Boguslaw Jagusiak
ORCID 0000-0001-5453-1649
Jacob of Paradies University
Agata Jagiello-Tondera
ORCID 0000-0002-9370-6197
Military University of Technology

Language education in the security system of the Republic of Poland

Abstract

The English language has become the lingua franca of the contemporary world; a global language. The process of globalisation has also influenced the increasing demand for learning English. The demand involves not only general language but also language for specific purposes, including language of the military environment, Military English.

English has also become the language of interoperability in NATO. The North Atlantic Alliance has always paid particular attention to the knowledge of foreign languages, which was expressed, among others, by the establishment of the BILC International Language Coordination Office and the development of language standards applicable to all Member States, STANAG 6001. Language education in the armed forces in Poland follows the Alliance's guidelines. The correct use of military language and its understanding creates a successful administrative and operational military environment. On account of appropriate application of terminology, potential misunderstandings or misinterpretations of military activities can be avoided. Language education is one of the elements of language policy in the field of security.

Keywords: Military English, lingua franca, security, NATO, STANAG 6001

Introduction

Expressing his opinion on language, Curzio Malaparte, an Italian writer and war correspondent, stated that "Language is very important […] not only for writers, but for peoples and states. In a sense, war is a syntactic error"[1].

---

[1] C. Malaparte, *O wojnie, wojsku i żołnierzach – dla żołnierzy… (myśli-aforyzmy-sentencje)*, wybór Bogdan M. Szulc, Torun 1995, p. 64.

The Cold War contributed to the intensification of efforts, especially American ones, to improve the effectiveness of foreign language learning, although the issue of specialist language education was dealt with by both the North Atlantic Alliance and the Warsaw Pact. The changes that took place after 1989 forced the former Warsaw Pact countries to redefine their language policy. However, at the time of joining NATO, these countries were in a language situation diametrically different from the long-standing members of the Alliance, and their efforts to achieve the Alliance's language standards have been carried out to this day.

The most important factors influencing state security are political and military alliances. Therefore, when considering Poland's place in the world, it is necessary to emphasize its membership in the EU, and when it comes to security, in the North Atlantic Alliance. The North Atlantic Alliance has always paid special attention to the knowledge of foreign languages, which was expressed, inter alia, by the establishment of the BILC, Bureau of the International Language Coordination and the development of language standards applicable to all member states.

"In an increasingly diverse and interconnected world, language skills are gaining rather than losing their relevance"[2]. The 2013 *Lost for Words: The Need for Languages in UK Diplomacy and Security* British Academy research was conducted on the assessment of the importance of knowledge and teaching of foreign languages in the areas of security and international relations for the implementation of the UK public policy. In NATO's language policy, an important element is also the cultural factor, related to the linguistic factor, which may be of significant importance in a threatening situation, which was particularly noticeable during military interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Furthermore, knowledge of foreign languages exerts an influence on formulating concepts relating to security[3]. "One has to take into account the important regularity that the use of the literature available to us seriously limits the knowledge of the problems we are interested in, separating us from the literature that is not available to us due to the lack of knowledge of the foreign languages. Formulating views solely on the basis of the materials available to us should not, in this situation, affect their absolute acceptance, devoid of comparisons and free from criticism from the followers of other theories, unavailable to our knowledge due to language barriers"[4].

---

[2] https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/publications/lost-words-need-languages-uk-diplomacy-and-security [accessed on 15.01.2021].
[3] B. Jagusiak, *Systemy bezpieczeństwa w teorii i praktyce*, Warszawa 2018.
[4] Stańczyk J., *Formułowanie kategorii pojęciowej bezpieczeństwa*, Poznań 2017, ibuk.

Effective communication ensuring internal and external security for each entity has become a condition sine qua non. The issue of language skills and knowledge of foreign languages to ensure the security of transnational and international organizations is appreciated both in the North Atlantic Alliance and the European Union.

Language communication and interoperability

The political, military, cultural and technological might exerted by the Anglo--American nations over the world due to the globalization of human activities has contributed to the spread of English and its entrenching as the international language for global communication.

In his seminal book *English as a Global Language* B. Crystal notices that no language becomes a global language purely because of its intrinsic structural properties, the size of its vocabulary, or because of its role as a vehicle of great literature in the past, or because of its association with bygone great cultures or religion. All of these factors can motivate to learn a language, but none of them alone, or in combination, can ensure a language's worldwide spread. On the one hand, guaranteeing survival as a living language may not be accomplished, as in the case of Latin. On the other hand, inconvenient structural properties such as awkward spelling in English, do not seem to inhibit a language from achieving international status either.

"A language has traditionally become an international language for one chief reason: the power of its people – especially their political and military power. The explanation is the same throughout history. Why did Greek become a language of international communication in the Middle East over 2,000 years ago? Not because of the intellects of Plato and Aristotle: the answer lies in the swords and spears wielded by the armies of Alexander the Great. Why did Latin become known throughout Europe? Ask the legions of the Roman Empire. Why did Arabic come to be spoken so widely across northern Africa and the Middle East? Follow the spread of Islam, carried along by the force of the Moorish armies from the eighth century. Why did Spanish, Portuguese, and French find their way into the Americas, Africa and the Far East? Study the colonial policies of the Renaissance kings and queens, and the way these policies were ruthlessly implemented by armies and navies all over the known world. The history of a global language can

be traced through the successful expeditions of its soldier/sailor speakers. And English has been no exception"[5].

