AD-A170 894

REVIEW OF NON-RESIDENT LANGUAGE TRAINING
FOR LINGUISTS IN THE U.S. ARMY

Clinton L. Anderson
Kinton, Incorporated

DTIC
SELECTED
AUG 1 3 1986
D

for

Contracting Officer's Representative
Ray S. Perez

Instructional Technology Systems Technical Area
Zita M. Simutis, Chief

TRAINING RESEARCH LABORATORY
Harold Wagner, Acting Director

U. S. Army
Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

June 1986

DTIC FILE COPY

86   8   11   182

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM	
1. REPORT NUMBER ARI Research Note 86-69	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A170894	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE *(and Subtitle)* Review of Non-Resident Language Training for Linguists in the U.S. Army		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Report January - December 85
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(*s*) Clinton L. Anderson		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*s*) OPM Work Order 3029-003
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Kinton, Incorporated Bailey's Crossroads, VA 22041		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q162722A791
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333-5600		12. REPORT DATE June 1986
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 153
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS*(if different from Controlling Office)* - -		15. SECURITY CLASS. *(of this report)* Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE - -

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT *(of this Report)*

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT *(of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)*

- -

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

Ray S. Perez, contracting officer's representative

19. KEY WORDS *(Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)*

Army Linguists	Language Proficiency
Language Acquisition	Foreign Language Training
Language Maintenance	
Language Refreshing	

20. ABSTRACT *(Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)*

   This report reviews the status of language proficiency for Army linguists in field environments. It concludes that the Army needs: a centralized refresher program, involvement of the Training and Doctrine Command in promotion of language awareness among Army personnel, updated curricula, refresher training programs at initial training sites, an incentive award system, monitoring of language proficiency in tactical settings, and ongoing assessment efforts.

DD FORM 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE
1 JAN 73

U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE

FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency under the Jurisdiction of the

Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

WM. DARRYL HENDERSON
COL, IN
Commanding

Peer Review by:
Joan Harman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUALITY INSPECTED 4

Accesion For		
NTIS CRA&I	☑	
DTIC TAB	☐	
Unannounced	☐	
Justification		
By		
Distribution /		
Availability Codes		
Dist	Avail and / or Special	
A-1		

iv

Executive Summary

This review of non-resident foreign language training
for U.S.Army linguists is exploratory in nature. The
leadership of the U.S.Army Research Institute perceived an
Army need for research in this area but precise research
questions based on specific training deficiencies were not
available. This situation lead to a request to the Office of
Personnel Management for assistance in (1) investigating
perceived problems and concerns in this area, (2) reviewing
current policies, regulatory guidance, program activities,
and initiatives, (3) researching available data bases, and
(4) identifying possible research and development areas.
Based on an ARI-approved work management plan, this study
was conducted using a historical research methodology and
employing such qualitative research techniques as interviews
with key personnel and observations of field practices. In
gaining concurrence of the work management plan, the study
was expanded to include a requirement to outline some
conceptuals models that may improve current operational
efforts and to develop an annotated bibliography to assist
present and future researchers and practitioners in the area
of non-resident foreign language training.

The study identifies twelve major issues that influence
non-resident foreign language training for linguists, eight
broad research areas, and ten conceptual models. Primary
concerns center around Army program management, command
support, use of linguists in field enviornments, the
integration of general and technical language, and the use
of advanced instructional technology.

This study recommends the following: (1) the
development of a functional, cohesive non-resident language
program for linguists, under a centralized leadership; (2)
increased involvement of U.S.A. Training and Doctrine
Command; (3) development of instructional materials using
advanced technology to incorporate learning strategies and
motivaional techniques; (4) establishment of a non-resident
instructional expertise base at the Defense Language
Institute, Foreign Language Center; (5) development and
implementation of a language R&D plan using the fifty-two
research questions outlined in this report; (6) development
of an effective incentive award system to recognize
outstanding performance by linguists; and (8) the
establishment of a technical language proficiency inspection
to ensure Military Intelligence units' capability to perform
its language-related missions, particularly in tactical
settings.

Section I: Introduction

A. General:

The Army Research Institute (ARI) requested the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to conduct an exploratory study to determine what research areas were appropriate with regard to non-resident foreign language training for United States Army linguists. The basis for this request was a perceived lack of current and programmed research in this area. In the initial phases of coordinating the Work Management Plan with the Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Headquarters, Department of the Army (OACSI,HQDA) and the Defense Language Institute, Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC), the need was made apparent for conceptual models to improve operational efforts and for an annotated bibliography to assist current and future researchers and practitioners.

An OPM contractor, Kinton Incorporated, was assigned the job of accomplishing this study. Dr. Clinton L. Anderson, Kinton's principal investigator for this work, outlined the main issues involved in this complex area of concern. From these issues, fifty-two possible research topics in eight categories were identified. In addition, this study outlines ten conceptual models aimed at improving non-resident foreign language training and unit technical language training in operational settings.

This study attempts to provide the Army Service Program Manager and other key agents with information needed to develop an Army Research and Development Plan regarding non-resident foreign language training. It also offers ideas to key Army personnel regarding ways in which non-resident foreign language training may be more effectively implemented.

B. Tasks:

This study involves the following tasks:

1. Investigate perceived problems and concerns inherent in non-resident foreign language training for Army linguists as currently provided.

2. Review and become thoroughly familiar with existing policies, regulatory guidance, instructional techniques, needs assessments, selected curricula and instructional materials, program implementation, evaluation procedures, and on-going improvement initiatives.

3. Research available empirical data that may be pertinent to foreign language training for linguists.

4. Identify possible research and development needs to include use of advanced instructional technology, instructional methodologies, learning strategies and motivational techniques

C. Methodology:

The principal investigator used W. Gray's (1956) six simple steps in historical research methodology as guidelines for this study. These steps were (1) select an appropriate topic (in this case the topic was a given), (2) track down all relevant evidence, (3) take notes, (4) evaluate evidence, (5) arrange evidence into a meaningful pattern, and (6) present evidence in an interesting manner that will communicate to readers the fullest possible understanding of the subject. The investigator first developed a Work Management Plan which was submitted to ARI for approval on 31 December 1984. The following specific work tasks were detailed in this plan: (1) acquire government-furnished materials;(2) conduct a selected literature review;(3) become familiar with perceived problems and concerns, instructional techniques, program implementation procedures, and on-going improvement initiatives by (a) discussing non-resident foreign language training with key personnel and (b) personal observation in some field environments; (4) explore alternative model(s) for non-resident foreign language training; (5) provide assistance to ARI; and (6) develop a report of findings.
After the approval of the Work Management Plan, the Investigator began the literature review and discussions with key individuals. Observation in field environments occurred in United States Army, Europe (USAREUR) and United States Army Forces Command (FORSCOM), specifically at Fort Stewart, Georgia. A detailed chronicle of work accomplished is incorporated into this report as Appendix A. A briefing was given to the Army Service Program Manager (Major J. Cox, OACSI,HQDA) near the beginning of the project and his concurrence obtained in the conduct of the study. Two formal "In Progress Reviews" were submitted to ARI (31 October 1985; 31 December 1985). Detailed trip notes (FORSCOM, DLIFLC, USAREUR) were also developed and submitted to ARI.

D. Personnel Contacted:

Key personnel who were contacted as part of this study are noted by name and agency at Appendix A. In each case these personnel were intimately familiar with foreign language training. A summary of agencies in which personnel

were contacted include: HQDA(OACSI, Office of the Deputy
Chief of Staff, Personnel (ODCSPER), Office of the Deputy
Chief of Staff, Operations (ODCSOPS)); USAREUR; FORSCOM;
United States Army Intelligence and Security Command
(INSCOM); DLIFLC; ARI; National Security Agency (NSA);
United States Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC)
(Training Technology Agency (TTA), Office of Education,
Soldier Support Center, Command & General Staff College
(C&GSC), United States Army Intelligence Center and School
(USAICS)); United States Army Military Personnel Center
(MILPERCEN); Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges (SOC). Some
brief discussions occurred with personnel associated with
the University of Maryland, University of Southern
California, and Boston University. Enlisted linguists in
97B, 97E, 98C and 98G MOSs were included in discussions.
Although no attempt was made to attain a representative
sample in talking with linguists, some were from (1) a field
station (fixed site),(2) a continental United States (CONUS)
divisional Military Intelligence Battalion,(3) an outside
continental United States (OCONUS) divisional Military
Intelligence Battalion, (4) Military Intelligence
Battalions which were part of a Military Intelligence Group
(non-divisional), and a field detachment operating in an
OCONUS environment.

E. Literature Reviewed:

     The annotated bibilography in Section VII reflects the
selected review of the literature conducted as part of this
study. Special emphasis was given to documents directly
related to non-resident foreign language training in the
U.S.Army. A thorough review of documents maintained by the
Training Division, ODCSOPS HQDA, revealed a wealth of
information on nearly every aspect of foreign language
training and initiatives contemplated over the past ten
years. The Pentagon Library was used extensively during the
literature review. Also, Stanford University, Teachers
College Columbia University, University of Virginia,
Virginia Military Institute and Washington and Lee
University libraries were used. Many key personnel who were
contacted during this study contributed documents, books and
other materials to the literature review. Primary source
documents included regulations, circulars, pamphlets,
letters, notes, instructional materials, booklets, forms,
and other memoranda. Only a very selective review of
secondary sources (books and journal articles) was conducted
regarding foreign language education and training in
general. A major consideration given to including or
excluding a source was whether it seemed to have specific
relevance to foreign language training for linguists in the
U.S.Army.

Section II: Overview of Non-Resident Foreign Language
Training in the U.S.Army

A. Definitions:

1. Defense Language Program (DLP): All foreign language
and English (as a second language) training programs
conducted by, or under contract to, Department of Defense
(DOD) Components, except language training conducted at the
National Cryptologic School, NSA, and language training
provided cadets and midshipmen at Service academies,
dependents in dependent schools operated by DOD, and
individuals pursuing programs conducted strictly for the
purpose of voluntary personal development or obtaining
academic credit.(AR 350-20,p1-1)

2. Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP): The foreign
language element of the DLP. AR350-20 differentiates between
resident and non-resident training: " DLIFLC conducts
full-time, intensive foreign language training in
residence..."(p2-1) "Field activities may conduct
nonresident training under the technical control of DLIFLC.
Normally, this training provides elementary language
training, maintains/refreshes language skills, and provides
job-related language skills..."(p2-1)

3. Non-resident Foreign Language Training (AR
611-6,1985): This regulation differentiates between
non-resident foreign language training and unit training.
"Nonresident foreign language training is usually conducted
at or through the Army Education Center (AEC). This training
includes individual and unit programs using Headstart,
Refresher Maintenance, Professional Development Program
Extension Courses (PDPEC), Training Extension Courses(TEC),
and other materials provided for in AR 350-20." (p8) On the
other hand, unit training is described as follows:
"a. Commanders at all levels, whose unit mission
accomplishment depends on the foreign language skills of
assigned personnel, will establish on-duty refresher
maintenance training programs per AR 350-20. Sufficient
refresher/ maintenance training will be given in units
training programs under the BTMS to ensure maintenance of
minimum job specialty language proficiency.
"b. Commanders, at all levels, whose mission accomplishment
does not depend on language skills but who consider language
training necessary for other reasons, may establish training
programs under AR350-20.
"c. Commanders will set up close liaison with the
installation language coordinator normally located at the
AEC. The AEC has the expertise and the resources to help
commanders conduct training programs." (pp8-9)

4

4. As can be noted from the official definitions and descriptions of non-resident foreign language training outlined above, no clear definition of non-resident language training exists. For the purposes of this study, non-resident language training is defined broadly as foreign language training and testing that occurs in the Army outside of DLIFLC (which is considered "resident training"). This includes general (global) and technical (directly job related) language training and testing. This includes unit language training, training in Foreign Language Training Center, Europe and other such field organizations, contract training provided by MACOMs and ACES through its installation AECs and other support agencies, testing by Military Personnel Testing sections and academic degree programs that have a direct relevance to maintaining and/or enhancing language proficiency.

5. "Linguist" is equally a difficult term to define. A key person in HQS USAREUR stated that every soldier stationed in that Command (outside of the United Kingdom) required some proficiency level of a foreign language. Then at what level of proficiency is one considered a "linguist"? FORSCOM reviewed AR 611-10; AR 611-112; and AR 611-201 to determine language requirements by MOS and specialty. (Results of that review are included at Appendix B.) Documentation of language requirements is sketchy and indicates the lack of doctrine in the use of linguists in how the U.S.Army intends to fight. As will be shown below, the major consideration in this study is given to enlisted soldiers trained at DLIFLC and sent through Advanced Individual Training (AIT) and to the field as 97Bs (Counterintelligence (CI) Agents), 97Es (Interrogators), 98Cs (Electronics Warfare/ Signal Intelligence (EW/SIGINT) Analysts), and 98Gs (EW/SIGINT Voice Intercept Operators).

B. Target Groups:

1. Personnel engaged in survival foreign language and acculturation programs. This group consists of those individuals taking (a) Headstart in CONUS, (b) Gateway at DLIFLC (Commanders Course) (normally could be considered "resident training"), (c) Headstart/Gateway I,II,& III in USAREUR, (d) orientation course in Korea, and (e) other such programs, courses and activities. In FY1984, ACES recorded 102,661 individual enrollees in this type of program in its system with funds expended in the amount of $2,889,453.(Department of the Army (DA) Form 1821 HQDA Consolidated Report, Education Division (DAPE-MPE)). This effort represents the major element in non-resident foreign language training conducted at AECs. This group is rarely addressed in this study with one exception: use of technology in the DLIFLC Gateway course. Nevertheless, this group has a bearing on non-resident language training in

terms of the Army Continuing Education System's (ACES's)
contribution.

2. Personnel engaged in foreign language training for
the purposes of "interoperability" with allied forces. Often
U.S. soldiers and units must work as an intergal part of an
allied force whose language is other than English. USAREUR,
in particular, has developed courses to facilitate this
training. Army Planning Guidance (1992-2005)(1985)
emphasizes the need to "fight as part of joint and combined
forces" (p9); "rationalization, standardization, and
interoperability will continue as guidelines..."(p12) This
group was rarely addressed except in USAREUR Trip Notes.

3. Personnel engaged in foreign language training for
the purposes of being a Foreign Area Officer or Specialist,
a MAAG officer, and/or service with an embassy or mission or
assigned against security assistance spaces. Army Planning
Guidance emphasizes the need for "appropriate training " for
these personnel (p21). This group was rarely addressed in
this study except in regard to U.S.Army Russian Institute
(USARI) and C&GSC and perhaps in general discussions with
military intelligence (MI) personnel.

4. Personnel engaged in foreign language training for
the purpose of service in Special Operations Forces (SOF).
Although documents were included in the literature review
regarding this group, it was not addressed in detail in this
study. The use and role of foreign languages in the mission
of this element of the Army appeared not well defined. From
a cursory review, there seems to be a lack of emphasis on
foreign language training or on achieving and maintaining a
required language proficiency among this group. Perhaps
doctrinal questions in this area persist for SOF.

5. Linguists engaged in foreign language training for
duty in the counterintelligence field. This group was
briefly addressed with a discussion with some 97B personnel
in the 21st Support Command, USAREUR.

6. Linguists engaged in foreign language training for
duty in divisional Military Intelligence battalions both in
CONUS and OCONUS. This group was addressed extensively with
discussions with linguists and command personnel at Fort
Stewart and in USAREUR.

6. Linguists engaged in foreign language training for
duty in non-divisional field units. This group was addressed
with discussions with linguists and command personnel within
the 66th MI Group (Munich/Augsburg).

7. Linguists engaged in foreign language training for
duty in fixed strategic sites. This group was addressed with

discussions with linguists and command personnel at Field
Station Berlin.

C. Regulatory Guidance.

     DOD Directive 5160.41 (2 August 1977) and AR 350-20 (15
July 1978) appeared to be the lastest offical DOD regulatory
guidance. A draft revision of AR 350-20 was also reviewed.
AR 611-6 (Army Linguist Management (16 October 1985) seemed
to represent the latest Army guidance regarding the Army
Linguist Program. Yet, it is primarily a personnel selection
and classification document. Even its name was changed from
"Army Linguist Program" to "Army Linguist Management" with
the 1985 AR revision. Little regulatory guidance exist
regarding non-resident foreign language training in the
U.S.Army.AR 350-20 states that the Commandant,DLIFLC, is
"responsible for exercising technical control over
non-resident language programs".(p4-2) Yet little guidance
is given as to what "technical control" really means and how
it is to be enforced effectively to insure timely,quality
job-related opportunities for language learning at numerous
locations throughout the world, operated by elements of all
military services. Neither do Army planning documents nor
Army doctrinal concepts (e.g.,AirLand Battle 2000/ Army 21)
address the role and use of linguists or need for foreign
language proficiency. The dearth of guidance at HQDA and
TRADOC suggests a failure of the Army leadership to face
the issues regarding foreign language training and develop
guidelines for their resolution.

D. The Linguist Learner.

     Characteristics of the typical linguist learner were
difficult to determine from the quantitative data derived
from the enlisted and officer master files. The Language
Skills Change Project, now in progress, has a large
demographic and attitudinal component which is expected to
provide considerable information in this area.
Arriving at mere numbers of individuals in MOSs that may
have a foreign language requirement is a matter of
conjecture. USAISC provided the latest active Army
statistics (see Appendix C). FORSCOM personnel who were
involved in reserve component language training stated that
there were over 300 Reserve Component Units (MI, Civil
Affairs, Psychological Operations (PSYOPS)) with between
three to five thousand positions requiring foreign language
proficiency. Then there are the linguist learners who are
not filling any authorized language identified positions and
who are attempting to maintain their language skills.
     Based on observations of linguists who were involved
with this study, the following characteristics were noted:
(1) linguists appear to be intelligent and articulate in

conversation concerning themselves and their work; (2) many have one or two years of college, some are college graduates, most are interested in continuing college at either the bachelors or masters level; (3) all wanted to work in positions which emphasized use of their language skills (a major complaint was lack of use of language skills for which the linguist had been trained); (4) most were more interested in incentives involving self esteem and recognition rather than in monitary compensation; (5) all seemed dedicated to doing a professional job (many in the tactical area were distressed that they did not have a professional job and could not recall any mission that required foreign language proficiency in practice, what they said was, that "If the balloon goes up, the Army will bomb-out on language"); (6) most felt that DLIFLC Basic Course gave them at least an apprentice status as linguists; (7) most felt that more job-relevant military scenerios could be included in the last third of the Basic Course; (8) most felt that the DLFT had little or nothing to do with job performance as linguists; (9) participants in Foreign Language Training Center, Europe (FLTCE) felt that experience in foreign language training to be excellent but many other non-resident courses, particularly in CONUS, were found to be less than satisfactory...often, no non-resident instruction was available...even when instruction was available, the chain of command would not permit linguists to attend because of higher priority functions.

E. Current Program Status.

The non-resident foreign language program in the Army, as it currently exists, is not a program but, rather, is a series of fragmented activities. Often it consists, at installation/community level, of nothing more than an occasional instructor offering a class where students come if they can. Some installations/communities, however, such as Munich and Berlin, seem to have a rich and varied program of opportunities for linguist maintenance -refresher-enhancement training and education. Many installations/communities have large language laboratories but usage appears minimal. Linguists complain that conventional language instruction, particularly listening to tapes, is boring and fails to achieve desired results. INSCOM and FORSCOM recent directives have required units to address command language activities. Whether this will result in improved command language programs in actual practice remains to be seen. Little if any evaluation efforts were noted in the non-resident training area. A wide gap appeared to exist between technical language training and general language refresher-maintenance needed to pass the DLFT, which was not perceived to be relevant to linguist military job performance (tea and cookies vs guns and tactics). The DLIFLC technical control is undefined and

appears to be ineffective. Instructional materials, if available from DLIFLC, were not considered adequate in field environments.

Yet there were also some bright spots among the program activities observed. First, key personnel in the various commands and agencies appeared concerned about program shortcomings and seemed to be working toward improved opportunities for linguists to maintain and enhance their language proficiency. FLTCE appears to be a successful initiative worthy of emulation in other theaters. The intensive language training offered by FLTCE's exceptionally well-qualified instuctors and staff has made a most positive impression on all linguists interviewed who had participated in the school. Second, HQS TRADOC seems to be increasing its interest in foreign language training as evidenced by General Richardson's Memorandum For Record (Department of the Army,1985,Nov.7). This emphasis can bring benefits not only to DLIFLC and its resident courses but also to non-resident activities throughout field commands. For example, if DLIFLC can produce basic course graduates who score at a 2 level of proficiency on the DLPT, refresher-maintenance training in field commands will become a more managable problem. Third, there has been a recent up-surge in research and development in foreign language training both at DLIFLC and USAICS. For example, Language Needs Assessment and the five part approach to sustaining and enhancing the mission competencies of MI linguists appear to be steps in the right directions. The Language Skills Change Study has potential for making a major contribution to the knowledge base essential to implementing an effective non-resident foreign language program for linguists. These and other initiatives indicate that considerable thought and effort are being expended in this area to overcome past and current problems. Generally, an optimistic feeling exists concerning the future of foreign language training, in part, because of the perceived strong leadership and cooperation currently being exhibited among the various agencies and commands.

Section III: Issues

A. Army Program Management.

There appears to be no one agency fully responsible for the Army Foreign Language Program which has the authority and resourses to bring together a cohesive, functional effort. Because of this perceived situation, weaknesses in planning, doctrinal development, testing, training and education, evaluation and technical language proficiency of linguists persist. DLIFLC is a Defense schoolhouse. It has not taken its role of "technical control" of non-resident foreign language training seriously. In part, the Army probably has resisted and resented DLIFLC playing a significant role in its internal operations. DLIFLC insists on developing "global" language (which makes it easier on it and its staff) when Army units feel a need for linguists to be capable of performing their linguist functions in the context of their military jobs. Army Program Mangement (even though the Army exercises Executive Agent responsibility for DLIFLC and perhaps because of it) has not provided effective guidance in this crucial area, consequently a gulf exists between Army users and DLIFLC. Until the Army Management issue is further clarified, the program will continue to suffer from the lack of effective leadership and guidance.

B. Command Support.

A common complaint heard among linguists is the lack of command recognition and support for linguists in their role as linguists. Often command personnel are non-linguists and have little appreciation for the jobs linguists are supposedto perform and the training needed to maintain language proficiency. This lack of recognition is a serious detriment to sustainment of language skills. If commanders and first sergeants find foreign language proficency to be of little importance in their concept of unit operations, then their linguists and their language capabilities will almost invaribly suffer from neglect. Little if any sensitization or familiarization is provided in officer, warrant officer and non-commissioned officer education systems as to the role, function, or importance of linguists and language proficiency in the performance of Army missions. This whole matter seems smothered by a cloak of secrecy which common soldiers are not allowed to understand much less appreciate. Perhaps non-linguists tend to resent this separateness and aloofness. They will instead emphasize mission requirements that they do understand and can relate to as soldiers and human beings.

C. Motivation of Learners.

Motivation of linguist learners is, in large part,
contingent on chain of command interest and recognition. Use
of lanuguage constitutes a *major motivational factor* in
maintaining and enhancing language proficiency. Intrinsic
motivational factors are affected by extrinsic motivational
incentives built into the personnel and training systems.
Self-esteem and image building incentives appear to be the
most wanted by linguists. Development of an effective
decorations and awards system may prove to be the most
effective and least costly of all the incentive measures
under consideration. Education is an especially attractive
incentive for intelligent, upward mobile linguists, who are
intent on improving themselves and their families. Bonuses
are attractive, but Veap and Army College Fund appear to be
disincentives for retention. Some linguists feel compelled
to get out of the Army in order to take advantage of these
"Army incentives". Promise of working in a field station
("where the real action is") seems to be a motivating factor
for tactical linguists. Return from field station duty to
tactical duty seems to be a disincentive and a reason for
not reenlisting. Promotion points for E-4s and E-5s seem to
be motivating factors. Promotion to E-7 was viewed as a
disincentive since E-7s were often removed from using
language skills to becoming "people pushers". At the point
were individuals in their careers could be expected to be
master linguists and linguist technical language teachers,
E-7s are removed from the language area and made platoon
sergeants in tactical units. Incentive pay (pro-pay) was
viewed as a positive measure. Who would reject more money!
But this incentive received the least favorable reception
particularly if the perception is that the chain of command
is to continue to give such low priority to language
proficiency and the role of linguists. (Soldiers seem to
know when they are being bought off.) Linguists were
especially concerned that incentive pay would be based on
DLPT scorces which many felt did not reflect technical
language proficiency needed to perform military jobs. In
some cases, such as Arabic, the job required a dialect that
the DLPT did not test. Consequently soldiers would get Army
pay to maintain a language which was not used and no pay to
sustain proficiency in a language which was essential for
job performance. All these factors point to the complicated
nature of foreign language training and use of language.

D. Use of Linguists.

        Perhaps the greatest complaint was the lack of use of
language skills by linguists. Linguists operating live
peacetime missions were apparently using their language
skills at least to a degree. Even in this area, a 97E
Russian linguist admitted the subject she was debriefing was
better in English than she was in Russian so most of the
debriefing was actually occurring in English. In divisional

11

MI units the usage complaint was loud. "No one cares if you
can do your job as a 98G or 98C." "The Army does not have a
mission for tactical linguists." "Tactical linguists cannot
gain recognition by doing their jobs within the MOS." One
98G (Russian linguist) stated that he was graduated from
DLIFLC, came to Germany, never used his Russian language
skills in his MI unit, lost much of his proficiency, was
sent to FLTCE where he regained proficiency to a point
nearly equivalent to where he was when he originally left
DLIFLC, came back to his tactical MI unit where he continued
not using his language. He felt that he had again lost his
proficiency needed to be an effective linguist. Until the
problem of usage of the target languages in MI organizations
is properly addressed, sustainment of language proficiency
is nearly impossible to achieve.

E. "Strategic" vs. "Tactical" Linguists.

        Many linguists distinguish between strategic and
tactical assignments. Strategic assignments appear to be
with fixed sites or field stations. These assignments
generally require daily usage of their language skills in
the performance of peacetime missions. On the other hand,
tactical assignments are generally with Division MI units
who are preparing for anticipated wartime requirements.
Tactical unit missions are not as well defined, with regard
to language usage, as strategic missions. Tactical MI
linguists must perform many and diverse tasks in order to
survive and function effectively in a modern battlefield
situation. Consequently, language training and usage differ
markedly between tactical and strategic situations. For
example, tactical situations demand troop leadership and
vehicular maintenance, whereas, the supervisory requirements
of a field station may necessitate a shift leader who is
more technically qualified in specialized language skills.
Difficulties appear to arise when linguists are transferred
between tactical and strategic assignments. The charge has
been made, that linguists who arrive at field stations from
tactical assignments, are generally not qualified to perform
their linguist functions. When the reverse of this situation
is experienced, some tactical unit personnel claim that
strategic linguists "don't want to get their hands dirty".
The training and assignment of linguists between tactical
and strategic units appears to be a serious career
management issue.

F. Career Management.

        The principal issue in career management is whether to
form a linguist career management field where the technical
military specialties are additional identifiers. The current
management system is based on military technical jobs with

language being the additional identifier. A thorough review
of the advantages and disadvantages of both management
systems is required.

G. Documentation of Spaces.

Authorization of linguists should be based on Army
doctrine and planning, whereby requirements are identified
for language usage. Weaknesses in these areas are reflected
in poor documentation and specification of spaces both
within the active and reserve components. This area is
particularly weak in the reserve components. The entire
issue of documentation of spaces deserves to be addressed.

H. General vs. Technical Language.

This issue divides the Army Foreign Language Program
into two distinct camps. Most linguists, teachers, and
administrators, fully understand the need for each linguist
to have "a basic load" of general (global) language. No
agreement exists as to how much this basic load should be
(1+ to 3 levels on the DLPT). DLIFLC emphasizes only the
general or global language skills. The DLPT measures general
language. Non-resident instruction, whether provided by
instructors hired by AECs or by FLTCE, emphasize general
language. Units with military missions using linguists
require considerable technical vocabulary.
Counterintelligence units require their agents to use target
languages in rather standard scenarios. These military units
would like linguists to come prepared to operate at least at
a minimal level in this area. Military commanders often feel
that technical language proficiency is neglected throughout
the system. On the other hand, those who provide
non-resident training claim they would prefer to use more
relevant military scenarios as contexts for target language
training and to emphasize actual vocabulary needed for job
performance. They are, however, prevented from doing this
because of the classified nature of the subject matter.
Nearly all linguists, linguist trainers and managers,
indicated that linguists needed, in the final analysis, a
"good" grounding in general language proficiency. For
example, one warrant officer stated: "What sentence is it
that tells when the war is going to start?".
Integration of general and technical language is probably
the weakest area in linguist development.

I. Curricula/POI/Instructional Materials.

DLIFLC attempts, in part, to provide some general
(global) language instructional materials. USAICS and other
military agencies are attempting to provide some technical

language materials. Instructors in command language programs and FLTCE are using commercial materials, which they find more relevant to local linguist needs. Target language newspapers, magazines and broadcasts, etc., are used extensively to make language instruction a live and real time experience. Linguists complain that conventional curricula/POI/instructional materials are an adventure in boredom and drudgery. One linguist warrant officer stated emphatically: "Spruce up language training; see as well as hear; it is no fun to sit and refresh your language skills using current tapes".

J. Use of Advanced Instructional Technology.

Some key personnel contacted in this study were opposed to Computer-assisted Language Instruction. Their argument was that in areas so highly dependent on interactive person-to-person communications development only people are appropriate to teach other people language skills. Yet the capabilities of advanced instructional technology should not be overlooked. Computers have considerable numbers of strong features in language training. Interactive video disc systems can provide situational contexts for language learning and require interactive communications. Drill and practice can be made fun. "Sprucing up" non-resident training can become commonplace using advanced instructional systems. The problem often is inflated expectations concerning use of technology. The expense in development of quality products is high. Often instructional developers fail to use the full capabilities of the technology that are available to them. Both formative and summative evaluations are omitted, hence little if any determination of valve or lack thereof is made and few "lessons learned" are systematically feed into future developments. Army 21 doctrine and Army planning guidance stresses the important role of technology. Language training needs its fair share of research and development, particularly in the applied research area.

K. Learning Strategies and Methods of Instruction.

Oxford-Carpenter(1985) developed an excellent review concerning the status of learning strategies in foreign languages. This paper will not duplicate her work. Development and use of learning strategies by linguists are extremely important in acquiring and sustaining language proficiency. This area is particularly rich for research and may be enhanced when combined with advanced instructional technology. Methods of instruction also present challenges for personnel working in non-resident instruction. DLIFLC has considerable expertise in resident training. Its exposure to non-resident training has been

14

limited. Are methods used in classrooms at the Presidio of
Monterey applicable in field environments? Some
practitioners think not. Some key personnel in the field
advocated that DLIFLC develop an expertise in non-resident
training and its methods and then provide instructor
training for field personnel. Currently DLIFLC provides
periodically an instructor training course for FORSCOM and
other personnel.

L. Role of Army Continuing Education System (ACES).

ACES through its 369 Army Education Centers and
subcenters can provide considerable support to command
language programs. AEC can be a place on an installation/or
on a community where a linguist who is not in a linguist
space can always go to find where help in maintaining
language proficiency can be found. Army education personnel
are strong in counseling, and in providing college and basic
skills education programs. Most AEC personnel are
non-linguists. They have no charter to assume responsibility
for unit language training. Target language proficiency is a
direct responsibility of the linguist's chain of command,
not of the AEC. The AEC can merely serve in a support role.
AR611-6 directs linguists to the AEC for non-resident
training but fails to give responsibility to the Army agency
which operates ACES for language training for linguists. In
some situations observed, excellent support was being
provided through ACES channels. In other cases, ACES
language personnel did not even know where the MI personnel
were located even though they suspected they were in the
same building.

