

CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES IN TEACHING ENGLISH TO MILITARY PERSONNEL: PEDAGOGICAL LIMITATIONS AND STRATEGIC ADAPTATIONS

Alina-Elena ONET

“Nicolae Bălcescu” Land Forces Academy, Sibiu, Romania
onet.alina@armyacademy.ro

ABSTRACT

*This paper examines the contemporary challenges associated with teaching English to military personnel in institutional training contexts. In recent decades, the role of English has expanded considerably, particularly within multinational operations, peacekeeping missions, and strategic cooperation frameworks such as NATO. Consequently, military learners are increasingly expected to develop not only general linguistic competence but also specialized communicative abilities suited to operational and high-pressure environments. The paper adopts a literature-based and pedagogically oriented approach, drawing on scholarship in applied linguistics, English for Specific Purposes (ESP), and military language education to examine the principal challenges affecting English language instruction in military settings. Particular attention is devoted to institutional constraints, learner characteristics, standardized assessment frameworks, and the adaptation of communicative and task-based pedagogies to military requirements. The discussion also considers the pedagogical implications of STANAG 6001, the potential effects of assessment-driven instruction, and the contribution of scenario-based learning to communicative competence. The paper concludes by **outlining** several directions for future research and pedagogical development while **emphasizing** the need for greater interdisciplinarity, methodological flexibility, and closer alignment between language instruction and operational communication.*

KEYWORDS:

teaching English, military personnel, NATO, linguistic competence, communicative skills

Submission Received: 11 May 2026; Revised: 03 July 2026; Accepted: 24 July 2026; Published: September 2026

1. Introduction

In the current geopolitical and security landscape, English language proficiency has become an essential professional competence for military personnel. English functions as the principal lingua franca of multinational military cooperation, supporting joint operations, peacekeeping missions, multinational exercises, and institutional collaboration within NATO and other international organizations. This development reflects broader processes of globalization, technological advancement, and the

increasing complexity of contemporary military operations, all of which require accurate and efficient communication across linguistic and cultural boundaries. Consequently, military institutions are expected to prepare personnel who possess not only general English proficiency but also the specialized communicative competence required for operational environments.

English language instruction in military contexts differs substantially from language teaching in civilian educational institutions. Military learners represent a distinctive group whose professional responsibilities, institutional culture, and operational requirements shape both learning processes and instructional practice. Hierarchical organizational structures, strict discipline, and standardized training procedures frequently restrict instructional flexibility and influence classroom interaction. These institutional characteristics may limit opportunities for learner-centred and highly interactive pedagogical approaches that are commonly advocated in contemporary language education.

Military personnel also frequently operate under conditions of stress, physical fatigue, and significant time pressure. Language learning is therefore often viewed primarily as an operational necessity rather than as an academic pursuit, influencing learner motivation and encouraging a preference for immediately applicable communicative skills. Furthermore, military communication requires exceptional precision, clarity, and consistency. Misunderstandings may compromise operational effectiveness and, in certain circumstances, have serious consequences. Language instruction must therefore extend beyond general linguistic proficiency to include standardized phraseology, professional terminology, intercultural communicative competence, and the ability to communicate accurately under pressure.

The present paper examines the principal pedagogical challenges associated with English language instruction for military personnel and discusses instructional adaptations proposed in the literature. Rather than reporting original empirical research, the study presents a literature-based review of relevant scholarship in applied linguistics, English for Specific Purposes, and military language education. By synthesizing current theoretical perspectives and pedagogical approaches, the paper aims to identify practices that may enhance the effectiveness of military English instruction while remaining compatible with institutional requirements and operational realities.

Within contemporary military organizations, English functions not merely as a means of communication but also as a strategic professional resource. Participation in multinational operations increasingly depends upon the ability to communicate efficiently using standardized terminology and internationally recognized communication procedures. As Orna-Montesinos (2018) observes, English as a *Lingua Franca* has become central to international military communication, requiring personnel to negotiate linguistic and cultural diversity while maintaining operational precision. Consequently, English proficiency has become closely associated with professional mobility, participation in multinational missions, and access to specialized military education. These developments further reinforce the need for pedagogical approaches that combine linguistic accuracy with communicative flexibility and operational relevance.

2. Theoretical Framework

The process of teaching English to military personnel can be effectively understood through several established approaches in applied linguistics, particularly Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), and English for Specific Purposes (ESP). Each of these frameworks offers valuable

insights into language learning and instruction; however, their application in military contexts requires careful adaptation to institutional requirements and operational realities.

