



## **NATO Stanag Language Proficiency Levels for Joint Missions and Its Implementations at a State Organization**

Ekrem SOLAK<sup>1</sup>

### **Abstract**

Turkish Armed Forces have been participating in joint missions together with other nations for decades. Since English is the medium of instruction in these missions, participating members should have NATO Standards in terms of language proficiency levels in four skills. Therefore, this study aims to specify personnel's views and their language proficiency levels in terms of NATO Stanag Level 3 objectives. Subjects are the personnel (n=30) attending English courses at a state organization. NATO Stanag Level 3 questionnaire and NATO Stanag 6001 Level 3 exam were administered to them at the end of the English course. Findings prove that subjects need improvement in speaking and writing skills though they consider themselves comparatively better in reading and listening skills. As a result, it is suggested that four language skills should be taken into consideration in evaluation and the current materials should be supported by some auxiliary documents to meet professional needs.

**Key words:** Language standards for law enforcement, language levels for joint missions, language requirements for international missions.

## **Müşterek Görevler İçin Gerekli NATO Dil Standartları ve Bu Standartların Bir Kamu Örgütünde Uygulamaları**

### **Öz**

Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri onlarca yıldır diğer uluslarla birlikte müşterek görevlere katılmaktadır. Bu görevlerde İngilizce ortak iletişim aracı olduğu için, katılımcıların dört dil becerisinde NATO Standartlarına sahip olması gerekmektedir. Bu sebeple, bu çalışma uluslararası görevler için zorunlu olan NATO Stanag 6001 3. seviye dil yeterlilikleri konusunda personelin görüşlerini ve mevcut dil yeterlilik seviyelerini belirlemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Örneklem grubu, İngilizce kursunu tamamlayan 30 personelden seçilmiş olup, bu gruba NATO Standartları 3. Seviye Anketi ve NATO Standartları 3. Seviye Sınavı uygulanmıştır. Bulgular, örneklem grubun okuma ve dinleme becerilerinde göreceli olarak kendilerini yeterli görmelerine rağmen yazma ve konuşma becerilerinde gelişmeye ihtiyaç olduğunu göstermektedir. Sonuç olarak, değerlendirmelerde dört dil becerisinin dikkate alınması ve mevcut ders kitaplarının mesleki ihtiyaçları karşılayacak şekilde yardımcı malzemelerle desteklenmesi tavsiye edilmektedir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Kolluk kuvvetleri için dil standartları, müşterek görevler için dil seviyeleri, uluslararası görevler için dil gereklilikleri.

---

<sup>1</sup> Yazışma Adresi: Yrd.Doç.Dr., Jandarma Okullar Komutanlığı, Ankara, ekremsolak@gmail.com

## Introduction

The history of language teaching in military context goes back to the World War II, especially by the entry of the United States into World War II. At that time, the United States Army needed personnel who were fluent in some languages to work as interpreters, code-room assistants, and translators. The government entrusted some American Universities to develop foreign language programs for military personnel. With the participation of some American Universities, the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) was developed in 1942. (Richards and Rodgers, 1997)

The most important characteristics of this program was to use an informant, that is why it is sometimes known as the “informant method”, since it used a native speaker of the language. The informant served as a source of phrases and vocabulary and provided sentences for imitation and memorization which were the fundamentals of the method. There was also a linguist who did not necessarily know the language, however, was trained to extract basic structure of the language from the informant. Those courses were intensive programs and students studied 10 hours a day and 6 days a week. The Army Specialized Training Program lasted only two years; however, it attracted considerable attention especially during the World War II. The program could be considered innovative in terms of the procedures used and the intensity of teaching rather than in terms of its underlying theory. These aspects of the method contributed to the development of Audiolingualism which was a combination of structural linguistic theory, ASTP, contrastive analysis, aural-oral procedures and behaviorist psychology and its principles are still used in language teaching even today .(Richards and Rodgers, 1997)

Afterwards, the United States Ministry of Defense, Defense Language Institute prepared some documents and series called American Language Course (ALC) Series which were primarily based on ASTP and Audiolingualism and the series have been used in many parts of the world including Turkey in the military context. Later on, towards the end of 1990s, the series were revised and updated according to the current humanitarian development in language teaching and it can be cited that it is now more communicative oriented.

During the 2000s, as the greatest International Military Organization, NATO has given special importance to language teaching and standardization activities in the military context particularly after the collapse of the former Soviet Union. Because of the increasing number of joint operations like Somalia, Afghanistan, and Iraq generally under the

umbrella of NATO, the need for a common language for the troops coming from different nations has been extremely vital. Therefore, NATO has been trying to establish a common understanding of language among the member nations by means of standardization activities like NATO Stanag 6001.