Section IV

Possible Research Topics

A. Doctrine and Army Planning Guidance.

1. Research Question:What technical foreign language needs are inherrent in "Army 21" doctrine?

Rationale: Army 21 doctrine is being used extensively in long range Army planning. Army 21 Interim Operational Concept(June,1985) omits technical foreign language needs in its contents. If consideration of technical foreign language requirements were included in sections on "The Soldier","Intelligence, Electronic Warfare", "Communications", and "Special Operations Forces" there would exist a basis for priority planning and technology focus. This inclusion in Army 21 doctrine would also provide the necessary recognition of the technical foreign language requirements throughout the entire Army organizational structure and provide a basis for priority inclusion in Army Planning Guidance, Program Objectives Memorandum (POM) and the Command Operating Budget (COB). Additionally, technical foreign language proficiency of Army linguists could easily be considered intergal to combined arms excercises, interoperability training, and other major training and operations functions.

Suggested Approach: ACSI through DCSA task Cdr TRADOC to form an in-house committee from USAISC, DLIFLC, SOF and other concerned service schools and agencies to review Army 21 doctrine and determine what technical foreign language requirements are inherent in this concept of warfare and document those needs in later Army 21 editions.

Expected Outcomes: Definition of the role and mission of Army linguists performing their military jobs using their target language skills. Increased awareness of the importance of Army linguists by non-linguists and recognition that maintenance of target language skills by linguists is a critical responsibility of the entire Army chain of command.

2.Research Question: How do Foreign Armies develop, maintain and use linguists (e.g., Russian, German, Chinese, Canadian, and British)?

Rationale: Although DLIFLC attempts to provide a center of excellence in foreign language training for the U.S.Department of Defense, its personnel and the key individuals charged with the responsibility to oversee its operations appear to lack any clear understanding as to alternative methods employed by foreign armies/nations in

16

the development, maintenance and employment of their
linguist assets. A thorough review in this area may reveal a
wealth of valuable information useful in assisting the DFLP
to develop recommended changes to improve the U.S. posture
regarding language training and use to protect and promote
the national interests. In addition, both interoperability
among allied forces and OFFOR operations involving potential
enemy forces seem to demand basic knowledge and
understanding regarding how other armies develop, maintain
and use their linguists.

Suggested Approach: Training Division, ODCSOPS HQDA, acting
on behalf of the Executive Agent of DLIFLC, commission the
Commandant,DLIFLC, to contract for such a study to be
performed and to report on recommended DFLP changes as a
result of this study. The study should entail an in-depth
literature review, case studies with interviews with key
personnel and on-site observation of use and training of
linguists in foreign armies.

Expected Outcomes: A detailed analysis of various national
policies and underlying assumptions regarding the
development, maintenance and use of linguists. Selected case
studies of national defense foreign language programs or
strategies with specific consideration given to (1) setting
and history, (2) philosophy, purpose, and goal setting
process, (3) linguists' characteristics, (4) needs
assessment procedures, (5) recruitment and/or selection of
linguists, (6) curriculum, curriculum development,
instructional methodologies, learning strategies, (7)
support services (e.g., counseling, language resource
centers, sustainment activities and strategies), (8)
linkages (internal within the defense structures and
external to full scope of national linguist assets), (9)
evaluation and assessment of proficiency, (10) key roles,
positions or personal characteristics that are critical to
the functioning of the program or strategy.

   3.Research Question: How do the U.S. Navy, Air Force
and Marine Corps develop, maintain and use linguists after
graduation from the Basic Course at DLIFLC?

Rationale: Other services, especially the Navy, have
developed foreign language maintenance proficiency programs,
scenario training units and military job-related proficiency
assessment instruments. Some of these materials and concepts
may be relevant to Army needs.

Suggested Approach: Army Service Program Manager (OACSI)
obtain concurrence for such a study from the other service
program managers, then task USAICS through TRADOC to conduct
it. An in-house team from USAICS with some contractor
support should review in-depth how these services develop,
maintain and use linguists. Instructional materials and

tests should be reviewed by subject matter experts. Study report to the Army Service Program should include recommendations for improving the Army's program based on "lessons-learned " from the other services, whether some instuctional material and tests that have been developed by other services can be used or modified for use within the Army, recommendations for improving DLIFLC and its foreign language training operations, linguist career management suggestions, etc.

Expected Outcomes: Valuable insights for USAICS and the Army Service Program Manager on how to improve the Army's program based on what works and doesn't work well with the other services. Recommendations from all services on how to improve DLIFLC which can be given to Training Division, ODCSOFS, for consideration and appropriate action.

4.Research Question: What is the optimal mix of target language training in relation to other tactical and technical training infield units? In fixed-station units?

Rationale: Army 21 Interim Operational Concept calls for small and self-sufficient units that are highly mobile and agile, firepower intensive, less manpower reliant, capable of rapid strategic mobility, more easily logistically supportable, and capable of real-time intelligence acquisition. Army linguists in tactical field MI units must prepare to operate in a wartime environment. Tactical and technical training in response to various, perhaps competing, unit mission requirements must be appropriately managed by MI commanders and training officers. Yet little guidance is available to assist these officers in establishing training priorities. Often non-resident language training and even unit technical language training and target language use receive low priority.

Suggested Approach: DACSI, through OCSA, task CDR, TRADOC to develop MI (CEWI) BN training management guidelines which incorporate non-resident foreign language training and unit technical foreign language training and perhaps even "arrival training" based on a thorough review of all CEWI unit and individual mission requirements.

Expected Outcomes: Needed guidance which will help standardize CEWI unit training and establish a priority for refresher/maintenance/enhancement target language training for linguists in relation to other training and operational functions.

5.Research Question: At what general language proficiency level (basic load) can technical language be effectively and efficiently taught and learned by Army linguists in order to perform their military jobs properly?

18

Rationale: Army Language Program 2000(draft) mentions that the Army should start providing the service members with an Army language program which combines and reinforces all the skills required in performance of job related tasks as his/her career progresses. DLIFLC, FLTCE, and ACES only provide general language training. The DLFT only measures general language proficiency. Linguists need technical language proficiency to do their respective military jobs. The question becomes how much general language is enough and technical, military job-relevant language should be the order of the day. Subject matter experts will say from 1+ to 3 level on DLFT.

Suggested Approach: DACSI arrange for AFI, in conjunction with DLIFLC and FLTCE, to develop an empirical research project as a follow-on to the Language Skills Change Project designed to determine an appropriate mix of general and technical language that should be taught initially by DLIFLC and maintained through non-resident instruction or a return to DLIFLC/FLTCE for advanced instruction.

Expected Outcomes: Data whereby the Army leadership could make major decisions on the fundamental character of foreign language training in the Army and at DLIFLC.

B. Assessment of Foreign Language Proficiency

1. Research Question: What is the proper mechanism(s) to test linguistically the technical ability of an Army linguist to do his/her military job?

Rationale: There is a need to develop the characteristics and specifications of a mechanism to test linguistically the technical ability of an Army linguist to do his/her military job (97B,97E,98C,98G minimum). The DLFT measures general language ability.

Suggested Approach: ASCI through DCSA task TRADOC to develop the characteristics and specifications of a model mechanism (perhaps employing advanced systems technology). The DLIFLC Language Needs Assessment for 97B, 97E, 98C, and 98G perhaps could be used as front-end analysis documents for such a project.

Expected Outcomes: The basis for SQT, ITEP, ARTEP, interoperability training for Army linguists.

2. Research Question: Can the Job Performance Language Tests, developed by USAICS, be validated as psychometrically sound and reliable measurement instruments for use with Army linguists?

19

Rationale: USAICS is in the process of designing and developing JPLTs. They need to be validated psychometrically to insure their reliability and validity.

Suggested Approach: OACSI/TRADOC arrange with ARI or other third party research organization to conduct validation testing. DLIFLC should have a major consultant role in such an effort.

Expected Outcomes: Validated testing instruments to be used in the short term upon which to base Army linguists' EER, incentive pay and other military personnel management decisions.

3. **Research Question:** Are there other measures besides the DLFT that can provide valid and reliable general language proficiency data regarding Army linguists?

Rationale: The DLFT III appears to be a much improved DLFT version than previous ones. Yet it is very time-consuming, not easily administered, and results are not readily available for the oral portion. A study of off-the-shelf test instruments, both US and foreign developed, may produce some valuable information on ways to improve or replace the DLFT.
It is recognized that DLIFLC developed the DLFT with the help and coordination among many governmental and civilian agencies and may be the standard for the United States. Yet a fresh look periodically at other measures may prove helpful.

Suggested Approach: Training Division, ODCSOPS, (acting as the Executive Agent's representative) arrange a comparative analysis study of existing language testing instruments to determine ways to improve the DLFT.

Expected Outcomes: A comprehensive analysis (such as contained in the Mental Measurement Yearbook) of general language proficiency testing instruments in use today, and their ratings regarding their validity, reliability, ease of administration, adaptability to automated administration, etc. This effort may prove highly beneficial in developing the next version of the DLFT.

4. **Research Question:** What usage factor is required to retain linguistics skills once they have been attained at the L2, R2 level as measured by the DLFT III? At the L1, R1 level?

Rationale: Army Linguist Personnel Study (1976) stated: "Once a linguistic skill has been attained, constant use is required to retain this perishable skill. Programs for this maintenance of proficiency must be provided as well as on duty training time, to keep the linguist as proficient as possible for his next utilization assignment"(p.4). This basic assumption that "constant use is required" seems unchallenged yet undocumented through research. The idea that, in linguist documentation of positions, two positions should be authorized as a minimum (even though only one may be required to perform the mission) so that the opportunity is afforded for constant interpersonnel communications in a target language.

Suggested Approach: DLIFLC/ARI conduct a follow-on empiricial research project using results of the Language Skills Change Study as a starting point. Experimental and control groups of Army linguists should be developed to provide the necessary data for this research.

Expected Outcomes: Guidelines in terms of time, learning environment, interpersonnel communications requirements needed to retain linguistic skills at spcific levels once attained (as measured by the DLPT).

5. Research Question: If linguists maintain a minimum of S2 as measured by DLPT III, can they better maintain a L2, R2 than those linguists who don't maintain a high level of speaking ability?

Rationale: The premise raised by personnel at FLTCE is that emphasizing the requirement for speaking (i.e. the requirement to interactively communicate effectively) facilitates the development of the ability to think in the target language. Listening and reading skills more or less trailor speaking skills.

Suggested Approach: DLIFLC, in conjunction with FLTCE, explore this hypothesis with contractor assistance using experimental and control groups and analyzing the results.

Expected Outcomes: New insights into structuring foreign language training which may have long term benefits both for linguists and the military services.

6. **Research Question**: What level of language proficiency (as measured by DLPT III) is the minimum required by most user agencies for DLIFLC graduates?

Rationale: FORSCOM Cir. 350-84-11 lists the following minimum scores as required:

MOS	Speaking	Listening	Reading	
96C	2.0	2.0	1.0	
97CL	2.0	2.0	1.0	
98CL	1.0	2.0	2.0	
98G	1.0	2.0	2.0	(p.2-1)

FORSCOM also provides specific linguist training profile guidance to include enrollment in an "Arrival Training Program" if linguists arriving in the command score below the maximum DLPT standard listed above. Research is needed to validate FORSCOM's minimum required scores and establish minimum standard scores throughout the Army. This effort would provide the Executive Agent for the Defense Foreign Language Program with a charter to either insure that graduates of DLIFLC meet those minimum standards or to insure that appropriate non-resident training is available to user commands in order for linguists to meet those minimum standards.

Suggested Approach: OACSI, through OCSA, task TRADOC to produce a report which addresses this question, which would be based at least in part on the Military Intelligence Foreign Language Survey and Analysis now in progress and the Language Needs Assessment already conducted by DLIFLC. OACSI should then staff this report through user agencies and establish standard guidance in AR 611-6.

Expected Outcomes: By MOS, the minimum scores, as measured by DLPT III, in terms of speaking, listening, reading and writing proficiency required for Army linguists in order to perform their military duties.

7. **Research Question**: How much time to proficiency is there for each major language group with listening, speaking, reading, with repeated measures as criteria? (See DLIFLC Candidate Research Projects, p.D-10.)

8. **Research Question**: What guidelines/exemplars can be developed to aid user specifications of end-of-course proficiency level? (See DLIFLC Candidate Research Projects,

C. Selection, Recruitment and Retention of Army Linguists

1.Research Question: How valid and reliable is the DLAB as a selection instrument?

Rationale: Some graduates from DLIFLC have extreme difficulty in achieving DLPT III scores of S2, L2, R2. Reports from field agencies indicate some DLIFLC trained linguists do not have a working ability in the target language throughout the entire first enlistment. The charge is being made that some of these individuals do not have the basic ability to learn a second language. These individuals should have been screened out during the recruitment process. The validity and reliability of the DLAB as a selection instrument is being questioned.

Suggested Approach: DLIFLC should revalidate the DLAB on a current population using standard validation procedures. A relationship between the DLAB and the current DLIFLC student population should be established.

Expected Outcomes: Valuable insights toward development of a new DLAB version.

2.Research Question: How does the student/linguist "motivation" variable affect the validity and reliability of the DLAB?

Rationale: A hypothesis provided by key practitioners in the field is that the motivation variable is the key to success for those students who score below average on the DLAB. This hypothesis does not appear to have been proven through research. The Language Skill Change Project (now in progress) may provide this answer. If it does not, then such a project is needed.

Suggested Approach: This research effort could be a part of 3A above or a separate research project based on qualitative research methods (interviews, observations, etc.).

Expected Outcomes: A more in-depth understanding of motivation as a selection variable. Input toward development of a new DLAB version or a supplementary selection criterion instrument.

3.Research Question: Are there other measures besides the DLAB that can provide valid and reliable language training aptitude data upon which to base selection of students?

23

Rationale: An in-depth review of language aptitude and student selection instruments both U.S. and foreign-developed would be helpful in developing a new version of the DLAB.

Suggested Approach: Training Division, ODCSOPS, task DLIFLC to conduct an in-depth comparative analysis of other U.S. and foreign-developed language aptitude and student selection instruments and mechanisms. TRADOC TTA may be able to provide valuable assistance in such a project to determine if an alternate theoretical concept can be devised that makes sense.

Expected Outcomes: Valuable insights into ways to improve current student selection procedures.

4. **Research Question:** With empirical supporting data, what are the advantages and disadvantages in recuitment and selection of native speakers for Army linguists?

Rationale: The hypothesis is that recruitment of native speakers would greatly lessen the target language proficiency problem because the Army would have natural bi-linguals. Possible disadvantages include difficulties in acquiring background security investigations and in English language proficiency. These assumptions have not been varified by research.

Suggested Approach: OACSI arrange with ARI Manpower and Personnel Research Laboratory to conduct a research project to determine the advantages and disadvantages in terms of language proficiency development and maintenance savings, retention rates of general and technical language, administrative problems, attrition, job performance, and English language proficiency.

Expected Outcomes: Guidelines to Recruiting Command for selection of recruits for linguist positions. Data for DLIFLC in training native speakers vs. non-native speakers.

5. **Research Question:** How can an Army linguist information network be properly established and maintained which will best facilitate job ulilization and total force career retention (Active, Reserve and Civilian Components) of this valuable national asset?

Rationale: Currently neither the ARNG nor the Reserves to include the IRR systematically recruit highly qualified and experienced Army linguists who are departing active duty. An appropriately established and maintained Army linguists' information network could provide essential and timely information to network members which could allow for systematic career development with choices of regular,

reservist, ARNG and/or civilians to include NSA for individuals within the system. Such an effort could provide support for a comprehensive National Defense total force strategy. A review of the current effort being done through the Defense Documentation Center could serve as a starting point for such a project.

Suggested Approach: ODCSPER task CDR MILPERCEN to develop a detailed conceptual plan. If that plan shows such a network to be feasible, task MILPERCEN and other PERCENs to implement this network.

Expected Outcomes: A feasilibility study regarding the development of an Army (or Defense) linguist information network. Based on that study, an implemented network.

     6.Research Question: What effect does non-language utilization have on retention of Army linguists?

Rationale: MILPERCEN reenlistment data indicate that the Army has not been very successful in retaining linguists in the military service. One hypothesis is that linguists are dissatisfied with the Army because they do not use their language skills as part of their military jobs.

Suggested Approach: Information being received from the Language Skill Change Study may resolve this research question. If not, OACSI could arrange a pinpoint survey with the Soldier Support Center Survey Branch to all Army linguists. Results of this survey could then serve as a basis for a study whereby a representative sample of linguists are interviewed in-depth. Such an approach could also be used to validate and/or eloborate on information received from the Language Skill Change Study.

Expected Outcomes: Input for an improved career management system for linguists and use of linguists. Long term result would be greater retention of linguists not only in the Active Component but also extending over to the ARNG, Reserves, and Civilian Component.

D. The Linguist Learner

     1.Research Question: What motivational factors or "softer aspects" are involved in language training and linguistic skill retention and how can they be used to promote recruitment, job performance, and career retention objectives?

Rationale: Learning and retention of linguistic skills are dependent on rather undefined motivational factors both internal and external to the individual learner. Numerous

incentives have been suggested and some even attempted which were targeted toward motivating individuals to learn a language, sustain proficiency and make the Army a meaningful career. Such incentives may include bonuses, college entitlements, proficiency or incentive pay, rapid promotion, enlistment and reenlistment options, training and area of assignment options, etc. Little, however, is known regarding how these incentives affect motivation, what incentives are most cost-effective over the long term, and how they can be applied to achieve the short-range and long-range objectives of the DFLP and the Army mission in general. A comprehensive study in this area could assist the military personnel managers in advocating the " most appropriate incentive package" for recruitment and career retention of linguists (an area of current poor performance with only 18% of 98Gs in USAREUR being reenlisted) and the military trainers and educators in providing both initial and sustainment training.

Suggested Approach: Information received as a result of the Language Skill Change Study should be analyzed prior to development of this effort. Based on its findings, DACSI then arrange with ARI to conduct a follow-on study to insure that the intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors impacting on individual linguist learners have been appropriately defined and that an incentive package has been crafted that is in tune with these motivational factors.

Expected Outcomes: A suggested mix of incentives that would impact most favorably on recruitment and career retention objectives for Army linguists.

2. Research Question: What factors contribute to academic attrition, in addition to aptitude? (See DLIFLC Candidate Research Projects, p. D-7.) (Part of Language Skills Change Project now underway.)

3. Research Question: What are the skill decay rates and estimation of timing for refresher/retraining? (See DLIFLC Candidate Research Projects, p. D-12.) (Language Skills Change Project now underway.)

4. Research Question: What is the minimum English language proficiency level required for students to engage effectively in the DFLP? (See DLIFLC Candidate Research Projects, p. D-15.)

5. Research Question: What educational degree opportunities can be developed as part of the Army Continuing Education System which are directly targeted toward Army linguists and their career management field(s)?

Rationale: ACES has developed 18 SOCAD networks targeted at various career management fields. It is now developing

26

Bachelor Degree networks. No networks are being implemented
or are now under development which are targeted toward the
Military Intelligence MOS's or career management fields. Yet
Army linguists appear eager for educational degree
opportunities and consider these as excellent incentives for
reenlistment.

Suggested Approach: OACSI arrange with ODCSPER to have its
Education Division perform a feasibility study of developing
a networked Bachelor Degree program targeted directly at
Army linguists.

Expected Outcomes: Necessary information and data for
deciding on whether to develop and offer a specific
Bachelor Degree network for Army linguists.

E. Organization and Administration

     1.Research Question: What resources are required to
permit current graduates at DLIFLC to achieve a minimum of
L2,R2,S2 level of language proficiency (as measured by DLPT)
(or minimum DLPT scores as listed in FORSCOM Circular
350-84-11) in resident training? In non-resident training?

Rationale: User agencies complain that many, if not most
graduates from DLIFLC have no higher language proficiency
than a 1+ in any area as measured by the DLPT. An assumption
is that a solid 2 level of proficiency is required generally
in most areas. The Training Division, ODCSOPS, in
fulfillment of its responsibilities of the Army as Executive
Agent for DLIFLC and DFLP needs this information for
planning, programming and budgetry purposes either to
support DLIFLC in resident training to provide the 2
proficiency level minimum for graduates or to make
appropriate provisions in non-resident training for the
achievement of this minimum level.

Suggested Approach: Work is already in progress at DLIFLC to
have basic course graduates at a minimum 2 level.

Expected Outcomes: Essential data needed by Army
decision-makers on whether to make this a resident or
non-resident requirement, or not recognize the requirement
altogether.

     2.Research Question: What measures could be taken to
facilitate command support at Division level and below for
refresher-maintenance-enhancement training of Army
linguists?

Rationale: A common complaint among key individuals involved
in Army language training is the perceived lack of command

27

support, particularly in tactical units, for
refresher-maintenance-enhancement language training for
linguists. Often commanders fail to show sensitivity (a) to
the needs of linguists to remain fluent, (b) to the time and
effort required to sustain linguistic skills, (c) to the
perishable nature of language learning and the requirements
for sustainment and often enhancement training, (d) to the
need for constant usage in the target language through
meaningful duty requirements, (e) to the degradation of
his/her organizational abilities to accomplish the wartime
mission by the lack of capable, functioning Army linguists
who can provide essential intelligence, leadership,
interoperability resources at least in part through their
ability to think and operate effectively in their target
languages.

Suggested Approach: OACSI arrange with ODCSPER/MILPERCEN to
develop a series of possible initiatives aimed at increasing
command support for non-resident foreign language training
for linguists. These initiatives should include ways to
educate officers and NCOs in their respective Army education
systems.

Expected Outcomes: Suggested initiatives for increasing
effective command support for non-resident foreign language
training for linguists.

    3.Research Question: What career management program
involving Army linguists would be most beneficial in
facilitating recruitment, job utilization, career
development and training, language sustainment, and career
retention?

Rationale: Currently Army linguists are divided into several
MOSs and Career Management Fields with emphasis on technical
job performances. Several key individuals involved with Army
language training questioned whether a single
language-oriented CMF with emphasis on language fluency
would better facilitate acquisition and sustainment of
linguistic skills with additional identifiers indicating
specific job performance requirements. Such a career
management program would facilitate the development of a
linguistic pool better capable of meeting a variety of
mission contingencies instead of strapping linguists into
specific job categories which ultimately detract from their
primary function of being Army linguists.

Suggested Approach: OACSI arrange, through the VCSA, for the
DCSPER to appoint an ad hoc task force to conduct a thorough
review of the CMF question and report its recommendations.
Consideration should be given to a DOD linguist management
program. Recommendations be staffed through the MACOMS and
be approved by the VCSA and forwarded to OSD if applicable.

28

Expected Outcomes: A detailed analysis of career management program alternatives upon which Army leadership can expect to make a fair and equitable decision concerning management of Army linguists.

4.**Research Question:** What is entailed in establishing a flexible, centrally-managed, linguist pool capable of meeting Army wartime as well as peacetime contingency plans? What are the advantages and disadvantages in maintaining such a pool? What is the expected role of indigenous personnel to fulfill contingency needs for linguists?

Rationale: The Army has experienced serious difficulties in recruiting qualified candidates for language training to ulimately fill linguist positions. Problems also exist in training those individuals in language and technical job requiements; sustaining their linguistic skills, and retaining those linguists who eventually become well-qualified and experienced either on active duty or in the Reserve Components. The development and maintenance of a flexible linguist pool composed of military and civilian personnel fluent in target languages may provide some relief.

Suggested Approach: DACSI arrange with ODCSPER to conduct an exploratory study involving establishment and maintenance of a flexible, centrally-managed, linguist pool. This effort could be done in conjunction with 5C above.

Expected Outcomes: Necessary data upon which the Army leadership could base decisions involving further consideration of this initiative.

5.**Research Question:** What authorization documentation is needed to allow field commands to acquire essential equipment and facilities to conduct foreign language testing?

Rationale: The 66th M.I. Group Test Control Officer indicated that he had, what he determined to be, inadequate testing equipment needed to administer the DLFT and other language tests. Consequently he was attempting to acquire a cassette laboratory for his command. But he was unable to find an authorization document upon which to base a valid request through the Army supply channels. Apparently his quest for such documentation had involved queries to MILPERCEN and DLIFLC without success. With DLFT testing being made an annual requirement, the need for appropriate equipment and facilities to conduct foreign language testing becomes increasingly critical. Appropriate authorization documents which allow for standard specifications for procurement and for engineer use will facilitate the testing effort.

29

Suggested Approach: Training Division, ODCSOPS, in conjunction with ODCSLOG, Office of the Chief of Engineers and ASA (RDA) and perhaps AMC, work with DLIFLC and MILPERCEN to develop appropriate authorization documents.

Expected Outcomes: Appropriate authorization documentation for equipment and facilities essential for language testing based on standardized usage factors, etc.

F. Curriculum and Instruction

1.**Research Question**: What is the optimal mix of general language and technical job language in refresher-maintence-enhancement training?

Rationale: Some key users of Army linguists have taken the position that, if the linguist is thoroughly fluent in the target language, they can teach the technical job language through units' in-house training. But if the linguist is weak in the general language, the teaching of technical job language is difficult if not impossible. Hence, DLIFLC (both Resident and Non-Resident efforts) should concentrate on general language fluency and sustainment. On the contrary, other key users contend that functional, job oriented language skills are all that is needed. By emphasizing general language fluency, DLIFLC is guilty of over training Army linguists. Instead all language training should be, to the degree possible, functionally oriented to specific Army jobs that the individual is expected to perform. Non-resident language training should be directly related to specific individual soldier's job tasks. Terminal job language task objectives should be clearly and precisely identified. Hence, DLIFLC should differentiate between individuals by teaching directly to those specific terminal job language task objectives inherent in specific MOSs and duty positions. Little research has been found to support either position. Yet this training philosophy issue profoundly affects the entire DFLP. Research in this area is critically needed.

Suggested Approach: Based on information received as part of the Language Skills Change Project, OACSI, as the Army Service Program Manager, arrange a committee with representatives from DLIFLC, INSCOM, FORSCOM, and other appropriate commands to develop rough guidelines. Contractor support should be made available. TRADOC TTA may assist in this analysis if a branch is established at DLIFLC.

Expected Outcomes: A study that will shed light on this issue and serve to guide Army community as well as DLIFLC with regard to general and functional language training; provide support for "Army Language Program 2000" concept.

2. Research Question: How can general and technical foreign language training be integrated into a continuum of career learning for Army linguists through curriculum and instruction?

Rationale: This research question is a corrolary with 6 A above. Not only is the optimal mix of general language and technical job language in refresher-maintenance-enhancement training unknown; but also, its integration into a continuum of career learning is a missing element. There seems to be considerable confusion as to who is responsible for this integration effort. DLIFLC seems intent on developing global (general) language proficiency while USAISC maintains its emphasis on technical AIT skills in English and looks to DLIFLC as the "language schoolhouse". The confusion seems to lie in who has the resources and foreign language capabilities to effect this integration. This study is needed to review the entire linguist career program and develop a model series of curriculum and instruction directly related to the particular phases of the linguist career program that have been identified.

Suggested Approach: DACSI, as the Army's Service Program Manager, work with DLIFLC, TRADOC, USAISC, Goodfellow and other agencies, to develop clear lines of responsibility for the integration of technical and general language. Using information developed in 6 A above, the agency(ies) found to be responsible be tasked to develop a model series of curriculum and instruction, to include testing instruments appropriate to the particular phases of the linguist career program. The resulting curriculum and instruction should be implemented simultaneously with the linguist career program. After this series has been refined, other series be patterned after this model.

Expected Outcomes: A model series of curriculum and instruction appropriate for a full linguist career program.

3. Research Question: What are instructional methodologies which can accommodate a variety of learning environments and instructional delivery situations inherrent in operational non-resident command language programs?

Rationale: DLIFLC's expertise in instructional methodologies lies in the resident area. FORSCOM periodically sends non-resident instructors to DLIFLC for Instructor Training. DLIFLC could provide more relevant training if its area of expertise was broadened in non-resident areas to include instructional methods, procedures, helpful hints, lessons learned in non-resident training.

Suggested Approach: DLIFLC establish a non-resident dean of instruction who would make it his/her first priority to

31

establish a non-resident instructional methodologies
expertise within DLIFLC and develop an instructor training
course appropriate to helping non-resident instructors in
facilitating learning among linguists who are attempting to
maintain their language skills. These experts should not be
limited to general (global)language needed to score
appropriately on the DLPT but should also handle technical
language needed for military job performance.

Expected Outcomes: A much improved instructor training
program, consequently more relevant non-resident training
targeted to Army needs.

4.Research Question: Is the current DLIFLC
Refresher-Maintenance Package, where coupled with the
Professional Development Program Extention Courses for
SIGINT/ HUMINT linguists, an adequate set of instructional
materials for refresher-maintenance-enhancement in language
proficiency sustainment training in field commands?

Rationale: Chief, Non-resident Division, DLIFLC, expressed a
belief that the current DLIFLC refresher-maintenance
package, when coupled with the professional development
extension course, constitutes adequate
refresher-maintenance-enhancement instructional materials
for field use. FORSCOM key personnel found the current
DLIFLC refresher-maintenance package weak. Nowhere in
USAREUR or FORSCOM were these materials observed in use.
Several key people, however, mentioned the good quality of
the PEPEC materials. Because of the contradictory
information received during this study, an evaluation of
current non-resident instructional materials produced and
provided by DLIFLC is advised.

Suggested Approach: OACSI request TRADOC conduct a summative
evaluation of instructional materials in question and use
the data in conjunction with formative evaluations by DLIFLC
for future instructional developments.

Expected Outcomes: The determination of the value of the
current non-resident instructional materials targeted toward
linguists.

5.Research Question:What is the state-of-the-art in
teaching methodologies? (See DLIFLC Candidate Research
Projects,pD-4.)

6.Research Question: What technical target language
scenario would be appropriate for integration into National
Training Center combined arms training excercises and
evaluations?

Rationale: The Army Plan and other Army planning and
training documents emphasize the importance of the National
Training Center in CONUS as a vehicle for training and
evaluation of training in the United States Army. Foreign
language proficiency of Army linguists is not currently a
factor included among the various scenarios at NTC. Although
the Army expresses a requirement for realistic training
(train as you would fight), the lack of foreign language
element appears to be a gross omission.

Suggested Approach: DACSI request TRADOC to include
foreign language proficiency as an element in NTC training
and evaluation. TRADOC then would develop an appropriate
scenario.

Expected Outcome: More realistic NTC training; evaluation
data on foreign language proficiency and usage.

7. Research Question: What are the advantages and
disadvantages of establishing common methodology for unit
technical language training under the Army Standardization
Program initiatives?

Rationale: Key personnel at USAISC indicated a reluctance to
establish a common methodology for unit technical language
training. The Army Training Plan, Army Planning Guidance,
and The Army Plan emphasize the importance of the Army
Standardization Program. The Army Training Board, in its
assessment of standardization in the Army, is critical of
Service School efforts in this area. A study in this area
with regard to technical language training seems warranted.

Suggested Approach: DACSI request TRADOC/USAICS to conduct a
feasibility study regarding the establishment of a common
methodology for unit technical language training.

Expected Outcomes: Study findings which will indicate
whether a common methodology for unit technical language
training should be developed in accordance with the mandate
of the Army Standardization Program.

8. Research Question: Can a model cross-training
instructional package be developed to help MI commanders and
training officers better use the MOS-grade mismatch
personnel currently assigned in tactical units?

Rationale: 124th MI BN Commander pointed out the shortfalls
and overages in personnel by MOS and grade. Although his
battalion was nearly at its total authorized strength, its
MOS and grade mismatch were major. For example, how do you
use Morse Code operators to fill linguist positions? If
appropriate cross-training instuctional packages were
available, perhaps some of these rather bright soldiers

could rapidly acquire a working proficiency to fill in for missing linguists in emergancy situations such as would possibility occur if this unit was sent into war as part of the Rapid Deployment Forces.

Suggested Approach: DACSI request TRADOC to investigate the possibility of developing a model cross-training instructional package to quickly train soldiers to fill linguist positions at marginal levels of competence.

Expected Outcomes: A model effort aimed at better utilization of "on-hand, for duty" personnel to perform critical tasks normally expected of linguists.

9. Research Question: How can live satellite broadcasts/telecasts from Eastern Block/ Middle East/ Pacific Basin/Latin America be appropriately integrated in non-resident and unit technical language training settings?

Rationale: FLTCE and the Army Russian Institute indicated that satellite broadcasts/telecasts would be received at their facilities in the near future. Some key personnel at DLIFLC indicated the possibility of satellite broadcasts being used as part of the resident program. Yet no methodology for using this medium was found to exist during the present study. A need was apparent for a project to develop this methodology in order to optimally use this medium to enrich both non-resident as well as resident instruction.

