

Assessing the Impact of and Needs for Navy Language, Regional Expertise, and Culture Training

Neil B. Carey • Edward J. Schmitz • Zachary T. Miller • Sara M. Russell




DRM-2012-U-001502-Final
October 2012

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE OCT 2012		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2012 to 00-00-2012	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Assessing the Impact of and Needs for Navy Language, Regional Expertise, and Culture Training				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) CNA Analysis & Solutions,4825 Mark Center Drive,Alexandria,VA,22311				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 102	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Photo credit line: East Timor (Mar. 13, 2002) -- Hospital Corpsman 1st Class Geoff Barker from San Francisco, CA, gives medication to a child during a medical & dental community assistance project (MEDCAP/DENCAP). Petty Officer Barker is stationed aboard USS Blue Ridge (LCC 19) and is part of a nine person MEDCAP team treating patients in the Dili area. USS Blue Ridge is underway in the South Pacific. U.S. Navy photo by Photographer's Mate 3rd Class Kurt Eischen. (RELEASED)

Approved for distribution:

October 2012



Henry S. Griffis, Director
Defense Workforce Analyses Team
Resource Analysis Division

This document contains the best opinion of the authors at the time of issue.
It does not necessarily represent the opinion of the Department of the Navy.

Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited. Specific authority: N00014-11-D-0323.
Copies of this document can be obtained through the Defense Technical Information Center at www.dtic.mil
or contact CNA Document Control and Distribution Section at 703-824-2123.

Copyright © 2012 CNA

This work was created in the performance of Federal Government Contract Number N00014-11-D-0323. Any copyright in this work is subject to the Government's Unlimited Rights license as defined in DFARS 252.227-7013 and/or DFARS 252.227-7014. The reproduction of this work for commercial purposes is strictly prohibited. Nongovernmental users may copy and distribute this document in any medium, either commercially or noncommercially, provided that this copyright notice is reproduced in all copies. Nongovernmental users may not use technical measures to obstruct or control the reading or further copying of the copies they make or distribute. Nongovernmental users may not accept compensation of any manner in exchange for copies. All other rights reserved.

Contents

Executive summary	1
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	3
Issues.....	4
Organization of this report.....	7
Chapter 2: Previous assessments of language, regional expertise, and culture	9
Congress.....	9
Defense Language and National Security Office (DLNSEO)	10
Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC)	11
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC)	14
The Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI).....	16
Department of the Navy.....	17
Navy Foreign Language Office	17
Office of Naval Research (ONR)	18
Navy Personnel Research, Studies, and Technology (NPRST)	18
CNA's Center for Naval Analyses	18
Marine Corps Center for Advanced Operational Culture Learning (CAOCL)	21
Navy Expeditionary Combat Command (NECC)	23
Army	24
Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI)	25
Air Force.....	26
Summary and discussion	27
Chapter 3: LREC survey questions.....	29
Section I: Your mission and interactions with foreign nationals during deployment.....	32
Section II A: Challenges/issues with foreign nationals' <u>culture</u> during deployment	33

Section II B: Challenges/issues with foreign nationals’ <u>language</u> during this deployment	34
Section III: Self-assessment of individual knowledge of the culture and language of the foreign nationals with whom you worked	35
Section IV: Assessment of your predeployment <u>culture and language</u> training.....	35
Section V: Demographics and operation supported	37
Summary and conclusion	39
Chapter 4: Alternatives and recommendations	41
Alternatives for questions and respondents	41
Survey of sailors	41
Survey of officers and unit commanders.....	44
Interviews of sailors and unit commanders	45
Interviews or surveys for flag officers.....	46
Alternatives for fielding surveys or interviews/focus groups	46
Fielding surveys	47
Fielding interviews/focus groups.....	50
Summary and conclusion	51
Appendix A: Email collection tool.....	53
Appendix B: Postdeployment survey for sailors.....	55
Appendix C: Postdeployment survey for officers and unit commanders.....	69
Appendix D: Postdeployment interviews for sailors and unit commanders.....	79
Appendix E: Postdeployment survey for flag officers.....	87
References	89
List of figures.....	93
List of tables	95

Executive summary

Changes in worldwide strategic relationships since 9/11 and lessons learned from Operations Iraqi Freedom, Enduring Freedom, and New Dawn demonstrate the importance of Navy personnel being able to communicate in foreign languages and to comprehend foreign cultures. The Center for Information Dominance's Center for Language, Regional Expertise, and Culture (CLREC) plays a central role in training Department of the Navy personnel in the language skills and cultural knowledge required to effectively carry out their missions. CLREC provides predeployment cultural orientation training in a variety of forms, such as (1) group instruction facilitated by Mobile Training Teams, (2) semiautomated group presentations facilitated by a member of the command being trained, (3) individual instruction using automated and nonautomated presentations, and (4) one-on-one language tutoring for flag officers who will soon take an assignment in which linguistic training would be beneficial.

For the following reasons, CLREC wants to improve its current processes and procedures for soliciting customer feedback: to determine how well its products are being accepted, to characterize the effects of its work, and to identify whether there are unmet needs that should be addressed. CLREC turned to CNA to provide feasible options for providing feedback from customers after mission performance, instead of immediately after predeployment training (the current process). CLREC wants these options designed to provide information about (a) whether training was applied during deployments and (b) whether the skills that were applied had a beneficial effect on mission accomplishment and minimizing liberty incidents.

To develop options for CLREC, we took a four-part approach:

1. Investigate how CLREC and other organizations have assessed their LREC training.
2. Develop draft survey questions for a Navy CLREC assessment.

3. Investigate how CLREC and other organizations have assessed their LREC training.
4. Get feedback on our draft survey questions from a variety of knowledgeable individuals, including sailors serving on the 2011 Southern Partnership Station deployment.
5. Recommend methods for deploying the Navy's CLREC assessment at appropriate times and places.

From our analyses, we found the following:

- Assessing whether training was effective in supporting mission objectives needs to be done at a later time, not immediately after training has occurred.
- Data and analyses should focus on determining needs for training rather than on providing tightly defined input-output or return-on-investment models of dollars for training and dollars of benefit. A better goal would be to provide return-on-expectations evidence showing that sailors were prepared and responded well to situations that required LREC skills.
- Because of the high cost of developing tests of proficiency, self-assessments will probably need to be used as a principal indicator for assessing the results of training.
- Compared with the other services, the Navy has provided training to a lower percentage of personnel, but the Navy compares favorably in terms of such important indicators as sailors' satisfaction with LREC training and its beneficial results.
- Ideally, an assessment of Navy CLREC training would include collecting survey/interview data from sailors and their officers/unit commanders. We developed a series of survey instruments and interview guides that are tailored to assess the major CLREC products. For example, flag officers would be requested to complete a short five-item survey or interview.

Various organizations could field a survey for CLREC and collect data (e.g., Defense Manpower Data Center; Navy Personnel Research, Studies, and Technology; federally funded research and development centers; and survey research organizations). CLREC could also explore with the Navy Education and Training Command whether selected instruments can be embedded in Navy Knowledge Online.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Changes in worldwide strategic relationships since 9/11 and lessons learned from Operations Iraqi Freedom, Enduring Freedom, and New Dawn demonstrate how important it is for Navy personnel to have skills in foreign languages and understanding of foreign cultures [1]. The Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower (CS-21) emphasizes the need to develop relationships with emerging partners to develop Global Maritime Partnerships (GMP) and foster Theater Security Cooperation (TSC). GMP and TSC improve our Navy's ability to secure sea lanes for international trade and to police the littorals to improve the safety of coastal populations and stability of coastal regions. Working more closely with international partners in day-to-day operations also improves the Navy's ability to render humanitarian assistance and disaster relief when required. By knowing more about the values, beliefs, behaviors, and norms of foreign cultures, Department of the Navy (DON) personnel experience less culture shock and can communicate with foreign peoples more efficiently. This makes them both better ambassadors of our Navy and our nation and a more mission-capable force.¹

The Center for Information Dominance's Center for Language, Regional Expertise, and Culture (CLREC) plays a central role in training DON personnel in the language skills and cultural knowledge required to effectively carry out their missions. CLREC provides pre-deployment cultural orientation training to sailors in a variety of forms that include but are not limited to the following:

1. Group instruction facilitated by Mobile Training Teams (MTTs)
2. Semiautomated group presentations facilitated by a member of the command being trained

1. The need for Navy language and culture training will not go away when U.S. forces leave Iraq and Afghanistan; this is a basic change in defense strategy. See, for example, the 2010 *Quadrennial Defense Review Report* [2].

3. Individual instruction via

- a. Paced Navy e-Learning (NeL)
- b. Automated and nonautomated presentations

In addition, CLREC provides sailors predeployment foreign language familiarization training via MTTs and through paced training materials and products developed by the government or commercial industry. It also coordinates language training for flag officers who will soon take an assignment that would benefit from linguistic training.

The goal of this language, regional expertise, and cultural (LREC) training is to reduce culture shock and develop rudimentary language skills among sailors. It is believed that sailors who understand the culture and can communicate even a little are better able to anticipate the attitudes and actions of those they will meet and those with whom they will work while overseas.

Issues


CLREC desires to improve its current processes and procedures for soliciting customer feedback. CLREC is seeking to:

- determine how well its products are being accepted;
- characterize the effects of its work on individual and unit readiness and fleet operations; and
- identify whether there are unmet needs that should be addressed.

Figure 1 graphically depicts the goals that are attained by CLREC's current assessment process and what it wants to add to that process.

The current feedback process allows CLREC to gather students' impressions immediately after their training, as shown by the solid dark blue arrows. The intent of our study is to assist CLREC in its efforts to provide feedback loops *after* mission performance (shown by the dashed red lines). We do this by developing survey questions for a Navy CLREC assessment and by recommending methods for deploying the assessment.

Figure 1. Current and proposed feedback loops for Navy's CLREC training assessments



There are two parts of the proposed feedback loops. One is to assess the impact of the CLREC program on the behavior and performance of Navy personnel during their mission, which we have labeled as “Impact.” The other part is to assess needs for training, as communicated by sailors who are finishing, or just recently finished, their mission assessment (“Needs”).

One way to conceptualize the impact portion of the new feedback avenues is by using Kirkpatrick’s levels of training evaluation [3, 4], shown in table 1. The four levels can be succinctly described as reaction, learning, behavior, and results. CLREC currently gets systematic feedback immediately after training, measuring the students’ reactions to the training, how satisfied they are with the training, and what they liked/disliked about the class (Kirkpatrick Level 1). Level 2 assessments, in contrast, include evaluation of whether participants acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes based on their participation in CLREC training.

CLREC wants to add evaluations primarily at Kirkpatrick Levels 2, 3, and 4 to its current evaluation processes. Level 3 evaluations involve assessing how much participants *apply what they learned* in CLREC training when they get to their deployment situations. Level 4 would involve assessing whether desired outcomes occur as a result of CLREC training.

Table 1. Kirkpatrick’s four levels of training evaluation (adapted from [3] and [4])

Level	Description of the evaluation level
1	Degree to which participants react favorably to the training event
2	Degree to which participants acquire the intended knowledge, skills, and attitudes based on their participation in the learning event.
3	Degree to which participants apply what they learned during training when they get back to the job.
4	Degree to which targeted outcomes occur, as a result of the learning events and subsequent reinforcement; includes return on investment and return on expectation.

Some training evaluators [5] describe a fifth level, return on investment (monetary return minus costs). The Kirkpatricks themselves see return on investment as part of the fourth level, but they prefer to advocate “return on expectation” [6]. Unlike return on investment, the Kirkpatricks’ return on expectation involves both qualitative and quantitative measurement of all benefits realized as a result of training—not only those that can be measured quantitatively or converted into monetary values, as would be the case with return on investment.

There are several challenges to providing feedback loops, as shown in figure 1 and table 1. First is the need to identify sailors who use CLREC services in a way that would allow them to be contacted during—or, more likely, after—their deployments. Second, sailors might not remember very much about their predeployment training since the time span between receiving training and returning from deployment can be six or more months. Third, sailors have had enough time on deployment to have learned skills since their training, and it will be difficult for sailors to distinguish between skills that they learned *before* deployment and those learned *during* deployment.

To help CLREC meet these challenges, we took a four-part approach: (1) develop draft survey questions for a Navy CLREC assessment, (2) investigate how CLREC and other organizations have assessed their LREC training, (3) get feedback on our draft survey questions from a variety of knowledgeable people, including sailors serving on the 2011 Southern Partnership Station deployment, and (4) recommend methods for deploying the Navy’s CLREC assessment at appropriate

times and places. The second step involved visiting CLREC and other commands and offices of the armed forces that train and survey servicemembers in language or culture to derive “lessons learned” in terms of what questions to ask, when to ask them, and how to ask them.

Organization of this report

This report is organized in four chapters:

- *Chapter 1, Introduction*
- *Chapter 2, Previous assessments of language, regional expertise, and culture*, reviews the reasons for assessing LREC training and findings from previous studies and activities related to LREC training assessment—both within and outside the DON.
- *Chapter 3, LREC questions*, explains and reviews the survey questions that we developed and then modified on the basis of feedback.
- *Chapter 4, Alternatives and recommendations*, describes different ways that CLREC can field these surveys in an efficient and economical way.

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 2: Previous assessments of language, regional expertise, and culture

As part of our study of how CLREC can best assess the training and information that it provides to the Navy, we reviewed information from a number of different sources, including policy documents, research reports, and survey results. We also interviewed people throughout the government who have familiarity with language and culture programs and assessment. This chapter summarizes the results of this research.

Congress

Congress has been concerned with the skills and expertise needed by today's military during Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). As the counterinsurgency role of troops increased in these operations, key committees investigated whether the Department of Defense (DOD) and the services were addressing language, culture, and regional studies in the general forces.