### **The Historical Development of the NATO Stanag 6001 Scale**

During the 50's, the United States Government needed to specify the language ability of Government employees, but at that time, there was no standardized system in the academic community; the Government wanted to develop its own to tackle this problem. The Foreign Service Institute (FSI) formed an interagency committee that formulated a language scale ranging from level 1 to 6, but the scale was not as detailed as it is today. The scale was eventually standardized to six levels, ranging from 0 (= no functional ability) to 5 (= equivalent to an educated native speaker). In 1968, several agencies jointly wrote formal descriptions of the base levels in four skills – speaking, reading, listening, and writing. By 1985, the document was revised under the umbrella of the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) by including full descriptions of the plus levels that was adopted into the scoring system. Since then, the document has been known as “ILR Scale”, “ILR Guidelines”, or the “ILR Definitions” (Herzog, 2005).

In 1976, NATO adopted a language proficiency scale related to the Interagency Language Roundtable's 1968 document. This aimed to respond to a need for defining language proficiency and to form a common understanding among member countries. In addition, authorities believed that it must be applicable to all languages and could be used by many different countries whether or not positions were military or civilian. At that time, it was thought this approach would help to meet the language needs when the great diversity of positions, tasks, and roles of military and civilian personnel were taken into consideration (Dubeau, 2006).

The STANAG adopted by NATO in 1976 has been utilized until recently. However, participants in the 1996, 1997, and 1998 Partnership for Peace (PfP) Seminars emphasized inconsistencies among NATO Member Nations' STANAG ratings. According to the Bureau of International Language Coordination (BILC) Report, October 2001, it was expressed that limited details in the original Stanag could cause various interpretations and pressure to inflate officers' ratings to qualify them for assignments, as well as involvement of various criteria like achievement and job-performance resulted in inconsistencies for the same levels of proficiency. (Dubeau, 2006)

In the late 1990's, an opportunity emerged to update the scale with the accession of some countries after the collapse the Former Soviet Union. In 1999 a committee consisting of expert members from eleven participating countries reinterpreted the descriptors of the original 1976 STANAG. In 2000, the BILC Steering Committee approved the trial of the draft interpretation and the scale was trialed in 2000 and 2001 with participants from 15 countries who attended the first two installments of the Language Testing Seminar, in Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany (BILC Report, October, 2001). The NATO Standardizing Agency integrated the updated interpretation and published Edition 2, in 2003. In 2005, another similar international committee effort led to the development of plus levels which were added as an optional component to the six base level document in 2006 (BILC Steering Committee Minutes, June 2006).

### **Current Applications of NATO Language Issues**

English is the operational language and the teaching, testing, and using the English language within the NATO community have become more important because of the addition of new countries and increasing number of joint tasks such as peace support operations. Due to the vitality of the language issues, the Bureau of International Language Coordination (BILC) was established within the NATO Training Group (NTG) as a consultative and advisory body for language training matters in NATO.

BILC released NATO Stanag 6001 Language Proficiency Levels Edition 2 in 2003 and since then member countries have been following these principles while deploying personnel for International Joint Missions. (BILC Constitution, 2004)

The aim of this agreement is to provide NATO Forces with a table describing Language proficiency levels. Participating nations agree to adopt the table of language proficiency levels for the purpose of :

- a. Meeting language requirements for international staff appointments.
- b. Comparing national standards through a standardized table.
- c. Recording and reporting, in international correspondence, measures of language proficiency.

The proficiency skills are broken down into six levels coded 0 through 5. In general terms, skills may be defined as follows:

|         |   |                               |
|---------|---|-------------------------------|
| Level 0 |   | No practical proficiency      |
| Level 1 | - | Elementary                    |
| Level 2 | - | Fair (Limited working)        |
| Level 3 | - | Good (Minimum professional)   |
| Level 4 | - | Very good (Full professional) |

Level 5 - Excellent (Native/bilingual)

Language proficiency will be recorded with a profile of 4 digits indicating the specific skills in the following order:

Skill A (US : L) Listening

Skill B (US : S) Speaking

Skill C (US : R) Reading

Skill D (US : W) Writing

US= United States

This number of 4 digits will be preceded by the code letters SLP (PLS in French) which is to indicate that the profile shown is the Standardized (S) Language (L) Profile (P). (NATO STANAG 6001, Ed.2, 2003)

