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Executive Summary

This report presents the results of a Combined Computer Assisted Study (CAS) and Video Teletraining (VTT) pilot test performed by the Defense Language Institute, Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC). The pilot test was conducted at Fort Lewis, Washington during Spring 1991. The language addressed was Korean. The pilot test course participants were MI linguists who had previously completed the DLIFLC Korean program. Three course participants were selected from the 341st Washington National Guard MI Battalion and two were from the 199th MI Battalion at Fort Lewis. The VTT portion of the course originated from the DLIFLC VTT center at the Presidio of Monterey, California and was received at the I-Corps Language Training Facility, North Fort Lewis, Washington. The CAS training was held in the language training classroom of the 201st MI Brigade on the main post of Fort Lewis.

The purpose of the Korean language refresher course was to improve MI linguists reading and listening proficiency levels in the Korean language. The course also addressed the improvement of speaking skills. The course was conducted on weekdays during the period 29 April to 10 May. Six hours per day of VTT instruction and eight hours of CAS instruction were provided for the 68-hour course.

Course development was undertaken by staff from the DLIFLC Korean Department during the several weeks preceding the pilot test by a designated course coordinator and members of the teaching staff. The overall goal of the course was to provide global Korean language training to personnel designated 98G (voice interceptors) to assist them in increasing their language proficiency toward the 2/2 levels in listening and reading and above the 1 level in speaking.

Some of the major instructional formats for the course were as follows:

- Presentation of specific topics
- Thematic exercises in listening comprehension, reading comprehension, and speaking
- Interactive communication and reinforcement
- Student generated activities
- Pair and group work
- Current events presentations
- CAS lessons and review (CAS lessons addressed topics including military themes, health, weather, and transportation).
The course developers capitalized upon the interactive features of VTT technology; adapted current DLIFLC language pedagogy, and used advance organizers in facilitating student work with authentic materials and audio/video media segments. The course involved a variety of instructional activities presented in one-hour blocks. Four VTT instructors alternated in presenting various course segments. The CAS computer activities were developed for a prior pilot test involving elements of the 107th MI Bn at Fort Ord and the 201st MI Bde at Fort Lewis. CAS lessons addressed reading, listening and speaking skills. CAS lessons were designed to address five topical areas and lesson subcomponents. They presented instruction in vocabulary, grammar, listening and reading comprehension, and speaking. CAS lessons were taken during the final hour of eight of the instructional days. The instructors attempted to integrate CAS and VTT by introducing the content of the CAS lessons during a prior VTT instruction period and discussing the results of CAS training on the following VTT instructional day.

The technology used in the pilot test was as follows. VTT involved two-way compressed audio/video carried via satellite and two-way graphics transmissions. Teachers were assisted throughout the course by a VTT technician. Teachers transmitted graphics including text, charts, photos, maps, newsprint, and magazine articles to the students. Teachers could both see and hear the five students taking the Korean course. Students were located in a classroom in the Language Training Facility at North Fort Lewis, Washington. They could see, hear, and speak to the DLIFLC teachers. Students could both receive and send graphics. Training personnel at the Fort Lewis Language Training Facility provided on-site VTT technical assistance and troubleshooting support.

The Computer Assisted Study lessons were offered at the 201st MI Bde language training center on the Fort Lewis main post. These lessons resided on Macintosh SE computers equipped for sound input/output and display of Korean characters. Knowledgeable staff from the 201st MI Bde instructed the students in the use of the CAS lessons and provided technical assistance to students during the training sessions.

The cooperation of the field participants, the 341st MI Bn, 199th MI Bn, 201st MI Bn, and I-Corps language training staff was outstanding. Attendance of the soldiers at the training sessions was excellent. Local personnel were able to perform the technical tasks associated with operating the VTT classroom and computer equipment to support the CAS les-
sons. The effort was well coordinated locally. The DLIFLC successfully accomplished the coordination and field support tasks required for both the technical and instructional aspects of the pilot test.

The project evaluation addressed a number of specific objectives. These were divided into two areas: (1) objectives related to the technology and (2) objectives related to the training. Technology objectives included determining:

- the appropriateness of the media mix (CAS and VTT)
- the viability of CAS/VTT to facilitate language training
- the reliability of the equipment and communications
- the cost of providing the training
- the acceptance of the delivery approach to the target community

Training objectives included determining:

- the effectiveness of the training in meeting the learning objectives
- the identification of effective instructional techniques
- the effectiveness of the CAS/VTT course in maintaining student motivation
- the relationship of effectiveness to student variables
- the general effectiveness of the course in supporting annual training requirements for National Guard and active MI linguists

The evaluation was conducted by the DLIFLC Evaluation and Research Division with assistance from the Defense Training and Performance Data Center and the Institute for Simulation and Training, University of Central Florida.

A variety of evaluation data was collected at the learning site to address the various evaluation objectives. These data included the following: student background data, including prior language proficiency; language training options currently available to linguists from the 199th and 341st MI battalions; daily CAS and VTT instruction logs; a pre-post achievement test; post-course interviews with students and unit training personnel; and a post-course student questionnaire. Information collected at the DLIFLC included the course description, post-course CAS/VTT instructor questionnaire, and cost data. In addition, the contract evaluator conducted on-site observations during the final two of the
ten training days.

Some of the results of the pilot test are as follows:

- The execution of the development and delivery of the Korean course was excellent. The results of the project illustrate the significant future potential of VTT and CAS to support nonresident language training for MI linguists.

- The instructional media available with the VTT - interactive audio, video, and graphics - provide an effective media mix for language instruction. CAS lessons appear to have the potential to supplement listening, reading, grammar, and vocabulary study.

- The VTT equipment and communications links functioned at a level of reliability sufficient to support the VTT training. CAS equipment and courseware performed at a reliable level.

- MI linguists demonstrated language skills improvement as a result of taking the course.

- The acceptability of the CAS/VTT training to the project participants was high.

- Participants commented about the excellent quality of the VTT course and the DLIFLC instructors. They considered the course structure and contents to be motivating and interesting. The course developers incorporated a variety of effective instructional activities and formats into the course.

- The DLIFLC gained valuable experience in using the CAS/VTT media to best advantage to address the specific needs of RC and active MI units.

- A number of specific lessons were learned from the pilot test which can enhance the future quality of VTT language instruction.

In summary, the project was developed and conducted in a highly professional manner. The Korean course was of excellent quality and generated lessons learned for future course development of this type. The project demonstrated the potential of VTT as a key nonresident language training medium. CAS was found to have excellent potential for certain aspects of language learning when used in the context of a broader course of instruction. Strategies were suggested to tie the
two media together, although the level of CAS/VTT integration present in this pilot test was not sufficient to provide detailed data in this regard.
Section I. INTRODUCTION

The Defense Language Institute, Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) was charged at the January 1990 General Officer Steering Committee meeting with exploring the feasibility of assisting MI units in maintaining and enhancing linguists' foreign language proficiency via computer assisted study (CAS) and video teletraining (VTT). This action resulted in the design and implementation of pilot tests involving CAS and VTT technologies during the September 1990 to July 1991 time frame. Prior pilot tests addressed the use of CAS (Korean language training) and VTT (German language training) technologies separately. The current report documents the results of a Korean language course in which the use of CAS and VTT was combined. A comprehensive evaluation report on the three FY 91 CAS and VTT pilot test projects is scheduled for completion at a later date.

The Korean language CAS/VTT course provided refresher language training for linguists in the 341st MI National Guard Battalion, Camp Murray, Washington and the 199th MI Battalion (active) stationed at Fort Lewis, Washington. The course was conducted at the Language Training Facility at North Fort Lewis, Washington, from 29 April to 10 May, 1991. The purpose of the project was to develop, implement, and evaluate Korean language refresher training provided via two-way compressed video and supplemented by computer assisted study lessons. The DLIFLC provided the hardware, communications, and courseware for the 68-hour course conducted during the ten working days in the pilot test period.

Although not a part of the original Educational Technology Assessment (ETNA) Project, the task of assisting with the pilot test evaluation was added to the Defense Training and Performance Data Center/Institute for Simulation and Training, University of Central Florida ETNA team's workscope.
A. Background/History

The DLIFLC has, for several years been developing and testing the use of video teletraining for foreign language instruction. During 1989 and 1990, the DLIFLC offered several courses to MI linguists using the Department of Defense Communications Teleconferencing Network (DCTN), most notably for Arabic language instruction. More recently, beginning in the fall of 1990, the DLIFLC began to test the use of two-way compressed video teletraining with the (TRADOC-assisted) installation of TNET equipment at several CONUS U.S. Army installations.

The DLIFLC has also, for a number of years, been developing and testing (and to a limited degree distributing) computer assisted language learning software/courseware and interactive videodisc programming. Such products have been developed for a number of languages taught at the DLIFLC and for various computer platforms (e.g., SONY SMC-70, SONY View, EIDS, and Macintosh) available at the institute.

Recent surveys of FORSCOM and USAEUR command language programs conducted by ETNA project researchers, determined that distance learning and computer assisted language learning (CALL) technologies are not commonly available for the maintenance and enhancement of the language skills of practicing military linguists. FORSCOM MI units are increasingly developing the capability to receive satellite-delivered foreign video programming from SCOLA. However, the video received from SCOLA is intended to supplement training and does not include formal courses of instruction. While language courses via video teletraining are not commonly available to MI units, the ETNA surveys revealed a substantial degree of interest on the part of these units to utilize distance education technologies to meet language training needs.

1. In discussing the CAS instructional materials, we make the distinction between software and courseware. Under software we include such items as authorware, programming languages and code. In the case of CAS, this includes Hypercard, the cards and stacks developed, the language text font, and any other code written to implement the program. By courseware we mean the software, plus the specific material inserted for the lessons, i.e., the computer based course as the student sees it. We find that distinguishing between software and courseware allows for a clearer discussion of evaluation results and have chosen to employ this distinction in this writing.
Likewise, there are few computers currently available at military bases to support language learning, but there was considerable interest expressed by language training managers in developing the capability to capitalize upon computers for language training.

Given the experience of the DLIFLC in applying modern technologies to language instruction, the needs being expressed by units, and the emerging results of the DLIFLC Language Skills Change Project (which point to the rapid decay of basic language skills in the absence of intensive practice), it appears desirable to assess the potential of modern language learning technologies to assist with nonresident language training.

B. Purpose of Project

The goal of the Korean language computer assisted study/video teletraining pilot test was to assess the potential of combined computer assisted study (CAS) and video teletraining (VTT) as a means to provide foreign language refresher training to MI linguists at U.S. military installations. A further purpose of the study was to make recommendations regarding future training uses these technologies.

Following guidance in the distance education literature (see Bramble, 1990) on evaluating the results of distance education projects, the evaluation addressed two separate, but related issues. These are (1) the technology used to provide the instruction and (2) the actual instruction provided. The evaluation objectives for the project are documented in the Korean CAS/VTT Pilot Test Data Collection Notebook (Bramble, 1991). They are as follows:

1. Objectives related to delivery technology
   a. Determine the appropriateness of the chosen media mix (CAS and VTT) to facilitate the target training.
   b. Determine the success of the CAS/VTT approach in providing a viable means for access to the target training.
   c. Determine the reliability of the equipment and transmissions used in the pilot test.
d. Determine the cost of providing the CAS/VTT training and compare with Mobile Training Teams (MTTs) or other approaches which could be taken.

e. Determine the acceptability of the delivery approach to the target community.

2. Objectives related to instruction

   a. Determine the effectiveness of the training in meeting established learning objectives.

   b. Identify effective instructional techniques for using CAS/VTT for maintenance and enhancement language training for practicing MI linguists.

   c. Assess the effectiveness of CAS/VTT in facilitating and maintaining student motivation.

   d. Relate the effectiveness of the training to student variables.

   e. Determine the overall effectiveness of the instruction in supporting annual language training requirements of National Guard and Active MI linguists battalions.

The DLIFLC Evaluation and Research Division was assigned the responsibility for conducting the pilot test evaluation. This division contracted with the Defense Training and Performance Data Center (TPDC) in Orlando, Florida, for assistance in completing this task. TPDC, in turn, subcontracted with the Institute for Simulation and Training (IST), at the University of Central Florida to conduct the specific evaluation tasks.

C. Discussion of the Potential of CAS/VTT

Video teletraining may have the potential to serve some of the needs for the nonresident language training. It has the potential to project the expertise at the DLIFLC to linguist units both in and out of the Continental United States. As stated in Bramble (1990), this form of training has the potential to provide such services as:

1. Language short courses
2. Full length language courses
3. Language tutorials
4. Delivery of media and materials to enhance local program offerings
5. Local program improvement workshops or courses
6. Inservice training to local language instructors
7. Technical assistance to local programs

The Korean CAS/VTT focuses upon category 1 above, a language short course. As it happens, the DLIFLC is also utilizing the VTT equipment to provide services in category 6 above to personnel of the Language Training Facility at Fort Lewis, Washington. While the evaluator received a number of very positive comments on the latter type of service during site visits, the success of DLIFLC efforts in providing inservice training via VTT was not formally evaluated.

Language training short courses via video teletraining have the following potential advantages:

- Local language programs can access high quality DLIFLC instructors not normally available to provide language instruction on-site.
- The VTT allows for a high level of interaction between students and DLIFLC VTT teachers.
- DLIFLC instructors can be utilized for nonresident instruction without the need for extensive travel.
- Remote access can be gained to DLIFLC staff expertise and instructional materials and media for effective course design and delivery.
- MI linguists can gain access to sophisticated language training on-site, without the requirement for TDY to distant training site.
- Articulation and coordination of local program curriculum and DLIFLC curriculum.
- Potential long-run cost savings.

Language training short courses via video teletraining have the following potential limitations:

- Less than 100% current reliability of the VTT equipment.
- Current complexity of equipment operation and program support functions at the local instruction sites.
- Potential for mismatch between local needs and course design if not carefully coordinated.
- Current limitations of VTT media available for the instructional process.
- Cost of equipment procurement, equipment operation and maintenance, and communications.

Computer assisted study may have the potential to supplement the use of VTT to serve the needs for nonresident maintenance/enhancement training of military linguists. As envisioned, CAS has the following potential advantages:

- High quality instruction designed and developed by experts in target language training.
- Portability, flexibility and ease of use.
- Incorporation of several media (audio, text, graphics) in the instructional approach.
- Features of computer-based instruction such as immediate feedback, repetition, diagnosis and prescription, self-paced instruction, and learner independence.
- Relatively low cost.

Some potential limitations are:

- Lack of compatible equipment in the field.
- Lack of on-site familiarity with the use of the computers for language training.
- Perceived lack of the "human element" in computer-based instruction.

Note that the above potential advantages and limitations are presented for illustrative purposes. They are not intended to constitute a justification for using or not using VTT or CAS in the future. A number of issues related to the above advantages and limitations are addressed in the present evaluation report.
In conducting the pilot test, the DLIFLC researchers felt that the advantages of the technologies potentially outweigh their limitations - specifically for portions of the training required by practicing military linguists. It was felt that the combined use of the two technologies may offer advantages over their separate use. It was also felt that the pilot test results would offer insights into the future application of the technologies to serve the purpose for they were designed. It was envisioned that the results would identify factors contributing to optimum design and usage of CAS/VTT courseware.
Section II. METHODOLOGY

A. Description of Instructional Approach

1. Pedagogical Rationale

The Korean CAS/VTT course was designed to improve the language skills of five MI linguists whose most recent language DLPT proficiency levels ranged from 1/1 to 2/2 in listening and reading. Recent speaking scores were not available, but scores for three of the students at the time of DLIFLC graduation were all reported to be 1+.

The precise language proficiencies of the students were not known to the teachers ahead of time. Thus, while the general course activities were planned, adaptations were made to fit the needs of the students as the teachers became familiar with the students. Specific course activities are listed in the daily schedule included in Appendix B. Additional details are provided in the reporting of the DLIFLC VTT teacher interviews presented in the Results section of this report. The language proficiency levels that were addressed by the activities were as follows: Reading at 1+ to 2+; Listening at 1+ to 2; and Speaking at 1 to 2.

The stated overall goal of the course was "to provide maintenance, remediation, and enhancement training to Army Reserve Unit students, whose proficiency levels in listening, and reading range between 1+ and 2. By the end of the VTT training, the students will demonstrate an improvement in the post-test over the pre-test by interacting in level 1+ and 2 activities." The major objectives of the course were contingent upon implementation of the VTT instruction and the determination of actual student needs. Flexibility and modification of syllabus and curriculum of the course was required throughout.
Major presentations and learning strategies that were used in the daily training sessions are illustrated by the VTT daily activities. A listing of these activities and a designation of the general training objectives (skill getting vs. skill using) they address is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Objective(s) Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural, Notional-Functional,</td>
<td>Lead-in activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation, Task-and-Skill</td>
<td>SKILL-GETTING STAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based Syllabi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency-oriented Instruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive Skills Integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method.</td>
<td>(Mutually skill-reinforcing activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximizing student participation.</td>
<td>SKILL-USING STAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The typical daily schedule for the VTT instruction and other activities were broken down into hourly frames in the following manner:

- Hour 1: CAS Review, Current Events
- Hour 2: Presentation of the Topics
- Hour 3: Thematic Exercises in LC, RC & and Speaking
- Hour 4: Interactive Communication, Reinforcement
- Hour 5: Student-generated Activities, Group Work
- Hour 6: Informal Evaluation and Feedback
- Hour 7: Homework, CAS

The major learning materials used in the course were:

- Instructional materials specifically designed for VTT instruction.
- The DLIFLC Korean Refresher Course materials.
- CAS Course materials
The types of materials transmitted via the VTT graphics projector or audiotape and videotape players during the VTT sessions included:

- Video tapes
- Audio tapes
- Maps
- Pictures
- Charts
- Advanced Organizers
  a. Question & Answer sheets;
  b. Match-up lists;
  c. Vocabulary lists;
  d. Grammar notes

The specific techniques that were to be used in the course to enhance the amount of teacher/student or student/student interaction in the course include:

- Instructor ———> Student: Q & A
- Student ———> Instructor: Q & A
- Student ———> Student: paired-activities
- Group activities: Problem solving
  Joint projects
  Debate, discussion

Steps taken to ensure that the course would meet the specific needs of the unit/students were based upon the DLPT scores of the students and upon brief VTT interviews of some of the students during a Saturday session, 6 April 1991.

