INSIGHTS OF HUMAN ERROR FACTORS RELATED TO MARITIME ACCIDENTS

Bhoopathy Bhaskaran[1] & D Rajasekar[2]
[1]Department of Marine Engineering, AMET deemed to be University, 135, East Coast Road, Kanathur, Chennai-603112
[2]AMET Business School, AMET deemed to be University, 135, East Coast Road, Kanathur, Chennai-603112

ABSTRACT   *Shipping is one of the most economically sound industry wherein accidents leads to loss of heavy capital. Hence, factors influencing the maritime accidents are always a concern. This article provides a comprehensive and critical analysis on the influence of human factors on the maritime accidents. The purpose is to analyse different factors that could influence the maritime accidents with special focus on human errors would certainly pave way to locate the causes of such accidents which ultimately may prevent heavy losses due to accidents. It is always essential to identify the cause to find a solution. The human factors that could cause various maritime accidents include errors in decision making process, mistakes in exercising core skills and distractions during work process. The human errors that cause maritime accidents are of various types which include decision error, skill-based mistakes, perceptual errors, group error etc. Violation is an incident that occured while the willful departure from authority and classified such as routine/infractions and exceptional violations. Routine tends to be habitual by nature constituting a part of the individual's behavioral repertoire and it further divisible into routine, optimizing and situational violations. Exceptional is appeared to be an isolated departures from authority, not necessarily indicative of an individual's typical behavior pattern, nor is it condoned by management. Indeed, present investigation has been endeavored in evaluating the recurrence of hierarchical factors, and the impacts of authoritative culture on accident causation. The possible means of actions were highlighted in details and error recovery strategies were also discussed in the present study.*

Keywords: simulators, Human error, violations, Organizational factors

Introduction

Cutting edge ships are prepared with innovatively progressed systems that are probably dependable. Marine accidents still happen, and the number of casualties is alarmingly high. Not even the state of the craftsmanship systems utilized to make strides the unused ships' operation have diminished the number of occurrences and mishaps at sea. The most figure that actuates the display circumstance is the human figure. Not being a machine, a human cannot be modified to take after the culminate way in each circumstance. Moreover, taking into consideration the variety of elements able to interfere with human work onboard the ship, it is practically impossible to have a rule or regulation for each state that can occur (Raluca and Alina 2016).

The analysis of human factors in accident causation is still generally juvenile in the maritime world (U.K. P and I Club, 1992). But violations are not all that bad, through constant pushing at accepted boundaries they got us out of the caves!Because it is unavoidable that mistakes will be made, the central point of blunder organization is set on reducing the shot of these errors happening and on restricting the impact of any mistakes that do happen. In expansive scale fiasco, the oft- cited to reason for "human error" is regularly taken to be synonymous with "administrator error" be that as it may a degree of commitment habitually lies with system makers. To find a human blunder is imperative to recognize energetic and torpid disillusionment keeping in intellect the conclusion objective to comprehend why mischances happen and how it may be kept from happening once more afterward on.

Humans, by their exceptionally nature, commit errors , therefore, it has been implicated in a variety of occupational accidents, including 70% to 80% of those in common and military flight (O'Hare, Wiggins, Batt, and Morrison, 1994; Wiegmann and Shappell, 1999; Yacavone, 1993). Indeed, while the quantity of accidents inferable exclusively to mechanical disappointment has diminished especially finished the previous 40 years, those inferable at any rate to some extent to human error have declined at a much slower rate (Shappell and Wiegmann, 1996).

A perception of technology as fully reliable and trustful, can lead to underestimating risks and consequently to the change of attitude toward seamanship practices and procedures, thus enabling

occurrence of human error (Schröder –Hinrichs *et al.,* 2012). A complacent behaviour can be manifested as a failure to closely monitor and check instruments, relying on one source of information instead utilizing all navigational aids, overlooking procedures, resorting to incorrect practices, missing important signals, misinterpreting signs. Consequently, detection of potentially dangerous situations can be delayed or missed (Toni Bielić *et al.,* 2017). As described by Reason, active failures are the actions or inactions of administrators that are accepted to cause the mischance (Wagenaar W.A. also, Groeneweg J., 1987). Interests, dormant disappointments are mistakes committed by individuals some place else within the supervisory progression of authority that impact the appalling progression of events ordinary for a mishap. The enhancements in preparing and association of the ship's team are proposed as preventive measures. The point of the display paper is to propose measures and sorts of mistakes and infringement, hazardous acts and preconditions in arrange to avoid recurrence of oceanic accidents.

