Innovative SOft SkillS to Maritime Education and Training - iSOL-MET

MARITIME CASE STUDY HANDBOOK
# CONTENTS

1 Introduction 4
2 iSOL-MET European Partnership 5
3 Methodology 25
4 Case Studies Repository 32
   4.1 Team and Leaders Time Shortage 33
   4.2 Attitude Does Matter! 39
   4.3 The Growth Mindset 43
   4.4 Communication and Cooperation Thrive When There is Mutual Trust 47
   4.5 Resilience is Contagious! 52
   4.6 Good Teamwork, a Proper Leadership During the Covid Pandemic on Board 61
   4.7 Train the Leader for Leadership 67
   4.8 How to Prevent a Small Incident from Turning into a Disaster 74
   4.9 Leadership to Overcome Cultural Differences 80
   4.10 Leadership to Overcome Second Generation Gender Bias for Women 86
   4.11 The Conflict with the Captain 90
   4.12 No Consent to Repatriation for Extraordinary Reasons 94
5 How to Chose the Right Case Study? 97
6 Table 1 - Case study selection matrix 100
“Innovation in the Blue Economy: realising the potential of our seas and oceans for jobs and growth” adopted on 15/10/2014, reference: TEN/554-EESC-0000, recognizes the lack of skilled workforce knowledgeable in the latest technologies and a range of other disciplines, as a challenge and hindering factor of blue economy. The New Skills Agenda for Europe, COM/2016/0381 final, confirms same status and suggests taking action for the improvement of the quality and relevance of training for obtaining the necessary skills.

A challenge met across blue economy is the poor image of the activities among young and the lack of information in respect to career opportunities, which in combination with the ageing trend of European population may generate lack of qualified personnel.

Maritime schools face several challenges in preparing students to meet workplace demands in an increasingly complex, knowledge and technology-based environment while lacking generic skills that are requested by employers, such as critical thinking, creativity, problem solving, communication and teamwork.

This is why The Consortium iSOL-MET was established. We aim to:

- Bridge the gap between shipping world requirements in respect to human resources soft skills and competences, through developing innovative educational material based on the case study methodology;
- Bridge the needs of maritime professionals for ongoing career opportunities even after completing their sea service on board;
- Bridge the experience gap of maritime universities’ students in respect to the on-board operations and the shipping practices;
- Exchange best practices and cultural awareness on maritime education and shipping issues.

One of the main outputs of the project is Maritime Case Study Handbook, which is a collection of all case studies identified and analyzed during project’ life time. Case studies were identified in close collaboration with the industry and constitute an integrated educational material, designed to address current soft skills gaps, while providing to the educators with useful material in respect to the content and the teaching methods.

The development of the Handbook consists of three main activities:

1) the analysis of the appropriate case studies, as defined in the previous stages of the project,
2) the development of teaching guidelines,
3) assessment tools.

Each project partner was responsible for compiling two or three case studies, which have been assigned in the previous steps of the project, as well the teaching and evaluating method which was used during the Intensive Study Programs (ISP). In addition, the experience gained from teaching the case studies during the ISPs is integrated as part of the recommendation section of each case.

When the material was finalized, it was reviewed by all members of the consortium and proof read by Lead partner. The Handbook before publishing was presented to the Panel of Experts, to ensure consistency and validity of the content.
The University of the Aegean

The University of the Aegean is called to serve the modern needs of studies and research in a place with diachronic contribution to the promotion of knowledge and culture. Polynesianism and the introduction of modern objects are the dominant features from its foundation in March 1984 until today. Parts of it are located on six (6) islands. It has a presence in the five Prefectures of the Aegean and is the only Greek University with Departments in two Regions of the country. Academically it consists of 18 Departments subject to 6 Faculties. It provides 18 Undergraduate Programs of Study while there are more than 60 postgraduate courses. In addition, a Doctoral Dissertation is offered in the 18 Departments of the Institution. New forms of education in which the University of the Aegean is developing significant activity, concern the "Distance Learning" Programs and the "Summer Schools" Programs. An internationally recognized research project is implemented with the doctoral programs and the operation of 74 institutionalized Research Laboratories as a vehicle. The student population amounts to approximately 15,600 people in the Undergraduate Programs, exceeds 1,900 people in the Postgraduate Programs and approaches 630 at the level of Doctoral Studies. As far as the Staff is concerned, the Teaching and Research Staff (DEP) are of the order of 315 Members, the special categories of Teaching and Laboratory Staff reach the number of 65 Members, while respectively the staffing of administrative staff exceeds the number of 260 people.

The Department of Shipping, Trade and Transport (STT) was founded in 1998 in the island of Chios, in line with character of the Aegean region and the long nautical tradition of Chios. The core STT mission is to deliver high quality academic education services based on undergraduate, postgraduate, and doctoral programs, the dissemination of innovative theoretical and applied research of international standards and its interrelation with the economy and the society, paying attention to the sectors Shipping, Transportation, International Trade, and Entrepreneurship.
The Department of Shipping, Trade and Transport (STT) has succeeded to emerge as an extrovert international Centre of Excellence in University shipping studies. This success is confirmed by the global academic community, as certified by numerous grants, distinctions and prizes, and the distinctive career paths of the Department's graduates. The Department of Shipping, Trade and Transport is a research intensive department and study the fields that matter, in order to transform the maritime world and your future.

The University's academics are world-leading experts in the fields of finance, shipping management and port economics, maritime law and geopolitics, transportation modeling, environmental studies, digital technology and innovation.

Dr. Maria Lekakou
Professor in Maritime Economics in Department of Shipping, Trade and Transport, and Dean of the School of Business Studies in University of the Aegean. She has a longstanding experience in shipping and maritime policy, as Advisor to the Minister of Mercantile Marine, member of the National Regulatory Authority for Maritime Transportation and as a maritime expert in many national or European bodies. Maria Lekakou is co-author of books examining European Maritime Policy, Greek shipping competitiveness, island transports and cruise tourism and she has studied coastal shipping, short-sea shipping policy, maritime tourism, maritime governance, cruise industry, passenger shipping, labour affairs as well as European policies related to liner shipping, maritime competition and regional development.

Maria Lekakou is the Scientific Coordinator for the iSOLMET Project aiming to Bridge the gap between shipping world requirements in respect to human resources soft skills and competences, through developing innovative educational material based on the case study methodology taking into account the issues of digitalization, globalization and sustainability.

She runs the initiative BlueGrowth for the promotion of ocean literacy and sustainable blue economy by organizing European Maritime Days, BLUEHACATHONS (for students) AEGEAN BLUEGROWTH COMPETITION (for startuppers) and Living Labs for developing sustainable business ideas. The Blue Aegean was selected as national winner for introducing entrepreneurial skills for European Enterprise Promotion Awards in 2020.
Dr. George K. Vaggelas
Associate Professor of Shipping and Transport Management at the Department of Shipping, Trade and Transport of the University of the Aegean. He is member of the “Research in Shipping and Ports Laboratory” of the University of the Aegean and a founding member of PortEconomics – a web-based initiative advancing knowledge exchange on port economics, management and policies.

Markella Gota
Maritime Economist. In 2020, she graduated from the Department of Shipping, Trade and Transport and she is a holder of MSc in Shipping Management from the University of the Aegean. She is currently employed as an Operations Assistant for a Greek Shipping Company and as a Research Fellow at the University of the Aegean. Markella’s scientific interests revolve around strategic management, sustainable development, diversity and inclusion in the shipping industry.

Dr Helen Iakovaki
Assistant Professor at the University of Aegean, Department of Shipping, Trade and Transport. She has been teaching ESAP (Maritime English, Business English) and Business Communication at the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Program of Studies. She has a Ph.D from the University of Sorbonne (Paris IV) and her research interests include English for Specific Purposes, Special Terminology, and English as a Workplace Language with emphasis on intercultural competence. She has written a course book (English for Shipping, Trade and Transport) and a number of articles on task-based communicative learning in ESP. She has participated in a number of European funded programs (KNOWME, SLIM VRT, CAPTAINS etc.) concerning mainly the teaching of Maritime English.
Ioannis Katsounis
Social and Political Scientist. In 2009 he graduated from the Department of Sociology from Panteion University and is a holder of an MSc Diploma in International and European Studies from the University of Piraeus. Since 2015 he is employed as a Researcher at the University of the Aegean, under which he carries out his PhD thesis. Ioannis' scientific interests lie on the grounds of Social Cohesion, Sustainable Development, Island Development, Maritime Sociology and Blue Economy. He participates as a researcher and scientific associate in a significant number of research projects related to social cohesion and sustainable development in Greece and the European Union. His doctoral dissertation examines the contribution of Blue Economy in Social Cohesion and the development of Greek island regions.

Charis Pappas
In charge of Corporate Communications of Naftika Chronika - the most acclaimed and long-standing Greek shipping publication- and is editor-in-chief of the educational initiative Isalos.net. He has graduated from University of the Aegean, Department of Shipping, Trade & Transport with an MSc in Marketing & Communications from the Athens University of Economics and Business.

Georgoulis Georgios
Teaching and Laboratory Staff at University of Aegean. In 2000, he acquired the Captain Licence and served as a Captain in Very Large Crude Carriers (VLCC) until 2003 when he was engaged by the University of the Aegean in the department of Shipping Trade and Transport as a Teaching Associate to support the Nautical studies in both under graduated and post graduated programs where he works until today. He received a MSc from University of the Aegean emphasizing in new technologies for Maritime industry on 2007 and he is a phd candidate. From February 2011 to July 2012 he worked in the ministry of maritime affairs as an advisor to the secretary general. He is an active Captain and he is specialised on shipping operation, seafarer education issues, on the International Safety Management Code, and on maritime Risk Assesment.
Maria Koutiva (MA, Ph.D. candidate)
Graduated from the Department of English Language and Literature of the University of Athens, and holds a research MA from the University of Utrecht, the Netherlands. She has worked for several years as a Teacher of English as a Foreign Language in Greece. Since 2019 she has been working on her doctoral dissertation, specializing on Maritime English (ESP), under the supervision of Dr. Iakovaki. She contributed to the iSOL – MET project by translating the case studies’ scripts.
Constanta Maritime University (CMU) is a higher education and research state-owned institution from Romania, established in 1990 by Government Resolution no. 113/06.02.1990. CMU is governed by its University Charter, which establishes the mission and strategic goals, together with the rights, duties and responsibilities of its academic community, in the public interest. These comply with the provisions of The Lima Declaration on Academic Freedom and Autonomy of Institution of Higher Education (1988), The Magna Charta of European Universities (Bologna, 1988) and the Bologna Declaration (1999). CMU provides undergraduate and master's degree programs for the following majors:

- Navigation and Waterborne Transport,
- Marine Engineering,
- Electrical Engineering,
- Economic Engineering in Transports,
- Technology and Telecommunication Systems,
- Electroenergetic Systems,
- Environment Engineering and Environment Protection in the Industry.

Doctoral studies focus on the field of mechanical engineering. In addition to the academic course offer, CMU provides professional courses required by the blue industry, in the area of risk and resource management, environmental systems, waste water treatment and dynamic positioning. CMU has developed and completed, either as beneficiary or as partner, several EU funded research projects focused on enhancing safety at sea and the efficiency of waterborne transport as well as on the training of the academic teaching staff involved in lecturing on maritime disciplines.