Suggested Approach: OACSI request TRADOC/DLIFLC in conjunction with FLTCE to develop appropriate methodologies for using satellite communications in language training settings.

Expected Outcomes: Guidelines that would assist in making satellite communications in language training cost effective.

10.__Research Question__: Are there long-term significient differences among Army linguists who are "totally immersed" in FLTCE training as opposed to those who are not?

__Rationale__: FLTCE has a portion of its students "totally immersed" during their six weeks of training (eg. live with target language speaking families, etc.) and a portion who are not. The DOI indicated a lack of quantitative data that shows the superiority of one method over the other. He feels that linguists who have the total immersion experience retain their language skills longer than those who do not have this experience. This setting seems ideal for a quantitative study on the benefits of immersion.

__Suggested Approach__: OACSI request TRADOC and INSCOM, in conjunction with DLIFLC, to develop and conduct an analysis using FLTCE students to determine any possible short and long term benefits of immersion.

__Expected Outcome__: Methodological guidelines for non-resident instruction in group settings.

G. Language Instructor Qualifications and Staff Development

1.<u>Research Question</u>: What is the minimum English language proficiency level needed by language instructors employed in DFLP? (See DLIFLC Candidate Research Projects, p.D-13.)

2.<u>Research Question</u>: What are the optimal selection criteria for contract-hiring language instructors for non-resident command language programs? For FLTCE-styled foreign language training centers?

<u>Rationale</u>: Current selection criteria used in USAREUR procurement, principally by ACES, for selecting Headstart/Gateway instructors may not be suited to hiring Refresher-Maintenance instructors even though some modifications have been made to the criteria specifically for selection of these instructors. Some complaints centered around the current criteria's emphasis on maintaining a stable work force that does not need continuous orientation to the U.S. military community, its specific needs and job language requirements. Some key personnel advocated emphasis be shifted to finding the most qualified <u>language</u> instructor(s) available each time the contract is offered for bid. FLTCE indicated that it was going to discontinue using the USAREUR criteria by inserting its own. A review of current selection criteria for refresher-maintenance language instructors seems warranted not only for USAREUR but for the entire Army procurement system. Alternate contracting procedures need to be explored.

<u>Suggested Approach</u>: DACSI develop a task force composed of MACOM user elements, procurement experts, DLIFLC, USAISC and other interested parties. This task force would be charged with developing selection criteria to include work performance elements and devising procurement strategy capable of acquiring the best qualified instructors in a timely manner fully able to meet local needs.

<u>Expected Outcomes</u>: A more satisfactory acquisition system for hiring language instructors.

3.<u>Research Question</u>: What is the optimal mix of native speaker language instructors and U.S.-trained linguists who are technically and tactically proficient in the target language in a non-resident program?

<u>Rationale</u>: Considerable difference of opinion exists on whether the Army should use "native speaker" language instructors or U.S.Army trained linguists as instructors. It appears that some of both are essential. In some locations, team teaching (native linguist along side U.S. trained

linguist) provides excellent training for linguists. No
guidelines appear to exist in this area. The root problem
appears to be whether emphasis should be placed on general
language development and sustainment or on technical
language proficiency needed to perform military job tasks.

Suggested Approach: DACSI arrange with ARI to develop some
guidelines in this area through research.

Expected Outcomes: Guidelines on what are appropriate mixes
of native speakers and U.S. trained linguist instructors and
staff to develop and sustain language proficiency among
linguists in non-resident settings.

4.Research Question: What technical language instructor
training packages can be developed to assist the native
speaker contract-hired instructor?

Rationale: USAREUR ACES personnel expressed a frustration
that they would like to better orient instructors hired
through its offices to teach foreign languages in military
job-related context. Yet they have been unable to obtain
materials which are unclassified in nature that can be used
in instructor orientation to show appropriate military
contexts. Military Intelligence personnel indicate that such
materials could be made available. An instructor training
package needs to be developed that is unclassified yet
directly related to developing functional vocabulary in
senarios that have meaning in performing military tasks.
Such a package may well have applicability to resident
training at DLIFLC.

Suggested Approach: DACSI arrange with TRADOC/USAISC and
Goodfellow to develop a model instructor orientation package
using sample vocabulary in military job-related senarios.
Perhaps such a package could first be developed to support
97B/97E refresher-maintanence training. Information received
from the Language Needs Assessment, the Language Skill
Change Project, MANTECH Project, and other such efforts
could serve as base documents for this development.

Expected Outcomes: Instructors who are better qualified in
providing language training that is directly related to
military requirements.

5.Research Question: What staff development training is
needed for Test Control Officers who administer the various
language tests such as the DLPT?

Rationale: Apparently little staff development is available
for Test Control Officers who acquire, maintain, safeguard,
and administer language tests in non-resident environment.

Such training appears to be imperative if uniform, correct procedures are to be followed. Technical assistance should be readily available. A systematic approach needs to be developed, implemented and enforced if language testing in the Army is to have meaning.

Suggested Approach: Training Division, ODCSOPS, require DLIFLC, in conjuntion with appropriate military testing agencies, to determine what staff development is needed and develop a mechanism to ensure that such training is implemented worldwide.

Expected Outcomes: Test Control Officers fully capable of performing their tasks regarding military foreign language testing.

6.Research Question: What are the minimum, maximum and optimal instructor-student ratios in command language programs and in FLTCE-styled classroom environments for "cost-effective" training?

Rationale: Army Audit Agency is conducting an audit on FLTCE's intructor-student ratio. Apparently it would like to recommend a higher ratio (go from an average of 1-3 to 1-6 instructor to students) in order to save money. It seems odd that AAA would be the correct agency to attempt to set policy in this area. Education Services Officers also require a minimum number of students in order to hire an instructor. A research effort in this area may be beneficial to explain the need for specific instructor-student ratios in order for instruction to be cost-effective or cost-beneficial.

Suggested Approach: Training Division, ODCSOPS, task DLIFLC to conduct field research and develop guidelines on instructor-student ratios in command language programs and FLTCE-styled classroom environments.

Expected Outcomes: Standards that can be defended in the area of instructor-student ratios in non-resident foreign language training.

H. Applications of Technology

1.Research Question: How does Gateway German instruction, taught via interactive video at DLIFLC, improve language and acculturation skills of Battalion and Brigade Commanders over that provided by conventional instruction?

Rationale: DLIFLC is developing a Gateway German program of instruction for use in interactive video disc systems. ARI's Field Unit at Monterey is conducting what might be a

formative evaluation of that effort. Its scope is limited to
data elements that can be observed within DLIFLC. Perhaps
more helpful and of long-term use in development of
computer-assisted language instruction (CALI) would be a
summative evaluation that would assess impact of this type
of instruction over more conventional instruction on learner
performance once actually confronted in Germany with
language and acculturation problems. The extra capacity of
the interactive video disc system to visually depict
situations and actual in-country environmental and
interpersonal conditions would seem ideally suited for its
instructional program; however, its value and actual and/or
potential benefits over conventional instruction needs to be
well-documented, if no more than to justify costs inherent
in development of automated instructional systems. DLIFLC is
also developing a resident course "Gulf to the Ocean" in
Arabic that may be suited to a similar evaluation.

Suggested Approach: An evaluation of Gateway German (and the
resident Arabic course) using both automated and
conventional instruction methods based on data obtained in
part from interviews, observations, and questionnaires
conducted in Germany with program graduates (and their
German (Arabic) counterparts, if possible).

Expected Outcomes: Data for use in justifying costs inherent
in development of future automated instructional programs.

    2. Research Question: What is the role of the human
instructor in the use of advanced instructional technology,
specificially Computer-Assisted Language Instruction (CALI)?

Rationale: Current research indicates a need to develop
guidelines on the role of the human instructor in using
automated instructional systems. The lack of attention to
the human instructor may well be causing a turning back to
more conventional instructional methodologies, particularly
within the Navy and the Army. Until human instructors and
training management become convinced as to the value and
potential benefits of automated systems as true extensions
of their power and abilities to facilitate learning, use of
advanced instructional technology will suffer from lack of
use in operational settings.

Suggested Approach: OACSI arrange with ARI to conduct an
in-depth literature review to include work done by HRL,
U.S. Air Force. Based on that review, develop and test (a)
functional guidelines for human instructors in the use of
advanced instructional technology and (b) a model
instructor/training staff development program.

Expected Outcomes: An in-depth understanding about the roles
of the human instructor. Functional guidelines and a model

staff development oriented toward an optimal mix of human
instruction and automated instruction maximizing the
benefits and potential of both resources.

3.Research Question: What will the state-of-the-art in
advanced instructional technology be in the Year 2000
regarding CALI interactive systems; what long-range Army R&D
planning and project development is required to capitalize
on these technological developments?

Rationale: R&D needs to exploit the advancing development in
artificial intelligence and computer/video/audio systems.
Without long-range planning, programming and budgeting, Army
R&D will not be in position to take advantage of these
advancing technologies in the field of language training.

Suggested Approach: OACSI arrange with the Training Research
Laboratory, ARI, to conduct a comprehensive review of the
literature and to discuss with leading American experts the
expected advances in CALI as part of its annual long-range
planning analysis process.

Expected Outcomes: A comprehensive review of current
literature regarding potential advances in artificial
intelligence and computer/video/audio systems; development
of proposed R&D projects to be implemented between 1990 and
2002 that will capitalize on expected advancing technologies
that would facilitate language learning and sustainment of
linguistic skills.

4.Research Question: What technical foreign language
aspects are required for incorporation into development of
the Artificial Intelligence systems referenced in the
Military Intelligence section of Army 21 doctrine which
will allow real-time intelligence capability?

Rationale: Army 21 Interim Operational Concept mentions the
need for data bases with appropriate language of a specific
geographical area to include pertinent data for all
potential threat forces (p.E-5). It also mentions automated
translation systems to include small, handheld systems for
use at tactical level. Artificial intelligence systems are
expected to receive, analyze, and collate data, develop and
store new algorithms based on their experiences (p.E-22)
There appears to be a need to develop the technical foreign
language aspect needed for inclusion in these AI systems.

Suggested Approach: OACSI work with TRADOC to establish
TRADOC Systems Manager who would be responsible for these
type of research requirements. Such a person with staff
could work closely with the developers of Army 21 doctrine
and insure the language aspects are planned for and
developed in line with other aspects of this doctrine.

Expected Outcomes: Inclusion of the language elements in
Army 21 doctrine.

5.Research Question: What are the educational
technology applications to computer-assisted study? (See
DLIFLC Candidate Research Projects, p.D-8.)

6.Research Question: What "lessons learned" can be
achieved from an evaluation of the automated systems
approach to language learning incorporated in Technical
Language Systems, Inc., efforts?

Rationale: Some non-resident language instructors and
program administrators, both in USAREUR and FORSCOM,
mentioned the value of the instructional system being
marketed by Technical Language Systems, Inc. Apparently they
are being used perhaps in lieu of DLIFLC materials. An
objective evaluation of the automated assessment, tailoring
of instruction to identified weaknesses, availablity in
needed languages and dialects may prove beneficial for
non-resident training.

Suggested Approach: OACSI request TRADOC to assemble task
force of language training experts (civilian and military)
and conduct a thorough evaluation of this method. Results of
such a study could be used by DLIFLC/USAICS in developing a
new generation of non-resident training.

Expected Outcomes: An greater understanding concerning the
benefits and shortfalls of an automated instructional
delivery system for non-resident language training.

7.Research Question: Can USAICS Interactive Video Disc
(IVD) Map Tracking effort, now under development in English,
be converted into target languages and serve as a model for
further IVD foreign language technical training materials?

Rationale: USAISC is currently developing an IVD Map
Tracking course for interrogators in English. Once developed
and refined, this model effort may be able to be translated
into target languages.

Suggested Approach: OACSI encourage USAICS to pursue this
effort.

Expected Outcomes: Improved language sustainment training in
97E AIT.

Section V

Conceptual Models

The conceptual models outlined below have been developed specifically to improve non-resident foreign language training and unit technical language training. They vary in detail of development. Each could be developed into a full scale model depending upon Army interest.

A. Conceptual Model.

A bachelor's degree program networked Army-wide as part of the Advance Program to facilitate refresher-maintenance-enhancement general language development and proficiency sustainment.

Operational Need: Army Education Centers are tasked in AR611-6 to provide assistance to linguists in non-resident training. Currently, there is no common program which these centers can provide. They can only react to local preceived needs by providing instructors to MI units when .equested and when sufficient students are available. The strong capability of the Army Continuing Education System of which these centers are a part is college programs funded by tuition assistance. Although billed as in-service voluntary college education, more and more initiatives are being implemented to steer these college program opportunities toward Army career management fields and their needs. TRADOC service schools and training centers are able to train soldiers only to minimum levels in critical tasks. College educational programs can provide depth and breath to that knowledge base. They also allow for the learners to take a active role in establishing and following through on their own learning objectives. Educational theorists find this significant especially in developing thinking and reasoning abilities and in promoting integration of knowledge and skills in life situations. A bachelor's degree program designed to support linguist needs could well serve both the Army in sustainment of general language proficiency and increased depth of knowledge in content areas and the linguist by offering quality education recognized in the civilian community. It could provide AECs with a program that could be networked around the world. Linguists who initially enlisted for the Army College Fund would not have to leave the Army in order to use this benefit. It could be achieved in-service. Numerous options could be made available and tied to this initiative including reenlistment, transfer to Reserve Components, civil schooling (along the lines of "bootstrap" for degree completion), requirements for progression along a linguist career pattern, etc.

42

Discussion: The Advance bachelor's degree system under development by ODCSPER (DAPE-MPE) and Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges is made up of networks of curriculums. An educational institution is a member of the Advance system of Army bachelor's degrees only in the designated curriculums, and the Advance system membership requirements pertain only to those curriculums. Bachelor's degree networks now being developed in the initial phase include Management related, Computer related and Accounting. Other network areas that are being developed for future phases include Criminal Justice, Technical Management, Applied Science and Technology, Occupational Education, and General Studies. Each Advance member institution is a member of SOC, is accredited by one of the regional accrediting institutions and serves as the "home college" for soldiers enrolling in bachelor's degree curriculums that are part of the Advance system. Each Advance member institution will (1) limit academic residency requirements to a maximm of 25% of the degree requirements; (2) award appropriate credit for completion of service school courses, for Army MOS experience, and for non-traditional or other prior learning based on the results of one or more national, validated examinations in accordance with the American Council on Education Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services; (3) complete an Advance student agreement containing an official evaluation and degree plan; (4) accept and transfer, with no individual prior approval, all comparable courses taken from other institutions in the same Advance network.

No Advance network is planned for foreign languages or foreign area studies. A model bachelor's degree program in Soviet studies and Eastern European studies is currently being offered by the University of Maryland University College at the request of Field Station Berlin. (See Appendix E for documentation.) Linguists in the Berlin Command as well as throughout the Army appear quite interested in degree-based education programs, particularly at the bachelors and masters levels. Some linguists indicated a willingness to reenlist if an attractive in-service degree program was available. Such a program could combine civil schooling at CONUS and OCONUS institutions as well as part time on and off duty courses. Experience, or lessons learned, from the Berlin model include difficulties in teaching content in target languages where students are at different levels of target language proficiency. Colleges noted for their expertise in foreign language education help in making such a degree program attractive.

NSA has experienced some successful programs operated by civilian education institutions. Since targeted to civilian employees, academic credit is incidental to the learning objectives being taught.

<u>Suggested Approach</u>: OACSI arrange with ODCSPER (DAPE-MPE) to investigate the possibility of developing a bachelor's degree network involving foreign language/area studies.

B. <u>Conceptual Model</u>.

An Associate degree program networked Army-wide as part of the SOCAD Program targeted to support Army linguist career management fields.

<u>Operational Need</u>: This concept is a first term stepping stone to a bachelor's degree program outlined above. It would serve to document work done at DLIFLC and in maintenance and enhancement of target languages and target area studies. This degree could be a intermediate credential achieved while on the way to bachelor's degree completion.

<u>Discussion</u>. Numerous SOCAD programs are currently networked throughout the Army and identical SONAV programs in the Navy. These Associate Degree programs have been designed specifically with common curriculums initially developed by Army subject manner experts and college curriculum experts. Each network supports a career management field or fields. No program currently exists to support Army linguists.

<u>Suggested Approach</u>:OACSI arrange with ODCSPER (DAPE-MPE) to investigate the possibility of developing a SOCAD AA network specifically to support Army linguists.

C. <u>Conceptual Model</u>.

Language NCOES (PTC, BTC, ANOC for enlisted linguists) with satellite language detachments in operational Active and Reserve Component commands, operated by DLIFLC as language training detachments and augmented by Mobile Training Teams furnished by DLIFLC.

<u>Operational Need</u>: The enlisted educational system appears to have omitted foreign language proficiency for linguists as an element of emphasis. Yet technical language proficiency is critical for linguist job performance. Language proficiency is a result both of education and training of linguists. Linguists need this emphasis in their career development.

<u>Discussion</u>: This NCOES omission may be attributed to the lack of a linguist career field. Its inclusion may fall into the realm of "too hard". Yet the failure to address this requirement indicates a lack of understanding of needs of linguists for career development. Emphasis seems solely on non-linguist functions. This deficiency needs to be corrected.

Suggested Approach: OACSI request TRADOC to review NCOES courses targeted toward MOSs containing linguists and insert an element emphasizing sustainment of language proficiency, especially technical language, where possible.

D. Conceptual Model.

Language Sustainment Courses for officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel, contracted with civilian colleges and universities. Institutions would use DLIFLC materials to provide a basis for the courses. Schools may award academic credit only as incidental to the principal course learning objectives.

Operational Need: Linguists, regardless of rank or position, need to maintain their language skills if they are to continue to serve as assets in a linguist pool. Available sustainment courses with some incentives for attendance are needed to assist linguists, particularly those who do not use their language skills daily on the job.

Discussion: FORSCOM has an operational model in this area at BYU. NSA has an operational model at University of Hawaii, etc. Yet the Army's civil schools program does not seem to have incorporated this requirement into its offerings.

Suggested Approach: OACSI request ODCSPER/ODCSOPS/NGB/OCAR (Education and Civil Schooling staff elements) to investigate the possibility of incorporating an Army-wide system of offerings involving language sustainment education.

E. Conceptual Model.

Language component in Command and General Staff College and Army War College (AWC) to emphasize the critical importance of language training on upward mobile career Army officers. A language element could be developed and inserted into one or more map tactical excercises in C&GS. Research requirements on language issues could be inserted into AWC program of instruction.

Operational Need: Officers, both non-linguists and linguists, need to be sensitized to the mission and needed capabilities of linguists. They must understand the consequences resulting from lack of linquist assets and/or "linguists" who are not proficient in their target language. They need to understand when the services of a linguist are imperative. Officer education (basic, career, CAS, C&GS, War College) appears to omit this educational need.

Discussion: A common complaint heard among linguists is the perceived lack of command support for linguist functions. Maintenance of vehicles, administrative functions, beautification of the physical facilities, etc., appear to have higher priority than linguist functions. Often it appears that officers have no concept concerning the role of linguists nor the requirement for linguists to sustain their language proficiency. Often they consider language learning to be procedural in nature whereby a short review every year or so will do the job. Recognition by non-linguists as to the importance of linguists both in peacetime and wartime operations seems lacking. Linguists, for the most part, seem to feel under-appreciated. Non-linguist officers may take special delight in sending their "prima donna" linguists to the motor pool to get their hands dirty without fully understanding exactly what they are doing. Officer education which is designed,in part, to develop the officer corps to understand the Army mission and to use and care for its soldiers, seems to omit the role and function of linguists and language. Officer education seems to operate on the assumption that all allied and enemy forces speak English fluently and are always willing to communicate in that common language. For example, in C&GS in Low-intensity Warfare, a Central American scenerio is apparently being taught purportly to help prepare officers to serve in MAAG positions. The script was prepared as if every person in that environment was a fluent English speaker. No consideration was given to Spanish and the consequences of not being proficient in the native language.
This lack of sensitivity to language and the cultural overtones which it represents seems a potential fatal flaw in preparing Army officers to function in the modern world.

Suggested Approach: OACSI request TRADOC to develop and insert a series a language elements into scenarios used in officer education courses.

F. Conceptual Model.

Major restructuring concepts to include (1) recruitment for a 12 year enlistment, with in-service college entitlements, and with part of the enlistment served in Reserve Component status; (2) recruitment of native speakers as Sergeant E-5 to be awarded after successful completion of BT, basic orientation course at DLIFLC and AIT, after which individuals serve as apprentices, later attend a DLIFLC advanced course; (3) establishment of military and civilian linguist pool drawn from native speakers, well-qualified linguists with active duty experience, etc.

Operational Need: The need to revamp the MOS/CMF system to better care for linguists and to acquire, manage, use, and

maintain linguist assets seems well recognized throughout the system.

Discussion: The current system contributes to the problem rather than facilitates acquiring and maintaining a capable linguist contingent throughout the Total Army. "Major surgery" is needed to produce a capable linguist element to support Army 21 as well a peacetime intelligence needs.

Suggested Approach: OACSI,in conjunction with ODCSPER/MILPERCEN and ODCSOPS, think creatively in this area and task appropriate agencies to develop proposals for change.

G. Conceptual Model.

Army Linguist Information Network aimed at providing critical elements of information that may enhance career retention of Army linguists in some part of the total force structure.

Operational Need: Some reserve component units are attempting to train "linguists" starting from "0" proficiency with 4 MUTAs per month and 2 weeks each summer. Unless for political reasons, this training scenario is doomed to failure and total lack of readiness. Meanwhile, monthly qualified linguists are returning to the civilian sector and are not being recruited by these units. A need exists to consider qualified linguis's as a total Army asset,and possibly a national asset. An Army Linguist Information Network could help in this regard.

Discussion: Narrow thinking by various Army elements have prevented a Total Army approach in acquiring, training, maintaining, using and retaining linguists to meet long-term mission requirements. Reserve Component forces have allowed non-productive training to exist. Positions are being filled and salaries paid personnel who are not competent to do established job requirements and never will be capable unless by some unforeseen magic. This situation could be corrected, at least in part, by management and care of linguist assets. A Total Army Linguist Network could be a result of that management. Currently, a limited initiative with Defense Documentation Center is implemented.

Suggested Approach: OACSI request ODCSPER/MILPERCEN to spearhead a management initiative that would result in a Total Army Linguist Network.

H. Conceptual Model.

47

TRADOC Systems Manager for Foreign Language and
Technical Foreign Language Training.

Operational Need: Matters of doctrine, long-range
battlefield development planning, use of advanced systems
technology and officer/enlisted education and training
involving language and role of linguists and language
technology seem underdeveloped in the Army and not
integrated as an important factor in planning and executing
how the Army intends to fight.

Discussion: TRADOC has assigned Systems Managers for areas
it deems important for Army doctrine and training. These
officers and staffs become the focal points to ensure
coverage of their particular areas of concern in the
planning, development and training process. Omission of
language seems to represent a serious flaw for TRADOC in
conceptual thinking and planning and also for the Defense
Language Program which tends to maintain its separateness
and is forgotten. HQ TRADOC apparently feels restricted in
this area and tends to avoid responsibility for language as
integral to doctrine and Army training except as allowed by
AR350-20 (a housekeeping role for DLIFLC).

Suggested Approach: DACSI come to agreement with HQ TRADOC
regarding an active role in Army language doctrine,
long-range planning, development and training perhaps much
of which is outside the purview of DLIFLC. DACSI encourage
HQ TRADOC to establish a Systems Manager at USAICS to front
this responsibility and carry out inherent tasks.

I. Conceptual Model.

    Development of a series of Foreign Language Training
Centers based on the FLTCE model.

Operational Need: Non-resident training is fragmented and
often appears not productive. Foreign Language Training
Centers in major theaters of operation would allow for
concentrated blocks of instruction presented by highly
qualified instructors. The Center in Munich offers an
excellent model for similar schools in CONUS, Central
America and the Far East.

Discussion: Every participant who had attended FLTCE and was
involved in this study had high praise for FLTCE and its
instructors and staff. These linguists were 97B, 97E, 98C
and 98G and were from tactical and field station units and
some in between. Acclaims were unanimous. Supervisors were
concerned about the 6 weeks loss of duty time by
participants but on the whole seemed to feel that this loss
was compensated by having a more proficient and dedicated
linguist on return. The morale boost given to the

48

participants by participating in this school was significant. For tactical linguists, this may have been the only time they really used their language skills.

<u>Suggested Approach</u>: DACSI request INSCOM to investigate the possibility of expanding the FLTCE model into other theaters.

J. Conceptual Model.

Use of a Technical Language Proficiency Inspection (TLPI) augmented with mobile training teams to assist in unit training to prepare for unit TLPI certification.

<u>Operational Need</u>: Field MI units do not seem to have a sense of urgency regarding attainment and sustainment of effective technical language proficiency essential to perform wartime missions. Inspections such as the Annual General Inspection (AGI) and the Command Maintenance Inspection (CMMI) [or its replacement] carry sufficient weight to cause the Chain of Command to prepare and cause the unit to be able to perform correctly at least one day a year or serious repercussions occur. Apparently no such inspection exists for technical language proficiency. Meanwhile, unit emphasis goes to areas the Chain of Command is pushed to emphasize. Language proficiency is among the least of its concerns.

<u>Discussion</u>: Nuclear weapons units and Air Defense units have technical inspections that indicate unit readiness or the lack thereof. It is not just a pencil drill such as filling out a Unit Readiness Report. A team of technical experts (hopefully the best in the Army) makes an on-site visit and determines the unit's technical ability to perform is assigned mission. If the unit is found not capable, the Chain of Command is quickly engaged. Even though such a system has its disadvantages, it carries the needed emphasis essential for technical proficiency to compete with other Chain of Command pressures. During this study, linguists and supervisors/trainers alike complained that language proficiency carried little or no emphasis in tactical units. Perception of some linguists was that if "we go to war, we will bomb out". It seems imperative that the Army come to grips with its language requirements and place enough "teeth" in the system to insure technical proficiency at least at the minimum level. Inspection by experts preceeded by adequate preparation and training is one proven way to accomplish this mission. If weapons system units are required to undergo such measures, why don't units that suppose to provide the intelligence that triggers their use also be required to ensure their technical proficiency?

<u>Suggested Approach</u>: DACSI seriously investigate the possibility of a Technical Language Proficiency Inspection system for field MI units.

Section VI

Conclusions and Recommendations

A. Conclusions.

1. The Army's Non-Resident Foreign Language Training Program is not a program but rather a series of fragmented activities.

2. There appears to be no one agency fully responsible for the Army Foreign Language Program which has the authority and resources to bring together a cohesive, functional program.

3. Little, if any, sensitization or familiarization is provided in officer, warrant officer,and enlisted education and training as to the role, function or importance of linguists and language proficiency in the performance of Army missions.

4. Motivation of learners is, in large part, contingent on chain of command interest and recognition.

5. Money is less an incentive for linguists to maintain their language proficiency than incentives involving self-esteem and image enhancement.

6. Greatest complaint among linguists is lack of language use.

7. Documentation of spaces which require language proficiency is weak, especially in Reserve Components. This indicates weakness in doctrinal and long range planning.

8. Army 21 and Army planning guidance omit,for the most part, references to projected language requirements.

9. The issue of general versus technical language proficiency overshadows the entire effort.

10. Many linguists find conventional curriculum and instructional materials boring. There is a need to "spruce up" language training.

11. Development and use of learning strategies by linguists are extremely important in acquiring and sustaining language proficiency.

12. ACES can provide a support function but the linguist's chain of command is responsible for refresher/ maintenance/ enhancement training essential to sustain an appropriate level of proficiency.

13. Credential education is an important incentive for linguists.

14. Advanced instructional technology offers numerous possibilities for improvement in foreign language training.

15. Many possible research topics can be identified. A HQDA R&D Plan is needed to guide the Army research effort.

16. Several operational models that may be pursued include: networked credential education programs, language NCOES, civil schools language sustainment courses, language component for C&GS and AWC, Army linguist information network, TRADOC Systems Manager for languages, series of foreign language training centers based on the FLTCE model and technical language proficiency inspection for field MI units.

17. HQ. TRADOC should take more active role in Army language doctrine and training.

18. Numerous references exist that are important to researchers and practitioners in the Army foreign language training arena.

B. Recommendations.

1. That the Army, under the leadership of the ACSI, develop and implement a cohesive, functional non-resident foreign language program for linguists. Emphasis should be placed on the integration of general and technical language training.

2. That TRADOC develop and insert elements in its service schools' programs of instruction which sensitizies and/or familiarizes officers, warrant officers and enlisted personnel as to the role, function or importance of linguists and language proficiency.

3. That the Army, under the leadership of OACSI, develop an incentive awards system for linguists. Special attention should be given to recognizing linguists for outstanding service in maintaining and enchancing language proficiency needed for military job performance.

4. That the Army leadership consider the establishment of a TRADOC Systems Manager for Language.

5. That OACSI and TRADOC include references to projected language requirements in doctrinal and long-range planning documents such as Army Planning Guidance, Army 21, The Army Plan, and the Battlefield Development Plan.

6. That DLIFLC develop instructional materials using advanced instructional systems technology that incorporate learning strategies and motivational techniques which aid in making foreign language training more exciting and personally rewarding to the student.

7. That ACES continue to provide non-resident foreign language training and testing support on an as-needed basis to MI units. Consideration should also be given to development of degree programs which are networked around the world that facilitate language and area studies by linguists.

8. That OACSI, in conjunction with other major Army agencies, develop a Language R & D Plan using Section IV of this report as a starting point.

9. That OACSI, in coordination with major field commands, consider establishing additional foreign language training centers modeled after FLTCE.

10. That DLIFLC develop an expertise in the non-resident training area.

11. That the Army leadership seriously consider the establishment of a Technical Language Proficiency Inspection to ensure MI units' capability to perform its language-related missions, particularly in tactical settings.

Section VII

Annotated Bibliography

American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages. ACTFL
Review of Foreign Language Education (formerly Britannica
Review of Foreign Language Education), 15 volumes.
-v.1:Birkmaier,E.H. (ed.) (1969).Foreign language education:
An overview.
-v.2:Lange,D.L.(ed.) (1970). Individualization of
instruction.
-v.3:Lange,D.L.(ed.) (1971). Pluralism in foreign language
education.
-v.4:Lange,D.L. & James,C.L.(eds.) (1972). Foreign language
education:A reappraisal.
-v.5:Jarvis,G.A.(ed.) (1974a). Responding to new realities.
-v.6:Jarvis,G.A.(ed.) (1974b). The challenge of
communications.
-v.7:Jarvis,G.A.(ed.) (1975). Perspective:A new freedom.
-v.8:Jarvis,G.A.(ed.) (1976). An integrative approach to
foreign language teaching: Choosing among the options.
v.9:Phillips,J.K.(ed.) (1977). The language connection: From
the classroom to the world.
v.10:Phillips,J.K.(ed.) (1979). Building on experience,
building for success.
v.11:Phillips,J.K.(ed.) (1980). The new imperative:
Expanding the horizons of foreign language education.
v.12:Phillips,J.K.(ed.) (1981). Action for the 80's: A
polical, professional, and public program for foreign
languageeducation.
v.13:Higgs,T.V.(ed.) (1982). Curriculum, Competence, and the
foreign language teacher.
v.14:James,C.J.(ed.) (1983). Practical applications of
research in foreign language teaching.
v.15:Higgs,T.V.(ed.) (1984). Teaching for proficiency,the
organizing principle.
    This series of works offers the practitioner and
researcher in foreign language education a wide array of
reference materials by numerous authors. Professionals in
the field should be familiar with this series of resources.

American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages (1986)
ACTFL proficiency guidelines. Washington, DC: ACTFL.
        The 1986 proficiency guidelines are a product of
grants from the U.S.Department of Education and represent a
hierarchy of global characterizations of integrated
performance in speaking, listening, reading and writing.
They appear to be a refinement of DOD/DA standards as
developed by DLIFLC and contained in AR611-6.