The House Armed Services Committee (HASC) Oversight and Investigations (O&I) Staff has produced two reports addressing LREC issues. The first [7], *Building Language Skills and Cultural Competencies in the Military: DOD's Challenge in Today's Educational Environment*, identified for further study the question of how well the services provided language and cultural awareness training for deploying units. They found that the services needed to measure language, regional expertise, and cultural awareness, and develop the relationship between these measures and overall unit readiness. In 2010, the HASC O&I Subcommittee issued a second report [8] on military language and cultural competencies. It found that the service policies still fell short of recognizing language, regional expertise, and cultural awareness as core competencies essential to mission success.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) also has investigated DOD's and the services' work in developing language skills and

regional proficiency. In 2009, it found that DOD lacked methods to assess regional expertise requirements and skills [9]. When GAO reexamined language and culture training in 2011, it noted that DOD has recognized that its ability to identify general purpose forces that have language and culture knowledge and skills will be critical to managing these forces in the future [10]. The services, however, were not capturing information in training and personnel systems on the completion of language and culture training and corresponding proficiency gained from training. The services do not have the information they need to effectively leverage the language and culture knowledge and skills of these forces when making individual assignments and assessing future operational needs.

Defense Language and National Security Office (DLNSEO)

DLNSEO has been involved in establishing policies and coordinating among services with respect to language, regional expertise, and culture. It has been involved with tracking Regional Proficiency (RP) in the force but has not yet implemented tests for culture or regional experience.

DLNSEO is working with the Center for Advanced Study of Language (CASL) to develop a means to rate the regional experiences of personnel according to the RP guidelines in DOD Instruction 5160.70, *Management of DoD's Language and Regional Proficiency Capabilities*. This rating project is an examination of experiential data that are or should be contained in service databases (primarily personnel databases). DLNSEO and CASL use a weighted algorithm to derive a rating (not a score). The ratings should allow them to swiftly identify who has experience in any of the regions.

The Defense Manpower Data Center conducted a DLNSEO-sponsored survey in November 2011 on assessing regional proficiency. While the survey results have not yet been released, the survey includes a number of questions on education, language knowledge, cultural and family background, and military training. The questions on deployment history and predeployment training provide examples of questions that could be used as a benchmark with which to compare other survey results.

Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC)

Over the last several years, DMDC has performed annual Status of Forces Surveys of Active Duty Members (SOFS-A) and Reserve Component Members (SOFS-R) that include items to identify members who have deployed in the past 24 months and who are currently deployed.

The June 2010 SOFS-A and January 2011 SOFS-R included the items requested by DLNSEO that addressed language and culture. These items considered:

- Whether the members had received any language, cultural, or regional training before deployment
- How satisfied they were with the training
- Whether the Language, Region, and Culture (LRC) training met the specified objectives
- Whether the training helped them in performing their job

DMDC's findings [11] have been reported by service/reserve component. Within each service/reserve component, data are further broken out by enlisted or officer and by rank. Additional breakouts—by marital status, gender, ethnicity, and broad location categories—are also provided for many of the questions.

The survey contains many of the elements that would be useful for a high-level program assessment, including the Kirkpatrick framework. For example, the first step in an evaluation would be to find out if any LRC training was received. The survey asks whether the respondent has had any LRC training. DMDC found that 64 percent of troops deploying for either OEF or OIF had received cultural training, 53 percent had received regional training, and 29 percent had received language training. Figure 2 shows the percentage of each service that received language, regional, or cultural training. It shows that the Navy provided LRC training to a smaller percentage of its forces than did the other three services. The figure also shows that, for all four services, cultural training is provided more often than regional training; language training is the least commonly provided LRC training.

The DMDC survey also provides indicators of the outcomes of training. Customer satisfaction is considered a Kirkpatrick Level 1 metric. It is also frequently used as an assessment measure for service delivery. Figure 3 shows the percentage of deployed members who were satisfied with their LRC training. Among the four services, the highest percentage of satisfied LRC participants was in the Navy (46 percent), followed by Marine Corps (40 percent), Air Force (38 percent), and Army (35 percent). The Navy was significantly higher than the other services.

Figures 2 and 3, taken together, suggest that the Navy trains a smaller segment of its deploying population in LRC skills; however, those it trains are more satisfied with the training they receive.

DMDC also asked about the degree to which LRC training was beneficial. First, they asked whether the training had met their objectives, which is an example of a high-level assessment of Kirkpatrick level 2 (see figure 4)

Figure 5 shows that, across all the services, officers saw greater benefit to their LRC training than did enlisted members. It also shows that Navy and Marine Corps officers viewed their LRC training as beneficial more often than any other group—with 67 percent saying their training helped them perform their job (Kirkpatrick Levels 3 and 4).

Figure 2. Percentage of active duty servicemembers who received LRC training before deployment




Figure 3. Percentage of deploying active duty servicemembers satisfied with their LRC training (Kirkpatrick Level 1)




Figure 4. Percentage of servicemembers deployed for OEF and/or OIF saying LRC training met the objectives (Kirkpatrick Level 2)





Figure 5. Percentage of servicemembers deployed for OEF and/or OIF who rated LRC training as beneficial for performing their job (Kirkpatrick Level 3 and 4)



In contrast, only 64 percent of Army officers and 56 percent of Air Force officers agreed that their LRC training was beneficial. On the enlisted side, the highest percentages of servicemembers describing their LRC training as beneficial were Marines (61 percent), followed by Navy (59 percent), Army (55 percent) and Air Force (53 percent).

It would be useful for the survey to probe into additional detail on what kinds of knowledge the respondents received. The survey asked respondents whether they received training in a number of different areas, such as religion, geography, social organization, and political structure. This kind of feedback is useful to the services' LRC trainers because it provides additional information on the specific areas in which respondents received training. However, additional types of feedback, such as what kinds of training people actually used, and especially the areas where they would desire additional training, would be a useful addition.

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC)

DLIFLC is the world's largest foreign language instructional institution. In addition to running educational programs to train

professional linguists, DLIFLC supports several programs that provide training to general purpose forces in language and culture.

DLIFLC supports selected soldiers in the general purpose force with 16 weeks of predeployment training. In addition to education in regional studies and culture, the language training is designed to raise soldier proficiency from 0 to 1 on the interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) scale (basic functionality).

The assessment of general purpose soldiers is focused on when they return from deployment. Soldiers usually spend a week at Fort Campbell, KY, after deployment. During this week, DLIFLC surveys the soldiers to learn about the suitability of their training and the kinds of language and culture issues that they were involved in during their deployment.

A second major language and culture program administered by DLIFLC is the Afghanistan/Pakistan Hands (AFPAK Hands) program. The AFPAK Hands Program was established in 2009 to create greater continuity, focus and persistent engagement on Afghanistan and Pakistan. This program develops a cadre of military and civilian personnel who speak the local language, are culturally attuned, and focus on regional issues. Participants undergo initial training, then deploy into assignments in the region, and return to the AFPAK region after undergoing additional training.

DLIFLC provides the language and culture training for the AFPAK Hands program. Participants initially receive 16 weeks of training, including language training that is designed to bring them up to the 1 level on the ILR scale.

DLIFLC receives feedback from AFPAK Hands members at various times. Students are surveyed after completion of initial training. Once deployed to Afghanistan or Pakistan, they are also surveyed in country at a conference where all trainees are brought together to learn about their experiences with language and culture. When participants return to the continental United States (CONUS), they are assessed again, with a focus on a needs assessment before receiving additional training. During debriefings they have an opportunity to discuss their language and culture experiences and training needs in a group session.

The Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI)

The Division of Cultural Readiness of DEOMI conducts basic and applied cultural research to inform DOD policy-makers; it develops, validates, and assesses cultural training; and it provides measurement, analytic capability, and online knowledge management tools for culture training available across the DOD and industry. It has also sponsored symposia on the role of culture, language, and regional expertise in military operations.

One example of the work that DEOMI supports is the paper, “Assessing Organizational Cross-Cultural Competence in the Military: Developing a Measure,” by Marinus van Driel [12]. Dr. van Driel explains how DEOMI developed, pretested, and modified a measure of military servicemembers’ perceptions of their units’ cross-cultural competence. It started by collecting critical incidents mentioned during focus groups conducted with United Special Operations Forces (SOF), such as Army Special Forces (Green Berets) or Navy Sea, Air, Land team members (SEALs). Critical incidents are vignettes that are important to mission accomplishment and also illustrate something about the competencies needed by a special operator.

The critical incidents served as the basis for 59 items reflecting some aspects of the performance, preparation, or resources related to cross-cultural competence. DEOMI researchers included these items with the DEOMI Equal Opportunity Climate Survey (DEOCS) and asked respondents to indicate the importance of cross-cultural competence attributes to their unit during its previous deployment. From this pilot test, they selected 17 items that respondents agreed were critically important to cross-cultural competence for special operations forces. These 17 items, and 5 additional items, were included for additional pilot testing as part of the DEOCS—obtained from 474 servicemembers in 50 units who were deployed outside CONUS (OCONUS). Further item analysis led Dr. van Driel to recommend a 10-item measure of units’ cross-cultural competence in military units.

Department of the Navy

Navy Foreign Language Office

The Navy's Foreign Language Office (N13F) provides guidance to CLREC and other entities within the Navy. When we met with N13F staff, they said that they wanted CLREC to get systematic feedback, not just ad hoc feedback. They were particularly interested in having CLREC get information on how much their products and services helped sailors (1) perform their mission better or (2) keep from creating incidents during liberty. N13F's philosophy is that there is a limited amount of time to train, so CLREC should not provide any more LREC training than necessary. This is why all Navy LREC training is "demand-based"—meaning that units must request LREC training in order to receive it. In other words, units will not be forced to receive LREC training.

On one hand, N13F notes that the Navy's language, regional expertise, and culture programs need to be different from those in other services in several ways. The Navy does more with general cultural competence because a ship's cruise can take a sailor from Indonesia, to India, and to the Persian Gulf within a six-month period. All of these would be port calls—not extensive contact with foreign peoples, but brief, superficial encounters.

Most of the Army's deploying units, on the other hand, can rely on the fact that they will be serving around Afghanistani people, often over long periods of time where it makes sense to learn cross-cultural, regional, and language competencies in more depth.

All of these differences between the Navy and Army change the way CLREC provides Navy LRC training. CLREC provides information on a larger number of countries because Navy personnel are likely to be deployed anywhere in the world. This is why Navy personnel can request products from CLREC, such as language DVDs, CDs, lessons, and operational cultural awareness training (OCAT).

Some of the Navy commands that use CLREC products and services the most include Seabees (Construction Battalions), Military Civil Affairs Units, Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) units, and the Expeditionary Intelligence Command. There is also some demand from Carrier Strike Groups.

The client needs to tell CLREC what the specific mission will be and work with CLREC's personnel to determine the appropriate package of language, regional expertise, and cultural training that is needed. The package for a unit doing reconstruction might be different from a unit doing humanitarian operations. CLREC also provides Navy personnel with training on how to work with interpreters, if that is needed.

Office of Naval Research (ONR)

ONR supports a variety of research to help the Navy perform its missions. ONR has developed a program called ISLET, which stands for Interservice System for Language Education and Training. This is a way to learn a language through playing games. ISLET currently contains training in five different languages. CLREC developed a tactical Swahili module for them.

Navy Personnel Research, Studies, and Technology (NPRST)

NPRST, based in Millington, TN, is the Navy's only personnel-focused research laboratory. One of its capabilities is to provide Navy-wide survey development, administration, and analysis. It operates two types of surveys within this mission. One is a scientific survey of the entire Navy's Total Force. The second type of survey is a "quick poll," where NPRST surveys specific populations concerning specific topics, such as family readiness, knowledge of technology, or stress management.


CNA's Center for Naval Analyses

CNA is a nonprofit research organization that operates the Center for Naval Analyses and the Institute for Public Research. The Center for Naval Analyses provides research and analysis services to the military to help improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our national defense efforts.

In earlier research related to LRC training [13], Center for Naval Analyses' Ed Schmitz and his colleagues developed metrics for the Navy's Bureau of Medicine (BUMED) to assist in the manning and training of medical personnel for performing humanitarian assistance (HA) and stability, security, transition and reconstruction (SSTRO) missions. Our focus was on identifying and training medical personnel with respect to the language and cultural aspects of their missions.

Figure 6 shows a diagram of the model that Schmitz and his colleagues developed. On the left side are the inputs to the delivery of HA. These are the attributes of the personnel assigned, characteristics of the mission, and the nature of additional mission-specific training that is provided.

Figure 6. A model of evaluating language and culture training [10]



In this model, the personnel assigned to the HA or SSTRO mission would be assessed for their knowledge of culture at the beginning of the mission. This would typically be done with a self-assessment against the previously established cultural awareness metrics. Army Research Institute (ARI) reports such as Abbe, Gulick, and Herman (2010) [14] or Caligiuri et al. (2011) [15] provide examples of the kinds of assessment tools that could be used. If any additional language training were provided, the candidates could be assessed, either through the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) or through a self-assessment.

In this model, the personnel assigned to the HA or SSTRO mission would be assessed for their knowledge of culture at the beginning of the mission. This would typically be done with a self-assessment against the previously established cultural awareness metrics. Army Research Institute (ARI) reports such as Abbe, Gulick, and Herman (2010) [14] or Caligiuri et al. (2011) [15] provide examples of the kinds of assessment tools that could be used. If any additional language training were provided, the candidates could be assessed, either through the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) or through a self-assessment.

Schmitz and his coauthors identified two types of measures to be collected at the service delivery point. The first metric was the identification of service delivery issues. These are often referred to as performance indicators. These can include measures of the frequency and kinds of interactions medical personnel had with patients and host nationals, kinds of communication problems encountered, and narratives with detailed comments on issues and experiences.

For medical personnel, working with interpreters was an important topic that needed to be addressed. Nearly all medical personnel deployed on HA or SSTRO missions end up working with interpreters at some point. Previous research by Hayes and Baker [16] had found that working with medical interpreters presented specific challenges. Thus, the assessments of service delivery needed to address the person's experiences in working with interpreters. This feedback was important to improving training, as well as providing guidance to the organization providing interpreter services.

