

AD N

REPORT NO. NADC-78015-60





# SIMULATORS IN AVIATION MAINTENANCE TRAINING: A DELPHI STUDY

Robert M. Herrick, Ph.D. Joann B. Wright, B.A. Richard A. Bromberger, Ph.D. Aircraft and Crew Systems Technology Directorate NAVAL AIR DEVELOPMENT CENTER Warminster, Pennsylvania 18974

10 DECEMBER 1977



AIRTASK NO. A413413A 0016 X413000030

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

Prepared for NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND Department of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20361

## NADC-78015-60

## NOTICES

REPORT NUMBERING SYSTEM - The numbering of technical project reports issued by the Naval Air Development Center is arranged for specific identification purposes. Each number consists of the Center acronym, the calendar year in which the number was assigned, the sequence number of the report within the specific calendar year, and the official 2-digit correspondence code of the Command Office or the Functional Directorate responsible for the report. For example: Report No. NADC-78015-20 indicates the fifteeth Center report for the year 1978, and prepared by the Systems Directorate. The numerical codes are as follows:

CODE	OFFICE OR DIRECTORATE
00	Commander, Naval Air Development Center
01	Technical Director, Naval Air Development Center
02	Comptroller
10	Directorate Command Projects
20	Systems Directorate
30	Sensors & Avionics Technology Directorate
40	Communication & Navigation Technology Directorate
50	Software Computer Directorate
60	Aircraft & Crew Systems Technology Directorate
70	Planning Assessment Resources
80	Engineering Support Group

PRODUCT ENDORSEMENT - The discussion or instructions concerning commercial products herein do not constitute an endorsement by the Government nor do they convey or imply the license or right to use such products.

APPROVED BY:

M. PASSAGLIA

Captain, USN/ Deputy Director, ACSTD

DATE: 2/1/71

UNCLASS IF IED SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered) READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM **REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE** REPORT NUMBER 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER NADC-78015-60 TITLE (and Subtitle) SEBORT - PERIOD COVERED inal Simulators in Aviation Maintenance Training: echnical Report. (Final) A Delphi Study . ORT NUMBER AUTHORIAL 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) Robert M. Herrick, Joann B. Wright and Richard A. Bromberger . PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Aircraft and Crew Systems Technology Directorate (Code 604) Naval Air Development Center Warminster, PA 18974 1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS REPORT DATE Naval Air Systems Command (Code 413) 19 Dec 277 Department of the Navy LANOP 1 Washington, DC 20361 111 A. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(It different from Controlling Office) 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 154. DECLASSIFICATION DOWN GRADING 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited APR 17 19 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetrect entered in Block 20, if different from Rep 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Aircraft maintenance training Simulators for maintenance training Delphi study Navy training Training devices ASSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This study gathered expert opinion on the use of simulators for training aviation maintenance technicians. Following the Delphi technique, three successive questionnaires were administered to 60 experts. The questionnaires asked what information an administrator needed to decide between simulators and real equipment for training at a Naval Aviation Maintenance Training Detachment. Included under information requirements were the areas of course content, economics, life-cycles, repairs, students and instructors. Suggested sources of information were considered. Additionally, the experts rated DD 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF I NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE UNCLASSIFIED S/N 0102- LF- 014- 6601 SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

UNC LASSIFIED

R. 6140

ABBOLN TH

onferts to

S/N 0102- LF- 014- 6601

SECONTY - U. ASSALLAN THE P. THIL PAGE PRAN DATA

#### SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

The feasibility, training effectiveness, and cost effectiveness of simulators for maintenance training for nine aircraft systems.

The questionnaire data were analyzed separately for Navy and Marine maintenance instructors (n = 26) and for all the other experts (professors, manufacturers, researchers, administrators) combined (n = 34). Although both groups agreed with each other in most areas, a few differences that may have significant practical applications were uncovered. The data should interest those associated with simulators used for training.

bos jonerrW . & ansol , Molrowki

in Radio of Stimut and guarant of still of the still

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)

#### SUMMARY

The aim of this study was to gather expert opinion on the use of simulators for training technicians at Naval Aviation Maintenance Training Detachments (NAMTRADETs). The information collected was based on the expectation that the Navy will replace real equipment with simulators for training technicians in future years.

The opinions were collected with three successive questionnaires completed by 60 experts representing a variety of job categories— Navy and Marine instructors, simulator manufacturers, university professors, researchers, and administrators. In the second and third questionnaires of the series, each expert was provided with the group's responses to the preceding questionnaire, and allowed to revise his previous opinion, a method of data collection known as the Delphi technique.

The questionnaires asked what information an administrator needed to decide between simulators and real equipment for training at a NAMTRADET. Also included was an estimate of how much effort would be required to obtain the needed information. Subsumed under information requirements were items on course content, economic considerations, life-cycle considerations, repair considerations, physical considerations, and considerations about instructors and students. Additionally, the experts judged the usefulness of various sources of information, both personnel and documents.

Also, on the assumption that an administrator had decided to procure a simulator, the questionnaires asked the experts to judge the importance of addressing various issues and to estimate the frequency with which each such issue had been addressed in the past.

Finally, the experts were asked to rate the feasibility, training effectiveness, and cost effectiveness of simulators for maintenance training for nine aircraft systems, separately for O-level and I-level maintenance.

The questionnaire data were analyzed separately for the Navy and Marine maintenance instructors (n = 26) and for all the other experts combined (n = 34). Although both groups agreed with each other in most areas, a few differences that may have significant practical implications were uncovered. For example, the instructor group disagreed among themselves concerning the feasibility, training effectiveness, and cost effectiveness of simulation for I-level maintenance training while the other experts were often in agreement and generally in favor of simulation for I-level training.

The results of the study should be of use to administrators, training analys, and planners, instructors, simulator manufacturers, and evaluators of maintenance simulators.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Q.

.

1.	INTRODUCTION	
п.	DATA COLLECTION PROCESS	
	a. Delphi Technique	
	b Selection of experts	
	C. Quastionnaire One	
	d Questionnaire Tro	
	a. Questionnaire into	
	e. Questionnaire inree	
111.	FINAL RESULTS	
	ati to second studietors and real solution along the	
	a. Groups	
	b. Consensus	
	c. Data analyses	
	d. Reordering of items	
	e. Reading tables	
	f. Results	
	g. Comments of experts	
IV.	RECOMMENDED USE OF RESULTS	
v.	REFERENCES	
	LIST OF TABLES	
1.0523	Composition of experts participating in Delphi study	
na Len	of simulators in aviation maintenance training	
-	Maintenance.	
4.	illustration of table items and definitions for	
	table symbols	
1.	Information Required for Decision Making	
	Course Content Considerations	
	Economic Considerations	
	Life Cycle Considerations	
	Repair Considerations	
	Physical Considerations	
	Considerations about Instructors and Students	
11.	Sources of Information for Decision Making	
	Personnel	
	Documents	
	Documentes	

III.	Issues to be Addressed in Procuring Simulators	•	27	
IV.	Feasibility, Training Effectiveness, and Cost Effectiveness of Simulators for <u>Organizational</u> - <u>Level</u> Aircraft Maintenance Training at NAMTRADETs.	•	29	
V. '	Feasibility, Training Effectiveness, and Cost Effectiveness of Simulators for <u>Intermediate-Level</u> Aircraft Maintenance Training at NAMTRADETs	•	30	
A-1.	Number of experts returning questionnaires of Delphi study	•	A-1	
A-2.	Number of experts used as a basis for computing percentages for questionnaire tables	•	A-2	
	Questionnaire One Tables		Appendix	c
	Questionnaire Two Tables		Appendix	D
	Questionnaire Three Tables	•	Appendix	E
F-1.	Number of balls randomly assigned to each of five urns assuming equal probability (p = .20) that any of the 20 balls will fall in any urn	•	F-2	
	LIST OF FIGURES			
F-1.	Distributions of interquartile ranges derived from Monte Carlo simulations with five response categories	•	F-4	
	APPENDIXES			
A	Participation of experts in the Delphi study		A-1	
В	Expert participants in Delphi study of simulators in aviation maintenance training	•	B-1	
С	Questionnaire One and the material provided with Questionnaire One	•	C-1	
D	Questionnaire Two and the material provided with Questionnaire Two	•	D-1	
E	Questionnaire Three and the material provided with Questionnaire Three		E-1	
F	Statistical analyses of data	•	F-1	
G	Summary of comments made by experts		G-1	

Page

#### I. INTRODUCTION

In the last few years about 30 simulators for aviation maintenance training have been introduced into Naval Aviation Maintenance Training Detachments (NAMTRADETs). With the expectation that many more simulators will be used at NAMTRADETs in future years, the Weapons Training Division, Code 413, of Logistics/Fleet Support of the Naval Air Systems Command tasked the Naval Air Development Center (NAVAIRDEVCEN), Code 6043, to report on the area of simulators for aviation maintenance training.

Although the literature on simulators in aviation is vast, almost all reports address the functions of air crews, not maintenance personnel. Moreover, the studies on simulators in aviation maintenance training that do exist are mostly descriptions of techniques or concepts still in the research and development stage or descriptions of field evaluations of simulators. Most of what is known, or at least believed, is grounded not on experimental data or theoretical foundations but on experience or best guesses based on a general knowledge of simulation and training.

Since the only extensive source of information is expert opinion, the decision was made to systematically collect and organize such expert opinion. The technique selected to obtain the experts' opinions was the Delphi Technique, a procedure devised by the Rand Corporation about thirty years ago.

The Delphi Technique has been used in a variety of ways to obtain expert opinion on a variety of topics. For examples of the uses of the Delphi Technique, experimental evaluations of the Technique, as well as criticisms of the Technique, see Cooper, 1974; Dodge & Clark, 1977; Helmer, 1966, 1967; Linstone & Turoff, 1975; Quade & Boucher, 1968; Sackman, 1974.

The Delphi Technique, as employed in the present study, will be described in Section II, Data Collection Process.

**II. DATA COLLECTION PROCESS** 

a. Delphi Technique

In the first questionnaire submitted to the experts, the Delphi Technique was described as follows:



The Delphi Technique is a method for obtaining and organizing the independent opinions of experts. The technique is based upon a series of questionnaires. The first questionnaire consists of a few general questions designed to evoke discussion of the selected topic by the experts. In their responses to the first questionnaire, the experts identify the areas of relevance and importance, describe their knowledge, provide examples and experiences to support their opinions, suggest problems, offer solutions. In short, in the first questionnaire the experts try to get at the essence of the topic under consideration. (Typically, the first questionnaire requires the most thought and time by the expert.)

The responses to the first questionnaire are analyzed, organized, and converted into individual items for the second questionnaire. Thus, by this procedure, the experts themselves, not the coordinator, determine the content of the second (and subsequent) questionnaires.

The format of the second questionnaire is like that of a typical questionnaire: the expert is presented with a series of items that he checks to indicate that he agrees or disagrees with a statement, or that an area is important or unimportant, or an approach is feasible or infeasible. In most cases, the response required is not simply a Yes-No, agreedisagree response, but a rating on a scale. For instance, the expert might be asked to check his preference on a 5-point scale varying from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree).

The results of the second questionnaire are summarized by the coordinator and presented to the experts in the third questionnaire for further consideration. The aim of the Delphi Technique is to obtain a consensus of opinion on the topic under consideration.

Sometimes the Delphi Technique is continued through four or five or more questionnaires, with the goal of obtaining a consensus of opinion on every item. Because of a tight time schedule, the present application of the Delphi Technique will be limited to three successive questionnaires. In many ways, the Delphi Technique accomplishes what one may accomplish by a well-run conference addressing a specific topic. The Delphi Technique, however, has certain advantages over a conference:

1. It gives each expert the opportunity to express his opinions without intimidation by other experts or by higher military or civilian authorities.

2. It allows the expert to express his hunches and half-thought-out opinions with impunity since responses are not attributed to any expert by name.

3. It provides the expert with the benefit of opinions from a variety of other experts with different orientations and biases.

4. It gives the expert the chance to leisurely examine the opinions of other experts before reacting.

b. Selection of Experts

To obtain opinions from experts who perceived simulators in different ways, experts with a variety of job categories were selected. Simulator manufacturers, university professors, administrators, researchers, and users of simulators (Navy and Marine aviation maintenance instructors) participated. From an initial pool of about 125 experts, invitations to participate were extended, by telephone or in person, to 62 experts. Sixty experts completed some or all of the three questionnaires (See Appendix A).

The composition of the experts is summarized in Table 1. As Table 1 indicates, there were 26 Navy and Marine aviation maintenance instructors. This group, the users of maintenance simualators, was purposely large in order to allow meaningful comparisons with the other experts. In the text that follows, the 26 instructors will be called the NAMTRADET group and the other 34 experts, collectively, will be termed the NON-NAMTRADET group.

The names and addresses of all participants are listed in Appendix B.

	Institutional affiliation													
work - Category	Navy	Marines	Army	Air Force	Other Govern- ment	Industry	Univer- sity	Total						
Aviation maintenance instructor	23	il ditty en to ang eng S	roinig r Beau	1 326-31 11236 11236	ipporta-il ion ata a	14 0 2		26						
Administrator	10		1	1	1 1 1	4	1	18						
Researcher	3		4	1		5	1	14						
Consultant						2		2						
Total	36	3	5	2	0-00- <b>1</b> 00-1	11	2	60						

# Composition of experts participating in Delphi study

Table 1

of simulators in aviation maintenance training

#### c. Questionnaire One

Appendix C presents Questionnaire One, the material that accompanied the questionnaire, and the cover letter. The description of the Delphi Technique is omitted from Appendix C because it was given above. The material accompanying Questionnaire One oriented the expert to the Delphi Technique, described the training situation at a NAMTRADET, defined operational (real) equipment and simulators, and described maintenance levels in the Navy. The instructions to Questionnaire One pointed out that the study:

- (1) is limited to maintenance training at NAMTRADETS,
- (2) includes both O-level and I-level (but not depot level) maintenance training, and
- (3) is limited to simulator systems that cost no more than \$200,000.

Part of Questionnaire One consisted of four essay questions. Here is one of the four questions:

#### (1) General Comparisons.

If you were serving as an advisor to Naval administrators and were asked to list the advantages and disadvantages of simulators and the advantages and disadvantages of operational equipment for aviation maintenance training, how would you respond?

Another part of Questionnaire One, namely, Question V, required the expert to rate, on 5-point scales, the feasibility, training effectiveness, and cost effectiveness of simulation for nine aircraft systems (e.g., propulsion, electrical and instrument), separately for O-level and I-level maintenance. Question V was included because at least two Navy agencies had issued recommendations for simulating (or not simulating) aircraft systems for use in training, without documentation for their recommendations. Responses to Question V should provide a firmer basis for such recommendations.

The development of Questionnaire One, as well as subsequent questionnaires, was aided by inputs from members of NAVAIRDEVCEN, Code 604, and from aviation maintenance technicians assigned to NAS Willow Grove, Pennsylvania.

d. Questionnaire Two

Appendix D presents Questionnaire Two along with the cover letter. The sections on the Delphi Technique (given above) and on the background material (given in Appendix C) are omitted from Appendix D, although they were included with the material sent to the experts.

The development of Questionnaire Two was based on the responses to Questionnaire One, along with some additional material generated by the authors. Section I of Questionnaire Two assumed that an administrator faced the problem of deciding between a simulator and operational equipment to be used in a course at a NAMTRADET. In Section I the expert was asked to judge the utility of given information, and to judge the difficulty of obtaining such information. Section I also asked the expert to evaluate possible sources of information, both personnel and documents.

Section II of Questionnaire Two assumed that the administrator had decided to use a simulator, and asked the expert (a) to evaluate the issues to be considered to implement the simulator decision, and (b) to estimate how frequently these issues had been addressed in the past. The second part of the development of Questionnaire Two consisted of summarizing the responses to Question V of Questionnaire One, namely, the material on feasibility, training effectiveness and cost effectiveness of simulators for O-level and I-level maintenance training. The procedure was to tally the number of experts selecting each of the five alternatives for each aircraft system for each category (e.g., feasibility), convert into percentages, and round each percentage to the nearest whole number. (See Appendix A for details on the number of questionnaires completed.)

The group's percentages were inserted in the tables which were then resubmitted to the experts as Section III of Questionnaire Two. For each item, each expert's own selection was circled in red to remind him of his previous selection (on Questionnaire One) while he examined the group's percentages to the same item. The expert was allowed to retain his previous selection or change to another alternative.

e. Questionnaire Three

Appendix E presents Questionnaire Three, along with its cover letter and a personnel data sheet.

The development of Questionnaire Three consisted of merely summarizing the results of Questionnaire Two and converting to percentages. (See Appendix A on the details of the number of experts contributing to the percentage calculations.)

A few new items, suggested by the experts when completing Questionnaire Two, were included in Questionnaire Three.

The tables on feasibility, cost effectivenesss, and training effectiveness, for O-level and I-level maintenance, initially presented in Questionnaire One and resubmitted in Questionnaire Two, were omitted from Questionnaire Three.

## III. FINAL RESULTS

This section presents the tables of Questionnaire Three and the tables on simulators for O-level and I-level maintenance training from Questionnaire Two.

a. Groups

'Although the questionnaires were presented to the experts as if the experts comprised a single group, in the analysis given here, the total group was subdivided into two sub-groups: the NAMTRADET group, which consisted of the Navy and Marine maintenance instructors, and the NON-NAMTRADET group, which included all others. The NAMTRADET group consisted of 26 experts; the NON-NAMTRADET group consisted of 34 experts. For each group the data were analyzed and summarized separately, and then the two groups were compared.

b. Consensus

One aim of the Delphi Technique is to determine the items on which the experts are in agreement, i.e., the items on which there is a consensus of opinion. In Appendix F, the problem of defining consensus is discussed and a mathematical index of consensus is derived: if the interquartile range, namely,  $P_{75} - P_{25}$ , of a distribution of judgements to an item is less than 1.30, consensus exists; if the interquartile range is equal to or greater than 1.30, no consensus exists.

c. Data analyses

For each item of the tables, the 25th, 50th (the median), and 75th percentiles of the distribution of judgements were computed. Also, the interquartile range, namely,  $P_{75} - P_{25}$ , was computed to determine if a consensus of opinion existed.

For each item, the distribution of judgements of the NAMTRADET group was compared with the distribution of judgements of the NON-NAMTRADET group by the two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnoff test (See Appendix F).

d. Reordering of items

For each section of each table to be presented, the items were listed according to two criteria. First, the items on which a consensus of opinion existed for either group were listed first. Second, within the list of consensus items, the order followed according to the value of the median  $(P_{50})$ --the lower the median, the earlier in the listing. When two or more categories of responses existed for an item (e.g., the categories "Need for information" and "Effort required to obtain information"), the ordering was based on the first category listed for the item. [The non-consensus items followed the consensus items, according to the value of the median.] The principal purpose of reordering the items was to present, in a simple fashion, items on which the experts agreed, listed according to the importance attributed to the item.

e. Reading tables

Table 2 is an aid to reading Tables I, II, III, IV, and V that follow. The format and symbols illustrated in Table 2 were derived to summarize the results of the study without getting bogged down in numerical trivia.

Consensus, as discussed earlier (See Appendix F), is defined as a distribution of judgments that yields an interquartile range less than 1.30; that is, consensus exists when  $(P_{75} - P_{25}) < 1.30$ . In Table 2, an arrow represents consensus. A dashed arrow represents consensus for the NAMTRADET group; a solid arrow represents consensus for the NON-NAMTRADET group.

The scale on top of Table 2 represents the five alternatives, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and the vertical line on each side of a scale number represents the lower and upper limits of that number; thus the vertical line to the left of 1 represents the value 0.50 and the vertical line to the right of 1 represents 1.499. Similarly, the vertical line to the left of 2 designates 1.50 (or 1.499) and the vertical line to the right of 2 designates 2.499; etc..

An arrow points to the median (P<sub>50</sub>) of the distribution of responses, referred to the scale just discussed. Thus, in item 20, for the Effort category, for the NON-NAMTRADET group the arrow designates  $P_{50} = 2.3$ , which falls in the alternative Slight Effort. For the same item and category, the arrow for the NAMTRADET group indicated  $P_{50} = 1.4$ , which falls in the alternative Little Effort.

When both the NAMTRADET group and the NON-NAMTRADET group demonstrated consensus, and their medians differed by 0.25 or less, the data for both groups were represented by a single double-headed arrow, as in item 1 of Table 2.

Nonconsensus in Table 2 is represented by a horizontal line and a dot. The line and dot refer to the scale discussed above. The left end of the horizontal line designates  $P_{25}$ , the right end designates  $P_{75}$ , and the dot designates  $P_{50}$ . A dashed line represents the NAMTRADET group; a solid line represents the NON-NAMTRADET group. In item 1 of Table 2, the dashed horizontal line indicates non-consensus for the NAMTRADET group, with distribution values of  $P_{25} = 1.5$ ,  $P_{50} = 2.3$ , and  $P_{75} = 3.1$ . Some items in Tables I - V referred both to simulators and to operational (real) equipment. In such cases, instead of repeating the item, the item was presented once but the expert made two judgments, one considering the item as referring to a simulator (S) and the other considering the item as referring to operational equipment (0). Item 20 of Table 2 illustrates such an item.

An asterisk (\*) in a box indicates that the NAMTRADET and the NON-NAMTRADET distributions differed significantly (.05 level, two tailed, two-sample, Kolmogorov-Smirnoff test). The Effort category of item 20 indicates such a significant difference between the distributions of the two groups.

