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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the results of a video teletraining (VTT) pilot test performed by the Defense Language Institute, Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC). The test was conducted at Fort Lewis, Washington during Spring 1991. The language addressed was German. The participants were German linguists from the 341st Washington National Guard MI Bn. The course originated from the DLIFLC VTT center at the Presidio of Monterey, California and was received at the I-Corps Language Training Facility (LTF), North Fort Lewis, Washington. The German VTT course was designed to improve interrogators' language skills and addressed both global language development and interrogation skills. The course was conducted on weekdays during the period 1 April to 12 April. Six hours per day of VTT instruction were provided for the 60-hour course.

Course development was undertaken by DLIFLC Central European School staff during the three-week period preceding the pilot test. Curriculum specialists and the three course instructors accomplished this task. The overall goal of the course was to provide language training to interrogators (at a level 2 ILR proficiency) and to train them to understand and take notes on messages received during interrogation. Specific course objectives included training the interrogators to: conduct interviews (on a variety of topics including military related); understand interview messages, take notes on information heard, extract and exchange information from authentic audio passages; understand the gist of authentic audio and video passages; and discuss news events on the basis of information presented in authentic, up-to-date video (e.g., German news broadcasts received via SCOLA).

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

- presentation of thematic topics;
- presentation of authentic audio;
- presentation of authentic video;
- teacher presentations of grammar, vocabulary, etc.;
- mystery guest interviews;
- instructional activities based upon graphics presentations or written materials sent ahead of time;
- pair or group learning activities.

The course developers capitalized upon the interactive features of the VTT technology, incorporated current DLIFLC language pedagogy; and used effective advance organizers in
facilitating student work with authentic materials. The course was fast-paced and it included a variety of instructional activities. Activities were presented in one-hour blocks and separated by short breaks. The three teachers alternated between presenting course segments (individually or in teams) and preparing and assisting with alternate segments.

The teletraining technology used included two-way compressed 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 six students taking the German course. Students were located in a classroom at the Language Training Facility (LTF) at North Fort Lewis, Washington. They could see, hear and speak to the DLIFLC teachers. Students could both receive and send graphics. Students were provided technical assistance by training personnel from the Fort Lewis LTF.

The cooperation of the field participants, the 341st MI Bn and the I-Corps Language Training Facility staff was outstanding. Attendance of the soldiers at the training sessions was virtually perfect. Local personnel were able to perform with the technical tasks associated with operating a VTT classroom, and 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 specified 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;
- the viability of the approach 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 tech-
niques;
• the effectiveness of the course in maintaining student motivation;
• the relationship of effectiveness to student variables;
• the general effectiveness of the VTT course in supporting annual training requirements.

The evaluation was conducted by the DLIFLC External Evaluation unit with assistance from 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 341st MI Bn linguists; daily VTT instruction and trouble report logs; pre-post achievement tests; post-course interviews with students and unit training personnel; and post-course student questionnaires. Information collected at the DLIFLC included the course description, post-course VTT instructor questionnaires, post-course debriefing; and cost data. In addition, a representative of the DLIFLC Central European school and the contract evaluator conducted on-site observations during six of the ten days of training. VTT class sessions were videotaped for future study by the DLIFLC.

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

• The execution of the development and delivery of the German VTT course was outstanding. The results of the project illustrate the significant future potential of VTT to support nonresident language training for MI linguists.

• The instructional media available with the VTT - interactive audio, video, and graphics - provide an excellent media mix for language instruction.

• National guard MI linguists met the instructional objectives.

• The equipment and communications links functioned at a level of reliability sufficient to support the VTT training.

• The acceptability of VTT training to the project participants was high.
The effectiveness of the course in meeting the stated training objectives was demonstrated.

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

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

The DLIFLC gained valuable experience in using the medium to best advantage in addressing the specific needs of RC MI units.

In summary, the project was developed and conducted in a highly professional manner. The telecourse was of outstanding quality and points the way for future course development of this type. The project demonstrated the potential of VTT as a key nonresident language training medium.
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 skills 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. The current report documents the evaluation of the 1 April to 12 April 1991, German language video teletraining pilot test. An interim summary of evaluation results was provided to the DLIFLC on 17 April, 1991. A comprehensive evaluation report of five FY 91 CAS and VTT pilot test projects is scheduled to be completed at a later date.

The German language video teletraining pilot project provided language training for interrogators from the 341st MI National Guard Battalion. The training was provided at the I-Corps Language Training Facility at North Fort Lewis, Washington. The purpose of the project was to develop, implement, and evaluate German VTT language training provided via two-way compressed video to six National Guard MI German linguists. The DLIFLC provided the hardware, communications, and courseware for the 60-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 the DLIFLC with the pilot test evaluation was added to the Defense Training and Performance Data Center/Institute for Simulation and Training (IST), University of Central Florida ETNA team's workscope.
A. Background/History

The DLIFLC has, since 1989 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 Video Teleconferencing Network (DCTN), most notably for Arabic language instruction. More recently, beginning in Fall 1990, the DLIFLC began to test the use of two-way compressed video teletraining with the (TRADOC-assisted) installation of compressed video and satellite communications equipment at several CONUS U.S. Army installations.

Based upon recent surveys of FORSCOM and USAEUR command language programs conducted by ETNA project researchers, distance learning technology is not commonly available to support language training for practicing military linguists. FORSCOM MI linguist units are increasingly developing the capability to receive foreign video programming from Satellite Communications for Learning Associated (SCOLA). However, the video received from SCOLA is supplementary in nature and does not presently include formal courses of instruction. Language courses via distance education technologies such as video teletraining are not commonly available to MI units. However, the ETNA surveys revealed a substantial interest on the part of MI units to utilize this form of training to address the training needs of linguists.

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

B. Purpose of Project

The general purpose of the German video teletraining pilot test was to test the feasibility of using video teletraining for language refresher and interrogation skills training for practicing MI linguists and to make recommendations regarding future training using this technology.

Following the guidance in the distance education literature (see Bramble, 1990) on evaluating such projects, the
evaluation plan addressed two separate, but related issues. These are (1) the delivery system for providing the instruction and (2) the instruction provided. The evaluation objectives for the project, documented in the German Tele-training Pilot Test Data Collection Notebook (Bramble, 1991), are as follows.

1. Objectives related to delivery method
   a. Determine the appropriateness of the chosen media mix to facilitate the target training.
   b. Determine the success of the 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 this training through VTT and compare with Mobile Training Teams (MTTs) or other approaches which could be taken.
   e. Determine the acceptance of the delivery approach to the target community.

2. Objectives related to instruction
   a. Determine the effectiveness of the training in meeting the established learning objectives.
   b. Identify effective instructional techniques for using VTT for maintenance and enhancement language training for practicing MI linguists.
   c. Assess the effectiveness of the 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 a National Guard MI battalion.

The DLIFLC Evaluation and Research Division was tasked with the responsibility for conducting the pilot test evalua-
tion. 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), University of Central Florida (UCF) to conduct the specific evaluation tasks required by the DLIFLC.

C. Discussion of the Potential of VTT

Video teletraining has the potential to address non-resident language training needs. It has the potential to project the language training expertise of the DLIFLC to linguists in MI units located both in and out of the Continental United States. As stated in a review of the distance education literature (Bramble, 1990), this type training could 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 German video teletraining pilot test 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 to personnel from the language training program at Fort Lewis, Washington. The evaluator received a number of very positive comments on the latter type of service during site visits, but the success of DLIFLC inservice training of local language personnel 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 of students with DLIFLC VTT teachers.
- DLIFLC instructors can be utilized for nonresident instruction without the need for extensive travel.
DLIFLC course designers and instructors have broad access to resident staff expertise and instructional materials and media for effective course design and delivery.

Linguists at remote sites can obtain access to high quality language training on-site, without the requirement for travel to a distant training site.

Enhanced articulation and coordination is possible between the curriculum of local programs and that of the DLIFLC.

Cost savings are possible as an offset to travel and local program delivery costs.

Language training short courses via video teletraining have potential limitations including:

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

Note that the above potential advantages and limitations are presented for illustrative purposes. They are not intended to provide a justification for using or not using VTT in the future. A number of issues related to these potential advantages and disadvantages are addressed in this report.
Section II. METHODOLOGY

A. Description of Instructional Approach

1. Pedagogical Rationale

The German VTT course was designed to improve interrogator language skills for six Washington National Guard MI linguists whose ILR language proficiency ranged from 0+/1 to 2+/3. The training addressed both language skills and interrogator skills. Almost all of the training was conducted in German. The precise language proficiencies of the students were not known to the teachers ahead of time. Thus, while the general course activities were planned ahead of time, adaptations were made to fit the needs of the students as the course progressed. Specific daily course activities are listed in the daily schedule included in Appendix B. Additional details are provided in the discussion of the DLIFLC VTT teacher interviews and the DLIFLC post-course briefing presented in the Results section of this report.

The German VTT course focused upon the following:

Language related areas

- Listening comprehension
- Speaking proficiency
- Reading comprehension
- Vocabulary
- Grammar

Interrogator related areas

- Interrogation skills (establishing rapport, encouraging the subject to talk freely, phrasing questions to obtain specific information, understanding answers sufficiently to formulate follow-on questions, and capturing the essential information from responses to questions)
- Related vocabulary (e.g., political, military)
- Dialects
- Specific grammar skills
- Culture, context, current events

The stated overall goal of the course was "to train interrogators how to interrogate (at a level 2 proficiency) in German and to train them to understand and take notes on messages received during interrogations."
The major training objectives of the course were:

1. To be able to interview, question, and interrogate (German speakers) on a variety of topics (with as much as military flavor as possible).
2. To be able to understand interview messages.
3. To be able to take notes on information heard.
4. To be able to extract specific information from authentic passages (audio) and exchange that information.
5. To be able to understand the gist of authentic passages (video and audio) and exchange that information.
6. To be able to discuss news events on the basis of information presented in authentic, up-to-date video presentations (e.g., German news broadcasts from SCOLA).

The German VTT course was developed and presented by the Central European Languages Department (DCE) headed by Dr. Neil Granoien. The DLIFLC Video Teletraining Course Coordinator was Dr. Pat Boylan of DCE. The course design team included three instructors from the German School: Joshi Hutschneider; Brigette Olson; and Monica Lavelle. The VTT coordinators of equipment orientation and teaching were Brigitta Ludgate and Kiril Boyadjieff.

Information presented in the remainder of this subsection of the report was furnished by Dr. Boylan. Skills and proficiency levels that were specifically addressed in the course were Reading, ranging from 1+ to 2+, Listening, ranging from 1+ to 2+, and Speaking, ranging from 1+ to 2.

Major presentations and learning strategies used in the daily training sessions are illustrated by the VTT daily activities. A listing of these activities and a designation of the training objectives they addressed are as follows:

- Presentation of thematic topics, vocabulary, questions for the day, student paired interviews, interrogation of mystery guests, review of student notes from mystery guest interrogation. Objectives 1, 2, and 3 are addressed.
- Presentation of authentic audio material: pre-listening activities (vocabulary, schema, etc.); follow-up comprehension checks; and open discussion of ideas/information. Objective 4 is addressed.
• Same presentation as in #2 above. Objective 5 is addressed.
• Same presentation as in #2 above, but with videotaped stimulus. Several viewings were given and each time students were asked additional questions to increase comprehension. Objective 6 is addressed.
• Overt presentation (overview) and review of corresponding grammar points. Typically the overhead projector (graphics transmission) was used. Student assignments from materials sent to the classroom ahead of time. Objective 7 is addressed.

The typical daily schedule was segmented into hourly frames in the following manner:

Hour 1: Current events
Hour 2: Topics of the day
Hour 3: Thematic exercises
Hour 4: Interactive communication
Hour 5: Guest interview
Hour 6: Feedback
Occasional homework assignments

Learning materials that were used included: SCOLA (up-to-date authentic news video - used daily); Deutschland Spiegel Videos (for daily theme presentations); and Schau ins Land Radio News Magazine (authentic audio). Sources also included Deutsch-California Staatszeitung, Wechselspiele, DLIFLC German Basic Course LC Exercise Book, LAB II Workbook, and German Special Forces Functional Program.

The types of materials transmitted via the VTT overhead projector or videotape player during the VTT sessions are listed below. The objectives that each addressed are indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Videotapes</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary lists</td>
<td>4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation questions (lists)</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension checks</td>
<td>4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charts, diagrams, graphs</td>
<td>4, 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor writing on-the-spot (as needed)</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar review items both prepared and written on-the-spot</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Techniques to enhance the amount of teacher/student or student/student interaction were:

- Presentations followed by questions directed to students.
- Frequent student/student pair work. Students were required to change their seating daily to interact with a variety of people.
- Student interrogation of instructors and mystery guests – several times a day.
- Students were asked to interview each other as homework and then report back the next day.

To ensure that the course met the specific needs of the personnel of the participating MI unit, listening and reading proficiency were taken into account. Student speaking levels varied between levels 1 and 2 (with one exception). Course materials were chosen/designed to progressively target those levels. The teachers anticipated that the students' predominant MOS was interrogation. It was found after beginning the course that five of the students were interrogators and one student was a voice interceptor. The materials and "classroom" activities were designed to provide practice and enhance speaking and listening skills, focusing primarily on interview situations. Periodic grammar reviews were required for the students to accomplish the assigned tasks. In addition, a military "sprinkling" was interjected for various instructional levels and presentation formats (LC passages, guest interviews, etc.).

VTT teachers were instructed as follows to maximize the effectiveness of the course. "Show warmth and humor. Be down to earth and be able to poke fun at yourself when things go wrong. Be able to admit (and stop) when something isn't going well. Be natural and let go. Don't change your normal "good" teacher behavior because of the medium. Use language-related jokes as time permits." As it happened, students also got into the act and started bringing in their own jokes.

2. VTT lesson design

Six hours per day of instruction were provided during the ten class days. Classes were taught from the DLIFLC VTT Center in Monterey, California. VTT technologies included two-way, compressed video, graphics transmissions, and occasional FAX delivery of materials not already on site. Most hard-copy materials were prepared ahead of time and delivered to the site prior to the first class. Instruction
began daily at 8:30 and concluded at 15:30. There was time out for lunch and for regular breaks. A typical instructional day is illustrated by day five below:

8:30 Short song and SCOLA news "Bundeswehr", with question and answer session
9:10 Reporting back about Metzger. Students give details.
9:20 LC Exercise "Name This Job" with multiple choice questions and discussion of vocabulary.
9:40 Break
9:50 Students ask for a list of items to be sent, grammar modules and maps, etc.
10:00 Video segment with True/False questions and discussion of vocabulary.
10:50 Break
11:00 Grammar review. Verbs and prepositions.
11:30 Lunch
12:30 Guessing game. "Who am I?" Students try to identify a person by asking yes/no questions.
12:45 Continue with questionnaire about professions. How to ask questions.
13:15 Break
14:00 Video segment "Amateur Ham Radio Operators" with true/false questions.
14:30 Break
14:40 Interrogation of mystery guest (A DLIFLC German instructor as a communist).
15:20 Student feedback session

Learning activities were designed to optimize the use of the VTT media components and to lessen the perceived distance between the instructors and the students. The activities were designed to optimize the level of student/teacher and student/student interaction and to facilitate the learning of the specific instructional content and objectives of the course. Example learning activities are described as following:

- Interrogating mystery guests; interacting and posing questions to the guests in German, formulating follow-up questions, then answering specific instructor-posed questions about and summarizing the guest responses to questions.

