



1

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANCARDS (2005 A

TDI-TR-83-3



DTIC FILE COPY

AN EVALUATION OF THE CAI SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET AND THE HAWK CW RADAR REPAIR COURSES

DEVELOPED BY:

LARRY D. FRANCIS, Ph.D.

LAWRENCE G. WELLING

GIRARD W. LEVY, Ph.D.

BATTELLE COLUMBUS LABORATORIES

29 JUNE 1983

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE

DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

PREPARED FOR: US ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND FORT MONROE, VA 23651

086

09 30

83

US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS SCHOOL REDSTONE ARSENAL, AL 35897



OCT 6 1983

F.

NOTICES

This report has been reviewed and is approved.

Frank C. A.

FRANK E. GIUNTI Chief, Instructional Development Division

ALABUS EDMOND J.

Colonel, Infantry Director, Training Developments Institute

DISCLAIMER

The contents of this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

DISPOSITION

Destroy this report when it is no longer needed. Do not return it to the originator.



REPORT NUMBER 1. GOVT ACCESSION NG. 1. RECIPICAT'S CATALOG NUMBER TDI-TR-83-3 AD-A [33304] YILE (and JANIMO) 5. TYPE OF REPORT A PERIOD COVERN AN EVALUATION OF THE CAI SEGMENTS OF THE SPECTAL REPORT TOW FIELD TEST SET AND THE HAWK CW RADAR SPECTAL REPORT NUMBER TOW FIELD TEST SET AND THE HAWK CW RADAR SPECTAL REPORT NUMBER AUTHORY S. TYPE OF REPORT NUMBER AUTHORY GOVT ACCESSION NG. AUTHORY SECURITY SCIENCE BATTELLE COLUMBUS LABORATORIES SOLOLUMO STATE SECURITY SCIENCE SOLOLUMO STATE SECURITY SCIENCE SCOLUMADANT SECURITY SCIENCE SOLOLUMO STATE SADESUT AUTHOR MONOGET MARCHARM SCIENTIFIC SCHEDUL, AUTHOR STATEMENT (c/ div Apperd) SECURITY SCIEN		N PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS
TDI-TR-83-3 AD - A / 33 30 4 VIVLE (and Shalling) S. TYPE OF REPORT A PERIOD COVERN AN EVALUATION OF THE CAI SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET AND THE HAWK CW RADAR AN EVALUATION OF THE CAI SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET AND THE HAWK CW RADAR SPECIAL REPORT MUMBER (MAY 82 - JUN 83 REPAIR COURSES Image: Contract of Grant Number() AUTHOR(4) S. CONTRACT OF GRANT NUMBER() DR. LARRY D. FRANCIS BATTELLE COLUMBUS LAB DELIVERY ORDER NO. 019 MR. GIRARD W. LEVY DELIVERY ORDER NO. 019 PROGRAM DELIVERY ORDER NO. 019 DR. GIRARD W. LEVY DELIVERY ORDER NO. 019 PROGRAM DELIVERY ORDER NO. 019 DIRECTOR US ARMY TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS INSTITUTE DIRECTOR US ARMY TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS INSTITUTE US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER 4 SCHOOL, ATSK-TC SCHOOL, ATSK-TC SCHOOL, ATSK-TC REDSTONE ARSENAL, AL 35897 SCHEONIT FOR TOWNGRADING MITHOUTON STATEMENT (of the abstrait entered in Block 20, if different from Repart) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANC MINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ANTHELAKENT (of the abstred in Block 20, if different from Repart)	. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO	. 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
The few 3-winner is type of REPORT & PERIOD COVERN AN EVALUATION OF THE CAI SEGMENTS OF THE SPECIAL REPORT & SPECIAL REPORT & SPEC	ጥ ፲፲_ ጥ፬_ 83_3	00 - A133 300	d
AN EVALUATION OF THE CAI SEGMENTS OF THE SPECIAL REPORT TOW FIELD TEST SET AND THE HAWK CW RADAR REPAIR COURSES AUTHORY DR. LARRY D. FRANCIS DR. LAWRENCE G. WELLING DR. GUTARD W. LEVY FERFORMUNG ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS DATTELLE COLUMBUS LABORATORIES S05 KING AVENUE COLUMBUS, OHIO 43201 CONTACLING OFFICE ANA MAD ADDRESS DIRECTOR US ARRY TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS INSTITUTE ATTG-DID, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 TO COMMANDANT US ARRY TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS INSTITUTE ATTG-DID, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 TO SCHOOL, ATSK-TC COMMANDANT US ARRY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER & SCHOOL ATSK-TC COMMANDANT US ARRY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER & SCHOOL ATSK-TC COMMANDANT US ARRY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER & SCHOOL ATSK-TC THE STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on favores wide If accessery and Hamily by Mach number) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, MINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABSTRACT (Conduct on favores wide If accessery and Hamily by Mach number) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, MINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABSTRACT (Conduct on favores wide If accessery and Hamily by Mach number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD ASTRACT (Conduct on favores of the MACKS. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BOY COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC6S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BOY COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC6S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BOY COURSE SHAR PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH		HD-113330	THE TYPE OF REPORT & REPORT OF CONTRACT
Int Division of the set and the set and the set of the se	AN EVALUATION OF THE CAT SI	CONFINITS OF THE	SDECTAL PEDOPT
Nom TALLD DI OLT AND THE HAWK ON KNDAK PLAT OLY STONE OUT ONE AUTHOR(3) FERFORMING ONG.REPORT NUMBER(5) CONTACT OR GRANT NUMBER(5) CONTACT OR GRANT NUMBER(5) CONTACT OR GRANT NUMBER(5) COLUMBUS LABORATORIES SCHOTAN CULTURE COLUMBUS LABORATORIES SCHOTAN CULTURE COLUMBUS LABORATORIES SCHOTAN CULTURE COLUMBUS LABORATORIES SCHOTAN CULTURE COLUMBUS LABORATORIES COLUMBUS, OHIO 43201 CONTACTING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS REPORT DATE REPORT ADTE REPORT	TOW FIFTD TEST SET AND THE	HAWY CW DADAD	MAV 92 THN 93
AUTHORGY TDI-TR-83-3 AUTHORGY TDI-TR-83-3 AUTHORGY TDI-TR-83-3 DR. LARRY D., FRANCIS BATTELLE COLUMBUS LAB MR. LAWRENCE G. WELLING DELIVERY ORDER NO. 019 DR. GARAN LEVY DELIVERY ORDER NO. 019 DR. GARAN LEVY DELIVERY ORDER NO. 019 COLUMBUS, OHIO 43201 DELIVERY ORDER NO. 019 COLUMBUS, OHIO 43201 PROGRAM COLUMBUS, OHIO 43201 12. REFORM DATE CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS 13. NUMBER OF PAGES CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS 13. NUMBER OF PAGES US ARMY TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS INSTITUTE 13. NUMER OF PAGES COMMANDANT US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER 4 US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER 4 UNCLASSIFIED SCHOOL, ATSK-TC SEGURITY CLASS, (of the approx) COMMANDANT US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER 4 SCHOOL, ATSK-TC SEGURITY CLASS, (of the approx) CONTROLLING AGENCY HAME & ADDRESS UNCLASSIFIED SCHOOL, ATSK-TC SCHOOL REDSTONE ARSENAL, AL 35897 SCHOUL GUTABUMON STATEMENT (of the abstreet entered in Block 20, II different hem Report) MICROC	PEDATE COURSES	HAWK CW KADAK	A REPEOPHING ORG REPORT NUMBER
AUTHOR(s) IDENTRACT OF GRANT HUMBER(s) DR. LARRY D. FRANCIS BATTELLE COLUMBUS LAB MR. LARRY D. FRANCIS BATTELLE COLUMBUS LAB MR. LARRENCE G. WELLING DELIVERY ORDER NO. 019 DR. GIRARD W. LEVY PENFORMER ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS BATTELLE COLUMBUS LABORATORIES SCIENTIFIC SERVICES SOTSKING AVENUE SCIENTIFIC SERVICES COLUMBUS, OHIO 43201 SCIENTIFIC SERVICES STATELLE COLUMBUR AND ADDRESS 12. REPORT DATE DIRECTOR CONTROLLING OFFICE HAME AND ADDRESS 13. NUMBER OF PAGES ATTG-DID, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 13. NUMBER OF PAGES ATGG-DID, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 13. NUMBER OF PAGES COMMANDANT US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER 4 SECURITY CLASS. (of dis mpont) US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER 4 SECURITY CLASS. (of dis mpont) SECURITY CLASS. (of dis mpont) OBSTRIEWTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, H different from Report) SECURITY CLASS. (of dis mpont) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, H different from Report) SECURITY CLASS. FLATO, MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANC MINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K,	REFAIR COURSES		TTT TT 83-3
DR. LARRY D. FRANCIS BATTELLE COLUMBUS LAB MR. LAWRENCE G. WELLING DELIVERY ORDER NO. 019 MR. GRAD W. LEVY DELIVERY ORDER NO. 019 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS D. PROGRAM ELEMENT PROJECT, TASK AREA NORN WITH NUMBER BATTELLE COLUMBUS LABORATORIES SCIENTIFIC SERVICES DOTADLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS D. REFORM DATE COLUMBUS, OHIO 43201 CONTONING ADERCY DATE CONTONING ADERCY TRANSMERS DISTRIBUTION TATE ATTG-DID, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 13. NUMBER OF PAGES COMMONING ADERCY DATE 29 JUN 83 SCHOOL, ATSK-TC SECURITY CLASS (of the memory) COMMONING ADERCY TAKE & ADDRESS 13. SECURITY CLASS (of the memory) COMMANDANT US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER 4 UNCLASSIFIED SCHOOL, ATSK-TC SECURITY CLASS (of the memory) MUNCLASSIFIED APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE. DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED. 14. SECURITY CLASS, (of the memory) MISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electrical inford in Block 20, If different from Report) 15. SECURITY CLASS. PLATO, MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, 11. NETRACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCH MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, 11. NI	AUTHOR(.)		6. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(+)
MR. LAWRENCE G. WELLING DELIVERY ORDER NO. 019 DR. GIRARD W. LEVY DELIVERY ORDER NO. 019 DR. GIRARD W. LEVY DELIVERY ORDER NO. 019 BATTELLE COLUMBUS LABORATORIES SCIENTIFIC SERVICES 505 KING AVENUE PROGRAM ELEMENT PROJECT. TASK COLUMBUS, OHTO 43201 SCIENTIFIC SERVICES CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS 12. REPORT DATE DIRECTOR 29 JUN 83 US ARMY TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS INSTITUTE 73 ATTG-DID, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 73 COMMANDANT UNCLASSIFIED US CHOOL, ATSK-TC 15. SECURITY CLASS, (of Bits report) COMMANDANT UNCLASSIFIED US CHOOL, ATSK-TC 15. SECURITY CLASS, (of Bits report) COMMANDANT UNCLASSIFIED USCHOOL, ATSK-TC 15. SECURITY CLASS, (of Bits report) ONTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) OBTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) BUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on Traverse slide If necessary and Identify by Moch number) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCI MICROCOM	DR LARRY D FRANCTS		BATTFLLE COLUMBUS LAB
M. GIRARD W. LEVY Did ton ton built for order PERFORMING ORGANIZATION MARE AND ADDRESS Different of the control of the property	MR LAWRENCE G. WELLING		DELTVERY ORDER NO 019
PERFORMING ONGAMIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS 10. PROGRAM LEWENT, PROJECT, YASI BATTELLE COLUMBUS LABORATORIES 10. PROGRAM LEWENT, PROJECT, YASI SOS KING AVENUE SCIENTIFIC SERVICES COUTMBUS, OHIO 43201 11. REPORT DATE CONTROLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS 12. REPORT DATE US ARMY TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS INSTITUTE 29 JUN 83 ATTG-DID, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 73 COMMANDANT 15. SECURITY CLASS, (of the report) COMMANDANT 15. SECURITY CLASS, (of the report) COMMANDANT 35897 CONTROLING OFFICE AND MUNITIONS CENTER 4 15. SECURITY CLASS, (of the report) SCHOOL, ATSK-TC 14. DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED. DISTRUBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract intered in Block 20, If different from Report) DISTRUBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract intered in Block 20, If different from Report) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCE MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABUTAL TO ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	DR. GIRARD W. LEVY		
BATTELLE COLUMBUS LABORATORIES 505 KING AVENUE COLUMBUS, OHIO 43201 COLUMBUS, OHIO 43201 CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS DIRECTOR US ARMY TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS INSTITUTE ATTG-DID, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 ATTG-DID, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 ATTG-DID, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 ATTG-DID, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 ATTG-DID, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 COMMANDANT US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER & SCHOOL, ATSK-TC REDSTONE ARSENAL, AL 35897 OBTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE. DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCI MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ADTRACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCI MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ADTRACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCI MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ADTRACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCI MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ADTRACTIVE ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD THES IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD THE TFTS COURSE BAD THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAR COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BO' COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH INTO THE TFTS COURSE HECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TO'	PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRE	55	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TAS
SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES PROCENT DATE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES PROCENT OF PAGES SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES PROCENT DATE SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES PROCENTION OF PUBLIC RELEASE. DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electric entered in Block 20, If different from Report) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME_SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D	BATTELLE COLUMBUS LABORATOR	TES	AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43201 CONTROLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS 12. REPORTATE DIRECTOR 29 JUN 83 US ARMY TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS INSTITUTE 13. NUMBER OF FAGES ATTG-DID, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 73 *MONTORING AGENCY HAME & ADDRESS(# different from Controlling Office) 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) COMMANDANT COMMANDANT US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER & UNCLASSIFIED SCHOOL, ATSK-TC UNCLASSIFIED REDSTONE ARSENAL, AL 35897 35897 OBTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE. DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANC: MINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABUTACT (Continue on reverse afde If measures and identify by block number) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANC, MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABUTACT (Continue on reverse afde If measures and identify by block number) MICROCOMPUTER, SISTED INSTRUCTION (CAL) SEGMENTS OF THE TOK </td <td>505 KING AVENUE</td> <td>~~~~~</td> <td>PROGRAM</td>	505 KING AVENUE	~~~~~	PROGRAM
CONTROLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS 12. REPORT DATE DIRECTOR 29 JUN 83 US ARMY TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS INSTITUTE 13. NUMBER OF PAGES ATTG-DID, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 73 - MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) 15. SECURITY CLASS. (cl file report) COMMANDANT US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER & UNCLASSIFIED SCHOOL, ATSK-TC SCHOOL, ATSK-TC UNCLASSIFIED BEDSTONE ARSENAL, AL 35897 35897 OBSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (cl file Report) APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE. DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (cl file abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCI MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABSTRACT (Configure on reverse of the inservery and identify by block number) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCI MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABSTRACT (Configure on reverse of the inservery and identify by block number) THE ONPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD ABSTRACT TOCE SE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSE ONDUCTED AT MECAS. COMPUT	COLUMBUS ONTO 43201		
DIRECTOR 29 JUN 83 29 JUN 83 20	CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	······	12. REPORT DATE
SATURY TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS INSTITUTE 12.5 000 ATTG-DID, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 73 * MONITORING AGENCY HAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) 13. NUMBER OF PAGES * MONITORING AGENCY HAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) 13. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER & 13. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER & UNCLASSIFIED SCHOOL, ATSK-TC 20.0000 REDSTONE ARSENAL, AL 35897 0011000 OBTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Aberract entered in Block 20, II different from Report) APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE. DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the aberract entered in Block 20, II different from Report) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCE MINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABETRACT (Continue on reverse side If measures and Identify by block number) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCE THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD THE SET SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM, PLATO WAS BRO	DIRECTOR		29 JUN 83
ATTG-DD, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 ATTG-DD, FORT MONROE, VA 23651 MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling Office) COMMANDANT US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER & SCHOOL, ATSK-TC REDETONE ARSENAL. AL 35897 OBSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the aberial APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE. DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the aberial entered in Block 20, II different from Report) APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE. DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the aberial entered in Block 20, II different from Report) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCI MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCI MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABETRACT (Continue on reverse of the freecomp and identify by block number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BO' (COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM, PLATO WAS BROUGH' INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TO	US ARMY TRAINING DEVELOPMEN	ITS INSTITUTE	13. NUMBER OF PAGES
ADDITIONING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office) 15. SECURITY CLASS. (c) this report) COMMANDANT US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER & UNCLASSIFIED SCHOOL, ATSK-TC Isa. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING REDSTONE ARSENAL, AL 35897 Distribution statement (of this Report) APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE. DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the about set of the report) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the about set of the report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANC: MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABSTRACT (Conduct of provide the message and identify by block number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD ABSTRACT (Conduct of provide the message and identify by block number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD ABSTRACT (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM, PLATO WAS BROUGH' THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TOW	ATTG_DID FORT MONROF VA	23651	73
COMMANDANT US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER & SCHOOL, ATSK-TC REDSTONE ARSENAL, AL 35897 OSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE. DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the aberreet entered in Block 20, 11 different from Report) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the aberreet entered in Block 20, 11 different from Report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elds 11 necessary and identify by block number) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCE MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABTRACT (Continue on reverse elds 11 mercessary and identify by block number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION O THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM, PLATO WAS BROUGH' INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TO	MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(I dille	ent from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the absirect entered in Block 20, if different from Report) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the absirect entered in Block 20, if different from Report) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the absirect entered in Block 20, if different from Report) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the absirect entered in Block 20, if different from Report) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the absirect entered in Block 20, if different from Report) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the absirect entered in Block 20, if different from Report) EUPPLEMENTARY NOTES XEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCE ABSTRACT (Conduce as reverse abs if memory and identify by block number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OI THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TOW	COMMANDANT		
SCHOL, ATSK-TC REDSTONE ARSENAL, AL 35897 OSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE. DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES REY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCE MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse and M necessary and identify by block number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TOW	US ARMY MISSILE AND MUNITIC	NS CENTER &	UNCLASSIFIED
Schedule Schedule Schedule Schedule OBSTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE. DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) Supplementary notes supplementary notes KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by Mock number) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCE MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABSTRACT (Conduce on reverse and in memory and identify by Mock number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSE WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TOW	SCHOOL ATSK-TC		154. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING
APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE. DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the above of intered in Block 20, 11 different from Report) DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the above of intered in Block 20, 11 different from Report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse wide 11 necessary and identify by block number) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCE MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABITRACT (Conduce on reverse and the 11 necessary and identify by block number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BOY COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLAVE CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TOW	PEDSTONE ADSENAL AL 3589	,	SCHEDULE
SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCE MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABYTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by block number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BO' COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH' INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TO	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE	. DISTRIBUTION	UNLIMITED.
SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCE MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse state if necessary and identify by block number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BOY COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGHY INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TOW	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract enter	DISTRIBUTION	UNLIMITED.
KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCE MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABSTRACT (Continue of reverse stat if necessary and identify by block number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BOY COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGHY INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TOW	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE	DISTRIBUTION	UNLIMITED.
MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESSOR, TIME-SHARED COMPUTERS, PLATO, INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANC. MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABSTRACT (Centhus as reverse and M messerery and Ideality by block number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BOY COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH' INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TOW	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abelract enter SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	DISTRIBUTION	UNLIMITED.
INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2D), PART TASK TRAINER, MAINTENANC MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABSTRACT (Centre of France and Manual and Manual and Marking Street And The Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) segments of the Tow Field THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BOY COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH' INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TOW	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract enter SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	and identify by block number	UNLIMITED.
MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 24K, MOS 27E, "HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT ABETRACT (Candidate as reverse and M measurement and Identity by block number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BO' COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH' INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TO	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract enter- SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary MICROCOMPUTER _ MICROPROCESS	end identify by block number	UNLIMITED.
ABSTRACT (Candles as reverse and W measurery and Identify by block number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BO' COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH' INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TO	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract enter- SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESS INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONA	and identify by block number SOR, TIME-SHARE	UNLIMITED.
ABSTRACT (Candidus as reverse and W measurery and Identify by block number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION O THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIEL TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BO COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TO	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the aberract enter- SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESS INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONA MAINTENANCE TRAINING. MOS 2	end identify by block number SOR, TIME-SHARE L (2D), PART T 24K, MOS 27E. "	UNLIMITED.
ABSTRACT (Catching of Provide and M measuremy and Identity by block number) THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BO' COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH' INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TO	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the aberract enter SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aide if necessary MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESS INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONA MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 2	end identify by block number SOR, TIME-SHARE L (2D), PART T 24K, MOS 27E, "	UNLIMITED.
THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON A PROJECT TO CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BO COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TO	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract enter SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESS INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONA MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 2	end identify by block number SOR, TIME-SHARE L (2D), PART T 24K, MOS 27E, "	UNLIMITED.
THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION (CAI) SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BO' COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH' INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TO	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract enter- SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESS INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONA MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 2 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary	end identify by block number SOR, TIME-SHARE L (2D), PART T 24K, MOS 27E, "	UNLIMITED.
TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND THE HAWK CONTINUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BO' COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH' INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TO	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abotract enter SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide if necessary MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESS INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONA MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 2 ADSTRACT (Continue on reverse eide if necessary THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON	end identify by block number OR, TIME-SHARE L (2D), PART T 4K, MOS 27E, " mat identify by block number A PROJECT TO	UNLIMITED.
COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION FOR BO COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TO	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abotract enter SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide if necessary MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESS INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONA MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 2 ADSTRACT (Continue on persons eide if necessary THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTR	end identify by block number OR, TIME-SHARE LL (2D), PART T 4K, MOS 27E, " mail identify by block number A PROJECT TO UCTION (CAI) S	UNLIMITED.
COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE PLATO CAI SYSTEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH' INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TO	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the about act anter SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide if necessary MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESS INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONA MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 2 ADSTRACT (Continue on performe eide if necessary THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTR TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND	end identify by block number OR, TIME-SHARE L (2D), PART T 4K, MOS 27E, " mat identify by block number THE HAWK CONTT	UNLIMITED.
INTO THE TFTS COURSE BECAUSE IT WAS ANTICIPATED THAT VERY FEW TO	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the about act enter SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide if necessary MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESS INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONA MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 2 ADSTRACT (Continue on reverse eide if necessary THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTR TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMCAS	end identify by block number OR, TIME-SHARE L (2D), PART T 4K, MOS 27E, " Market Identify by block number A PROJECT TO UCTION (CAI) S THE HAWK CONTI COMPUTER ASSI	UNLIMITED. The Report) D COMPUTERS, PLATO, ASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCH HANDS ON", EQUIPMENT CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF EGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD NUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR STED INSTRUCTION FOR BOY
THIS THE FIRST SOUNDE TO HER DEFINE THE THE THE THE TOP IS	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the about act anter SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESS INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONA MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 2 ADSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTR TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE	end identify by block number OR, TIME-SHARE L (2D), PART T 4K, MOS 27E, " Mail identify by block number A PROJECT TO UCTION (CAI) S THE HAWK CONTI COMPUTER ASSI E PLATO CAI SY	UNLIMITED.
FIELD TEST SETS WOULD BE AVAILABLE AT THE SCHOOL FOR TRAINING	APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abertact enter SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary MICROCOMPUTER, MICROPROCESS INTERACTIVE, TWO-DIMENSIONA MAINTENANCE TRAINING, MOS 2 ADSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary THIS IS THE FINAL REPORT ON THE COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTR TEST SET (TFTS) COURSE AND COURSE CONDUCTED AT MMC&S. COURSES WAS PROVIDED VIA THE INTO THE TETS COURSE BECAUS	end identify by block number OR, TIME-SHARE L (2D), PART T 4K, MOS 27E, " Mail identify by block number A PROJECT TO UCTION (CAI) S THE HAWK CONTI COMPUTER ASSI E PLATO CAI SY E IT WAS ANTIC	UNLIMITED. The Report) D COMPUTERS, PLATO, ASK TRAINER, MAINTENANCHANDS ON", EQUIPMENT CONDUCT AN EVALUATION OF EGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD NUOUS WAVE RADAR REPAIR STED INSTRUCTION FOR BO' STEM. PLATO WAS BROUGH' IPATED THAT VERY FEW TOU

