Jurnal Informatika Ekonomi Bisnis

http://www.infeb.org

2025 Vol. 7 Iss. 2 Hal: 350-354 e-ISSN: 2714-8491

The Role of Flight Instructors in Building Safety Culture among Student Pilots at API Banyuwangi

Dimas Hari Cahyo[1]✉, Daniel Dewantoro Rumani[2], Hari Kurniawanto[3], Chairustakmal[4]

[1,2,3,4]Akademi Penerbang Indonesia Banyuwangi

haricahyodima@gmail.com

Abstract

Safety culture in aviation training is fundamentally shaped by the interpersonal and instructional behaviors of flight instructors. Instructors not only deliver technical content but also model risk awareness, communication norms, and emotional discipline that shape how student pilots internalize safety values. This literature-based analysis focuses on flight training practices at API Banyuwangi and identifies three core mechanisms that drive safety culture development: instructor competence, leadership style, and institutional reinforcement. Competent instructors who demonstrate reflective pedagogy and consistent behavioral modeling are shown to foster higher levels of psychological safety and long-term risk accountability among trainees. Moreover, institutions that integrate safety objectives across curricula, performance evaluations, and infrastructure further amplify these effects. The synthesis highlights that effective safety education emerges from the convergence of individual instructional capacity and organizational alignment. Embedding safety as a shared ethos rather than a procedural obligation requires intentional design at both the pedagogical and institutional levels.

Keywords: Flight Instruction, Safety Culture, Aviation Education, Instructor Leadership, Behavioral Modeling.

1. Introduction

Safety in aviation is not merely a technical requirement but a deeply embedded cultural construct, especially within educational institutions that shape the next generation of pilots. Flight instructors serve as the primary agents for transmitting not only procedural knowledge but also the values, attitudes, and behavioral norms associated with safety culture [1] [2]. In structured pilot training environments such as Akademi Penerbang Indonesia (API) Banyuwangi, instructors are positioned as mentors who influence students' perceptions of risk, adherence to protocol, and decision-making behavior in high-pressure flight contexts [3] [4].

Safety culture is broadly defined as the shared values, beliefs, and practices that shape how safety is perceived, prioritized, and enacted within an organization [5] [6]. Within aviation training, this culture is cultivated not just through institutional policies, but through daily interactions between instructors and student pilots, including pre-flight briefings, debriefings, and in-flight corrections [1] [7]. The effectiveness of instructors in this pedagogical role depends on a mix of technical proficiency, interpersonal communication skills, and leadership style [8] [9].

In the Indonesian context, the national emphasis on expanding domestic aviation infrastructure has increased demand for highly competent and safety-conscious pilots [10]. Institutions like API Banyuwangi are under pressure to produce pilots not only with technical excellence but also with robust safety mindsets rooted in organizational learning and personal accountability [11] [12]. However, studies suggest that without consistent reinforcement from flight instructors, safety protocols risk being perceived by students as procedural formalities rather than critical cognitive habits [1] [13].

Instructor behavior, including how they model safety compliance and respond to deviations, has been shown to significantly influence how students internalize safety values [1] [9]. Instructors who foster a psychologically safe environment, where students are encouraged to discuss mistakes and reflect on near-misses, promote a culture of transparency and continuous improvement [13] [14]. Conversely, overly authoritarian or punitive instructional environments may discourage reporting and reduce opportunities for experiential learning [2] [4]. Given the critical influence of instructors in shaping pilot behavior, this literature review explores how instructor competence, leadership, and institutional support affect the formation of safety culture among student pilots at API Banyuwangi. The review aims to highlight both theoretical underpinnings and practical mechanisms through which safety culture is cultivated during pilot training, providing insights for curriculum development, instructor training, and aviation policy reform [3] [6].