In the contemporary world, English has also become the language of interoperability in supranational and integrated organisations[6]. According to *NATO glossary of terms and definitions* interoperability is the ability to act together in a coherent, effective and efficient way in order to achieve Allied objectives: tactical, operational and strategic[7]. "Linguistic interoperability is as important to ensuring that countries are able to participate effectively in both NATO missions and wider Alliance activities as any other form of interoperability"[8].

The end of the Cold War contributed to the intensification of efforts to improve the efficiency of language learning. The transformations after 1989 forced the former states of the Warsaw Pact to redefine language policy as foreign language training became increasingly important within the armed forces. Numerous projects were set up to encourage innovative teaching and to foster change and the Peacekeeping English Project was one of paramount importance.

Language skills are crucial for communicative interoperability and therefore they are an important tool for strategic, operational, tactical and every day deliverables in the military milieu[9]. The role of languages in war, as language is perceived as integral to the constitution and development of military conflicts, has been contextualised by researchers[10]. Furthermore, language is an integral part of peacekeeping and peace-maintaining process as well, and since English has become the lingua franca of the contemporary world, it is essential for the military milieu to master it. The mission of language instruction in the Polish Armed Forces is to provide high quality and effective training in line with the requirements of the interoperability of NATO Alliance. Military vocabulary becomes an instrument meant to serve the final purpose of communication in a strictly defined framework: the military environment. The acquisition of the English language serving as a tool for NATO capabilities is the prevailing objective.

---

[5]   D. Crystal, *English As A Global Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2003, p. 9.

[6]   Cf E. Vandevanter, *A further inquiry into the nature of alliances: NATO and the OAS*, Santa Monica, Calif., Rand Corp., Santa Monica 1968.

[7]   *NATO glossary of terms and definitions* nso.nato.int›TERMINOLOGY_PUBLIC› AAP-6 [accessed on 15.09.2019].

[8]   R. Monaghan, *Language and interoperability in NATO: The Bureau for International Language Co-ordination*, "Canadian Military Journal" 2012, vol 13, no 1.

[9]   Cf. Crossey M., *Peacekeeping English in Poland* in: Tribble C. (ed), *Managing Change in English Language Teaching: Lessons from Experience*, British Council 2012.

[10]   Cf. Footitt H., Kelly M. (eds), L*anguages and the Military: Alliances, Occupation and Peace Building*, Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire 2012.

Military vocabulary fulfils, among others, two functions: specialist and collective. The specialized function of the military vocabulary is that it handles, especially its terminological part, the process of communication of people operating under special circumstances, such as peace-maintaining missions or warfare activities. Military vocabulary in the service of the modern army has become a modern tool. The efficiency of military vocabulary, in furtherance to general linguistic competence, in capacities such as commanding, issuing orders and acknowledging them, is of paramount importance[11]. Incredible productivity and flexibility of military terminology is one of its distinctive features. Moreover, the differences between British and American military register render both the teaching and language acquisition challenging, and pose interesting research queries in the field of translation studies, and in cultural and rhetorical studies. In *Forbidden Words* Allan and Burridge use the term *militarese* to describe the language used by and about the military[12]. By attaching the suffix -ese they implied that it is just as distinct a language as any other '-ese', for example Japanese or Maltese.

Military English is an umbrella term as it does not have any paradigm to it according to many researches. In the opinion of B. Dobbs, there are three components to be considered:

− "Hard"/"technical" Military English
− English for the Military
− English in Military Contexts.

The above listed components form Operational Military English, a term coined by Dobbs. With regard to "hard"/"technical" Military English, some military experience to teach it is needed, as it encompasses military jargon, specialist knowledge of equipment, procedures, commands, etc. A teacher with no prior experience could struggle in this case. In English for the Military, military elements provide the context for it. It has application in case of, e.g. UN civilian environment in whatever capacity the personnel may work. English for the Military can be taught at pedagogical departments, university language departments, in military settings. It covers a whole range of military matters, but the international communication is most important. ESP is relevant to the communication, functions and roles. The third element, English in Military Contexts, places English close to

---

[11] Cf. Mielczarek A., *Z zagadnień słownictwa wojskowego. Rozważania terminologiczne*, Warszawa 1976.
[12] Cf. Allan K., Burridge K., *Forbidden Words*, Cambridge 2006.

General English and the only difference between those two is the setting. It is used mainly at Military Academies, for students in uniforms, and bespoke courses[13].

Language bodies in NATO

A good command of English is an operational requirement of NATO, as military personnel would not able to cooperate effectively during joint manoeuvres or exercises, proceedings, international interventions and subsequent peace-maintaining missions. Nevertheless, to use the language as a tool for successful professional career it is necessary to prove language skills. Consequently, language abilities in NATO Armed Forces are described in accordance to STANAG 6001 standards introduced by one of the NATO Standardisation Agencies.