Communicative Language Teaching emphasizes the development of communicative competence rather than the exclusive mastery of grammatical rules. The concept of communicative competence was originally introduced by Hymes (1972), who argued that successful communication depends not only on grammatical knowledge but also on whether language is feasible, appropriate, and actually used in particular social contexts. Building on Hymes' sociolinguistic perspective, Canale and Swain (1980) proposed an operational model consisting of grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence, a framework that has become one of the most influential models in language pedagogy. Within military environments, communicative competence is particularly important because personnel must communicate accurately and efficiently in situations characterized by uncertainty, urgency, and intercultural interaction. Nevertheless, the implementation of CLT may be constrained by institutional norms that prioritize discipline, hierarchy, and standardized procedures over spontaneous interaction (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Furthermore, military language training within NATO contexts is closely linked to standardized proficiency descriptors such as STANAG 6001, which introduces an additional level of structure in both instruction and assessment (NATO, 2011).

Task-Based Language Teaching provides a complementary perspective by placing meaningful communicative tasks at the centre of instruction (Ellis, 2003; Nunan, 2004). Learning is viewed as emerging through the completion of tasks that resemble authentic language use rather than through isolated practice of linguistic forms. In military education, task-based learning is especially valuable when activities simulate operational situations, such as mission briefings, checkpoint interactions, multinational coordination meetings, or emergency response procedures. Such activities develop not only linguistic competence but also decision-making, collaboration, and problem-solving skills. Recent research on task-based language assessment further suggests that authentic performance tasks may provide a more accurate representation of communicative ability than traditional discrete-item testing (Norris, 2016). Nevertheless, implementing TBLT successfully requires curricular flexibility, which may be difficult to achieve within highly standardized military training programmes (Willis & Willis, 2007).

English for Specific Purposes provides a more targeted framework by focusing on the linguistic and communicative needs of particular professional communities (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998). As Basturkmen (2010) argues, ESP instruction should be based on systematic analyses of learners' professional needs and workplace communication. Military English therefore extends beyond general language proficiency to include technical terminology, standardized phraseology, operational discourse, and intercultural communication. Assessment likewise needs to reflect the communicative requirements of military practice rather than general language proficiency alone (Douglas, 2000).

Recent developments in language education have also emphasized technology-enhanced learning, learner autonomy, and blended instructional environments (Chapelle, 2001). Within military education, however, the adoption of digital learning technologies must remain compatible with institutional security requirements and organizational policies. At the same time, adaptive digital assessment systems aligned

with **STANAG 6001** have demonstrated considerable potential for improving both assessment efficiency and learner feedback (Gawliczek et al., 2021), suggesting that technological innovation can support military language education when appropriately implemented.

An additional theoretical perspective relevant to military language instruction is Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller, 1988), which explains how working-memory limitations influence learning. Military learners frequently perform under conditions of elevated cognitive load because of multitasking, operational stress, and time pressure. Consequently, instructional design should minimise unnecessary cognitive demands while presenting language input in carefully sequenced and meaningful ways.

A related perspective is Skill Acquisition Theory, originally developed by Anderson (1982, 1983) and more recently synthesised in second language acquisition by DeKeyser and Suzuki (2025). According to this framework, language learning progresses from controlled processing to increasingly automatic performance through repeated practice and meaningful application. In military contexts, where rapid and accurate communication is essential, the development of automatic language processing is particularly important, as personnel must produce and comprehend language efficiently under operational pressure.

3. Specific Features of Military Learners

Military learners differ from civilian students in several important respects, with direct implications for language acquisition and instructional practice. These differences are deeply embedded in institutional culture, professional expectations, and operational requirements and should therefore be carefully considered when designing and implementing English language instruction in military settings.

Firstly, the hierarchical structure of military organizations plays a central role in shaping classroom interaction. Learners are accustomed to clearly defined chains of command in which authority is explicitly established and rarely questioned. This institutional conditioning often results in a learning environment characterized by reduced spontaneity and limited peer-to-peer negotiation of meaning. Consequently, learners may demonstrate a preference for teacher-centred instruction, in which the instructor is viewed as the principal source of knowledge and authority. Such expectations may create challenges for communicative approaches, including Communicative Language Teaching, which rely on active participation, collaboration, and the co-construction of meaning (Hofstede, 2001; Harmer, 2007).

