

PERCEIVED FACTORS RELATING TO PARTICIPATION  
OR NON-PARTICIPATION IN OFF-DUTY EDUCATION  
OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL AT  
TINKER AIR FORCE BASE,  
OKLAHOMA

By

LOLA PATTON KING

Bachelor of Arts in Education  
Langston University  
Langston, Oklahoma  
1969

Master of Education  
Central State University  
Edmond, Oklahoma  
1975

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
MAY, 1983

Thesis  
1983D  
K52p  
Cop. 2



PERCEIVED FACTORS RELATING TO PARTICIPATION  
OR NON-PARTICIPATION IN OFF-DUTY EDUCATION  
OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL AT  
TINKER AIR FORCE BASE,  
OKLAHOMA

Thesis Approved:

*Hayne B. James*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*John L. Beard*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Leroy L. Davis*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Ernest Ruggen*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*W. Jaynes*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Norman N. Durbin*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank numerous individuals who provided support and encouragement during this project. Dr. Wayne James, my dissertation adviser, gave generously of her time and expertise in providing constructive criticism and direction throughout this study. The other members of my doctoral committee, Dr. Jerry Davis, Dr. John Baird, Dr. Cecil Dugger and Dr. William Jaynes, all provided significant contributions and guidance from their professional backgrounds in the preparation of the final manuscript. Dr. Eric Jones was helpful with suggestions as he prepared the manuscript on the word processor. Mr. William Sappington, Education Services officer, Dr. Harvey Nye and Mr. Weldon Jackson, former Education Services Officers, all made significant contributions in the collection of historical information and data. A note of thanks is given to Mr. Troy Corder for his collaboration in the development of the questionnaire, portions of which were also used in his study. Most of all I would like to thank my children, Rhonda, Curtis, Roshiel and Carle, whose love, encouragement and understanding helped to sustain me during the process of this project.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Tinker Air Force Base - Historical Perspective . . . . .	2
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	4
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	5
Research Questions . . . . .	5
Scope . . . . .	5
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	6
Assumptions . . . . .	6
Definition of Terms . . . . .	7
Organization of the Study . . . . .	9
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	10
Introduction . . . . .	10
History of Off-Duty Education . . . . .	11
Army . . . . .	11
Navy . . . . .	12
Air Force . . . . .	14
The Mission, Goals, Objectives and Standards of The Air Force Education Services Program . . . . .	16
The History of Tinker Air Force Base Education Services Program . . . . .	19
Related Studies . . . . .	24
Why Adults Participate in Education . . . . .	24
Barriers to Participation . . . . .	30
Adult Counseling Concerns . . . . .	31
Summary . . . . .	35
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES . . . . .	37
The Selection of the Sample . . . . .	37
The Survey Instrument . . . . .	37
Data Collection . . . . .	38
Analyzing the Data . . . . .	39
IV. FINDINGS . . . . .	40
Response Rate . . . . .	40
Demographic Characteristics of Respondents . . . . .	42
Factors Relating to Participation or Non-Participation . . . . .	50
Discussion of Chi-Square . . . . .	65

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	69
Summary . . . . .	69
Conclusions . . . . .	71
Recommendations . . . . .	72
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	75
APPENDIX A - SURVEY INSTRUMENT . . . . .	78
APPENDIX B - PANEL OF EXPERTS . . . . .	84
APPENDIX C - ENDORSED COPY OF APPROVAL REQUEST . . . . .	86
APPENDIX D - COMMENTS REGARDING COUNSELORS BY PARTICIPANTS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS . . . . .	88

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Response Rate by Rank . . . . .	41
II. Frequencies and Percentages of Usable Respondents Classified by Demographic Characteristics . . . . .	43
III. Length of Time Respondents Assigned to Tinker AFB . . . . .	45
IV. Number of Years Respondents Expect to Remain in the Air Force . . . . .	45
V. Frequencies and Percentages of the Educational Background of Participants and Non-participants . . . . .	47
VI. Major Reason for Air Force Enlistment . . . . .	48
VII. Responses to Question Concerning Respondents' Temporary Schedule and Usual Work Schedule . . . . .	49
VIII. Frequency and Percentage of Previous Off-Duty Participation and Current Participation Status . . . . .	51
IX. Responses to Questions Concerning Non-participants' Frequency and Percentages of Last Time of Enrollment . . . . .	53
X. Frequency and Percentage of Current Participants' Program Goal . . . . .	53
XI. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Visiting Tinker Base Education Office . . . . .	54
XII. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Reasons for Visiting the Education Office . . . . .	56
XIII. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Reasons for Not Returning to the Base Education Office After Initial Visit . . . . .	58
XIV. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Reasons for Never Visiting the Education Office . . . . .	59

Table	Page
XV. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Reasons for Non-Participation . . . . .	60
XVI. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Reasons for Participation . . . . .	62
XVII. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Feelings About the Base Education Office Personnel . . .	64
XVIII. Participation Status and Perception of Education Services Center Personnel . . . . .	66
XIX. Participation Status and Temporary Duty Schedule . . . . .	66
XX. Chi Square Counseling Visits and Participation Status . . .	68



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The recognition of the need for military education dates back to George Washington's winter at Valley Forge, in 1778. Indications were that morale and military effectiveness were related to basic education (Bailey, 1979). However, "Washington's request for educational programs were first tabled and then forgotten" (Houle, 1947, p. 13). Although the need for education was recognized, no responsibility was assumed by the military until the end of World War I.

Since the end of World War I, military education programs have established broad objectives, expanded, and have generally come to be considered a benefit and need of the military services. In 1947, the Air Force became a separate military service, branching from the Army-Air Force. Educational programming continued to be accomplished as a joint effort until 1949 (Cox, 1981). From that time, the Air Force Education Program grew rapidly and is considered one of "the most visible and energetic among the four military services" (Bailey, 1979, p. 2).

The Air Force Education Services Program is designed to provide a wide range of educational opportunities to Air Force members. Utilizing the Education Program, Air Force members can develop their academic, professional, personal, and occupational capabilities from the basic skills level through the graduate level.

The Air Force Education Services Program mission is stated in terms of why the program is needed:

To provide Air Force personnel with opportunities for career long learning and means to develop the background essential to meeting the immediate and long range needs of the Air Force and of the nation (Air Force Regulation 213-1 1976, p. 1-1).

The program responsibilities are dispersed among three levels:

1. Headquarters United States Air Force -- support and guidance functions.
2. Major Command -- monitoring functions.
3. Installation or Base Level -- implementation functions (Hansen, 1979).

The Education Services Officer (ESO) is assigned the duty of direct program implementation and administration. Staff support is provided to the ESO in order to accomplish base level objectives. The staff usually consists of Education Guidance Counselors, Education Specialists, and Technicians or Aids. Support is also provided for clerical and testing functions by clerk typists and test proctors, respectively. The functions of the Education Services Center include counseling and advisement, enrolling, testing and test interpretation and miscellaneous related support functions (Hansen, 1979).

#### Tinker Air Force Base - Historical Perspective

Tinker Air Force Base (AFB) is one of five military installations within the Air Force Logistics Command (AFLC). Tinker AFB became an air depot January 15, 1942 (Tinker Take-Off, 1951). Tinker is one of Oklahoma's largest industries, employing approximately 22,000 civilians and military personnel (Knapp, 1983).

The forerunner of the Education Services Center, previously called the Information and Education Office, had been established prior to Tinker becoming an Air Force Base in order to provide educational opportunity to members of the Army-Air Force. By 1966, Tinker had "one of the most complete Education Centers in the Air Force, except the U. S. Air Force Academy" (Tinker Take-Off, 1966, p. 1). This thrust for education at Tinker was provided by Major General Melvin McNickle, who established a liasion with the educational community. He repeatedly verbalized to Oklahomans the need to fill "The Know How Gap", (Tinker Historical Office, 1968, p. 25) through a series of speeches and articles published in local community newspapers. In one article, McNickle stated:

The Defense Department is generous in providing special advanced and refresher courses for military and civilian employees alike, but few take advantage. Between January and March of this year 184 military personnel and 106 civilians started courses at Tinker. No civilians completed, 35 military completed (Tinker Historical Office, 1968, p. 25).

Since McNickle's tenure, the Air Force has not only continued to provide educational support, but has broadened the scope of its efforts. In spite of this, Tinker officials have continued to be concerned and have sought answers to the problems relating to high ratios of non-participation among enlisted personnel.

The Tinker Education Services Program was established to provide Air Force personnel with educational opportunities in support of mission requirements, member retention/procurement, and fulfillment of individual aspirations. The Air Force has established objectives and standards which are implemented at the local level. The Education Services Officer must therefore tailor the local program to the population peculiarities and needs as much as possible, but at the same

time, must meet or exceed Air Force standards.

Many factors impinge upon the participation rate. Known relating factors are taken into consideration at the planning stage. Tinker Base Education Officers, past and present, have attempted many innovative methods, ideas and programs in an effort to increase enlisted participation in off-duty programs. Although the participation has increased, it has not done so in proportion to the population increase (Sappington, 1982).

Educational opportunities have been one of the mainstays of the Air Force recruitment and retention program. According to the Tinker Education Officer, a high ratio of Tinker enlisted personnel state that they joined the Air Force in order to take advantage of available educational opportunities (Sappington, 1982). This trend is consistent with findings of the Air Force Laboratory studies. Two 1970 studies (cited in Barlow and Christensen, 1976), conducted by Mullins and others, concluded that educational opportunity was the reason most frequently given for Air Force enlistment. There was a total of 44,239 respondents in these two surveys.

It is necessary to determine how the needs of the target population can be more effectively met. One phase of this endeavor is to receive and analyze input from the target population in order that increased program viability can be accomplished.

#### Statement of the Problem

The problem with which this study dealt was a lack of information regarding factors Tinker Air Force Base enlisted personnel perceived to be barriers or motivators to their participation in off-duty education.

## Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine what factors enlisted personnel perceive as barriers or motivators to their participation in off-duty education. In essence, this involved determining how enlisted personnel perceived the feasibility of participation in available off-duty programs. The insight from their vantage point could be a vital link in future program development.

## Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What factors are related to participation status in off-duty education programs which will provide significant insight to administrators in programing efforts at Tinker AFB?
2. Is there a relationship between enlisted members' perception of the Education Services Center personnel and their participation status?
3. Is there a relationship between perceived personal encouragement/interest of supervisors or significant others and participation status?
4. Is there a pattern of relationship between counseling sessions and participation status.
5. Is there a pattern of relationship between temporary duty and and participation status?

## Scope

The scope of this study was:

1. The study dealt only with enlisted personnel assigned to

Tinker AFB at the time the study was conducted.

2. The study did not include enlisted personnel who had been assigned to Tinker AFB less than one year. First year members were eliminated because of the anticipated limitations imposed on these individuals by on-the-job training requirements which preclude off-duty participation.

3. The definition of off-duty programs restricted the study to those programs of a voluntary nature. Therefore, all educational activities in which participation was mandatory or which occurred during duty time were eliminated.

#### Limitations of the Study

The study was conducted under the following limitations:

1. The implications of this study may not be applicable to enlisted members assigned to other installations due to the unique mission of many Tinker Squadrons. The results, therefore, will be primarily of local value.
2. Limitations inherent in the questionnaire technique.
3. Ethnic and gender considerations were excluded from the study.

#### Assumptions

Assumptions underlying this research effort were:

1. Perceived factors reported by individuals in the sample population were valid indices of what they actually perceive.
2. Each respondent was capable of self-assessment in regard to factors which have impacted his off-duty education status.
3. There were enlisted members in the non-participation status

who were motivated to join the Air Force for educational purposes.

4. Not all enlisted personnel were interested in off-duty education.

5. Each respondent in the survey read and completed the survey instrument in a truthful and independent manner.

#### Definition of Terms

The following definitions apply throughout the study:

Air Depot - An installation established by the Air Force to repair aircraft or aircraft components.

Air Force Education Services Program - a program that provides academic and technical/occupational opportunities, as well as testing and counseling services to Air Force members.

Air Force Regulation 213-1 - the regulation which provides procedural guidance and directives regarding the administration and implementation of voluntary education programs.

Airmen or Airman - a term used synonymously with enlisted personnel in this study.

Base Education Office - synonym for Education Services Center.