NATO Standardisation Office (NSO) established in 1951 (former Military Standardisation Agency) is one of the principal agencies existing in NATO. It co-ordinates the work of NATO Committees and Working Groups dealing with standardisation. The definition of standardisation includes the development of concepts and procedures and their implementation to achieve the required levels of interoperability[14]. The primary product of this process is STANdardisation AGreement or STANAG, an international military standard for regulating training, equipment, procedures, etc.

The process of standardisation is of paramount importance to language usage. During the first Session of the North Atlantic Council in September 1949, two basic languages for the official meetings, English and French, which were to be translated afterwards into the other languages, were accepted. With the process of globalisation and transformations in the world, English has become the de facto language of NATO.

The NATO language subcommittee Bureau for International Language Co-operation (BILC) was established in 1966 and in 1978 recognised as a consultative and advisory body on language training. The purpose of BILC is to foster support within the field of language proficiency, language education and testing. BILC coordinates language education with the aim of enhancing interoperability and making more efficient use of language education and training resources. BILC is responsible for maintaining NATO STANAG 6001 (NATO Standardisation Agreement 6001). BILC disseminates print and multimedia

---

[13] http://www.mondiale-testing.de/web/de/downloads-und-links/iatefl-poland-esp-sig-3rd-iatefl-esp-sig-conference-15-16-januar-2016 [accessed on 15.01.2021)]

[14] Cf. www.nato.int [accessed on 15.01.2021].

instructional materials and information on developments in the field of language training, and is the overseer of NATO STANAG 6001. BILC promotes language interoperability, advises on language proficiency defined in job descriptions and conducts training on language testing in accordance with NATO STANAG 6001. Members of BILC cooperate multilaterally in the field of defence-sponsored and defence-related language policy in designing general curriculum and language for specific purpose courses, and conducting language training[15].

In order to meet the requirements of NATO interoperability, the Ministry of National Defense has introduced new language courses scheme in the Polish Armed Forces. The Polish Armed Forces School of Languages (PAFSL) was established on the basis of the Central Language Training School in Lodz. Thousands of officers and NCOs representing all arms and services as well as civilian personnel have been trained in language courses since the beginnings of its existence in 1971. PAFSL has performed advisory, training and informative functions for other language training centres within Polish Armed Forces. Its personnel have participated in organizing and conducting numerous undertakings on a central level, such as methodology conferences for foreign language teachers, assessments of other military language schools and centres. PAFSL maintains working contacts with institutions dealing with language education, for instance British Council consultants working for Peacekeeping English Project, officers from Partnership for Peace (PfP) and NATO countries. Undoubtedly, common training initiatives and exchange of experience augment the process of language acquisition. PAFLS's mission is to prepare syllabuses for the didactic process in the military, to prepare exam papers and theoretical basis for examining, and certify language skills of candidates deployed for posts abroad. PAFL administers STANAG 6001 exams in English, Russian, French and German languages at levels 1-4. It trains examiners and test constructors, and provides 5-month residential courses, 1-2- month- specialized or remedy courses[16].

In accordance with regulation No. 242/MON of the Minister of National Defence from 10th September 2002, a full-time Central Examinations Board for Foreign Languages of the MoD (CEBFL) was created within the structure of the school in 2003. The Board examines more than two thousand military and civilian personnel from the PAF annually. The Board conducts the department examinations of the proficiency in English, French, German and Russian at levels 1-4 and prepares the examination papers for the post-course examination sessions at

---

[15] https://www.natobilc.org/documents/BILC%20Terms%20of%20Reference%20Edition%201v2%20 (2016).pdf [accessed on 15.01.2021].

[16] https://archiwum-wsnjo.wp.mil.pl/pl/index.html [accessed on 15.01.2021].

levels 1and 2 at other military language centres. The requirements of the language proficiency levels have been determined on the basis of the NATO Standardization Agreement STANAG 6001 as described heretofore. The Regulations of the Central Examination Board for Foreign Languages of the Ministry of National Defence provide the principles of CEBFL and the forms of conducting the examinations.

NATO STANAG 6001 examination is scheduled for one or two days, and the skills are administered in the sequence: reading, listening, writing and speaking.

Table 1. Time duration of particular skills in department examination

LEVEL	LISTENING	READING	WRITING
1	Approx. 35 min	70 min	60 min
2	Approx. 35 min	70 min	75 min
3	Approx. 45 min	65 min	80 min
4	Approx. 40 min	60 min	70 min

Source: https://wsnjo.wp.mil.pl/pl/pages/przebieg-egzaminow-2020-05-04-t/ (accessed 15.01.2021).

To pass the examination successfully, 70% of the maximum number of points in a skill (14/20) is to be obtained. The examination papers are coded and are marked by the CEBFL, and a special protocol from the examination is prepared.

Language teaching and preparation for foreign language exams takes place at levels 1-3, and in the case of level 4, only at PAFSL, in the form of a refresher course. No teaching and examinations are conducted at level 5. A successful candidate receives a certificate issued by the appointing authority within three months of the date of the examination.