## Method

### Significance of the Study, Hypotheses and Research Questions

Accurate and fluent use of English language is an important factor for the accomplishment of the joint missions. Since the personnel may serve either at administrative positions or operational duties, misunderstandings sometimes result in the failure of the mission. Although the NATO Language Standards is considered primarily important for international missions in military context, very rare scientific study has been conducted on its implementations in Turkish Armed Forces so far. Therefore, the aim of the study is to obtain a profile of personnel's views and their language proficiency levels in terms of NATO Stanag Level 3 perspective and make some suggestions if there are any deficiencies. It is believed that the results obtained from this study will also highlight the other research which can be conducted in other forces of Turkish Armed Forces. It is hypothesized that the personnel are not equally proficient in four language skills to meet the language requirements for NATO joint missions. In this study, the following research questions will be answered:

- What are views of language trainees on their proficiency in four skills in terms of NATO Stanag 6001 Level 3 perspective?
- What level do the trainees reach at the end of the course in accordance with NATO Stanag 6001 Level 3 requirements?

### Subjects and Instruments

This study was conducted at a state organization and subjects were 30 trainees attending English Courses for 20 weeks.

First, NATO Stanag 6001 Level 3 Questionnaire was administered to the subjects at the end of the course. This questionnaire was adapted from an official document released in 2003 by the Bureau of International Language Coordination (BILC) which was an authorized institution of NATO on language issues. This document consisted of the language descriptions in four language skills which were to be acquired by all the military members of the NATO countries so as to participate in international joint missions. The “can do” statements in this document were changed into a five-scale questionnaire form ranging from “I completely agree” to “I completely disagree”. In the questionnaire, there were four sections as Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. The aim of the questionnaire was to collect data on the trainees’ needs and current status in terms of NATO Stanag 6001 Level 3. The data was analyzed in SPSS program based on number of participants, mean and standard deviation.

Second, a test prepared by Macmillan Company in four language skills in accordance with NATO Stanag 6001 Level 3 was given to trainees to understand whether they can achieve the goals in terms of NATO language requirements.

### Findings and Results

**Table 1.** Descriptive Statistics of Listening Section

| Listening/ Statements  | N  | Mean | SS  |
|--|----|------|-----|
| 1) I can understand most formal and informal speech on practical, social, and professional topics, including particular interests and special fields of competence         | 30 | 3,30 | ,83 |
| 2) I can demonstrate, through spoken interaction, the ability to effectively understand face-to-face speech delivered with normal speed and clarity in a standard dialect. | 30 | 3,40 | ,77 |

|   |    |      |     |
|---|----|------|-----|
| 3) I can demonstrate clear understanding of language used at interactive meetings, briefings, and other forms of extended discourse, including unfamiliar subjects and situations.                                | 30 | 2,56 | ,67 |
| 4) I can follow accurately the essentials of conversations among educated native speakers, lectures on general subjects and special fields of competence, reasonably clear telephone calls, and media broadcasts. | 30 | 3,06 | ,86 |
| 5) I can readily understand language that includes such functions as hypothesising, supporting opinion, stating and defending policy, argumentation, objections, and various types of elaboration.                | 30 | 2,76 | ,77 |
| 6) I can demonstrate understanding of abstract concepts in discussion of complex topics (which may include economics, culture, science, technology) as well as his/her professional field.                        | 30 | 2,50 | ,68 |
| 7) I can understand both explicit and implicit information in a spoken text.  | 30 | 3,13 | ,93 |
| 8) I can rarely request repetition, paraphrase, or explanation.   | 30 | 3,40 | ,81 |
| 9) I can understand native speakers if they speak very rapidly or use slang, regionalisms, or dialect.  | 30 | 3,50 | ,82 |

\* 5 point likert scale is used in measurement

In the listening section, there were 9 items and trainees neither agreed nor disagreed with 1, 4, 5, 7 statements. Subjects agreed with 2, 8, 9 statements and stated positive ideas. In this group, the most remarkable point was 3,5 mean in item 9 which expressed “they may not understand native speakers if they speak very rapidly or use slang, regionalisms, or dialect.” As for statements 3 and 6, subjects mostly expressed negative attitudes towards listening comprehension. The most significant result was 2, 5 mean in item 6 saying “I can demonstrate understanding at abstract concepts during the discussion of complex topics as well as those concerning my professional field.”