#### f. Results

The final results of the Delphi study are presented in Tables I through V.

A few general remarks may be made about the tables. Table I, concerning the information needed to decide between simulators and operational equipment, indicates that, on about 80% of the items, both the NAMTRADET group and the NON-NAMTRADET group indicate a consensus of opinion, the opinion being that the need for information is crucial or extremely useful. Both groups also agree, in general, that a moderate effort would be required to obtain such information.

Table II indicates a reasonable agreement for both groups on what sources, both personnel and documents, should be consulted to acquire the needed information.

As noted earlier, many of the individual items in Table III are items that summarize several items of Table I. For example, "Verify that course objectives are met with the simulation system" summarizes a number of items in the Course Content section of Table I. In Table III all experts agree that the need to address most issues was crucial or extremely useful. There was, however, generally no agreement, for either group, on the past performance in addressing an issue.

Table IV, concerning organizational-level maintenance training, indicates that both the NAMTRADET and the NON-NAMTRADET groups concur in the opinion that simulators are more cost effective than operational equipment. With regard to the feasibility of simulation for different aircraft systems, however, the NON-NAMTRADET experts agree, among themselves, that simulation is definitely feasible for all systems except propulsion while the NAMTRADET members agree, among themselves,

 Table 2

 Illustration of table items and definitions for table symbols

	193	( - I	1 int	leed fo	on	ž emio		Effort obtain	requir inform	red to nation	
ate but the expect finte the referring to a simulator referring to operational satistes such an item. ates that the NAMEANET and ed significantly (.05 level that test). The Sitort	o be as a as a lli shu tetta s	CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EXTREME EFFORT
Item of information	- 59	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1. THE TRAINING OBJECTIVES OF THE COURSE		1				J Luza		2	1		
6. LISTS OF FAULTS THAT CAN	s	1	<b>N</b>		N da	e hroe	1 89	Tabl	*		
INTO THE DEVICE	0	1	<b>+</b>	iauai 1.,de	oʻini azgli	edi ; pe le	atana Iti ya	opero.	*		
20. A DESCRIPTION OF THE PHYS- ICAL ENVIRONMENT ON THE JOB (e.g., HEAT, NOISE)	sda oe La	tadi aquu	agied Adied Agied	ŧ	gerad Lgo e Lules Lules	1	1		×	k	
22. THE PHYSICAL FIDELITY (e.g., SIZE, WEIGHT) REQUIRED TO MEET THE COURSE OBJEC- TIVES	fdiin must	oesan h I <del>ng</del>			61 31 1990	elde , des	5 51158	+			
SYMBOL	.1	NTER	PRETA	TION	torig e	and	e.0833	028			
	N-NAM	DET GF	ROUP, C ET GRC CONSEI	ONSEN DUP, CO NSUS	ISUS	US		ARROW MEDIAI 1, 2, 3, 4	POINT NONS 4,5 ON	TS TO CALE TOP	
P25 P50(MEDIAN) P75	ATRA	DET GF	ROUP, N	IONCO	NSENSI	JS	)	P <sub>25</sub> , P <sub>5</sub>	0, <sup>P</sup> 75 I	REFERI	RED
S SIM	N-NAM	TRAD	ET GRO	UP, NO	NCONS	ENSUS	• )	TO SCA	LEON	TOP	
0 OPE	RATIO	ONAL B		ENT							
* STA	TISTIC	CALLY	SIGNI	ICANT	DIFFE	RENCE	BETW	EEN TH	E TWO	GROU	PS

that simulation is feasible for only four systems. For training, the NON-NAMTRADET group agree that simulation is more effective for most aircraft systems while the NAMTRADET experts fail to agree with each other on the training effectiveness for any system.

Table V, addressing intermediate-level maintenance, shows the greatest differences between the NAMTRADET and NON-NAMTRADET groups; in 15 of the 27 comparisons in this table, the two groups differed at a statistically significant level. Within the NAMTRADET group, a lack of consensus occurred on all but five occasions, and these five instances of consensus were votes against simulation. The NON-NAMTRADET experts agreed among themselves on 12 of the 27 occurrences, and all 12 agreements were in favor of simulation. In general, the NAMTRADET instructors hold a rather dim view of simulation for intermediate-level maintenance training while the NON-NAMTRADET experts feel, at least for some systems, that simulation is both feasible and cost effective.

g. Comments of experts

The experts were encouraged to provide comments when completing the questionnaires. Such comments, roughly classified in categories, are reproduced in Appendix G.

### IV. RECOMMENDED USE OF RESULTS

The findings summarized in Tables I - V can serve as a checklist for a variety of personnel associated with simulators for aviation maintenance training. The administrator can employ the data tables to decide whether to buy a simulator or operational equipment, and the areas he should consider if he decides to buy a simulator. Others concerned with task analyses, learning objectives, design, manufacture, support and updating, and other areas can consult the tables as a starting point for their work assignments. The data of Tables I - V should be of use to administrators, training analysts and planners, Navy and Marine instructors, manufacturers, and evaluators of maintenance simulators.

Table V indicates that the NAMTRADET instructors disagree among themselves on the feasibility, training effectiveness, and cost effectiveness of simulators for I-level maintenance training. This disagreement may result from a lack of experience, since most maintenance simulators in the fleet are O-level, not I-level simulators. When the NAMTRADET instructors do agree with each other, they have a negative attitude toward I-level maintenance simulators. This finding suggests problems of user acceptance will probably develop when I-level maintenance simulators are introduced into the fleet in quantity. Steps to facilitate user acceptance should be instituted now.

Table I. I	nformation	<b>Required</b> for	<b>Decision Making</b>	1
------------	------------	---------------------	------------------------	---

	four systems. For frainin mulation is nore affective ADET experts fail to agree ess for any system.		for a site the site of field	N inf	eed Fo	or ion	lasi ATMA 13a71 50 13	(単語) (日本) (日本) (日本) (日本) (日本) (日本) (日本) (日本	Effort obtain	requin inform	red to matior	
ine in Ballar in 27 27 27 27 20 27 20 27 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	<ul> <li>ace-level enturphance, and wentshelf and tos-hanffahls in this table, the two groups at level. Withip the two groups a weiss against simulation is themselves on 12 of the noid a reter dim view of noid a reter dim view of the.</li> </ul>	iber bot bot bot bot bot bot bot bot bot bot	CRUCIALthe information must be obtained	EXTREMELY USEFULthe information should be obtained	USEFULthe information probably should be obtained	OPTIONALthe information might be obtained	TRIVIALthe information need not be obtained	requires LITTLE EFFORT to obtain information	requires SLIGHT EFFORT to obtain information	requires MODERATE EFFORT to obtain information	requires MAJOR EFFORT to obtain information	requires EXTREME EFFORT to obtain information
.100	Item of information	1 32	1.1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
667 200 30 65	1. THE TRAINING OBJECTIVES OF THE COURSE		1				10000 , 210 8 4 8	o an Dosti a co	•	-1		
stş valus-	2. THE ABILITY OF THE DEVICE	s	1	1	-96 B 560 172 5	i Borie (Vali oduna	*	as 1 plan i of	Lab.) Setti 4071	1		
gaola	ATING CONDITIONS	0	1	986) 2114			1 V 1	Tabl Sectw		1		
lais ∼nla tors.	3. A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF EACH TASK THE STUDENT MUST PERFORM	na dos dos dese	1	aucus ictà igai	) ni ( ) ni (	0 10 7 TAO 8 TAO	e e nam Priorite Lunal e	ែសស ស្ត្រ៩៩៥ ស្តេសខ្មែរ		_•	• 1	*
atbara val-I	4. THE REQUIREMENT FOR "HANDS-ON" EXPERIENCE	1 45 11 20 11 20	1	-1 5 -1 5		abas tens	123A	64111 64111 8282	sgah Sgah	#		
	5. LIST OF MALFUNCTIONS (FAULTS) THAT THE MAINTEN- ANCE MAN MUST RECOGNIZE AND CORRECT ON THE JOB	BING	1	ane Beggi	e 1000 1000	tə qu	02943	iioe i	0.02	*		

## COURSE CONTENT CONSIDERATIONS

## COURSE CONTENT CONSIDERATIONS

						in and	- 1		inf	ormati	or ion			obtain	inform	nation	
EXTREME FRORT				THAN'S THAN			EXCREMENTA OREANT	CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EXTREME EFFORT
а			s I	tem of inf	ormatio	on	12	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
		ſ	6. LISTS	OF FAULT	S THAT	CAN	s	1			त्व के स्ट 	revizieri 91.6. usid 116. Bilge		178 178 23.1	+		
		1	INTO T	HE DEVICE	E INSER		0	1	1	40.0	4 0 2 1 4 8 0 2 1 5 8 1	10 (ABT 1 (ABT 1 (ABT 1 (ABT)	an usa an usa	IGA IUD	1	1	
:		1	7. THE CR EVALU PERFO TASK	RITERIA USE DATE THE ST RMANCE FO	D TO UDENT'S	5		+-	<b>.</b>	MRO"	0.000 1989 0	112 () T. T.A.S	STUD STUD H TASA	1	1		*
			8. THE TO AND D ABLE	OOLS, TEST OCUMENTA TO THE STU BAINING A	EQUIPME TION AV UDENT D	ENT, AIL- DUR- TING		\$		ADT	OWHO	/483 /	NESS IN ITES IN NEURO	\$	_		
			9. THE TO AND D ABLE T FORM	OOLS, TEST OCUMENTA TO THE STUI EACH TASK	EQUIPMI TION AV DENT TO ON THE	ENT, AIL- PER- JOB		1		40181	903803 803	190 TA 197 (M	NIDED VIDED	-1	<b>•</b> -		
			10. THE C. VICE	APABILITY	OF THE	DE-	s	+	1		2017-3 40-374 (\$21	0 3442-13 04-7-40	HACAS HAS PLAS	5 7.05 8.5 855	\$		
		1	SAFET	Y PROCEDUI	RES		0	1	1			*	DBON NBLINT NAR BJI		*		
		Γ	11.ANALY URES WEAPO	SIS OF FRE	QUENT F	AIL- THE		+	1	01 0 330	to an	a leta auco	онам () 9нт т 93	1578 1514			
		T	12. THE A TO THI PERFOR	MOUNT OF E STUDENT RMANCE	FEEDBA	ACK		1	+	0383	00200 00000 143	413 Y			-1-		
	13. THE AMO TO THE STUDENT			MOUNT OF FEEDBACK E INSTRUCTOR ABOUT NT PERFORMANCE					\$	.03.04	an ins	404	oran Shine	M THE	\$		
			14. THE AVAILABILITY OF OTHER COURSES WHICH MIGHT MEET THE OBJECTIVES OF THE PLANNED COURSE														

## COURSE CONTENT CONSIDERATIONS

	ed to	niups htoto	ffort r otain i	a o				Na Inio		in	Veed f forma	or tion	1		Effor obtain	n info	mation	n T
EXTREME EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	NODERVIE STROMI		THORE EFFORT	f info	JAMOITO	UBEFUL		CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EXTREME EFFORT
				rtein o		mau		c	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
		Å	15. TH ST LE	RUCTION	IBILITY	OF IN OS (e.g. OVIES)	v.			1				-		*1-		-
	19 99049 		16. TH Al	E AMOU	INT AN	ND TY	PE OF	Ą		+	Cat	19210	Sal Ye	NMAD D BNT	ONA OTAL	\$		
			17.TH TH EA	E TIME	IT SH	OULD O PER	TAKE	). 		1	1	THE NOR	0320 A 012 34 803 30	13740 13740 13740	13847 1400 3 149(3)	*1		
		T	18.TH RC LE	E NEED OUTES (i.e	FOR A	LTERN	G) FOR				1	(111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (11) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (111) (	a tada 17.0 Tura 19.11 a la	20000 20000 2000	741E 2847 495 E	1	•	
			19. TH PF		NT OF S	SUPER E JOB	VISION				**		1914 (19 2) 1221 (14753 80012	A LOCAL		-		
			20.A IC JC	DESCRIP	TION O	OF THE	E PHYS	1		8	1	397.3	o ynu	HEAR STA	• 1	77		*
		ſ	21.TH ML SIM	E NEED	TO DE AULTS	MONS FOR	TRATE		-		-		HE HE	289 YT	SAPE	**		
		1-	22. TH SI M TI	TE PHYSIA ZE, WEIG EET THE VES	CAL FI	IDELIT EQUIR RSE C	ED TO	1			3.17	ч тизч 80. 8	ADEAS ALASSIS	0 618 V 0 618 V 0 61 8	1			
			23. TH FF M	ALE NEED	TO I		DE IN-	ķ				enerati Teloa	4 40 1 4 1090 30	400M 078-34 023380	1748 70.09 70.09	\$		
	24.T			24. THE NEED FOR SELF-PACED									TREAMS ON ST					
									1.9131	10.50	VIII.	e fi a y	ENAT.	471		1		

# ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

			i nottā i rostdo	Need for Information			ir	Need forma	for tion			Effor obtair	t requi	red to matior	1 
EXTREME SPECIAL						CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EXTREME EFFORT
		8	Item of ir	nformation	1	1	2	3	4	5	ms <b>1</b>	2	3	4	5
					s	1						-	- 1		
		1	25. THE COST TO	D BUY EACH DEVICE	0	*	0	<del></del>	04'3'90	a criste	ALWTE ALWTE EVACE	1			
		4	26. THE FUNDS THE PROJECT	AVAILABLE FOR		*	8	106.9	14040			1-1	<b>-</b>		
					s	\$	0	0000	es cive larare (	23 00 1924 1924	30113 39-17 V		-1-		
			27. THE COST F FOR EACH DI	OR SPARE PARTS EVICE	0	1	2					- 4	-+		
		T	28. THE COST TO	MODIFY	s	4		wa th	0426474 8,012.80	S OT TI MOAE	46 00 15740	т. <u>сс</u> я	1		
			USE DEVICE		0	1							1		
		410	29. THE COST AN STRUCTORS	ND NUMBER OF IN- AND SUPPORT	s	1		1800 c 91739	1274-38 19249	ANRO R STATE	83/30 10 0	etas: F	1		
			PERSONNEL DEVICE	WITH EACH	0	#							1		
		Γ	30. THE COST	TO REPAIR EACH	s	1									
			30.THE COST TO REPAIR EACH DEVICE IF IT MALFUNCTIONS			\$						-			
		F												1	

# ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

-	or be noite			8 6 1		noi T	Need fr informat			ir	Need forma	for ation			Effort obtain	requir inform	red to mation	<u> </u>
LINDERFORT	WVIOH ELLOUS	MODERATE EFFORT	STICHLEELOML					EXILEMENT INSERT	CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EXTREME EFFORT
		2	2	Item	of inf	ormati	ion		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
		1	31		ST EOE			s	1							\$		
			1	DEVICE	NANCE	OF EAC	H	0	\$	5					<del></del>	*		
			32.		OST TO	UPDAT	E EACH	s	\$	Ĥ	07. <i>a.jt</i>	AILAN	A 201 103	(3 PU 09(3 B)	7 85 71	-1	L	-
		-**	- 1	DEVICE	AS CH WEAPON	ANGES	MS	0	*	8						-1	•	
		1	E					s	+		<u>. ne s</u>	2014.50 317	1730 H	2A3 R0	1			
		11	33. 1 I	NSTAL	ST TO T	RANSPO	ORT AND	0	4	4	_	YRIGO	N 07 3	100 31	#			
		1					Actor	s	-		_		901	230 32	1	+		
		*	34.1	POWER	AND R	EACH	D COSTS DEVICE	0	4		1 10 A	uraum	CIMA 7.	CID 3M	T. est	1		*
		t						-				JAC -	142.230	EDLER REDER RDIV R				
										H.B.	/43 RI 01100	aqər Qəan	CT 18 TI 31	801V4 05 8H 201V9	T_06			

# LIFE CYCLE CONSIDERATIONS

•					у (0)5		la Arsj		f int	Need format	or ion			Effo	ort req in info	uired ormati	to on
ENTROIS STREAM		ZFICHL ELBORT	tem of	finforr	nation	Unser.	EXTREMENT DEELDE	CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EXTREME EFFORT
			1.		<u> </u>	6. 		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	1	5. THE	LENG	TH OF	TIME RE, DE-	RE	S	1		JATOR TERM	P 403	etuz; Phi ci	13191080 (A 8,15	44.9 D	ŧ		
		DEVI	ICE	DINSTAI	LL THE		0	\$	0		orved	16,25,3	NAMER /	Q47	11		
	3	6. THE MAT	AVAIL	ABILITY		FOR-	1	*	2	21000	22.80	। बगतह	aajos	45.84	*1		
		37. THE TRA REQ WEA	TIME A IN THE UIRED PON SY	VAILAE PERSON TO SU	BLE TO	тне		*	0		3,000				\$		
		38. FOR THE FLEE	A NEW DELIT	W WEAP	ON SYS DATES 'ION	TEM, FOR		<b>†</b>	e	A A A A A	154.92 -		134.J14 134.J14	1	1		*
	e. 	39. THE WEA	EXPE	CTED L	IFE OF	THE		1					SIA!	an i	+-	-	
	-	O. THE ANCE TO SYST	NUME E PERS SUPPO	SONNEL	MAIN REQUI	TEN- IRED		4	12	er 10.90 10.90	recióa a situe	11 + 6 1	at ASH	183.54 198	1		
	4	1. THE QUEN MOD WEAF	ANTICI NCY AN IFICAT PON SY	PATED	FRE- PLEXITY THE	r of		4								1	
	1	2.POLI	TICAL	PREFER	ENCES	FOR	s				11010	A-9 -46 0.5 A-40	म्ह्रान महार महार	12.3.84 104	1		
	di.	DIFF	ERENT	DEVICE	S		0		0-			-	301		\$		
	4	3. THE TIES NEXT	ANTIC OF SIM	ULATO	CAPAI	BILI- HE	1	-								-	
									1	1				1			

## **REPAIR CONSIDERATIONS**

	r baut disteri	nistan Ani a	Effo obtei			0		N inf	leed fo ormati	or ion		Effort required to obtain information					
EVOLUEVAE ERFORT		MODERATE FFORT	BFIGHL ELEOH1	LEINIVE		EXLISENELA REFAIL	CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EXTREME EFFORT	
		F	Item of	informatic	n	-	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
		1	44. REQUIREN	MENTS FOR	SPECIAL	s		1	- 343	9 2007 200	10 A1	D4(EL) OT DB	SHT 2	1			
	44.REQUIR TOOLS TO REPA			R EACH DEV	/ICE	0	1	1		314 3 1	AT2N1	10, 4140 310 910	1960 1730	1			
		1	45. REQUIREN	s	*		1907) 81.09	er 90 y V90 g	0101 0101	nav. R. Bo	-3147.a (1,237	1					
	1		LY TRAIN PAIR EACH	NED PEOPLI H DEVICE	0	*	1	314	US TO INFL PPORT		174417 SH1 M 075 R31		1				
			46. AVAILABI	LITY OF SP	ARE	s	1	-	1697 1907	ave vo	2003 20072-0 1 - V 2007 1 - V 2007	Cian Li Lui 20 Lui 20	R01-0 301-0				
		-11	PARTS IF REPAIR	DEVICE	REQUIRES	0	1	-	3147	40 ST	J OST MITE		3947 .81 3947 .81	±			
			47.ESTIMATE	JENCY OF	s	1	1	1898 1842 1842 1842 1845	20 A M O C 3 R G 3 M 3	10 83 044470 11 11	NUMAN PERI STOPPOS	aret o areta o.t	4	<u> </u>			
			REPAIR	0	4	1	Y OF	100 Tax 34 Tax	NOTAN NOTAN NO LING			1					
		alad	48.EXTENT	s	1	8						-+-					
		1	PORT REQUIRED TO REPAIR DEVICE					0		, B	Gen Sta	tude:	19410	*			
		E															

MOTARBOIGNOD BUDYO BRU

# REPAIR CONSIDERATIONS

						n Ini	•	in	Need	for ition			Effor obtain	rt requ n info	ired to rmatic	o n
				THANK		. XUNEWER A REENT	CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EXTREME EFFORT
	-	49.ESTIMATES OF AVERAGE TIME				5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
						s	1	1	Dien Tau	594 Q	un ner	H3E 3	947 .52 171	1		
	1	TO R	EPAIR	EACH D	EVICE	0	1	1			AL WIN ISLAND	RAN 3 233403	99W 11 21	1		
	5	0. THE	ACCES	SIBILIT	Y OF COM-	s	1 -	-		1975	IC 850	ikan s		1		
		QUIR	ING RE	PAIR	E RE-	0	1 -		†		10 7 212	NA SHA	;	1		
		51.THE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE			s	1_			/विद्यालय व विभाग	1 RO 83	enion a Many	58. THI	\$			
		STUDENTS MAY DAMAGE THE DEVICE				0								1		
		52.REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIAL DOCUMENTATION TO REPAIR EACH DEVICE			s		•	<u></u>		TI JIBA	iua a vice u	нт ж жо	-2	_		
					0	-						120	*			
	1									1					1	

