especially for less commonly taught languages
- newer teaching methodologies
- concepts of language and culture integration into single course of study.
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