



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANGARDS 1965 A

-



NPRDC Special Report 83-28

April 1983

Kanadian Start

1.4

ESTIMATING SKILL DEGRADATION FOR AVIATION ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE OPERATORS (AWs): ASSESSMENT OF JOB AND TRAINING VARIABLES

P. J. Konoske S. K. Wetzel W. E. Montague

Reviewed by John D. Ford, Jr.

Released by James F. Kelly, Jr. Commanding Officer

Navy Personnel Research and Development Center San Diego, California 92152

REPORT NUMBER B. GOVT ACCESSION NO. 1 RECIPIENT CONTROL CONTRETATION NUMBER PREDOK NUMBER B. GOVT ACCESSION NO. 1 RECIPIENT CALLON CONTRETATION NUMBER A TITLE (and BANING SKILL DEGRADATION FOR AVIATION INTISUBMARINE WARFARE OPERATORS (A Ws): SSESSIMATING SKILL DEGRADATION FOR AVIATION INTISUBMARINE WARFARE OPERATORS (A Ws): SSESSIMATING CALLONG AND TRAINING VARIABLES Special Report TAUTHORY - J. Konoske - PREFORMER CONTRETATION CONTRETATION NUMBER A. Wetzel - REPORT NUMBER - PREFORMER CONTRETATION NUMBER A SESSIMATING CARANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS - REPORT OF ARMAR FLENDER, TABUERY AND LEGO, California 92152 - REPORT SATE I. CONTROLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS - REPORT OF AREA AND DEGO, California 92152 - REPORT OF AREA I. NONITONING AGENERY WARE & ADDRESS - REPORT OF AREA A HONITONING AGENERY WARE & ADDRESS - REPORT CONTROL CONTROL OF THE AND ADDRESS A HONITONING AGENERY WARE & ADDRESS - REPORT OF PAGES A HONITONING AGENERY WARE & ADDRESS - REPORT CONTROL OF THE AND ADDRESS A HONITONING AGENERY WARE & ADDRESS - REPORT CONTROL OF THE AND ADDRESS A HONITONING AGENERY WARE & ADDRESS - REPORT CONTROL OF THE AND ADDRESS A HONITONING AGENERY WARE & ADDRESS - REPORT CONTROL OF THE AND ADDRESS<	REPORT DOCUMENTATIO		READ INSTRUCTIONS
JPRDC SR 83-28 Ab A/2 & 3 A TITLE (and Swalling) STIMATING SKILL DECRADATION FOR AVIATION STIMATING SKILL DECRADATION FOR AVIATION Is TYPE OF REPORT & PEROD COVERE SSESSMENT OF JOB AND TRAINING VARIABLES Is TREPORT OF REPORT NUMBER AUTHORY: - AUTHORY: AUTHORY: - Contract: AUTHORY: - Contract: </th <th>1. REPORT NUMBER</th> <th>2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.</th> <th>3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOS NUMBER</th>	1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOS NUMBER
TITLE (and SAMING) TITLE (and SAMING) TITLE (and SAMING) TITLE (and SAMING) STIMATING SKILL DEGRADATION FOR AVIATION Mar 1982-Dec 1982 Secial Report Sample Statement of PJOB AND TRAINING VARIABLES Secial Report Sample Statement of PJOB AND TRAINING VARIABLES Secial Report Sample Statement of PJOB AND TRAINING VARIABLES Secial Report Sample Statement of PJOB AND TRAINING VARIABLES Secial Report Sample Statement of PJOB AND TRAINING VARIABLES Secial Report Sample Statement of PJOB AND TRAINING VARIABLES Secial Report Sample Statement of PJOB AND TRAINING VARIABLES Secial Report Sample Statement of PJOB AND TRAINING VARIABLES Seciel Statement Sample Statement of PJOB AND TRAINING VARIABLES Seciel Statement Sample Sta	NPRDC SR 83-28	Ab 41283	2-1
STIMATING SKILL DEGRADATION FOR AVIATION NATISUBMARINE WARFARE OPERATORS (AWs): SSESSMENT OF JOB AND TRAINING VARIABLES Special Report Mar 1982-Dec 1982 ** Autronomy of the analysis SSESSMENT OF JOB AND TRAINING VARIABLES ** Performing offer number 13-82/17 ** J. Konoske ** J. Konoske ** K. Wetzel ** E. Montague ** Contract of senary Hubble ** Performing offer number in Diego, California 92152 ** Contract of senary Hubble ** Performing offer in the And AdDress an Diego, California 92152 ** Contract of senary Hubble ** For and Development Center an Diego, California 92152 ** Control Ling office name And AdDress and Diego, California 92152 ** Exponse and Development Center an Diego, California 92152 ** Exponse and Development Center is an Diego, California 92152 ** HONITORING AGENEY WARE & ADDRESS (avy Personnel Research and Development Center in Diego, California 92152 ** ESCARTY CLASS (of the meaning UNUTORING AGENEY WARE & ADDRESS (of the senary) ** DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) ** SECURITY CLASS (of the meaning) ** DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Steek 20, If different free Report) ** DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Steek 20, If different free Report) ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** </td <td>4. TITLE (and Subtitle)</td> <td></td> <td>S. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED</td>	4. TITLE (and Subtitle)		S. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
NNTISUBMARINE WARFARE OPERATORS (A Ws): Mar 1952-Dec 1952 LSSESSMENT OF JOB AND TRAINING VARIABLES	ESTIMATING SKILL DEGRADATION	FOR AVIATION	Special Report
SSESSMENT OF JOB AND TRAINING VARIABLES Prevenue one. Report Humber 1.3-82/17 J. Konokic J. Konokic K. Wetzel W. E. Montague Prevenue one and the second and backback Prevenue one one one one one one one one one on	ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE OPERA	TORS (AWs):	Mar 1982-Dec 1982
A UTHOR(a) J. KOnoske J. K. Wetzel J. K. Wetzel V. E. Montague PERFORMING ORGANIZATION HAME AND ADDRESS PERFORMING ORGANIZATION HAME AND ADDRESS PERFORMING ORGANIZATION HAME AND ADDRESS Apy Personnel Research and Development Center an Diego, California 92152 CONTROLLING OFFICE HAME AND ADDRESS Apple Office Apple Apple Apple Apple Apple Apple Apple	ASSESSMENT OF JOB AND TRAININ	G VARIABLES	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