HIS THE SLUCTHIGAS ON DITAL

# PHYSICAL CONSIDERATIONS

	uipert tolot	tors . Effor nion obtein		1		in	Need f forma	or tion			Effor	t requi	ired to mation	<b>,</b>
	WODEBY LE ELEORI	SHERT EREORIE FLUTE EREORIE BRAIVE T		EXIMER'S OZEANT	CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EXTREME EFFORT
		Item of information	8	5	1	2	3	4	5	101	2	3	4	5
		53. THE SCHEDULING FLE	XIBIL-	s	1	ie l						\$		
	4	WILL HAPPEN IF THE DI IS INOPERATIVE?)	EVICE	0	+	toi		ADIA ADIA	G HOA	na na 1 Ritan	19.01	<b>†</b>		
	-dese	54.THE NUMBER OF STUE	DENTS	s	1			0 44		23004	\$			
		AT THE SAME TIME	EVICE	0	1				Hie	13 A. DU	1			
	1	55. THE NUMBER OF STUDEN BE TRAINED WITH THE D	ITS TO EVICE	s	1		्यभर	TAHT	GODH	() and 12				
	1	IN ONE YEAR	YEAR							8				
		56. THE DURABILITY OF DEVICE UNDER FREQUES	EACH	s	1	1	JAC		C79 874	(14三日)	. NEDU		-	
	4	56. THE DURABILITY OF EACH DEVICE UNDER FREQUENT USE 57. THE ELECTRICAL OR OTHER POWER REQUIREMENTS FOR		0	1	10	Na A.		Concept 1	DEVIC	NDAL	1		
				R S A										
		POWER REQUIREMENTS EACH DEVICE	FOR	0		*				-1	r•	-		

#

## PHYSICAL CONSIDERATIONS

1 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4			d'		N inf	leed fo	or ion		1.12	Effor obtain	t requi	red to matior	, 
			ALBENETA NOEMOT	CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EXTREME EFFORT
	Item	of information		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
	58.THE CL	ASS TIME THAT MIGHT	s	- 1	1						+1		*
	BE SAVE	ED WITH EACH DEVICE	0	14 14	1	YRULA	ZRUA	0 128 19200	2 111	94 01	1	1	*
	59.THE P	ERCENTAGE OF THE	s	8	- •			antu		^			
	BE USE		0		1-	67 (83 	8003	≉ 3 <u>80</u> 01V30	1043		<u> </u>		
	60. THE DIN	MENSIONS AND WEIGHT	s			-		ADITIO ADITIO ADITION	-1	2	-		
	A.	i franciska i stan	0			aŭerte Stano	00, 201 027, 30	90 06 2010 2010 2010	• +	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	$\mathcal{C}$
	61.THE DUI COURSE	RATION OF THE		-	•	<b>.</b> —	ITE an	210.01	- 1	L			
	62. THE PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED S					*	_						
	EACH DE	VICE	0			1	145 .14 1417 143	нонт ай топ тай		+			
	63. THE NUM		RE S					4					
	EACH D	EVICE WILL BE USED	0			-		Price	a 240 2	*			
	And the second se				-	1	1			-	1		

# CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT INSTRUCTORS AND STUDENTS

	at bei naiten	notal Notal				a ne	lised for formatik	ai		int	Need format	or ion			Effor	t requi	red to matior	1
L'ATTRASE EVENAN	TROTAL BOLMS	THORE EFFORT	21 L H1 ENCLUI	LITTLE ELEORIT	TRIVIAL		COT MARK	EXTREMECT REENED	CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EXTREME EFFORT
				Item	of info	ormat	ion	S.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
			64. TH	IE LIK	ELIHOO	о тн	AT THE	s	1-	• •	HDIM	7.A+17_	mar a	8. ID 3	58.TH	1		
		10	TC	EVICE D THE S	MAY C	T	INJURY	0	t	0.						1		
		-	65. THE AMOUNT OF TRAINING OF INSTRUCTORS REQUIRED TO								947 a		au 204	34 9) 2 920				
			U	USE EACH DEVICE					د.				-	0520		•		
			66.THE EXTENT OF INSTRUC- TOR'S EXPERIENCE WORKING WITH MAINTENANCE OF THE SYSTEM					alere (		1	1	una s	NIGIQIA NIGIQIA					
			67. TH TC TH	R'S EXTE	ENT OF PERIEN RSE	THE IN	ACHING				•				*	_		
			68. TH Al	HE ATTI	ITUDES ACH DE	OF ST	UDENTS	s	*		£	SHT 10	10177	មិល្លប នា ១៩៣-ល		-1-		
			- ]?-	-		3	11	0			<u>.</u>	10884	anto de	1934 - 2 1945 - 1945	47 <u>5</u> 2			
·:			69. THE EDUCATIONAL BACK- GROUND OF POTENTIAL STUDENTS											13 G HO	-1			
		70. THE ATTITUDES OF INSTRUC				S	ی در میں			23712 15. J.M	1.0 X94 9019	ukun a an nés	VT.88 4-1	• 1-	•			
	70.THE ATT TORS AN			BOUT	EACH	DEVICE	0								* -			
	70. THE ATTITUE TORS ABOUT					1	1		-			-			-			







Table II. Sources of Information for Decision Making

PERSONNEL

	s besi Nyano	1) 3									N C	leed to onsult		
PUMECERSVEA						110	necessar			MANDATORY	PROBABLY VERY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	UNNECESSARY
	L 9			Sou						1	2	3	4	5
		8. NA	VY MANA	AGEMENT	2009-270 200-270	11.41.130 G	HUCAR KO			5.487V	* -7			
		9. INS	TRUCTO	RS TEACHIN	NG SIMILI	IAR COURS	SES			SQUE SQUE SQUE	*	•		
		10.NA	VY SUPPL	Y SPECIALI	ISTS			90 . N 93. M	Netes		1	1		
		11.NA	VY PROCI	UREMENT S	PECIALIS	STS	er et ane	O OT YAA		A SHOT	A.9	+		*
		12.STL	DENTS O	F THE COU	RSE	is follown	01780931 		ENDONE	2373CI	22.495	-+		
		13.NA	VY SCHOO		STRATOR	IS	HENCY AN	1399 1993 1993 	O EDAON	-				
		14.NA	VY SAFET	TY SPECIAL	ISTS	QUA EDIA			196 3A	80, 714 131714				
	1	15.AIR	CRAFT	ANUFACTU	RER		11 UMA 30 (3)	2012 (2012) 2014 - 1003 2014 - 1003	non ann	and and a				
	 	16.GR	ADUATES	OF THE CO	OURSE									
		17.MA	NUFACTU	JRERS OF A	IRCRAFT	COMPONE	ENTS							
								- Avi						

DOCUMENTS

					Need to consul	o t	
		Source of information	MANDATORY	PROBABLY VERY USEFUL	NSEFUL	OPTIONAL	UNNECESSARY
	C 4 S	Source of information	1	2	3		5
	18.MAINTENA	NCE MANUALS FOR THE WEAPON SYSTEM	1				
	19. MAINTENA CONCEPT TENANCE AND EQUIP	NCE PLAN(i.e., WRITTEN RECORD OF MAINTENANCE FOR SYSTEM AND EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING MAIN- TASKS, LEVEL OF REPAIR ANALYSIS, AND SUPPORT MENT)	1	2941		<u>.</u>	
	20.PERSONNE AND TRAIN	L AND TRAINING PLAN (i.e., WRITTEN RECORD OF PERSONNEL NING REQUIRED TO OPERATE AND SUPPORT THE EQUIPMENT)	<b>†</b> •	<b>_</b>			
	21.TECHNICA MATION A	L DATA PLAN (i.e., WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF ALL INFOR- IDS NECESSARY TO OPERATE AND SUPPORT THE EQUIPMENT)	1				
	22. RESEARCH	AND EVALUATION REPORTS ON MAINTENANCE SIMULATORS	*				
	23. FLIGHT M	ANUALS OF THE WEAPON SYSTEM	* 4				
	24. FACILITIE BOARD, SH FACILITIE	S REQUIREMENTS PLAN (i.e., WRITTEN RECORD OF SHIP- IORE, OPERATIONAL, MAINTENANCE AND TRAINING S)		1			
	25.TRANSPOF PACKAGIN REQUIREN	TATION AND HANDLING PLAN(i.e., WRITTEN REPORT OF IG, HANDLING, STORAGE, AND TRANSPORTATION MENTS FOR EQUIPMENT)	7343	1	1		*
	26. RELEVAN		- 4				
	a Barrense		1		1		



	-								Need	to ad an issu	dress e			Past paddres	erform ssing a	n issue	in e
								ddressed	ssue should be addressed	should be addressed	e addressed	be addressed	been addressed in the past	addressed in the past	en addressed in the past	en addressed in the past	en addressed in the past
								t be a	-the is	ably	ght b	not	has t	been	as be	las be	as be
								e mus	FUL-	prob	ine mi	need	VAYS	Y has	ЧЛТ	ורא	FR h
								the issu	Y USEI	the issue	the iss	the issue	ST ALV	UENTL	SIONAL	GUENT	ST NEV
								CRUCIAL-	XTREMEL	SEFUL	OPTIONAL		ssue ALMO	ssue FREQ	ssue OCCA	ssue INFRE	OM IN MO
			Issu	e to b	e addr	essed			2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	-
		1. VE JEC SIA	RIFY	THAT ARE M	COURS ET WIT	E OB-		1		Shirin .	The second	163-50 1762-50	<1001 17191 1				-
		2. INS TO SP	SURE TI OLS, DO ARE PA	HAT AD DCUMEN ARTS, AVAIL	EQUAT	E N. ERSON- OR RE-	1	1		38400	an v tany	24290 191 #V	0.40 T. 24 1.72				
	3	3. EV FE	ALUAT CTIVEN TOR S	E THE ESS OF	TRAINI F THE BY TE	NG EF- SIMU- STING		1					4024 MAD.	'	L	•	
-		4. ES TE US	TABLIS	H PROG STRUCT	RAMS TORS H	OW TO		1		10 10	TD 441 MAS	53 1272 S		NKL VIR			
4		5. IN: AC	SURE T	HE TRA	INING REPARE F SIMU	SITE IS	Ĩ.	1		The Ta				1	1		
	-	6. INS	SURE RUCTO	ADEQU. R TRAIN	ACY ONING FO	OF IN-	1	1		397	120					•	
						-					1					1	1

Table III aldsTo be Addressed in Procurne Simulators

				Need	to ad in issu	dress e		F	Past pe addres	erform sing ar	ance in issue	n
	Past Dan addrets							sed		P	pa	p
tang arts in becauting in send out of heatstobe o	tend not in her sublis us a fand our not here of the	baserdak of bluode an baserbiks of bluod	CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	ALMOST ALWAYS addrei	FREQUENTLY addressed	OCCASIONALLY addresse	INFREQUENTLY address	ALMOST NEVER address
	Issu	e to be addressed	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
U.A.P.	7. INSURE PI UPDATES	ROVISIONS FOR AND CHANGES	1						· — –	- 1-	<b></b> .	
AND AND A	8. VERIFY A ATED WIT WITHIN ES	ALL COSTS ASSOCI- H THE SIMULATOR ARE STIMATES	1	1								
UNUNE	9. ESTABLIS TIME SCH OPMENT	H AND MONITOR IEDULES FOR DEVEL- AND INSTALLATION										
	10. ESTABLIS CHANNEL TION BET	SH EFFECTIVE LS OF COMMUNICA- TWEEN INSTRUCTORS		1	laste	3000	ad of a	unel				
	11.VERIFY T FREQUEN ARE WITH	HAT ACTUAL REPAIR ICY AND "DOWNTIME" IIN ESTIMATES			480 1910	PROCE	*	940) 880(1	1 VES 281			
	12.INSURE A FACTORS MENTS HA	DEQUATE HUMAN DESIGN REQUIRE- AVE BEEN MET		1	MORE					1	•	
	13. EVALUAT FORMAN	TE INSTRUCTOR PER-		t-	-49 0 -0460 06473	SOTAJ MALAA SMT SMT VI	8 9999 1467 153 06 17674	1 80 9 120 0 130 1 130 1 130 1 10 10	1.	1		*
	14. ASSESS A ING FROM SIMULATO	LL EFFECTS RESULT- M INTRODUCTION OF DR SYSTEM		1	0 DW 10 RAIM		NUANS NOORA TOURT DROTA			-•	-	*
	15. ESTABLIS CEDURES STRUCTO TITUDES SIMULATO	H FOLLOW UP PRO- TO MONITOR IN- R AND STUDENT AT- TOWARD THE DR SYSTEM		1	81 311 901 4	2 DISH 15 R A 33	ANT 2	17. JAU 17. JAU 17. JOS				
	16. ESTABLIS TIME SCH NAMTRAE	H AND MONITOR EDULES FOR DET COURSE		1	-401 - 5 920 #	0 x5 010 F0	NUÓRO. VINAST	- 2 <b>0</b> 0 60100				
	17.PREVENT SIMULATO	OVERUSE OF THE DR AS A TOY TO VISITING DIGNITAR-				_				1	1	-
				1					-			
Table IV. Feasibility, Training Effectiveness, and Cost Effectiveness of Simulators for Organizational-Level Aircraft Maintenance Training at NAMTRADETS

	Fe	asibili	ty			Eff	Trainir fective	ng ness			Eff	Cost ective	ness	
Th or	e simu all of	ulation this sy	of mo stem	ost is:			C ec	Compa quipm	ent, sir	opera nulato	tional ors are	:		
		it or ii	an jo mate		ining									
Definitely feasible	Possibly feasible	Uncertain	Possibly infeasible	Definitely infeasible	Much more effective for tra	Possibly more effective	Equally effective	Possibly less effective	Much less effective	Much more expensive	More expensive	Equally expensive	Less expensive	Much less expensive
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
					1		٤_		*	Citypics 			*1	•
1	•	*		*		t-		-	Texta				<b>†</b> †	
ŧ					1					ort an	are No.		1	t
+	•					+-		-				_	\$	
+		*				1-	•						11	
1		1				ŕ		-					-+	
1	- 2		-					-				_	\$	
1	1					+			 RDVA			-	#	
-					****				*			-		
		Fe The simu or all of Definitely feasible 1 Definitely feasible 1 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Feasibili The simulation or all of this sy all of this sy begins teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible teasible t	Feasibility The simulation of mo or all of this system all of this system begins all of this system all of this system a	Feasibility         The simulation of most or all of this system is:         all of this system is:       all of this system is:         all of this system is:       all of this system is:         all of this system is:       all of this system is:         all of this system is:       all of this system is:         all of this system is:       all of this system is:         all of this system is:       all of this system is:         all of this system is:       all of this system is:         blocking all of this system is:       all of this system is:         blocking all of this system is:       all of this system is:         blocking all of this system is:       all of this system is:         blocking all of this system is:       blocking all of this system is:         blocking all of this system is:       all of this system is:         blocking all of this system is:       blocking all of this system is:         blocking all of this system is:       blocking all of this system is:         blocking all of this system is:       blocking all of this system is:         colstant all of this system is:       blocking all of this system is:         colstant all of this system is:       blocking all of this system is:         colstant all of this system is:       blocking all of this system is:	Feasibility         The simulation of most or all of this system is:         Optimized of this system is:         Image: Image of the system is:         Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:         Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:         Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:         Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:         Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:         Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:         Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:         Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:         Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is:       Image of this system is: <td>Feasibility     Eff       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Image: system is:       Image: system im</td> <td>Feasibility     Effective       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     ea       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:   <td>Feasibility     Effectiveness       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compa equipme       Image: Second Sec</td><td>Feasibility     Effectiveness       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to equipment, sir       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this:<td>Feasibility     Effectiveness       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to operate equipment, simulator       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     I</td><td>Feasibility     Effectiveness     Eff       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to operational equipment, simulators are       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this is all of all of the system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this is all of all of this is all of all of the system is:       below:     and all of this is all of all of the system is:       below:     below:       and all of this is all of all of the system is:     below:       below:     below:       below:     below:       below:     below:       below:     below:       below:     below:       compared to operation     below:       compared to operation</td><td>Feasibility     Infiniting Effectiveness     Effective equipment, simulators are:       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to operational equipment, simulators are:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system of the</td><td>Feasibility     Effectiveness       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to operational equipment, simulators are:       a     a     b     b     a     a     a       b     b     a     b     a     a     a       a     b     b     a     b     a     a       b     a     b     b     a     a     a       b     a     b     b     b     a     a       b     b     b     b     b     a     a       c     a     b     b     b     a     a       c     b     b     b     b     b     b       c     b     b     b     b     b     a       c     b     b     c     b     b     b       c     b     b     c     c     c     c       c     b     b     c     c     c     c       c     c     c     c     c     c     c       c     c     c     c     c     c     c       c     c     c     c     c     c     c<!--</td--></td></td></td>	Feasibility     Eff       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Image: system is:       Image: system im	Feasibility     Effective       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     ea       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is: <td>Feasibility     Effectiveness       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compa equipme       Image: Second Sec</td> <td>Feasibility     Effectiveness       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to equipment, sir       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this:<td>Feasibility     Effectiveness       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to operate equipment, simulator       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     I</td><td>Feasibility     Effectiveness     Eff       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to operational equipment, simulators are       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this is all of all of the system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this is all of all of this is all of all of the system is:       below:     and all of this is all of all of the system is:       below:     below:       and all of this is all of all of the system is:     below:       below:     below:       below:     below:       below:     below:       below:     below:       below:     below:       compared to operation     below:       compared to operation</td><td>Feasibility     Infiniting Effectiveness     Effective equipment, simulators are:       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to operational equipment, simulators are:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system of the</td><td>Feasibility     Effectiveness       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to operational equipment, simulators are:       a     a     b     b     a     a     a       b     b     a     b     a     a     a       a     b     b     a     b     a     a       b     a     b     b     a     a     a       b     a     b     b     b     a     a       b     b     b     b     b     a     a       c     a     b     b     b     a     a       c     b     b     b     b     b     b       c     b     b     b     b     b     a       c     b     b     c     b     b     b       c     b     b     c     c     c     c       c     b     b     c     c     c     c       c     c     c     c     c     c     c       c     c     c     c     c     c     c       c     c     c     c     c     c     c<!--</td--></td></td>	Feasibility     Effectiveness       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compa equipme       Image: Second Sec	Feasibility     Effectiveness       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to equipment, sir       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this system is:     Image: Strain of this system is:       Image: Strain of this: <td>Feasibility     Effectiveness       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to operate equipment, simulator       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     I</td> <td>Feasibility     Effectiveness     Eff       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to operational equipment, simulators are       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this is all of all of the system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this is all of all of this is all of all of the system is:       below:     and all of this is all of all of the system is:       below:     below:       and all of this is all of all of the system is:     below:       below:     below:       below:     below:       below:     below:       below:     below:       below:     below:       compared to operation     below:       compared to operation</td> <td>Feasibility     Infiniting Effectiveness     Effective equipment, simulators are:       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to operational equipment, simulators are:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system of the</td> <td>Feasibility     Effectiveness       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to operational equipment, simulators are:       a     a     b     b     a     a     a       b     b     a     b     a     a     a       a     b     b     a     b     a     a       b     a     b     b     a     a     a       b     a     b     b     b     a     a       b     b     b     b     b     a     a       c     a     b     b     b     a     a       c     b     b     b     b     b     b       c     b     b     b     b     b     a       c     b     b     c     b     b     b       c     b     b     c     c     c     c       c     b     b     c     c     c     c       c     c     c     c     c     c     c       c     c     c     c     c     c     c       c     c     c     c     c     c     c<!--</td--></td>	Feasibility     Effectiveness       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to operate equipment, simulator       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     Image: Strain of the system is:       Image: Strain of the system is:     I	Feasibility     Effectiveness     Eff       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to operational equipment, simulators are       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this is all of all of the system is:       and all of this system is:     and all of this is all of all of this is all of all of the system is:       below:     and all of this is all of all of the system is:       below:     below:       and all of this is all of all of the system is:     below:       below:     below:       below:     below:       below:     below:       below:     below:       below:     below:       compared to operation     below:       compared to operation	Feasibility     Infiniting Effectiveness     Effective equipment, simulators are:       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to operational equipment, simulators are:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system is:       Image: State of the system is:     Image: State of the system of the	Feasibility     Effectiveness       The simulation of most or all of this system is:     Compared to operational equipment, simulators are:       a     a     b     b     a     a     a       b     b     a     b     a     a     a       a     b     b     a     b     a     a       b     a     b     b     a     a     a       b     a     b     b     b     a     a       b     b     b     b     b     a     a       c     a     b     b     b     a     a       c     b     b     b     b     b     b       c     b     b     b     b     b     a       c     b     b     c     b     b     b       c     b     b     c     c     c     c       c     b     b     c     c     c     c       c     c     c     c     c     c     c       c     c     c     c     c     c     c       c     c     c     c     c     c     c </td

to a summer a second of the second second

	-	Fe	asibilit	TY I	olisis). Calabi	1916 197 19 19 14 1	T Effe	rainin	g iess			Eff	Cost	ness	
	The	simulation simulation is simulated as a simulated a	ation o his sys	of mos tem is:	t or				Comp equipr	nent, s	o oper imula	rationa tors ar	e:		
	Definitely feasible	Possibly feasible	Uncertain	Possibly infeasible	Definitely infeasible	Much more effective for training	Possibly more effective	Equally effective	Possibly less effective	Much less effective	Much more expensive	More expensive	Equally expensive	Less expensive	Much less expensive
Aircraft System	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1. ELECTRICAL & INSTRUMENT	+		-		*					*	10 /44	elian -		-1	*
2. COMMUNICATIONS AND NAVIGATION	1			2 -	*	1			+	*	antes	ny qette		-1	
3. ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE	1				*			-		*!				-+	
4. AUTOMATIC FLIGHT CONTROLS	1	-		2_	*			_	2	*		-		-1	
5. RECONNAISSANCE	1			1	*				1	*		NT DAY		1	•
6. ARMAMENT/WEAPONS DELIVERY	_				*	R				•-*				-+	
7. ENVIRONMENTAL/EGRESS	1	•		L	-				-+	1			-	-*+	
8. STRUCTURE, HYDRAULICS, & FLIGHT CONTROLS					*				-			-			
9. PROPULSION					-*		_		•						
			1				1								

 Table V. Feasibility, Training Effectiveness, and Cost Effectiveness of Simulators

 for Intermediate-Level Aircraft Maintenance Training at NAMTRADETS

#### V. REFERENCES

Cooper, T. L. Professionalization and utilization of police---Delphi forecast on police values. Journal of Criminal Justice, 1974, 2, 19-35.