**Table 2.** Descriptive Statistics of Speaking Section

| Speaking/ statements   | N  | Mean | SS  |
|--|----|------|-----|
| 10) I can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics.   | 30 | 2,86 | ,77 |
| 11) I can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence with considerable ease.  | 30 | 2,50 | ,73 |
| 12) I can use the language to perform such common professional tasks as answering objections, clarifying points, justifying decisions, responding to challenges, supporting opinion, stating and defending policy. | 30 | 2,70 | ,79 |
| 13) I can demonstrate language competence when conducting meetings, delivering briefings or other extended and elaborate monologues, hypothesising, and dealing with unfamiliar subjects and situations.           | 30 | 2,56 | ,81 |

|  |    |      |     |
|--|----|------|-----|
| 14) I can reliably elicit information and informed opinion from native speakers.   | 30 | 2,56 | ,81 |
| 15) I can convey abstract concepts in discussions of such topics as economics, culture, science, technology, philosophy as well as his/her professional field.                             | 30 | 2,70 | ,79 |
| 16) I can produce extended discourse and convey meaning correctly and effectively.   | 30 | 2,63 | ,71 |
| 17) I can speak readily and in a way that is appropriate to the situation.   | 30 | 2,76 | ,81 |
| 18) I can use the language clearly and relatively naturally to elaborate on concepts freely and make ideas easily understandable to native speakers without searching for words or phrases | 30 | 2,73 | ,86 |
| 19) I cannot fully understand some cultural references, proverbs, and allusions, as well as implications of nuances and idioms, but can easily repair the conversation.                    | 30 | 2,46 | ,73 |
| 20) I can make occasional errors in pronunciation, grammar, or vocabulary which are not serious enough to distort meaning, and rarely disturb the native speaker.                          | 30 | 2,73 | ,78 |
| 21) Can sometimes express nuances, subtleties, and humor, and may respond appropriately to culturally-related references, including proverbs and allusions.                                | 30 | 2,73 | ,94 |

\* 5 point likert scale is used in measurement

There were totally 12 items in the speaking section and subjects neither agreed nor disagreed with the statements 10, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21. In items 11, 13, and 19, the participants disagreed with the statements at a high rate. The most remarkable one was Item 19, 2,4 mean, expressing “they cannot fully understand some cultural references, proverbs, and allusions, as well as implications of nuances and idioms but can easily repair the conversation”. None of subjects agreed with the statements in speaking section. In other words, subjects were not positive in speaking skill.

**Table 3.** Descriptive Statistics of Reading Section

| Reading/ statements  | N  | Mean | SS  |
|--|----|------|-----|
| 22) I can read with almost complete comprehension a variety of authentic written material on general and professional subjects, including unfamiliar subject matter. | 30 | 3,00 | ,90 |
| 23) I can demonstrate the ability to learn through reading comprehension which is not dependent on subject matter.   | 30 | 3,20 | ,92 |
| 24) I can readily understand such language functions as hypothesising, supporting opinion, argumentation, clarification, and various forms of elaboration.           | 30 | 3,20 | ,80 |
| 26) I can most always interpret material correctly, to relate ideas, and to “read between the lines,” or understand implicit information.                            | 30 | 3,36 | ,85 |
| 27) I can generally distinguish between different stylistic levels and often recognise humor, emotional overtones, and subtleties of written language.               | 30 | 3,23 | ,85 |

|  |    |      |     |
|--|----|------|-----|
| 28) I can get the gist of higher level, sophisticated texts, but may be unable to detect all nuances.  | 30 | 3,30 | ,98 |
| 29) I cannot always thoroughly comprehend texts that have an unusually complex structure, low frequency idioms, or a high degree of cultural knowledge embedded in the language. | 30 | 3,46 | ,89 |
| 30) I can read somewhat slower than that of a native reader.   | 30 | 3,56 | ,89 |

\* 5 point likert scale is used in measurement

As for the reading skill, there were 9 items asking for the participants' ideas on their current level in Stanag 6001 Level 3. Subjects neither agreed nor disagreed with the statements 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28. Subjects agreed with the items 29 and 30 and demonstrated positive attitude towards their current level at reading. While Item 22 got the lowest rate with a mean of 3.0, item 30 had the highest rate with a mean of 3,56. Item 30 maintained "they can read somewhat slower than a native speaker." Likewise, item 29, 3,46 mean, expressed "they cannot always thoroughly comprehend texts with an unusually complex structure, low frequency idioms, or a high degree of cultural knowledge embedded in the language."

