



The Comprehensive LOFT

SWISS Flight Training July, 2019 Immanuel Barshi NASA Ames Research Center Immanuel.Barshi@nasa.gov 20 August 2008 Madrid Spanair 5022 16 August 1987 Detroit Northwest Airlines 255

NASA ASRS: Since 2000, pilots have reported their failure to properly set the flaps for takeoff well over 80 times!

Hanging by a thread...

- ASRS #658970
- DCA, VMC
- Crew of B737-800 reporting:

• ".. As we started the taxi, I called for the taxi checklist, but became confused about the route and queried the first officer to help me clear up the discrepancy. We discussed the route and continued the taxi... We were cleared for takeoff from runway 1, but the flight attendant call chime wasn't working. I had called for the Before Takeoff checklist, but this was interrupted by the communications glitch. .. On takeoff, rotation and liftoff were sluggish. At 100-150 ft as I continued to rotate, we got the stick shaker. The first officer noticed the no flap condition and placed the flaps to 5. (No takeoff warning horn.) Discovered popped circuit breaker at the gate)..."

20 August 2008 Madrid Spanair 5022 16 August 1987 Detroit Northwest Airlines 255

21 years, or rather 32, and what have we learned?

How come we keep making the same mistakes?





Question:

So what are we learning?

Or

What are we being taught?













Activities are:

- <u>Linear</u>: task B always follows task A, in a fixed sequence
- <u>Controllable</u>: tasks initiated by each pilot, independently, at their choice
- <u>Predictable</u>: information available when needed, communications possible when necessary
 Which makes for simple teaching and easy learning!





		Taxi Errors			FIRST OFFICER					
	OMITTED CALL F	OR FLAPS	RUSHED TO	CLEAR RAI	MP/G	ATE AREA FO		ING AIRCRAFT -	ABORTED TA	
Request taxi cleara	nce							Obtain clearance		
STARTED TAXI WITHOU	IT CLEARANCE - T	ROUBLE-SH	OOTING PRO	DBLEM WITH	I ENGI	NE START - N	EARLY			
HIT GROUND HANDLER	2							OTHER AIRCRAFT WAITING		
		TO PULL INTO GATE; RADIO CONGESTION; MARSHALL					LER'S HEADSE	Т		
^{Sta} CA TAXIS WITHOUT	' HAVING FULLY UI	NDERSTOO		IONS - BUSY		OUND CONTR	OLLER			
LOOKING AT OTHER AIRCRAFT ON		XIWAY AND	ARNING ISSU	JED			BEFORE TAKEOFF PRO	CEDURE		
BY GROUND CONTR		STARTE	D TAXI WITH	OUT CLEAR	ANCE		USSING T	AXI INSTRUCTIO	DNS - STRUCK	
INCORRECT TRIM SET	TING - CHECKLIST	INTERRUP		TEM HAD B	EEN R	EAD BUT NO		D — ABORTED T		
FAILED TO START ENGINE #-2 - DISTRACTED WHILE DISCUSSING SPECIAL OPERATIONS FOR DESTINATION; OMITTED CHECKLISTS -										
NE	GLECTED TO SET	FLAPS - PR	EOCCUPIED		DEPAR	RTURE CLEAP	RANCE A	ND PACKS-OFF	OPERATION -	
FO FAILED TO MONI	<mark>FOR CA - BUSY CH</mark>	CHECKING AND					ED TO MO	DNITOR CĂ — BI	USY WITH	
CORRECTING CALCU	JLATIONS OF LOAI	DATA - AIF		FLOW; NIGI			IT TAXI — TAXIED IN WRONG			
TAXIED PAST HOLD	SHORT LINE			IOTICING D	URINO	CH DIRECTI	ON			
CREW BUSY WITH FUEL PROBLEM, RUNWAY CHANGES, PROGRAMMING										
	OMIT FMC - ABOR	TED TAKEO	DFF				N	IGINE START		
ASK TOP CHECKIIST	Ask for checklist AND CHECKLISTS -								in checklist	
CONFUSE OWN POSITI	CREW RUSHED TO) PERFORM	I DELAYED E	NGINE STAR			TENTIAL	EQUIPMENT		
TAXIED INTO FO FAILE	D TO MONITOR CA	A - BUSY RE	PROGRAMM	ING FMC F	OR RU	NWAY CHAN	GE - TAXIE			
FAIL TO CON INTENDE	D TAXIWAY								st complete	
CLEARANCE - ABOF FO FAILED TO MONITOR CA - BUSY WITH PRE-TAKEOFF PREPARATIONS - AIRCRAFT CROSSED										
OMITTED CHECKL HOLD SHORT LINE										
CHECKLISTS; RUSHED TO ACCEPT TAKEOFF CLEAR			ARANCE - FL	APS DEVERSED LIGHT' CREW BUSY TROUBLESHOOTING						
NOT SET, ABORTED TAKEOFF										
MISUNDERSTOOD TO	OWER INSTRUCTIO	N - NEW FO	<mark>) on IOE, C</mark>	A COACHIN	G FO	- TAXIED ONT	O RUNW/			
WITHOUT CLEARANC	CE		INCORRECT					V CHANCE		
Ask for checklist							in checklist			
Line up wit our our		CLEAR	ANCE - ABOF							
CHECKLIST INTERPLIETED BY TOWER			Transponder		ED FL	APS CHECKL	ISI ISI	Checklis	st complete	
LOUKOP STREETED CLEARANCE FOR			Master Caution xx xxxx		ED TO	ACCEPT TAK	EOFF		toompiete	
TAKEOFF - ABORTED TAKEOFF				CLEAF	RANCE	-ABORTED T	AKEOFF			