Dodge, B. J. & Clark, R. E. Research on the Delphi Technique. Educational Technology, April 1977, XVII, 58-59.

Helmer, O. The use of the Delphi Technique in problems of educational innovation. Report P-3499. Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California, December 1966.

Helmer, O. Analysis of the future: the Delphi method. Report P-3558. Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California, March 1967.

Linstone, H. A. & Turoff, M. (Eds.). <u>The Delphi method, techniques</u> <u>and applications</u>. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1975.

Quade, E. S. & Boucher, W. I. <u>System analysis and policy planning</u>. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Co., 1968.

Sackman, H. Delphi assessment: expert opinion, forecasting and group process. Report R-1283-PR. Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California, April 1974.

Siegel, S. <u>Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences</u>. New York: McGraw Hill, 1956.

### APPENDIX A

EDING PAGE NOT TILLED

#### Participation of experts in the Delphi study

A total of 62 experts were invited to participate in the Delphi study. The numbers of experts returning the questionnaires are summarized in Table A-1.

#### Table A-1

Number of experts returning questionnaires of Delphi study

Questionnaires returned Numbers	of experts
All three questionnaires	46
Only Questionnaires One and Two	3
Only Questionnaires One and Three	0 0 T
Only Questionnaires Two and Three	6
Only Questionnaire One	ar <b>1</b> :243
Only Questionnaire Two	2
Only Questionnaire Three	2
None	2

Note.--Each questionnaire was mailed to all 62 experts.

As discussed in the text, the responses of the experts to one questionnaire were summarized in percentages and resubmitted in a subsequent questionnaire. The percentages were computed on the final day specified for the return of a questionnaire. For example, 50 experts returned Questionnaire One, but two chose not to complete the O- and I-level tables and two others returned the questionnaire too late for inclusion in the computation of the percentages. Thus, the percentages given in the O- and I-level tables of Questionnaire Two are based on 46 experts. The preceding sentence must be qualified because not all of the 46 experts completed every one of the 54 selections for the O- and I-level tables. In all computations, the percentages were based on the number of experts completing an item.

#### Table A-2

Table Designation Number of experts Total NAMTRADET NON-NAMTRADET group group group 0- and I-level tables for Questionnaire Two 46 Tables for Questionnaire Three 52 Tables in final results 60 26 34

Number of experts used as a basis for computing percentages for questionnaire tables

The same reasoning and rules were applied in the computation of the percentages for all tables, including those representing the final results. In addition, in computing the percentages for the final results (not given in this report), the most recent input from an expert was counted towards the final results. Thus, if an expert return orly Questionnaires One and Two, his data of Questionnaire Two were included in the final results.

As discussed in the real, whis responded of the superia to one questions its dote summarized if percentages and resubmitted is armosequent questionsaire. The percentages were computed on the first say spectried for the return of a questionnaire. For example, 50 expects ad for the return of nairs One, one use where not to complete the O- and I-level tables and two compres returned the questionsairs too late to inclusion on the computation of the questionsairs too late to percentages group in the O- and I-level (ables of Questions contents for the computation of the proceeding settation doire for any backed on the seturned the questionsairs too late to contentages group in the O- and I-level (ables of Questions contents be followed to request of all of the proceeding settation many be followed to compare all of the proceeding settation

A-2

#### APPENDIX B

Expert participants in Delphi study of simulators in aviation maintenance training

A. NAMTRADET instructors

ADCS Kenneth I. Bryant NAMTD 1048 NAS Pensacola, FL 32508

AT1 David L. Cooper NAMTD 1048 NAS Pensacola, FL 32508

AEl Donald R. Cornelius NAMTD 1069 NAS North Island San Diego, CA 92135

> GYSGT Don H. Foster NAMTD 1078 MCAS El Toro Santa Ana, CA 92709

AFCM James W. Frush NAMTD 1002 NAS Key West, FL 33040

AMSC Thomas R. Griffith NAMTD 1011 NAS Jacksonville, FL 32212

ATC Garry K. Hanson Box 10 NAMTD 1018 NAS Meridian, MS 39301

AMH1 J. Howington NAMTD 1069 NAS North Island San Diego, CA 92135

AEC James J. Jozwiak NAMTD 1018 NAS Meridian, MS 39301 AT1 Robert L. LaPorte NAMTD 1026 NAS Norfolk, VA 23511

> ATCS Peter McConnell NAMTD 1008 NAS Miramar, CA 92145

AEC Gary McCullough NAMTD 1011 NAS Jacksonville, FL 32212

GYSGT James R. McNulty NAMTD 1006 MCAS Cherry Pt., NC 28533

AT2 Stuart F. Morgan NAMTD 1014 NAS Oceana Bldg. 240 Virginia Beach, VA 23460

ATC James E. Morrison Box 10 NAMTD 1018 NAS Meridian, MS 39301

AQ1 James A. Nuessle NAMTD 1001 NAS Whidbey Island Oak Harbor, WA 98277

AECS Curtis G. Olson C. O. AIRANTISUBRON 33 % FPO San Francisco, CA 96601

MSGT K. D. Osborn NAMTD 1078 MCAS El Toro Santa Ana, CA 92709

B-1

AQC J. M. Owens NAMTD 1008 NAS Miramar, CA 92145

AMCS L. Purviance NAMTD 1034 NAS Cecil Field, FL 32215

AMHC Salvatore Rao NAMTD 1018 NAS Meridian, MS 39301

AVCM Jerry D. Rohrer NAMTD 1002 NAS Key West, FL 33040

B. NON-NAMTRADET experts

Mr. D. B. Adams NAVAIRSYSCOM AIR 4131 Washington, DC 20360

Robert J. Biersner, Ph.D. LCDR MSC USN Naval Submarine Medical Research Lab. Naval Submarine Base New London Box 900 Groton, CT 06340

Dr. Harold Booher Code 308 Naval Personnel Research & Development Center San Diego, CA 92152

LCDR Ray S. Bouder General Programs Officer NAMTRAGRU 34 NAS Memphis Millington, TN 38054

AVCM Ronald E. Rumpf NAMTD 1026 Norfolk, VA 23505

> ATCS James W. Scrivner VAW-124 Avionics FPO New York, NY 09501

ATC Walter J. Todd NAMTD 1034 NAS Cecil Field, FL 32215

AQC John F. Williams, Jr. NAMTD 1001 NAS Whidbey Island Oak Harbor, WA 98277

Dr. Richard Braby Training Analysis & Evaluation Group Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. William H. Crooks Perceptronics, Inc. 6271 Variel Ave. Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Dr. John P. Foley, Jr. AFHRL Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Mr. Raymond B. Fox IBM Federal Systems Division Bldg. 400/043 9500 Godwin Drive Manassas, VA 22110 Dr. F. C. Frick MIT Lincoln Laboratory Lexington, MA 02173

Mr. K. C. Hageman Hageman Consulting Services P.O. Box 11409 Ft. Worth, TX 76109

Dr. Donald F. Haggard U. S. Army Research Institute Field Unit Bldg. 2423 Fort Knox, KY 40121

Mr. Alfred J. Homann OMNIDATA, Inc. 7300 Route 130 Pennsauken, NJ 08110

Dr. Richard Hurlock Code 304, Development of Training Technology Naval Personnel Research & Development Center San Diego, CA 92152

Mr. Reid P. Joyce, Principal Scientist Applied Science Associates, Inc. Box 158 Valencia, PA 16059

Dr. William King Code N-215 Naval Training Equipment Center Orlando, FL 32813

Mr. Manuel Lopez NAVAIRSYSCOM AIR 4132 Washington, DC 20360 Dr. George Lukas, Senior Mathematician Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc. 50 Moulton St. Cambridge, MA 02138

Mr. Arthur Mann San Diego Aeronautical Audit Complex NAS North Island Bldg. 252 San Diego, CA 92135

Mr. Arthur Marcus, Senior Research Scientist U. S. Army Research Institute 1300 Wilson Boulevard Rosslyn, VA 22209

Dr. Lee A. Miller Honeywell, Inc. 2600 Ridgway Parkway Minneapolis, MN 55413

Dr. John A. Modrick, Staff Scientist Honeywell, Inc. 2600 Ridgway Parkway Minneapolis, MN 55413

CDR R. L. Mudgett Code 315 NAMTRAPAC NAS North Island San Diego, CA 92135

Mr. William G. Muller Naval Air Technical Services Facility (123) 700 Robbins Ave. Philadelphia, PA 19111

Dr. Marshall Narva U. S. Army Research Institute 1300 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22209

B-3

Dr. Leon H. Nawrocki U. S. Army Research Institute 1300 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22209

> AVCM J. R. Nelson NAMTRAGRU NAS Memphis Millington, TN 38054

> > Mr. Robert D. Plunkett Directorate of Training Development USA Signal School Fort Gordon, GA 30905

Mr. Jack Richardson, C.P.L. Supervisory General Engineer Naval Air Systems Command AIR 4134 Washington, DC 20361

Dr. J. W. Rigney Behavioral Technology Lab. Univ. of Southern Calif. University Park Los Angeles, CA 90007

Dr. Marty R. Rockway Technical Director Technical Training Division (AFHRL/TT) USAF Human Resource Laboratory Lowry AFB, CO 80230

Dr. Edgar L. Shriver, President Kinton, Inc. 100 Prince St. Alexandria, VA 22314

Mr. Nicholas A. Siecko, Vice President, Education Research and Development Educational Computer Corporation 175 Strafford Avenue Strafford, PA 19087

Dr. Leonard C. Silvern, Education Consultant Aeronutronic Ford Corp., The Ford Motor Company Box 49899 Los Angeles, CA 90049

Dr. Robert G. Smith, Jr. Assistant for Personnel Logistics Plans OPNAV OP-987 Pl0 Washington, DC 20350

#### APPENDIX C

# Questionnaire One and the material<sup>1</sup>

provided with Questionnaire One

Following this becoment information is Deschonated the one, which you are asked to complete and return. A postage-free, addressed any plots the enclosed.

is lifely that the rearity will be convertified, at least to some estent, to uther training situations. Thus, even if you are not assoclated with the day, you and our argamization should provid frap the study. A copy of the final papert of the study util he ages to you.

I so and baing av serd. Contact at if peressary. If i arthor wealtable, as for mean wright who is also writing on this propert.

One lest request. Los time concolle un this project is vor plant ILE DELDA Technique ordinarily lakes a lot al Fine because the experts delay recurning the quescionations. Please return the exclosed question natic recurning the quescionation of dars if at all constant. (Since vor atte recurning to a solid an it everturally, why not at it howly if it's throughly to get to it intendiately, why not at it howly if it's tangents.

> <sup>1</sup>The description of the Delphi Technique, which was included with Questionnaire One, is omitted. It is reproduced in the section on the Data Collection Process.

Dear \_\_\_\_

Thank you again for agreeing to serve as an expert in our study on aviation maintenance training simulators.

The enclosed material provides background information relevant to the study;

1. The Delphi Technique, the method to be used in this study, is described.

2. Definitions and descriptions are given for:

a. The Navy training situation.

b. Operational equipment and simulators.

c. Maintenance programs in the Navy.

Following this background information is Questionnaire One, which you are asked to complete and return. A postage-free, addressed envelope is enclosed.

Although the study is specific to maintenance training in the Navy, it is likely that the results will be generalizable, at least to some extent, to other training situations. Thus, even if you are not associated with the Navy, you and your organization should profit from the study. A copy of the final report of the study will be sent to you.

I am enclosing my card. Contact me if necessary. If I am not available, ask for Joann Wright who is also working on this project.

One last request. The time schedule on this project is very tight. The Delphi Technique ordinarily takes a lot of time because the experts delay returning the questionnaires. Please return the enclosed questionnaire promptly, within a couple of days if at all possible. (Since you are going to spend time on it eventually, why not do it now?) If it's impossible to get to it immediately, please be sure to return it within ten days.

Sincerly,

#### ROBERT M. HERRICK

The opinions expressed or implied in the enclosed material are mine, not the Navy's. No remuneration will be provided to the part of ents of this study.

#### BACKGROUND MATERIAL

#### Training Situation

The training under consideration occurs at a Naval Aviation Maintenance Training Detachment (NAMTRADET), which is a technical school that supports the squadron at a Naval Air Station. Typically, a NAMIRADET includes several classrooms, each with chalkboards, slide projectors, and other common classroom aids. The student is provided with a variety of books, pamphlets, maintenance instruction manuals (MIMs), and other material to support his training. In recent years, the courses have included lists of instructional objectives (also called behavioral objectives, or specific behavioral objectives) so the student has a rather precise description of what he has to learn and what tasks he must learn to perform. Aircraft components are also on display or available for "hands-on" instruction in the classroom. An aircraft wing (costing perhaps a million dollars), or a radar system, or an ejection seat mounted in a section of an aircraft, or part of a computer system might be found in a typical classroom. Oscilloscopes. pressure gauges, and other test equipments are also available.

In Fiscal Year 1974, 1300 instructors at 49 NAMTRADETS presented 818 different courses in aircraft maintenance. Each of the 818 courses was taught several times for a total of 9,077 course presentations. There were 55,750 graduates of these courses in FY74.

Compared with conventional classroom training, the number of students attending a course is very low, usually 5 or 6.

The duration of a course at a NAMTRADET depends, naturally, upon the complexity and depth of training. Maintenance courses for the A-7 aircraft, for example, range from 8 hours to 480 hours. In FY74 the average course length was 111 hours.

The students attending the courses have varied backgrounds. Most are high school graduates. However, one student may be fresh from a technical school with approximately 9-17 weeks of technical training whereas another student may have had several years of Navy maintenance experience behind him.

#### Operational Equipment and Maintenance Training Simulators

The term <u>operational equipment</u> refers to real aircraft equipment or real test or other ground-support equipment. When operational equipment is used for training, the equipment may be in its normal condition or it may be modified somewhat; e.g., the cover of the equipment may be removed, the equipment may be partially disassembled, equipment that is normally adjacent to the equipment under study may be removed. A <u>maintenance training simulator</u> is a training device that represents the components and the functioning of operational equipment. Although physical fidelity may not be a necessary requirement, simulators typically represent faithfully some or all of the components of the operational equipment. The student interacts with the simulator to acquire the knowledge and skills required for his maintenance tasks. Maintenance training simulators vary greatly in their complexity, training capabilities, and costs.

In the past few years, several NAMTRADETS have incorporated maintenance training simulators into their courses. The simulator most in use at NAMTRADETS is the EC II simulator of the Education Computer Corporation, which currently costs about \$70,000. The EC II simulator comes in two sizes, a desk-type version for individual instruction and a large panel (about four foot high by ten foot wide) version for instructing several students simultaneously. Included in the EC II system are power supplies, a random access projector system, and a computer that can be programmed by a cassette tape. Each simulation model incorporates a display panel, a pictorial/schematic model of operational equipment, and means for "hands-on" interaction between the student (or the instructor) and the simulator.

#### Maintenance Levels

The Navy maintenance program distinguishes three levels of maintenance: organizational level (0 level), intermediate level (I level), and depot level.

<u>O-level maintenance</u> is maintenance performed at an aircraft squadron on a day-to-day basis in support of its own operations. O-level maintenance includes equipment inspections, equipment servicing, equipment handling, corrective and preventive maintenance for equipment <u>on board</u> the aircraft. At the O-level, defective components are typically identified, removed, and replaced. The expression "remove and replace" is often used to characterize O-level maintenance, but, as indicated, above, O-level maintenance includes other functions.

<u>I-level maintenance</u> is performed by shops in support of the aircraft squadron. Typically, most I-level maintenance is performed on components that have been <u>romoved</u> from the aircraft. I-level maintenance includes repair, test, modification, calibration, and qualification testing of components. Depot-level maintenance is maintenance for systems requiring major overhaul or a complete rebuild of parts, assemblies, subassemblies, or end items that is beyond the capability of I-level maintenance.

Each maintenance task is designated as 0 level, I level, or depot level, so each worker knows the limits of his task and knows when to pass on the maintenance task to the next higher maintenance level.

Here is an example of 0-level and I-level maintenance tasks. The engine life recorder (ELR) of the AV-8A Harrier aircraft propulsion system measures the used life of the aircraft engine. Sensors in the engine measure the heat and time and convert that information to a count that is displayed on a digital counter.

At preflight and postflight inspections, the <u>O-level technician</u> tests the ELR for accuracy by measuring the count rate when a built-in test switch is in each of two test positions. If the ELR fails the tests, the technician replaces it and sends the defective ELR to the I-level maintenance shop. The O-level technician also logs the ELR count at preflight and postflight and performs scheduled checks.

The <u>I-level technician</u> troubleshoots the malfunctioning ELR, replaces the defective subassembly, and verifies his repair by performing a functional test. If the ELR cannot be repaired by the maintenance procedures approved for I-level maintenance, the technician ships the defective ELR to the depot maintenance shop. The I-level technician is also responsible for testing each new ELR that enters the supply system for his squadron.

#### QUESTIONNAIRE ONE

TURNS PAGE NOT FUL

The aim of this study is to obtain expert opinion on the use of simulators versus the use of operational equipment in aviation maintenance training.

This study:

- a) is limited to maintenance training at NAMTRADETS,
- b) includes both O-level and I-level (but not depot level) maintenance training, and
- c) is limited to simulator systems that cost no more than \$200,000.

This first questionnaire consists of five questions. Questions I through IV are discussion questions. In answering these questions, present any ideas, opinions, facts, anecdotes, guesses, or hunches that you believe are relevant. If you can support a statement with facts or logic, do so; if not, include the statement anyhow. Consider yourself to be talking "off the record"; no statement you make will be attributed to you by name. In short, in answering Questions I through IV, err in the direction of giving too much rather than too little information. We can always ignore what we consider superfluous, but your opinion will not be heard if you fail to state it.

We are interested in your personal opinions, not the opinions of your supervisor or your colleagues or anyone else. So you will not influence or be influenced by others, please do not discuss this or subsequent questionnaires with anyone.

In responding to Questions I through IV indicate if (and where) you fael distinctions between 0 and I levels maintenance training are required.

To lessen your task on this first questionnaire, <u>don't concern</u> yourself with writing well. All that is necessary is that we are able to discern your meaning.

You may write or type your answers to Questions I through IV.' However, if you prefer to dictate your answers, please do so.' Send us a <u>cassette tape</u> of your remarks.' If you want the tape (or a blank tape) returned, please indicate this on the tape.' Also, give us your name at the beginning of the tape.'

C-7

Question V is a specific question with instructions for answering.

In responding to questions I through V, feel free to add additional sheets if necessary and make any comments about the questions (general or specific). You are also encouraged to comment on any questions you feel we should have asked but have not.

There are many terms used in discussion of maintenance training and simulators. The following is a list of a few of the terms that are used. You may wish to consider some of these items when responding to the questions.

Roles of NAMTRADET training experts (instructors), aircraft manufacturer, simulator manufacturer and others.

Attitudes Recurring costs Fidelity Versatility "Hands-On" Reliability Maintenance of training equipment Updating Life span of curriculum Procurement Accessibility Fault insertion Safety Power Requirements Educational strategies Individualized training Transfer of training

Theory of instruction Programming Task/Skill analysis Training Objectives (Specific Behavioral Objectives) Class size Instructor training Administration of training Evaluation On the job training Squadron/shop performance Future state of the art Standardization Uniformity of training Feedback Measures of student behavior

You say write of type your entrers to Gimerifons I through IV; Entrement, 16 you praise to distance your shownes, places do so. Send us a conjecte have at your reparts. If you want the tupe (on a binuk tape returned places indicate this on the tope, Also, give us your name at the bestands, of the tabel

to leasen whit citle on this first questionnaire, don't concern

## I. General Comparisons.

If you were serving as an advisor to Naval administrators and were asked to list the advantages and disadvantages of simulators and the advantages and disadvantages of operational equipment for aviation maintenance training, how would you respond?

NAME

II. Factors in Decision Making.

This question deals with <u>how</u> the decision should be made to use operational equipment or simulators for maintenance training. What information should the decision-maker have available to him? What sources of information are likely to be most valuable? What factors are most critical in the decision process? Which are least critical?

NAME

# III: Specification for Simulator System.

An administrator decides a simulator rather than operational equipment should be used for maintenance training in a particular NAMTRADET course. What items should be included in the contract for the simulator system? What personnel should contribute to the specification for the simulator system?

NAME

OF EAST

NAME TARALISTA IN IN IN IN IN

EDGING PAGE

·, 2 , n .