Techniques used to maximize the effectiveness of the course, given the specific media available with the VTT, included the use of Audio-Visual teaching aids to enforce interactive communication and the devising of activities which were mutually reinforcing in terms of skill getting and skill using interactions among the students.

The Korean CAS/VTT course coordinator was Mrs. Alice Lee. Nine Korean faculty participated in the course development process. These included: S. Chang, J. Eehn, H. Ko, D. Lee, K. Lee, B. Park, J. Piccuta, S. Smith, and Y. Woo. The four on-camera VTT instructors were J. Eehn, H. Ko, K. Lee, and S. Smith. The VTT coordinators on equipment orientation and teaching strategies were Brigitta Ludgate and Kiril Boyadjieff. Mr. John Neff coordinated the course evaluation.
2. Lesson design

Six hours of VTT instruction were provided daily during the ten class days, 29-30 April, 1-3 May, and 6-10 May, 1991. Classes were taught from the DLIFLC VTT center. Technologies used included two-way, compressed audio/video, and graphics transmissions. The DLIFLC Korean Refresher Course was conducted in a classroom at the Language Training Facility, North Fort Lewis, Washington. Instruction started at 8:30 and ran until 15:30 with time out for breaks and lunch. The daily schedule of instruction is presented in Appendix B. A typical instructional day is illustrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic/Lesson</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS Review</td>
<td>At home/game site</td>
<td>Cultural Realia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Events</td>
<td>On vacation/at home</td>
<td>Role play, Q&amp;A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports/Leisure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Audio/Videotapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents/Natural</td>
<td>At scene of accident</td>
<td>LC/RC/Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disasters</td>
<td>fire, flood</td>
<td>Reinforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drought</td>
<td>Student generated activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal Eval. and Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS- Homework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teaching/learning activities included in the VTT portions of course were designed to optimize the use of the components available with the VTT medium, to lessen the perceived distance between the instructors and the students, to optimize the level of student/teacher and student/student interaction, and to facilitate the learning of the specific instructional content and objectives selected for the course.

CAS lessons were provided during 16:00 - 17:00 on 29-30 April, 1-3 May, and 6-8 May. CAS lessons were introduced during VTT segments and discussed in follow-up VTT sessions. Selected frames from the CAS lessons are included in Appendix C of this report. The courseware was developed by Mr. Hong of the DLIFLC Korean Department during Spring/Summer 1990 and was used in the Korean CAS pilot test Fall 1990.

The Korean language CAS courseware consists of a series of five lessons. Each lesson deals with a specific topic area. The topics are as follows:

Lesson 1: Military 1 - Korean position towards the U.S.
Lesson 2: Military 2 - Training, Tactics
Lesson 3: Weather - Broadcasts, Forecasts
Lesson 4: Travel - Transportation
Lesson 5: Health - Medicine, Public Health

A consistent lesson format is used for each of the above lessons. This format includes the following components:

1. Authentic Text/Scanning - reading a Korean text related to the topic being covered and answering questions on the content.
2. Controlled Level Paraphrase - reading a passage and answering questions on comprehension of the content.
3. Vocabulary Study - drill on Korean vocabulary items from the various reading passages.
4. Grammar Study - presentation of grammar points and drills on constructions.
5. Conversation Exercise - presentation of recorded dialogues with questions that require oral responses from the students.
6. Lesson Evaluation - Four-part, multiple-choice tests with 20 questions per lesson, that test the mastery of the lesson content in each of the lesson components, except for the conversation component.

B. Pilot Project Evaluation Design

1. Project Participants

The course participants included three Seattle/Tacoma area Korean MI linguists serving the 341st MI National Guard Battalion, Camp Murray, Tacoma, Washington. The guard personnel were serving their two weeks of active duty during the training period and were available for ten days of full-time training. Given that only three appropriate-level Korean linguists were available from the 341st, two additional students from the Fort Lewis 199th MI Battalion (active) were invited to participate in the class. The MOS of all five of the soldiers was 98G (voice interceptor). Thus the training was designed to focus on global reading, listening and speaking skills. Listening skills were emphasized both in the course and in the pre-post achievement test. The students are further described under the section of the report presenting data from the Student Background Questionnaire.
2. Evaluation Instruments

Copies of the evaluation instruments are included in Appendix A. The following instrumentation was developed for the project:

a. Site Form A: Baseline Data - Language Proficiency. On Form A the Fort Lewis site coordinator (person responsible for the day-to-day operation of the on-site program) was asked to list and describe the Korean linguists participating in the CAS/VTT Korean Refresher Course.

b. Site Form B: Current Language Program Description. On Form B the site coordinator was asked to provide information about the language training program available to Korean linguists in the participating units. This form was completed for both the 341st MI National Guard Battalion and the 199th MI Battalion.

c. Site Form C: Student Background Questionnaire. Form C was completed by the students during the initial day of class. On this form they recorded information about attendance at the DLIFLC, their DLPT scores, specific language skills they needed to address in language training, the progress hoped for in the two-week CAS/VTT Korean course, the level of personal priority they placed on Korean language training, and the amount of Korean language training they had received in the previous year.

d. Site Form D: VTT Instruction Log. A class leader was selected and asked to complete the VTT instruction logs for each morning and afternoon VTT session during the ten days of instruction. On this form the class leader listed the students in attendance, the teachers who presented, topics covered, problems with audio and video portions of the system, and the perceived quality of instruction. Instructional quality was rated on the following dimensions: presentation quality; student enthusiasm (motivation); quality of interaction; use of graphics and charts; relevancy of presentation; and wise use of available time.

e. Site Form E: Student Computer Instruction Log. Form E was designed to collect data about the use of the CAS lessons. On this form, students recorded their progress on the lessons and their lesson test scores.

f. Site Form F: CAS/VTT Student Questionnaire. Form F, adapted from a questionnaire listed in TRADOC Circular 351-87-1 pertaining to interactive courseware, was completed
by each of the students at the conclusion of the training. The questionnaire addressed the issues of appropriateness and value of the training, specific strengths and weaknesses, specific problems encountered with the technology, and overall impressions of the training.

**g. Site Form G: Site Coordinator Interview Form.** Form G was used for interviewing the site coordinator at the conclusion of the training period. The open-ended questions on the form addressed such issues as the appropriateness and value of the training relative to unit needs, adequacy of the training and documentation provided by DLIFLC to prepare the site coordinator for site management, identification and resolution of problems that occurred during training, and issues in local coordination and coordination of the project with the DLIFLC. The site coordinator was also asked to rate the quality of DLIFLC efforts on the project on a number of dimensions. The site coordinator was asked about likes and dislikes for aspects of the training and about the potential of VTT to serve future unit language training needs.

**h. Site Form H: Student Interview Form.** Form H was used for interviewing CAS/VTT course participants at the conclusion of the training period. The open-ended questions on the form addressed such issues as the relevance and appropriateness of the training to the student, understanding of the goals and purposes of the training, problems encountered, validity of the training, level of opportunity for interaction with the DLIFLC instructors, and aspects of local language training to which CAS and VTT are best suited.

**i. Form I: DLIFLC CAS/VTT Teacher Interview Form.** The DLIFLC Korean course instructors responded on this form after the completion of the course. Questions were included concerning the media and equipment, instructional strategies selected for the course and the success of each, suggestions for improving future CAS/VTT courses, amount of preparation time and training required for effective CAS/VTT teaching, technical support provided instructors during the course delivery, the relationship of student variables to instructional effectiveness, strengths and weaknesses of the CAS/VTT technologies, and advice for future developers and instructors of DLIFLC CAS/VTT courses.

**j. DLIFLC Course Description Form.** The Course Description Form provided a means to describe the CAS/VTT Korean course. Included were items such as: development team members, instructors, goal and objectives of the course, presentation/learning strategies employed, outline of the
daily schedule of activities, listing of learning materials used, methods to optimize the use of interaction in instruction, methods to ensure that the course met the specific needs of students, and techniques to maximize the use of the media available for VTT instruction.

k. Pre-Post Achievement Test. A 20-item achievement test was developed to measure the effectiveness of the Korean language course. The test consisted of 10-question sections measuring aural translation and listening comprehension. Students first listened via VTT to ten recorded sentences voiced in Korean and selected the best translation from four multiple choice answers. In the second exercise, students heard ten dialogues in Korean, voiced twice, and then answered comprehension questions pertaining to the dialogue in English. The pre and post versions of the test were identical.

3. Procedures, Data Collection, Scheduling

a. Data Sources

The project evaluation required data from three sources. These included the DLIFLC, the participating units (341st MI Bn, 199th MI Bn and I-Corps Language Training Program), and the site visit by the evaluator. The categories of data obtained from each source are listed below.

1) DLIFLC

a) Course description form
b) Copy of daily course schedule
c) Development of pre-post achievement test
d) Teacher interviews
e) Cost data

2) Participating Units

a) Baseline data - language proficiency
b) Current language program description
c) Student background questionnaire
d) VTT instruction logs
e) Computer instruction logs
f) CAS/VTT training questionnaire
g) Pre-post achievement test administration
h) Equipment/transmission trouble log
i) Cost data
3) Site Visits

Evaluator site visit including the following:

a) Site coordinator interview
b) Student interviews
c) Other site personnel interviews
d) Classroom observations

b. Procedures and Scheduling

The VTT portion of the Korean refresher course was held at the I-Corps Language Training Facility at North Fort Lewis, Washington. Training originated from the VTT Center on the campus of the Defense Language Institute, Foreign Language Center at the Presidio of Monterey, California. A pilot test evaluation notebook (Bramble, March, 1990) and the evaluation forms were sent by mail to the Fort Lewis Language Training Facility. Mr. John Neff of the DLIFLC telephoned the facility director, Ms. Yvonne Pawelek, and the 341st training officer, Captain Mary Forbes, prior to the start of the course. They discussed the procedures for collecting the locally-gathered portions of the evaluation data. Ms. Pawelek oversaw the completion of the forms and assigned a senior class member to record the observations on the Daily VTT Instruction Logs.

The IST evaluator, Dr. William Bramble, visited the classroom site on 9-10 May. At this time, he conducted the classroom observations and collected the remaining site data for the evaluation.

Supervision of the data collection at the DLIFLC and coordination with Fort Lewis personnel were provided by Mr. John Neff, director of External Evaluation at the DLIFLC.

C. Cost Model

The cost model provides a means to calculate the cost of the CAS/VTT, as implemented in the pilot test. It takes into account each of the activities in developing and implementing the training. When the appropriate data are entered into the model, it will be possible to calculate the costs of each of the separate activities involved in the project: development; course delivery; course implementation on-site; and evaluation. In addition, the model allows for the calculation of projected costs for larger scale development and implementation efforts and for comparison to alternative forms of de-
livering the training (e.g., Mobile Training Teams (MTTs), local classroom delivery, etc.).

1. Specification of Cost Model and Components

The cost model relates the components of developing and implementing VTT to the total cost of the project. The general model is given as:

$$ C = DE + CD_i + SO_i + EV $$

The variables in the model are defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>total cost of the VTT project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>cost of developing the courseware including planning, design, development, and in-process revision. This is computed as the sum of DE (CAS) and DE (VTT), the costs of developing the two course components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD_i</td>
<td>course delivery cost for site i including such factors as site coordinator training, courseware delivery and installation, field support, teaching site equipment and communications, program coordination and travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO_i</td>
<td>site operating costs for site i including personnel costs, site equipment, supplies, contractual expenses, telephone, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV</td>
<td>cost of the project evaluation including related costs at the DLIFLC, the site, and the contractual assistance costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Cost Data Collection Procedures

The Resource Management unit at the DLIFLC was asked to provide the relevant cost data for DLIFLC expenditures for the project. Additional data regarding time assigned to the project are being obtained from the project staff. Site cost data were obtained from the instruction logs, the site coordinator and other Fort Lewis personnel.

Costs will be obtained for each variable above by adding the relevant costs in each of the conventional cost
categories: personnel, travel, contractual, supplies, and equipment. Complete data for the cost analysis are not available at this time. They will be presented in a separate report scheduled for completion at a later date.

3. Specification of Comparison Alternatives

Potential comparison alternatives for the overall distance education pilot test project will include (as data allow) Computer Assisted Study (CAS), video teletraining (VTT), combined CAS/VTT, mobile training teams (MTTs), and local training options.
Section III. RESULTS

A. Baseline Data

1. Linguist Proficiency and Other Student Background Information

There were five enlisted personnel, three from the 341st MI National Guard Battalion and two from the Fort Lewis 199th MI Bn, who participated in the Korean VTT training. All five students reported that they were graduates of the DLIFLC Korean program. The students reported that they had between 1.9 and 11 years experience as military linguists (average 6.05 years). The MOS of all of the students was 98G, voice interceptor.

The reported listening, reading and speaking Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) scores of the participating students are depicted in Table 1. Note that the earliest DLIFLC graduates in the class took a previous form of the DLPT which is reportedly somewhat easier than the current version.

Table 1
Student DLPT Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Number</th>
<th>DLIFLC Completion</th>
<th>DLPT Scores</th>
<th>Most Recent Scores</th>
<th>Most DLPT Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KP1</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2,2,1+</td>
<td>10/90</td>
<td>2,2,na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP2</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2,2,1+</td>
<td>12/91</td>
<td>1+,1+,na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP3</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>2,2,1+</td>
<td>12/90</td>
<td>1+,1+,na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP4</td>
<td>1983,1989</td>
<td>2,2,na</td>
<td>10/90</td>
<td>1,1+,na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP5</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>3,3,na</td>
<td>04/91</td>
<td>1,1,na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recent listening and reading proficiency of the students ranged from 1,1 to 2,2. This represented an average 1.6 step decline in listening proficiency and an average 1.4 step decline in reading proficiency compared to DLPT proficiency levels at the time of DLIFLC completion. DLPT speaking proficiency scores were only available for three of the students at the time of DLIFLC completion. All reportedly scored at the 1+ level. Three of the students stated that they felt that their language proficiency was unchanged since the time of the last DLPT testing. Two stated that their proficiency levels had declined somewhat.
On the Student Background Questionnaire, the course participants were asked to rate (on a five-point scale) the priority they personally placed upon improving their Korean language skills. The two active military personnel stated that they placed a "very high priority" or "high priority" on this improvement. One of the three National Guard personnel chose the "very high priority" option, and two chose the second highest option, "high priority". Students listed the following areas they needed to address in language training (frequency of responses in parentheses):

- Speaking (3)
- Listening comprehension (2)
- Listening comprehension - phrases (retention and call-back) (2)
- Listening comprehension - long passages
- Grammar, grammar rules (2)
- Reading - vocabulary and grammar
- Reading
- Chinese characters - mastery of Hanja
- Interaction with a native speaker
- Vocabulary

Students were also asked on the Background Questionnaire what specific progress they hoped to make in the 10-day CAS/VTT Korean course. They responded as follows:

- Refresh myself in Korean.
- Hopefully, be able to speak on a basic level more clearly and make progress to the 2/2 level.
- Bring listening and reading skills back up.
- Better retention and call back of phrases heard.
- Improved proficiency in all areas.

The students indicated that they had received varying amounts of language training in the past year. The two active personnel reported 40 hrs. and 600 hrs. of training time. The guard personnel reported 14, 32 and 56 hrs. of training in the previous year. All indicated that they had received this training at the Fort Lewis Language Training Facility. When asked whether they had any prior experience in using computers, one of the students chose the option "a little", three chose "some", and one chose "a lot". However, all five of the students indicated that they had not previously received language instruction through either computers or television.
2. Training Options Available

Soldiers from two MI units participated in the training, the 199th MI Bn (active) and the 341st National Guard MI Bn. Data regarding training options are reported separately for the two groups.

a. 199th MI Bn, Fort Lewis

The members of the 199th MI Bn receive their language training through the I-Corps Language Training Program managed by Ms. Yvonne Pawelek. The contractor providing the training is Central Texas College and the contract training manager is Ms. Cathy Grism. Two Korean language instructors, Mrs. Song Burrows and Ms. Nan McCaffrey, are available to instruct soldiers in the unit. Under the contract, each instructor must be 1) an educated native speaker (at least a high school graduate), 2) score a 3/3 or better on the DLPT in the native language, 3) pass an interview with the DLIFLC, 4) have some prior teaching experience, 5) speak/understand English grammar, and 6) attend 80 hours of prescribed training prior to teaching.