A second category of measures was outcome or impact indicators. These measures address whether the performance of the activity was contributing to the overall program goals. Defining the outcome of HA or SSTRO missions was a subject of considerable discussion. Past analysis by Nelson et al. has examined such metrics as the number of patients treated and the character of care provided [17]. Other recent studies, such as Vernon's 2008 report, have focused on attitudinal measures of effectiveness [18].

Schmitz and colleagues developed survey instruments to assess the training, service delivery, and mission outcomes in two cases: the deployment of *Mercy* to provide humanitarian assistance in 2008 and medical personnel in Afghanistan performing SSTRO missions. The model was most fully applied in *Mercy's* Pacific mission. Metrics were collected on (1) the cultural training provided for medical and non-medical personnel, (2) medical personnel's assessment of service delivery issues and medical outcomes, and (3) patient surveys providing their assessment of delivery problems and medical outcomes.

Previous research by Flores (2005) had found that indicators of patient feedback on medical services could serve as a reasonable indicator of successful treatment [19]. Our conceptual model, validating

assessment of cultural training outcomes to mission success, remains a promising approach for future exercises.

Marine Corps Center for Advanced Operational Culture Learning (CAOCL)

CAOCL began in 2006 and is focused on support for general-purpose forces. CAOCL is operationally oriented, concentrating its training on a very specific culture where Marines deploy. For example, it prepares Marines for Helmand Province, not Afghanistan.

CAOCL has always been the single point of contact for culture training for the Marine Corps' general forces. And, since 2010, the Marine Corps has mandated training for all deploying forces. Some of the specific programs they support include the following:

- 16 hours on culture for deploying forces
- Additional modules available on Islam, gender roles, and the drug economy
- Language programs in a variety of different lengths: 40/80/120/160 hours, including how to work with interpreters
- 13 mission-oriented sets of lessons—for missions such as doing a search mission, a medical mission, etc. (pulled from the Marine Corps' training manuals)
- University training provided by San Diego State University and University of Coastal Carolina (8 weeks)
- Key leader engagement program—"Leader +4," in which a unit commander and up to four other key individuals receive enhanced cultural training

CAOCL has been aggressive in establishing an assessment approach. It began in 2006 and 2007 by surveying Marines about their language and culture experiences. CAOCL personnel also interviewed many returning Marines and looked at reports of lessons learned. They used these information sources to determine how to develop the doctrine, produce training manuals, and advise on strategy.

CAOCL's assessment system has two purposes: (1) to find and fix problems and (2) to understand how the training and materials benefit the Marine Corps.

CAOCL has found it useful to develop an assessment platform that allows its staff to use methods and instruments that can provide different kinds of information for different purposes. They have tests (for some courses) and evaluation forms at the class level. They follow what happens at the practical exercises, such as Enhanced Mohave Viper in Twentynine Palms, the exercise that occurs for units just about to deploy to the Middle East. They have the Longitudinal Assessment Project, which uses qualitative methods to get insights from a few units before, during, and after training events, during deployments when possible, and after deployment. They also have surveys that are designed to gather Marine perspectives on what knowledge and skills are useful, how best to teach these skills, and how useful these skills are for their missions.

CAOCL's experience has been that it is not possible to gather information on learning/capacity, especially if the need is to link it to a particular training event, using a survey instrument administered days, weeks, or months after a training event. There are too many confounding factors, such as learning from other sources, coupled with a weak memory for where and from whom they learned something. Measuring learning/skill requires a carefully designed testing instrument and, potentially, baseline instruments. Even then, confounding factors will mean that links to specific training events will be weak. In contrast, surveys were useful for gathering information about learning preferences, perceptions of the value and effectiveness of certain skills and knowledge, and the way such skills/knowledge are prioritized in comparison with other military training. This can be used to improve programs and to make decisions about application of resources to different kinds of training.

After years of discussion about the issue, CAOCL's consensus is that this cannot be assessed using experimental science or quantitative measures. There are simply too many confounding factors, and the indicators are too variable across contexts. Also, direct observation of effectiveness would constitute an operational burden on Marines. While we might be able to come up with something that appears to be quantitative, it would not be solid. Instead, CAOCL believes that it

is more scientifically appropriate to acknowledge that effectiveness assessment is an area where we must rely on the judgment of Marines. CAOCL thinks it is unlikely and undesirable to reach full input-output modeling (e.g., battalion with training will incur fewer casualties). However, it is looking for evidence that other types of evaluations, such as survey responses, attitudes, or observations, can serve as reasonable surrogates for underlying performance.

CAOCL advised us that any evaluation instrument has to be designed with the delivery platform in mind. So, if CLREC plans to use something like Survey Monkey² or handwritten responses, a simple design, is essential—one that will limit what can be assessed. For example, the most basic options do not have the capability to do skip patterns or reminder emails. Likewise, CLREC will need to factor in the capabilities and time constraints of CLREC's staff to analyze results of any survey design. For example, if they have time to look only at averages for each question, the instrument needs to be designed so that they can get some value from that level of analysis.

Navy Expeditionary Combat Command (NECC)

NECC is one of the major users of CLREC language and culture training since many of its units deploy overseas. We had discussions with the language and cultural training coordinator on how NECC develops its requirements and on possible ways for obtaining feedback on the suitability of the training for its missions.

Requirements are based on Navy Tactical Task (Navy Mission Essential Task List) NTA 4.8.5, which requires military personnel to maintain cultural awareness. This was the requirement that led to the founding of CLREC, too. Most NECC personnel require OCAT, but some units choose MTT training events.

The three organizations that require and receive the most LREC training are (1) Navy Expeditionary Intelligence Command (NEIC), (2) Maritime Civil Affairs and Security Training Command, and (3) Construction Battalions (Seabees). The requirement for a unit to

2. Survey Monkey is a company that provides web-based survey capabilities for people who want to field a survey themselves. We describe this alternative for fielding CLREC's surveys in the final chapter of this report.

have at least one Dari speaker at the platoon level (McChrystal, 2009 [20]) created a major hardship for NECC. The Army solution—computer-based training—was not practical for Seabees. CLREC's staff member, Mike Longoria, developed and delivered the required curriculum via a live training event to Seabee units. Later, the material was made available on Navy Knowledge Online (NKO).³

NECC identified a number of places where assessment information could be collected. CLREC has been doing after-training events—either electronically or by paper—following MTT events. NECC also mentioned that there should be information in commanders' after-action briefs that provide information on language and cultural issues. These lessons-learned reports should be available on the classified network.⁴

Army

We visited a group of Army personnel in the Pentagon who work on language and culture training programs for the Army. These Army experts told us that soldiers who take language and culture training do not know the value of what they have learned until they experience a deployment where soldiers have to apply their knowledge.

The Army has had difficulty getting feedback on the utility of its courses, although feedback has improved now that the Rapport

3. However, CLREC informed us that it has stopped allowing downloads of products on NKO because of difficulty obtaining any information on the number of downloads, reasons for use, and number of personnel using the material. CLREC would probably make the materials available again if NKO could provide usage statistics. Unfortunately, there is a moratorium on new Navy websites (since 2006), so CLREC must rely on other Navy websites to distribute materials (personal communication from Pete Christensen, June 18, 2012).

4. However, we looked at Marine and Navy lessons-learned databases and found that, although culture and language training was sometimes mentioned, the lessons learned were not very helpful for CLREC insights or metric development. For example, one lesson was that Marines should be taught the dialect of the region where Marines are going, rather than the country's official language.

program⁵ is a requirement for all soldiers who are going to deploy. The Army has produced a video that provides examples in which knowledge of language and culture was mission essential. In one example from the video, an Army Medic describes how the ability to speak and understand Dari made a mission-critical difference in the success of a medevac.

The Army language and culture program is getting requests from theater commanders to provide more training to soldiers. The letter from General McChrystal—specifying that each Army unit will have a soldier who is Level 1 capable in Dari [20]—has greatly improved the recognition of the importance of language skills among Army rank and file.

Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI)

ARI has performed research to support the Army's cross-cultural competence development. ARI analysts have reviewed behavioral models that can be used to identify how well people adapt to different cultures and what kinds of training programs are most likely to produce results (Abbe, Gelle, and Everett, 2010 [21]). They have reviewed existing instruments to identify those that appeared most promising for measuring cultural competence and have tested them against populations of enlisted personnel, officers, and cadets.

Recently ARI staff have provided a strategic overview of many of the aspects of cross-cultural competence as it applies to the military, including its relationship to training (Caligiuri, 2011 [15]). They discuss the importance of acquiring general skills for developing competence, including time constraints and the applicability of training. As part of this, ARI has developed a five-stage model for cultural learning:

-
5. The Army's Rapport program is mandatory online basic language and cultural awareness training in Dari and Pashto for soldiers deploying to Afghanistan. Iraqi Rapport (training Iraqi Arabic) is mandatory for soldiers deploying to Iraq. All three languages were made available in October 2010, while Rapport is accessible to all services via the Joint Language University website (<http://www.army.mil/standto/> archive/2010/11/09).

- Identifying—being aware of the different cultural system
- Understanding—grasping principles of how the different foreign culture works
- Coping—beginning to interact with the other system and beginning to learn
- Managing—learning how to manage the other system in mutually acceptable ways
- Integrating—incorporating selected elements into their own operating framework

ARI also notes that validating training effectiveness needs new feedback mechanisms, such as postdeployment interviews and surveys.

Air Force

The Air Force categorizes personnel into one of three tiers to determine what level of language and cultural training they need. Most airmen are in tier 1 and receive general cultural awareness training since they won't be interacting with local nationals. Tier 2 training is country specific and recently has focused on either Iraq or Afghanistan. This training is for airmen who will sometimes interact with locals. Tier 3 training is for those airmen who will interact often with local nationals and is delivered through human instruction. Training for tiers 1 and 2 is only available online.

Currently no one is assessing whether this training is effective at a level higher than Kirkpatrick Level 1, although the Air Force Culture and Language Center has developed a survey to receive feedback on the training. This center also develops the curriculum for cultural training.

Iraq and Afghanistan have driven most of the demand for cultural training in the Air Force. Air Force deployments are for six months. Each airman usually has four to five days of administrative and equipment processes to go through before deploying to a foreign country. It is possible that Africa and parts of Asia could be useful to understand in the coming years, but there is a sense that culture training may become less of a concern after we withdraw from Iraq and Afghanistan.

Summary and discussion

Our review of assessments and research related to language and culture training for general forces identified several important themes.

First, every organization—including Congress, GAO, DOD, and the services—is interested in assessing, in a systematic fashion, the relationship between language and cultural training and mission effectiveness. There have been concerns that the existing systems have not been adapting effectively to the importance of LRC training that SSTRO actions require. Most of the existing evidence for the need for LRC training has focused on anecdotes, both good and bad, that imply an important relationship between training and mission effectiveness—such as the Army’s example of the medic whose medevac was successful because of his ability to understand Dari.

Also, the need for widespread development of LRC capabilities will remain after the completion of OEF. National security policy, such as outlined in the Quadrennial Defense Review, is expanding the geographic areas, cultures, languages, and capabilities that will be required in the future. The widespread desire from Congress and DOD will be for a more systematic approach for developing and evaluating the needs for LRC training.

The assessment of training and mission outcomes requires at least two separate instruments. Feedback on how well training was delivered can be performed immediately after the training was completed. However, assessing whether the training was effective in supporting the mission objectives needs to be performed at a later time. A mission-oriented assessment would ideally be done either during deployment or immediately on completion of deployment.

It is not realistic to expect sailors (or other deployed personnel) to connect mission impacts related to culture, language, or regional expertise directly to training. There will be a significant time gap between training and mission effects. Also, individuals may have learned material on their own, from family members, or while deployed. And they are not likely to be able to connect specific training to specific outcomes.

For these and other reasons, it is not likely that LREC training can be incorporated into simple input-output models that have been developed to translate traditional military inputs into mission success

outcomes. The effects of LREC training are too diffuse and difficult to control for in operational settings.

Language metrics are more developed than cultural or regional expertise metrics. Also, measures for assessing low-level language expertise are being promulgated that will provide a way to assess the levels of expertise that are appropriate for the general forces, as compared with language professionals. However, the bulk of training received across all services has been cultural and regional training.

The different stages of a Kirkpatrick-style evaluation are present at various places throughout DOD. The Navy and Marine Corps evaluate their LREC programs for their learning content. And DOD has collected some basic high-level assessments of mission benefits. However, no service has yet produced sets of evaluation metrics over time in an integrated fashion.

Level 2 and 3 evaluations would need to be performed on a broad Navy population to capture not just who received training, but specifics about what kinds of issues need to be addressed, and how effective current preparations have been. Such information would need to be collected in some systematic fashion, such as an annual survey of Navy personnel.

It is likely that self-assessments will need to be used as the principal indicators for assessing the results of training. Virtually all current efforts have used feedback from personnel either while deployed or after completing a deployment to provide feedback on LREC issues and training.

A survey of Navy personnel with respect to LREC should address at least two types of training—(1) general preparation for limited interactions, such as shore leave, and (2) more extensive interactions, such as working with foreign nationals or while deployed overseas.

While the Navy has provided training to a lower percentage of personnel than other services, Navy personnel ranked highest among the services in satisfaction with their LRC training and above average in terms of beneficial results.

We found at least two organizations that would be able to perform service-wide surveys that could be used to track some Level 2 or 3 metrics: DMDC and NPRST.

Chapter 3: LREC survey questions

In this chapter, we describe the survey questions that we recommend CLREC ask, in a systematic fashion, of all Navy personnel returning from deployments (or of all Navy personnel who have used CLREC products and services returning from deployment)⁶ and an interview/focus group protocol.)