### IV. Introduction of Simulators.

When simulators are introduced (or in use) at NAMTRADETS there are sometime obstacles which hinder their acceptance and use. What are some problems which might hinder acceptance and/or use? What actions can be taken at your level to reduce these problems? What actions can be taken by higher authority? V. The following question asks you to rate the feasibility, the training effectiveness, and the cost of simulation for training for each of ten aircraft systems. Each of the ten systems, which are briefly described on the following page, includes a variety of equipment. You may have different judgements for different equipments within one system. If so, your rating should apply to most of the equipment within a system.

1 1 10

Two answer sheets are provided. One, as marked, applies to your ratings for organizational-level maintenance training; the other applies to intermediate-level maintenance training.

The first column of each answer sheet is labelled "totally ignorant of this system". Check this column <u>only</u> if you have <u>no knowledge at all</u> of the system. You do not have to be an expert in the particular system to provide ratings. Your general knowledge of a system is sufficient for you to participate.

Here is an example of ratings for a system:



These ratings indicate that simulation is definitely feasible (for most or all of the system), that simulation is as effective as operational equipment for training, and that simulation is much less expensive than operational equipment.

#### BRIEF DESCRIPTIONS OF AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SYSTEMS

Structure, Hydraulics and Flight Controls Systems - includes for example: airframe structure components, corrosion control, hydraulic power supply and distribution systems, alighting and launching gear, wing and finifold systems, primary and secondary flight control systems, empennage.

<u>Propulsion Systems</u> - includes for example: engine maintenance, quick engine change, assembly and buildup, removal/installation, aircraft fuel storage and transfer, fuel system operation and maintenance.

<u>Electrical and Instrument Systems</u> - includes for example: drive generator, electrical power supply and distribution, instrument indicating systems, lighting, and electrical circuits for following systems: engine and related system, hydraulic, environmental, life support, armament.

Environmental Control and Egress Systems - includes for example: cabin air conditioning, cabin air pressurization, crew egress component/subsystems, oxygen system.

Armament/Weapons Delivery System - includes for example: guns, mounts, weapon direction equipment, launcher, pods, bomb racks and other mechanical or electro-mechanical equipment for weapons delivery function.

<u>Communications and Navigation Systems</u> - includes for example: intercom, radio system(s), data link, radar, radio, direction finding set, doppler compass.

Automatic Flight Controls - includes for example: automatic pilot, flight displays, mechanical and electrical parts for signal transmission and application of power, reference sensors, air data computer.

Reconnaissance Equipment - equipment necessary to reconnaissance mission. Includes for example: photographic and electronics, infared and other sensors, search receivers, recorders, warning devices, magazines and data link.

Anti-Submarine Warfare - equipment peculiar to the antisubmarine warfare. mission. Includes for example: acoustic and nonacoustic sensor systems, computer, displays.

# ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL

(Refer to earlier descriptions for distinctions between 0-level and I-level maintenance)

		Thof		im st is is	or sy	all stem	Co	epa nen	red t s	to	o	Per	ati B a	.014	1	ъđя	ip-
Talaici	Totally ignorant of this system	1. Definitely feasible	2. Possibly feasible	3. Uncertain	4. Possibly infeasible	5. Definitely infeasible	1. Much more affactive for training	2. Possibly more effective	3. Equally effective	4. Possibly less effective	5. Nuch less effective		I. Much more expensive	2. More expensive	3. Equally expensive	4.' Less expensive	5. Much less expensive
Structure, Hydraulics, & Flight Controls	Π	Γ			-								Γ				$\square$
Propulsion	Π	i			ļ						Π		Γ				
Electrical & Instrument	Π	F									Π						
Environmental/Egress	Π																
Armament/Weapons Delivery																	
Communications and Navigation																	
Automatic Flight Controls																	
Reconneissance		Γ															
Antisubmerine Werfare																	

# INTERMEDIATE LEVEL

(Refer to earlier descriptions for distinctions between O-level and I-level maintenance)

		H 0.0	he f m f t	sin bis f	s:	all stem	Co		int	i t si	o op	per	at	Lon	al 8:	equ	ip-
	Totally ignorant of this system	1. Definitely feasible	2. Possibly feasible	3. Uncertain	4. Possibly infeasible	5. Definitely infeasible	1. Much more effective for training	2. Possibly more effective	3. Equally effective	4. Possibly less effective	5. Much less effective		1. Much more expensive	2. More expensive	5. Equally expensive	4. Less expensive	5. Much less expensive
Structure, Eydraulics, & Flight Controls						• <											
Propulsion		Γ															
Electrical & Instrument		Γ									Π						
Environmental/Egress		Γ															
Armament/Weapons Delivery		F									Π						
Communications and Navigation		Γ															
Automatic Flight Controls		Γ												a.			
Reconnaissance																	
Antisubmarine Warfare		Γ										-					

#### APPENDIX D

PACE MY THE

Questionnaire Two and the material

# provided with Questionnaire Two

sone of the entrepts farred to below the crist sample, when example, when completing the teris of frontlemente for an end sample derided that the system "Structered by Ministics, o filelt Controls" can the broad so is spire if into two systems and their component file other testores could not be identified with the responses of the other experts, his responses to this liter had to be discinced. Another problem was then a few of the experts builded to remolere all items.

In completing (unstandated Two, which is antiosed, planas tollow directions carefully. If you have not thmahis shout any of the items of Questionmary Two, first respect to the loom, the give your domaent, either in the narging or on the back of the seen.

Plasse occulate Gorstigoneiro Tod prospilo, sichio a opuple of days if possible. Four corperation and <u>culok terponae</u> will be reacty constitutes.

Sinceroly,

ROBERT M. HERETOR

The blue sheets descripting the baraground esterist and the Delphi Teorgique, which a re included with Westlenacire ( are included sprin.

<sup>1</sup> The sections on the Delphi Technique (given in the text of this report) and on the background material (given in Appendix B) are omitted from this appendix.

Dear .

Thank you for completing Questionnaire One in our Delphi Study of simulators and operational equipment in aviation maintenance training.

We encountered a few minor problems with Questionnaire One because some of the experts failed to follow directions. For example, when completing the table of Questionnaire One, one expert decided that the system "Structures, Hydraulics, & Flight Controls" was too broad so he split it into two systems and then responded. Since his responses could not be integrated with the responses of the other experts, his responses to this item had to be discarded. Another problem was that a few of the experts failed to complete all items.

In completing Questionnaire Two, which is enclosed, please follow directions carefully. If you have any comments about any of the items of Questionnaire Two, first respond to the item, then give your comment, either in the margin or on the back of the sheet.

Please complete Questionnaire Two promptly, within a couple of days if possible. Your cooperation and <u>quick response</u> will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. HERRICK

The blue sheets describing the background material and the Delphi Technique, which were included with Questionnaire One, are included again.

The socians on the Delphi Tachnique (given in the test of this report) and on the lackground materia (given in Appendix D) are culted . ton this append

Introduction to Questionnaire Two

The aim of this study is to obtain expert opinion on the use of simulators versus operational equipment in aviation maintenance training.

This study:

- a) is limited to maintenance training at NAMTRADETS,
- b) includes both 0-level and I-level (but not depot level) maintenance training, and
- c) is limited to simulation systems that cost no more than \$200,000.

Questionnaire Two consists of three sections. In writing Section I we imagined a naval administrator confronted with a choice between simulators and operational equipment for a NAMTRADET course. We ask, in this section, what information is needed to aid the administrator, and how difficult is it to obtain such information. Also, in Section I, we ask about possible sources of information, both personnel and relevant documents.

In Section II we assume that the administrator has decided to use a simulator rather than operational equipment. And we ask: What issues should the administrator consider to implement his decision? And, how frequently have these issues been considered in the past?

In Sections I and II no distinctions are made between O-level and I-level maintenance training. In giving your opinions in these two sections consider each item to apply to both O-level and I-level training.

Section III presents the results of Question V of Questionnaire One and gives you the opportunity to retain or revise your opinions.

Comments shout from may be written in the marging or on the back

Table I concerns gathering and evaluating information to help decide between simulators and operational equipment.

An illustration will indicate the procedure you are to follow in completing Table I. Reproduced below are two items of Table I.

		ir	Nee	ed fonatio	or on		Eff obt	fort tain	requi	uirec ormat	t to
Item of Information	and and a	-	2.	з.	4.	5.	-	2.	3.	4.	5.
23. The funds available for the project	t	X	5 15	tion	199	2 2	e ev	X	(p <sub>k</sub>		
24. The cost to buy each device	S	X				: 15	15. 21	17		X	
	0	X						X			

[The column headings (e.g., 1. CRUCIAL--the information <u>must</u> be obtained) have been omitted here. Refer to the first page of Table I for the complete headings.]

In the above illustration the expert decided that item 23. "The funds available for the project" is information that must be obtained. He therefore placed an X in the box 1. CRUCIAL--the information <u>must</u> be obtained. For item 23., he also decided that it would require slight effort to obtain such information. Therefore, he marked X under 2., requires SLIGHT EFFORT to obtain information.

In each row of Table I you are to follow the same procedure, namely, mark an X for one of the five alternatives under the category "Need for information," and mark an X for one of the five alternatives under the category "Effort required to obtain information."

In many of the items we use the word <u>device</u> in a special way. By device we mean either a simulator or operational equipment. Thus, in item 24. above, "The cost to buy each device" means the cost to buy a simulator or the cost to buy operational equipment. Instead of listing two items separately, one for simulators and one for operational equipment, we list only one item. However, we split the section for your responses into two rows, one marked "S" for simulators and one marked "O" for operational equipment. Fill in each row as described above. In the example given above, in the category "Need for information," the expert marked 1. CRUCIAL for both simulators (the row marked "S") and for operational equipment (the row marked "O"). In the other category, "Effort required to obtain information," the expert marked 4. MAJOR EFFORT for simulators and 2. SLIGHT EFFORT for operational equipment.

Comments about items may be written in the margins or on the back of the pages.

In the blank rows at the end of Table I you may add new items.

NAME

Section I. Gathering Information to Help the Decision Maker Decide between Simulators and Operational Equipment.

Table I. Information Required for Decision Making

									L	Nee	d fo mat	r ion		Effo	in i	equi nfor	red mati	to
		INTERNET ALL INTERNET	TANAL TRANSPORT			FRANKS		avironaeri avironaeri Jectuss es vaich ne planned al xida (e.g., attructor cudent stout	the information <u>must</u> be obtained	USEFULthe information should be obtained	he information probably should be obtained	-the information might be obtained	the information need not be obtained	LITTLE EFFORT to obtain information	SLIGHT EFFORT to obtain information	MODERATE EFFORT to obtain information	MAJOR EFFORT to obtain information	EXTREME EFFORT to obtain information
	Item o	of In	form	nati	ior	۱		ad repairs of	CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY	USEFUL	OPTIONAL.	TRIVIAL	requires	requires	requires	requires	requires
								no rate of the second second		5.	<u>.</u>	4	5.	÷	2.	З.	4	5.
1.	A det	aile	d de	escr	rip	otio	RATI n of	each	22.23		30		1 (	65 14 9 209	13.0 00000 10000			Γ
2.	The t to pe	ime	it s m ea	hou	uld	l ta	ke t	he student		90 IN	ara Star		291	0631	nse nse			
3.	The t tion train	ools avai ing	, te labl and	est le t tes	eq to sti	uip the ng	ment	, and documenta- dent during	Grad	in an		13		5.12 5.12 5.12	ror ror	T	B/II	
4.	The c stude	rite nt's	ria per	use	ed	to	eval for	uate the each task	69+		7 - 16	31	 15-1110	t tupe	9.01	1		
-	The +	rain	ing	obj	jec	tiv	es o	f the course										Γ
5.	ine c								and the second se			the second se	the second se	and the second se	-		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

	Equipment. Ation Required for Decision Making	ing n taol n	Ne info	ed f	or ion	2103	Eff obt	ort ain	requ info	ired rmati	to ion
ufred ormat	Item of information	UCIAL	TREMELY USEFUL	EFUL	TIONAL	IVIAL	TTLE EFFORT	IGHT EFFORT	DERATE EFFORT	JOR EFFORT	TREME EFFORT
		. CR	. EX	SU .	d0 .	. TR		· SL	OM .	MA .	EX.
7.	A description of the physical environment on the job (e.g., heat, noise)	-	2	e	4	5	-	2	m	4	5
8.	The physical fidelity (e.g., size, weight) required to meet the course objectives	$\mathbf{f}$									
9.	The availability of other courses which might meet the objectives of the planned course										
10.	The availability of instructional aids (e.g., lesson plans, movies)										
11.	The amount of feedback to the instructor about student performance									•	
12.	The amount of feedback to the student about his performance										
13.	Analysis of frequent failures and repairs of the weapon system		1	Dist	anol	n 4	0 119	51			
14.	The tools, test equipment, and documentation available to the student to perform each task on the job		-		- 0				~		
15.	List of malfunctions (faults) that the maintenance man must recognize and correct on the job	17A)	80.13 9539	103	DXS1		ies:	03 			
16.	Lists of faults that can and cannot be S inserted into the device 0		67-1		2	971 971					
17.	The need to demonstrate multiple faults for a single failure	0.06	0.24	0 21	63 (	210	é 97	1. 1. 1.			
18.	The need to include infrequently encount- ered maintenance tasks		Bu	106.	phi	80	11.01 11.157 11.000				
19.	The requirement for "hands-on" experience	fan	adni 	Source Source	190	2100	e e ebili	2			
20.	The amount and type of additional training required on the job	rfoi	2 VT	Sup	10	nuor	0 01				

.

rmation self-paced learning alternative routes hing) for learning SIDERATIONS ilable for the project by each device		1. CRUCIAL	2. EXTREMELY USEFUL	3. USEFUL	4. OPTIONAL	5. TRIVIAL	1. LITTLE EFFORT	2. SLIGHT EFFORT	3. MODERATE EFFORT	4. MAJOR EFFORT	
self-paced learning alternative routes ning) for learning SIDERATIONS ilable for the project by each device			2.	3.	4	2 2	-	2	3	-	
alternative routes ning) for learning SIDERATIONS ilable for the project Ly each device		an an 15 c 27201 0 son 594 s	5 19 19 29 29 29 20	27.1	29	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-	-		ł
SIDERATIONS ilable for the project by each device	na oen na s	q son sev s		17 3	U30W 85 14	pec kee for	5 8 5 1 230	61 (7)	.45 .85		
ilable for the project uy each device	s			nt et soos	ta ta	nada s ba	00 S 7100	11. 91	36,		
uy each device	s						10 J	14 - I			Г
	U	n í sai Hari	10	a16)		ne a Sel		61 24 25	137.2		
spare parts for each device	S O					- <u></u>		45 65	001		
ransport and install	S O							1. 1. 1.1			
odify NAMTRADET o use device	S O						- Curt	47	-01		
ated costs to device	S O	4.674	i osi			1073	157 - 10				
the routine maintenance of	s O		2.69	23. 	01 13014	1.103 1003		19			
epair each device tions	<u>s</u> 0		V)		a si otvi			100			
odate each device as ' in the weapon	<u>s</u> 0					oi.ve		13	11		
number of instructors personnel with	s 0		109		81° 83 2 - 201		n Fo apř	het Ist	,44,		
DNSIDERATIONS	enter	s vite solve	stores o stores	12 11	12 23 12091	10900	atu; sfq:	8.ec	.24		L
	S 0						action a				
	nber of instructors rsonnel with SIDERATIONS rences for different	nber of instructors S rsonnel with 0 SIDERATIONS rences for different S 0 D-7	nber of instructors rsonnel with 0 SIDERATIONS rences for different S 0 D-7	nber of instructors rsonnel with 0 SIDERATIONS rences for different S 0 D-7	nber of instructors rsonnel with 0 SIDERATIONS rences for different S 0 D-7	In the weapon     0       Inber of instructors rsonnel with     S       SIDERATIONS       rences for different       D	In che weapon     0       Inber of instructors rsonnel with     S       SIDERATIONS       rences for different       D	Image: Second	Image: Second	In the weapon of instructors S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	In che weapon     0     0       Inber of instructors rsonnel with     S     0       SIDERATIONS     0     0       rences for different     S     0       D-7     D-7

TRUE EVENIE

1

	Need for differt information -otain			No info	eed f	or ion		Eff obt	ort i ain	info	mat	to ion
THUT ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL ALL AL	Item of Information		CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EXTREME FFEORT
24	The expected life of the weapon system	errentereter (1999 er er		2.	3.	4	5	-	2.	э.	4.	2
35.	For a new weapon system, the delivery dates for fleet introduction		nnes	1 na	1. (e	er ar Ma	1070		1)	8		_
36.	The number of maintenance personnel required to support the weapon system	1000 C		2861			0.0	AND A	200			
37.	The time available to train the personnel required to support the weapon system		80	dev	1019	Xur	63	1203	SME			
38.	The length of time required to procure, deliver, and install the device	S O		25-16	1 5		101		1997			
39.	The availability of information needed to develop a training course	1 (12)9 					iota I		169			
40.	The anticipated frequency and complexity of modifications of the weapon system	14 1	134	6 10) 0133 		20 U 20 U 20 U	es es f re	0111 0111	9911 251  9-046	8.8		
41.	The anticipated capabilities of simulators in the next few years	e tenat	n t esta	ent	100	90 1 903	103	5201 1051	990 9d3	.0		
	REPAIR CONSIDERATIONS							39 N	0.04		-	
42.	Estimates of frequency of repair for each device	S O		9 3123 	253 253		10					
43.	Estimates of average time to repair each device	S O	2145		9 9	903 90 3	10.4	0 2 3 3 0 8 5 1 0 8 5 1	en. 6/15 8/12			
44.	Requirements for special tools and test equipment to repair each device	<u>s</u> 0	e serv th	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0/87	noun paun		126	and bos			
45.	Requirements for specially trained people to repair each device	s O		4917	1973) 1973)		.3.2	<u>.</u>	21.1		-	

D-8

	Need for Effort			Nee	ed format	or ion		Effo	ort i ain '	requ <sup>r</sup> info	ired mat	to ion
INDERGIE LANDIG	Item of Information		CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EXTREME EFFORT
46	Popularements for special documentation	s		2.	e.	4.	5.	-	2.	3.	4.	5.
40.	to repair each device	0	. 31		End and	B232	35	13		-86		
47.	Availability of spare parts if device requires repair	s 0	17.3	. 104	Ge 1.7	ent	ub9		art I	.03	cature and a se	
48.	Extent of factory support required to repair device	<u>s</u> 0			31	933 933	150	10				
49.	The accessibility of components of device requiring repair	S O	1121	(, 10 (173	184. 76.16	evos evos	19.913	12.1	00			
	PHYSICAL CONSIDERATIONS	as per Lei Che	2 81	notou neten	nd en Gritte	) 10 6 10	ane g v	txs hi th	aft ov	-13		
50.	The dimensions and weight of the device	s 0	00.04	2 11 20	80	10	me	2 X2		 - 32		
51.	The electrical or other power require- ments for each device	S O		0132					anti.			
52.	The problems associated with moving and storing each device	S O				1.10	110					
53.	The durability of each device under frequent use	S O		0103	080			103	60.			
54.	The number of sites where each device will be used	s 0		5.110	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	1000 1000						
55.	The number of students who could use each device at the same time	s 0	6 23	1500	12							
56.	The number of students to be trained with the device in one year	s 0									1	
57.	The duration of the course											
58.	The percentage of the class time the device will be used	s 0										

. .

100

	taronnas on obtain			N inf	eed orma	for tion		Ef ob	fort tain	req	uire orma
	Item of Information		1. CRUCIAL	2. EXTREMELY USEFUL	3. USEFUL	4. OPTIONAL	5. TRIVIAL	1. LITTLE EFFORT	2. SLIGHT EFFORT	3. MODERATE EFFORT	4. MAJOR EFFORT
59.	The class time that might be saved with each device	<u>s</u>	and the second	6	inga Ny Nat	103			62		_
60.	The scheduling flexibility of the course (i.e., what will happen if the device is inoperative?)	S 0		24   - 194 194	ear.	2911	1097 137		etxe txt		4
	CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT INSTRUCTORS AND STUDENTS		100								
61.	The extent of instructor's experience working with maintenance of the system			340		10 1-21	63	401	1913		
62.	The extent of the instructor's experience teaching the course	ana							Vel 1		11-2
63.	The attitudes of instructors about each device	s 0		9			3	1 22	109A		
64.	The amount of training of instructors required to use each device	so			190	059		510 2003	and		
65.	The educational background of potential students	ia			0.0	1.30	1009	9 3			
66.	The maintenance experience of potential students						030	56.	11st		
67.	The attitudes of students about each device	s O	812 	sine di e	e 5d	1 2 E 11 2	eoh o m	st 	1355		12
Here			1650	50	o ni	0.21 5. 5 -	sh i	63 	12 T W		
Items		9.37E	28	15	933 979	50 s	121	019 799	2 90		
Add New	B-9		elare con		-	sers dans					ourse.
-1											

Specific Instructions for Completing Table II

Table II lists possible sources to be consulted when gathering information to help decide between simulators and operational equipment.

An illustration will indicate the procedure you are to follow in completing Table II. Reproduced below are two items of Table II.

			Need to consult					
	Source of Information	-	2.	3.	4.	5.		
1.	Instructors of the course	x						
2.	Instructors teaching similiar courses		x					
		19133	mon	1.3	1-90	1905		

[The column headings (e.g., 1. MANDATORY--must be consulted) have been omitted here. Refer to the first page of Table II for the complete headings.]