The Fort Lewis Language Training Facility provides 205 hours of Korean language training each year. All of the 199th MI Bn Korean linguists were reported to participate in at least a portion of this training each year. The training program is designed to address all levels of relevant Korean language proficiency. Korean language training materials available at the facility include the following: DLIFLC Korean Gateway, DLIFLC Korean FLAMRIC, and DLIFLC Korean Basic Course. Options available to the soldiers are a four-week intensive refresher course at the facility and a two-week refresher course at Brigham Young University. A modest amount of technology is available at the center to support instruction. This includes videotape players and several EIDS computers. Access to SCOLA satellite video programming is available. This year through the CAS and VTT pilot tests with the DLIFLC, six Macintosh computers are available at the 201st MI Bn language training center on the main post of Fort Lewis. The video teletraining equipment has been placed in a first floor classroom at the Language Training Facility on North Fort Lewis.

b. 341st Washington National Guard MI Bn

Information on the training options available to the members of the 341st MI Battalion was provided by Ms. Yvonne
Pawelek and Captain Mary Forbes. Captain Forbes indicated that language training is a top priority for linguists in the battalion. Specifically, each soldier receives training six hours per month (for 11 months of the year) during monthly weekend duty. During their two weeks per year of active duty each soldier receives 10 days of language training, six hours per day (total of 60 hours). Prior to the availability of VTT training, language training has been provided to 341st MI linguists by instructors at the I-Corps Language Training Facility. Some of the 341st linguists have attended the Brigham Young University language refresher course during their two weeks of annual training.

Only a portion of the 341st MI Battalion linguists are DLIFLC graduates and there is a wide range of language proficiency represented in the battalion. Non-DLIFLC graduates have typically received some type of preparation or instruction in their target languages, but they depend upon the unit training to improve their skills. Guard linguists are rarely able to attend the DLIFLC as part of their National Guard service. Some are able to attend Fort Huachuca for interrogator training. The unit currently has only two Korean linguists (native speakers) above the 2+ level. Most instruction provided to the soldiers is at the 1/1 to 2/2 levels.

At the battalion headquarters, located a few blocks from the Language Training Facility on North Fort Lewis, there are a number of language training materials available for the soldiers to check out for study. These include DLIFLC refresher courses, DLIFLC FLAMRIC courses, English-Korean and Korean-English dictionaries, "201 Korean Verbs Fully Conjugated," and military-related language training materials. For the new fiscal year, the battalion has ordered additional dictionaries and reference guides for Korean. These materials are also available for the other three Pacific Rim languages of primary focus for the unit. Soldiers can also request additional DLIFLC nonresident training materials after they have taken the DLPT. The unit has some videotaped materials, e.g., Russian language material related to treaty activities and developed by BYU. It also has access to SCOLA video through the I-Corps satellite dish.

The I-Corps language training program, to which the 341st has access, is stated to be excellent in comparison to other FORSCOM command language training programs. The Washington National Guard representatives feel fortunate to
have such an excellent language training resource so close at hand, at least for the personnel stationed in the Seattle/Tacoma area. Those who live in the Spokane area in the eastern part of the state of Washington are less fortunate in this regard. Since the target languages for MI linguists at Fort Lewis and the 341st MI Battalion are Korean, Chinese, Russian, and Tagalog, the training resources for these languages are somewhat greater than for other languages. Because of the number and proficiency levels of students available for Korean instruction, there is some opportunity for grouping students. Language instruction is available on a contract basis both for weekend and annual training.

Instructional technology available to the 341st MI Bn includes the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audiotape players</td>
<td>Each company has 10 or more (30 total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotape players</td>
<td>Each company has at least two with monitors -- the Spokane company has a large-screen TV. The battalion has 12 VCRs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>Three EIDS machines -- one each at Camp Murray, Seattle, and Spokane. Hope to increase to five per location. Have Spanish software, CALLIS, authorware and some miscellaneous language courseware. The 341st also has one Zenith computer. I-Corps has 6 Macintosh computers on loan from DLI/FLC. These were used in the Korean CAS/VTT training. The LTF also has two Zeniths and one Macintosh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video disc</td>
<td>EIDS has video disc capability, have copy of German Velvet program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satellite dish Available through I-Corps
Other Two camcorders, total of three large screen TVs, 45" screen.

B. Video Teletraining Component

1. VTT Equipment/Transmission Reliability

a. CAS/VTT Student Questionnaire

Responses to five VTT equipment items from the CAS/VTT Student Questionnaire are summarized in Table 2. Items 4 and 7 are rated on a 5-point scale with 5 being the highest response. (Note: here as elsewhere in the report, questionnaire items have been reflected, if necessary, so that positive ratings are always represented by larger numbers.)

Table 2
VTT Equipment and Transmission Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Average/Percent Yes</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. VTT Equipment and Course Material Ease of Use (Five-point scale)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reliability of VTT Equipment Compared with Other Training Equipment</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Site Coordinator Ability to Operate and Troubleshoot Equipment</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Not Hampered or Distracted By Type of Video Used in VTT</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. VTT Audio or Video Technical Problems Do Not Hamper or Detract from its Effectiveness</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The VTT equipment (item 4) was rated quite easy to use (average rating of 4.6 on a five-point scale with 5 = highest). Compared with other training equipment that the students have used, the reliability of the equipment for VTT (item 7) is rated (average of 4.2) as better than other training equipment. Four of the five students indicated (item 25) that they felt that the site coordinator was able to operate and troubleshoot the VTT classroom equipment.

Four of the five students (item 27) felt somewhat hampered or distracted by the type of video (compressed) used in the VTT for the following reasons:

- Headaches and tiredness (2)
- The focus, the lag time in movement were distracting and hard on eyes, and it was difficult to get used to (2)

From the site VTT equipment trouble log, it was found that only three outages were reported. The system was operational for approximately 58 of the 60 planned VTT instruction hours. Thus, system reliability was approximately 97%.

One of the five students indicated (item 28) that they were sometimes hampered or distracted by technical problems with the VTT. The student commented that some audio problems occurred due to transmission lag time when instructors and students ended up talking on top of each other. If microphones were left open by a student, the background noise would override the instructors signal.

b. Site Coordinator Interview

Item 4 on the site coordinator interview form addressed equipment reliability. The response to the item was as follows.

"What specific problems did you encounter in using the computer and VTT hardware during the training?"

"We experienced VTT outages three times. Sometimes we would see, but not hear. After an outage we would fiddle with the Hughes equipment and reboot the Rembrandt. The system worked then, but we don't know why. We go through the troubleshooting procedures and it works."

Were these problems resolved? "Yes"

How could these problems be avoided in the future?
"We don't know enough about the VTT equipment yet. Maybe it is the humidity here. We should look at getting a contractor with the requirement to rove and troubleshoot. Julio (from the VTT equipment contractor - Oklahoma State University) will come here in a week to check out the equipment. The Oklahoma State University and the Ft. Eustis technical support services have improved. Various people have been helpful. Technical sophistication is improving here on site."
2. VTT Log Results

SITE FORM D: VTT INSTRUCTION LOG

Table 3 depicts the median, average, and standard deviation for the instructional quality ratings on the VTT Instruction Logs. Items were rated on a 1 to 5 scale from low to high respectively. Table 3 presents item medians and averages across the ten instructional days.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average VTT Instructional Ratings</th>
<th>Medain</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>St.Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Quality</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Enthusiasm</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Interaction with DLIFLC Instructors</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor's use of graphics/charts</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevancy of presentation</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise use of available time</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typical responses reported in Table 3 center on "average" to "above average" ratings (3 to 4 on a five point scale with a rating of 5 highest). The highest rating concerned interaction with the DLIFLC instructors. It should be noted that the VTT Instruction Log ratings were provided by a single class member chosen as the class leader. Thus they are only partially representative of the perceptions of all the class members.
3. Pre-Post Achievement Test

Table 4 depicts the results of the Korean CAS/VTT pre and post achievement tests.

Table 4
Average Pre-Post Achievement Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Number</th>
<th>Pre Part Test (Total)</th>
<th>Post Part Test (Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre One</td>
<td>Part Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Dev.</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The achievement test consisted of two portions utilizing multiple choice and completion formats. Part one (multiple choice) tested translation skills by asking students to listen to a Korean voice and select the best translation of a sentence. Part two (completion) tested listening comprehension by having students listen to a Korean passage twice and then answer questions concerning the dialogue. As seen in Table 4, pre-post improvement did occur. Students averaged 11.2 items correct (56%) on the pretest and 14.4 correct (72%) on the posttest. The average pre-post improvement was 16%. Improvement occurred on both part one and part two of the test. However, students generally performed better on translation items than on listening comprehension. The average translation scores improved from 70% to 82%. Average listening comprehension score improved from 42% to 62%. The small sample size does not allow for statistical tests of significance in comparing the pre-post achievement test scores.
C. Computer Assisted Study Component

1. CAS Equipment Reliability

a. CAS/VTT Student Questionnaire

Table 5 depicts data from the CAS/VTT Student Questionnaire regarding the reliability of the CAS computer equipment.

Table 5
CAS Equipment Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Stand. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. CAS Equipment and Course Material Ease of Use (Five point scale, 5 = highest)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reliability of CAS Computer Equipment (Five point scale)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Did Not Experience Problems with Computer Equipment or Software in CAS (Percent Yes)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Computer Equipment Available and Operational (Percent Yes)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Knowledgeable Person Available at Computer Learning Center Assisting with Technical Difficulties of CAS (Percent Yes)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CAS equipment (item 5) was rated as easy to use (average rating of 4.00 on a five-point scale with 5 highest). The reliability of CAS computer equipment (item 8) was rated as "somewhat better" than other computer equipment (average rating of 4.00). Only one of the five students (item 30) reported problems using the CAS computer equipment. All five students (item 33) reported that the computer equipment was available and operational when they were scheduled to use it. The student responding "No" on item 30 commented that two computers would not accept typing input in grammar.
sections. All five students (item 34) reported that the 201st MI Bdge representative, CW2 Jones, assisting them with the CAS equipment was knowledgeable about the technology. It should be noted that Mr. Jones was the site coordinator for an earlier pilot testing of the Korean CAS courseware at Fort Lewis.

b. Student Interviews

The Student Interview Form included one question pertaining to the CAS reliability.

"Did you experience technical problems with the CAS equipment or software? Please explain."

Four of the students reported experiencing some technical problems. Their responses were as follows.

"No, the CAS was easy. I have worked with computers a bit in the past. Mr. Jones was there to introduce us to the computers on the first day and for assistance after that. The cursor didn't blink on two machines. I could not type in words in the grammar section."

"The problem was that after staring at video all day, looking at the small Macintosh screen was difficult."

"When I got to CAS at end of day, my eyes weren't able to focus well after watching the rather fuzzy VTT all day."

"The system shutdown was hard, the cursor didn't work on two computers, when we had to type in a sentence we heard pronounced. There wasn't a major problem."

"The computer keyboard locked during grammar lesson input. The difficulty of the lessons varies. Mr. Jones' help was quite adequate."

"The CAS lessons were pretty limited. After a while, I memorized the answers rather than learning the material."
2. CAS Log Results

Students were to record each day's CAS participation on the CAS Instruction Log. The median reported lesson completion times varied from one to two hours and were as follows: lesson 1, 60 minutes; lesson 2, 120 minutes; lesson 3, 60 minutes; lesson 4, 70 minutes; and lesson 5, 80 minutes. The average time to complete all five lessons was 430.7 minutes or 7.07 hours. Table 6 depicts the results of the lesson evaluations recorded on the CAS logs. Note: not all students reported test scores.

Table 6
SITE FORM E: STUDENT COMPUTER INSTRUCTION LOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAS Lesson #</th>
<th>Average Lesson Subtest Score</th>
<th>Total 20 items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-item Listening 5-item Key Word Test 5-item Phrase 5-item Paragraph Ident. Compre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Military 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average #</td>
<td>90.00% 100.00% 70.00% 90.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Reporting</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Military 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average #</td>
<td>80.00% 93.30% 93.30% 66.67%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Reporting</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Weather</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average #</td>
<td>60.00% 100.00% 80.00% 90.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Reporting</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td>97.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average #</td>
<td>100.00% 100.00% 100.00% 90.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Reporting</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>88.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average #</td>
<td>80.00% 80.00% 100.00% 93.30%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Reporting</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>82.00% 94.67% 88.66% 85.99% 87.82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 6, the overall post test score (20-item test was 87.82%). Average post test scores for the individual CAS lessons varied from 83.32% on lesson 2 to 97.50% on lesson 4. There was variability in the average
scores on the lesson subtests. These values ranged from 82.00% on part 1 (listening) to 94.67% on part 2 (key words) when averaged across all five CAS lessons.

Students only took the lesson tests as post tests. Thus, the level of gain from the lessons could not be determined. Interestingly, the CAS post test scores were quite similar to those of the Fort Ord 107th MI group who studied the Korean CAS lessons during the Fall 1990 Korean CAS pilot test. A comparison of the current group of students to the Fort Ord group may shed some light on the issue of achievement gains related to CAS. Table 7 presents these results for comparison purposes. In general, the post test scores of the current group were quite similar to, although not quite as high as, those of the earlier group who had spent more time studying the CAS lessons. The Fort Ord students gained an average of 29.3% from pre to post testing.

Table 7
Comparison of CAS test scores of Korean CAS and Korean CAS/VTT Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAS Lesson #</th>
<th>CAS/VTT Group (Fort Lewis) Post Test</th>
<th>CAS Group (Fort Ord) Pretest</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Mean</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>68.15%</td>
<td>88.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mean</td>
<td>83.32%</td>
<td>65.93%</td>
<td>92.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mean</td>
<td>82.50%</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>90.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mean</td>
<td>97.50%</td>
<td>76.25%</td>
<td>97.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Mean</td>
<td>88.32%</td>
<td>64.88%</td>
<td>95.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>87.82%</td>
<td>68.90%</td>
<td>92.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. User Receptivity

1. CAS/VTT Student Questionnaire

Students filled out the Korean CAS/VTT Questionnaire on the final day of the training. For ease of presentation, questionnaire items are grouped into three categories representing the various aspects of the course: general perceptions, video teletraining, and computer assisted study. Tables 8 through 10 depict the questionnaire data from these three categories.

Table 8 presents the results for nine items that address general perceptions about the course. Item ratings were on a five point scale. For all items a rating of 5 is highest and a rating of 1 is lowest.
Table 8
General Perceptions about the CAS/VTT Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Help Me Perform My Job Better</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Make Me More Proficient in My MOS</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CAS/VTT as Compared to Other Army Training Received</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Would like to Use CAS/VTT for Other Language Related Training</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Advise Friend to Use vs. an Alternative Method Covering the Same Material</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Applicability of CAS/VTT Applicable to Job</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Quality of Training by CAS/VTT vs. Locally Available Training</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Speed of Learning Skills by CAS/VTT</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Effectiveness of CAS/VTT Holding Attention</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students agreed (average response 3.60 on item 1) with the statement that the CAS/VTT training will help them perform their jobs better. A similar average rating (3.40) was obtained for item 2 which addressed the degree to which CAS/VTT training made the students more proficient in their MOS. The students felt (average rating of 3.80 on item 3) that CAS/VTT training ranks high compared to other Army training that they had received. Students felt (average of 3.40 on item 6) that much of what they learned could be
applied on the job. Students reported that they would like to use the CAS/VTT for other language related training (average rating of 4.20 on item 9). Item 10 addressed advising a friend who had a choice between a course using CAS/VTT and a course that covered the same material, without CAS and VTT, the student average response (4.00) was to "request the CAS/VTT course, if convenient." On item 14, students rated the quality of the training provided by CAS/VTT as "better than" (average rating of 3.80) other available language related training by contract instructors. A rating of 3.60 on item 15 indicated that students felt they learned "somewhat faster" via CAS/VTT in comparison to local language training. CAS/VTT classes were rated (average of 3.40 on item 16) between "somewhat better" and "about the same" in their effectiveness in holding students attention as compared to other language related training.
Table 9 depicts the average ratings for nine items related to specific features of VTT. All items except #12 are questions requiring a Yes or No response. Item 12 was rated on a five point scale with 5 = very difficult, 3 = about the same, and 1 = very easy.

**Table 9**  
*Student Questionnaire: Videoteletraining Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean/Percent Yes</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Difficulty Level of VTT Compared to Proficiency Level (Five Point Scale)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Comfort with Format of Class Sessions (Percent Yes)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Sufficient Opportunity to Interact with Instructors (Percent Yes)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher Competence and Well Preparedness (Percent Yes)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Teacher Use of Charts, Maps, or Other Visuals (Percent Yes)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Teachers Provide Accurate Useful Responses to Questions (Percent Yes)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Teachers Good Use of Interactive Capabilities of Two-way Television (Percent Yes)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Print Support Materials Adequacy and High Quality (Percent Yes)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Percentage of Classes Attended (All Students)</td>
<td>98.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results in Table 9 are summarized below.

Relative to the students' individual proficiency in Korean, and the targeted language proficiency level of the VTT lessons (item 12), students rated the course 4.00 "somewhat difficult."

On item 17, three of the five students felt comfortable with the VTT classroom while two did not. In support of the latter responses, the following comments were made:

"No audiences, please. It's distracting and makes me self-conscious and uncomfortable."

"During the afternoon sessions it was difficult to keep my attention on the teachers."

"While I became somewhat more comfortable as the course progressed, I disliked being on TV with people I didn't know, and couldn't see, watching me."

On item 19, all five students felt that they were provided sufficient opportunity to interact with VTT instructors. One student commented that interrupting the instructors was difficult, given the strict formality of the syllabus structure. He/she would have preferred more informal interactions. Another student commented that the opportunity for interrupting the instructors was there, but not always taken.