UNCLASSIFIED SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (Then Date Entered) UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)

PLATO INSTRUCTIONAL SEGMENTS, WHICH COULD BE BETTER CHARACTERIZED AS "SIMULATION", WERE INTERSPERSED THROUGHOUT THE TFTS COURSE. ALL TFTS STUDENTS RECEIVED PLATO SEGMENTS AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THEIR INSTRUCTION. THERE WAS NO "NON-PLATO" CONTROL GROUP AVAIL-ABLE.

THE HAWK COURSE WAS NOT CONSTRAINED BY EQUIPMENT SHORTAGES IN THE WAY OF TFTS COURSE WAS. THE PLATO SEGMENTS OF THE HAWK COURSE WERE VERY SMALL IN COMPARISON TO THE LENGTH OF THE OVERALL COURSE. THEREFORE, WITH RESPECT TO THE HAWK COURSE EVALUATION, IT WAS POSSIBLE TO HAVE A CONTROL (NON-PLATO) GROUP AND AN EXPERIMENTAL (PLATO) GROUP FOR COMPARISON PURPOSES.

DATA ANALYSIS FOR BOTH THE TFTS AND THE HAWK EVALUATION WAS ORGANIZED AROUND THE QUESTIONS OF EFFECTIVENESS, EFFICIENCY, USER ACCEPTANCE, QUALITY OF IMPLEMENTATION, GENERALIZABILITY, SYSTEM RELIABILITY, AND COST EXTRAPOLATION.

THE RESULTS ARE THAT, FOR THE TFTS COURSE, THE PLATO SIMULATIONS WERE EFFECTIVE, EFFICIENT, ACCEPTED BY STUDENTS AND INSTRUCTORS, RELIABLE, AND POTENTIALLY COST EFFECTIVE. THE HAWK RESULTS ARE THAT THE PLATO SIMULATIONS ARE EQUALLY EFFECTIVE (TEST RESULTS) OR LESS EFFECTIVE (SUBJECTIVE RESULTS), OF QUESTIONABLE EFFICIENCY, UNACCEPTABLE TO STUDENTS AND INSTRUCTORS, RELIABLE, AND LESS LIKELY COST EFFECTIVE. FINAL REPORT

on

AN EVALUATION OF THE CAI SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET AND THE HAWK CW RADAR REPAIR COURSES

to

U.S. ARMY TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS INSTITUTE

June 29, 1983

bу

Larry D. Francis Lawrence G. Welling Girard W. Levy

The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the authors and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision unless so designated by other documentation.

> BATTELLE Columbus Laboratories 505 King Avenue Columbus, Ohio 43201

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The objective of this study was to conduct an evaluation of the computer assisted instruction (CAI) segments of the TOW Field Test Set (TFTS) Course and the HAWK Continuous Wave Radar Repair Course conducted at MMC&S. Computer Assisted Instruction for both courses was provided via the PLATO CAI system. PLATO was brought into the TFTS course because it was anticipated that very few TOW Field Test Sets would be available at the school for training. PLATO instructional segments, which could be better characterized as "simulation", were interspersed throughout the TFTS course. All TFTS students received PLATO segments as an integral part of their instruction. There was no "non-PLATO" control group available.

The HAWK course was not constrained by equipment shortages in the way the TFTS course was. The PLATO segments of the HAWK course were very small in comparison to the length of the overall course. Therefore, with respect to the HAWK course evaluation, it was possible to have a control (non-PLATO) group and an experimental (PLATO) group for comparison purposes.

>Data analysis for both the TFTS and the HAWK evaluation was organized around the questions of effectiveness, efficiency, user acceptance, quality of implementation, generalizability, system reliability, and cost extrapolation.