In the above illustration the expert decided that item 1. "Instructors of the course" must be consulted. He therefore placed an X in the box 1. MANDATORY--must be consulted. In item 2. "Instructors teaching similiar courses," the expert decided that it would probably be very useful to consult such a source. He therefore placed an X in box 2. PROBABLY VERY USEFUL--should be consulted. In each row of Table II, you are to follow the same procedure, namely, mark an X for one of the five alternatives under the category "Need to consult."

[Note: In Table II we are concerned with the need to consult each listed source to help decide between simulators and operational equipment. Such sources should also prove useful <u>after</u> the decision has been made to buy a simulator or operational equipment.]

Comments about the items may be written in the margins or on the back of the pages.

4

In the blank rows at the end of Table II you may add other sources of information.

		Need to consult				
	<pre>edit 1: hists bissible sources to be enhaulted when gathering mation to help dedide between signalators and operational equipment. in illustration will indicate the procedure you are to follow in eting Table II. Reproduced below are two items of Table II.</pre>	-must be consulted	ERY USEFUL <u>should</u> be consulted	USEFULprobably should be consulted	OPTIONAL <u>might</u> be consulted	UNNECESSARYneed not be consulted
	stors of the course					
	ource of Information	MANDATORY-	PROBABLY V			
_	need aved (bastic not ed augh-evstraching (1 n.e) sperbeed envio		2.	з.	4.	5.
	PERSONNEL	heed				
1.	Instructors of the course	0 07 1 X0			1	
2.	Instructors teaching similiar courses					
3.	Instructors who are teaching with simulators	0110	e T			
4.	Training analysts	V 1 2 8				
5.	Personnel doing the maintenance job in the fleet	1271	-			
6.	Graduates of the course	3 Ned eben				
7.	Students of the course		-			
8.	Aircraft manufacturer	1.01	0			
9.	Manufacturers of aircraft components	n1 1				•

Table II. Sources of Information for Decision Making

NAME
(bsonttmos) 11. sideT		Ne co	ed to nsult	b
Source of Information	1. MANDATORY	2. PROBABLY VERY USEFUL	3. USEFUL	A ADTIONAL
10. Navy supply specialists				
11. Navy procurement specialists				
12. Navy safety specialists				Γ
13. Manufacturers of simulators				T
14. Navy school administrators	to strie	2		T
15. Navy management				
DOCUMENTS	ana na Agri ase			
16. Maintenance manuals for the weapon system				Γ
17. Flight manuals of the weapon system				T
<ol> <li>Maintenance Plan (i.e., written record of maintenance concept for system and equipment, including maintenance tasks, level of repair analysis, and support and test equipment requirements)</li> </ol>				
19. Personnel and Training Plan (i.e., written record of personnel and training required to operate and support the equipment;			S. J.	
<ol> <li>Technical Data Plan(i.e., written description of all information aids necessary to operate and support the equipment)</li> </ol>				
<ol> <li>Facilities Requirements Plan (i.e., written record of shipboard, shore, operational, maintenance, and training facilities)</li> </ol>				
22. Transportation and Handling Plan (i.e., written record of packaging, handling, storage, and transportation requirements for equipment)				
D-13				

	×	ed (to t (uari			Table II (continued)					
James of Colors and Colors	Oht.Robit.				of Information	4.5*	1003	Nee	d to sult	
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				tiv specialists survent specialists ty specialists vers of simulators	NDATORY	OBABLY VERY USEFUL	EFUL	TI ONAL	VECESSARY
	1		S	ource	e of Information	2	a .	1		:
		2	S 3. 4.	ource Relev Resea	e of Information want government instructions arch and evaluation reports on maintenance simulators	× .	2. P	3. 1	4. (	
		2 2	S 3. 4	Relev	e of Information vant government instructions urch and evaluation reports on maintenance simulators		2. P	3. 1	4 (	-
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	At any items have	S 3. 4	Relev	e of Information want government instructions arch and evaluation reports on maintenance simulators		2. P	3. 1	4 (	
		Att mail items have	S 3. 4	Relev	e of Information rant government instructions rch and evaluation reports on maintenance simulators		2. P	3. 1		
		Ad and there have	S 3. 4	Relev	e of Information want government instructions arch and evaluation reports on maintenance simulators		2. P	3. 1	31 B - 4 - 4	
		Ad and there have	S 3.	Relev	e of Information		2. P	3. 1	31 31 31 3 - 2 4 - 4 - 4	

## Specific Instructions for Completing Table III

In this section we assume that the administrator has considered all the relevant information and <u>decided to use simulators</u> rather than operational equipment. Table III concerns the administrator's role in implementing his decision.

Most of the items in Tables I and II, which were applicable to the decision process, are applicable also to the implementation process-the process of procuring, installing, and using a simulator system. Rather than repeat the items of Tables I and II in Table III we have chosen to list items that summarize much of the material of Tables I and II. In addition to the summary items, Table III includes material not considered in Tables I and II. Also, Table III asks you to judge how frequently the issues have been considered in past simulation systems.

An illustration will indicate the procedure you are to follow in completing Table III. Reproduced below is one item of Table III.

	And and an and an and an and an and an an and an	N	eed ar	to a iss	ddre	ess	Past	t per	form	nance an is	in sue
100	Issue to be addressed	-	2.	з.	4.	5.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
1.	Verify that course objectives are met with the simulator system	X								x	

[The column headings (e.g., 1. CRUCIAL--the issue <u>must</u> be addressed) have been omitted here. Refer to the first page of Table III for the complete headings.]

In the above illustration the expert decided that item 1. "Verify that course objectives are met with the simulator system" is an issue that must be addressed in procuring simulators. He therefore placed an X in the box 1. CRUCIAL-- the issue <u>must</u> be addressed. For the same item, he also decided that the issue had been infrequently considered in past simulation systems. Therefore, he placed an X in alternative 4. issue INFREQUENTLY has been addressed in the past.

In each row of Table III you are to follow the same procedure, namely, <u>mark an X for one of the five alternatives under the category</u> "Need to address an issue," and mark an X for one of the five alternatives under the category "Past performance in addressing an issue."

Comments about the items may be written in the margins or on the back of the pages.

In the blank row at the end of Table III you may add new items.

D-15

Section II. The Implementation of a Decision to Use Simulators.

Instructions for Completing Julia III

Table III. Issues to be Addressed in Procuring Simulators

NAME

elor s'anterizzanine and shashoo iii s	iotzi	Need	to n ís	addr sue	ess	Pa	st p dres	erfo sing	rman an	ce i issu
<pre>bies 1 and 11, which were applicable to the spleadso to the implementation process- crafting, and using a simulator system. of Tables 1 and 11 in Table 111, we have chosen much of the Galerial of Tables 1 and 11. In a life ack you to judge now frequently the isoles intate the procedure you are to follow in these ten of Table 111. Shade the procedure you are to follow in these ten of Table 111. Sheet to address Past performant inter the procedure you are to follow in the set of the set ten of Table 111.</pre>	addressed	should be addressed	should be addressed	e addressed	be addressed	n addressed in the past	ddressed in the past	addressed in the past	addressed in the past	addressed in the past
Issue to be addressed	cRUCIALthe issue must be	EXTREMELY USEFULthe issue	SEFULthe issue probably	PTIONALthe issue might t	'RIVIALthe issue need not	issue ALMOST ALWAYS has bee	issue FREQUENTLY has been a	issue OCCASIONALLY has been	issue INFREQUENTLY has been	issue ALMOST NEVER has been
1 Varify that course objectives are not with	1. (	2. 1	3. 1	4.	5. 1	-	2.	3.	4.	5.
the simulator system		-0-0	110 110	0.0		d a ti	1911			
<ol> <li>Evaluate the training effectiveness of the simulator system by testing student performance</li> </ol>		id ala	a VJ 30	M38 Ion	3374 13.89	1.0	1223			
<ol> <li>Verify all costs associated with the simulator are within estimates</li> </ol>			516 V	1241 1281	006 006	1 200	sn"			
<ol> <li>Establish and monitor time schedules for development and installation of the simulator</li> </ol>	entres.*	ento	300 .3	5 20 1980	1000 1001	10 10	lasį			
5. Insure provisions for updates and changes	20.00	1			2014					
<ol> <li>Insure that adequate tools, documentation, spare parts, and personnel are available for repair of the simulator</li> </ol>										

# Table III (continued)

		Need to address an issue							rforming a	nance in is	insu
	Issue to be addressed	CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	ALMOST ALWAYS addressed	FREQUENTLY addressed	OCCASIONALLY addressed	INFREQUENTLY addressed	AI MOST NEVER addressed
9	t entry groes the percention of experts splecting		2.	з.	4.	5.	141	2.	з.	4.	5
1.	Verify that actual repair frequency and "downtime" are within estimates					19 9 10 12 1 0 12 1 0	ont ant				
8.	Insure the training site is adequately prepared for installation of simulator		010 02 02	10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2018 5275 14 95	1019 1019 2040	10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				
9.	Establish and monitor time schedules for NAMTRADET course										
10.	Establish follow up procedures to monitor instructor and student attitudes toward the simulator system	8-9 8-9 8-5 1	5612 6073	102 H		100					
11.	Insure adequacy of instructor training for use of simulator system	218) 953 213			The Suc						
12.	Insure adequate human factors design requirements have been met		24	1342	10 (G)	380	19				
13.	Evaluate instructor performance	105		8.044 0.070	211		8293 57956				
14.	Establish effective channels of communi- cation between instructors and management					10.54	C E I	3			
15.	Assess all effects resulting from introduction of simulator system	1410A 1081	100	16 I		618 0/	3.35				
16.	Prevent overuse of the simulator as a toy to impress visiting dignitaries			ul I	11	N.	CIME)	9			
here											
tems		-									+
new i	81-0										
Add	•										

Instructions for Completing Section III

<u>Results</u>. Question V of Questionnaire One asked you to rate the feasibility, the training effectiveness, and the cost of simulation for nine aircraft systems. The opinions of all participants are summarized in two tables given in this section.

In these tables each entry gives the percentage of experts selecting that alternative for a given category, such as feasibility. For example, for the Organizational Level table for Structures, Hydraulics, & Flight Controls, under the category feasibility, 59% of the experts said simulation was <u>Definitely feasible</u>, 20% said simulation was <u>Possiblv feasible</u>,..., and 5% said simulation was <u>Definitely infeasible</u> (see table). The percentages add to 101%, rather than 100%, because each percentage was rounded off to the nearest whole number. For the same system and maintenance level (see table), 18% of the experts stated that simulators were <u>Much more effective</u> for training, 46% stated that simulators were <u>Possibly more effective</u>, 10% stated that simulators and operational equipment were <u>Equally effective</u>,....

<u>Delphi</u>. As discussed earlier, the Delphi Technique obtains the independent opinions of experts, summarizes those opinions, and then asks each expert to reconsider his opinion in light of the opinions of all the experts. The aim of the technique is to obtain <u>agreement</u> among the experts, if such agreement actually exists. Agreement is indicated by a high percentage (perhaps 50% or more) of the experts selecting the same alternative, such as the 59% selecting <u>Definitely</u> feasible.

The Delphi Technique is similar to a conference in which each expert presents his independent opinion on the topic and then, after having heard the opinions of other experts, he is given the opportunity to change his opinion.

<u>Illustration of Instructions</u>. In Question V of Questionnaire One, in two tables, you gave your opinions on simulators and operational equipment. Now you are asked to reexamine your opinions in the light of the opinions of the group, and if you desire, change your opinions. An example will illustrate how to change or retain your opinion.

## Here is a portion of the table for Organizational Level Maintenance:

	10 100	Fea	asil	bil	ity	Ef	SS	Eff	Co fect	ost tive	enes	ss			
		2.	3.	4.	à	1-	2	e.	4.	2		2.	Э.	4.	5.
Structure, Hydraulics, & Flight Controls	(3)	20	10	7	5	18	46	10	23	3	3	(8)	13	×	26
Propulsion	37	29	10	12	12	15(	30	17	20	17	(3)	×	19	32	35

[The column headings (e.g., Definitely feasible) have been omitted here. Refer to the complete table for the headings.]

In the above table, the circles in red indicate the judgements of one expert in Questionnaire One. (On the complete tables the opinions you gave are indicated by the red circles.) Thus, for Structures, Hydraulics, & Flight Controls, this expert judges that simulation was <u>1. Definitely feasible</u>, that operational equipment and simulators were <u>3. Equally effective</u> for training, and that simulators were <u>2. More</u> <u>expensive</u> than operational equipment.

In the category Feasibility, the expert examines the percentages representing all the experts and decides to retain his original opinion, <u>1. Definitely feasible</u>. He therefore makes no mark on the table. He also decides to retain his original opinion on Training Effectiveness, namely, <u>3. Equally effective</u>. On Cost Effectiveness he decides to change his opinion (Simulators are <u>2. More expensive</u>) to the opinion that simulators are <u>4. Less expensive</u>. He <u>indicates this new opinion by placing</u> an X in the box 4. Less expensive.

For the Propulsion system the expert retains his former opinions on Feasibility and Training Effectiveness, but for Cost Effectiveness he changes his opinion from 1. Much more expensive to 2. More expensive and indicates this change by marking an X in the box 2. More expensive.

If he cares to, the expert may provide a comment on the back of the sheet explaining why he did or did not change his opinion. Such comments are particularly helpful if the expert's opinion differs greatly from the opinion of the group.

You are under no obligation to agree with the other experts. If an honest difference of opinion exists among the experts, we want the results of the questionnaire to reflect that difference of opinion.

D-19

Here is a portion of the table for Organizational Lavel Maintenance:

## Summary of Instructions to Complete Two Tables

1. The table entries give the percentage of experts expressing a given opinion (e.g., 59% of the experts said Definitely feasible).

2. The red circles indicate the opinions  $\underline{you}$  expressed on Questionnaire One.

3. Examine the table entries for each aircraft system and category and decide if you want to retain or change your opinion.

If you want to retain the same opinion you gave on Questionnaire One, make no mark on the table.

If you want to change your opinion, put an X in the appropriate box.

4. If your opinion differs from the general opinion of the group, if you can, please provide a comment on the back of the table to support your opinion or to refute the majority opinion.

in the category Feasibility. The expert examines the percentages representing of the experts and decides to ratain his original connion, <u>Definitally feasible</u> to therefore dates in mark on the table a sisd decides to retain his original apinion on Fraining Effectiveness, remain, <u>Edually effective</u> On oss offectiveness he decides to change is obligion (simulators are 2 More exdensive) to the opinion that simulators and 4, tess expensively de indicates this devices by placing

For the Propulsion system the expect retains his former opinions of Fastivility and Instaing Effectiveness, but fem CostrEffectiveness he changes his opthion from 1. <u>Publy mere expensive</u> to 2. Pore expensive and increates this change by marking as V is the box <u>2. Pore expensive</u>.

If he cares to, the expert may provide a cumment on the back of the sheet croisiainto why he did or did hat change his opinion. Such comments are particularly helpful if the expert's opinion differs greatly from the carnier of the aroust

You are under no doligation to agree with the other experts. If an honest difference of opinion exists shong the experts, we want the results of the questionneire to reflect that difference of opinion.

### Brief Descriptions of Aircraft Maintenance Systems

Structure, Hydraulics and Flight Controls Systems--includes for example: airframe structure components, corrosion control, hydraulic power supply and distribution systems, alighting and launching gear, wing and fin foil systems, primary and secondary flight control systems, empennage.

<u>Propulsion Systems</u>--includes for example: engine maintenance, quick engine change, assembly and buildup, removal/installation, aircraft fuel storage and transfer, fuel system operation and maintenance.

<u>Electrical and Instrument Systems</u>--includes for example: drive generator, electrical power supply and distribution, instrument indicating systems, lighting, and electrical circuits for following systems: engine and related system, hydraulic, environmental, life support, armament.

Environmental Control and Egress Systems--includes for example: cabin air conditioning, cabin air pressurization, crew egress component/sub-systems, oxygen system.

Armament/Weapons Delivery System--includes for example: guns, mounts, weapon direction equipment, launcher, pods, bomb racks and other mechanical or electro-mechanical equipment for weapons delivery function.

<u>Communications and Navigation Systems</u>--includes for example: intercom, radio system(s), data link, radar, radio, direction finding set, doppler compass.

Automatic Flight Controls--includes for example: automatic pilot, flight displays, mechanical and electrical parts for signal transmission and application of power, reference sensors, air data computer.

<u>Reconnaissance Equipment</u>--equipment necessary to reconnaissance mission. Includes for example: photographic and electronics, infrared and other sensors, search receivers, recorders, warning devices, magazines and data link.

<u>Anti-Submarine Warfare</u>--equipment preculiar to the anti-submarine warfare mission. Includes for example: acoustic and nonacoustic sensor systems, computer, displays.

her boolensighted

D-21

# ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL

## (Refer to earlier descriptions for distinctions between O-level and I-level maintenance)

		Thof	ie s ma th	sim st is i	or sy	all stem	21394 21394 21394	Con	mpa men	red t s	ta	o o ula	per	ati B a	ona	1	equ	ip-
maintegrande, quiek allation, aircraft and maintegrades wert indicating systems, stans engine and re- batens engine and re- batens component/sub- egress component/sub- nacks and other atons delivery function.	Totally ignorant of this system	1. Definitely feasible	2. Possibly feasible	3. Uncortain	4. Possibly infeasible	5. Definitely infossible		1. Much more affactive for training	2. Possibly more effective	3. Equally affactive	4. Possibly less effective	5. Much less effective		I. Much more expensive	2.º Hore expensive	3. Equally expensive	4. Lass expensive	5. Much less expensive
Structure, Hydraulics, & Flight Controls		59	20	10		5		18	46	10	23	3	i a	3	8	13	50	26
Propulsion		37	29	10	1 1:	12		15	30	17	20	U		3	11	19	32	35
Electrical & Instrument		79	16		2	0	09	47	28	9	14	2	013 25	0	2	15	51	32
Environmental/Egress	T.	46	36	10	5	3		14	38	16	24	8	(n)	0	9	17	Р	23
Armament/Weapons Delivery	an o	57	25	10	3	5	tiocos: storas	33	27	20	13	7		0	8	5	55	32
Communications and Navigation		71	15	5	7	2		46	24	7	12	10		0	5	15	37	43
Automatic Flight Controls	Π	57	29	12	2	0		43	29	14	12	2		0	0	10	61	30
Reconnaissance		43	38	5	11	3		27	30	14	24	5		0	8	14	49	30
Antisubmarine Warfare		56	18	8	5	3		34	29	16	16	5		0	5	11	50	34

INTERMEDIATE LEVEL

(Refer to earlier descriptions for distinctions between 0-level and I-level maintenance)

		Too	he fr ft	sir ost his i	or sy	all stem		Co	mpa	irec	i t si	0 0	per	ations	ion	al e:	equ	ip-
antes find and and and and and and and and and a	Totally ignorant of this system	1. Definitely feasible	2. Possibly faasible	3. Uncertain	4. Possibly infeasible	5. Definitely infeasible	the t i hav i) i) i) ce Le	1. Much more effective for training	2. Possibly more effective	3. Equally effective	4. Possibly lass effective	5. Much less effective		1. Much more expensive	2. More expensive	3. Equally expensive	4. Less expensive	5. Much less expensive
Structure, Hydraulics, & Flight Controls		27	10	23	20	20		13	26	3	26	3:		6	11	28	36	19
Propulsion		23	15	23	17	23		10	28	3	26	3:		3	16	22	35	24
Electrical & Instrument		56	10	13	13	8		35	20	7	23	1	5	0	13	15	46	26
Environmental/Egress		27	14	22	14	24		19	22	6	28	2	5	3	9	18	44	26
Armament/Weapons Delivery		36	17	11	22	14		25	19	6	25	2	5	0	14	20	40	26
Communications and Navigation		45	15	10	20	10		36	15	5	21	2	3	0	15	18	41	26
Automatic Flight . Controls		36	18	18	18	10		29	16	8	26	21		3	16	16	42	24
Recomaissance		35	19	16	19	11		28	22	3	25	22		0	16	19	41	24
Antisubmarine Wariare		46	11	14	19	11		31	14	14	Ð	22		0	19	11	41	30

D-23

(Faler to sarilar descriptions for distinctions between 0-lavel and I-lavel maintenance)

Before mailing,

**TARANA** 

\*

Please check to see that you have written your name on the first page of each table and that you have included all the tables of Questionnaire Two.

D-24

Table for	Intermediate Level	(1 page)
Table for	Organizational Level	(1 page)
Table III	(2 pages)	
Table II	(3 pages)	
Table I	(6 pages)	

## APPENDIX E

## Questionnaire Three and the material

## provided with Questionnaire Three

"hank you for completing (mestionnaits Twong our study of singistory and operational equipment in eviation maintenance training,

Desstantaire Erree is quoiosof. It is, you shill as happy to haar, the last questionation of the study. The tisk required to complete Desstionneice Three should be such lass than that required for siteer of the two Stovians questionnings

He would be grainful for any consents obtain Questioboairs Three of carlier tweet innaites, or about this separate for obtaining expant optadom. While your consents on a separate sheet of paper. This is your last share to voirs your thoughts about the utablem of simulators varies operational comprent. You will be went a roop of the final report of this study as soon as it is conflated.

