

УДК 81'42

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1517-2025-39-106-117>**Юлія НЕНЬКО**

доктор педагогічних наук, професор,
професор кафедри мовної підготовки,
Національний університет цивільного
захисту України

Yuliia NENKO

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences,
Professor, Professor of Language
Training Department, National
University of Civil Defense of
Ukraine

ORCID:

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7868-0155>

Бібліографічний опис статті: Ненько, Ю. (2025). Іншомовна освіта фахівців безпекового сектору як чинник успішної міжнародної взаємодії. *Theoretical and didactic philology*, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1517-2025-39-106-117>

ІНШОМОВНА ОСВІТА ФАХІВЦІВ БЕЗПЕКОВОГО СЕКТОРУ ЯК ЧИННИК УСПІШНОЇ МІЖНАРОДНОЇ ВЗАЄМОДІЇ

Дослідження присвячене багатоаспектному аналізу викладання англійської мови в безпековому секторі та підкреслює насальну потребу в більш комплексних дослідженнях у цій сфері. Незважаючи на зростаючий попит на знання англійської мови серед особового складу, насамперед через збільшення кількості міжнародних спільних операцій, ґрунтовних досліджень, присвячених вивченню англійської мови для конкретних цілей, все ще бракує. Результати наукової розвідки підкреслюють складність викладання англійської мови у військовому контексті, де традиційні методи можуть не відповідати унікальним лінгвістичним вимогам. Крім того, автором акцентовано на дисбалансі між академічною незалежністю і структурованою дисципліною, яка притаманна освітньому процесу у відомчих закладах сектору безпеки та оборони. Ця дихотомія може перешкоджати впровадженню інноваційних методів викладання, оскільки безпековий контекст може вимагати більш регламентованих підходів, які відповідають оперативним протоколам. Дослідник також розглядає ініціативи Бюро міжнародної мовної координації НАТО зі стандартизації мовних тестувань і тренувань. Проаналізовано актуальність дескрипторів STANAG 6001, які визначають рівні володіння мовою для військовослужбовців, а також Загальноєвропейських

рекомендацій з мовної освіти. Ця система забезпечує цінний орієнтир для оцінювання мовних навичок військовослужбовців, сприяючи тим самим кращій оперативній сумісності між партнерами по коаліції. Дослідження ілюструє, що ефективна комунікація – це не просто лінгвістична навичка, а життєво важливий актив для сприяння успішній співпраці в багатокультурному військовому середовищі. Оскільки країни прагнуть до оперативної сумісності, вдосконалення викладання англійської мови, адаптоване до оборонного контексту, має першорядне значення. Вирішуючи унікальні завдання і використовуючи успішні стратегії викладання, освітні заклади можуть підготувати персонал, який володіє як мовою, так і культурним розумінням, прокладаючи шлях до більш ефективних спільних операцій.

Ключові слова: військова англійська; англійська за професійним спрямуванням; англійська як друга мова; взаємосумісність; мовна освіта; працівник сектору безпеки.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION OF SECURITY SECTOR PROFESSIONALS AS A FACTOR OF SUCCESSFUL INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

This review delves into the multifaceted landscape of English language instruction in defense sector, highlighting an urgent need for more comprehensive research in this domain. Despite the increasing demand for English proficiency among personnel, primarily due to the rise in foreign joint operations, robust studies specifically addressing English for specific purposes remain scarce. The findings underscore the complexities of teaching English within military contexts, where traditional methods may not sufficiently address the unique linguistic requirements. Furthermore, the study highlights the tension between academic independence and the structured discipline inherent in military training. This dichotomy can hinder the adoption of innovative teaching methods tailored to meet the specific needs of defense personnel. For example, while interactive language labs may be beneficial in civilian settings, military contexts may require more regimented approaches that align with operational protocols. The research also evaluates the NATO Bureau for International Language Coordination's initiatives in standardizing language testing and training. The relevance of STANAG 6001 descriptors, which outline proficiency levels for military personnel, is explored, alongside the Common European Framework of Reference

for Languages. This framework provides a valuable benchmark for assessing language skills within the military, thereby facilitating better interoperability among coalition partners. Ultimately, the study illustrates that effective communication is not merely a linguistic skill but a vital asset for fostering successful collaboration in a multicultural military environment. As nations strive for interoperability, enhancing English language instruction tailored for defense contexts is paramount. By addressing the unique challenges and leveraging successful teaching strategies, military institutions can cultivate a workforce proficient in both language and cultural understanding, paving the way for more effective joint operations.