The University is endowed with laboratories useful for the research activity and a Complex of Integrated Simulators for the practical training of its over 3,000 students. The Integrated Complex of Simulators covering all the departments of a real ship is a state-of-the-art tool helping to develop seamanship skills in students. It is the best simulation system in the transport field that can be found in any of the Romanian universities.
Academic cooperation plays an important role in CMU’s internationalization. CMU is an active member of major international and global networks, with high potential for student and teacher mobility and joint research programs: Black Sea Association of Maritime Institutions (BSUN 1999), International Maritime Lecturers Association (IMLA 2000), International Association of Maritime Universities (IAMU 2000) and International Association of Universities (IAU 2007). In 2013, CMU chaired IAMU and hosted its 14th Annual General Assembly. This was in recognition of CMU’s role in the global maritime education and of assistance in promoting its values and mission of enhancing synergies within the blue industry.

CMU has recognised the gaps between teaching curricula and the international regulatory framework and accessed European funds (2014) to align its curricula to the STCW requirements. Meeting the industry requirements beyond regulatory compliance is regarded as the ultimate goal of the blue education and therefore CMU works closely with the marine and energy industry and attained membership of the International Maritime Contractors Association (2015) and The Nautical Institute (2015), which accredited the DP training centre.

CMU developed and implemented a quality management system, certified by Bureau Veritas since 2003. CMU operates an integrated management system certified by the same body in 2006 and maintained to date, in compliance with ISO 9001:2008 and ISO 14001:2004. This refers to process management matters, including teaching and practical activities, assessment of competences, issuance of certification, analysis of the feedback from students and industry.

Assoc. Prof. Anastasia Duse, EngD

Project Manager of iSOL-MET in Romania, received her bachelor’s degree in 2005 at Constanta Maritime University. In 2010 she got her master’s degree in Maritime and Port Management at Constanta Maritime University. In 2008 she started teaching Astronomy and Celestial Navigation at Constanta Maritime University. In order to continue her teaching career and her research work she got her EngD. diploma in Mechanical Engineering at Constanta Maritime University in 2013. Presently she is an Associate Professor at Constanta Maritime University, and she is determined to continue her work in helping students obtain knowledge about Navigation onboard ships. As a teacher and a researcher, she has participated in international conferences and she has been involved in numerous European projects.
Assoc. Prof. Nicoleta Acomi, EngD

Vice Dean of Faculty of Navigation and president of the Romanian Intermodal Transport Association. She has a 16-year academic background in the maritime field and has been a Project Manager for 30+ projects. She is the Rapporteur for research project evaluations of the International Association of Maritime Universities, the Vice-President of Women’s International Shipping & Trading Association, Romania and the President of the Romanian Intermodal Transport Association.

Dr. Nicoleta Acomi is the founder and director of Constanta Maritime University Training Centre. She has previously coordinated the project of development and international accreditation of the Dynamic positioning vocational courses. Under her continually improved leadership in the subject field, CMU extended its educational tangible assets with course specific simulators and electronic library as deliverables of successfully managed projects. Dr. Nicoleta Acomi has also been actively involved in international marine professional organisations, being committed to internationalisation of the maritime education.

Anca Sirbu, PhD

An Associate Professor at Constanta Maritime University with a long-standing experience in teaching ESP (English for Specific Purposes) on an academic level. As a translator, she has always been keen on the study of terminology, hence her passion for Specialized Languages. She has been teaching Maritime English and Specialized English for the Departments of Marine Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Environmental Engineering and Economic Engineering of CMU since 2012. Dr. Anca Sirbu is also a certified instructor of Maritime English in accordance with the provisions of section A - 1/6; paragraph 3 of the Code of the International Convention on STCW for Seafarers, 1978, as amended. Throughout her career Dr. Anca Sirbu has participated as a member or as an external collaborator or consultant in numerous national and international research projects carried out by CMU.
Luminita Stan, BEc
Coordinator of the Professional Counseling Department at CMU. Her work focuses on the professional development of students: job match/mismatch, labour market, with an emphasis on the relation between students and maritime companies. She also has experience in national and EU projects, such as ROSE and ERASMUS. Prior to joining CMU, she worked as Senior Account Executive at MEMRB, a multinational research marketing company. She has a Bachelor’s degree in economics in the field of marketing from Bucharest University of Economic Studies and also a Postgraduate Degree in Advertising from the Faculty of Journalism and Communication Sciences, University of Bucharest.
The Maritime University of Szczecin is a public, technical university with a long-established tradition that dates back to 1947. That year, the first school for maritime professionals was established in the Polish city of Szczecin, which was incorporated together with West Pomerania province (former German territories) into Poland after World War II.

Over the decades, the school supplied a few thousand, world-renowned officers for the merchant and fishing fleet. Those days, deep-sea fisheries, in particular, were in rapid expansion and graduates from Szczecin were present on the world's most remote waters, exploring uncharted fishery zones, becoming unquestionable experts in their profession. Meanwhile, the maritime school in Szczecin, changed its name a couple of times, settled (1962) in one of the best locations in the city - at Chrobry Embankment and since 1968, as Maritime School of Higher Education (Pol.: Wyższa Szkoła Morska) grew to become one of the major maritime schools in Europe.

In 2002, the new Faculty of Economics and Transport Engineering was established. Its graduates are specialists in land-based professions (management, transport, logistics). Expanding the educational offer with new courses resulted in upgrading to a higher status within the Polish education system. In 2004 the name of the school changed to Akademia Morska (Maritime Academy) which is the direct equivalent of a university in the generally accepted educational terminology. In Polish, "academy" is a term referring to an institution providing higher education, particularly in the uniformed or artistic professions. The recent development of our University in terms of facilities, staff competence and expanding numbers of courses provided, resulted in the Polish parliament’s decision to again upgrade the status of Maritime University of Szczecin.

On 1st September 2022, the Polish name of the MUS was changed from "Akademia Morska" to "Politechnika Morska". The word "politechnika" comes from ancient Greek - polýtechnos - and means proficient in many arts. In the Polish educational system, a higher education institution called "politechnika" corresponds to a university or institute of technology in the generally accepted educational terminology used in English-speaking countries. Our name in English though remains the Maritime University of Szczecin.
MUS offers students a wide range of courses that also provide highly qualified personnel for IT, surveying services, transport, freight forwarding, and logistics, with a particular focus on maritime industry jobs. Our graduates meet all the requirements of the STCW standards and demands of today's global job market.

Another part of our mission is developing scientific research with a profound commitment to innovative technologies. We strongly support - with increasing concern for sustainability - the close cooperation between the University, business and society. MUS flexibly responds to the challenges of the educational and job markets.

Moreover, MUS has been actively participating in numerous externally funded, international projects which resulted in state-of-the-art research and didactic infrastructure but also in researching into most pressing, maritime issues and following the latest educational trends (in 2007-2017 the value of MUS projects amounted to ca. 25 MEUR). MUS has been involved in projects co-financed from the following EU instruments and international programmes such as: Horizon 2020, Baltic Sea Region 2007-2013 and 2014-2020, South Baltic Programme 2007-2013, BONUS-185, Era-Net Transport III, Era-Net Martec, Polish-Norwegian Research Programme, 5th and 7th Framework Programme, Tempus, Leonardo da Vinci, Erasmus+ and structural funds (ERDF and ESF) via national programmes for training and development of innovation and infrastructure.

Piotr Wołejzsa, Master Mariner, professor at MUS

iSOLMET coordinator at MUS, works as project and impact manager promoting and fostering the university's engagement with external stakeholders both in education and research. He has also experience as project manager within the framework of different EU, ERASMUS and national policies and funds. Holds PhD in Geodesy and Cartography, which was successfully commercialized as a Navigational Decision Support System NAVDEC.

Marek Narękiewicz

Lecturer at the Maritime University of Technology in Szczecin. He holds a PhD in geodesy and cartography and a master's degree in law. He also has extensive experience as a captain on commercial ships.
Patrycja Narękiewicz
She graduated from the Maritime University and worked in a port company. She is a Social Psychologist, holds a PhD in economics. Employed as an assistant professor at the Maritime University of Technology in Szczecin, she teaches psychology, communication and management.

Bogusz Wiśnicki, Assistant Professor at MUS
His career relates to the maritime industry, i.a. worked for the Polish and foreign shipowners and was employed in port companies. Bogusz Wisnicki is the author of over 120 scientific publications, numerous scientific studies commissioned, and he made several foreign internships. His main research area is maritime and intermodal transport systems with emphasis on new technologies implementation. He actively participated in international research and development projects, including several Erasmus+ Strategic Partnership and Capacity Building projects.
Piri Reis University is a private university founded by the Turkish Maritime Education Foundation in 2008 in Istanbul, Turkey. It has the support and sponsorship of all maritime sector (almost 9000 stakeholders) namely the Turkish Chamber of Shipping through the Turkish Maritime Education Foundation (TUDEV), as a maritime university.

TUDEV, forming the core of PRU, has a very successful history of training of seafarers and EU Projects since 1993 to bring the Turkish Shipping Sector to the world-class standards and to establish maritime policies and identify targets that will enhance the economic power, welfare and efficiency of the country in this area as well as to training professional personnel and opening and operating special training institutions for the interested people to have a career or assisting the educational institutions in maritime to e opened and improve their capabilities in terms of facilities and education with a goal to promote the Turkish shipping industry. It pushes the limits of knowledge with the principles of global awareness and with its strong prominent academic staff and students.

The aim of the university is to educate individuals who have high confidence and full technological knowledge, who are eager to participate, who know how to access information and question everything as well as specializing in every maritime field and developing scientific studies. There are undergraduate and postgraduate students in and out of the country and approximately 600 professionals are attending professional development courses at the continuos professional development center of the university at various ranks and seniority at different times of the year. The university educates competent and qualified engineers through student-centered and project-based education programs.

Piri Reis University is a full member of the International Maritime Universities Association, and currently holds the chairmanship of the Black Sea Association of Maritime Institutions. Turkish Higher Education Council has awarded PIRI REIS UNIVERSITY “The Prize for Excellence in International Co-operation”, due to the cooperation it exhibited with Qatar Naval Military College in the frame of the provision of education and the development of research institutions abroad".
Taner Albayrak, Capt Prof. Dr.
iSOL-MET PRU manager, is graduate of Naval Academy and Naval War College and qualified as a line officer (both deck and engineering). Following his retirement from the Navy, he worked as Head of Vocational Programmes, Dep. Head of Navigation Engineering Department and EU Projects Coordinator at TUDEV (Turkish Maritime Education Foundation—established by Chamber of Shipping) Institute of Maritime Studies for Merchant Navy prior to his present post at Piri Reis University. He is secretary of the Black Sea Association of Maritime Institutes and is presently a senior lecturer at the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences Maritime Business Management Department. His research interest include Management and Organization, Maritime Business Management, Leadership Skills, Maritime Business Ethics, Marine Pollution and Environment Protection, Maritime Policy and Advance Topics in Maritime Management.