Once again 1 user sek you to refurb the questionhalts <u>promptly</u>, within a few tays if possible. A quick response will save av (and you) the time spent on a reminder phone call and will acan co will have the final report sconer.

Once succe, thanks for your coordention to this steay.

13.970 310 200 4 20

ACCRETE M THERE

1 ,

E-1

provided with Questionnite Three

Dear \_\_\_

Thank you for completing Questionnaire Two in our study of simulators and operational equipment in aviation maintenance training.

Questionnaire Three is enclosed. It is, you will be happy to hear, the last questionnaire of the study. The time required to complete Questionnaire Three should be much less than that required for either of the two previous questionnaires.

We would be grateful for any comments about Questionnaire Three or earlier questionnaires, or about this method for obtaining expert opinion. Write your comments on a separate sheet of paper. This is your last chance to voice your thoughts about the problem of simulators versus operational equipment. You will be sent a copy of the final report of this study as soon as it is completed.

Once again I must ask you to return the questionnaire promptly, within a few days if possible. A quick response will save me (and you) the time spent on a reminder phone call and will mean you will have the final report sooner.

Once again, thanks for your cooperation in this study.

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. HERRICK

E-2

# Questionnaire Three

In Questionnaire Three, you are to reexamine the opinions you expressed in Questionnaire Two and also give your opinion on a few new items. In completing this questionnaire remember that this study:

- a) is limited to maintenance training at NAMTRADETS,
- b) includes both 0-level and I-level (but not depot level) maintenance training, and
- c) is limited to simulation systems that cost no more than \$200,000.

<u>Results.</u> Tables I, II, and III show, for each item and category of Questionnaire Two, the percentage of experts that selected each alternative. For example, consider in Table I, item 1. "A detailed description of each task the student must perform." In Questionnaire Two for this item (see Table I), under the category <u>Need for Information</u>, 73% of the experts selected the alternative CRUCIAL, 13% selected the alternative EXTREMELY USEFUL, ..., and 0% selected the alternative TRIVIAL.

For each item, for each category, the alternative that you selected in Questionnaire Two is indicated by a red circle.

<u>Instructions</u>. These instructions for completing Questionnaire Three are similar to those you followed for the O-level and I-level tables of Questionnaire Two.

For each item of Tables I, II, and III examine the percentage data and decide if you want to change or retain your opinion.

If you want to retain the opinion you gave on Questionnaire Two, make no mark for that item.

If you want to change your opinion, put an X in the box for the new alternative you have chosen.

If your opinion differs from the general opinion of the group, if you can, <u>please provide a comment</u> on the back of the table to support your opinion or to refute the majority opinion.

When examining Table I, recall that a row labelled "S" means that the device referred to in the item is a simulator, and a row labelled "O" means that the device referred to in the item is operational equipment.

When <u>new items</u> have been added, they appear at the end of a table. To indicate your opinion for each new item, mark an X under one of the five alternatives for each category.

E-3

student's partdrashie for sach task

Section I. Gathering Information to Help the Decision Maker Decide between Simulators and Operational Equipment. Table I. Information Required for Decision Making subute eine theit this study: Need for Effort required to information obtain information obtained USEFUL--the information probably should be obtained ton systems that cost no more than to obtain information TRIVIAL--the information need not be obtained information requires LITTLE EFFORT to obtain information EFFORT to obtain information be requires MAJOR EFFORT to obtain information OPTIONAL--the information might be obtained show for asch item and category of obtained EXTREMELY USEFUL--the information should In Questionnaire lag for ting item obtai.. þe must t0 requires MODERATE EFFORT information tet by a red chefe. EFFORT as for completing Questionnitie Three are the O-level and I-level tables of EXTREME SLIGHT CRUCIAL--the requires requires Item of Information ŝ COURSE CONTENT CONSIDERATIONS A detailed description of each 1. task the student must perform 73 13 8 10 8 25 42 6 15 0 2. The time it should take the student to perform each task 10 38 8 4 29 6 37 8 18 43 3. The tools, test equipment, and documentation available to the student during training and testing 62 38 2 0 19 35 35 6 6 0 4. The criteria used to evaluate the student's performance for each task 119 21 4 10 25 35 23 8 56 0 The training objectives of the course 5. 0 24 8 8 18 25 33 33 0 2 The amount of supervision provided on 6. the job 37 38 6 23 3 35 35 4 E-4

-------

a substantiant and

NAME

	Table I (continued)			Ne	ed f	or ion		Eff	ort ain	requ <sup>r</sup> info	ired rmat	to
DEBUTE EFFORT	Item of information		CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	<b>OPTIONAL</b>	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EVTREME FFENRT
X				2.	з.	4.	5.	-	2.	e.	4.	4
7.	A description of the physical environment on the job (e.g., heat, noise)	rn1.n	8	25	44	17	6	31	37	25	8	
8.	The physical fidelity (e.g., size, weight) required to meet the course objectives	Net al	38	21	35	2	4	13	37	25	10	12
9.	The availability of other courses which might meet the objectives of the planned course		35	33	ż5	6	2	21	27	44	4	
10.	The availability of instructional aids (e.g. lesson plans, movies)	.,	25	37	29	4	6	15	21	46	13	
11.	The amount of feedback to the instructor about student performance	058	38	42	13	6	0	2	25	46	17	11
12.	The amount of feedback to the student about his performance	i stat	38	37	17	4	4	4	31	46	13	
13.	Analysis of frequent failures and repairs of the weapon system	of	37	42	21	0	0	4	14	39	29	14
14.	The tools, test equipment, and documentation available to the student to perform each task on the job	on	54	33	12	0	2	15	35	29	21	
15.	List of malfunctions (faults) that the maintenance man must recognize and correct on the job	1997) 	65	27	6	2	0	4	8	48	29	10
16.	Lists of faults that can and cannot be	s	57	29	10	2	2	12	13	33	37	1
21.2	inserted into the device	0	55	29	10	6	0	4	8	46	31	12
17.	The need to demonstrate multiple faults for a single failure		34	36	30	0	0	6	12	44	29	10
18.	The need to include infrequently encount- ered maintenance tasks		20	30	28	20	2	4	12	53	25	
19.	The requirement for "hands-on" experience		63	23	12	2	0	13	17	42	25	2
20.	The amount and type of additional training required on the job		29	42	23	4	2	4	19	44	25	1

.

1910 1 Per in all

EV MENE

1. 12

and all a set

The second

....

-

. .

·····

-----

----

Table 1 (co	ntinu	ed)									
Information obtain in			Nee	ed format	or ion	ß	Effo	ort ain	requ <sup>.</sup> info	ired	to ion
Item of Information		CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EXTREME EFFORT
Insurant		:	2.	з.	4.	5.		2.	e.	4.	5
21. The need for self-paced learning	1911	18	29	18	27	8	4	16	36	24	20
22. The need for alternative routes (i.e., branching) for learning	61720 15200 	20	29	27	16	8	4	12	42	32	10
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS	13 JU	1.59	(t) a	obje	3:13	198	8 31 97*	10 TAN 1900			
23. The funds available for the project		87	9	4	0	0	27	38	18	9	9
24. The cost to buy each device	S	85	12	4	0	0	8	20	35	22	1.6
	0	81	6	12	0	0	18	41	27	8	6
25. The cost for spare parts for each device	S	65	31	4	0	0	6	18	39	25	12
	0	63	29	8	0	0	12	29	39	12	8
26. The cost to transport and install	S	44	23	25	6	2	12	.51	27	8	2
		46	19	27	6	2.	14	45	35	6	0
27. The cost to modify NAMTRADET	S	60	23	15	2	0	6	19	44	23	8
		60	25	15	0	0	0	21	27	15	4
28. Power and related costs to operate each device		42	27	19	0 /	4	12	38	40	0	2
20 The cost for the resting minterest		60	23	15	- 2	0	2	15	54	15	13
each device	0	60	21	15	2	2	6	25	54	10	6
30. The cost to repair each device	5	57	35	8	0	0	2	10	33	35	20
if it malfunctions	ŏ	55	33	8	2	2	2	22	37	27	12
31. The cost to update each device as	s	45	25		-	2	2	1926	1.5	20	10
changes occur in the weapon	0	71	10	6	1	0	2	4	40	27	15
272 reil		11	1.5	0		-	-	0	40	-1	1.
32. The cost and number of instructors and support personnel with each device	S D	71	21 23	6	0	2	0	31 29	49 49	6 8	14
LIFE CYCLE CONSIDERATIONS		10-21	onsel	1 10	9 20	959/1	1 UPC	17 80	17	EI.	L
33. Political preferences for different	s	18	20	24	12	24	14	10	47	8	0
	and the second se										1

**E**-6

Table I (continued)

rupen	amatal tor beau		Need for information						fort tain	requ info	ired rmat	to ion
WOOKINTE FEEDEL	Item of Information		. CRUCIAL	. EXTREMELY USEFUL	. USEFUL	. OPTIONAL	. TRIVIAL	. LITTLE EFFORT	. SLIGHT EFFORT	. MODERATE EFFORT	. MAJOR EFFORT	. EXTREME EFFORT
34.	The expected life of the weapon system		46	38	15	0	0	4	23	40	23	10
35.	For a new weapon system, the delivery dates for fleet introduction		54	33	6	6	2	8	37	33	17	6
36.	The number of maintenance personnel required to support the weapon system	niup	52	29	13.	6	0	4	28	48	19	0
37.	The time available to train the personnel required to support the weapon system	ots	60	27	8	4	2	8	19	48	19	6
38.	The length of time required to procure, deliver, and install the device	S O	69 75	25 19	6	0	0	8	15 17	42 46	33 25	2
39.	The availability of information needed to develop a training course	1	57	37	4	0	2	4	. 10	41	29	16
40.	The anticipated frequency and complexity of modifications of the weapon system	iven.	35	42	19	4	0	0	4	25	43	27
41.	The anticipated capabilities of simulators in the next few years		35	23	31	8	4	2	8	35	37	19
	REPAIR CONSIDERATIONS		50 9	nodw.	ter.	2 10	780	nùn i	6917	. 58		
42.	Estimates of frequency of repair	S	46	42	10	0	2	4	12	37	35	13
	for each device	0	50	44	4	0	2	2	12	48	35	4
43.	Estimates of average time to repair each device	S	33	50	15	0	2	4	12	46	29	10
44	Requirements for special tools and	S	52	29	17	0	2	6	23	44	15	4
	test equipment to repair each device	Ő	52	31	15	0	2	8	35	42	13	2
45.	Requirements for specially trained	S	54	40	4	0	2	10	19	46	19	6
al for an and	people to repair each device	0	48	37	10	0	6	15	17	42	19	6

Table I (continued)

tot i	terformation obtain			Ne info	ed format	or ion		Eff obt	ort ain	requ info	ired rmat	to
AUNCH PALON	Item of Information		CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EXTREME EFFORT
2.14				N	m	4	2.	-	N	e.	4.	3
46.	Requirements for special documentation	S	30	28	32	6	4	12	22	34	24	8
	to repair each device	0	24	24	43	6	4	16	30	32	18	4
47.	Availability of spare parts if	s	62	25	13	0	0	8	24	31	27	10
	device requires repair	0	56	27	15	2	0	14	31	33	16	5
48.	Extent of factory support required	s	48	38	8	6	0	8	27	33	27	6
84	to repair device	0	42	42	12	2	2	14	26	42	16	2
49.	The accessibility of components of	s	25	23	44	6	2	6	37	37	12	ŝ
	device requiring repair	Ō.	23	23	46	4	4	10	41	41	6	2
50.	PHYSICAL CONSIDERATIONS The dimensions and weight of the device	s	19 25	23	40	12 10	6	46	31	19	2	2
51.	The electrical or other power require-	s	31	29	27	8	6	42	35	17	4	2
	ments for each device	0	38	27	25	6	4	44	31	19	4	2
52.	The problems associated with moving	s	13	25	38	15	8	27	39	25	6	2
	and storing each device	0	13	29	40	12	6	25	48	23	4	0
53.	The durability of each device	S	44	46	6	4	0	8	27	31	22	12
136	under frequent use	0	44	46	6	4	0	6	30	46	14	4
54.	The number of sites where each device	s	37	29	27	6	2	31	42	19	6	2
EN	will be used	0	37	29	27	4	4	33	40	19	6	2
55.	The number of students who could use	s	43	43	12	2	0	25	38	29	8	0
2.1	each device at the same time	0	41	47	10	2	0	21	42	27	8	2
56.	The number of students to be trained with the device in one year	s 0	42	44	6	4	4	12	43	25	18	2
57.	The duration of the course	ris.	22	32	34	5	7	39	31	23	8	0
58.	The percentage of the class time	s	25	42	19	12	2	19	23	37	19	2
C.C.	the device will be used	0	27	42	19	LO	2	17	25	37	17	4

	on to Halp the Decision Maker Decide between	ito am Food	in finite and the second secon	N inf	eed orma	for tion	1 (0) 27(2)	Ef ob	fort tain	req	uire orma	d to tion
a bay ofasm	Item of Information	13210	CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	LITTLE EFFORT	SLIGHT EFFORT	MODERATE EFFORT	MAJOR EFFORT	EXTREME EFFORT
			-	<u>م</u> .	з.	4.	5.	-	2.	з.	4.	ui.
59.	The class time that might be saved with each device	S	27	57	12	4	0	0	8	46	40	6
			57	27	12	0	0	0	0	48	40	0
60.	course (i.e., what will happen	0	57	21	14	2	0	0	20	54	10	
1.34	if the device is inoperative?)		53	31	14	2	0	0	22	5/	14	<u> </u>
Galdo o	CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT INSTRUCTORS AND STUDENTS											
61.	The extent of instructor's experience working with maintenance of the system		14	31	35	12	8	24	33	33	10	0
62.	The extent of the instructor's experience teaching the course		16	18	47	12	8	31	35	29	4	0
63.	The attitudes of instructors about	S	41	25	22	6	6	16	18	43	16	6
15	each device	0	31	24	29	8	8	16	27	39	12	6
64.	The amount of training of instructors required to use each device	S	39	39 31	20	2	0	12	32	38	18	0
65.	The educational background of potential students	15	29	31	22	14	4	24	35	25	14	2
66.	The maintenance experience of potential students	noite Arti	27	22	31	16	4	24	22	37	16	2
67.	The attitudes of students about each	s	27	16	31	16	10	8	27	39	16	10
1.82	device a la l	0	22	14	37	18	10	10	24	43	12	10
	The likelihood that the students may damage the device	.0	10		(22) ( - 137 - 137	233	210 100		11 12 12	6		
tems	The likelihood that the device may cause injury to the student	0 0	12. B	0.0		an a	1007					
New I	The capability of the device for demonstrating safety procedures	00	Ťo	19V1		80 80	en s	61 9	n 14	0	7	
	The ability of the device to duplicate actual operating conditions	0	ns*				1 (11) (1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			.8		

Table I (continued)

and the second state of th

--

007	epen	S	ectio	on I. ators	Ga and	ther Open	ing rati	Info onal	rmatio Equip	n to Help ment.	the D	ecisi	ion M	laker	De	cide	betw	veen		
1	61		•		Tab	le I	. I	nfor	mation	Required	for D	ecisi	ion M	lakir	ig					
	FLEE											Nee	ed fo	r		Effo	ort r	equi	red	to
1.1	Tint		3 17	ALVE	INNOT						F	Τ		1.000	105	1.9	- 1859			Γ
							254					ined	ped							
1	n n	111							and a second	and the second state of th	and a particular	obta	btai		P	esected and	en La constante La	uo	subjects	-
ł										593	P	þ	be o	ned	aine	tion	tion	mati	ion	
			0		2	a president de la			2	•	aine	pluo	PI	btai	obt	orma	orma	nfor	rmat	- and -
				D	5 -	41		53			bt	u sh	sho	be	t be	1 Inf	1 the	in i	info	
											on must b	Informati	n probabl	ion might	on need n	to obtai	to obtai	RT to obt	to obtain	State of the state
	r lee	53	2.5	8	11		12	14	-	tence'	rformati	'ULthe	Iformatio	informat	nformati	E EFFORT	IT EFFORT	ATE EFFO	EFFORT	
	29			8							-the i	Y USEF	the in	the	-the i	ПП	SLIGH	MODEF	MAJOF	
		I	tem o	of In	form	atior	25		0	95	CRUCIAL-	EXTREMEL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL-	requires	requires	requires	requires	
	1 04	Tee.	181	i.	12	25				2 102 2		N	з.	4.	5.		2.	з.	4.	
		c	DURSE	CON	TENT	CONS	IDĘ	RATI	ONS		TO			iad Ionei	one i s tuo			ad T PG	55	
1		. /	det task	the s	d des stude	scrip ent m	otion	n of per	each form	tentiai	73	13	8	6	0	10	8	25	42	
	2	2.	the t	ime	it si n ead	nould ch ta	l tal Isk	ke ti	he stud	lent dose	10	38	37	8	8	bud 1 4	18	43	29	
	3	. 1	tion train	avai ing a	tes able and	st eq e to testi	the ng	stud	, and d dent du	locumenta- iring	62	38	2	0	0	19	35	35	6	
-	4	l. 1	he c tude	ritent's	ria u peri	ised forma	to e	for	each t	ne lask	56	19	21	4	0	10	25	35	23	
	5	. 1	he t	rain	ing o	bjec	tive	es of	f the c	ourse	83	8	8	0	2	18	25	33	24	I
	6	. 1	he a	mount	t of	supe	rvis	ion	provid	led on	0.0		VSD	19/12		NO T.	Lain	26		T

----

..........

-

-----

	and the second second second				
Table II. Sources of Information for Decision Ma	aking				1.4.5
	N	eed to	o con	sult	t
Librout Librou	1 10 50 00	ould be consulted	be consulted	Ited	
	be consu	EFULSh	should	be consu	
sent specialists	ty procure	N NS	dably	ght	1
21 21 21 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	y safety	VER	prop	E	
Source of Information	DATOF CONCERN	BABLY	FL-	IONAL	
	WAN echool	PRO	USE	TPO	
21 at 100 851	stred succes it is	. N		4	
PERSONNEL	DOU (ENTS	0			
1. Instructors of the course	71	21	8	0	T
2. Instructors teaching similiar courses	. 19	35	33	13	T
3. Instructors who are teaching with simulators	a nstray 27	42	21	10	Ī
4. Training analysts	44	23	17	10	I
5. Personnel doing the maintenance job in the fleet	ane fan 644	29	19	8	T
6. Graduates of the course	neasture 14	35	29	20	I
7. Students of the course	10	18	33	29	I
	Second second second second		15	21	T
8. Aircraft manufacturer	Tage 1	31	112		1

.....

:..

----

.

.

• •

22. Transportation and Handling Plan (i.e., written record of packaging, and)ing, storage, and transportation requirements for equipment)

E-11

	Table IT. Sources of Information for Decision Making		Ne	ed t nsul	o t	
batfueros ad biv	Source of Information	MANDATORY	PROBABLY VERY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	IINNECESCADY
		÷	2.	ы. т	4	4
10.	Navy supply specialists	12	29	35	15	10
11.	Navy procurement specialists	23	17	42	12	6
12.	Navy safety specialists	24	27	35	12	2
13.	Manufacturers of simulators	52	23	17	6	2
14.	Navy school administrators	27	31	29	12	2
15.	Navy management	28	32	16	20	4
. An er	DOCUMENTS	13 040	i ja		a filmente	
16.	Maintenance manuals for the weapon system	92	8	0	0	0
17.	Flight manuals of the weapon system	54	22	8	10	6
18.	Maintenance Plan (i.e., written record of maintenance concept for system and equipment, including maintenance tasks, level of repair analysis, and support and test equipment requirements)	88 5 301	10	2	0	0
19.	Personnel and Training Plan (i.e., written record of personnel and training required to operate and support the equipment)	73	12	12	4	0
20.	Technical Data Plan(i.e., written description of all information aids necessary to operate and support the equipment)	63	27	10	0	0
21.	Facilities Requirements Plan (i.e., written record of shipboard, shore, operational, maintenance, and training facilities)	38	42	16	4	0
22.	Transportation and Handling Plan (i.e., written record of packaging, handling, storage, and transportation	19	23	42	6	10

# Table II (continued)

·····

.... i....

