STANAG 6001: A LINGUODIDACTIC FRAMEWORK FOR MILITARY ENGLISH PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT

ABDURAZAKOVA SHOHRUZA VALIYEVNA
PhD Candidate
National University of Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The increasing importance of English as a lingua franca in international defense cooperation has necessitated standardized approaches for evaluating language proficiency in military contexts. The NATO Standardization Agreement (STANAG) 6001 is a widely accepted way to test military personnel's language skills. This study examines STANAG 6001 from a linguodidactic perspective, highlighting its role as both an evaluative tool and a pedagogical framework for improving communicative competence in military English. The debate emphasizes theoretical foundations, practical obstacles, and comparative frameworks, particularly the CEFR, utilizing perspectives from Western, Russian, and Uzbek study. It also supports the incorporation of STANAG 6001 principles into the military education system of Uzbekistan. The study finds that STANAG 6001 is a complete and flexible standard that makes it easier for military English to be used by people from different countries, for schools to be the same, and for people to get better at their jobs.

Index Terms- STANAG 6001, linguodidactics, communicative competence, military English, CEFR

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In today's world of defense and security, English fluency is essential for multinational military professionals to work together well. Joint operations, multinational exercises, peacekeeping missions, and defense diplomacy are relying on English more and more as a common language for operations. To be able to communicate well in high-stakes situations, you need more than just good grammar. You also need to know how to use operational language, be sensitive to other cultures, and be able to adjust when things go tough [1], [2].

Conventional methods of teaching English frequently neglect the specific needs of military environments, where communication failures can lead to significant repercussions. Teaching should be based on real-world duties like giving briefings, preparing reports, managing teams from other countries, and working out rules of engagement [3].

To satisfy this demand, NATO created STANAG 6001, which set a guideline for how member states should test their language skills. STANAG 6001 not only serves as a testing standard but also offers a significant framework for developing curriculum and teaching methodologies [4]. This essay examines its potential as a linguodidactic instrument, contextualizing it within extensive theoretical, methodological, and practical frameworks.

2.0 RESEARCH ELABORATIONS

2.1 Linguodidactic Principles of Military English

Linguodidactics is the study of how to teach language. It combines linguistics, education, psychology, and societal aspects [5]. When it comes to military English, linguodidactics focuses on both language abilities and how they might be used in real-life situations.

Western scholarship underscores communication ability as a complex construct, integrating grammatical, sociolinguistic, and strategic skills [1], [6]. Researchers in Russia stress the need of discipline, uniformity, and combining language acquisition with professional training [7], [8]. Uzbek linguodidactic studies emphasize the integration of international standards with national traditions, concentrating on practical applications in non-philological domains, including the military [9], [10].

These viewpoints all agree that military English instruction needs to be useful, standardized, and relevant to operations. STANAG 6001 meets all three of these needs.

2.2 Overview of Stanag 6001 Proficiency Levels

STANAG 6001 describes proficiency across six levels (0–5), covering listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Level 1 (Survival): Basic exchanges (directions, introductions).

Level 2 (Functional): Routine military interactions such as reporting and following orders.

Level 3 (Professional): Delivering briefings, writing reports, and staff participation.

Level 4 (Expert): Near-native ability for strategic discussions and negotiations [4].

For example, a Level 2+ officer might deliver a short briefing with hesitation, while a Level 3 officer would conduct complex staff meetings confidently. Linking communicative tasks to descriptors ensures measurable, transparent, and operationally aligned competence.

2.3 Stanag 6001 As A Linguodidactic Framework

Although primarily designed as an assessment tool, STANAG 6001 can also guide curriculum design. Instructors can use descriptors to sequence lessons from survival exchanges to professional-level discourse [4], [9].

Pedagogical applications include:

- ✓ **Task-based learning:** Simulated missions, radio communication, and reporting tasks [6]
- ✓ **Genre-based literacy:** Mastery of briefing notes, situation reports, and orders [11]
- ✓ **Intercultural pragmatics:** Training for multinational coordination and negotiation [7]
- ✓ **Integrated assessment:** Continuous alignment with descriptors for transparency [1]

This dual function—as testing tool and teaching framework—makes STANAG highly effective.

2.4 Comparative Perspectives: Stanag 6001 and CEFR

Candidates utilize the CEFR framework a lot in civilian education. CEFR focuses on broad communication abilities, while STANAG focuses on military-specific speech [3], [12].