2. J. Konoske 3. K. Wetzel 4. E. Montague 5. FERFORMING ORDANIZATION HAME AND ADDRESS 4. AND ADDRESS 4. ADDRESS 4. CONTROLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS 4. CONTROLING OFFICE NAME ADDRESS 4. CONTROLING OFFICE NAME ADDRESS 4. CONTROLING OFFICE NAME ADDRESS 4. CONTROLING AGENCY WAKE & ADDRESS(II different frem Centrolling Office) 4. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the destreet information down of the provide in the destreet information and the accustics analysis is the amperimental survey questionnaire measure was successful in provide information analysis is the apperimental survey questionnaire measure was successful in provide information analysis is the apperimental survey questionnaire measure was successful in provide information analysis is the distribution from the assure their performance on acoustic analysis is the aceustic in the AW community. It is likely that this general technique could used to assess skill degradation/maintenance in other technical rating as well. 7. Trans. 1. AT Superimental Survey and the assure their performance on acoustic analysis is the distribution of the destreed in the destreet the performance in the AW community. It is likely that this general technique could used to assess skill degradation/maintenance in other technical ratings as well. 7. The superimental survey are superimentation approximation about the analysis is the destreed to assess skill degradation/maintenance in other technical ratings as well. 7. The superimentation of the stances of the destreed technique of the de	7. AUTHOR(a)		I J-02-17
	P. J. Konoske		
V. E. Montague V. E. Montague V. FERFORMUNG GRANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS PERFORMUNG GRANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS ANY PErsonnel Research and Development Center an Diego, California 92152 I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS I. G. MONTORIL RESEArch and Development Center an Diego, California 92152 I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS I. RESURPT CLASS. (I and Development Center an Diego, California 92152 I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS I. RUBBER OF PAGES I. RECONTONIA CLASS. (I and Development Center an Diego, California 92152 I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS I. RUBBER OF PAGES AND INTERPORT OF PAGES I. RUBBER OF PAGES INTERPORT OF PAGES INTERPORT OF PAGES I. RUBBER OF PAGES INTERPORT OF PAGES INTERPORT OF PAGES INTERPORT OF PAGES I. RUBBER OF PAGES INTERPORT OF PAGE	5. K. Wetzel		
PERFORMING ORBANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Any Personnel Research and Development Center an Diego, California 92152 Is controlling office Hame AND ADDRESS Is controlling office Hame AND ADDRESS Is controlling office Hame AND ADDRESS Is controlling office Is SECURITY CLASS. (of the research In UNCLASSIFIED Is SUPPLEMENTARY HOTES In UNCLASSIFIED Is SUPPLEMENTARY HOTES Is SUPPLEMENTARY HOTES It Is SECURITY Class. It is security to the research In Internance Intial training and job conditions associated with acoustics analysis results indicated that the questionnaire measure was successful in predicting sonar Intial training and job conditions associated with acoustics analysis results indicated that the questionnaire measure was successful in predicting sonar Intial training Internance in other technical ratings as well. If MICLASSIFIED Intin Internance In Internance In Internance In Internance In Internanc	W.E. Montague		
Navy Personnel Research and Development Center RF63-522-001-03.07 I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Number of PAGES I. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Number of PAGES I. CONTROL RESEARCH and Development Center April 1983 II. NUMBER OF PAGES Number of PAGES II. DECLASSIFIED Number of PAGES II. DECLASSIFIED NUNCLASSIFIED III. DECLASSIFIED NUMBER OF PAGES III. DECLASSIFIED NUMBER OF PAGES III. DECLASSIFIED NUNCLASSIFIED III. DECLASSIFIED NUMBER OF PAGES III. DECLASSIFIED NUMER OF PAGES III. DECLASSIFIED NUNCLASSIFIED III. DECLASSIFIED NUMBER OF PAGES III. DECLASSIFIED NUMER OF PAGES III. DECLASSI	9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDR	185	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK
in Diego, California 92152 II. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS iany Personnel Research and Development Center April 1983 ian Diego, California 92152 II. NUMBER OF PAGES ia. WONITORING ACCUCY WAKE & ADDRESS(II different free Centerling Office) II. SECURITY CLASS. (of the reserve) II. UNITORING ACCUCY WAKE & ADDRESS(II different free Centerling Office) II. SECURITY CLASS. (of the reserve) II. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Reserve) III. SECURITY CLASS. (of the reserve) II. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Black 20, II different free Reserve) III. SECURITY CLASS. (of the reserve) II. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Black 20, II different free Reserve) III. SECURITY CLASS. (of the reserve) II. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES III. SECURITY Class. (of the reserve) IIII. Security Class. (of the reserve) III. SECURITY Continue on reverse side If necessary and Identify by Meet number) IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Navy Personnel Research and Develop	ment Center	RF63-522-001-03.07
	5an Diego, California 92152		1
iavy Personnel Research and Development Center an Diego, California 92152 April 1983 is. NUMBER OF PAGES 16 Is. NUMBER OF PAGES 16 is. NUMBER OF PAGES 16 Is. NUMBER OF PAGES 16 is. NUMETORING AGENCY WAKE & ADDRESS(If different inse Cantrolling Office) Is. SECURITY CLASS. (of the report) UNCLASSIFIED is. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Is. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 30, If different inse Report) is. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 30, If different inse Report) is. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES is. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES is. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES is. Asstract (Centinue on reverse side If necessary and Identify by block mather) initial training kill maintenance ob candidate is. ASSTRACT (Centinue on reverse side If necessary and Identify by block mather)	11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS		12. REPORT DATE