We have developed variations on a basic survey so that it will be possible to address the major categories of Navy personnel who use CLREC services:

- Navy personnel returning from deployments
- Commanding officers
- Flag officers who receive individual language instruction and tutoring

Some of these Navy respondents would be returning from ground deployments to the Middle East, whereas others would be returning from ship deployments that spanned many areas of responsibility (AORs). In this chapter, we explain the rationale, strengths, and weaknesses of the recommended questions. At the end of this chapter, we make further recommendations that will facilitate using the survey.

We group our recommended survey questions in five major sections:

- *Section I.* Your mission and interactions with foreign nationals during most recent deployment
- *Section II.* Challenges/issues with culture and language during this deployment

⁶ This chapter describes a single survey, shown in appendixes A and B, intended for all Navy personnel returning from deployments. Appendixes C, D, and E provide surveys for smaller populations (e.g., commanding officers and flag officers).

- *Section III.* Self-assessment of culture and language awareness and understanding
- *Section IV.* Assessment of predeployment culture and language training
- *Section V.* Demographics and operation supported

The remainder of this chapter describes what is included in each section.

Table 2 provides an overview of the recommended survey questions. Some questions are in red because they are particularly important to get specific answers to assess the impact of and needs for LREC training. Note that our recommendations regarding the mechanics of data collection (where, when, how), how to report/aggregate responses, and how to provide feedback to respondents are in chapter 4, “Alternatives and recommendations.”

Table 2. Overview of recommended survey questions

Section I. Your mission and interaction with foreign nationals during deployment	Section II. Challenges/issues with culture and language during deployment	Section III. Self-assessment of culture and language awareness and understanding	Section IV. Assessment of predeployment culture/language training	Section V. Demographics and operation supported
Needs	Needs	Kirkpatrick Level II	Kirkpatrick Level III	
What AOR, country did you deploy?	Experience challenges with foreign culture?	Understanding of language?	Receive culture/language training before deployment? (Yes/No)	Current military service?
What was your primary mission?	Who were challenges with?	Speak the language?	What organization provided training?	Active duty, reservist, civilian?
Did work duties involve foreign nationals?	Part of work or liberty time?	Know cultural do's and don'ts?	Total amount of culture and language training?	Enlisted or officer?
If yes, how often?	What was biggest challenge?	Male/female protocols?	What topics were covered in training?	Rank?
Types of interactions?	How significant were challenges?	Religious beliefs?	How useful was culture training?	How long was your deployment?
Part of your liberty time?		Body language?	How useful was language training?	What Naval Enterprise?
	Experience challenges with foreign language?	How difficult to communicate?	What did you like best about training?	Seabees? Military Civil Affairs Unit?
	Who were challenges with?	Where gain knowledge?	What did you like least about training?	Explosive Ordnance Disposal?
	Part of work or liberty time?		What improvements could be made?	Expeditionary Intelligence Combat Command?
	How significant were challenges?			What operation /exercise / deployment did you support?

Section I: Your mission and interactions with foreign nationals during deployment

The first section of our survey begins with questions about the mission and interactions that the respondent had with foreign nationals. The purpose is to get the respondents thinking back to their most recent deployment, setting the stage for other survey sections to follow. Note that survey questions are in boldface at the beginning of each paragraph. The discussion of each question follows in regular type.

In what AOR and country did you most recently deploy? (Drop-down menu of AORs/countries) The intent of the first question is to pinpoint what areas of responsibility were included in the respondents' latest deployment. This is particularly important because it matches the respondent's answers with the CLREC AOR coordinator who arranged or provided any training that the sailor might have received. From this first question, CLREC will be able (1) to determine who at CLREC will be most interested in the response and (2) to use the survey responses to provide an overview of CLREC's client/customer base.

What was your primary mission on this most recent deployment/overseas assignment? (Ground and Sea deployment drop-down menus) This question is meant to add information about what the respondent was actually doing during the deployment. The responses from these questions could be useful to determining how well CLREC is doing at supporting different kinds of primary missions.

Did any of your work duties involve interaction with foreign nationals? (Yes/No) This query is critically important for determining what question the respondent will be asked during the rest of the survey and for reducing the burden on those sailors who have not had exposure to foreign nationals during their work activities. Respondents who answer "No" will be directed to the next section of the survey.

If "Yes," how often did your work duties involve interaction with foreign nationals? This question is designed to get an idea of how large a part of the sailor's duties involved working with foreign nationals. It will be particularly important if the survey finds, for example, that

there are sailors who work daily with foreign nationals who are not getting any LREC training before deployment (pinpointing need).

What types of interactions did you have with foreign nationals while performing your duties? We asked this question to get an idea about how the respondent worked with foreign nationals. Did respondents use interpreters? Did the foreign nationals speak English? Was the respondent responsible for working with foreign nationals alone or as part of a group?

Was your interaction with foreign nationals part of your duties, or strictly part of your liberty time while aboard? This question is meant to validate the earlier question about whether the respondents worked with foreign nationals, and to get an idea of how often the respondents met with foreign nationals, both on liberty and as part of work.

Section II A: Challenges/issues with foreign nationals' culture during deployment

We developed this section in response to CLREC's desire to know about what challenges their customers were facing (and about which CLREC might not be aware). For example, CLREC personnel mentioned to us that, when they were supporting a humanitarian mission to Haiti, the culture training did not mention that Haitians greatly value their cell phones—even more than they value having housing. This knowledge would have been useful in planning and executing this humanitarian operation. For example, they could have planned to use Haitians' cell phone numbers for identification and communication purposes.

Did you experience any challenges/problems or issues with foreign nationals' culture during his deployment? The intent of this question is to determine whether there were any problems that CLREC's training might address. Respondents who answer "No" to this question will skip to another part of the survey.

What was the greatest cultural barrier or friction point that you encountered during your deployment and how did you/your unit overcome the problem? Unlike all earlier questions, this one allows the respondent to write in an answer (free response). We included this

question to gather descriptions of the type of cultural problems that sailors encounter during deployment. When we pretested this question on a humanitarian assistance cruise to Latin American ports (“Southern Partnership Station”), we obtained an unanticipated answer: More than one respondent said that the biggest work-related problem was the foreign military coming aboard ship unexpectedly because the Navy personnel did not know the ranks and names of the ranks in Spanish. This response demonstrates that CLREC customers do not know enough about CLREC’s products, because CLREC produces a product called NORTH/SOUTHCOM Military Rank Insignia.

From the standpoint of completing your mission, how significant were the challenges and issues you faced with foreign nationals’ culture during this deployment? What was the “cost” of these issues, in terms of accomplishing your mission? We wrote this question to get an idea of the costs of not having enough cultural knowledge and the benefits of having such knowledge (Kirkpatrick Level 4). Although the answers will not obtain monetary values for return-on-investment analysis, it will provide information that allows CLREC to do a “return on expectation” analysis.

From the standpoint of maintaining good relations with foreign civilians, how significant were the challenges and issues you faced with foreign nationals’ culture? This question is intended to provide return-on-expectation information about the indirect benefits of learning about cultures, and the costs of being without that knowledge base.

Section II B: Challenges/issues with foreign nationals’ language during this deployment

This section makes the same queries as does section 2A, but it asks about language rather than cultural issues. We added this section in response to CLREC’s request that we differentiate problems with culture from challenges with language. This section starts with a Yes/No question about whether there were any language challenges faced. Respondents who answer “No” skip to a later section in the survey.

Section III: Self-assessment of individual knowledge of the culture and language of the foreign nationals with whom you worked

We developed this section to get a self-rating of the knowledge and ability of respondents (Kirkpatrick Level 2). We asked about six different areas: ability to understand the language, ability to speak the language, knowledge of cultural do's and don'ts, male/female protocols, religious beliefs, and body language/gestures. This is followed by a question about the overall difficulty of communicating with foreign nationals during this deployment. The final question asks where respondents acquired their cultural and language knowledge. This question was added as a result of our pilot testing on the humanitarian cruise. Several of the respondents said that they had high understanding of Spanish but that it was because they grew up in households where Spanish was the primary language spoken. We added this question because we thought that it was important to know the sources of cultural/language knowledge and skills.

Section IV: Assessment of your predeployment culture and language training

This section of the survey asks respondents to connect any culture/language training they received with their deployment experiences. CAOCL cautioned against using this approach because they found that respondents had difficulty remembering their predeployment training. We added this section anyway because it seems that the only way to honestly assess the impact of predeployment training is to collect data after deployment, even if the data are not as believable because of concerns about respondents' memories.⁷

Prior to this deployment, did you receive any training in culture/language of the foreign nationals with whom you interacted on

7. In an ideal study design, we would compare units that were randomly assigned to receive culture and language training ("experimental group") with ones that were randomly assigned to receive no such training ("control group"). This design is unlikely to be acceptable to the Navy for logistical, ethical, and cost reasons.

this deployment? (Yes/No) This question is designed to allow those who received no training to skip to the last section of the survey.

What organization provided the culture/language training or training products that you received prior to your deployment? (Circle all that apply) We added this question to differentiate CLREC training from training by other organizations.

Please estimate the total amount⁸ of CULTURE training that you received prior to this latest deployment (select one response only). We asked this question to get a better understanding of how much culture training the respondents had. For example, it would be more understandable if earlier self-ratings were low if they had received very little training.

Please estimate the total amount of LANGUAGE training that you received prior to this latest deployment (select one response only). This is the same question as above, but substituting the word “Language.” We asked this question to get a better understanding of how much culture training the respondents had. For example, it would be more understandable if earlier self-ratings were low if they had received very little training.

Please mark the extent to which the following topics were covered in the predeployment culture/language training that you received. We ask about six different areas: ability to understand and speak the language, knowledge of cultural do’s and don’ts, male/female protocols, religious beliefs, and body language/gestures. This is the same list that we used in the self-assessments earlier in the survey. The idea is to determine how much training respondents had in these areas.

Overall, how useful was the CULTURE training that you received? (Please circle one). The purpose of this question is to determine whether the training was actually used during the deployment (Kirkpatrick Level 3).

8. The response alternatives for amount of training are (a) one hour or less, (b) more than an hour, up to a day, (c) more than a day, up to a week, and (d) more than a week of training.

Overall, how useful was the LANGUAGE training that you received? (Please circle one). This question is the same as the one above, except that it concerns language, not culture. The purpose of this question is to determine whether the training was actually used during the deployment (Kirkpatrick Level 3).

What did you like best about the training that you received? (Free response) We included this free-response question to give respondents a chance to pinpoint specific areas where their training was particularly useful or enjoyable.

What did you like least about the training that you received? (Free response) This free response question was designed to give respondents a chance to pinpoint particular areas where their training was especially useful or enjoyable.

What improvements could be made to help improve training? (Free response) We included this free-response question to give respondents an opportunity to suggest areas of improvement that did not make their list of things they “liked best” or “liked least” about training they received.

Section V: Demographics and operation supported

In this section of the survey, we wanted to obtain more detailed information about the respondents. This information could be used to gain better understanding of who receives CLREC training and what type of deployments they have.

What is your current service component? (Please circle one) CLREC should ask this question to be consistent with its Kilpatrick Level 1 surveys and to determine whether there is a difference between the responses of active duty Navy (USN), reservists (USNR), Coast Guard, and others.

If you are currently in the military, are you enlisted or officer?⁹ Earlier research shows that officers and enlisted have different views of the

9. We are allowing for the possibility that some respondents will be Navy civilians when they take the survey.

benefits of culture, regional, and language training. Therefore, we must ask whether the respondent is officer or enlisted.

If you are enlisted, please provide your Distributable Navy Enlisted Classification (DNEC). In this question, we leave a space for the respondent's first and second DNEC. We ask this to determine whether needs for CLREC training differ depending on the skill set of the sailors responding.

If you are an officer, please provide your designator code. This question is meant to determine whether officers with different designators have different LREC training needs.

What is your current rank? We found studies where the ratings of the usefulness of training were different for senior military than for junior military. Therefore, we ask about rank.

What is your UIC? This question is asked because we want to know where the sailor is, which is uniquely defined by Unit Identification Code (UIC).

What is your command and location? This is a way to identify the respondent's unit, for those who do not provide a proper UIC number.

How long did your latest deployment last? There is some evidence that longer deployments have different problems than do shorter deployments. This is why we want to know deployment lengths.

What is your naval enterprise? We ask this question to find out whether responses to culture and language training are different for the different naval enterprises.

What is the operation/exercise/deployment that you supported on this latest deployment? We thought that it would be useful to know in what deployment, exercise, or operation the respondent had just participated. For those who repeat on a yearly or semiyearly cycle (e.g., Cobra Gold), perhaps a separate distinct curriculum would need to be developed.

What unit did you serve with? We asked this question because we know that many of CLREC's clients come from Seabees, Military Civil Affairs Units, Explosive Ordnance Disposal Units, Navy Expeditionary

Intelligence Combat Command, and Carrier Strike Groups. It might be that some groups have different culture/language training needs than others.

Summary and conclusion

This chapter has reviewed the reasoning behind our recommended questions for ongoing, systematic assessment of CLREC training and training materials.

The data collection tool and questions that we have developed (appendixes A and B) obtain the basic information that would be most useful for CLREC to have available when it determines needs for new or different courses, and as it documents the impact that it has on improving the job performance and reducing liberty incidents of troops overseas. These survey questions, however, could be asked of a number of different customers—not strictly of sailors, but also of unit commanders and commanding officers (see appendix C) of sailors who participate in culture and language training. Ideally, flag officers who receive CLREC-coordinated language tutoring should also be surveyed (see appendix E). The next chapter summarizes our recommendations for which customers should be surveyed and how they should be contacted.

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 4: Alternatives and recommendations

In this chapter, we describe a set of alternatives that CLREC should consider as it takes the next step in getting a systematic feedback on the needs for, and impacts of, its products and services.

Alternatives for questions and respondents

Table 3 provides an overview of the data that CLREC ideally needs in order to have a comprehensive assessment capability. CLREC might decide that some data collection alternatives are not needed. This chapter follows the sequence of table 3 in describing the alternatives for, and placing priorities on, different analyses.