Violations and errors

The infringement itself may not harm but rather the demonstration of disregarding brings the violator into locales in which ensuing errors are much liable to have awful results. This relationship can be summarized quite simply by the equation that violation synergistic with errors will lead to injury, fatel and damage. The resultant circumstance can sometimes be made much worse because persistent rule violators often assume, somewhat misguidedly, that no one else will disregard the standards, at any rate not in the meantime! Abusing safe working techniques isn't only an issue of rashness or indiscretion by those at the sharp end.

Factors prompting conscious disobedient expand well past the brain science of the person in coordinate contact with working dangers and incorporate such hierarchical issues such as nature of the workplace, the quality of tools and equipment [IMO, 2000], whether or not supervisors or managers turn a "blind eye" in order to get the job done, the quality of the rules, regulations and procedures and organization's overall safety culture, or indeed its absence.

Unsafe acts and preconditions

The unsafe demonstrations submitted by administrators by and large interpretation of two structures, errors and violations. The hazardous demonstrations of administrators confer can be bifurcated into three, one fundamental errors and two kinds of violations. The basic errors are classified as decision, skill-based and perceptual errors and violation such as Routine/Infractions and exceptional. Decision error is a typical error shape represents to the actions or inactions of people whose heart is in the correct place, but either did not have the appropriate information accessible or essentially picked inadequately. Skill-based errors describes basic operating skills that occur with little or so significant conscious thought, are particularly vulnerable to failures of attention and/or memory. Perceptual errors can be varied from others and defined such as visual illusions or spatial disorientation.

Violation is an occurrence that occurred whereas the willful flight from specialist and can be clarified in two unmistakable sorts such as routine/infractions and extraordinary. Schedule tends to be routine by nature constituting a portion of the individual's behavioral collection and it advance detachable into schedule, optimizing and situational infringement. Uncommon is showed up to be an disconnected flights from specialist, not fundamentally characteristic of an individual's normal behavior design, nor is it condoned by administration.

Preconditions for unsafe acts are described as substandard conditions and substandard practices of operators. The substandard conditions of operators is further viewed as adverse mental states whose mental conditions would affect performance whereas adverse physiological states illustrates whose medical or physiological conditions that preclude safe operations. Physical/Mental limitations occured when the task requirements exceed the capabilities of the individual at the controls. The substandard practices of operators can be viewed as Crew Resource Mismanagement and it exhibits that the substandard practices of the team will lead to the conditions and unsafe acts whereas, personal readiness is considered to be individual error. Team error is one kind of human error. Team error can be considered how a group of people made human errors when they work in a team or a group and in team process. Reasons may be attributed to the mistakes, lapses and slips. Mistakes and lapses originate in the planning and thinking process, whereas action slips emerge primarily out of these execution processes. Mistakes and lapses are more likely to be associated with group processes. Slips are errors in the action process of a single individual and are likely to be divorced from the activities of the team as whole.

The error making process

Person mistakes are committed by an person without any support of other colleague. Person blunders may be encourage sub-partitioned into autonomous mistakes and ward blunders. Free mistakes happen when all information available to the guilty party is essentially right. In subordinate errors, in any case, some piece of this data is wrong, truant or inaccurate with the goal that the individual makes an error inadmissible for a specific circumstance. Shared errors will be considered to be the errors which are shared by a few or the greater part of the colleagues, paying little heed to regardless and were in coordinate correspondence. Shared errors may be sub-partitioned into independent and ward. Group error is one type of human error and looks at how a gathering of individuals influenced human errors when they work in a group. At this juncture, we can characterize group error as human error made in bunch forms. Based on the reason, sorted human errors are of three kinds such as oversights, passes and slips. Oversights and failures emerge in the arranging and thinking process, while activity slips develop fundamentally out of these execution forms. Slip-ups and passes will probably be related with assemble forms. Slips are errors in the activity procedure of a solitary individual and are probably going to be separated from the exercises of the group as entirety.

Active and latent errors

Two sorts of mistake happening in a complex framework such as marine transportation can be recognized: dynamic and inactive errors.The impacts of active errors are felt very quickly after the mischance while the results of dormant errors may not be obvious until the point when a specific mix with different factors happens. Active errors are the ones made by pilot, control room group, ship officers and other "cutting edge" administrators. Creators, abnormal state leaders, supervisors, upkeep faculty and so forth are in all probability causing latent errors. As per Reason, past accidents have demonstrated that the greatest risk to an intricate framework's safety originates from latent errors A disaster may have been lurking in the system a long before the accident due to poor design, incorrect installation, faulty maintenance, poor management decisions, etc., and the operator has just added the finishing touch. Because of this, improvements in the immediate human-machine interface might not have a great impact on improving safety.