- Interviewing student partners to determine essential information about them, question and answer practice.
• Using new vocabulary to obtain information about interviewees in specific areas.
• Viewing news and current events video segments and answering specific questions about the presentations.
• Listening to audiotape presentations; gisting, translating, and answering specific questions about the content.
• Presentation of specific elements of German grammar, e.g., verb forms, prepositions, etc.
• Games and simulations, e.g., "Who Am I?", completing a job application, describing a famous personality.

Teachers took turns (individually or in teams) in offering the various instructional components during the day. This made the teaching job manageable for the instructors and offered variety to the students. However, all three teachers were present in the studio during the entire instructional day to assure continuity, to assist the on-camera instructor, and to offer suggestions for lesson improvement. The teaching team and project coordinator regularly discussed the progress of the course. Mid-course corrections and improvements were made as needed.

B. Pilot Project Evaluation Design

1. Project Participants

The project participants were six MI linguists selected by the 341st MI National Guard Battalion, Camp Murray, Tacoma, Washington. The soldiers were serving their annual two weeks of active duty and were available for ten days of full-time training during the pilot test. Five of the six soldiers were interrogators. VTT participants were selected from the pool of Washington National Guard German language MI linguists residing in the Seattle/Tacoma area. According to the 341st site coordinator, Captain Mary Forbes, soldiers were selected for training on the basis of having 2/2 or close to 2/2 proficiency skills in listening and reading. The students are further described under the section of the report presenting the data from the Student Background Questionnaire.
2. Evaluation Instruments

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

a. Site Form A: Baseline Data - Language Proficiency. On Form A the site coordinator was asked to list and describe the German linguists participating in the VTT German Refresher Course.

b. Site Form B: VTT Instruction Log. Form B asked for a list of the students in attendance, the teachers who presented, topics covered, problems with audio and video portions of the class. Perceived quality ratings of the instruction were also included. Instructional quality was rated on the following dimensions: presentation quality; student enthusiasm (motivation); quality of interaction; use of graphics and charts; relevancy of presentations; and wise use of available time. This form was designed to be completed by a designated class leader for each morning and afternoon session.

c. Site Form C: Site Coordinator Interview Form. Form C was used in interviewing the site coordinator (from the 341st MI Bn) at the conclusion of the course. The open-ended questions on the form addressed such issues as: the appropriateness and value of the training relative to military unit needs; the adequacy of the training and documentation provided by DLIFLC to prepare the site coordinator for local VTT management tasks; identification and resolution of technical problems; local project coordination; and coordination of the project with the DLIFLC. The site coordinator was asked to rate the quality of specific facets of the DLIFLC pilot project effort. The interview also addressed the unit's likes and dislikes for aspects of the training and the perceived potential of VTT to serve future unit language training needs.

d. Site Form D: Student Interview Form. Form D was used for interviewing the students at the conclusion of the course. Open-ended questions on the form addressed such issues as: relevance and appropriateness of the training; 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 identification of components of language training to which VTT is best suited.
e. **Site Form E: VTT Training Questionnaire.** Form E was adapted from a form listed in TRADOC Circular 351-87-1 pertaining to interactive courseware. It was completed by each of the students at the conclusion of the training. The questionnaire addressed the appropriateness and value of the training, specific strengths and weaknesses, specific problems encountered with the technology, and overall impressions of the training.

f. **Site Form F: Student Background Questionnaire.** Form F was completed by the students on the initial class day. Students recorded information about attendance at the DLIFLC, DLPT scores, individual training scores, progress to be made in the two-week VTT course, the level of personal priority placed on German language training, and the amount of German language training received in the previous year.

g. **Form G: DLIFLC VTT Teacher Form.** The teachers filled out Form G after course completion. Questions were included about: the media and equipment; instructional strategies selected for the course and the success of each; suggestions for improving future VTT courses; the amount of preparation time and training required for effective VTT teaching; technical support provided teachers during course delivery; the relationship of student variables to instructional effectiveness; strengths and weaknesses of the VTT; and advice for future developers and teachers of VTT courses.

h. **DLIFLC Course Description Form.** This form provided a means to describe the VTT German course. Included were items such as: a list of development team members and instructors; a list of course goals and objectives; the presentation/learning strategies employed; the daily schedule of activities; the learning materials used; the methods chosen to optimize the interactive features of instruction; the methods employed to ensure that the course met the specific needs of students; and the techniques used to maximize the use of the available VTT media.

i. **Pre-Post Training Self Assessment.** This test was designed by the DLIFLC Department of Central European Languages to measure the students' pre and post training language proficiency. The test was a self-report instrument on which students were asked to judge the degree to which they could perform specified language tasks. The test included twenty tasks related to speaking or conversational ability, nine tasks related to listening comprehension, and five tasks related to interrogation. The speaking and listening tasks were selected to represent various levels of
ILR language proficiency. Students were also asked on this instrument what they hoped to gain from the course and whether their expectations were met.

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 and I-Corps Language Training Program), and site visits by the evaluator and a representative of DLIFLC DCE. The categories of data obtained from each source are listed below.

1. DLIFLC
   - Course description form
   - Copy of daily lesson plans
   - Pre-post training self assessment
   - VTT teacher forms
   - Post-training debriefing session
   - Oral proficiency post-test via VTT
   - Cost data

2. Participating MI Units
   - Baseline data - language proficiency
   - Local program description
   - Student background questionnaire
   - VTT instruction logs
   - Equipment/transmission trouble log
   - VTT training questionnaire
   - Cost data

3. Site Visits
   - Report of initial course observations and suggestions for improvement and administration of pre-training self assessment — DLIFLC DCE representatives.
   - IST evaluator site visit including the following:
     - Site coordinator interview
     - Student interviews
     - Other site personnel interviews
     - Classroom observations
     - Administration of post training self assessment
b. Procedures and Scheduling

The German VTT refresher course for 341st MI National Guard linguists was held at the I-Corps Language Training Facility at North Fort Lewis, Washington, on 1-5 April and 7-12 April, 1991. Training originated from the VTT Center on the campus of the Defense Language Institute, Foreign Language Center. During a 1-3 April site visit of the DLIFLC DCE representative, Dr. Gordana Stanchfield, delivered the evaluation data collection notebook to the site.

The initial evaluation data were collected during her visit.

Dr. Stanchfield completed the daily morning and afternoon VTT instruction logs for the first three class days. The remainder of these logs were completed by the senior student in the class.

The IST evaluator, Dr. William Bramble, visited the classroom site on 10-12 April. During his visit, he collected the remaining site data for the evaluation. Mr. John Neff, External Evaluation director at the DLIFLC, provided general oversight of the data collection effort, gathered the DLIFLC portions of the data, and coordinated videotaping of VTT class sessions. He was assisted in this effort by Mr. Alan Stanchfield.

C. Cost Model

The cost model was derived from the literature on distance education (see Bramble, 1990). It provides a means to calculate the cost of the VTT course, as implemented in the pilot test. The model takes into account each of the activities in developing and implementing the training. After 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; on-site course implementation; and evaluation. The model allows for the calculation of projected costs for larger scale development and implementation efforts and for comparison to alternative forms of delivering the training (e.g., Mobile Training Teams (MTTs), local classroom delivery).
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:

\[
C = DE + CD_i + S_{Oi} + EV
\]

The variables in the model are defined as follows:

- **C** = total cost of the VTT project
- **DE** = cost of developing the language course including planning, design, development, and in-process revision
- **CD_i** = course delivery cost for site \(i\) including such factors as site coordinator training, courseware delivery, the VTT instructors, field support, teaching site equipment and communications, program coordination and travel
- **SO_i** = site operating costs for site \(i\) including personnel costs, site equipment, supplies, contractual expenses, telephone, etc.
- **EV** = cost of the project evaluation including costs at the DLIFLC, the site, and the contractual assistance costs

2. **Cost Data Collection Procedures**

The Resource Management unit at the DLIFLC was asked to provide the relevant cost data for DLIFLC expenditures on the project. Additional data regarding time assigned to the project were obtained from the project staff. Site cost data were obtained from the site coordinator and other Fort Lewis language 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. The results of 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 video teletraining will include (as data allow) Computer Assisted Study (CAS), combined CAS/VTT, mobile training teams (MTTs), and local language training on-site.
Section III. RESULTS

A. Baseline Data

1. Linguist Proficiency

Six soldiers, three officers and three enlisted personnel, from the 341st MI National Guard Battalion participated in the German VTT pilot test. Five of the six students were interrogators and one was a voice interceptor. The training was designed to meet the needs of interrogators in improving both language skills and interrogation skills. Only one of the students was a graduate of the DLIFLC. She reported that her DLPT scores at graduation were 3 in listening and 3 in reading. The most recent DLPT scores of the participating students are depicted in Table 1.

Table 1
Participants Prior DLPT Proficiency Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listening Level</th>
<th>Listening frequency</th>
<th>Reading Level</th>
<th>Reading frequency</th>
<th>Speaking Level</th>
<th>Speaking frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Report</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Report</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Report</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the reported DLPT proficiency scores were relatively recent (October 1990 or later). When asked whether their proficiency levels had changed since the date of the last testing, four students reported they felt that their scores were unchanged and two indicated that they felt their scores had improved somewhat by virtue of other training received. The two top students in the class reported DLPT listening and reading scores of 2/2+, one student reported 1+/1+, two reported either 1/1+ or 1+/1, and one student reported 1/1. None of the students reported high speaking scores. The student cohort presented a challenge to the instructors both in terms of the range of proficiencies represented and the relatively low speaking proficiency of some of the students.

Additional information was reported on the Student Background Questionnaire. The students reported that in the past
year, they had spent between 20 and 150 hours in language training. Students with the highest numbers of training hours stated that they studied on their own in addition to formal training obtained through the I-Corps language training program. One student indicated that he had attended a Brigham Young University German language immersion program in the past year. The students were asked on the Student Background Questionnaire about the level of priority they placed upon language training. Three stated that they placed a "very high priority" on language training. Two stated that they placed a "high priority" on training and one stated that he placed "some priority" on it. Students were asked about the specific language skills they needed to address in training. The following skills were listed (number of students listing items in parentheses):

- Conversational skills (4)
- Reading ability, reading comprehension, translation (4)
- Grammar - review, general (3)
- Grammar - verb tenses (1)
- Grammar - noun genders (1)
- Listening skills, listening comprehension (3)
- Vocabulary - general (2)
- Vocabulary - military (1)
- Idiomatic expressions (2)
- Cultural/political knowledge (1)
- Increased confidence with language skills (1)
- General language skills improvement (1)

Students were also asked what specific progress they hoped to make in the two-week German VTT course. The responses were as follows:

"I really hope to review grammar, because I feel this is the root of the other skills. A great deal of progress is impossible to achieve in just two weeks and with various skill levels in the class, but I know I have a lot to gain from the class."

"I hope to touch on all areas."

"I hope to improve my conversational skills."

"I hope to improve overall to the extent that I can score better on the DLPT and have the attendant skills to converse, read, write and comprehend easily."
"To be able to carry on a conversation in German with a native speaker on a topic of current events, at a reasonable level of comprehension. To be able to read a newspaper with a good level of understanding."

"I hope to improve in reading and vocabulary. Other improvement will be welcomed too."

While the statements of what the students hoped to gain from the VTT class were not as precise as the objectives stated by the course designers, there is rough correspondence between the expectations of the students and the course design parameters chosen by the course design team.

2. Training Options Available

Information about the training options available to the members of the 341st MI Battalion was furnished by Captain Mary Forbes on Site Form B: Baseline Data - Current Language Program. She stated that language training was a top priority for linguists in the battalion. Specifically, each soldier receives language training six hours per month (for 11 months of the year) during monthly weekend duty. During their annual two weeks of active duty, soldiers receive 10 days of language training, six hours per day (total of 60 hours). Prior unit language training for 341st MI German linguists has been provided by contract instructors from the I-Corps language training center. Some soldiers have attended the Brigham Young University (BYU) language training program during their two weeks of annual training.

A portion of the 341st Battalion MI linguists are DLIFLC graduates. The remainder have received some other prior preparation or instruction in their target language, but depend upon the unit training to improve their skills. Guard members are rarely able to attend the DLIFLC as part of their service in the National Guard. Some are able to attend the interrogator school at Fort Huachuca, Arizona for interrogator-related training. A wide range of language proficiency is represented in the battalion.

There are a number of language training materials available at the 341st Bn headquarters for the soldiers to check out for study. The materials include DLIFLC refresher courses, FLAMRIC, and military-related language training materials. For the new fiscal year, the battalion has ordered dictionaries and reference guides for the lower density languages such as German. These materials are also available for the four Pacific Rim languages of primary focus for the
unit. Soldiers can request other DLIFLC nonresident training materials after they have taken the DLPT. The MI unit has some videotaped materials, e.g., BYU Russian language material related to treaty activities. It also has access to SCOLA video programming through the I-Corps satellite dish.

The I-Corps language training program was stated to be excellent in comparison to other similar FORSCOM command language training programs. The Washington National Guard MI representatives feel fortunate to have such an excellent language training resource close at hand, at least for the personnel stationed in the Seattle/Tacoma area. Linguists residing 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 both at Fort Lewis and the 341st MI Battalion are Korean, Chinese, Russian, and Tagalog, the training resources applied to these languages are somewhat greater than for other languages. Because of the lower number of German linguists, there is less opportunity for grouping the students, etc. Still, language instruction is available on a contract basis both for weekend and annual training for German linguists.

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

- Audiotape players
  
  Each company has 10 or more

- Videotape players
  
  Each company has at least two with monitors -- Spokane has a large-screen TV

- Computers
  
  Three EIDS machines -- one each at Camp Murray, Seattle, and Spokane. Hope to increase to five per location. Spanish software, CALLIS, authorware and miscellaneous other language software. I-Corps has 6 Macintosh computers on loan from DLIFLC. These will be used in the Korean CAS/VTT training for the 341st. I-Corps also has one Zenith computer.
- Video disc  
  EIDS has video disc capability, have copy of German Velvet program.
- Satellite dish  
  Available through I-Corps
- Other  
  Two camcorders

B. Video Teletraining Component

1. Pre-Post Self Assessment of Language and Interrogation Skills

A three-part self assessment was administered prior to and after the completion of the VTT course. The test items were designed to measure skills represented in the DLPT subtests dealing with speaking and listening and skills representative of the interrogator MOS. A copy of this test is included in Appendix A. Students responded to each question by selecting one of three responses most closely describing their ability to perform a given task. Responses included: "quite easily;" "with some difficulty;" and "with great difficulty or not at all." The pattern of student responses on the test, provides an estimate of student proficiency levels. The distribution of the 29 speaking and listening items by proficiency level is shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0+</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,1+</td>
<td>5,9,10</td>
<td>2,3,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+,2</td>
<td>8,15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,2+</td>
<td>11,13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+,3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5,7,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16,18-20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring of the speaking and listening portions of the pre-post self assessment test was accomplished in the following manner. If items were marked "quite easily," a passing
(+ sign was given for that level, if marked "with some difficulty" then proficiency was questionable (?) at that level, and if marked "difficult or not at all" then a negative (-) sign was assigned. The patterns of +, -, and ? responses then allowed for the determination of self-assessed proficiency levels speaking and listening.