Army Audit Agency (1983, Aug.31). Audit of 10th Special
Forces Group (Airborne), Fort Devens, Ma. NE-83-9.
(Document located in HQDA ODCSOPS Training Division Language
Files.)
        This report illustrates problems in language and
language training to perform unconventional warfare
missions. It cites a finding that a commercial school was
providing advanced language training at Fort Devans and that
this training appears to be comparable to the Army's
advanced level requirements.
        It indicated the necessity for research in
correlating the DLPT and mission-oriented training. This
report also indicated a lack of command emphasis within the
Special Operations Command. (Document can be found in HQDA
ODCSOPS Training Division Language Files.)

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (1985) .
Career Linguist System. Prepared by LTC (AF) R.L.Pankratz,
Executive Officer to the Dean. Presidio of Monterey.CA:
DLIFLC.
        This document is a product of the Commandant's
Task Force on drafting a proposed DOD linguist System.
Elements discuss.a portrait of the current situation, a
proposed DOD linguist System, "Global" versus "Job-Specific"
language,and non-resident program upgrade. Although
considered, the DLIFLC responsibility for the technical
control of worldwide foreign language training within DOD
does not seem to have been addressed realistically and in
terms of increased job performance of Army linguists,
particularly those in OCONUS assignments where foreign
language materials and instructors may will be more readily
available than at DLIFLC.

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
(1986,Feb).1985 Annual Program Review. Presidio of Monterey,
CA: DLIFLC.
        This brochure provides the latest information on
the status of DLIFLC and its programs and personnel. It was
prepared for and given to attendees at the Annual Program
Review 5-7 Feb. 1985.

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
(1986,Mar.27).97B Language Needs Analysis(LNA). Memorandum
For Record (J.A.LETT,Jr.) Presidio of Monterey,CA: DLIFLC.
        This memorandum is a follow-on to the Department
of the Army Language Needs Assessment information paper
(DAMI-ISI) 6 Aug. 1985. It contains the language level
requirements for 97B personnel.

Department of Defense (1986, Jan 31). U.S. Army Field
Station Berlin, USAFSB Regulation 350-3. Field Station
Berlin command language program. APO NY 09742-4821: USAFSB.
        This regulation implements USAINSCOM Regulation
350-3 and ilustrates a command language program at a fixed
(strategic) site.

Department of the Army (1978). A review of education and
training for officers, Volume 4. Washington DC:HQDA.
(Document located in the Pentagon Library.)
        ANNEX P--Professional Military Education--contains
the following recommendations:
        1. Officer foreign language requirements be
documented.
        2. Testing procedures be updated to include
testing for speaking ability.
        3. Officers who do not take the tests or who fail
to achieve a grade of R2/L2/S1 be decertified.
        4. Additional skill identifier be assigned to
officers who achieve"3"or better in two of the skills and at
least"2"in the third.
        5. Development of language maintenance packets be
accelerated.
        6. ROTC scholarship recipients be encouraged to
include 2 years of foreign language study in their
undergraduate curriculum.
        7. Self-paced foreign language electives be
established in Army schools.
        8. Current command language programs be continued.
(p. P-2; P-3). Appendix 3 "Foreign Languages and the U.S.
Army Officer" to Annex P "Professional Military education
for Army Officers," Volume 4, contains detailed information
on Army requirements for foreign language proficiency of
officers. In 1978, 839 officer spaces were identified as
requiring foreign language proficiency yet the study
concluded that the Army was no closer than it has ever been
"to knowing its foreign language requirements for officers,
or the state of current foreign language capabilities of the
officer corps, (p. P-3-8).
        This study addressed the pros and cons relating
to the question "Should all officers be required to attain
and maintain foreign language proficiency?" It concluded
that "a policy which requires all officer foreign language
specialists to maintain a certain degree of proficiency can
meet the needs of the Army satisfactorily only if position
requirements are documented, assignments are more carefully
managed and regulations enforced (p. P-3-11).

Department of the Army (1985,Jun.). Army 21 interim
operational concept. Fort Monroe,VA: HQ TRADOC.
        Army 21, developed by TRADOC and AMC, is a vision
for how the U.S.Army may fight in the 21st century, and thus

focuses those combat development efforts. Technical foreign
language proficiency requirements appear to be omitted.

Department of the Army (1985,October 19). Army language
program laydown (draft). Washington,DC: HQDQ OACSI.
        This planning document, in briefing format, (1)
provides an overview of how the language program is
currently being conducted; (2) identifies major program
deficiencies;(3) proposes courses of corrective action; and
(4) charts a timetable the general program responsibilities
to be (a) access talent; (b) train to proficiency
requirements; (c) sustain language skills; (d) enhance
language skills; (e) retain talent;(f) provide professional
development of language skills through advanced training and
multiple linguist assignments.

Department of the Army (undated). Army language program
2000. Draft manuscript. Washington, DC: HQDA. (Document
located in HQDA ODCSOPS Language Files.)
        Good thought piece as far as it goes! It proposes
"Army Language Program 2000" be "designed to alter Army
thinking from incidental training to programs which consider
the soldier's whole career as a linguist; taking a portion
of the burden of attainmemt of full performance off the
individual service member and putting it in the training
program; and stop trying to force the DLIFLC or the
proponent school to accomplish the impossible and start
providing the service members with a program which combines
and reinforces all the skills required in performance of job
related tasks as his/her career progresses."(p6)
        It is especially critical of "some individuals and
agencies" who are "doggedly attempting to perform the
impossible--trying to have language courses developed based
on the analysis of specific job technical skills".(p4) The
goal of Army Language Program 2000 appears to be integration
of skills within a career framework which is reinforced at
each school, and at the unit level. The mechanics for this
proposed integration are largely missing.

Department of the Army (1976) Army linguists personnel study
(ALPS). 5 volumes. Washington, DC: HQDA ODCSPER. J.P.Rice,
APLS Chairman. (Complete copy located in Pentagon Library.)
        This is perhaps the most comprehensive and
detailed study that explored the Army's linguist needs and
programs.
        The executive summary and the basic study document
is contained in an unnumbered volume; Volume I is a summary
of background data and information materials and policy
statements submitted by DLI Aug. 75, in support of ALPS;
Volume II is part 2 to Volume I; Volume III contains a
summary of material furnished by DLI concerning command

language programs (CLP); and Volume IV concerns English language training for U.S. Army personnel.

In addressing "maintenance of proficiency" ALPS recognized the perishable nature of language learning: "Once a linguistic skill has been attained, constant use is required to retain this perishable skill." ALPS emphasized the importance of "strong command emphasis at all levels," funding, use of on-duty time, use of both training and education sponsored programs.

The overall Army policy for linguists advocated by ALPS contained the following main elements:

(1) All officers are encouraged to attain at least an elementary proficiency in a language;

(2) Officers and Warrant Officers in the Intelligence or area specialty fields have a language proficiency;

(3) Non-Commissioned Officers and Enlisted men be encouraged to attain an elementary language proficiency;

(4) Non-Commissioned Officers and Enlisted men in linguist MOS's must have the required proficiency;

(5) Training time will be provided for maintenance or acquisition of a language proficiency to the desired/required level;

(6) Command language program and educational programs will be emphasized to provide the means for language maintenance and acquisition; and

(7) Strong command emphasis will be placed upon language acquisition and proficiency maintenance programs. (pp. 4,5, unnumbered volume.)

VOLUME III (Command language program): This document provides excellent historical source materials concerning the establishment of DLI and its early involvement in nonresident language training. For example, it statesthat DLI became operational on 1 July 1963 and nonresident training was conducted in CONUS and overseas for approximately 100,000 U.S. military personnel under the technical control of the Nonresident Training Operations Division which was established at the Presidio of Monterey on 1 October 1974. The name was changed to Office of Worldwide Training Operations on 1 June 1975. It traces the strong involvement of General Education Development (GED) in providing nonresident training citing AR621-5, 26 August 1974, as a principal reference in its 25 June 1975 position paper on Command Language Program. Among its primary source materials included as part of this document are descriptions of the Command Language Conference, Washington Navy Yard (Anacostia Annex),2-3 May 1974. The majority of Army participants were members of the GED program (now known as the Army Continuing Education System (ACES)(i.e.,Robert Rambicur,ESO, Fort Meade; Albert S. Gau, Command Language Coodinator, HQ USAREUR & 7th Army who worked out of the GED office;Tilton Davis, HQDA ODCSPER GED Section; Leon McGaughey, Education Program Administrator, OTAG; Bruce Blevins, Assistant Director of Education, HQ TRADOC; John T.

Pollock, ESO,Fort Gordon, GA; and Eugene F. Bolick, ESO, Fort Story. DLI relationship with the services education programs was one of the principal agenda items. Major problem areas cited in this document included (a) DLI and the SPMs have not yet achieve full technical control over the CLP;(b) the working relationship with the SPMs is not yet effective, partly because other Service Departments have not put enough emphasis on the importance of the CLP within the Defense Language Program; (c) TRADOC has not provided the funds necessary to staff the Nonresident Training Operations Division and to develop urgently needed materials for MOS-related self-study refresher courses and suitable elementary level courses;(d) budgetary constraints on travel funds prevent the Nonresident Training Operations Division from conducting on-site evaluation and review;(e) major projects had to be postponed because of lack of personnel and funds.(p3)

Department of the Army (1985,Mar.29) Augsburg Military Community ACES Division. Augsburg language resources inventory.
        This 49 page catalog illustrates the numerous line items of"stuff" located in language laboratories. Quanitity apparantly has no relationship to quality in this area.

Department of the Army Circular 350-85-2 (1985). Language training for enlisted personnel. Washington DC: DAPC-EPT-L. (Inquiries may be addressed to Commander, USA MILPERCEN, ATTN: DAPC-EPT-L, 2461 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22331-0400.)
        This circular announces the schedule of language courses for which Active Army Enlisted and Army Reserve personnel may apply during FY 85, and provides information to commanders based on their projected Army Enlisted linguist requirements reported to Headquarters, USA MILPERCEN.

Department of the Army (1985,Oct.11). 18th MI Bn.,66th MI GP. 18th MI BN Language Program SOP. APO NY 09108: 18th MI Bn.
        This document provides procedures and guidelines for the implementation, enrollment, and attendance of all 18th MI BN prsonnel in the Battalion Language Program. This SOP represents an effort by a non-divisional MI Bn.

Department of the Army (1985.Jan.) 18th MI BN, 66th MI GP. 18th MI BN Redtrain evaluation program.
        This document outlines a way participants in Redtrain can be evaluated.

Department of the Army (undated). 5th MI CO, 18th MI BN, 66th MI GP. Intelligence translation aid (German-English). (Copy may be located at HQ 66th MI GP, Munich, Germany).
This document provides job-relevant terminology for 97E German linguist interrogators. It is an excellent example of field unit initiative in developing useable technical language training materials.

Department of the Army (undated). 409th Military Intelligence Company command language program(draft)(Copy of this document can be located at Flak, Augsburg Military Community,Germany.)
This document illustrates the stated policy and implementation procedures at MI Co. level albeit in draft.

Department of the Army (1985,Oct.9). Headquarters,124th MI BN. Battalion commanders training guidance--MI gunnery. Fort Stewart, GA: 124 MI BN. (Copy can be located in the 124th MI Bn at Fort Stewart.)
This battalion is attempting to tackle its proficiency shortcomings by initiating a series of phased, 7-week, sequentially-based MI Gunnery seasons. The battalion's MI Gunnery season uses the building block approach. This effort appears to represent efforts by a CONUS-based divisional MI BN to prepare soldiers for their war-time tactical mission. Language qualification is only one element of this comprehensive training plan.

Department of the Army (1979, Dec 17). Headquarters U.S. Army Field Station Berlin Command Memorandum No. 350-10. Field Station Berlin foreign area studies program. APO NY 09742: USAFSB.
This memorandum establishes the foreign area studies program to provide background training that will support the mission of Field Station Berlin and to encourage personnel to pursue higher levels of education. This effort is made in conjunction with the G-3 ACES Education Branch. The university program has been offered by the University of Maryland, University College. It represents a way civilian education institutions can be used to support nonresident foreign language training for Army linguists.

Department of the Army (1986, Jan 24). Headquarters, United States Army, Europe. Memorandum for the Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations. Interoperability language courses. (Copy located in Headquarters, USAREUR ACES, Heidelberg, Germany).
USAREUR ACES is developing a series of 40-hour interoperability language courses designed to enhance soldier interaction with German counterparts. Necessity for

such language training was recognized during joint exercises with the Bundeswehr when communication barriers became evident and mistakes were made. During such an exercise ACES contractor, Human Resourses Research Organization (HumRRO), conducted an on-site task analysis. This analysis reaffirmed the need for elementary proficiency in German that every soldier can be expected to achieve.

Department of the Army (1985,April 9). Headquarters, United States Army, Europe. USAREUR Supplement 1 to AR 621-5. Army continuing education system (ACES). Appendix S--USAREUR Army continuing education system command language program (pp28-41). (Copy located in Headquarters, USAREUR ACES, Heidelberg, Germany)
    This appendix provides policy and procedures for implementing USAREUR ACES CLP for units and activities assigned or attached to USAREUR. It emphasizes HEADSTART/GATEWAY/INTEROPERBILITY language activities but includes provisions for foreign language refresher-maintenance training for Army linguists.

Department of the Army (1980,November30) Headquarters, United States Army, Europe, and 7th Army. Student study Guide:HEADSTART German orientation. 5th ed. APO NY 09403:AEAGC-ACES. (Copy located in Headquarters, USAREUR ACES, Heidelberg, Germany.)
    This training document illustrates the in-country work done by USAREUR. Its language coordinators and DLIFLC Language Training Detachment Representative appear to how excellent capabilities to provide relevant materials for classroom instruction.

Department of the Army (1984,September 15). Headquarters,United States Army Forces Command. FORSCOM Circular 350-84-11. FORSCOM command language program. Fort McPherson,GA: HQ FORSCOM.
    This circular prescribes policy, procedures and responsibilities for management and operation of the Active Component (AC) FORSCOM Command Language Program (FCLP).It describes the AC FCLP and provides guidelines to FORSCOM subordinate commanders for development of operating instructions concerning language training and training materials. It establishes minimum DLPT standards by MOS (e.g.,96C-S2,L2,R1; 97CL-S2,L2,R1; 98CL-S1,L2,R2; 98G-S1,L2,R2).(P2-1) It requires that major subordinate commanders within FORSCOM to establish a Language Council and to provide Arrival Training for those linguists who do not meet the minimum FORSCOM-estabished DLPT standards.

Department of the Army (1985,Nov.7). Headquarters,United
States Army Training and Doctrine Command Memorandum For
Record (Gen.W.R.Richardson). Visit to the Defense Language
Institute. Fort Monroe,VA: HQ TRADOC.
      This document gives excellent insight regarding how
the current CDR TRADOC views foreign language training and
the operations at DLIFLC. This document is particularly
interesting with regard to DLIFLC becoming an "education"
institution rather than a "training" center. The idea of a
National Language Center at DLI was discussed.

Department of the Army(1985, Aug.6). Language Needs
Assessment. Information Paper. Washington,DC: DAMI-ISI HQDA.
            In accordance with Sep. 1984 General Officer
Steering Committee, a language needs assessment was
conducted on 97E, 98G, and 98CL MOSs to more accurately
determine the type and length of language training required.
he results of this study are contained in this information
paper. Language proficiencies required to perform the
TRADOC-approved standards for the MOSs. These levels of
proficiencies were described as "ideal". Minimum acceptable
MOS skill level 1 proficiency requirements were also
specified:

MOS	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing
97E	2	2	1	na
98G	2	na	1	na
98CL	na	na	1	na

Study recommandation was that DLIFLC require a minimum
graduation proficiencies in speaking and listening to the 2
level for HUMINT students, and a listening proficiency of 2
level for SIGINT students.

Department of the Army (undated). Language strategy Army
Service Program Manager for language. Washington DC: HQDA (a
series of briefing charts found in language file of Training
Division, DCSOPS, HQDA).
            From the Army's service program manager's
perspective language problems include (a) shortage of MOS
qualified linguists; (b) identification of personnel with
language capabilities in other than linguist MOS; (c)
recruiting shortfalls in some languages; (d) limited ability
to train initial language (Reserves); (e) limited retention
and improvement of language capability; (f) high turnover
rate for linguists; (g) linguist requirements not clearly
identified; (h) Specialty Code/MOS language requirements not
clearly defined; (i) linguist requirements not properly
documented and reported; (j) proliferation of uncoordinated
MACOM actions. These problems are addressed in four

62

categories: inventory, requirements, training and management.

These briefing charts indicate that sustainment training programs are being addressed as follows:

-Generic language maintenance- DLIFLC
  --Standardize installation programs
  --Develop individual maintenance packages
-MOS specific language maintenance- TRADOC
  --Standardize unit programs by MOS
  --Evaluate/standardize CTF, ITAAS & LET
  --Develop individual study aids
    ..Soldiers manuals/MOS job book
    ..Technical support packages

Department of the Army Regulation 350-20 (1978). Management of the defense language program. Washington DC: DAMO-TRI (formerly DAPE-MPT). (Inquiries may be addressed to the Training Division, HQDA ODCSOPS (DAMO-TRI), Washington DC 20310.

This is a joint services regulation that is used, in conjunction with DOD Directive 5160-41, to prescribe policy, procedures and responsibilities for the management and operation of the Defense Language Program (DLP). It describes the Defense Foreign Language Program and the Defense English Language Program. It lists the Secretary of the Army as Executive Agent for the DFLP.

Chapter 4 provides guidance on Nonresident language programs. It defines nonresident language programs as any language training program or course of instruction operated by service/agency institutions and active duty or Reserve Component commanders. Nonresident language programs do not include training conducted under the auspices of the National Cryptologic School, NSA, or training for cadets at acadamies, for dependent schools operated by DOD, or for personnel persuing programs conducted strictly for the purpose of voluntary personnel development or obtaining academic credit. (p. 4-1).

Nonresident language programs in foreign languages are further defined as programs being conducted to satisfy missions and/or job-related requirements. They are conducted normally for achievement of elementary proficiency or maintenane/enhancement of linguist proficiency. (p. 4-1).

It empowers DLIFLC to exercise "technical control over non-resident language programs" and moniter "the management of non-resident language programs." (p. 4-2).

It outlines the procedures for formally establishing a recognized nonresident language program, for obtaining nonresident language program materials and for submission of the nonresident language program training report. (This regulation is currently undergoing revision. A draft of the revised regulation was also reviewed as part of the literature review.)

63

Department of the Army Regulation 611-6 (1985). Army
linguist management. Washington DC: DAPC-EPT-L. (Information
concerning this document can be found by writing HQDA
(DAPC-EPT-L), Alexandria, VA 22331-0400).

This regulation sets policies and procedures for
establishing Army linguist requirements and identifying,
testing, reporting, evaluating, reevaluation, training, and
assigning Army linguist personnel.

Nonresident foreign language training is defined
as usually conducted at or through the Army Education
Center. This training includes individual and unit programs
using Headstart, Refresher Maintenance, Professional
Development Program Extension Courses (PDPEC), Training
Extension Courses (TEC), and these nonresident materials
provided at or through the Army Education Center. This
training includes individual and unit programs using
Headstart, Refresher Maintenance, Professional Development
Extension Courses (PDPEC), Training Extension Courses (TEC),
and these nonresident materials provided for in AR 350-20.
"Unit training" is listed with the following provisions:
(a).Commanders at all levels, whose unit mission
accomplishment depends on the foreign language skills of
assigned personnel, will establish on-duty refresher
maintenance training programs per AR350-20. Sufficient
refresher/maintenance training will be given in unit
training under the BTMS to ensure maintenance of minimum job
specialty language proficiency. (b) Commanders, at all
levels, whose mission accomplishment does not depend on
language skills but who consider language training necessary
for other reasons, may establish training programs under AR
350-20. (c). Commanders will set up a close liason with the
installation language coordinator normally located at the
AEC. The AEC has the expertise and resources to help
commanders conduct training programs.(p8-9)

This document contains qxplanations of language
codes and levels of proficiency.

Department of the Army (1986,Jan.28). U.S. Army Intelligence
and Security Command Foreign Language Training Center Europe
letter. Non-resident language training materials development
for ACES (German). APO NY 09407: FLTCE. (Copy can be located
at FLTCE, Munich, Germany.)

This document provides background information on
the request by ACES for FLTCE to develop and produce German
language proficiency training materials for use in unit
language refresher/maintenance/enhancement programs.

Department of the Army (1985,August 5). U.S.Army
Intelligence and Security Command. USAINSCOM Regulation
350-3. INSCOM command language program. Arlington Hall
Station, VA: HQ INSCOM.

This regulation prescribes policy, procedures and responsibilities for the management and operations of the INSCOM Command Language Program (ICLP). It provides guidance to INSCOM subordinate commanders for development of CLPs. It outlines the various language training opportunities supported, sponsored, funded, or contracted by HQ INSCOM or INSCOM units. It also establishes incentive awards for outstanding achievement in general or technical language studies and/or foreign language training.

Department of the Army (1985,July 25). U.S.Army Intelligence Center and School memorandum (ACTSI-TD-IT). U.S.Intelligence Center and School foreign language training initiatives. Fort Huachuca, AZ: USAICS.
        This memorandum indicates that foreign language usage is stressed in the following areas:
- Research projects involving the determination of enemy strength, weapons and equipment.
- Map tracking.
- Enemy tactics, training, and logistics.
- Use of interpeters.
- "Approach" techniques.
- Translation exercises.
- During Field Training Exercises (FTX).
Emphasis is placed on using military terminology in context with all the above subject areas.
        This document indicates that on 1 April '85, USAISC contracted to conduct a survey and analysis of all MTOE/MTDA linguist positions that require foreign language proficiency. Other initiatives include (a) developing technical support packages, (b) converting English version TEC lessons to foreign languages, (c) developing Army unit language training program, (d) assisting with the Language Skill Change Study, (e) developing interactive videodisc lessons, (f) revising the 97E interrogation training and testing (the testing initiative is based on a terminology proficiency diagnostic examination focused on job relevant, military-specific, terminology) , (g) investigating technical feasibility and cost effectiveness of acquiring live Soviet television.

Department of the Army (1985,Feb.5) United States Army Russian Institute. Soviet forces specialist skill area. (Copy can be located at USARI,Garmisch,Germany)
        This proposal is to establish a Soviet forces specialist program and to provide Soviet forces specialist training. This proposal is aimed at filling a gap in this area.

Fiks,A.I. & Brown,G.H.(1969,March) Student attitudes and foreign language learning. HumRRO Technical Report 69-2.

Washington,DC: The George Washington University Human
Resources Research Office.

This report is a historical example of research
conducted in support of foreign language training. The goal
of this research was to determine what, if any, implications
data on student attitudes and motivational factors might
contain for foreign language student selection and
course-administration purposes in the DLI system. The
conclusions of this study included: (1) student attitudes
toward foreign language learning in DLI classrooms are
measurable in the form of various components (e.g., interest
and xenophilic orientation), all of which appear to be
fairly high in the sample measures; (2) the
"glamour" and "status" associated with foreign language
stidy was the single greatest source of student satisfaction
with their courses; (3) the impression of many language
teachers to the effect that student motivation typically
declines as the course progresses was substantiated by data
obtained in this research; (4) two of the attitude
components studied in this project, interest and xenophilic
orientation, correlated significantly, though quite
modestly, with achievement indices. It suggested research be
directed at improving the predictive validity of these
subscales as developed in this study.(vii)

Fischer,A. (undated). Reservist's pocket guide to Germany.
APO NY 09325:HQ 21st SUPCOM attn:AERSP-A (Copy found at HQ
21st SUPCOM, Kaiserslaurtern,Germany.)

This pocket guide is an example of the work of a
long-standing language coordinator in USAREUR. He and his
command felt a need to provide reservists a helpful German
pronunciation guide that would assist them while in Germany
for short periods of time such as for Reforger Excercises.
This particular booklet is designed to help these American
soldiers get around Germany.

Gardner,R.C.,Lalonde,R.N.& Moorcroft,R.(1985,June). The role
of attitudes and motivation in second language learning:
Correlatioal and experimental considerations. Language
learning: A journal of applied linguistics 35(2),207-228.

This study investigated the multitrait-multimethod
validity of the Attitude/Motivational Test Battery. Its
findings,based on 170 volunteers learning French/English
vocabulary pairs, were (1) subjects high in language
aptitude learned faster than those who were low; (2) those
high on integrative motivation learned faster than those who
were low; (3) the rate of learning was more rapid under
visual/written conditions as compared with aural/oral ones.

General Accounting Office (1980, April 15). <u>More competence in foreign languages needed by federal personnel working overseas.</u> ID-80-31. Washington,DC:USGAO

This study's findings include that foreign languages skill requirements have not been adequately defined; language competence affects employees' performance. A substantial number of persons filling jobs and their supervisors said that low foreign language proficiency limits job performance.

General Accounting Office (1973, Jan. 22). <u>Need to improve language training programs and assignments for U.S. government personnel overseas</u>. B-176049. Washington DC: USGAO.

This report noted that because of inadequate criteria for determining and reviewing the validity of language requirements, inadequate measurement of language proficiency skills, and other problems, Defense was not satisfactorally meeting certain overseas language requirements. DLI had been unable to achieve technical control over foreign language training activities within Defense, primarily because authority and responsibility for conducting these training activities needed clarification.

General Accounting Office (1976, Nov. 24). <u>Need to improve foreign language training programs and assignments for Department of Defense personnel</u>. ID-76-73).

The 1976 GAO report noted that similar conditions continued to exist as found in the 1973 report. It recommended to the U.S. Congress that it direct DOD components to:

(1) Review their procedures for selecting foreign language training candidates and for assigning personnel to language essential positions.

(2) Establish more detailed criteria to help local commanders identify positions requiring foreign language skills.

(3) Review current procedures for determining whether the Department has an adequate overview of the degree to which language requirements are being satisfactorily met.

(4) Implement procedures for ensuring periodic retesting of language proficient personnel.

(5) Reemphasize responsibilities for complying with regulations governing the Command Language Programs. In doing so, a more precise definition of these programs would be helpful. Also, the service program manager concept should be reviewed to identify and correct the weaknesses which inhibit effective coordination between DLI and CLP's. (pp. 2,3).

These recommendations were based, in part, on findings that personnel were assigned to language essential

positions although they lacked the appropriatelanguage skills because they did not (1) receive language training before being assigned, (2) have time to complete training, or (3) achieve desired proficiency levels after completing training.

It gave an example of only 37% off incumbents at MAAG's visited having required language capabilities. It found similar situations at military poliece groups, Defense Attache offices, and other military units. Although an impact of this situation was not quantifiable, many incumbents believed their work performance was adversely affected by not having required language skills.

General Accounting Office (1982, May 6). Weaknesses.in the resident language training system of Defense Language Institute affect the quality of trained linguists. FPCD-82-22. Washington DC: USGAO.

This report cites that DLI's course development efforts as having been unproductive, That DLI lacks an adequate mechanism for determining the quality of its students, and that failure to effectively set priority on resident basic courses resulted in disproportionate amount of resources spent on nonresident courses.

GAO recommends that DLIFLC (1) replace outdated basic course materials, (2) upgrade the management of classroom instruction, and (3) better assess the effectiveness of its trainin mission.

Gray,W. (1956). The George Washington key to historical research. Washington,DC: The George Washington University Book Store.

It provides simple, yet effective research methodology for qualitative research projects.

Hicks,F.A.(1959,March). Consolidation of language training. Student thesis. Carlislie Barracks,PA: U.S.War College.

This thesis explored the desirability and feasibility of consolidating all governmental training in foreign languages under one agency or under a selected adency for each language. It recommended that foreign language training programmed for military officer and civilian employees of the government be conducted by the Foreign Services Institute and that foreign language training programmed for enlisted personnel of the military services be conducted at the Presidio of Monterey, CA, under the jurisdiction of the U.S.Navy. This study conducted by a Lieutenant Colonel, Infantry, illustrates involvement and greater understanding that can be gained by research on language issues by Army War College students. Hicks provided a good historical documentation regarding the Army language program and its development during World War II.

Higgins,J. & Johns,T.(1984). <u>Computers in language learning.</u> Second Language Professional Library. Glasgow,United Kingdom: Addison-Wesley.

This work attempts to reveal some underlying assumptions involved with computer-assisted language learning(CALL). Although pro-CALL, this effort emphasizes that computers are mere machines and that they can replicate human activity but only if activity can be comprehensively and unambiguously described. It questions if teaching is such an activity.

It focuses on teacher activities that can be replicated by a computer such as "manager of routines", "responder","facilitator","model", "informant", etc. It strongly advocates de-mystification of automated instructional systems by having language teachers try to acquire some understanding of how computers work, how they can be applied in language teaching, and how they are programmed. It discusses computer input and output, computers both inside and outside the classroom, and programs specially designed for language teachers. This book is used as standard text in Teachers College, Columbia University.

Jones,W.P.(1960,January). <u>Language training for the officer corps.</u> Student thesis. Carlislie Barracks,PA: U.S.Army War College. (Copy located in Pentagon Library.)

This thesis explored the need for Army officer linguists, appraised existing trained resources for meeting this need, evaluated training means and programs and recommended improvements. This work, produced by an Engineer Colonel, recommended mandatory language training for officers overseas and exploitation of second-generation Americans and those who have lived abroad, as a source of complete bilinguists. This thesis illustrates the sensitivity and understanding of language problems that can be gained through research as part of officer education.

Littlewood,W.(1984). <u>Foreign and second language learning: Language-acquition research and its implications for the classroom.</u> New York: Cambridge University Press.

This work surveys the growing body of research in this field. It organizes the research into 8 areas: First language acquisition, behaviorism and second language learning, errors and learning strategies, the internal syllabus of the language learner, accounting for differences between learners, models of second language learning, using a second language, and learning and teaching.

Matthew,R.J.(1947). <u>Language and area studies in the armed services.</u> Washington,DC: American Council on Education.

This work is one of a series developed by the Commission on Implications of Armed Services educational programs as implemented during World War II. This work has significant historical valve. It concludes that "the integration of separate academic disciplines (as offered by civilian educational institutions) into a common core of knowledge covering a cultural area or region, however difficult and beset with obstacles the process may be, is possible."(p166) It also states that the development of the oral skills in language learning, with neglect of reading and grammar or embodying but a minimum of both, cannot be classified either as education or research. "To speak an understand a foreign language is a benefical and useful art. Any intensive and through understanding of a foreign culture implies a reading knowledge of the language in which that culture finds expression, for chiefly there does one find the record of its realized ideals, its age-old traditions, and its cherished aspirations."(p166) This work addresses the oral inductive method used in World War II, selection and motivation of students, training of teachers and in-service training, planned language training environments or language houses, and the integration of language training and area studies.

McGregor,E.W.(1960,January). The ugly American military advisor. Student thesis. Carlisle Barracks,PA: U.S.Army War College.(Copy located in Pentagon Library)
This thesis explores the effectiveness of military advisors to underdeveloped friendly nations. This Lieutenant Colonel,Infantry, recommended expanded language training and practical exercises for all officers on orders for MAAG assignments. This work appears to illustrate the increased understanding of language problems gained by research as part of officer education.

Montrone,A.J.(1960,January). Language training for the officer corps. Student thesis. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S.Was College.(Copy located in Pentagon Library.)
This thesis, prepared by a Lieutenant Colonel, Artillery, demonstrates the sensitivity and understanding of foreign language requirements that can be gained through Army War College research efforts. Montrone concluded that "refresher training is esential for both the maintenance of proficiency and the accurate testing and reporting of the abilities of officer linguists."(p37) Among his recommendations were that a complete language training laboratory be installed at each Class I and II military installation and that periodic refresher training be given to all officer linguists. This document appears to have an especially good bibliography of primary and secondary source documents of that period.

70

Oxford-Carpenter,R.L.(1985,August). Non-resident language training for linguists in the U.S.Army. Task 4, Subtask A: Develop questionnaire and recommend statistical analysis of Army foreign language skill change. Final Report. Bailey's Crossroads,VA: Kinton,Incorporated.