Key words: *Military English; English for specific purposes; English as a second language; interoperability; language education; security sector employee.*

Problem statement. Globalization, which brings with it a number of phenomena like heightened competition and constant attempts to improve the efficacy and efficiency of goods and services, has undoubtedly affected practically every institution and organization in the globe. As a result, a variety of forces have emerged that are now known as the K-factors (where K stands for knowledge-based). These include phenomena like the K-Economy, the K-Revolution, and the K-Force, which is the focus of this study. English, the undeniable lingua franca of worldwide communication for commerce and technology, has easily adapted to this role since these forces rely on efficient communication and require the usage of a common language.

The Ukrainian security sector employes are no exception to this trend, and are thus constantly engaging in efforts to upgrade themselves in all aspects, especially those related to equipping themselves with the necessary knowledge and expertise required to meet the demand for better services to the country and the people.

The fact that these workers must have a solid grasp of specialized literature, primarily in English, in order to reach their full potential is a critical concern. The K-Force

represents the development of a knowledge-enabled workforce that is open to global and technological developments and possesses pertinent knowledge and ICT skills. They must be proficient in the English language in order to be so enabled. The professionals must have the proper type of labor in place and possess the necessary training and abilities in order to fulfill the K-Force's principles. As the government works to gain the information and technology necessary to be a significant force well into the twenty-first century, ways of thinking must shift.

The relevance of staff proficiency in English is further justified by the fact that it is crucial for cooperative operations during United Nations peacekeeping missions and for international military drills. All instructions are provided in English, using a prescribed military register for language to achieve optimum comprehension and collaboration. Since officers are the primary strategists in any conflict, this is particularly crucial for them.

It is crucial to keep in mind that the security sector officers have their own linguistic register, and that the structures and vocabulary of this register—such as «wardroom», «RV», «tarmac», and «bombardier» – have unique connotations that are only known and understood by military people. As a result, the English proficiency that these employees must acquire lies somewhere on the EGP-ESP continuum. To assist them in learning it, a requirements analysis must be conducted to determine their needs, wants, and deficiencies with regard to the English language.

Second language acquisition is a complex procedure, and learners vary widely in their learning abilities. In everyday life language helps us to express our feelings, emotions and questions to the people around us but in the case of the military having a foreign language and cultural expertise is essential in sustaining coalitions, maintaining

regional stability, and conducting multinational missions in humanitarian, nation building, stability operations, and security. Language and cultural understanding are important assets in an efficient working and cooperating with any coalition partners in any multicultural environment. Not only the leaders but also the regular forces should have the right blend of culture and foreign language knowledge, skills, and professional expertise. Knowing a foreign language and having cultural awareness creates more positive attitudes and less prejudice toward people who are different. Studying a foreign language is more than linguistic acquisition; it implies developing of the communication skills, enhancing listening, reading comprehension or writing skills, problem solving, dealing with abstract concepts or a more profound understanding of one's own culture, thus making a person more flexible and tolerant. In short, it can make a person lead out with commitment and trust in his/her own forces.

Analysis of recent research and publications that have begun to address the problem under consideration, and identification of previously unresolved parts of the general problem to which this article is devoted.

Zhong, W., Zhang, Y. & Jin, Y. [13] reviewed the studies in the field of military English teaching in Chinese academies in terms of the overall situation, problems in topic selection, and problems in research design. Researchers indicate that both quality and amount of relevant studies need further boost; while all facets necessary for military English teaching have been taken into consideration although far less attention has been paid to equally essential topics including technology application in teaching, students and teachers as well as testing and assessment; most studies are non-empirical and lack substantial evidence to support their analysis and discussion; among empirical ones, more adopt the quantitative approach and thus cannot investigate data

that cannot be gained from quantitative approach, leaving many interesting topics untouched [13].

Singh, S., & Balraj, B. M. [11] look at the status quo of the English language in relation to the three Services (Army, Navy and Air Force), and the role played by the English language in the career development of an Armed Forces officer using Task Based Language Teaching focusing on Acquisition-Learning hypothesis and the Affective Filter hypothesis. The scholars highlight that the Malaysian Armed Forces are expected to project a positive image of Malaysia in the international arena as they engage in peace-keeping and relief operations with joint forces from various other countries. The Armed Forces have been impacted by globalization, and thus constantly engaging in efforts to upgrade itself in all aspects, especially those related to equipping itself with the necessary knowledge and expertise required to meet the demand for better services to the country and the people [11].

Aim of research. Through reviewing studies of military English teaching in the context of higher education institutions teaching employees for the defense sector all over the world, this paper is aimed at locating both research gaps and weaknesses as well as achievements in an effort to contribute to research and development of military English teaching.