Survey of sailors

CLREC's largest numbers of customers are sailors who later deploy around the world as part of sea or ground operations. The sailors' units might be participating in such missions as Theater Security Cooperation (TSC), Humanitarian Assistance/Disaster Relief, Multi-National Force Operations, or a multitude of more traditional assignments, such as serving in a Carrier Strike Group, working on a submarine deployment, or assisting antipiracy operations. Some of these sailors might serve on the ground (e.g., a Judge Advocate General officer providing legal advice to a Marine Corps commander in Kandahar) or on the sea.

CLREC is missing two elements that it needs to obtain convincing quantitative information on the impact of training and needs for different (or additional LREC training): (a) an exhaustive list of individuals who use CLREC's training and (b) surveys and interview/focus groups to obtain details on the challenges that their customers have while on deployments. The main questions CLREC would like to ask follow: (1) Did you receive LREC training? (2) If not, how might it have helped the mission? (3) If so, what kind of CLREC training did you receive? (4) Did CLREC training help? (5) If not, why not? and (6) How can we improve CLREC training?

Table 3. Clients, services, data needs, and data collection tools

Target population and data collection tool	Service or product provided	Appendix	Help measure impact?	Help measure needs?	Comment
Email collection tool sent to training point of contact for sailors	MTT or auto-mated training	A	Yes--provide information on who (and how many) use CLREC services and products	No	Collecting email addresses will also allow CLREC to contact customers directly.
Postdeployment survey for sailors	MTT or auto-mated training	B	Yes--customers rate usefulness of training after deployment completed (quantitative and qualitative). More quantitative than an interview.	Yes--customers rate and describe their biggest cultural and language challenges during deployments (quantitative and qualitative).	DMDC survey results already verify benefit from Navy LRC training (see figures 2, 3, 4 in chapter 2), but DMDC survey is not ongoing and might have overincluded customers.
Postdeployment <u>survey</u> for officers and unit commanders	MTT or auto-mated training	C	Yes--officers and unit commanders rate the usefulness of training, but the survey would not provide the descriptive detail that an interview could obtain.	Yes--officers and unit commanders describe their units' biggest cultural and language challenges.	This survey would gather observations from unit commanders, who have a different perspective than sailors.
Postdeployment <u>interview</u> for sailors and unit commanders	MTT or auto-mated training	D	Yes--but might not be as convincing as a large number of survey respondents	Yes--this would provide greater descriptive detail than would a survey.	This would provide greater descriptive detail than would a survey (but less quantitative detail).
Postdeployment interview or short survey for flag officers	Language tutoring coordinated by CLREC	E	Yes	Yes	This provides the highest-rank opinions to support CLREC's mission.

List of individuals requesting and/or using CLREC services and products (email collection tool)

CLREC has done an excellent job of providing its products and services in a wide variety of modalities; unfortunately, that makes it more difficult to obtain an exhaustive list of individuals who use their materials. Nevertheless, CLREC can do the best it can by systematically requesting information on customers from the points of contact who ask for CLREC courses and materials. Appendix A shows one format for a sign-in sheet that would provide sufficient information for CLREC to (a) document the number of, ranks, and units of customers, and (b) provide email addresses that could be used to contact customers immediately after they complete their deployments. The form also asks sailors about how they think they will use the training that they have received.

In our experience with other projects, sailors on vessels that are returning from deployments often have some downtime when they could respond to a survey more easily than they could during an earlier part of the cruise. This same format (shown in appendix A) could be used for sailors who are using CLREC-supplied materials, whether the materials are OCAT DVDs, courses on NKO, or supplementary materials provided to sailors serving as individual augmentees (IAs) in non-Navy units.

The form in appendix A collects a bare-bones amount of information on the number and units of individuals using CLREC materials. Therefore, it will help measure the impact of CLREC activities, but it provides almost no information on the needs of sailors before deployment—except for one short question on how the sailor intends to use the information he/she just received.

Postdeployment survey

CLREC currently lacks a standard survey form that will systematically request postdeployment information from individuals. Appendix B provides a survey form that could be used. This form, which we explained in chapter 3, could obtain much more extensive information on needs for LREC training (by providing information on the type of missions, descriptions of their biggest cultural/language challenges),

as well as on the impact of training (by gathering customer ratings on the usefulness of training after deployment has been completed).

The reader might wonder why we are asking about the usefulness of training after we wrote in chapter 2 that customers are unlikely to remember their training (or the source of their cultural and language knowledge) once their deployments have ended. We answer this two ways. First, even though customers might not remember how they obtained their cultural knowledge, it is important to get a self-assessment of skills to know whether there are “holes” in the current system that CLREC might help fill. (In other words, for the assessment of needs/requirements for training, it does not really matter whether sailors adequately remember their training; however, the self-assessment will not provide perfect evidence for assessing the results of CLREC training.) Second, there is currently no way to know what culture and language deployment needs there are for CLREC customers from the perspective of those returning from deployment.

The DMDC survey provides evidence that Navy customers are satisfied with their LRC training (see chapter 2, figures 2 through 4), but it is not clear how many of these sailors obtained their training from CLREC. Some might have received training from other organizations, such as the Defense Language Institute. With benefit of a list of personnel who used CLREC’s products (appendix B), CLREC can focus its efforts on getting feedback just from its own customers.

Survey of officers and unit commanders

Appendix C includes a survey form to be sent to the officers and unit commanders of sailors who use CLREC materials. Getting the email addresses of officers and unit leaders would involve some “detective work” on the part of CLREC (or an organization CLREC chooses to perform the survey). The detective work would involve using the unit’s identified in the email collection tool (appendix B), and looking for officers who lead those units. Using the Navy’s deployment databases and Navy global, CLREC could obtain a good list of officers who led sailors identified in the email collection tool.

The advantages of collecting responses to the postdeployment survey for officers and unit commanders are that (1) officers and unit commanders have a wider view of their sailors’ missions and assignments than do the seamen themselves, (2) officers and unit commanders

know more about the wider impact of their sailors' behavior than do the troops themselves, and (3) officers and unit commanders know about assignments that are not made to their sailors, and why.¹⁰ We believe that without obtaining information from the officers who lead CLREC-trained troops, we would (a) neglect an important client of CLREC services and products, (b) fail to obtain quotes from commanders on the benefits of knowledge and skills in culture and language, and (c) ignore one method by which CLREC could become better known by officers and unit commanders.

Interviews of sailors and unit commanders

The fourth data collection tool that we have provided, shown in appendix D, is an interview protocol for both sailors and officers/unit commanders who lead sailors who have used CLREC services and products. We consider this tool to be superior to a survey in some respects, and inferior to a survey in others.

On one hand, a survey is a good way to obtain information (especially quantitative information) from a large number of people cheaply and efficiently. It is efficient because it can be deployed to widely different physical locations by means of an email with a link to the survey's website. The survey is efficient because it is impersonal and automated. It is best at providing quantitative evidence of the impact and needs for CLREC training.

On the other hand, interviews are better than surveys at providing details about a topic. Interviews allow the data collector to ask follow-up questions if a response is unclear or incomplete—a survey does not provide that option. For example, let us say that a respondent to a survey replies to “Please describe the changes that would improve the training” by stating that “we should add more language training that would help us deal with foreign military.” In a survey, you cannot ask questions about what kind of language training (understanding, speaking, or reading), which foreign military, or what particular incident prompted the respondent to recommend more training. Does the respondent mean that they need help using interpreters,

10. For example, an officer might decide against giving an assignment to a unit because he/she believes that the unit has insufficient language and cultural understanding.

with knowing the ranks of foreign military, or what? An interview, however, provides an opportunity to probe for the reasons and details that a survey response does not provide. In other words, an interview will provide better information for getting qualitative understanding of training needs and impact.

Interviews or surveys for flag officers

We show our final recommended data collection tool in appendix E. It is designed to ask brief questions of flag officers who had language tutoring arranged by CLREC. This set of five questions is very brief because of flag officers' busy schedules and many demands on their time.

We have elected first to ask each flag officer what training he or she received because collecting this information will help show what services the flag officer obtained. The second and third questions ask how much instructor time the training used and whether the flag officer had been given previous training in the language. These two questions were meant to determine what level of language training the flag officer requested. The fourth question asks for an evaluation of how useful the language training was—a measure of impact. The fifth and final question asks for any suggestions on how training could be improved.

The protocol in appendix E would elicit richer data if it could be used as an interview, but doing so would require more resources because of the time to schedule interviews with flag officers (and re-schedule if the flag officers' schedules change), to conduct the interview, and to write and analyze the notes. It would require far fewer resources if it were distributed as a survey.

Alternatives for fielding surveys or interviews/focus groups

Now that we have described what questions should ideally be addressed to which customers of CLREC products, this final subsection of our report reviews various methods for how these questions can be asked, responses can be collected, and analyses can be performed.

Fielding surveys

Fielding a survey includes deciding on the sampling frames, applying for any possible Institutional Review Board (IRB)¹¹ considerations, contacting respondents, collecting data, and analyzing the results of those surveys. A decision about how to field a survey requires consideration of (a) whether CLREC wants to have its results (needs, impact) compared with those of other military services, (b) whether it has the staff capacity to field a survey of returning deployers itself, (c) when it needs the information, and (d) whether it wants to perform a one-time survey or ongoing surveys.

Data collection and sampling frames

The issues of data collection and sampling frames are interconnected. If we assume that CLREC's first priority for a survey is to obtain feedback from sailors returning from deployment, we do not think that probability sampling will be a feasible option. Probability sampling is concerned with selecting individuals from within a population to estimate the characteristics of the entire population. It requires a method to define the population and a sampling frame, or list of all target population members. For example, a survey of students in schools could have probability sampling with a complete list of the schools, and each school having a complete list of students. This lends itself to probability sampling because the list of schools changes slowly, as does the list of students. Furthermore, students are required to attend school. The most important advantage of probability sampling is the ability to weight respondents' answers to estimate how the entire population would have responded to the question.

However, since ships deploy (and return home) at difficult-to-predict times, those times frequently change, and the decision for a sailor to participate is voluntary, we do not think that probability sampling is the best method for CLREC's needs: The list of course participants changes too rapidly.

11. CLREC should not have difficulty with an IRB as long as surveys confine themselves to training issues. Interviews and focus groups, however, would require more detailed review because of the face-to-face nature of the interaction (i.e., respondents are not anonymous).

Instead, we would recommend a survey to use a convenience sample based on one of two methods: (1) surveying all sailors who are returning from deployments (as NPRST has done) and/or (2) sending an email to all CLREC course participants at the email address.

Analysis of data

We favor surveying all sailors who are returning from deployment because doing so would allow a statistical comparison of responses of CLREC participants versus nonparticipants. By using regression techniques, the analysis could help describe (1) how returning CLREC participants are different from returning non-CLREC participants and (2) what factors predict favorable responses on the survey (saying that they have a good understanding of the cultural do's and don'ts, language, etc.). For example, analysis could explore whether sailors who deployed to South America are more favorable toward CLREC training than those who deployed to another area of the world.

Reporting results

CLREC needs to decide if survey results need to be reported formally (e.g., a technical report) or if a less formal method (e.g., a briefing) is desired. The more CLREC desires a formal account of the study, the greater the need for an outside organization to perform and report results of the survey. If a less formal report is desired, it is more feasible to use CLREC's own staff resources.

Feedback to participants

Another consideration is whether there could be feedback to survey participants. It is a nice touch to provide a brief (one-page) report to survey participants. This habit of reporting back to participants (e.g., with sailors who took CLREC training) *would help spread awareness of CLREC* and make it more likely that participants will respond to future surveys if they take another CLREC course.

Regardless of CLREC's decisions regarding these questions, we recommend an electronically based survey for returning deployers because of the convenience of data collection and the potential for quick turnaround of survey findings, once the survey has been approved and set up, as CLREC requires. We think that the portable document format (pdf) works well for Level 1 surveys given to

participants immediately after a course is completed, but this electronic format would be more difficult for an instrument attempting to survey sailors returning from deployment.

Cross-service comparisons

If CLREC wants to have its data collected and compared with other organizations across services, DMDC would be the strongest choice for fielding the survey. DMDC's mission is to provide and store cross-service databases, and it has the experience of fielding the Status of Forces special survey on language, regional, and cultural training. It is even possible that DMDC has data from its earlier Status of Forces survey that could pinpoint respondents who used CLREC-provided services and products, although we doubt that is the case.

If CLREC does not want cross-service comparisons, a natural alternative for fielding a survey would be NPRST, which performs many surveys every year for the Navy and its commands. One of the advantages of choosing NPRST is that it has its own Institutional Review Board. Furthermore, it has established particularly strong contacts and experience within the Navy to conduct a Navy-wide survey, whether it is a special-needs survey or a matter of including CLREC questions on an ongoing survey that NPRST already performs.

Capacity to field survey

It is our impression that, at present, CLREC does not have the staff necessary to field a survey on its own. The organization's staff members are currently too busy providing products and services to spend time collecting and analyzing systematic survey data. Furthermore, there are advantages to having an outside organization field and analyze one's data, if it is meant to demonstrate the impact of a program. Outside organizations are considered more objective, evenhanded, and convincing than are program self-evaluations.

However, if CLREC chooses to field a survey on its own, there are off-the-shelf programs, such as Survey Monkey™, which could make the process of fielding an electronic survey much easier than it has been in the past. The cost for a year of Survey Monkey™ could be about \$300 for basic capabilities, or \$780 with special features and phone support. However, it would still require significant time for staff members to identify a list of respondents, deal with bounce-backs for

wrong email addresses, write second-and third-time appeals for individuals to respond to the survey, keep statistical data on response rates, maintain and update the database as responses come in, perform statistical analyses on responses, perform qualitative analyses on free-response answers, and write and present results. Furthermore, by confining the survey to participants, it would not be possible to compare participants and nonparticipants.