Pinar Ozdemir, Asst. Prof.
iSOLMET coordinator at PRU, works as coordinator/manager of the EU projects as an expert in education and research. She holds PhD in Business Management, currently works as Head of the Culinary Department in Maritime Vocational Higher School. Her research interests include entrepreneurship, management and organization, organizational behavior, leadership, organizational justice, and education in the maritime industry.
PPP

PPP is a training consulting firm helping people develop the kind of versatile thinking that is resilient to change, that is creative even in uncertain times and that challenges the existing way of doing things, when a new way of doing things is required for success.

PPP organizational development methodology covers the three distinct aspects of the human interactions in the business environment, relations with customers, relations with others and relations with self. The development of PPP methodology is based on a systemic approach that is implemented through the formulation of “Academies” and the use of “Training Engineering”. Academy is a thorough organizational intervention in a specific area of business needs. Academies utilize learning objects from PPP’s libraries of content. Each learning object of PPP constitutes a behavior system, which is the result of several years' research and expertise, experience and insight into core corporate issues and organizational behaviors. Training Engineering is a methodology of instructional design, development and distribution of training content. All learning objects have been developed using the Training Engineering methodology.

PPP has the know-how (Training Engineering) and the content (Academies) for designing and developing Blended Learning training programs. They meet all the criteria to support certification programs.

Drama based training creates a new innovative proposition of people development. Our method is based on the most modern drama techniques, coming from the Physical Theatre, the Complicity Theatre, the Body Theatre, The Forum Theatre and the Spontaneity Theatre. Drama based training has impacted the PPP curriculum and educational practice in three significant ways: (1) as a method for learning, (2) as a subject for developing specific skills, and (3) as a helping agent (coaching).

The Sales, Leadership and Personal Development Learning systems of PPP have been applied in the largest organizations, as well as multinational companies in Greece and the surrounding area such as Cyprus and Balkan countries.
Dimitris Vintzilaios
PPP Learn General Manager, Senior Trainer Consultant, Coach, Drama facilitator, Business strategist and Mentor. iSOLMET coordinator at PPP Learn, works as General Manager promoting and fostering the company's engagement with clients both in training and consulting acting as Senior Trainer Consultant in Management, Total quality, Human Behavior and Organizational Development. Author of the book “Stories for savages and ... others – The power of storytelling to influence, motivate and activate in organizations, society and politics”. He has graduated Drama schools (2000, 2011) specialized in improvisation, body theatre, dramatic play, and communication forms and he designs experiential learning modules using theatrical and drama techniques in education and adult training.

Eva Lekakou
Account Manager. iSOLMET consultant at PPP Learn. She holds a Diploma in Sociology from Panteion University of Athens. She has also attended one year drama school on experiential training using theatrical techniques. She has been working on the training sector since 1998, handling all verbal and written communication as well as administrative matters.

Thaleia Vintzilaiou
Learning Consultant. iSOLMET consultant at PPP Learn. She holds a Diploma in Business Administration and studies Psychology in Panteion University of Athens. She has also attended Vocational Program on “Multi-Media Content Development for ELearning training for Business environment” as well as “Train the Trainer: Principals and Methodology”.

The "Nikola Y. Vaptsarov" Naval Academy of Varna is the only higher education institution in Bulgaria for the maritime officers and managers, both civilian and military. It delivers 3-cycle study programmes in the field of maritime transportation, management and security & defence. The Bulgarian Naval Academy has about 3,500 students overall and a professional teaching and research staff. Scientific research is focused on all areas of the maritime industry, thus including the maritime/naval leadership topics.

The traditions of the Bulgarian Maritime education date back to 1881. After 1953 The Naval Academy" established itself as the center of the maritime education in Bulgaria. New trends were set: training of foreign students (1953); intensive research, publishing and invention-related activities in the field of the maritime industry and for the Bulgarian Naval Forces and Merchant Marine (1962) and building modern laboratories and simulators (1974). 1986 was marked by the opening of the Planetarium. Following the unique integrated training of officers for the Navy and the Merchant Marine, the Naval Academy enriched the tradition and in 1992 started also to admit and train civilian students as officers for the Merchant Marine. Nowadays ‘N. Vaptsarov’ Naval Academy has modern facilities. The training is assigned to highly qualified and talented lecturers, apt to the dynamics of the intensive educational process and research work. The curricula and the syllabus conform to the stringent requirements of IMO (International Maritime Organization) and aim at the safety of navigation. The Naval Academy obtained the first program accreditation of its main specialties in 1998 and in 2000 it was entered in the IMO “White List” as a higher school with approved maritime education, meeting the requirements of STCW 78/95 Convention. In 2000 ‘Nikola Vaptsarov’ Naval Academy became a founder and a regular member of the International association of Maritime Universities (IAMU) and a co-founder of the Institute of Maritime Law and Logistics at ‘Chernorizets Hrabur’ Varna Free University, the National Oceanographic Committee – a member of the intergovernmental oceanographic committee of UNESCO, as well as of the Business Incubator of High Technologies, Varna.
The education is performed by two Faculties, Navigation and Engineering, and the Department for Post-graduate Qualification. They are responsible for the training in the special subjects as well as for the fundamental scientific and comprehensive training in eight specialties: Navigation, Ship Power Plants, Electrical Engineering, Shipboard Radioelectronics, Shipping and Port Management, Technology of Ship Repairs in the form regular and extramural instruction. Distance learning is in the process of being introduced. Furthermore, the Naval Academy is a venue for the successful development of activities in "Naval research center", "Center for career development", "Center for training ship brokers and agents" run by the Charter Brokers' Institute, London.

The contacts and business-like connections with counterpart higher schools and organizations in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea regions are long-standing. The Naval Academy is a holder of an inclusive charter "Erasmus" and participates in teacher and student exchanges. For the last 3 years NVNA has conducted more than 800 student’s mobility’s on KA1 of Erasmus+.

The Naval Academy is a founder of Black Sea Association of Maritime Institutions (BSAMI) in April 2010 (together with another five higher education institutions around the Black Sea) who decided to meet the responsibility as a team to further enhance themselves as the major global centre of the highest quality maritime human resources through knowledge, innovation and implementation towards the future. Call 2019 Round 1 KA2 - Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices KA203 - Strategic Partnerships for higher education Form ID KA203-98E3567A Deadline (Brussels Time) 26 Mar 2019 12:00:00 EN 27 / 208. The total academic staff of the Naval Academy is app. 120, where the full professors are 8, the associate professors are 37 and the other PhD holders are 21. On the other hand, the academic staff has maritime qualification: 9-Master on ships of 3000 gross tonnage or more; 1- Master on ships up to 500 gross tonnage; 1- Chief Engineer Officer; 6 - Watch keeping Officers; 7- Second Engineer Officers; 2 - Ship's Electrical Engineer Officers; 20 - GMDSS General Operators; 4 - First/second-class Radio electronic; 5 - Maritime Security Trainers.

In 2014 NVNA was audited by the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism from Japan and recognized NVNA as as a certified institution in their System of Recognition for Maritime Education and Training Institutions. In 2015 NVNA was audited successfully by EMSA.
Nedko Dimitrov, Assoc. Professor, PhD
Navy officer experience. Experienced in VDG project governance. NVNA coordinator for the E-maritime medicine project and MINE-EMI Project. Team leader of Integrated maritime spatial planning WP of the project "Integrated Information System Supporting Coastal Zone Management" on EEA grants. PhD degree on Maritime critical infrastructure protection. Dean of the faculty of navigation.

Valeri Stoyanov
Retired Navy officer, professor, doctor of sciences, psychologist. iSOLMET expert from the Naval Academy in Varna, Bulgaria. He is the head of the Department of National Security at the Faculty of Navigation. He teaches organizational psychology and has experience as an expert in various research projects funded by both national and European funds. He also has extensive experience as the head of a research laboratory for the selection of candidates for training at the Naval Academy.

Petina Vicheva, Associate Professor, PhD
Petina has been a lecturer at the Naval Academy, Varna, Bulgaria since 1996. Since 2010, she has been an Associate Professor at the Academy and Head of the Language Department since 2019. Her areas of research are applied linguistics, English for specialized studies, maritime English, semiotics and communication. She has several proficiency certificates in teaching English as a foreign language and a certificate in teaching Maritime English. She is an author of several Maritime English course books.

Yana Gancheva, Assistant professor, PhD
Lecturer at the Department of Exploitation and Management of Maritime Transport of Nikola Vaptsarov Naval Academy. She has interests in the field of port management, port technologies, port logistics and holds a doctorate in the professional field "Transport, shipping and aviation".
Anna Karadencheva, Assistant Lecturer at Nikola Vaptsarov Naval Academy
Holds PhD in National Security and Master degree in Public Communications in Security and Defence.
Specializes and teaches in the field of National security, Leadership and Psychology. Experienced in training development, their execution and follow-up analysis.
Participated in a number of EU, ERASMUS and national projects.

Katya Ancheva, Senior Lecturer of English at Nikola Vaptsarov Naval Academy
Teaching Maritime English to Navigator students for the Merchant Marine and cadets for the Navy. Author of Maritime English course books. ESP workshop and seminar attendance. Participation in teacher training international courses in Great Britain, USA and Canada. Participation in Erasmus+ Teaching Mobility Program.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Lutzkanova
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Case studies are short stories which present real-life and contextually rich situations. A good case study is:

…THE VEHICLE BY WHICH A CHUNK OF REALITY IS BROUGHT INTO THE CLASSROOM TO BE WORKED OVER BY THE CLASS AND THE INSTRUCTOR. A GOOD CASE KEEPS THE CLASS DISCUSSION GROUNDED UPON SOME OF THE STUBBORN FACTS THAT MUST BE FACED IN REAL LIFE SITUATIONS [1]

Maritime case studies relate to events, which occurred either onboard, at the office, or during communication between the vessel and the office.

The structure of a case study is based on a series of events, which can be divided into micro-events, that evolve in time and is comprised of a person or a group of people that strives to achieve a goal. Particularly in a case study that is used to teach soft skills, the structure is a series of events, where events are nothing more than behaviors which a person develops in situations that the person attempts to control; situations through which the person tries to survive or achieve goals.

METHODOLOGY

There is a very large piece of human nature which we are not in position to observe. We can use the iceberg paradigm, in which all below the water line is invisible. In relation to human, the invisible part comprises values, perceptions, beliefs, convictions and feelings, including naturally emotions which most of the times are not expressed. When we want to alter or develop soft skills, we will have to alter and/or develop types of behavior, and simultaneously we will have to comprehend through the study of soft skills what the generation mechanism of behavior is.

Each of these events is shaped by these two factors:

INTERNAL FACTORS
which trigger behavior, meaning factors that involve people themselves (the invisible part of the iceberg) such as their convictions, beliefs, knowledge and emotions felt at that moment

EXTERNAL FACTORS
that concern the situational context, the conditions under which people are requested to act

These two group factors affect the development of events at two different levels:

COINCIDENCE LEVEL
as this level is shaped by the objective framework of the external factors that determine explicitly or implicitly the surrounding environment and its conditions

RELATION LEVEL
as this level is shaped by subjective factors and emotional processes that take place in each person under the influence of internal factors, and shape the relations of the people involved in the incident

Most case studies have been utilized as skills for problem-solving, and for this reason they often focused more on the external factors, the situational context and conditions. In the case of soft skills, the case study is about problems risen around human relations, communication, and the means through which a person that has the appropriate soft skills can solve better specific kinds of problems, conflicts and frictions. Due to the nature of these problems, the depiction of internal factors and the study of the incident at the relation level gains particular significance, and special attention should be given when noted down.