Teachers were reported (100% Yes to item 20) to be competent and well-prepared for the class sessions. Teachers were also found (100% Yes to item 21) to make proper use of charts, maps, or other visual aids in the presentations.

All students felt (item 22) that VTT teachers provided accurate and useful responses to questions. One student commented that sometimes a student would ask for the English and not get it, or that teachers would correct student responses before they could finish their answer.

VTT teachers (item 23, 100% Yes) were reported to make good use of the interactive capabilities of two-way television. The print support materials (item 24, 100% Yes) provided for the sessions were adequate and of high quality. The overall attendance rate for the VTT classes was found to be 98.82%. 
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Five items on the Student Questionnaire related to the Computer Assisted Study portion of the course. Question 13 was rated on a five point scale. Questions 18, 29, 31, and 32 were Yes/No questions. The results for these items are depicted in Table 10.

Table 10
Computer Assisted Study Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean/Percent</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Difficulty of Korean Language Proficiency Required for CAS Lessons (5 = very difficult)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Comfortable with Computer Lessons (Percent Yes)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Received Adequate Training in Use of Computer Equipment (Percent Yes)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Content Appropriately Supported Overall Proposed Learnings (Percent Yes)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Material Covered Appropriate to Your Needs and Proficiency (Percent Yes)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average level of difficulty (item 13) for the Korean language proficiency required for the CAS lessons was 3.40. This was between "somewhat difficult" (4) and "about right" (3). All of the students (item 18) felt comfortable with the computer lessons, but two students made the comment that more software/lessons are needed for the CAS to reach its potential.

Students stated (item 29) that they received adequate training in the use of computer equipment. They also stated
(item 31) that the content of the CAS lessons appropriately supported what they were learning in the overall CAS/VTT course. Four of the five students found that the material covered by CAS was appropriate to their needs and proficiency levels (item 32).

Items 35 and 36 on the Student Questionnaire addressed overall impressions of the CAS/VTT. They required narrative responses from the students. The results for these questions are summarized below, with the number of common responses in parenthesis.

Item 35. The aspects most liked about CAS/VTT listed in order of common responses:

- VTT Instructors (5)
- Interaction in Korean with VTT teachers (3)
- CAS immediate feedback (1)
- The types of lessons (1)
- New and interesting technology and graphics (1)
- Role playing by VTT instructors (1)
- Special guests on VTT (1)

Item 36. The aspects not liked about the CAS/VTT were as follows:

- Observation by onlookers at both ends of VTT (3)
- Cramped positioning of the VTT classroom seats (2)
- Limited CAS software/lessons (1)
- Headaches attributed to the VTT (1)
- Constraint on VTT teachers regarding time (1)
- Role play required by students in VTT without sufficient directions (1)
- VTT delayed audio response (1)
- VTT video not of high resolution (1)

Item 37 asked students to rank which method of training would be preferred when language related training is provided in the future. A rank of one is highest while seven is lowest. The items were ranked, based upon average responses, as follows:

a) On-base instruction from a local instructor - 2.00
b) TDY to another location to obtain the training - 2.40
c) Videoteletraining supplemented by Computer Assisted Study (CAS/VTT) - 3.00 (tie)
d) Mobile Training Team from DLIFLC - 3.00 (tie)
e) Video Teletraining (VTT) from the Defense Language Institute (no computer portion) - 3.20
f) Computer-based instruction (no VTT portion) - 5.60

g) Self-study package using print materials/audio tapes - 6.80

These results indicate that on-base instruction from a local instructor and TDY to study at another location were most favored. Self-study packages using print materials/audio tapes was least favored. VTT/CAS, MTTs, and VTT were ranked relatively high. CAS by itself is ranked relatively low, but CAS alone would be perceived by the students as serving a more restricted (supplemental) purpose than the other options.

2. Student Interviews

Interviews of the five students were completed by the IST evaluator during the site visit. The interview responses are summarized below.

Question 1. Were the goals and objectives of the CAS and VTT lessons made clear to you?

Four of the students felt that the goals and objectives of the CAS and VTT lessons were made clear while one did not. The latter student commented as follows:

"VTT goals and objectives were not formally addressed. We had a class schedule. I had a hard time then getting into the Korean language. For CAS - the goals and objectives were shown on the computer."

Question 2. Was the lesson content appropriate to your needs (CAS and VTT)?

Four stated that the lesson content was appropriate and one did not feel it was appropriate. Comments were as follows:

"Although more military content would have been good."

(2)

"A good tool, needs improvement."

Question 3. How were you helped by the CAS/VTT training?

"Gain in speaking proficiency. This is a priority for me. CAS was too short though."
"My Korean was idle prior to this time. The VTT course brought back speaking rhythm. The presentation of vocabulary was helpful at the beginning of the course. On the first day, I was a bit intimidated by the hardware and the people watching. After half a day or so, I felt more comfortable."

"The VTT course revived some of my Korean. My skills had suffered because of a lack of practice, speaking, listening."

"VTT was valuable in refreshing my ears to Korean. Hearing it constantly helps. The VTT course refreshed vocabulary. With CAS, I sometimes memorized the responses in sequence, rather than learning the material."

"VTT was a valuable refresher. It brought me back into the flow of the language. I (Guard member) don't get to use Korean much in civilian life. My skills have been fading."

Question 4. Did you attend all of the VTT lessons? If not, how many did you miss? Why?

Four of the five students reported that they attended all the lessons while one missed half a day.

Question 5. Did you encounter any problems in fully participating in the VTT lessons?

"Sometimes there was a microphone switching problem. The fact that there was an audience at the studio at the DLIFLC was intimidating. The level of instruction was challenging, but OK. I experienced headaches after lunch (around 2 p.m.) or when the video was fluttery. The videotapes (shown over the VTT) were sometimes fuzzy. The classroom (at Fort Lewis) was cramped. It was hard to see past the other students."

"The VTT system was OK. The instructors spoke clearly. The presentation was simplified."

"The instructors asked questions of the group. Then if no one answered, they called on individuals. The only problem was that some students were too long-winded."

"I felt a bit intimidated by the visitors we had here and the interruptions. Sometimes I felt I was in a fish
bowl. The teachers from the DLIFLC were all good. With the LTP here (at Fort Lewis), they are very strict about interruptions. When you learn a language, you need to be able to make mistakes, etc. It is uncomfortable to make mistakes in front of visitors."

"Today (10 May) the system was down for 5 minutes. On the morning of 2 May, we experienced an outage of one and one-half hours in the morning. After lunch on that same day there was an outage of 10 minutes at beginning."

"VTT is tiring after so many hours. I was exhausted at end of day."

"VTT was fast paced, and it was sometimes hard to keep up. Watching the TV screen so many hours was tiring. At the end of the day, I sometimes experienced headaches. The compressed video format seemed to cause this."

Question 6. Do you feel that video teletraining is valid, despite the fact that the teacher is not physically present on-site?

All five students agreed with the statement that video teletraining is a valid method of language training. Comments were as follows:

"I like (VTT instruction from the DLIFLC) better than that from the on-site instructors. I like using the new technology. I have attended three LTP one-month training sessions which were more game-oriented, more elementary. VTT instruction is fast-paced and graphic, etc. We were lost sometimes, but could help each other out."

"You can still learn (with VTT) the same way as with an instructor present. It is the best solution if the local program doesn't have the necessary instructors. There is a clear purpose, variety, and extra resources. VTT is good for shorter courses that are more targeted training - proficiency or content-wise."

"VTT is valid, but I would prefer a live teacher. The quality is better from the DLIFLC, but some of the teachers here are also good. There are trade-offs."

"As long as VTT is live, it is the same as the teachers being here."
"VTT is the same as the classroom environment. However, the length of day sometimes exceeded my attention span. This is true in any classroom, but somewhat less so with a live teacher. So it's harder."

"The live classroom is better, but VTT is a good substitute, given the same quality. If VTT is compared to Ft. Lewis instruction - it depends on the teacher here. Some teachers we have had here are as good as those at the DLIFLC. For more specialized military training, the DLIFLC is better."

Question 7. Would you like to participate in additional video teletraining?

All five students stated that they would like to participate in additional videoteletraining. One student reported preferring a live teacher, although he felt VTT was a fine resource. If a VTT course is what's available, he stated he would take it.

Question 8. For what specific aspects of language training do you feel VTT is best suited? Responses were as follows:

- **Listening** (3)
- **Speaking practice, gateway** (3)
- **Vocabulary, grammar** (more elaborate explanations)
- **Generic training, rather than MOS procedures that are classified, access to quality of instructors at the DLIFLC** (2)

Question 9. Do you feel that you were provided an adequate opportunity to interact with the VTT instructors? Please comment.

All of the students felt they were provided adequate opportunity to interact with the VTT instructors. They commented as follows:

"But the teachers sometimes seemed to be on a tight, inflexible schedule. (One student) was on a roll, but they needed to cut him off because of the time limit. There is also a cultural factor. In Korea, a student simply doesn't interrupt a teacher, even though a teacher may have said to do it."

"Having an audience at (the VTT center at) the DLIFLC was intimidating. The classroom was cramped; it was hard to see past the other students."
"The teachers said anytime you want to interrupt, do so."

"The opportunity was there. Students didn't take as much advantage of it as they could have. They were sometimes inhibited by their speaking skill or a lack of comprehension of the subject. We had to rely on each other quite a bit in clarifying what was said/wanted. Presenting more vocabulary ahead of time would have helped."

Question 10. Which of the CAS lessons did you complete?

Students attempted most of the CAS lessons. Lessons 1-5 were attempted by four of the five students while one student concentrated on Lessons 2 and 5. Comments concerning the CAS lessons were as follows:

"We weren't assigned a particular lesson. My choices were 2 and 5. I chose lesson 2 to prepare for the upcoming Language Olympics at Fort Lewis."

"The CAS lessons weren't much of a challenge."

"Reading exercises were easy. It was also easy to memorize the answers. But I have more trouble with speaking/listening skills."

Question 12. How were you helped by the CAS training?

"Reading and listening skills, maybe. Military terminology and the other topics. Since the VTT was so global, CAS should maybe have emphasized military aspects more."

"CAS helped reinforce vocabulary from VTT. For speaking, it didn't help."

"The grammar portion of the CAS lessons didn't work."

"CAS helped with vocabulary. Speaking exercises were not effective for me."

"In the listening portions, some of vowels were not distinguishable. For speaking, I need a live teacher. In CAS, I couldn't tell the difference between my own recorded voice and the model. But I thought that the voice quality from computer was amazingly clear."
"CAS vocabulary and reading lessons were somewhat of a help. CAS needs more lessons to be effective. That type of training gets boring in large time blocks. In smaller ones, it's OK."

Question 13. Would you like to participate in additional CAS language training?

Four of the students stated that they would like to participate in additional CAS language training. One stated that he/she would not. Comments were as follows:

"I am lukewarm on the CAS. It's focus is reading. My priority is more on listening and speaking."

"I like CAS for reading; VTT for speaking/listening."

"If CAS had more lessons and more than one lesson per subject it would be better. There is currently so little content, that we could memorize the answers to questions without learning the material. Also, the lesson tests are presented in the same order all the time. It is too easy to memorize the answers. In concept, I am interested in CAS for the reading aspect. For listening, it's not much help in its current form. It doesn't handle speaking well."

Question 14. For what specific aspects of language training do you feel that CAS is best suited?

Reading (3)

"It's best for vocabulary building, listening, number drills. We could learn a lot of this without the help of an instructor, as with VTT. But the number drills need to be faster."

"Speaking requires more refined feedback, speaking is better done on VTT."

"CAS will help with listening, if you know vocabulary in context and idiom."

"Grammar and vocabulary study. For interaction, the VTT is better."

Question 15. Do you feel that the combination of CAS and VTT is superior to one of these types of training by itself? Why or Why not?
All five students felt that the combination of CAS and VTT was superior to either of these types of training by itself. The following comments resulted:

"The CAS focus is on reading. The VTT focus is on listening and speaking. But the timing was bad. We had VTT all day, then drove to the 201st to sit in front of a mini-screen. By then, I was burned out. I liked the VTT really well."

"For basic Korean- the VTT alone is OK. In other cases use the CAS and VTT together, but don't have them duplicate each other. VTT could be used for basic Korean, and CAS more for military themes across the year. Together, they make a good combination, if used appropriately. But basic language instruction via CAS wouldn't work as well. The needs are too broad."

"Would like to have CAS in the morning. After watching TV all day, the CAS screen in black and white tended to fade out. With VTT, the teachers can keep you awake."

"CAS wasn't well integrated with the VTT (only briefly mentioned in VTT). If it were better integrated there would be an advantage to the combination. Then they would be combined and not two separate things. Having CAS the last hour of the day was a problem, but maybe this was necessary because of the separate locations (for the two technologies)."

"CAS is a useful addition to VTT. VTT alone is OK. CAS alone would not be sufficient in the long term."

Question 16. Please provide any additional comments which you feel may assist in improving the quality of this type of language training in the future.

"VTT is a great system. The course was great. We should recommend the four teachers for outstanding service. They should get some kind of medal for this. I suggest that the teachers use visual aids more. I didn't like the audiotaped parts."

"I suggest grouping students by proficiency more. Also, encourage more of the students to talk more. I tended to give short answers. I should have been pushed to speak more, to elaborate. Place the computers closer to VTT classroom. We had to go to the 201st MI to use the computers in the course."
"If the teachers could distribute printed comprehensive vocabulary lists, either before or after course, it would be helpful. The VTT presented all the information on the screen. The interaction was fine, although sometimes the teachers needed to wait a little longer for answers."

"The handouts should relate to what you're going to be talking about, e.g., the stories from Korean language newspapers, we read aloud. Good handouts and better coordination would help with reading, speaking, and comprehension." As it was, we were sometimes flying blind, didn't know the topic. We would see a picture of "x", then go from there. It would be helpful to have a handout to rely on, to fall back on."

"The system worked fairly well technically. The audio delay was annoying. The use of the microphones was touchy. If someone accidently keyed a microphone, we lost the sound. The picture quality could be improved (compressed video format was somewhat limited). I got some headaches in the afternoon. I felt I was mentally working."

"The teachers rotated, the activities were varied, and we were working hard. This may have been the source of my headaches, rather than the video. My Korean has sagged badly and I had to work hard to keep up. The quality of the video wasn't great, but it wasn't a huge problem, except for one video segment."

Students offered general comments on the last page of the questionnaire as follows:

"I like the visual-aids aspect of the VTT. Graphics, video, audio, and the use of the second television monitor as a blackboard were all strong features. A good instructional technique used in the course was that teachers corrected the students speech by repeating it correctly. The VTT was down several times. On one occasion, it was down for one and one-half hours and (we played pictionary and other language games). The other occasions were shorter and we just waited in class for the transmissions to resume."

"I liked the role playing (for example, Mrs. Smith as an accident victim). This was interesting and fun. Otherwise, we could get bored. That also happened at the DLIFLC sometimes."
"I wondered why we students couldn't have one of our microphones on at all times. The DLIFLC microphones were always on. The graphics were quite clear, clearer than the studio shots on the other monitor. Maybe some of the graphics should have been blown up more."

3. Classroom Observations

The IST evaluator, Dr. William Bramble, visited the Fort Lewis VTT classroom during 9-10 May, 1991. He was not able to observe students in the CAS classroom since it was scheduled for use in the annual Language Olympics at Fort Lewis. During the visit, Dr. Bramble spent a number of hours in the classroom with the students. During class breaks, he spoke with the students, asking about their experiences with the course activities and with the technology.

Students generally reported that they enjoyed the Korean VTT portions of the course. One student said, however, that a live instructor would have been preferable. Students stated that the CAS study went well, although several mentioned that the lessons were quite short and needed more material. Students commented that they were somewhat intimidated by the visitors to the VTT classroom (especially given the number of visitors at Fort Lewis for the Language Olympics) and by the presence of observers (they could not see, but could sometimes hear) at the DLIFLC VTT center in Monterey.

Other classroom observations or student comments were as follows:

- Students commented upon the excellent quality of the DLIFLC VTT instructors.
- They felt that the difficulty level of the instruction was about right, although they sometimes felt a bit stretched.
- Students stated that they tended to get headaches in the afternoon sessions due to compressed video, etc.
- Some students worried about being called upon to participate, especially with the presence of observers.
- Students commented positively about the presentation of graphics (text, pictures, video, etc.), all related to the target language and culture.
- Students assisted each other in the interactive sessions (e.g., by vocabulary, etc.). They felt that this was a positive aspect in keeping everyone involved.
Students suggested including learning activities such as games (e.g., Korean pictionary, trivial pursuit, etc.) as backups for when the VTT system is down.

Some students suggested grouping more by ability levels. They noted that level 2+/3 proficiency students are not often well served in the local program and could benefit from higher level VTT instruction from DLIL.

Students commented that CAS instruction was valuable for reading skills, but that CAS should be used in conjunction with a broader program of study, rather than as a stand-alone program.

The video and graphics were generally reported to be clear. Some videotaped segments were less clear.

The use of the VTT system to present taped voice segments for the post test was effective. However, on item 19 of the comprehension test students commented that part of the recorded dialog appeared to be missing.