NATO STANAG 6001 was established by BILC in 1976 with the aim of communicating language requirements for international staff appointments, comparing national standards through a standardized table, recording and reporting measures of language proficiency[17]. STANAG 6001 is the main document specifying the language proficiency in listening, reading, speaking and writing for NATO forces. The skills are known as Standardized Language Profile (SLP) and each skill area is defined by six levels:

0 no proficiency
1 survival
2 functional
3 professional
4 expert
5 highly-articulate native

---

[17] www.natobilc.org/files/ATrainP-5%20EDA%20V2%20E.pdf [accessed on 15.01.2021].

The descriptors were developed to define the general English proficiency (non-military specific) of military personnel. NATO member countries use the STANAG 6001 levels as a means of communicating language requirements and expectations across a range of assignments and postings within the military. BILC generated the interpretation of STANAG 6001 language proficiency levels for non-language experts.

Fig. 1. Interpretation of STANAG 6001 language proficiency levels for non-language experts
Source: https://www.natobilc.org/files/STANAG%20for%20Non-Specialists_Modified_June2013%20 doc%20(3).pdf [accessed 15.01.2021].

In addition to the main proficiency levels, a plus (+) indicator, which may serve both training and reporting purposes, was introduced in 2009. It indicates

that the proficiency level exceeds base skill levels (0 through 4) but does not meet all criteria for the next higher base level[18]. The required passing score, according to decision of the Minister of National Defence No. 501/MON dated December 29, 2010, for STANAG 6001 in Poland is 70% at each level. Achieving the result of 60% up to 70% means obtaining the directly lower level with the plus indicator. Language proficiency profile is recorded with a sequence of 4 digits, preceded by the code letters SLP: Skill L Listening, Skill S Speaking, Skill R Reading, Skill W Writing. For instance, SLP 3333 means that both oral and written proficiency is at level 3; and SLP 2231 denotes level 2 in listening, level 2 in speaking, level 3 in reading and level 1 in writing. The language proficiency levels for international personnel assigned to the NATO structure pose sometimes a problem, as the levels required for these posts are at a much higher level than the actual requirement. For instance, most staff officers are required to obtain SLP 3333 regardless of their area of responsibility, and in Allied Command Operations the requirement for a Colonel post is SLP 4343 only because of the rank and not the remit.

Although STANAG 6001 serves as a benchmark for language requirements in member countries, language abilities of soldiers and military personnel are assessed with regard to internal regulations in proper Armed Forces. Because of it, a homogenous language training system or examination model has not been achieved so far.

STANAG 6001 examinations, prepared according to military standards, have undergone comparative analysis of the descriptors and levels of outcomes in relation to the forms provided by the Council of Europe, to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR)[19]. The precise comparisons are difficult as there are differences between NATO STANAG 6001 descriptors and the CEFR. A comparative analysis project in Poland has been elaborated by M. Gos, who also came to the conclusion that language abilities required in STANAG 6001 examinations exceed the ones which are needed to fulfil the CEFR requirements, which may be caused by the fact that military language examinations are mainly occupational in nature. Thus STANAG 6001 examination at Level 1 is situated at level A2, and STANAG 6001 Levels 2 and 3, although placed slightly higher, can be compared to levels B1 and B2 described by the Council of Europe respectively.

---

[18] Cf. Annex B to STANAG 6001, Descriptions of plus levels of language proficiency NATO, 2016.

[19] Cf. M. Gos, 2009, 2013; Julie J. Dubeau, 2006.

Form	Overall	A1	A2	A2.2	B1	B1.2	B2	B2.2	C1	C2
A9	Listening Comprehension						▓			
A10	Reading Comprehension						▓			
A11	Spoken Interaction						▓			
A12	Written Interaction							▓		
A13	Spoken Production							▓		
A14	Written Production							▓		
A19	Linguistic Competence in Reception							▓		
A19	Socio-linguistic Competence in Reception							▓		
A19	Pragmatic Competence in Reception						▓			
A19	Strategic Competence in Reception							▓		
A20	Linguistic Competence in Interaction							▓		
A20	Socio-linguistic Competence in Interaction							▓		
A20	Pragmatic Competence in Interaction						▓			
A20	Strategic Competence in Interaction							▓		
A21	Linguistic Competence in Production							▓		
A21	Socio-linguistic Competence in Production							▓		
A21	Pragmatic Competence in Production							▓		
A21	Strategic Competence in Production						▓			

PROFILE OF THE STANAG 6001 EXAMINATION AT LEVEL 3 IN RELATION TO THE CEFR LEVELS

Figure 7. Form A23: Graphic Profile to the Relationship of the Examination to the CEFR Levels

Fig. 2. Graphic profile of the relationship of STANAG 6001 level 3 to the CERF
Source: M. Gos 2013, p. 98

Hence teaching English and designing curricula and syllabi is based on the aforementioned NATO STANAG 6001 guidance, as one of the aims of

the language acquisition for learners is to reach a particular level as defined by military post requirements. In order to support the policies and objectives of the Polish Armed Forces, and to secure proper language training for the military, official bodies for organising and overseeing the process have been appointed. Stanag 6001 constitutes an important element in the language education process in the security system of Poland.