Both use level descriptors, try to be comparable across countries, and focus on receptive and productive abilities.

Differences: CEFR (A1–C2) is about how civilians communicate with each other, while STANAG is about military activities like briefings and coordinating operations.

Using both CEFR for basic preparation and STANAG for mission-specific benchmarks is helpful [10]. This dual alignment is especially useful for Uzbekistan, where education needs to suit both military and academic needs.

Table 1. Comparison of CEFR and STANAG descriptors

CEFR Level	STANAG Equivalent	Focus Area	Example Task
B1	Level 2	Functional communication	Report a minor incident orally
B2	Level 2+–3	Independent/professional use	Deliver a short operational briefing
C1	Level 3–4	Advanced professional	Chair a multinational planning meeting
C2	Level 5	Expert mastery	Negotiate policy at strategic level

This comparison reveals that CEFR has wide communication descriptors, while STANAG is more focused on operations because it lists mission-related duties.

2.5 Implications for Uzbekistan

Uzbekistan can upgrade its military education by implementing STANAG 6001. Some important effects are:

Standardization: A single way to evaluate across all institutions.

Curriculum design: Lessons that are based on tasks and are useful in real life.

Teacher training: Learning how to teach military English as a profession [9].

Development of materials: real resources that have been changed from field manuals and operational documentation.

International cooperation: Better prepared for NATO exercises and peacekeeping duties [2].

Adding STANAG to the military training in Uzbekistan would improve both communication skills and the ability to work together in defense.

3.0 RESULTS OR FINDINGS

The investigation demonstrates that STANAG 6001 operates efficiently as both an evaluative and pedagogical framework. Some of the most important findings are:

It makes communication competence real by using mission-related descriptions.

It goes along with CEFR by talking about military language used in professional settings.

Its hierarchical tiers give curriculum designers a way to measure results.

Adopting this in Uzbekistan would make systems work better together and make training more effective.

Example Tasks by Level:

Level 2: After a small event, a soldier writes a SALUTE report.

Level 3: An officer gives a 10-minute operational briefing and answers questions.

Level 4: A colonel talks about the rules of engagement with a group of people from different countries.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Because English is now the main language used by multinational defense, structured, task-oriented language training is now necessary. STANAG 6001 serves as both an assessment tool and a framework for teaching. Its acceptance promotes authenticity, functionality, and global comparability. For Uzbekistan, incorporating STANAG into military curricula, teacher training, and evaluation methods provides a means to achieve internationally acknowledged communication competence.

Future study should concentrate on piloting STANAG-based curricula, creating Uzbekistan-specific instructional resources, and assessing the long-term impacts on operational preparedness.

STANAG 6001 gives Uzbekistan a means to follow global norms, make the military more professional, and make contributions to collective security stronger.

REFERENCES

1. D. H. Hymes, On communicative competence, in J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics: Selected readings, Penguin, 1972, pp. 269–293.
2. NATO Standardization Office, STANAG 6001: Language Proficiency Levels (Edition 5), Brussels: NATO, 2021.

3. S. Salaberri, "ESP for the military: Designing task-based syllabi for operational needs," Revista de Lenguas para–Fines Específicos, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 73–92, 2019.
4. Bureau for International Language Coordination (BILC), NATO Benchmark Advisory Test (BAT) Guidelines, Brussels: NATO, 2022.
5. L. F. Bachman, Fundamental considerations in language testing, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
6. R. Ellis, "Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings," International Journal of Applied Linguistics, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 221–246, 2009.
7. E. I. Passov, Communicative foreign language teaching methodology, Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1991.
8. V. V. Safonova, Learning and teaching cultures in foreign language education, Voronezh: Voronezh State University Press, 1996.
9. G. T. Makhkamova, Communicative approach in teaching foreign languages in Uzbekistan, Tashkent: Tashkent State Pedagogical University Press, 2010.
10. D. R. Yuldasheva, "Linguodidactic principles of teaching English for professional purposes in non-linguistic higher education," Philology Issues, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 112–119, 2021.
11. E. Cotos, S. Link, & S. Huffman, "A principled approach to corpus-based materials development for writing," Language Learning & Technology, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 192–218, 2017.
12. Council of Europe, Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Companion volume, Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2020.