During the final hour of the VTT class, the DLILIC instructors asked that students discuss their reactions to the course. Points from this discussion are summarized below:

- Students stated that the Korean CAS/VTT teachers were excellent and that they very much enjoyed the course.
- They stated that the use of graphics was excellent, but that they would have preferred a live voice to some of the audiotape segments (even though the instructors had recorded them). They stated that it was more interesting to talk with a live person face-to-face than to hear that same person on tape.
- Students stated that during the role playing activities, they needed to have a better idea of what they were supposed to be talking about. They suggested that additional handouts sent to the site ahead of time would have been helpful in this regard.
- Students suggested that more written study aids would have been helpful in general (e.g., vocabulary lists, etc.)
- Students commented positively about the instructional strategy of teachers rephrasing student speech to assist them in improving speaking ability.
- Students liked the interactive features of the course, but commented that they were sometimes hesitant to interrupt what the teachers were presenting.
- When asked about difficulties in understanding particular course elements, the slower students...
commented about the course difficulty level. They suggested that when audio/video materials are presented more vocabulary should be presented ahead of time to aid students in understanding them.

4. Site Coordinator Interview

Because of the I-Corps Language Olympics in process at the time of the interviews, the 341st MI Bn language training officer was unavailable. The I-Corps G-2 training officer and the I-Corps Language Training Facility manager were interviewed using the Site Coordinator Interview Form. Their responses are summarized below.

Item 1. Did the CAS/VTT meet the specific training needs of Korean linguists in your units? Please explain:

"The students seem happy. The first day they felt that the register was too high, but the DLIFLC teachers corrected this. The training has gone very well. The grooming of the teachers at DLIFLC is helping. The teachers are getting better at using the medium. This time (second VTT pilot test course) the students have been successful without local teacher support. The equipment is getting more reliable."

Item 2. How much improvement in the targeted skills did you observe in your linguists as a result of the training?

"They talk (in the language) more now, but they're fatigued at end of day."

Item 8. How did the students like the CAS/VTT training in comparison to other alternatives available to them?

"We have limited feedback. There are mixed responses."

"CAS training wasn't really folded in. Also, the students had to drive to another location for CAS."

Item 9. What do you like most about this form of training?

"We're excited about many possibilities with the technology, not only language training. There are plans to put in VTT at Ft. Huachuca, this will open other opportunities for training."
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"A real enhancement. It gives us entry to DLIFLC resources. We like VTT teacher training and oral testing (it worked very well with Arabic). The technology provides diversity for students. They are not in front of live teachers all time."

**Item 10. What do you like least about this form of training?**

"More time should be programmed in for local teacher training. We would spend local funds to participate in additional VTT training, but our funds are limited - equipment purchase would have to be subsidized."

"Technical problems and not feeling 100% sure that the VTT will be operational. This is a problem for NG units because of the limited time personnel are available for training."

**Item 11. Would you like to expand the use of CAS/VTT training in the future? If so, how.**

"Yes, although not necessarily CAS and VTT for the same course. We need to use each to it's best advantage. We are hopeful that VTT will continue. We are also putting together a Desk Top III type of computer configuration. We hope to do more with these technologies next year."

**Item 12. How could this type of training best be used to complement your existing language training program?**

"Enhancing existing courses, for 3/3 linguists, instructor training, oral testing, LCT languages."

"Developmental, MOS-related capabilities in intelligence (e.g. 98G listening or 98E interrogation). Deployments (e.g., 201st MI Bde Team Spirit). With CAS, we want to take advantage of available computer capabilities for briefing slides, CALLIS, and teaching teachers to author. We need training for teachers (an NSA recommendation)."

**Item 13. Could this type of instruction, if it were more available, replace a portion of your existing training program? If yes, please specify.**

"It is especially valuable to RC units."

"Live instructors are preferred. VTT doesn't really seem to replace teachers. At Fort Lewis there is less
of a requirement for this. VTT alone is not sufficient. VTT seems better than BYU courses as an alternative. If VTT is broadly available, it would tend to help generally."

Item 14. If this type of training were more available would you expend unit funds for any of the following?

1. VTT equipment- "Too expensive at $9,000/month. If it were cheaper, or given multiple uses (in addition to language training), maybe. We need staff training to maximize it's use. Both for the teachers at DLI and for staff here. We would like DLIFLC VTT training to include teachers here."

2. Computers- "We're already buying three. We hope to get three more next year."

3. Communications costs- "For a limited period, we don't have unlimited funds."

4. Lesson development- "Maybe for a special project, perhaps cooperatively funded."

5. Lesson teaching- "Maybe for a special project."

6. Computer software- "In a cooperative sense, especially for special projects. There is a priority for teacher training here."

"VTT/CAS needs top level support at the DLIFLC. It currently comes out-of-hide for the DLI Departments."

"Our participation level is not so much a dollar issue as a coordination and time issue."

Item 15. Which of your training needs do you feel are best facilitated by the following types of training?

a. Self study- "Our classrooms are always open, units come in and use them. The computer can help here."

b. On-base classroom instruction- "Mission-related languages, RC and Active, Special Forces, and Civil Affairs. The 24-week Arabic course at Fort Lewis worked well."

c. Computer assisted study- "Enhancing self study, in-unit training, tracking mechanism for self-study, aid to classroom instruction, homework, remedial, accelerated learning."

d. Video teletraining- "Special purpose training and training integrated with the local program. We need the infrastructure to support this. Within a unit, it is not as easy. Extra duties and military priorities come and go."
e. **TDY to a training program at another site**— "BYU is overrated and expensive—the quality is sometimes good, but it varies. Sometimes TDY is used as a reward to troops. We provide some special trips for language personnel (e.g., technical training, conferences, etc)."

f. **Mobile Training Team (MTT) from the DLIFLC**— "We value this teacher support on-site, if expertise is not available here. Occasional, two-week courses are good. The use of MTTs shouldn't be negated by VTT. It's good for DLI representatives to visit the field sometimes too, to see our program and become familiar with our needs."

**Item 16.** Compared to courses with VTT or CAS by itself, what special advantages/disadvantages do you see with the combined CAS/VTT approach to language training.

"This wasn't a proper test to determine the advantages of combining the two technologies."

The I-Corps representatives also offered the following general comments were also offered concerning their general experience this year with CAS and VTT technologies:

"We appreciate the flexibility with which the DLIFLC has approached using these technologies and plan to adjust the (future) Russian course to incorporate strategies that haven proven successful in this regard. We see advantages to team teaching - DLIFLC/I-CORPS. We will use CAS for 341st MI Bn training."

"We feel that VTT use is better in conjunction with a local teacher."

"I-Corps and DLIFLC representatives met this morning (10 May) to discuss VTT. We agreed that 6-7 hours per day is too much on VTT. We feel that VTT is not a replacement for local language training. We plan in the future to try a couple of hours per day each (VTT, CAS, and local instruction), with grouping at the 1-2-3 proficiency levels. While some students are in the VTT class, others will be with our teachers or using computers.

"We appreciated the opportunity at 15:00 each day to provide VTT course feedback. DLIFLC has been really responsive to the students. We need people at the DLIFLC who are problem solvers. We are finding that our impression of VTT has changed, as it has improved. We
need people (at DLIFLC) who will listen, and are willing to coordinate and solve problems. Most DLIFLC staff have been very helpful. A few are sometimes not as helpful. There was a problem with the DLIFLC initially understating the local requirements to operate a VTT system."

E. Remote Training Support Component

Several items on the Site Coordinator Interview Form addressed the issue of DLIFLC coordination of remote training. A summary of these responses, again from the I-Corps Language training personnel appears below.

Item 3. Do you feel that you were provided adequate training and documentation by the DLIFLC to manage this sort of training?

"We are getting better at this. We were all new to it at the beginning. The fact that the DLIFLC has been open, has helped."

"The technologies are becoming more manageable, but we need to decide on the roles they will play. We need to determine how they will help us to meet our requirements. The technologies have the potential to play a tremendous support role. We need to capitalize on their strengths, avoid their weaknesses."

Item 5. What specific problems did you encounter in the local management of the project?

"Local management was smooth because of the LTF coordination procedures already in place. Captain Forbes (of the 341st) scheduled and observed the VTT initial training."

Item 6. What specific problems did you encounter in coordinating the CAS/VTT training with the DLIFLC?

"We need central Point of Contact (POC) and helpful problem solvers. If we don't have a central POC, we reinvent the wheel every time."

Item 7. How would you rate the efforts of the DLIFLC in each of the following aspects of the project? (Use 5 = highest, 1 = lowest)
Addressing your specific language training priorities - 4
Course design - 4
Course delivery (instructional approach and execution - 4
Technical aspects (equipment, communication) - 4
On-going support during the project (from DLIFLC) - 5+
Responsiveness to trouble shooting requests - 5
Availability alternative materials/activities to be used in case of equipment failure - 5

F. DLIFLC VTT Teacher Interviews

After the course completion, the DLIFLC course coordinator and each of the three primary Korean VTT teachers completed the interview form, Form I. A summary of their responses is included below.

Item 1. Considering the media available to you with the system (two-way video and graphics), how difficult was it to provide language training of similar quality to that which you could provide on-site at DLIFLC? Please comment on advantages and disadvantages of the media included with VTT.

Advantages:
1. The VTT training makes the students more proficient by using video and graphics.
2. The quality of this training is better than that which the DLIFLC normally provides (on-site training for MI units)
3. Students concentrate on listening and speaking.
4. The students seem to pay more attention. (2)
5. VTT allows the use of a wider variety of media than classroom instruction.

Disadvantages:
1. It is difficult to teach the students with the VTT system, without having well organized and planned activities. The VTT requires additional work to organize media for each class. (2)
2. Teachers cannot interact with the students as fast as in classroom teaching. Teachers can't correct the student's mistakes every time. (2)

Item 2. Given the VTT equipment capabilities, how effective was the language training in meeting the objectives established for the two-week training session?
"The training helped communicate student opinions in the target language. The technology made the students fully participate in activities. After sending graphics, audio tapes, or videotapes, the students were required to do their work."

"I cannot comment on the effectiveness of VTT training we have done. However, I can say that all of the instructors appear to have met the objectives they established for the training."

"The training was useful, but it was designed assuming an equal level of knowledge for each student. This slowed the course of instruction. Results of the student pretests must be processed more quickly to allow classes to be organized based on the students' level of knowledge."

"The Cassette Tapes, pictures and live voice etc. were great."

Item 3. Given the VTT capabilities and the particular learning strategies chosen for the training, how well were you able to encourage and maintain student motivation to learn the targeted language skills?

"We approached this issue in the following ways:

- Helping students build self-confidence.
- Providing student-centered activities.
- Showing videotapes on Korean culture.
- Using authentic materials on current events."

"According to the students' comments during the discussion held in the final training hour, they seemed to have been very much encouraged and motivated in learning the target language."

"Students were attentive. However, the large amount of material that was presented caused a lack of attention during some periods of training."

"We addressed listening and speaking up to level 2+. I think we were able to do this because of the students' high motivation to learn and concentrate."

Item 4. Of the specific teaching/instructional strategies selected for the VTT course, which were particularly successful? Why?

1. Role play: We let them talk and discuss. (3)
2. Video segments on specific topics: Students were asked to share their experiences. Videotape use seems to get more attention from the students because of audio-visual effectiveness. (2)
3. Current events and information sharing: Sharing their experiences and information was helpful. (2)
4. Student generated activities: Students were asked to prepare the activities.
5. Audio and visual transparencies for lead-ins, so that the students were prepared for what they were going to learn.

Item 5. Which were not successful? Why?

1. Reading comprehension activities. It is hard to read the passages on the screen and takes too much time (2)
2. Audiotapes were provided for listening but students preferred more live voices.
3. True and False questions were not used. They were not used because they did not force the students to learn the vocabulary or grammar, nor force the students to practice in the target language.

Item 6. Given your experience with the VTT, which new strategies would you suggest to increase the effectiveness of a course such as the one you taught?

1. Student-generated and student-centered activities (2)
2. Error-Correction techniques, rephrasing the questions.
3. Communicative approaches
4. Lead-in strategies
5. Provide the students incentives and encouragement
6. Vocabulary review.
7. Grammar review using tape or transparency.
8. Cultural background

Item 7a. What specific types of training were provided to you at the DLIFLC to prepare you as a VTT teacher?

"An awareness workshop. Instruction in how to use the technology of VTT equipment."

"I was not provided any specific type of training to prepare as a VTT teacher - except practicing both as a VTT teacher and as pretending to be a VTT student, a few hours per day for two weeks."
"We reviewed training conducted by other DLIFLC schools. We conducted rehearsals for one week."

"Training on the microphones and technical equipment. Using totally new methods."

Item 7b. What type of additional training would have been desirable to better prepare you as a VTT teacher?

"A formal training course needs to be provided."

"I participated in VTT teacher training through pretending to be a VTT student. More training would be helpful."

"We needed more training on appropriate VTT teaching methods (e.g., progressing from simple content to difficult)."

Item 8a. How many work days were you allotted to prepare for the VTT Korean course?

An average of 10.25 days each was reported to prepare for the VTT Korean course for the coordinator and the on-camera instructors. It was also reported that an additional five Korean teachers dedicated 5.0 days each to the planning tasks.

Item 8b. What were you able to accomplish during the preparation period?

Course coordinator:

"Developing the teaching plan
Preparing/selecting audio and video tapes on the scheduled topics.
Selecting authentic materials appropriate for the required proficiency levels.
Recording the audio passages and gathering photographs and other materials for the activities involving graphics transmissions.
Coordination with other instructors."

Instructors:

"Preparing the materials to be presented in VTT training."

"Arranging videotapes to be shown during the classes and developing dialogues with questions and answers. Collecting relevant pictures and recording audio dialogues to be played for the students."
"Preparing new teaching plan materials (magazines, papers, dialogue tapes)"

Item 8c. Was the time allotted for preparation adequate?

The coordinator and on-camera instructors all agreed that adequate time was allotted.

Item 9. How did student variables such as proficiency level, motivation, and aptitude affect students individual and collective abilities to benefit from the VTT course? Were there problems for some students in mastering the course objectives?

Three of the four respondents stated that there were no problems while one made the following comment:

"Student proficiency levels must be determined earlier and classes organized based on proficiency. By organizing classes to address specific proficiency levels, the VTT training would be much better."

Item 10. Was the level of technical support in the DLIFLC VTT facility sufficient to meet your needs? Cite any specific problems in this regard.

All four respondents found the technical support sufficient and cited no problems.

Item 11. In comparison to classroom teaching, how difficult was it to present instruction and manage interaction in the "VTT Classroom?" Cite specific problems and solutions.

Course coordinator:

"Problems are: 1. Eye contact with the students
2. Writing practice (Translation)
3. The use of the microphone switches

Solutions are: 1. Personalization and small group activities
2. Transmitting the passages over the system
3. More training for instructors"

Instructors:

"Both VTT teachers and students should be trained to avoid "voice crushing" each other because of the use of the satellite."
"VTT does not easily permit improvisation if the class completes the material early or if students are moving slowly. We did not feel comfortable using the system until the course was almost complete. I believe this can only be overcome through more familiarity with the VTT system."

"Correcting students' activities: spelling, pronunciation, etc."

Item 12. Overall, what do you feel are the specific strengths of VTT language instruction (i.e., what do you like about it)?

Course Coordinator:

1. Highly motivated students
2. Positive attitude of students
3. Addressing one topic at a time (contextualization)
4. Two additional instructors during activities
5. Use of a new technology
6. Quality of the instructors selected

Instructors:

"Teachers get more attention (alertness) from the students in comparison to classroom teaching."

"The accelerated pace of VTT forced instructors to focus on good teaching methods to ensure that the materials were covered in the time allotted."

"It was excellent for listening and speaking training."

Item 13. Overall, what do you feel are the specific weaknesses of VTT language instruction (i.e., what do you not like about it)?

1. Technical problems
2. Lack of face-to-face contact
3. Limited classroom activities
4. No textbook
5. The lack of direct feedback from students made it difficult to assess whether students were learning material completely.
6. Reading and pronunciation
Item 14. If you were to advise a friend who is going to teach a VTT language course later this year, what specific advice would you offer?

1. Training in the use of new technology
2. Teaching for proficiency
3. Active laboratory for teacher training
4. Develop your own teaching techniques and skills
5. Have enough time to prepare the lesson plans.
6. Try to avoid "voice crush" with the students.
7. Emphasize preparation and practice, and (with technical assistance) become comfortable with the system.
8. Present simple topics first and then expand on them.

Item 15. What specific advice can you offer the DLIFLC in improving future VTT language courses?

1. Instructor training for VTT
2. At least one month for preparation
3. Install a chain of command for VTT teaching
4. Complete active lab training before VTT
5. VTT back-up system available, so that if one system becomes inoperative, the instructor can move to another system to avoid losing training time.
6. We need a cooperative effort in teaching through VTT - both instructors and management. Both need to cooperate with each other. We had a very good coordination relationship and shared new ideas and also clarified each other.

Item 16. How familiar were you with the content of the Computer Assisted Study (CAS) portions of the course?

Coordinator:

"I gave the basic information and content of the CAS to the instructors in order for them to become familiar with the CAS study."

Instructors:

"I was fully familiar with the CAS portions of the course and ready to answer students' questions. However, no students asked questions on CAS."

"I was familiar with the CAS lessons because I was involved in their development for two weeks."
"I studied all CAS lessons and tried to use them in my class as listening material."

Item 17. In your lesson plans and VTT teaching, how were you able to integrate what the students were learning from the CAS lessons?

"Lesson plans and VTT teaching were designed and developed to study the topics of the CAS study."

"Since the students did not ask any questions on CAS, I did not have to make any particular lesson plans for VTT teaching."

"I was unable to fully interface with the students and assess their learning (via CAS)."

"CAS appears to be helpful for students to understand new vocabulary and grammar patterns."

