

Aug 15th, 8:00 AM - 9:30 AM

## A Method of Identification of a Failed Engine in Twin-Engine Turboprop Aircraft: A Survey

Andrey Babin

*Piedmont Airlines, Inc.*, andrey.k.babin@gmail.com

Andrew R. Dattel Ph.D.

*Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University*, andy.dattel@erau.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.erau.edu/ntas>



Part of the [Aviation Safety and Security Commons](#)

---

Babin, Andrey and Dattel, Andrew R. Ph.D., "A Method of Identification of a Failed Engine in Twin-Engine Turboprop Aircraft: A Survey" (2018). *National Training Aircraft Symposium (NTAS)*. 43.  
<https://commons.erau.edu/ntas/2018/presentations/43>

This Presentation is brought to you for free and open access by the Conferences at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in National Training Aircraft Symposium (NTAS) by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [commons@erau.edu](mailto:commons@erau.edu).

# A METHOD OF IDENTIFICATION OF A FAILED ENGINE IN TWIN-ENGINE PROPELLER AIRCRAFT – A SURVEY

Andrey Babin

Andrew R. Dattel, Ph.D

Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

## INTRODUCTION

- From 1985 to 1997, among all documented in-flight engine shutdowns, wrong engine included almost 50% for turboprop and 30% for turbojet aircraft (Sallee & Gibbons, 1999)
- 40% of interviewed twin-engine helicopter pilots admitted confusing engine throttle in an emergency at least once (Wildzunas et al., 1999; as cited in Aviation Safety Council, 2016)
- Under stress, people tend to rationalize expected outcome, even if it does not correlate with reality, thus justifying erroneous decisions (Kontogiannis & Malakis, 2008)
- Decision-making is especially critical on takeoff, when time is of the essence
- “Dead foot – dead engine” is currently used for identification of a failed engine

## REFERENCES:

Available on handout

## METHOD

A survey was created to acquire more information on wrong identification of a failed engine in twin-engine turboprop aircraft

- The survey was created through SurveyMonkey
- The survey consisted of 10 questions
- Participants were sampled from one U.S. airline that operates twin-engine turboprop aircraft
- Link to the survey was distributed via email

## RESULTS

- 49 airline pilots completed the survey
- Average experience flying twin-engine turboprops – 9 years and 6,300 flight hours
- Almost 23% admitted having problems identifying a failed engine at least once in simulator training
- Pros: most respondents found the method redundant and accurate
- Cons: most respondents found the method time-consuming and having a likelihood of error
- **29% of respondents agreed that there could be a better method of identification of a failed engine**

## DISCUSSION

- Pilots were experienced in flying turboprop twins
- Almost 1/3 of pilots agreed that there could be a better method, which shows that the current method might not be very effective
- Most pilots practice this method only during the simulator and rarely use it. This could be the explanation as to why they consider it systematic and accurate

## CONCLUSION

- The results of this study correlate with previous findings
- This survey was part of a larger study aimed at testing an alternative method of identification of a failed engine
- For further research, it is suggested to collect data from a bigger sample, as well as from pilots operating other aircraft types