The results are that, for the TFTS course, the PLATO simulations were effective, efficient, accepted by students and instructors, reliable, and potentially cost-effective. The HAWK results are that the PLATO simulations are equally effective (test results) or less effective (subjective results), of questionable efficiency, unacceptable to students and instructors, reliable, and less likely cost-effective.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Implementation of the CAI Simulations	1
A Brief Description of the PLATO System	2
Lesson Topics	2
Description of TFTS and HAWK Radar Equipment	3
EVALUATION ISSUES	4
Overall Evaluation Questions	4
Specific Evaluation Issues	4
Overall Evaluation Summary	5
EVALUATION DESIGN	7
TFTS Evaluation	7
HAWK Evaluation	7
Sample Size	7
Evaluation Variables	9
DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS	10
Data Collection	10
Data Analysis	ii
RESULTS	12
Mode of Discussion for Likert-Type Rating and Evaluation Items	12
Effectiveness	12
Training Efficiency	16
User Acceptance	17
Quality of Implementation	21
Generalizability	22

Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

Reliability	23
Cost Extrapolation and Analysis	25
CONCLUSIONS AND FINDINGS	28

APPENDIX A

Appendix A.	Description of Evaluation Variables	
	Tables 1 through 9	A-1

APPENDIX B

Appendix B.	TFTS Student Evaluation Forms and Raw Data	
	End-Of-Week Evaluation	
	End-Of-Course Evaluation	B-1

APPENDIX C

Appendix C. TFTS Instructor Evaluation Forms and Raw Data C-1

APPENDIX D

Appendix D.	HAWK Student Evaluation Forms and Raw Data	
	End-Of-Week Evaluation	
	End-Of-Course Evaluation	D-1

APPENDIX E

Appendix E. HAWK Instructor Evaluation Forms and Raw Data E-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table (0.	Index of Questionnaire Items and Subjective Training Effectiveness Variables	15
Table	1.	Index of Questionnaire Items and Subjective Training Efficiency Variables	16
Table :	2.	Index of Questionnaire Items and Student Acceptance Variables	20
Table (3.	Index of Questionnaire Items and Instructor Acceptance Variables	21

FINAL REPORT

on

ΠÈ,

AN EVALUATION OF THE CAI SEGMENTS OF THE TOW FIELD TEST SET AND THE HAWK CW RADAR REPAIR COURSES

to

U.S. ARMY TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS INSTITUTE

June 29, 1983

from

BATTELLE Columbus Laboratories

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the study was to conduct an evaluation of the computer assisted instruction (CAI) segments of the TOW Field Test Set Course (hereafter referred to as the TFTS course) and the HAWK Continuous Wave Radar Repair Course (hereafter referred to as the HAWK Course). This evaluation was based on a previously developed test and evaluation plan^{*}.

Implementation of the CAI Simulations

The courseware that was evaluated was implemented on the Control Data PLATO CAI system. This courseware was available in two forms: (1) a time-sharing supported system, and (2) a stand-alone, microcomputer system. Materials on both systems were very similar with only a few differences due to the advantages allowed by each method of delivery.

In both the TFTS and the HAWK course, the style of use and the style of courseware were atypical of the usual CAI implementation. For example, the CAI lessons were taken simultaneously by two students. One student read through the technical manual (TM) step-by-step while the other student performed the actions called for, by touching the screen or typing an answer.

The CAI lessons were unusual too, although they appeared to be very appropriate for their use. These CAI materials could more properly be called

^{*} Francis, L. D., and Levy, G. W., A Test and Evaluation Plan for the CAI Segments of the TOW Field Test Set and the HAWK CW Radar Repair Courses, Battelle-Columbus, 1981.

CAI simulations than CAI lessons. That is, the simulations had no instructional objective, per se, other than the overall instructional objective of the module. The "objective" of each lesson was to reproduce as closely as possible the actions of the actual test or operating hardware, and to provide feedback (much like an instructor would) to the student actions. Because of the design objectives, enhanced achievement scores and retention were not expected. Some increase in student motivation/attitudes was anticipated.

A Brief Description of the PLATO System

The PLATO computer-based instruction system is a modern, sophisticated delivery system. As used for HAWK and TFTS training, the system consisted of a high-resolution (512 x 512 dot) monochrome CRT equipped with a 16 x 16 touch sensitive panel. The keyboard contained about a dozen extra keys that facilitated the instructional process and that were labeled for instructional uses (HELP, LAB, BACK, etc.). An internal microprocessor controlled the system. Some of the PLATO terminals at MMCS were connected to a large mainframe control computer by telephone lines. Other terminals (called micro-PLATO terminals) got their data only from connected floppy disks. Although centrally-connected terminals are needed to create courseware, once created, the courseware can be delivered more inexpensively via stand-alone, disk-based terminal systems. With proper attachments micro-PLATO terminals can use central PLATO services. This evaluation focused on the most efficient, minimum cost configuration that could be used for long-term courseware delivery and notes only briefly alternate configurations.

Lesson Topics

The lesson topics for the TFTS course were:

Controller DVM Alignment

Controller Counter Al Alignment

Controller Timer A7 Alignment

Controller Timer A6 Alignment

Functional Analysis and Alignment of the Power Source Unit

Functional Analysis and Alignment of the Power Supply Modulator/Test Adapter

TOW Weapon System Verification Test (6 lessons)

2 new lessons on Troubleshooting written by MMCS course staff (not yet in general use)

The lesson topics for the HAWK course were:

Repair Antenna Positioning Circuits

Repair Horizontal Amplifier and Power Supply

The TFTS Simulations (15 - 17 hours) were placed throughout the three week course in essentially an even distribution. For nearly every exercise where a computer simulation could be predicted to offer a significant advantage, that simulation has been created.

The HAWK simulation (1 - 1-1/2 hours) was located past the half-way point in the course. It was a very samll part of a relatively long course (27 - 45 weeks).

Description of TFTS and HAWK Radar Equipment

The TOW Field Test Set consists of a group of about a dozen devices that are used to check the readiness of and troubleshoot problems for the TOW missile and its firing system. Most of the checks made are electronic, although there are some optical and mechanical tests as well. The test instruments are relatively large (compared to a simple test instrument like a multimeter) and rather complex in terms of the numbers of knobs, gauges, and jacks. The individual devices are packed in large trunks when moved.

The Improved HAWK Radar Set is a large piece of equipment mounted on a medium-sized rubber-tired trailer. A tower supports the revolving radar antenna and a side panel opens to become a control panel. Troubleshooting typically involves isolating a printed circuit board and then a circuit element on that board.

EVALUATION ISSUES

Overall Evaluation Questions

The evaluation attempted to look at the general questions, "Were the HAWK and TFTS CAI simulations implemented well enough to meet their intended objectives?" and "Can these results be generalized to other sites and situations?" This was to be done by examining specific issues about effectiveness, efficiency, cost, reliability, and user acceptance. The extent of generalizability is an important, but difficult question to answer with certainty. The results of any single study have low generalizability until they are combined with and compared to other studies with similar objectives and parameters. Even then, generalization is limited to other situations where the environment, objectives, and situation are similar to those studies from which the generalizations are made. Additionally, all evaluations have one further limitation: the quality of the implementation. If the quality of courseware and the associated instructor-led teaching is high, it is possible for participants (especially instructors or school administrators) to validly make subjective estimates about, for example, how widely applicable this CAI simulation technique is. However, if the quality of the implementation is low, it is very hard to believe that the measures of user acceptance, effectiveness, etc., would not be so low as to affect any estimate about how generally useful these simulations are. Note that a high quality implementation may still show that this technique could be applied successfully to only a few other courses. Thus, the generalizability of the results from this evaluation are limited by the quality of the implementation, and no attempt to draw conclusions and recommendations were to be made unless the implementation was first shown to have been satisfactory.

Specific Evaluation Issues

In order to collect the data to answer the relevant issues, seven types of questions were asked.

- 1. Effectiveness. Normally this question would be "Do the materials teach?", but because of the objectives of these simulations, two appropriate questions for both courses were considered to be: "Was the simulation fidelity high?" and "Did transfer occur?"; for the TOW course, "Was equipment damage reduced?"; and, for the HAWK course, "Was there a significant difference in scores and grades when portions of the course are taught via simulation?"
- Efficiency. This question had two meanings in the context of these courses. First, "When engaged with the CAI system, was the student's time well used?"; second, "When CAI systems were introduced for practical exercises, was efficient

use made of the student's available time?"

3. <u>User Acceptance</u>. This issue was raised among two groups: students and instructors.

In various formats, the essential question was, "If you had a choice, would you try to use CAI simulations again?"

- 4. <u>Reliability</u>. This information was gathered separately for each type of delivery system. It was to be measured in a quantitative, objective way by calculating hardware reliability factors such as mean time between failure and also by subjective estimates of the comparative reliability. Courseware reliability was considered as an integral part of the implementation quality issue (see above).
- 5. Cost. Cost extrapolation was to answer the question, "How much would it cost if these CAI simulations were permanently installed as an on-going part of these courses?"

The issues of generalizability and quality of implementation were treated equally with the five issues above, but have been discussed previously. The latter issue was measured both by questioning users and by analysis of logged data about student problems.

Overall Evaluation Summary

Looking at evaluation only from an "issues" point of view tends to obscure the reasons and objectives for the original decision to implement the PLATO system in the courses chosen. Therefore, these objectives are reviewed here.

TOW Field Test Set Course

PLATO was brought into the TFTS course because it was anticipated that very few TOW Field Test Sets (TFTSs) would be available at the school for training. The reasons for the addition of PLATO-simulated test components were many:

> • During practical exercise (PE) time, four students are typically paired with one instructor. It is possible for only two students to work at a piece of equipment under the instructor's supervision. The other half of the time a student must be occupied with self-study. In such a case, the student's time in PE (particularly PE1, hands-on

training) is not efficiently used. Taking advantage of this time for PLATO simulations would keep the student stimulated and motivated and would provide nearly double the "hands-on time" (if the simulations were effective).

- Furthermore, it sometimes happens that the course starts before all the TFTS equipment has arrived and been readied. In that case, a PLATO simulation could provide the only experience a student gets before having to work in the field with a piece of equipment.
- Also because of equipment shortages, the availability of spare parts or replacement items was expected to be low. Therefore, equipment damage caused by students who misconnect or improperly control the test equipment could have a major, long-term effect on the ability of the school to teach the course. The threat was very real in that there are several excellent opportunities for misadjusted controls to damage very expensive equipment. The PLATO simulations were programmed to catch these cases and provide unforgetable feedback about the consequences of such actions on the actual TFTS.
- Although not their direct responsibility, school officials looking at an overall Army need for training realized that, for those portions of the course with PLATO simulations, it might be possible to have training exportable to anyone who has a TFTS and access to a PLATO terminal and the TFTS courseware.

The TFTS course had no comparison group for a CAI vs. non-CAI study. Overall, therefore, its evaluation asked, "What does having PLATO simulations available add to this course?"

HAWK Continuous Wave Radar Repair Course

The HAWK course had a comparison group (CAI vs. non-CAI) available, but was not constrained by equipment shortages in the way the TFTS course was. Therefore, the questions asked were: "What is the effect of replacing some hands-on equipment experience (which has little feedback) with some computer simulated experience (with feedback)?" "Does the CAI help bridge the gap between theory classes and PE or does it enhance motivation (since this is a relatively long course)?"

EVALUATION DESIGN

This section of the report presents the evaluation design for the TFTS and HAWK courses. These designs were based on discussions at MMCS and a thorough exploration of alternatives. They appeared to be the most feasible from a technical, cost and schedule viewpoint.

TFTS Evaluation

The TFTS evaluation was severely constrained by the absence of any control group. There was no comparable group of students that was taught the TOW Field Test Set course without the use of PLATO. The evaluation of effectiveness, therefore, focused on whether an acceptable level of performance was achieved by an acceptable percentage of students. The evaluation of efficiency focused on two questions: whether students were acceptably trained using fewer equipment end items per student than in traditional courses (i.e., four students per equipment end item), and whether better use was made of the students' time during P.E.s.

In general, the evaluation consisted of subjective comparisons (by students and instructors) of the effectiveness, efficiency, acceptance, and generalizability of PLATO simulations compared with the use of real equipment.

HAWK Evaluation

The HAWK effectiveness evaluation was based on test scores for the lesson using PLATO, comparing those students who used PLATO with those who did not. In the evaluation design, classes would be randomly assigned to PLATO and non-PLATO conditions until the required number of students was obtained.

Another part of the evaluation consisted of subjective comparisons (by students and instructors in PLATO classes) of the effectiveness, efficiency, acceptance, and generalizability of PLATO simulations compared with the use of real equipment.

Since the amount of PLATO use could vary widely in the HAWK classes, a question on amount of use was given to students, for possible use as a control variable in the statistical analyses.

Sample Size

Minimum sample size for a study were determined based on three statistical considerations: (1) the desired precision of estimation or the

desired amount of difference that is to be reliably detected, (2) the desired confidence level for the study, and (3) the population variance. Desired levels for the first two items were established. The third item, the population variance, was estimated from previous experience. Nonstatistical considerations, such as cost of additional sampling units or difficulty in obtaining additional units, also figured into the determination of sample size. Samples larger than the minimum were requested to counteract any attrition due to dropouts, missing data, etc.

Sample Size - TFTS

The minimum sample size required for the TFTS evaluation was based on the desired precision of estimation for the student subjective judgments (since there was no control group). As most of the questions are based on a 5-point rating scale, this type of scale was used as the basis for calculating the required sample size. It was first assumed that the desired precision of estimation is just under one-half of a scale step (i.e., .49 units). That is, if the mean judgment for a particular question is 2.5, it would be desirable to have a large enough sample, so that we could state that the population mean is greater than 2.0 and is less than 3.0 with a specified level of confidence. The usual level of confidence selected is 95 percent. That is, we would make an error only 5 times in 100 replications of the study. Other levels of confidence, such as 90 percent or 99 percent, are sometimes used.

The required minimum sample size (N) was calculated from:

$$N = 4\sigma^2 (Z_{1-\alpha/2})^2/w^2$$

where: N_2 = minimum sample size σ^2 = population variance α = 1-the confidence level (α = 1-.95 = .05) $r^2 1-\alpha/2$ = abcissa of the unit normal curve corresponding to $1-\alpha/2$ ($Z_{.975}$ = 1.96) w = width of the confidence interval (w = ± .49 = .98)

Previous experience with 5-point scales has shown that the sample variance (used as an estimate of the population variance) is likely to lie between 1.00 and 1.96. (This latter number is only coincidently the same as the value for Z.975). If $\sigma^2 = 1.96$, then the required minimum sample size was approximately <u>31</u> students. Actual sample size attained in the study was 34 students.

The same considerations apply to the number of instructors and school staff required to provide reasonably precise estimates of their judgments. Since it is unlikely that there would be as many as 31 different TFTS instructors, we simply had to accept as many as we could get. (Because of differences in PLATO implementation in the TFTS and HAWK courses, and the different experiences of the instructors, the data from TFTS and HAWK instructors were not combined.)