an Diego, California 92152 14. MONITORING AGENCY WAME & ADDRESKII different free Centrelling Office) 14. BECLASSIFIED 15. BECLASSIFIED 16. BECLASSIFIED 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed on Hendrich by Block number) 11. BECLASSIFIED 16. BECLASSIFIED 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed on Identify by Block number) 11. BECLASSIFIED 16. ASSIFIED 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed on Identify by Block number) 11. BECLASSIFIED 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed on Identify by Block number) 11. BECLASSIFIED 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed on Identify by Block number) 11. BECLASSIFIED 11. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed on Identify by Block number) 11. BECLASSIFIED 11. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed on Identify by Block number) 12. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed on Identify by Block number) 13. ASSIFIED 14. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed on Identify by Block number) 14. BECLASSIFIED 14. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed on Identify by Block number) 15. BECLASSIFIED 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the OS IN OCELASSIFIED 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT	Navy Personnel Research and Develop	ment Center	April 1983
HONITORING AGENCY WAKE & ADDRESS(If different how Centrolling Office) 16. SECURITY CLASS. (of the nearly UNCLASSIFIED UNCLASSIFIED UNCLASSIFIED Lost Riburds on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) hitial training Feedback Asstract (Centimus on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) hitial training Feedback Asstract (Centimus on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) hitial training Feedback Asstract (Centimus on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) hitial training Feedback Asstract (Centimus on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) hitial training Feedback Asstract (Centimus on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) hitial training Feedback Asstract (Centimus on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) hitial training Feedback Asstract (Centimus on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) hitial training Feedback Asstract (Centimus on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) hitial training Feedback D _ 1 A sample of experimental survey questionnaire designed to provide information about e quality of initial training and job conditions associated with acoustics analysis, erformance tests were then used to measure their performance on acoustic analysis erformance in the AW community. It is likely that this general technique could is used to assess skill degradation/maintenance in other technical ratings as well. D _ 1 And 1 Aff a Ebrion or 1 NOV 81 8 Genesser	San Diego, California 92152		13. NUMBER OF PAGES
UNCLASSIFIED The BECK of the Adverted in Block 20, if different from Report LUNCLASSIFIED The BECK of the Adverted in Block 20, if different from Report LUNCLASSIFIED The BECK of the Adverted in Block 20, if different from Report LUNCLASSIFIED The BECK of the Adverted in Block 20, if different from Report LUNCLASSIFIED The BECK of the Adverted in Block 20, if different from Report LUNCLASSIFIED The BECK of the Adverted in Block 20, if different from Report LUNCLASSIFIED The BECK of the Adverted in Block 20, if different from Report LUNCLASSIFIED The BECK of the Adverted in Block 20, if different from Report LUNCLASSIFIED The BECK of the Adverted in Block 20, if different from Report LUNCLASSIFIED The BECK of the Adverted in Block 20, if different from Report LUNCLASSIFIED The BECK of the Adverted in Block 20, if different from Report LUNCLASSIFIED The BECK of the Adverted in Block 20, if different from Report LUNCLASSIFIED The BECK of the Adverted in Block 20, if different from Report LUNCLASSIFIED	TA MONITORING AGENEY MAKE A ADDRESS AND	cont from Controlling Allera	1 16
UNCLASSIFIED The DECLASSIFIED THE DECLAS	MARITANINA VARAFI AVWE & VANKESS (1 8114		
			UNCLASSIFIED
			18. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING
 KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) initial training Feedback kill maintenance ob candidate ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) → A sample of experienced aviation antisubmarine warfare operators (AWs) was dministered an experimental survey questionnaire designed to provide information about the quality of initial training and job conditions associated with acoustics analysis. erformance tests were then used to measure their performance on acoustic analysis tests. Results indicated that the questionnaire measure was successful in predicting sonar perator performance in the AW community. It is likely that this general technique could a used to assess skill degradation/maintenance in other technical ratings as well. D + JAM 75 1473 EDTION OF + NOV 65 IS GEOLETE UNCLASSIFIED 	DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for public release; distributi 7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract enter	on unlimited. red in Block 20, 11 dillerent fre	ai Report)
 AsstRACT (Continue on reverse side it nessessing and identify by block masked) → A sample of experienced aviation antisubmarine warfare operators (AWs) was dministered an experimental survey questionnaire designed to provide information about the quality of initial training and job conditions associated with acoustics analysis, erformance tests were then used to measure their performance on acoustic analysis is set. Results indicated that the questionnaire measure was successful in predicting sonar performance in the AW community. It is likely that this general technique could be used to assess skill degradation/maintenance in other technical ratings as well. D 1 JAM 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 55 IS DESOLETE UNCLASSIFIED 	16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distributi 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract onto 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	on unlimited. red in Block 30, 11 different fre	a Report)
