DOCUMENT RESULE

:	ED 173 423	TE 009 491	8
y	AUTHOR	Kanter, Jeffrey E.; And Others	ŝ
	TTTLE	Development and Validation of the Air Force Technical	
÷		Training Student Survey: Attitudinal Correlate's of	
an te interne	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Course Attrition Level and Student Gender. Findi	
		Keport for Period Halth 1975- December 1970.	
,	INSTITUTION ,	All Force Human Resources Lab., Brooks Arb, lexds.	
	REPORT NO	AFHRL = TR = 77 - 27 (31)	
	PUB DATE	Apr 79	
	NOTE.	31p.	
	AVAILABLE FROM	National Technical Information Service, Springfield,	۰.
1		Virginia 22161	1
	EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.	
V	DESCRIPTORS	Dropout Attitudes: *Dropout Characteristics; Enlisted	
•		Personnel; Graduation; *Military Training;	
•		*Persistence; Postsecondary Education; Predictor	
•		Variables: *Program Attitudes: *Sex Differences;	
`		*Student Attitudes; Student Motivation; Technical	
		Education: Test Construction	
	JDENTIFIERS	*Air Force: Technical Training Student Survey	
۷,			

ABSTRACT

As part of a multiphase study on male and female student attitudes towards Air Force technical training and the relationship between those attitudes and student performance, the 121-item Technical Training Student Survey (TTSS) was administered to 12,666 technical training students. The attitudes of students from high attrition courses were compared to the attitudes of students from low attrition courses to identify those attitudes related to course attrition rate and to compare attitudes related to student performance at different lavels of student attrition. Many · · · similarities were found, but differences suggested the importance of motivational factors. Male, and female attitudes towards the training experience were found to differ in Several areas. While some differences referred to specific aspects of training, most appeared to be reflecting the differences in attitudes between a group with experience in a particular environment (man) versus those of a group -entering a relatively new experience (women). The attitudes related to performance for men and women were found to be very similar with some indications that women were having greater difficulty with some aspects of the academic work. These findings and the application of this methodology to other subsets of the existing data base are discussed. The TTSS is appended. (Author/All)



NOTICE

When U.S. Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than a definitely related Government procurement operation, the Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever, and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise, as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

This final report was submitted by Personnel Research Division, under project. 7719, with HQ Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFSC), Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 78235. Dr. Jeffrey E. Kantor (PEM) was the Principal Investigator for the Laboratory.

This report has been reviewed by the Information Office (OI) and is releasable to the National Technical Information Service (NTIS). At NTIS, it will be available to the general public, including foreign nations.

This technical report has been reviewed and is approved for publication.

3

LELAND D. BROKAW, Technical Director Personnel Research Division

RONALD W. TERRY, Colonel, USAF Commander

, t	−Un	Class	111ec				
					÷		
ロウィイ	V ĒL	ASSI	EIC.	ATION	OF.	THIS I	0 A C

led by ERIC

DEDART RACINELITICAL AL	READ INSTRUCTIONS
	ION NO. 3 RECIPIENT'S CATALOG, NUMBER
AFHKL-1 K-//-2/(IF) 4. TITLE (and Sublitie)	S. TYPE OF BEPORT & PERIOD COVERED
DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE AIR FORCE TECHNICAL TRAINING STUDENT SURVEY ATTITUDINAL CORRELATES OF COURSE ATTRITION LEVEL AND STUDEN GENDER	Final March 1973 December 1978 T S REPORTING ORO, REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(-) Jeffrey E. Kantor Nancy Guinn Bart M. Vitola	B CONTRACT OF GRANT NUMBER(-)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Personnel Research Division Air Force Human Resources Laboratory Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 78235	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS HQ Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFSC) Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 78235	12, REPORT DATE April 1979 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 30
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II dillorent from Controlling C	Diffice) 15. SECURITY CLASS (of this report) Unclassified
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this (Popert)	13. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract ontered in Black 20, if diffe	rrent (rom Report)
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	M Study Nrs. 6154, 5940, 5933, 5776
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block attitudes graduates sex differences attrition high attrition courses student aptitude eliminees low attrition courses student perform female students male students student motivati gender differences men technical training	number) training performance s women ance on
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side it necessary and identify by block in As part of a multiphase study on student attitudes towards between those attitudes and student performance, a data base we data and course performance measures on 12,666 technical train utilize that data base to compare the attitudes of two students ub attrition courses were compared to the attitudes of students from attrition courses were compared to the attitudes of students from	Air Force technical training and the relationship as established consisting of attitudinal self-report ing students. The purpose of this study was to groups. First, the attitudes of students from high low attrition courses to identify those attitudes student performance at different levels of student

Unclassified

ECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Deta Entered)

Item 20.(Continued)

comparing the attituding similarities were four attitudes of nale and to performance for m in several areas. Whil differences in attitud entering a relatively neuto be very similar with se academic work. These finding distorsed. of performance between students from high and low attrition courses, many differences suggested the importance of motivational factors. Second, the were compared to identify gender-specific attitudes and those attitudes related iMale and female attitudes towards the training experience were found to differ tes referred to specific aspects of training, most-appeared to be reflecting the typ with experience in a particular environment (men) versus those of a group of men). The attitudes related to performance for men and women were found fors that women were having greater difficulty with some aspects of the implication of this methodology to other subsets of the existing data base are

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)

PREFACE

This work was conducted at the request of Air Training Command (RPR 72726) and accomplished under project 7719, Selection and Classification Technology; task 771902, Exploration of Methods for Increasing the Effectiveness of Personnel Programs.

Appreciation is expressed to the many people at Air Training Command and the Computational Sciences Division of the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory who gave-valuable assistance throughout the course of this research. Their support and enthusiasm were essential for the successful completion of this project.



TABLE OF CONTENTS.

		Page
#	$\langle 1 \rangle$	Introduction
•	n.	Method
		Subjects 5 Survey Instrument 6 Survey Administration 6 Statistical Analysis 6
•	III.	Results and Discussion
•		Attitudinal Correlates of Course Attrition Level
,	IV.	Conclusions and Recommendations
	Ref	erences
	Арг	pendix A: Technical Training Student Survey
9	Apr G	bendix B: Correlation of TTSS items to Course Attrition Level, raduation/Elimination of Students, and Sex of Respondent
\ <u>.</u>	Figu 1	An example of the type of item and response format used in the technical training student survey
ĺ.	2	from low vs. high attrition courses
Ì	. 3	Major attitudinal differences between graduates and eliminees in low attrition courses
	4	Major attitudinal differences between graduates and , eliminees in high attrition courses
	1 5	Major attitudihal differences between males and females
	.6	Major attitudinal differences between nue graduates and interes
÷	7	Major attitudinal differences between emale graduates/eliminees
-	-	
) •.	••	LIST OF TABLES
	Tab	le page
۱. 	1	Major Attitudinal Factors Related to Graduation/Elimination
• т •	2	Major Attitudinal Factors Related to Graduation/Elimination
	r	

3-47

ŗ

DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE AIR FORCE TECHNICAL TRAINING STUDENT SURVEY: ATTITUDINAL CORRELATES OF COURSE ATTRITION LEVEL AND STUDENT GENDER

I. INTRODUCTION

At the request of the Air Training Command, the Personnel Research Division of the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory initiated a study of student attitudes toward Air Force technical training and of the relationship between those attitudes and performance/attrition in technical training. This research was divided into three phases: (a) the development and validation of an instrument sensitive to student attitudes and related to technical training performance, (b) a comparison of student attitudes from courses having different levels of student attrition, and (c) a comparison of attitudes from specific student subgroups of interest. The first phase, development and validation of the Technical Training Student Survey (TTSS), was completed in 1977 and reported in Kantor, Vitola, and Guinn (1977).