Timeframe for needing survey results

The sooner that CLREC needs data to support its impact and needs for its services, the more important it will be to use an organization that is well positioned to field the survey and has institutional knowledge of the respondents to be surveyed. This criterion would mean that organizations within the Department of Navy would be better positioned than private contractors for this work. Using private contractors would necessitate developing a request for proposal (RFP), taking bids, and choosing among a variety of organizations to perform the work.

Although our discussion of organizations to field a survey has pinpointed DMDC and NPRST as potential choices, there are a number of other organizations that could perform this work, such as federally funded research and development centers (e.g., the Center for Naval Analyses, IDA, and RAND), defense contractors (e.g., SAIC and Booz Allen Hamilton), and firms specializing in survey research (e.g., Research Triangle Institute, Westat, Gallup, and Mathematica Policy Research).

Fielding interviews/focus groups

It is more expensive to collect data from large numbers of people using interviews or focus groups because of the extensive hours required to collect data (and possible travel or phone bills). Nevertheless, the data from interviews and focus groups is likely to produce more insights and detail than could be provided by a survey. The organizations just mentioned could all perform interviews or focus groups, although we would think that with these two data collection methods it is even more important to use a data collection organization that has experience interfacing with military/Navy personnel.

Summary and conclusion

In this research memorandum, we have reported the results of our interviews with organizations that have conducted previous assessments of language, regional expertise, and cultural training, looking for insights that could be applied to CLREC's needs. Our analyses of the interviews and the previous assessments yielded the following conclusions:

1. Many organizations are interested in assessing LRC training, but much of the evidence reported (so far) involves anecdotal rather than systematic data collection.
2. Assessing whether training was effective in supporting mission objectives needs to be done at a later time, not immediately after training has occurred. Ideally, a mission-oriented assessment would be performed during deployment or immediately upon completion of deployment.
3. It is not realistic to expect sailors or other deployed personnel to connect mission impacts related to culture, language, or regional expertise directly to training. It is more realistic to expect evaluations of what problems and challenges they encountered, how well they met those challenges, and what they wish they knew before the deployment began.
4. Data and analyses will be better at determining needs for training than at providing tightly defined input-output or return-on-investment models of dollars for training and dollars of benefit. A better goal would be to provide return-on-expectation evidence showing that sailors were prepared and responded well to situations that required skills of language, regional expertise, or cultural awareness.
5. Because of the high expense of developing tests of proficiency, it is likely that self-assessments will need to be used as a principal indicator for assessing the results of training. The proficiency tests that currently exist are narrowly focused on language skills of specialists (e.g., FAOs, crypto-linguists, interpreters), who form a small part of CLREC's customer base.
6. While the Navy has provided training to a lower percentage of personnel than have the other services, it compares favorably

in terms of satisfaction with their LRC training and its beneficial results.

7. Ideally, an assessment of Navy CLREC training would include collecting data from sailors and their officers/unit commanders via surveys and interviews. Flag officers would be requested to complete a short five-item survey or interview.
8. CLREC should prioritize among the five different data collection alternatives provided in table 3: (1) email data collection tool, (2) postdeployment survey for sailors, (3) postdeployment survey for officers and unit commanders, (4) postdeployment interviews with sailors and unit commanders, and (5) post-deployment surveys of flag officers taking CLREC-coordinated language tutoring.

Many different organizations could field and collect a survey for CLREC, including (but not limited to) DMDC and NPRST, studies and analysis federally funded research and development centers, survey research organizations, and defense studies contractors.

Appendix A: Email collection tool

The following page shows an email data collection tool for obtaining contact information on course participants.

54

This form should be returned to CLREC at the following e-mail address: peter.j.christiansen@navy.mil, or via paper

Center for Information Dominance

640 Roberts Avenue

Pensacola, FL 32511-5152

Appendix B: Postdeployment survey for sailors

The next page begins the Postdeployment Survey for Sailors, for gathering Level 3–4 information from returning troops.

Language, Regional Expertise, and Cultural (LREC) Postdeployment/Overseas Assignment Survey for Sailors, Marines, and Coast Guard Personnel

Level 3-4 End of Deployment Survey

This survey covers your “Cultural Awareness Training Event.”

PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT: Authority to request this information is granted under Title 5, U.S. Code 301 and Department of the Navy.

PURPOSE: The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect and compile data to evaluate the effectiveness of training.

ROUTINE USES: The information collected will be used by the Navy Foreign Language Office and the Center for Language, Regional Expertise and Culture (CLREC) to evaluate training and make improvements.

DISCLOSURE: The information that you provide WILL NOT become part of your permanent record.

This survey will take you approximately 25 minutes to complete. After clicking the “SUBMIT” button, please wait until you receive a response indicating that the survey has been submitted. This report will be forwarded electronically to CLREC at clrec@navy.mil.

Language, Regional Expertise, and Cultural (LREC) Post-deployment/Overseas Assignment Survey for Sailors, Marines, and Coast Guard Personnel

We are looking for feedback on your most recent deployment or overseas assignment, on behalf of the Navy's Center for Language, Regional Expertise and Culture (CLREC). The purpose of this survey is to learn more about the types of missions that might require culture and language training, and what training might be required. Your feedback will be used to improve the usefulness of CLREC's products and services.

I. Your mission and interaction with foreign nationals during your deployment/overseas assignment

1. To what AOR and country did you most recently deploy?

A. USCENTCOM (Select the one in which you spent the MOST time ON YOUR LATEST DEPLOYMENT):

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| ☐ Afghanistan | ☐ Jordan | ☐ Pakistan |
| ☐ Bahrain | ☐ Kazakhstan | ☐ Qatar |
| ☐ Egypt | ☐ Kyrgyzstan | ☒ Saudi Arabia |
| ☐ Iran | ☐ Kuwait | ☐ Syria Yemen |
| ☐ Iraq | ☐ Lebanon | |
| ☐ Israel | ☐ Oman | |

B. USPACCOM (Select the one in which you spent the MOST time ON YOUR LATEST DEPLOYMENT):

- | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| ☒ Australia | ☐ Laos | ☐ Samoa |
| ☐ Bangladesh | ☐ Malaysia | ☐ Singapore |
| ☐ Bhutan | ☐ Maldives | ☐ Solomon Islands |
| ☐ Brunei | ☐ Marshall Islands | ☐ South Korea |
| ☐ Burma/Myanmar | ☐ Micronesia | ☐ Sri Lanka |
| ☐ Cambodia | ☐ Mongolia | ☐ Thailand |
| ☐ China | ☐ Nauru | ☐ Timor-Leste |
| ☐ Fiji | ☐ Nepal | ☐ Tonga |
| ☐ India | ☐ New Zealand | ☐ Tuvalu |
| ☐ Indonesia | ☐ North Korea | ☐ Vanuatu |
| ☐ Japan | ☐ Palau | ☐ Vietnam |
| ☐ Jordan | ☐ Papua New Guinea | |
| ☐ Kiribati | ☐ Philippines | |

C. USSOUTHCOM (Select the one in which you spent the MOST time ON YOUR LATEST DEPLOYMENT):

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------|
| ☐ Argentina | ☐ Cuba/Guantanamo Bay | ☐ Honduras |
| ☐ Belice | ☐ Dominican Republic | ☐ Nicaragua |
| ☐ Bolivia | ☐ Ecuador | ☐ Panama |
| ☒ Brazil | ☐ El Salvador | ☐ Paraguay |
| ☐ Chile | ☐ Guatemala | ☐ Peru |
| ☐ Columbia | ☐ Guyana | ☐ Suriname |
| ☐ Costa Rica | | ☐ Uruguay |

D. USAFRICOM (Select the one in which you spent the MOST time ON YOUR LATEST DEPLOYMENT):

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| ☐ Algeria | ☐ Gabon | ☐ Nigeria |
| ☐ Angola | ☐ Gambia | ☐ Rwanda |
| ☐ Benin | ☐ Ghana | ☐ Sao Tome and Principe |
| ☐ Botswana | ☐ Guinea | ☐ Senegal |
| ☐ Burkina | ☐ Guinea-Bissau | ☐ Seychelles |
| ☐ Burundi | ☐ Ivory Coast | ☐ Sierra Leone |
| ☐ Cameroon | ☐ Kenya | ☐ Somalia |
| ☐ Cape Verde | ☐ Lesotho | ☐ South Africa |
| ☐ Central African Republic | ☐ Liberia | ☐ South Sudan |
| ☐ Chad | ☐ Libya | ☐ Sudan |
| ☒ Comoros | ☐ Madagascar | ☐ Swaziland |
| ☐ Congo | ☐ Malawi | ☐ Tanzania |
| ☐ Democratic Republic of Congo | ☐ Mali | ☐ Togo |
| ☐ Djibouti | ☐ Mauritania | ☐ Tunisia |
| ☐ Equatorial Guinea | ☐ Mauritius | ☐ Uganda |
| ☐ Eritrea | ☐ Morocco | ☐ Zambia |
| ☐ Ethiopia | ☐ Mozambique | ☐ Zimbabwe |
| | ☐ Namibia | |
| | ☐ Niger | |

E. USEUCOM (Select the one in which you spent the MOST time deployed IN YOUR LATEST DEPLOYMENT):

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| ☐ Albania | ☐ France | ☐ Montenegro |
| ☐ Andorra | ☐ Georgia | ☐ Netherlands |
| ☐ Armenia | ☐ Germany | ☐ Norway |
| ☐ Austria | ☐ Greece | ☐ Poland |
| ☐ Azerbaijan | ☐ Hungary | ☐ Portugal |
| ☐ Belarus | ☐ Iceland | ☐ Romania |
| ☐ Belgium | ☐ Ireland | ☐ San Marino |
| ☐ Bosnia and Herzegovina | ☐ Italy | ☐ Serbia |
| ☐ Bulgaria | ☐ Latvia | ☐ Slovakia |
| ☐ Croatia | ☐ Liechtenstein | ☐ Slovenia |
| ☐ Cyprus | ☐ Lithuania | ☐ Spain |
| ☐ Czech Republic | ☐ Luxembourg | ☐ Sweden |
| ☐ Denmark | ☐ Macedonia | ☐ Switzerland |
| ☐ Estonia | ☐ Malta | ☐ Ukraine |
| ☒ Finland | ☐ Moldova | ☐ United Kingdom |
| | ☐ Monaco | ☐ Vatican City |

F. USNORTHCOM (Select the one in which you spent the MOST time deployed IN YOUR LATEST DEPLOYMENT):

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| ☐ Antigua and Barbuda | ☐ Dominican Republic | ☐ Nicaragua |
| ☐ Bahamas | ☐ El Salvador | ☐ Panama |
| ☒ Barbados | ☐ Grenada | ☐ Saint Kitts and Nevis |
| ☐ Belize | ☐ Guatemala | ☐ Saint Lucia |
| ☐ Canada | ☐ Haiti | ☐ Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| ☐ Costa Rica | ☐ Honduras | ☐ Trinidad and Tobago |
| ☐ Cuba | ☐ Jamaica | |
| ☐ Dominica | ☐ Mexico | |

2. What was your primary mission on this most recent deployment/overseas assignment? (Please select one):

(a) On the ground (drop down List ONE)

(b) At sea (drop down List TWO)

- ☐ Direct military action/patrols
- ☐ Staff headquarters
- ☐ Humanitarian assistance/disaster relief
- ☐ Theater security cooperation
- ☐ Multinational Force ops
- ☐ Other (specify): _____

- ☐ Direct military action/maneuvers
- ☐ Staff work at sea
- ☐ Humanitarian assistance/disaster relief
- ☐ Theater security cooperation
- ☐ Multinational Force ops
- ☐ Other (specify): _____

3. Did ANY of your work duties involve interaction with foreign nationals? (Select one)
- ☐ Yes ☐ No (If "No," please skip to question #7)
4. If "Yes," how often did your work duties involve interaction with foreign nationals?
- ☐ Less than once a month ☐ Once a week
☐ Once a month ☐ Daily
☐ Several times a month
5. What types of interactions did you have with foreign nationals **while performing your duties**? (Please select "Yes" to all that apply, if any):
- A. Did you use an interpreter while performing your duties?
- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- B. Did the foreign nationals speak English to you?
- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- C. Did you interact with foreign nationals *as part of a group of Americans and our allies* while performing your duties?
- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- D. Did you have **individual interaction** with foreign nationals, where you did (a) not have an interpreter and (b) were not part of a group?
- ☐ Yes ☐ No
6. Did you also interact with foreign nationals while on liberty (for example, port calls)?
- ☐ Yes ☐ No

II. A. Challenges/issues with foreign nationals' CULTURE during this deployment

7. Did you experience any challenges/problems or issues with foreign nationals' culture during this deployment? (Please select one):
- ☐ Yes ☐ No (If "No," please skip to question # 13)
8. If "Yes", were these challenges/problems with foreign nationals' culture concerning:
- | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Uniformed foreign nationals | ☐ Yes | ☐ No |
| Foreign civilians | ☐ Yes | ☐ No |

9. When did you experience challenges/problems with foreign nationals' culture during this deployment?

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| As part of my work responsibilities | ☐ Yes | ☐ No |
| During my time off, away from work | ☐ Yes | ☐ No |
| During both my work and my time off | ☐ Yes | ☐ No |

10. What was the greatest cultural barrier or friction point you encountered during your deployment and how did you/your unit overcome the problem?

11. **From the standpoint of completing your mission**, how significant were the challenges and issues you faced with foreign nationals' culture during this deployment?

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ Not at all significant | ☐ Very significant |
| ☐ Not very significant | ☐ Extremely significant |
| ☐ Somewhat significant | |

12. **From the standpoint of maintaining good relations with foreign civilians**, how significant were the challenges and issues you faced with foreign nationals' culture?