Commander - "an officer in charge of a unit; a functional title not rank; anyone who commands and leads" (Cox, 1981, p. 8).

Commission - an official conferring of rank making one a commissioned officer in the United States Armed Forces. The rank thus granted by the President of the United States.

Education Services Center - the physical location which serves as the on-base focal point for voluntary educational activities provided for Air Force Personnel. This includes the personnel, funds and

facilities which support the educational opportunities and professional services provided by the Education Services Officer.

Education Services Officer - "the individual responsible for organizing, planning, directing, managing and arranging for education programs for military personnel on an Air Force Base or installation" (Cox, 1981, p. 9).

Education Specialist - a member of the Education Services staff who may have a wide range of duties, usually similar but not limited to those of the guidance counselor. The duties of the specialist are individualized as defined by the personal job description.

Enlisted Personnel/Enlisted Member - in this study these terms are used to refer to all members of the Air Force who are not Commissioned Officers. Rank for these persons range from E-1 to E-9.

Guidance Counselor - a person who is professionally qualified to provide educational and vocational guidance and counseling services to members of the Air Force. In the review of literature, this term is particularly delineated from the advisement function.

Off-duty Education Program/Voluntary Programs - off-duty participation includes those pursuits occurring when the individual is not primarily engaged in the performance of military duty. The definition is restricted to those programs in which participation is voluntary. This is opposed to directed or job related requirements occurring on duty time (Houle, 1947).

Rank - the official pay grade of an Air Force member. Promotions are based on a combination of factors such as; time in grade, speciality knowledge testing, time in service, decorations, and performance evaluations. There are nine grades within the enlisted



rank structure: Airman Basic (E-1), Airman (E-2), Airman First Class (E-3), Senior Airman (E-4), Staff-Sergeant (E-5), Technical Sergeant (E-6), Master Sergeant (E-7), Senior Master Sergeant (E-8), and Chief Master Sergeant (E-9). Direct supervision is decreased and responsibility increased as the enlisted member progresses within the rank structure (Tollison, 1983).

Temporary Duty (TDY) -temporary assignment or duty at a site or base other than the home base. Duration of TDY is usually one to 99 days.

### Organization of the Study

Chapter I introduces the study and presents the problem, the purpose of the study, the research questions, the scope and limitations of the study, and definition of terms. Chapter II is a review of related literature including the background of military off-duty programs, Tinker AFB program implementation, and studies in adult education relating to participation/nonparticipation, as well as adult counseling concerns. Chapter III explains the methodology and procedures utilized for the research in the study, including a description and selection of the subjects, creation of the survey instrument, and collection and analysis of the data. Chapter IV presents the findings of the study. Chapter V concludes the study with a summary, conclusions and implications for further research and practices in the Education Services Center at Tinker AFB.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### Introduction

The review of literature was conducted to determine what information was available to the researcher, either directly or indirectly related to participation or non-participation in off-duty voluntary education of enlisted personnel assigned to Tinker Air Force Base. In conducting the review, it was apparent that literature specifically focusing on the Air Force Education Services Programs was extremely limited. There is no literature available which relates directly to perceptions of the Tinker enlisted force as a group.

The literature related to this study is presented in five categories. The categories include:

1. The history, background and evolution of military off-duty education programs in general and the Air Force in particular.
2. Tinker Air Force Base program implementation milestones.
3. Studies in adult education which specifically relate to adult participation or non-participation.
4. The literature which focuses on adult student counseling and guidance.
5. The summary of the literature review.

## History of Off-Duty Education

### Army

The need for off-duty education was an outgrowth of a need for military education in general (Bailey, 1979). Until the latter part of World War I, only training related to duty or combat was considered a part of the Army's responsibility. During World War I, the Army had come to recognize the need for assuming responsibility for activities which affected morale. The Mobilization Regulations were written October 28, 1939, which defined morale in terms of physical welfare: food, leave, discipline, and recreation. This regulation was implemented in mid 1940, with little emphasis or impact.

In March 1941, the Army Morale Branch was categorized into four major divisions: Welfare and Recreation, Planning and Research, Public Relations, and Services. Education was provided by the Welfare and Recreation Division. By January 15, 1942, the Morale Branch changed its name to the Special Services Branch and established new services, due to new demands and interests. A broader program began to take shape. A non-military education program was worked out to include both long and short-term goals. The plan provided correspondence study and the materials and leadership for off-duty classes through the Army Institute at Madison, Wisconsin. The instruction was to be directly patterned from civilian institutions, based on freedom of choice and the initiative and interest of the student. Materials were adopted from civilian sources. By March 1944, the Morale Services Division of the Adjutant General had established its major activities and was directing the largest program of its type in history.

In August 1944, the Morale Services Division of the Adjutant General was changed to the Information and Education Division. Clearly defined duties at all levels were set forth, describing personnel to carry out these duties. The effort to define an operating philosophy continued. Three diverging concepts were combined to formulate a technical manual for Information and Education Officers in 1945. This manual set forth and described in detail the qualities an Information and Education Officer should possess (Houle, 1947).

Experimental studies were also being conducted by the Research Branch in conjunction with on-going programs. The long-range goal was to secure objective information on basic factors affecting soldier morale. Another goal was to study the motivation and reactions of soldiers. Experimental studies by the Research Branch indicated that soldiers learned more effectively information that they felt was of immediate and personal use (Houle, 1947). This finding was one of the major factors which reinforced the need for rapid expansion of the off-duty program.

Houle (1947) listed four major factors leading to the expansion of services of the Army Morale Branch:

- A. The intellectual qualities and interests of the new personnel brought into the Branch.
- B. The stimulus of public interest and criticism.
- C. Objective information on basic factors affecting soldier morale.
- D. The needs of the expanding Army as developed in the field and reported to Washington (p. 18).

### Navy

In February 1941, President Roosevelt directed the Army and Navy

to form the Joint Army and Navy Committee on Welfare and Recreation. The Navy remained inactive in programming efforts until May 1942. Participation in the Joint Committee meetings led to the Navy's preparation of a new program entitled Navy Voluntary Wartime Education. Five objectives of the program were announced on May 27, 1942:

1. Improvement in service personnel efficiency.
2. Supplementary skills training for Navy and civilian work.
3. War indoctrination.
4. Improved morale.
5. Preparation for civilian life (Houle, 1947).

The lack of programs and facilities had been a major morale problem. A Naval officer was sent to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba to establish programs there. The Guantanamo experiment was activated October 2, 1942, very successfully. An education center was established from a reclaimed, abandoned school. The first day of enrollment, 275 men requested enrollment.

The Guantanamo center set the pattern for the Naval program, establishing classroom instruction as its core. In August 1942, Navy personnel were granted the privilege to enroll in the Army Institute at Madison, Wisconsin. The interest and enthusiasm in these activities indicated a need for off-duty education which led the Navy to establish a coordination agency. On January 7, 1943, the War Education Section was created within the Training Division of Navy Personnel. The name was later changed to Education Services Section (Houle, 1947).

The overall goal of the Navy program was to offer opportunities for active duty personnel to continue their education, in service. These goals were to be accomplished by various means:

The educational function is to make available at high school, technical school and college levels three methods of study: (a) Voluntary classes in subjects of interest to personnel taught by volunteer instructors; (b) Correspondence courses available through enrollment in the United States Armed Forces Institute including courses from 85 cooperating colleges and universities; (c) Self-study through the local issuance of texts to interested individuals or by enrollment with the United States Armed Forces Institute. Fundamental to the educational aspect of the program are: (a) Counseling, directed toward assisting Naval personnel to formulate their educational and vocational plans and to undertake steps in attaining them; (b) Accreditation, . . . whereby Naval personnel are assisted in making application to civilian schools and agencies for credit for their military training and experience (Houle, 1947. p. 34).

The expansion of the Navy program had further strengthened the foundation laid by Army programs. It also had added the foundation stones of counseling, accreditation and testing (Houle, 1947).

### Air Force

The origin of the Air Force dates back to August 1, 1907, when the Chief Signal Officer of the U. S. Army established the Aeronautical Division. However, it was not until July, 1947 that it came into being as a separate service, with the passage of the National Security Act (MacCloskey, 1965). The Air Force continued to offer its education programs as a joint effort with the Army until 1949 (Cox, 1981).

Cox (1981) notes that the greatest growth of Air Force Education Programs occurred during the 1960's. Central to this expansion was on-base course offerings to the extent that undergraduate degree completion became feasible. Cox (1981) states that the University of Maryland is considered the pioneer in on-base offerings, having begun programs in 1947. Cox (1981) estimates that approximately 6500 civilian institutions offer instruction on or near military installations. These programs range from remedial offerings through

graduate programs. Also included are vocational and commissioning program preparation.

"The United States Air Force has always prided itself on the quality of its enlisted force" (Gill, 1973, p.205). In order to recruit and maintain the quality of the enlisted force, the Air Force has established an intricate network of various programs to meet the needs of the airman at his level and assist progress to his desired goal. The responsibility for these programming efforts is spread among three major levels:

1. Headquarters United States Air Force (USAF).
2. Major Air Force Command.
3. Base level.

The broadest responsibility is vested at the USAF level.

According to Cox (1981):

The responsibility of Headquarters USAF is to (1) obtain necessary legislation, (2) implement Department of Defense (DOD) policy, (3) preparation of basic directives, (4) reviewing financial plans, (5) specifying priority for program accomplishments, (6) identifying particular programs for emphasis, (7) visiting field activities, (8) holding conferences, and (9) resolving programs of Air Force-wide significance (p. 19).

The United States Air Force is organized on a functional basis into ten major commands. Each major command has an established headquarters, with an assigned Education Officer. All directives, policies and plans flowing from Headquarters USAF are filtered through the command level, to the base level functions. The primary function of the command level is to insure the adequacy of educational opportunities for all organizations in the command (Hansen, 1979).

Cox (1981, p. 20) states that "the installation or base level is of key importance in that the Air Force objectives are to be

implemented at this level." The education officer is directly responsible for implementation according to Hansen (1979):

He or she has the primary responsibility for conducting an effective program for all eligible personnel of the area. He or she must determine their needs and furnish them an opportunity to satisfy their needs (p. 5).

### The Mission, Goals, Objectives and Standards of The Air Force Education Services Program

The mission of the Air Force Education Services Program was translated from the Department of Defense education objectives, and is stated in terms of why the program is needed:

To provide Air Force personnel with opportunities for career-long learning and the means to develop the background essential to meeting the immediate and long-range needs of the Air Force and the Nation (Air Force Regulation 213-1, 1976, p. 1-1).

Although the mission statement is only one brief sentence, it provides the basis for broad and varied education opportunities. The mission statement has been translated into educational goals, some directed toward airmen, some directed toward officers and others toward both. Only those directed toward the enlisted force off-duty voluntary program will be listed here:

1. Each enlisted member should have completed high school (received a high school diploma or equivalent certification from a civilian jurisdiction) by the end of the the first enlistment. Individuals who achieve qualifying applicable scores on the high school General Educational Development tests should be counseled and assisted to obtain diplomas or civilian certificates of equalivalency. Further, all enlisted members, especially noncommissioned officers, are encouraged to pursue post-secondary education compatible with their academic qualifications, Air Force specialities, and career objectives. Such education should be with regionally accredited institutions. . . .Opportunities to begin and complete post-secondary certificate, associate, and baccalaureate programs should be available to all enlisted personnel.



Graduate programs also should be available to enlisted personnel who hold baccalaureate degrees.

2. Programs also should be available to meet specific Air Force requirements for undergraduate and graduate education in fields which are feasible through part-time study.

3. In geographical areas where English is not the primary language, instruction in the locally applicable language(s), should be made available and the achievement of basic competence should be encouraged.

4. Without regard to formal educational level, programs must be provided for personnel to meet the academic prerequisites for commissioning programs.

5. Members of the Air Force must be able to acquire the knowledge, insight, vision, and self-confidence to understand and defend the principles of American democracy and to contribute effectively to national, manpower and economic needs, both military and civilian (Air Force Regulation 213-1, 1976, p. 1-1).

Educational objectives of the Air Force program were established in support of the Human Goals of the Department of Defense to assist the individual to:

1. Perform military jobs more effectively.
2. Prepare for positions of high military responsibility.
3. Qualify for advanced military training and educational programs.
4. Adjust to productive postservice careers.
5. Fulfill individual aspirations and enhance individual capabilities (Air Force Regulation 213-1, 1976, p. 1-1).