kill maintenance ob candidate ABSTRACT (Continue on revues side it necessary and identify by block master) A sample of experienced aviation antisubmarine warfare operators (AWs) was dministered an experimental survey questionnaire designed to provide information about the quality of initial training and job conditions associated with acoustics analysis, erformance tests were then used to measure their performance on acoustic analysis isks. Results indicated that the questionnaire measure was successful in predicting sonar perator performance in the AW community. It is likely that this general technique could a used to assess skill degradation/maintenance in other technical ratings as well. D 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 55 IS OBSOLETE S/N 0102-LF-014-6601 UNCLASSIFIED	16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distributi 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract enter 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 18. KEY WORDS (Centinue on reverse side if necessory	on unlimited. red in Block 20, 11 different fre and identify by block number)	# Report)
ob candidate ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side it nessessary and identify by block masker) A sample of experienced aviation antisubmarine warfare operators (AWs) was dministered an experimental survey questionnaire designed to provide information about the quality of initial training and job conditions associated with acoustics analysis, erformance tests were then used to measure their performance on acoustic analysis isks. Results indicated that the questionnaire measure was successful in predicting sonar perator performance in the AW community. It is likely that this general technique could a used to assess skill degradation/maintenance in other technical ratings as well. D (JAN 75 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 55 IS OBSOLETE S/N 0102-LF-014-6601 UNCLASSIFIED	16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distributi 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the aboutact enter 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 18. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary nitial training	on unlimited. red in Block 30, 11 different fre and identify by block number)	Eeedback
ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side it necessary and identify by block masker) $-^{\perp}$ A sample of experienced aviation antisubmarine warfare operators (AWs) was dministered an experimental survey questionnaire designed to provide information about the quality of initial training and job conditions associated with acoustics analysis, erformance tests were then used to measure their performance on acoustic analysis isks. Results indicated that the questionnaire measure was successful in predicting sonar perator performance in the AW community. It is likely that this general technique could t used to assess skill degradation/maintenance in other technical ratings as well. D 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 55 IS OBSOLETE S/N 0102-LF-014-6601 UNCLASSIFIED	DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distributi Jostribution Statement (of the obstract enter Jostribution Statement (of the obstract enter Supplementary notes KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if necessary hitial training kill maintenance	on unlimited. rod in Block 20, 11 dillorent fre and identify by block number)	Feedback
$^{-1}$ A sample of experienced aviation antisubmarine warfare operators (AWs) was dministered an experimental survey questionnaire designed to provide information about he quality of initial training and job conditions associated with acoustics analysis, erformance tests were then used to measure their performance on acoustic analysis isks. Results indicated that the questionnaire measure was successful in predicting sonar perator performance in the AW community. It is likely that this general technique could be used to assess skill degradation/maintenance in other technical ratings as well. D 1 JAM 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 55 IS DESOLETE 5/N 0102-LF-014-6601 UNCLASSIFIED	DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distributi T. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract enter T. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract enter T. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Titial training kill maintenance ob candidate	on unlimited. red in Block 30, if different fre and identify by block number)	Feedback
S/N 0102- LF-014-6601	16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distributi 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract enter 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary nitial training ikill maintenance 10b candidate 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary	on unlimited. rod in Block 20, 11 dillorent bro and identify by block number) and identify by block number)	Feedback
	 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distributi 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract enter) 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse alde if necessary nitial training jkill maintenance Job candidate 18. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse alde if necessary A sample of experienced aviation idministered an experimental survey of he quality of initial training and Performance tests were then used to asks. Results indicated that the quest operator performance in the AW commended to assess skill degradation/mai 20. 100 11473 20. 100 20 11473 	on unlimited.	Feedback warfare operators (AWs) was ed to provide information about clated with acoustics analysis. formance on acoustic analysis as successful in predicting sonar nat this general technique could chnical ratings as well.