Presentation of the main research material. One of the first steps to building a long-lasting, stable personal or professional relationship is being able to speak with people directly in their native tongue. However, in the military, whether it be the air, sea, or land forces, it can literally mean the difference between life and death for everyone directly under subordination during a combat mission. Learning and employing phrases to communicate effectively and possessing sufficient cultural knowledge to comprehend

different cultures are both essential components of mastering a foreign language. Personnel who have a certified proficiency in a foreign language and need it to carry out their principal duties are referred to as «language professionals» [6].

It appears that Americans were the first to recognize the need of foreign language proficiency for the military. Since they acknowledged «the need and provided the impetus, for both cultural awareness and enhanced pre-deployment language preparation», they maintain that «there is no doubt that foreign language skills and cultural expertise are critical capabilities needed by today's military to face the challenges of our present security environment» [2].

Foreign language proficiency and regional expertise are now specifically recognized by academics as «critical war fighting skills» that need to be incorporated into operations in the future «to ensure that combat forces deploy with the essential ability to understand and effectively communicate with native populations, local and government officials, and Coalition partners when in theater» [12].

More than that strengthening foreign language and cultural awareness capabilities is one of the top priorities of the current language training centers or departments, so that «a pool of linguistically and culturally educated personnel capable of operating in priority countries» exists throughout the joint force, not just the special operations force [4].

We can explain the need for an international office to coordinate language learning and to standardize the assessment of proficiency levels for NATO members and partners if we agree that «language skills...are now seen as critical operational capabilities – just as important as weapons – on the battlefield and across the entire array of the educational missions».

For interoperability reasons, military personnel are calling for more and more use of military English [8]. Interoperability is «the ability to act together coherently, effectively, and efficiently to achieve Allied tactical, operational, and strategic objectives», according to the. In order to accomplish this, personnel and nations must synchronize their equipment, protocols, and communication. The current article specifically addresses military personnel's English communication skills as they work to participate in joint training and education [10].

In 1966 the Bureau for International Language Coordination (BILC) has been created, which served as NATO's advisory and consultative body for matters pertaining to language testing and training.

The primary goals of BILC, the custodian of STANAG 6001, are to sponsor and uphold the language proficiency levels specified in the standard and to improve the interoperability of individual language instruction and training by standardizing language descriptors and assessment procedures [3].

Although NATO implemented the BILC-drafted standards from 1973 to 1975, the STANAG's applicability for evaluation was constrained by the absence of uniform specifications.

The first edition of STANAG 6001 was not a success in 1976 because the descriptions were so brief that they may be interpreted in a variety of ways. For this reason, BILC established a Testing and Assessment working group in 1999 with the intention of clarifying and interpreting the original STANAG 6001 descriptors. The group's «Interpretation and Elaboration Document» was created in 2000 and tested at a BILC language training seminar.

After being approved by the NATO Standardization Agency in 2002, STANAG 6001 Edition 2 was released after

a three-year delay. The working group made significant adjustments over the ensuing years, and in May 2009, 200 Benchmark Advisory Tests were distributed across 11 countries following a thorough investigation and testing process. The purpose of these exams was to ensure that STANAG 6001 was interpreted consistently across national testing programs.

The following significant adjustment was made in that year's Edition 3 to better align the levels with the level descriptions:

- Level 0 = No proficiency.
- Level 1 = Elementary Survival.
- Level 2 = Fair Functional.
- Level 3 = Good Professional.
- Level 4 = Very Good Expert.
- Level 5 = Excellent Highly-articulate native.

«Unrehearsed, general language communication ability» was the definition of language proficiency in that year's edition. «Plus levels» were described as follows: «A plus level is understood to be more than halfway between two base levels and it substantially exceeds the base level, but does not fully or consistently meet all of the criteria for the next higher base level». Additionally, «A plus level may be added to a base level for training, evaluation, recording or reporting purposes», according to Edition 4 of 2010.

The format and opening pages were revised for Edition 5 in 2014, but the standards remained the same. During the 2017 annual conference in Vienna, Austria, BILC received two requests: to determine whether Language Education can be more effectively incorporated into Military Training and Exercises, and to look into the portability of NATO military language certification into civilian terms and vice versa [1].

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR) was

created by the Council of Europe. In order for learners to be able to communicate in a variety of contexts and languages, the document emphasizes the significance of establishing language proficiency in other languages.

The «achievements of learners of foreign languages across Europe and, increasingly, in other countries» are described by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment, a framework of reference and set of guidelines.