Sample Size - HAWK

The minimum sample size required for the HAWK evaluation was based on the amount of difference in mean test lesson scores between PLATO and non-PLATO classes that is to be reliably detected. It was assumed that a difference of 10 percentage points or more between the means was important to detect. Further, it was assumed that a difference this large or larger should be detected 90 percent of the time (90 out of 100 replications of the study). Finally, the level of confidence was set at 95 percent.

The required minimum size for <u>each</u> group was calculated from:

$$N = 2\sigma^2 (Z_{\alpha/2} + Z_{\hat{e}})^2/d^2$$

where:

- N_2 = minimum sample size in one group σ^2 = estimated population variance
- α = 1-the confidence level, or the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis when it is true (α = 1-.95 = .05)
- β = the probability of accepting the null hypothesis when it is false (β = 1-.90 = .10)
- Z = abcissa of the unit normal curve corresponding to the subscripted area
- d = difference between independent means (10 percent)

It is estimated that the sample variance is likely to be 100 percenage points. If $\sigma^2 = 100$, $\alpha = .05$, $\beta = .10$, and d = 10, then the required minimum sample size in each group was approximately 21 students. Actual sample size attained in this study was 35 students in the experimental group and 25 students in the control group.

Evaluation Variables

The evaluation variables (i.e., effectiveness, efficiency, user acceptance, quality of implementation, generalizability, reliability, and cost) are presented in Appendix A, Tables 1 through 9, together with their metrics, rationale for use, and data sources.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Data Collection

Data was collected on the TFTS and HAWK courses in accordance with the data collection plan.

- For each course, the school designated a person who was responsible for gathering, making minor checks upon, and storage of the course data during the evaluation period.
- 2. HAWK course instructors chose five test items that clearly and primarily reflected knowledge gained during the portion of the block that was taught via PLATO.
- 3. Instructors who used PLATO were briefed on:
 - Usage logs
 - Administration of questionnaires
 - Problem logs
 - Recording of unusual incidents weekly
- 4. Copies of problem and usage logs were reproduced.
- 5. Lists of terminal number, terminal type, and terminal location were prepared.
- HAWK student data (common subjects scores, and scores on the relevant test items) for both PLATO and non-PLATO classes were obtained.
- 7. The evaluators screened end-of-course evaluations for PLATO-related comments.
- 8. At the end of the PLATO instruction, the instructor or someone designated by the school:
 - Verified the accuracy and completeness of the usage and problem logs and checked that back-in-service time/data were recorded.
 - Recorded any anecdotes about class events that were related to the CAI lessons.
 - Transcribed common subjects course scores to student data form (HAWK only).
 - Distributed and collected the PLATO end-ofcourse evaluation.
- 9. Battelle evaluators:
 - Gathered PLATO cost data from the CDC sales representative and reviewed budget completeness.

• Gathered TFTS acquisition and repair costs from the school.

The only staff questionnaires received for both the TFTS and HAWK courses were from the course instructors. Other school administrative personnel did not complete these forms.

Data Analysis

Data analysis for both TFTS and HAWK evaluations was organized around the questions of effectiveness, efficiency, user acceptance, quality of implementation, generalizability, system reliability, and cost extrapolations. Reliability and cost data from the TFTS and HAWK courses were pooled. The other data were analyzed separately for the TFTS and HAWK course evaluations.

Analysis of the subjective questions involved obtaining frequency distributions for each question. Differences between students and instructors, and between TFTS and HAWK courses were examined.

The HAWK effectiveness evaluation involved a comparison of the means on the test lesson for the PLATO and non-PLATO classes. Scores on the common course subjects portion of the course and the estimated time spent were used to interpret the effectiveness results.

RESULTS

This section reports the results for the TFTS and HAWK course evaluations with respect to effectiveness, efficiency, user acceptance, quality of implementation, generalizability, reliability, and cost.

Mode of Discussion for Likert-Type Rating and Evaluation Items

The evaluation will be discussed issue by issue, treating all evaluation items for one issue before beginning a new issue. The tables found at the end of each issue discussion will direct the reader to the specific questions asked on each questionnaire. The questionnaires will be found in Appendices B-E; the frequency of each response has been entered onto the questionnaire form. The discussion of the issues will generally note only trends or consensuses, leaving the details of the response profile to be found in the appendices.

Effectiveness

HAWK Effectiveness

The HAWK effectiveness evaluation was based on derived 5-item subtest scores related to the PLATO lessons, comparing those students who used PLATO with those who did not. The observed mean for the experimental (PLATO) group on this test was 93% (N=35), which was slightly worse than the control (non-PLATO) group mean of 97% (N=25). With respect to the common subjects portion of the course and the time required for completion of the HAWK course, the experimental group took less time but did not perform as well when compared to the control group. While the evaluation plan considered the use of covariance analysis to compare the experimental and control group on the five item effectiveness measure, this was not done because the distribution of scores on the five item test did not lend itself to covariance analysis. As is obvious from the means achieved (i.e., 97% vs. 93%), the scores on the effectiveness measure were consistently high across both the control and the experimental groups. It is difficult, therefore, to establish any important or practical difference between the two groups in terms of the five item test. Go/No-Go data from criterion referenced tests were also examined but found to be essentially all "qo" in both groups.

TFTS Effectiveness

TFTS students received course grades based on 2 PE and 2 written test scores. The class that began in March 1983 was told that their PLATO test scores would also be included in the average. As a result, students treated PLATO exercises even more seriously. Interestingly, their PLATO scores remained the same, but written and PE scores increased considerably (see below). Since this change in procedures (announcing that PLATO scores would be averaged into the grades) was not part of the original experimental design, Battelle captured only the following averaged data from the last three classes in the evaluation period.

Class Information			Ove Gr	rall ade	PLAT	D-Only ade
<u>Class #</u>	Started	N	Avg.	Range	Avg.	Range
105	Dec. 82	9	84.9	79-88	86.2	83-89
001	Jan. 83	7	86.6	82-94	86.0	82 -89
002	Mar. 83	6	94.3	94-95	86.2	85-88

The sample sizes are too small to draw firm conclusions, but anecdotal information from the instructors indicates a significant improvement of an already excellent situation after the announcement was made. All of the above scores should be viewed as very commendable: the criterion level for passing the course is 70.

Subjective Effectiveness Data

Training effectiveness was also measured via ratings by students and instructors. TFTS students comparing PLATO to the real equipment felt they learned equally from each and felt they could learn "a great deal" if they had learned only from PLATO. HAWK students felt they learned less from PLATO and could have learned "a little" using only PLATO. TFTS instructors found PLATO greatly increased student learning and greatly increased learning about the relationships among system components and tests. HAWK instructors saw little or no change in either of these categories.

Speed of learning for TFTS students was self-rated as faster on PLATO, but HAWK students felt they learned slower on PLATO.

Simulation fidelity or realism is an important dimension of training effectiveness in cases where a training simulation is used. Most (22) TFTS students stated they were never confused by differences between real and simulation equipment and several (12) said they occassionally were confused. None reported being confused often. These students were divided between the two highest ratings for the fidelity and adequacy of PLATO for training. HAWK students were divided fairly evenly between those who were never confused by differences between real and simulated equipment and those who occassionally were. Four students reported being confused often. Opinions on the adequacy of simulation fidelity for training spanned the range of alternatives. Overall

the ratings were slightly positive.

Students answered one rating question about the relevancy or applicability of PLATO learning to the actual job. TFTS students gave PLATO very high marks here, HAWK students were neutral to slightly negative. Instructors had a similar question: TFTS instruction got positive responses; HAWK instruction got mostly neutral and one negative response.

Student confidence could be expected to increase as a result of using the simulators. TFTS responses were all positive or neutral, with half the students reporting PLATO "increased my confidence". HAWK students were almost exactly neutral. A similar question to TFTS instructors produced all positive comments; HAWK instructors comments mirrored in reverse the TFTS results: they were all negative. If the simulator can boost a student's confidence, it's also possible the simulator could lead to overconfidence. However, TFTS instructors found student overconfidence decreased (a positive finding). Three of the four HAWK instructors agreed, but one reported increased overconfidence.

Because students don't always use tech manuals (TMs) as frequently as they ought, one goal of the PLATO simulations was to increase this use. TFTS instructors reported a considerable increase in TM use (both in a rating item and in open-end comments), but HAWK instructors saw no change (3 of 4) or a great decrease (1).

One of the most consistent findings about why computer-based training improves performance is that student attention is enhanced. Most TFTS students checked the highest category for their interest level while using PLATO; all three instructors also recorded greatly increased attention. HAWK students reported a rather high interest level, only slightly lower than TFTS students. HAWK instructors, however, noted no change or even a decrease in attention.

The student questionnaire contained one item (number 3) that was an overall rating of effectiveness and acceptance. On a 1 to 10 scale (10 being highest) students rated the usefulness of PLATO simulation. TFTS student's ratings were all positive (i.e., the lowest rating was 6), the mode was 10, and the mean was 8.9. HAWK student's ratings spanned the range from 1 to 10, the mode was 10, and the mean was only 5.7.

TABLE O. INDEX OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS AND SUBJECTIVE TRAINING EFFECTIVENESS VARIABLES

	Subjective Training Effectiveness Variables (Keyed to Tables 1 and 2a in Appendix A)	Student End-Of-Course Evaluation	Instructor End-Of-Course Evaluation
1.2	Perceived amount of learning	Questions 5 & 12	Questions 6 & 17
1.3	Perceived speed of learning	Question 6	
1.4	Perceived fidelity of simulation	Questions 4 & 11	
1.5	Perceived application of training to job perform- ance	Question 10	Question 12
1.6	Perceived extent of student confidence	Question 8	Question 9
1.7	Perceived extent of student overconfidence		Question 14
1.8	Perceived use of TM's		Question 10
1.9	Perceived holding of student attendion	Question 9	Question 8

15

i

Training Efficiency

Training efficiency questions as defined in this study address two issues. The first is, "Was the available practical exercises (PE) time well used?" Instructors in TFTS found a lower workload and more time for helping students when they had PLATO available, but HAWK instructors had essentially an opposite view. TFTS students felt their time was used better or perhaps much better with PLATO whereas HAWK students perceived no difference. Instructor opinions matched those of their students.

The second efficiency question is, "Was the simulation itself efficient?" To measure this, the evaluation plan made two assumptions: the simulated tasks should not take longer than the actual tasks, and greater individualization (because of feedback, help, etc.) should make the ratio between fastest and slowest student larger for an efficient simulation than for the real task. Only TFTS had a subject for which the above comparisons could be reasonably made, and only two instructors had enough experience to accurately estimate the time needed to perform the tasks. The first hypothesis was upheld: simulated operation was as fast or faster than actual operation. However, the second hypothesis, that PLATO feedback would increase the disparity between fast and slow students, was not observed. In fact, the students who were slowest on the real equipment apparently received the greatest "speed-up" when using PLATO: instructors estimated that for the slowest, simulated operation took 1.0 hours whereas on actual equipment the operation took 1.5 hours.

	Subjective Efficiency Variables (Table 3, Appendix A)	Student End-Of-Course Evaluation	Instructor End-Of-Course Evaluation
1.2	Use of instructor's time during P.E.		Questions 11 & 16
1.3	Use of student's time during P.E.	Question 7	Question 15
1.4	Estimated time to complete tasks		Questions 25 - 28

TABLE 1. INDEX OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS AND SUBJECTIVE TRAINING EFFICIENCY VARIABLES

Salvaged Time

Another measure of efficiency is "salvaged time". Since typically only half the students could work with the real TFTS equipment at once, the time of the other students was being underutilized before PLATO simulations were added to the course. Based on comments from course personnel, it seems fair to count as "salvaged time" all the student time spent using the TFTS simulations; the average time for TFTS students, 12.3 hours/person, is therefore regarded as the amount of extra instruction each student received because of the PLATO simulations, but without extending the length of the course. TFTS instructors also indicated via oral comments that PLATO totally eliminated student complaints regarding underutilized time that occurred earlier. HAWK instructors felt because real equipment was available, PLATO took away from experience using it. As a result no "salvaged time" would be gained.

Reduction of the Need for Hardware

One possible purpose for PLATO-type simulations is the replacement of real hardware with simulated hardware. To measure this possibility the evaluation plan proposed to calculate the number of students per set of real hardware before and after PLATO. In actual practice, the number of students was more a function of class frequency and class size than of hardware availability. For that reason and because there is no value against which to compare the ratio obtained, this issue was examined by informal interviews of course staff. The clear consensus in the TFTS course was that even as valuable as the PLATO simulations were, some minimum time with the real equipment was necessary and that for the TFTS course, for example, a further "dilution" of hardware among students would be detrimental to the training program. They pointed out that it was not infrequent that one of the three TFTS systems was broken. Whereas the remaining operable equipment could temporarily accommodate a 50% increase (from one-third of the load to onehalf of the load), if there were only two TFTS units when one failed, the remaining unit could not be expected to handle a 100% load increase (from onehalf to the full load).

User Acceptance

User acceptance was broken into two parts: student acceptance and instructor acceptance. The responses from TFTS and HAWK students were sufficiently different that they were analyzed separately.

Analysis of TFTS Student Comments from Open-End Questionnaire Items

Two questions on the end-of-course student evaluation asked TFTS students what they liked and what they disliked about the PLATO part of the course. In addition, several students added comments of a similar nature to other questions and to the end-of-week evaluation sheet. All these comments were divided into roughly a dozen positive and a dozen negative categories. The total number of comments exceeds the number of students because most students made multiple comments.

Likes. The aspect of PLATO that most student comments noted (17) was the extra simulated practice with the equipment. A large number (10) also felt that use of the computer added "interest" and "fun" to the course. Equal numbers of comments (6) were received for: practice with the TMs using a computer, and general positive (but non-specific) comments. Five comments showed appreciation of the graphics, three comments each dealt with the feedback received and the testing aspects of the computer. Two comments mentioned interaction and one each noted the touch input and the reduced possibility of equipment damage. Thus, in general, the objectives for which PLATO training was designed were noted by the students. The comments were really quite positive (i.e., no sarcastic remarks) and no unexpected or unusual comments appeared.