Secondly, military personnel frequently operate under conditions of sustained stress, fatigue, and cognitive overload. Training schedules are intensive and highly structured, leaving limited opportunities for reflective or exploratory learning. In these circumstances, English language instruction is often perceived as an operational requirement rather than an academic objective, influencing both learner motivation and engagement. According to Gardner's (1985) socio-educational model, second-language motivation is shaped by both integrative and instrumental orientations. Within military education, instrumental motivation generally predominates because learners seek to achieve operational readiness, qualify for multinational assignments, or satisfy standardized proficiency requirements such as those established by STANAG 6001 (NATO, 2011).

Psychological factors also influence language acquisition in demanding operational environments. According to Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis (1982, 1985),

elevated levels of anxiety, stress, or low self-confidence may restrict learners' ability to process linguistic input effectively. Arnold (1999) likewise emphasizes the broader role of affective variables in language learning, highlighting the importance of creating supportive learning environments that reduce unnecessary anxiety. In military contexts, where performance expectations are high and errors may have significant consequences, learners may become reluctant to take communicative risks, thereby limiting opportunities for meaningful language practice.

Another defining characteristic of military learners is the highly goal-oriented nature of their training. Unlike many civilian educational contexts, where language learning may serve broader academic or personal purposes, military personnel typically study English to accomplish clearly defined operational tasks, including participation in multinational missions, cooperation with allied forces, compliance with NATO standards, and professional advancement. While this clarity of purpose often strengthens discipline and commitment, it may also encourage reliance on formulaic language and standardized expressions at the expense of greater communicative flexibility (Nation, 2001).

The growing internationalization of military operations has also introduced considerable linguistic and cultural diversity into military classrooms. Multinational groups frequently include learners with different levels of English proficiency, diverse educational backgrounds, and distinct communicative conventions. Although such diversity can enrich the learning experience, it may also present challenges for instructional pacing, classroom interaction, and group cohesion. Consequently, instructors should adopt flexible pedagogical strategies that accommodate heterogeneous learner profiles while maintaining clear instructional objectives (Byram, 1997).

In addition to structural and cognitive factors, professional identity significantly shapes learners' attitudes toward language learning. Military identity is commonly associated with discipline, precision, self-control, and adherence to established procedures. However, communicative language learning often requires experimentation, negotiation of meaning, and the acceptance of errors as part of the learning process. These expectations may appear incompatible with military culture unless instructors deliberately establish psychologically supportive learning environments that encourage participation while respecting institutional norms.

Finally, military education places considerable emphasis on teamwork and collective performance. These characteristics can be used productively in language classrooms through carefully designed collaborative tasks that foster learner engagement and shared responsibility. At the same time, instructors must remain aware of differences in language proficiency within military groups, as stronger learners may dominate interaction while less proficient participants withdraw from communication. Appropriate classroom management and structured task design are therefore essential to ensure balanced participation and meaningful communicative practice.

4. Methodological Considerations and Pedagogical Limitations

The implementation of **effective** English language instruction in military contexts is influenced by several methodological and institutional limitations that significantly shape pedagogical decision-making. These limitations should not be regarded as peripheral concerns but rather as central factors defining the conditions under which military language education takes place.

One of the principal methodological challenges concerns the balance between linguistic accuracy and communicative fluency. In military communication, accuracy is essential because even minor ambiguities may result in operational misunderstandings with potentially serious consequences. This is particularly evident in high-**stakes** environments such as multinational operations, aviation, crisis-response activities, or joint military exercises, where standardized communication protocols must be followed precisely (Moder, 2013). Consequently, instructors frequently emphasize form-focused instruction and corrective feedback. Nevertheless, an excessive focus on accuracy may reduce opportunities for spontaneous interaction and hinder the development of communicative fluency (Skehan, 1998). Achieving an appropriate balance between accuracy and fluency therefore remains one of the central pedagogical challenges in military English instruction.

A second major limitation concerns assessment practices. Military language programmes are commonly aligned with standardized proficiency frameworks, particularly NATO STANAG 6001, which specifies language proficiency levels required for operational duties (NATO, 2011). While such frameworks contribute to institutional consistency and comparability, they may also encourage instructional practices that prioritize examination performance over broader communicative competence. This phenomenon, widely known as **washback**, may result in curricula becoming increasingly oriented toward test preparation rather than authentic language use (Brown, 2004). Although standardized assessment remains indispensable for certification and personnel selection, military language education should seek an appropriate balance between measurable proficiency and the communicative demands of operational environments.