In short, a case study is nothing more than a chronological order of micro events, which develop under the influence of external factors and/or the actions of the person himself motivated by internal factors. In the case of two or three people interacting with each other, who are recognized as the main heroes of the story, the chronological order involves all these people.

To create a maritime case study, first and foremost we have to gather data from incidents, which occurred either onboard, at the office, or during communication between the vessel and the office. This will be managed through narrations of people who have experienced such incidents and are willing to share them. The interview is the basic tool for accumulating such information.

The interview aims at accumulating as much information as possible through a structured procedure, so that we are then able to build case studies with an educational aim, and more specifically aiming at teaching soft skills. The information that we need to gather for the incidents described have to be related, on the one hand to a specific soft skill, and on the other to the maritime industry. At the same time, they have to be rich in the sense that they have to include the events, conditions, actions, thoughts and emotions of the participants, namely all the internal and external factors. Importantly, keep in mind the following obstacles during the interview process:
METHODOLOGY

1) a confused or distorting maritime industry perception of soft skills, that may result in not actually receiving incidents that project the soft skills of our interest;
2) the heroic model of the Captain or the interviewee, that may result in intense weakness to describe in detail actual interactions and communication between the all people involved;
3) the tendency to focus only on difficult situations as these are the most important, that may result that ship accidents not incidents are described firstly and some maritime industry areas are hard to explore, e. g. incidents at ship-operator office;
4) the unwillingness to disclose information which negatively expose their colleagues and companies, that may result we will not learn the full description of the event.

To tackle the above obstacles, it is recommended to use the following three pillars. The first pillar is the total control of the interview procedure. We should not depend on the interviewees to select the topics or the incidents they are about to describe. The second pillar is the selection of the appropriate people according to the incident they are related or the strategic pattern of not allowing interviewees to prepare themselves for any incident. The third pillar is the need to have a large pool of professionals from the industry to be interviewed. The key is the way to communicate with shipping industry executives and how we explain the case study interview purpose and procedure.

The entire interview-based procedure of collecting data on which we shall build the case studies, comprises the following stages:

- The invitation, through which we inform of our intentions the people we want to come in contact with and interview
- The appropriate selection of the incident, which will be narrated by the interviewee so that it fits the purpose of the project
- The main interview, from which we extract the narration of the incident
- The recording, so that no crucial detail is lost
- The transcription of the recorded narration in the form of a text
The expansion the text on the case study structure, to map in chronological order people’s acts, thoughts and actions

The identification of narration gaps

The return to the interviewee with a second interview so that we can fill in these gaps

"Thank-you letter” offered to the interviewee

As the result of the whole process the maritime case study is delivered. The case study structure as an educational text comprises the following sections:

- the title, which relates to the area where soft skill is deployed,
- the executive summary, giving information about why the case is of particular interest,
- the scenery, as a description of the situational context, the conditions and the people involved, before the beginning of the incident development.
- introducing the people involved;
- the challenge, as a description of the incident including facts and actions that led to the problem or helped towards solving it;
- the dilemma, as a description of the problem and crucial factors that influence behaviour;
- the resolution, which reveal the final choices, decisions, solution given by the protagonists.
The title should be self-explanatory and related to the area where soft skills are deployed, and of course, as simple as possible.

Usually, a case study title looks like the single sentence with an explanation of the solution.

Executive Summary
- Please provide a summary of your case study.
- Please include information here about why the case is of particular interest.

The narration
- The scenery
  Where & when it happened
- Introducing the characters
  Who is involved (personality & traits)
- The challenge
  The facts and actions, what was the problem
- The dilemma
  Crucial factors that influence behavior
- The resolution
  Choices, decisions, solutions given by the protagonists

METHODOLOGY
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The incident being described is not a typical one. Discussing the teamwork and crew actions, we usually consider those on the bridge and in the engine room. This case presents teamwork in an emergency situation, a spillage, one of the most serious accidents on board the tankers. It can lead directly to a disaster, as is the case with the world’s largest oil spills. The case is considered interesting and exemplary as it happened upon relieving of the watch at noon, when the crew was having lunch in the mess room. At the beginning of the incident, the AB (able seaman) and the Second Officer were on deck, but very soon the entire crew, without exception, was involved in the clearance of the oil spill. The emergency situation involving the whole crew shows the significance of team cooperation and the role of leadership and exemplary performance in management of hazards in an emergency.

THE NARRATION

1. The Scenery

The case presented below is a good example of the role of the human factor at sea and more specifically the role of team cooperation and leadership in dealing with emergency situations. The narrator is Captain Georgi Panayotov, who was a Second Officer on board the ship which suffered distress in 2004.

The ship was “Seasprite”, crude oil carrier, Suezmax type, 160,000 t of cargo, with displacement of 200,000 t, operated by “Thenamaris”. The ship was in Puerto Jose, Venezuela at the time of the incident.

The ship was hired on a time charter from Puerto Jose, Venezuela to St. Croix, Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, unincorporated territory of the United States. Two types of oil - heavy and light crude oil - were exported to one of the largest American refineries, located offshore, in the Caribbean Sea, supplied with Venezuelan oil.
2. Introducing the people involved

**The Second Officer**
Capt. Georgi Panayotov was Bulgarian. He was 47 years old. He graduated from “N. Y. Vaptsarov” Naval Academy. He had served as an officer in the Bulgarian Navy for 13 years. Later, he started a career in the merchant shipping. He had already had 11 years of experience on board tankers at the time of the incident.

**The Captain**
“The Chief Officer was Greek. He was 40 years old, a graduate of the Greek Maritime Academy. He had already had 13-14-years experience on board tankers at the time of the incident. Being a very attentive and communicative officer, he was loved and respected by the whole crew. He cared a lot about the people regardless of their level in the crew and their nationality. The Chief Officer’s role is especially important on board the ship, therefore his personality is an extremely critical factor. We spend 4-5 months on board a ship with other 18-20 persons, without our families. It is necessary that everyone lives and works in a calm and friendly environment. Therefore, everyone should contribute to such an environment. The Chief Officer managed to create an environment of trust and mutual respect.”

**The Chief Engineer**
“The Chief Engineer was also Greek. He was 47 years old, a graduate of the Greek Maritime Academy. He had already had over 20 years experience as a naval ship engineer. I would say that he was quiet, shy, and very attentive. When I embarked the ship, my luggage was delayed and arrived a week later. He called me and gave me overalls and other equipment necessary for my work on board. He had a very subtle sense of humor which was greatly appreciated by the crew. He was the preferred partner in informal conversations.”

**The Master**
“The Greek Master of the ship, Stavros Zaveris, was a wonderful person, not only an experienced master, respected by his crew, but also a very good man. He is one of the best people I have worked with. He did some simple and ordinary things that stirred up my emotions. For instance, he ordered special flowers and soil from Greece and planted them around the bridge. The greenery created a warm and relaxing atmosphere. He was also one of the greatest cooks. He regularly assisted the chef in making specialties. Once he got on the bridge and said, "Go to the galley and try what I have prepared." I said, "Captain, I cannot leave the bridge, you know" and he replied, "No problem. I will take over the watch, you go down." This had never happened to me before. Someone may think it is a joke, but it was a fact."

“Two courses - 1°, 181 °, 30 hours of passage, 32 hours of loading, and 32 hours of unloading. I spent 8 months and 12 days on board this ship. Along with “Kim Jacob”, another tanker ship, we supplied the US refinery on St. Croix Island.”
He has always been a very positive person, caring for the crew. I have never met another Master who returned on board after a visit to any port city carrying three bags full of food - one for the cargo control room, the other for the engine control room, the third for the bridge or the deck department. This happened every two or three days. He allowed some of the religious holidays, the Independence Day of the Filipinos, Easter and others to be celebrated on board. He showed amazing respect to every crewmember. He constantly took care of the crew - checking regularly what supplies were necessary to be ordered. And no problem had occurred during loading and unloading operations so far. Master's attitude towards the crewmembers established a spirit of respect and dignity - regardless of the mariners' positions in the hierarchy of the ship's crew and their national and cultural affiliation.

The AB
“The AB was Filipino, about 40 years old, very skilled, with 20 years of experience at sea, hard working, strict and disciplined.”

The rest of the crew
“It was a multinational crew, almost all officers were Greek, including the Pumpman, the Electrical Officer and I were Bulgarian, and the rest of the crew were Filipino. As per the policy of “Thenamaris”, all ratings were Filipino. In fact, the crew consisted of three nations. The relationships and the cooperation within the crew were exemplary. The Master, being respectful of the cultural and religious differences, contributed greatly to the friendly environment.”

3. The challenge
Capt. Panayotov remembers and describes the incident: “The incident I would like to describe is not a typical one. Discussing the teamwork and crew actions, we usually consider those on the bridge and in the engine room. Here I will present a team work in an emergency situation, a spillage, one of the most serious accidents on board the tankers. It can lead directly to a disaster, as it has happened with the world’s largest oil spills. That incident would have occurred anywhere and it was not our fault. Telegraphically, a new terminal equipped with new valves.”

“At 1205, when I was relieving the Greek Chief Officer from 6-hour duty, the cargo alarm was sounded on deck indicating to the cargo control room that there was an oil spillage.”

The duty AB on deck sounded the cargo alarm to the cargo control room by VHF. The Second Officer, Capt. Panayotov (the narrator), was on watch. The Chief Officer was also there as at the moment of the incident he had just been relieved from watch.
Capt. Panayotov continues the story: “Looking through the skylight, we observed that the chiksan was getting disconnected from the ship and crude oil started to spill on the deck, of course, not to leak into the sea. A huge amount. Keep in mind that when a tanker is loaded, as was in this case, by a line with a rate of 3,000 cubic meters per hour, this makes 1 cubic meter per second; you can imagine what it means regarding spillage. Meanwhile, our ship was slightly listed to portside. We had been moored port side alongside. Oil started spilling from the manifold as well, as the chiksan had already got disconnected. Actions in such a situation should be immediate, instantaneous:

First, I shouted to close the manifold.

Second, I ordered to turn on the pump to suck all the oil that would leak into the tray under the manifold.

And I had to correct the slight list - 0.3, 0.4 to portside – immediately, as if the oil passed over the portside stem it would spill straight into the sea. The Civil Liability Convention 176 says that even if one litre leaks overboard, you bear full financial and legal responsibility, regardless of the reasons, and regardless of whose fault it is. As the ship was being loaded, we had to deballast. In order to prevent the starboard list, we immediately closed the starboard ballast tanks and continued deballasting only from the portside tanks, so that the ship would lean to portside and the whole quantity of spilled oil to be spread on deck without spilling overboard. The stem was 22 cm.

Meanwhile, the Venezuelan inspector was on board the ship to have lunch. Seeing what was happening, he started asking in Spanish - what was the reason, why was the loading arm disconnected.