In the first phase, it was found that the TTSS had satisfactory psychometric properties and was capable of identifying differential attitudes specifically related to student performance. Based on this validation phase, it was concluded that the TTSS could form the basis for a methodology capable of identifying attitudes differentially related to many different criteria. The remaining two phases of this research, comparing attitudes related to differential course attrition rates and identification of attitudinal differences between student subgroups, were accomplished both to delineate specific differential attitudes of interest and to illustrate some/of the potential applications of a methodology based on the TTSS.

In the course of the validation study, a data base was established consisting of attitudinal responses and technical training course performance measures on 12,666 technical training students. From this data base, it was possible to abstract and study various data subsets of interest. Attitudinal differences between groups could be identified, and the relationships between attitudes and course performance could be compared. In this study, two data subsets were extracted and evaluated. First, the attitudes of students from courses having relatively high attrition rates were compared to the attitudes of students from courses having relatively low attrition rates. A comparison of this type should be beneficial in determining whether attitudes remain constant regardless of the level of attrition.

The second data subset dichotomized the sample by student gender. Comparisons drawn between a men and women are of interest for several reasons. While male/female differences have been, historically, an area of both popular and scientific inquiry;, the current increase in numbers of women entering the Air Force increases the importance of identifying and assessing gender differences which might impact on personnel training and utilization. Also, in many technical training areas, particularly involving mechanical and electronics, men and women exhibit differential attrition rates unrelated to entering aptitude scores. Therefore, the objectives of this study were (a) to identify attitudinal differences between students from courses having high vs. low attrition rates, (b) to compare and contrast the relationships between attitudes and performance for students from courses having high vs. low attrition rates, (c) to identify attitudinal differences between the and female technical training students, and (d) to compare and contrast the relationships between attitudes and performance for male and female students.

IL METHOD

Subjects

A stotal of 12,666, nonprior-service enlisted accessions (10,980 men and 1,686 women) were administered the TTSS while attending one of 53 Air Force technical training courses conducted between September 1974 and August 1975. For comparative purposes, to study the issue of high vs. low attrition, this sample was first divided into students from courses having relatively high attrition (more than 8%) and students, from courses having relatively low attrition (less than or equal to 8%). These groups were then subdivided on the basis of technical training outcome to form four groups: (a) High Attrition-Graduates (5,340), (b) High Attrition-Eliminees (847), (c) Low Attrition-Graduates (6,083), and (d) Low Attrition-Eliminees (396). To study male/female differences, the sample was recombined, then divided by gender and training outcome to form four different groups: (a) Male-Graduates (9,993), (b) Male-Eliminees (987), (c) Female-Graduates (1,430), and (d) Female-Eliminees (256).

Survey Instrument,

The TTSS contains 121 items designed to tap student attitudes about specific aspects of Air Force technical training. These measures reflect the student's expectations.abdut training; motivation for training; perceptions of instructors, fellow, students, and physical settings; degree of perceived stress in training; and the degree of personal satisfaction derived from the student's training and career choice. Approximate administration 'time' for the TTSS is 30 minutes. A copy of the TTSS is presented in Appendix A. An example of the type of item and response format used is presented in Figure 1.

Survey Administration

The TTSS was administered inder standardized conditions to students in the training setting. Sampling points were chosen to allow comparisons across all technical training courses, between technical training centers, and between courses having differing attrition rates. It is assumed that the response patterns obtained the accurately reflect the spectrum of attitudes present in the population of Air Force technical training students.

Statistical Analysis

To evaluate student attitudinal differences, a stepwise discriminant analysis approach was utilized. This technique provided both an identification of specific attitudinal differences and a relative importance weighting of those attitudes. Additionally, these analyses were conducted in a manner designed to insure high levels of confidence. Not more than 5% of the items identified as significant could have been included incorrectly ($\alpha \le .05$ per discriminant analysis).

, III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Attitudinal Correlates of Course Attrition Level

To identify the attitudinal differences between students from courses having a low attrition rate (less than or equal to 8%) vs. a high attrition rate (greater than 8%), a discriminant analysis was accomplished across all students using an attrition level indicator as the dependent variable. From this analysis, 42 of the 121 TTSS items were found to be significantly ($p \le .05$) related to articlian level differences. These 42 items accounted for 22.2% of the dependent variance (r = .47); Based upon the content of the item, its order of entry into the stepwise discriminant process, and its correlation with the attrition level indicator, the major attitudinal differences between students from low vs. high attrition courses were summarized and are presented in Figure 2 (a complete list of the 42 items and their individual correlations with the attrition level indigator are presented in 'Appendix B1). From these attitudinal differences, it would appear that student from high attrition courses were experiencing more difficulties with study guides, shift schedules, and study facilities outside the classroom than were students from low attrition courses. High attrition course students also reflected more of a concern that too much emphasis was placed on passing the course rather than actual learning. On the positive side, students from high attrition courses saw fewer problems with other students and were more satisfied with various physical aspects of the classroom (e.g., chairs, ventilation, workspace). Finally, students from low attrition courses saw more incentives for classroom performance (e.g., less menial duties, good civilian jobs after service, greater work freedom) and were more satisfied with the Air Force. In general, these attitudinal differences appear to reflect that, as might be