Language instruction according to STANAG 6001

The process of managing education, especially language education[20], requires continuity in order to build the linguistic capital of the participants in the educational process. The publications of Polish and foreign scientists consider responsible management of education in the light of contemporary challenges and deficits in educational systems as a management challenge. For a sustainable process of language education, it is important to cultivate an organizational culture supporting learning, implement new solutions and maintain the process of continuity of educational activities. Models of learning theorists are also applicable, e.g. Kolb cycle.

      The Polish Armed Forces prepare military and civilian personnel to communicate in English and provide English language training and services according to established methodologies. The institution responsible for coordinating the process of language improvements is the Department of Science and Military Education. Language instruction is based on the Decision on the training and examination of foreign languages of the Minister of National Defence No. 501/MON, 2015. The Decision provides guidance and specifications of language training in the PAF in accordance with STANAG 6001. The following levels of knowledge of foreign languages are officially defined:

      1) Level 0 lack of knowledge of the language
      2) Level 0+   incomplete basic knowledge
      3) Level 1   elementary
      4) Level 1+   elementary plus
      5) Level 2   fair (limited working)
      6) Level 2+   fair plus
      7) Level 3   good (minimum professional)

---

[20] Cf. Ritz R., Lingua, *Lingua Franca, Lingua Academica: Are European Universities Language Happy*?, [in:] (eds) Komorowska H., Zając J., *Multilingual Competences for Professional and Social Success in Europe*, Foundation for the Development of the Education System, Warsaw 2012.

8) Level 3+   good plus
9) Level 4   very good (full professional)
10) Level 4+   very good plus
11) Level 5   excellent (native/bilingual)

The forms of foreign language teaching embrace curricular teaching of cadets at military academies; training of soldiers and civilian employees on intramural language courses; improvement of the knowledge of military terminology within the system of professional development of soldiers on specialized courses; improving the knowledge of foreign languages of professional soldiers within the framework of training in military units; teaching on ad-hoc organized courses. English language courses are organized at the PAFSL, military academies and language development and training centres.

The need for teaching military English in the PAF has increased significantly since Poland joined NATO in 1999. Officers and non-commissioned officers cooperate with the military and the civilian personnel from other countries, and participate in peacekeeping missions, military courses, international training exercises, therefore, a good command of English, and military English, becomes a prerequisite. Following the directions from language methodologists and ESP researchers, a group of specialists at the Educational Department of MoD prepared the Framework Programme for bespoke courses. The Framework Program for Teaching English in the PAF is one of the most important tools for organizing the teaching process, influencing the educational realisation of learners. The quality of the process and its effects depend largely on the Framework conception, the adequacy of objectives, content, methods and means of teaching. It reflects both the needs of soldiers – language users and educators, for whom it is necessary to specify the purpose, subject and content of courses.

The consecutive editions of the program aimed at achieving the maximum degree of convergence between the programmatic intentions of the standardization agreement STANAG 6001, the requirements of the CEBFL and the content of the training. The Framework Program was predominantly based on the European System of Language Education Description: Learning, Teaching, Assessment, Edited by Hanna Komorowska, CODN 2001, and Framework Programs for Language Education in the PAF by WSNJO 2003.

The Framework Program[21] covers three essential functions in the didactic process: normative, advisory, and integrative. In its normative function,

---

[21] https://www.wojsko-polskie.pl/awl/u/c2/8a/c28accca-f5bb-49bf-a060-2b4a7e8e092f/ramowy_program_nauczania_jezyka_angielskiego_2009.pdf [accessed on 15.01.2021].

the program identifies the main objectives of language courses, necessary for the performance of foreign language teaching at the appropriate level of skill within the individual language skills, together with the means for their implementation. In the advisory function, the program presents the means for achieving the course objectives in the form of inventories: tasks and communication categories, grammatical and syntax structures, and thematic circles in the field of general-purpose and military-specialized lexis. Based on these inventories, selection of textbooks and developing own didactic materials and their correlation is expected, which is obtained by defining parts of components of language knowledge and skills at a certain level of advancement. The selected teaching material creates a separate detailed curriculum for a language course. As part of the integration function, the Framework Program ensures the uniformity of education standards. Moreover, it creates a foundation for the preparation of a foreign language test by specifying the criteria a learner must meet. At all levels of language proficiency, the program has adopted a unified shape and presents learning objectives, semantic grammatical categories and communication functions, structural material, and subject areas.

The program also includes guidelines for the development of lower level planning documents, the organization of courses and the development of competences of learners within all language skills. The final element of the program is the list of recommended textbooks for each level. The program is intended to ensure the compatibility of teaching at foreign language centres in the PAF. All language courses have clearly defined teaching objectives and are related to the level of language proficiency specified in the program, with regard to all or selected language skills.