FOREWORD

This research and development was performed in response to recognized Navy needs for an investigation of the effects of initial training and job conditions on skill retention under subproject RF63-522-001 (Computer-aided and Classroom Training), work unit 03.07 (Skill and Knowledge Retention). This issue was initially addressed in a paper prepared in 1976 in response to a request from the Chief of Naval Operations (OP-96), citing the concern that training and job conditions might not be conducive to the maintenance of competent performance. The objectives of the subproject are to (1) derive ways of detecting potential problems existing in the Navy and (2) recommend means to minimize performance deterioration by restructuring training and job conditions.

This is the sixth report concerned with skill deterioration. Previous reports described long-term retention of factual information in the Propulsion Engineering Basics Course, the effects of different instructional strategies on long-term retention of materials taken from that course, existing research relevant to skill and knowledge loss, a survey of the three Navy sonar communities--aviator, subsurface, and surface--to identify conditions leading to skill loss, and an assessment of job and training variables leading to skill loss in sonar technicians (surface) (STGs) (NPRDC TN 80-5, TR 81-22, SR 82-21, SR 83-18, and SR 83-26). This report describes an assessment of those variables for aviation antisubmarine warfare operators (AWs). Assessments were conducted using a job condition guestionnaire.

The empirical results of this work are primarily intended for the Commander, Antisubmarine Warfare Wing, Pacific (COMASWWINGPAC), and for other agencies concerned with AW training. The development of the questionnaire method of performance assessment that uses the quality of initial training and job conditions to estimate the likelihood of skill degradation should be of interest to personnel and training managers.

Appreciation is expressed to the staff at the ASW Operational Center, Naval Air Station, North Island, particularly AWCS Guyette, and to the staff of the Training Department at COMASWWINGPAC, particularly AWCM Helenihi, AWCM Sweeney, and AWC Mauffrey, for their time, expertise, and aid in this research effort.

JAMES F. KELLY, JR. Commanding Officer JAMES W. TWEEDDALE Technical Director

. Yor . . . al R losed h1100 11.1011 C:de**s** or

SUMMARY

Problem

Navy personnel in technical ratings must maintain high levels of skill and knowledge to be able to perform their jobs correctly when required. However, job conditions may not support maintaining critical skills at the required levels because of infrequent practice of tasks, inadequate feedback about the quality of the performance, long periods of nonutilization of specific skills, and interference due, for example, to assignment to task-irrelevant duties. Since the cost of measuring performance to monitor skill degradation directly is prohibitive, an indirect method for predicting skill loss is needed.

Objective

The objective of this work was to identify job conditions associated with skill and knowledge degradation in aviation antisubmarine warfare operators (AWs) using a specially developed questionnaire.

Approach

A sample of 42 AWs, with varying levels of training and experience in operating sonar systems, was administered an experimental survey questionnaire designed to provide information about initial training and job conditions associated with performing acoustic analysis. In addition, direct performance measures for both acoustic ASW knowledge factors and acoustic analysis/classification on the lofargram were obtained.

Findings

Findings support those of earlier efforts showing that the AW community is characterized by mastery level initial training, relatively frequent task practice, individual feedback, and short periods of task nonutilization. Subjects performed well on the direct performance tests that measured knowledge and passive acoustic analysis skills.

Conclusions

Results indicate that the questionnaire method accurately predicts good performance as well as bad performance. The general finding of this work indicates that good initial training and job conditions are related to good performance on objective tests. It is probable that this general technique can be used to assess the likelihood of poor performance due to skill degradation and/or training inadequacies in other technical ratings. Further, the categories of conditions may be used to suggest corrective action.

Recommendation

Job condition questionnaires should be developed for other technical ratings to determine if this method is generalizable to other technical tasks.

CONTENTS

	Page
	1
Problem and Background	1 2
PROACH	2
Subjects and Procedure	2 2 2 2
NDINGS	4
Job Condition Questionnaire	4 5 6 6 6
	7
DNCLUSIONS	8
	8
FERENCES	9
STRIBUTION LIST	11

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Subjects' Estimates of Acoustic Analysis and Classification Skills Over Time	Ļ
2.	Subjects' Estimates of Amount of Practice	5
3.	Subjects' Estimates of Frequency and Type of Feedback	6
4.	Subjects' Estimates of Periods of Nonutilization (Item 7)	7
5.	Results of ASW Wing Quarterly Exam	7

and the state of the

-

C

INTRODUCTION

Problem and Background

The modern Navy is a complex, highly technical organization. Approximately 75 percent of Navy ratings require technically skilled personnel who must most often perform procedural tasks (i.e., those requiring the operator to perform multiple steps in the correct sequence to accomplish the job).¹ Such tasks are difficult to learn, easy to forget, and the most likely to result in critical errors. Vineberg and Joyner (1982), in a review of military studies, found that the ratings classified as hardest to learn and requiring the most training were those in which it was most often predicted that errors would result in failure to carry out missions or in losses of ships, planes, and personnel.

It has been demonstrated that the level of initial training and the quality of job conditions affect the degree to which procedural skills are degraded over time (Hurlock & Montague, 1982). Since investigation has shown that ratings differ as to the quality of initial training and job conditions (Wetzel & Montague, 1983), some ratings may be more vulnerable to skills loss than others.

Navy personnel in technical ratings must be well trained and must maintain high levels of skill and knowledge to be able to perform their jobs correctly when required. Yet training for particular skills may suffer from lack of resources or time because of the need to economize or because of other tradeoffs. Furthermore, to maintain skill on complex procedural tasks, individuals need frequent opportunity to practice that skill and receive feedback about the quality of their performance on the task. Failure to provide opportunity to practice with adequate feedback is likely to produce skill degradation. The degradation of these critical skills directly affects personnel readiness and is of real concern to the Navy.