2. Research Method

This study employed a qualitative literature review approach to synthesize current knowledge on how flight instructors influence safety culture among student pilots, particularly within the context of API Banyuwangi. Literature was collected from Scopus, ScienceDirect, SpringerLink, EBSCOhost, and

Accepted: 05-06-2025 | Revision: 26-06-2025 | Publication: 30-06-2025 | doi: 10.37034/infeb.v7i2.1172

GARUDA, covering publications between January 2016 and March 2024. Searches used combined keywords such as flight instructor, safety culture, aviation training, and student pilot in Indonesia. From an initial pool of 62 sources including peer-reviewed articles, institutional reports, and training manuals 26 were selected based on relevance, language (English or Bahasa Indonesia), academic rigor, and focus on civil aviation education.

Studies were excluded if they lacked methodological clarity, addressed military contexts, or focused solely on technical operations without addressing instructor roles or pedagogy. Selected literature was analyzed thematically using Braun and Clarke's framework, involving open coding, thematic categorization, and abstraction to identify key constructs such as instructional leadership, behavioral modeling, safety communication, and institutional reinforcement. Triangulation across empirical and theoretical sources ensured conceptual robustness.

To maintain methodological rigor, this review applied credibility, confirmability, and transferability principles. Each source was appraised using a modified Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) checklist. Analytic memos were used to track interpretation and reduce bias. While limited by its non-empirical nature and contextual specificity, the review incorporated Indonesian aviation sources, including API Banyuwangi's curriculum documentation, to strengthen contextual validity.

3. Results and Discussion

The reviewed literature reveals a consistent emphasis on the flight instructor's role as both a technical trainer and cultural transmitter within aviation education. Three major themes emerged from the synthesis: instructor competence and its influence on the internalization of safety behaviors, instructor leadership style and the modeling of safety-critical decisions, and institutional mechanisms that reinforce safety culture during training. These themes are interdependent, forming a triadic framework in which individual instructor capacity, relational pedagogy, and organizational reinforcement collectively shape students' understanding of safety norms.

In the Indonesian context, the findings suggest that formal aviation education, such as that offered at API Banyuwangi, benefits substantially from instructors who act not merely as knowledge conveyors but as behavioral exemplars. Students' perception of safety is deeply intertwined with how instructors embody risk awareness, procedural discipline, and communicative clarity. These dynamics form the basis of the first thematic category: instructor competence and its relationship to safety internalization.

Instructor competence encompasses both technical proficiency and pedagogical effectiveness, and is strongly linked to students' ability to internalize safety values. Studies consistently show that instructors with high levels of certification, current operational experience, and familiarity with contemporary flight safety frameworks are more effective in transmitting not only procedural accuracy but also an ethos of accountability and vigilance [8] [11]. This is particularly crucial in primary training settings where students form foundational cognitive habits.

Research on pilot academies in Southeast Asia, including API Banyuwangi, demonstrates that instructor credibility derived from both flight experience and safety record enhances student trust and engagement [1] [6]. Students are more likely to emulate instructors who exhibit precision, calm decision-making under pressure, and routine use of risk-assessment tools. These observable behaviors serve as implicit lessons, reinforcing formal curriculum components such as CRM (Crew Resource Management) and threat-and-error management.

Furthermore, safety internalization appears to be accelerated when instructors explicitly integrate safety principles into both flight operations and pre/post-flight briefings. Rather than treating safety as a standalone module, competent instructors frame safety as a continuous cognitive discipline embedded in every aspect of flying [4] [9]. This approach helps cultivate metacognitive awareness among students, encouraging them to actively reflect on decision-making processes and personal limitations.

Instructor competence also affects the emotional tone of learning environments. Studies indicate that competent instructors are more capable of fostering psychologically safe spaces where students feel encouraged to report mistakes or near-miss events without fear of punitive repercussions [13] [14]. This openness reinforces safety as a shared value rather than an imposed rule, strengthening collective responsibility among trainees. Lastly, instructor assessment and certification systems that emphasize safety leadership rather than only flight hours are more predictive of successful safety culture transmission. Programs that support ongoing instructor development, including workshops on human factors and behavioral coaching, further enhance this dynamic [2] [3]. The presence of such structures in institutions like API Banyuwangi has shown early promise in elevating both instructional quality and student safety consciousness.