This document is the core curriculum for the development of specific curricula that defines the necessary linguistic and communicative functions at a given level of teaching and examination. The course organizers establish a hierarchy of learning objectives in the preparation phase of the specific program or material distribution. Regardless of the length of the course and the way the course is taught, the framework program stands the basis for the didactic activities. The Framework Program describes in detail the receptive and productive skills, subject areas to be covered, performance expected of the candidates, semantic and lexical categories, and communicative functions for all levels of the STANAG 6001 courses.

Military English in the teaching process

The need for teaching military English in the Polish Armed Forces (PAF) has increased since accession to NATO in 1999. Soldiers from Poland participate in international joint exercises, NATO and EU peacekeeping and peace-maintaining missions and Civil-Military Co-operation (CIMIC), military seminars and conferences conducted in English, thus teaching military English has become of paramount importance.

English language courses in the PAF are planned according to the STANAG 6001 examination requirements and criteria. STANAG 6001 exam is one of the main target needs for course participants, it is an official job requirement. Several types of courses of English, such as intensive courses and refresher courses for the military personnel are organised. The number of students in one class is usually from six to fourteen. The age range of the students varies significantly, and the level of English is different as well. The prospective students of level 2 and 3 courses are pretested before grouping. Nevertheless, there still can occur discrepancies within those levels regarding a given skill.

The criteria for the selection of military terminology used in classes are primarily didactic[22]. The aim of teaching military terminology in heterogeneous groups is to prepare the participants to continue work on their jergon upon completion of the course. On the other hand, an in-depth analysis of language strategies, registers and taught partial skills introduced at the time of the classes is required, which does not preclude applying specific terminology in some situations in groups with a clear profile. The military lexicon is not included in the teaching hours as a separate type of classes. Classes are conducted using military sources or lexis necessary for the use of language for professional purposes. The Framework Programme defines the minimal percentage of military English component in the general number of hours at Level 1 as 5%, Level 2 as 15%, Level 3 as 30% and provides the following descriptions of levels:

STANAG Level 1 courses provide learners with the minimum necessary military terminology to meet the communication requirements of the workplace abroad and the basic knowledge of the functioning of the allied armed forces. At Level 1, mostly adapted teaching materials containing the basic expressions are used. The lexical units of Military English at Level include the following topic:

---

[22] https://www.wojsko-polskie.pl/awl/u/c2/8a/c28accca-f5bb-49bf-a060-2b4a7e8e092f/ramowy_program_nauczania_jezyka_angielskiego_2009.pdf [accessed on 15.01.2021].

    ✓ Types of forces, armies and services.

    ✓ Military ranks of selected types of armed forces.

    ✓ Names of basic official posts of the chosen type of troops and services.

    ✓ Course of the day and basic activities of cadets at a military academy.

    ✓ Basic terminology for selected areas of military service:

timetable or work schedule and typical activities in barracks; the order of the day in the barracks; types of uniforms; personal weapons of a soldier and armament and weapons systems of the chosen type of troops and services; typical titles and commands relating to military service.

STANAG Level 2 vocabulary classes introduce and consolidate a large number of lexical units, allowing the learner to work in a foreign language. The first part of the course is to develop receptive skills with adapted and original teaching materials. The second part is dedicated to the consolidation of lexical material in general military terminology and the improvement of skills acquired. Special attention is paid to productive efficiency and the independent use of military vocabulary. At level 2 a specific program for the specific needs of the training group may be designed. The lexical units of Military English at Level 2 comprise:

    − Military ranks and basic armament systems of all types of forces.

    − Basic abbreviations and acronyms in military documents.

    − Business correspondence in written form and by technical means of communication.

    − Types of forces and services:
      organization of selected types of armed forces; equipment and armament systems of soldiers of selected types of troops and services.

    − Military service:
      education and training in the armed forces; professional career in the army; basic instructions and documents.

    − Military exercises:

    − basic combat and school-based activities; international joint exercises; basic elements of military orders.

    − International military cooperation:

NATO and work outside the state borders; international military units; peacekeeping and humanitarian missions.

      STANAG Level 3 classes consolidate and extend the lexical material of general military terminology, extend specialist terminology and improve skills acquired, with special attention directed at productive efficiency and skilful use of military vocabulary in writing texts independently. Thematic scope, selection

of non-adapted materials and ways of working with the students are to activate the exchange of views and discussions. The thematic scope and quantitative dimension leave the teacher room for tailoring material to the needs and capabilities of the group. The lexical units of Military English at Level 3 comprise:

- − Military ranks - nomenclature and comparability.
- − Basic abbreviations and acronyms in military documents.
- − Current political and military world affairs.
- − Types of forces and services:

basic organization of types of forces; basic equipment and armament of soldiers; equipment and armament systems of soldiers of the chosen type of troops and services; naming of selected weapon system.

- − International military cooperation:

NATO and deployments; international military units; peacekeeping and humanitarian missions; actions under disarmament agreements.

- − Weapons of Mass Destruction:

operation of WMD; international agreements; current military-political affairs.

- − Military service:

education and training in the armed forces; professional career in the army; instructions and normative documents; operations of combined types of forces.

- − Military exercises:

combat and military actions; international joint exercises; C4I Command, Control, Communication, Computers, Intelligence; military command elements.