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ Not at all significant | ☐ Very significant |
| ☐ Not very significant | ☐ Extremely significant |
| ☐ Somewhat significant | |

II. B. Challenges/issues with foreign nationals' LANGUAGE during this deployment

13. Did you experience any challenges/problems or issues with foreign nationals' LANGUAGE during this deployment? (Please select one):

- ☐ Yes ☐ No (If "No," please skip to question #19)

14. If "Yes," were these challenges/problems with foreign nationals' language concerning:

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Uniformed foreign nationals | ☐ Yes | ☐ No |
| Foreign civilians | ☐ Yes | ☐ No |

15. When did you experience challenges/problems with foreign nationals' culture during this deployment?

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| As part of my work responsibilities | ☐ Yes | ☐ No |
| During my time off, away from work | ☐ Yes | ☐ No |
| During both my work and my time off | ☐ Yes | ☐ No |

16. What was the greatest language barrier or friction point you encountered during your deployment and how did you/your unit overcome the problem?

17. **From the standpoint of completing your mission**, how significant were the challenges and issues you faced with foreign nationals' language during this deployment?

- ☐ Not at all significant

☐ Not very significant

☐ Somewhat significant

☐ Very significant

☐ Extremely significant

18. **From the standpoint of maintaining good relations with foreign civilians**, how significant were the challenges and issues you faced with foreign nationals' language?

- ☐ Not at all significant

☐ Not very significant

☐ Somewhat significant

☐ Very significant

☐ Extremely significant

III. Self-assessment of your individual knowledge of the CULTURE and LANGUAGE of the foreign nationals where you were deployed

19. Please rate your cultural and language awareness and understanding using the scale below.

	No awareness	A little awareness	Some awareness	A lot of awareness	Almost complete awareness
Ability to understand spoken language	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ability to speak the language	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Knowledge of cultural do's and don'ts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Male/female protocols	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Religious beliefs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Body language/gestures	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (specify): _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

20. If you have significant awareness of the culture and language where you deployed, where did you acquire this knowledge? (Please check all that apply)
- ☐ I learned about this culture and language as a child growing up.
 - ☐ I had pre-deployment training in culture and language.
 - ☐ I had served previous deployments in this area of the world.
 - ☐ I taught myself.
 - ☐ Other (please specify): _____
 - ☐ Does not apply—I do not have significant awareness of the culture and language where I deployed.
21. Overall, how difficult was it for you to communicate with foreign nationals during this deployment?

IV. Assessment of your pre-deployment culture/language training for interacting with foreign nationals*

(*Note—This section is only for those who received pre-deployment culture/language training. If you did not have such pre-deployment training, please skip to question #32.)

22. Prior to this deployment, did you receive training in the culture or language of the foreign nationals with whom you interacted during this mission? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If “Yes,” what kind of training did you receive?

If “No,” please skip to question #32.

23. What organization provided the culture/ language training or training products that you received prior to your deployment? (Select all that apply):

- ☐ Center for Language, Regional Expertise and Culture (CLREC)
- ☐ Defense Language Institute (DLI)
- ☐ Naval Cryptologic Services (NCS)
- ☐ Partner Language Training Center Europe (PLTCE)
- ☐ Other government provider
- ☐ Civilian contracting vendor
- ☐ Other (specify) : _____
- ☐ I do not know what organization provided my culture and language training or training products

24. Please estimate the TOTAL amount of CULTURE training that you received prior to this latest deployment. (Select one response only):

- ☐ One hour or less of training
- ☐ More than one hour of training, up to one day of training
- ☐ More than one day of training
- ☐ More than one week of training

25. Please estimate the TOTAL amount of LANGUAGE training that you received prior to this latest deployment. (Select one response only):

- ☐ One hour or less of training
- ☐ More than one hour of training, up to one day of training
- ☐ More than one day of training
- ☐ More than one week of training

26. Please mark the extent to which the following topics were covered in the pre-deployment culture/language training that you received:

	No training	One hour or less of training	More than one hour of training, up to one day	More than one day of training	More than one week of training
Ability to understand spoken language	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Ability to speak the language	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Knowledge of cultural do's and don'ts	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
Male/female protocols	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Religious beliefs	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Body language/gestures	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Other (specify): _____	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

27. Overall, how useful was the CULTURE training that you received (did you use it while deployed)? (Please select one):

- ☐ Very useful
- ☐ Somewhat useful
- ☐ Not very useful
- ☐ Not at all useful
- ☐ Not applicable

28. Overall, how useful was the LANGUAGE training that you received (did you use it while deployed)? (Please select one):

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ☐ Very useful | ☐ Not at all useful |
| ☐ Somewhat useful | ☐ Not applicable |
| ☐ Not very useful | |

29. What did you like best about the culture and/or language training that you received?

30. What did you like the least about the culture and/or language training that you received?

31. What improvements could be made to the culture and/or language training that you received?

V. Your demographics/unit

32. What kind of unit did you deploy with?

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ Seabees | ☐ Military Civil Affairs Unit |
| ☐ Navy Expeditionary Intelligence | ☐ Explosive Ordnance Disposal Unit |
| ☐ Command | ☐ Carrier Strike Group |
| ☐ Other (Specify): _____ | |

33. What is your current service component? (Please select one):

- | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| ☐ USN | ☐ Coast Guard |
| ☐ USNR | ☐ Other |

34. If you are currently in the military, which best describes you? (Please circle one):

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| ☐ Enlisted | ☐ Contractor |
| ☐ Officer | ☐ Government Employee |

35. If you are enlisted, please provide your DNECs:

a. DNEC1: _____

b. DNEC2: _____

36. If you are an officer, please provide your designator code: _____

37. What is your current rank? (Please select one)

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| ☐ E1-E2 | ☐ O1-O2 | ☐ CW01 |
| ☐ E3-E4 | ☐ O3-O4 | ☐ CW02 |
| ☐ E5-E6 | ☐ O5-O6 | ☐ CW03 |
| ☐ E7 or higher | ☐ O7 or higher | |
| ☐ Other (specify): _____ | | |

38. What is your current UIC? _____

39. What is your current command and location? _____

40. How long was your last deployment? (Please select one):

- ☐ 1 week or less
- ☐ Over 1 week, but no more than 3 months
- ☐ Over 3 months, but less than 6 months
- ☐ 6 months or more

41. What is your Naval Enterprise?

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| ☐ Surface | ☐ Aviation |
| ☐ Subsurface | ☐ Expeditionary |
| ☐ Other (Specify): _____ | |

42. What is the Operation/Exercise/Deployment you supported?

- | | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| ☐ OEF | ☐ Balikatan |
| ☐ OIF | ☐ Cobra Gold |
| ☐ Ulchi Freedom Guardian | |
| ☐ Other (Specify): _____ | |



THANK YOU FOR PROVIDING FEEDBACK ON YOUR DEPLOYMENT AND CHALLENGES
REQUIRING KNOWLEDGE OF CULTURE AND LANGUAGE.

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix C: Postdeployment survey for officers and unit commanders

The following page starts the Postdeployment Survey for Officers and Unit Commanders, which collects Level 3–4 information from leaders of returning sailors.

Language, Regional Expertise, and Cultural (LREC) Postdeployment Survey for Officers and Unit Commanders

We are looking for feedback on your most recent deployment, on behalf of the Navy's Center for Language, Regional Expertise and Culture (CLREC). We want to know more about the types of missions that might require culture and language training. We are especially interested in learning about your insights, as an officer or unit commander, into the needs for culture and/or language training **during your current (or most recent) deployment**. This feedback will be used to improve the usefulness of CLREC's products and services.

I. Your mission and interaction with foreign nationals during your deployment

1. In what country (or countries) did you most recently deploy?

2. What kind of primary mission did your unit perform during this deployment?

- ☐ Serving as part of a crew aboard a ship
☐ Serving as part of a land-based command that included work with foreign military personnel
☐ Serving as part of a land-based command that included work with foreign civilians
☐ Other (please specify): _____

3. During this deployment, how often did **personnel under your command** interact with the following types of foreign nationals **as part of their mission**? (Please make a selection for each row)

	Never	Less than once a week	Once a week	More than once a week	Every day
Foreign military personnel	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Foreign civilian government personnel	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Foreign civilians	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other foreign personnel	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

4. During this deployment, how often did personnel under your command interact with the following types of foreign nationals **during their time off duty**?(Please make a selection for each row)

	Never	Less than once a week	Once a week	More than once a week	Every day
Foreign military personnel	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Foreign civilian government personnel	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Foreign civilians	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other foreign personnel	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5. What was the **most common primary language** that these foreign nationals spoke?

6. What **other languages** did these foreign nationals speak, if any?

7. What types of interactions did you, as a unit commander, have with foreign nationals **while performing this mission**? (Please select all that apply):

- A. Did you use an interpreter while performing this mission? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- B. Did you interact with foreign nationals *as part of a group of Americans and our allies* while performing this mission? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- C. Did you have individual interaction with foreign nationals, where you did not have an interpreter and were not part of a group? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- D. Overall, how often did you interact with foreign nationals during this mission?
(Please select one):

- ☐ Never
- ☐ Less than once a month
- ☐ Once a month
- ☐ Several times a month
- ☐ Once a week
- ☐ Daily

II. Challenges/issues with foreign nationals' culture or language during this deployment

8. Did you (or your unit) experience any challenges or issues with foreign nationals' culture or language during this deployment? (Select one) ☐ Yes ☐ No
9. If "Yes," please describe the most important challenges or issues you or your unit faced with culture or language during this deployment. (This can be for interaction as part of the immediate mission, or during off-duty hours.)

10. From the standpoint of **completing your mission**, how significant were the cultural and language challenges and issues you or your unit faced? (Please select one):

Not at all significant
Not very significant
Somewhat significant

Very significant
Extremely significant

11. From the standpoint of **maintaining good relations with foreign civilians**, how significant were the challenges and issues you or your unit faced with foreign nationals' culture or language? (Please select one):

☐ Not at all significant
☐ Not very significant
☐ Somewhat significant

☐ Very significant
☐ Extremely significant

III. Assessment of your unit's knowledge of the culture and language of the foreign nationals

12. Please rate your unit's cultural awareness and understanding of the foreign nationals using the scale below. (Please make a selection for each row):

	No awareness	A little awareness	Some awareness	A lot of awareness	Almost complete awareness
Ability to understand spoken language	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ability to speak the language	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Knowledge of cultural do's and don'ts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Male/female protocols	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Religious beliefs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Body language/gestures	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (specify): _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

13. If your unit had significant awareness of the culture and language where you deployed, how did members of the unit acquire this knowledge? (Please select all that apply):

- ☐ They learned about this culture and language as children growing up.
- ☐ They had pre-deployment training in culture and language.
- ☐ They had served previous deployments in this area of the world.
- ☐ They taught themselves.
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____
- ☐ Does not apply—my unit did not have significant awareness of the culture and language.

14. Overall, how difficult was it for members of your unit to communicate with foreign nationals during this deployment?

- ☐ Extremely difficult
- ☐ Very difficult
- ☐ Somewhat easy
- ☐ Very easy
- ☒ Extremely easy

IV. Assessment of your unit's pre-deployment culture/language training

(*Note—This section is only for those whose units received pre-deployment culture/language training. If your unit did not have such pre-deployment training, please skip to question #21.)

15. Prior to this deployment, did your unit receive training in the culture or language of the foreign nationals with whom you interacted during this mission? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If "Yes," what kind of training did your unit receive?

If "No," please skip to question #30.

16. Did your unit receive any culture training, language training, or both prior to this deployment?

Culture training only

Language training only

Both culture and language training

I do not know what kind of culture or language training they had, if any

17. What organization provided the culture and language training or training products that your unit received prior to your deployment?

- ☐ Center for Language, Regional Expertise and Culture (CLREC)
- ☐ Defense Language Institute (DLI)
- ☐ Naval Cryptologic Services (NCS)
- ☐ Partner Language Training Center Europe (PLTCE)
- ☐ Civilian contracting vendor
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____
- ☐ I do not know what organization provided the culture and language training or training products

18. Please estimate the TOTAL amount of **culture** training that your unit received prior to this deployment. (Select one response only)

- ☐ One hour or less of training
- ☐ More than one hour of training, up to one day of training
- ☐ More than one day of training, up to one week
- ☐ More than one week of training

19. Please estimate the TOTAL amount of **language** training that you received prior to this deployment. (Select one response only)

- ☐ One hour or less of training
- ☐ More than one hour of training, up to one day of training
- ☐ More than one day of training, up to one week
- ☐ More than one week of training

20. Please mark the extent to which the following topics were covered in the pre-deployment culture/language training that your unit received. (Please make a selection for each row):

	No awareness	A little awareness	Some awareness	A lot of awareness	Almost complete awareness
Ability to understand spoken language	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ability to speak the language	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Knowledge of cultural do's and don'ts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Male/female protocols	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Religious beliefs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Body language/gestures	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (specify): _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

21. Overall, how useful was the CULTURE training that your unit received? (Select one)

- Very useful
- Somewhat useful
- Not very useful
- Not at all useful

22. Overall, how useful was the LANGUAGE training that your unit received? (Select one)

- ☐ Very useful
- ☐ Somewhat useful
- ☐ Not very useful
- ☐ Not at all useful

23. Do you have any suggestions for how the training your unit received could be made more helpful?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

24. If you have any suggestions for how your unit's cultural and language training could be improved, please describe them here.