About 1225 hours the spilling was stopped and thanks to the starboard list the whole quantity was spread on deck. The ship’s LOA was about 280 m. The whole area from the manifold to the superstructure (roughly somewhere about 90 m) was covered with crude oil. Under Murphy’s Laws, so to speak, sometimes things happen beyond our control. The Filipino released the pump for pumping the oil very quickly, causing the air valve to burst. Therefore, it could not suck up.

4. The dilemma

“It was not our fault. We found out that a pneumatic air valve had burst, which automatically required disconnecting of the loading arm to prevent the oil from spilling into the sea but rather leaking onto the deck, i.e. we had to take the necessary measures. If we took an immediate action, we would prevent the spill. If not, the situation would get very complicated, both legally and financially.”
“... The prevention of oil spillage from a tanker is equal to prevention of collision or grounding by other types of ships. These are some of the most serious accidents that happen at sea, and this incident meant to us a disaster.”

During the incident “... everyone was at lunch, and everyone had taken off their overalls and their safety shoes. The temperature was 42 degrees. It takes time to put on your safety shoes, and I told you what happened in 1 second. We were all extremely worried. It all happened instantly, within 4-5 minutes. There were serious consequences. However, this incident clearly showed good teamwork.”

“The best case scenario for the ship and the company is to avoid paying claims. I will never forget this incident, my heart had sunk. There is no person who would not worry in such situation, but the conclusion I can make is that we did not panic. There was no panic. If there was any panic, it could lead to delayed reactions. Secondly, there were no insults or grievances that someone had caused it, and finally the whole crew, including the cook, came on deck.”

“If the duty Able Body seaman had not checked if all Kingston valves were closed and sealed, the situation could have been a lot worse. If only one of them was left unsealed, the oil would spill into the sea, and there were about 25 on each side. If his colleague the Bosun, the Third officer or the Second officer (the four crewmembers carrying out the inspection) had not inspected them afterwards, the incident would have been fatal.”

5. The resolution

Cleaning of the spill on deck took more than 12 hours; the temperature was about 42°C. The full procedure was under the direct supervision of the Master. He personally participated in the cleaning and constantly made sure that there was no fatigue due to the high temperature. He ensured that everyone received the required amount of drinking water and after the critical first hours he distributed the crew into small groups to have dinner. He himself did not leave the deck before the completion of oil clearance.

Every crewmember was on deck. Only the chef, who joined on his own initiative, was released by the Master. He still had to prepare the dinner. Everyone else, including the stewards, worked on deck.

The Chief Engineer played a significant role in dealing with the consequences of the spillage. He made every crewmember from the engine room participate in the cleaning of the deck, repairing the damaged manifold pump, and transferring the spilled crude oil from the tray under the left manifold to the slop tanks. He supervised the operation of the portable pumps on both sides of the superstructure on the main deck pumping the crude oil into the slop tanks. He personally took part in the cleaning of the deck and managed
the shifts in the engine room. He even preserved his sense of humour in that tense and awkward situation. This was keeping the crew in good spirits. Until 0300 he participated in the recovery of the loading operations. His actions were inspiring not only for the engine room crewmembers.

The Chief Officer also took part in cleaning the deck from the crude oil and washing it with chemicals.

“On the following morning the crewmembers were very impressed by his gratitude to the persons on duty on the deck, who had executed the plugging of the dozens of Kingston valves very strictly and accurately.”

As is obvious from the case, the role of the ship’s crew management level is very important for motivating all crewmembers to observe strictly the ship safety procedures in such situations.

The personal involvement and exemplary actions of the Master, the Chief Officer and the Chief Engineer in cleaning the deck had a positive effect on the responsibility of the whole crew and the serene working atmosphere despite the adverse weather conditions and the extreme tiredness.

“No crewmember requested a break until completion of the deck cleaning. This responsibility showed respect for the Master and the other officers’ leadership skills not only in this particular situation but during the whole contract.”

1. Describe the key persons in the event. Who participates in the story?

2. What has happened suddenly? What was the actual situation?

3. Describe the reactions of the crewmembers in the incident.
CASE STUDY: ATTITUDE DOES MATTER

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This case study describes a situation, which involves not only the subordination on board, but also shows the multicultural diversity onboard, which shall be also considered. A number of persons are being involved, starting with the narrator, who is a fitter onboard of cargo ship, the Chief officer, the Chief Engineer and Filipino crew members. This incident comes to prove that the position that someone holds on board should not be a prerequisite for behaving condescendingly with the part of the crew that is subordinate to him. In addition, the multicultural prejudices should also be forgotten on board.

THE NARRATION

1. The Scenery

The narrator is Georgi Dimitrov, who was a fitter on board of the vessel when the incident happened. It took place just before entering into the port of Rotterdam. The ship was more than 25 years old and the crew often had problems with the maintenance.

2. Introducing the people involved

The Chief Officer
He was an officer from Ukraine. In general, the narrator did not have a lot of contact with him. It should be considered, that the captain, the Chief Officer, the Chief Engineer and the Second Engineers were all Ukrainians, in most some cases they behaved rudely with the whole crew. He was about 45 years old.

The Chief Engineer
He was an officer from Ukraine. He was born in Moscow, but he was prejudiced mostly against Bulgarians, because we were in the EU and we did not support them during the conflict in Crimea. In general, it was a difficult trip for the narrator, because there were a lot of failures of the main equipment. In addition, the Chief Engineer was usually very nervous and pushing us to the limit in order to solve the problems with the equipment. The Chief Engineer was like 50-55.

The fitter
He graduated from the Technical School of Shipbuilding and Navigation in the city of Varna. He started his carrier as a seaman in the Bulgarian Shipping Company and later worked for a number of foreign maning companies, reaching the position of fitter. This was his fourth contract with this company. Besides him, there were four other Bulgarians on board.
The rest of the crew
A big part of the remaining crew was the Philippines. In general, the Captain, the Chief Officer, the Chief Engineer and the Second Engineer were arrogant and rude to all the sailors, but especially to the Filipinos, who felt mistreated and were very angry against them.

The narrator described the culture of the Filipino crew members like always hard working, but they are such people that if you approach them with a smile they help a lot, but it is not the same when you are rude to them.

3. The challenge

People of a lot of different nationalities gather on the ship. The narrator remembered that he usually easily got along with them and found ways to communicate with them. However, sometimes there are also big bullies, usually some of the officers.

Everyone on the ship - the Captain, the Chief Officer, the Chief Engineer and the Second Engineer were all Ukrainians and generally behaved arrogantly and rudely with all the sailors, especially the Filipinos, who were very upset and angry at them.

The ship was about to enter the port, and the narrator told the Chief Officer that there was an error in his data on the ship's fuel and lubricant supplies.

Soon after that, he was surprised when he saw the Chief Officer and the Chief Engineer in the engine room together. Then they showed the note with his data and started to shout at him and to insult him.

At first I thought that I had made a mistake in checking the ship's supplies, but that did not explain that rude behavior from the Chief Officer and the Chief Engineer.

Dimitrov tried to stay calm by suggesting that they could check the data together. After that proposal, the Chief Engineer became even more angry and started shouting louder and almost tried to push him away.

As soon as the Chief Officer and the Chief Engineer started to shout, several Filipinos appeared from somewhere and stood behind him.

As the officers kept shouting at him, Dimitrov heard the Filipinos to shout angrily, "What are we going to do to them? Are we going to throw them overboard? Hearing these words from the Filipinos, the Chief Officer and the Chief Engineer froze.
4. The dilemma

The narrator remembered that he had heard of such incidents at sea and that he always thought they were just sea stories, however he admitted that for a moment he also doubted if the situation would get into a physical collision.

Georgi Dimitrov also shared that before the incident, there were prejudices on the part of Ukrainian officers, which was quite difficult for him to accept, because on the ship there is no place for prejudices or attitudes based on origin or position.

At the time of the incident, he was initially overwhelmed and upset, but after the actions of the Philippine sailors, the main thing he was worried about was not getting into physical violence.

There was the dilemma of whether the narrator would leave the Ukrainian officers to deal with the Filipinos on their own or despite their bad behavior by the moment to take the necessary actions to reduce the tension.

5. The resolution

Meanwhile, the Filipinos quickly spread the word about what happened on the ship. Once this information reached the other Bulgarians (there were 4 people) and they came immediately.

Despite the fact that the Philippine sailors stood behind the narrator he was fully aware that such behavior on their part and even only the mentioning of such measures as "throwing overboard" were illegal and unacceptable on board a ship, so he tried to show them that such behavior is unacceptable and that he could not encourage such a reaction.

In a second, he remembered that tonight the ship's cook would be making national dishes for the crew, and he had mentioned that he would prepare Lumpia. The narrator then quickly told them "Wait, wait, why overboard?! Let's use them for Lumpia."

For a moment there was a slight astonishment among the Filipinos, but suddenly a burst of laughter broke out.

Later Dimitrov admitted that he had no idea what Lumpia was and he had just heard it as a type of dish. He later learned that this was a traditional Filipino rolls filled with minced meat and vegetables.
Apparently, the Chief Officer and the Chief Engineer didn’t know how to react in this situation, so I told them that we could double-check the data together, and as it turned out later they had made a mistake.

This managed to reduce the tension and after a while the Filipinos went away.

Subsequently, Dimitrov tried to prevent such similar reactions. He also shared, that when they were gathered in one place, it was very difficult to convince Filipinos that their reaction was wrong, because they were very emotional. Later, when he had the opportunity to work separately with one of them or to see each other during a meal or just for a cigarette, he tried to bring them back to the incident, describing the situation like a joke and at the same time saying some serious words.

He tried to show them that in such situations they could not have such extreme and illegal reactions.

In addition to speaking with the Filipinos, he had several conversations with the Chief Engineer to try to reduce the tension. The Chief Engineer later apologized that there indeed was a mistake in the data and that their reaction was incorrect, but all this was due to the fact that the equipment failures on board caused this.

**PREPARATORY QUESTIONS**

1. What was the main reason for the tension between the crew?
2. Who participated in the accident?
3. What soft skill were used by the narrator in order to prevent any violence?
THE NARRATION

1. The Scenery

Our narrator is Phoebe. Phoebe is a crew operator, in the process of accepting back her company's VLCC, a bareboat charter. A USA port has been agreed to be the place.

2. Introducing the people involved

Crew operator
Phoebe has been a Crew Operator in a well-known Greek shipping company for about 5 years. I would say that, as a person, Phoebe Gerontakis is resourceful enough. She always contemplates on how to find things, read stuff, learn more, etc.

Operations Manager
Konstantinos Vitos is the operational manager with whom they cooperate. As far as his job is concerned, Operations, he is a brilliant man. He does a lot of work in other departments, too, an excellent person. When it comes to leadership and as a manager, everyone in the department, complain about him. He is exceptional at anything that revolves around the vessel.

Harry Sims
Agent.

3. The challenge

I was in charge of accepting back the VLCC, the bareboat charter. Thus, the time, place and the means for the ship-owning company to man the vessel with her own crew had to be determined. This involves crew changes, too, and demands very good coordination and planning.
The receipt was agreed to be made during COVID, and in fact during the first period crew changes had restarted, so it must have been January – February, 2020. The additional restrictions that came up due to COVID made the process more complicated.