Dislikes. The most popular negative comment was, in fact, a positive comment. Fifteen comments of "none" or "nothind" were listed as dislikes about the PLATO part of the course. The second most frequent comments regarding dislikes may have related to an apparent problem with differing tolerances between the PLATO and the TM requirements. Some students said merely that right answers were sometimes marked wrong; other students went on to explain about the tolerances problem. Discussion with course personnel indicated that the tolerance difference was a deliberate design decision to try to get better results through tighter tolerances. Four people commented about touch input problems. This could be a result of overly restrictive judging by the software (failing to account for parallax and sloppy finger placement) or a result of hardware problems. The number of problems noted is predictable for touch input. Three people made what is probably another example of positive comment in a negative category: they felt there was not enough time to use PLATO. Three comments were noted regarding difficulties in moving from PLATO simulator to the real equipment. Two comments each were received that PLATO feedback was confusing and that the computer instruction was too simplistic. Four comments were made only once: a better introduction to using the computer was needed, touch input combined with typing was confusing, the student should be able to insert errors into the simulated equipment, and a student felt as if he were just playing a game with the computer.

TFTS Summary. Total comments about likes totaled 60; those about dislikes totaled 42. Considering that all of the likes were positive comments and 18 of the dislikes were positive comments; this gives a ratio of 78 to 24 negative.

Overall these comments paint a picture of a very satisfied student user group. It might be noted that although some minor courseware rewrites might be needed to reduce even further the number of problems noted in the comments, no problems were apparently severe enough to warrant writing them down in the problem log.

Analysis of HAWK Student Comments from Open-End Questionnaire Items

The HAWK students who used PLATO answered the questions about likes and dislikes rather differently than the TFTS students.

Likes. The most common reason for liking PLATO (9 responses) was that "it broke the routine/was fun/a good toy". Six people found it faster to use and five enjoyed working with PLATO as a computer. A few (4) felt "it makes you think/it helps to understand the circuitry" and two liked it because it was easy to use. One comment each was received that a student liked the PLATO simulation because: it saved the training equipment, it was good and more of the subject should be on PLATO, that it was NOT good for teaching, and that it was good if integrated with the rest of the course.

Dislikes. Two types of comments tied for the most common dislikes: six students each noted "not enough realism/no feeling of learning" and "doesn't give enough information/does too much automatically". Several comments (4) were made about the brevity of the PLATO experience being too short to be useful. Three students found nothing to dislike and three said PLATO simulations were only good if there was an equipment snortage [there isn't a shortage currently in the HAWK course]. One comment each was received that PLATO was "boring", "not detailed enough" and "mixed up".

HAWK Summary. Total positive comments were 30 and negative were 25. Moving negative comments under "likes' to "dislikes" and vice-versa, one finds there were 32 positive and 23 negative comments. Despite their numerical majority, the positive comments were often weak (e.g., the most popular comment), and the negative comments were strong. Overall it's clear the HAWK students felt PLATO's advantages were those of an interesting diversion from learning; few comments suggested that it had an important role in training. The HAWK student's experience with PLATO was much different and much less positive than that for TFTS.

Ranked Acceptance Items: Students

Two end-of-course items rated student acceptance on a 5-point scale. TFTS students voted overwhelmingly that they would like to use PLATO for other hands-on training; most also said they would recommend to a friend that a PLATO course be selected over a non-PLATO course if convenient and many said they would advise the friend to "fight tooth and nail to get into the PLATO course". These are both very strong recommendations. Most HAWK students, in contrast, felt they would prefer not to take more PLATO in other training or were undecided (there was not a strong consensus). Similarly, they were neutral to slightly negative about advising a friend with respect to other PLATO-containing courses.

TABLE	2.	INDEX OF	QUESTIONNA	AIRE	ITEMS	AND
		STUDENT	ACCEPTANCE	VARI	ABLES	

	Student Acceptance Variables (Table 4, Appendix A)	Student End-Of-Course Evaluation
1.1	Likes and dislikes about PLATO training	Questions 1 & 2
1.2	Willingness to use PLATO in other P.E. lessons	Question 14
1.3	Willingness to take other courses involving PLATO	Questions 15

Acceptance Items: TFTS Instructors

Instructor acceptance attitudes matched student attitudes fairly closely. TFTS instructors each listed multiple advantages: student selfconfidence, lack of equipment damage, saved instructor time, individual feedback to students, increased attention, etc. Two instructors found no disadvantages and a third noted that use of PLATO meant less time on actual equipment (but qualified his comment saying the advantages outweighed the disadvantages). An open-end question about role changes caused by a wider PLATO implementation produced two similar positive comments of "more time to give individual attention" and one comment predicting little role change. A rating question measuring existing role changes was very positive. An openend question about training practices elicited explanations of implementation procedures and reiterations of advantages.

TFTS instructors had consensus at the highest positive level regarding more PLATO simulations for their course and for other courses at the school. Regarding their seeking a position as instructor in a PLATO-based course, their responses were strung evenly between a neutral and very positive.

Acceptance Items: HAWK Instructors

HAWK instructors responding to advantage/disadvantage questions found no PLATO advantages (3) and use possibly for remediation (1). Disadvantages were plentiful: six disadvantages were cited by four instructors. They all dealt with the extra time and manpower needed to implement PLATO. Considering the amount of terminal familiarization time compared to the student learning time, the instructor's comments are certainly understandable. An open-end question about role changes caused by a wide implementation of PLATO in the course resulted in responses nearly identical in substance to the "disadvantages" question. A rating question measuring existing role change was neutral to negative.

Instructor's comments-to an open-end question about changes in training practices resulting from PLATO had only negative comments: time lost from real equipment, students lax in procedures after using PLATO (2), and students less safety conscious (touching on PLATO was theorized to induce students to touch actual components).

HAWK instructors were mostly undecided about advocating PLATO simulation for other courses at the school, but definitely did not want them in the HAWK course. Of the four instructors, two would avoid if possible teaching a course using PLATO simulation and two would neither request nor avoid such a course.

	School Staff Acceptance Variables (Table 5, Appendix A)	Instructor/Staff End-∂f-Course Evaluation
1.1	Advantages and disadvantages with using PLATO	Questions 2 & 3
1.2	Willingness to expand PLATO lessons in current course	Question 18
1.3	Willingness to teach other courses using PLATO	Questions 19 & 23
1.4	Perceived changes in role of instructor/staff	Questions 5 & 7
1.5	Perceived changes in conduct of training	Question 4

TABLE 3. INDEX OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS AND INSTRUCTOR ACCEPTANCE VARIABLES

Quality of Implementation

An adequate summative evaluation requires that some attention be given to the quality of implementation of the courseware. Unless the implementation is carried out in accordance with the project plans, and is of high quality, conclusions cannot be made about the impact of the courseware.

Quality of implementation was assessed by means of seven questions that recorded the frequency of typical problems experienced with incompletely-tested courseware. All these items were listed on what was labeled the "end-of-week evaluation". In both courses a <u>single</u> end-ofweek evaluation was used, even if the PLATO simulations were used over several weeks. Also, two slightly different forms of this evaluation were used. One course used an earlier draft form and the other used a finalized version. TFTS students had three response options for describing the frequency of occurrence of each problem: never, once, more than once. HAWK students had the same questions, but were just given a yes/no item, "did this problem ever cocur", followed by "if yes, how often: once, two or three times, four or more times".

A subjective reading of the TFTS results, based on Battelle's experience and based upon analysis of student's open-end comments as explanations of the above implementation data, suggests that most of the "bugs" had been removed prior to student testing and that efforts toward further polishing of the courseware would probably not have influenced the results. The only cases in which a majority of students had a problem more than once seemed to be caused by non-responsive touch panels and needing an instructor for further information. Considering the number of hours on PLATO, the predictability of responses (question 4), the indexing of content (question 6), and the simulation fidelity (question 8) all received very high tallies in the "never a problem" category.

HAWK student data are difficult to compare directly to TFTS data since the duration of the PLATO experience was so different. However, the pattern of responses for HAWK is basically similar, with fewer problems noted because of fewer hours of operation. Two exceptions to the pattern were that HAWK students recorded more touch panel problems (possibly a hardware or programming problem) and simulation fidelity problems. The higher rate of problems recorded for HAWK could have contributed to the lower acceptance of PLATO by students in that course, particularly since, for example, 10 of the 34 students reported problems with simulation fidelity that occurred two or more times during their short usage. An alternate explanation is that the high number of problems noted was a <u>symptom</u> of dissatisfaction arising from some other cause rather than a <u>contributory</u> factor to the cause.

An instructor questionnaire item (number 24) measuring the quality of implementation in terms of instructor assistance required produced positive results for TFTS and negative results (more assistance needed) for HAWK.

Generalizability

There are two questions that might be termed "generalizability"; first, "Are the results valid, and thus generalizable to other students and courses?" and second, "Based on the knowledge and experience of the instructors and school staff, are there other training situations that would benefit from application of this technology?" Although both questions are related, the first question is not a measurable quantity, but is based on the quality of the implementation and the quality of the research design, whereas the second question was hoped to be measurable to some extent using subjective ratings. Two rating items attempted to reasure the instructor's impressions of the generalizability of the PLATO simulation approach within their own course (question 21) and to other courses (question 22). TFTS staff found PLATO applicable to all other P.E. lessons in TFTS and "almost all" similar situations in other courses with limited equipment for training. (Note: the HAWK course does not suffer from equipment snortages as does the TFTS course.) The HAWK instructors (3 of 4) said PLATO was not applicable to other PE lessons and some (2 of 4) said PLATO shouldn't have been used where it was. Their opinion about applicability to other courses was also negative: 3 of 4 found only a limited number of courses that might benefit and one instructor found no use at all for PLATO simulation. Clearly instructor experience strongly colors opinion, even about applications outside their own course. The total lack of instructor consensus demonstrates that inadequate data are available with which to form a conclusion on generalizability, and that instructor data alone are probably not adequate to settle this issue.

Reliability

Failure Rates

Because of the excellent performance of the hardware and software, many of the reliability measurements have little meaning or cannot be calculated. As stated in the test plan, the software problems encountered during the very first class should not be included in the calculation of mean time between problems (MTBP). Since no problems were logged after the first week, this value cannot be calculated. The only software errors logged were four noted during the first TFTS class.

As a result of the above, the three metrics: mean time between failures (MTBF), mean time between problems (MTBP) and mean time to repair (MTTR) as well as the malfunction profile are not calculable or reported here. The only terminal hardware failure was a touch panel that took exactly one week to repair.

Perceived Reliability

In addition to various measures of reliability it is also instructive and important to measure perceived reliability since a few failures at critical moments may disproportionately affect user's perceptions of reliability. TFTS students rated PLATO reliability (question 13) as much better than other training equipment. HAWK student's ratings were positive to neutral, although no reliability problems were logged in that course. The three TFTS instructors (question 20) saw PLATO reliability as much better than other training equipment; HAWK instructors saw it as "much better" or about the same (1).

PLATO System Availability

Availability is the percentage of time the system is available to deliver training. Availability will be reported separately for each type of terminal, but the values will mean slightly different things in an operational sense. If one had 90% availability on 10 micro-PLATO systems, one could expect on the average that one system would be inoperable. About 1% of the time, two systems might be inoperable. Very, very rarely would they all be inoperable at once. If one had central PLATO, all failures were central system problems (no inoperable terminals) and 90% reliability, one would have no terminals operable 10% of the time. Hence 90% availability may describe both systems accurately, yet have very different implications operationally.

The HAWK terminal's usage was combined with TFTS usage for all analyses. Availability was calculated according to the following formula:



For micro-PLATO system, central PLATO system downtime is ignored. For that system of five terminals, availability was calculated to be 99.173. For central PLATO based systems, both local hardware problems and central PLATO system problems are included. For a system of seven terminals, two of which were connected to central PLATO, availability was 99.20%.

Amount of Use

The amount the terminals were used may have had a bearing on how much maintenance was required and how frequently intermittent problems (including central system downtime) were noticed. Two kinds of usage were discernible from logs of usage: student use and author use. For HAWK there was no usage of the terminals by authors. Student usage from 11 May through 18 October on one terminal totaled 20.25 hours.

for HAWK was 0.84 hours/week/terminal. For TFTS, two terminals were connected to central PLATO for authoring purposes and were not to be used by students unless necessary because of equipment failure. No such failure occurred and logged usage indicated:

<u>Terminal #</u>	<u> #Hours Student Usage</u>	#Hours Author/Demo Use
1	80:40	0
?	39:10	274:00
3	0	900:55
4	0	23:20
5	32:35	0
6	87:45	1:50
Total	240:10	1200:05

The four TFTS student terminals compiled usage of 10 hours/week or 2.50 hours/week/terminal. The four TFTS terminals used for authoring or demonstrations had an average usage of 12.5 hours/week/terminal, with terminal #3 in "fulltime" use 37.5 hours per week.

With a higher percentage of terminal time in use, it might be expected that breakdowns would increase and system availability would decrease.

A further analysis of the usage logged revealed the following: The log was apparently maintained very carefully. Very few data were lost due to incomplete records, etc. Session length varied by usage type. HAWK students use varied from 1 hour to 2-3/4 hours with the two modes at 1 hour to 2-3/4 hours. TFTS students typically had brief sessions: 5-15 minutes was not uncommonly short and 20-40 minutes typical. Only a few students spent long blocks of time (2-6 hours) at the terminal. Author usage tended to be at least an hour in length, but 6-8 hours was not uncommon. Off-hours use was most typically author usage. Since so few failures were recorded, off-hours use was not separately analyzed.

Cost Extrapolation and Analysis

For TFTS and HAWK, the costs were figured similarly. Most cost items were based on quotes from current GSA rates combined with estimates about the time and resources needed for software maintenance to keep training materials up-to-date. For each course, the minimum configuration possible was costed. Thus, such items as on-line PLATO services (connection to a large time-sharing system), printers, etc., were eliminated. Originally for TFTS, it was estimated that six (6) stand-alone micro-PLATO terminals would be needed for a class of 12 students. During implementation it was found that four (4) terminals were sufficient. The HAWK course has used a single terminal throughout the test period. Costs were calculated based on 1982 constant dollars; that is, 1982 costs were extended for the estimated 10 years of life of hardware and software with the assumption that maintenance costs would rise at the same rate as inflation. Thus no inflation rate nor time-value of dollars have been explicitly included in the calculation. The one cost that could not be determined exactly is the 1982 cost of a micro-PLATO terminal on a GSA schedule. The manufacturer has a different model than used in this test (equivalent, but newer) on the GSA schedule at \$6,780. The manufacturer has the exact model used in this test available, only at retail, for \$7,450. In our calculations, the \$6,780 figure was used. For TFTS the calculation for minimum cost is:

First Year

Four (4) Terminals x \$6,780	\$ 27,120		
Maintenance for four (4) Terminals at \$81/Terminal/ Month (3 months free maintenance with purchase)			
4 x 9 x \$81	2,916		
20 Hours Software Maintenance x \$31.50/hr.	630		
Disk space rental \$4/Month/Space x 12 x 70 spaces	3,360		
Remastering Disks and Copying	136		
Total	\$ 34,162		
Second through Tenth Year			
Maintenance for four (4) Terminals at \$81/Terminal/ Month	\$ 3,888		
20 Hours Software Haintenance x \$31.50/hr.	630		
Disk Space Rental \$4/Month/Space x 12 x 70	3,360		
Remastering Disks and Copying	136		
Total	\$ 8,014		
x Nine (9) Years	72,124		
10 Year Grand Total	\$106,288		

The costs for a terminal for the HAWK course are one-fourth those for TFTS, or \$26,572. The incremental cost for additional terminals (should, for example, the student flow rate in the TFTS course increase so much that more computer terminals were needed) is \$16,597 per terminal over the 10 years for either HAWK or TFTS.