Two other studies

Casner, S. M., Geven, R. W., and Williams, K. T. (2013). The effectiveness of airline Pilot training for abnormal events. *Human Factors* 55(3), 477-485. <u>http://hfs.sagepub.com/content/55/3/477.abstract</u>

Casner, S. M., Geven, R. W., Recker, M. P., and Schooler, J. W. (2014). The retention Of manual flying skills in the automated cockpit. *Human Factors* 56(8), 1506-1516. <u>http://hfs.sagepub.com/content/56/8/1506.abstract</u>





http://www.newyorker.com/science/ maria-konnikova/hazards-automation



THREE ABNORMAL EVENTS PRESENTED IN TWO WAYS



Stalls Wind Shear Encounter at 600' on Landing Engine Failure on Takeoff After V₁

18 current 747-400 pilots.

EXPECTED

The Familiar Ways We See in Training

- Classic "stall series" demo
- Wind shear after suggestive ATIS
- V_1 cut on 2nd or 3rd takeoff

Compared EXPECTED and UNEXPECTED

UNEXPECTED

Different, Less Expected Ways

- Stall on departure at 2,500 ft
- High-altitude (FL340) stall
- Wind shear after calm winds ATIS and no "wind shear" alert
- V₁ cut on 1st takeoff of session



STALLS

THRUST RESPONSE:



V₁ CUT

9 pilots saw failure on first takeoff.
2 aborted after V₁
9 pilots saw failure on later takeoff. All 9 continued

WIND SHEAR ON LANDING

ALTITUDE LOST:



CONFIGURATION CHANGES:

EXPECTED: 2 of 18 changed config. UNEXPECTED: 10 of 18 changed config.

WHAT WE SEE IN THE MEDIA

msn Vutlook More - bing Maddow The Last Word menbc

Home US World

Politics Business

Entertainment

Sports

Business ... AND NBC NEWS.com

Are airline pilots forgetting how to fly?

Industry is suffering from 'automation addiction,' industry insider says

of manual flying skills in highly automated aircraft Skills

FLIGHTOPS



Do we really have a problem?

How bad is this really?

"Manual flying" refers to a broad collection of skills. Are we forgetting **all** of it? Do we need to launch a comprehensive program to train everything?