We had Filipino seafarers. During that period only the Red Cross conducted PCR tests in Manila, and 3 -5 days were required for the results to come out. So, I had to meet a lot of challenges. Also, it was very difficult to find tickets because airlines had limited their flights. I was very tired, but had managed to complete all the processes to man the vessel. It was 1 am, I was working from home, had just finished everything, satisfied I had made it, and about to get some rest.

I was almost ready to go to bed, when at around 1:30 am my phone rang. It was the USA agent, telling me to fill in the eNOAD (Electronic Notice of Arrival/ Departure) for the vessel. He had also sent me an email.

It was the first time I was requested to do such a thing because usually it is completed by the Captain, the Operations Department or the charterer.

The completion of that particular document required certain details that I had to look for from various sources, including files I had never accessed before.

The company I was working for then granted access to all files and to all its employees. Full transparency was its value. HR was the only locked file. This practically means I could read and find out everything. More or less I knew where to look for the information. Naturally, the USA eNOAD resembles very little the eNOAD elsewhere in the world. It is rather different, because it requires much more information. It is more demanding. I was trying to understand what I had to do. I read the email again and again, opened the excel sheets and tried to assess it, understand its urgency and what was going on.

I was thinking that the message had reached the crew Department because they knew me and I was hoping I would not be the one to complete that document.

As I was thinking all that, within an hour after I had received the email, Konstantinos called me, the Operations Manager, to inform me about the agent’s email I had already viewed.

More or less, our talk over the phone was as follows.

Konstantinos: Phoebe, did you see the agent’s email?

Phoebe: Yes, he wants the eNOAD to be completed. I have completed all the crew processes and we are ready to accept her.

Konstantinos: You have to do the eNOAD, too, to finish the job.
Phoebe: But it has nothing to with the crew, that is the Captain's job or the Operations Department or the charterer's!

Konstantinos: There is no time, it has to be done immediately!

Phoebe: But I have never done this before!

Konstantinos replied this, and then hang up: Search, find and send it, and if there is anything, let me know. It can't be done differently. Let's not waste time talking. I have to go, good luck!

I remember I hung up the phone very disappointed. And I was thinking I just had to do it. I was so exhausted. The worst thing was that the joy I felt despite everything and the vessel's readiness to depart lasted for so little.

On the other hand, of course, I told to myself he must have been very tired, he could not have been in charge of it.

4. The dilemma

When the phone hung up, I was in shock. The time was limited, the hour had passed, I was no experienced in that, and I could not refuse to do it.

At first negative thoughts surrounded me. I feared I would do something wrong. Of course, anything that happens to me, if I have to do something, I am not intimidated by it. I do it, thinking that I will do the best I can, maybe even more. If I will be scolded afterwards or not is another story. However, on the one hand I was shaking, my right wrist was in pain, my eyes were closing, I feared I would make a mistake, but on the other hand I was telling to myself “The vessel will depart. You will make it.” I was going through this in great stress and fear, but I thought I was doing anything I could.

5. The resolution

My strategy was to start with anything I knew, that could be found easily and completed confidently.

The next step was the crew list. By the way, if one letter is mistaken in the passport, you will be in serious trouble. I was very nervous not to make a mistake in any of the 33 persons’ names! The crew consisted of Croatians, Filipinos, and one from Montenegro. I, thus, focused on completing the crew list, which I knew well, but I had to focus more on.

Anything I did not know was left for the end.
There was one piece of information I could not find anywhere. So, I sent the eNOAD to Operations, stating that only that thing was missing and then it could be submitted. I can't remember which information that was. Yet, I honestly searched for it and couldn't find it.

I felt pretty good when I finished it. I thought to myself: “Well done you, one thing off my list. Let’s see what’s next”. The following day at work I was really proud of myself, and waited for the others to recognise it. To my big disappointment, I received nothing as recognition. And that was awful. Konstantinos only told me a typical “Well done, old Phoebe”. That was it! I was in need of a real recognition. Though I did not receive it from those who could, I received it from the charterer, who was commenting for an entire week that “you have the best crewing department we have worked with”. Thus, the recognition came from third parties.

**PREPARATORY QUESTIONS**

1. Who are the primary characters? Briefly describe the problem from the perspective of each, and what (believes, values, culture) drives the behavior of each character. Explain how the behaviors of the characters shape the series of facts that lead to the case outcome.

2. What issues are raised by this case? Why are they important to consider?

3. If you consider that there is an alternative path of action, what would it be? Please specify a plan of such an action.
THE NARRATION

1. The Scenery

Our narrator is Captain Iakovos Venieris, who is Pilot at the port of Piraeus, and the incident involved the approach of a vessel carrier to the port.

It was autumn in 2017. While it was a sunny day, the Beaufort force was 6. The winds were particularly strong and windward during the course to enter the port.
The vessel was of a big, well-known company. It was 200 meters long. The Captain, the officers and the crew were all Indians.

That particular vessel on that day faced some issues with the engine, which were also evident in the previous port during departure and arrival in Piraeus. The engines did not start immediately, thus sometimes she did not respond to bridge orders.

2. Introducing the people involved

The Pilot
Captain Iakovos is the narrator of this incident. He is about 45 years old and significantly experienced in vessels. He works as a Pilot at the port of Piraeus for the last 5 years. He is an analytic man, visionary, cooperative and with good communication skills. He knows his port well enough, and is successful at his job.

The Captain
The Captain of the vessel was a middle-aged Indian with a 10-year-successful experience on vessels. He was a reclusive, insular person, with a high opinion of himself which he did not wish to be ruined. He was over confident and did not open up himself, nor trusted others. This resulted in him lacking control of his subordinates’ actions. A lot of times he was distant even from his crew. When he had to work with the office or the authorities, he was more like “you do your job, and I’ll do mine”. He was very cautious with his image and wanted to be in full control so that his or the vessel’s deficiencies were not apparent.
This resulted in him feeling the obligation to disclose these deficiencies so that the company and the coast guard did not find them out; such obligation was more important than the danger he underwent at that time.

**The rest of the crew**
The rest of the crew were all of the same nationality, all were Indians. They had developed their own cultural code, acted as a family that tries to hide what is happening inside it. They were comfortable as if they were at home and during communication on the vessel spoke in their mother tongue.

### 3. The challenge

The vessel was outside the port and contacted our office requesting a Pilot. I made the first contact with the Captain of the vessel and pointed out where he would stop so that I boarded her. The Captain’s reply was that “My vessel is big, it is a 200 –meter vessel, and I cannot approach the port from very close.”. At the tone of his voice I distinguished arrogance and a slight irony that offended me. I replied this: “In Piraeus we dock 400 –meter vessels, yours is not treated as a big one.”, only to receive this abrupt answer without the possibility to counter act it: “The vessel is a big one, I cannot approach very close, I will stop here at three nautical miles.”, and he stopped very far away.

Because on that day the weather was bad with strong crosswinds, I then asked him to turn the vessel so that there is a sheltered side where the waves are small so that we could approach and board her. He turned the vessel onto the weather, meaning onto the eye of the wind, resulting in big waves and I could not board safely. All those actions showed me that he meant to scare me, as if he was hazing me so that he would be have the upper hand after I had boarded. I felt from the first moment that the manoeuvre would not turn out well. There was no connection. I felt that. For that reasons, I ordered an extra tug boat for safety reasons, because I saw that, judging by his behaviour, that something was concealed, that something was wrong.

I boarded the vessel and headed towards the bridge. As I entered the bridge, instead of a salutation or some brief get-to-know chat, without him offering me a coffee, his first words were these: “Show me my position”. Meaning, for me to show him the course on the map, a thing that a Pilot is obliged to do, it is among his duties. I replied this: “Mr Captain, this is our course, I plan to do this manoeuvre like this, I will enter from here, I will stop the vessel here”. I felt that the Captain was, to say it in our own language, he was ‘meowing’, meaning he was not what he was supposed to be: cooperative. The moment he understood where he had to go, he ordered in his language to start the engine while that is my order. Instantly I realized what was crystal clear: he would do his stuff. I was certain he was hiding something from me...
CASE STUDY: COMMUNICATION AND COOPERATION THRIVE WHEN THERE IS MUTUAL TRUST

During briefing between the Pilot and the Captain as to how to go and where all those involved in the process had to be informed and in fact there was a need to schedule a briefing so that opinions are exchanged on that matter; that is if the agreed process changed anyhow if something had to be changed, taking into consideration that all the factors had not been regarded. This does not mean that we two, the Pilot and the Captain, had considered everything. Perhaps something had skipped our minds. The fact that such briefing did not take place shows that he did not trust his crew. Also, it shows unresponsibility and sloppiness in managing the approach, because he did not manage to set responsible the people who are in charge of the approach.

In that specific case, from what I understood, an officer did not go to the bow, only the boatswain was there. One always has to have an officer on the bow, but even if that is the case, the boatswain should have been briefed on his duties. Otherwise, a person might think: “I was told to have both anchors ready, why would they want both, one is fine. Let’s not make this a big deal”. Having thought this, it is unlikely that he went to check them, to get them ready, to do this and that, because he might had thought that “this may not be needed. Oh, man!”. This is because he was unaware of the whole situation, nor did the Captain tell him to mind the bow because their engine was not operational. At least from the inside the problem could have been made known and for them they could have been ready. The Captain did not even do that!

The vessel started and approached the entrance port. There was a strong crosswind at the entrance port and for me to face it until approach I had to order a certain speed so that I am in command of it. As I started to make the move for slow ahead, which is the second highest engine order, I saw him worried and told me: “Mr. Pilot, you have great speed.”. His manners showed fear, as if he wanted to show that he was there on his duty, he was the one who warned that it would not be his fault if the vessel would not stop. He felt that there was an issue and he would not share it with me from the beginning. He did not trust me enough to tell me “You know what? There is a situation here, when you exceed a speed of 5 knots she will not stop.”. I would rather he had trusted me than what happened next...

When we entered the port I ordered the engine to ‘Hold’ and the opposite ‘Reverse’ so that she reduces speed. However, the vessel did not respond. The engine was dead and, as a result, she continued on at the same speed inside the port. Then, realizing the danger, I ordered to drop both anchors so that she stopped. I heard the Captain on the radio speaking in their language, I don’t know what they said, perhaps communication with the bow to drop the anchors.

He spoke in his language though prohibited. Because each vessel does not only carry one nationality, she may have a Ukrainian Captain and crew of two nationalities Filipinos and Indians, it is clearly stated in the ISM of the company’s vessel that English is the working language. When a Pilot boards, it is a necessary precondition that all conversations are in English. Yet, there were times when the first Officer and the Captain together with
another apprentice officer on the bridge spoke in their language and I did not understand what they said.

The anchors dropped on time. I looked at him and saw fear in his eyes, he froze because he was seeing what was coming. The moment he said the anchors were not dropped, I heard people banging them with a hammer. An emergency situation happens once every fifty approaches, it does not happen daily, these vessels are not usually anchored in the port, only at berth, when they are on stand-by to enter. The bad maintenance of the anchor gear the moment I requested to drop the anchors resulted in their breaks being stuck. Perhaps he himself was not aware of it because one had not informed him. That maintenance was the First Officer’s duty. No one informed anybody. However, the result was that at difficult moments the anchors were not dropped. This particular matter may not have been concealed, he may have also been ignorant about it; still, he did conceal the engine matter.