The error recovery process

The error recovery training may drop into discovery, sign and redress stages. The first step in recouping errors is to identify their event.When the remainders of the team do not notice errors, leads to no chance to correct them. Actions can be initiated based on those errors will be executed. Once errors detected, the recovery of an error will depend upon whether team members bring it to the attention of the remainder. This is the second barrier to team error making. If any error is detected but not indicated necessarily be recovered and the actions shall be executed based on those errors extent. The last barrier is considered to be the actual correction of errors. It is prevalent that even if the remainder of the team notices and indicates the errors, the people who made the errors, may not change their minds, the actions based on those errors will go unchecked.

Check - Organisational factors

The importing training to the operators can only ever be part of the solution to reducing accident causation. The fact that databases held by safety net providers and characterization social orders do incorporate human error scientific categorizations, little investigation is attempted to distinguish patterns or examples.

The differences in organizational culture between shipping companies are a well known phenomenon; however, a little work on understanding on the impacts of authoritative culture on protected and productive execution. Similarly ,this study is trying to distinguish an arrangement of behavioral markers to survey the fitness of individuals.Hence, there is a need to build up an arrangement of authoritative measurements to decide the ability of shipping organizations to perform safely.

A very little studies were prevailed on the parameters governing and performing the management systems. There is few research studies showed that what influences an administration framework to work or to be sure what keeps it from working. Similarly, insufficient is thought about the measurements that empower the status of an administration framework to be resolved. Preferably, what is required is an arrangement of "driving" pointers that will anticipate future execution so medications can be made before accidents happen. It is to infer that what constitutes hierarchical conduct and in choosing which "practices" are driving pointers of proficiency and finaly, in outlining techniques that can gauge these markers precisely.

Conclusion

Larger efforts are made to identify the causes of maritime accidents. Many regulatory frameworks have been made to minimize maritime accidents. Training programmes have been refined with contents for maritime satefy. Even then, maritime accidents do happen. The main reason is human errors. Our efforts in understanhding the issues on maritime accident caused by the human errors concludes that the failure or ineffective coordination between human element, technaical interface and unsafe preconditions largely found responsible for human errors that may cause maritime accidents largely.

References

1. Raluca APOSTOL-MATES1 Alina BARBU2 (2015). Human Error-the Main Factor In Marine Accidents :"Mircea cel Batran" Naval Academy Scientific Bulletin, Volume XIX – 2016 – Issue 2
2. U.K. P&I Club (1992). The United Kingdom Mutual Steam Ship Assurance Association (Bermuda) Limited. Analysis of Major Claims.
3. O'Hare, D., Wiggins, M., Batt, R., & Morrison, D. (1994). Cognitive failure analysis for aircraft accident investigation. Ergonomics, 37, 1855-69.
4. Shappell, S., Wiegmann, D., Fraser, J., Gregory, G., Kinsey, P., & Squier, H. (1999). Beyond mishap rates: A human factors analysis of U.S. Navy/Marine Corps TACAIR and rotary wing mishaps using HFACS. Aviation, Space and Environmental Medicine , 70, 416-7.
5. Shappell, S., & Wiegmann, D. (1996). U. S. Naval Aviation mishaps 1977-92: Differences between single- and dual-piloted aircraft. Aviation, Space and Environmental Medicine, 67, 65-69.
6. Yacavone, D. (1993). Mishap trends and cause factors in Naval aviation: A review of Naval Safety Center data, 1986-90. Aviation, Space and Environmental Medicine, 64, 392-5.
7. Schröder-Hinrichs, J-U, E. Hollnagel, and M. Baldauf. 2012. "From Titanic to Costa Concordia—a century of lessons not learned". WMU Journal of Mariti.
8. Toni Bielić , Nermin Hasanspahić and Jelena Čulin :Preventing marine accidents caused by technology-induced human error, Scientific Journal of Maritime Research 31 (2017) 33-37.
9. Wagenaar, W.A., and J. Groeneweg. 1987. "Accidents at sea: Multiple causes and impossible consequences". International Journal of Man-Machine Studies 27(5-6): 587–98. doi: 10.1016/S0020-7373(87)80017-2.