B747-400 SIMULATOR STUDY:

We asked 16 current B744 pilots to fly published arrivals, approaches, and missed approaches in five different automation situations:

- 1. Full automation
- 2. No autopilot
- 3. No flight director
- 4. No FMC
- 5. Instrument system failures with no EICAS



PILOT PERFORMANCE: HAND FLYING & RAW DATA

TABLE 3: Pilots' Flying Performance (Instrument Scanning and Manual Control Skills) in Three Automation Conditions (N = 16)

	Automation Condition					
Flight Phase	Autoflight	Manual Control	Raw Data and Manual Control			
Arrival						
Off course (3 course assignments per pilot)	0% (0 of 48)	0% (0 of 48)	2% (1 of 48)			
Speed > 10 kts (3 speed assignments per pilot)	8% (4 of 48) (<i>M</i> = 17 kts)	23% (11 of 48) (<i>M</i> = 15 kts)	15% (7 of 48) (<i>M</i> = 42 kts)			
Altitude > 300′ (3 altitude assignments per pilot)	2% (1 of 48) (<i>M</i> = 740')	10% (5 of 48) (<i>M</i> = 968')	10% (5 of 48) (<i>M</i> = 732')			
Approach						
Off localizer (1 localizer assignment per pilot)		0% (0 of 16)	6% (1 of 16)			
Off glide slope (1 glide slope assignment per pilot)		0% (0 of 16)	13% (2 of 16)			
Speed > 10 kts (3 speed assignments per pilot)		0% (0 of 48)	6% (3 of 48) (<i>M</i> = 21 kts)			
Altitude > 300' (3 altitude assignments per pilot)		0% (0 of 48)	0% (0 of 48)			
Missed Approach						
Off course (1 course assignment per pilot)		6% (1 of 16)	13% (2 of 16)			
Speed > 10 kts (2 speed assignments per pilot)		6% (2 of 32)	38% (12 of 32)			
Altitude > 300′ (1 altitude assignment per pilot)		0% (0 of 16)	6% (1 of 16) (<i>M</i> = 310')			



Note. Data in cells refer to percentage of tasks during which pilots committed at least one operationally significant

PILOT PERFORMANCE: DEALING WITH FAILURES

System Failure Event and Pilot Action	Proportion of Pilots				
Altimeter lag					
Verbalized problem	100%				
Cross-checked instruments	69%				
Deviated from altitude	75%				
Diagnosed problem	81%				
Heading indicator skew					
Verbalized problem	94%				
Cross-checked instruments	63%				
Deviated from heading	38%				
Diagnosed problem	56%				
Unreliable airspeed					
Verbalized problem	100%				
Cross-checked instruments	94%				
Approached stall (# of stick shakers)	94% (<i>M</i> = 4.6, <i>SD</i> = 4.0)				
Diagnosed problem	94%				

TABLE 7: Pilots' Performance During the Three Instrument System Failure Events (N = 16)



Conclusions from these three studies

We seem to do a good job training crews for the training situations, but perhaps not such a good job for the (unexpected) line situations.

Hand-eye skills that are "just like riding a bike" seem to be reasonably wellretained if initially well-learned, even when they are not practiced very often: e.g., raw data flying. But still could use some practice.

We don't seem to have a performance problem, but a recognition problem. When pilots recognize the situation correctly – they respond correctly.

We may not be losing "manual flying skills," But we seem to be losing "manual thinking skills!"







So,

maybe we are not teaching right.





Traditional Training









Psychological principles underlying The Comprehensive LOFT:

- Strategic use of knowledge and scaffolding
- Deliberate practice
- Generation effect
- Depth of processing
- Variability of practice
- Spacing
- Procedural reinstatement
- •

Barshi, I. (2015). From Healy's training principles to training specifications: The case of the Comprehensive LOFT. *American Journal of Psychology, 128,* 219-227.

THANK YOU for your attention

Additional Information:



THE LIMITS OF EXPERTISE

Rethinking Pilot Error and the Causes of Airline Accidents





THE MULTITASKING MYTH

Handling Complexity in Real-World Operations

> Loukla D. Loukopoulos R. Key Dismukes Immanuel Barshi



MISUNDERSTANDINGS IN ATC COMMUNICATION

Language, Cognition, and Experimental Methodology

Immanuel Barshi Candace Farris

Or contact me at: Immanuel.Barshi@nasa.gov