In an earlier study (Wetzel & Montague, 1982), subject matter experts (SMEs) in the Navy's three sonar communities--surface, subsurface, and aviation--were surveyed to identify training and job conditions indicative of serious skill degradation problems. Analysis of interview results showed that, because of the training and job conditions experienced by surface sonar technicians (STGs), it was highly probable that their skill would degrade over time. Thus, in a follow-on effort, a sample of STGs was administered a questionnaire requiring subjective estimates of initial training and job conditions (Wetzel, Konoske, & Montague, 1983). Analysis of questionnaire responses supported the conclusions reached by Wetzel and Montague; that is, they suggested that training quality was marginal, task nonutilization periods after initial training were long, on-job practice was infrequent, and feedback about task performance was inadequate. When direct measures of performance were used to assess STG competency on critical sonar skills, their test scores were very low. The results of this research effort indicated that the questionnaire method was useful in identifying a potential performance problem in STGs.

For the aviation sonar community, Wetzel and Montague found that the initial level of learning was high, practice of the critical job tasks was fairly frequent, individual feedback about performance was consistent and of good quality, and periods of task nonutilization were short. Because of the relatively high quality of the training and job conditions, it was expected that skill levels on these critical tasks would be comparably

¹Fredericks, P. and Montague, W. E. San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, Letter report to Chief of Naval Education and Training, Ser 638, 16 October 1980; subj: IQI evaluation of fleet feedback questionnaire.

1

high when measured. However, the cost of monitoring skill levels by direct performance measurement is prohibitive. It requires considerable time from testees as well as from instructors or supervisors, and it ties up equipment. It also requires the development of a standardized system for carrying out the testing, scoring, data storage, and reporting. The usefulness of an alternative method of proficiency assessment that uses the quality of initial training and job conditions to estimate the likelihood of skill degradation needs to be evaluated.

Objective

The objective of this work was to identify initial training and job conditions associated with skill and knowledge degradation for aviation antisubmarine warfare operators (AWs). It was undertaken to evaluate further the questionnaire method for assessing the expected performance quality of AW operators. Since results of the prior study (Wetzel & Montague, 1983) suggested good conditions of training and skill maintenance for AW's, it was expected that those results would be reconfirmed.

APPROACH

Subjects and Procedure

Forty-two AWs, ranging in rank from chief petty officer to third class petty officer, were selected on the basis of their participation in the ASWWINGPAC Quarterly Exam. All subjects were members of aviation ASW squadrons (S3-A) stationed at the Naval Air Station, North Island, and all had training plus varying amounts of experience in performing acoustic analysis.

A job condition questionnaire was administered to the subjects immediately prior to the administration of the ASW Wing quarterly examination, which is administered on a regularly scheduled basis to all acoustic analysts stationed at NAS North Island. All of the subjects were tested in one test administration. The examination was scored by the experimenters using grading criteria supplied by the ASW Wing staff.

Materials

Job Condition Questionnaire

The job condition questionnaire was an experimental survey device designed to assess the quality of initial training in acoustic analysis, practice on the job, feedback conditions, and lengths of nonutilization periods. Questionnaire items are shown in Figure 1.

Performance Measure

The purpose of the ASW Wing quarterly examination is to assess operator proficiency of both knowledge factors and lofargram analysis and classification skills. The knowledge factors are tested on a paper and pencil test, consisting of 50 multiple-choice and fill-in questions that cover physics of sound, acoustic intelligence, and computation items. The lofargram analysis and classification test requires the operator to perform analysis and classification procedures on five static, linear lofargrams.

2

JOB CONDITION QUESTIONNAIRE

Formal Training

1. How long ago was your last formal training (FRS) in gram analysis? (Circle the number of months)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 longer

2. How well could you perform acoustic analysis/classification after you had completed FRS training? (Circle one)

<u>a</u> <u>b</u> <u>c</u> <u>d</u> (where a = never could perform the task correctly, b = could perform the task correctly half of the time, c = could perform the task correctly most of the time, and d = could perform the task correctly every time)

3. While you were in FRS, which of the following best describes your ability to do the task? (Circle one)

<u>a</u> <u>b</u> <u>c</u> <u>d</u> (where a = skills in analysis and classification were equally poor, b = could do both very well but better at analysis, c = could do both very well but better at classification, and d = skills in analysis and classification were equally good)

Practice

4. How many deployments (i.e., 6-month cruise) have you made as an acoustic analyst? (Circle one)

 $\underline{a} \underline{b} \underline{c} \underline{d} \underline{e}$ (where $\underline{a} = 0$, $\underline{b} = 1$, $\underline{c} = 2$, $\underline{d} = 3$, and $\underline{e} = 4$ or more)

5. How many hours per week do you average actually performing acoustic ASW in flight? (Circle one)

 $\underline{a} \underline{b} \underline{c} \underline{d} \underline{e}$ (where a = 0-1 hours, b = 2-3 hours, c = 4-6 hours, d = 7-10 hours, and e = more than 10 hours)

6. How many hours per week do you average studying or practicing acoustic ASW? (Circle one)

 $\underline{a} \ \underline{b} \ \underline{c} \ \underline{d} \ \underline{e}$ (where a = 0-1 hours, b = 2-3 hours, c = 4-6 hours, d = 7-10 hours, and $\underline{e} = more$ than 10 hours)

7. Since the last wing test (December), what is the longest period of time that you have <u>not</u> performed analysis and classification? (Circle the number of weeks)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

Feedback (In answering the following questions, circle one)

 $\underline{a} \ \underline{b} \ \underline{c} \ \underline{d} \ \underline{e}$ (where a = never, b = rarely, c = some of the time, d = most of the time, and <math>e = always)

- 8. When you have <u>correctly</u> classified a target on an exercise, do you receive feedback about your analysis (sound source, predominant spectrum, line characteristics)?
- 9. When you have <u>correctly</u> classified a target on an exercise, do you receive feedback about intelligence information (ERPM range, TPK)?
- 10. When you have incorrectly classified a target on an exercise, do you receive feedback about your analysis of the target?
- 11. When you have incorrectly classified a target on an exercise, do you receive feedback about intelligence information?