Item 18. How effective were the CAS lessons in increasing the overall amount of student learning in the Korean course?

"Based on the students' comments, the CAS lessons enriched their vocabularies and grammar patterns."

"I have no comments on this item since the students didn't ask questions on CAS lessons."

"Based on the students' feedback at the end of course, CAS was very helpful for the students and they were able to recall large amounts of vocabulary by the course end."

"Outstanding. I could see how much they have improved on both sides: listening and speaking. I try to use CAS in my classroom, too."

Item 19. How would you suggest that the DLIFLC best design and use CAS to augment the VTT lessons in future language courses?

"The two courses should be designed and developed to meet specific objectives and proficiency levels so that the CAS can be used for remediation and enrichment purposes."

"VTT course objectives could be designed based on CAS lessons so that the two would complement one another."
Item 20. Please comment on the desirability and effectiveness of integrating computer lessons with future VTT language instruction as opposed to using VTT by itself?

"With only two weeks of VTT teaching experience, I cannot comment on this item."

"If possible, the VTT lesson plan should tie together with CAS. It would be more effective. I tried to use CAS material in my teaching hour as much as I could."

G. Evaluation Results Summary

The following summary of results is organized to address each of the stated objectives for the pilot test evaluation.

1. Objectives related to delivery method

- Determine the appropriateness of the chosen media mix (VTT and CAS) to facilitate the target training.

The VTT media, two-way compressed audio and video supplemented by graphics, provided an excellent means for the 60-hours of interactive live teaching in the Korean course. The teaching method used by the instructors focused upon interactive learning activities with substantial student participation. Instructors were able to present taped audio and video segments to the students and to display a variety of materials using the overhead projector (e.g., text, photographs, illustrations, etc.). CAS lessons were used to supplement the VTT lessons during approximately 8 hours of instruction. The CAS lessons focused upon grammar, vocabulary, listening, reading comprehension, and speaking. The level of integration of the CAS and VTT portions of the course was limited. However, the potential value of combining the two instructional formats was demonstrated.

- Determine the success of the approach in providing a viable means for access to the target training.

The VTT/CAS approach appears to provide an excellent means to address the training needs of students from active and RC units. The training was conveniently provided on-site, where the students are sta-
tioned. It brought to the students both the excellent instructional resources available at the DLIFLC and the latest applications of instructional technology to language training. The course combined the use of an excellent system for real time, interactive distance learning and the use of computer lessons which incorporated various input and response formats and drill and reinforcement techniques.

Determine the reliability of the equipment and transmissions used in the pilot test.

The VTT equipment performed at a 97% reliability level. There were three outages during the course which resulted in a loss of two hours of instruction time. During the longest outage period (1 1/2 hours), alternative, on-site learning activities were performed by the students. The computer equipment used for CAS was operational during the test. Minor problems were reported with segments of lessons requiring student input via the keyboard. On-site and network-level technical support for both VTT and CAS was excellent.

Determine the cost of providing the CAS/VTT training and compare with Mobile Training Teams (MTTs) or other approaches which could be taken.

Complete cost data are not currently available to IST. The analysis of cost data will be presented in a separate report due for completion at a later date.

Determine the acceptance of the delivery approach to the target community.

Students reported that they were comfortable with the CAS and VTT technologies. They felt that they benefited from the instruction via both systems, although they stated that each system had its particular strengths. As with other distance learning students, some course participants stated that they would have preferred an on-site classroom teacher for instruction. However, given the excellent quality of the course in comparison to locally available alternatives, they were excited about their participation in CAS/VTT. The students stated
that they would like to receive additional training through the media employed.

2. Objectives related to instruction

- **Determine the effectiveness of the training in meeting the established learning objectives.**

  The results of the pre-post VTT achievement tests administered to the course participants indicated gains in listening skills, both translation and comprehension. Students scored well on the CAS lesson post tests. Their post test performance was comparable to that of an earlier pilot test group which utilized CAS exclusively and for a longer period. Students and instructors cited a number of specific skill area improvements as a result of completing the course.

- **Identify effective instructional techniques for using CAS/VTT for the specified language training.**

  The VTT portions of the course effectively employed interactive activities of three types: teacher-student, student-teacher, and student-student. Listening and speaking activities were especially effective. More use of advance organizers is suggested when authentic materials are used on the VTT. CAS was effective for reading and listening skills. Students commented upon the value of CAS for vocabulary, grammar, and number skills. The testing capability of CAS was effective and appears to hold potential for further development. Specific suggestions for further CAS and VTT courses are included in Section IV of this report.

- **Assess the effectiveness of the CAS/VTT in facilitating and maintaining student motivation.**

  The VTT course was fast paced and the level of difficulty was challenging to the students. The format of instruction was appropriate to the course objectives and the VTT instructors rotated hourly providing additional variety. Role playing was used. Interactive activities, both CAS and VTT were stressed. Numerous audio, video, and graphics presentations both maximized the efficient use of instructional day and added varied aural and visual
presentation stimuli. As a result, based upon student reports, teacher comments, and classroom observations, students found the course challenging, interesting, and motivating.

- **Relate the effectiveness of the training to student variables.**

Efficient language refresher training must target the specific proficiency levels of students. In a one-on-one tutoring situation this issue is easily addressed. When students are grouped in classrooms, problems can arise if the group is heterogeneous and group learning activities employed. In the case of the Korean CAS/VTT course, the participating units attempted to select students in the 1-2 proficiency level range. The resultant level of heterogeneity was, for the most part, manageable for VTT interactive learning activities, although the lowest one or two students were at a disadvantage. The instructors adjusted reasonably well to this variability. More able students assisted less able students (e.g., with vocabulary) during interactive learning activities. CAS lessons were individualized and accommodated the diversity of proficiency present in the group. Instructors modified the course difficulty and content as they grew more familiar with the specific needs of the students. However, both teachers and students suggested tighter ability groupings would be helpful in the future.

- **Determine the overall effectiveness of the instruction in supporting annual language training requirements of National Guard and Active MI linguist battalion.**

Both site training personnel and course participants felt that the use of technology-based language instruction from the DLIFLC has a definite place in their program. They stated that it was potentially valuable for the training of both active and reserve MI linguists. They felt that the training was potentially useful for both monthly and intensive annual language training. Local training staff would like to see technology-based language training programs more fully integrated with the local program in the future. Fort Lewis and DLIFLC staff plan to continue to work together in the
future to more fully exploit VTT and CAS training technologies.
Section IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT

A number of lessons were learned from the Korean CAS/VTT pilot test. These can assist with future DLIFLC applications of these technologies. The lessons are discussed in greater detail elsewhere in the report. They are summarized in this section by topical area.

A. Technology Lessons

- The operational requirements of the present CAS/VTT equipment/networking configuration place a high level of demand on both the training origination and classroom sites. It takes considerable effort to maintain network operability at a sufficient level of reliability for training to be successfully presented. The availability of well-trained technicians at both the studio and classroom ends is required. VTT system redesign or improvement may be needed.

- Microphone switching constraints are a frequently reported VTT problem. Problems in switching between graphic and video occur as well. Additional user training and/or equipment modifications are indicated.

- Specifications are required for facilities modification and CAS/VTT classroom setup at the training locations. In addition, there are requirements for telephone, fax, photocopying, and reliable electrical power. Guidelines need to be developed for staff support and staff training at these sites. Careful planning and coordination is required to assist with the development of successful CAS/VTT training sites.

- The computer equipment for CAS appears to be reliable and less prone to problems than the VTT equipment. Trained site personnel are required, however, to instruct students in the use of CAS and to stand by for occasional troubleshooting and assistance.

B. Course Development/Lesson Planning

- Advanced work is necessary with field units scheduled to receive training to determine unit training priorities and the characteristics of
the soldiers scheduled to receive the training. This work should commence with several months' lead time in order to allow course developers to spread their effort across a reasonable period of planning time. Approximately 10-15 days of team effort were sufficient to plan for a high quality two week language course. However, these planning days are probably more effective if spread across several months' planning time.

- The first time a given CAS/VTT course is offered, there is a requirement for greater planning and preparation than for classroom teaching. This preparation includes specification of the course goal and objectives, detailed daily lesson planning, development of materials to be shipped ahead of time to the training site, identification or development of appropriate pre-taped media, development of graphics presentation materials and planning for alternative learning activities during potential system outages.

- A team effort involving an appropriate language curriculum expert, an instructional design specialist, a technology specialist, an evaluation expert and experienced teachers is suggested for optimum VTT course design. CAS development requires a longer, more intensive effort.

- Careful planning is required to optimize the features available with a combined CAS/VTT system. A fast-paced, highly interactive VTT course with a variety of motivating instructional activities is optimal. Supplemental CAS lessons need to be carefully developed to augment the VTT presentations.

- The CAS lessons used in the test were prototypes with limited content. Fuller lessons with flexibility to allow for adaptation to specific circumstances are required for operational CAS/VTT courses in the future. All features of CAS, with the exception of the speaking lessons, appeared to be useful in the pilot test.

- CAS lessons should be carefully developed to supplement VTT instruction and the unique
strengths of CAS employed to best advantage in the context of the available media mix. The integration of VTT and CAS portions of the training should be carefully articulated and operationalized in order to maximize the effectiveness of the overall instructional system. DLIFLC CAS developers should be cross-trained in VTT and VTT developers cross-trained in CAS to facilitate this process. CAS instruction should be located close to the VTT classroom.

- Fatigue and eye-system are factors that need to be addressed in planning instructional days via VTT and CAS. Interspersing CAS and VTT activities appears preferable to six hours of VTT followed by an hour of CAS instruction. Shorter instructional days might be considered. Combining CAS and VTT with other local training activities (when available) could also be considered.

C. Course Delivery

- Careful coordination and maintenance of good rapport with local training site staff is required. A partnership with local staff, to the point of joint "ownership" of the training may facilitate project success.

- Experienced instructors, who also have good camera presence, the optimize chances for success of a CAS/VTT course. Outgoing, charismatic instructors who can appropriately motivate students and who appropriately use humor are suggested.

- Systematic prior orientation and training to CAS/VTT should be provided to course developers, instructors, and local training site staff to facilitate smooth operation.

- System reliability in the 95% or greater range and responsive troubleshooting capability are suggested for optimum course delivery. Ultimately, system reliability should approach 100%.

- A team teaching approach to CAS/VTT courses appears to offer significant advantages over a single instructor.
• The assistance of on-site training staff with CAS familiarity is required for the implementation of computer-based instruction activities.

D. Evaluation and Record Keeping

• Student progress should be systematically recorded and appropriate, timely feedback provided. As course offerings increase, an automated student record system will be helpful.

• A pre-post measure of student achievement, carefully tied to course objectives should be developed for each course. The pre-post administration of this test will assist in determining the success of the course and identifying general areas needing improvement. A standard course questionnaire to identify strengths and areas for course improvement is also desirable.

• Feedback mechanisms should be built into the course to allow for mid-course corrections. Early feedback from the students allows for important mid-course improvements.

• An automated student record keeping capability could be built into the CAS lessons to record progress on the CAS lessons. An expansion of the CAS concept could provide for broader student testing and recording of progress in both VTT and CAS portions of the course.

E. Recording Lessons Learned

• Numerous lessons were learned from the CAS/VTT course. These are documented in several sections of this report and address a full range of issues including technical, field coordination, pedagogy, course and lesson development, selection of students, student motivation, etc.. These lessons should be reviewed for applicability to future courses.

• As the DLIFLC implements additional CAS and/or VTT courses, the documentation of additional lessons learned is essential. These can both
provide general guidance for future development and serve as input to the development of formal training procedures and operational guidelines.
Section V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This report presents the results of a Combined Computer Assisted Study (CAS) and Video Teletraining (VTT) pilot test performed by the Defense Language Institute, Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC). The pilot test was conducted at Fort Lewis, Washington during Spring 1991. The language addressed was Korean. The pilot test course participants were MI linguists who had previously completed the DLIFLC Korean program. Three course participants were selected from the 341st Washington National Guard MI Battalion and two were from the 199th MI Battalion at Fort Lewis. The VTT portion of the course originated from the DLIFLC VTT center at the Presidio of Monterey, California and was received at the I-Corps Language Training Facility, North Fort Lewis, Washington. The CAS training was held in the language training classroom of the 201st MI Brigade on the main post of Fort Lewis.

The goal of the Korean language refresher course was to provide maintenance, remediation, and enhancement training to improve MI linguists reading and listening proficiency levels in the Korean language. The course also addressed the improvement of speaking skills. The course was conducted on weekdays during the period 29 April to 10 May. Six hours per day of VTT instruction and eight hours of CAS instruction were provided for the 68-hour course.

Course development was undertaken by staff from the DLIFLC Korean Department during the several weeks preceding the pilot test by a designated course coordinator and members of the teaching staff. The overall goal of the course was to provide global Korean language training to personnel designated 98G (voice interceptors) to assist them in increasing their language proficiency toward the 2/2 levels in listening and reading and above the 1 level in speaking.

Some of the major instructional formats for the course were as follows:

- Presentation of specific topics
- Thematic exercises in listening comprehension, reading comprehension, and speaking
- Interactive communication and reinforcement
- Student generated activities
- Pair and group work
- Current events presentations
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CAS lessons and review (CAS lessons addressed topics including military themes, health, weather, and transportation).

The course developers capitalized upon the interactive features of VTT technology; adapted current DLIFLC language pedagogy, and used advance organizers in facilitating student work with authentic materials and audio/video media segments. The course involved a variety of instructional activities presented in one-hour blocks. Four VTT instructors alternated in presenting various course segments. The CAS computer activities were developed for a prior pilot test involving elements of the 107th MI Bn at Fort Ord and the 201st MI Bde at Fort Lewis. CAS lessons addressed reading, listening and speaking skills. CAS lessons were designed to address five topical areas and lesson subcomponents offered instruction in vocabulary, grammar, listening and reading comprehension, and speaking. CAS lessons were taken during the final hour of eight of the instructional days. The instructors attempted to integrate CAS and VTT by introducing the content of the CAS lessons during a prior VTT instruction period and discussing the results of CAS training on the following VTT instructional day.

The technology used in the pilot test was as follows. VTT involved two-way compressed audio/video carried via satellite and two-way graphics transmissions. Teachers were assisted throughout the course by a VTT technician. Teachers transmitted graphics including text, charts, photos, maps, newsprint, and magazine articles to the students. Teachers could both see and hear the five students taking the Korean course. Students were located in a classroom in the Language Training Facility at North Fort Lewis, Washington. They could see, hear, and speak to the DLIFLC teachers. Students could both receive and send graphics. Training personnel of the Language Training Facility provided on-site VTT technical assistance and trouble shooting.

The Computer Assisted Study lessons were offered at the 201st MI Bde language training center on the Fort Lewis main post. These lessons resided on Macintosh SE computers equipped for sound input/output and display of Korean characters. Knowledgeable staff from the 201st MI Bde instructed the students in the use of the CAS lessons and provided technical assistance to students during the training sessions.

The cooperation of the field participants, the 341st MI Bn, 199th MI Bn, 201st MI Bn, and I-Corps language training
staff was outstanding. Attendance of the soldiers at the training sessions was excellent. Local personnel were able to perform the technical tasks associated with operating the VTT classroom and computer equipment to support the CAS lessons. The effort was well coordinated locally. The DLIFLC successfully accomplished the coordination and field support tasks required for both the technical and instructional aspects of the pilot test.

The project evaluation addressed a number of specific objectives. These were divided into two areas: (1) objectives related to the technology and (2) objectives related to the training. Technology objectives included determining:

- the appropriateness of the media mix (CAS and VTT)
- the viability of CAS/VTT to facilitate language training
- the reliability of the equipment and communications
- the cost of providing the training
- the acceptance of the delivery approach to the target community

Training objectives included determining:

- the effectiveness of the training in meeting the learning objectives
- the identification of effective instructional techniques
- the effectiveness of the CAS/VTT course in maintaining student motivation
- the relationship of effectiveness to student variables
- the general effectiveness of the course in supporting annual training requirements for National Guard and active MI linguists

The evaluation was conducted by the DLIFLC Evaluation and Research Division with assistance from the Defense Training and Performance Data Center and the Institute for Simulation and Training, University of Central Florida.

A variety of evaluation data was collected at the learning site to address the various evaluation objectives. These data included the following: student background data, including prior language proficiency; language training options currently available to linguists from the 199th and 341st MI battalions; daily CAS and VTT instruction logs; a pre-post achievement test; post-course interviews with students and unit training personnel; and a post-course student question-
naire. Information collected at the DLIFLC included the course description, post-course CAS/VTT instructor questionnaire, and cost data. In addition, the contract evaluator conducted on-site observations during the final two of the ten training days.

Some of the results of the pilot test are as follows:

- The execution of the development and delivery of the Korean course was excellent. The results of the project illustrate the significant future potential of VTT and CAS to support nonresident language training for MI linguists.
- The instructional media available with the VTT - interactive audio, video, and graphics - provide an effective media mix for language instruction. CAS lessons appear to have the potential to supplement listening, reading, grammar, and vocabulary study.
- The VTT equipment and communications links functioned at a level of reliability sufficient to support the VTT training. CAS equipment and courseware performed at a reliable level.
- MI linguists demonstrated language skills improvement as a result of taking the course.
- The acceptability of the CAS/VTT training to the project participants was high.
- Participants commented about the excellent quality of the VTT course and the instructors. They considered the course structure and contents to be motivating and interesting. The course developers incorporated a variety of effective instructional activities and formats into the course.
- The DLIFLC gained valuable experience in using the CAS/VTT media to best advantage to address the specific needs of RC MI units.
- A number of specific lessons were learned from the pilot test which can enhance the future quality of VTT language instruction.