	5	a tria				-			 		•		J.
•		<u> </u>		· .					Definitely	. 4		•	Definitely Agree
Jertain :	students a	re hostile	toward	other clas	a members					0	ζÓ	O.	Ö
2 i V			۰ ۲	1 / 6 ¹				9 8 - 4 1					
Most sti	idents get	t along wi	il togeti	107 2		• • • • • • •	• • • • •	• • • • • • • •	نيون. 	<u> </u>		<u>ب</u>	
Fellow	students i	ook out j	or each	other					Öʻ.				° O
• • • • •		•	-			•	•			<u>*: </u>			
Certain	students	are uncoo	perative	••••	<u>, </u>	1	••••		., Ç		 	ت ــلـــ	
Certain	students		nsible fo	r petty qu	arrels and	bed feelings	among class	members.	🔿		Ö	0	0
	•	<i>J</i>	• • •	5				8 - 4	, L				
There a	re tensior	ns.among	some stu	idents wh	ich interfer	e with train	ing activities		<u>.</u>	<u>ب</u>	<u></u>		
Certain	students	are incap	able of v	vorking to	gether					Ū,	0		
•		1	.:		•	- -	•					<u></u>	، لينہ
Studen	ts help ee	ch other '	to learn	the neces	ery course	material., .	• • • • • • •		··· 😄	رت. 			
Some a	tudents a	re nòt lik	ed or acc	epted by	fellow stud	j 🧐 Ients . 🗄	а 	 .) O			Ō,
·	· · .	1 . 1 81			. :	·	s .				<u></u>	 	
Studen	ts have to	take adv	entage o	f others i	n order to s	ucceed in tr	eining	• • • • • • •					
	· · · · ·	tn	• •		2 · •				4 .		•		
Note.	1. Belo	ons for R ow is a ser	ies of sta	tements r	elated to be	oth your trai	ning and tra	ining environ	nent.			<u>,</u>	i 🛶 .
	2. Plea	se darken	the one	circle on	each scale t	hat best exp	resses your 1	eeungs. 🛎	•		•		•
· .			, (.							•			•

Figure 1. An example of the type of item and response format



44

۰,



Students from high attrition courses see less hostility and petty quarrels among fellow students

Students from high attrition courses think that study guides are difficult to understand Students from low attrition courses see more "rewards" for performing well in school (e.g., less "Mickey Mouse" duties, good civilian jobs after service, greater freedom in accomplishing class work)

Students from high attrition courses think that some students would perform better on a different shift

Students from high attrition courses are more satisfied with classroom chairs, ventilation, and workspace

Students from high attrition courses are less satisfied with study facilities outside the classroom

Students from low attrition courses are more satisfied with the Air Force

Students from high attrition courses felt that too much emphasis was placed on passing the course than learning

Figure 2. Major attitudinal differences between students from low vs. high attrition courses.

expected, students from high attrition courses are experiencing more academic problems than are students from low attrition courses. However, the high attrition students are also perceiving fewer rewards for their classroom performance than are the low attrition students. An interaction between lack of perceivedincentives and difficult academic work could produce an overall negative atmosphere capable of fostering higher attrition rates. Therefore, for high attrition courses it might be beneficial to explore means of providing highly visible short-term rewards for academic work early in training. This is supported by previous research (Pritchard, VonBergen, & DeLeo, 1974) where it was found that the right incentives can be useful in establishing and reinforcing appropriate academic behavior.

To differentiate between the attitudes of graduates and eliminees from low-attrition courses, an analysis was accomplished among students, from low attrition courses using training outcome (graduation/elimination) as the dependent variable. From this analysis, it was found that 20 of the 121, TTSS items were significantly related to training outcome (r = .37) and that these 20 items accounted for 14% of the dependent variance. The major attitudinal differences between graduates and eliminees from low attrition courses were summarized and are presented in Figure 3 (a complete list of the 20 items is provided in Appendix B2). Graduates from low attrition courses exhibited some more positive attitudes (e.g., effect of tech training satisfaction with training and career field) but were not more satisfied with the Air Force than were eliminees. It would appear that attitudes about the Air Force in general do not accurately reflect an individual's performance in training. It may be that the negative attitudinal impact of elimination might be relatively confined to specific appects of the training experience and not carried over to general feelings regarding the Air Force. Therefore, individuals being eliminated from one course still might have a good probability of succeeding in another course because their first failure experience does not appear to affect their feeling of commitment to the Air Force in general.

Although performing academically better than the eliminees, graduates from low attrition courses desired more off-duty study time, did hot feel that supplementary study materials were as readily available as they should have been, and believed that some fellow students were hostile to others. Also, graduates were more motivated to avoid menial or make work duties and to pursue educational growth and development. Eliminees reflected their performance difficulties by feeling more pressure for perfection and believing that course materials were more difficult than they should have been. Overall, the impression is

Graduates felt that tech training had a positive effect on their feelings about their career field

Eliminees felt more pressure for perfection the set

Avoiding "Mickey Mouse" duties was more important to graduates

Graduates more satisfied with technical training and career field but not more satisfied with the Air Force in general

Graduates do not feel off duty study time is sufficient

Graduates see some fellow students as hostile.

Eliminees think course materials are more difficult than they should be

Increased educational growth and development more important to graduates,

Graduates felt that supplementary study materials were not readily available

Figure 3. Major attitudinal differences between graduates and eliminees in low attrition courses.

that graduates had more positive attitudes, felt less stress, and were more motivated to study outside the classroom.

To differentiate between the attitudes of graduates and eliminees from high attrition courses, an analysis was accomplished using training outcome as the dependent variable but drawing subjects only from the high attrition courses. From this analysis, it was found that 26 of the 121, TTSS items were significantly related to training outcome (r = .50) and that these significant items accounted for 25% of the dependent variance. The major attitudinal differences between graduates and eliminees from high "attrition" courses were summarized and are presented in Figure 4 (a complete list of the items is provided in Appendix B3). From the high attrition courses, graduates again appeared to hold more positive attitudes regarding training and their career fields, but were not more satisfied with the Air Force than were eliminees. Similarly, as in the low attrition courses, eliminees feit more pressure for perfection, and graduates desired increased availability of training equipment. However, in the high attrition courses, graduates were more motivated by the idea of job security, while eliminees saw early completion of training, chance to

Graduates felt that tech training had a positive effect on their feelings about their career field

Graduates were more satisfied with tech training and career field but not more satisfied with the Air Force in general

Eliminees felt more pressure for perfection.

Assigned career field more similar to preferred career field for graduates

Job security more important to graduates

Graduates did not think that training equipment was readily available for student practice Eliminees saw school performance linked to completing training ahead of schedule, chance to participate in decisions, and more challenging assignments after graduation

> Figure 4. Major attitudinal differences between graduates and eliminees in high attrition courses.

participate in decisions, and more challenging assignments after graduation as incentives for their classroom performance. It is interesting to note that within much of the training environment, the incentives important to the eliminees are not particularly realistic goals. These findings may reflect two underlying factors particularly relevant to attrition in high attrition courses: (a) the graduates, compared to the eliminees; appear to gain significantly more satisfaction from what they are doing and have a more favorable outlook on their career potential and (b) the eliminees appear to have somewhat less realistic expectations than do the graduates. In a personnel system as large as that of the Air Force, manning needs often supplant personal desires; therefore, after graduation job security is a much more fikely training outcome than assignment of choice or increased participation in personnel decisions. If the eliminees do hold somewhat less realistic expectations and are assigned to career fields less to their preference than are the graduates; then the eliminees could be less prepared for the rigors of the actual training experience. Realization of these misconceptions could be demotivating and result in decreased effort in academics. Better job-person matching and increased information about realistic training outcomes might be of 'particular benefit for students entering high attrition courses.

The major attitudinal factors found related to training outcome for students from both low and high attrition courses are summarized and compared in Table 1. From a casual evaluation of this table, it would appear that considerable commonality exists between the differing attitudes of graduates and eliminees; regardless of course attrition rate. However, students from low attrition courses seem to reflect more academic concerns (e.g., off-duty study time, course materials, educational growth) while students from high attrition courses reflect more motivational concerns (similarity of the assigned to the preferred field, job security, payoffs for school performance). These findings seem to indicate that although academic difficulties are encountered in both high and low attrition courses, there is also more of a motivational component to attrition in higher attrition courses. Though beyond the scope of this study, it might be beneficial to tap student motivation prior to entry and during school to determine whether there are systematic differences in entering students or whether in-course factors differentially affect motivation. Future research in this area may prove particularly fruitful.

	Rank Order d	of Importance	
Attitudinal Factors	Low Attrition	High Attrition	1
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Effect of training on feelings about career field	1 5 *	1	
Pressure for perfection	<u>ن</u>		
Importance of avoiding "Mickey Mouse" duties	<u>ئ</u>	3	
Satisfaction with training, career field, and Air Force	, 4	<u>ئ</u> ر.	
Amount of off-duty study time	5		,
Interaction with fellow students	6		
Difficulty of course materials	7		
Importance of educational growth and development	8		
Availability of study materials/equipment	9	6	
Availability of study materials equipments		• '4	
Similarity of assigned and preferred earder ments		5	
Importance of job security		,	
Relationship between school performance and carry			
completion of training, participation in decision,		7	
and assignment after school			

Table 1. Major Attitudinal Factors Related to Graduation/Elimination for Students in Low and High Attrition Courses

13

10

ERIC Pruil Text Provided by ERIC i A

Attitudinal Correlates of Student Gender Differences

The first gender-related analysis was accomplished to identify attitudinal differences between male and female students. For this analysis, sex was the dependent variable and significant relationships were identified between the sex of the respondent and his or her responses on 33 of the 121 items from the TTSS. These 33 items accounted for 9.5% of the dependent variance (r = .31). The major attitudinal differences between men and women were summarized and are presented in descending order of importance in Figure 5 (a complete list of the 33 items and their correlations with the dependent variable is presented in Appendix B4).

> Females desire more off duty study time Females do not think classroom temperature is satisfactory Males see more petty quarrels among fellow students Males believe military bearing distracts from school performance Females desire better dorm sleeping facilities Females believe students look out for each other Females do not think enough time is spent on difficult subjects Females are more satisfied with the Air Force Males think tech training has been more beneficial to their career

Figure 5. Major attitudinal differences between males and females.

From these attitudinal differences, a few general findings seem apparent. Women show more concern about academics (i.e., desire more off duty study time, desire more time be spent on difficult subject matter). This is possibly related to the fact that in this sample the female attrition rate from technical training schools was considerably higher than that for men (males = 8.98%; females = 15.23%). This may reflect a desire on the part of the women to perform up to standards even if additional time and effort are required. Additionally, women were found to be less satisfied with certain aspects of the physical environment (classroom temperature, dorm sleeping facilities) but had a more positive perception of their fellow students (fewer petty quarrels, more support). Finally, although women seemed happier with their military status (more satisfied with the Air Force, less bothered by military bearing), it was the men who felt that technical training had been a more beneficial experience. This last finding might be related to gender differences in reasons for enlistment. Previous research (Vitola, Mullins, Williams, & Michelson, 1974) has found that men were more likely to enlist for vocational skill training while women were more interested in travel and personal growth opportunities. Overall, it appears that the women evidenced more academic difficulty, more group cohesion, more satisfaction, but perhaps were less sure of what benefit they were getting out of training. These attitudes might be considered typical of those of a group entering winto a new environment, and it is possible that as the numbers of women and the experiences in technical training increase, some of the male/female differences will be moderated.

To differentiate between the attitudes of male graduates and male eliminees, an analysis was accomplished using only the male subjects with graduation/elimination being the dependent variable. Significant relationships were identified between the dependent variable and responses on 22 of the 121 TTSS items accounting for 9.76% of the dependent variance (r = 31). (A complete list of these items is provided in Appendix B5). The major attitudinal differences between male graduates and eliminees are summarized in Figure 6.

11

ERIC

-14

Eliminees feel more pressure for perfection Job security more important to graduates Avoiding "Mickey Mouse" duties more important to graduates Eliminees believe they can complete training mead of schedule Eliminees believe course materials are too hard Graduates think certain students are hostile Eliminees see certain tension between students Eliminees believe squadron duties interfere with studies Eliminees think instructors are boring Graduates want more time on training equipment

Figure 6. Major attitudinal differences between male graduates/eliminees.

From these attitudinal differences, it would appear that male eliminees felt more stress (pressure for perfection, difficulty with materials, interference with studies), that male graduates placed more importance on training rewards (job security, avoidance of duties), and that both male graduates and eliminees perceived some inter-student disharmony. Overall, it might be that the male eliminee evidences more susceptibility to pressure, less personal motivation, and is less attracted by the available training. This makes the eliminee easily discouraged and very difficult to keep on track and working when arduous effort is required.

To, differentiate between the attitudes of female graduates and eliminees, an analysis was accomplished using the 1,687 female subjects again with graduation/elimination being the dependent variable. Significant relationships were identified on 12 of the 121 items, accounting for 11.52% of the dependent variance (r - .34). The major attitudinal differences between female graduates and eliminees are summarized in Figure 7. (A complete list of the 12 items is presented in Appendix B6.)

Eliminees feel more pressure for perfection Graduates desire more off duty study time Eliminees believe course materials are too hard Job security more important to graduates Eliminees believe they can complete training ahead of schedule Eliminees believe student workload is too heavy Graduates desire more time on training equipment Off duty privileges more important to graduates

Figure 7. Major attitudinal differences between female graduates/eliminees.

From these attitudinal differences, it would appear that female eliminees also felt more stress (pressure for perfection, difficulty with course materials, student workload), that female graduates were more motivated (desire more study time, more time on equipment), and that female graduates placed more importance on system rewards (job security, off-duty privileges). Again, like the men, it would appear that

12

15

Full Baxt Provided by ERIC

the female eliminees evidence more susceptibility to pressure, less drive towards the goal, and might be Hifficult to motivate since they appear less sensitive to system reinforcers.

The major attitudinal factors found related to graduation/elimination for men and women are summarized and compared in Table 2. It would appear evident that considerable overlap exists between the factors associated with technical training performance for men and women. Out of the first five more important factors, four are shared by men and women, leading to the conclusion that the similarities outweigh the differences between the sexes. However, the differences which exist appear to point to the conclusion that women have somewhat more academic difficulty than men. Since all students entering any particular training course are qualified for that course and have generally comparable aptitude scores, this finding is interesting because it suggests a difference in ability not currently being measured. Several areas of research were suggested by these findings. First, it should be determined if the relationships between aptitude test scores and performance in technical school are the same for both males and females. Second, course materials and structure should be investigated for sex bias which might negatively impact on female performance. Finally, the Air Force selection and classification system, developed on a primarily all-male force, should be evaluated to ensure that females are being properly managed with respect to the maximally effective classification of female personnel and their assignment to areas wherein they will have the highest probability of success. Research is currently underway in these areas.

	Rank Order of	Importanc
Attitudinal Factors	Males	Females
	1	1
Pressure for perfection	1.	1
Importance of job security	- 2	4
Importance of avoiding "Mickey Mouse" duties	3,	
Chance of completing training ahead of schedule	e 4	5
Difficulty of course materials	5	3
Amount of off-duty study time		· · 2
Relationships with fellow students	·6 °	· .
Interference by squadron duties	7	
Instructor-interest level	8	
Amount of time on training equipment	9	7
Amount of student workload		6
Importance of off-duty study time		8

Table 2. Major Attitudinal Factors Related to Graduation/Elimination for Males and Females

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Attitudinal differences were found to exist between students from low and high attrition courses. While some of these differences referred directly to academic issues, other differences appeared to reflect metivational factors. In comparing the correlates of attrition from students in low and high attrition courses, much commonality was found, but again, differences suggested the importance of motivational and preference factors. These results support the conclusion that individual attitudes, motives, and preferences play an important role in student performance and should be considered before assignment to technical training. In particular, these findings support the utilization of a vocational interest inventory as a component of the Air Force enlisted classification and assignment process. Such an inventory has been developed, and its operational use should have a positive impact in the training environment.

The male and female attitudes regarding the Air Force technical training experience were found to differ significantly in several areas. Some of these differences may be dealy with directly, but most appear

Full Fact Provided by ERIC

13

to be reflecting the differences in attitudes between a group with experience in a particular environment (men) versus those of a group entering a new experience (women). It is possible that as the "newness" of having large numbers of women in technical training wears off, the similarities between male and female students will increase. The similarities between factors associated with graduation/elimination for men andwomen are substantial and appear to indicate similar problems in eliminees of both sexes. However, some differences were noted and appear to be indicative of females having more academic difficulties. In summary, certain attitudinal differences do exist between men and women in Air Force technical fraining, but there is substantial commonality-indicating similar perceptions, concerns, and a similar relationship between attitude and performance.

The results of this study demonstrate the potential usefulness of the TTSS, as well as provide specific data for the courses included. It would appear that the TTSS can form the basis of a flexible methodology capable of identifying the attitudinal differences between many varied subject groups. As long as identification of the individual membership of a group is available, in conjunction with the TTSS data, then analysis via a discriminant process will provide a delineation of those attitudes which are held differentially by these groups. In this manner, in addition to studying subject-related differences, it is possible to uncover attitudinal differences between career areas, training centers, or even training courses. It is also possible to collect data on a periodic basis and thereby evaluate trends in student attitudes related to policy/management changes or accession characteristics. Additionally, sampling across time could be useful in helping to uncover developing problem areas before they become serious obstacles to learning. In general, the TTSS can be used to monitor student attitudes in the training system as a whole and within the training environment along almost any dimension of interest. In this way, the TTSS can provide useful information to course and training managers on how students are perceiving the training experience, by giving the manager the view of training seen through the eyes of the student.

REFERENCES

Kantor, J.E., Vitola, B.M., & Guinn, N. Development and validation of the Air Force technical training student survey. AFHRL-TR-77-27(1), AD-A042 967. Brooks AFB, TX: Perspanel Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, June 1977.

Pritchard, R.D., VonBergen, Jr., C., & DeLeo, P.J. Incentive motivation techniques evaluation in Air Force technical training. AFHRL-TR-74-24, AD-A005 302. Lowry AFB, CO: Technical Training Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, November 1974.

Vitola, B.M., Mullins, C.J., Williams, J.D., & Michelson, A.E. Preliminary evaluation of the effectiveness of Air Force advertising, AFHRL-TR-73-62, AD-775 049. Lackland AFB, TX: Personnel Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, January 1974.





ERIC.

Zı	· · · · ·		TECHNICAL	TRAINING STUD	ENT SURVEY		• 18, •		
		۰۴ ۲۰ ۲۰	AIR FORCE HU	IMAN RESOURCE	S LABORATOR	Y	1		
= -		ବ୍ରତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ର ବ୍ରତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ର କ୍ରତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ର୍ତ୍ତ୍ର	GENERAL INSTR 1. The items contain	UCTIONS: ed on this form are de	signed to measure a	tudent w	× 500000 × 5000000 × 5000000000000000000000000000000000000	900000 900000 900000	
	SSAN	00000000000 000000000 0000000000	2. The form is intend improve student to 3. It is very importan This is not a test a	ied to give you the op raining. ht-that your answers re ind you are not require	portunity to help flect your true feel ed to put your name	ings.			
	•	ଭତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ର ଭତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ର ଭତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ର ଭତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ତ୍ର	the form. 4. Please carefully fo each of the four m	llow the instructions in the sections of this fo	at the beginning of rm.			11002	
		SECTION I	seribing rewards a fluc	lant might receive if h	e performs well in t	echnical tra	uining.		ان ب
	•	 Beside each statement and 	re two separate rating	scalest /			- *	1	ų
		On Scale 1 indica	ite how likely it is for	you to receive the rew	ard if you perform	well in train	ning. how likely or unlik	elv vou are to	5
		On Scale 2 indica receive the rewar	ite <u>how important</u> the d.	reward is to you. Con		nançe, nort		ach scala . The	5
	* *	 Notice that each scale h three circles in the mide each scale as similar to ; 	as five circles. The wo die of each scale repres a thermometer lying o	rds above the scales d ent feelings between t n its side.	ascribe the meaning hose described at ti	he scale and	is. You might went	t to think of	
		4. Answer each item by de	arkening one circle on, ou need.	pech scale to indicate	how you feel about	t the statem	ent. Read each sta	tement carefu	μliγ «
	- I.		(-				
	؛ لې	0	· · · · ·	SCALE 1:			SCALE HOW IMPOI	2: RTANT	-
۰ ۲	؛ ل ے ، ،	· A	Very	SCALE 1: IF YOU PERFORM W	ELL Very	Not	SCALE HOW IMPOI TO YO	2: RTANT DU	Very
	Г., 1.	Increased job security after gradu	Verv Unlikely	SCALE 1: IF YOU PERFORM W	ELL Very Likely	Not Important		2: RTANT DU	Very
	د لیے اس ا 2. 3.	Increased job security after gradu REChnical school Faster promotion	Very Unlikely important de-	SCALE 1: IF YOU PERFORM W			SCALE HOW IMPOI TO YO		
	ال بر بر بر بر بر بر بر بر بر بر بر بر بر	Increased job security after gradu REChnical school Faster promotion Greater chance to participate in i cisions after graduating from tech More challenging duty assignmen gradulating from technical school	Very Unlikely important de-	SCALE 1: IF YOU PERFORM W			SCALE HOW IMPOI TO YO		
	f 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.	Increased job security after gradu REFinical school Greater chance to participate in i cisions after graduating from tech More challenging duty assignmen graduating from technical school More job responsibilities after gr technical school Greater chance of being skilled a	Very Unlikely uating from	SCALE 1: IF YOU PERFORM W 	+ −0 −0 −0 −0 −0 −0 −0 −0 −0 −0 −0 −0 −0 −0 −0 −0		SCALE HOW IMPOI TO YO 		
FORM NO. 2853 W 2200	لم ال 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.	Increased job security after grade Technical school Greater chance to participate in i cisions after graduating from tech More challenging duty assignmen gradulating from technical school More job responsibilities after gr technical school Greater chance of being skilled a in your career field Increased chance of getting a god job after Air Forca service	Very Unlikely uating from	SCALE 1: , IF YOU PERFORM W) (- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0-	-0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0		SCALE HOW IMPOI TO YO O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O		
TY, IOWA. FORM NO. 3853 W.2300	ال ال ال ال ال ال ال ال ال ا ا ا ا ا ا ا	Increased job security after grade Technical school Greater chance to participate in i cisions after graduating from tech More challenging duty assignmen graduating from technical school More job responsibilities after gr technical school Greater chance of being skilled a in your career field Increased chance of getting a go job after Air Forca service Greater chance to be assigned to of choice Increased off-duty privileges (fo	Very Unlikely uating from important de- hnicePschool hts efter duating from duating from duating from und competent und competent und competent und competent	SCALE 1: IF YOU PERFORM W 	+0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 -0 +0 -0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 *5 ≤	ko ro ro ro ro ro ro mi	SCALE HOW IMPOI TO YO O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O		
	لي ا ي ي ي ي ي ي ي ي ي ي ي ي ي ي ي ي ي ي	Increased job security after gradu REChnical school Faster promotion Greater chance to participate in i cisions after graduating from tech More challenging duty assignmen gradulating from technical school More job responsibilities after gr technical school More job responsibilities after gr technical school Greater chance of being skilled a in your career field Increased chance of getting a go job after Air Forca service Greater chance to be assigned to of choice Increased off-duty privileges (fo three-day passes or no squadrom Greater freedom in deciding h	Very Unlikely important de- hnical school its after aduating from aduating from od civilian your base r example, detail)	SCALE 1: IF YOU PERFORM W - 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0	0	0 r0 r0 r0 r0 r0 r0 r0 r0 s	SCALE HOW IMPORTO YO TO YO 0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-	$\begin{array}{c} 2:\\ \text{RTANT}\\ \text{DU} \end{array}$	-0 -0, -0, -0, -0, -0, -0, -0, -0, ==========
ED BY MAC IOWA CITY, IOWA. FORM NO. 3863 W 2000	لي ا 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10 11	Increased job security after gradu VEChnical school Faster promotion Greater chance to participate in i cisions after graduating from tech More challenging duty assignmen graduating from technical school More job responsibilities after gr technical school Greater chance of being skilled a in your career field Increased chance of getting a go- job after Air Forca service Greater chance to be assigned to of choice Increased off-duty privileges (for three-day passes or no squadron Greater freedom in deciding h accomplish class work Increased chance of being admin respected by fellow students	Very Unlikely important de- hnics after aduating from aduating from aduating from ind competent your base your base ir example, detail).	SCALE 1: IF YOU PERFORM W - 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0-	+0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 -0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 *33	ro ro ro ro ro ro ro ro ro g≊	SCALE HOW IMPORTO YO TO YO 0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-	$\begin{array}{c} 2:\\ \text{RTANT}\\ \text{DU} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $	
PRINTED BY MAC IOWA CITY, IOWA: FORM NO. 2003 W.2000 I	ليا 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10	Increased job security after grade REFinical school Greater chance to participate in in cisions after graduating from tech More challenging duty assignmen graduating from technical school More job responsibilities after gr technical school Greater chance of being skilled a in your career field Increased chance of getting a gou job after Air Forca service Greater chance to be assigned to of choice Increased off-duty privileges (for three-day passes or no squadron Greater freedom in deciding h accomplish class work Increased chance of being admin respected by fellow students ATC Form 1631, Jun 2000	Very Unlikely uating from important de- hnicerschool 0 its efter aduating from aduating from od civilian in competent in c	SCALE 1: IF YOU PERFORM W 	+0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 +0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0 -0	P0 F0 F0 F0 F0 F0 F0 F0 F0 F0 ∰₹	SCALE HOW IMPOI TO YO O- O	2: RTANT DU 0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-	
PRINTED BY MAC IOWA CITY, IOWA, FORM NO. 3803 W.2300 I	لي ب ب ب ب ب ب ب ب ب ب ب ب ب ب ب ب ب ب ب	Increased job security after grade REFinical school Greater chance to participate in i cisions after graduating from tech More challenging duty assignmen gradulating from technical school More job responsibilities after gr technical school in your career field Increased chance of being skilled a in your career field Increased chance of getting a god job after Air Forca service Greater chance to be assigned to of choice Increased off-duty privileges (for three-day passes or no squadron Greater freedom in deciding h accomplish class work Increased chance of being admin respected by fellow students ATC Form 1631, Jun 1	Very Unlikely important de- hnicerschool aduating from aduating from aduating from od civilian rexemple, ow to red and	SCALE 1: IF YOU PERFORM W 0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-		LO FO	SCALE HOW IMPORT TO YO O- O	2: RTANT DU 0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-	

SECTION	SCALE 1:	SCALE 2:
	PERFORM WELL	
12. Instructors pay more attention to your	Unlikely Likely	Important Important
ideas and suggestions		
- development		
 the subject matter		
16. Receive compliments, recognition and preise		
17., Fewer "Mickey Mause" duties in the Squedron		
18; Fewer "Mickey Mouse" assignments in class		
19. Feeling of self-respect and sense of		
20. Increased opportunity to use your abilities		
21. Receive more challehoing class assignments,		
ter of special interest to you		
sheed of schedule		
24. Provided with more spare time.		
25. Instructor less critical of your work		
graduate 4,		
1. Please use the scalar bei 2. Darken the one circle o	ow to describe your SSAN of main (lead) instructon each scale that best expresses your featings.	an a
27. Ineffective Effective	34. Unprepared	41. Considerate Inconsiderate
28. Kňowledgeable ignorent :	36 Intelligent Stupid	42. Hinders
30, Dependeble / Undependeble :	37. Encourages Discourages	44 Supportive Hostile
31. Disorgenized	38. Criticizer Preises	45. Ridicules
32. Unsure	39. Fair Unfair	46. Cooperative
33. Convincing Unconvincing	40. Impetient Petient	• • -
	40 	
0		

ERIC	
Full Text Provided by ERIC	

ur L	· • • •		¥	and the first of the second
Ţ.	1		:	
į,	. V	•		
Ξ.			. ,,	a state of the second se
	1	· 43 • 14		for the second sec
. ,	Ξ.	÷.		
- - ,		\ .	٠	
<u> </u>		, F ,	œ	DOODOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO
<u> </u>	1	· '	¢	DOGODOO
-	4]		6	1. Below are a Series of statements related to both your training and training environment.
 ,	1	Y	e	
: س	-	12	4	2. Plaase darkan the one circle on each scale that best expresses your regiment
-	.	1	12	
-	·		Æ	
÷		1		Definitely Definitely Definitely
	l The			
` خدو	، افرار و مر ا	7		
Ζ	- 1	4	8. I	Most students get along well together
	·			
		A	9. 1	Fellow students look out for each other
_		zΫ	*	
	, P .	15	0, 0	Certain students are uncooperativa
-	·.		76	
-		5	. /	
)	·	. e		There are tensions any increase students which interfere with training activities
<u> </u>			. /	
يندر	- *	÷ .	53.	Certain students are incepable of working together
_	· •			
<u>.</u>			54.	Students help each other to learn the necessary course material
_	•			
-		1. A	55.	Some students are not liked or accepted by fellow students
		· *		
· —	· · · ·		56. ∳	Students have to take advantage of others in order to advected in the magnetic state and the state advected of
-	• . •	· · (£:,	Students are given an equal opportunity to demonstrate their capabilities
. —	ļ.,		÷,	
,==	, .	.'	58.	Students are subject to strict discipline
>			•	
		• •	59 .	Student training is too closely supervised.
_	id.		<i>.</i>	
	• *		60.	Students are encouraged to speak their minds even if it means disagreeing with the instructors .
	•		~ ~	Suctors and the suggest improvements or solutions to training problems
• —	•		61,	
-	• • • •		82	Students are encouraged to participate in classroom discussions
	• ,			
	•		63.	Students are given the opportunity to participate in clars
	a ,		64.	Student suggestions and recommendations are considered with fairness
-		.(•		
	-	1.	65.	Students ara seldom able to use their own judgment
, . 			e 0	Surfacts have no say about what happens to them.
	- =		ω.	
· —			67.	Students have little chance to influence the way the class is conducted
. =	•			
],			68.	Students have the freedom to establish their own-study schedules
		,		
° -		•	, 89	. Späre time in class may be spant as each student erre in the state of the state o
-	. 😷		-	Students are received when the character to freely express their ideas in the classroom
-	. =	•	70	
a 4	· . I 🗭		, ·	21 GO TO THE NEXT PAGE
	•			18
. *			۴	n en
		/	'	
	-1			

-I ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

· ·	
SE	CTION III: Definitely Definitely
71.,	Students are seldom allowed to act independently
72.	
, ⁷ 73.	The military atmosphere in the classroom interferes with Berning of the subject metter.
\ 74.	
75.	In order to do well in training, students have to do things that are against their personal values.
. 76	Students don't know what is expected of them
1	
, 78.	
79.	Performance standards are unreasonably high
80,	Emphasis is placed on passing the course rather than learning subject matter
81.	There is a good deal of disagreement on how this training should be conducted.
. 8	The student workload is too heavy
, 83.	The quantity of class work interferes with how evel it is done
. 84.	Emphasis on military bearing and appearance datract from student performance
1 85.	Training hours are too long.
- 86 .	Conflicss exist in the training requirements
7 87	Training equipment (including trainers) is adequate.
/ . 88.	Training equipment (including trainers) is gledity evaluable for student practice
89.	Time allowed on training equipment (including trainers) is sufficient.
90.	Training evaluation or testing is an accurate indication of student performance
91.	
92	Excessive attention is given to unimpertant détails
67	Course meterials are to poor that they contribute little to learning
	Course materials are not closely related to the course objectives
. 96	My progress in class is not what it should be due to the poor quality of training or course
:	
, 97	
· 98	
- , · ,	
	19

0	
ERIC	
Full Text Provided by ERIC	

	2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-1.	•		ð	r - 1
	• 7		6.	•		• .	بڑ ج ۳ ۱	-
, <u> </u>	•	·	s . ♥ ■	۲. as	بر لو	• • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	n n Astronya Marina	- 15 18 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19
· <u> </u>	بر					X		
	99	C@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@		-	• •		• · · · ·	. ,
	NN 1010	00000000000		· · · · ·		* *	، مر	
. . . .	SS/ 9 9 6		SECTION III:	•	•	e y K	•	= e = -4
	e e			`` کې د ب		ړ. ۲۰	-	' *
				`. <u>`</u>		Definitely Disagree	· — ` — `	Definitely Agree
	99.	Classroom lighting is adiguite		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	······································			
= = -	100.	Classroom chairs are comhorts		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
	101.	Classroom seating arrangemen	rioht	·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\sim \sim \sim	0.0	
	102.	Number of class breaks is suffic	cient		ا به در د د د د د د		- $ -$	
	[,] 104.	Study facilities outside the class	sroom are adequate			, Ç Ç	0- 0-	·
-	105.	Classroom ventilation is about	right	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u> </u>	
	106.	Time allowed for testing is suf	ficient					
	07.	Classroom noise control is effe	ntive	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				<u> </u>
·	162 fv	clessroom work space is suffic Supplementary study material	ient (desk or table top are a (manuals, regulations, tec	s). ∮) are readily			
		evailable for student use			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
ere n,	110.	Base recreation facilities are as	nt.,		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\circ		
· · · · ·	^D 112.	Time allowed for review of ter	its is adequâte				0 0	
	113.	Enough training time is spent	on difficult and important	subject matter				
	114.	Some students would perform	better on a different shift				<u> </u>	
s. s. <u>.</u>	, 1. 2	Below are statements about ye Please darken the circle that b	our satisfaction with your satisfaction with your satisfaction with your satisfactions.	training and career about the stateme	field. nt in the same way	you have in the oth	er sections of this f	orm
	,		· ·			Completely Disstisfied		Completely Setisfied
_ =) 15. -	How do you feel about your t	achnical training? (· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			د 0
	116.	How do you feel about your a	Eorce?			$\dot{\circ}$		
	117. L		*			L L		
_ <u> </u>		1	с. с			60 70 '	THE NEXT PAG	Ē
	•••.			20	2'9			- ,
4	•.	۲. مر ` [™] م		•	40	•		N