In addition to educational goals, program objectives with companion standards have been established to provide functional guidelines. The standard provides the minimum acceptable operational level for each objective at major installations. Air Force Regulation 213-1 (1976) reflects the following objectives and standards:

1. Objective: Provide voluntary educational opportunities to at least the masters level in support of procurement, retention, and career-long individual growth.

- Standard: a. At least two masters degree programs, feasible for the part-time student, available to personnel at each major base having normal tour of 2 years or longer; at least one program conducted fully on-base; at least one (on-base or off-base) in the business/management/administration area or in scientific/technological/engineering field.
- b. For personnel at short-tour major bases, the availability of graduate level courses.

2. Objective: Provide technical/occupational program offerings in support of enlisted personnel procurement efforts under the all-volunteer concept.

Standard: The availability of feasible on-base voluntary programs leading to certificate and/or associate degrees in technical/occupational fields at all major bases.

3. Objective: Provide voluntary opportunities at the associate and baccalaureate level in support of procurement, retention, and career-long growth of enlisted members.

- Standard: a. Associate and baccalaureate programs conducted at each major installation. At least one in each category conducted fully on-base.
- b. Coverage of collegiate mathematics adequate to assure the opportunity to enroll, at least once per year in a course in the differential calculus. The on-base mathematics sequence satisfies prerequisites; the calculus course conducted on-base unless conveniently available in the local community.
- c. Laboratory physics or chemistry courses at least once per year (either on-base or off-base if available in the local community).
- d. The overall undergraduate curriculum covers all courses needed to meet the general education component of CCAF degrees.

4. Objective: Provide secondary educational programs which will provide opportunities for completion of the high school level by the end of the first enlistment.

Standards: The availability of feasible programs leading to the high school level at all major installations where there are enough clients to support courses. Where there are not

adequate numbers of support on-base courses, off-base community resources should be utilized.

5. Objective: Provide voluntary postsecondary educational opportunities or personnel at small and geographically separated units in support of personnel procurement, retention, and career-long, growth.

Standard: On-site instructional programs, DANTES testing, and access to counseling for personnel at each Air Force station with military strength between 80 and 1000 (p. 1-11).

### The History of Tinker Air Force Base Education Services Program

The Office of Information and Education provided the focal point for early program efforts at Tinker. The group study courses available through the United States Armed Forces Institute were coordinated by the Information and Education Office. Unlike other Air Force programs that "provided mere group study programs and correspondence courses" (Cox, 1981, p. 15), Tinker officials established a working liaison with the local educational community and established night courses especially for base personnel. Many of these programs were offered at nearby high schools: "Voc Tech courses offered at Central High at the request of veterans . . ." (Tinker Take-Off, 1947, p. 7), "30 Oklahoma University courses offered at Midwest City High for Tinker personnel . . ." (Tinker Take-Off, 1952, p. 2).

According to Cox (1981), the 1960's brought a period of rapid growth in Air Force education programs. The literature indicates that the efforts at Tinker also experienced growth and expansion in this time period. A major thrust was provided to program efforts during the

tenure of General McNickle. Although his major focus was toward technical training, many of his speeches and newspaper articles addressed education in general. McNickle urged Tinker employees to increase participation in available programs and petitioned education officials to provide greater educational accessibility (Tinker Historical Office, 1968).

By 1966, "Tinker's Education . . . had laid claim to having one of the most complete Education Centers anywhere in the Air Force, except the U. S. Air Force Academy" (Tinker Take-Off, 1966, p. 1). The program efforts during this time consisted of civilian courses provided by off-campus divisions, the United States Armed Forces Institute, Extension Course Institute, and General Educational Development testing (Tinker Take-Off, 1966).

In 1971, another stimulation for programming efforts was the establishment of a requirement to employ professional guidance counselors at all major Air Force installations. Jackson (1982) states:

The counselors were a real boom to the success of the program. They brought into the educational process many Air Force members who previously would not have become involved in any schooling effort (n.p.).

Before counselors were employed, information regarding available programs was provided by the Information and Education Officer, assisted by an Air Force Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO) or Civilian Education Technician.

The counselors did individual work with Air Force members, giving tests, reviewing academic histories and counseling on available opportunities. During this period regional workshops were held to provide military counselors and Education Officers the opportunity to

compare notes and discuss problems peculiar to the Air Force program. Command level conferences were also presented to provide training to the new counselors. Staff members from the United States Armed Forces Institute at Madison, Wisconsin provided Tinker counselors a four-day testing workshop during the Fall of 1972 (Jackson, 1982).

Additional impetus was provided to Tinker efforts with the founding of Oscar Rose Junior College in Midwest City, Oklahoma, one mile from the Base. The first enrollments were accepted for the term beginning September 20, 1970. Oscar Rose provided freshman and sophomore level courses at the rate of \$7.75 per credit hour. In 1972, Oscar Rose officials designed eight-week semesters primarily due to "military personnel needs to complete courses in a shorter length of time because of their constant moving" (Tinker Take-Off, 1973a, p. 26).

Another major impetus for program expansion was provided by the establishment of the Community College of the Air Force (CCAF) in April, 1972, at Randolph Air Force Base, Texas. The primary goal of CCAF was "to orchestrate the vocational and academic training of enlisted personnel toward attaining an associate degree" (Earle, 1977, p. 2). The CCAF program was designed to serve as an incentive for personnel to supplement their Air Force Vocational Training with off-duty education, offered in the local area, by civilian institutions.

The incentive was provided by obtaining accreditation for technical training which the individual was required to take for his/her Air Force Career speciality. Additionally, CCAF permitted an easy method of equating Air Force training into civilian education terms.

The advent of CCAF overcame one factor which had been a primary barrier to associate degree completion, the mobility and transfer factor. It enabled the enlisted person to record his/her training and progress with one institution, regardless of his/her place of assignment (Earle, 1977).

According to Jackson (1982) the Predischarge and Education Program (PREP) was also a milestone in Tinker's programming efforts. The PREP program was initiated as a part of the Veterans Benefits Amendments of 1970. It was designed to help educationally disadvantaged service persons who had served more than 180 days of active duty to continue their education. Gill (1973) states that the program was aimed at two groups:

those who are educationally disadvantaged at less than the high school level, and those who may hold high school diplomas and yet not be ready for a college classroom or technical/occupational programs at the postsecondary level (p. 205).

PREP was implemented at Tinker in September, 1972, to provide high school diploma courses and those of a remedial/refresher nature. Initially 76 students were enrolled, with a total enrollment of 262 students the first year (Tinker Take-Off, 1973b). According to Jackson (1982), during the tenure of the program many Tinker enlisted members initiated voluntary off-duty courses after developing more self-confidence and motivation through PREP enrollment. The program had the advantage of being personalized on a one-to-one basis. PREP was discontinued in 1977 due to veterans' benefits changes.

In the Spring of 1974, "the innovative approach to bring higher education to Tinker personnel through Talkback Television" (Tinker Take-Off, 1974, p. 2) was completed and in place. The system was adopted primarily to bring off-duty education to military personnel,

but was also made available to civilian employees and military dependents. In conjunction with the establishment of the Talkback Television System, Central State University established "a new type degree entitled 'B.S. Degree in General Studies', specifically designed for military personnel" (Tinker Take-Off, 1974, p. 2).

During the same time frame, a three-year effort by Oklahoma City Southwestern College was culminated with the beginning of the External Directed Studies Program. The program had one main difference from correspondence schools in that it provided cassette tape recordings of lectures for audio reinforcement. The students were also provided blank cassettes to record any questions or discussion they desired to mail back to the professor. Most of the program participants were military personnel and prison inmates (Oklahoma City Times, 1974).

During the later 1970's, additional options were provided to Tinker's Educational programs through technical and non-technical offerings by Oklahoma State University and Central State University. Freshman and sophomore level noontime "brown bag" classes were offered on base by Oscar Rose Junior College.

The later 1970 thrust was also given momentum by the establishment of on-base college representatives. Each college desirous of establishing an on-base representative was provided office space and telephone service. The school provided, at its own expense, a suitable representative. Oklahoma State University was the first to provide on-base representation. Later Oscar Rose Junior College established an on-base, part-time office as did Central State University and the University of Oklahoma (Jackson, 1982).

As of this writing, courses leading to the associate degree are

offered in both the noontime and evening format by Oscar Rose Junior College. Upper level undergraduate courses are offered by Central State University and Oklahoma State University. Graduate courses are offered by the University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University and Central State University. Courses at all levels are available via Talkback Television.

Preparation for the General Educational Development testing program is provided on base through the Moore Public Schools. English-as-a-Second-Language is also provided by Moore Public Schools in evening hours (Sappington, 1982).

#### Related Studies

##### Why Adults Participate in Education

A classic study of why adults engage in learning was conducted by Houle in the 1950's, focusing on continuing learners. Houle examined 22 learners through in-depth interviews in an attempt to find out why they engaged in continuing learning. The study omitted faculty and degree students.

The study reflected that there were three types of adult learners who could be viewed as overlapping circles, yet constituting fairly distinct types:

1. Goal Oriented - seeks education for fairly clear cut objectives.
2. Activity Oriented - seeks educational activity for reasons having no connection with the stated purpose of the class or educational activity.
3. Learning Oriented - seeks learning for the sake of the



knowledge itself (Houle, 1961).

Houle's study, conducted at the University of Chicago, was extended by Tough at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. According to Knowles (1978, p. 45), "Tough's investigation was concerned not only with what and why adults learn, but how they learn and what help they obtain for learning". Tough found that most adults are continually involved in some type of learning project, mostly on their own. Tough (1978) defined a learning project as:

a highly deliberate effort to gain and retain certain definite knowledge and skill, or to change in some other way. To be included, a series of related learning sessions (episodes in which the person's intention was to learn) must all add up to at least seven hours (p. 250).

Some conclusions of the Tough (1978) study were:

1. Approximately 90 percent of adults engage in at least one major learning project per year.
2. Twenty percent of the learning projects are professionally planned, 80 percent by amateurs --73 percent by learners, 3 percent by friends or 4 percent by a peer group.
3. The most common motivation is application or use of knowledge.
4. The least common motivation is learning for certificate or degree.
5. Males, professionals and highly educated persons tend to need more help with their projects.
6. Blacks tend to be more involved in formal pursuits whereas whites tend toward self-planned learning.
7. Demographic variables did not account for much difference between the learning oriented and the non-learner (pp. 252-261).

In January 1962, a landmark study, focusing on the nature of the educational pursuits of American adults, was conducted by Johnstone and Rivera (1965). The investigation centered around four phases of inquiry:

1. The nature and scope of the adults' participation in formal and informal educational pursuits.

2. Assessment of attitudes and opinions held by adults concerning education. This phase investigated what adults have in mind when they enroll and the impact of adult education on their life.

3. This phase sought to understand the range of programs available to adults, the types of institutions and the public's awareness and attitude about these facilities.

4. The fourth phase of the study was directed toward young adults 17-24 years, to trace their educational and occupational experiences immediately after termination of regular school.

The study was conducted using a national sampling through the personal interview method. Johnstone and Rivera (1965) estimated that 25 million (more than one person in five) had been involved with learning. The results indicated that "the major emphasis in adult learning is on the practical rather than the academic; on the applied rather than the theoretical; and on skills rather than on knowledge or information" (Johnstone and Rivera, 1965, p. 3).

Adults, overall, seemed to prefer formal methods of study, although the lower income persons were more reluctant to expose themselves to formal learning situations. No differences were found in preferred methods of study for men and women.

Three major factors emerged from the Johnstone and Rivera (1965) study which distinguished participants from non-participants: (1) age, (2) the amount of prior schooling, and (3) where they lived. The participant was better educated than the adult population average, and more likely to be white collar, residing in an urban or suburban area

with a higher income than the non-participant.

A majority of participants listed an occupational reason for their first enrollment, which usually occurred quite early in adult life. A high correlation was found to exist between length of formal schooling and knowledge about available educational facilities. The most frequent barriers to participation were perceived to be financial (43 percent), time (39 percent) and lack of energy at the end of the day (37 percent).