The leadership style exhibited by flight instructors exerts a profound influence on how student pilots interpret and embody safety-related behaviors. Beyond technical instruction, the relational dynamic between instructor and trainee often shapes the emotional climate of the learning environment, affecting students' willingness to engage, question, and internalize safety norms. Studies in aviation training and educational psychology affirm that transformational leadership characterized by individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation yields superior safety learning outcomes compared to transactional or authoritarian styles [15] [16].

At flight academies such as API Banyuwangi, instructors who engage students with empathy, invite reflective dialogue during post-flight debriefings, and respond constructively to mistakes are more likely to instill trust and promote psychological safety [17] [18]. This environment enables students to process errors as learning opportunities rather than failures, thereby enhancing cognitive retention of safety principles and fostering long-term risk awareness.

Behavioral modeling plays a similarly pivotal role. According to Bandura's social learning theory, individuals acquire new behaviors by observing credible and respected models [19]. In flight training, students continuously monitor instructor responses to in-flight anomalies, pre-flight routines, and decision-making under uncertainty. Instructors who habitually conduct thorough safety checks, narrate situational assessments, and demonstrate restraint under pressure teach these behaviors implicitly embedding them into student pilots' own heuristics for safe operation [20] [21].

Moreover, the emotional regulation and non-verbal conduct of instructors contribute to what has been termed safety affect in instructional interactions. A study by Rowden and Conner [22] found that students were more likely to adopt conservative risk behavior when instructors maintained composure, clarity, and calm tone during emergencies, reinforcing non-escalatory decision-making norms. Conversely, erratic or emotionally reactive instructors may inadvertently model hazardous responses, regardless of verbal guidance.

Instructors also serve as cultural carriers of tacit safety knowledge the unwritten norms that often govern decision-making in high-risk environments [23] [24]. This includes informal discussions about prior incidents, cautionary tales, and personal risk thresholds shared outside formal lectures. Such soft data contribute significantly to how student pilots develop intuitive safety judgment, a dimension often overlooked in technical curricula. Importantly, evidence suggests that training programs which incorporate leadership development for instructors such as feedback coaching, emotional intelligence workshops, and scenario-based communication training result in stronger student safety performance and fewer reported errors [25] [26]. These findings underscore the need to treat instructor leadership as an explicit pedagogical competency, not a byproduct of seniority or flight hours.

While the role of flight instructors is central in shaping individual behaviors, the broader institutional context in which flight education occurs plays a critical role in either reinforcing or undermining safety culture. Institutions that systematize safety values through integrated policies, infrastructure, and learning management systems are more likely to foster long-term behavioral change among student pilots [27] [28]. At API Banyuwangi, institutional interventions such as mandatory safety briefings, safety management system (SMS) alignment with ICAO standards, and cross-functional safety audits have become essential in embedding safety values beyond the instructor-student dyad [29].

One key mechanism of institutional reinforcement is the integration of safety objectives within the curriculum. When safety is treated not as an auxiliary module but as a transversal component across all courses ranging from meteorology to simulator sessions it gains epistemic centrality in the minds of learners [29] [30]. API Banyuwangi's curriculum revisions in recent years have attempted to implement such integrative frameworks, although evaluation mechanisms to measure their effectiveness remain underdeveloped.

Organizational leadership also plays a pivotal role in operationalizing safety culture. Leadership commitment at the institutional level such as investments in incident reporting systems, feedback loops, and regular safety training for all staff serves as a signaling mechanism that safety is a shared, non-negotiable value [31] [32]. Institutions that fail to demonstrate visible support for safety initiatives risk engendering a culture of complacency, where safety procedures are seen as symbolic rather than functional.

