

HUMAN FACTORS (continuation)

More often than naught, in our interpersonal experiences and in pursuit of tasks, accomplishments or goals we face the presence of conflict. While conflict can “wear many hats”, the type we are referring to here is an operational conflict. One whose simplest footprint is nothing more than a difference in expectation (You expect to thermal to the right, I to the left). The presence of conflict itself is not all bad, and great things can happen (alternate solutions, more efficient results, etc.) if we learn to manage conflict in a positive way – so how do we do that?

1. Apply 3 principles
 - a. *Be unemotional – beware of “emotional jetlag”*
 - i. *“Emotional jetlag” is when conflict hijacks our logical processing abilities, the situation continues to flow and we are stuck in the realm of unresolved conflict. Thereby having to play “catch up” which historically is not only difficult but in a more dangerous fashion is the “petri-dish of errors”.*
 - b. *Focus on what not whom*
 - c. *Be open to suggestions*
2. Ask 3 questions
 - a. *“What do I expect”?*
 - b. *“What do others expect”?*
 - c. *“Why do I expect what I expect”?*
3. Make 3 statements
 - a. *Make an “I” statement of concern*
 - b. *Clearly state the problem*
 - c. *Succinctly and timely propose a solution*
 - i. *Post accident data clearly suggests that not actually proposing a solution is a cornerstone of tragic or unwanted outcomes.*
4. Do three things
 - a. *Stop talking and listen – why are they saying what they are saying?*
 - b. *Abandon your idea if the other is better*
 - c. *Be assertive if required, loop if necessary*

We have previously identified non-assertion as a leading casual factor – it is therefore imperative that we know/understand/apply an assertion model which will allow us to effectively transmit our ideas to those with which we interact. This model is one that allows us to be assertive while still being respectful. It is a simple 5 step model.

ASSERTION MODEL *See it – Say it - Fix it*

- d. Get someone's attention (*See it*)
 - i. *Either call them by name or gently touch them to ensure their attention.*
- e. Express concern (*Say it*)
 - i. Make an "I" statement (i.e. concerned, uncomfortable).
This gives you a "buy-in" a vested interest.
- f. Clearly state the problem - (*Say it*)
- g. Propose a solution, *loop if necessary* – (*Fix it*)
 - i. *Looping means restarting at the first step, and continuing with appropriate persistence until a decision is made.*
- h. Get a decision – (*Fix it*)
 - i. *Realize that the eventual decision indeed may not be the one you proffered.*

In the last article we outlined several "landmines" that affect how we frame out thoughts:

- Ambiguity - *2 sources of information disagree*
- Confusion – *Uncertainty with what to do next. The leading cause for confusion is the lack of procedural knowledge. Want to minimize this? Learn your procedures cold!*
- Preoccupation -*Fixation on one task at the expense of others*
- Not communicating - *Not talking / not listening*
- Rushing - *Unexpected pace / presence of shortcuts*
- Distraction – *Departure from current need or plan / broken habit pattern*
- Violation of corporate SOP/FARs – *Non compliance (4 phase)*
- Failure to meet targets – *Technical / human factors*
- Not addressing discrepancies – *Ignorance / apathy / CYA*
- Presence of stress/fatigue - *#1 casual factor in error chain*
- Presence of 1st error – *Where there is one.... others likely*

While all of these certainly rank high in regards to fostering that lack of S.A. – there are two that by their very nature are insidious and most dangerous. First is fatigue, way too sneaky - hard to truly ascertain when we are operating by ourselves and along with it's first cousin – dehydration just makes this overall pitfall that much more dangerous.

The second one centers on the issues of non-compliance. As soaring enthusiasts we have decided that some aspects of our operations are so crucial to safety and good order, that we have codified them into mandatory requirements for the common good. Having said all that – we all know that from time to time we may feel over-regulated or just too busy to take the time to learn or apply the myriad of requirements that have been developed to safely de-conflict and guide our ground and airborne operations. So why do we stray? Let's briefly look at various reasons. All of these, by the way, involve disciplined decision making to some extent – and therefore find its roots in (or in the lack of) personal accountability.

- *"Don't know it"* -- An aviator can be ignorant of a regulation. Usually due to failures in education and self-preparation. Complacency, even perhaps apathy or even unfamiliarity with a new environment can reflect similar results. In the end we are responsible for not only what we do know, but also what we don't. Interesting statistics indicate that this type of deviation go unreported, as the perpetrator is as unaware of the violation as he or she is of the regulation itself.
- *"Can't help it"* -- "I knew the rule, but circumstances were such that I could not avoid the violation". Often the case of poor planning or rapidly changing conditions.
- *"Won't do it"* – Most difficult to understand and therefore, deal with. Some aviators routinely and intentionally violate known rules and regulations, often they get away with it, - sometimes they do not.

There seem to be four distinct types of noncompliance:

- Routine – frequent and unofficially condoned violations of procedures - *"everybody's doing it, nobody cares"*. Unrecognized eventually becomes "the norm" and is expected, most dangerous at this point.
- Optimizing – people who have discovered truly "better ways" of getting the job done outside the lines.
- Situational – *"Just this once"* type violations based on a unique set of circumstances.
- Rogue - People who violate policies and procedures for self-gratification and to feed their egos.