The result was that the vessel did not stop on time, there was impact between the bow and the dock and there were damages on both. Luckily, thanks to the tug boats, and particularly the extra one I had ordered, the vessel was held back and the damages were small.

There was lack of briefing of the Pilot by the Captain, and from that point it becomes clear that a chain of problems was created. As a result, there was an impact—and to some extent material damages.

4. The dilemma

On that day this particular vessel faced some engine issues which were evident at the previous port, too; these issues were evident both during departure from the port of Piraeus and entrance into it. Some times the engine may not have been operational, a fact that is crucial when a vessel approaches a port, the Pilot wants to know that the engine is fully operational and disposable. Otherwise, meaning if he does know that the engine is not always operational, he will act differently.

The Captain’s dilemma was this: on the one hand to reveal the vessel’s deficiency as well as his in management not only to the authorities at the port but also to the company, and, thus damage his image, and on the other hand to be able to cover it all up successfully in the same way he had done it up to that moment. The Captain concealed too much and took a huge risk so as not to reveal any of the vessel’s deficiencies which eventually were shown. I guess it was such a huge stress on him that he did not regard the consequences.
5. The resolution

The outcome was that there was an impact between the vessel's bow and the dock and there were damages to both the vessel and the dock. Thanks to the tug boats, the vessel was held back and the damages were small. The vessel was delayed one week at the port of Piraeus so that the damages would be restored. Naturally, there was a court on this case but the Captain was released due to doubts. Still, he did not continue on with the same company, and this was a blot in his resume.

The significance of the human factor determined this particular incident. A Captain who does not wish to damage his image, does not trust or brief his partners and allows them to act with knowledge shortage. There was lack of briefing of the Pilot by the Captain, and a chain of problems was created. As a result, there was an impact – and to some extent material damages.

PREPARATORY QUESTIONS

1. Who are the primary characters? Briefly describe the problem from the perspective of each, and what (believes, values, culture) drives the behavior of each character. Explain how the behaviors of the characters shape the series of facts that lead to the case outcome.

2. What issues are raised by this case? Why are they important to consider?

3. If you consider that there is an alternative path of action, what would it be? please specify a plan of such an action.
1. The Scenery

It was November 2000. I had been the Captain of that vessel for 2 and a half months. The vessel was an Ultra Large Crude Carrier (ULCC), a very big one.

ULCC vessels had around 330 meters length and their hull width was 60 meters. So that you know, she was like three football courts one after the other. In 2000 she was of a certain age, we had received her in 1976, and there were a lot of issues about her.

She had started her journey from Egypt loaded with crude oil. Rotterdam was her first port of call.

In Rotterdam we had to discharge a large batch of crude oil, and we would get rid of what would be left in Fawley, at the EXXON oil refinery, one of Europe’s largest oil refineries in England’s Southampton.

All the officers and the lower -rank officers were Greek, and the boatswain was Greek, too.
2. Introducing the people involved

The Captain
Captain Pavlos was Greek at around 45 with great sea experience. The company trusted and appreciated him deeply, because he had accomplished several difficult missions assigned to him. He was highly confident in the way he managed his crew and estimating situations. As a person, one would describe him as outward-looking and communicative. He was an open-hearted, conciliatory and cooperative man. He gave each person what he deserved, and was loved even when difficult decisions were made.

The Chief Engineer
The Chief Engineer was Kostas, Greek, 50 years old. He had served on that type of vessel for years, knew them very well; radiated professionalism and duty consciousness. He was optimistic and a yeller, he liked to yell, laugh, and what he mostly enjoyed was to stand by the side of the Captain, supporting him. I should say that he was one of the few engineers of his time whose relation with the crew was not toxic.

The rest of the crew
All the officers and lower – rank officers were Greek, and the boatswain was Greek, too. The rest were of various nationalities.

3. The challenge

The vessel had started from Egypt loaded with crude oil. Her first port – of call was Rotterdam.

In Rotterdam we had to discharge a large batch of crude oil, and we would get rid of what would be left in Fawley, at the EXXON oil refinery, one of Europe's largest oil refineries in England's Southampton. Among other things we also had our resources. When I had boarded the vessel two and a half months ago, I headed to the bow and said: "Hey guys, do we have spare wires?"; headed to the bow and saw there were none. And I thought to myself “Now that I am in the Netherlands, that the materials are inexpensive, why not order a few?”. And I ordered two, and our person in charge of our supplies found them cheap and sent me four. Naturally, this created a thing about where to store them, because I did not have storage for them.

We had a heavy schedule in Rotterdam: besides discharging, the inspections were continuous. Things in ports have changed legally, in terms of regulations, etc, there are also the notorious Venting since 1992 every Tom, Dick and Harry boards looking which of the 600 things the VID Questionnaire includes is not done well by the vessel. There is also the port inspection and many more other inspections.
As soon as we reached Rotterdam after docking, instead of the Captain and the crew going to the hotel, like the Pilots and the plane’s crew do, the whole world fell on us! Three – four different persons boarded the vessel to do all kinds of inspections! Each with his own aim. For a moment everyone was requesting the log, so the Captain, calm, I had not seen such a resilient person before, at that time he said: “You should issue priority tickets, like in banks”.

One slap led to the other in that journey. We were in Rotterdam, at the dock and we started discharging. The regular pace of discharge lasted for around 12 hours, and the Chief Engineer called to tell me that he had a problem with the empty space of the auxiliary refrigerator. The auxiliary refrigerator is what cools the discharging pumps. And he told me: “You know what, I only have a pump with low revolutions”, so that seriously prolonged discharge time. This threatened to delay our next freight.

When the discharge in Rotterdam was over it was foggy, and we left there to go opposite to England with the crew nearly exhausted, we had to speed up to gain lost time.

We left Rotterdam and in the afternoon we arrived at Fawley. We entered the river and arrived at the position we would dock. When the vessel was oriented towards the berth and it was about to dock, the linesmen, those who tie up the vessels’ lines, boarded her and went to the mooring wires. After they took a look, shook their heads and told the Pilot they thought that three – four wire ropes on the bow were not as they were supposed to be, according to them. The mooring wires were fine for us, but for them they were not. The same thing applied to three – four other mooring wires on the stern.

CASE STUDY: RESILIENCE IS CONTAGIOUS!
Thus, the linesmen said: “We will not take the responsibility of docking the vessel”.

“Now you are telling us this?” the Pilot said.

The Pilot did not support the linesmen because he thought they had not informed him on time and they had put in danger not only the vessel but also himself.

When I heard the chat between the Pilot and the two linesmen, about not letting the vessel tie up in the dock I thought there would be a chance that happening. That specific moment I thought to myself “I have to convince them to tie up her otherwise I will turn her into a sight for many more years here in the river, there is no other choice.”. That moment I instantly saw that the vessel has been oriented to be tied up in the dock and that there were not many chances of turning her. The vessel almost fitted in the Strait, how would we turn her? And do not think that such vessels had supporting propellants, they had a small propeller, like all vessels, neither two propellers, nor a bow thruster, none of such aids that vessels nowadays have of that size. And we had 17 meters draught underneath us.

The Pilot turned and told me: “You know, Captain, we have a problem! We have to turn her back.”

I told him: “No way, not a chance, she won’t turn on her own.”

I tried to change their minds, to tell them that what I was told went against every marine reasoning, meaning I could not accept what I was told, that one of the little wires of the piston that has 8 wires...you are telling me that there is a chance of a linesman being hurt. “Come on, man, no way that might happen.”, we know far too well that, first and foremost the wire is not touched by anyone, I explained this to them, the wire is contacted by no one. There is no danger of hurting anyone, because the wire is not touched by anyone. You may say on the one hand that there is the chance the wire might not break because a little wire has broken, that is absolutely nonsense, and there is not any marine rule that states that would be the case. I told him that “That's the port's weirdness and yours, too, and I accept it because I can’t do any other way”, pouring out.

It was impossible to convince them. On the contrary, the Pilot convinced me offering the solution.

He told me: “This tug that accompanies us is not a random tug, rather it's a very big tug. Its power is 200 tons bollard pull. We can tie her up from the bow and turn her”.

The 200 tons bollard pull of the tug meant that it would be as powerful as to give propulsion to the stern to turn quickly. We weighed the situation and said that, if we had the engine as we were supposed to have, we would turn her safely. In that case the Chief Engineer of the vessel would play a major role. That was important, because we had to work as a team.
I did not estimate the situation instantly, I needed the engineer’s opinion because the information around the tug did not suffice. I also had to see what the chances were to deal with the situation immediately. In other words, the engine’s operation had to be done instantly, and for us on these vessels such immediacy is unknown, particularly for the engineers. I had to take that into mind, the mentality of the engineers on such large vessels is not to perform so many, steep and big moves.

I called him and told him: “Handy Kostas, I will tell you something in a hurry. In 5 minutes, I want, when I tell you full power, I want you to give full power, everything you’ve got at that time, do anything you can. Give maximum engine power.”

He told me: “But, I can’t go that fast.”

-“As much as you can, anyway, from halt to full in 2 minutes, ready?”

-“But it has not happened before!”

-“Ready?”

-“Ready.”

-“If you tell me yes, I will start the turn, otherwise I will say no to the Pilot.”

And he told me: “No, let’s do this.”

And then I turned to the Pilot and told him: “Yeah, alright, because she is almost loaded, she will do it, she has the pivot point ahead. If the tug is very strong in the stern she might make a full circle, form an arc, and then turn with the bow towards the exit. Alright, let’s do this.”

It was around 7 at night when all these were happening.

The handling on the other hand was the Pilot’s responsibility. I told him: “You will talk with the tug, I will handle the vessel, stay alert in case the tug quits because I will hunt you down.”

I told him that, and made him responsible for his actions. “If, even for this bit, the tug’s bollard loosens up, you are screwed.”

I mean I cornered him, too, did not let him like that. And the tug was cornered, as well. He called the tug, then, and told them to watch out, things were not easy there. And I told the Pilot: “If anything goes wrong, I will lose my job, but you will have a vessel in the middle of the river for 3 – 4 years, and your hands will be tied. That simple.”

CASE STUDY: RESILIENCE IS CONTAGIOUS!
Those particular vessels were steam ones, meaning with a boiler as big as a block of flats, the specific vessel to be turned in trials – I was on it during trials when she was delivered – it took her 27 minutes (4.5 miles) from full – ahead, from full to go ahead, stop, not turn. When we headed for berth on our own, without tugs with those vessels, because the Chief Engineers were complaining as the engine was overheating due to that big turn, and they were right. The engine had refrigerators, thus it took us a lot of time to turn her, it was a hard task for those down in the ER. I had the empathy to realize the problem of the Chief Engineer who was down there. Talking about resilience, wait to see what kind of resilience was needed for the Captain, so that he cooperated for the greater good, which was to navigate the vessel safely and as it was supposed to happen.

And indeed, when I told Handy Kostas to give full power, so he did. I turned and looked at the telegraph to see the response in the revolution counter, to see the revolutions rising. It was so direct that I could not believe my eyes. It was the first time I had seen that at the revolution counter, because there were not many instruments on the bridge back then.