To determine the validity of the pre-post self assessment test, the proficiency levels obtained on the pretest were compared with the most recent DLPT scores reported by the students on the background questionnaire. This comparison is shown in Table 3. As seen in Table 3, not all students reported DLPT Speaking scores. However, where scores are available for comparison purposes, the self assessment and DLPT scores have close correspondence.

Table 3
Comparison of Pre Self Assessment Test with Last Reported DLPT Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self Assess.</td>
<td>DLPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM1</td>
<td>1+,2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM2</td>
<td>1+,2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM4</td>
<td>1+,2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM5</td>
<td>1+,2</td>
<td>1+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM6</td>
<td>1+,2</td>
<td>1+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Pre and Post Self Assessment listening and speaking proficiency level gains were also calculated. The pre-post assessment proficiency levels are depicted in Table 4.

**Table 4**

Pre to Post Assessment Gains in Listening and Speaking Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Pre Assessment</th>
<th>Post Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM1</td>
<td>1+,2</td>
<td>1+,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM2</td>
<td>1+,2</td>
<td>1+,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM4</td>
<td>1+,2</td>
<td>0+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM5</td>
<td>1+,2</td>
<td>1+,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM6</td>
<td>1+,2</td>
<td>0+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1+,2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Reporting Improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Pre-Post Self Assessed Gain in Interrogation Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pre-Assessment Average</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Post Assessment Average</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Establish initial relationship.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Encourage talking freely.</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ask questions to elicit needed information.</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Understand answers and formulate follow on questions.</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Understand answers and capture the essential info.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improvement, e.g., a higher mean value for the post test than the pretest, was indicated for all items. The small number of subjects does not allow for tests of statistical significance.

Spaces were also provided on the pre-post assessment forms for student comments. Comments made by students on both the pre and post administrations are summarized below.

On the pre assessment the students were asked what they hoped to gain from the course. The comments were as follows:

"To gain more confidence in the spoken language. Review of grammar. Increased vocabulary. The desire to do more self-study."

"To increase German language capability and vocabulary."
"To build a groundwork of basic conversational knowledge from which to increase to a higher level of fluency."

"To gain a basic understanding and ability to use the German language."

"To gain increased ability to understand spoken German and to respond in reasonably correct spoken German. To increase my vocabulary in technical military subjects. To gain a better understanding of German grammar. (I have had very little formal instruction)."

"To further my learning in German. To hopefully gain in areas which will benefit MOS training directly, as well as language proficiency in general."

On the pre-assessment students were also asked how they would know if their expectations had been met. The responses were as follows:

"If I have a feeling of accomplishment and feel more confident in the spoken language. If my DLPT scores improve, or at least if I feel more confident after having taken it."

"By knowing whether I am more confident than before."

"I will be able to carry on a basic level conversation."

"Presumably, it will become easier to understand and my use of the language will broaden greatly."

"Self observation and relative improvement in listening and reading ability."

"Very difficult to say how much can be accomplished in overall goals. Certainly new vocabulary and knowledge gained about grammar can be tested. My real measure of success comes from the number of hours I can spend furthering my goals."

Students were asked parallel questions on the post-assessment. In response to the question, "What did you hope to gain from the course?", the students offered the following:

"A better understanding of the German language."

"Improve language skill."
"Improve my ability to interrogate in German."

"A better understanding of German."

"Better understanding of basic German grammar."

"Improvement, direction."

Students were also asked on the post assessment whether they felt that their expectations had been met. Their responses were as follows:

"Yes, I feel much more comfortable in the spoken language as well as in listening comprehension."

"Yes, Excellent instruction and materials."

"Yes, I am confident in my ability to interrogate in German."

"Yes, Some instruction is better than nothing."

"Moderately, The instructors did not place a great deal of emphasis on grammar instruction."

"Yes. The quality of instruction was very high and positive. This facilitated both learning and knowledge of how to proceed with self study."

To summarize the above comments concerning the degree to which the course met the students' expectations, we note the following. Students hoped to improve aspects of their general proficiency in the language. Specific language skills cited were vocabulary, grammar, conversational skills and interrogation skills. After completing the course, five of the students stated that their expectations had been met. One responded with a qualified "yes". Specific positive comments praised the quality of the course and cited increased confidence in the language. Reservations about the course included the lack of emphasis on grammar instruction and, in one case (poorest student in the class), a lack of enthusiasm for the medium ("Some instruction is better than none").

2. Oral Proficiency Test via VTT

In an attempt to validate pre-post test proficiency gains through self assessment, oral proficiency assessments were conducted via VTT on the final day of the course. The objective was to obtain an independent assessment of oral
proficiency against which to verify the self-assessment post test scores and the reported pre-post course proficiency gains. At the same time, the oral assessments were an experimental facet of the project in that the feasibility and methods of performing this assessment via VTT were not known ahead of time. An experienced DLIFLC-DCE tester was designated to conduct the oral proficiency tests via VTT on the final day of the course. Ten minutes per student were available for this activity.

Information provided to the evaluator about the results of this testing was as follows. The approach to oral proficiency testing was rather broad and the time allowed for testing each student was brief. Thus, it was not possible to accurately assess proficiency levels. The limitations of the equipment (especially audio quality and switching) and the lack of familiarity of the tester with the equipment made the testing difficult. Oral proficiency test data were thus not available for evaluation purposes.

It is not known whether oral proficiency testing could have been successful if approached in a different manner. However, it is the evaluator's understanding that oral proficiency testing via VTT was used successfully in the spring of 1991 for assessing Arabic skills for soldiers who completed an Arabic language course at Fort Lewis. The DLIFLC may wish to conduct research into the future feasibility of oral proficiency testing for VTT courses.

3. Classroom Observations

The IST evaluator, Dr. William Bramble, visited the Fort Lewis VTT site on April 8-10, 1991. During the visit, he spent a number of hours in the classroom with the soldiers involved in the training. During class breaks, he questioned the students, asking about their experiences with the course activities and with the technology. The general input about the course was very positive. Students stated that the instruction was of high quality, the presentations were excellent, and appropriate skills were learned. Students appreciated the training opportunity. The following are examples of specific observations and discussions with the students. Other information from the site visit is presented in the section of this report summarizing the formal student interviews.

- The quality of the VTT instruction and the VTT instructors was said to be outstanding. The DLIFLC is to be commended for its selection of outstanding in-
structors for the course. These instructors were both pedagogical experts and outstanding performers. The personalities of the instructors shone and their use of humor was outstanding. They were well liked and appreciated by the students.

- The pacing and variety of the course activities was appropriate. Six hours per day is a substantial period of training time. The interest level and variety of instructional activities were positive factors in maintaining high student motivation levels during the training. Students did mention, however, that VTT instruction required them to remain stationary for extended periods of time. Fatigue and eyestrain appeared to take their toll by the early afternoon in the early days of the course. During the second week of the course, students appeared to adjust to the VTT technology and the long class days. As the course progressed, teachers asked the students to perform a variety of activities that required them to break away from the monitor and move around the classroom (e.g., TPR, physical training, etc.). Students stated that they were not as affected by fatigue and eye strain during the second week. However, they stated that they welcomed the occasional opportunity for physical activity during VTT classes.

- The lack of a live teacher in the VTT classroom had no apparent detrimental effect, although students sometimes lamented the fact that they didn't have more personal and direct access to the instructors. Students depended upon staff from the Fort Lewis Language Training Facility for technical assistance. The technical requirements of supporting the VTT equipment on-site appear to be substantial.

- The VTT classroom facility was adequate for instruction to proceed, but it was not optimal in terms of lighting, ventilation, furnishings, or space. The electrical power supply was not entirely reliable and caused a system outage during one of the observed class periods. It should be noted that the Language Training Facility is housed in a World War II era barracks. Local staff worked hard to adapt the classroom to VTT and power protection equipment was installed. Plans are in place to move the VTT to a larger classroom on the second floor of the building and suitable furniture and equipment have been
ordered.

- The VTT video and graphics transmissions were clear and readable, although additional adjustments or second attempts at transmission were sometimes required. The compressed video format does not handle motion well and some of the videotaped segments with excessive motion were difficult to watch. Switching from graphics to studio video and switching among microphones was sometimes problematic for VTT teachers, especially in the earlier sessions. However, problems of this nature were correctable with the interactive capability of the network (e.g., students asked that necessary switching be done).

- Several forms of interaction were employed in the course. There was a good deal of teacher-student interaction built into the instruction. This was often initiated through questions from the instructors. The questions were either addressed to the group as a whole or addressed to individual students. There were occasions when it was difficult to equalize opportunities for interaction among the students. Sometimes this was due to the variation in language proficiency among the class participants. Sometimes it was simply related to individual differences in propensity to participate, as one would see in a conventional classroom. However, the instructors were aware of these factors and encouraged each student to participate. The VTT teachers improved in their capability to manage interactivity as the course progressed.

- Other facets of the incorporation of interaction were as follows. Questions were sometimes student initiated, especially in cases where students required clarification. During the interrogations of "mystery guests," students initiated the questioning and the mystery guests were the respondents. The instruction also incorporated sessions in which students performed work or solved problems in pairs or groups. The teachers listened to paired or small group student interactions through a designated "hot mike" associated with a chosen pair or group. In general, the use of interactive activities was a strong and essential feature of the course, especially with the course emphasis upon speaking and interrogation skills. While there were technical difficulties in switching between microphones and with eavesdropping
on student conversations during pair or group work, the interactive feature of the VTT medium was employed to excellent advantage in the course activities.

- The use of realia in the course (e.g., videotapes of news broadcasts and current events, audio tapes, magazine and newspaper articles) was especially appreciated by the students. Due to the difficulty level of much of the material, however, students required assistance in translating and comprehending it. The instructors' use of advance organizers in the form of question lists and the presentations of relevant vocabulary and grammar was therefore excellent. The instructors' patience in answering questions and responding to requests for clarification enhanced the instructional value of the selected realia.

- Hard copy handouts, illustrations, and narrative segments were provided to the classroom prior to the start of the VTT training. These were very helpful to the students. The prior planning and preparation by the course developers were exemplified by the performance of this task. Where additional items were needed, they were either transmitted via the VTT graphics projector or FAXed to Fort Lewis. Unfortunately, there was no FAX machine at the Foreign Language Facility and thus delays occurred when materials were FAXed to another building at Fort Lewis. When planning future VTT projects, FAX capability in proximity to the classroom should be included. (Plans have now been put in place to rectify this problem at Fort Lewis.)

- The level of classroom management appeared to be adequate for the instruction. However, both teachers and students commented that there was less classroom control than would have been possible if the instructors had been present on-site with the students. Video and audio feedback from the classroom via the VTT system helped in this regard. Additional support for class management could be provided by an in-class site coordinator. However, the local language program was not funded to provide other than on-call assistance. This factor should be addressed in future projects.
4. Equipment/Transmission Reliability

An inspection of the equipment trouble log kept by personnel at the VTT training site listed the following outages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Outage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 April</td>
<td>12:00-13:45</td>
<td>1:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 April</td>
<td>12:45-13:00</td>
<td>0:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 April</td>
<td>08:30-11:30</td>
<td>3:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 April</td>
<td>09:15-09:20</td>
<td>0:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 April</td>
<td>08:30-09:30</td>
<td>1:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 April</td>
<td>15:20-15:30</td>
<td>0:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April</td>
<td>08:30-09:30</td>
<td>1:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7:15</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the 60-hour duration of VTT instruction, the seven system outages caused a 12.1% loss of instructional time (seven hours and fifteen minutes of instructional time). The system was operational during 87.9% of the course.

Personnel from the Fort Lewis Language Training Facility and the 341st National Guard Battalion stated that they were pleased with the improvement in VTT equipment reliability in comparison with the performance of the equipment during prior phases of testing. They stated that they had gained confidence in the VTT equipment, but still worried that major outages might occur in the future. (Note: in subsequent VTT courses, equipment reliability has substantially improved and Fort Eustis TNET system personnel are planning to provide detailed technical training for future VTT site support personnel.) The Distance Education staff at the DLIFLC and other agencies responsible for the installation and operation of the VTT system are to be commended for their outstanding efforts in improving VTT reliability to the level enjoyed during the German VTT test.

5. DLIFLC VTT Teacher Interviews

The three DLIFLC German VTT instructors, Ms. LaVelle, Ms. Olson, and Mr. Hutschner, each completed a VTT Teacher Form after the course. Information presented by the teachers on the Teacher Interview Form is summarized below.
Question 1. How difficult was it to provide language training of similar quality to that which you could provide on-site at the DLIFLC? Comment upon the advantages and disadvantages of the media included with the VTT.

"We could provide more intensive, faster paced and more individualized training on site; however, VTT does make possible distance education, training that is otherwise unavailable and of amazingly similar quality."

"The system makes distance education viable. Disadvantages include delay, double image of the same thing, lack of 3/4" video capabilities, technical breakdowns and necessity for the technician to be told what to do when teachers should be technically trained."

"VTT makes distance education possible. It is a somewhat slower mode; requires additional prior preparation, e.g., shipment of handouts."

Question 2. How effective was the training in meeting the objectives established for the two-week training session?

"The goal established beforehand, i.e. to train interrogators how to interrogate effectively in the given foreign language, was completely met, as demonstrated in the final interrogation on day 10."

"Very effective. The only thing we could not offer was sufficient military expertise, which has nothing to do with the equipment."

"Very successful! We met our objectives."

Question 3. How well were you able to encourage and maintain student motivation to learn the targeted language skills?

"The students appeared to become increasingly interested and encouraged in their motivation as the training progressed. Students were able to assess their own progress in the daily interrogations."

"Very well. The frequent breaks helped and the great variety of related exercises kept them interested."

"We succeeded well! Our group of three instructors paced the lessons, rapidly changing activities. By tailoring up or down, we feel we reached and motivated the student group."
Question 4. Of the specific teaching/instructional strategies selected for the VTT course, which were particularly successful? Why? (Multiple responses are indicated in parentheses.)

All interrogative exercises with the instructors on day one and then the "mystery guests," because of the "information gap" to be overcome and the natural curiosity aroused when questioning a stranger. The live interviews with invited guests enabled students to use the material they learned in "real" situations. (3)

Listening Comprehension exercises, because audiotape transmissions suffered less from technical problems. In these exercises, the short authentic texts forced students to listen for specific information and exchange information. (3)

Video segments (some were from SCOLA) because these offered the opportunity to practice all three skills (i.e. listening comprehension, reading comprehension, speaking) simultaneously, plus visual comprehension in the "slices of German life." In the videos (self contained mini episodes) there was a great deal of vocabulary and information. It was dynamic and immediate. (3)

"Structural exercises supported by video and graphics."