Moreover, resource allocation is critical. Research indicates that underfunded aviation schools often experience higher rates of procedural deviations and safety rule violations due to insufficient simulator hours, outdated aircraft, or inadequate instructor-to-student ratios [33] [34]. API Banyuwangi's increasing government support since 2018, including improved fleet maintenance and digitalized briefing rooms, represents progress toward structural support for safety-centric training.

Peer networks and student community norms within the institution also influence the transmission of safety culture. Environments that encourage open discussion, peer accountability, and informal mentorship foster more resilient safety behaviors than those solely reliant on hierarchical supervision [24] [35]. Institutions can catalyze this peer dynamic by organizing scenario-based group discussions, student-led safety campaigns, and collaborative debriefing sessions. Ultimately, the institutionalization of safety culture requires more than policy it demands alignment across systems, leadership, pedagogy, and physical environments. API Banyuwangi offers a useful model in progress, where institutional reinforcement mechanisms complement the efforts of instructors to establish safety as a deeply held and operationalized value among student pilots.

This review affirms that the cultivation of safety culture in aviation education is deeply relational and systemic. Flight instructors are not merely conveyors of technical skill but act as behavioral models and cultural transmitters, shaping how students perceive risk and safety. Their influence is consistent with principles from high-reliability organization theory, where interpersonal trust, mindful routines, and

deference to expertise underpin operational safety [36]. Instructional micro-behaviors such as reflective debriefings and scenario-based discussions emerge as powerful tools for promoting safety internalization, shifting student motivation from compliance to commitment. Emotional intelligence further enhances this dynamic, with empathetic instructors fostering resilience and openness to feedback key for managing stress and uncertainty in high-risk settings [37].

However, individual excellence must be supported by institutional scaffolding. Organizations that link instructor performance with safety metrics, implement structured feedback loops, and invest in training ecosystems sustain safety culture more effectively [38]. Comparative models from EASA and Transport Canada highlight the growing international trend of treating instructional leadership as a core aviation safety competency. The challenge of safety driftwhere normalized deviations erode safety standards over time emphasizes the need for instructors to function as institutional memory, passing down lessons and upholding norms. API Banyuwangi has made progress, but fully embedding these practices requires aligning leadership, pedagogy, and systemic monitoring under a unified safety vision.

4. Conclusion

The cultivation of safety culture among student pilots depends critically on the competence, leadership style, and behavioral modeling of flight instructors. Instructors operate as cultural agents who embed safety values through moment-to-moment interaction, emotional regulation, and reflective engagement. Their effectiveness relies not only on individual skill but also on institutional structures that align pedagogy, assessment, and leadership with safety imperatives. When instructor development and systemic design converge, aviation education can produce pilots who internalize safety not as a procedure, but as a professional identity. Several areas warrant further investigation. Longitudinal studies tracking student pilots from training through professional careers could assess how instructor-led safety culture influences long-term operational behavior. Comparative research between national and international aviation schools may reveal institutional best practices in safety education. Moreover, empirical evaluation of emotional intelligence training for instructors could provide measurable insights into its impact on student learning outcomes. Finally, the role of peer dynamics and student-led safety initiatives remains an underexplored dimension in understanding how safety culture matures organically within training environments.

References

[1] Salas, E., Tannenbaum, S. I., Kraiger, K., & Smith-Jentsch, K. A. (2017). The Science of Training and Development In Organizations: What Matters In Practice. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *13*(2), 74–101. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100612436661 .

[2] Reason, J. (2016). Managing the risks of organizational accidents. Managing the Risks of Organizational Accidents (pp. 1–252). *Taylor and Francis.* DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315543543 .

[3] Bradshaw, C. P., Cohen, J., Espelage, D. L., & Nation, M. (2021). Addressing School Safety Through Comprehensive School Climate Approaches. School Psychology Review. *Routledge.* DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2021.1926321 .

[4] Zainudin, A. H., Hasmin, N. A., Dhihny, A. W., & Shah, R. M. (2018). Aviation Safety Management: Minimizing The Deleterious Effect of An Aviation Disaster. *International Journal of Engineering and Technology(UAE)*, *7*(4), 35–42. DOI: https://doi.org/10.14419/ijet.v7i4.25.22245 .