The results also indicated that when educational facilities are abundant and accessible more adults use them. This utilization, however, tends to be limited to that group of adults with previously developed readiness to engage in formal learning (Johnstone and Rivera, 1965).

Johnstone and Rivera (1965) summarized the findings thus:

By far the most persistent finding in our investigation was that formal educational attainment plays a highly crucial role in determining whether or not one enters the ranks of adult students. Better educated adults were found not only to be more active in learning pursuits, but also to be more interested in learning per se, more ready to turn to formal instruction to satisfy interests and much more knowledgeable about the existence of resources for continuing education . . . Most people who turn to adult education have at least average, and in most cases, above-average educational credentials. Because it is much more than remedial education, adult learning in America today can be better characterized as "continuing education"--in the sense of applying systematic learning process to the particular demands and interests of adult life rather than in the sense of extending a formal education (p. 21).

Research and synthesis efforts by Cross (1981) provided several points of view related to the issue. From her review of the literature, Cross (1981) concluded that "research studies seem to cluster themselves into three definitions of adult learners" (p. 52)

which creates a problem of synthesizing the data into a meaningful whole. She therefore separated adult learners according to the type of learning activity undertaken, along with the participation rate for each: (1) organized learning (one third of all adults), (2) self-directed learning (includes almost everyone), and (3) adults pursuing formal credit learning (less than ten percent).

Cross (1981) states that the finding of Johnstone and Rivera regarding the socioeconomic elitism of adult education is as true today as it was 15 years ago. Results of the 1978 census indicated a 12 percent adult education participation rate overall. Cross (1981) therefore concludes, "any group with a participation rate below that can be considered underrepresented" (p. 53). According to that definition the following groups are listed as underrepresented in organized learning activities today: "the elderly, blacks, non-high school graduates, persons with income under \$10,000" (Cross, 1981, p. 54).

Referencing several earlier studies, which have been consistently replicated, Cross (1981) suggests:

The initial barrier to adult education for the poorly educated is lack of interest . . . Frank Riessman, who has worked extensively with cultural deprivation . . . is convinced that education is perceived differently by the poorly educated: There is practically no interest in knowledge for its own sake; quite the contrary, a pragmatic antiintellectualism prevails. Nor is education seen as an opportunity for development of self-expression, growth and the like. The average deprived person is interested in education in terms of how useful and practical it can be to him (pp. 55-56).

Studies reviewed and cited in Cross (1981) (Armstrong, Coolican, Hiemstra, and Penland) indicate that while self-directed learning does reduce the social class bias, it is not eliminated. Hiemstra's study

found that nonwhites averaged 256 hours per year on learning projects versus 325 hours for whites; 397 hours for those with above high school levels versus 262 hours for higher school or less. Hiemstra also found that completion rate to be highest among the better educated. He identified the non-learners who were mostly the poorly educated, low income or elderly. Coolican and Penland reported similiar findings (Cross, 1981).

The study by Armstrong explored learning prone personalities (Cross, 1981). Cross states that Armstrong's study is unique and important because it attempts to answer the question of who participates in adult learning by looking at personality characteristics and attitudes. Armstrong compared "low learners" (those who averaged 100 hours of independent learning projects during the previous year) with "high learners" (those who averaged 1,121 hours of independent learning during the previous year). The research indicated:

Although there were no differences between the two groups in the nature and extent of learning undertaken for the purpose of gaining academic credit, the independent learning projects initiated by the two groups were quite different, Armstrong describes high-learner projects as enduring over a long period of time, motivated by high-level psychological needs, inner-directed, systematically planned, and generally related to the learner's self-concept; low-learning adult noncredit projects usually were stimulated by crisis or chance, poorly planned, designed to fulfill low-level needs and unrelated to the learner's self-concept . . . . High learners saw themselves as reliable, tenacious; independent, with broad interests, high achievement motivation, and openness to new experience. Low learners perceived themselves as warm and friendly, masculine, conformist, and either complacently satisfied with or angrily resigned to their current life situation (p. 66).

Cross (1981) states that Armstong's study is important because it seeks to answer who participates in adult learning by looking at

personality characteristics and attitudes: "few studies. . . have done that" (p.66).

Cross (1981) indicates that few generalizations can be made about the adult degree-seeking student other than to describe these adults as "serious, upward mobile people from working class background" (p. 68). These individuals are usually highly motivated, stable, successfully employed, self-confident individuals who know what they want out of college.

The nontraditional degree student has been studied frequently with reasonably consistent descriptions. This group is older (median age 36), mostly men (71 percent) and are usually professional, semi-professional or technically employed (54 percent). Eighty-two percent had previous college with 27 percent possessing college degrees. Primary reasons for lack of earlier academic advancement were indicated: (1) family responsibility, (2) unclear educational goals, and (3) military service. Primary considerations for external degree programs were ability to maintain work schedules and recognition of previous college work (Cross, 1981).

Cross (1981) summarizes a picture of the adult learning force as a pyramid. The self-directed learner is the base, those who participate in some type of organized instruction the mid-level, and the degree-seeking student the tip.

### Barriers to Participation

Barriers to educational participation have been classified by Cross (1981) into three basic types: (1) Situational barriers are those which preclude participation due to life circumstances. Examples

are financial, time or location. (2) Institutional barriers are requirements by the school or institutions which discourage participation. Examples are scheduling, entry requirements or unsuitable curriculum. (3) Dispositional barriers are learner internalized, related to self-concept and attitudes about learning. Examples are negative educational perceptions, low interest levels or age.

Cross (1981) has developed a conceptual framework which is useful in identifying variables and their interrelationships. The model has been entitled the chain-of-response model. The idea is advanced that participation or non-participation does not result from a single event or act, rather from a chain of responses. Each response is based on the individual's self-evaluation of his position within his environment.

#### Adult Counseling Concerns

Goldberg (1980) states that there has been an increase of approximately 20 percent in the participation of adults in education. George C. Mann, (cited by Axford 1980) former Chief of Adult Education for the state of California, has estimated from his surveys that 75 percent of the adult enrollees need and want counseling and guidance of some kind. From Goldberg's (1980) comprehensive review of literature, she concluded that despite the growing demands for counseling services to meet the needs of this new population, there has not been a corresponding increase in research and scholarship directed to the counseling of adult learners.

The body of knowledge is expanding which demonstrates that the

adult is a unique learner. Education is evolving from its historical pedagogy-based applications. Yet the related service of counseling these students seems to be lagging sorely behind. The literature indicates that the adult student is still counseled as though he were only a tall child. Farmer (1971) cites Zahn's statements on this issue:

Adults are not merely tall children. They differ from the young in many ways that influence their learning. They have different characteristics, different learning histories, reaction speeds, attitudes, values, interests, motivations and personality. Therefore, those who are trying to help adults learn must be aware of these differences and adjust teaching and the learning environment accordingly (p. 18).

Several definitions of an adult and adult counseling have been offered. This author utilized the working definitions developed by a participant group at a conference "The Training of Counselors of Adults" held at Chatham, Massachusetts, May 1965:

Counseling is a systematic exploration of self and/or environment by a client with the aid of a counselor to clarify self-understanding and/or environmental alternatives so that behavior modifications or decisions are made on the basis of greater cognitive and affective understanding (Farmer, 1971, p.22).

Kaback, (cited in Farmer, 1981) in commenting upon this definition states:

This definition assumes that the adult is sufficiently independent and responsible for himself and perhaps for others, to be able to develop a plan of action during the counseling process that can be actualized without the mitigating influences of those who feel themselves responsible for his welfare and adjustment (p. 22).

The literature indicates a general agreement that the need for adult student counseling exists. Goldberg (1980) cites results of several studies, conferences, surveys and conventions as verification that this need and its implications exist. Additionally all literature reviewed



by this author indicated an unsatisfied need for adequate adult counseling.

One of the common misconceptions that seems to prevade the counseling arena is that of the counselor's role and limitations. Counseling and advisement are often considered synonymous; however, such is not the case. Farmer (1967) provided the following role dichotomy:

Advising calls for a different role than counseling and creates a different learning situation for the student. A counselor is an advisor when he provides suggestions, directions or information. Whereas in counseling, behavior change is achieved primarily through insight and self-recognition, rather than the acquisition of new knowledge (p. 41).

The advising function is more commonly accommodated within the educational setting, than is true counseling. Broadly this includes providing information concerning institutional requirements or other administrative functions. According to Farmer (1971), the advising function is not sufficient to support and sustain the adult student, with the multidimensional demands and roles interfacing with his studies. Many of the various roles assumed by the adult overlap, interact and subsequently impact the learning and progress of the adult as a student. Knowles (1978) conceptualized one of the chief distinctions between the adult and the adolescent as that of role, ranging from dependency on one extreme to independence on the other.

Adulthood has traditionally been viewed as a period of stability, security, maturity and certainty. Only recently has adulthood been viewed as unfolding in stages which involve confusion, conflict and crises, indicated in such works as Passages (Sheehy, 1981), Working (Terkel, 1975), and The Seasons of a Mans' Life (Levinson, 1978).

Schlossberg and Entine (1977) state that many adults feel inadequate in coping with these conflicts, yet a feeling of ambivalence prevails regarding seeking help, because the stigma that only the immature need help to sort out their problems still exists. If the adult does risk seeking help and meets with a child-trained counselor, alienation could result. Jackard (cited in Goldberg, 1980) points out that what is successful for the full-time traditional student is not necessarily successful for the adult. In counseling, the adult must be able to confront, internalize, and deal with the inevitabilities and impact of role transformation, self-concept, values, abilities, his time perspective, potentialities and his subsequent adjustment to these (Schlossberg and Entine, 1977).

Schlossberg and Entine (1977) relate how the inadequacy of the pedagogy-based model was forcefully demonstrated during a workshop session:

During one of the demonstration sessions, a graduate student whose experience was limited to counseling elementary school students and to a few courses in adolescent psychology modeled an interview with a 45-year-old man who was trying to decide whether or not to apply to graduate school. The graduate student conducted the session as if the client were a 17 year-old-trying to decide whether to enter college; for instance he seemed unaware that the 45-year-old man might feel some discomfort over age deviancy. His counseling skills and his knowledge ability about childhood and adolescence were not enough to make him an effective counselor of adults. If this counselor had possessed a knowledge of the decision-making process, an understanding of adult development and an awareness of his own age bias, he would have been able to help his client (pp. 81-82).

Many adults have increasingly come to feel a loss of control over their own lives. One method by which an adult client can regain a feeling of self control is by the counselor helping him to understand the components of the decision-making process. Tredeman and O'Hara's

model, described by Schlossberg and Entine (1977) serves as a diagnostic and intervention tool. According to this model each decision has two stages, anticipation and implementation. During the first stage the client and counselor together explore the choices by using activities such as fantasizing, brainstorming or role-play. As the alternatives are explored, some are rejected, some are pursued. The decision crystallizes and the choice can be made. The second stage, implementation, begins when the client executes his decision, such as enter schools or begins a new job.

Another requisite for the counselor is an understanding of adult development. Schlossberg and Entine (1977) state:

The counselor must be aware of the salient issues of adulthood. This awareness aids the counselor in listening to the client from a different perspective than the counselor whose knowledge is limited to child and adolescent psychology.

A knowledge of adult development also enables the counselor to pick up the client's subtext . . . The counselor must listen with the third ear (pp. 83, 84).

The third requisite for adult counselors is to become aware of age bias, their own and those of others. "The extent to which counselors are age-biased is directly and inversely related to the amount of support and encouragement they can give to the client to make free choice" (Schlossberg and Entine, 1977, p. 85).

#### Summary

The review of literature reflects a progressive philosophical change in the military services' responsibility for the provision of off-duty education for military members. Initially, only duty-related training was considered to be the responsibility of the military services. The later philosophy resulted in the establishment of broad

goals, objectives and standards to be met through off-duty education programs, such as preparation for post-service careers and individual fulfillment.

The Tinker AFB Education Services program evolved from group study courses and off-base sponsored courses to the provision of on-base courses sufficient to meet degree goals, at the associate, bachelors and masters level. Additionally, remedial and developmental courses are available for persons functioning below the high school level or those needing college preparatory courses.