Developmental costs were not addressed by the test and evaluation plan, but some data gathered as part of the evaluation paint a broad picture of these costs. The vendor, CDC, was paid \$93,845 to develop the purchase of HAWK and TFTS materials. Not included in that amount were hardware and computer time used by CDC and MMCS staff in development. No estimates of the staff time or other resources used at the MMCS were made.

Important cost questions which cannot be explicitly answered are, "Can a PLATO microcomputer that costs under \$10,000 each replace, for training purposes, TFTS components which cost over \$100,000 each," and, "Can use of
PLATO simulation reduce equipment damage?" Although these questions cannot be answered, information addressing these issues was gathered as part of this evaluation. For training a class of 12 students, three TFTS units are needed. Purchase price for these three units is estimated at \$345,000 - \$400,000. Procurement of these units is slow and difficult compared to procurement of PLATO microcomputers. Because spare parts for the TFTS units are difficult to obtain, downtimes tend to be long (especially compared to that of PLATO simulators). During the time Battelle visited MMCS to collect data, one TFTS unit was down.

One of the instructor questions asked if damage to equipment changed as a result to PLATO simulation usage. The analysis showed that the two TFTS instructors who responded both felt that PLATO simulations greatly decreased damage whereas 3 of 4 HAWK instructors noted little or no difference and one felt damage had increased.

Interviews revealed no indications that significant changes had occurred to the number of safety violations nor was any equipment apparently damaged via student error. Lack of equipment damage is a positive finding, but not conclusive since there was no control group and equipment damage is not a frequent event.

CONCLUSIONS AND FINDINGS

The conclusions and findings differ sharply between the two courses in which PLATO simulations were implemented. Considering that the training materials for both courses were developed by the same team of people, the difference is even more dramatic. It is dangerous to make statements that are broad, based on data collected from so few instructors (3 TFTS, 4 HAWK), but a few observations seem warranted based on the high degree of consensus found within each of the two sets of instructor data. Without exception, the instructor and student data within a course supported each other. With few exceptions, the data from one course contradicted the data from the other course. In general, the instructor data (admittedly few in number) tended to represent a more extreme view than did student data. It would be too strong to say that this showed students were mirroring instructor attitudes; on the other hand, some research studies have indicated that students are strongly cued by instructor attitudes.

The basis for the instructor and student attitudes, whatever their source, seems rooted in two factors: (a) the original purpose for introducing PLATO simulators and (b) size of the implementation. In the TFTS, there was a considerable need for some technique or technology to solve the problem of a shortfall of equipment. Other alternatives than PLATO may have been as welcome and effective if they addressed this problem. For the TFTS course a considerable number of hours of PLATO instruction are available (about 12). Therefore the time "invested" to figure out how to run this new device could be "amortized" over a considerable "payback" period.

For the HAWK course the above two factors were reversed. The HAWK course was working fine as it stood. Plenty of equipment was available. Instead of implementing PLATO as part of a new course (as in TFTS), implementing PLATO in the HAWK course meant discarding some existing training so that PLATO could be substituted. The best PLATO could do in the HAWK course was a little better since the current instruction was at least adequate. If PLATO did nothing at all or functioned in the mediocre way that the first draft of instruction materials often do, it would be worse than the previous situation. In TFTS, the best PLATO could do would be to "save the day" with respect to delivering the course while suffering an equipment shortage. If it did nothing, it wouldn't be much more than a blind alley to be abandoned in a search for an equipment shortage solution.

With those constraints understood, the TFTS results are that the PLATO simulations were effective, efficient, accepted by students and instructors, reliable, and potentially cost-effective. The HAWK results are that the PLATO simulations are equally effective (test results) or less effective (subjective results), of questionable efficiency, unacceptable to students and instructors, reliable, and less likely cost-effective. The lower potential for cost-effectiveness is because the large number of terminals needed to quickly serve a class would sit unused for long periods. APPENDIX A DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION VARIABLES TABLES 1 THROUGH 9

.....

	l.O Variable		2.0 Metric		3.0 Rationale		4.0 Data Source
1.1	Skill level at end of training	2.1	Course grade	3.1	PLATO should sup- port an overall "acceptable" level of achievement	4.1	Course Records
1.2	Perceived amount of learning using PLATO versus using actual equipment	2.2	Subjective question on amount of learn- ing, 5-point scale	3.2	Amount of learning using PLATO should be as great as using real equip- ment, instructional objective	4.2	Student End-Of- Course Evaluation Instructor End-Of- Course Evaluation
1.3	Perceived speed of learning using PLATO versus using actual equipment	2.3	Subjective ques- tion on speed of learning, 5-point scale	3.3	Learning using PLATO should be as fast as using real equipment, instruc- tional objective	4.3	Student End-Of- Course Evaluation
1.4	Perceived fidelity of simulation	2.4	Subjective question on simulation fidelity and con- fusion, 5-point scale	3.4	Departures from perfect fidelity should not confuse the student	4.4	Student End-Of- Course Évaluation
1.5	Perceived appli- cation of training to job perfor- mance using PLATO versus using actual equipment	2.5	Subjective question on application of training to job performance, 5- point scale	с. С	Learning using PLATO should be as applicable to job as using real equipment, instruc- tional objective	4.5	Student End-Of- Course Evaluation Instructor End-Of- Course Evaluation

TABLE 1. TRAINING EFFECTIVENESS VARIABLES - TOW COURSE

. -

	1.0 Variable		2.0 Metric		3.0 Rationale		4.0 Data Source
.6	Perceived extent of student confi- dence using PLATO versus using actual equipment	2.6	Subjective question on student confi- dence, 5-point scale	3.6	PLATO simulation should enhance student confidence with real equip- ment, instructional objective	4.6	Student End-Of- Course Evaluation Instructor End-Of- Course Evaluation
	Perceived extent of student overconfi- dence using PLATO versus using actual equipment	2.7	Subjective question on student over- confidence, 5- point scale	3.7	PLATO simulation should not result in overconfidence with respect to real equipment, instructional objec- tive	4.7	Instructor End-Of- Course Evaluation
8	Perceived use of TM's with PLATO versus with actual equipment	2.8	Subjective question on use of TM's, 5- point scale	3.8	PLATO simulation should encourage use of TM's, instruc- tional objective	4.8	Instructor End-Of- Course Evaluation
6.1	Perceived holding of student atten- tion using PLATO versus using actual equipment	2.9	Subjective question on holding student attention, 5-point scale	3.9	PLATO simulation should hold student attention as well as actual equipment, instructional objec- tive	4.9	Student End-Of- Course Evaluation Instructor End-Of- Course Evaluation

....

TABLE 1. TRAINING EFFECTIVENESS VARIABLES - TOW COURSE (Continued)

	1.0 Variable		2.0 Metric		3.0 Rationale		4.0 Data Source
	Skill level on test lesson	2.1	P.E. test, and written test sub- score on test lesson	3.1	Measures level of achievement on test lesson	4.1	Derived from course records
1.2	Perceived amount of learning using PLATO versus using actual equipment	2.2	Subjective question on amount of learn- ing, 5-point scale	3.2	Amount of learning using PLATO should be as great as using real equip- ment, instructional objective	4.2	Student End-Of- Course Evaluation Instructor End-Of- Course Evaluation
1.3	Perceived speed of learning using PLATO versus using actual equipment	2.3	Subjective question on speed of learn- ing, 5 point scale	3.3	Learning using PLATO should he as fast as using real equipment, instruc- tional objective	4.3	Student End-Of- Course Evaluation
1.4	Perceived fidelity of simulation	2.4	Subjective question on simulation fidel- ity and confusion, 5-point scale	3.4	Departures from perfect fidelity should not confuse the student	4.4	Student End-Of- Course Evaluation
1.5	Perceived appli- cation of training to job perfor- mance using PLATO versus using actual equipment	2.5	Subjective question on application of training to job performance, 5- point scale	а. 5	Learning using PLATO should be as applicable to job as using real equipment, instruc- tional objective	4.5	Student End-Of- Course Evaluation Instructor End-Of- Course Evaluation

TABLE 2a. TRAINING EFFECTIVENESS VARIABLES - HAWK COURSE

A-3

1

į	1.0 Variable		2.0 Metric		3.0 Rationale		4.0 Data Source
9	Perceived extent of student confi- dence using PLATO versus using actual equipment	2.6	Subjective question on student confi- dence, 5-point scale	3.6	PLATO simulation should enhance student confidence with real equip- ment, instructional objective	4.6	Instructor End-O Course Evaluatio
r.	Perceived extent of student overconfi- dence using PLATO versus using actual equipment	2.7	Subjective question on student over- confidence, 5- point scale	3.7	PLATO simulation should not result in overconfidence with respect to real equipment, instructional objec- tive	4.7	Instructor End-O Course Evaluatio
Ø	Perceived encour- agement for use of TM's with PLATO versus with actual equipment	2.8	Subjective question on encouraging use of TM's, 5-point scale	3.8	PLATO simulation use of TM's, instruc- tional objective	4.8	Instructor End-O Course Evaluatio
6	Perceived holding of student atten- tion using PLATO versus using actual equipment	2.9	Subjective question on holding student attention, 5-point scale	3.9	PLATO simulation should hold student attention as well as actual equipment, instructional objec- tive	4.9	Instructor End-G Course Evaluatio

TABLE 2a. TRAINING EFFECTIVENESS VARIABLES - HAWK COURSE (Continued)

TABLE 2b. CONTROL VARIABLES - HAWK COURSE

1.0 Variable	Skill level before test lesson	Speed of learning	Amount of PLATO use
	2.1	2.2	2.3
2.0 Metric	Written test score on cummon subjects portion of course	Hours spent on common subjects por- tion of course	Hours spent on PLATO Subjective question on amount of time spent (above average, average, below aver- age) compared with other students in class
	3.1	3.2	з. Э.
3.0 Rationale	Provides reliable, current measure of aptitude	Provides reliable, current measure of aptitude	Amount of PLATO usage could vary in HAWK test lesson, and could affect achievement and subjective judg- ments
4.0 Data Source	4.1 Course Records	4.2 Course Records	4.3 PLATO Use Log Student End-Of- Course Evaluation

	1.0 Variable		2.0 Metric	ст ₁ (3.0 Rationale	4	L.O Data Source
	Number trained per hardware item	2.1	Number of graduates 3 divided by the num- ber of end items in laboratory		PLATO simulation is intended to reduce the number of equipment end items needed for training (TOW) or supplement use of actual equipment	4.1	Course Records
1.2	Use of instructor's time during P.E.	2.2	Subjective question on availability of time to assist stu- dents, 5-point scale	3.2	PLATO should reduce time spent setting- up and monitoring use of equipment	4.2	Instructor End-Of Course Evaluation
1.3	Use of student's time during P.E.	2.3	Subjective question on use of time dur- ing P.E., 5-point scale	e.	PLATO should reduce time spent waiting for other students to finish or for down equipment	4.3	Student End-Of- Course Evaluation Instructor End-O Course Evaluation
1.4 1	Estimated time to complete tasks using PLATO versus using actual equipment	2.4	Difference between the ratios of fast- est student time to slowest student time using PLATO and using real equipment	3.4	Performance of tasks using PLATO simulation should not be slower than performance using actual hardware	4.4	Instructor End-O Course Evaluatio

TABLE 3. TRAINING EFFICIENCY VARIABLES - TOW AND HAWK COURSES

A-6

Á

TABLE 3. TRAINING EFFICIENCY VARIABLES - TOW AND HAWK COURSES (Continued)

	l.O Variable	2.0 Metric	3.0 Rationale	4.0 Data Source
1.5	Salvaged time	2.5 Number of hours of extra training pro- vided per student due to use of PLATO	3.5 Semi-productive time should be upgraded due to availability of PLATO	4.5 PLATO Use Log and Course Records

					2 0 Distriction	n •	
	1.0 Var lause				ט.ט אמר וטוומ וב	J .	.U DALA SUULCE
1.1	Likes and dislikes about PLATO train- ing	2.1	Open-ended question	3.1	Allows unantici- pated attitudes and problems to be expressed	4.1	Student End-Of- Course Evaluation
1.2	Willingness to use PLATO in other P.E. lessons	2.2	Subjective question, 5-point scale	3.2	If PLATO training is accepted, students should be willing to use it in other P.E. lessons	4.2	Student End-Of- Course Evaluation
1.3	Willingness to take other similar courses involving PLATO	2.3	Subjective question, 5 alternatives	3.3	If PLATO training is accepted, stu- dents should be willing to take other courses involv- ing PLATO	4.3	Student End-Of- Course Evaluation

TABLE 4. STUDENT ACCEPTANCE VARIABLES - TOW AND HAWK COURSES

A-8

1

AWK COURSES
AND H
- TOW
VARIABLES -
ACCEPTANCE
STAFF
D SCHOOL
R AN
INSTRUCTO
ABLE 5.