The use of authentic instructional materials presents an additional methodological challenge. Operational documents, mission briefings, military reports, and communication transcripts are frequently classified or subject to security restrictions, limiting their availability for classroom instruction. Consequently, instructors must often adapt or simulate authentic materials. Although such adaptations inevitably reduce complete authenticity, carefully designed simulations can successfully reproduce essential communicative features of operational contexts while maintaining institutional security (Crookall, 2010).

Technological integration likewise presents both opportunities and limitations. Digital learning platforms, online resources, and computer-assisted language learning offer significant possibilities for individualized instruction, learner autonomy, and continuous feedback (Chapelle, 2001). However, within military institutions their implementation must remain consistent with cybersecurity requirements, organizational policies, and available technological infrastructure. Recent developments in adaptive language testing and digital assessment aligned with STANAG 6001 requirements demonstrate that appropriately designed technologies can strengthen both learning and assessment without compromising institutional security (Gawliczek et al., 2021).

Another important challenge concerns the compressed timeframe within which military language training is typically delivered. Programmes are generally designed to achieve functional communicative competence within limited instructional periods, creating tension between instructional efficiency and long-term language development. Under such conditions, teaching often emphasizes intensive practice, repetition, and immediate operational applicability. Evidence from cognitive psychology nevertheless suggests that durable learning requires opportunities for consolidation, retrieval

practice, and progressive skill development. Consequently, instructional planning should incorporate strategies such as spaced repetition, focused communicative practice, and systematic recycling of previously acquired language.

Finally, military institutions generally rely on standardized curricula and clearly defined learning outcomes to ensure consistency across training programmes. Although this standardization supports institutional coherence, it may also restrict pedagogical innovation and reduce instructors' autonomy in adapting materials or instructional approaches to the specific needs of individual learner groups. Nevertheless, meaningful pedagogical improvements remain possible through carefully planned adaptations, contextualized communicative tasks, and instructional strategies that preserve institutional requirements while promoting authentic language use.

5. Discussion: Pedagogical Adaptations and Strategic Approaches

Considering the challenges discussed above, it is necessary to examine how established language-teaching approaches can be adapted to the specific requirements of military English instruction. Rather than replacing existing methodologies, the emphasis should be placed on their contextual adaptation and strategic integration within military educational environments.

One promising direction is the integration of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) into a structured instructional framework that reflects operational realities. Tasks may be designed around authentic military scenarios such as mission planning, operational briefings, checkpoint procedures, crisis-response communication, or multinational coordination exercises (Ellis, 2003; Nunan, 2004). Such activities promote not only linguistic accuracy and communicative fluency but also decision-making, teamwork, and situational awareness, all of which are essential professional competencies in contemporary military operations.

Another important pedagogical adaptation involves the gradual development of learner autonomy within an institutional culture traditionally characterized by hierarchy and instructor-directed learning. Although military learners often expect explicit guidance and structured instruction, research suggests that autonomy can be fostered progressively through carefully scaffolded activities that encourage reflection, independent problem-solving, and collaborative learning without undermining institutional discipline (Littlewood, 2004). Consequently, learner autonomy should be viewed not as an alternative to military training culture but as a complementary competence that supports operational effectiveness.

Motivational factors likewise play a significant role in military language education. Learner engagement may increase when English instruction is explicitly connected to operational responsibilities, professional advancement, and participation in multinational missions (Gardner, 1985). Scenario-based learning further strengthens motivation by situating language use within realistic professional contexts that learners readily recognize as relevant to their future duties.

Intercultural communicative competence should also be regarded as an essential component of military English instruction. Contemporary military operations routinely involve cooperation among personnel from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Effective communication therefore depends not only on grammatical accuracy but also on the ability to recognize differences in communicative conventions, institutional

practices, leadership styles, and decision-making processes (Byram, 1997; Orna-Montesinos, 2018). Integrating intercultural awareness into language instruction prepares military personnel for the communicative realities of multinational operational environments.

A particularly important consideration concerns the relationship between instructional practice and standardized language assessment. Within NATO member states, military English programmes are generally organized around the proficiency descriptors established by **STANAG 6001**, which provide a common framework for evaluating listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Although this framework promotes institutional comparability and interoperability, it may also encourage instruction that focuses primarily on examination performance rather than communicative effectiveness.