"Grammar lessons - these mini exercises were well received."

"Discussions of news segments. These were interesting and brought new vocabulary and questioning techniques."

"WECHSELSPIELE. These segments encouraged partner work in a very specific, forced format (avoids rambling) and reinforced syntax."

"Partner work and reporting back."

Question 5. Which were not successful? Why?

"The mini oral proficiency interviews on the last day, because they were too short and consequently produced unrateable speech samples. The students were not prepared for an OPI, either mentally nor training-wise. There were no DLPT data on speaking proficiency to compare to; Students expectations were disappointed (no feedback) and consequently, the OPI was counter
productive." (3)

"Normal graphics format (8 1/2" x 11") does not lend itself well - 4" x 4" is ideal. We needed to redo." (2)

"Videos used were too short, perhaps two to three minutes in length. The picture quality and tone quality suffered through transmission."

Question 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?

"120 hrs. each of preparation time for a curriculum of 60 hrs. is sufficient, but not necessarily in one block of three weeks. More advance notice is needed for logistical reasons, e.g., video and audio tape preparation."

"Cannot think of any one. Maybe enlarge the graphics format to include newspapers and full page or picture."

"As we thought of new strategies, we worked them into the program."

Question 7a. What specific types of training were provided to you to prepare you as a VTT teacher?

The VTT instructors commented that they had not received training in the formal sense. They were provided some familiarization with the VTT equipment and afforded the opportunity for one dry run. Training opportunities were restricted due to equipment/transmission problems occurring prior to the start of the course. The instructors felt that the specialists at the VTT center at the DLIFLC should develop a comprehensive program of training to prepare future VTT teachers. Such a program is now under development by appropriate DLIFLC staff.

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

"Intensive training in VTT technology prior to the start of preparation of the curriculum is needed to make teaching more effective." (3)

"Learning how to operate the console in advance." (2)

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

All teachers reported that they were allowed 15 days (120 hours) of preparation time.

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

"Preparing a curriculum of 60 hours which met the objectives established for this two-week training session."

"Selecting materials and cutting and pasting them into the proper format - developing worksheets to go with materials."

We prepared the curriculum, developed the new material and hoped for the best.

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

The teachers reported that the number of hours allotted for the training was adequate. However, they felt that if the 15 available days could have been spread over a longer period of time, it would have been more effective. They felt that more advanced notice and information about the students should be given in the future. They also noted that sufficient time is required to identify military film footage on 3/4" cassettes, which in turn must be copied to 1/2" tape for use over the VTT system.

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

"Fortunately, only one student demonstrated problems in mastering the course objectives because of his low proficiency level."

"Actually, only one (the poorest student) needed to rely on his classmates a lot. But he seemed to profit nevertheless. Motivation, however, was at a high level for all."

"The range of the proficiency level was wide (1 - 2+). Each was motivated, all progressed - although the weak-
est at times showed some strain."

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

"Initially, the level of technical support was nearly insufficient especially with regard to video transmission, but it gradually improved."

"At first, there was confusion and disagreement as to training or not training instructors. One said "Let her do it," another said, "Don't let her touch anything." Also our technician sometimes drifted off."

"We could not get to our work station at times since the main door (to the VTT center) was locked from 11:30 A.M. to until 12:30 P.M.. Also, since the technician did not speak German, requests for technical assistance caused minor delays."

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

"Monitoring role - plays between two students, partner and group work - was difficult because interaction between students could not be transmitted properly (acoustically)."

"The only problem was listening in on student partner conversations simultaneously. A solution was to have a single partner team turn on their mike. We did this, but then lost the others, which doesn't happen in the standard classroom. Also error correction is hard during this activity because it's delayed. I can offer no solution other than to avoid partner work, but that's not a good solution."

"Partner work would have been better motivated if a single microphone had been installed. If chairs had been easier to rearrange, students would have had more mobility."

Question 12. Overall, what do you feel are the specific strengths of VTT language instruction (i.e., what do you like about it)?
"The fact that it allows for distance education, providing visual and aural interaction between teachers and learners despite the physical distance."

"It's fun, different, and relaxing because of the delay and confined format. Its strength appears to lie in the fact that it's a necessity. The future of refresher courses, rather than sending a mobile training team."

"You can't interrupt. People listen to each other more intently. It's a novel and pioneering way to teach."

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

"The breakdowns and glitches in the technology."

"It's not as immediate and intense as being in the classroom. Students don't get the instant feedback. It's sometimes frustrating to have to repeat two or three times if your microphone is on mute or the student's microphone is on mute. Two cannot talk at the same time. The format for graphics is cramped."

"It's tedious. Every exercise takes somewhat longer than it would in the classroom."

Question 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?

"Read our memo to Drs. Granoien and Boylan. Then talk to the three of us and ask pertinent questions. Insist on training in the VTT technology."

"Be yourself. Be natural. Stay cool. Be prepared to jump in with materials if a colleague's video or program has a technical malfunction. Offer lots of graphics and visuals. Don't talk too much. Give students frequent breaks. Change them around often: new partner, new chair arrangement. If possible, be humorous, tell jokes. Know exactly what you're going to do when you're on and have extra things ready as well."

"Read our material. Be well prepared and be flexible."

Question 15. What specific advice can you offer the DLIFLC in improving future VTT language courses?
"Allow for more advanced notice (not necessarily preparation time) for the instructors involved; offer training in the VTT technology; improve the ventilation in the studio; establish definite objectives for the training session well in advance; manage it efficiently."

"Please see our memo and train teachers to operate the equipment themselves."

"As soon as a course date is known, start action. We had little time, yet the course was scheduled over half a year ago."

6. DLIFLC German VTT Course Debriefing

In the week following the completion of the German VTT course a debriefing of DLIFLC project participants was held at DCE to assess the course and determine the lessons learned from the experience. The following summarizes the results of this debriefing based upon notes taken at the meeting by a DLIFLC evaluation representative. There is overlap between the points made in the debriefing and the teacher comments presented above. However, main points of the debriefing are presented below as lessons learned.

- More advance notice and a longer planning period would be helpful in developing VTT courses such as this one. Finding materials was the easiest part, but adapting/editing them took time. Printed course materials needed on-site should be sent at least a week ahead of time. Certain media requirements (e.g., graphics and individual video segments) took extra time to prepare.

- Site-level (military base classroom) support issues (e.g., technical support, FAX access, telephone, advance data on participants abilities and needs, photocopying) need to be worked out ahead of time. It would be helpful if site buy-in and ownership of the project is increased. There should be the perception that a course is a joint effort between DLIFLC and the participating site.

- The pre and post achievement test needs to be tied more specifically to the course objectives. The test should be part of the plan up front and students should be apprised of this fact.

- Military experts at DLIFLC should be brought into
course design and planning to assist in fully developing and accurately incorporating military aspects of the course. The students wanted military-related content.

- Some activities are difficult for the students, but very valuable (e.g., graphics, videotaped news clips). They can be effective, but require lead-ins, advance organizers, mind mapping, and asking students what they already know about a topic. These can be prepared in advance or sometimes developed on the spot and transmitted using the overhead camera.

- The selection of appropriate instructors is critical to the success of VTT instruction. The instructors need not only to be well qualified technically, but a primary source of success is charisma on camera.

- Strategies that increase the level of teacher/student interaction are important to the success of such courses. Self-assuredness and appropriate uses of humor are likewise important elements. These were strengths of this particular course.

- In implementing a VTT course such as this certain administrative items need to be considered. Roles should be clarified ahead of time. Teachers shouldn't have to solicit colleagues' participation on their own. Time for the activity needs to be built into department/school personnel schedules. Time needs to be allowed for coordination to avoid conflicting duties, etc. There may be unavoidable delays at certain points in the planning and these should be anticipated. Comp time may be an issue if long days or after-hours participation are required.

- Students should receive feedback about their performance on written assignments, tests, and any oral tests or classroom activities. A mechanism is needed to record and provide this type of feedback to both teachers and students. Written individual student progress reports might be appropriate and, perhaps, "diplomas", specially developed to recognize VTT course completion. Also, it is important to develop a means to honor student requests for follow-up materials from the DLIFLC.

- In VTT courses such as this one, the use of English
is appropriate for presenting directions and schema.

- Six hours per day of VTT instruction is quite a bit for students, although it worked all right for this course. It is a good idea to insert frequent breaks for students, to vary the format and activities frequently, and to work hard to provide highly motivating, relevant, and enjoyable course activities.

- It was difficult to see individual students on the video transmitted from the classroom. It would be beneficial to have a technician in the room who could provide appropriate camera shots, especially during individual interaction segments. Also, the restricted options for student seating were limiting. It would be helpful if the students could run the equipment themselves, if feasible.

- We learned that it is not effective to have the teachers moving around in the studio at the DLIFLC. The "talking head" problem is better resolved by use of graphics, audio and video clips, etc. The easel isn't effective because of glare problems. Teachers can use the graphics transmission equipment themselves if it is positioned properly.

- The development of a written course curriculum and daily lesson plan is essential. The curriculum and its sub-components should have an identifiable progression and be interrelated.

- Particularly in the developmental stages of VTT instruction, it is useful to keep a notebook on the progress of the course including comments on what went right and wrong and how the elements of the course could be improved. This should be shared with others who are developing VTT courses.

In summarizing the debriefing discussions Neil Granoien, Dean of DCE, offered the following cogent remarks. The course developers need to find out as much as possible ahead of time about the nature of the needs and pre-course skills/proficiencies of the students. The local teacher or language coordinator should be contacted ahead of time for coordination and to obtain the background information required for course design. Topics selected for the course should have a flow, be linked. Military Language Instructors (MLIs) should be involved to identify particular military and MOS-related topics. In-depth oral interviews of students
should be conducted well ahead of time, perhaps during weekend drills, if the students are from Reserve Components. An agreement should be reached with the local unit about the range of prior language proficiency the course participants can have in order to avoid too much heterogeneity in the class. The curriculum needs to be adapted to unit/student needs. Don't expect to just take a portion of the resident curriculum and transmit via VTT. And, as a final note, dead time is worse on-camera. Plan activities ahead of time to avoid this.

7. Site Visits

Two site visits were conducted during the 1-12 April term of the German VTT course. Dr. Gordana Stanchfield of DCE was present during 1-3 April. Dr. Stanchfield was sent to Fort Lewis partially to serve as a backup German instructor in case of VTT equipment failure. While the provision of a backup instructor from the DLIFLC is not anticipated for future courses, this precaution was taken in the German course because of prevailing technical problems prior to the start of the course. Dr. Stanchfield was also tasked to observe VTT instruction from the classroom end. She was able to provide formative feedback to the instructional team at the DLIFLC. Dr. William Bramble, the contract evaluator from the Institute for Simulation and Training, University of Central Florida, was on site during 10-12 April. The results of their site visits are summarized in the following.

a. DLIFLC DCE Representative

Given technical difficulties with the VTT equipment during a prior January-February pilot test of Korean language instruction, the DLIFLC opted to send Dr. Stanchfield to the Fort Lewis VTT site for the start of the German VTT course. During her visit, problems were encountered with the VTT equipment and she offered several hours of on-site instruction to the students. Toward the end of her visit, the equipment began to operate more reliably and she was able to return to the DLIFLC. The students received the remainder of the instruction via the VTT.

As a second part of her assignment, Dr. Stanchfield observed the course start-up and brought back a number of suggestions to the VTT team at the DLIFLC. Many of her suggestions were incorporated into the course. Her comments were documented in a 22 April memorandum to Dr. Neil Granoien and
portions are summarized below.

On the whole, the curriculum is well conceptualized and well designed. It consists of several components as follows:

Working on Improving Students' Interrogation Skills. Students were provided language-specific lexical items needed to interrogate a person. Language/vocabulary moved progressively from simple to more complex. Students interacted with their teachers, interrogating them; students interacted with each other, gathering information on each other. Each day culminated in an interview of a "mystery guest" -- a different member of the German faculty. The major task for the students was to report back on the information gathered about the mystery guest. Previously introduced vocabulary was recycled and rehashed.

Working with Authentic LC (Audio or Video and RC Passages). During the first and second day, students exhibited difficulties working with authentic listening and reading passages. This was partially due to students' disparate language skills and partially due to the instructional approach. Initially, the instructors requested the students to answer multiple choice or true/false questions as soon as the students had listened to a passage. Dr. Stanchfield recommended changes in the sequence of presenting the passages (simple to complex) and the sequence of sub-activities (for a given passage), allowing students to hear/see the passages a second time and to ask questions about vocabulary, etc., prior to answering questions about the content of the passages. She also recommended the increased use of advance organizers and the introduction of key vocabulary prior to viewing/listening. These suggestions were followed by the instructors on the third day and were very helpful to the students. She complimented the teachers on careful preparation, stage presence, rapport with the students, and establishing bonding with the students.

Working with Current Events. Dr. Stanchfield recommended that the current events selections be reevaluated and sequenced by levels beginning with level 1+, working towards level 2, and stressing level 2. She suggested that students work with several level 2 passages, before encountering passages at 2+ or 3 levels. She suggested that "mind mapping", "brain storming" or similar techniques be used to collect information on certain
topics. This approach to reviewing vocabulary and structure sensitizes the students to what will be occurring in the passage. In working with a lengthy passage (which she recommended against), "chunk" it into topics; deal with one topic at a time. Chunking provides smaller, easier digestible, segments and allows students to internalize one segment before moving on.

Dr. Stanchfield also commented on other aspects of the course and the media used as follows:

Teacher accommodation to the new instructional medium, use of graphics, texts, charts, maps, video clips, etc. Both teachers and students experienced frustration during initial hours of instruction. Each time the students' audio switches were "green" (on) they could not hear the instructors. With increased understanding of the system, and, as more experience was gained, the instruction ran smoothly. She recommended redoing the graphs, texts and charts prepared for the VTT sessions in a smaller format to fit the graphics projector.

Student motivation and achievement: student reactions and impressions of VTT class. How well the instruction accommodated to individual differences. Students expressed satisfaction with the on-site DLIFLC instructor (Dr. Stanchfield), when the equipment malfunctioned. However, motivation was high and enthusiasm was strong regarding the VTT medium. Students showed extreme interest in being "guinea pigs" for the initial phase of the VTT experiment. Students repeatedly iterated that they were learning a lot. Their "bombardment" with interesting instructional activities all day long, so stimulated and inspired them that they reported "thinking" and even "dreaming" in German.

Individual differences were accommodated remarkably well, even though the students' language skills were quite disparate. This was mostly accomplished by "reporting back" techniques. When reporting back, the more advanced students engaged in a higher level language, while the more basic students used a language level commensurate with their language ability. Students did not appear frustrated or impatient about their differences in ability to handle the language. On 3 April, when the experiment totally broke down, three of the students mentioned their physical exhaustion and inquired as to
the possibility of reducing VTT contact hours from six to three hours per day.

Dr. Stanchfield recommended that, in order to better accommodate individual differences, specific homework be assigned to address individual student strengths and weaknesses, e.g., specific pages in the grammar reference book.