**Table 4.** Descriptive Statistics of Writing Section

| Writing/ statements   | N  | Mean | SS  |
|---|----|------|-----|
| 31) I can write effective formal and informal correspondence and documents on practical, social, and professional topics. | 30 | 2,40 | ,72 |
| 32) I can write about special fields of competence with considerable ease.  | 30 | 2,30 | ,59 |

|  |    |      |     |
|--|----|------|-----|
| 33) I can use the written language for essay-length argumentation, analysis, hypothesis, and extensive explanation, narration, and description.  | 30 | 2,40 | ,67 |
| 34) I can convey abstract concepts when writing about complex topics (which may include economics, culture, science, and technology) as well as his/her professional field.                  | 30 | 2,33 | ,47 |
| 35) I can write in a way that the relationship and development of ideas are clear, and major points are coherently ordered to fit the purpose of the text.                                   | 30 | 2,70 | ,74 |
| 36) I can control the structure, vocabulary, spelling, and punctuation adequate to convey the message accurately.  | 30 | 2,70 | ,74 |
| 37) I can make occasional errors which do not interfere with comprehension, and rarely disturb the native reader.  | 30 | 2,80 | ,84 |
| 38) I can write in a style which may be non-native, it is appropriate for the occasion. When it is necessary for a document to meet full native expectations, some editing will be required. | 30 | 3,00 | ,94 |
| Valid N (listwise)   | 30 |      |     |

\* 5 point likert scale is used in measurement

As for the writing skill, there were totally 8 items in the relevant section. Subjects disagreed with items 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34. In this group, Item 32 had a mean of 2,3 which stated "I can write about fields of special competence with considerable ease." On the other hand, subjects neither agreed nor disagreed with the items 35, 36, 37, 38. In this group, Item 38 got the highest rate with a mean of 3,0 which expressed "I can write in a style which may be non-native, it is appropriate for the occasion. When it is

necessary for a document to meet full native expectations, some editing will be required.” In this section, none of the participants agreed with the items.

### **The Nato Stanag 6001 Level 3 Exam**

A NATO Stanag 6001 Level 3 exam in four skills was obtained from the Macmillan Company and administered 30 trainees attending the English Course to measure their proficiency in accordance with NATO Stanag Level 3 perspective. Each skill was measured as 25 points and the total was 100.

The average score of reading skill of 30 trainees was 14,2 out of 25. For listening, it was 13,6, for speaking it was 12 and for writing it was 10. It can be understood that learners consider themselves better at receptive and or interactive skills i.e. reading and listening, but they need improvements in speaking and especially writing. This result indicates that the current program generally focuses on reading and listening comprehension and partly neglects productive skills. Since trainees' aim is mainly to get a high score from Language Proficiency Exam for State Employees (KPDS) and General Screening Test (Listening Test), they try to improve the receptive skills at large. The average of four skills was 65,5 out of 100. It can be generalized that the trainees' level in reading skill was the best and in writing was the worst.

**Table 5.** NATO Stanag 6001 Level 3 Exam Results in Four Skills

| Trainees | Reading | Listening | Writing | Speaking | Total |
|----------|---------|-----------|---------|----------|-------|
| 1        | 13      | 8         | 10      | 10       | 42    |
| 2        | 15      | 12        | 9       | 12       | 50    |
| 3        | 16      | 16        | 12      | 14       | 61    |
| 4        | 12      | 12        | 12      | 11       | 51    |
| 5        | 12      | 8         | 0       | 7        | 32    |
| 6        | 17      | 12        | 12      | 11       | 58    |
| 7        | 13      | 15        | 13      | 12       | 60    |
| 8        | 15      | 16        | 12      | 14       | 65    |
| 9        | 14      | 19        | 11      | 14       | 67    |
| 10       | 13      | 11        | 5       | 9        | 48    |
| 11       | 14      | 10        | 7       | 10       | 52    |
| 12       | 17      | 15        | 10      | 13       | 67    |
| 13       | 17      | 16        | 14      | 15       | 75    |
| 14       | 12      | 15        | 12      | 13       | 66    |
| 15       | 13      | 16        | 12      | 13       | 69    |
| 16       | 19      | 16        | 16      | 17       | 84    |

|         |      |      |      |    |      |
|---------|------|------|------|----|------|
| 17      | 15   | 15   | 12   | 13 | 72   |
| 18      | 14   | 15   | 5    | 11 | 63   |
| 19      | 11   | 13   | 4    | 9  | 56   |
| 20      | 13   | 8    | 10   | 10 | 61   |
| 21      | 15   | 12   | 9    | 12 | 69   |
| 22      | 16   | 12   | 12   | 11 | 73   |
| 23      | 13   | 15   | 12   | 14 | 77   |
| 24      | 14   | 19   | 11   | 14 | 82   |
| 25      | 13   | 11   | 5    | 9  | 63   |
| 26      | 14   | 10   | 7    | 10 | 67   |
| 27      | 17   | 16   | 14   | 15 | 89   |
| 28      | 12   | 15   | 12   | 13 | 80   |
| 29      | 13   | 16   | 12   | 13 | 83   |
| 30      | 14   | 15   | 12   | 13 | 84   |
| Average | 14,2 | 13,6 | 10,1 | 12 | 65,5 |

\* Each skill is measured as 25 points. Total score is 100.