Studies relating to why adults participate in education indicate that there are three broad learning types which overlap, yet are fairly distinct; (1) Goal Oriented, (2) Activity Oriented, and (3) Learning Oriented. One of the most consistent findings of the various studies reviewed by the author was that formal educational attainment is a crucial factor in whether or not an adult is actively involved in learning pursuits, formal or self-directed.

The literature indicated a general agreement that the need for adequate adult counseling is unmet. Further indications were that the training needs of counselors of adults cannot be met through programs geared toward counselors of primary and secondary school clients.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this chapter is to describe: (1) the procedures used in the selection of the sample, (2) the methods and procedures which were used in the design of the survey instrument, (3) the method of collecting the data, and (4) the procedures used in analyzing the data.

#### The Selection of the Sample

The total enlisted population of Tinker Air Force Base was 5060 individuals on January 20, 1983, when the sample was drawn. A random sample, stratified by rank, was drawn by the computer. The sample was stratified by rank to prevent a biased sample due to length of service or rank. The sample consisted of 506 enlisted personnel, constituting 10 percent of the total enlisted personnel assigned to Tinker.

#### The Survey Instrument

The review of literature revealed no existing questionnaire that could be used in the study. Therefore, it was necessary to develop a survey instrument that permitted enlisted personnel, participants and non-participants, to indicate what factors they perceived to affect their participation status. The instrument (see Appendix A for a copy of the final questionnaire) was developed to collect demographic

information, participation status, and to elicit responses relating to the research questions.

The survey instrument was reviewed by Tinker Base Education office staff members, serving as a panel of experts, for wording and purpose (see Appendix B for a list of the panel members). Suggested minor changes and refinements were made prior to the pre-test. The instrument was pretested on November 15, 1982, using enlisted personnel assigned to Tinker. Each pre-test participant was interviewed immediately following the completion of the questionnaire in order to identify any perceived errors or lack of clarity.

The questionnaire was developed in conjunction with Corder (1983), who surveyed the same sample population for a different study using the same instrument. The purpose of this joint effort was to limit the number of different surveys being sent within the Tinker military community.

The survey instrument was submitted to the Tinker Director of Personnel and the Tinker Base Commander for approval. Local approval was granted on January 4, 1983, for the survey to be conducted on January 24, 1983 (see Appendix C for an endorsed copy of approval request).

#### Data Collection

The data collection began January 24, 1983, in collaboration with Corder (1983). The questionnaire was mailed to 491 members of the sample, with instruction for its completion and return. Pre-addressed envelopes were provided for return of the questionnaire by mail. Fifteen individuals in the random sample were dropped because they were

assigned duty outside the state or had departed the base making a total of 491 sample participants.

No second mailing was conducted. The Tinker Director of Personnel refused to approve the request for a follow-up mail-out based on the following reasoning:

1. Historical data indicates that a return rate of approximately 35 percent is normal due to high mobility of the military population.

2. Follow-up is considered tantamount to failure to comply within the military community. A follow-up therefore could have resulted in mandatory compliance which would have been detrimental to the validity of the survey.

#### Analyzing the Data

The presentation and analysis of data appear in Chapter IV. The demographic data were summarized into profiles and incorporated into tables. The summary included frequency counts and percentage responses for each question. The data relating to the research questions were also summarized into tables for participants or non-participants.

Chi-square was used to determine if there was a relationship between participation status and pre-selected factors. Significance was established at the .05 level (Bartz, 1981). The contingency coefficient was used to express the strength of significant relationships (Kerlinger, 1973).

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS

The information in this chapter has been organized into four sections: (1) the response rate; (2) demographic characteristics of the respondents; (3) presentation and discussion of the factors relating to participation or non-participation; (4) discussion of the Chi-Square and follow-up analysis.

#### Response Rate

The sample was drawn by the computer, stratified by 10 percent of each rank. The enlisted population was 5060 which resulted in a 10 percent sample of 506. Fifteen names from this sample were discarded because the individuals were assigned duty away from the base, in other states or had permanently changed base of assignment. The remaining 491 questionnaires were mailed to the selected individuals. A total of 218 (44.4 percent) questionnaires were returned. From the total number of returned questionnaires, 17 (7.8 percent) were discarded because the indicated length of time assigned to Tinker Air Force Base did not meet the one year criterion established by the researcher. The frequency of total respondents, according to rank, is recorded in Table I. The total response rate data seemed to indicate a relationship between rank and percentage of returns. The percentage response tended to increase with an increase in rank or level of responsibility.



TABLE I  
TOTAL RESPONSE RATE BY RANK

Rank	Number Sent	Total Number Returned	Percent of Rank Returned	Percent of Total
E-1	6	1	17	.5
E-2	19	5	26	2.3
E-3	114	31	27	14.2
E-4	118	50	42	22.9
E-5	117	51	44	23.4
E-6	67	39	58	17.9
E-7	35	30	86	13.8
E-8	10	7	70	3.2
E-9	5	4	80	1.8
Total	<u>491</u>	<u>218</u>		<u>100.0</u>

The largest group of respondents overall, was Staff-Sergeants (E-5) with 51 returns. This was 23.4 percent of the total number returned. A close second to that group was the Sergeants' (E-4) group with 50 responses or 22.9 percent of the overall responses. The lowest overall response rate was from the Airman Basic (E-1) group, with 0.5 percent of the total returns.

The Master Sergeants' group had the highest within rank return rate with 30 persons or 86 percent of the rank responding. This was followed closely by the Chief Master Sergeants' (E-9) group with four returns which was 80 percent of the rank responding. The lowest rank percentage response was the Airman Basic (E-1) with 17 percent of the rank responding.

#### Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The demographic characteristics data of the usable sample are recorded in Table II. The highest number of respondents was in the ranks of Airman First Class (E-3) through Staff Sergeant (E-5), for a total of 122 (60.7 percent). The ranks of Technical Sergeant (E-6) through Chief Master Sergeant (E-9) had a total 79 respondents (39.3 percent).

One hundred-eighty three (91 percent) of the respondents were male. The female respondents totaled 18 (9 percent).

The largest single age category was 18-28, with a frequency of 100 (49.8 percent), followed closely by the 29-38 age group with 80 members (39.8 percent). The 49 and older age group was the lowest, with one person (0.5 percent).

Four years or less of Air Force service constituted the largest

TABLE II  
 FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF USABLE RESPONDENTS  
 CLASSIFIED BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
<b>Rank</b>		
E-3 - E-5	122	60.7
E-6 - E-9	79	39.3
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	183	91.0
Female	18	9.0
<b>Age</b>		
18-28	100	49.8
29-38	80	38.8
39-48	20	9.9
49 and older	1	0.5
<b>Years of Air Force Service</b>		
4 years or less	67	33.3
5-8	31	15.5
9-12	27	13.4
13-16	38	18.9
17-20	22	10.9
Over 20	16	8.0
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Single	60	29.9
Married	138	68.6
Single parent	3	1.5

category of service time with 67 persons (33.3 percent). Thirty-eight persons (18.9 percent) had served 13-16 years in the Air Force, followed by 31 (15.5 percent) with five-eight years. The nine-twelve year group had 27 members (13.4 percent) and 22 (10.9 percent) were in the one-two years of service category. Those having served over 20 years had the lowest number of respondents with 16 persons (8 percent).

The married personnel constituted the largest marital status group with 138 (68.6 percent) in this category. There were 60 single persons (29.9 percent) followed by the lowest marital status category, single-parents with three members (1.5 percent) responding.

The length of time respondents were assigned to Tinker Air Force Base is recorded in Table III. The group reporting assignment length of one-four years was the largest, totaling 180 (82 percent). Twenty-one members (10 percent) reported an assignment time of five-eight years. This was followed by the lowest group who were assigned less than one year. Personnel in this group totaled 17 persons (8.0 percent) and these responses were discarded from the sample.

Data reflecting the number of years respondents expect to remain in the Air Force are presented in Table IV. The largest category was those expecting to remain in the Air Force 20 years or more with 123 (61.2 percent) indicating this expectation. The second highest frequency was 42 (20.9 percent), those expecting to serve one-four years. This was followed by the five-eight years group with 18 (8.9 percent) and the nine-twelve year group with 16 responding (8.0 percent). The 13-16 year group tied for the lowest rank with an undecided report, both for one (0.5 percent) each.

The educational background of the respondents is recorded in

TABLE III  
 LENGTH OF TIME RESPONDENTS  
 ASSIGNED TO TINKER AFB

Years assigned	Frequency	Percent
Less than one year	17	8
1-4	180	82
5-8	21	10

TABLE IV  
 NUMBER OF YEARS RESPONDENTS EXPECT  
 TO REMAIN IN THE AIR FORCE

Years	Frequency	Percent
1- 4	42	20.9
5 - 8	18	8.9
9-12	16	8.0
13-16	1	0.5
20 and over	123	61.2
Undecided	1	0.5

Table V. There were 79 members (39.3 percent) indicating high school graduation. The second highest group was the 30-59 semester hour group with 40 (19.9 percent) indicating this level. Closely following was the 15-29 semester hour category with 32 (15.9 percent) having this level. The fourth highest frequency was recorded in the 60-89 semester hour level with 16 persons (8.0 percent) indicating this category. Nine individuals (4.5 percent) were listed at the associate degree level, closely followed by eight persons (4.0 percent) reporting 90-124 semester hours. Four persons (2.0 percent) indicated 124 semester hours with an associates degree as their education level. Three categories of education levels tied for the low with two responses (1.0 percent) each; less than high school, Over 124 hours (no degree), and masters degree.

Data relating to the major reason for Air Force enlistment is reported in Table VI. Enlistment for a career was indicated by 86 persons (42.8 percent) as their major reason for enlistment, followed by educational opportunities with 60 persons (29.8 percent) indicating this reason. The third highest reason indicated was to complete the military obligation, to which 41 persons (20.4 percent) responded. The two lowest reasons indicated were to become an officer, reported by five (2.5 percent) and other (miscellaneous reasons) with nine persons (4.5 percent) providing various write-in responses. Reasons such as (1) uncertainty of career goals, (2) to grow-up, (3) to see the world, or (4) to escape an unpleasant personal situation were listed by the write-in respondents.

The responses relating to the temporary duty (TDY) schedule and usual work schedule are presented in Table VII. The largest usual work schedule reported was day shift (stable hours). There were 125 of the

TABLE V  
 FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF THE EDUCATIONAL  
 BACKGROUND OF PARTICIPANTS  
 AND NON-PARTICIPANTS

Educational Background	Frequency	Percent
Less than high school	2	1.0
High school graduate	79	39.3
15-29 semester hours	32	15.9
30-59 semester hours	40	19.9
Associate degree	9	4.5
60-89 semester hours	16	8.0
90-124 semester hours	8	4.0
124 semesters hours	4	2.0
Bachelors degree	7	3.4
Over 124 hours no degree	2	1.0
Masters degree	2	1.0

TABLE VI  
MAJOR REASON FOR AIR FORCE ENLISTMENT

Reason	Frequency	Percentage
Career	86	42.8
To complete military obligation	41	20.4
Educational opportunities	60	29.9
To become an officer	5	2.5
Other	9	4.5



TABLE VII  
 RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING RESPONDENTS'  
 TEMPORARY SCHEDULE AND USUAL WORK SCHEDULE

Schedule	Frequency	Percent
<u>Usual Work</u>		
Day shift (stable hours)	125	62.2
Swing shift (stable hours)	16	8.0
Mid shift (stable hours)	9	4.5
Day or shift work (unstable hours)	19	9.4
Rotating shift (unstable hours)	10	5.0
Aircrew member (frequent flying)	22	10.9
<u>Temporary Duty (TDY)</u>		
Never go TDY	37	18.4
Rarely go TDY	58	28.9
Uncertain/irregular TDY,	51	25.4
Frequent TDY	55	27.3

respondents (62.2 percent) in this group, followed by 22 (10.9 percent reporting the aircrew member (frequent flying schedule). There were 19 (9.4 percent) reports of day or shift work with unstable hours. Members indicating swing shift schedule (stable hours) totaled 16 (8.0 percent). The fewest number of respondents indicated the rotating shift (unstable hours) 10 (5.0 percent) and mid-shift nine (4.5 percent). The usual work schedule indicates the type of shift the individual will work during duty at the base. This has no bearing on the TDY schedule, except that those indicating an aircrew member status are also more likely to be in a frequent TDY status.