This report provided general and specific comments on analyses proposed for the Language Skill Change Study and discussed the development of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning(SILL). Perhaps the most valuable element of this report is a paper enclosed as Exhibit B entitled "Second language learning strategies: What research has to say". Oxford-Carpenter makes a strong point that "there's more to learning strategies than instructional techniques."(p1) For example, she points to learner attributes as crucial in understanding learning. She developed the five following questions and provided answers to help focus her paper squarely on learning strategies.
-What kinds of learning strategies exist?
-What does research on L1 acquisition strategies imply for L2 language learning strategies?
-What implications for second language learning strategies arise from research on general (academic but non-L2)learning strategies?
-What has L2 learning strategy research discovered to date?
-What assessment issues exist regarding L2 learning strategies? (p4)

President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies (1979,November). Strength through wisdom: A critique of U.S. capability. Washington,DC: U.S.Government Printing Office. (includes cover letter to the President of the United States from J.A.Perkins,Chairman of the Commission,15 Oct.79)

This hard-hitting report found U.S. programs and institutions for education and training for foreign language and international understanding to be "both currently inadequate and actually falling further behind."(Perkins' letter) This commission found the issue at stake to be the nation's security. It found that the U.S. requires far more reliable capabilities to communicate with allies, analyze the behavior of potential adversaries, and earn the trust and sympathies of the uncommitted.Yet the commission found that "there is a widening gap between these needs and the American competence to understand and deal successfully with other peoples in the world of flux."(2) It restates its finding:"Americans' incompetence in foreign languages is nothing short of scandalous, and it is becoming worse."(p5) For example, it found that only 15% of American high school students study a foreign language (as opposed to 24% in 1965). One out of 20 high school students studies French, German, and Russian beyond the 2nd year.(Four years are considered minimum prerequisite for useable language competence.) Only 8% of Amaerican colleges and universities

71

require foreign language for admission (as opposed to 34% in 1966). The report found the foreign affairs agencies of the U.S. government to be deeply concerned that declining foreign language enrollments of new recruits for the services and increased language training costs.

President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies (1979,November). Background papers and studies. Washington,DC:U.S. Government Printing Office.
        This volume supplements the Final Report of the Commission. It contains 23 separate papers prepared for the Commission by distinguished authors and thinkers.

Ramsey, R.M.G. (1977). Multilinguals and successful language learners: Cognitive strategies and styles of approach to language learning in adults. New York: City University of New York. Dissertation (Copy may be obtained from University Microfilm International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 481060).
        This study involved 10 monolingual and 10 multilingual adults who werwe exposed to an unfamiliar language, with hte goal of learning as much as possible of the language in a limited time period. A summary of earlier studies on multilingualism and a synopsis of tests of cognitive style are included in this work.
        Adult language learning variables summarized in this dissertation research effort include methods of instruction, motivation, attitude of the learner's culture, aptitudes, communicative or sociolinguistic factors, personality type, affect, development or maturation and cognition.

Rivers,W.M.(1986,Spring). Comrehension and production in interactive language teaching. The Modern Language Journal,70(1), 1-7.
        This journal article is an example of the discussion underway concerning the interactive approach as the most appropriate pedagogical way of developing a usable language control. It states that teachers who direct and dominate classrooms can not have true interactive classrooms since interaction by its very nature is 2-way, 3-way or 4-way ,but never 1-way! This paper discusses interaction methodology in some detail.

Rocklyn,E.H., Moren,R.I.& Zinovieff,A.(1962,January). Development and evaluation of training methods for the rapid acquisition of language skills. HumRRO Research Report 9. Washington,DC: The George Washington University Human Resources Research Office. (Copy located in Pentagon Library.)

This study report is a historical example of a
foreign language training research effort. It responded to a
need for limited language course to be used as a basis for
teaching combat soldiers enough about an enemy language to
enable them to obtain tactical information from newly
captured prisoners of war. It concluded that
machine-teaching a limited language course (in this
case,Russian) to be feasible. The possibility of
machine-teaching a full-scale foreign language was suggested
by this research.(p24)

U.S. House of Representatives Appropriations Committee
Survey and Investigations Staff Report (1981, Dec-Volume 1;
1982, Apr-Volume 2). Foreign language programs of the
intelligence community. Washington DC: U.S. Congress.
The report provides a picture of linguist programs
in mid-1981. It dealt, in part, with Army recruitment,
training and language maintenance problems. The importance
of this document is that problems faced by the Army are
faced by all agencies in the intelligence community.

APPENDIX A

Chronicle of Work Accomplished by Principal Investigator

° 30 Jan - 1 Feb 85: Attended CALICO Symposium, Baltimore, MD. Became acquainted with numerous personnel connected with computer-assisted language instruction (CALI). Discussed use of advanced instructional technology at DLIFLC with Al Scott, Maj. Rowe, et al. Attended demonstrations and workshop sessions where FSI, CIA, NSA, DLIFLC, etc., representatives discussed CALI and other high technology projects involving language learning. Collected numerous journal articles and other handouts provided by exhibitors. (Shared these items with ARI POC after Symposium.) Subscribed to CALICO Journal for 1 year. Results of this experience included:

   a. a familiarization with the state-of-the-art of advanced instructional technology (e.g., artificial intelligence and the uses of speech recognition devices, courseware development to include programming of software and use of hardware, interactive audio/video to include random-access audio devices, and machine-assisted translation);

   b. a perceived notion that CALI and advanced instructional technology in general with regard to language training is still in its infancy (e.g., at demonstrations attended, hardware seemed cumbersome, often difficult to operate, subject to frequent malfunction; little mention of cost benefits or cost trade-offs as a result of use of CALI, etc.; slight, if any, consideration given to the role of the human instructor or long range benefits of CALI, etc., over conventional instruction (Sylvia Charp as the key note speaker mentioned the need to emphasize "warmware" or the human element, as contrasted with hardware, software, and courseware which has been emphasized in the past), little evaluation data presented, except to indicate that students can learn via CALI, etc.);

   c. that computer-literacy perhaps defined as simply the ability of human beings to operate and maintain a computer system or systems more or less as a technician is overshadowed in importance by the human ability to use the vast amounts of information that can be made readily available by technically operating and maintaining a computer system(s); hence information management may be the key to exploiting advanced instructional technology for the benefit of fulfilling human and organizational goals and objectives.

° 22-25 Apr 85: Participated in the DOD-University of Maryland Eleventh Worldwide Military Services Education Conference, College, Park, MD. Made numerous contacts and discussed work with key individuals within the Army educational community. For example, discussed project with representatives of University of Maryland both from the home campus and the European Division, Big Bend Community College European Division, HQDA,

TRADOC, FORSCOM, EURA, DANTES, and Southern Regional Accrediting Association. Results of this experience included:

a. A service member Bachelor's Degree-type program that is language-heavy may be a feasible project provided that

   (1) the Army can spell out clearly its refresher-maintenance language objectives to include providing participating colleges and universities with recommended instructional materials,

   (2) sufficient interest can be generated among personenl eligible to participate; one suggestion made was to develop, network and implement a bachelor of arts degree with a major in managment with a two year foreign language minor (rationale: 60 hours of language--heavy courses for refresher-maintenance-enhancement of general language for linguists with content in such areas as literature, sociology, geography, political science, etc., could emphasize the learners' ability to think, converse, write and, in general, function in the target language and be joined with 60 hours of management courses, some of which could be taught in the target language. (The technical nature of some of the management courses may require that they be taught in English.) Yet, this combination could, in the long run, be more useful both to the learner and the Army since a Sergeant E-5 (second term enlistee) is generally expected to fill leadership and managerial positions. A BA degree in management may be more attractive to students than a BA in a specific language);

   (3) adequate funds can be made available to develop and implement such a program in the appropriate target language. (Such an effort would be quite expensive to develop initially and, since it is targeted toward small number of personnel stationed around the world, the necessary courses would be expensive to conduct; many courses may attract less than the 10-15 participants normally considered cost-effective in operating a course; hence, tuition assistance funding would be important and, in some cases, fully funded tuition may be necessary to cover student costs.)

b. none expressed a belief that it was beyond the capability of the colleges and universities to produce, network and implement a program or sets of courses that would, in effect, refresh, maintain and enhance a linguist's ability to use his or her target language;

c. all personnel contacted expressed a willingness to cooperate in developing a concept for such an effort if asked to do so.

° 15 Aug 85: Visited HQs, TRADOC, Fort Monroe, VA. Discussed project with Joe Crosswell, Deputy Director of Education and Bill Thompson, TTA. Results of this visit included:

a. a suggestion that this effort include a case study of a few (6

more or less) linguists chosen either by DLIFLC, MILPERCEN or by field commands and who, by their records, appear to have diverse backgrounds, varied linguist functions and needs; such an effect would permit the principal investigator to gain, first hand, some insights into "real live" problems and real time perceptions of these individuals; the inclusion of such a section in this study would lend a sense of credibility to the study findings and to the model concepts that might be developed; linguists chosen for study need not be portrayed as representatives of the larger groups but merely examples of linguists, their needs and perceptions.

b. use of technology in language training is an area of ongoing interest in TTA; it would be appropriate to discuss any model concept that involved advanced instructional technology with representatives of TTA; if, as this study progresses, any model concepts involve technology, Bill Thompson could be a point of contact to coordinate and discuss it.

o   30 Aug 85: Visited HQs INSCOM, Arlington Hall Station, VA. Met with Ms. Brenda Rowe, INSCOM Director of Education, and Captain Plummer, INSCOM Command Language Specialist. Meeting occurred at the Installation Army Education Center. Discussion took place regarding perceived needs of linguists; motivation to participate in command language programs; etc. These representatives of INSCOM appeared to welcome this study and promised to cooperate in its developments. Results of this visit included:

a. a sense that Army education was not currently as responsive to the needs of Army linguists as it could be. INSCOM troops are tenants on numerous installations and communities around the world and, as such, they must look to installation/community education centers operated by the major command elements for help; this situation has not always worked out well; most AEC personnel to include administrators and counselors are not linguists and may have difficulty relating to linguist problems; educators often consider language training as MOS training, hence not in the strict purview of ACES funded mission; difficulty appears to be increasing with ACES support of non-resident foreign language training.

b. problems exist regarding motivation of linguists to study and improve their language skills; many linguists apparently find this learning to be boring and unproductive. (Some skepticism arose concerning linguists' propensity to participate in any sort of off-duty degree program that would entail development and use of language skills; instead linguists may rather sit around, drink beer and enjoy their leisure time);

c. many linguists have difficulty with english language skills as well as foreign language skills usage; a program that emphasizes correct English language usage may also be beneficial to linguists;

d. perception that a model concept where Army education can assist

in general foreign language refresher-maintenance could be a positive step forward in helping resolve some non-resident foreign language training problems.

°   18 Sep 85: In the company of Dr. Judy brooks, visited with Major James Cox, the HQDA ACSI Service Program Manager, in the Pentagon. Results of this visit included:

a. Major Cox's concurrence in the conduct of the study;

b. his primary interest was in alternative models for non-resident foreign language training; that the investigator should think creatively in this area, "don't close any doors"; concepts should include both non-degree as well as degree programs; his interest was in programs where students go to class to learn, i.e., structured programs with emphasis on oral/aural comprehension;

c. he requested a copy of study products be forwarded to him for his information and possible suggestions;

d. he provided a list of POCs that he viewed as appropriated from within the HQDA agencies, NSA, USAICS, INSCOM and FORSCOM.

°   18 Sep 85: Visited with Ms. Brenda Karasik, Education Division, ODCSPER who serves as HQDA program manager for SOCAD. Results of that visit included:

a. a better understanding regarding the mechanism for establishing a network of schools who offer a common curriculum targeted at military career management field; a four-year program should consist of 120 semester hours course work; subject matter experts (SMEs) normally are requested from the appropriate service school(s) and field commands who meet in conjunction with university/college curriculum specialists to explore the possibilities of developing a draft common curriculum; these meetings can be arranged through the Office of Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges, Suite 700, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 [telephone (800) 368-5622 or (202) 293-7070], Dr. Arden Pratt, Director. If these meetings indicate that technically the development of a common curriculum is possible and feasible, and if enough interest is manifested by the user community, the Education Division, ODCSPER and SOC could be tasked to develop the common curriculum using Army SMEs and civilian curriculum personnel, establish a network of interested colleges and universities around the world to offer the program and begin its implementation; usually such efforts go through a series of pilot tests to work out problem situations prior to full implementation;

b. Education Division, ODCSPER and SOC are currently reviewing possibilities for developing four year programs; current programs have been restricted to 2 year AA degree programs;

c. visibility of SOCAD is rising with Ms. Karanik preparing to brief

the Army Policy Council this fall; current 2 year programs are gaining in acceptance throughout the varied Army commands; the features of the SOC networked concept include:

(1) a student agreement for each degree-seeking student in a SOC curriculum; a copy of this agreement is maintained by SOC at One Dupont Circle; this provides a check on member institutions and their implementation of the common curriculum; and provide excellent statistical data on how the program is being implemented;

(2) award of credit for non-traditional learning through use of tests, such as CLEP and DANTES SSTs and ACE Guide recommendations appropriate to the SOC curriculum (for example, credit for the DLIFLC residency programs could be awarded);

(3) limit residency to a maximum of 25 percent of the degree requirements, with residency to be taken at any time;

(4) accept in transfer, with no prior approval, courses identified as comparable in the transferability charts and course substitution tables as developed by SOC and SOCAD manager, Education Division, ODCSPER, and approved by member schools and published by SOC.

° 3-4 Oct 85: Visited DLIFLC and ARI Field Unit, Monterey, CA. Met with LTC H. Marschall, John Lett, Maj. Tom Hooten, Hank Marschik, and Ted Horn from DLIFLC and Jack Hiller, Otto Kahn, and Anna Ekstrom, ARI Field Unit. Results of this visit:

a. acquired numerous primary source documents, relevant to study;

b. obtained suggested references and studies that should be reviewed as part of this study;

c. developed a list of needs expressed during meeting to include:

(1) the assembly and catalog of various studies conducted or are being conducted that are relevant to Foreign Language Training in DOD;

(2) a review of ways Foreign Armies develop, maintain and use linguists;

(3) motivational factors research;

(4) human role definition in use of technology;

(5) command support and ways to attain it;

(6) appropriate career management program for linguists;

(7) military personnel management initiatives (e.g., proficiency pay, promotion, re-enlistment options) and their use for linguists;

A-5

(8) meaning of operational control and technical control of non-resident foreign language training;

d. gleaned numerous perceived problems, areas where non-resident foreign language training are needed and ideas for model concepts. Details regarding this visit were written in a memorandum for record, subject: "Trip Notes from Visit to DLIFLC/ARI Field Unit." A copy of this memorandum was delivered to Dr. Brooks, ARI POC on 11 Oct 1985 for her information.

° 17 Oct 85: Visited Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, KS (not programmed, nor costed to this project). Discussed language project with LTC Bond, Chairman of the Low Intensity Warfare Committee and who is responsible for instruction in C&GS in that subject. He is a member of the Intelligence Corps and a Russian Linguist. Results of this meeting include:

a. importance and use of foreign language are not taught or emphasized in their preparation of MAAG officers for assignment in areas subject to low intensity warfare such as Central/South America, Africa or Middle East; all work is strictly in English and officers appear not to be sensitized to the "language problem";

b. no plans appear to change this situation; the committee chairman seemed vaguely aware that DLIFLC had a Spanish Refresher-Maintenance Package but no first-hand knowledge about it or its possible uses.

° 30 Oct 85: Visited HQs, FORSCOM, Fort McPherson, GA. Discussed language project with Dr. Bill Dempsey and Dr. Elaine McAllister, AFIN-CBD and Maj. Mike Abel (ARNG) and Dr. Leon McGaughey (AFOP-TE). Results of this visit included:

a. no detailed assessment of non-resident foreign language training exists for Reserve Components forces although over 300 units have been identified as requiring such training; it was estimated that between 3 and 5 thousand positions in RC units require or should require personnel with 1-1 language qualification or better; documentation of positions that require language proficiency is poor; few assigned personnel have proficiency ratings recorded on current personnel files (apparent exception is 142 MI BN in Salt Lake City, Utah); no effective system exists for recruiting linguists who are leaving active military duty and are returning to civilian life for either the ARNG, USAR or even the IRR (one or two specific units have shown some local initiatives in this area);

b. FORSCOM Command Language Program for active duty linguists is non-standard with implementation dependent largely on the interests and priorities of local commanders. Efforts have been made to have a Language Council established at each FORSCOM installation to help define problems, set objectives and policy, and establish an effective program of language training and use of language-trained personnel; no full-time language training coordinators such as used throughout

A-6

USAREUR are employed in FORSCOM, consequently training support is often planned and provided by non-linguist educators within ACES;

c. philosophy should be that language proficiency to include the training needed to attain and then maintain the required level be the responsibility of the soldier and his immediate chain of command with primary unit responsibility resting at company level; Army Education Centers and sub-centers can and should provide language training support in response to needs expressed by the command elements but they should not be primarily responsible for such training. They should perform a support role only;

d. some identified needs for non-resident foreign language training are:

    (1) training materials; the Spanish Refresher - maintenance package as provided by DLIFLC has little depth; although impressive in its table of contents; it does little to fulfill its objectives; PDP materials are very technical but apparently good; the Standard Unit Training Package being produced by USAICS expected to be good but USAICS takes two years to produce one language package and can only do one at a time;

    (2) methods of instruction; DLIFLC has provided FORSCOM with a two week instructor training course; another one is in the planning stages; yet DLIFLC is generally geared to resident training and to methods of instruction which appear to work well for them in that mode; the need is to develop an instructor training course fully attuned to non-resident training both in field units and reserve/NGB environments; DLIFLC personnel generally are not knowledgeable of those environments and have not developed methods of instruction to include optimal uses of advanced instructional technology tailored to those environments;

    (3) an appropriate organization and administrative structure; one proposal is for full-time language instructor/program administrator ofr FORSCOM units; a closely related proposal is for the establishment and maintenance of Language Training Facilities under the control of the installation Language Councils;

    (4) better documentation of linguist positions; AR 611-101 provides little language requirement specifications for officers (e.g., special operations, MP, TAC INTELL, STRAT INTELL, IMAGERY EXPLOIT, CI, HUMINT, TAC SIGINT/EW, and STRAT SIGINT/EW officers) list no language requirement at all. AR 611-112 for warrant officers and AR 611-201 for enlisted personnel are also extremely vague regarding language proficiency requirements.

e. Automated Language Processing System (ALPS) may have applications in translation training; 2 pilot systems (one at Fort Hood, TX, and the other with the 142nd MI BN at Salt Lake City, UT);

f. identified universities and colleges with noted excellence in language training include Middleberry College in Vermont, Georgetown, UCLA, Stanford, BYU , and University of Texas;

g. concepts for degree programs which emphasize oral/aural language development in target languages and language sensitization of officers to language problem situations in Basic, Career, C & GS and War College courses are interesting and potentially helpful;

h. little effective coordination and/or sharing of information was noted between FORSCOM, INSCOM and particularly USAREUR (exception: at the initiative of FORSCOM Director of Education, two USAREUR language coordinators are being scheduled to visit FORSCOM to discuss non-resident foreign language instruction in the near future;

i. FORSCOM personnel who were contacted appeared to feel that the overall Army leadership (with some noted exceptions) has little regard for foreign language training as a high priority mission; hence there is a general lack of determination on the part of that leadership to demand that a coordinated, effective, realistic program be developed and to provide the necessary resources (e.g., manpower spaces and money) to achieve it;

j. numerous other results and conclusions were drawn from this visit. They are included in a memorandum for record "Trip Notes to HQS FORSCOM" (copy provided to Dr. Brooks the ARI POC on 22 November 1985);

° 31 Oct 85: Visited Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges, an element of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, at One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. Met with Dr. Arden Pratt, SOC Director. Results of that visit included:

a. a better understanding concerning the development of networked bachelor degree programs. Phase 1 of the Advance baccalaureate degree system is being currently developed by SOC for Department of the Army. During this phase only business related curriculum areas related to accounting, computer studies, and management are being networked. Approximately 25 colleges and universities who offer upper level programs have been identified as potential Advance network member institutions. As development occurs other institutions will be considered for membership. (Note: Over 400 regionally accredited colleges and universities within the United States have ascribed to the principles and criteria of SOC and are officially recognized as members of SOC; approximately 60 of these institutions are currently networked in Associate Degree programs offered at over 35 CONUS installations and at numerous locations in Europe, Korea, Japan, and Hawaii where American troops are stationed.) Other areas that have been identified for later phases of development include:

   - Criminal Justice, including Criminology, Law Enforcement, Police Science, Corrections, and Safety

   - Occupational Education

A-8

- Applied Science/Technology, including degree areas in Aviation, Electronics

- Technical Management, including Aviation Management, Electronics Management, Health Care Management, Office Management

- General Studies

b. a working knowledge of the objectives of networked degree programs which include:

- the requirement for a student agreement between the soldier and the institution which outlines precisely the specific degree program requirements; credit awarded based on prior collegiate work, MOS experience and service school courses successfully completed, examinations taken, etc.; and what courses remains to be taken in order to complete the degree requirements;

- the establishment of a "home" institution which works out student agreements with soldiers, accepts comparable courses from network institutions, awards credits for Army courses and MOS experience when applicable, awards a bachelor degree when all prescribed work has been accomplished, and limits residency requirements to one quarter of the total hours required for the degree or less and those residency requirements can be met at any time during the degree program;

- therefore, a student can choose a specific degree program, establish a "home" institution, obtain a student agreement, complete the required number of resident courses, and then if transferred take the remaining course requirements with network member institutions situated around the world, have transcripts sent to the "home" institution and, when the student agreement is fulfilled, the "home" institution will award the degree;

c. a general sense of the parameters of the current effort which seem to include:

- no real curriculum development; instead the current networking effort is aimed at programs that already exist and which contain a series of comparable elements;

- HQDA (Education Division, ODCSPER) which provides SOC with guidance and direction with regard to work to be accomplished and priority of degree programs to be networked;

- member institutions remain independent degree-granting organizations but who voluntarily accommodate the Army and the individual soldiers by joining the networks and complying with the stipulations inherent in network membership;

- SOC asserts rather strong leadership by closely monitoring

compliance with those stipulations, by conducting regional
workshops annually where Army and collegiate personnel
meet and learn proper usage of the handbook and correct
operations of the networks, by first warning institutions
noted as non-complying with network requirements and
second, if institutions continue non-compliance, to expel them
from the network system and replace them with institutions
with programs that will network;

d. possibilities exist whereby a degree program(s) can be developed
between the Army and networked colleges and universities to meet
specific Army objectives such as refresher-maintenance-enhancement
language training for linguists. thus far no such suitable program
is known to exist by SOC, but if requested by HQDA, prioritized
high enough in the work plan and the necessary funds provided to
support the work plan, such an effort can be undertaken.

° 31 Oct 85: Submitted First In-Progress Review to ARI (Dr. Judy Brooks,
POC).

° 6 Dec 85: Met with Major Les Bowlen, Chief of Language Branch, MILPERCEN
and LTC Gary Cochard, Military Programs Division, ODCSPER in Room 332,
Hoffman I, Alexandria, VA. Needs and ideas expressed during that meeting
included:

a. need to establish a pool of known linguists;

b. need to recruit more native speakers;

c. need to find ways to retain qualified linguists. Retention rate
among 98G in USAREUR is 18%;

- must be willing to pay for skills. Ideas include bonus
payments; tie in with special college programs;

d. need to establish a linguist information network which would
include MEPCOM, IET sites, DLIFLC, MILPERCEN, NGB, ARPERCEN.
Such information system would encourage recruitment of native
speakers, establish a pool of qualified linguists, maintain
records regarding their proficiency, job performance, skills
attained during training and on-the-job duties, encourage active
duty retention, but for those departing active duty, identify
opportunities with the Army National Guard and the Selected
Reserve, alert ARPERCEN and NGB personnel where to actively
recruit personnel departing active duty. At least such a system
could be used to enlist qualified linguists in the IPR;

e. need to be able to assist commanders in maintaining linguists'
proficiency in their target languages. A basic assumption is that
commanders in tactical environments have less understanding about
refresher-maintenance-enhancement requirements of linguists; the

A-10

importance of frequent functioning in the target language in meaningful assignments; the nature of language learning being non-procedural and highly perishable if not used; that linguists do, in fact, require "exceptional" treatment;

f. need to understand the time requirements for training linguists. Example given was for MOS 98G (8 weeks of Basic Training, 25 weeks of language training at DLIFLC, 4 weeks of AIT for absolute minimum; but if the requirement was for a (J2) LEFOR, 8 weeks of Basic Training, 74 weeks of language training at DLIFLC, 13 weeks of AIT, 12 weeks for additional skill identifier, plus leave and personal requirements). If linguists positions are identified and documented and the requirements are placed on the personnel systems to recruit, train and deploy individuals to fill those positions, the time lag may be 3 years or more;

g. need for a recognized proponent for a linguist career management field. Currently none exists. Perhaps the first three MOS digits for linguists should denote "linguist" and the additional skill identifiers denote specific Army jobs;

h. some other ideas for improvement expressed during the meeting include:

-   employment of mobile training teams out of DLIFLC to provide refresher-maintenance-enhancement training both for active and reserve personnel. (LTC Cochard emphasized this idea.) Build a well-qualified cadre of instructors at DLIFLC and deploy on an as needed basis throughout the total force;

-   when documenting and authorizing a linguist position, require a minimum of 2 individuals. In order to refresh, maintain and/or enhance linguist proficiency, it is essential that linguists be able to converse with each other in the target language;

-   when offering college incentives, this offering should be intertwined with the recruiting process. Perhaps instead of a 3-4 year enlistment, offer a 6-year enlistment with an in-service bachelor degree opportunity;

-   define clearly what is meant by non-resident foreign language training for linguists when preparing final report;

-   look in 1978 Review of Education and Training for Officers for ideas;

-   no particular empirical data were suggested for inclusion in this study effort;

° 6 Dec 85: Met with Mrs. Louise Ellis, Education Division, ODCSPER, who delivered the computer printouts resulting from empirical data elements requested. Questions concerning VEAP-GI Bill participation, etc., were not available.

A-11

° 6 Dec 85: On this and several subsequent dates, researched reference documents at Pentagon Library. Results of these efforts included acquisition and review of the 1976 Army Linguist Personnel Study (ALPS), studies conducted at the Army War College and by HumRRO, and numerous other references. (Note: Few source documents dated after 1979 were found in the Pentagon Library.)

° 16 Dec 86: Met with LTC Claudia Kennedy, Training Division, ODCSOPS, who performs action officer responsibilities for the Secretary of the Army as Executive Agent for DLIFLC. This meeting occurred at Dupont Gardens, Washington, D.C. Results of this meeting included:

a. problems exist in documentation and career development. For example, for linguists, should the MOS emphasis (first 3 digits) be language or a technical area identifier;

b. problems exist in sustainment training; but not impressed with computer-assisted language instruction; instead human intercommunication using drill and practice techniques seem to be of paramount importance;

c. possible research questions include:

  - a survey of other measures besides the DLPT in determining linguist's proficiency;

  - assess the impact of not doing the language mission well (e.g., in terms of loss of intelligence information, ability to influence actions among allies (interoperability), ability to serve in MAAG assignments and on special operations, etc.);

  - evaluate the ability of non-native speakers to learn other languages and develop an appropriate list of learning strategies;

  - since DLIFLC is producing a 1+-1+ graduate and FORSCOM and other commands state a force requirement for a 2-2 linguist; what resources are required to bring the average DLIFLC graduate up to a 2-2 level;

  - research the importance of English language proficiency in foreign language training. If recruitment of native speakers is seriously implemented particularly among Hispanics, Chinese, etc., what problems exist in use of the English language particularly oral/aural abilities;

  - study incentives for re-enlistment and/or enlisment after departing active duty into ARNG and USAR to include IPR;

d. suggestions regarding sustainment training included:

  - development of a solid core of instruction needed;

  - employment of mobile training teams to conduct proper instruction and monitor proficiency testing;

A-12

- establishment of adequate language laboratories or language training facilities which are conducive to optimal language learning;

- development of a viable career program for linguists which will attract recruits, promote retention, and allow for proper utilization of linguists. Include in the career development of linguists scheduled trips and/or assignments in the country of the target language and opportunities to attend major universities to study and improve language skills;

e. emphasis must also be placed on documenting Army language needs. Currently this is particularly poor among special operations positions;

f. an invitation to review Training Division, ODCSOPS, language training files to augment literature review;

° 23 Dec 85: At invitation and supervision of LTC Claudia Kennedy, reviewed language training files at the Training Division, ODCSOPS, HQDA, Room 1E 529, Pentagon. This review included documents pertaining to:

a. implementation of a linguist unique career management field;

b. language strategy as viewed from the perspective of the Army Service Porgram manager for language;

c. development of unit language training program;

d. Army language program 2000 (long range planning);

e. foreign language training for all officers;

f. Army initiatives to increase manning of military intelligence linguists;

g. language training in conjunction with civil schooling programs.

This review provided the researcher with a wide scope of materials essential in understanding language problems as they exist and efforts taken to resolve those problems and/or rationale for doing or not doing specific tasks to solve problems and enhance language training.

° 31 Dec 85: Prepared and submitted Second In-Progress Review to ARI (POC Dr. Judy Brooks).

° 3-18 Feb 86: Conducted visit to United States Army, Europe and 7th Army. (Detailed trip notes were prepared and a copy submitted to ARI on 5 Mar 86). Key personnel contacted (in proximate order as visit progressed).