When we compare NATO Stanag 6001 Level 3 exam scores with the data collected through the questionnaire, it proves similar results about the level of participants in NATO Stanag 6001 Level 3. Both instruments show that participants consider themselves better in reading and listening, but need improvements in writing and speaking. While the subjects have positive attitude to the reading skill, they have a negative attitude to the writing skill.

### **Discussion and Conclusion**

The personnel have to cooperate with other international organizations to fight against crimes and terrorist activities as a law enforcement agency. Since English is the medium of instruction in these activities, misunderstandings sometimes can result in casualties and failure in the mission. Therefore, personnel should have the required language proficiency level to participate in joint missions.

According to data collected through the questionnaire and the exam, the personnel do not consider themselves fully competent in four language skills to accomplish the joint missions in terms of language proficiency. In reading and listening skills, as receptive skills, they are more positive than speaking and writing skills, as productive skills. NATO Stanag 6001 Level 3 exam scores also prove this idea. Since the personnel has to take Language Proficiency Exam for State Employees (KPDS) and General

Screening Test (Listening Test) to participate in joint missions, they generally focus on to improve reading and listening skills to get a high score in these exams and ignore productive skills. However, when they attend the mission, they encounter some problems in communication in terms of speaking and writing skills. Therefore, speaking and writing exams should be included in the evaluation and this will lead the personnel to take into consideration four language skills while preparing for the mission. In addition, testing four language skills will cause the revision of the language teaching programs at the organization as a result of washback effect and four language skills will be the focus of attention.

In comparison of the findings of this study with others conducted under NATO Stanag 6001 language standards, there are no similarities, because there is no other study found under the same topic. However, Dubeau (2006) investigated the inter-reliability of ratings among member countries (one hundred and three participants from eighteen countries); this exploratory research informs on the comparability of ratings assigned to oral proficiency interviews (OPI). Results indicated that there were some differences in the ratings assigned from country to country, and differences in ratings within each country. The results also showed that experience alone is an insufficient condition for rating correctly and consistently, and the need for more scale training was evident, if score reliability is to be achieved.

Işık (2005) also states that a foreign language can be learned best via comprehensible input. Therefore, learners should spend much time listening, reading and watching in the target language, but the level of language studied should be appropriate for learners' level and interest. Exposure to listening and reading activities in the target language helps to improve the productive skills, speaking and writing as well. In addition, a communicative setting which the target language is used as a means should be created and the most important characteristic of the setting is to provide an atmosphere to use or practice the language rather than learning about the grammar of the target language. Moreover, learners should get rid of stress, anxiety and should have self-confidence.

As Hutchinson and Waters (2006) assert that the kind of changes in the language teaching materials previously adopted in an L2 teaching environment is directly related to the degree of match between the properties of the materials and the assessed needs and requirements. Therefore, it is necessary to provide materials that will serve the goals based on institutional, individual and professional needs of the learners. In this context, the previously used course book American Language Course series should be supported with supplementary materials. Campaign 2-3 course

books, Campaign for law enforcement, internet sites (British Council Peacekeeping project), listening passages from Voice of America (VOA) and TOEFL CDs are the supplementary materials that can be adapted into the language teaching programs. The best suggestion is to prepare a series of course books at different levels addressing the professional needs of the organization and this material will help the personnel to prepare for joint missions in accordance with NATO Stanag 6001 Level 3 objectives.