The temporary duty schedules indicated approached an equal spread with 58 individuals (28.9 percent) reporting rare TDY assignments. Those who indicated frequent TDY totaled 55 individuals (27.3 percent) followed closely by uncertain or irregular TDY, with 51 respondents (25.4 percent). The least indicated TDY schedule was never go TDY, with 37 respondents (18.4 percent).

#### Factors Relating to Participation or Non-Participation

Frequency and percentage of previous off-duty participation since Air Force enlistment and current participation status data are reflected in Table VIII. Previous participation since Air Force enlistment was indicated by 124 (61.7 percent) of the respondents. Seventy-seven persons (38.3 percent) indicated that they had never participated in off-duty education since Air Force enlistment.

The members who indicated that they were not currently enrolled totaled 165 (82.1 percent). Thirty-six individuals (17.9 percent)

TABLE VIII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF PREVIOUS OFF-DUTY  
PARTICIPATION SINCE AIR FORCE ENLISTMENT  
AND CURRENT PARTICIPATION STATUS

	Previous Participation		Current Participation	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	124	61.7	36	17.9
No	77	38.3	165	82.1
Total	<u>201</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>201</u>	<u>100.0</u>

indicated current enrollment.

Those who were not currently enrolled, but who had been enrolled since enlistment were asked to identify their last time of enrollment. These data are listed in Table IX. The high for this group was 35 persons (47.3 percent) indicating participation less than one year ago. The second highest group had 18 (24.3 percent) who indicated participation one-two years ago. Followed by the three-four years ago category, with 14 responses (18.9 percent). The low group had seven (9.5 percent) indicating enrollment more than four years ago.

The sample members who indicated current participation status were asked to define their program goal. These data are presented in Table X. The associate degree was the most frequently stated goal, followed closely by the bachelor degree goal. These goals were reported to 23 (45.1 percent) and 21 (41.2 percent) times respectively. Four members (7.8 percent) indicated the masters degree goal and two (3.9 percent) a vocational-technical goal. There was one person (2.0 percent) undecided on an educational goal.

Some members responded to this question who did not indicate current enrollment. This is considered normal for military persons. Personnel who have been scheduled for extensive military training away from the base or anticipate a lengthy TDY will drop out for that time frame, but still maintain program goals.

The sample members were asked if they had visited the Tinker Base Education Office, and, if so, the approximate number of times. The response data are listed in Table XI. Those indicating visitations totaled 168 (83.6 percent) and no visitations totaled 33 (16.4 percent). The visitation category with the largest number of

TABLE IX  
 RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING NON-PARTICIPANTS'  
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGES OF LAST TIME  
 OF ENROLLMENT

Time	Number	Percentage
Less than one year ago	35	47.3
1 - 2 years ago	18	24.3
3 - 4 years ago	14	18.9
More than 4 years ago	7	9.5
	<u>74</u>	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE X  
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF CURRENT  
 PARTICIPANTS' PROGRAM GOAL

Program	Number	Percentage N=51
Vocational-technical	2	3.9
Associate degree	23	45.1
Bachelor degree	21	41.2
Master degree	4	7.8
Undecided	<u>1</u>	<u>2.0</u>
	<u>51</u>	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE XI  
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS'  
 VISITING TINKER BASE EDUCATION OFFICE

Visited Tinker Base Education Office	Number	Percentage
Yes	168	83.6
No	<u>33</u> 201	<u>16.4</u> 100.0
Number of times visited		
Only during in-processing	30	17.8
Only once voluntary	14	8.3
2 or 3 times since assignment	67	39.9
2 or 3 times per semester	8	4.8
4 or more times since assignment	42	25.0
4 or more times per semester	<u>7</u> 168	<u>4.2</u> 100.0

respondents was two or three times since assignment with a total of 67 (39.9 percent) followed by four or more times since assignment, totaling 42 responses (25 percent). The third largest category was those indicating visits only once during in-processing, with 30 (17.8 percent) responses. Those indicating only one visit voluntarily totaled 14 (8.3 percent). The two lowest groups were those who indicated visits two or three times per semester, eight (4.8 percent) and seven (4.2) who had visited four or more times per semester.

Personnel who stated they had visited the Tinker Base Education Office were requested to provide the reason(s) for their visitations. The data relating to these responses are presented in Table XII. Those who indicated they went on their own to obtain additional information constituted the largest frequency with 98 responses (48.8 percent). Those who indicated that the counselor was helpful on their initial visit and that they were encouraged to return were the second largest group with 40 responses (19.9 percent). Closely following were those who went to enroll in career development courses. There were 32 persons (15.9 percent) who listed this as their reason for going. Twenty-nine (14.4 percent) went for required appointments only. Seventeen persons (8.5 percent) indicated they went to obtain financial aid paperwork as the reason for their visit. Sixteen persons (8.0 percent) indicated that their visits were due to supervisor or commander encouragement. The encouragement of a friend was given by nine persons (4.5 percent) as the reason for their visit to the Base Education Office. The "other" reasons category had eight respondents (4.0 percent).

Members of the sample who had gone to the Education Office for an

TABLE XII  
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS' REASONS  
 FOR VISITING THE EDUCATION OFFICE

Reason	Number	Percentage
For required appointment only	29*	14.4
Supervisor or commander encouragement	16	8.0
Encouragement of friend	9	4.5
Counselor was helpful	40	19.9
Went on my own	98	48.8
To obtain financial aid paperwork	17	8.5
To enroll in career development course	32	15.9
Other reasons	8	4.0

\* Responses may indicate more than one reason per person.



initial visit but did not return at a later time were requested to indicate the reason(s). These data are listed in Table XIII. The most frequently listed reason for non-return--they could not go to school because of TDY--had 24 responses (33.8 percent). This was closely followed by those indicating a lack of time as their reason for not returning. Eight (11.3 percent) responded to the statement that the counselor offered no voluntary information as the reason for non-return. The least selected reasons were that "the counselor talked to me like I was a child", "the Education Office staff members are not helpful" with two responses (2.8 percent) each, and "I am not going to school until I get out" with one response (1.4 percent).

The respondents who indicated they had never visited the Education Office were requested to select a reason for their non-visitation. These data are recorded in Table XIV. The largest number responding said they could not go to school because of TDY. There were 17 individuals (51.5 percent) responding to that reason. This was followed by those indicating a "lack of time to go" with nine (27.3 percent). Those indicating they had "no interest in going to school" totaled eight (24.2 percent). Two individuals (6.1 percent) indicated the fact that they were not going to school until after they were discharged from the Air Force; therefore, there was no reason to visit.

Enlisted members who were not currently participating were requested to select their primary reasons(s) for non-participation. Data relating to these responses are presented in Table XV. The most frequently selected reason was frequent TDY's, with 50 responses (30.5 percent). The second most frequent reason was selected by 37 persons

TABLE XIII  
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS' REASONS  
 FOR NOT RETURNING TO THE BASE EDUCATION  
 OFFICE AFTER INITIAL VISIT

Reason	Number	Percentage
Cannot go to school because of TDY	24	33.8
Not interested in school	13	18.3
Education office staff members not helpful	2	2.8
Counselor talked to me like a child	2	2.8
Not going to school until I get out	1	1.4
The counselor provided no voluntary information	8	11.3
I have not had time to return	21	29.6

TABLE XIV  
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS' REASONS  
 FOR NEVER VISITING THE EDUCATION OFFICE

Reason	Number	Percentage
Cannot go to school because of TDY	17*	51.5
Not interested in going to school	8	24.2
Not going to school until I get out, therefore no reason to go	2	6.1
I have not had time to go	9	27.3

\* Responses may indicate more than one response per person.

TABLE XV  
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS'  
 REASONS FOR NON-PARTICIPATION

Reason	Number	Percentage
Do not know how to start	17 *	10.4
Costs too much	14	8.5
Supervisor says I cannot go to school	5	3.0
The program I want is not available	8	4.9
My family doesn't want me to go to school	1	0.6
Frequent TDY's	50	30.5
Air Force will not pay for program I want	7	4.3
Off-duty courses take too much time from family and other things I want to do	37	22.6
I have not finished high school therefore I cannot take other courses	0	0.0
Plan to only take CLEP and DAN TES Tests for now	2	1.2
I work a part-time Job after work	23	14.0

\*Multiple responses were possible

(22.6 percent) indicating "off-duty courses take too much time away from the family or things I want to do." Many of these responses had been altered to reflect "things I have to do." Most of those who altered responses also indicated a part-time job after work, which was indicated by 23 persons (14 percent). Seventeen persons (10.4 percent) indicated they did not know how to start, closely followed by those indicating cost considerations. Fourteen (8.5 percent) chose this as a reason. A few write-in comments were attached to this category such as "my wife is in nursing school, can't go til she gets out" and serious costly health problems of family members. Eight members (4.9 percent) indicated the program they desired to pursue is unavailable, followed closely with seven members (4.3 percent) selecting as their reason, "the Air Force will not pay for the program I want." Five persons (3 percent) indicated their supervisor will not permit them to go to school at this time. The reasons least selected were: "I am only going to take CLEP tests for now" with two persons (1.2 percent) and "my family doesn't want me to go to school" with one response (0.6 percent).

The participant group was requested to select the reason(s) for their school involvement. More than one response was possible, with most respondents selecting multiple (five or more) choices. The data resulting from these choices are represented in Table XVI. The most frequently chosen reason for participation was "self-improvement" with 57 responses (28.8 percent). The second most selected reason was "to prepare for a post-military career," with 44 responses (21.9 percent). Following this was 28 persons (13.9 percent) selecting "education will help for promotion." Eighteen persons (9.0 percent) indicated their

TABLE XVI  
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS' REASONS  
 FOR PARTICIPATION

Reason	Number	Percentage
My friends are enrolled	3*	1.5
To prepare for a commission	12	6.0
Supervisor/commander encouragement	6	3.0
To prepare for post-military career	44	21.9
My family wants me to go	4	2.0
Education counselor encouragement	9	4.5
Will help for promotion	28	13.9
Self-improvement	57	28.4
To use up my VA benefits	7	3.5
Good use of time	5	2.5
To use my Air Force benefits	18	9.0

\* Multiple responses were possible

participation was "a good way to use Air Force benefits," followed by 12 persons (6.0 percent) indicating "commissioning preparation" as a motive. Nine members (4.5 percent) indicated "education counselor encouragement" as a motivating reason. The use of Veterans benefits was chosen by seven persons (3.5 percent) followed by six persons (3.0 percent) indicating supervisor or commander encouragement as the motivating force. Five (2.5 percent) chose "education is a good way to use time," followed by four (2.0 percent) persons selecting family encouragement as a related reason. The least selected choice was because of the enrollment of friends. Three (1.5 percent) chose this reason.

Both participants and non-participants, who had visited the Tinker Base Education Services Office, were requested to indicate their personal feeling about the counseling staff. These data are reflected in Table XVII. One hundred-seventeen (58.2 percent) indicated they viewed the staff as helpful and caring. The second highest selection was "the counselors appeared not to care about me" with 31 responses (15.4 percent). The third choice, other (miscellaneous) had 11 responses (5.4 percent). Forty-two individuals (21.0 percent) provided no response, some with comments of explanation such as they "had not been there for a couple of years" or they felt their "viewpoint was biased, based on previous negative experience with other education offices." The comments resulting from these two categories are grouped by participant and non-participants responses and are listed in Appendix D.

The responses included within their text some reference to parking and its non-existence, although this was not a solicited remark. The

TABLE XVII  
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS'  
FEELINGS ABOUT THE BASE EDUCATION  
OFFICE PERSONNEL

Feeling	Number	Percentage
The counselors are helpful and caring	117	58.2
The counselors appear not to care	31	15.4
Other	11	5.4
No response	42	21.0



second most received comment reflected a reference to a previously mentioned category, "See item 19F above". That statement indicated these persons felt that the counselors only answered the questions asked and offered no voluntary information. Seven persons indicated a negative past impression of base education offices. Four respondents indicated improvement could be made or the counselors should show more interest in helping students. All other responses were indicated by one person and are reported in Appendix D.