This tension illustrates the phenomenon of **negative washback**, whereby assessment requirements shape classroom practice in ways that may narrow instructional objectives (Brown, 2004). When learners concentrate predominantly on passing proficiency examinations, opportunities for developing spontaneous interaction, pragmatic competence, negotiation of meaning, and adaptive communication under operational pressure may be reduced. Yet these communicative abilities are precisely those required during multinational deployments, where interaction frequently occurs in unpredictable, rapidly changing situations rather than under controlled testing conditions.

For this reason, recent scholarship has argued for closer alignment between language assessment and authentic communicative performance. Norris (2016) emphasizes that task-based assessment provides richer evidence of language ability because it evaluates learners while they perform realistic communicative tasks rather than isolated linguistic exercises. Within military English instruction, this approach could include simulated operational briefings, multinational planning meetings, incident reporting, checkpoint interactions, or crisis-management scenarios that require learners to integrate linguistic accuracy with professional decision-making.

Accordingly, standardized assessment and communicative language teaching should not be regarded as competing priorities. Rather, military language programmes should seek to combine the reliability and comparability of STANAG 6001 with instructional practices that develop the flexible communicative competence required in operational environments. Such an integrated approach is more likely to produce language users who can satisfy institutional certification requirements while communicating effectively during multinational military operations.

6. Implications for Instructor Training and Professional Development

An often-overlooked dimension of military English instruction is the role of the instructor. Effective teaching in this context requires not only linguistic expertise but also an understanding of military culture, institutional structures, and operational communication. Consequently, instructors must develop a hybrid professional identity that combines language pedagogy, English for Specific Purposes, intercultural competence, and familiarity with military discourse.

Professional development programmes should therefore include training in ESP methodologies, exposure to operational communication practices, and strategies for teaching within highly structured institutional environments. Instructors should also be prepared to manage diverse learner profiles, maintain learner motivation under demanding training conditions, and adapt instructional practices while respecting

organizational requirements. Reflective teaching remains particularly valuable because it enables instructors to evaluate and refine their pedagogical decisions in response to evolving operational and educational demands.

Assessment occupies a central position in military English instruction because it influences not only learner achievement but also instructional priorities and professional opportunities. Within NATO institutions, standardized frameworks such as STANAG 6001 function simultaneously as instruments of language certification, personnel selection, and professional advancement. Consequently, assessment practices inevitably shape both what is taught and how it is taught.

One of the principal challenges concerns the relationship between standardized proficiency assessment and authentic operational communication. Although STANAG 6001 provides internationally recognized proficiency descriptors across the four language skills, real military communication frequently requires personnel to respond to incomplete information, rapidly changing situations, and intercultural interaction under considerable time pressure. Such communicative demands cannot always be fully represented through standardized testing alone.

This discrepancy may generate negative washback, whereby classroom instruction becomes increasingly directed toward examination performance rather than the development of communicative competence (Brown, 2004). Learners may devote disproportionate attention to test-taking strategies and predictable examination formats instead of developing the flexibility required for authentic operational communication. As Norris (2016) argues, assessment should increasingly incorporate communicative tasks that mirror real-world language use if it is to provide valid evidence of functional language ability.

For military English programmes, this suggests the value of integrating performance-based assessment alongside standardized testing. Scenario-based evaluation, role-play activities, simulated operational briefings, incident reporting, and multinational planning exercises enable instructors to assess not only grammatical accuracy but also clarity, coherence, interactional competence, and situational awareness. These approaches more closely reflect the communicative demands that military personnel encounter during multinational operations while remaining compatible with institutional assessment frameworks.

Feedback likewise plays a decisive role in military language learning. Because military training frequently occurs within compressed instructional schedules, feedback should be timely, specific, and constructive. Effective feedback should address both linguistic accuracy and communicative effectiveness while maintaining learner motivation and confidence. At the same time, instructors must balance detailed correction with the practical constraints imposed by intensive military training programmes.

An integrated assessment strategy should also combine **summative** and **formative** evaluation. Although summative assessment remains indispensable for certification purposes, formative assessment provides continuous opportunities for learning through instructor feedback, self-assessment, peer evaluation, and guided reflection. These approaches encourage learner autonomy and facilitate the gradual development of communicative competence without compromising institutional standards.

Recent technological developments further expand assessment possibilities within military language education. Computer-adaptive testing, digital learning platforms, and simulation technologies can provide individualized feedback and more flexible assessment procedures while maintaining alignment with STANAG 6001 requirements (Gawliczek et al., 2021). Nevertheless, the implementation of such technologies must

remain compatible with military cybersecurity regulations and institutional policies.