-

Foble 111. Issues to be Addressed to Procurring Simulators:

		120	3 525 6								~	Nee	d to sult	
they been addressed in the		Sour	ce 01	bazzartola ad tan basa In	form	hatio	un tarna utànjà và shàtaa	terrorubs 84 7.00 g		. MANDATORY	. PROBABLY VERY USEFUL	. USEFUL	. OPTIONAL	
Г	N I I I			FIG S CA						-	2.	3.	4	
1000	00	0.1				and the state of		The second						
H	23.	Re1 Res	evan	t go	d ev	ment	: ins	truct	ions	38	25	25	10	
	23.	Re1 Res	evan earcl	t gor n and	verr d ev	nment valua	tins ition	truct repo	ions rts on maintenance simulators	38 49	25	25	8	
and the index of the local division of the	23.	Re1 Res Res for	evan earcl earc tra	t go n and h pe inin	d ev rsor	nment valua nnel	tins tion expe	truct repor	ions rts on maintenance simulators ed with simulators used	38 49	25	22	8	
and the second second	23. 24.	Re1 Res Res for Com	evan earcl earc tra pani	t go n and h pe inin es w	verr d ev rsor g ith	nment valua nnel the	t ins tion expe pote	truct report rienco ntial	ions rts on maintenance simulators ed with simulators used for manufacturing simulators	38	25	22	8	
and a second second	23. 24.	Re1 Res for Com	evan earcl tra pani	t go n and n pe inin es w	verr d ev rsor g ith	nment valua nnel the	t ins tion expe	truct repon rienco ntial	ions rts on maintenance simulators ed with simulators used for manufacturing simulators	38	25	22	8	
	23. 24. Vew items	Re1 Res for Com	evan earcl tra pani	t go n and h pe inin es w	verr d ev rsor g ith	nment valua nnel the	t ins tion expe pote	truct repon rienco ntial	ions rts on maintenance simulators ed with simulators used for manufacturing simulators	38	22	22	8	
	23. 24.	Re1 Res for Com	evan earcl tra pani	t go n and n pe inin es w	verr d ev rsor g ith	nment valua nnel the	t ins tion expe pote	truct report rienco ntial	ions rts on maintenance simulators ed with simulators used for manufacturing simulators	38	22	22	8	
	23. 24. New items	Re1 Res for Com	evan earcl tra pani	t go h and h pe inin es w	verr d ev rsor g ith	nment valua nnel the	tion expe	truct report rienco ntial	ions rts on maintenance simulators ed with simulators used for manufacturing simulators	38		22	8	
	23. 24. New items	Res Res for Com	evan earcl tra pani	t go h and h pe inin es w	verr d ev rsor g ith	nment valua	: ins ation expe pote	truct report	ions rts on maintenance simulators ed with simulators used for manufacturing simulators	38	25	22	8	



Section II. The Implementation of a Decision to Use Simulators.

Table III. Issues to be Addressed in Procuring Simulators

NAME

					Need	to n is	addr sue	ess	Pa ad	st p dres	erfo sing	rman an	ce i issu
1977 1977					ddressed	dressed		9	in the past	the past	n the past	n the past	n the past
og 13 nærjunt	C S BHOCKER AERA ALEEP		0.05	the issue must be addressed	USEFULthe issue should be a	he issue probably should be ad	-the issue might be addressed	the issue need not be addresse	<b>ST ALWAYS has been addressed</b>	<b>UENTLY has been addressed in</b>	ASIONALLY has been addressed i	REQUENTLY has been addressed t	<b>DST NEVER has been addressed i</b>
22	Is	sue '	to be addressed a son sestimation of at	CRUCIAL1	EXTREMELY	USEFULt)	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL1	issue ALM	issue FREC	issue OCC	issue INF	issue ALM
1.	Ver	ify ·	that course objectives are met with		2.	÷.	4	i.		2.	ы.	4.	2
are the	th	e sir	nulator system	96	2	0	0	2	18	14	37	20	12
2.	Eva si pe	luato mula rfor	e the training effectiveness of the tor system by testing student mance	83	15	0	2	0	24	12	25	22	18
3.	Ver	ify a mula	all costs associated with the tor are within estimates	44	33	17	2	4	12	30	26	18	14
4.	Est de , si	abli: velop mula	sh and monitor time schedules for pment and installation of the tor	44	38	15	0	2	22	39	25	10	4
5.	Ins	ure	provisions for updates and changes	65	33	2	0	0	10	27	31	12	20
6.	Ins sp fo	are p r rep	that adequate tools, documentation, parts, and personnel are available pair of the simulator	78	20	2	0	0	8	33	24	18	18

E-14

•	Personne) Data Sheet	N	eed an	to ad issu	idre: Je	\$5	Pas add	t per ress	erformance in sing an issue					
	And her and the second of the	CRUCIAL	EXTREMELY USEFUL	USEFUL	OPTIONAL	TRIVIAL	ALMOST ALWAYS addressed	FREQUENTLY addressed	OCCASIONALLY addressed	INFREQUENTLY addressed	ALMOST NEVER addressed			
7	Verify that actual repair frequency	-	~	з.	4.	5.	-	2.	ë.	4	5			
1.	and "downtime" are within estimates	29	41	27	0	2	6	20	33	29	12			
8.	Insure the training site is adequately prepared for installation of simulator	67	29	4	0	0	25	25	35	8	8			
9.	Establish and monitor time schedules for NAMTRADET course	31	33	27	4	4	23	33	29	6	8			
10.	Establish follow up procedures to monitor instructor and student attitudes toward the simulator system	25	40	31	2	2	6	19	19	31	25			
11.	Insure adequacy of instructor training for use of simulator system	67	21	8	2	2	10	21	35	29	6			
12.	Insure adequate human factors design requirements have been met	37	50	8	4	2	6	17	38	27	12			
13.	Evaluate instructor performance	40	37	19	2	2	13	31	21	13	21			
14.	Establish effective channels of communi- cation between instructors and management	38	38	12	10	2	10	27	33	22	8			
15.	Assess all effects resulting from introduction of simulator system	27	57	12	2	2	8	12	24	22	35			
16.	Prevent overuse of the simulator as a toy to impress visiting dignitaries	21	19	33	12	15	2	4	21	23	50			
	Establish programs to teach instructors how to use simulators for training													
w item														
Ne	6-16									12				

# Table III (continued)

• • • •

## Personnel Data Sheet

In the final report on this study we want to identify the participants and provide some information on their backgrounds. (The opinions and comments you provided will, of course, remain confidential; no name will be associated with any comment.)

For inclusion in the final report please provide the following information.

(bauntinoo) III eldeT

. I. In the space below, type or print your rank or other title (e.g., Dr., Prof., ATCS), your name, and your address.

	22	25	nd g	2. one	Pleitem	ase in	check the 1	one ist	it.	em in the list of institutional affiliations jobs.	
8					Ins	titu	tiona	<u>1 Af</u>	fil	iation Principal Job	.2
8.		29	23		Navy Mar Army Air	y. ines For				NAMTRADET instructor Administrator Researcher	.9
23	12		er		Indu Univ Othe	vers er (	y ity speci	fy)		University professor Consultant Other (specify)	
		s	imul	3. lator	Briers, i	fly	descuding	ribe the	the	e extent of your knowledge or experience with nes of the simulators.	
		88		1.0			8		τe	Lesure acequate human factors design requirements have buen met	
122	£1	15	30	E.I.	i i					Evaluate festructor performence	.52
8	22		22	10	5		11	82	85	Establish affective channels of communi- cation between instructors and menagement	14
22		24	12		2		si	15		Assoss all effects resulting from introduction of simulator system	5.
30			÷.	1	21	1 54				Prevent overuse of the simulator as a toy to impress visiting dignitaries	6.
										Establish programs to teach instructors how to use simulators for training	
											1 tens
								nineri n		E-16	10H
the dam	and the second		lamena				in case was h	aristen of		E-15	

## Before mailing,

Please check to see that you have:

- a) completed the new items in the tables
- b) enclosed Tables I (6 pages), II (3 pages), and III (2 pages)
- c) enclosed the Personnel Data Sheet.

#### APPENDIX F

#### Statistical analyses of data

#### 1. Problem of consensus

One aim of the Delphi technique is to determine the items on which the experts are in agreement. Complete agreement would occur, of course, if all the experts selected the same alternative. For example, in response to an item, if the experts were to select one of five alternatives (varying from, say, "crucial" to "trivial") and all selected, say, alternative two ("extremely useful"), complete agreement would exist. On the other hand, if the responses of the experts were randomly distributed among the five alternatives, no agreement would exist.

To specify precisely what is meant by consensus of opinion some statistical definition of consensus must be derived. Some authors have concluded that a consensus of opinion existed if 50% of the experts selected the same category. Other authors have used more sophisticated measures to define consensus, usually some measure of variability.

Consideration of the problem of defining consensus suggests that two crucial variables must be considered: the number of experts participating and the number of alternatives available. The essential question is whether the division of the experts' responses among the several alternatives is likely to occur by chance. If chance is a likely outcome, then consensus cannot be said to exist.

2. Probability considerations on consensus

Evaluation of chance outcomes may be determined with the aid of probability theory. The assignment of experts' responses to alternatives may be considered analogous to the classical probability scheme of randomly assigning balls to urns. If we have five urns (representing five response alternatives) and, say, 20 balls (representing the selections of 20 experts), how would the balls be randomly distributed among the urns? Ten computer simulations of the problem (20 balls randomly distributed among five uns) gave the results indicated in Table F-1. Table F-1 indicates, for example, that in the seventh simulation, of the 20 balls, two 11s fell in Urn No. 1, one in Urn No. 2, nine in Urn No. 3, three in Urn No. 4, and five in Urn No. 5. This simulation is analogous to two experts selecting alternative one (e.g., "crucial"), one expert selecting alternative two ("extremely useful"), nine experts selecting alternative three ("useful"), etc..

# Table F-1

## Number of balls randomly assigned to each of five urns assuming equal probability (p = .20) that any of the 20 balls will fall in any urn

the second of the second for some	
BYING ATTACTOR AND THE OF FROM MA LA COMPANY	

Simulation	taquatie :	itil to st	Urn number	rts wars to "cructal"	esgee , vaa
number	osingras i apo edi 1	dellares . Secondes	("Logen	Long 4 and a	5
Look tigence tije	on teactor		an war Sar	an and a second	19289 19289
<b>1</b>	3	3	desident A	6	3
	6 - 16-	3 10	3	4	4
ddus 73 30	1.5 <b>1</b> .5 65	7	4	4	4
4	6	6111 <b>5</b> 8kusa	5.004	0	4
us, ale Seanoo gr	the lab to	8	2	5	4
linva 6 vilante	0	2	3	8	7
nose o <b>7</b> ylésti	2	1	9	3	5
8	6	4	3	2	5
9	303000	3 3 3	5	7	2
10		6.670 <b>5</b> 700	3	3	5

Continuing the analogy further, statistical measures of central tendency and variability may be computed for each row of data in Table F-1. To perform such computations, assume that the Urn Numbers represent scores; thus, Urn No. 1 represents a score of value 1, Urn No. 2 represents a score of value 2, Urn No. 3 represents a score of value 3, etc. Assume further that a score stands for a class interval that extends half a unit below and above its nominal value. Thus, a score of 1 represents a class interval extending from 0.5 to 1.5 (or 1.4999), a score of 2 represents a class interval extending from 1.5 to 2.4999, etc. To describe the situation in terms of the responses of experts to a questionnaire item, consider Simulation No. 7 of Table F-1. In this case, two experts selected category 1 ("crucial"), and each received a score of 1; one expert selected category 2 and received a score of 2; nine experts selected category 3 and each received a score of 3, etc.. From this frequency distribution of scores, one may compute statistical measures to summarize the distribution. Thus, the mean score is (2x1 + 1x2 + 9x3 + 3x4 + 5x5)/20 or 3.40. The median or 50th percentile, namely, the point below which fall 10 scores and above which fall 10 scores, occurs within the class interval nominally called score 3, namely, between 2.50 and 3.4999. Since three scores fall below 2.5, and nine scores fall within the class interval, the median is 2.5 + (7/9)(1) or 3.278. Thus, for this row of data of Table F-1, the mean is 3.40 and the median is 3.278.

Following similar reasoning, one may compute measures of variability for each row of data of Table F-1. For example, for Simulation No. 7 of Table F-1, the 25th percentile ( $P_{25}$ ) is 2.722 and the 75th percentile ( $P_{75}$ ) is 4.500, so the interquartile range, namely,  $P_{75} - P_{25}$ , is 1.778. [The smallest interquartile range possible is 0.50, and this would occur if all selections were the same alternative.]

#### 3. Statistical definition of consensus

Following the procedure described in the preceding section, simulations were performed with the aid of a computer. The goal of the simulations was to determine what interquartile ranges would be likely to result on the basis of chance. Such interquartile ranges, would, of course, indicate a lack of consensus. However, smaller interquartile ranges, below those likely to occur by random assignment, can be considered examples of consensus.

All simulations employed five response alternatives (five urns), because the questionnaire items had five categories. In one set of 1,000 simulations, the number of "judgments"(balls) used in each simulation was 35, which corresponded approximately to the number of NON-NAMTRADET experts. In another set of 1,000 simulations, the number of "judgments" used in each simulation was 25, which corresponded approximately to the number of NAMTRADET experts. In addition, in a set of 1,000 simulations, the number of "judgments" used in each simulation was 20, as in Table F-1. This last set of simulations was included to represent cases where some of the NAMTRADET experts failed to respond to an item.

F-3

FREQUEN



The results of the simulations are summarized in Figure F-1. Figure F-1 shows that, with "judgments" randomly assigned to any of five alternatives, the interquartile range typically falls between about 1.80 and 3.00. The cut-off point, selected as an index of consensus, was 1.2999. That is, in the present study, if the responses to a questionnaire item yielded an interquartile range of less than 1.30, a consensus of opinion was said to exist. If the item yielded an interquartile range of 1.30 or greater, it was concluded that no consensus existed.

This index of consensus, namely, an interquartile range less than 1.30, is a stringent measure, selected to exclude almost all cases where the results might occur by chance. In the 1,000 simulations with 35 "judgments" none fell below 1.30; in the 1,000 simulations with 25 "judgments", only three fell below 1.30; in the 1,000 simulations with 20 "judgments", only four fell below 1.30. The selection of such an extreme measure of consensus means, of course, that a questionnaire item on which a consensus of opinion really existed might be classified as an item of non-consensus.

4. Evaluation of difference between the two groups

For each questionnaire item, the difference between the NAMTRADET distribution of judgments and the NON-NAMTRADET distribution of judgments was evaluated by the Kolmogorov-Smirnoff (K-S) two-sample test. The K-S two-sample test "is sensitive to any kind of difference in the distribution from which the two samples were drawn--differences in location (central tendency), in dispersion, in skewness, etc." (Siegel, 1956).

Occasionally, not all experts responded to an item. This minor variation in the number of responses was ignored in order to simplify comparisons between the two groups of experts. Also ignored was the difference in the two sample sizes, since this difference would have only a small influence on the outcome. The comparison between the two distributions for a questionnaire item was considered to be statistically significant if the difference between the two cumulative percentage distributions differed by 40 percentage points or more at any response alternative. A difference of 40 percentage points represents a difference significant at the .05 level, two-tailed test, when each sample contains 25 responses. (With  $n_1 = n_2 = 30$ , at the .05 level, two-tailed test, the difference required is 37 percentage points.)

#### APPENDIX G

## Summary of comments made by experts

A. Evaluation of and skepticism of comments of others

- --"I would have liked many times to have said I didn't really know - but I know that I know better than most people who will be less reticent."
- -- "Maybe the other experts are wrong and ignorance is being pooled."

-- "These kats don't know what they are talking about."

--"My best response is that you have a mixed bag of respondents, many of whom do not know where the cost savings leverage rests."

--"I am stunned that so many are willing to state the effectiveness of simulators is so much better than operational equipment. Where is the data?"

--"Where do all these guys get the idea that simulation is cheap?"
--"I would question the actual experience of some of the responders with regard to operational equipment designed for training."

B. Discussion about "the decision" objective

- -- "Many items I marked trivial are <u>crucial</u> in determining training course strategies but don't affect the simulator v. hardware decision."
- -- "Most 'trivial' items are germane to NAMTRAGRU Headquarters, not Chief of Naval Material."
- --"I think other people responded to general course planning, not specific decisions."

--"I found it hard to keep the overall objective in mind."

--"These are important questions to the actual development of maintenance trainers--but don't appear very necessary to making a choice between operational equipment or simulators."

C. Difficulty with interpretation of items

- -- "Answer depends on interpretation."
- -- "Too specific."
- -- "Bad term."

<sup>--&</sup>quot;Question and answer contingent on interpretation of 'need'."
--"Question somewhat ambiguous."

- --"I interpret this as Congress not as school commander." --"I am assuming you mean the evaluation for a particular phase and not the complete course."
- --"It is usually difficult to ask the right questions and even is you do, you do not know what criteria the person who is responding is using for each item on the questionnaire."
- D. Discussion about the "effort to obtain" information

--"Information is not available when decision must be made." --"Rarely is all this information available in the real world at the time the equipment is selected."

- E. Most experts underestimated difficulty
  - -- "This should be easy to do but just isn't."
  - --"I think I rated this information harder to obtain because I am not satisfied with anything but 'hard' data."
  - --"I think the Navy doesn't have a readily accessible system to do this--the data are probably there but hard to get."
  - --"For the most part my ratings are higher on the effort side because of bitter experience at trying to pry these things loose from the fleet and the primes."
- F. Experts overestimated difficulty

-- "This may not be documented but it's usually easy to find out."

G. Ideas for new work, areas of consideration

--"What is missing or weak are questions addressing linkage between recommendation and adaptation, i.e. who is decision maker?"

--"I do feel that training simulators could have a major impact on ... maintenance training (at all levels)... but, unfortunately the manufacturers of these simulators (and even the research community) have totally failed to exploit the potential capabilities of these systems... I would suggest that the Naval administrators first find out how to more imaginatively use simulators and how to stimulate a new and more instructionally relevant generation of simulators to be built.." --"I have always believed that a few courses should be offered in the design of simulators... the need to train engineers and others to design simulators is a real need... I would suggest that your study be the beginning of a handbook or textbook, to be published by a major technical publisher... Such a test would be the guts of a course which could be given through an extension division of a state institution. Such a course could run during the summers and be sponsored, i.e., supported spiritually (not financially), by the military training organizations. I readily admit that the number of individuals reading the book and/or taking the course will always be relatively small. Despite this, the need explored in the context of your Delphi study is real and will probably increase over the next 25 years--our productive lifespans."

--"I don't believe the Navy is taking advantage of the technical skills available when they (simulators) are designed. There is absolutely too much inferior workmanship in some of the details. I have pointed this out to a number of people but I never get any kind of feedback. Does the Navy intend to let these people continue to put out consoles that fall apart and electronic boards that will only fit in certain slots?"

H. Justification for changes/choices on earlier questionnaires

### Changes

- --"My opinions on cost effectiveness, which are more liberal than average, are based on the data (limited data) which are available comparing the \_\_\_\_\_\_ with MTUs. These data generally show enormous savings ratios."
- --"I have changed my mind. I talked with \_\_\_\_\_ who teaches and uses the \_\_\_\_\_ for the hydraulics systems. He has convinced me that they are superior to mock-ups, for instance, the ease of entering system malfunctions, upkeep and space requirements." --"Marked wrong block first time."

Remained with first choice

- --"I insist, it requires extreme effort to do this right." --"Provisioning is critical."
- --"I insist, "hands on" experience is the only way."

- ---I do not wish to change any of the opinions expressed as they are my own. After 15 years of working with aircraft... and now working and teaching daily with simulators, I feel that some areas of instruction just cannot be simulated adequately."
- --"Without further amplification of the questions, I find it difficult for an expert to change his mind merely on the basis that others checked a different block."
- I. Skepticism of simulator manufacturers
  - --"The manufacturers tell one story when selling something and another when they have to repair it or supply parts for it."
- J. Difficulty with cost comparisons
  - --(Simulators) may not be less expensive in the long run."
    --I am somewhat rusty when comparing the cost of simulators and cost of operational equipment for each particular subsystem."
  - --"Development costs (for simulators) are high and are in addition to development costs for the original equipment." --"Depending on the quality of the training analyses and the specifications derived from them, simulators could be less expensive--or more cost-effective, which you probably should have asked about--then operational gear." --"I had difficulty with the \$200,000 limit."
  - --"I think you are mistaken to set a limit of 200K per device. Each requirement should be handled on an individual basis."
- K. Criticism of O and I Tables
  - --"Considering the limited nature of O level tasks, simulation is easily applied to all categories of equipment."
    --"In this day and age anything along the lines of this inquiry is feasible. Just because something is feasible does not mean it's necessary... each situation of each
    - area of each system must be analyzed and determined on actual facts and this determines what method is best to present the material to be learned."
  - --"I just don't feel comfortable trying to answer such

abstract questions about these systems, even though I'm familiar with most of the systems. Current state of the art probably makes simulation feasible for all such systems. Properly used such simulators could be more effective than operational equipment."

# DISTRIBUTION LIST

# REPORT NO. NADC-78015-60

# AIRTASK NO. A413413A-0016-X413000030

# No. of Copies

an.

Chief of Naval Personnel (Pers-10c)	1
Chief of Naval Education and Training (N5)	1
Naval Air Systems Command, Code 413	5
Naval Air Systems Command, Code 340	2
Naval Air Systems Command, Code 954	3
Chief of Naval Education and Training Support	1
Chief of Naval Technical Training	1
Chief of Naval Technical Training (016)	1
Chief of Naval Material	1
Commander Training Command, Pacific	1
Commander Training Command, Atlantic (Code N3A)	1
Commanding Officer, Naval Education and Training Program	
Development Center	1
Commanding Officer, Naval Development and Training Center,	
Code 0120	1
Commanding Officer, Service School Command, San Diego	1
Commanding Officer, Naval Aerospace Medical Institute	
(Library Code 12)	2
Director, Training Analysis and Evaluation Group (TAEG)	1
Commanding Officer, Naval Aviation Maintenance Training Group	5
Office of Naval Research, Engineering Psychology	2
Commanding Officer, Naval Personnel and Research Development	
Center	5
Commanding Officer, Naval Training Equipment Center	5
U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and	
Social Sciences	3
Personnel Research Division, Air Force Human Resources	
Laboratory (AFSC), Lackland Air Force Base	1
Technical Training Division, Air Force Human Resources	
Laboratory, Lowry Air Force Base	1
Advanced Systems Division, Air Force Human Resources	
Laboratory, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	1
Defense Documentation Center	12