#### Discussion of Chi-Square

Each member responding to the survey was requested to select the response that most nearly described his perception of the Education Services Center personnel. Three options were provided: (1) The counselors are helpful and caring; (2) the counselors appear not to care about me; or (3) other. One hundred fifty-eight persons, both participants and non-participants, responded to this question. The responses were used to compute a two-way classification Chi-Square. Data reflecting the computation are presented in Table XVIII. The critical value of Chi-Square was 2.58 with two degrees of freedom. The level of significance was established at the .05 level. The Chi-Square result indicates that there was not a significant difference in the perceptions of Education Services Center personnel by participants when compared with those of the non-participants.

A second Chi-Square analysis was performed to determine if there was a relationship between temporary duty schedules and participation status. The Chi-Square analysis data is presented Table XIX. The analysis resulted in a Chi-Square of 5.29, with three degrees of

TABLE XVIII

CHI SQUARE OF PARTICIPATION STATUS AND PERCEPTION  
OF EDUCATION SERVICES CENTER PERSONNEL

Currently Participating	Counselor Helpful	Counselor not Helpful	Other	Total
Yes	30	5	1	36
No	<u>86</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>122</u>
Total	116	31	11	158

$\chi^2 = 2.58$   
 $\chi^2 = .05, df = 2$  is 5.99  
 not significant  $P > .05$

TABLE XIX

CHI SQUARE PARTICIPATION STATUS  
AND TEMPORARY DUTY SCHEDULE

Currently Participating	Never Go TDY	Rarely Go TDY	Irreg TDY	Freq TDY	Total
Yes	11	11	6	8	36
No	<u>26</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>165</u>
Total	37	58	51	55	201

$\chi^2 = 5.29$   
 $\chi^2 = .05, df = 3$  7.82  
 Not Significant,  $P > .05$

freedom. The data indicates that there is no significant relationship between temporary duty schedule and participation status.

Although temporary duty schedule and participation status are not significantly related statistically, the temporary duty schedule does appear to have an impact on the continuity and stability of education pursuits. Referencing the data reported in Table IX, 47 percent of the individuals who were not currently participating indicated they had participated less than one year ago. This data in conjunction with data reported reflected in Table X, (Frequency and Percentage of Current Participants' Goal) seem to indicate that there are persons who consider that they are pursuing an educational goal, yet are not currently enrolled.

A Chi-Square analysis was performed to determine if there was a relationship between counseling sessions and participation status. The results are presented in Table XX. The Chi-Square critical value was 6.92 with one degree of freedom. This was significant at .0085, which exceeds the .05 level. The data indicate that a relationship exists between participation status and counseling sessions.

The contingency coefficient was used to express the magnitude of this association. Kerlinger (1973, p. 171) provides the following formula for the contingency coefficient:  $C = \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{\chi^2 + N}}$ . The computation resulted in a contingency coefficient of .18, which indicates little relationship.

TABLE XX  
 CHI SQUARE COUNSELING VISITS  
 AND PARTICIPATION STATUS

Currently Participating	Counseling Yes	Visits No	Total
Yes	36	0	36
No	<u>133</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>165</u>
Total	169	32	201

$\chi^2 = .05$ ,  $\chi^2 = 6.92$ ,  $df = 1$  3.84  
 $P < .05$   
 $C = .18$

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine: (1) what factors are related to participation in off-duty education programs at Tinker AFB; (2) if there is a relationship between enlisted personnel perceptions of the Education Services staff members and participation status; (3) if a relationship exists between perceived personal encouragement/interest of supervisors or significant others and participation status; (4) if there is a pattern of relationship between counseling sessions and participation status; and (5) if a relationship exists between temporary duty schedule and participation status.

#### Summary

In order to accomplish the stated purpose, a questionnaire was developed by the researcher and verified by Tinker Base Education Staff members serving as a panel of experts. The instrument was pretested, using enlisted personnel assigned to Tinker Air Force Base. Each pretest participant was interviewed immediately following the completion of the questionnaire in order to identify any perceived errors or lack of clarity. The survey instrument was submitted to the Tinker Director of Personnel and the Tinker Base Commander for approval, which was granted on January 4, 1983.

A random stratified sample was drawn by the computer, stratified by 10 percent of each enlisted rank. The enlisted population was 5060 individuals on January 20, 1983, when the sample was drawn. This resulted in a sample of 506 enlisted personnel. Fifteen members of the sample were eliminated because they were assigned duty outside of the state or had departed the base.

The data collection began January 24, 1983 in conjunction with Corder (1983), another researcher. The questionnaire was mailed to 491 members of the sample with instructions for its return by prepaid mail, to the researcher. Two hundred eighteen questionnaires were returned, with 201 being usable for this study.

Demographic information requested was rank, age, years in the Air Force, years assigned to Tinker, anticipated years of service, sex, marital status, and educational background. Responses were totaled and incorporated in frequency and percentage tables. The responses relating to participation status were also incorporated into tables by frequency counts and percentages. Chi-Square was computed to determine if there was a relationship between: (1) the enlisted members' perception of the Education Services Center personnel and participation status; (2) participation status and temporary duty schedule; and (3) participation status and counseling sessions.

In general, the findings of this study seemed to indicate there was no relationship between the enlisted person's perception of the Education Services Center personnel and participation status or temporary duty schedule and participation status. The results indicated that there was a relationship between counseling sessions and participation status of enlisted personnel at Tinker Air Force Base.

## Conclusions

Conclusions emerging from this study are as follows:

1. Educational opportunities appeared to be one of the major reasons Tinker Air Force Base enlisted personnel enlisted in the Air Force. This trend was consistent with the findings of studies conducted by the Air Force Laboratory (Barlow and Christensen, 1975).
2. Participation in off-duty education of some Tinker enlisted personnel appeared to be unstable. Forty-seven percent of the personnel who indicated participation since enlistment, but who were not currently enrolled, were enrolled less than one year ago.
3. The data indicated 15 individuals, who were not currently enrolled, still maintained a program goal.
4. The enlisted members' perception of the Education Services Center Staff was not related to participation status.
5. Forty percent of the persons who visited the Education Services Center indicated that their perception that the counselor was helpful encouraged them to return for additional counseling sessions.
6. Few enlisted members perceived that their commander or supervisor encouraged them in educational endeavors.
7. An information "gap" seemed to exist regarding available non-traditional approaches to education. This was indicated by the frequency (30.5 percent) of persons who selected "I cannot go to school because of TDY."
8. Experiences with other Base Education Centers tended to have an effect, to some extent, on the clients' perception of the Tinker Base Education Office personnel.
9. Parking availability around the Education Center was perceived

by some persons as a barrier to their office visitations.

10. There seemed to be a significant relationship between participation status and counseling sessions.

#### Recommendations

Numerous recommendations emerge as a result of this study.

Recommendations for practice are:

1. A more flexible school leave policy should be established especially for enlisted personnel who are frequently assigned TDY duty.

2. A greater effort should be made by Tinker officials to coordinate with local school officials for the establishment of innovative alternatives and non-traditional approaches to education for personnel who are assigned TDY frequently.

3. An adult education background should be incorporated into the requisites for employment as an Air Force Educational Counselor. This background would assist the counselors to have an increased awareness of the developmental stages, roles, and crises of adulthood and their implications for counseling and the educational pursuits of the clients.

4. More attention needs to be focused on the improvement of the image of the Air Force Education Services Program.

5. Supervisors should be encouraged to assume more responsibility in the educational endeavors of their employees.

6. Education should be used to provide bonus points in the weighted airman promotion system at the NCO level to encourage greater participation.

7. The Air Force should award ribbons for formal education



attainment comparable to those awarded for military training to provide an official method of recognition and encouragement.

8. A greater emphasis should be placed on continuing professional development for Education Services staff members.

9. The Tinker Education Office, institutions of higher learning, and organizations that have frequent TDY assignments should work together to develop programs around mission requirements.

10. Increased visibility of currently available programs is needed, particularly those aimed at beginners and non-participants.

11. Special emphasis and follow-up should be geared to interested non-participants to provide in-depth counseling, academic and career exploration.

12. Managerial attention is needed in seeking a solution to the parking problems around the Education Center facility.

Numerous recommendations for study emerge as a result of this study. Recommendations for further study are:

1. A study conducted by the Air Force investigating the relationship between perceptions and participation status would be helpful in creating new policies and allocation of resources.

2. An ex post facto long range, follow-up study conducted by the Air Force, sampling personnel who indicated educational opportunity as the primary motivation for enlistment may provide information regarding the success and failure rate in implementing the original goals.

3. A pilot study conducted at a base with a large population of flying crews investigating the feasibility of flying an instructor with crews going on extended temporary duty to establish on-site courses may provide information that could lead to new alternatives in program

efforts.

4. A study to determine what public relation techniques and methods are most effective could lead to more viable recruitment efforts.

5. A study investigating the effects of the counselors' orientation on the clients' perception and responsiveness to future sessions could aid in the development of future training programs.

6. A study investigating the difference in perceptions of students who are provided counseling as compared with students who are provided advisement only could be helpful in future policy-making.

7. An Air Force study of the perceptions held of Air Force education programs could be the first step in an image building program.

8. A study of the military member's perception of the counselor's role compared to the counselor's perception of his/her role would be helpful in determining if there is a wide disparity in these perceptions.

9. A modified replication of this study using matched pairs of participants and non-participants by an impartial, outside researcher could provide additional information in programming efforts as well as in determining the consistency of the findings.

## A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Air Force Regulation 30-23, The Air Force Personnel Program. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Air Force, 1976.
- Air Force Regulation 213-1, Operation and Administration of the Air Force Education Services Program. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Air Force, 1976.
- Axford, Roger W. Adult Education: The Open Door to Lifelong Learning. Indiana, Pennsylvania: Haldin Co., 1980.
- Bailey, Stephen K. Academic Quality Control: The Case of College Programs on Military Bases. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.
- Barlow, Esther M. and Maria S. Christensen. Annotated Bibliography of the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory Technical Reports-1968 through 1975. Brooks Air Force Base, Texas: Human Resources Laboratory, 1975.
- Bartz, Albert E. Basic Statistical Concepts. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1981.
- Bell, Thomas T. "Continuing Education Needs of Aircrew Members." (Unpublished M.S. Thesis, Library, Oklahoma State University, 1981.)
- Corder, Troy. "Factors Relating to the Participation of United States Air Force Enlisted Personnel at Tinker Air Force Base in the Community College of the Air Force Programs." (Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Library, Oklahoma State University, 1983.)
- Cox, William E. "A Study of the Difference Between the Perceptions of Air Force Education Services Officers and Guidance Counselors with Respect to the Air Force Education Services Program." (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Library, George Washington University, 1981.)
- Cross, K. Patricia. Accent on Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.
- Cross, K. Patricia. Adults as Learners. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1981.

- Earle, Frederick S. "Factors Relating to the Participation of United States Air Force Enlisted Personnel in the Community College of the Air Force Programs." (Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Library University of Southern California, 1977.)
- Farmer, Martha L. Student Personnel Services for Adults in Higher Education. Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1967.
- Farmer, Martha L. Student Personnel Services for Adults in Higher Education. Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1971.
- Gill, William A. Jr. "PREP: Hope for the Educationally Disadvantaged in the Military Service," Adult Leadership, Vol. 22, No. 6 (1973), pp. 205-207.
- Goldberg, Joan C. "Counseling the Adult Learner: A Selective Review of the Literature," Adult Education. Vol. 30, No. 2, (1980), pp. 67-75.
- Hansen, Morris N. Education Specialist: AFSC 75150, Vol I. Gunter Air Force Station, Alabama: Extension Course Institute, 1979.
- Hoppe, Edward W. and Robert J. Parsons. Questionology. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Printing Service, 1974.
- Houle, Cyril O., Elbert W. Burr, Thomas H Hamilton and John R. Yale. The Armed Services and Adult Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1947.
- Houle, Cyril O. The Inquiring Mind. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1961.
- Jackson, Weldon. Personal Interview. Oklahoma City, November 5, 1982.
- Johnstone, John W. and Ramon J. Rivera. Volunteers for Learning. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965.
- Kasworm, Carol E. "The Older Student as an Undergraduate," Adult Education. Vol. 31, No. 1, (1980), pp. 30-47).
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Knapp, Bobby G. Personal Interview. Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, January 6, 1983.
- Knowles, Malcolm S. The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species. 2nd Ed. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co. 1978.
- Levinson, Daniel J. The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Knopf Publishing Co., 1978.
- MacCloskey, Monro. You and the Draft. New York: Richard Rosen Press, Inc., 1965.