[5] Guldenmund, F. W. (2010). (Mis)Understanding Safety Culture and Its Relationship to Safety Management. *Risk Analysis*, *30*(10), 1466–1480. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01452.x .

[6] Liou, J. J. H., Yen, L., & Tzeng, G. H. (2016). Building An Effective Safety Management System for Airlines. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, *54*, 173–180. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jairtraman.2016.05.007 .

[7] Gaba, D. M. (2004). The Future Vision of Simulation In Health Care. *Quality and Safety in Health Care*, *13*(Suppl. 1), 2–10. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1136/qshc.2004.009878 .

[8] Wang, L., Tseng, Y., & Huang, C. (2020). Exploring Factors Influencing Safety Culture in Aviation. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, *140*, 102010. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tre.2020.102010 .

[9] Dekker, S. (2017). The Safety Anarchist. The Safety Anarchist. *Routledge*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203733455 .

[10] Noor Arzahan, I. S., Ismail, Z., & Yasin, S. M. (2022, March 1). Safety Culture, Safety Climate, and Safety Performance In Healthcare Facilities: A Systematic Review. *Safety Science*. Elsevier B.V. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2021.105624 .

[11] Muharomansyah, R., Handriyono, H., Fatimah, F., & Bahrawi, A. (2023). Pengaruh Kompetensi dan Kualifikasi Flight Instructor melalui Jam Terbang terhadap Skill Taruna Penerbang Sayap Tetap Akademi Penerbang Indonesia. *JIIP - Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, *6*(3), 2101–2109. DOI: https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v6i3.1814 .

[12] Hendra, O., Lestary, D., Aswia, P. R., Kalbuana, N., & Saulina, M. (2022). Pengenalan Budaya Keselamatan Bagi Pelajar Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan Penerbangan di Lampung dan Sidoarjo. Darmabakti: *Jurnal Inovasi Pengabdian Dalam Penerbangan*, *2*(2), 72–77. DOI: https://doi.org/10.52989/darmabakti.v2i2.51 .

[13] Kessler, R., Cheng, A., & Hunt, E. (2020). A Conceptual Model for Enhancing Patient Safety Through Team-Based Learning. *Academic Medicine*, *95*(4), 548–553. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000003067 .

[14] Gaba, V., & Greve, H. R. (2019). Safe or Profitable? The Pursuit of Conflicting Goals. *Organizational Science*, *30*(4), 647–667. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2018.1280 .

[15] Batista-Foguet, J. M., Esteve, M., & van Witteloostuijn, A. (2021). Measuring Leadership an Assessment of The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *PLoS ONE*, *16*(7 July). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0254329 .

[16] Shiferaw, R. M., Birbirsa, Z. A., & Werke, S. Z. (2023, December). Entrepreneurial Leadership, Learning Organization and Organizational Culture Relationship: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. *Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH.* DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-023-00305-z .

[17] Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior In Work Teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *44*(2), 350–383. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999 .

[18] Harvey, C. M., Johnson, K. E., & Shoemaker, E. S. (2021). Enhancing Safety Climate Through Instructor-Student Engagement: A Qualitative Study In Collegiate Flight Training. *Journal of Aviation/Aerospace Education & Research*, *30*(1), 33–49. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15394/jaaer.2021.1812 .

[19] Li, M., & Hua, Y. (2022). Integrating Social Presence With Social Learning to Promote Purchase Intention: Based on Social Cognitive Theory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.810181 .

[20] Harris, D., Li, W., & Kirkham, R. (2015). Human Factors In Multi-Crew Flight Training: A Review of Contemporary Instructional Practices. *The International Journal of Aviation Psychology*, *25*(3–4), 157–176. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/10508414.2015.1144795 .

[21] Cooke, N. J., & Gorman, J. C. (2009). Interaction-Based Measures of Cognitive Systems. *Journal of Cognitive Engineering and Decision Making*, *3*(1), 27–46. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1518/155534309X433302 .