In summary, the project was developed and conducted in a highly professional manner. The Korean course was of excellent quality and generated lessons learned for future course
development of this type. The project demonstrated the potential of VTT as a key nonresident language training medium. CAS was found to have excellent potential for certain aspects of language learning when used in the context of a broader course of instruction. Strategies were suggested to tie the two media together, although the level of CAS/VTT integration present in this pilot test was not sufficient to provide detailed data in this regard.
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Section VII. APPENDICES
A. Evaluation Instruments
Site Form A: Baseline Data

Date ___________________  Person Completing Form ________________________________

For each participant in the video teletraining (VTT) pilot test please enter the following data. Use additional pages, if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Rank</th>
<th>PMOS</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Last DLPT</th>
<th>Completed DLIFLC Basic</th>
<th>Korean Course?</th>
<th>Experience. as Linguist</th>
<th># Years</th>
<th>Active Reserve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Site Form B: Baseline Data - Current Language Program

Unit ___________________ Site Coordinator _______________________
Date ___________________ Person Completing Form _______________________

Provide the following information about the language training program available to Korean linguists in your unit.

1. Local program of instruction.
   a. Name of Language Training Manager ___________________ Telephone # ______
   b. Name of Contractor Providing Training ___________________ Telephone # ______
   c. Names of Korean language instructors ______________________________________
   d. Qualifications of instructors: ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________

   e. How many hours of Korean language instruction are provided each year? ________ hours
   f. On the average how many of the unit’s Korean linguists participate in the instruction each year? Number _______
   g. For those Korean linguists who do participate in this instruction how many (average) hours of instruction do they receive each year? ________ hours
   h. Where is the instruction provided? Place _______________________
   i. Are all levels of instruction provided (e.g., 0+ to 1, 1+ to 2, 2+ to 3)?
      Yes/No _______ Explain__________________________________
j. What materials are available for Korean language instruction? Please list major items below.

__________________________________________  __________________________________________

__________________________________________  __________________________________________

__________________________________________  __________________________________________

k. Other options may exist for language training for your Korean linguists (e.g., programs at local colleges, immersion training at BYU or other locations). List below those other language training opportunities in which your Korean linguists participate or are planning to participate.

__________________________________________  __________________________________________

__________________________________________  __________________________________________

__________________________________________  __________________________________________

2. Instructional technology available in the classroom for Korean language instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number available</th>
<th>Number used in instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Audio tape players/recorders</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Video tape players</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Computers</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Video disc players</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Satellite dish</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other, specify</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Form C: Student Background Questionnaire

Date ______________________  PMOS __________________

Name/Rank ___________________  Unit __________________

1. Did you attend the DLIFLC? Yes ______  No ______
   If so, Did you graduate? ______  Year? ______
   Language(s) studied? _____________________________

   What were your Korean DLPT scores upon completing the
   program at the DLIFLC?
   ______ Listening
   ______ Reading
   ______ Speaking

2. What was the date of your last Korean DLPT test in
   Korean? ______

3. What scores did you receive on that test?
   ______ Listening
   ______ Reading
   ______ Speaking

4. If you feel your proficiency level has changed since your
   last DLPT test, what do you feel your current proficiency
   level is?
   ______ a. Unchanged
   ______ b. Changed (specify below)
   ______ Listening
   ______ Reading
   ______ Speaking

5. What specific skills do you need to address in your
   overall language training? List in order of priority.
   1. ____________________________________________
   2. ____________________________________________
   3. ____________________________________________
   4. ____________________________________________
   5. ____________________________________________
6. In view of your answer to question 5 above, what specific progress do you hope to make in the two-week CAS/VTT Korean course? 

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

7. What level of priority do you personally place upon improving your Korean language skills? (check one)

____ Very high priority
____ High priority
____ Some priority
____ Little priority
____ No priority

Please explain __________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

8. How many hours of Korean language training have you received in the past year? ______

Providers(s): __________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

9. How much prior experience have you had in using computers?

____ A lot
____ Some
____ A little
____ Practically none

10. Have you previously participated in instruction through:

   a) Computers: Yes ____ No ____

   b) Television: Yes ____ No ____
Date ____________________________

Students in Attendance
________________________________________

Topics Covered
________________________________________

Person Completing Form ____________________________

Quality

Instructional Rating
(Insert one for each item)

Low 2 Medium 3 High 4 5

Trouble Report: Check all problems that occurred.

Video from DLI

None (no picture) Some Problems Poor Quality

Audio from DLI

None (no audio) Some Problems Poor Quality

Video to DLI

None (no picture) Some Problems Poor Quality

Audio to DLI

None (no audio) Some Problems Poor Quality

Presentation Quality

Student enthusiasm

Quality of Interaction

Instructor's use of graphics/charts

Relevancy of presentation

Wise use of available time

Instructional Comments:
________________________________________

How were problems resolved? ______

Trouble Report Comments:
________________________________________

VTT Instructor(s)

________________________________________
Site Form E: Student Computer Instruction Log

Please use this form to record each day’s participation in the Computer Assisted Study Project.

Unit ____________________________  Name ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lesson Number</th>
<th>Time Started</th>
<th>Time Completed</th>
<th>Lesson Pretest Score (when taken)</th>
<th>Lesson Posttest Scores (when taken)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Part 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Form F: Computer Assisted Study/Video Teletraining (CAS/VTT) Student Questionnaire

Name/Rank ____________________________  Unit ____________________________

Date ____________________________

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with these statements about the Computer Assisted Study/Video Teletraining (CAS/VTT). Use the following codes:

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Undecided
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

___ 1. The CAS/VTT training will help me perform my job better.
___ 2. The CAS/VTT training makes me more proficient in my MOS.
___ 3. The CAS/VTT training ranks high compared to other Army training I have received.
___ 4. The VTT equipment and course materials were easy to use.
___ 5. The CAS equipment and course materials were easy to use.

Please answer the following as indicated (check one answer for each item).

6. How much of what you learned via CAS/VTT could be applied on the job?
   ___ Almost all of what I learned
   ___ Most of what I learned
   ___ Some of what I learned
   ___ Little of what I learned
   ___ None of what I learned

7. Compared with other training equipment you have used (for example computers, slide projectors, video cassettes, Besseler Cue/See Projectors), rate the reliability of the equipment for VTT.
   ___ Much better than other training equipment
   ___ Better than other training equipment
   ___ About the same as other training equipment
   ___ Worse than other training equipment
   ___ Much worse than other training equipment
8. In a similar manner, please rate the reliability of the computer equipment used for the CAS portions of the course.

- ______ Much better than other computer equipment
- ______ Better than other computer equipment
- ______ About the same as other computer equipment
- ______ Worse than other computer equipment
- ______ Much Worse than other computer equipment

9. Would you like to use the CAS/VTT for other language related training?

- ______ Would very much like to use it
- ______ Would like to use it
- ______ Undecided
- ______ Would not like to use it
- ______ Would very much not like to use it

10. How would you advise a friend who had a choice between a course using CAS/VTT and a course that covered the same material, without CAS and VTT?

- ______ Try hard to get into the CAS/VTT course
- ______ Request the CAS/VTT course if convenient
- ______ Neither request, nor avoid the CAS/VTT course
- ______ Avoid the CAS/VTT, if possible
- ______ Avoid the CAS/VTT at any cost

11. How much time did you spend preparing for and taking the CAS/VTT training compared with other Korean linguists who took the course?

- ______ Much more time than the others
- ______ More time than the others
- ______ About the same time as the others
- ______ Less time than the others
- ______ Much less time than the others

12. Relative to your individual proficiency in Korean, how difficult was the required language proficiency level of the VTT lessons?

- ______ Very difficult
- ______ Somewhat difficult
- ______ About right
- ______ Somewhat easy
- ______ Very easy

13. How difficult was the Korean language proficiency required for the CAS lessons?

- ______ Very difficult
- ______ Somewhat difficult
- ______ About right
- ______ Somewhat easy
- ______ Very easy
14. In comparison to available language-related training by contract instructors, what was the quality of the training provided by CAS/VTT?

   _____ Much better
   _____ Better
   _____ About the same
   _____ Worse
   _____ Much worse

15. In comparison to available language-related training by contract instructors, how fast were you able to learn the required skills by CAS/VTT?

   _____ Much faster
   _____ Somewhat faster
   _____ About the same
   _____ Somewhat slower
   _____ Much slower

16. In comparison to other language-related training you have experienced, how effectively did the CAS/VTT classes hold your attention.

   _____ Much better
   _____ Somewhat better
   _____ About the same
   _____ Somewhat worse
   _____ Much worse

The following questions call for a yes or no answer and allow you to provide a short explanation or comment.

17. After your initial familiarization with the VTT classroom, were you comfortable with the format of the class sessions?

   Yes ____  No ____
   Comment: ________________________________________________________________

18. After your initial familiarization with the CAS instruction, were you comfortable with the computer lessons?

   Yes ____  No ____
   Comment: ________________________________________________________________

19. Did you feel that you and the other students were provided a sufficient opportunity to interact with the VTT instructor(s) from DLIFLC?

   Yes ____  No ____
   Comment: ________________________________________________________________
20. Were the DLIFLC VTT teachers competent and well-prepared for the class sessions?  Yes _____ No _____
Comment: 

21. Did the DLIFLC VTT teachers make proper use of charts, maps, or other visual aids in the presentations?  Yes _____ No _____
Comment: 

22. Did the DLIFLC VTT teachers provide accurate and useful responses to your questions?  Yes _____ No _____
Comment: 

23. Did the DLIFLC VTT teachers make good use of the interactive capabilities of the two-way television used in the VTT?  Yes _____ No _____
Comment: 

24. Were the print support materials provided for VTT sessions adequate and of high quality?  Yes _____ No _____
Comment: 

25. Was your team leader/site facilitator able to operate and troubleshoot the equipment necessary for the VTT?  Yes _____ No _____
Comment: 

26. Approximately what percentage of the VTT classes were you able to attend: _____%  
Comment: 

27. Were you hampered or distracted by the type of video used in the VTT (compressed video)?  Yes _____ No _____
Comment: 

28. Did technical problems with the audio or video used in the VTT, substantially hamper or detract from its effectiveness?  Yes _____ No _____
Comment: 

29. Did you receive adequate training in the use of computer equipment for the computer assisted study lessons?  
Yes  No  
Comment:  

30. Did you experience any problems with the computer equipment or software when taking the computer assisted study lessons?  Yes  No  
Comment:  

31. Did you feel that the content of the computer assisted study lessons appropriately supported what you were to learn in the overall CAS/VTT course?  Yes  No  
Comment:  

32. Did you find that the material covered in the computer assisted study was appropriate to your needs and proficiency level?  Yes  No  
Comment:  

33. Was the computer equipment available and operational when you were scheduled to use it?  Yes  No  
Comment:  

34. Was there a knowledgeable person available at the computer learning center to assist you with any technical difficulties that occurred during the CAS training?  Yes  No  
Comment:  
The following questions address your overall impression of the CAS/VTT.

35. What did you like about the CAS/VTT? List in order of importance, starting with the most important.
1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________
4. __________________________________________
5. __________________________________________

36. What did you not like about the CAS/VTT? List in order of importance, starting with the most important.
1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________
4. __________________________________________
5. __________________________________________

37. When language related training is provided in the future, which method of training would you prefer? (Rank from 1= highest to 7= lowest)
   _____ a) On-base instruction from a local instructor
   _____ b) TDY to another location to obtain the training
   _____ c) Computer-based instruction
   _____ d) Video Teletraining (VTT) from the Defense Language Institute (no computer portion)
   _____ e) Videoteletraining supplemented by Computer Assisted Study (CAS/VTT)
   _____ f) Self-study package using print materials/audio tapes
   _____ g) Mobile Training Team from DLIFLC
Site Form G: Site Coordinator Interview Form

Person Interviewed __________ Date __________
Unit __________ Interviewer __________

1. Did the CAS/VTT meet the specific training needs of Korean linguists in your unit(s)? Please explain.

2. How much improvement in the targeted skills did you observe in your linguists as a result of the training? 

3. Do you feel that you were provided adequate training and documentation by the DLI to manage this sort of training? How would you improve this training and documentation in the future?

4. a) What specific problems did you encounter in using the computer and VTT hardware during the training?

b) How were these problems resolved?

c) How could these problems be avoided in the future?

5. What specific problems did you encounter in the local management of the project? How could these problems be avoided in the future?

6. What specific problems did you encounter in coordinating the CAS/VTT training with the DLIFLC? How could these problems be avoided in the future?
7. How would you rate the efforts of the DLIFLC in each of the following aspects of the project? (use 1= highest, 5= lowest)
   ___ a. Incorporating your specific training priorities.
   ___ b. Course design
   ___ c. Course delivery (instructional approach and execution)
   ___ d. Technical aspects (equipment, communications)
   ___ e. On-going support during the project (from DLIFLC)
   ___ f. Responsiveness to trouble shooting requests.
   ___ g. Availability alternative materials/activities to be used in case of equipment failure.

8. How did the students like the CAS/VTT training in comparison to other alternatives available to them? _____

9. What do you like most about this form of training? _____

10. What do you like least about this form of training? _____

11. Would you like to expand the use of CAS/VTT training in the future? If so, how? _____

12. How could this type of training best be used to complement your existing language training program? _____

13. Could this type of instruction, if it were more available, replace a portion of your existing training program? If yes, please specify. _____

14. If this type of training were more available would you expend unit funds for any of the following?
   1. VTT equipment 
   2. Computers 
   3. Communications costs 
   4. Lesson development 
   5. Lesson teaching 
   6. Computer Software 
   7. Other
15. Which of your training needs do you feel are best facilitated by the following types of training?
   a) Self study ________________________________
   b) On-base classroom instruction __________________
   c) Computer assisted study __________________________
   d) Video teletraining ____________________________
   e) TDY to program at another site __________________
   f) Mobile Training Team (MTT) from the DLIFLC ______
   g) Other _______________________________________

16. Compared to courses with VTT or CAS by itself, what special advantages/disadvantages do you see with the combined CAS/VTT approach to language training? ____________________________________________________________
Site Form H: Student Interview Form

Name/Rank __________________________ Date __________
Unit __________________ Interviewer ___________________

1. Were the goals and objectives of the CAS and VTT lessons made clear to you? __________________________

2. Was the lesson content appropriate to your needs (CAS and VTT)? ______

3. How were you helped by the CAS/VTT training? __________________________

4. Did you attend all of the VTT lessons? __________
   If not, how many did you miss? Why? __________________________

5. Did you encounter any problems in fully participating in the VTT lessons? __________________________

6. Do you feel that video teletraining is valid, despite the fact that the teacher is not physically on-site? __________________________

7. Would you like to participate in additional videoteletraining? __________________________

8. For what specific aspects of language training do you feel that VTT is best suited? __________________________

9. Do you feel that you were provided an adequate opportunity to interact with the VTT teacher? Please comment. __________________________

10. Which of the CAS lessons did you complete? __________

11. Did you experience technical problems with the CAS equipment or software? Please explain. __________________________
12. How were you helped by the CAS training? ________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________

13. Would you like to participate in additional CAS language training? ________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________

14. For what specific aspects of language training do you feel that CAS is best suited? ________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________

15. Do you feel that the combination of CAS and VTT was superior to one of these types of training by itself? Why or Why not? ________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________

16. Please provide any additional comments which you feel may assist in improving the quality of this type of language training in the future. ________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
Form I: DLIFLC CAS/VTT Teacher Interview

Teacher Interviewed ______________________ Date ________

Interview ____________________________

1. Considering the media available to you with the VTT system (two-way video and graphics), how difficult was it to provide language training of similar quality to that which you could provide on-site at DLIFLC? Please comment on advantages and disadvantages of the media included with the VTT.

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

2. Given the VTT equipment capabilities, how effective was the language training in meeting the objectives established for the two-week training session?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

3. Given the VTT capabilities and the particular learning strategies chosen for the training, how well were you able to encourage and maintain student motivation to learn the targeted language skills?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

4. Of the specific teaching/instructional strategies selected for the VTT course, which were particularly successful? Why?

1. __________________________________________________________________________________________

2. __________________________________________________________________________________________

3. __________________________________________________________________________________________

4. __________________________________________________________________________________________

5. __________________________________________________________________________________________
5. Which were not successful? Why?
1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 

6. Given your experience with the VTT, which new strategies would you suggest to increase the effectiveness of a course such as the one you taught?
1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 

7a. What specific types of training were provided to you at the DLIFLC to prepare you as a VTT teacher? 
____________________
____________________
____________________
____________________
____________________

b. What type of additional training would have been desirable to better prepare you as a VTT teacher? 
____________________
____________________
____________________
____________________
____________________

8a. How many work days were you allotted to prepare for the VTT Korean course? _____

b. What were you able to accomplish during the preparation period? 
____________________
____________________
____________________
____________________
____________________
c. Was the time allotted for preparation adequate?
   ____ Yes  ____ No
   If not, how many days were needed? _____

9. How did student variables such as proficiency level, motivation, and aptitude affect their individual and collective abilities to benefit from the VTT course? Were there problems for some students in mastering the course objectives? ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________

10. Was the level of technical support in the DLIFLC VTT facility sufficient to meet your needs? Cite any specific problems in this regard. ____________________________
    ____________________________
    ____________________________

11. In comparison to classroom teaching, how difficult was it to present instruction and manage interaction in the "VTT Classroom?" Cite specific problems and solutions. ____________________________
    ____________________________
    ____________________________

12. Overall, what do you feel are the specific strengths of VTT language instruction (i.e., what do you like about it)?
    ____________________________
    ____________________________
    ____________________________
13. Overall, what do you feel are the specific weaknesses of VTT language instruction (i.e., what do you not like about it)?