Technical Support: Fort Lewis Language Training Facility and its staff. Technical support at Fort Lewis was provided by the I-Corps language training coordinator, Yvonne Pawelek, the contract training supervisor, and the contract German teacher. Dr. Stanchfield was advised by these personnel that they were neither staffed for nor prepared to deal with the demanding level of administrative, technical or teaching chores associated with the VTT courses. They stated that they were not funded for VTT and could not be before FY 1993. At this point in time with VTT, they would have preferred to have a technician and a teacher to serve as standby support for VTT, but were not able to afford to do so. In general, however, the unit worked hard to adequately support the pilot test.

The Fort Lewis Foreign Language Facility had no accessible copying facility (the closest was two miles distant and was broken at the time). They also had no FAX machine on site. FAXes sent from DLIFLC to a FAX machine in another building on the post could not be easily retrieved. It would be helpful if the facility could acquire various types of German/English and English/German dictionaries, including WAHRIG's German/German needed by the more advanced students and contract teacher. This would hold true for languages other than German.

Miscellaneous: Training on the use of VTT for students and teachers; selection of materials. Dr. Stanchfield recommended that, before starting with the VTT, all the teachers and students selected for VTT should be trained to operate the equipment. She felt that it was not wise to rely on someone else to perform this function. A technician should, however, be available as a troubleshooter and advisor, and might be able to use the zoom lens to benefit in the classroom. It should be noted that the Fort Lewis site coordinator does not recommend that students handle the equipment because of its sensitivity and the level of training required to do so.
Transcripts of all listening and reading comprehension materials used during VTT should be sent to the VTT training site ahead of time. These materials should be made available to the students during the relevant instructional activity and/or at the end of each instructional day. Some amount (relatively modest) of materials having a military slant and military vocabulary should be interspersed throughout the course. The students expressed a strong desire to deal with military materials and to refresh their military vocabulary.

Dr. Stanchfield noted that the classroom for the students (in a converted World War II era barracks) was too small, too dark, and too hot. Better lighting (so teachers can more easily identify students by their faces) would heat the room even further. Lighting and cooling are badly needed. The students need chairs they can move around and reconfigure. Soft, swivel chairs on rollers are needed by students who must occupy them a minimum of six hours daily. It is necessary to zoom in on student (and teacher) faces. Someone should be operating the camera's controls who will take full advantage of zoom and other capabilities. Close-up shots of the mystery guests at the DLIFLC need similar adjustment.

Dr. Stanchfield also noted the limitations of the microphones provided for the VTT classroom (switchable, table-top models). To ensure that all students can be heard and understood during their small-group activities (it is difficult to listen in on one group), she felt that some other arrangement is needed (perhaps a central microphone in the room).

b. IST Evaluator

Dr. William Bramble visited the site on 10-12 April. During his visit he completed the student and site coordinator interviews, administered the VTT questionnaire, collected the self-assessment post tests, inspected the classroom equipment trouble log, collected the VTT logs, interviewed Fort Lewis and 341st MI personnel, observed a number of class sessions, and informally discussed the course with the students. Data from the formal data collection activities and classroom observations are presented elsewhere in this report. Two other results are as follows.
Equipment reliability was a concern to both the I-Corps language training personnel charged with maintaining the site and the 341st MI battalion representatives. They were aware of prior VTT equipment outages and the outages which had occurred during the German course. Their confidence in operating and maintaining the equipment and their confidence in its improving reliability was building, but they felt that backup language instructors were still required in case the system should fail for an extended period of time.

Local language training personnel envisioned various future roles for VTT at Fort Lewis. Local staff referenced the fact that they had a local language training program of some considerable quality. They felt that the quality of the DLIFLC language training via VTT, as exemplified by the German course, was excellent. Looking to the future, they stated that the VTT medium could provide training in areas where there was not existing local capacity (e.g., low density languages, special military related applications, higher level instruction, etc.). They stated that VTT courses could be a valuable addition to their offerings, enhancing local capability to provide training in special areas. Some also expressed excitement about participating in a cutting-edge training experiment. Senior personnel in the 341st MI envisioned a broader potential role for VTT in direct language training in addition to enhancing local language program offerings.

C. Remote Training Support Component

The support provided to Fort Lewis and 341st MI personnel was sufficient to successfully offer the course. For the first time at Fort Lewis, the VTT equipment operated relatively reliably in transmitting the course. The course met the expectations of both the unit involved in the training and the individual soldiers. The DLIFLC deserves high marks for coordinating the project, but the operation of VTT at the local level is not without its difficulties. The personnel tasked with local facilitation of the project did not find the equipment easy to operate and maintain. They sometimes experienced frustration with coordination from the DLIFLC (during this initial course in the VTT series). Below are some comments, both positive and negative, from the 341st MI Battalion site coordinator interview conducted on 11
April.

1. Site Coordinator Interview

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

"Not entirely. We were surprised at how much training it took to run the equipment. Ideally, we need a technically trained person in the VTT classroom, but the center is not staffed to do that. We underestimated the amount of effort it takes to operate and troubleshoot the equipment. DLIFLC visited here to assist us and a technology expert was on-site adjusting the equipment. The technical part is the real challenge. The complexity of this equipment is high. Otherwise, DLIFLC (Mr. Horn of the Distance Education unit and representatives of the German Department, etc.) kept in good contact. We're all learning - and we need to be able to cope with the unexpected. A major difficulty has been the VTT reliability. For the scheduled April 13th (Saturday) Russian language training (another VTT course not being evaluated as part of the pilot test), we have elected to pay for a local Russian instructor as a backup. We either need a technician here or more confidence in the VTT technology."

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

"There is intermittent speech cutoff. Also, the system was down for several hours during the first days of the course. Fortunately, the DLIFLC instructor (Dr. Stanchfield) was here at that time and stepped forward to teach those portions of the course. There was a problem with the operation and sensitivity of the microphones. This improved after technical adjustments by a visiting technology guru."

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

"Coordination is smooth here (at Ft. Lewis). We have a monthly language meeting, including myself as the National Guard representative. There is good communication among the various representatives. Language Training Facility staff. Major McVey of G-2, I-Corps is very helpful. There are no real problems. We are fortunate to have the language facility here. The
Guard is able to add on to the I-Corps language training contract. Quality assurance is good in the local program."

**What specific problems did you encounter in coordinating the VTT training with the DLIFLC?**

"It was disjointed at first, different people were contacting us and coordination was difficult. Later, our point of contact was narrowed to Major Nuno. That helped a great deal."

**How could these problems be avoided in the future?**

"We need a central POC at the DLIFLC until things get arranged. Then the course instructors can contact individual staff here. Communication protocol seems to have been a headache for I-Corps. We had a VTT planning meeting (over the VTT) with DLIFLC 2-3 weeks ago. DLIFLC Distance Education and the German VTT teachers were quite helpful. We would like to have another planning session to prepare for the other VTT courses."

**How would you rate the efforts of the DLIFLC in each of the following aspects of the project? (use 5 = highest, 1 = lowest) Responses were as follows.**

- Incorporating your specific training priorities - 5
- Course design - 4
- Course delivery (Instructional approach and execution) - 4
- Technical aspects (equipment, communications) - 4
- On-going support during the project (from DLIFLC) - 5
- Responsiveness to trouble shooting requests - 3
- Availability alternative materials/activities to be used in case of equipment failure - 2

**2. I-Corps Language Program Personnel Interviews**

The I-Corps director of language training, Ms. Yvonne Pawelek and representatives of the language training contractor at Fort Lewis, Central Texas College, were interviewed on 11 April. They offered a number of comments on the operation of the video teletraining project. Their comments about the quality of the German teletraining were generally quite positive. A summary of their comments concerning project coordination and their efforts in dealing with the technical aspects of VTT is presented below.
Local facilitation of the video teletraining has taken an inordinate amount of time. The level of effort was not explained up front by the DLIFLC. In an operational, rather than test mode, the VTT will require a trained staffer to be assigned to serve as facilitator on at least a half-time basis. The level of initial VTT equipment training was not adequate. Our main phone line has been tied up by VTT needs. We were not informed beforehand that another line was needed. Due to the unreliability of the VTT equipment, we have had to provide backup instructors in case of major outages. Coordination provided by the VTT equipment installer was poor.

Our perception is that the DLIFLC needs to state in advance what the expectations are for site support. Clear written guidance on roles and expectations for local program staff would be helpful. Also, information on troubleshooting and problem resolution is needed. We are currently cataloging the technical problems that have occurred in the hope that this may be helpful to others in the future.

D. User Receptivity

User receptivity to the German Video Teletraining course was measured in several ways. This information is presented in several subsequent sections of the report.

1. VTT Student Questionnaire

The VTT Student Questionnaire consisted of 27 questions asking about the VTT course and its contents. Students filled out the VTT Student User Questionnaire after the completion of the CAS training. Average ratings were computed, where appropriate, to summarize the responses of the six students. Items are grouped into categories that represent various aspects of the lessons. Tables 6 through 9 break the data down into these areas and present the results.

Table 6 examines items 1-5, 7-8, and 11-13 which reflect general perceptions about the course. A rating of 5 for each item is the optimal score while 1 is the lowest rating. Note that in this section of the report, as in several other sections, item responses are converted from the original form (see Appendix A) so that positive ratings are consistently represented by higher values.
Table 6
General Perceptions about the VTT Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Help Me Perform Job Better</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Make Me More Proficient in My MOS</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ease of Use of Equipment and Course Material</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Training Ranks High Compared to Other Army Training</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Applicable to My Job</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Like to Use for Other Language Related Training</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Would Recommend VTT to a Friend</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Quality of VTT Training vs. Local Instructors</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Speed of Learning the Required Skills</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Effectiveness in Holding Attention</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 6, the students felt that the German VTT course will help them to perform their jobs better (average rating 4.33) and make them more proficient in their MOS (average rating 4.00). They felt that the equipment and materials were relatively easy to use (average rating 3.83). Students felt that what they learned in the course (average rating 4.50) was applicable to their jobs and that the training ranks relatively high with respect to other Army training with which they were familiar (average rating 3.50). Students
responded that they would like to use VTT for other language related training (average rating 4.17). If advising a friend who had a choice between a course using VTT and a course that covered the same material (but without VTT), students reported (average rating of 3.83) that they would request the VTT course, if convenient. In comparison to comparable on-base, language related training by contract instructors, the quality of the training provided by VTT was rated as better (average rating of 4.17). In comparison to comparable on-base, language related training by contract instructors, the speed with which students were able to learn the required skills by VTT was somewhat faster (average rating 3.83). In comparison to other language training that students have experienced, VTT classes were reported to be somewhat better at holding the students attention (average rating of 3.67).

Table 7 examines questionnaire items 9 and 10 which rate the difficulty and required study time for VTT lessons. Scales ranged from 1 to 5 with 3 being "the same as" and 5 being "much more than". The following results were obtained.

### Table 7
**Difficulty and Required Study Time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Time Spent Preparing for And Taking VTT Compared With Other German Linguists</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Difficulty Level of VTT Compared to Proficiency Level</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 reveals that about the same amount of time was perceived to be spent by individual students in preparing for and taking the VTT training as they felt the other students were spending (average rating 2.83). It is noteworthy here that the course was quite demanding during the standard six-hour instruction period, but there was only a modest amount of homework assigned. Relative to students' profi
iciency levels in German, the difficulty level of the course was rated on average (rating of 3.50) "about right" to "somewhat difficult."

Table 8 displays percentages based upon the six student responses to questionnaire items 14 through 22. Questions 14-21 are "Yes" or "No" questions that address specific aspects of the video teletraining.

Table 8
Videoteletraining Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percentage of Yes Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Comfort with the Format of Class Sessions</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sufficient Opportunity to Interact with Instructors</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teacher Competence and Preparedness</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teacher Use of Charts, Maps, or Other Visuals</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Teachers Provided Accurate and Useful Responses to Questions</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Teachers Effective Use of Interactive Capabilities of Two-Way Television</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Print Support Materials Adequacy and Quality</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Team/Site Facilitator Ability to Operate and Troubleshoot Equipment</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Percentage of Classes Attended</td>
<td>99.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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All students responded "Yes" to each of the items 14-20. A single "No" response was given to item 21. Item 22 indicates that the overall attendance rate for the VTT course was reported to be 99.67\%.

Specific item responses and student comments are summarized below.

On Item 14, 100\% of the students felt comfortable with the VTT classroom. Comments were as follows:

"Nice structure and flow."

"The instruction was very well orchestrated. It allowed for the enhancement of job skills (interrogator) as well as the overall improvement of language skills."

"After the initial familiarization with equipment and instructors, all went well."

"Once we became familiar with VTT, it became much easier to interact with the instructors."

On Item 15, regarding the students' opportunity to interact with the instructor(s) from DLIFLC, there were 100\% "Yes" responses. Comments were as follows:

"Plenty of give and take."

"The course was designed so that there was a great deal of two-way communication. As a matter of fact, it was imperative that students took an active role."

"All students are required to interact."

"Audio interaction needs technical improvement."

"The teachers were excellent in their preparation and execution of this training."

Item 16 rated the teachers competent and well-prepared for class sessions (100\% "Yes"). Comments were as follows:

"I cannot say enough about the DLIFLC instructors. They offer the best foreign language training available anywhere."

"Teachers are great."
"The instructors were both confident and prepared and were very enthusiastic."

"All were very competent."

On item 17, 100% of the students agreed that teachers made proper use of charts, maps, and other visual aids in the presentations.

"Visual aids enhanced the course greatly."

"The <SEND> function for graphics and the second video screen proved excellent for this function."

"Teachers also made good use of the interactive capabilities of the two-way television used in the VTT."

"The audio link was annoying by virtue of its delay."

"Instructors did not seem to be at all inhibited by the technology. Their personalities shone through. They were quite vibrant."

"They required us to interview various guests, thus using the two-way television feature."

"Audio is a bit of a problem"

Items 18-20 received 100% "Yes" responses, and the students offered no substitutive comments or clarifications.

On item 21, five of the six students found the team leaders/site facilitators able to operate and troubleshoot the equipment necessary for the VTT. Comments were as follows:

"But only through interaction with the other units involved."

"Generally, but there were some holdups due to technical problems."

"Some trouble, but the end result was positive."

Table 9 presents the means for the questionnaire items related to VTT equipment. A score of 5 is optimal for item 6 (which incorporated a 5 point scale) and items 23-24 have Yes or No answers.
Table 9
Videoteletraining Equipment Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean/ Percentage</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Reliability of VTT Equipment Compared with Other Training Equipment (5 point scale)</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Not Hampered or Distracted by Type of Video Used in VTT</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. VTT Audio/Video Technical Problems Do Not Hamper or Detract from Effectiveness</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared with other training equipment that the students have used, the reliability of the equipment for VTT is rated as (item 6) "about the same" (average rating 2.83).

Five of the six students (item 23) were not hampered or distracted by the type of video used in the VTT. Two of the six found (item 24) that technical problems with the audio or video used in the VTT hampered or detracted from its effectiveness. Regarding technical problems, some students commented about the poor quality of some of the recorded audio segments and about difficulties in using the microphones during interactive segments of the instruction.

Items 25 and 26 on the questionnaire addressed the students' overall impressions of the VTT. The results for these items are presented below.