25. Did your unit receive any pre-deployment training in culture or language from the Navy's CLREC?
(If "No," please skip to question #30)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't Know

26. If your unit received training from the Navy's CLREC, was it culture training, language training, or both?

- ☐ Culture training only
- ☐ Language training only
- ☐ Both culture and language training
- ☐ I do not know

27. How useful was any CULTURE training that your unit received from CLREC?

- ☐ Very useful
- ☐ Somewhat useful
- ☐ Not very useful
- ☐ Not at all useful
- ☐ Not applicable

28. How useful was any LANGUAGE training that your unit received from CLREC?

- ☐ Very useful
- ☐ Somewhat useful
- ☐ Not very useful
- ☐ Not at all useful
- ☐ Not applicable

29. Do you have any suggestions for improving CLREC training? If so, please describe them here.

V. Your demographics/unit

30. What is your current service component? (Please select one)

- USN
- USNR
- Coast Guard
- Other

31. If you are currently in the military, which best describes you? (Please select one)

- Enlisted
- Officer
- Civilian

32. If you are enlisted, please provide your DNECs:

- a. DNEC1: _____
- b. DNEC2: _____

33. If you are an officer, please provide your designator code: _____

34. What is your UIC? _____

35. What is your command and location? _____

36. During this deployment, was your unit primarily active duty, reservists, or civilians? (Please select one)

- Active duty
- Reservists
- Civilians

37. How long did this deployment last?

- ☐ 1 week or less
- ☐ Over a week, but less than 3 months
- ☐ Over 3 months, but less than 6 months
- ☐ 6 months or more

THANK YOU FOR PROVIDING FEEDBACK ON YOUR DEPLOYMENT AND CHALLENGES REQUIRING
KNOWLEDGE OF CULTURE AND LANGUAGE

If you have questions or concerns about this questionnaire, please refer them to Neil Carey, Ph.D., at 703-824-2356 or careyn@cna.org.

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix D: Postdeployment interviews for sailors and unit commanders

The next page starts the interview protocol for collecting post-deployment data from sailors and their unit commanders.

Language, Regional Expertise, and Cultural (LREC) Postdeployment Survey for Sailors and Unit Commanders

We are looking for feedback on your most recent deployment, on behalf of the Navy's Center for Language, Regional Expertise and Culture (CLREC). The purpose of this survey is to learn more about the types of missions that might require culture and language training. Your feedback will be used to improve the usefulness of CLREC's products and services.

I. Your mission and interaction with foreign nationals during your deployment

1. What kind of mission did you perform?

2. Did your deployment involve interaction with foreign nationals? ☐ Yes ☐ No
(If "No," please skip to question #15)

3. If "Yes," was your interaction with foreign nationals part of the mission, or was it strictly part of being abroad during "free time" (for example, during port calls or shopping trips)?

4. What country or region did these foreign nationals come from?

5. What types of interactions did you have with foreign nationals while performing this mission?

- A. Did you use an interpreter while performing this mission? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If "Yes," how did you use an interpreter while performing this mission?

- B. Did you interact with foreign nationals *as part of a group of Americans and our allies* while performing this mission?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If "Yes," how did you interact as part of a group while performing this mission?

- C. Did you have individual interaction with foreign nationals, where you did not have an interpreter and were not part of a group? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If "Yes," please describe the individual interactions you had with foreign nationals.

- D. How often did you interact with foreign nationals during this mission?

II. Challenges/issues with foreign nationals' culture or language during this deployment

6. Did you experience any challenges/problems or issues with foreign nationals' culture or language during this deployment? ☐ Yes ☐ No
(If "No," please skip to question #12)

7. If "Yes," please describe the most important challenges or issues you faced with culture or language during this deployment. (This can be during interactions as part of the immediate mission, or during non-mission "free time.")

8. Were the most important challenges you faced ones of culture, language, or both? (Select one)

- ☐ The most important challenges we faced involved culture only.
☐ The most important challenges we faced involved language only.
☐ The most important challenges we faced involved both culture and language.
☐ Other (please specify): _____

9. How important were the challenges and issues you faced with foreign nationals' culture or language?

10. Did these challenges interfere with your ability to accomplish your mission? Yes No

11. If "Yes," please describe how culture and/or language challenges interfered with your ability to accomplish your mission.

III. Self-assessment of your knowledge of the culture and language of the foreign nationals with whom you worked.

12. How much did you know about the foreign nationals' culture and language at the beginning of this deployment?

13. Please rate your cultural awareness and language understanding in the following areas. (Please make a selection for each row.)

	No awareness	A little awareness	Some awareness	A lot of awareness	Almost complete awareness
Ability to understand spoken language	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ability to speak the language	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Knowledge of cultural do's and don'ts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Male/female protocols	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Religious beliefs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Body language/gestures	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (specify): -----	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

14. Overall, how difficult was it for you to communicate with foreign nationals during this deployment?

IV. Assessment of your pre-deployment training for interacting with foreign nationals

15. Prior to this deployment, did you receive any training in the culture or language of the foreign nationals with whom you interacted (or might have interacted with) during this mission?

☐ Yes ☐ No

(If "No", please skip to question #26)

If "Yes," what kind of training did you receive?

16. Did you have culture training, language training, or both?

Culture training only.

Language training only.

Both culture and language.

Other (please specify): _____

17. What organization provided the culture and language training or training products that you received prior to your deployment?

18. Please estimate the TOTAL amount of culture training that you received prior to this deployment. (Please select only one response)

- ☐ One hour or less of training
☐ More than one hour of training, up to one day of training
☐ More than one day of training, up to one week of training
☐ More than one week of training

19. Please estimate the TOTAL amount of language training that you received prior to this deployment. (Please select only one response)

- ☐ One hour or less of training
☐ More than one hour of training, up to one day of training
☐ More than one day of training, up to one week of training
☐ More than one week of training

20. Please mark the extent to which the following topics were covered in the pre-deployment culture/language training that you received. (Please make a selection for each row.)

	No training	One hour or less of training	More than one hour of training, up to one day	More than one day of training	More than one week of training
Ability to understand spoken language	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ability to speak the language	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Knowledge of cultural do's and don'ts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Male/female protocols	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Religious beliefs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Body language/gestures	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (specify): _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

21. Overall, how useful was the CULTURE training that you received?

☐ Very useful (Why?) _____
☐ Somewhat useful (Why?) _____
☐ Not very useful (Why?) _____
☐ Not at all useful (Why?) _____
☐ Not applicable (I received no culture training)

22. Overall, how useful was the LANGUAGE training that you received?

☐ Very useful (Why?) _____
☐ Somewhat useful (Why?) _____
☐ Not very useful (Why?) _____
☐ Not at all useful (Why?) _____
☐ Not applicable (I received no language training)

23. Do you have any suggestions for how the training you received could be made more helpful?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not sure

24. If you have any suggestions for how your training could be improved, please describe them here:

25. Did you receive any pre-deployment training in culture or language from the Navy's Center for Language, Regional Expertise and Culture (CLREC)? (Select one)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't Know

26. If you received training from the Navy's CLREC, how useful was the training that you received?

- ☐ Very useful (Why?) _____
- ☐ Somewhat useful (Why?) _____
- ☐ Not very useful (Why?) _____
- ☐ Not at all useful (Why?) _____

V. Your demographics/unit

26. What is your current service component? (Please select one)

- ☐ USN
- ☐ USNR
- ☐ Coast Guard
- ☐ Other

27. If you are currently in the military, which best describes you? (Please select one)

- ☐ Enlisted
- ☐ Officer
- ☐ Civilian

28. If you are enlisted, please provide your DNECs:

- a. DNEC1: _____
- b. DNEC2: _____

29. If you are an officer, please provide your designator code: _____

30. What is your UIC? _____

31. What is your command and location? _____

32. During this deployment, was your unit primarily active duty, reservists, or civilians? (Please select one)

- ☐ Active duty
- ☐ Reservists
- ☐ Civilians

33. How long did this deployment last?

- ☐ 1 week or less
- ☐ Over a week, but less than 3 months
- ☐ Over 3 months, but less than 6 months
- ☐ 6 months or more

THANK YOU FOR PROVIDING FEEDBACK ON YOUR DEPLOYMENT AND CHALLENGES REQUIRING KNOWLEDGE OF CULTURE AND LANGUAGE.

If you have questions or concerns about this questionnaire, please refer them to Neil Carey, Ph.D., at 703-824-2356 or careyn@cna.org.

Appendix E: Postdeployment survey for flag officers

The following page displays a one-page survey for flag officers who have received CLREC-coordinated language tutoring.

Language, Regional Expertise, and Cultural (LREC) Postdeployment Survey for Flag Officers

The purpose of this questionnaire is to give feedback to the Navy's Center for Language, Regional Expertise and Culture (CLREC) on the usefulness of the language training it coordinates and provides. This feedback will be used to improve the usefulness of CLREC's products and services.

1. What kind of language training did you receive that was arranged by CLREC? (Please specify the language(s) for which you received training.)

2. How much total instructor time did you receive for your language training? (Please select one):

- ☐ No instructor time
- ☐ An hour or less of instructor time
- ☐ More than an hour, up to 8 hours of instructor time
- ☐ More than 8 hours of instructor time, up to one week
- ☐ More than one week of instructor time

3. Did you have any other training in the language before the CLREC training? (Please select all that apply):

- ☐ I already had some background in the language.
- ☐ I had previous in-theater training in the language.
- ☐ I had previously taught myself the language.
- ☐ No, I had not had any previous training in this language.

4. How useful was the CLREC language training that you received? (Please select one):

- ☐ Very useful
- ☐ Somewhat useful
- ☐ Don't know—(for example, I have not had a chance to use my language training)
- ☐ Not very useful
- ☐ Not at all useful

5. If you have any suggestions for how your training could be improved, please describe them here:

References

- [1] Chief of Naval Operations. "U.S. Navy Language Skills, Regional Expertise, and Cultural Awareness Strategy." Jan. 2008.
- [2] Department of Defense. Quadrennial Defense Review Report. Feb 2010.
- [3] Donald L. Kirkpatrick and James D. Kirkpatrick. Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels. 3rd ed. San Francisco:
- [4] Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2006.
- [5] James D. Kirkpatrick and Wendy Kayser Kirkpatrick. Training on Trial: How Workplace Learning Must Reinvent Itself To Remain Relevant. New York: AMACOM, 2010.
- [6] James J. Phillips. "How Much Is Training Worth?" Training and Development, 50, 4, 1996: 20-24.
- [7] Our Philosophy: Return on Expectations. Website of Kirkpatrick Partners (The One and Only Kirkpatrick®), last accessed Jul. 1, 2012, at <http://www.kirkpatrickpartners.com/Our-Philosophy/tabid/66/Default.aspx>.
- [8] U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight. Building Language Skills and Cultural Competencies in the Military: DOD's Challenge in
- [9] Today's Educational Environment. Nov. 2008.
- [10] U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight. Building Language Skills and Cultural Competencies in the Military: Bridging the Gap. Dec. 2010.
- [11] Government Accountability Office. Military Training: DOD Needs a Strategic Plan and Better Inventory and Requirements

Data To Guide Development of Language Skills and Proficiency. GAO-09-568. Jun. 2009.

- [12] Government Accountability Office. Language and Culture Training: Opportunities Exist To Improve Visibility and Sustainment of Knowledge and Skills in Army and Marine Corps General Purpose Forces. GAO-12-50. Oct. 2011.
- [13] Defense Manpower Data Center. June 2010 Status of Forces Survey of Active Duty Members: Topics: Language, Regional, and Cultural (LRC) Training, DoD/VA Benefits, and MyDoD Benefits. Apr. 2011.
- [14] Marinus van Driel. "Assessing Organizational Cross-Cultural Competence in the Military: Developing a Measure." Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute unpublished paper. 2010.
- [15] Ed Schmitz, Jessica Wolfanger, and R. Azar. Regional Cultural Awareness: Defining Metrics for BUMED Missions. CNA Research Memorandum D0019939.A2. Mar. 2009.
- [16] A. L. Abbe, L. Gulick, and J. Herman. Cross-Cultural Competence in Army Leaders: A Conceptual and Empirical Foundation. U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences S.R. 2008-01. Oct. 2007.
- [17] P. Caligiuri et al. Training, Developing, and Assessing Cross-Cultural Competence in Military Personnel. U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences T.R. 1284. Apr. 2011.
- [18] R. Hayes and D. Baker. "Methodological Problems in Comparing English-Speaking and Spanish-Speaking Patients' Satisfaction With Interpersonal Aspects of Care." Medical Care 36, Feb. 1998: 230-236.
- [19] John Nelson et al. Measures of Effectiveness for Humanitarian Assistance Operations. CNA Research Memorandum 95-166. Apr. 1996.

- [20] Alison Vernon. Do Naval Engagement Missions Have an Impact on Host Nations, and Why? CNA Research Memorandum D0017500.A2. Jul. 2008.
- [21] G. Flores. "The Impact of Medical Interpreter Services on the Quality of Health Care: A Systematic Review." *Medical Care Research and Review* 62, no. 3, 2005: 25-299.
- [22] S. A. McChrystal. COMISAF/USFOR-A Counterinsurgency (COIN) Training Guidance, Nov. 10, 2009.
- [23] A. L. Abbe, D. Gelle, and S. Everett. Measuring Cross-Cultural Competence in Soldiers and Cadets: A Comparison of Existing Instruments. U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences T.R. 1276. Nov. 2010.

This page intentionally left blank

List of figures

Figure 1.	Current and proposed feedback loops for Navy's CLREC training assessments.....	5
Figure 2.	Percentage of active duty servicemembers who received LRC training before deployment.....	12
Figure 3.	Percentage of deploying active duty servicemembers satisfied with their LRC training (Kirkpatrick Level 1)	13
Figure 4.	Percentage of servicemembers deployed for OEF and/or OIF saying LRC training met the objectives (Kirkpatrick Level 2)	13
Figure 5.	Percentage of servicemembers deployed for OEF and/or OIF who rated LRC training as beneficial for performing their job (Kirkpatrick Level 3 and 4)	14
Figure 6.	A model of evaluating language and culture training.....	19

This page intentionally left blank

List of tables

Table 1.	Kirkpatrick's four levels of training evaluation (adapted from [3] and [4])	6
Table 2.	Overview of recommended survey questions	31
Table 3.	Clients, services, data needs, and data collection tools	42

This page intentionally left blank

DRM-2012-U-001502-Final



4825 Mark Center Drive, Alexandria, VA 22311-1850 703-824-2000 www.cna.org