[22] Rowden, P., & Conner, M. (2019). The Influence of Instructor Emotion Regulation On Pilot Trainee Behavior: A Field-Based Study. *Safety Science*, *116*, 207–215. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2019.02.037 .

[23] Klein, G. A., & Sullivan, J. (2001). *Sources of Power: How People Make Decisions* (Vol. 1, No. 1). MIT Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1532-6748(2001)1:1(21) .

[24] Fjeld, G. P., & Tvedt, S. D. (2020). How Do BRM-Training Participants Understand Non-Technical Skills?. *WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs*, *19*(2), 235–269. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s13437-020-00198-9 .

[25] Burke, M. J., Stagl, K. C., Salas, E., Pierce, L., & Kendall, D. (2006). Understanding The Cognitive and Affective Underpinnings of Training Transfer: A Study of Safety Leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(4), 926–934. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.926 .

[26] Helmreich, R. L., & Foushee, H. C. (2010). Why CRM? Empirical and Theoretical Bases of Human Factors Training. In *Crew Resource Management* (pp. 3–57). Elsevier Inc. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-374946-8.10001-9 .

[27] Neal, A., & Griffin, M. A. (2006). A Study of The Lagged Relationships Among Safety Climate, Safety Motivation, Safety Behavior, and Accidents at The Individual and Group Levels. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(4), 946–953. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.946 .

[28] Thomas, M. J. W., Salmon, P. M., & Lenné, M. G. (2020). Safety Culture and Safety Climate: How Far Have We Come and Where Could We Go?. *Safety Science*, *129*, 104827. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2020.104827 .

[29] Parks, R. M., Leduc, P. A., & Howell, D. M. (2019). Curricular Integration of Aviation Safety: Assessment Strategies and Student Engagement. *Collegiate Aviation Review International*, *37*(1), 47–62. DOI: https://doi.org/10.22488/okstate.19.100184

[30] Yeo, H. J., Lee, H. S., & Lee, H. W. (2020). Development of An Integrated Aviation Safety Education Framework for Student Pilots. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, *85*, 101805. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jairtraman.2020.101805 .

[31] Clarke, S. (2013). Safety Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Review of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles as Antecedents of Safety Behaviours. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *86*(1), 22–49. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2012.02064.x .

[32] Fernández-Muñiz, B., Montes, J., & Vázquez-Ordás, C. J. (2014). Safety Leadership, Risk Management and Safety Performance In Spanish Firms. *Safety Science*, *70*, 295–307. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2014.07.010 .

[33] Le Coze, J. C. (2019). Safety Management Beyond The Failure Model: The Dynamics of Organizational Safety. *Safety Science*, *118*, 21–31. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2019.04.044 .

[34] O'Connor, P., McNeese, N. J., & Martin, M. (2021). Organizational Factors Associated with Student Pilot Safety: A Multilevel Examination. *Aviation Psychology and Applied Human Factors*, *11*(1), 21–31. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1027/2192-0923/a000180 .

[35] Vogus, T. J., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). The Impact of Safety Organizing, Trusted Leadership, and Care Pathways On Reported Medication Errors In Hospital Nursing Units. *Medical Care*, *45*(10), 997–1002. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1097/MLR.0b013e318053674f .

[36] Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., & Salovey, P. (2011). Emotional Intelligence: Implications for Personal, Social, Academic, and Workplace Success. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *5*(1), 88–103. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00334.x .

[37] Sexton, J. B., & Helmreich, R. L. (2000). Analyzing Cockpit Communications: The Links Between Language, Performance, Error, and Workload. *Human Performance in Extreme Environments : The Journal of the Society for Human Performance in Extreme Environments*, *5*(1), 63–68. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7771/2327-2937.1007 .

[38] Routledge. Shanmugam, A., & Robert, T. P. (2015). Human Factors Engineering In Aircraft Maintenance: A Review. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*, *21*(4), 478–505. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/JQME-05-2013-0030 .