Item 25 asked what the students liked about the VTT. The number of students citing each course attribute is shown in parentheses.

- Opportunity to personally interact with the DLIFLC and the instructors; brings DLIFLC instruction to Fort Lewis (4)
- The instructors - they made the course both fun and a valuable learning experience; quality of the instructors (2)
Two way interaction with instant results (i.e. live communication); could both see and communicate (2)

Multipurpose medium (e.g., personal conversation, videos, news reports, etc.) (2)

Variety of class work. (2)

Current events presentations - e.g., current conditions in Germany resulting from the re-unification. Both in military and civilian life.

Value and ease of use of the graphics exercises.

Use of authentic native speaker audio and text.

Item 26 asked what the students did not like about the VTT. The results were as follows:

Voice cutout; problems with microphones and audio switching (6)

General VTT system outages; unspecified technical problems (3)

Being managed by two staffs (local and DLIFLC), being interrupted by visiting dignitaries (2)

Imperfect sound quality of video tapes

The duration; six hours per day of televised instruction was a lot.

Lack of personal attention (i.e. instructor not here); inability to speak off-line with the instructors. Reduced classroom control by instructors

2. Student Interviews

Each student was interviewed by the project evaluator during the last several days of the course. Information obtained from the interviews is summarized below.

Attendance at the VTT class sections was virtually perfect. One student missed two hours for medical reasons.

All of the students stated that the goals and objectives were made clear to them. While there wasn't an
extensive explanation of goals/objectives, they felt that the purpose and expectations of the course were made clear. Individual lessons were explained. When students had questions about what was expected, they could ask questions to clarify the instructional tasks. They felt that the course was generally targeted at bridging the 1/1+ to 2 gap in proficiency.

- Most students felt that the lesson content was appropriate to their needs. The one exception was a 98G (voice interceptor) who correctly surmised that the course was targeted for interrogators. Others stated that the course was challenging and that the proficiency level targeted by the course was generally appropriate. Students commented that the proficiency levels of the class participants varied, but that the VTT teachers generally accommodated to the variation in abilities. The poorest student in the class commented, however, that some of the instruction was above his level.

When students were asked how they were helped by the training, they responded with the following:

- Grammar skills (4)
- Listening comprehension (4)
- Vocabulary (3)
- Speaking, conversation skills (2)
- General language proficiency (2)
- Current events, news (from primary sources), politics (2)
- Interaction with the instructors (2)
- Reading comprehension
- Interrogator skills
- Thinking on one's feet, impromptu interaction
- Opportunity to interact with other people in the language. It's hard to do in the Guard, much of our learning is through self instruction
- Provided guidance in what to study throughout the year

Students were asked in the interviews whether they encountered any problems in participating in the VTT lessons. They offered the following:

- Audio switching was a problem during the interactive activities, it took some time to become comfortable with the microphones, voice cutout. (6)
- When questions were addressed to the group, several of the better students felt compelled to respond in order to avert dead air time. Less able students sometimes were reluctant to speak up, but then commented that they did not have as much opportunity to interact as some of the better students. Addressing questions to individual students helped. (3)

- Many of the instructional activities were geared above the level of the poorest student. He suggested slowing down the instruction. Another student suggested that VTT classes should be formed from more homogeneous groups of students. (2)

- The quality of some of the recorded audio portions was poor. (2)

- During the first week (about the middle of the week) some of the students had headaches. One felt that six hours/day of compressed video may be too much. The room was confining, students had little physical activity. During their normal Saturday training, some learning activities include physical movement or games. Supplementing VTT with some such activities would be helpful.

- Audio delays (characteristic of satellite communications) were bothersome at first, but not noticeable in later sessions.

- Problems with the quality of videotapes (audio and/or video)

- Given the experimental nature of the course, it felt like being in a fish bowl at times.

- Initially, I was not used to VTT, but after the first day or so, it was fine.

- Sometimes there was a bit of overemphasis on the weather.

- There was less tight control over the classroom with VTT instruction.

Students were asked in the interviews whether they felt that VTT is a valid method of training, despite the fact that the teacher is not physically on-site? All of the students responded in the affirmative. They commented as follows:
"Yes, local language instructors here may fear the VTT because they feel that it might put them out of work. But instruction from DLIFLC is on a much higher level. With VTT you lose something with the equipment. However, the quality of instruction from the DLIFLC is better than (locally available) instruction face to face."

"Certainly yes, compared to current weekend contract instruction. The VTT instruction was much better than what is currently provided here. I especially liked the current events, access to foreign video, and the excellent quality of the DLIFLC instructors. The instructors were more military-oriented and they have access to the right materials. Here we have to make do, although our new SCOLA capability may help in this regard."

"Yes, I enjoyed VTT and I learned a lot. I felt that my German improved over the two weeks."

"Yes, it is a valid method."

"Yes, I felt that I got a lot out of it. It was a positive experience. But at my level of proficiency (1,1), I would prefer a live teacher. Voice quality is important (sound quality). With a live instructor there is the potential for more precise communication, not available via by equipment and for personal communication at breaks, etc. Trying to express precise thoughts is part of learning language. This is hard enough in person. With this equipment, some of the subtle nuances of communication can be lost in the transmissions. Perhaps some of these things can be improved over time."

"Yes, I felt that I had a good experience with the VTT class. We could not have received this quality of instruction without it. VTT is the next best thing to Monterey. I liked this kind of opportunity. However, compared to the BYU program, the VTT was not as good for me. I feel that BYU is better because of the access to face-to-face instruction. Due to the excellence of the DLIFLC instructors, the quality of VTT instruction was higher, but I still prefer live classroom instruction. In comparison to on-base, classroom instruction I felt that the instruction from DLIFLC was more "Major League."
Students were asked, "Would you like to participate in additional training of this type?" All six students said "Yes" to this item and offered the following comments:

"For refresher training, the VTT is good. Good DLIFLC instructors. They're the professionals. DLIFLC is well respected in and out of MI community. I feel fortunate to have been instructed by DLIFLC instructors. I appreciated their professionalism, and ability to interact with students. The military context was helpful."

"I especially liked the interviewing aspect and the showing of tapes, if they are of good quality."

"VTT should be good for either monthly or annual language training."

Students were asked to suggest specific aspects of language training for which they felt VTT is best suited? They responded as follows:

"VTT seems good for all aspects of training. Providing written feedback could be a problem, however. It might be helpful to split the day for different ability groups. Six hours a day, was OK. But at the beginning, we experienced some headaches. The quarters were cramped. The fact that there wasn't much homework helped. The breaks also helped, as did the variety of activities."

"VTT excels at providing video coverage of news and other programs. The graphics capability is great. DLIFLC instruction has a military orientation. The VTT teachers were outstanding in this regard."

"Immersion. Refresher works well this way. For this length of course VTT was OK. Lengthy basic language instruction, however, would seem to require a real teacher. Other good areas for VTT are enhancement training or military-specific vocabulary or training."

"The greatest strength of VTT is its ability to teach conversation skills. Dialects and stories of the mystery guests varied and this was a real plus. The DLIFLC resource base is much larger than the one here, so DLIFLC can offer those things."

"I don't see any limitations to VTT once the technical problems can be worked out."
Students were asked whether they felt that they were provided an adequate opportunity to interact with the VTT teachers? All answered "Yes" to this statement and offered the following comments:

"Yes, but sometimes I tried to fill in dead time. The instructors should call on people by name more. I liked the feature of student/student interaction, if kept short. During these sessions, the microphone focused on one pair of students. Instructors provided comments."

"Yes, that's the wonder of the system. It's two-way interactive - more than just watching TV. I feel that time was shared pretty equally among the six students."

"I think that better microphones would help (perhaps lavaliere microphones would be better; like the ones you see on TV or push-to-talk microphones). A switchable type. With the VTT mikes, you have to switch them off. I suggest a wide-angle lens for classroom TV camera, so the students don't have to be squashed together. Or cameras that automatically focus on the person who's talking. The instruction was great - especially because of the orientation of content and materials provided and military content. Some type of follow-up package would be helpful for the next year. I liked the variety of questions students were furnished for interrogations. These are applicable to our MOS skills."

"Yes, the VTT instructors asked for students to respond or ask questions. In one activity, we played a game where we addressed an historical question and asked questions, etc., to solve a problem."

"It was adequate. I would have liked more. I felt I had an equal share of time."

"The presence of a teacher on-site provides more control over class interaction. There was some bumping into each other, etc. Some people were more inhibited by technology than others. I had a problem expressing myself as easily as with a live teacher."

"Yes, apart from the glitches in audio switching. If another student pushes their microphone button, it cuts off the instructor."
3. Site Coordinator Interview

The VTT site coordinator from the 341st MI Battalion addressed issues related to the quality of the VTT German course during an interview conducted on 11 April. These results are presented in the following.

Did the VTT meet the specific training needs of German linguists in your unit(s)?

"Yes, the students seem excited, the training is challenging them, they're not bored."

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

"The improvement won't register on a DLPT, but confidence and enthusiasm have improved. This will help the unit carry on with training during the coming year. The course hands responsibility for language training back to the students. Their confidence levels are up. The training appears to be preferable to sending students to the BYU language training program."

How did the students like this type of training in comparison to other alternatives available to them?

"In comparison with the BYU program, we prefer the current VTT. BYU is too expensive, and gets mixed reviews. We liked the VTT training. If we compare the VTT to the on-base program we probably prefer having access to live instructor. VTT can't replace a live teacher, but VTT is a good alternative, given the different methodologies employed and the quality of the teachers. If the costs are equivalent, we would go with local training or a mix of the two approaches. If VTT is cheaper we would probably opt for that approach. For one thing, the DLIFLC and its instructors have the advantage of more military knowledge."

What do you like most about this form of training?

"Students are being challenged, being pushed. This is really comprehensive instruction. It is fun, different, interesting, and something to look forward to in future. But we would like to have a mix of strategies (live teacher, computer, VTT, etc.)."
What do you like least about this form of training?

"Lack of confidence in technical reliability. We can't have students sit around waiting. The VTT classroom is not the best. The room is kind of sterile, and there are problems with the lighting and chairs. We need to improve this."

Would you like to expand the use of VTT training in the future? If so, how?

"Yes, we would like to see what mix is best. We don't want VTT to substitute entirely for the live teacher. Cost matters. If VTT is more expensive than local classroom instruction, it is not cost effective. VTT may be more attractive at places that don't have a high quality language facility such as we have here at Fort Lewis."

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

"VTT can be useful for monthly training for our MI linguists, especially for less-common languages. It is difficult for us to get this training here. VTT can be useful in addressing the overall language training problem in the sense that it is a useful element to put into the mix. Students need more variety than just sitting in a classroom - there are attention problems if there is insufficient variety. The group of students selected for the VTT training is a class of better, more mature students. Our less mature students have a shorter attention span. They may need more variety in the instruction program than the current VTT group."

Could this type of instruction, if it were more available, replace a portion of your existing language training program?

"VTT could partially replace classroom instruction for less-common languages, or for more specifically targeted instruction - e.g., interrogation skills. With VTT we're more interested in having the training address specific training objectives, rather than refresher/enhancement training. If we didn't have the excellent facility here at Fort Lewis, we could replace training 100% with VTT. We also have linguists residing in the Spokane area who can't easily commute to Fort Lewis. We would like to have VTT for the 341st MI Guard company stationed there."
If this type of training were more available would you expend unit funds for any of the following:

1. VTT Equipment: "Yes, for Spokane, depending upon cost. It would be better than a language laboratory."
2. Communication Costs: "Yes, up to a limit."
3. Lesson Development: "Yes, depending cost."
4. Lesson Teaching: "Yes, depending cost."
5. Other Equipment: "We are buying EIDS machines now."

4. I-Corps Language Program Personnel Interviews

During the 11 April interview with I-Corps language training personnel the following response was obtained regarding the potential of VTT to assist their program in the future.

"We feel that VTT has a place in the language training program at Fort Lewis. We have an excellent existing program in place here and may have less need for more basic types of VTT courses than other bases may have. However, we envision VTT serving several purposes. We have been very impressed with the inservice training for our teachers which DLIFLC provides via the VTT. We would like to continue to receive this training. VTT could assist us with less commonly taught languages or low incidence languages for our linguists here at Fort Lewis. VTT could assist with special topics courses, military related courses, or higher levels of instruction. In basic areas, we feel that we can do a good job locally, do it in person, and probably at a lower cost than VTT. In general, we are positive about the VTT experience, but prefer in-person language instruction. We would order our priorities for DLIFLC language training assistance as follows: resident, mobile training teams, and then VTT."

5. VTT Instruction Log

Information was obtained twice daily (after the morning and afternoon VTT sessions) on Site Form B: VTT Instruction Log. Table 10 presents the average morning and afternoon quality ratings of the VTT lessons. Ratings for the first three class days were provided by the DLIFLC site visitor and the ratings for the remaining class days were provided by the senior participant in the class. Each area below was rated as: no problems = 3, some problems = 2, and poor quality = 1.
### Table 10
Technical Quality Ratings from the VTT Instruction Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Video from DLIFLC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audio from DLIFLC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Video to DLIFLC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audio to DLIFLC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average ratings for the above technical features of VTT center on the value 2.0, "some problems". These problems are discussed in detail in other sections of the report. While the problems did not interfere with the overall conduct of the course, they did, at times, interfere with its perceived quality and should be addressed by the DLIFLC in future VTT courses.

Additionally, six instructional aspects of the VTT course were evaluated for perceived quality after the morning and afternoon sessions of each instructional day. Average ratings for these items are displayed in Table 11. Items were rated from 1 - 5 with 1 being lowest and 5 being highest.
### Table 11
Ratings for Instructional Items on the VTT Instruction Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Enthusiasm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructor's use of Graphics/Charts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevancy of Presentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wise use of Available time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Virtually all of the ratings depicted in Table 11 were very high. The one exception was the instructors' use of graphics and charts, which was rated moderately high. From the comments included on the VTT Instruction Logs, it appears that the technical problems associated with transmitting graphics and charts depressed these ratings.
E. Evaluation Results Summary

The results of the German VTT pilot test are summarized in this section. Results are organized according to the evaluation objectives for the project.

Objectives related to delivery method

1. Determine the appropriateness of the chosen media mix to facilitate the target training.

The media included in the test were two way compressed video and audio and graphics transmissions. The video was transmitted via a satellite link. The VTT instructors in Monterey, California were separated by a distance of almost 1000 miles from the students at Fort Lewis, Washington. However, the media allowed for the creation of a classroom in which the psychological distance was reduced and the opportunity for immediate interaction made possible.

The media allowed for the great majority of interactions involved in classroom language instruction. Skilled language teachers from the DLIFLC German Department were able to make presentations and ask questions of students. Teachers could display text, charts, maps, news articles, etc., using the graphics transmissions capability of the system. Teachers were able to present audiotapes and videotapes to the students. Students were able to ask questions of the teachers and interrogate "mystery guests." Teachers were able to assign pair or group work to the students. In short, the variety of options made available by the media included in the network, allowed the teachers to conduct most of the language learning activities one would find in DLIFLC classrooms.