Figure 1. Job condition questionnaire.

3

FINDINGS

Correlational analysis between results of the job condition questionnaire and the performance test scores was precluded because of low variability among responses to the job condition questionnaire and the test scores.

Job Condition Questionnaire

Level of Initial Learning

Table 1, which provides frequencies for operator estimates of the degree of original learning on acoustic analysis and classification procedures (items 2 and 3), shows that their estimates were relatively high. Sixty-nine percent of the subjects estimated that they could perform acoustic analysis correctly most of the time after training; and 26 percent, that they could perform the tasks correctly all of the time. Only one student estimated that his skills in acoustic analysis and classification procedures were poor while in training. Approximately 26 percent of the subjects reported having had formal training in acoustic analyses and classification within the previous 6 months (item 1).

Table 1

Subjects' Estimates of Acoustic Analysis and Classification Skills Over Time

Response		Frequency	Percent ^a
Description	of Skills While in Training a	t FRS (Item 3)	
Skills in analysis and classifica poor.	tion were equally	1	2.4
Could do both very well but be	tter at analysis.	1	2.4
Could do both very well but be	tter at classification.	9	21.4
Skills in analysis and classifica	tion were equally good.	30	71.4
No response		1	2.4
Descrip	otion of Skills After Training	(Item 2)	
Never could perform task corre	ectly.	0	0.0
Could perform task correctly h	2	4.8	
Could perform task correctly n	nost of the time.	29	69.0
Could perform task correctly e	every time.	11	26.2
Number of Mo	nths Since Last Formal Trai Analysis/Classification (Item	ning in Acoustic	
0-3 months	7		16.7
4-6 months	4		9.5
7-9 months	6		14.3
10-12 MONTAS	/		16./
15 months or longer	1/		40.2
no response	1		2.4

^aTotals do not always equal 100 because of rounding.

Practice

Table 2 provides frequencies, means, and standard deviations (SDs) for items concerning the amount of practice (items 5 and 6). Over 85 percent of the subjects said they spent only 3 hours a week or less practicing acoustic ASW in flight. However, 54 percent said they practiced or studied gram analysis for at least 4 hours per week; and 31 percent, over 10 hours per week. Only 10 percent reported that they had made more than one deployment as an acoustic analyst.

Table 2

Response	sponse Frequency		
Time Spent Performin	g Acoustic ASW in Flight (Item	5)	
0-3 hours per week	36	: 7	
4-6 hours per week	6	÷ 3	
7-10 hours per week	0	J.0	
More than 10 hours per week	0	0.0	
 Mean	3.29	= = = = = [#] = [#] = [#] = [#] = [#] = [#]	
SD	0.71		
Time Spent Studying or	Practicing Acoustic ASW (Iter	n 6)	
0-3 hours per week	10	23.8	
4-6 hours per week	13	30.9	
7-10 hours per week	6	14.3	
More than 10 hours per week	13	30.9	
Mean	7.26		
SD	3.68		
Time Spent Deploye	ed as Acoustic Analyst (Item 4)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
0 deployments	17	40.5	
1 deployment	21	50.0	
2 deployments	Ī	2.4	
3 deployments	ī	2.4	

Subjects' Estimates of Amount of Practice

^aTotals do not always equal 100 because of rounding.

4 or more deployments

2

4.8

Feedback

Table 3 presents frequencies for the amount and type of feedback received. Sixtytwo percent of the subjects reported that they receive feedback on analysis procedures most or all of the time when they have incorrectly classified a target, compared to 45 percent when they have classified the target correctly. For acoustic intelligence, 38 percent reported receiving feedback most or all of the time when they classified a target incorrectly; and 29 percent, when they classified a target correctly.

Table 3

	Type of Feedback			
	Anal	ysis	Intelligence	
Frequency of Feedback	Frequency	Percent ^a	Frequency	Percent ^a
	Correct Classi	fication (Items 8 a	and 9)	
Never	4	9.5	6	14.3
Rarely	7	16.7	14	33.3
Some of the time	12	28.6	10	23.8
Most of the time	12	28.6	7	16.7
Always	7	16.7	5	11.9
	Incorrect Classif	fication (Items 10	and 11)	
Never	4	9.5	6	14.3
Rarely	2	4.8	6	14.3
Some of the time	8	19.0	12	28.6
Most of the time	12	28.6	5	11.9
Always	14	33.3	11	26.2
No response	2	4.8	2	4.8

Subjects' Estimates of Frequency and Type of Feedback

^aTotals do not always equal 100 due to rounding.