Agreeing on one common military specialty terminology is an arduous, if not infeasible task. There can be defined sub-registers typical for a given type of army and service, so language learning should be targeted to a specific group profile. However, the teaching process is most often performed in groups that can be described as heterogeneous. In creating the distribution of material for such groups, general military terminology is commonly chosen. However, the most common courses apply terminology of ground troops, including the terminology of general military documents and general combat.

With regard to the teaching resources, the main materials used are predominantly paper-based. However, with the advent of new technologies, interactive media have been employed in the military vocabulary teaching. An interesting e-learning platform for advanced students is NATO Joint Advanced

Distributed Learning (JADL), where the course participants can bring into effect their English language knowledge. Additionally, they are issued with a certificate in a field of their interest.

The materials used by teachers as a source of language, a learning support, for motivation and stimulation, and for reference[23] form the pillar of a course[24]. Choosing materials may mean developing new materials, collecting a variety of materials, or adapting existing materials. Subsequently, specialized vocabulary may be integrated in authentic written or spoken materials. The Armed Forces usually are divided into several arms: Land Forces, the Navy, the Air Force, and Special Forces, which are divided into several branches of services, into specialities, with their own specialized terminology, routine, responsibilities, etc. therefore it is not feasible to cover all military matters in one single coursebook. Authors of military English coursebooks decide on the topics which would interest not only the students representing a narrow speciality, and more general topics need to be included as well. Several coursebooks for teaching military English have been published, of which the Campaign series has been adopted as the leading textbook in the PAF.

In the Campaign series used at all levels, military terminology is presented together with grammar points and numerous exercises follow the text with new vocabulary. The coursebook is topical and covers a wide range of common military matters. The series is, however, British-centred, and not always compatible with Polish military issues. British Military terms have their American synonyms in all units, and this ambiguity leads sometimes to course participants' confusion as to which terminology they are expected to use at work and during international military exercises. It should be emphasised that American English prevails during joint operations and peacekeeping missions.

WORLD ENGLISH	
UK	**US**
mess dress / mess kit	mess uniform
number 2 dress uniform	service uniform
combat uniform	battle dress uniform (BDU)

Fig. 3. Example of British and American military English
Source: Y. Altamirano, S. Mellor-Clark 2005, Campaign 3, p. 68.

---

[23] Cf. Dudley-Evans T. And St. John M., *Developments In ESP: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach*, Cambridge 2012.
[24] Cf. Graves K., *Teachers As Course Developers*, Cambridge 1996, p. 26.

Correspondingly, there is no official glossary of the military terminology of the Campaign series, and translation of military terms varies due to the existence of synonymous military terms also in Polish. One of the greatest advantages for the teachers themselves is the background information on the subjects covered explained in the Teacher's Book. According to Dobbs, Campaign series uses the military element to provide context, contrary to hard/ technical Military English in Bowyer's *Check your vocabulary for military English*.

The language of the military, and of warfare in particular, has greatly influenced the English language. Numerous dictionaries have been compiled in the attempt to record the ephemeral vocabulary which is associated with particular wars and military conflicts, terminology not only concerning weaponry, technical jargon and warfare itself, but also vibrant slang characterizing every war, especially in the case of American troops. Nonetheless, linguists reckon that it is impossible to draft a complete dictionary of current British English and American military terminology, as it is not feasible to compare British military acronyms system with the American one because of different military structures and different habitus, even if the expressions, including those in military slang, are mutually translatable[25]. Roman conducted a parallel analysis of British and American military terminology after WWII, and confirmed that accurate understanding of military terminology in English, with regard to British and American varieties, is a mechanism that depends on the level of knowledge in terms of linguistic specialization, and on proper military practice. Roman observed that there are some terms in American English with no equivalent in British specialized terminology.

The rhetoric of military language is rich in abbreviations, acronyms, euphemism, jargon and slang terms, and as these terms evolve, they take a life of their own. Roman notices that in terms of military terminology, the development of English has not led to a language unity throughout all English-speaking countries. A critical need of standardized military terms is emerging as different military terms are encountered depending on the country they come from. Military terminology standardized at NATO level employs American military terminology as benchmark. Contemporary bilingual military dictionaries available in Poland are limited. The dictionaries used commonly are, among others, *Dictionary of military terms* Danysz J., 2001, *The Military Terminology Glossary* Graczyk K., Kuziela D. eds., 2007. Students' vocabulary learning process is augmented by publications of NATO, e.g.: AAP-6 NATO Glossary of Terms and Definitions

---

[25] C. Roman. 2014, *Comparative Analysis Of British And American Military Terminology*, [in:] "Redefining Community in Intercultural Context", https://www.ceeol.com/search/journal-detail?id=1610 [accessed on 15.01.2021].

AAP-6, AAP-19 NATO Combat Engineer Glossary. The glossaries are translated into national languages; however, they incorporate only chosen aspects of military subjects. In the contemporary world, English has become the language of interoperability in NATO. In order to achieve this interoperability, the prerequisite of a common language emerged, triggering a need for common terminology to be used by the forces. "Variations in terminology […] were the source of confusion. Having a common and understandable terminology […] also contributes to interoperability"[26].