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

The VTT system was found to provide a valid system for offering the German language course. With some effort, local language training personnel were successfully able to operate the VTT classroom. DLIFLC staff and instructors developed an excellent plan of instruction which was then successfully implemented. The performance of the instructors in conducting the course was exemplary.
3. **Determine the reliability of the equipment and transmissions used in the pilot test.**

The VTT equipment was operational during 87.9% of the 60 hours allotted to the course. This was sufficient to complete the training. Video, audio, and graphics transmissions from the DLIFLC studio were clear and readable. Transmissions of video from the classroom were somewhat hampered by poor lighting and restricted seating arrangements. The audio and graphics transmissions from Fort Lewis were relatively clear.

One obstacle introduced by the equipment was the necessity for consistent, appropriate switching (microphones on/off, and graphics to video). When participants on one side of the system neglected to implement appropriate switching, those on the other side couldn't see/hear appropriately. A second obstacle related to the size of items appropriate for transmission using the overhead projector. 8 1/2" by 11" items were not optimal and smaller size materials had to be constructed.

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

Complete cost data for the German VTT pilot test have not yet been received from the DLIFLC. This analysis will be included in a later evaluation report.

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

The students, the unit language training officer, and the unit commander expressed satisfaction with the training. They expressed a continuing interest in using the VTT for additional language training. When asked about the issue of purchasing future VTT equipment or services, the unit answered that cost effectiveness was the key determinant. They did not know the costs associated with VTT. They responded that, if there were cost savings with VTT, they would be inclined to expend unit funds for it. Unit training personnel reported that they observed student achievement gains as a result of the course.
Objectives related to instruction

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

Students praised the high quality of the instruction. They reported that they gained a great deal from the course. Pre and post self assessments of German language listening and speaking proficiencies indicated that the course produced gains. Language-related interrogation skills reportedly increased.

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

A variety of instructional techniques were designed for the German VTT course. They addressed language and interrogation objectives. Among the techniques used were Grammar presentations, interviews of German-speaking mystery guests, interactive conversation exercises, reading comprehension, listening comprehension exercises based upon audio and videotapes, etc.

With the exception of an oral proficiency test via VTT, all of the course strategies were successful. Details regarding the use of the specific techniques are included in the body of this report.

3. Assess the effectiveness of the VTT in facilitating and maintaining student motivation.

Students found the VTT course highly motivating. Although students stated they would have preferred high quality live instruction if that were available, they felt that VTT was the next best thing to studying at the DLIFLC. The pacing of instructional activities, the variety and interest of the various activities, the quality of the teachers, the design effort put into the course, and the impressive multiple capabilities of the VTT system all contributed to a high level of student motivation. Having two (or three) teachers present at the same time, often interacting with each other in the target language, was an effective feature of the course.
4. **Relate the effectiveness of the training to student variables.**

The instruction was targeted to the needs of five of the six students with higher entry level proficiency. The sixth student had relatively lower language skills and thus had some difficulty keeping up with the class. The instructors were partially successful in helping this student to benefit from the instruction, but suggested tighter groupings of the students for future VTT courses. Students indicated, however, that the reality is that VTT courses for RC units will probably continue to have students of mixed ability. They suggested that occasional class sessions could target slower students while more advanced students worked on their own.

5. **Determine the overall effectiveness of the instruction in supporting annual language training requirements of a National Guard MI linguist battalion.**

The site coordinator and the commanding officer of the 341st MI Bn both expressed satisfaction with the VTT and its future potential for training MI linguists in the battalion. The presence of the high quality Language Training Facility at Fort Lewis makes the site something of a special case, in that a great deal of language training is available locally to linguists stationed in the Tacoma, Washington vicinity. However, the VTT was felt to have considerable value in supplementing the offerings of the local language training program and to be especially valuable to other Washington National Guard personnel not able (because of location) to access this facility.
Section IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT

A number of lessons were learned from the German VTT pilot test which can assist in improving future DLIFLC VTT courses. These 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 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 conducted. The availability of well-trained technicians at both the studio and classroom ends is required. System redesign or improvement may be indicated.

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

- Specifications are required for facilities modification and 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 VTT training sites.

B. Course Development/Lesson Planning

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

- The first time a given VTT course is offered, there is a requirement for greater planning and preparation than for classroom teaching. This includes specification of the course goals 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 curriculum/instructional design specialists, a technology specialists, an evaluation expert and experienced teachers is recommended for optimum course design.

- Careful planning is required to optimize the features available with the VTT system. A fast-paced, highly interactive course with a variety of motivating instructional activities is optimal.

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 the success of future VTT courses.

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

- Systematic prior orientation and training should be provided for VTT 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.

A team approach to teaching VTT courses appears to offer significant advantages over a single instructor.

D. Evaluation and Record Keeping

- Student progress should be systematically recorded and appropriate feedback provided. As VTT offerings increase, an automated student record system may be required.

- A pre-post measure of student achievement, carefully tied to course objectives should be developed. The pre-post administration of this test will assist in determining the success of the course and identify 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 DLIFLC site visit allowed for important mid-course improvements. Periodic debriefings via the VTT system are also recommended.

E. Recording Lessons Learned

- Numerous lessons were learned from the German 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 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 operations guidelines.
Section V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This report presents the results of a video teletraining (VTT) pilot test performed by DLIFLC and conducted at Fort Lewis during Spring 1991. The language addressed was German and the participants were German linguists from the 341st National Guard MI unit. The course originated from the DLIFLC VTT center at the Presidio of Monterey, California and was received at the Language Training Facility (LTF), North Fort Lewis, Washington. The German VTT course was designed to improve interrogators' language skills. It addressed both global language development and interview/interrogation skills. The course was conducted on weekdays during the period 1 April to 12 April. Six hours per day of VTT instruction were provided for the 60-hour course.

Detailed course development was undertaken by the DLIFLC Department Central European Languages (DCE) staff during the three-week period preceding the pilot test. Curriculum specialists and the three course instructors accomplished this task. The stated goal of the course was "to train interrogators how to interrogate (at a level 2 proficiency) and to train them to understand and take notes on messages received during interrogation." Specific course objectives included training the students to do the following: conduct interviews (interrogations on a variety of topics including military related); understand interview messages, take notes on information heard, extract and exchange information from authentic audio passages; understand the gist of authentic audio and video passages; and discuss news events on the basis of information presented in authentic, up-to-date video (from SCOLA).

Some of the major presentation and instruction formats for the course were as follows: presentation of thematic topics; presentation of authentic audio and video; teacher presentations on grammar, vocabulary, etc.; mystery guest interviews; instructional activities based upon graphics presentations or written materials sent ahead of time; and pair or group learning activities. The course developers capitalized upon the interactive features of the VTT technology, incorporated current DLIFLC approaches to language pedagogy; and effectively used advance organizers to facilitate student work with authentic materials. The course was fast paced, and included a considerable variety of instructional activities. It was presented in one-hour blocks separated by short breaks. The three teachers alternated between presenting segments (individually or in teams) and preparing and critiquing alternate segments.
The VTT technology included two-way compressed audio/video carried via satellite and two-way graphics transmissions. Teaching originated from the VTT studio at the DLIFLC and teachers were assisted throughout the course by a VTT technician. Teachers were able to transmit graphics including text, charts, photos, maps, newsprint, and magazine articles to the students. The teachers could both see and hear the six students taking the course. Students were located in a classroom at the LTF at Fort Lewis, Washington. They could see, hear and speak to the DLIFLC teachers. Students could also view and send graphics. Students were provided technical assistance by LTF personnel.

The cooperation of the field participants, the 341st MI Bn and the I-Corps LTF staff was outstanding. Attendance of the soldiers at the training sessions was virtually perfect. Local personnel were able to cope with the technical requirements associated with operating a VTT classroom. The effort was well coordinated locally and collection of detailed evaluation data was accomplished as planned. The DLIFLC successfully accomplished the coordination and field support tasks required for both the technical and training aspects of the pilot test.

The project evaluation addressed a number of specified 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 following: appropriateness of the media mix; viability of the approaches in facilitating language training; reliability of the equipment and communication; cost of providing the training; and acceptance of the delivery approach to the target community. Training objectives included determining the following: effectiveness of the training in meeting the learning objectives; identification of effective instructional techniques; effectiveness in facilitating and maintaining student motivation; relationship of training effectiveness to student variables; and general VTT effectiveness in supporting annual training requirements. The evaluation was conducted by the DLIFLC External Evaluation unit with assistance from the Institute for Simulation and Training, University of Central Florida.

A variety of evaluation data was collected at the learning site in order to address the various evaluation objectives. These data included the following: background data on the students including prior language proficiency; language training options currently available to 341st MI Bn linguists; daily VTT instruction and trouble report logs;
pre-post achievement tests; post-course interviews with students and site personnel; and post-course student VTT questionnaires. Data collected at the DLIFLC included a course description, post-course instructor questionnaires, post-course debriefing; and cost data. A representative of DLIFLC DCE and the contract evaluator gathered on-site observations during six of the ten training days. In addition, DLIFLC FS staff videotaped the teaching for future study by the institute.

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

- The results of the German VTT pilot project are very encouraging. They point to the significant future potential of the approach to support the future non-resident language training for MI linguists throughout the United States. The instructional media available with the VTT interactive audio, video, and graphics, provide an excellent mix for language instruction. The participating National Guard MI linguists were able to meet the designated instructional objectives. The equipment and communications functioned at a level of reliability sufficient to support the VTT training. The acceptability of the VTT training to the project participants was high.

- The effectiveness of the DLIFLC Department of Central European Languages in developing and delivering an outstanding course of German language study, combined with aspects of interrogator skill improvement, was demonstrated. Participants commented upon the outstanding quality of the course and the instructors. They considered the course structure and contents to be highly motivating and interesting. The DLIFLC gained valuable experience in the general use of VTT for language training and in using the VTT medium to best advantage to address the specific needs of RC MI units. The course developers incorporated a wide variety of instructional activities and formats into the course. These were refined during later class sessions based upon formative feedback from the field. 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 telecourse was of outstanding quality and points the way for future course development of this type. The project demonstrated the substantial potential of VTT as a nonresident language training medium.
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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 German Course?</th>
<th>Experience as Linguist Yes/No</th>
<th># Years Active Reserve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
# Site Form B: VTT Instruction Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Students in Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Instructional Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Insert one for each item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trouble Report: Check all problems that occurred.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video from DLI __None (no picture)___Some Problems___Poor Quality___Video to DLI __None (no picture)___Some Problems___Poor Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio from DLI __None (No audio)___Some Problems___Poor Quality___Audio to DLI __None (No audio)___Some Problems___Poor Quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How were problems resolved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VTT Instructor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student enthusiasm (motivation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor's use of graphics/charts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevancy of presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wise use of available time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trouble Report Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Form C: Site Coordinator Interview Form

Person Interviewed __________________ Date ________________
Unit __________________ Interviewer __________________

1. Did the VTT meet the specific training needs of German 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 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 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 this type of 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 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. Communications costs ______________________
   3. Lesson development ______________________
   4. Lesson teaching ______________________
   5. 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 ________________________________________________
Site Form D: Student Interview Form

Name/Rank ___________________________ Date ____________
Unit ________________ Interviewer ________________________

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

2. Were the goals and objectives of the lessons made clear to you? _______________________

3. Was the lesson content appropriate to your needs? ______

4. How were you helped by the training? _______________________

5. Did you encounter any problems in participating in the lessons? _______________________

6. Do you feel that this method of training is valid, despite the fact that the teacher is not physically on-site? __________

7. Would you like to participate in additional training of this type? _______________________

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

9. Did you feel that you were provided an adequate opportunity to interact with the VTT teacher? Please comment. ______
Site Form E: Video Teletraining (VTT) Questionnaire

Name/Rank ___________________________ Unit ________________

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with these statements about the video teletraining (VTT). Use the following codes:

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

1. The VTT training will help perform my job better.

2. The VTT training makes me more proficient in my MOS.

3. The VTT equipment and course materials were easy to use.

4. The VTT training ranks high compared to other Army training I have received.

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

5. How much of what you learned via 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

6. 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

7. Would you like to use the 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
8. How would you advise a friend who had a choice between a course using VTT and a course that covered the same material, but without VTT?

[ ] Try hard to get into the VTT course
[ ] Request the VTT course if convenient
[ ] Neither request, nor avoid the VTT course
[ ] Avoid the VTT, if possible
[ ] Avoid the VTT at any cost

9. How much time did you spend preparing for and taking the VTT training compared with other German 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

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

[ ] Very difficult
[ ] Somewhat difficult
[ ] About right
[ ] Somewhat easy
[ ] Very easy

11. In comparison to comparable on-base, language-related training by contract instructors, what was the quality of the training provided by VTT?

[ ] Much better
[ ] Better
[ ] About the same
[ ] Worse
[ ] Much worse

12. In comparison to comparable on-base, language-related training by contract instructors, how fast were you able to learn the required skills by VTT?

[ ] Much faster
[ ] Somewhat faster
[ ] About the same
[ ] Somewhat slower
[ ] Much slower

13. In comparison to other language-related training you have experienced, how effectively did the 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.

14. After your initial familiarization with the VTT classroom, were you comfortable with the format of the class sessions?  
Yes _____  No _____  
Comment: __________________________________________

15. Did you feel that you and the other students were provided sufficient opportunity to interact with the instructor(s) from DLIFLC?  
Yes _____  No _____  
Comment: __________________________________________

16. Were the DLIFLC teachers competent and well-prepared for the class sessions?  
Yes _____  No _____  
Comment: __________________________________________

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

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

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

20. Were the print support materials provided to VTT students adequate and of high quality?  
Yes _____  No _____  
Comment: __________________________________________

21. Was your team leader/site facilitator able to operate and trouble-shoot the equipment necessary for the VTT?  
Yes _____  No _____  
Comment: __________________________________________
22. Approximately what percentage of the VTT classes were you able to attend: ____%  
Comment: ____________________________________________________________

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

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

The following questions address your overall impression of the VTT.