	1.0 Variable		2.0 Metric		3.0 Rationale		4.0 Data Source
~.	Advantages and dis- advantages with PLATO training	2.1	Open-ended question	3.1	Allows unantici- pated attitudes and problems to be expressed	4.1	Instructor End-Of Course Evaluation
~	Willingness to expand PLATO les- sons in current course	2.2	Subjective question, 5-point scale	3.2	If PLATO training is accepted, instruc- tors should be will- ing to use it in other P.E. lessons	4.2	Instructor End-Of Course Evaluation
r.	Willingness to teach other courses using PLATO simu- lation	2.3	Subjective question, 5-point scale	3.3	If PLATO training is accepted, instruc- tors should be will- ing to teach other courses involving PLATO	4.3	Instructor End-Of Course Evaluation
4	Perceived changes in role of instructor	2.4	Open-ended question	3.4	Allows unantici- pated attitudes and problems to be expressed	4.4	Instructor End-Of Course Evaluation
s.	Perceived changes in conduct of training	2.5	Open-ended question	3.5	Allows unantici- pated attitudes and problems to be expressed	4.5	Instructor End-Of Course Evaluation

A-9

•

	l.O Variable		2.0 Metric		3.0 Rationale		4.0 Data Source
1.1	Occurrence of implementation pro- blems	2.1	Frequency of seven generic implemen- tation problems, 4 alternatives	3.1	Quality of simu- lation is a neces- sary prerequisite to other evalua- tions. Frequency of generic problems is indicative of implementation quality	4.1	Questionnaire give to students at end of each module involving PLATO
1.2	Ability of students to work without instructor involve- ment	2.2	Subjective question on amount of instruc- tor assistance required, 5-point scale	3.2	Frequent instructor involvement is indicative of poor quality	4.2	Instructor End-Of- Course Evaluation

TABLE 6. QUALITY OF IMPLEMENTATION VARIABLES - TON: AND HAWK COURSES

A-10

1

TABLE 7. GENERALIZABILITY VARIABLES - TOW AND HAWK COURSES

	1.0 Variable		2.0 Metric		3.0 Rationale	7	1.0 Data Source
1.1	Generalization to other P.E. lessons	2.1	Subjective question on generalizability to other P.E. les- sons, 5-point scale	3.1	PLATO simulation should be general- izable to other lessons	4.1	Instructor End-Of- Course Evaluation
1.2	Generalization to other equipment	2.2	Subjective question on generalizability to other equipment, 4 alternatives	3.2	PLATO simulation should be general- izable to other equipment	4.2	Instructor End-Of- Course Evaluation

	1.0 Variable		2.0 Metric		3.0 Rationale	7	1.0 Data Source
	Frequency and type of malfunction	2.1	Mean time between failure, Mean time between problem, Malfunction profile	3.1	Logged data will allow failures versus problems and types of malfunc- tions to be sorted. These are commonly quoted measures	4.1	Problem And Main- tenance log
1.2	Time to repair	3.1	Mean time to repair	3.2	A useful measure for estimating the impact of a failure	4.2	Problem And Main- tenance Log
1.3	PLATO system avail- ability	2.3	Percent of training time system is available	3.3	A measure needed to estimate number of terminals needed	3.4	Derived From Pro- blem and Mainten- ance Log
1.4	Amount of use	2.4	Weekly use per terminal	3.4	Amount of mainten- ance and occasions to log problems are proportion to use	4.4	PLATO Use Log
1.5	Purpose of use	2.5	Use profile	3.5	Type of use affects types of problems noticed	4.5	PLATO Use Log
1.6	Perceived relia- bility	2.6	Subjective question on reliability of PLATO versus other media, 5-point scale	3.6	Reflects confidence in reliability of PLATO versus other media	4.6	Student End-Of- Course Evaluation Instructor End-Of- Course Evaluation

COURSES
HAWK
AND
TOW
I.
VARIABLES
ION
EXTRAPOLAT
COST
9.
ABLE

Operations Contribute Structure Contact and the first in a format first in a format which in the interpretation, a interpretation, score a longer to actual equipment will be costed 4.2 CDC Sales ceived equipment 2.3 Subjective question 3.3 Use of PLATO should 4.3 Instructor End-0 course interference interf		oldrinev V I		9 0 Motuio		2 A Dationalo		
aconfigura-2.11981 dollars per vear for a 10- year for a 10- which allows maximum flexibility in interpretation, a minimum configura- tion for each course and an incremental cost for expansion will be costed4.1CDC Sales Representative Representative and an incremental cost for expansion will be costed4.1CDC Sales Representative Representative and an incremental course and an incremental cost for expansion will be costed4.2CDC Sales Representative Representative Representative and an incremental cost for expansion will be costed4.2CDC Sales Representative Representative Representative Representative Representative Representative Representative Representative Representativeend equipment2.3Subjective question actual equipment simulation, 5-point simulated3.3Use of PLATO should actual equipment actual equipment actual equipment4.4School Staffand cost3.4To show advantages a denipment and cost4.4School Staff	N 0.1	dridbie		2.U Metric	***	J.U Kationale		4.U Data Source
mental cost2.21981 dollars per year for a 10- year life4.2CDC Sales Representativeived equipment2.3Subjective question3.3Use of PLATO should4.3Instructor End-0ecourse equipment3.3Use of PLATO should4.3Instructor End-0ecourse question3.3Use of PLATO should4.3Instructor End-0ecourse question3.3Use of PLATO should4.3Instructor End-0ecourse quipmentactual equipmentactual equipment4.4School Staffe2.4Acquisition time3.4To show advantages4.4School Staffand simulated2.4Acquisition time3.4To show advantages4.4School Staffent2.4Acquisition time3.4To show advantages4.4School Staff	Minim tion (um configura- cost	2.1	1981 dollars per year for a lO- year life	3.1/0	3.2 To provide cost data in a format which allows maximum flexibility in interpretation, a minimum configura- tion for each course and an incremental cost for expansion will be costed	4.J	CDC Sales Representative
ived equipment 2.3 Subjective question 3.3 Use of PLATO should 4.3 Instructor End-O e on extent of damage reduce damage to course Evaluatio to actual equipment actual equipment when using PLATO simulation, 5-point scale 3.4 To show advantages 4.4 School Staff and simulated and cost extender, PLATO should be much faster and cheaper	Incre	mental cost	2.2	1981 dollars per year for a 10- year life			4.2	CDC Sales Representative
comparison of 2.4 Acquisition time 3.4 To show advantages 4.4 School Staff and simulated and cost as an equipment ment should be much faster and cheaper	Perce damaç	ived equipment Je	2.3	Subjective question on extent of damage to actual equipment when using PLATO simulation, 5-point scale	3.3	Use of PLATO should reduce damage to actual equipment	4.3	Instructor End-Of- Course Evaluation
	Cost real equip	comparison of and simulated ment	2.4	Acquisition time and cost	3.4	To show advantages as an equipment extender, PLATO should be much faster and cheaper	4.4	School Staff

APPENDIX B <u>TFTS STUDENT EVALUATION FORMS AND RAW DATA</u> END-OF-WEEK EVALUATION END-OF-COURSE EVALUATION

STUDENT END-OF-WEEK EVALUATION

You have just completed course modules using PLATC. Please fill in this form as best you can, so that we can improve the modules. Your answers should only apply to this week's study.

Course Name:	TFTS			
Today's Date:	day	month	year	

1. Which week of this course have you just completed?

Please answer the questions below. If you found any of the problems, show how often the problem came up in your use of PLATC during the week. Remember, your answers should only be for the week you have just completed.

- 2. Were you ever unsure of what to do next on PLATO (for example, touch the screen, hit a key, or wait for PLATO)? No 24 Yes 11
 - If yes, how often did this happen?
 - Once <u>5</u> Two or three times 3 Four or more times 4
- 3. Were you ever sure you gave the right answer, but PLATO said you were wrong? No 24 Yes 10
 - If yes, how often did this happen?

Once 3 Two or three times 3 Four or more times 3

4. Did PLATO ever do something that surprised you (for example, you hit BACK, but PLATO went forward)? No 28 Yes 7 If yes, how often did this happen?

Once 1 Two or three times 3 Four or more times 1

5. Did you ever hit a key or touch the panel, and nothing happened? No<u>18</u> Yes<u>17</u>

If yes, how often did this happen?

Once <u>3</u> Two or three times <u>12</u> Four or more times

6. Was it ever hard to study or practice a test on PLATO because you couldn't get to it, or because you had to go through too many other steps to get to the part you wanted? No 30 Yes $\frac{1}{2}$ If yes, how often did this happen?

Once_1 Two or three times____ Four or more times

7. Did you ever have to ask your instructor for help because PLATO was not correct or was incomplete? No $\frac{22}{13}$ Yes $\frac{13}{13}$

If yes, how often did this happen?

Once <u>3</u> Two or three times <u>3</u> Four or more times <u>1</u>

8. Were you ever confused because the drawings on PLATO looked or worked different from the real equipment? No____ Yes____

If yes, how often did this happen?

Once <u>2</u> Two or three times <u>6</u> Four or more times 4

STUDENT END-OF-COURSE EVALUATION

luua	vie Dates								
	y s Date.	day		mont)	year			
1.	What did	you like	about t	he PLAT() part of	the cour	•se?		
2.	What did	you disl	ike abou	t the PL	.ATO part	of the c	course?		
3.	On a sca you thin	le of 1 to k the PLA	o lO (wi TO simula	th 10 be ations w	ing the vere?	highest s	core),	how usefu	1 d
	Circle	? a rumber	e: 1 :	23	4 5	6 ² 7 8	97	10 ¹³	
4.	Did the looked o	training r worked	on PLATO differen	ever control ever	o <mark>nfuse</mark> yo n the PLA	u becaus TO simul	e the reations?	eal equípr	nen t

- 5. When you used PLATO, how much do you think you learned compared with using the real equipment?
 - 2 1) Learned much more using PLATO
 - 3 2) Learned more using PLATC
 - 3) Learned about the same amount using PLATO
 - 7 4) Learned less using PLATC
 - 5) Learned <u>much less</u> using PLATO
- 6. When you used PLATO, how fast do you think you learned compared with using the real equipment?
 - 3 1) Learned much faster using PLATO
 - 2) Learned faster using PLATO
 - 3) Learned in <u>about the same time</u> using PLATO
 - 4) Learned slower using PLATO
 - 5) Learned <u>much slower</u> using PLATO
- 7. When you used PLATO, how did it affect the use of your time during P.E.'s?
 - _____1) Made much better use of my time
 - 19 2) Made better use of my time
 - 3) Made little or no difference in use of my time
 - 1 4) Made worse use of my time
 - 5) Made much worse use of my time
- 8. How did use of PLATO influence your confidence about operating the real equipment?
 - 10 1) Greatly increased my confidence
 - 13 2) Increased my confidence
 - 3) Did not change my confidence
 - 4) Decreased my confidence
 - 5) Greatly decreased my confidence
- 9. How interested were you in going through the PLATO lessons?
 - 19 1) Very interested while using PLATO
 - 13 2) Interested while using PLATO
 - 3) Not interested while using PLATO
 - 2 4) Bored while using PLATO
 - _____5) Very bored while using PLATO

- 10. How much of what you learned using PLATO could be applied on the job?
 - 17 1) Almost all of what I learned
 - <u>12</u> 2) Most of what I learned
 - 5 3) Some of what I learned
 - 4) Little of what I lea mea
 - ____5) None of what I learned
- 11. For training purposes, now adequately did the PLATO simulations work like the real equipment?
 - 14 1) Very Adequate for training
 - 14 2) Reasonably adequate for training
 - 5 3) Borderline for training
 - 1 4) Somewhat inadequate for training
 - 5) Very inadequate for training
- 12. How much do you think you could have learned about the operation of the real equipment using only PLATO?
 - l) Almost everytning <u>ز</u>
 - <u>18</u> 2) A great deal

 - 1 4) A little
 - 5) Almost nothing at all
- 13. Compared with other training equipment you have used (slide projector, video cassettes, Beseler Cue/See), PLATO's reliability was:
 - 22 1) Much better than other training equipment
 - <u>(2</u> 2) Better than other training equipment
 - _____3) About the same as other training equipment
 - 4) Worse than other training equipment
 - 5) Much worse than other training equipment
- 14. Would you like to use PLATO for other hands-on training?
 - 24 1) Would very much like to use PLATO
 - 3 2) Would like to use PLATO

 - 1 4) Would not like to use PLATO
 - 5) Would very much not like to use PLATO

- 15. How would you advise a friend who had a choice between taking a course where there was a great deal of PLATO simulations or another course that covered the same material but without PLATO?
 - 13 1) Fight tooth and nail to get into the PLATO course
 - 17 2) Request PLATO course, if convenient
 - 2 3) Neither request nor avoid course
 - 1 4) Avoid PLATO course, if possible
 - 5) Avoid PLATO course like the plague
- 16. How much time did you spend on PLATO compared with other students in your class?
 - 4 1) More time on PLATO than others
 - 28 2) About the same amount of time on PLATO as others
 - 2 3) Less time on PLATO than others

والمنافع والمنافع المنافع المنافع المنافع المنافع والمنافع والمنافع

APPENDIX C TFTS INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION FORMS AND RAW DATA

Ś

PLATO INSTRUCTOR/STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete this form to the best of your ability so that this course can be fully and fairly evaluated.

Cours	se Name: _	TFTS	······································		
Toda	/'s Date: _	day	month	year	
1.	Please ch 	eck the ite _ 1) Regula _ 2) School Specif	m which best d r instructor (staff (Stop a y position:	escribes your role i Answer all questions fter Question 5.)	n this course. .)
2.	What do y particula	ou feel are r course? _	the instructi	onal <u>advantages</u> of u	sing PLATO in this
3.	What do y this part	ou feel are icular cour	the instructi	onal <u>disadvantages</u> o	f using PLATO in
4.	What chan because o	ges in trai f the use o	ning practices f PLATO?	occurred in this pa	rticular course

5. If the use of PLATO became more widespread (more lessons in this course and/or more courses), how would your role be changed?

In Questions 6 through 17, compare practical exercises using PLATC with practical exercises using only real equipment. For each question, please check the <u>one</u> box which best describes your opinion about the impact of FLATC simulations in this course.

	•					_
	How did use of PLATO in practical exercises affect:	Greatly Increased	Increased	Little or No Change	Decreased	Greatly Decreased
6.	Student learning during P.E	2	1			
7.	Instructor's confidence and feeling of use- fulness during P.E	2	1			
8.	Student attention during P.E	3				
9.	Student confidence when dealing with real equipment.	1	2			
10.	Use of TM's	2	1		}	
11.	Instructor's workload during P.E			1	2	
12.	Application of learning to job performance	1	2			
13.	Damage to equipment items used for training					2
14.	Student overconfidence when dealing with real equipment.				2	1
15.	Efficient use of student's time during P.E	1	2			

	How did use of PLATO in practical exercises affect: (Continued)	Greatly Increased	Increased	Little or No Change	Decreased	Greatly Decreased
16.	Instructor availability to assist students during P.E.	1	2	_		
17.	Learning of relationships among system components and tests.	3				

Please check the one response which best describes your opinion.