Dr. Thomas E. Powers--USAREUR Director of ACES (Heidelberg)
Dr. Hester Telman--USAREUR Deputy Director of aCES (Heidelberg)
Mr. Werner Radig--Chief, Education Programs Branch, USAREUR ACES (Heidelberg)
Mr. Leslie Johnson--Language Program Officer, USAREUR ACES (Heidelberg)
Mr. Gerd Brendel--Training Specialist, Defense Language Institute, Foreign
    Language Center (DLIFLC) Language Trainign Detachment (Heidelberg)
Mr. Charles Best--Sound Recording Equipment Operator, USAREUR ACES (Heidelberg)
LTC Raub--Operations and Training Branch, ODCSI, HQ USAREUR (Heidelberg)
Mr. Michael J. Nowell--Intelligence (ISEW) Systems Specialist, Operations
    and Training Branch, ODCSI, HQ USAREUR (Heidelberg)
Herr Weiner Naas--contract employee, USAREUR Command Language School,
    Mark Twain Village Building 3796 (Heidelberg)
Mr. Alwin Fischer--Language Coordinator, 21st Support Command (Kaiserslautern)
Mr. David G. Symes--Regional Director, ACES, 21st Suport Command (Kaiserslautern)
Mr. Robert B. Van Hoose--Deputy Regional Director, ACES, 21st Support Command
    (Kaiserslautern)
Mr. Mike Ackermann--Military Intelligence Field Detachment Commander (Pirmasens)
Mr. Frank Mitchell--former Field Detachment Commander (Retired U.S. Army
    Military), currently language instructor (Pirmasens)
Four (4) 97B counterintelligence agents (Pirmasens). At least
    one had worked as a 98G
Mr. Philip E. Hughes--Regional Director, ACES, V Corps (Frankfurt)
Ms. Hildegard Von Wedel--Language Coordinator, V Corps (Frankfurt)
Mr. Paul Tillery--Senior Educational Services Officer, Frankfurt Military
    Community (Frankfurt)
Dr. John H. Culliton--Regional Director, ACES, berlin
Ms Heidi--Acting Language Coordinator (Berlin)
Ms. Cindy Fuller--Administrative Secretary aCES Office (berlin)
MSG Francis--766 MI (Berlin)
Maj. Brunet--766 MI (Berlin)
Mr. Bill Cook--766 MI (Berlin)
CWO Thornton--766 MI (Berlin)
Ms. Grace Larson--Education Advisor (Technician) Field Station Berlin
Col. Melanson--Deputy Commander, Field Station Berlin
Mrs. Betty Kasischke--Language Advisor, Field Station Berlin
Nine (9) 98G linguists including a SFC supervisor of 41 German linguist at
    T'berg, Field Station Berlin
G-3; Deputy G-3; numerous education personnel at dinner, 7 Feb. U.S. Army Berlin
Mr. Bruce E. McLeod, Jr.--Regional Director, ACES, VII Corps, Stuttgart and
    other VII Corps Regional ACES staff members
Mr. Klaus Klein--VII Corps Language Specialist (Stuttgart)
Mr. Robert George--Education Services Officer, Flak Kaserne (Stuttgart)
Mr. John Morris--Guidance Counselor, Coffey Barracks (Stuttgart)
Five (5) tactical linguists, 207 MI Unit, Coffee Barracks, including two 98G,
    one 97E, one 96B (four SGTs; one SSG) (one had been reassigned from
    05H to 97E) (Stuttgart)
Mr. Scott D. Downing--Senior Education Services Officer, Wuerzburg Community,
    Leighton Barracks (Wuerzburg)
Mr. Robert Brust--Language Specialist, VII Corps (Wuerzburg)
Mr. Dennis Sherroid--Education Services Officer, Leighton Barracks (Wuerzburg)
CW3 James Hogan--Training Officer, 103 MI Bn, 3rd Inf. Div. (Wuerzburg)
Mr. Joe L. Hurd--Senior Education Services Officer, Bamberg Community

A-14

Ms. Barbara Kadlec--Senior Education Services Officer, Munich/Bad Aibling
     Community (Munich)
Mr. Abdul R. Ali--Guidance Counselor, Bad Aibing Station (Munich)
Maj. John Grunden--Director of Instruction, Foreign Language Training Center,
     Europe (FLTCE) (Munich)
CWO Dave Kralik--FLTCE (Munich)
Dr. Maurice Funke--German Department, FLTCE (Munich)
Mr. James Nelson--Russian Department, FLTCE (Munich)
Mr. John J. Sakmamm--Czech Department, FLTCE (Munich)
Mr. Joseph--Egon Moravec-Czech Department, FLTCE (Munich)
Col. John G. Lackey, III--Commander, 66th MI Group (Munich)
Mr. Greg Wilkie--Military Personnel Specialist, Test Control Officer, SQT Section,
     66th MI Group
Maj. Doyle--S-3, 18th MI Bn. (Munich)
Cpt. Richardson--Assistant S-3, 18th MI Bn. (Munich)
CW4 Bruce W. Ohnesorge--Training Officer, 18th MI Bn. (Munich)
CWO Roehrick--18th MI Bn. (Munich)
Two (2) 97E linguists (Russian), 18th MI Bn. S-3 office
Herr Wedderman--German language instructor, contracted by Munich Education
     Office for duty with 18th MI Bn.
Ms. Nelda R. Messina--Education Specialist, Flak Kaserne (Augsburg)
Cpt. Carter--Plans and Training Officer, 502nd MI Bn. (Augsburg)
Lt. Wilkes--502nd MI Bn. (Augsburg)
Three (3) lingusits, 502nd MI Bn. (two 98G, one 98C) (two SSGs, one SFC)
     (Augusburg)
Mr. Bernard Mazer--Augsburg Community Language Monitor, worked with Field
     Station Augsburg (telephonic conversation)
Col. Don O. Stovall--Commander, U.S. Army Russian Institute (Garmisch)
LTC Michael H. Crutcher--Deputy Commander and Director of Instruction, U.S.
     Army Russian Institute (Garmisch)
Mr. Alan J. french--Language Studies Faculty Member, U.S. Army Russian Institute
     (Garmisch)
Mr. Tom Tower--Investigator, Army Audit Agency (working on an audit of FLTCE)
     (Munich)

Results of this visit include:

   a. HQ USAREUR ACES, 3 Feb 86, 0830-1300:

          -     USAREUR has considerable "in-house" capability to develop
                language instructional materials and is currently involved
                with language materials especially designed for interoperability
                requirements; VII Corps Language specialists appear to be working
                closely with HQ USAREUR in this developmental effort;

          -     there is a lack of precision in documenting what language
                skills are used by "linguists" in properly performing military
                jobs;

          -     a possible research questiona: At what general language
                proficiency level can technical language be effectively and
                efficiently taught and learned by an Army linguist?

- cost per our of instruction is an important quantitative measure, e.g., because of high frequency, cost per hour of Headstart/ Gateway is $0.66 per student;

- perceived problem: Commanders search for and emphasize instant results. There is a lack of hard data to show commanders that a need exists within their units for language instructional materials development. Yet it is well recognized that language is a highly perishable skill;

- USAREUR was apparently not invited to DLIFLC Annual Program Review, Feb 86 (Johnson); Dr. Powers was making visit to DLIFLC in Mar 86;

- a possible research question: Can USAREUR/DLIFLC develop instructional materials that use more technical language and more closely mirror actual job performance requirements in 98G, 98C, 97E, 97B, etc., and yet maintain all products based on that developmental effort in an unclassified status? (Is classification barriers preventing USAREUR ACES language instructional development from developing materials that mirror actual technical language used in the actual workplace?)

- American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages has developed some promising guidelines on sublevels of language proficiency within the DLIFLC level 1. Discussion with this group, particularly Dr. Pardee Lowe, Jr. may be helpful (Brendel).

b. USAREUR ODCSI, 3 Feb 86, 1300-1430:

- need to use ACTO hardware in courseware development for language job performance;

- MOS library and learning centers are separate from the Army library system (now under the DCSIM). Why should no MOS libraries and learning centers be made an integral part of that function?

- interactive training aids devices have potential for providing necessary specialized language training for soldier linguists;

- language proficiency is needed for all individuals stationed on the continent of Europe. There is merely a difference in the degree of proficiency needed by a 98G or 97B or 97E than other soldiers in combat, combat support and combat service support roles. Perhaps integration of foreign language training should occur as part of common soldiering skills IAW regiment/COHORT/ CAPSTONE mission. Perhaps military NCOs shold teach language (e.g., DI in BT/AIT/OSUT teach survival language skills). Soldiers can identify with the NCO. Interoperability requirements would be built in from the initial training of soldiers;

- idea for a career linguist field may be worth investigating, perhaps an enlisted FAO program is warranted;

- educators tend to teach and emphasize only general language development; what really is needed is technical language training which can best be done by military trainers.

c. USAREUR Command Language School, 3 Feb 86, 1530-1630:

- commercial material being used included Themen 1/Hueber and Eindruche-Einblicke Textbooks;

- "Hands-on," semi-formal language seminars such as studying opera in German and attending actual opera performances are being offered;

- facility appeared to be adequate, well staffed, busy with both military and family members and engaged both in language instruction and testing. It was situated near both living quarters and work areas.

d. 21st Support Command Staff, 4 Feb 86, 0900-1400:

- concern for language training among Reserve Component personnel and Reforger CSS elements;

- Perhaps more emphasis should be given to long term commitment to language training and use of target languages;

- key to maintenance and enhancement of language proficiency among linguists is to enhance the personnel status of linguists, i.e., the self-image that they have an essential military mission recognized and appreciated by the military chain of command. General and technical language proficiency at prescribed levels must be understood to be absolutely key in performing the military job. Self-image is important both to linguists, language teachers and language coordinators. Currently not enough is being done in this area;

e. Discussion with 97B personnel in Pirmasens, 4 Feb 86, 1100-1300:

- speakers course at DLIFLC needs more technical orientation twoards the end (e.g., interview techniques/PSO procedures, practice investigations in the target language);

- FLTCE rated extremely valuable by personnel who had attended;

- perhaps more emphasis should be given to exchange programs, use of the Goethe Institute, working directly with German and French military intelligence services, etc. One agent who lived with a German family found that this environment helped his conversational skills;

- most students arriving from DLIFLC could read reasonably well

in the target language but seriously lacked speaking and aural comprehension skills. Some DLIFLC graduates had been noted to have been on station 3 or 4 years and still could not converse adequately. FLTCE helps develop or enhance conversational skills.

- agent trained in French at DLIFLC and assigned to French slot stated that his French language proficiency was not adequate. Although he was stationed only about 10 km (6 miles) from the French border and French counterparts were stationed nearby, his contacts were so limited that he lost his language proficiency. (Apparently the slot is being eliminated.);

- need pinpointed for more in-service unit technical language training. (Perhaps most general vocabulary words but in the military job context.);

- agent trained in Polish at DLIFLC stated that he had not received Polish tapes from DLIFLC as he had thought would occur;

- problems relating to dialects were discussed; in this particular region dialects require mastery of many new words and word meanings;

- positive value of having an authentic native speaker and an American fluent both in the target language and military job requirements (the technical language) team teach in refresher/ maintenance/enhancement training. Linguists need the native speaker but they also need to identify with an American who is particularly skilled in use of the target language in actual job performance;

- agents expressed a desire for informal, seminar classes which are semi-structured. They seemed to prefer "hands-on," practical language refresher training;

- enlisted agents felt that a language-heavy bachelor degree program would definitely provide a positive influence in helping maintain language proficiency. They also felt incentive pay would help in this area;

- E-6/E-7s in the linguist areas apparently have marketable skills outside the Army, hence many NCOs are leaving the Army to take advantage of these opportunities;

- problem of requiring a minimum of 6 persons for a language class sponsored by ACES was discussed;

- (all agents exhibited a positive attitude; were bright and articulate in conversation and helpful in their insights regarding the language program.);

f. Discussions with V Corps ACES personnel, 5 Feb 86, 1000-1400:

- the greatest problems in non-resident foreign language

A-18

training was (1) lack of communications between MI and ACES personnel and (2) failure of students to follow through with classes once a teacher was hired and classes scheduled. With regard to the first problem, the Corps language coordinator did not know exactly where the MI elements were now located in the Abrams Building. Apparently they had moved, put up partitions seemingly in an attempt to isolate themselves. The language coordinator had previously worked with them over the past 20 years or so but currently she had no contact with them. She was unsure whether anything regarding language training for linguists was ongoing within V Corps. Traditionally, three communities (Frankfurt, Wiesbaden and Wildflecken) had such training with Wiesbaden usually doing the most. (After some inquiry, it was determined that no non-resident language training for linguists was currently on-going in the Frankfurt Community.) With regard to the second problem, in past years when the language coordinator was actively involved in such training, she noted that when the MI units asked for teacher to give a refresher-maintenance course and a teacher was hired and classes established, attendance would invariably drop to a point where the class was unproductive. Students would not attend regularly, thus creating a frustrating situation. (Seemingly, retaining a "minimum number of students" was a strong driving factor in V Corps ACES to insure "cost effectiveness" of Army education;

- Senior ESO, Frankfurt Community, emphasized the importance of having 10 people to begin a class. He commented that attendance by both MI and MP personnel was "appalling." If a class began with 10, it might have 4 show up for one class, 8 for another class meeting, 5 for another, with not the same students steadily attending. Also there was problem of "mixed proficiency levels" within a particular class. This factor has caused serious problems both for the instructor and the students.

- Senior ESO, Frankfurt Community, had experienced difficulty in acquiring appropriate instructors particularly in the Slavic/ Czech languages. In those languages, a "fresh" linguist (i.e., one who is current in language usage such as idoms, slang used in home areas) is needed; often teacher applicants do not have that "fresh" language ability. Also, "hands-on" reality in language training presented problems. For MPs, classes could possibly be directly related with MPs work such as directing barge traffic through Germany, Belgium and Holland; but not much "hands-on" reality could be inserted by the instructor for MI personnel. Consequently, language was taught primarily in a social context; clases were not homogenous and attendance was poor;

- some recommendations offered by Frankfurt ESO: (1) students be put on official orders to attend class, (2) 40-80 hour courses be established which would meet 2-3 days per week for 2-4 hours, (3) more exchanges be made with German linguists with German

A-19

sister divisions, (4) visual aids be developed for language training (language classes are often boring; listening to tapes is boring), something is needed to liven up classes, (5) an instructor manual is needed to be developed and given to teachers so they can better understand how best to teach various target groups such as MPs and MI personnel and how to function in a class with students at varying levels of proficiency, (6) that commanders be "clipped" for lack of retention of language skills by unit linguists.

g. Discussion with ACES Regional Director, Berlin, 7 Feb 86, 0900-1030:

- Berlin education program is organized differently than rest of USAREUR; e.g., education to include MOS-related courses were funded through the German Government;

- need to evaluate effectiveness of instruction was stressed. A problem experienced in Berlin was the varying levels of proficiency among students in a class. This makes it difficult to teach content effectively such as Eastern European Area studies in the target language. The University of Maryland is apparently preparing a diagnostic test to place students in classes according to proficiency levels;

- foreign area studies program offered by the University of Maryland seemed to have considerable promise. Only a few courses are being taught in the target languages. If the problem of variations in proficiency levels among students can be controlled, perhaps additional courses could be successfully taught in languages other than English;

- language training in Berlin was generally conducted in one of 3 ways: (1) in-house; (2) under contract with a school or institute (Berlin personnel have a wealth of experience in this area); (3) through a language laboratory;

- ACES and MI/Field Station elements have strong, cooperative, on-going working relationship in language training or linguists.

h. Discussion with 766th MI unit personnel, 7 Feb 86, 1030-1230:

- problem between strategic and tactical linguists surfaced; a comment was made by a non-linguist MI officer about linguists in tactical MI units who considered themselves "primadonnas" who didn't want to get themselves dirty in the motor pool nor go on extended field duty. Management of linguist personnel was seemingly a serious problem such as 98Gs who had to go back into military training. It was observed that some female linguists deliberately became pregnant to avoid tactical tour of duty;

- technical jargon was considered to be important but not sufficient;

A-20

linguists need a basic grounding in the general language for effective job performance. It was generally agreed that a strong need exists for language. The audio-lingual approach at DLIFLC several years ago had created some very poor graduates.

- FLTCE was considered to be a good school but it kept soldiers out of the unit for 6 weeks, hence rendering a hardship on the unit and its mission accomplishment;

- enlisted soldiers want privacy and money (Francis). Incentive pay or monetary awards might be most effective motivation for soldiers to maintain language proficiency;

- possible research question: what monetary incentive system would be most cost effective in motivating soldier-linguists to maintain and/or enhancing their language proficiency?

- FLTCE may wish to expand its program to include other languages such as Polish. One linguist trained in Polish stated he had lost all proficiency because of lack of use. (He was also a German linguist.);

- one Chief Warrant Officer stated that currently there is no emphasis or reaction to results scored on the DLPT. He suggested tying results of DLPT to Incentive Pay (make DLPT results count);

- suggestion was made to expand Redtrain; another suggestion was to allow linguists every 3rd week to have several hours a day specifically for language training;

- other possible research questions:

Is pro-pay an effective incentive for linguists to maintain their language proficiency level? If so, how much? For 2nd, 3rd languages as well as 1st foreign language?

Can degree-oriented education programs serve as an incentive? If so, what kind of program?

How can soldierization and language training be appropriately meshed together to help resolve the tactical/strategic linguist problem?

Should specialist career programs exist for linguists whereby an E-6/E-7 continues as a "master linguist" instead of leaving that function to become strictly a manager of people?

Can MILPERCEN schedule refresher-maintenance language training centrally as part of a soldier's career development program?

What interactive refresher-maintenance training materials which employee visuals could be developed in a cost-effective manner?

Language tapes are boring. There is a need for interactive system with visuals even if only a "dubbed" TV serial. "Spruce up language training"; "see as well as hear"; "it is no fun to set and refresh your language skills using current tapes." (Thornton)

i. Meeting with DCDR, Field Station Berlin, 7 Feb 86, 1300-1430:

- need for evaluation to determine relevance of DLPT to job performance;

- linguists such as 98Gs are facing increasingly complicated challenges, not just in military jargon but in a wide-ranging area of civilian terminology in relation to equipment, etc. More and more responsibility on training. Learning difficulty is increasing;

- strategic versus tactical linguists is a serious issue. Tactical linguists who come to a strategic assignment are often not capable of doing the military job;

- indigenous personnel have been used twice as linguists with some promising results. But if indigenous personnel are to be used in case of war, considerable planning is necessary;

- possible incentives include promotion points for language study and a supplement of in-house language training with civil schooling;

- OSD/HQDA should look at linguist recruiting more closely. Recruiters should check out high schools with strong language programs;

- DCDR suggested a talk with some linguists on site would be productive;

j. Discussion with 9 98G linguists at T'berg, 7 Feb 86, 1500-1645:

- NSA LPT augmented with a speaking element would be preferable to DLPT;

- lack of any image building incentives to maintain language proficiency such as Army Commendation Medal. Money is not all that important. "The Army is not giving you any incentives to keep up language skills" said one linguist and others seemed to agree;

- tactical versus strategic linguist problem was dominant theme. An E-7 supervisor of 41 German linguists stated that tactical linguists coming to his unit "bombed out." One E-6 estimated that over 70% of Army linguists were being wasted. Tactical exercises are invariably being conducted in English; tactical linguists have no opportunity to practice skills needed for war-

A-22

time mission. (One linguist who participated in this discussion stated that he had been stationed as a tactical linguist at Ft. Hood, Ft. Carson and with one tactical unit in Germany and found this to be true at all these locations.) Language training in tactical units was generally considered inadequate and without "any rhyme or reason." Instruction was generally not geared to the students and their particular needs. (Linguists who had been to Ft. Hood believed no language program existed there at all; those who had been to Ft. Carson found its program inappropriate; one linguist who had been stationed at Hunter Airfield believed its program to be excellent.) Most were dismayed at the prospects of returning to a tactical unit and would avoid it if possible.

- possible research question: Develop a simulator or a series of simulators which would allow tactical linguists to practice wartime skill requirements? (Perhaps one is already under development.);

- FLTCE was highly praised by those who had attended. Dr. Funke's vocabulary and grammar teaching was considered superb;

- suggestions offered included (1) more access to civilian language schools in CONUS, (2) a high quality BA or Masters Degree program with heavy concentration on language. (University of Maryland was not considered particularly "high quality." One linguist who stated that he had no intention of re-enlisting (he was getting out of the Army to use his VEAP/Army College Fund benefits) stated without hesitation that if he could be assured of a quality BA Degree program in-service he would re-enlist;

- Ms. Kasischke's Russian classes drew high praise from Russian linguists. Perhaps language advisors should be integral to all Field Stations.

k. Discussion with VII Corps personnel, Stuttgart, 10 Feb 86, 1000-1350:

- need exists for fresh, up-to-date foreign language materials for use by language instructors (e.g., daily newspapers, periodicals, Soviet and other Eastern Block books and materials that are readily available at certain bookshops in West Germany. Army regulations state that instructional materials must be approved by DLIFLC. A regulatory provision should be adopted which specifically authorizes this type of instructional material and allows for its official procurement. (Apparently a spokesperson for DLIFLC has verbally approved of its procurement and use in USAREUR language classes.) (Klein);

- need exists for authority to exist in USAREUR to evaluate officially the oral portion of the DLPT III. Currently it takes DLIFLC approximately 3 months or more to evaluate this part of the DLPT III and get results back to person taking the

A-23

test. Commanders want results in the immediate timeframe. Linguists deserve to know their results earlier. New AR 611-6 requires testing annually which will put additional work load on DLIFLC if current system continues. (Klein);

- need to improve attendance of linguists at scheduled language training classes. Often language training has such a low priority in MI units that every other function or detail imposed by the chain of command takes precedence over attending a scheduled refresher-maintenance language class with a paid instructor. Perhaps student-linguists need to put on official orders to attend these classes to insure that the chain of command is committed to sending students on a regular basis. ISG and Company Commanders are often non-linguists and are not sensitive to needs of linguists to maintain or enhance their language skills, nor do they fully understand the perishable nature of language learning and that it is not procedural learning. (Klein);

- suggestion: A procedure should be developed whereby materials from Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty could be made available to Army linguists for helping maintain their language proficiency. (Klein);

- contacts have been made with Herr Dr.h.c.Dohmen ("the Malcom Knowles of Germany adult eduction") to explore the possibility of an advanced degree program in Adult Education for American personnel stationed in VII Corps. (McLeod);

- comment: One German instructor who had just become a nationalized American citizen by choice was quoted as saying after teaching a refresher-maintenance German class for Army linguists: "If these are the best of the U.S. Army linguists, my new country's eyes and ears are so poor." He was in tears!;

1. Discussion with linguists from 207 MI unit, Coffee Barracks, 10 Feb 86, 1330-1500:

- as tactical linguists they never or very rarely ever used their language skills in performing their military jobs. No interrogations (97E) were conducted in target language; all were in English. One 98G (Russian linguist) stated that he graduated from DLIFLC, came to Germany, was assigned to a tactical MI unit, never used his Russian language skills, lost much of his proficiency, was sent to FLTCE where he regained proficiency to a point nearly equivalent to where he was when he graduated from DLIFLC, came back to his tactical unit where he never uses the language, and he feels that he has again lost his proficiency to be an effective linguist.

- some quotes: "A lot of 98Gs expected more out of the Army"; "if the balloon goes up, the Army will bomb out on language."

A-24

-   a general feeling expressed was that (1) the tactical MI companies
    have all other priorities higher than language training or unit
    training where foreign language skills are employed, (2) there
    is no real need to maintain language proficiency because it is never
    used (why attend language refresher-maintenance class, the 1SGT
    and the commander really don't care; they have much more important
    things to worry about such as vehicle maintenance and beautification
    of the company area and since linguists are never used in doing
    what they were trained to do and they are generally intelligent,
    they make excellent "gofors" or detail persons). Several linguists
    stated that they had no idea what military mission their unit might
    have which would require them to perform as 98Gs, 98Cs or 97Es using
    their target language skills.

-   one linguist stated that he could name 4 female linguists who
    deliberately got themselves pregnant in order to get a Chapter 8.
    Another stated that he was re-enlisting just so he could get an
    ITT to a field station and get out of this tactical unit.

-   use of technical language skills is not a part of a CEWI Bn
    ARTEP; nor a 98G, 98C, 97E ITEP; nor tested on SQT (except on
    98G). On recent field maneuvers, it was 8 days before any 98G
    play at all. 97E stated a similar situation for them;

-   linguists thought that a language-heavy BA degree program
    would be "great." They seemed to prefer a specialist career
    management system for linguists. They preferred native speakers
    to Army linguists as instructors.

-   (these soldiers did not appear to be chronic complainers; on
    the contrary, they appeared as intelligent, highly articulate
    U.S. soldiers who would like to do the military jobs that they
    received almost a year's training to do. They really didn't seem to
    mind the motor pool that much, if at least some recognition was
    given to their specialties and they were expected to do those
    specialty tasks on a reasonably high priority basis in conjunction
    with motor pool chores. They resented being the "company gofors.");

m. Discussion with CW3 Billie L. Hogan, Training Officer, 103 MI Bn, 3rd
    Inf. Div. Wuerzburg, 11 Feb 86, 1100-1200:

-   (Mr. Hogan described himself as a former manager of instructors and
    training of 98G and 98C AID at Goodfellow Air Force Base);

-   "Army does not have a mission for tactical linguists.";

-   CEWI Bn deals with some of the worst vehicles in the Division.
    Received new authorization tables almost yearly which requires
    continuous shifting of prime movers. In these shifts, receiving
    units nearly always receive the "dogs." What unit would give away its
    best vehicles willingly! Consequently, a lot of emphasis is
    needed on vehicle maintenance. "Your piece of equipment must
    roll to the field." Since the MI Bn commander is rated by the
    Deputy Division Commander for Support vehicle maintenance gets an

extra high priority because that is one of that person's prime
interests;

- "No one cares if you can do your job as a 98G or 98C.";

- the linguists stationed in the border residence offices, on
the other hand, do use their language skills. Personnel who
work with their language do not require maintenance training as
much as those who do not;

- tactical linguists cannot gain recognition by doing their job
within the MOS;

- 98Gs and 98C are working for people who are not nor have ever
worked in the MOS. Most have come up through the "tactical" ranks;

- linguists need good grounding in general language. "What
sentence is it that tells when the war is going to start.";

- if the Army enforces the new requirement for 98Gs to be at a 1-1
proficiency in the target language, around 70% of the first term
98Gs in this tactical unit will be reclassified, predicts
this training officer. He stated that he would test at the
latest possible date (May) and the retest would then be scheduled
for November, but he would be gone by that time;

- "98Gs are poorly managed." "It is criminal the way we are
wasting them." "These are intelligent men and women, paid to
do jobs they are not doing." "We do not allow these kids to
have pride in themselves.";

- VII Corps language specialist in ACES (Brust) is providing
all support possible; the problems are beyond his realm;

n. Discussion with Joe Hurd, former Ordnance Warrant, 11 Feb 86,
1230-1500:

- Technical Proficiency Inspections (TPIs) for special
weapons units are aimed at insuring that unit personnel are
capable of doing their technical jobs. They received tremdnous
command emphasis. If a unit fails, seriosu consequences
followed;

- (If Army specialties that employ special weapons receive
such rigorous scrutiny, shouldn't Army specialties that may
trigger the use of such weapons also receive a certification
of unit technical competence?);

o. Discussion with FLTCE personnel, 12 Feb 86, 0900-1230; 1330-1500:

- thrust is toward speaking skills development; interactive
conversation seems to promote thinking and reasoning in the
target language. Other skills seem to tailor these skills.
Writing does not seem important. "Speaking language correctly

requires all necessary elements.";

- teacher is key; must be able to tailor instruction to the specific student and his/her needs. Many teacher applicants are not grounded in the various methods of instruction that may be employed as situations arsie;

- school limited to Russian, German, and Czech. (Some difficulty being experienced in filling German quotas.) Some inquiries have been received concerning Polish and Arabic but no mission or funds;

- FLTCE involves general language not technical language and is based on the assumption that a good grounding in general language is essential for these linguists and the DLPT is an important measure of language proficiency;

- total immersion program where students reside with native speakers is used for about 63 students per year. Although differences between total immersion and non-total immersion students have not been quantified, it is suspected that skills retention will be longer with total immersion students;

- possible research question: What differences occur among FLTCE students who are totally immersed as opposed to those who are not;

- 80% of FLTCE students are from the Army: 814 (390-98G, 105-98C, 31-97E, 16-97B, 68-96C);

- project Trojan will bring training mission into garrison;

- linguists who received audio-lingual training approach at DLIFLC are "permanently crippled.";

- Army needs to prescreen language school applicants better; Top 50% of DLAB will pass, of the bottom 50% half will fail but we don't know which ones. (Rule of Thumb) Students with strong background in the target language when coming into DLIFLC may have a strategic advantage but there are tactical drawbacks;

- some people can never master a particular language; they will achieve a maximum of 1 or 1+ but go no higher;

- possible research question: Develop model BA degree program which is language-heavy and attach a 6 year enlistment option in order to achieve it;

- FLTCE is planning to install a satellite dish soon for receiving, no transmission. With this, real time broadcasts will be available for use in classes;

- personnel at DLPT 2 level often can not understand ordinary news broadcast once by;

A-27

- FLTCE uses small classes (e.g., 3) in order to tailor instruction to student and facilitate interactive speaking skills development;

- (possible research question: Only excellent comments were heard about FLTCE, it obviously has an excellent facility and capable staff. Perhaps it should serve as a model for similar organizations in other regions of the Army (CONUS, Far East, etc.);

p. Conversation with Commander of 66th MI Group, 12 Feb 86, 1500-1545:

- Intelligence Translation Aid should be included in an annotated bibliography important in non-resident foreign language training;

- Project Trojan is important to help linguists train in home stations. It should help field 98G gain same ability as those assigned to a field station. (Col Lackey was concerned about the use of terms such as tactical or strategic linguists and cautioned about their use without being defined.);

- "DLI product needs to move and do business."'

- recommendations: Go talk to some personnel from the 502nd in Augsburg and in Field Station Augsburg if possible; check on the 82nd problems in Grenada concerning language;

q. Conversation with Mr. Wilkie, SQT Testing Bn, 66th MI Gp, 13 Feb 86, 0810-0900:

- no authorization document exist concerning equipment/facilities needed in order to conduct DLPT testing. He was using some temporary cassette players and experienced difficulties in procuring any appropriate equipment because of the lack of any authorization documentation. Someone should establish what is required for language testing and in what environment should this testing occur;

- the GEL Model CLLS-15 is preferred;

- no meetings or workshops are conducted reference language testing (exception was an ACES conference where some mis-information was given by the speaker who was not current in the subject area);

r. Discussions with 18th MI Bn personnel, 13 Feb 86, 0900-1200:

- REDTRAIN personnel who come to the 18th use their language skills. It is considered a successful training program;

- possible research question: Develop a language diagnostic test that determines language training weaknesses. "The Army needs a realistic means to diagnose language training weaknesses.";

- Army needs a better initial screener for applicants to DLIFLC;

- "The Commander and the S-3 have a moral responsibility to keep linguists trained." (Doyle);

- people gain fluency through language usage. People communicate in the language they are most comfortable in. People are generally shy to speak in a language they are unsure about. (Wedderman);

- excellent cooperation between 18th and Munich Army Education Center staff. Class attendance had been 65%, now it is 85% in ACES sponsored classes;

- DLIFLC needs to do more in speaking skills especially for 97Es. (2 Russian 97Es interviewed). DLI is perceived by them to be skewed toward SIGNINT personnel;

- FLTCE is considered "excellent.";

- difference between "tactical" 97E and "strategic" 97E is defined (by Sp4 97E interviewed); A tactical linguist is in control of the conversation; it is and interrogation. A strategic linguist guides the conversation; it is a debriefing;

- some Russian is used in the operational section, need to use more. (SP4 Russian 97E linguist);

s. Discussion with 502nd MI Bn personnel, Augsburg, 13 Feb 86, 1300-1530:

- need for more technical language training. Perhaps a 1+ on DLPT would be sufficient for general language as a base if appropriate technical language skills were developed, maintained and enhanced as needed to do the job. (It was obvious that these linguists (whose unit mission is support above Corps) used their language skills on the job.);

- sometimes there are language maintenance problems when the chain of command are non-linguists. This was not an apparent problem at this time;

- there is a 98G track on SQT but some of 98Gs were working as 98Cs, consequently this test did not appropriately reflect job performance;

- DLPT was not considered a measure of job performance. It had little if anything to do with job performance;

- (Idea of a technical language proficiency inspection was conceived at this meeting. Perhaps an expert TLPI team composed of warrant officers headed by an MI officer would be detailed to inspect and certify each CEWI annually as to its

technical competence to perform its mission in the target languages. Mobile Training Teams could be deployed to guide unit training in preparation for the inspection. Failure to receive certification would be grounds for relief of chain of command personnel held responsible.);

- an award system similar to Parachutist Badge may be helpful if standards are kept high; the idea of a language-heavy BA program was well received; so was pro-pay;

- possible research question: Review Air Force, Navy, and Marine use of 98Gs; determine what lessons that may be applicable to the Army;

t. Discussion with Army Russian Institute personnel, 14 Feb 86, 1030-1200; 1300-1430:

- FLTCE model is replicable;

- enlisted personnel might well work in the Soviet Forces Specialist skills area proposal;

- "Language is not everything but it is the beginning." Quote from conversation *by Ambassador Vernon Walters to Col Stovall*;

- perhaps a language element could be inserted in a C&GSC tactical map exercise to sensitize officers as to the importance of linguists;

- language program needs someone in charge with enough authority to make meaningful decisions;

u. Summary of key issues discussed:

- "Tactical" linguists are apparently not using their target languages to perform their military jobs;

- the appropriate basic load of general language is undetermined (some questions estimated from 1+ to 3 DLPT proficiency level). Technical language skills need to be built on and around this basic load of general language ability;

- value and use of DLPT is questioned. Personnel felt it had little if anything to do with job performance;

- how to build and maintain a specific load of specialized language;

- command support or the lack of it. Ways to achieve it;

- Conventional Language training is "boring"; need ways to "spruce" it up;

- career management of linguists considered poor; most object to E-7s being driven out of field into pure management positions. Is there not a need for "master" linguist specialists?;

- lack of incentives to maintain/enhance language skills. Current system works more often as a disincentive than a positive force to encourage excellence among linguists. Based on conversations during this visit the following incentives would appear the most attractive in more or less descending order:

  perceived recognition that chain of command cares about linguists and the mission that linguists are supposed to be performing. Development of an effective awards system that promotes self esteem for excellence is badly needed;

  provide a quality Bachelor's Degree for linguist field (part in-service; part civil schooling) all tied to retention of quality personnel. (Of all incentives mentioned, this one achieved the most favorable responses particularly when coupled with possibility of Master's work for those who already have a BA degree. Education is an especially attractive incentive for intelligent, upward mobile personnel, who are intent on improving themselves and making a promising future happen for both themselves and their families. Most of linguist personnel contacted during this visit seemed to be in this category;

  bonuses were attractive. But VEAP and the Army College Fund are disincentives for retention. Some linguists felt compelled to get out of the Army in order to take advantage of these "incentives.";

  promise of working in a field station where linguists have a "real" mission.

  promotion points were especially attractive for E-4s and E-5s. But few were happy that higher grades would be unable to continue linguist functions;

  incentive pay (pro-pay) Who would reject more money! But this incentive received the least favorable reception particularly if the perception that the chain of command is giving such low priority to language proficiency and the role of linguists continues to exist. (Soldiers seem to know when they are being bought off.) (If the DLPT does not reflect military job performance, why bother to maintain 2-2-2 proficiency level scores?);

v. Summary of secondary issues discussed:

- evaluation of instructor applicants/criteria for hiring. (Is it based on keeping incumbents or acquiring best talent?);

A-31

- evaluation of oral language component of DLPT III;

  - acquiring up-to-date, authentic, and interesting material for
     language classes (visual as well as audio);

  - appropriate authorization documentation for language testing
     facilities/equipment;

  - training for instructors and language testers;

w. Summary of suggested research questions:

  - at what general language proficiency level (basic load) can
     technical language be effectively and efficiently taught and
     learned by Army linguists in order to perform properly the
     military job?