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

26. What did you not like about the VTT? List in order of importance, starting with the most important.
1. ________________________________________________________________
2. ________________________________________________________________
3. ________________________________________________________________
4. ________________________________________________________________
5. ________________________________________________________________
27. When language related training is provided in the future, which method of training would you prefer? (Rank from 1= highest to 5= 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
   ______ e) Self-study package using print materials/ audio tapes
   ______ f) Mobile Training Team from DLI
Site Form F: Student Background Questionnaire

Date ______________________

Name/Rank ____________________ Unit ____________________

PMOS _______________________

1. Did you attend the DLIFLC? Yes ___ No ___
   If so, Did you graduate? ___ Year? ___

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

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

3. What scores did you have 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 VTT German course?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

7. What level of priority do you personally place upon improving your German language skills? (check one)
   ___ Very high priority
   ___ High priority
   ___ Some priority
   ___ Little priority
   ___ No priority
Please explain ________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

8. How many hours of German language training have you received in the past year? ________
Providers: ____________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Form G: DLIFLC 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 German 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 effect 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?
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.
Site Form H: Pre-Training Self-Assessment

Name/Rank___________________________________________ Date ____________________
Unit ________________________________________________

A. Listed below are a number of "can do" statements about a person's speaking ability in a second language. Please read each description carefully and indicate by circling the appropriate number in one of the three columns, whether you would be able--at the present time in German--to carry out this task "quite easily," "with some difficulty," or "with great difficulty or not at all."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I can . . .</th>
<th>Quite Easily</th>
<th>With Some Difficulty</th>
<th>With Great Difficulty or Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. say the days of the week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. count to 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. give the current date (month, day, year)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. accomplish routine daily tasks involving interaction with others, e.g., in a restaurant, the post office, a department store, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ask directions on the street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. explain to emergency services personnel on the telephone what kinds of health and first aid services are needed at an accident site</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. introduce myself in social situations, and use appropriate greetings and leave-taking expressions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. describe someone or something very simply (e.g., a house, a relative, food, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ask and answer questions about my daily life and common occurrences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. give simple biographical information about myself (e.g., place of birth, composition of family, early schooling, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I can . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Quite Easily</th>
<th>With Some Difficulty</th>
<th>With Great Difficulty or Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. talk about my favorite hobby at some length, using appropriate vocabulary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. describe my present job, studies, or other major life activities accurately and in detail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. tell what I plan to be doing 5 years from now, using appropriate future tenses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. tell factually something that happened to me (e.g., during a vacation, an accident, an illness, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. give directions to someone who is lost (assuming I know the directions)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. talk my way through a complicated situation (e.g., misplaced credit card, lost reservation, missed appointments, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. compare two things, people, or places with a fair amount of detail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. discuss current economical/political issues using appropriate vocabulary (e.g., gun control, the role of sports in U.S. universities, alcohol vs. drug use, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. state and support with examples and reasons a position on a controversial topic (e.g., abortion, curfews for teens, death penalty, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. hypothesize on what I might have done had I not done something (e.g., had I not joined the Army, had I not married, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Regardless of how well you currently speak German, please react to each of the following "can do" statements in terms of your present level of listening comprehension in German. For statements 3 through 9, assume that the topics being discussed are topics whose vocabulary you are familiar with in German.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I can . . .</th>
<th>Quite Easily</th>
<th>With Some Difficulty</th>
<th>With Great Difficulty or Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. understand very simple statements or questions in German (&quot;Hello,&quot; &quot;How are you?&quot;, &quot;What's your name&quot;, &quot;Where do you live?&quot;, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. understand &quot;public address system&quot; announcements, such as airplane departures, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. in face-to-face conversation, understand a native speaker who is speaking slowly and carefully (i.e., deliberately adapting his or her speech to suit me)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. in face-to-face conversation with a native speaker who is speaking slowly and carefully to me, tell whether the speaker is referring to past, present, or future events.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. in face-to-face conversation, understand native speakers who are speaking to me as quickly and as colloquially as they would to another native speaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. on the telephone, understand a native speaker who is speaking to me slowly and carefully (i.e., deliberately adapting his or her speech to suit me)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. on the telephone, understand a native speaker who is speaking as quickly and as colloquially as he or she would to a native speaker of German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. understand two native speakers when they are talking rapidly with one another</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. understand news broadcasts on the radio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. If you were called upon to perform duties as an interrogator today, and to do so in German, how confident would you be in your ability to carry out your tasks? Please indicate by circling the appropriate number in one of the three columns, whether you would be able— at the present time—to carry out this task " quite easily," " with some difficulty," or " with great difficulty or not at all."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I can . . .</th>
<th>Quite Easily</th>
<th>With Some Difficulty</th>
<th>With Great Difficulty or Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. establish an initial relationship with the source (interrogatee)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. encourage him or her to talk freely with me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ask questions to elicit the information my commanders need</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. understand the answers quickly enough to formulate follow-on questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. understand the answers well enough to be able to capture the essential elements of information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Please give brief answers to the following questions concerning your expectations for this course.

1. What do you hope to gain from this course?

2. How will you know at the end whether your expectations have been met?

Thank you very much for your responses.
Site Form I: Post-Training Self-Assessment

Name/Rank ___________________________ Date ___________________________
Unit ________________________________

A. Listed below are a number of "can do" statements about a person's speaking ability in a second language. Please read each description carefully and indicate by circling the appropriate number in one of the three columns, whether you would be able--at the present time in German--to carry out this task "quite easily," "with some difficulty," or "with great difficulty or not at all."

I can . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quite Easily</th>
<th>With Some Difficulty</th>
<th>With Great Difficulty or Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>say the days of the week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>count to 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>give the current date (month, day, year)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>accomplish routine daily tasks involving interaction with others, e.g., in a restaurant, the post office, a department store, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ask directions on the street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>explain to emergency services personnel on the telephone what kinds of health and first aid services are needed at an accident site</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>introduce myself in social situations, and use appropriate greetings and leave-taking expressions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>describe someone or something very simply (e.g., a house, a relative, food, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ask and answer questions about my daily life and common occurrences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>give simple biographical information about myself (e.g., place of birth, composition of family, early schooling, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I can . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quite Easily</th>
<th>With Some Difficulty</th>
<th>With Great Difficulty or Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>talk about my favorite hobby at some length, using appropriate vocabulary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>describe my present job, studies, or other major life activities accurately and in detail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>tell what I plan to be doing 5 years from now, using appropriate future tenses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>tell factually something that happened to me (e.g., during a vacation, an accident, an illness, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>give directions to someone who is lost (assuming I know the directions)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>talk my way through a complicated situation (e.g., misplaced credit card, lost reservation, missed appointments, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>compare two things, people, or places with a fair amount of detail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>discuss current economical/political issues using appropriate vocabulary (e.g., gun control, the role of sports in U.S. universities, alcohol vs. drug use, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>state and support with examples and reasons a position on a controversial topic (e.g., abortion, curfews for teens, death penalty, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>hypothesize on what I might have done had I not done something (e.g., had I not joined the Army, had I not married, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Regardless of how well you currently speak German, please react to each of the following "can do" statements in terms of your present level of listening comprehension in German. For statements 3 through 9, assume that the topics being discussed are topics whose vocabulary you are familiar with in German.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I can ...</th>
<th>Quite Easily</th>
<th>With Some Difficulty</th>
<th>With Great Difficulty or Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. understand very simple statements or questions in German (&quot;Hello,&quot; &quot;How are you?&quot;, &quot;What's your name&quot;, &quot;Where do you live?&quot;, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. understand &quot;public address system&quot; announcements, such as airplane departures, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. in face-to-face conversation, understand a native speaker who is speaking slowly and carefully (i.e., deliberately adapting his or her speech to suit me)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. in face-to-face conversation with a native speaker who is speaking slowly and carefully to me, tell whether the speaker is referring to past, present, or future events.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. in face-to-face conversation, understand native speakers who are speaking to me as quickly and as colloquially as they would to another native speaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. on the telephone, understand a native speaker who is speaking to me slowly and carefully (i.e., deliberately adapting his or her speech to suit me)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. on the telephone, understand a native speaker who is speaking as quickly and as colloquially as he or she would to a native speaker of German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. understand two native speakers when they are talking rapidly with one another</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. understand news broadcasts on the radio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. If you were called upon to perform duties as an interrogator today and to do so in German, how confident would you be in your ability to carry out your tasks? Please indicate by circling the appropriate number in one of the three columns, whether you would be able—at the present time—to carry out this task "quite easily," "with some difficulty," or "with great difficulty or not at all."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I can . . .</th>
<th>Quite Easily</th>
<th>With Some Difficulty</th>
<th>With Great Difficulty or Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. establish an initial relationship with the source (interroggee)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. encourage him or her to talk freely with me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ask questions to elicit the information my commanders need</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. understand the answers quickly enough to formulate follow-on questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. understand the answers well enough to be able to capture the essential elements of information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Please give brief answers to the following questions concerning your expectations for this course.

1. What did you hope to gain from this course?

2. Do you think your expectations have been met?__________
   Please explain your answer.

Thank you very much for your responses.
B. Daily Class Schedule
Daily schedule of instruction used by German VTT team

First day
8:30 Introduction of students & instructors, introduction of course and daily schedule, question & answer session with students "What Are Your Expectations"
9:15 Interrogation of LaVelle & reporting back to Hutschneider about LaVelle
9:30 Break
9:40 LC exercise with multiple choice questions & subsequent partner Q&A practice
10:10 Interrogation of Olson & partner feedback about Olson
10:30 Break
Down - Interference from Ft. Eustis
10:55 Video segment with T F questions & translation exercise. (This segment was temporarily replaced by handouts in care package due to technical interruption)
11:30 Lunch
Down - truck ran over satellite cable in Oklahoma
1:40 Exercises on how to inquire about family data
2:20 LC exercise with multiple choice questions & Q&A partner session
2:50 Interrogation of Col. Fischer & Hutschneider
3:15 Feedback on interrogations and on first day

Second day
8:30 Students report on partner
8:45 Scola news segment on RAF & Stasi involvement with Q&A session
9:10 Exercises on how to inquire about a person's education, with new vocab
9:30 Break
9:40 LC exercise on military training & comprehension check, then Q&A w/partner
10:10 Video segment "Bundeswehrhochschule" with T F questions
Interrupted by technical problems and replaced by discussion on character traits
10:55 Second attempt of video segment "Bundeswehrhochschule" Successful!
11:30 Lunch
12:30 Geography lesson with German map
Technical interruption - open mike with Ft. Eustis - students busy with partner
1:15 LC on military personnel inquiries with new vocab & comprehension check
1:35 Break
1:45 Students ask partner about education using questionnaire
2:00 Video segment "Computers in German Schools" with T F questions
2:30 Break
2:40 Interrogation of mystery guest (Ingrid Tower)
3:15 Feedback on Tower & HW assignment - describe a person

Third day
Satellite down all morning
12:30 Exercises on how to inquire about political affiliations - with new vocab
1:15 LC on military personnel inquiries with new vocab & comprehension check
1:50 Break
2:00 Video segment "750 Years Berlin" with T F questions & translation exercise
2:30 Interrogation of mystery guest (Gitta Wray)
3:15 Feedback on Wray & HW assignment - describe a person
Fourth day
8:30 Scola news - NVA and Q&A session
9:00 HW feedback - students describe their assigned person
9:30 Break
9:45 Video segment “NATO” with T F questions & translation
10:30 Break
10:40 LC exercise “Women in the German Army” with multiple choice ex.
11:10 Grammar review exercises - word order
11:30 Lunch
12:30 Exercise on how to inquire about professions & work experience
1:10 LC exercise “German Embargo” with multiple choice & Q&A session
1:30 Break
1:40 Video segment “EC” with T F questions and translation exercise
2:30 Interrogation of mystery guest (Martin Metzger)
3:15 Feedback & HW assignment

Fifth day
8:30 Short song & Scola news “Bundeswehr” with Q&A session
9:10 Reporting back about Metzger - students give details
9:20 LC exercise “Name This Job” with multiple choice & discussion of vocab
9:40 Break
9:50 Students ask for list of items to be sent - grammar modules & maps etc.
10:00 Video segment with T F questions and discussion of vocab
10:50 Break
11:00 Grammar review - verbs and prepositions
11:30 Lunch
12:30 Guessing game - “Who am I?” students ask yes/no questions only
12:45 Continue with questionnaire about professions - how to ask
1:15 Break
1:25 LC exercise “Applying for a Job” with fill-in-the-blanks job application form
2:00 Video segment “Amateur Ham Radio Operators” with T F questions
2:30 Break
2:40 Interrogation of mystery guest (Sabine Atwell as communist)
3:20 Feedback

Sixth day
8:30 Scola news & discussion
9:00 Introduction of questions about weather & terrain
9:15 Scola news weather report with Q&A session
9:45 Break
9:55 LC exercise - military text on weather & terrain - students report to partner
10:20 Students report on climate of their hometown area
10:50 Break
10:50 Video segment on German village in winter with T F questions
11:15 RC exercise on illegal transport of salmon by military planes
11:30 Lunch
12:30 Guessing game “Who am I?” - students ask yes/no questions only
12:45 RC exercise “New Structure of German Army” with Q&A session
1:10 LC exercise about weather with multiple choice questions
1:30 Grammar review - verb infinitives & tenses
1:40 Break
1:50 Grammar review - wo & da compounds
2:20 Break
2:30 Interrogation of mystery guest (Ernst Honigmann)
3:15 Feedback of subjective impressions of guest
Seventh day
8:30  *Down - Rembrandt crashed*
9:00  SCOLA news on Rohwedder assassination with Q&A session
9:30  Wechselspiel #31 information gap exercise with partner
10:00 Break
10:15 Video on Rohwedder assassination with discussion in German
11:15 Interview feedback - students describe Honigmann
11:30 Lunch
12:30 Guessing game "Who am I?" students ask yes/no questions only
12:40 Wechselspiel #52 information gap exercise with partner
1:25  Break
1:40  Interrogation of Mystery Guest (Susanne Piccari)
2:20  Grammar review on verb tenses
2:30  Col. Fischer discussion on German newspapers
3:10  Students give description of imagined person
3:25  HW assignment

Eighth day
8:30  SCOLA news and discussion on German Army
9:00  HW feedback
9:10  LC exercise on paramilitary activities and drug investigation
9:30  Break
9:45  Video on health clinics for women with T/F questions and discussion
10:30 Break
10:40 Exercise on how to inquire about health problems and medical history
11:10 Video on paraplegics with T/F questions and discussion
11:30 Lunch
12:30 LC Steinbauer interview and QA session
1:30  Break
1:40  LC on AIDS with multiple choice questions
2:10  RC exercise with German newspapers
2:30  Break
2:40  Interrogation of Mystery Guest (Sigrun Seidel-Petry)
3:20  HW assignment
Ninth day
8:30 SCOLA news on German job market with discussion
9:10 Wechselspiel #45 information gap exercise to review passive voice
9:30 Break
9:40 Video “Sports for Health” with T F questions and discussion
10:10 LC on climbing Mt. Everest with multiple choice and partner QA session
10:30 Break
10:40 Grammar review - modals and infinitives
11:10 RC text from Spiegel on Gulf War with discussion
11:20 Video segment with grammar lead-in on compounds
11:30 Lunch
12:30 Students brainstorm with partner on sports activities and report back
1:00 LC with multiple choice on sports and tourism
1:30 Grammar refresher on compounds
2:10 Students describe a person and ask questions using compounds
2:30 Break
2:40 Interrogation of Mystery Guest (Karl Krueger)
3:20 Technical problem - visual image scrambled - students cannot see us

Tenth day
Rembrandt down
9:45 Briefing with Neil Granoien
10:00 Mini OPI’s with Sabine Atwell
11:00 Disguised “new” instructors do spoof mini lessons with rock video
11:30 Lunch
12:35 Feedback on HW assignment - modals and verbs
12:45 RC text “Peace is serious subject in German Army” with discussion
1:00 Interrogation of Mystery Guest (Gunther Bode)
1:50 Break
2:00 LC exercises on chemical factory and POW interrogation with QA session
2:40 Video “Back to Germany” on emigration with T F questions and discussion
3:00 Exercise on additional questions to use while interrogating
3:20 Debriefing with Pat Boylan and farewell to students!