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

14. If you were to advise a friend who is going to teach a VTT language course later this year, what specific advice would you offer?

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

15. What specific advice can you offer the DLIFLC in improving future VTT language courses?

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

16. How familiar were you with the content of the Computer Assisted Study (CAS) portions of the course?

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

17. In your lesson plans and VTT teaching how were you able to integrate what the students were learning from the CAS lessons?

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
18. How effective were the CAS lessons in increasing the overall amount of student learning in the Korean course?

19. How would you suggest that the DLIFLC best design and use CAS to augment the VTT lessons in future language courses?

20. Please comment on the desirability and effectiveness of integrating computer lessons with future VTT language instruction as opposed to using VTT by itself?
DLIFLC Video Teletraining
Course Description Form

Date: ___________ School: _______________________

Course Title: ________________________________

Dates Offered: _________________________________

1. Course Coordinator: _________________________________

2. Members of Course Design Team: _______________________________
   (Indicate DLI organization for each)

3. Course Instructor(s):

4. What language proficiency levels are addressed by the course (circle all that apply):
   Reading  0+  1  1+  2  2+  3
   Listening  0+  1  1+  2  2+  3
   Speaking  0+  1  1+  2  2+  3

5. What is the overall goal of the course? Please specify in terms of what the learners should accomplish in the course, not what is to be presented?
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

6. What are the major objectives of the course? Again, please specify in terms of what the learners are to master (e.g., be able to use a particular set of verb forms in orally describing common, everyday situations, be able to accurately translate a given set of military terms presented in context, etc.)
   1) ___________________________________________________________
   2) ___________________________________________________________
   3) ___________________________________________________________
7. What major presentation/learning strategies are to be used in the VTT sessions to accomplish the above objectives? Specify (by number) the objectives (from the list in item 6) each strategy addresses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Objective(s) Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Describe below the typical daily schedule for the VTT instruction and other activities where appropriate (e.g., reading, group work, worksheets, computer activities, etc.).

a) Hour 1
b) Hour 2
c) Hour 3
d) Hour 4
e) Hour 5
f) Hour 6
g) Hour 7
9. List below the major learning materials (e.g., books, study guides, etc.) used in the course.

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

10. List below the types of materials (e.g., videotapes, maps, charts, vocab lists, etc.) to be transmitted via the VTT overhead projector or videotape player during the VTT sessions. Indicate for each which objectives (from the list in item 6) are addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What specific techniques do you plan to use in the course to enhance the amount of teacher/student or student/student interaction in the course?

1.  
2.  
3.  
4.  
5.  
6.  

12. What steps were taken to ensure that the course will meet the specific needs of the unit/students to be served?
13. In general, what techniques did you use to maximize the effectiveness of the course given the specific media available with the VTT. 

Please attach a copy of the course syllabus and/or lesson plans developed for this VTT course.
Pre-Post Achievement Test

Part I

You will hear ten sentences in Korean voiced only once. Select the best translation of each sentence by circling the letter A, B, C, or D. (50%)

1. A. Have you been to Korea?  
   B. When did you come to Korea?  
   C. When will you come to Korea?  
   D. Did you come to Korea yesterday?

2. A. Some Army officers left for America yesterday?  
   B. There were some Army officers yesterday?  
   C. I met some Army officers yesterday?  
   D. I don't know how many Army officers there were yesterday?

3. A. I bought a briefcase at the market last weekend?  
   B. I bought a briefcase at the department store last weekend?  
   C. I bought a hat at the market last weekend?  
   D. I bought a hat at the dept. store last weekend?

4. A. It rains here only in Summer?  
   B. It rains here only in Autumn?  
   C. It is foggy here only in Summer?  
   D. It is foggy here only in Autumn?

5. A. Many people travel by train these days.  
   B. Not many people travel by train these days.  
   C. Many people stand in line to buy the train tickets nowadays.  
   D. Not many people stand in line to buy the train tickets nowadays.

6. A. When my younger brother was promoted to Corporal, I entered the service.  
   B. When I was discharged from the service, my younger brother got promoted to be Corporal.  
   C. When I was promoted to Corporal, my younger brother entered the service.  
   D. When my younger brother was discharged from the service, I was promoted to be Corporal.
7. A. The baby was given two pills every 3 hrs for three days.
   B. The baby was given three pills every 2 hrs for two days.
   C. I fed the baby two pills every 3 hrs for two days.
   D. I fed the baby three pills every 2 hrs for three days.

8. A. I went there by airplane and stayed there for 2 nights and 3 days.
   B. I went there by express bus and stayed there for 3 nights and 4 days.
   C. I went there by airplane and stayed for 3 nights and 4 days.
   D. I went there by express bus and stayed there for 2 nights and 3 days.

9. A. He has two older brothers, a younger brother, and a younger sister.
   B. He has an older brother, a younger brother, and a younger sister.
   C. He has two older brothers, two younger brothers and a younger sister.
   D. He has an older brother, a younger brother, an two younger sisters.

10. A. Because it is foggy, the airplane can not land.
    B. Because it was foggy, the airplane could not land.
    C. Because it is foggy, the airplane can not take off.
    D. Because it was foggy, the airplane could not take off.
Part II

You will hear ten dialogues in Korean voiced twice. After listening to each dialogue, write your answers to each question in English. (50%)

11. When did Choe get married?

12. What is SFC Lee's job now?

13. How do you address a married Korean lady?

14. Why is Korea called a Peninsula, according to this dialogue?

15. What supposedly has made PFC Choe to be prepared for rain today?

16. What are the symptoms of a cold, according to this dialogue?

17. What kinds of damages have been caused by the earthquake?

18. What did the person buy at the store?

19. Why do people go to Kukilkwan, although it is generally considered not a particularly good place?
   1. 
   2. 

20. What is the person looking for?

END OF TEST
B. VTT Lesson Plans
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>INSTRUCTORS</th>
<th>TOPIC / LESSONS</th>
<th>SETTING / ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Level Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 APRIL</td>
<td>1. KO, HYUNG C.</td>
<td>Personal Data</td>
<td>Information seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 APRIL</td>
<td>2. LEE, KAP SOON</td>
<td>Current Events</td>
<td>Weather forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At school, office, holiday resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student - generated activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal Evaluation &amp; Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUESDAY</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>CAS Review</td>
<td>At home, doctor's office, pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 APRIL</td>
<td>1. EEHN, JOHN</td>
<td>Current Events</td>
<td>Role Play, Q &amp; A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. LEE, KAP SOON</td>
<td>Health &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>Audio / Video tapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LC / RC Speaking Reinforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student - generated activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal Eval &amp; Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>CAS Review</td>
<td>At home / game site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 MAY</td>
<td>1. EEHN, JOHN</td>
<td>Current Events</td>
<td>Role Play, Q &amp; A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 APRIL</td>
<td>2. LEE, KAP SOON</td>
<td>Sports / Leisure</td>
<td>Audio / Video tapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LC / RC Speaking Reinforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student - generated activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal Eval &amp; Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURSDAY</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>CAS Review</td>
<td>At scene of accident, fire, flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MAY</td>
<td>1. EEHN, JOHN</td>
<td>Current Events</td>
<td>Role Play, Q &amp; A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 APRIL</td>
<td>2. LEE, KAP SOON</td>
<td>Sports / Leisure</td>
<td>Audio / Video tapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LC / RC Speaking Reinforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student - generated activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal Eval &amp; Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIDAY</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>CAS Review</td>
<td>At holiday resort, social gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 MAY</td>
<td>1. LEE, KAP SOON</td>
<td>Current Events</td>
<td>Role Play, Q &amp; A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 APRIL</td>
<td>2. SMITH, SUN.</td>
<td>Culture/Arts/History</td>
<td>Audio / Video tapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LC / RC Speaking Reinforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student - generated activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal Eval &amp; Feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# KOREAN VTT - CURRICULUM LAYOUT

## WEEK II

### (2-WEEK TRAINING)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>INSTRUCTORS</th>
<th>TOPIC / LESSONS</th>
<th>SETTING / ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONDAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 MAY 1991</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>📚 CAS Review</td>
<td>🛑 At travel agency, hotel, restaurant souvenir shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. LEE, KAP SOON</td>
<td>🗑 Current Events</td>
<td>🛑 At shopping mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. EENH, JOHN</td>
<td>🗒 Travel &amp; Entertainment</td>
<td>🛑 At hospital, home, pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.M.</td>
<td>🍀 Health / Medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. EENH, JOHN</td>
<td>🆕 CAS - Homework Assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. SMITH, SUN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TUESDAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 MAY 1991</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>📚 CAS Review</td>
<td>🛑 At home / game site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. SMITH, SUN</td>
<td>🗑 Current Events</td>
<td>🛑 On vacation / at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. LEE, KAP SOON</td>
<td>🗒 Sports / Leisure</td>
<td>🛑 Interest &amp; Hobbies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.M.</td>
<td>🍀 Military Affairs</td>
<td>🛑 Interrogation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. EENH, JOHN</td>
<td></td>
<td>🛑 Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. LEE, KAP SOON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEDNESDAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 MAY 1991</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>📚 Current Events</td>
<td>🛑 At scene of fire, flood, accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. LEE, KAP SOON</td>
<td>🗑 Accidents/ Natural Disasters</td>
<td>🛑 Weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. SMITH, SUN</td>
<td>🍀 Geography / Terrain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>🛑 Map reading/ weather/ climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. EENH, JOHN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. LEE, KAP SOON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THURSDAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 MAY 1991</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>📚 Current Events</td>
<td>🛑 Visiting towns, cities, monuments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. EENH, JOHN</td>
<td>🗑 Culture / Society</td>
<td>🛑 Korean Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. SMITH, SUN</td>
<td></td>
<td>🛑 Customs and Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.M.</td>
<td>🍀 Culture / Society</td>
<td>🛑 Festivities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. KO, HYUNG C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. LEE, KAP SOON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRIDAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 MAY 1991</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>📚 Current Events</td>
<td>🛑 Level Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. SMITH, SUN</td>
<td>🗑 General Review</td>
<td>🛑 Critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. LEE, KAP SOON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. KO, HYUNG C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. EENH, JOHN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. CAS Lesson Materials
This program was developed by the Educational Technology Division of the Defense Language Institute, Foreign Language Center. It is intended for use primarily in support of training military personnel as part of the Defense Foreign Language Programs (resident and non-resident) of the U. S. Department of Defense.

Inquiries concerning the use of this program, including requests for copies as well as permission to duplicate and/or modify should be addressed to:

Commandant,
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Attn: Educational Technology Division
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006
This CAS courseware has been developed for the sustainment, maintenance and enhancement of what they have learned at DLI for the field soldiers.
**STEP 1**  The pictures give you an introduction to the lesson. Scan through the Authentic Text. This is only a pre-study exercise. Then take the scanning test. This is not an evaluation, just take it once in order to understand the content.

**STEP 2**  You can study text in the Controlled Level Paraphrase exercise. Read it, study the vocabulary in it, most importantly, listen to it, at least two times. When you are ready for the vocabulary test, go to the next step.

**STEP 3**  Vocabulary Study is a form of test; the passing score is 90%; therefore before you take the test, try to memorize all the vocab. items underlined in step 1 and step 2. If you don't get a passing score, go back to STEP 2 and study again. You may try several times, however, do not go to STEP 4 until you get a passing score.

**STEP 4**  Grammar 1 and 2 consists of Explanations, Examples and Exercises. Read the first two parts and try the exercises; you must try at least 20 random generated sentences and record your voice using the microphone.
STEP 5  Conversation Exercise is designed to increase your speaking ability in Korean; follow the instructions step by step. Again you must record your voice using the microphone and compare with model answers.

STEP 6  When you complete all the steps from 1 to 5, you are ready for the Lesson Evaluation. The passing grade is 80%. If you don't get a passing grade, please go back to the previous steps and study again. The last card shows you your weak points. Even if you get a passing score, go back to any weak points and study again.

After completion of the lesson, you must go back to the Authentic Text and see if you understand it better.

SYMBOLS

To see the explanations, or the MODEL Answer.
Click this to replay what you have just heard from computer.

DOUBLE click this to start recording your voice.
Click this to replay your recorded voice.

10 seconds of recording time will be appeared at this area.
Click this to go back to where you started from.
## Time and number of questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>Required time</th>
<th>Number of questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Text</td>
<td>10 min.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanning</td>
<td>10 min.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Level P. (Reading)</td>
<td>20 min.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Level P. (Listening)</td>
<td>20 min.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Study</td>
<td>30 min.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar Study (Explanation)</td>
<td>10 min x 2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar Study (Exercise)</td>
<td>20 min x 2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Exercise</td>
<td>60 min.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Evaluation</td>
<td>30 min.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to set up folders for the DLL

1 (Name the hard disk as) **Macintosh HD**

2 (Make a folder with the name of **HyperCard**)

```
HyperCard
```

3 (Make another folder **DLL** inside the **HyperCard** folder.)

```
DLL
```

(Distance Learning Lab)

- Should start here.
- Put nine units inside.
- Never delete first card.
- This blank form is the MASTER.

Folder and stacks

```
Folder and stacks
```

- **Macintosh HD**
- **HyperCard**
- **DLL**
- **Resource**
  - **DLL-L1**
  - **DLL-L2**
  - **DLL-L3**
  - **DLL-L4**
  - **DLL-L5**

- **Lesson Start**
- **Reading**
- **Controlled Level Text Vocabulary**
- **GrammarL1-1**
- **GrammarL1-2**
- **Conversation**
- **Lesson Evaluation**
## Module 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Topical Domains</th>
<th>Class hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td>Military 1, Korean position toward U.S.</td>
<td>4 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
<td>Military 2, Training, Tactics</td>
<td>4 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 3</td>
<td>Weather, Broadcasts, forecasts</td>
<td>4 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 4</td>
<td>Travel, Transportation</td>
<td>4 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 5</td>
<td>Health, Medicine, Public Health</td>
<td>4 hr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix**

- Number drill
- Hangul Refresher

---

### Authentic text 1

상복은 전쟁으로부터 출발한다. 눈이 많은 시기가 높아도 전쟁이 망가지면 손톱이 없다. 90년대 우리나라 사람들이 평균 수명은 80세를 넘어서 보고 있다. 그러나 평균 수명 80세는 거짓말이지 않는 것이다. 이를 위해서는 국민 한 사람 한 사람이 자신의 건강을 잘 관리하는 일이 무엇보다 중요하다. 몇 해야 할까? 일부로 신경서야 할 건강관리를 만들어 본다.

1월 - 차가운 날씨는 심장병을 일으키기 쉬운 요소이므로 40~50대, 특히 여성보다 남성은 동맥경화성 심장병에 주의해야 한다. 남자 가운데도 비만중인 사람, 앉아서 생활하는 시간이 많은 사람이 심장병 발병률이 높다. 옷감만, 다리부종, 졸도, 가슴의 통증은 심장의 적
Scanning
- Weather
- Happiness and sexual positions
- House cleaning
- Health and disease
- Lessons grade 1.0

Gisting
The correct summary of the article is:
1. Health is the most important factor in life
2. Cold weather is dangerous for the middle-aged men
3. Proper prevention of seasonal diseases is necessary
4. Teenage problems are increasing nowadays

True / False
- Influenza is a common illness, mostly for children.

Titleing
The proper title of the article is:
1. Health and food
2. Prevention of mental disease
3. Happiness in life
4. Prevention of heart trouble
Lesson Evaluation - 20

Check here for the instructions before start.

Listening - General Comprehension - 5 items
Reading - Phrase Identification - 5 items
Reading - Paragraph Comprehension - 5 items
Reading - Key word test - 5 items

Question 1

1. He has symptoms of a cold.
2. When you catch a cold you sneeze and cough often.
3. He has fever because of the cold.
4. If you catch a cold, you cough frequently.

Listen to the Korean and mark the English statement that best describes the situation.

Correct Items: 0
Item Points: 0
Lesson Grade: 0

Question 2

1. He went to the hospital to have X-rays yesterday.
2. He went to the hospital to see a doctor yesterday.
3. He went to the hospital to get a shot against influenza yesterday.
4. He went to the hospital to get an annual check-up yesterday.

Listen to the Korean and mark the English statement that best describes the situation.

Correct Items: 1
Item Points: 4
Lesson Grade: 5

Question 3

1. He has a stomachache, because of eating too much bread.
2. The bread he ate might be spoiled.
3. He is still hungry due to not eating enough bread.
4. He has a stomachache due to sugar里的 eating habits.

Listen to the Korean and mark the English statement that best describes the situation.

Correct Items: 1
Item Points: 4
Lesson Grade: 5

Question 4

1. Failing to wash feet causes him to have athlete's foot.
2. His feet always become hot when he is sleeping.
3. His feet are very itchy.
4. Taking and skipping feet bother him when he is busy.

Listen to the Korean and mark the English statement that best describes the situation.

Correct Items: 2
Item Points: 8
Lesson Grade: 5

Lesson Evaluation - Analysis

Listening: You have achieved.
Keyword Test: You have achieved.
Phrase Identification: You have achieved.
Paragraph Comprehension: You have achieved.