Its purpose was to «offer a clear, logical, and thorough foundation for the development of language curricula and syllabuses, the creation of instructional materials, and the evaluation of foreign language competency». It is available in 40 languages and is utilized in Europe as well as other continents [5].

General competencies in knowledge, skills, and communication are separated out. Four categories of language activities are distinguished by the CEFR: mediation (translation and interpretation), production (spoken and written), interaction (spoken and written), and reception (listening and reading).

Students are separated into «three broad divisions that can be divided into six levels; each level describes what a learner is supposed to be able to do in reading, listening, speaking, and writing», according to the Common European Framework.

The CEFR has established a set of six Common Reference Levels to assist characterize the different levels of proficiency that a language user can acquire in each of these areas.

- Level A: A1 = Breakthrough or beginner
A2 = Waystage or elementary
- Level B: B1 = Threshold or intermediate
B2 = Vantage or upper intermediate

- Level C: C1 = Effective operational proficiency or advanced

C2 = Mastery or proficiency [3].

Oral skills (the ability to share knowledge and experiences, participate in discussions, present and interpret literary texts, and discuss a variety of topics) and reading skills (the ability to comprehend written texts, interpret and reflect on literature of all genres, comprehend and analyze a wide range of textual forms, and compose texts) are necessary for the learners.

Studying a foreign language should be a core competency for military students since they must become proficient in the language's knowledge, abilities, and attitudes in order to be both professionals and socially conscious global citizens. English will become vital once officers begin participating in international missions. It will be used to coordinate teamwork and translate higher-ranking choices into directives to subordinates, which are critical for a mission's success. By providing a rigorous and appealing curriculum, we as English teachers should aim to improve the caliber of our graduates' language communication abilities.

Conclusions from the study and prospects for further research. Language and culture are important whether the military is involved in a battle, humanitarian effort, or in-person negotiations to establish terms for a military strategy. Language learning promotes the knowledge, attitudes, and skills relevant to living responsibly in a multicultural, interdependent world.

REFERENCES

1. BILC Documents. Bureau for International Language Co-ordination. <https://www.natobilc.org/en/products/policy-documents-bilc-documents>
2. Building Language Skills and Cultural Competencies in the Military: DOD's Challenge in Today's Educational Environment. (2008). U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Oversight & Investigations, Washington, DC, Approved for public release. Available

- at:
https://prhome.defense.gov/Portals/52/Documents/RFM/Readiness/DLNSEO/files/LanguageCultureReportNov08_HASC.pdf
3. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Council of Europe. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/>
 4. E-learning. (2024). Defense Language Institute. Foreign Language Center. Available at: <http://www.dliflc.edu/>
 5. English Language Training, Bespoke. Defense Academy of the United Kingdom. Available at: <https://www.da.mod.uk/colleges-and-schools/defence-centre-for-languages-andculture/english-language-wing>
 6. Language, regional expertise, and culture capability identification, planning, and sourcing. (2023). Joint Chiefs of Staff Instructions. Available at: <https://www.jcs.mil/Portals/36/Documents/Library/Instructions/CJCSI%203126.01C.pdf>
 7. Ministry of National Defense of Romania. Available at: <https://dmru.mapn.ro>
 8. Nenko, Y., Yaryhina, V. & Vorona, V. (2021). Study of officers' readiness for foreign language interaction in international operations. *Educational Praxis, Vitória da Conquista*, v. 17, n. 46, p. 465-487, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.22481/praxisedu.v17i46.8816>
 9. Pateşan, Marioara & Zechia, Dana. (2018). Foreign Language Education in the Military. *International conference Knowledge-based organization*, 24, 351-355. <https://doi.org/10.1515/kbo-2018-0114>.
 10. Siegel, A., Vance, M., & Nilsson, D. (2024). Military English language education: a scoping review of 30 years of research. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2024.2370986>
 11. Singh, S., & Balraj, B. M. (2019). The English Language Needs of the Armed Forces Officers Using Task Based Language Teaching. *International Journal of Academic Research Business and Social Sciences*, 9(1), 1299–1308. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v9-i1/5861>
 12. The Irregular Warfare Joint Operating Concept. Version 2.0. (2010). Joint Chiefs of Staff Instructions. Approved for public release. Available at: https://www.jcs.mil/portals/36/documents/doctrine/concepts/joc_iw_v2.pdf?ver=2017-12-28-162021-510#:~:text=10%20This%20joint%20operating%20concept,actors%20who%20pose%20irregular%20threats.
 13. Zhong, W., Zhang, Y. & Jin, Y. (2022). Military English Teaching in Chinese Military Academies: A Review. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13, No. 5, 1105-1114. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1305.25>