  - an evaluation to determine how well linguists are actually
     performing their technical jobs;

  - what is the relevance of DLPT to job performance?;

  - how can USAREUR/DLIFLC develop instructional materials that use
     more technical language and more closely mirror job tasks of
     linguists?;

  - what monetary and non-monetary incentive systems would be most
     cost effective in motivating linguists to maintain and/or enhance
     their language proficiency and re-enlist for a second term of
     service?;

  - should specialist career programs exist (as exception to current
     Army policy) for linguists whereby an E-6/E-7 continues in a role
     of "master" linguist?;

  - what interactive refresher-maintenance training materials which
     employee visuals (and run on ACTO hardware) could
     be developed in a rapid and cost-effective manner aimed at
     relieving student boredom and enhanced learning;

  - what quantitative and qualitative differences occur among FLTCE
     students who are "totally immersed" and those who are not in
     their 6 weeks of language training?;

  - review of U.S. Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps use of 98Gs
     and their non-resident language training activities;

x. Summary of conceptual models that should be explored:

  - BA language-heavy degree program aimed at Army linguists'
     needs;

  - FLTCE as a model for other geographical regions;

- use of Technical Language Proficiency Inspection system augmented with mobile training teams to assist in unit training to prepare for unit inspection/certification;

- insertion of language element in C&GSC map exercise;

y. Suggested areas that this investigator should review as part of this study:

- Project Trojan

- 82nd Div. experience in Grenada regarding language;

° 14 Mar 86: Visited National Cryptologic School, National Security Agency, Friendship Annex, near Fort Meade, Maryland. Talked with Jim Painter, Staff Assistant to the Dean; Gil Estridge, Chief of E12, and Dr. Schwarzkopf, Dean of NCS. Results of that visit included:

a. better understanding concerning NSA's use of civilian educational institutions for language training. The University of Hawaii is being used as "bed of Pacific basin languages." This program is principally for NSA civilian employees. College credit is purely incidental to learning. Experience with civilian educational institutions has ranged from good to poor. Thus far the program at University of Hawaii has been very satisfactory. Yon Sei University, Seoul, Korea, has also provided some good courses. the emphasis is on listening and reading in the target languages;

b. a discussion concerning the use of educational institutional (e.g., George Washington, Yale, Syracuse, and Indiana Universities) in the 1950s to provide basic foreign language instruction. Military terminology was stressed in these contracted programs. Some of these courses were rated as "extremely successful." Graduates generally came to first duty assignment with a basic load of vocabulary suitable

for operating in a military environment;

c. a recommendation that a specialist career program for linguists be investigated as an exception to Army policy;

d. a recognition that a tactical CEWI Battalion has no active peacetime intelligence gathering mission. By lack of a proper initial basic course in language training at DLIFLC and by lack of language usage and/or extended language training at permanent duty assignments have caused the Army to be "full of incompetent linguists.";

e. a review of how the Navy uses its intercept/analysis personnel (Navy CTI). 98G and 98C are one rating. The Navy has a Foreign Language Maintenance Proficiency Program and use Scenario Training units (STUs). It has a FLMA examination that covers all job relevant areas. A sailor can receive one of three scores: (1) failed,

A-33

(2) passed but not direct support qualified; (3) qualified intercept. The Army could do well by looking at the Navy and its foreign language maintenance programs for intercept operators.

f. a discussion of work being done by Technical Language Systems, Inc., San Angelo, TX. This company has developed diagnostic tests (discreet item tests). Based on deficiencies noted when students take these tests, a functional language program is developed to correct weaknesses and language deficiencies. Training modules are then provided to the students. This process has been automated;

g. a suggestion that all Army linguists be assigned to one command and then sent TDY back to tactical commands as needed;

h. a possible research question: What effect does non-language utilization have on soldier-linguist retention?;

i. the need for good grounding in English prior to engaging in foreign language training. The Air Force Language Analysis Course was an attempt at improving English prior to being sent to DLIFLC;

j. another possible research question: How accurate is the DLAB and what effect does motivation have in relation to the DLAB?;

k. recommendation that students at DLIFLC be geographically separated by MOS for the last 1/3 of the course (upper class). Specific military language context could be taught during this period;

l. both native speakers and U.S. trained language instructors are essential for a good refresher maintenance program. The native speaker is needed for language correctness. The U.S. trained language instructor is required to insure the context and that military needs are being met (snytactical explanation);

° 14 Mar 86: Visited the Soldier Support Center (MDW branch), Hoffman II, Alexandria, VA. Talked with Maj. Michael Baier, who is a Vietnamese and Korean linguist, and with William T. Badey, Chief, Combat Arms Branch, Army Occupational Survey Program. Results of this visit included:

a. a better understanding concerning use of linguists in Korea based on Maj. Baier's experience;

b. a discussion on the mission for tactical CEWI Bn. Perhaps it is to shoot, jam and exploit; but it has not been properly developed in detail nor resourced;

c. a finding that there is little if any occupational data in the survey branch regarding language, use of language, or language training for 98G, 97E, 97B, etc.;

° 20 Mar 86: Visited the U.S. Army Intelligence Center and School (USAICS). Talked with the following key personnel:

- Dr. Glen Kjos - USAICS languagte initiatives briefing;

- Maj. Jackson - Chief, Individual Training Division;

- Mr. Reuss - Extension Training Team;

- Mr. Marchant - Extension Training Team;

- Mr. Delajoux - Military Intelligence Proponency Office;

- CW3 Chlarson - Department of Human Intelligence, Exploitation
  Division

  SFC Van Haunt - Department of Human Intelligence, Exploitation
  Division

  SSG Auditat - Department of Human Intelligence, Exploitation
  Division

Results of this visit included:

a. a better understanding concerning the language training initiatives
   underway at USAICS (e.g., Army Unit Language Training Program, Military
   Intelligence Language Survey and Analysis Project, inter active video
   disc effort on Map Tracking, etc.;

b. a briefing concerning how USAICS was approaching the foreign language
   training problem (by phases):

   - First Phase: address interrogator language training at USAICS
     (i.e., insure sustainment of language skills during AIT), hence
     the development of the Technical Proficiency Dialogue
     Examination (TPDE) and other initiatives to help the "school
     house" do its job;

   - Second Phase: Endorse existing language training products.
     "USAICS will not dictate how to do unit training." It attempts
     to standardize quality fo training products, but not the methodology;

   - Third Phase: Develop a coherent language training system using,
     to the degree possible, advanced instructional technologies.
     USAICS is developing the Job Performance Language Test. It
     hopes to have 98G test in 9 languages by 1986. It plans to
     have 97E test in 10 languages by 1987, 98CL/97B tests are lagging
     behind the 98G and 97E efforts;

c. the suggestion that a TRADOC Systems Manager for language be established
   and that individual operate from Fort Huachuca. Several TRADOC systems
   Managers are located at Fort Huachuca in areas that TRADOC deems
   important. Such a position would focus on language training and
   initiatives on-going in the language arena. (A part of the problem
   has been, over the years, a lack of understanding and priority given
   to language training by TRADOC.) "Horse power" is needed to front this
   effort;

A-35

d. the capabilities to teach, operate and do research using foreign languages within USAICS appear extremely limited. Some indications were inferred (not from Dr. Kjos) that USAICS would like to consider DLIFLC "the schoolhouse for foreign language training" and USAICS to operate as much as possible in an English speaking environment. The integration of general and technical language training must occur. USAICS would appear to be where it is suppose to start;

e. USAICS does send Battlaion Training Teams on visits throughout the Army. They brief doctrine, listen to complaints, answer questions when possible, and attempt to resolve problems;

f. 97E training is initially done in English and then applied in target languages. the students are graded principally by their abilities to perform 97E tasks in English;

g. possible research areas: Development of a proper mechanism to that technical ability of an interrogator linguistically;

° 25 Mar 86: Visited 124th Infantry Division and Fort Stewart, GA. Talked with the following key personnel:

- LTC Green - Commander, 125th MI BN;

- Maj Clark - S-3, 124th MI BN

- Gary Baker - Installation Education Division Office;

- Carol Woods - Education Services Specialist;

- Will Hodges - Education staff member who supports the 124th MI BN;

- Mr. Diemetry - Contracted Arabic Instructor;

- 2 97E Arabic linguists (one E-6; one E-3);

Results of this visit include:

a. a much better understanding and appreciation for the mission, operations and training of a tactical MI BN. Since MI soldiers must be well forward in battlefield configuration (near FEBA or even beyond in enemy territory) and have little if any infantry support, MI soldiers must be trained like Infantrymen to survive the rigors of that battlefield environment (Army 21; AirLand Battle-2000). Emphasis must be placed on individual and crew served weapons training, NBC training, physical fitness, continuous operations capability, equipment maintenance and other common soldiering tasks. While fixed units with peacetime surveillance mission can concentrate on duty performance using target languages, tactical field units must be highly proficient in a number of different technical areas to include the art of survival. Language proficiency is but one of many critical operational requirements;

b. DLPT does not reflect job technical language performance. It appears
    to be uneven among languages at the adjusted score level. In order
    to achieve a DLPT score of 2 (using the adjusted scores) means scoring
    more right answers in some languages than in other languages. The
    ability of the unit to enhance language ability to meet FORSCOM DLPT
    standards is little to non-existent. The gap between DLIFLC graduate
    ability on DLPT and the FORSCOM DLPT requirements is too great. Large
    chunks of Arrival Language Training is necessary. This should occur
    before individuals are assigned in tactical positions. At least they
    should be able to achieve the FORSCOM minimum DLPT standards. Then
    maintenance, not enhancement, is the language proficiency mission
    for tactical MI soldiers;

c. tactical units need non-commissioned officers, not shift supervisors.
    Specialist career programs would not be suited to a tactical unit's
    needs. There is a need for more tactical NCOES program
    (BNCO/ANCO). Cadre must be tactically and technically proficient;

d. MI unit training needs to be equated with combat arms training;
    hence "MI Gunnery.";

e. Project Trojan may help achieve greater technical proficiency;

f. MOS and grade mis-match serious in 124 MI BN. Often E-4's work
    in E-6 or E-7 positions. Authorizations versus fill by MOS show wide
    variance. Total numbers of authorization versus assigned personnel
    wold lead one to believe the unit was up-to-strength. But MOS and
    grade mis-match requires major shifting and cross-training of personnel;

g. no target language usage has been incorporated into the National
    Training Center scenario. Possible research question: how can technical
    language usage be made integral to the National Training Center
    training experience? (The Combined Intelligence Team appears to
    primarily support combat arms operations during that time.) If
    technical language usage is inserted in the scenario, where? before
    the maneuver battle or during the battle or both?

h. linguist receive no formal integration training regarding general
    and technical language requirements. This should occur during
    arrival language training or during the last 1/3 of DLIFLC Basic
    Course (or both);

g. FLAMRIC ARABIC is of no value in training Arabic Egyptian;

h. DLPT III is in "Basic Arabic." It may not reflect need for
    linguists who must operate in dialect.

i. Syrian dialect at BYU contracted course was not considered effective
    by a linguist participant;

j. Arabic Criterion-referenced test developed by Technical Language
    Systems, Inc., 3115 Loop 306, Suite 102, San Angelo, TX 76904,
    considered good.

° 21-22 Apr 86: Visited DLIFLC. (Second visit) A read ahead packet with draft Sections IV, V and VII were Federal Expressed to Dr. Otto Kahn, ARI Field Unit, Monterey, prior to visit in order for feedback both from ARI and DLIFLC. Talked with the following key personnel:

- Colonel Monte R. Bullard, Commandant, DLIFLC

- Dr. Ray Clifford, Dean, DLIFLC

- Dr. John Lett, Evaluation and Research Division

- Dr. Martha Herzog, Chief of Testing

- Dr. John Sohn, Chief of Evaluation and Research Division

- Major Tom Hooten, Acting Assistant Dean for evaluation and Standardization

- Mr. Victor Shaw, member of Evaluation and Research Division

- Mr. Hank Marshik, Chief of Non-Resident Instruction

- Maj. Bien, Chief of Extension Course Development

- Mr. Dave Shoemaker, Project Manager, New Systems Training Division

- LTC Troche, POC for Reserve Components, at DLIFLC

- Mr. Michael J. Cudlip, ATRM-S, HQ TRADOC, Fort Monroe, VA 23651-- (804) 727-2214

- Dr. Otto Kahn, ARI Field Unit, Presidio of Monterey, CA

- Others involved with New Systems Training at DLIFLC

Results of this visit include:

a. Valuable feedback concerning draft Sections IV, V and VII of the Final Report to include updating on the Skills Change Project, the Language Needs Assessment, the Pankratz Study Group report, DLPT testing and initiatives on-going with New Systems Training. This information has a direct bearing on the draft report. This information received will be reflected as the final report is further developed;

b. Suggestion to staff the final report, in draft, through agencies that have been involved in providing information. This, in effect, would bring out additional thoughts and information relevant toward making the report a usable document;

c. Suggestion to staff the final report through BG. Brashears, ODST, HQ TRADOC (ATTG-Z);

d. Information that HQ TRADOC considers that it has a "very restricted" scope with regard to development of fighting doctrine that relates to role and use of foreign languages and foreign language training and training technology that leads to tactical and technical proficiency in the U.S. Army. Apparently, HQ TRADOC feels that this prerogative has been retained by OCSI, HQDA. It delegated some areas directly to USAICS. (CUDLIP);

e. Apparently TRADOC TTA is planning to establish a branch at DLIFLC. This effort shoudl increase DLIFLC research and development capabilities. DLIFLC is being considered as a possible National Research center for Foreign Languages;

f. A composite of DLPT III, SQT, and JPLT was considered best measure of technical language proficiency;

g. Demographic data on characteristics of the linguist learner are expected as a result of the Skill Change Study;

h. DLIFLC is assuming a mission to have graduates at a 2 level proficiency. Non-resident materials will assume that participants once were at a 2 level;

i. Readily usable tactical operations voculatory is being used in the JOREMA series of refresher-maintenance materials. Commandant expects these short lesson cassettes to be available within a short period of time (e.g., a year or so). A model Chinese JOREMA has been developed. Apparently, the PDPEC materials are considered too long and require too much time and effort to produce. The need is non-resident training is for quick and simple instructional materials;

j. Many misconceptions are held concerning language training. Dean, DLIFLC, reviewed some of these areas and proposed a new framework for selection, development and use for linguists;

k. Copies of Language Needs Assessment, the Pankratz Report, the misconception briefing notes and DLPT testing briefing notes were provided to the investigator for use in this study.

° 7 May 86: Took final report (draft) to Dr. Joan Harmon, ARI, for comments.

° 20 Mar 86: Met with Maj. J. Cox, OASCI HQDA, to discuss report. Dr. Harmon was present.

Results of this meeting includes feedback needed to finalize report.

° 28 May 86: Visited Hazeltine Corporation Training Systems Center, 10800 Parkridge Boulevard, Reston, VA, to be briefed on the Spanish Video Disc project currently under development for the Central Intelligence Agency. Met with Dr. Lois S. Wilson, Courseware Manager, Jerry Moore, Director of Government Marketing and Suzanne M. Quadt.

A-39

Results of this visit includes a better understanding concerning the courseware development of the Spanish Video Disc project. Such courseware may be applicable for helping develop survival level Spanish language (Latin America) skills among Army personnel.

LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS BY MOS

Officers (AR 611-12, Jan 85)

```
18  - Special Opns          ─┐
31  - MP                     │
35A - Tac Intell             │
35B - Strat Intell           │
35C - Imagery Exploit        │--- no language requirement specified
36A - CI                     │
36B - HUMINT                 │
37A - Tac SIGINT/EW          │
37B - Strat SIGINT/EW       ─┘
```

```
48  - Foreign Area Officer . . .   "language proficiency when required"
  A - Security Assist . . . . .    "area & language expertise appropriate
                                       for specific assignment"
  B - PSYOP . . . . . . . . . .    "area & language expertise appropriate
                                       for specific assignment"
  C - Attache . . . . . . . . .    "knowledge of ... language of country to
                                       which assigned"
  D - Civil Affairs . . . . . .    "area & language expertise appropriate
                                       for specific assignment"
  F - Civil Military Opns . . .    "area & language expertise appropriate
                                       for specific assignment"
  G - Politico-Military Affairs    "area & language expertise appropriate
                                       for specific assignment"
```

Warrant Officers (AR 611-112, Jan 85)

```
180 - Special Opns Tech . . . .    "regional knowledge & experience in a
                                       specified geographical area (to
                                       include language & in-country
                                       experience)."
961 - Attache Tech . . . . . . .   DLAB of 89 or higher

964 - OB Tech               ─┐
971 - CI Tech                │--- no language requirement specified
972 - Area Intell Tech      ─┘

973 - Interrogation Tech . . . .   "minimum reading & speaking comprehen-
                                       sion rating of R3, S3 in a foreign
                                       language.... Must be able to conduct
                                       interrogation in this foreign lang-
                                       uage & through an interpreter"

982 - Traffic Analysis Tech ─┐
983 - ELINT Tech             │
984 - Morse Intcp Tech       │--- no language requirement specified
985 - Nonmorse Intcp Tech    │
986 - DF Tech               ─┘


988 - Voice Intcp Tech . . . . .   "read, write, comprehend, transcribe &
                                       translate a designated foreign lang-
                                       uage"
```

```
05D - EW/SIGINT Ident/Loc      ⌐|
05H - EW/SIGINT Intcp-IMC       |
05K - EW/SIGINT N-M Intcp       |
18B - Spec Opns Won Sgt         |
18C - Spec Opns Engr Sgt        |
18D - Spec Opns Med Sgt         |--- no language requirement specified
18E - Spec Opns Commo Sgt       |
18F - Spec Opns Intell Sgt      |
95B - MP                        |
96B - Intell Analyst            |
96D - Imagery Analyst          _|
```

```
96F - PSYOP Spec . . . . . . . . .   DLAB of 89 or higher
97B - CI Agent . . . . . . . . . .   DLAB of 89 or higher
97C - Area Intell Spec . . . . .     "area study, including the habits.
                                       customs. culture, & government of
                                       specified country"
97E - Interrogator . . . . . . . .   "be able to speak English & foreign
                                       languages idiomatically & without
                                       objectionable accent or impediment":
                                     "have a basic understanding of
                                       geographic, social, economic. &
                                       political conditions of at least one
                                       foreign country, area, or force in
                                       which a foreign language is spoken as
                                       the native tongue. "
                                     ECLT score of 100 or higher
     1L . . . . . . . . . . . . . .  DLAB of 89 or higher; AC L2/R2 in "a
                                       foreign language"
     2L . . . . . . . . . . . . . .  RC L1/R1, AC L2/R2 in "a foreign
                                       language"
     3L . . . . . . . . . . . . . .  RC L2/R2, AC L3/R3 in "a foreign
                                       language"
97G - SIGSEC Spec  . . . . . . . .   no language requirement specified
98C - EW/SIGINT Analyst  . . . .     no language requirement specified
98G - EW/SIGINT Voice Intcp  . .     DLAB 89 or higher; "possess a knowledge
                                       of a specific foreign language"
98J - EW/SIGINT NC Intcp . . . . .   no language requirement specified
```

OFFICER AS OF 30 NOV 85
(Source: OPMD STAT REPORT - 7, DAPC-OPD-D)

SCI/GRADE	AUTH	ON HAND	%FILL	ODP	%ODP	FEM OP	%AUTH	%OPER
35/0-6	96	99	103%	96	103%	1	1%	1%
0-5	328	310	95%	307	101%	5	2%	2%
0-4	581	500	86%	484	103%	24	4%	5%
0-3	1245	911	73%	847	108%	199	16%	22%
0-1/2	643	938	146%	885	106%	262	41%	28%
OTAL 35	2893	2758	95%	2619	105%	491	17%	18%
36/0-6	33	23	70%	33	70%	0	0%	0%
0-5	93	89	96%	86	103%	2	2%	2%
0-4	265	174	66%	220	79%	10	4%	6%
0-3	406	249	61%	258	97%	60	15%	24%
0-1/2	0	117	N/A	59	117%	42	N/A	36%
OTAL 36	797	652	82%	656	99%	114	14%	17%
37/0-6	39	36	92%	39	92%	0	0%	0%
0-5	124	108	87%	118	92%	3	2%	3%
0-4	258	199	77%	217	92%	10	4%	5%
0-3	556	331	60%	399	83%	77	14%	23%
0-1/2	N/A	162	N/A	66	245%	44	N/A	27%
OTAL 37	977	836	86%	839	100%	134	14%	16%
TOTAL MI	4667	4246	91%	4114	103%	739	16%	17%

WARRANT OFFICER AS OF 31 DEC. 85
(Source: CW4 Johnson, MILPERCEN, and OPMD STAT Report - 7, DAPC-OPD-D)

MOS	AUTH	ON HAND	%FILL	ODP	%	FEM OP	% AUTH	%OPER
285A	79	74	76%	60	123%	2	2%	3%
961A	56	64	94%	61	116%	1	2%	2%
962A	87	75	52%	67	115%	3	2%	4%
964A	122	94	50%	84	111%	5	3%	5%
971A	389	310	65%	251	110%	1	0.2%	0.3%
972A	103	90	74%	42	113%	0	0%	0%
973A	165	114	69%	104	110%	5	3%	4%
982A	231	141	61%	140	101%	6	3%	4%
983A	93	57	61%	53	108%	0	0%	0%
984A	32	22	69%	16	138%	0	0%	0%
985A	17	20	118%	11	182%	0	0%	0%
986A	19	18	95%	13	138%	1	5%	6%
988A	84	62	74%	37	168%	1	1%	2%
TOTAL	1736	1141	66%	1000	141%	25	1%	2%

(Source: COPO45 as of 31 January 1986; does not reflect CMF 96 restructure)

NOTE: Blank spaces denote non-applicable data.

MOS/GRADE	AUTH	OPER	%FILL	INTCH	OPER FEM	%INTCH	%OPER	NO. P1	% P1
26E/E-1 THRU E-3	9	19	211%	9	3	33%	16%		
E-4	18	39	217%	18	7	39%	18%		
E-5	10	18	180%	10	0	0%	0%		
E-6	22	28	127%	22	0	0%	0%		
TOTAL 26E	59	104	176%	59	10	17%	10%	0	0%
26F/E-1 THRU E-3	2	12	600%	2	0	0%	0%		
E-4	8	15	188%	8	0	0%	0%		
E-5	4	6	150%	4	0	0%	0%		
TOTAL 26F	14	33	236%	14	0	0%	0%	0	0%
33M/E5	67	38	57%	67	0	0%	0%		
E-6	38	51	134%	36	1	3%	2%		
E-7	112	89	79%	112	1	1%	1%		
TOTAL 33M	217	178	82%	217	2	1%	1%	0	0%
33P/E-1 THRU E-3	27	16	59%	27	0	0%	0%		
E-4	92	109	118%	92	10	11%	9%		
E-5	42	63	150%	42	3	7%	5%		
E-6	66	62	94%	66	3	5%	5%		
E-7		1							
TOTAL 33P	227	251	111%	227	16	7%	6%	0	0%

MOS/GRADE	AUTH	OPER	%FILL	INTCH	OPER FEM	%INTCH	%OPER	NO. P1	% P1
33Q/E-1 THRU E-3	32	11	34%	32	1	3%	9%		
E-4	94	94	100%	94	12	13%	13%		
E-5	44	54	123%	44	3	7%	6%		
E-6	59	71	120%	59	3	5%	4%		
TOTAL 33Q	229	230	100%	229	19	8%	8%	0	0%
33R/E-1 THRU E-3	35	7	20%	22	0	0%	0%		
E-4	55	21	38%	39	2	5%	10%		
E-5	28	23	82%	23	1	4%	4%		
E-6	48	37	45%	46	2	4%	5%		
TOTAL 33R	166	96	58%	130	5	4%	5%	36	22%
33S/E-1 THRU E-3		3							
E-4		1							
E-5		0							
E-6		1							
TOTAL 33S		5							
33T/E-1 THRU E-3	76	26	34%	52	2	3%	8%		
E-4	165	152	92%	111	16	14%	11%		
E-5	123	118	96%	90	7	8%	6%		
E-6	104	113	109%	99	5	5%	4%		
E-7	98	75	77%	94	1	1%	1%		
TOTAL 33T	566	484	86%	446	31	7%	6%	120	22%

MOS/GRADE	AUTH	OPER	%FILL	INTCH	OPER FEM	%INTCH	%OPER	NO. P1	% P1
33Z/E-7		4							
E-8	42	38	91%	42	0	0%	0%		
E-9	11	4	36%	11	0	0%	0%		
TOTAL 33Z	53	46	87%	53	0	0%	0%	0	0%
TOTAL CMF 33	1531	1427	93%	1375	83	6%	6%	156	10%

MOS/GRADE	AUTH	OPER	%FILL	INTCH	OPER FEM	%INTCH	%OPER	NO. P1	% P1
05G/E-1 THRU E-3		17			11		65%		
E-4		15			3		20%		
E-5		13			4		31%		
E-6		15			2		13%		
E-7		17			1		6%		
E-8/9		3			0		0%		
TOTAL 05G		80			21		26%		
17K/E-1 THRU E-3		24							
E-4		47							
E-5		69							
E-6		67							
E-7		25							
E-8		7							
TOTAL 17K		239							
17M/E-1 THRU E-3		2							
E-4		6							
E-5		4							
E-6		8							
TOTAL 17M		20							
96B/E-1 THRU E-3	150	206	137%	96	57	59%	28%		
E-4	306	349	114%	210	83	40%	24%		
E-5	609	631	104%	420	134	32%	21%		
E-6	688	737	107%	427	156	37%	21%		
E-7	547	399	73%	443	38	9%	10%		
E-8	367	211	57%	294	4	1%	2%		
E-9		3							
TOTAL 96B	2667	2536	95%	1890	472	25%	19%	777	29%

MOS/GRADE	AUTH	OPER	%FILL	INTCH	OPER FEM	%INTCH	%OPER	NO. P1	% P1
96C/E-1 THRU E-3		14			6		30%		
E-4		31			16		52%		
E-5		11			4		36%		
E-6		41			5		12%		
E-7		44			4		9%		
E-8		0							
E-9		1			0		0%		
TOTAL 96C		142			35		25%		
96D/E-1 THRU E-3	71	76	107%	71	51	72%	67%		
E-4	120	78	65%	115	17	15%	22%		
E-5	165	149	90%	150	39	26%	26%		
E-6	124	122	98%	119	23	19%	19%		
E-7	126	108	86%	117	8	7%	7%		
E-8	39	34	88%	36	0	0%	0%		
TOTAL 96D	645	567	88%	608	138	23%	24%	27	6%
96F/E-1 THRU E-3	5	5	100%	5	0	0%	0%		
E-4	48	33	69%	48	7	15%	21%		
E-5	66	40	61%	66	12	18%	30%		
E-6	46	29	63%	46	4	9%	14%		
E-7	33	13	39%	33	1	3%	8%		
E-8	9	8	89%	9	0	0%	0%		
TOTAL 96F	207	128	62%	207	31	15%	24%		

MOS/GRADE	AUTH	OPER	%FILL	INTCH	OPER FEM	%INTCH	%OPER	NO. P1	% P1
96H/E-1 THRU E-3	23	12	52%	23	4	17%	33%		
E-4	20	17	85%	20	3	15%	18%		
E-5	24	32	133%	24	2	8%	7%		
E-6	29	27	93%	29	4	14%	15%		
E-7	22	19	86%	22	0	0%	0%		
TOTAL 96H	118	107	91%	118	13	11%	12%		
96R/E-1 THRU E-3	216	137	63%					216	100%
E-4	355	556	157%					355	100%
E-5	330	241	73%					330	100%
E-6	197	127	64%					197	100%
E-7	56	36	64%					56	100%
E-8	35	21	60%					35	100%
TOTAL 96R	1189	1118	94%					1189	100%
96Z/E-8		4			0		0%		
96Z/E-9	57	50	88%	55	0	0%	0%		
TOTAL 96Z	57	54	95%	55	0	0%	0%	2	4%
97B/E-1 THRU E-3		34			12		35%		
E-4	25	43	172%	18	11	44%	26%		
E-5	205	239	117%	176	42	20%	18%		
E-6	318	322	101%	289	49	17%	15%		
E-7	374	199	53%	335	17	5%	9%		
E-8	111	100	90%	102	0	0%	0%		
E-9	11	11	100%	11	0	0%	0%	0	0%
TOTAL 97B	1044	950	91%	931	131	14%	14%	113	11%

MOS/GRADE	AUTH	OPER	%FILL	INTCH	OPER FEM	%INTCH	%OPER	NO. P1	% P1
97C/E-6	18	8	44%	18	0	0%	0%		
E-7	35	16	46%	35	2	6%	13%		
E-8	20	21	105%	20	0	0%	0%		
E-9		1							
TOTAL 97C	73	46	63%	73	2	3%	4%		
97E/E1 THRU E-3		48			23		48%		
E-4	145	269	186%	87	76	87%	32%		
E-5	140	145	104%	103	41	40%	28%		
E-6	215	165	77%	184	34	18%	21%		
E-7	126	55	44%	114	2	2%	4%		
TOTAL 97E	626	682	109%	488	176	36%	26%	138	22%
97G/E-1 THRU E-3	24	44	183%	24	27	113%	61%		
E-4	114	207	182%	104	41	39%	20%		
E-5	119	118	99%	113	18	16%	15%		
E-6	84	89	106%	81	18	22%	20%		
E-7	67	63	94%	62	1	2%	2%		
E-8	19	15	79%	19	0	0%	0%		
E-9	5	7	140%	5	0	0%	0%		
TOTAL 97G	432	543	126%	408	105	26%	19%	24	6%
TOTAL CMF 96	7058	7212	102%	4778	1124	24%	16%	2280	32%
(-96R)	5869							1091	19%

MOS/GRADE	AUTH	OPER	%FILL	INTCH	OPER FEM	%INTCH	%OPER	NO. P1	% P1
05D/E-1 THRU E-3	47	26	55%	47	9	19%	35%		
E-4	99	200	202%	97	68	70%	34%		
E-5	87	149	171%	85	27	32%	18%		
E-6	56	63	113%	56	8	14%	13%		
TOTAL 05D	289	438	152%	285	1	39%	26%	4	1%
05H/E-1 THRU E-3	321	176	55%	321	28	9%	16%		
E-4	354	798	225%	354	157	44%	20%		
E-5	357	512	143%	310	148	48%	29%		
E-6	191	187	98%	187	33	18%	18%		
E-7	181	216	119%	177	10	6%	5%		
E-8		8							
TOTAL 05H	1404	1897	135%	1349	376	28%	20%	55	4%
05K/E-1	84	62	74%	84	28	33%	45%		
E-4	211	293	139%	211	124	59%	42%		
E-5	325	388	119%	325	117	36%	30%		
E-6	155	164	106%	155	30	19%	18%		
E-7	90	96	107%	90	3	3%	3%		
E-8		7							
TOTAL 05K	865	1010	117%	865	295	34%	29%	0	0%
98C/E-1	298	57	19%	268	17	6%	30%		
E-4	536	694	129%	466	224	48%	32%		
E-5	672	718	107%	586	194	33%	27%		
E-6	365	386	106%	340	72	21%	19%		
E-7	274	232	85%	252	15	6%	6%		
E-8		5							
TOTAL 98C	2145	2092	98%	1912	522	27%	25%	233	11%

MOS/GRADE	AUTH	OPER	%FILL	INTCH	OPER FEM	%INTCH	%OPER	NO. P1	% P1
98G/E-1 THRU E-3		99			21		21%		
E-4	1214	467	38%	751	101	13%	22%		
E-5	819	833	102%	562	263	47%	32%		
E-6	441	464	105%	405	68	17%	15%		
E-7	306	267	87%	247	18	7%	7%		
E-8	19	19	100%	18	0	0%	0%		
TOTAL 98G	2799	2149	77%	1983	471	24%	22%	816	29%
98J/E-1 THRU E-3	48	76	158%	44	30	68%	39%		
E-4	302	311	103%	192	81	42%	26%		
E-5	274	278	101%	205	65	32%	23%		
E-6	284	280	99%	213	51	24%	18%		
E-7	137	97	71%	122	4	3%	4%		
E-8		4							
TOTAL 98J	1045	1046	100%	776	231	30%	22%	269	26%
98Z E-7		1							
E-8	292	233	80%	243	0	0%	0%		
E-9	39	38	97%	38	0	0%	0%		
TOTAL 98Z	331	272	82%	281	0	0%	0%	50	15%
TOTAL CMF98	8878	8904	100%	7451	2007	27%	23%	1427	16%

DLIFLC

CANDIDATE RESEARCH PROJECTS

Collective Training Design Team

ARI Field Unit – Presidio of Monterey

J. Hiller, Chief
O. Kahn, Team Leader
A. Ekstrom,
 Research Psychologist

21 October 1987/3

Candidate Research Projects

1. Teaching Methodologies

2. DLAB Validatiion (selection)

    a. Validity of screening procedures (Post Hoc).
    b. Validity, against on-the-job performance.