Nonutilization

Table 4, which provides frequencies for subjects' estimates of lengths of nonutilization periods, shows that the periods are relatively short. About 74 percent of the subjects have never had a period of more than 4 weeks when they had not performed analysis and classification.

Performance Measure

Table 5, which presents results of the ASW wing test, shows that subjects performed relatively well overall on the knowledge test. However, they performed better on the computational items than they did on the fact items. Also, subjects performed relatively well on the gram test, particularly on the analysis task.

Table 4

Frequency Percent Response 1-2 weeks 20 47.6 26.2 3-4 weeks 11 5-6 weeks 4 9.5 9.5 4 7-8 weeks 0.0 9-10 weeks 0 11-12 weeks 2.4 1 No response 2 4.8

Subjects' Estimates of Periods of Nonutilization (Item 7)

Table 5

Mean Percent **Raw Score** SD Test Mean Correct 80.06 40.03 4.18 Knowledge Test: Fact items 30.89 3.82 77.22 Computation items 9.13 0.46 91.30 Gram Test:^a 11.42 1.75 76.13 4.42 .33 88.40 Analysis items .98 62.00 Intelligence items 3.10 Classification items .46 76.60 3.83

Results of ASW Wing Quarterly Exam

N = 23.

^aOnly 23 of the 42 subjects took the gram test.

DISCUSSION

Operator responses to the job condition questionnaire in this effort supported the structured interview data obtained from SMEs (Wetzel & Montague, 1983) documenting a high level of initial training, relatively frequent practice on the task, individual performance feedback (including information about errors), and relatively short periods of task nonutilization. The subjects performed at a high level of proficiency on the knowledge and performance tests, as predicted by the questionnaire method.

Also, this study supports the Wetzel et al. (1983) study, in that the questionnaire method was successful in assessing the initial training and job conditions. It is probable that this general technique can be used to assess the likelihood of poor performance due to skill degradation and/or training inadequacies in other technical ratings. It is important to note that, since the specific items used relate to initial training and job conditions for a specific rating, different questionnaires would have to be constructed for

each of the ratings investigated. It does appear, however, that the concept of assessing level of initial training, frequency of practice, amount and quality of feedback, and lengths of task nonutilization is generalizable or ratings other than sonar operators.

CONCLUSIONS

The questionnaire method of performance estimation appears to be useful in identifying potential performance problems due to training inadequacies or skill degradation resulting from specific job conditions. Further, the categories of conditions may be used to suggest corrective action.

RECOMMENDATION

Job condition questionnaires should be developed for other technical ratings to determine if this method is generalizable to other technical tasks.

REFERENCES

Ellis, J. A. Long-term retention of factual information (NPRDC Tech. Note 80-5). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, January 1980.

Hurlock, R. E., & Montague, W. E. Skill retention and its implications for Navy tasks: An analytical review (NPRDC Spec. Rep. 82-21). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, January 1982. (AD-A114 211)

Sturges, P. T., Ellis, J. A., & Wulfeck, W. H., II <u>Effects of performance-oriented text</u> <u>upon long-term retention of factual material</u> (NPRDC Tech. Rep. 81-22). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, September 1981. (AD-A106 096)

- Wetzel, S. K., & Montague, W. E. <u>Conditions influencing skill deterioration:</u> A survey of <u>three Navy sonar communities</u> (NPRDC Spec. Rep. 83-18). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, March 1983.
- Wetzel, S. K., Konoske, P. J., & Montague, W. E. <u>Skill degradation in sonar technicians</u> (surface) (STGs): Assessment of job and training variables (NPRDC Spec. Rep. 83-26). San Diego: Navy Personnel Reserch and Development Center, April 1983.
- Vineberg, R., & Joyner, J. N. <u>Prediction of job performance: Review of military studies</u> (NPRDC Tech. Rep. 82-37). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, March 1982. (AD-A113 208)

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Chief of Naval Operations (OP-01), (OP-11), (OP-12) (2), (OP-13), (OP-29), (OP-39), (OP-59), (OP-95)

Chief of Naval Material (NMAT 00), (NMAT 05)

Chief of Naval Education and Training (02)

Chief of Naval Technical Training (016)

Commander in Chief U.S. Atlantic Fleet

Commander in Chief U.S. Pacific Fleet

Commander Naval Air Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet

Commander Naval Air Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet

Commander Naval Surface Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet

Commander Naval Surface Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet

Commander Sea Based ASW Wings, Atlantic

Commander Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet

Commander Submarine Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet

Commander Training Command, U.S. Atlantic fleet

Commander Training Command, U.S. Pacific Fleet

Commanding Officer, Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Center, Atlantic

Commanding Officer, Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Center, Pacific

Commanding Officer, Fleet Aviation Specialized Operator Training Group, Atlantic

Commanding Officer, Fleet Aviation Specialized Operator Training Group, Pacific (Code 32), (VS-41)

Commanding Officer, Fleet Training Center, San Diego

Commanding Officer, ASW Wing, Pacific

Commanding Officer, ASW Wing, Atlantic

Commanding Officer, Naval Training Equipment Center (Technical Library)

Director, Training Analysis and Evaluation Group (TAEG)

Commander, Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Alexandria (PERI-ASL)

Commander, Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Alexandria (PERI-ZT)

Commanding Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Research and Development Center, Avery Point Defense Technical Information Center (DDA) (12)

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED