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ABSTRACT

Two years ago at this conference, Dr. Sherrie Gott of the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory described an avionics troubleshooting tutor being developed under the the Basic Job Skills Research Program. The tutor, known as Sherlock, is directed at teaching the diagnostic procedures necessary to investigate complex test equipment used to maintain F-15 fighter aircraft. Since Dr. Gott’s presentation in 1987, the tutor has undergone field testing at two Air Force F-15 flying wings. The results of the field test showed that after an average of 20 hours on the tutor, the 16 airmen in the experimental group (who averaged 28 months of experience) showed significant performance gains when compared to a control group (having a mean experience level of 37 months) who continued participating in the existing on-the-job training program. Troubleshooting performance of the tutored group approached the level of proficiency of highly experienced airmen (averaging approximately 114 months of experience), and the performance gains were confirmed in delayed testing six months following the intervention. The tutor is currently undergoing a hardware and software conversion from a Xerox Lisp environment to a PC-based environment using an object-oriented programming language. This paper summarizes the results of the successful field test and focuses on (a) the instructional features that contributed to Sherlock’s success, and (b) the implementation of these features in the PC-based version of the avionics troubleshooting tutor.

INTRODUCTION

In developing the avionics troubleshooting tutor to be described in this paper, the Basic Job Skills Program attempted to address several fundamental problems that the Air Force maintenance community faces with respect to the training of maintenance technicians. First, while the complexity of the systems to be maintained is increasing with advances in aerodynamic technology, there has been no corresponding increase in the time available to new trainees to learn about these systems. As a result, the time needed to acquire the knowledge necessary to perform these jobs increases and the Air Force has received fewer of the benefits of its training by the time maintenance personnel leave the Air Force.

One response to the increase in the technical complexity of these jobs has been to provide technicians with proceduralized job aids and so-called “smart” machines equipped with self-diagnostic capabilities. The rationale supporting this response is that in providing technicians with cook-book procedures for dealing with maintenance problems they might encounter, together with machines that diagnose their own faults, one can reduce the knowledge and skill required of the human technician and still maintain productivity of the work force. Unfortunately, the adequacy of proceduralized job aids is limited by the fact that, given the complexity of current aircraft systems, even the best designers are unable to anticipate every conceivable fault or fault combination that their system might develop. There are also limits to the diagnostic capabilities of automated systems. For example, Gott (1987) cited a 65% hit rate for the diagnostics of some systems on the B1B. Thus, there is still a clear need for human expertise to pickup where procedural aids and automated diagnostics leave off. A related consequence is that reliance on such aids gives technicians a false sense of security and undermines the development of the expertise that will invariably be required when the technician is confronted with a novel set of conditions for which the proper repair procedures have not been prespecified. A final dimension of the maintenance training has to do with the fact that the
first priority in the shops. Where technicians receive their on-the-job training is rarely to train new technicians, but to keep experienced personnel from breaking expensive equipment, it is only the most experienced technicians who work on the more difficult problems. Thus, trainees are denied important learning opportunities where practice at solving difficult diagnostic problems would promote their understanding of the task and the system they are working with.

DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF AN AVIONICS TROUBLESHOOTING TUTOR

In order to ameliorate these effects, the avionics troubleshooting tutor, Sherlock, was designed to provide trainees with the type of troubleshooting practice that would develop both the total reliance of novice technicians on automated diagnostics and proceduralized job aids, as well as the amount of time required to achieve proficiency in the task of maintaining aircraft systems. The design was based on analyses of expert troubleshooting performance (Gitomer, 1984; Glaser et al., 1985; Gott, Bennetts, and Gillett, 1986) which identified three cognitive components of their expertise: the knowledge underlying experts' use of troubleshooting procedures such as tracing electrical signals using schematics and taking measurements of the signals; the strategic knowledge underlying decisions regarding appropriate actions to take given multiple alternatives; and the declarative knowledge of the system itself which allows experts to accurately represent the problem and thereby constrain the problem space. Sherlock incorporates a series of 34 troubleshooting scenarios that are designed to foster these multiple types of expert knowledge. The scenarios are presented to students in an ordered sequence. This sequence was informed by the examination of novice weaknesses in the cognitive task analysis, and was designed to foster increasingly sophisticated models of the test equipment and the troubleshooting task.

Sherlock was evaluated in a controlled experiment at two Air Force F-15 flying wings (Nichols, Pokorny, Jones, and Alley, in preparation; Gott, 1989). A verbal troubleshooting test was used to identify 32 avionics technicians who had either beginning or intermediate troubleshooting skills (see Nichols, et al. for a complete description of the verbal troubleshooting task). The basis of their performance, subjects were ranked within testing site and matched pairs were established. One member of each matched pair was then randomly assigned to either the experimental or control group such that half the subjects at each testing site were assigned to each group. Subjects' scores on the verbal troubleshooting task provided a baseline measure against which performance gains could be measured post-experimentally. The pretest scores revealed no significant differences between groups in performance on either the verbal troubleshooting problems that were administered at both times or on a number of other indicators that were used to corroborate the equality of groups prior to the intervention (see Nichols, et al. for a complete description of these measures).

The experimental subjects received an average of 20 hours on Sherlock over the course of approximately three weeks while the control subjects continued their on-the-job training. Parallel forms of pretest measures were then readministered as posttests by researchers who were blind with respect to individual subjects' participation in either the experimental or control group. Figure 1 shows differences in pre- and posttest performance on the verbal troubleshooting task for the two groups. An independent sample t-test revealed no significant differences between pretest scores of 53.40 for the control group and 50.93 for the tutor group (t(30)=0.38, p>.5), two tailed. Posttest performance, however, differed significantly (F(1,29)=15.62, p<.01), with tutored subjects obtaining a mean score approximately 20 points higher than that of control subjects. In order to get some idea of what this performance gain translates to in terms of increased experience, a group of skilled airmen with an average of 114 months of experience in this career field was tested on the verbal troubleshooting task. Their mean score is plotted in the upper left-hand corner of Figure 1, and is quite similar to that of the tutored group who had an average of only 28 months of experience. When experimental and control subjects were retested 5 to 6 months after the experiment had been conducted, the tutor's effect persisted with tutored subjects achieving a mean score approximately 15 points higher than that of the control group. When compared with their immediate posttest performance, the slight performance decrement of the tutored group on the delayed posttest was not statistically significant.

The success of the Sherlock field test has resulted in high-level support for the BJS program from within Tactical Air Command which employs the maintenance personnel whose training Sherlock targets. In order to get the tutor into Air Force maintenance work places, Sher-
lock is currently undergoing a hardware and software conversion which will allow the system to be delivered on standard PC hardware that is available in maintenance work centers. This conversion is being carried out at the University of Pittsburgh Learning Research and Development Center by researchers responsible for the original development of Sherlock. In addition to the need for delivering Sherlock on standard Air Force hardware, decisions regarding Sherlock's conversion have been driven by three primary concerns: first, the instructional features that led to the tutor's success must be better understood and retained; secondly, the tutor's limitations must be explic- cated and reduced; and finally, the resultant tutor courseware must be maintainable by Air Force personnel.

INSTRUCTIONAL FEATURES OF THE AVIONICS TROUBLESHOOTING TUTOR: TROUBLESHOOTING PRACTICE IN A SIMULATED, SUPPORTED WORK ENVIRONMENT

The instructional features of Sherlock that appear to be responsible for the dramatic learning gains are associated with the simulated, supported practice environment that the tutor provides. Specifically, opportunities for realistic practice and feedback to foster the development of a mental model of an electronic test, menus that support the development of goal-oriented activity, and multiple levels of hints from Sherlock's coach are of particular interest.

One of Sherlock's most important instructional features is that it provides students with the opportunity to practice solving realistic troubleshooting problems in a simulated but supported work environment. Figure 2 shows the tutor display as it appears to the student upon presentation of a troubleshooting problem. The context of the problem is established by presentation to the student of a scenario that technicians might encounter on the job. The problem is thus presented in much the same way that a real problem would present itself in the shop. The work environment of the shop is also represented in the form of a simulated test station, a unit from the jet that is being tested (referred to as a line replaceable unit or LRU), and a test package connecting the LRU to the test station. The simulated dimensions of the equipment are precisely the external controls of test station drawers rather than their internal functional behavior. Front panels of test station drawers were graphically simulated to appear as similar to the real work environment as possible, and indicators and controls were functionally simulated to allow manipulation by the student for the purpose of performing tests and taking measurements. Within the test station, measurements are taken by selecting test points on schematic diagrams displayed on Sherlock's screen. Measurement values have been prespecified, however, and do not result from an underlying deep simulation of the device (i.e., test equipment and LRU).

In most of Sherlock's problems, as in the real shop environment, a corrective action or 'fix' called out by the technical orders for a failed test step rarely fixes the problem. It is at this point then that students must begin to think on their own and develop a plan for isolating the fault. This requires relating the failed test to a mental model of the system as it was presumed to be functioning at the time of the fail. This envisioning process involves representing components of the system that were active during the test, and the flow of information through these components. Figure 3 illustrates an abstract model of an electronic test which can be used to characterize any circuit path that the student might have to investigate. A stimulus signal is generated by one of the drawers in the test station, and sent to a routing device which routes the signal through the test package and the LRU. The LRU responds to the input signal and produces an output which is sent back to the test station and routed to a measurement device (Lesgold, Lajoie, and Eggan, 1983). In relating this abstraction to a particular test, the student is encouraged to identify the active circuit path for that test. The model of the test thus provides a structure for the organization of the student's declarative knowledge of the system and constrains the search for the fault.

The tutor is also directed at the development of goal structures for investigating the equipment, procedural knowledge of specific troubleshooting actions, and additional strategic knowledge required to inform decision making during problem solving (Sott, 1989). Sherlock's action menu, shown at the right-hand side of the display reproduced in Figure 2, allows students to choose which area of the equipment they want to investigate, and to select the procedures for doing so. Some of these menu selections have additional choices embedded within them representing further decisions that the technician must make in pursuing a particular solution path. The menus serve to structure the problem-solving process and facilitate the apprentice's development of a conceptual model of the task. Thus, for example, in testing an LRU that has come in from the flight line, the student must access the technical order that describes the test procedures for that particular LRU, set up the drawers as
instructed for each test on the LRU (e.g., wiring integrity tests, power short tests, resistance tests, etc.), and run and interpret each test. If a test fails, the technical order might call out a suggested fix for the fault, and the student is encouraged to try that fix before investigating other components as the cause of the failed test. Other procedural choices represented in Sherlock's action menus include selection of test points, selection of components to be replaced, swapping of suspected bad components, checking connections, etc. Sherlock thereby provides a simulated learning and practice environment so that technicians can exercise the skills they must use in the real work environment. Moreover, Sherlock embodies a coach or master technician to foster apprenticeship learning with feedback and general problem solving assistance.

Sherlock's coach offers external support in the form of hints that are provided when the student asks for help. The hints, like the action choices, are tied to the goal structure of fault isolation tasks, and vary according to type and level of explicitness. Hint type is related to the student's current troubleshooting activity and specifies, for example, where to take a measurement or how to interpret a measurement already taken. The explicitness of the hint is determined by the student who can access up to five levels of increasingly directive hints, from a simple recap of past plans and actions, to detailed information concerning how to perform the next suggested action. Unsolicited intervention from the coach can also occur under certain circumstances, for example if the student fails to turn off a hazardous voltage prior to extending a circuit card, or investigates a piece of equipment that was not being used when the test failed. Sherlock's hints are thus adaptive in the sense that hints received are dependent on the individual student's activity at the time the hint is accessed, and the desired level of assistance as indicated by the specificity of the hint requested.

Sherlock's instructional limitations result primarily from the fact that the tutor's curriculum is to a large extent prespecified. The problems presented to students and their sequence is the same for all students, regardless of their individual strengths and weaknesses. Although the tutor evaluates students' problem solutions and highlights their strengths and weaknesses in post-problem feedback, this diagnostic capability is not exploited to provide problems that are particularly adapted to the individual student's current level of skill. This lack of adaptiveness exists because the tutor does not possess the capability of generating new problems on-line in the course of tutoring. Further, on-line diagnosis of students' troubleshooting is not robust enough to determine the appropriate type and level of hint to provide when a student asks for help. While the presentation of hints is adaptive in the sense described earlier, the hints themselves have been prespecified and the principles that determine hint content and guide Sherlock's decisions to intervene are not yet clearly established. In the next version of the tutor, simulation will be deeper in the sense that a set of circuits will be functionally simulated and the electronic tests performed on these circuits will be modelled. This simulation will provide the basis for improved student modelling and diagnosis, on-line problem generation, and more principled explanations and student feedback (see following section for a more complete discussion of how these improvements will be implemented).

THE AVIONICS TROUBLESHOOTING TUTOR II

The next generation of Sherlock is presently under development, with the concerns described above providing the foci for the effort. The goals include delivery of instruction on accessible, cost-effective hardware, simplification of tutor development and maintenance by Air Force personnel, and increased student diagnosis and on-line problem generation capability.

Sherlock was originally implemented in the Xerox Lisp environment in order to take advantage of its large memory capacity and superior graphics capabilities. The idea was to first test the validity of the cognitive models and theory underlying Sherlock's design utilizing optimal computer hardware. Now that the theoretical and empirical bases of Sherlock have been tested and evaluated, we must consider ways of delivering the tutor on a scaled-down system without sacrificing essential performance characteristics of more powerful machines. The basic configuration of the Avionics Troubleshooting Tutor II is depicted in Figure 4. The system consists of an 80386-based PC with one MB of internal memory and two to three MB of expansion memory. The PC is connected, via an RS-232 cable, to a video disc player which stores video images to be displayed on a 20-inch multiscan, high-resolution monitor. The PC is equipped with VDA graphics and a superimposer board for overlaying computer graphics on video images.

The use of video in displaying the work environment provides several advantages over computer graphics. First, by using
video images of the real test equipment, Sherlock's feature of providing a realistic work environment is retained, and in fact, enhanced with the addition of actual physical equipment. Figure 5 shows the front panel of one of the test station drawers in the original Sherlock. The time required to develop such detailed graphics and all possible configurations of each front panel, not to mention their storage requirements, signified a significant investment of resources to achieve work environment realism in Sherlock I. That investment will be significantly reduced via the use of video in Sherlock II. In that version of the tutor, computer graphics will be used almost exclusively in the menus, with a resultant savings in development time and storage. Second, because the Air Force maintenance community currently uses interactive video in developing (and delivering) its maintenance training, instructional designers who will ultimately maintain the tutor are already familiar with the technology.

The converted tutor is being developed in the Smalltalk V280 software environment which will allow significant savings in development time and facilitate the implementation of more adaptive instruction in the form of online testing and problem generation. Recall that the converted tutor will employ simulated circuits. The object-oriented environment provided by Smalltalk was chosen since it implements sophisticated class structures with asynchronous messaging between objects, thereby allowing for the simulation of complex systems. The environment also reduces development time because the object class structure defined by the programmer determines the properties of objects within a class and the operations that can be applied to them. Put another way, objects inherit the properties and operations of their class, which are defined only once for the entire class rather than for each object within the class. The reduction in development time thus results from the ability to, in effect, use a given piece of code for multiple purposes.

The implementation of a class structure is illustrated by the simulated circuits being developed for Sherlock II, and the electronic tests which operate on the circuit. Each instance of a test involves four elements: a signal source, an LRU (the unit being tested), a measurement device, and a circuit path. Although different tests may use different circuit paths, stimulus sources, etc., all instances of each element have certain behaviors in common. For instance, a broken wire in any circuit path will, in general, cause an ohms measurement to indicate infinite resistance. If, in a particular circuit, the wire was shorted to another wire, the reading might be different. It is only under unusual types of conditions that additional code must be written to override the behavior that defines circuits in general. Thus, rather than coding each circuit to be used in the tests independently, all circuits will share code that defines their common behaviors. This ability to capture the general properties of objects will provide the basis for rule-based problem generation and hint generation in Sherlock II. Given that problems and hints can be created by rule, then they can be generated during the course of the tutoring session in a way that is responsive to the individual's troubleshooting strengths and weaknesses, thus providing more adaptive instruction.

The object-oriented programming environment also promotes maintainability of the tutor because it allows itself to modularization. Modular code makes the structure of the program clearer, thus facilitating modifications by programmers who were not involved in the tutor's original development. Modules that do not require modification for new versions of the tutor or for other tutors being developed for different maintenance job specialties can also be easily transported. The BJS Program is currently conducting a training needs assessment to determine the type of programming expertise required for maintenance of intelligent tutors developed in the object-oriented language so that this task can be performed by Air Force personnel.

CONCLUSIONS

In addressing the needs of the Air Force maintenance community, the Basic Job Skills Program has benefitted from methodological and theoretical advances in cognitive science. These benefits are reflected in, for instance, the cognitive task analysis procedure which was used to inform Sherlock's design (Gott, 1987) and the increasingly comprehensive models of troubleshooting performance that the results of these analyses yield. To the extent that the cognitive approach to Sherlock's design contributed to the tutor's effectiveness, then an important future goal for the BJS Program will be to make this technology available to nonscientists in the Air Force who are responsible for instructional design and maintenance of educational courseware. Steps toward this goal include the development of maintainable software that is compatible with standard hardware, and the attempt to gain a better understanding of the instructional approach required in teaching a complex skill like troubleshooting.
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