- Oklahoma City Times, Southeast Area. "Oklahoma City Southwestern College Launches New Program," Vol. LXXXV, No. 166 (September 2, 1974), p. 6.
- Robbins, Stephen P. Organizational Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1979.
- Sappington, William E. Personal Interview. Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, November 6, 1982.
- Schlossberg, Nancy K. and Entine, Alan. Counseling Adults. Monterey, California: Brooks-Cole, 1977.
- Schlossberg, Nancy and Lillian Troll. Perspectives on Counseling Adults. Monterey, California: Brooks-Cole, 1978.
- Sheehy, Gail. Passages: Predictable Crises of Adult Life. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1981.
- Terkel, Studs. Working. New York: Avon Publishers, 1975.
- Tinker Historical Office. Technical Training. Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 1968.
- Tinker Take-Off, Vol. 5, No. 23 (March 21, 1947), p. 7.
- Tinker Take-Off, Vol. 9, No. 4 (January 12, 1951), p. 1.
- Tinker Take-Off, Vol. 10, No. 4 (January 11, 1952), p. 2.
- Tinker Take-Off, Vol. 24, No. 35 (September 2, 1966), p. 1.
- Tinker Take-Off, Vol. 31, No. 2 (January 12, 1973a), p. 26.
- Tinker Take-Off, Vol. 31, No. 37 (September 14, 1973b), p. 12
- Tinker Take-Off, Vol. 32, No. 1 (January 11, 1974), p. 2.
- Tollison, Robert. Personal Interview. Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, April 7, 1983.
- Tough, Allen. "Major Learning Efforts: Recent Research and Future Directions", Adult Education. Vol. XXVIII, No. 4 (1978), pp. 250-263.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

## EDUCATIONAL SURVEY

PLEASE FILL IN BLANKS WITH THE APPROPRIATE ANSWER.

1. What is your rank? \_\_\_\_\_
2. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_
3. How many years have you been in the Air Force?  
\_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months
4. How many years have you been assigned to Tinker?  
\_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months
5. When I separate from the Air Force I will have completed  
\_\_\_\_\_ years of service.

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE LETTER TO INDICATE YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS.

6. What is your sex?
  - A. Male
  - B. Female
7. What is your martial status?
  - A. Single
  - B. Married
  - C. Single parent
8. What is your educational background?
  - A. Less than high school
  - B. High school graduate
  - C. 15 to 29 semester hours of college
  - D. 30 to 59 semester hours of college
  - E. Associate degree
  - F. 60 to 89 semester hours of college
  - G. 90 to 124 semester hours of college
  - H. 124 semester hours or more of college and an associates
  - I. 124 semester hours or more of college and no degree
  - J. Bachelor degree
  - K. 15 or more semester hours of graduate work
  - L. Masters Degree  
\_\_\_\_\_ total number of post graduate hours

9. What was your major reason for enlisting in the Air Force?
- A. My primary purpose was for a career
  - B. To complete my military obligation before getting on with my life
  - C. Educational opportunities
  - D. To become an officer
10. What is your TDY schedule?
- A. Never go TDY
  - B. Rarely go TDY
  - C. Irregular or uncertain TDY schedule
  - D. Frequent TDYs
11. What is your usual work schedule?
- A. Day shift, normally stable hours
  - B. Swing shift, normally stable hours
  - C. Mid shift, normally stable hours
  - D. Day or shift work with irregular or unstable hours
  - E. Rotating shift schedule
  - F. Aircrew member on frequent flying status
12. Have you participated in off duty education classes since enlisting in the Air Force?
- A. Yes
  - B. No
13. Are you currently participating in off duty education classes?
- A. Yes
  - B. No
14. If you have participated in off duty education classes since enlisting in the Air Force, but are not now currently participating please indicate the last time you were enrolled in an off duty course.
- A. Less than 1 year ago
  - B. 1 to 2 years ago
  - C. 2 to 3 years ago
  - D. 3 to 4 years ago
  - E. More than 4 years ago



15. If you are currently participating in off duty education classes indicate the degree or program you are pursuing.
- A. None
  - B. Vocational-technical
  - C. Associate degree (including CCAF)
  - D. Bachelor degree
  - E. Master degree
  - F. Doctorate
  - G. Other \_\_\_\_\_
16. Have you visited the Tinker Education Office since being assigned to Tinker?
- A. Yes
  - B. No
17. If you indicated "yes" to question 16, please indicate the approximate number of times you visited
- A. Only once when I in-processed
  - B. Only once on my own
  - C. 2 or 3 times total since being assigned to Tinker
  - D. about 2 or 3 times per semester
  - E. 4 or more times total since being assigned to Tinker
  - F. 4 or more times per semester
18. If your answer to number 16 above is "yes" please indicate why you went to the Education Office. (Circle all that apply)
- A. The only time I have been there is when I received a letter for a required appointment.
  - B. My supervisor or commander encouraged me to go to get additional information on program(s) available to me.
  - C. A friend of mine suggested that I go to obtain additional information on a program we discussed.
  - D. When I went, the counselor was helpful and I was encouraged to return.
  - E. I went on my own to obtain information.
  - F. Only to obtain financial aid paperwork.
  - G. To enroll in CDC or ECI course.
  - H. Other reasons.

19. If you only visited the Education Office for required appointments or have only visited once, please indicate your reason(s) for not returning. (Circle all that apply)
- A. I can not go to school because I have to go TDY too much.
  - B. I am not interested in going to school.
  - C. The people at the Education Office are not helpful.
  - D. The counselors at the Education Office talked to me like I was a child.
  - E. I am not going to school until I get out so I do not have any reason to go back to the Education Office.
  - F. The Counselors only answered the questions I asked and offered no voluntary information.
  - G. I have not had the time to return.
20. If you have never visited the Education Office at Tinker, please indicate your reason for not visiting.
- A. I can not go to school because I have too much TDY.
  - B. I am not interested in going to school.
  - C. I am not going to school until I get out so I do not have any reason to go to the Education Office.
  - D. I have not had the time to go.
21. I am enrolled/participating in off duty education courses for the following reason(s). (Circle all that apply)
- A. My friends are enrolled.
  - B. To prepare for a commission.
  - C. Supervisor/commander encouragement.
  - D. To prepare for a job after my Air Force enlistment.
  - E. My family wants my to go.
  - F. Education counselor encouragement.
  - G. Will help for promotion.
  - H. Self improvement.
  - I. To use up my VA benefits.
  - J. Good way to use time.
  - K. To use my Air Force benefits.

22. I am not enrolled in off duty education for the following reasons(s). (Circle all that apply)
- A. I do not know how to get started.
  - B. Costs too much.
  - C. My supervisor says I can not go to school.
  - D. The program I want is not available.
  - E. My family doesn't want me to go to school.
  - F. Frequent TDYs.
  - G. The Air Force will not pay for the course or program that I want.
  - H. Off duty courses take too much time from my family and other things I want to do.
  - I. I have not finished high school and do not plan to; therefore, I can not take any other courses.
  - J. I am just going to take CLEP and DANTES tests for now.
  - K. I work a part time job after work.
23. My personal feelings about the Base Education Office personnel are:
- A. The counselors are helpful and caring.
  - B. The counselors appear not to care about me.
  - C. Other (explain)

APPENDIX B

PANEL OF EXPERTS

The panel of experts were all members of the Tinker Base Education office at the time the instrument was designed.

Mr. Troy Corder, Guidance Counselor

Mr. Joe Johnson, Senior Education Technician

Miss Carrie Nix, Education Technician

Mrs. Sue Murphy, Testing Proctor

Mrs. Geraldine Patterson, Education Specialist

Mr. William E. Sappington, Base Education Officer

SSgt. Johnnie Smith, Professional Military Education Instructor

TSgt. Gregory Snider, Professional Military Education Instructor

Mrs. Anick Wallace, Administrative Assistant

APPENDIX C

ENDORSED COPY OF APPROVAL  
REQUEST

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
 HEADQUARTERS 2854TH AIR BASE GROUP (AFLC)  
 TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA 73145



REPLY TO  
 ATTN OF 2854ABG/DPE

4 January 1983

SUBJECT Request Approval of Base Survey

TO: ~~2854ABG/DE~~  
~~2854ABG/CC~~

*King*  
*Out.*  
IN TURN

1. Request your approval of the attached survey instrument which will be administered to a sample of enlisted personnel at Tinker AFB.
2. The survey has been prepared by two Tinker Base Education Office employees, Lola King and Troy Corder. The purpose of the survey is two-fold: (a) To obtain information on how enlisted personnel at Tinker perceive the educational programs available, the service rendered by the counseling staff and other factors that studies indicate influence and impact participation in education. In essence it is a survey to gain insight on enlisted members perceptions of our program. This information will be helpful in our self-evaluation and planning efforts. (b) To be utilized in the dissertation of the two above named employees.
3. Contact was made with AFMPC/MPCYS (Mr. Charley Hamilton, AV 487-6122) on 30 December 1982. Mr. Hamilton advised that IAW AFR 30-23, para 11a-3 the survey required only local approval, since it dealt only with Tinker personnel. The time frame for the survey is 10 January 1983.
4. No civilians will be surveyed.
5. Questions may be addressed to Ms. Lola King, 2854ABG/DPE, ext. 7408.

*William E. Sappington*  
 WILLIAM E. SAPPINGTON  
 Chief, Education Services Branch  
 Personnel Division

2 Atch: Survey Instrument  
 Cy AFR 30-23, para 11a-3

*Approximately 500 military - Random sample - See 1-0  
 problem if you encounter  
 King*

APPENDIX D

COMMENTS REGARDING COUNSELORS  
BY PARTICIPANTS AND  
NON-PARTICIPANTS



COMMENTS REGARDING COUNSELORS BY  
NON-PARTICIPANTS

1. Your non-existent parking is the major reason I visit you as seldom as I do. (9 responses)
2. See 19F above (The counselors only answered the questions I asked and offered no voluntary information. (7 responses)
3. The counselors are alright I guess but I have an unfavorable impression of past experiences with base education office. (7 responses)
4. Could use improvement/should show more interest in helping students. (4 responses)
5. Will help if forced to.
6. I received more help and correct information at a remote site in Turkey on CCAF programs in 1978. Counselor seemed to be put out at the time of the interview.
7. Although "a" applies to some extent they do not go out of their way to help you.
8. Unfavorable -- true feather merchants
9. The counselors are alright but the atmosphere is one of your putting them at an inconvenience.
10. I feel that my questions are not answered clearly. I end up leaving and still not knowing what to do.
11. Most of our counselors are helpful, namely (a specific counselor was named).
12. They will give help only for people who can benefit in a short time. If the question is not posed to them they won't give all avenues which could be used.
13. I cannot make a good decision, since the last time I was there was 1 1/2 years ago and I was more or less just browsing. I know I cannot attend class with my TDY schedule.

COMMENTS REGARDING COUNSELORS  
BY PARTICIPANTS

1. I have found our counselors helpful to me my total seven years at Tinker. I could not list all help they have given me.
2. The counselors have fallen into the civil service path. Nothing is accomplished without a large amount of paperwork and a certain frustration level being achieved by the person requesting aid.
3. The counselors are helpful and provide good advice. I enjoy talking to them; however, I find that the location (lack of parking) deters me from making more frequent visits.
4. Was very pleased with the service and people of the Education Office. Good Job.

VITA

Lola Patton King

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: PERCEIVED FACTORS RELATING TO PARTICIPATION OR NON-PARTICIPATION IN OFF-DUTY EDUCATION OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL AT TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Guthrie, Oklahoma, May 19, 1940, daughter of Mr. and Mrs Roy Patton.

Education: Graduated from Faver High School, Guthrie, Oklahoma, in May, 1958; received Bachelor of Arts in Education degree in Secondary Education with majors in Social Science and Sociology from Langston University in 1969; received the Master of Education degree from Central State University in July, 1975; completed the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1983.

Professional Experience: Production controller, Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 1969-75; Guidance counselor, Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 1975-78; currently employed by Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma as Education Specialist.

Professional Organizations: American Association for Adult and Continuing Education, Oklahoma Adult and Continuing Education Association, Kappa Delta Phi, Phi Delta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, Tinker Management Association.