3. Factors contributing to academic attrition, in addition to aptitude.

4. Educational Technology Applications to Computer Assisted Study (CAS).

5. Time to proficiency for each major language group with listening, speaking, reading with repeated measures as criteria.

6. Development of guidelines to aid user specification of foreign language training requirements.

7. Skill Decay Rates and estimation of timing for refresher/retraining.

8. Minimum English proficiency level for instructors:

    a. Influence of perceived/actual proficiency on instructor classroom performance.
    b. Training requirements for administrative job tasks.

9. Minimum English proficiency requirements for students.

A Note on Resource Requirements:

1. Resource Requirements are characterized as:

    -   Intensive: Requiring contractors or extensive time/numbers of
        DLI students and/or staff.

    -   Moderate: Requires extensive involvement of DLI personnel
        (students, instructors, testing personnel, etc.).

    -   Minimal: Requires ARI in-house data/statistical analysis and
        reporting only – though work may be quite extensive.

2. Because the designs of these potential research projects are only
preliminary at this point, the resource estimates are necessarily very rough
and in some cases cannot be determined. They do not necessarily take into
account time and personnel required for coordination, literature
searches/reviews, and report writing.

Resource estimates refer only to requirements of time and/or personnel
required by the research project beyond normal responsibilities. Where data
from students or instructors are used and where that data is part of the
normal training activity at DLI, the number of persons involved may be
indicated but no time requirements are specified.

1. Teaching Methodologies - Suggestopedia Project

Army Need: To attain maximum level of student language proficiency in shortest possible time.

The Defense Language Institute is pressured by the needs of the various services to <u>achieve higher levels</u> of student proficiency, to <u>decrease the time</u> required to achieve given levels of proficiency and to <u>sustain student success,</u> i.e., decrease attrition.

Objective: To assess the potential benefits of using the Suggestopedia method to facilitate foreign language acquisition. Specifically, to evaluate the ability of the Suggestopedia method to achieve the learning goals for training military personnel at the Defense Language Institute as compared to the current instructional method.

Approach: The research approach is an experimental design in which two, 10 student sections of Russian language classes taught by contract teachers trained in the Suggestopedia method will be compared to two, 10 student control sections taught by DLI staff according to established DLI method. The research will cover the first 12 weeks of the standard 47 weeks. Students will demographically approximate the average DLIFLC Russian sections and then will be randomly assigned to either experimental or control sections. As an Army sponsored project, the students in all four sections will be from the Army.

The issues to be assessed are <u>proficiency</u> at the end of the experimental period as measured by a certified team (2) of Russian testing experts using the Interagency Language Roundtable (an established DLI assessment procedure); <u>rate of language acquisition,</u> determined by modular tests at the end of each course module (20, 33, 44, 55 days); and <u>student attitudes</u> about course, instructor, and subjective assessment of learning from course evaluation questionnaires (and other instruments to be developed).

Immediate ARI Steps:

1. Meet with appropriate personnel to determine specific measures involved in proficiency assessment.

2. Assist/consult in development of instrument to assess student response. Instrument should include (beyond items on instructor/course evaluation instruments):

     o   measures of self-confidence

     o   amount of study time

     o   subjective assessment of proficiency

     o   perception of being in "special classes"

     o   perception of impact of being in experiment

     o   satisfaction with the course

Current Status:

1. As of 28 Sep 83, decision was to try to find contractor to provide teaching staff for experimental group. Currently, the ability to continue with evaluation hinges on locating appropriate contractor. DLI and Soldier's Support Center will pursue.

2. Responsibility for student response instrument development is to be defined.

3. Instructors for control group are to be identified.

4. Alternatives for evaluation, in event of inability to find qualified teachers have been discussed, including training of DLI instructors in Suggestopedia. Agreement that this alternative did not constitute test of method in teaching foreign language but test of ability to train instructors in Suggestopedia. The Concept Evaluation Plan (CEP) would have to be redone if such an alternative were selected.

5. Follow-up to minimally include comparison of end-of-program (47 weeks) proficiency of experimental and control students.

Resource Requirement: Resource Intensive

	Personnel	Number	Time
DLI	Instructors	3 to 6	NA
	Students	40	12 weeks
	Proficiency Evaluators	4	2 weeks
ARI	Researcher	1-2	.25 PMY
DLI Contractor	Instructors	3	1.0 PMY

Expected Outcome:

1. Assessment of possible benefits/problems from use of Suggestopedia method.

2. Provide a basis for determining whether further experimentation is warranted.

Milestones:

9 Jan 1984	-	Begin Test (Classes)
30 Mar 1984	-	End Test - Begin Data Analysis
30 Apr 1984	-	Submit Data Analysis to DLI
30 May 1984	-	Test Report Written
30 Jun 1984	-	Proponent Evaluation Written

2. Existing DLAB Validation for Screening

Army Need: To identify skills/knowledge/abilities required for foreign language students.

Objective: To assess the validity of the existing Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB) as a screening test for foreign language training program success.

Approaches: The projects below represent methods for researching this objective. They may be considered as alternative projects or as two separate projects.

1. Enroll into selected languages in the DLI program a random sample of students who would ordinarily be screened out of the program on the basis of marginally low DLAB scores. Maintain as complete "blindness" as possible (not only would experimental students in no way be handled differently from other students, the fact the experiment was occurring should not be known beyond a minimum number of people required to monitor and authorize the experiment). Relate DLAB scores to performance measures such as end-of-program proficiency, attrition, (and occurrence of personal/academic problems identified in counseling records) to an established norm of student performances.

Resource Requirements: Moderate

	Personnel	Number	Time
DLI	Project Monitor	1	.1 PMY
	Students	30-50	NA
ARI	Researcher	1	.25 PMY or more

2. Select a language or a sample of languages as experimental units. Extend DLAB cut-off scores downward over time - e.g., set 10-point increments down to 69 as cutting scores to be used as screening criteria for entering student. Compare performance norms of students in each program to established norms of students where current cutoff of 89 is used. Compare to predicted success and attrition rate based on DLAB projections (Thain report).

Resources Requirements: Minimal

	Personnel	Number	Time
DLI	Students	?	?
	Staff	?	?
	Project Monitor	1	.1 PMY
ARI	Data Analyst	1	.25 PMY or more

Expected Outcome: An assessment of the predictive validity of DLAB relative to measures of performance and hard data for use in setting cut scores to reduce attrition.

3. Reduction of Student Attrition

Army Need: To obtain maximum productivity from school resources by minimizing student attrition.

Objective: To identify student selection criteria, in addition to aptitude, which contribute to attrition, and may legally be used for screening.

Approach:

1. Review prior research on attrition at DLI.

2. Broaden existing "attrition questionnaire" to include questions on areas previous research has identified as relevant to attrition.

3. Expand student data base by changing "attrition questionnaire" to an "exit questionnaire" to be given to all students. This would provide data for comparison of attritees to non-attritees and to high achievers.

4. Analyze poorly performing students to identify predictable basis of attrition.

Resource Requirements: Moderate

	Personnel	Number	Time
DLI	Project Monitor	1-2	.75 PMY
	Students	3000-4000	½ hr each
ARI	Researcher	1	.25 PMY

Expected Outcome:

1. Assessment of the possibility of identifying attrition-prone individuals for purposes of screening or special support.

2. Identification of attrition patterns related to instructional factors and point in program for possible intervention strategies.

4. Educational Technology:
Behavioral Evaluation of Videodisc Enhanced German Gateway

Army Need: Provision of effective short-term (six week) intensive language training in German for officers being assigned to Germany.

Objective: To assess the potential contribution of Videodisc technology to the German Gateway language instruction program.

Approach: Pretest/Posttest comparisons of performance by students in German Gateway program with students in experimental Videodisc program.

- Randomly assign students to alternative programs until N of at least 30 is achieved. (In this program, instruction is provided one-on-one as needed. There are no "classes"per se.)

- Participants will keep records of time spent in study; will fill out usual course program evaluations; will be interviewed on completion of program.

- Evaluation questionnaires and pre/posttest scores and records of study time will be statistically analyzed.

- Other Possibilities:

  1. Through interviews or questionnaires, obtain instructor perception of Videodisc contribution to learning. Since instructors are assigned as needed, there will be several instructors, and conceivably some involved in working with both experimental and control subjects.

  2. Develop a semi-structured interview instrument to be used in end-of-course interviews.

  3. Administer a brief questionnaire to Videodisc subjects only to obtain user-acceptance information on such things as: ease of use, specific problems in using Videodisc, perception of Videodisc contribution to learning.

Resource Requirements: Moderate

	Personnel	Number	Time
DLI	Instructor	5(?)	negligible
	Students	60	negligible
	Project Monitor	1	.25 PMY
ARI	Researcher	1-2	.50 PMY

Expected Outcome: Assessment of benefit and cost of Videodisc in intensive language instruction. The evaluation could provide guidelines for use of Videodisc in language instruction.

Milestones: Videodisc development schedule will determine when the evaluation can begin. Assignment of personnel to Gateway program will determine when evaluation will end and analysis begin.

5. Time to Proficiency

Army Need: Due to assignment restrictions, military personnel are provided a limited language training period (up to 47 week) regardless of the language to be learned or the performance level required by designated position. Needed is an assessment of the range and types of proficiencies attainable within the allotted time by language or language categories and an estimate of the time required to attain specific levels of proficiency.

Objective: To identify realistic proficiency levels by language group for the current allocated training periods, and to obtain information necessary to reset period lengths.

Approach:

1. Obtain student performance scores on interim and end-of-program reading, listening and speaking proficiencies for at least 20 classes in the highest enrollment language for each language category.

2. Perform statistical analyses to estimate:

   - student characteristics related to varying levels of proficiency achievement.

   - proficiency levels related to instructor characteristics and other instructional variables.

   - student learning curves to be used to extrapolate to longer training periods.

Resource Requirements: Minimal

	Personnel	Number	Time
DLI	Project Monitor	1	.25 PMY
ARI	Data Analyst	1-2	.5 PMY

Expected Outcome: Guidelines to advise services of appropriate expected end-of-course proficiencies by language (or at least language categories) as a function of the length of training..

6. Development of Guidelines to Aid User Specification
of Foreign Language Training Requirements

Army Need: To train foreign language personnel as appropriately as possible in the abilities required for adequate job performance.

Objective: To obtain from client organizations, as precisely as possible, the exact language skills required to adequately perform foreign language duties of high density foreign language MOSs.

Approach: Job Analysis.

Through use of semi-structured interviews, identify what information is needed by DLIFLC staff/administration in order to structure their language training to best fit the requirements of "users."

Based on data obtained from DLI staff, develop questionnaires or guides to obtain job skill descriptions from job incumbents and their supervisors in high density MOSs. Provide results to DLI staff and obtain feedback from DLI (and clients). Conduct several cycles, until DLI and clients are satisfied.

Resource Requirements: Resource Intensive

	Personnel	Number	Time
DLI	Staff/ Administrators	20-30	$\frac{1}{2}$-1 hr each
ARI	Researcher/ Analyst	1	.50 PMY
ARI or DLI Contractor	Foreign Language Specialist	5	3.0 PMY
	Researchers/ Interviewers	2-3	1.0 PMY

Expected Outcome: Development of a guideline for use by client organizations to specify job-related language requirements for selected MOSs.

7. Foreign Language Skill Decay Rates

Army Need: To insure that students trained for positions requiring foreign language skills, in fact have these skills when they reach their job destination.

Objective: To develop a system for predicting foreign language proficiency decay rates for periods of non-use. To identify refresher training needs and schedules.

Approach: Administer proficiency tests to randomly selected samples of students at incremental periods (to be determined in consultation with DLI) after language program termination. Plot ability loss rates over time relative to initial (end of program) proficiencies. Institute refresher training for samples of students at various points (to be determined). Data would provide a basis for many research refinements related to such issues as:

1. Decay rates after refresher training compared to initial decay rates.

2. Amount of refresher training (type and time) to return to original proficiency.

3. Contribution of on-the-job use of language to maintenance of proficiency levels.

4. Assessment of importance of initial proficiency (mastery) levels on decay rates.

5. Decay rates by language or language family.

6. Identification and assessment of factors in addition to time that contribute to decay rate or to greater retention.

Resource Requirements: Resource Intensive

	Personnel	Number	Time
DLI	Data Analyst	1	.25 PMY
	Ex-students	150-200	$\frac{1}{2}$-1 hr each
	Instructor	?	?
ARI	Data Analyst	1-2	1.-1.5 PMY
ARI Contractor	Test Administrator	3-5	3.0 PMY

Expected Outcomes: Determination of language ability decay rates to provide guidelines for determining needs for refresher training.

8. Minimum English Proficiency Level for Instructors

Army Need: To secure staff who are capable of effectively teaching required foreign languages to Army personnel.

Objective To assess the level and type of instructor proficiency in English required to effectively teach foreign language.

Approach: Obtain and analyze three sets of data.

1. Subjective Student Assessment:

 a. Incorporate items related to instructor's English ability (speaking and comprehension) on instructor evaluation questionnaire.

 b. Identify those instructors perceived by students as having limitation in English proficiency.

 c. Perform descriptive analysis to determine whether problems are idiosyncratic or patterned relative to language/language area, course characteristics, and instructor characteristics (especially English proficiency scores - see 3. below).

 d. Interview current students (at end of course) of instructors previously identified by students as having English problems to further identify nature and locus of problems (e.g., vocabulary, accent, syntax, whether student can't understand or _be_ understood).

2. Student Proficiency Measures:

 a. Conduct descriptive analysis of average student proficiency level for each instructor, controlled by language/language category.

 b. Correlate measures of average student performance (level) to student subjective assessments.

3. Instructor English Proficiency Assessment. Administer to a representative sample of instructors an English proficiency test comparable to that given students, to establish proficiency level scores for speaking, listening, and reading.

 a. Compare to student subjective assessment.

 b. Correlate with student proficiency levels.

4. Administrative Task Performance. Instructors are required to perform a variety of tasks in addition to classroom instruction. Supervisor job task ratings will be related to English test scores to identify important relationships, if they exist.

Resource Requirement: Resource Intensive

	Personnel	Number	Time
DLI	Instructors	rep. sample	1 hr each
	Project Manager	1	.25 PMY
ARI	Researcher	1	.50 PMY
DLI Contractor	Interviewer	1	.10 PMY
	Test Adminstrator	2-5	2.0 PMY
	Data Analyst	1	1.0 PMY

Expected Outcome:

1. Assessment of degree to which student/instructor (classroom) communication difficulties, as identified by students, are related to instructor English proficiency level scores.

2. Evidence of relation of instructor English proficiency to their student's Foreign language proficiency.

3. Identification of levels of instructor English proficiencies that impact on teaching and administrative performance. Provide a basis for delineation of instructor English training requirements.

9. Minimum English Proficiency of Students

Army Need: To insure successful training program completion for students selected for foreign language training through systematic identification of characteristics related to success.

Objective: To identify a minimum level of English proficiency for students entering DLI language training program.

Approach: Administer an existing test of English proficiency to a large (to be determined) random sample of persons taking DLAB. Perform correlational analysis of English proficiency scores with DLAB scores for _all_ persons taking both tests. Analyze English proficiency scores as related to attrition rates and end-of-program foreign language proficiency scores by language/language categories for those students selected for DLI program. Statistically assess: (a) whether English proficiency increases prediction of program success beyond that predicted by DLAB, and (b) whether English proficiency is indicative (positively or negatively) of differential success relative to language category and if so examine data to set cut scores.

Resource Requirement: Moderate

	Personnel	Number	Time
DLI	Testing/Analysis Staff	1-2	1.0 PMY
	Students	500+	$\frac{1}{2}$-1 hr each
ARI	Data Analyst	1	.50 PMY

Expected Outcome:

1.   Assessment of English proficiency as a potential screening basis for selection of students for foreign language training.

2.   Exploration of predictive relationship of English language ability and the learning of specific foreign languages.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HEADQUARTERS US ARMY FIELD STATION BERLIN
APO New York   09742

COMMAND MEMORANDUM   17 December 1979
NUMBER 350-10

TRAINING

FIELD STATION BERLIN FOREIGN AREA STUDIES PROGRAM

1. **PURPOSE.** This Command Memorandum prescribes administrative policies, **procedures**, and fixes responsibilities for the conduct of the FSB For- **eign Area** Studies Program.

2. **SCOPE.** The provisions of this Command Memorandum are applicable to **all assigned** and attached personnel.

3. **OBJECTIVE.** The purposes of the Foreign Area Studies Program are to provide background training that will support the mission of Field Sta- tion Berlin and to encourage personnel to pursue higher levels of educa- tion.

4. **POLICY.**

    a. Field Station Berlin in conjunction with G-3 Education Branch, USAB will sponsor a series of University courses for FSB personnel. The courses will be contracted to a DOD affiliated university, and will be fully funded by the Department of the Army. Funding will consist of tuition fees, matriculation fees and books.

    b. Participation - Individual participation in this program will be voluntary under the following provisions:

        (1) Attendance. This is a unit sponsored program and as such the responsibility for personnel accountability rests with the unit. This unit expects each student to take full responsibility for his/her academic work and progress Students are expected to attend classes regularly for consistent attendance offers the best opportunity to master the course material. As a rule three absences (9 contact hours) are permissible for every three credit hour course. Personnel will be required to substantiate the necessity for absences beyond the authorized three. For special one credit hour weekend seminars no absences will be allowed.

(2) Withdrawals. This is a unit sponsored activity and as such the authority for approving withdrawals rests with the unit. The intent of the command is to keep withdrawals to a miminum. Withdrawals should be for official reasons, i.e. military, medical, emergency, etc. With- drawals for other reasons will be evaluated on a case by case basis. Individual unit commanders are responsibile for approving or disapproving withdrawals. When a commander determines that an individual does not have a sufficient reason for withdrawal, the individual will be requested to complete the course. Personnel disregarding this request will be denied the privilege of attending further contracted courses sponsored by this unit. This denial will remain in effect for a two year period. Personnel will be required to submit a FSB withdrawal form in addition to the standard withdrawal forms required by the university.

(3) Aud~~iting. Auditing will be allowed on a space available basis only.~~

(4) Grades. Grades will be based on the policy of the contracted university.

(5) Registration and Enrollment. Registration and enrollment will be on a first-come-serve-basis during the designated registration period. Personnel will be required to sign a registration form indi- cating they will comply with the provisions of this command memorandum, in addition to completing the standard enrollment forms required by the contracted university. Personnel must meet the entrance require- ments of the contracted university to receive credit for the course. As a general rule, if two or more different courses are offered during the same term, personnel will be allowed to enroll in only one course. Personnel wanting to enroll in the additional courses offered will be placed on a waiting list. If there are not sufficient enrollments by different personnel for the additional class, personnel on the waiting list will be allowed to register for the additional course.

(6) Books. Books and other printed materials will be provided by the university. Personnel that successfully complete the course will be allowed to keep all printed materials. Personnel required to with- draw from the course or who do not complete the course for other reasons will be required to return all books and printed materials.

c. Non-military personnel may participate in the program on a space-available basis only.

5. Responsibilities.

2

a. S-3 Plans and Training.

(1) Has primary staff responsibility for the administration of the program.

(2) Is responsible for advising the commander and staff on the progress of the program.

b. S-3 Plans & Training Education Advisor.

(1) Implements and administers programs for Field Station Berlin.

(2) Coordinates with Army continuing Education Services (ACES) personnel for contractual arrangements, funding, and facilities.

(3) Coordinates with contracted university.

(4) Coordinates with commanders of FSB units and provides feeder data concerning individuals in their command.

(5) Registers students for the courses

c. Unit Commanders:

(1) Maintains an awareness of assigned personnel within training program.

(2) Approves or disapproves requests for course withdrawals in writing.

(3) Counsels personnel within their respective units concerning attendance, withdrawals, etc.

d. Students. Comply with the provisions outlined in this Command Memorandum.

The proponent Agency of this command memorandum is the Office of the A/S3 Plans & Training. Users are invited to send comments to the CDR, USAFS Berlin, ATTN: IAEB-OPT.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

DARRELL G. HILLIARD
MAJ, MPC
Adjutant

DISTRIBUTION:
A + 10 to A/S3 P&T

E-3

DISPOSITION FORM

IAFB CDR	Fully Funded Foreign Area Studies Program

TO	FROM	DATE	CMT 1
THRU: ESO, Andrews Education Center	Commander, USAFSB	7 Feb 85 Ms. Cunningham/3601	

TO: Director of Education
        USAB

1. For the academic Term III, 1985, G-3 Education Branch fully funded an advanced German course as requested by Field Station Berlin. Due to the positive response to this course and the enthusiastic feedback from the students, request that a program of fully funded Foreign Area Studies courses be conducted during off-duty hours during the normal academic term framework.

2. Since the majority of FSB and Air Force personnel who will be participating in this program are shift workers, request that the courses be conducted on a "trick" basis. When this is not possible due to instructor nonavailability, request alternate scheduling be considered. For example, a course could be offered one evening a week for 16 weeks.

3. The following courses and seminars from the University of Maryland catalog are suggested considerations for the Foreign Area Studies Program:

German Life and Culture	Soviet Union
Russian Life and Culture	Government and Administration of the
Russian Review Grammar & Composition	Soviet Union
Advanced Russian Conversation	Foreign Policy of the USSR
Selected Topics in German Literature	Comparative Studies in European Politics
Germany in the 19th Century	German Literature in Translation
Germany in the 20th Century	International Terrorism
Polish Crisis in its Historical	The KGB
Perspective	Marxism – The Soviet Ideology
NATO and the Warsaw Pact	Recent US/USSR Relations

4. For Term IV, 25 March - 17 May 1985, request Advanced German Conversation (GERM 312) be conducted on a "trick" basis. Specific course requests for the remainder of the year will be forthcoming from the FSB P&T office.

JOHN H. PROKOPOWICZ
LTC, MI
Acting Commander

E-4

PREVIOUS EDITIONS WILL BE USED

PROGRAM IN SOVIET STUDIES AND EASTERN EUROPEAN STUDIES

1. Degree requirements, in terms of both foreign language requirement, as well as courses used in the Primary Area of Concentration, are the same for both degrees. Students who are particularly interested in Eastern European Studies are encouraged to take a wider variety of courses having to do with more areas of Eastern Europe than just Russia.

2. Either Russian or Polish or Czech is applicable to the required hours of foreign language (6 s.h. for the certificate, 12 s.h. for the AA and Baccalaureate).

3. RUSS 333 and/or 334 are strongly recommended for all certificate/ degree levels.

4. Foreign language above the level required for the certificate or degree sought can be applied to the different certificate/degree programs as shown below:

> for the Certificate   3 s.h.
> for the Associate in Arts   6 s.h.
> for the Baccalaureate   6 s.h.

Below is a listing of courses which can be applied to the Soviet Studies/ Eastern European Studies certificate/degree programs.

> ECON 380 - Comparative Economic Systems
> ECON 482 - Economics of the Soviet Union
> GVPT 240 - Political Ideologies
> GVPT 280 - Comparative Politics and Governments
> GVPT 300 - International Political Relations
> GVPT 443 - Contemporary Political Theory
> GVPT 451 - Foreign Policy of the U.S.S.R.
> GVPT 481 - Government and Administration of the Soviet Union
> GVPT 486 - Comparative Studies in European Politics
> HIST 141 - Western Civilization 1 or
> HIST 142 - Western Civilization 11
> HIST 237 - Russian Civilization
> HIST 336 - Europe in the 19th Century, 1815-1919
> HIST 337 - Europe in the World Setting of the 20th Century
> HIST 340 - Eastern Europe under Communism
> HIST 344 - The Russian Revolutions of 1917
> HIST 424 - History of Russia to 1801
> HIST 425 - History of Russia from 1801-1917
> HIST 442 - The Soviet Union
> HIST 443 - Modern Balkan History
> RUSS 333 - Russian Life and Culture
> RUSS 334 - Russian Life and Culture

and other courses as may be occasionally offered by The University of Maryland and specifically designated area studies credit.

The following is a list of DLI courses which may be applicable
to a degree program in Soviet or East European Area Studies.
The listings are extracted directly from the ACE Guide.
Annotations are made to clarify Maryland's utilization of credit
when differences from the ACE recommendations occur or when
clarification is needed.

S H O R T   B A S I C   C O U R S E S

DLI 12 WEEK SHORT BASIC Course from JAN 54 through DEC 8'0
DD0602-0034   Romanian   8 s.h. LL =111-114

B A S I C   C O U R S E S

NOTE: For all the following DLI basic courses, the first 15 s.h.
       =111-201. The next 6 s.h. may be applied as L.L. area
       studies and may be used in GER, PAC/SAC, or electives.
       Basic courses are always applied as lower level.

DLI 36-46 WEEK BASIC Course from JAN 54 through DEC 56
DD0602-0001   Albanian (46wk) 18 s.h.
               Bulgarian(46wk) 18 s.h.
               Czech   (46wk) 18 s.h.
               Hungarian(46wk) 18 s.h.
               Romanian(36wk) 18 s.h.
               Russian (46wk) 18 s.h.
               Serbo-Croat(46wk)18 s.h.

DLI 47 WEEK BASIC Course from JAN 57 through DECEMBER 80
DD0602-0002   Albanian   21 s.h.
               Bulgarian   21 s.h.
               Czech   21 s.h.
               Hungarian   21 s.h.
               Polish   21 s.h.
               Romanian   21 s.h.
               Russian   21 s.h.
               Serbo-Croatian 21 s.h.

DLI 47 WEEK BASIC Course from JAN 57 through DECEMBER 80
DD0602-0014   Lithuanian   21 s.h.
               Slovenian   21 s.h.
               Ukranian   21 s.h.

DLI 37-47 WEEK BASIC Course from JAN 80 through PRESENT
DD0602-0018   Albanian (47wk) 7 s.h. Oral/aural
                                7 s.h. Writing/translation
                                7 s.h. Intermed conv & writing
               Romanian (37wk) 12 s.h. oral/aural
                                6 s.h. reading/writing

```
DLI 47 WEEK BASIC Course from JAN 81 through PRESENT
DD0602-0030    Hungarian          10 s.h. introductory
                                   6 s.h. advanced
                                   5 s.h. reading & translation
                                   3 s.h. culture & civilization


DLI 47 WEEK BASIC Course from JAN 81 through PRESENT
DD0602-0019    Bulgarian          6 s.h. elementary
                                  6 s.h. intermediate
                                  9 s.h. advanced (rdg,wrtng)
               Czech              6 s.h. elementary
                                  6 s.h. intermediate
                                  9 s.h. advanced (rdg,wrtng)
               Polish             6 s.h. elementary
                                  6 s.h. intermediate
               Russian            6 s.h. elementary
                                  6 s.h. intermediate
                                  9 s.h. advanced
               Serbo-Croatian     6 s.h. elementary
                                  6 s.h. intermediate
                                  9 s.h. advanced (rdg,wrtng)
```

A U R A L   C O M P R E H E N S I O N   C O U R S E S

AURAL COMPREHENSION courses are at a comparable level to BASIC
courses and credit is applied as in BASIC courses.

```
DLI 37 WEEK AURAL COMPREHENSION Course from JAN 54 through DEC 80
DD0602-0033    Albanian           15 s.h.
               Bulgarian          15 s.h.
               Czech              15 s.h.
               Hungarian          15 s.h.
               Romanian           15 s.h.
               Serbo-Croatian     15 s.h.
```

All credit for this course is applied as and =111-201

```
DLI 23-47 WEEK AURAL COMPREHENSION Course (2 VERSIONS)
DD0602-0017
VERSION 1 - OCT 78 through PRESENT (47 WK) except A.F. pre 1981*
               Russian            6 s.h. elementary
                                  6 s.h. intermediate
                                  9 s.h. advanced
                   *for AF personnel taking course prior to
                    1981, version 2 below applies!
VERSION 2 through JAN 54 - SEP 78
               Russian (23wk)  15 s.h. [=111-201]
               Russian (37wk)  18 s.h. [=111-201] + 3 s.h. A.S.
```

E X T E N D E D   C O U R S E S

EXTENDED DLI courses are applied as upper level and
duplicate coursework at the 301,302, 311 and 312 level.

```
DLI 27 WEEK EXTENDED Course from JAN 81 through PRESENT
DD0602-0020    Russian            10 s.h. advanced (conversation)
                                   3 s.h. advanced (reading)
```

EXTENDED OR BASIC INTERMEDIATE

EXTENDED or BASIC INTERMEDIATE courses are applied as
upper level and duplicate 301, 302, 311, 312.

DLI 27 WEEK Course (dates unknown) per ltr from ACE 14 Nov 84
NO INDEX #   Czech   12 s.h.UL (conversation)
                               6 s.h.UL advanced (reading)

INTERMEDIATE COURSES

INTERMEDIATE DLI courses are applied as upper level and
duplicate coursework at the 301,302, 311 and 312 level.

DLI 24-37 WEEK INTERMEDIATE Course from JAN 54 through DEC 80
DD0602-0036   Bulgarian (37wk) 18 s.h.UL
               Polish   (36wk) 18 s.h. UL
               Romanian (24wk) 15 s.h. UL
               Russian   (37wk) 18 s.h. UL
               Serbo-Croat(37wk) 18 s.h. UL

DLI 37 WEEK INTERMEDIATE Course from JAN 81 through PRESENT
DD0602-0022   Bulgarian   12 s.h.UL adv (conversation)
                               9 s.h.UL adv (reading)
               Polish   12 s.h.UL adv (conversation)
                               9 s.h.UL adv (reading)
               Russian   12 s.h.UL adv (conversation)
                               9 s.h.UL adv (reading)

DLI 36 or 37 WEEK INTERMEDIATE Course (2 VERSICNS)
DD0602-0024
VERSION 1 - JAN 78 through PRESENT (37 wk)
               Czech   12 s.h.UL adv (conversation)
                               9 s.h.UL adv (reading)
VERSION 2 - JAN 54 through DEC 77 (36 wk)
               Czech   18 s.h. UL

ADVANCED COURSES

ADVANCED courses are equivalent to 401 and 402 level courses

DLI 37 WEEK ADVANCED Course from JAN 69 through DEC 80
DD0602-0037   Russian   18 s.h. UL

DLI 37 WEEK ADVANCED Course from JAN 81 through PRESENT
DD0602-0027   Russian   6 s.h.UL Advanced (reading)
                               3 s.h.UL Advanced (syntax)
                               3 s.h.UL Advanced (stylistics)