Ultimately, assessment in military English instruction should not be viewed solely as a mechanism for certification. Rather, it should function as an integral component of the learning process, supporting the development of communicative competence that is both operationally relevant and institutionally measurable. Balancing standardized proficiency frameworks with authentic performance-based assessment represents one of the principal challenges - and one of the greatest opportunities - for the continued development of military English education.

7. Conclusions

The teaching of English to military personnel represents a complex intersection of language pedagogy, institutional structures, and operational requirements. As this review has demonstrated, effective military English instruction is shaped by a combination of cognitive, psychological, organizational, and communicative factors that distinguish it from language education in civilian contexts. These characteristics should not be regarded as obstacles to effective instruction but rather as defining conditions that require carefully adapted pedagogical responses.

The discussion has shown that established approaches such as Communicative Language Teaching, Task-Based Language Teaching, and English for Specific Purposes continue to provide valuable theoretical foundations for military language education when they are appropriately adapted to institutional realities. At the same time, recent developments in technology-enhanced learning, adaptive assessment, and performance-based evaluation offer additional opportunities to strengthen communicative competence while maintaining compatibility with standardized military proficiency frameworks.

Particular attention has been given to the relationship between instruction and assessment. Although STANAG 6001 provides an essential framework for standardized language evaluation across NATO member states, effective military communication requires competences that extend beyond formal proficiency descriptors. Balancing standardized assessment with authentic communicative tasks, scenario-based learning, and performance-oriented evaluation can help reduce the effects of negative washback while promoting language use that more closely reflects operational realities.

Consequently, successful military English programmes should seek to integrate institutional requirements with learner-centred pedagogical practices that develop linguistic accuracy, communicative flexibility, intercultural competence, and operational effectiveness. Such an approach enables military personnel not only to satisfy certification requirements but also to communicate confidently and appropriately in multinational professional environments.

As international military cooperation continues to expand and operational environments become increasingly complex, English language education will remain a strategic component of military readiness. Future research should build upon the literature reviewed in this paper by examining the effectiveness of specific pedagogical interventions, technology-enhanced learning environments, and performance-based assessment practices in military classrooms. Empirical studies involving classroom observation, learner performance, and instructor perspectives would further strengthen understanding of how military English programmes can continue to evolve in response to changing operational and educational demands.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J.R. (1982). Acquisition of cognitive skill. *Psychological Review*, 89(4), 369-406. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.89.4.369>.
- Anderson, J.R. (1983). *The Architecture of Cognition*. Harvard University Press.
- Arnold, J. (Ed.). (1999). *Affect in Language Learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Basturkmen, H. (2010). *Developing Courses in English for Specific Purposes*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brown, H.D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. Pearson Education.
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Multilingual Matters.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/1.1.1>.
- Chapelle, C.A. (2001). *Computer Applications in Second Language Acquisition: Foundations for Teaching, Testing and Research*. Cambridge University Press.
- Crookall, D. (2010). Serious games, debriefing, and simulation/gaming as a discipline. *Simulation & Gaming*, 41(6), 898-920. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/104687811039078>.
- DeKeyser, R.M., & Suzuki, Y. (2025). *Skill acquisition theory*. In B. VanPatten, G.D. Keating, & S. Wulff (Eds.), *Theories in Second Language Acquisition: An Introduction* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Douglas, D. (2000). *Assessing Languages for Specific Purposes*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M.J. (1998). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. Edward Arnold.
- Gawliczek, P., Krykun, V., Tarasenko, N., Tyshchenko, M., & Shapran, O. (2021). *Computer adaptive language testing according to NATO STANAG 6001 requirements*.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (4th ed.). Pearson Longman.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Penguin.
- Krashen, S.D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S.D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. Longman.
- Littlewood, W. (2004). The task-based approach: Some questions and suggestions. *ELT Journal*, 58(4), 319-326. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/58.4.319>.
- Moder, C.L. (2013). *Aviation English: A Lingua Franca for Pilots and Air Traffic Controllers*. Routledge.

Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge University Press.

NATO. (2011). *STANAG 6001: NATO Standardization Agreement – Language Proficiency Levels* (4th ed.). NATO Standardization Office.

Norris, J.M. (2016). Current uses for task-based language assessment. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 36, 230-244. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190516000027>.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Orna-Montesinos, C. (2018). Language practices and policies in conflict: An ELF perspective on international military communication. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 7(1), 89-111. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2018-0004>.

Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford University Press.

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257-285. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4.

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing Task-Based Teaching*. Oxford University Press.