Final remarks

Language is a significant element in providing security, is "a key to security"[27]. The end of the Cold War contributed to the intensification of efforts to improve the efficiency of language learning. The transformations after 1989 forced the former states of the Warsaw Pact to redefine language policy as foreign language training became increasingly important within armed forces.

Poland has been part of NATO for over two decades now. As English is the de facto operational language of NATO, it is of paramount importance for the military personnel to learn the English language in order to communicate with the military and civilian personnel worldwide and to achieve communicative interoperability.

The military coordinating centres and military language requirements follow STANAG 6001 guidelines. The correct use of military language and its understanding enables a successful administrative and operational military environment. On account of appropriate application of terminology, potential misunderstandings or misinterpretations of military activities can be avoided. Language can both promote integration and be an obstacle to its implementation, if its knowledge is not determined by the same level for each group. Language appears to be an important determinant of sustainable security. Thus, language education plays an important role in the security system of the Republic of Poland.

---

[26] I. P. Jones, Askew L., *Meeting the Language Challenges of NATO Operations. Policy, Practice and Professionalization*, Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire 2014, p.28.

[27] B. Jagusiak *Implications of Language Policy for International Security*, [in:] (eds) Jagusiak B., Jagiello--Tondera A., *Language policy and security in the 21st century*, Warsaw 2020, p.16.

Bibliography

1. Allan K., Burridge K., *Forbidden Words*, Cambridge 2006.
2. Crossey M., *Peacekeeping English in Poland*, [in:] Tribble C. (ed), *Managing Change in English Language Teaching: Lessons from Experience*, British Council 2012.
3. Crystal D., *English As A Global Language*, Cambridge 2003.
4. Dudley-Evans T., St. John M., *Developments In ESP: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach*, Cambridge 2012.
5. Footitt H., Kelly M. (eds), *Languages and the Military: Alliances, Occupation and Peace Building,* Hampshire 2012.
6. Gos M., *Language Levels and Examination Standards within NATO in relation to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*, "W dialogu języków i kultur" 2013, III.
7. Graves K., *Teachers as Course Developers*, Cambridge 1996.
8. Jagusiak B., *Systemy bezpieczeństwa w teorii i praktyce*, Warszawa 2018.
9. Jagusiak B., *Implications of Language Policy for International Security*, [in:] [eds] Jagusiak B., Jagiełło-Tondera A., *Language policy and security in the 21st century*, Warsaw 2020.
10. Jones I.P., Askew L., *Meeting the Language Challenges of NATO Operations. Policy, Practice and Professionalization,* Hampshire 2014.
11. Malaparte C., *O wojnie, wojsku i żołnierzach – dla żołnierzy (myśli-aforyzmy-sentencje)*, *wybór Bogdan M. Szulc*, Torun 1995.
12. Mielczarek A., *Z zagadnień słownictwa wojskowego. Rozważania terminologiczne*, Warszawa 1976.
13. Ritz R., *Lingua*, *Lingua Franca, Lingua Academica: Are European Universities Language Happy?*, [in]: (eds) Komorowska H., Zając J., *Multilingual Competences for Professional and Social Success in Europe, Foundation for the Development of the Education System,* Warsaw 2012.
14. Roman C. 2014, *Comparative Analysis of British and American Military Terminology,* [in:] "Redefining Community in Intercultural Context", https://www.ceeol.com/search/journal-detail?id=1610.
15. Stańczyk J., *Formułowanie kategorii pojęciowej bezpieczeństwa*, Poznań 2017.
16. https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/publications/lost-words-need-languages-uk-diplomacy-and-security.

Edukacja językowa w systemie bezpieczeństwa RP

Streszczenie

Język angielski stał się lingua franca współczesnego świata, językiem globalnym. Proces globalizacji wpłynął również na rosnące zapotrzebowanie na naukę języka angielskiego. Zapotrzebowanie obejmuje nie tylko język ogólny, ale także język specjalistyczny, w tym język środowiska wojskowego.

Język angielski stał się również językiem interoperacyjności w NATO. Sojusz Północnoatlantycki zawsze zwracał szczególną uwagę na znajomość języków obcych, czego wyrazem było m.in. powołanie BILC International Language Coordination Office oraz rozwój standardów językowych obowiązujących we wszystkich państwach członkowskich – STANAG6001. Edukacja językowa w siłach zbrojnych RP odbywa się zgodnie z wytycznymi Sojuszu. Prawidłowe użycie języka wojskowego i jego rozumienie stwarza dobre warunki dla powodzenia administracyjnych i operacyjnych działań w środowisku wojskowym. Dzięki odpowiedniemu zastosowaniu terminologii można uniknąć potencjalnych nieporozumień lub błędnych interpretacji działań wojskowych. Edukacja językowa jest jednym z elementów polityki językowej w dziedzinie bezpieczeństwa.

Słowa kluczowe: język angielski specjalistyczny, lingua franca, bezpieczeństwo, NATO, STANAG 6001