- 18. I would like to see PLATO simulations used in other P.E. lessons in this course.
 - ______ l) Strongly agree
 - _____2) Agree
 - Undecided
 - _____4) Disagree
 - 5) Strongly disagree
- 19. I would like to see PLATO simulations used in other courses at the school.
 - _____3_ 1) Strongly agree
 - _____2) Agree
 - _____ 3) Undecided
 - _____4) Disagree
 - _____5) Strongly disagree
- 20. Compared with other training equipment I have used (35-mm projectors, video cassettes, Beseler Cue/See), PLATO's reliability is:
 - 3 1) Much better than other training equipment
 - 2) Better than other training equipment
 - _____3) About the same as other training equipment
 - _____4) Worse than other training equipment
 - _____5) Much worse than other training equipment

- 21. In your opinion, how widespread is the applicability of PLATO simulations for use in other P.E. lessons in this course?
 - _____1) PLATO is applicable to all other P.E. lessons
 - 2) PLATO is applicable to most other P.E. lessons
 - 3) PLATO is applicable to a limited number of other P.E. lessons
 - _____ 4) PLATO is not applicable to any other P.E. lessons
 - 5) PLATO should not have been used in the P.E. lessons where it was used
- 22. In some courses there is limited availability of equipment for training purposes. In your opinion, how widespread is the applicability of PLATO simulations for teaching the operation or maintenance of equipment like that taught at MMCS?
 - 1) The teaching of <u>almost all</u> equipment items would benefit by being supplemented by PLATO simulations
 - 2) The teaching of most equipment items would benefit by being supplemented by PLATO simulations
 - 3) A limited number of equipment items would benefit by being supplemented by PLATO simulations, but most would not benefit
 - 4) Current computer simulation technology is too limited to be of practical benefit for equipment training purposes
- 23. If I had the choice of teaching another course where there was major use of PLATO simulations like those written for this course, I would:
 - 1 1) Fight tooth and nail to be assigned as the instructor
 - 2) Request assignment, if convenient
 - 1 3) Neither request nor avoid assignment
 - 4) Avoid assignment, if possible
 - 5) Avoid assignment like the plague
- 24. Once students became familiar with PLATO, how much instructional assistance did a typical student require when learning a new task using PLATO compared with using real equipment?
 - 1) Much more assistance needed when using PLATO
 - 2) More assistance needed when using PLATO
 - _____ 3) <u>About the same</u> amount of assistance needed using PLATO or using real equipment
 - 2 4) Less assistance needed when using PLATO
 - 1 5) Much less assistance needed when using PLATO

In Questions 25 through 28, consider the <u>Controller DVM</u> alignment test on the <u>TFTS</u>, which can be trained using real equipment or a PLATC simulation.

25.	How fast could your <u>fastest</u> student perform this task <u>on the real equipment</u> ?	0 <u>.5 and 0.6 hours</u>
26.	How fast could your <u>slowest</u> student perform this task on the real equipment?	1.5 and 1.5 hours
27.	How fast could your <u>fastest</u> student perform this task <u>on PLATO</u> ?	0.5 and 0.5 hours
28.	How fast could your <u>slowest</u> student perform this task <u>on PLATO</u> ?	1.0 and 1.0 hours

APPENDIX D HAWK STUDENT EVALUATION FORMS AND RAW DATA END-OF-WEEK EVALUATION END-OF-COURSE EVALUATION Please tell us how often you had any of the problems listed below. Check one box opposite each item to show how often the problem came up in your use of PLATO during the week. Remember, your answers should only be for the week you have just completed.

		Never	Once	More Than Once
2.	How often were you unsure of what to do next (for example, touch the screen, hit a key, or wait for PLATO)?	4	14	14
3.	How often were you sure you gave the right answer, but PLATO said you were wrong?	7	5	20
4.	How often did PLATO do something that surprised you (for example, you hit BACK, but went forward)?	25	6	0
5.	How often did you hit a key or touch the panel, and nothing happened?	14	3	15
6.	How often was it hard to study or practice a particular subject because you couldn't get to it, or because you had to go through too many other steps to get to the part you wanted?	24	6	2
7.	How often did you have to ask your instructor for help because PLATO was not correct or was incomplete?	8	9	15
8.	How often were you confused because PLATO looked or worked different from the real equipment?	23	4	5

D-1

STUDENT END-OF-COURSE EVALUATION

Plea be f	ise complet Fully and j	te this f fairlu eu	form to the paluated.	e best og	f your	ability	so that	this co	urse	ear.
Cour	se Name:	HAWK (CW RADAR							
Toda	y's Date:	day		month		year				
1.	What did	you like	about the	PLATO p	part of	the cour	rse?			
2.	What did	you disl	ike about	the PLAT	TO part	of the d	course?			
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					<u> </u>		<u> </u>
3.	On a scal you think Circle	e of 1 t the PLA a numbra	o 10 (with TO simulat $r: 1^2$ 2	10 bein ions wer 3 ⁵ 4 ²	ng the P re? 5 ⁵ 6	nighest s 5^6 7^1 8	score), 3 ² 9 ⁵	how use	ful d	0
4.	Did the 1 looked of 121) 132)	training r worked No, it <u>r</u> Yes, <u>occ</u>	on PLATO e different ever did assionally	ever con ly than 1 <u>/</u>	fuse yo the PLA	u becaus TO simul	e the re ations?	eal equi	pment	

<u>4</u> 3) Yes, <u>often</u>

- 5. When you used PLATO, how much do you think you learned compared with using the real equipment?
 - 1) Learned <u>much</u> more using PLATO
 - _____ 2) Learned more using PLATO
 - _____ 3) Learned about the same amount using PLATO
 - 17 4) Learned less using PLATO
 - 5 5) Learned much less using PLATO
- 6. When you used PLATC, how fast do you think you learned compared with using the real equipment?
 - 1) Learned much faster using PLATC
 - 5 2) Learned faster using PLATO
 - § 3) Learned in about the same time using PLATO
 - 9 4) Learned slower using PLATO
 - <u>3</u>5) Learned much slower using PLATO
- 7. When you used PLATO, how did it affect the use of your time during P.E.'s?
 - _____1) Made much better use of my time
 - ______ 2) Made better use of my time
 - 16 3) Made little or no difference in use of my time
 - ____5 4) Made worse use of my time
 - 1 5) Made much worse use of my time
- 8. How did use of PLATO influence your confidence about operating the real equipment?
 - 1) Greatly increased my confidence
 - <u>5</u> 2) <u>Increased</u> my confidence
 - <u>19</u> 3) <u>Did not change</u> my confidence
 - ____7 4) Decreased my confidence
 - 5) Greatly decreased my confidence
- 9. How interested were you in going through the PLATO lessons?
 - 10 1) Very interested while using PLATO
 - 15 2) Interested while using PLATO
 - 4 3) Not interested while using PLATO
 - <u>1</u> 4) Bored while using PLATO
 - 5) <u>Very bored</u> while using PLATO

- 10. How much of what you learned using PLATO could be applied on the job?
 - 1) Almost all of what I learned
 - 4 2) Most of what I learned
 - 75 3) Some of what I learned
 - § 4) Little of what I learned
 - <u>5</u> 5) <u>None</u> of what I learned
- 11. For training purposes, how adequately did the PLATO simulations work like the real equipment?
 - 1) Very Adequate for training
 - 12 2) Reasonably adequate for training
 - § 3) Borderline for training
 - 3 4) Somewhat inadequate for training
 - 3 5) Very inadequate for training
- 12. How much do you think you <u>could have learned</u> about the operation of the real equipment using only <u>PLATO</u>?
 - _____1) Almost everything
 - 5 2) A great deal
 - <u>5</u> 3) Some
 - <u>15</u> 4) A little
 - <u>3</u> 5) Almost nothing at all
- 13. Compared with other training equipment you have used (slide projector, video cassettes, Beseler Cue/See), PLATO's reliability was:
 - ______1) Much better than other training equipment
 - <u>10</u> 2) <u>Better</u> than other training equipment
 - 12 3) About the same as other training equipment
 - 1 4) Worse than other training equipment
 - 5) Much worse than other training equipment
- 14. Would you like to use PLATO for other hands-on training?
 - _____ 1) Would very much like to use PLATO
 - <u>6</u> 2) Would <u>like</u> to use PLATO
 - 8 3) Undecided
 - <u>10</u> 4) Would not like to use PLATO
 - <u>2</u> 5) Would very much not like to use PLATO

- 15. How would you advise a friend wno had a choice between taking a course where there was a great deal of PLATO simulations or another course that covered the same material but without PLATO?
 - ______ 1) Fight tooth and nail to get into the PLATO course
 - 8 2) Request PLATO course, if convenient
 - 11 3) Neither request nor avoid course
 - 10 4) Avoid PLATO course, if possible
 - 1 5) Avoid PLATO course like the plague
- 16. How much time did you spend on PLATO compared with other students in your class?
 - ____1 1) More time on PLATO than otners
 - 25 2) About the same amount of time on PLATO as others
 - ______ 3) Less time on PLATO than others

APPENDIX E HAWK INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION FORMS AND RAW DATA
PLATO INSTRUCTOR/STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

Plea: be fi	se complet ully and f	e this form airly evalu	to the best ated.	of you	ur ability s	o that this	course can
Cour	se Name: _		ΗΑ₩Κ				•
Toda	y's Date:	day	month	<u>۔</u> ،	/ear		
1.	Please ch 	eck the ite 1 Regula 2) School Specif	m which best r instructor staff (Stop y position:	descr (Answe after	ibes your ro er all quest Question 5.	le in this ions.))	course.
2.	What do y particula	ou feel are r course? _	the instruc	tional	<u>advantages</u>	of using PL	ATO in this
3.	What do y this part	ou feel are icular cour	the instructions of the instruction of the instruction of the second sec	tional	<u>disadvantag</u>	<u>es</u> of using	PLATO in
4.	What chan because o	ges in train f the use o	ning practico f PLATO?	es occu	urred in thi	s particula	r course

5. If the use of PLATO became more widespread (more lessons in this course and/or more courses), how would your role be changed?

ų.

In Questions 6 through 17, compare practical exercises using PLATO with practical exercises using only real equipment. For each question, please check the <u>one</u> box which best describes your opinion about the impact of PLATO simulations in this course.

	How did use of PLATO in practical exercises affect:	Greatly Increased	lncreased	Little or No Change	Decreased	Greatly Decreased
6.	Student learning during P.E			4		
7.	Instructor's*confidence and feeling of use- fulness during P.E			2	2	
8.	Student attention during P.E			3	1	
9.	Student confidence when dealing with real equipment.				3_	1
10.	Use of TM's			3		1
11.	Instructor's workload during P.E		4			
12.	Application of learning to job performance	 	_	3	1	
13.	Damage to equipment items used for training		1	3		
14.	Student overconfidence when dealing with real equipment.		1		3	
15.	Efficient use of student's time during P.E				3	1

	How did use of PLATO in practical exercises affect: (Continued)	Greatly Increased	Increased	Little or No Change	Decreased	Greatly Decreased
16.	Instructor availability to assist students during P.E.		1	i	3	
17.	Learning of relationships among system components and tests.			3		;

Please check the one response which best describes your opinion.

- 18. I would like to see PLATO simulations used in other P.E. lessons in this course.
 - _____1) Strongly agree

Ż

- _____2) Agree
- Undecided
- 3 4) Disagree
- 1 5) Strongly disagree
- 19. I would like to see PLATO simulations used in other courses at the school.
 - _____l) Strongly agree
 - _____2) Agree
 - ____3 3) Undecided
 - _____4) Disagree
 - 1 5) Strongly disagree
- 20. Compared with other training equipment I have used (35-mm projectors, video cassettes, Beseler Cue/See), PLATO's reliability is:
 - ____1) Much better than other training equipment
 - 3 2) Better than other training equipment
 - 1 3) About the same as other training equipment
 - 4) <u>Worse</u> than other training equipment
 - 5) Much worse than other training equipment

- 21. In your opinion, how widespread is the applicability of PLATO simulations for use in other P.E. lessons in this course?
 - 1) PLATO is applicable to <u>all</u> other P.E. lessons
 - 2) PLATO is applicable to most other P.E. lessons
 - 3) PLATO is applicable to a <u>limited number</u> of other P.E. lessons
 - 3 4) PLATO is not applicable to any other P.E. lessons
 - _____5) PLATO should <u>not</u> have been used in the P.E. lessons where it was used
- 22. In some courses there is limited availability of equipment for training purposes. In your opinion, how widespread is the applicability of PLATO simulations for teaching the operation or maintenance of equipment like that taught at MMCS?
 - 1) The teaching of <u>almost all</u> equipment items would benefit by being supplemented by PLATO simulations
 - 2) The teaching of most equipment items would benefit by being supplemented by PLATO simulations
 - 3 3) A limited number of equipment items would benefit by being supplemented by PLATO simulations, but most would not benefit
 - 4) Current computer simulation technology is too limited to be of practical benefit for equipment training purposes
- 23. If I had the choice of teaching another course where there was major use of PLATO simulations like those written for this course, I would:
 - 1) Fight tooth and nail to be assigned as the instructor
 - 2) Request assignment, if convenient
 - 2 3) Neither request nor avoid assignment
 - 2 4) Avoid assignment, if possible
 - 5) Avoid assignment like the plague
- 24. Once students became familiar with PLATO, how much instructional assistance did a typical student require when learning a new task using PLATO compared with using real equipment?
 - 1) Much more assistance needed when using PLATO
 - 3 2) More assistance needed when using PLATO
 - _____ 3) About the same amount of assistance needed using PLATO or using real equipment
 - 4) Less assistance needed when using PLATO
 - 5) Much less assistance needed when using PLATO

In Questions 25 through 28, consider the Controller DVM alignment test on the TFTS, which can be trained using real equipment or a PLATO simulation.

25.	How fast could your <u>fastest</u> student perform this task on the real equipment?	N/A	_hours
26.	How fast cculd your <u>slowest</u> student perform this task on the real equipment?	N/A	_hours
27.	How fast could your <u>fastest</u> student perform this task <u>on PLATO</u> ?	N/A	_hours
28.	How fast could your <u>slowest</u> student perform this task on PLATO?	N/A	hours