### References

- BILC Constitution. (2004). 30 Mart 2011 de <http://www.dlielc.org/bilc/Constitution2004.doc> adresinden alıntı yapılmıştır.
- Brown, J. (1995). *The Elements of language curriculum*. Boston: Heinle&Heinle
- Defense Language Institute (2000). *Materials Development Notebook*. U.S.A.
- Department of Air Force (1993). *Information for Designers of Instructional System, AF Handbook*. Washington D.C.: Headquarters
- Dubeau, Julie. (2006). *An Exploratory study of OPI ratings across NATO countries using the NATO STANAG 6001 scale*. (Masters Thesis). Carleton University, Canada.
- Herzog, M. (2005). *An overview of the history of the ILR language proficiency skill level descriptions and scale*. *Interagency Language Roundtable: History of the ILR Scale*. 25 Ekim 2010 tarihinde [http://www.govtilr.org/ILRscale\\_hist.html](http://www.govtilr.org/ILRscale_hist.html) adresinden alıntı yapılmıştır.
- Graves, K. (2000). *Designing language courses: A guide for teachers*. Boston: Heinle&Heinle
- Green, R. ve D. Wall. (2005) Language testing in the military :Problems, politics and progress. *Language Testing*. Vol. 22 no. 3 379-398
- Hutchinson, T. ve Waters A. (2006). *English for specific purposes*. U.K.: C.U.P.
- Işık, A. (1999) *Teaching EFL through english or content: Implications for foreign language learning*, (Unpublished Doctorate Dissertation). Boğaziçi University, İstanbul.

Işık, A. (2005). *Bir yabancı dil nasıl öğrenilir?* Ankara: Kara Harp Okulu Basımevi.

*Turkish Law Code 2803 on Organization, Duties and Powers of Turkish Gendarmerie.*

NATO STANAG 6001, Ed.2, (2003). 25 Mart 2009 da [http://www.dlielc.org/bilc/Sta\\_Edit2](http://www.dlielc.org/bilc/Sta_Edit2) adresinden alıntı yapılmıştır.

Pehlivan, Erdal (2003) *Analysis of ELT at TAFE advanced english course from content based instruction perspective.* (Unpublished Masters Thesis). İstanbul University, İstanbul.

Reviere, R. (1996). *Needs assessment: A creative and practical guide for social scientists.* U.S.A:Taylor & Francis.

Richards, J.ve Rodgers T. (1997). *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* U.S.A.: C.U.P.

Sarı, Rahim. (2003) *A Suggested english language teaching program for Gülhane Military Medical Academy.* (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

White, R.V. (1988). *The ELT curriculum: Design, innovation and management.* Oxford: Blackwell

## Geniřletilmiř zet

### Muřterek Grevler İin Gerekli NATO Dil Standartları ve Bu Standartların Bir Kamu rgtnde Uygulamaları

Askeri ortamlarda yabancı dil ğretimi zellikle ikinci dnya savařı ile birlikte daha da nem kazanmıřtır. İlk defa Amerika Birleřik Devletlerinde ortaya atılan Ordu iin zel Amalı Dil Programı Amerikan askerlerine ikinci dnya savařında Japonca ğretmeyi hedeflemekte idi. O tarihten bu yana uluslar arası en byk askeri kuruluş olan NATO atısı altında yabancı dil (zellikle İngilizce) ğretiminin standart hale getirilmesi ile ilgili birok alıřma yapılmıřtır. Sovyetler Birlięinin okmesi ile birlikte, Somali, Afganistan ve Irak gibi blgelerde yapılan operasyonlar belli standartlarda dil ğretiminin nemini bir kez daha ortaya ıkarılmıřtır. Bu nedenle NATO, bnyesinde bulunan Uluslar arası Dil Koordinasyon Birimi marifetiyle 2003 yılında NATO Dil Standartları 6001 ikinci baskısını yayınlamıřtır. Uluslar arası muřterek grevlerde NATO mensubu tm lke mensupları (Trk jandarması dahil) drt dil becerisinde bu standartları saęlaması gerekmektedir. Bu nedenle, bu alıřmadaki ama, jandarma personelinin NATO 6001 Dil Standartları Seviye 3 ynyle drt dil becerisinde İngilizce hazır bulunuřlukları ile ilgili grřlerini almak ve bu grřler doęrultusunda eksiklikler varsa tavsiyelerde bulunmaktır.

## Yntem

### rneklem ve aralar

rneklem grup, Jandarma Genel Komutanlıęı bnyesinde alıřan ve 20 haftalık İngilizce kursu gren 30 kursiyer subay ve astsubaydır. İlk olarak, kursiyerlere NATO Stanag Seviye 3 anketi İngilizce kursu sonunda uygulanmıřtır. Bu anketin amacı, kursiyerlerin NATO Stanag 6001 Seviye 3 doęrultusunda ihtiyalarını ve mevcut durumlarını tespit etmektir. Toplanan veri SPSS programında katılımcılar, ortalama ve standart sapma ltleriyle analiz edilmiřtir. İkinci olarak, NATO Stanag 6001 Seviye 3 standartlarında drt dil becerisinde kursiyerlerin kurs sonunda beklenen standartlara ulařıp ulařmadıęını belirlemek maksadıyla bir sınav uygulanmıřtır.