EREC Full East Provided by EFIC

0	SECTION IV			·		• •	1		
•		, <u>a</u> ,	e		* * * i	Completely Different		lden	tical 📥
(118. How similar is yo	ur assigned career fiel	ld to your preferre مراط	d cøreer field? .	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	···· Q	-	<u> </u>	· 📥 ·
	119. How accurate we	s the information you	received about yo	ur career field be	fore entering	Highly Inaccurate		Hij	iniy urate
,	technical training	R	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	••••	*		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	\mathcal{I} , \mathcal{L}
*	100: 10:			• • • •	1. 1 .	Negativa	¥ 	Stro	ithre 🛑
	120, What effect has to	រទាក់ពីខ្លាំ វោងកោត្តថ្នាំង៥ វ	on your teelings at	out your career	field? <u>.</u> 				
* ⁵	121. If you have the	chance will you chi	non to epother of	reer field?	.	No		Ye Ye	и
1				sinanen µnaitair., ⊱	• • • • • • • • • • • • •	, ,			י 🚍 י ד
	REMARKS:	ء ب +	2 *	× .	•	· · · ·	· · ·	• • ·	
	ten i							1*	
			J	ж. 	`# . , *		· •	* · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	nne		ē	•				*	.
₽`,	· ·		•	• • • •	1	_ •	ł	N	
• .			*	د. ا	•		1	SI.	
a . '			- 194 	ء جو	.* \		•		
			`r	 					
		100 and	× /	ι.		. •		."	
		1 4		т. 1	· ·			*	· .
		¢ ·			5 <u>1</u> 4	1		,	3
			· · ·]	. '	*			,	24 16
	. ф	: .	- /		1 a) 1	٠	<u>_</u>	8	
÷	<u>ه</u> ۰		· · ·	1		-			
. `				·	·		19		
							£		
	•		1	•	,	}			
		<i>`</i>				•			
·			×					1 1	
	-		· · .	•	4	· ·			~
	, i i i i	τ,	-	1	, •				* 4
						1 82		(-
			٠,		,		•		
•	· _	-							
	-				•		, <i>•</i>	1	
	 . 	* *				-		•	
• • •	N	· * _	_	Y.					· · · · ·
· · ·			•		,			5	
с.		-	, (* 1	·
	* *	ч.							
	1	· · ·	. •	21	9	A			
			•	1	4	¥. '			



item #	Correlation	Item #	Correlation
47	.188	103	¹ 077
91	177	54	057
17 (Scale 1)	.158	11 (Scale 2)	.102
114	130	12 (Scale 1) ·	.013
106	.152	87	
7 (Scale 1)	073	121	.022
100	→ .085	37	085
104 👘 🔔 🕳 🖉	.129	ʻ 35 ·	.015
105	072	32	.066
117 1	.114	· 112	.020
51	.168	2'(Scale 1)	.076
108	067 -	74	079
80	- 114	75	.047
85	.020 . *	119	.054
23 (Scale 1)	053	1 (Scale 1)	004.
23 (Scale 2)	.059	9 (Scale 2)	.059`
70	.018	7 (Scale 2)	069
64 。	,098	26 (Scale 2)	.088
10 (Scale 1)	.110	26 (Scale 1)	034
17 (Scale 2)	.001	A 65	.008
18	.074	84 🔹 👻	073

TTSS items significantly related to course attrition level coded: under 8% = 1; over 8% = 0. Item options coded as per Appendix A.

Appendix B1

ł



26

23

- TTSS items significantly related to graduation/elimination of students from low attrition courses; coding: graduates = 0, eliminees = 1.

= -		 <u></u>
ltem #	· · ·	 correlation
120		227
120		.155
17.		107
117		.012
115	· · ·	203
121	- 4	.181
111		.025
47	· · .	064
95		 .122
22 (Scale 1)	.003
13 (Scale 2)	097
109		.021
65		.097
116		207
7 (Scale 1)	009
110	· _	 .030
80		.104
106		091
9 (Scale 2	2)	073
48		.025

27

24



ł

副

TTSS items significantly related to graduation/elimination of students from high attrition courses; coding: graduates = 0, eliminees = 1.

¢

}

ltem #	Correlation	Item #	Correlation
120	317	25 (Scale 2)	.064
115	308	52	.098
117	.034	47	017
72	.212	40	096
118	253	. 107 ~	.005
88	-080	2 (Scale 1)	.065
3 (Scale 1)	.054	53	.064
1 (Scale 2)	147	· · · ·	
104	.047	· ·	
116	314	,	÷ بو
4 (Scale 1)	.048		
23	.104		
110	.049	· · ·	
90	.035	· .	
84	021	· ·	_
° 79	.169		-
7 (Scale 1)	021		
121	.271		
9 / /	022		

28

, 25

ERIC[®]

٦.,

١

ċ.

ç.,

ì

۱<u>:</u>

k.

.

énet

÷.,

ERIC Anticete Provided by ERIC ç

TTSS items significantly related to sex of respondent; coding: males = 1, females = 2. Item options coded as per Appendix A.

item #	Correlation	item #	Correlation
<u> </u>	117 5	118	054
111 6	11/	110	_ 034
97	111	15 c +	,03-T
51	075	82	.004
84	049	104	079
08 1	104	66	025
30	059	4 (Scale 2)	035
49	.037	119	005
113	095	112	090
117 '	.038		010
120	063	25 (Scale 1)	.010
109	.007	54	.050
2 (Scale 2)	054	· 59	·036
19 (Scale 1)	.029	62	030
56	058	с. — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —	
115	078		
38	.025	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
29	054		
88	.023		•
110	069	· · · ·	
8 (Scale 1)	.033		
69	054		<u> </u>

Note. Items are listed in order of entry into the stepwise discriminate analysis.

29

É

TTSS items significantly related to graduation/elimination of male students; coding: graduates = 0, eliminees = 1.

ltem "#	-	Correlation
72 •	• · · · ·	.182
1 (Scale 2)		124
17 (Scale 2)	• • • •	081
23 (Scale 1)		.074
95	A.	.128
47		058
52		.061
74		020
29		091
		.046
80	•	.099
110		.031
12 (Scale 2)		003
79		.139
13 (Scale 2)		082
. 51		032
70		.097
3 (Scale 1)		019
82		.109
89	1	.041
69		035
84	· 1.	.031

Note. Items are listed in order of entry into the stepwise discriminate analysis.

30

27



Y,

Witers),

TTSS items significantly related to graduation/elimination of female students coding: graduates = 0, eliminees = 1.

itegn #	Correlation		
72	.209		
111	.086		
. 95	.154		
1 (Scale 2)	117		
23 (Scale 1)	.121		
82	.142		
89	.049		
9 (Scale 2)	056		
80	.134 ,		
84	.004		
62	J .009		
33	.117		

Note. Items are listed in order of entry into the stepwise discriminate analysis.

31 28 ***

★ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE:1979-671-056/50

 \mathbf{P}_{i}

É