## Bulgular

NATO Stanag 6001 Seviye 3 sınav sonuları ile anketten toplanan veriler karřılařtırıldıęında sonuların benzerlik gsterdięi anlařılmaktadır. Her iki veri kaynaęında da katılımcılar kendilerini, okuduęunu ve dinledięini anlama konusunda daha iyi, yazma ve konuřma becerilerinde ise

gelişmeye ihtiyacı olduklarını değerlendirmektedirler. Ayrıca, katılımcılar okuduğunu anlama becerisine karşı olumlu, yazma becerisine karşı ise olumsuz bir tutum sergilemişlerdir.

### **Tartışma ve Sonuç**

Anket ve sınav sonuçlarından toplanan verilere göre, müşterek görevlerde dil yeterliliği yönüyle jandarmanın personeli kendilerini dört dil becerisinde tam olarak hazır hissetmemektedir. Algısal beceriler olarak, okuma ve dinleme becerilerinde, üretimsel beceriler olan yazma ve konuşma göre kendilerini daha yeterli görmektedirler. Sınav sonuçları da bu görüşü desteklemektedir. Kursiyerler müşterek görevlere katılabilmek için okuduğunu ve dinlediğini anlama odaklı olan Kamu Personeli Dil Sınavı ve Genel Dil Dinleme Sınavından yüksek not almak zorunda oldukları için, genellikle üretimsel becerilere yoğunlaşmamaktadırlar. Sonuç olarak da, müşterek görevlerde dil yeterlilikleri yönüyle iletişimde sorunlarla karşılaşmaktadırlar. Bu sorunların üstesinden gelmek için, personelin dört dil becerisini geliştirmeye yönlendirmek amacıyla, dört dil becerisi de değerlendirmeye alınmalıdır.

Literatür taramasında bu konuda NATO Dil standartları konusunda yapılmış başka bir çalışma bulunamadığından, elde edilen sonuçları karşılaştırma imkanı bulunamamıştır. Lakin, Dubeau(2006) NATO üyesi ülkelerin kendi yaptıkları sözel dil sınavlarında verilen notların güvenilirliği ile ilgili bir çalışma yapmış ve puanlamaların ülkeden ülkeye farklılık gösterdiği sonucuna ulaşmıştır. Ayrıca doğru puanlama için sınav uygulayıcılarının tecrübelerinin yeterli faktör olmadığı ve tüm ülkelerin ilgili uzmanlarının bu konuda ortak eğitim alması gerektiği vurgulanmıştır.

Işık (2005) en iyi yabancı dil öğrenme yönteminin anlaşılabilir girdi vasıtasıyla olabileceğini ifade etmiştir. Bu nedenle, yabancı dil öğrenenler bolca hedef dilde dinleyerek, okuyarak ve izleyerek vakit harcamalıdır. Ancak, çalışılan dilin düzeyi, öğrencinin seviyesi ve ilgisine uygun olmalıdır. Hatta dinleme ve okuma etkinliklerine maruz kalma konuşma ve yazma becerilerinin de gelişmesine katkı sağlar. Ek olarak, hedef dilin araç olarak kullanıldığı bir iletişim ortamı oluşturulmalı ve bu ortamın en önemli özelliği de hedef dilin dilbilgisi kurallarını öğretmeden ziyade dilin kullanılmasına imkân veren bir ortam olmasıdır.

Hutchinson and Waters'da (2006) dil öğrenme malzemelerinin özelliklerinin öğrenen kişilerin ihtiyaç ve gereksinimlerine uygun olması gerektiğini ifade etmektedir. Bu nedenle, malzemelerin kişisel, mesleki ve kurumsal ihtiyaçlarla uyumlu olması gerekmektedir. Bu anlamda, ders kitabı olarak okutulan Amerikan Dil Kursu serisinin amaca uygun

malzemelerle desteklenmesi doğru olacaktır. Campaign 2-3 ders kitapları, Campaign for law enforcement, internet siteleri (British Council barışı koruma projesi), Voice of America radyosundan dinleme metinleri (VOA) and TOEFL CDleri destekleyici malzemeler olarak kullanılabilir. En uygun tavsiye ise, jandarma teşkilatının mesleki ihtiyaçlarını karşılayan ders kitaplarının hazırlanması ve bu kitaplarında NATO Stanag 6001 Seviye 3 hedefleri doğrultusunda personeli müşterek görevler için hazırlamasıdır