And so we did our turn. Without much safety. Our stern scratched the buoy. The tug of course got out of the channel buoys, yet our stern zipped by the buoy.

This took us 10 minutes, from the moment we tied up the tug until we increased to full power and did the turn.

Then, we anchored, that was rather easy. We dropped anchors rather easily someone would say depending on the conditions, and the Pilot told me: “Captain we are off now, we will let you change the wires, in how many days should we come, Captain?”

-“At 4 in the morning (with the tide change) to be on time for the tide.”

-“No way, there is not a chance you will make it.”

-“At 4 o’clock I will have heaved up the anchor and will be waiting for you. I will call on the VHF so that the linesmen come and check, the lads that told us it was forbidden, and if they don’t tell you that everything is ok, don’t come.”

My next move, as soon as the anchor was dropped and I saw that the vessel is standing and that everything is ok, was to start working. The boatswain headed to the bow and myself to the stern with the Chief Officer. I would like to stress that luckily I had another 2nd Officer, whom I rotated, meaning he did a shift so that the rest would rest. I sent him rest so that, when the vessel would head for berthing, there would be a man ‘alive’; ‘alive’ meaning for him to be rested, more than the rest, and paying particular attention to the others, because everyone, due to fatigue, would be eligible for mistakes. So, one who was kept more rested had to look after us.
At the same time the Chief Engineer had made sure that the Second Engineer was resting. When I asked him to turn the vessel, he understood, too, that things would get tricky. He asked me, “What’s going on here? Why are we turning?” I told him it was because we had to change the wires and we had to try to be on time for the tide. What I really wanted to tell him was that we needed help; but I said nothing. I knew the Chief Engineer, I knew that he would do it. I was certain he would do it!

He told me: “We’ll head upstairs as soon as you ring giving me a signal. We will all head upstairs.” Back then the engine crew were not few people, there were three third Engineers, a second, three lubricators, two cleaners. There were many, not few.

And indeed they came. As soon as the vessel anchored, besides the fellows from the deck, I saw the Chief Engineer coming from the ER with all the engine crew who were exhausted from the continuous stand-by, because the Fawley – Rotterdam distance was small. An exhausted team with its own leader, the Chief Engineer was at the Captain and the Chief Officer’s disposal who were there to change the wires.

-“What do you want us to do?”

Even the Chief Engineer was at the boatswain’s disposal.

He told him: “What do you want me to do?”

Naturally the boatswain was Greek. Everybody assisted to change three mooring wires, which, even I do not know how big they are. I guess they are around 600 meters each and I don’t know how much they weigh. And they worked all night on the deck in the cold. Luckily, we had got 4 spare wires from Rotterdam which I had complained about, but now they seemed to me like heaven - sent.

Indeed we managed, and at 4 in the morning the vessel was ready. Yet, for that to happen, everybody worked extremely hard. All those who were already exhausted, I remind you that because I want you to bear it in mind. It was a case in which every Captain would feel proud of his crew and the crew for having that Captain.
4. The dilemma

The dilemma faced by the Captain and the entire crew was, on the one hand the need for rest and relaxation after a long period of exhausting work, and on the other the need for the vessel to respond to her job. It was a time when the vessel had received a fare that should not have been missed, and delay upon delay we had reached the deadline.

The challenges came one after the other during that trip. As soon as discharge was finished in a foggy Rotterdam, the Captain left immediately for England on the opposite side with a tired and exhausted crew. Arriving in England, the Captain and the crew faced another harsh situation that required even the last resources of physical and mental health to manage.

The extra time discharging we lost in Rotterdam due to the break-down of the auxiliary refrigerator plus the additional time for changing the mooring wires, made us risk of losing the next freight. Operationally, a vessel should serve her aims, just for the sake of pleasing the client. The client back then was a very important one, it was EXXON, not an ordinary client, that kind of client should be overjoyed. We had reduced the time of changing the mooring wires to 12 hours at all cost, so that we were in time for the next tide. If we had missed that, we would have had to wait for another 24 hours, meaning losing an entire day. That would have required an additional effort on behalf of an exhausted crew.

5. The resolution

That incident ended happily, because the Captain took advantage of the half-daily phenomenon of the tide. Because the tide is a half-daily phenomenon, every 12 hours we have one low and one high tide. And in 12 hours after he had told me to change the mooring wires, I could have crossed again the river and gone for discharging.

And despite all the fatigue and the trouble the crew had gone through, with cooperation, trust, empathy and effective communication, the Captain and the crew managed to work altogether so that the mission of the vessel would be accomplished. With coordination and under the Captain's leadership, they did all the necessary actions within the time limits given.

To acknowledge the self-denial the crew showed, the Captain without asking anyone, without having permission to do it, deposited 2 million Greek drachmas (6,000 Euros) in the crew’s payment slips and distributed it to them. Afterwards, he requested and was granted permission by the office without any negotiation.

Did they know that the crew would be paid extra?
Sometimes one has to say nothing. Everybody knew what they had to do to get the job done. Nobody asked at that time whether they will get paid or not, they knew it would happen, they did not know how much. They knew that they would get paid, they knew that I was willing to give my payment so that they get paid instead of me, they knew I would have done it. And I would have, if it was necessary, but it wasn’t after all.

**PREPARATORY QUESTIONS**

1. Who are the primary characters? Briefly describe the problem from the perspective of each, and what (believes, values, culture) drives the behavior of each character. Explain how the behaviors of the characters shape the series of facts that lead to the case outcome.

2. What issues are raised by this case? Why are they important to consider?

3. If you consider that there is an alternative path of action, what would it be? Please specify a plan of such an action.
CASE STUDY: GOOD TEAMWORK, A PROPER LEADERSHIP DURING THE COVID PANDEMIC ON BOARD

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This case study is about how the situation on board the ship was managed when a few of the crew members were infected with Covid and the others were exhausted by the large volume of work. The most affected of this virus were the AB, the Captain, the Chief Engineer, the 3rd Engineer, one motorman and two cadets. With the crew decimated by the Covid infection and the Puerto Rico Coast Guard’s refusal to help, the ship was forced to leave the US territorial waters and to sail 18 days back to Europe. Even though they were exhausted, due to their professionalism and experience, the rest of the crew managed to sail safely to Rotterdam.

THE NARRATION

1. The Scenery

This is a common thing today but at the beginning of the pandemic it was an example of human interaction and survival at sea. Our narrator is Razvan. Razvan remembers one of his voyages as a 3rd Officer back in 2020 on board a container ship. The ship was built in 2011, so it was like 9 years old. Not so old. At that time, the ship was fully loaded with containers and was carrying dangerous goods, too. The incident happened in the spring of 2020 and Razvan recalls and describes those moments: “we departed from Panama and the route was to Europe, so we had to cross the Atlantic Ocean”.

2. Introducing the people involved

The 3rd Officer
Today, Razvan is a third officer. He is 27 years old and he holds a bachelor’s degree from Constanta Maritime University and now he is studying for his master’s degree at the same university. He’s had three contracts as deck cadet and four contracts as third officer.
CASE STUDY: GOOD TEAMWORK, A PROPER LEADERSHIP DURING THE COVID PANDEMIC ON BOARD

At the time of the incident, he had been on board for three months and he knew his crew well, being on good terms with everyone.

He was not the only Romanian on board. There were two more Romanians on board the ship, the second officer and one deck cadet.

**The Captain**
The Captain was a Danish woman, aged about 43 years, single and without children. She had no emotional factors to distract her from her work. Razvan remembers that “she was very, very professional and she was friendly. I can say, the only problem she had was the food. But the rest, if you were behaving like you should behave, if you used to be a professional guy, she was friendly with everyone not giving hard time to anyone.”

In her work she gave a touch of professionalism and devotion. For example, “during the search and rescue, the Captain used to be on the bridge most of the time, she used to take very little rest, like 4 hours, …, but the rest of the time she was awake, and if not on the bridge, she was in her cabin waiting for our phone. She was really helpful.” told us Razvan.

She respected her crew and cared about their health. Razvan recalls that “even though she was sick, and she was the second most serious case after the AB whom we disembarked, she used to call me on the bridge and sometimes ask about the people. I think she was… even in this situation, she was concerned about the health of the crew”. Because she was always calm and gave clear instructions, showing professionalism and experience, the entire crew believed in her and respected her.

**The Chief Engineer**
The Chief Engineer was a 65 years-old Danish man with a lot of experience on board, 30 years of experience on sailing. He was that kind of guy who didn’t follow the rules or any guidance. He had his own opinion. “You know that old people sometimes are difficult to convince to do things right, to follow the company procedures… I think he had his own standards.”

Even though he did not interact with him in his spare time, Razvan could observe his behavior. “In the free time he was friendly at some point, like if he had an opinion which was contradicting yours, you had to accept his opinion, otherwise he was not friendly anymore and in the engine room he was like that…he used to pass all the things to the 2nd Engineer and he was like out of problem, except on the critical times - if they had a real problem in the engine room then he used to get involved too, but otherwise it was the 2nd Engineer leading the engine crew, with the engine problems.”

**The Chief Officer and the Second Engineer**

They were both Ukrainians. They were calm and peaceful.
After the Covid infection of some crew members, the 2nd Engineer had to deal with all the situations in the engine room and the Chief Officer took the charge of the bridge under a minimal guidance of the Captain.

As Razvan remembers, the Chief Officer “had everything under control. He never panicked. Or at least he was not showing to us that he’s panicked or something like that. So, during this whole situation, he managed to keep everything smooth and to take care also of the infected people on board. He was professional.” The Chief Officer is also the doctor on board, so he is the one who is giving medicines and signs for this or any treatment if you need and at the same time he was taking care of the ship, for maneuvering the ship.

Even if the rest of the time, the 2nd Engineer was calm, in those moments he was stressed by so much fatigue. “You could see on his face that he was tired and he was asking for help. He had with him some ABs from deck just to try to do his job easier, but it’s a difference when you have an AB with you in the engine room and when you have an engineer with you. He had to take care of everything”, Razvan tells.

The rest of the crew

“The rest of the crew was quite panicked even though we were trying to maintain everything smooth. All the officers were instructed not to give any reasons to the ratings to panic more.” This was a measure taken to protect them and not scare them more, considering that the first infected person was among them, one of the AB, a Filipino.

The officers were more or less professional, but all of them were quite stressed. The most stressed by the situation was the 3rd Engineer, a Chinese guy who started to panic the other telling everyone that they would all get infected and they would die.

The entire crew panicked and feared they would become infected. This fear was general, even if some did not show it.

The crew consisted of 5 nationalities: Danish, Ukrainians, Romanians, Chinese and Filipinos. Even if there were different nationalities, no one felt excluded because the official language on board the ship was English and everyone spoke it quite well.

3. The challenge

The incident consists of difficulties encountered on board the ship after a part of the crew was infected with Covid and were isolated in their own cabins and the rest of the crew had to take over all the tasks of the others.

The ship’s route was to cross the Atlantic Ocean from Panama to Europe. As Razvan remembers, that was not an easy route. “We had two ports a day or one port, it depends.
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But mainly the average was one port in one day. And we had had five or six ports there and after these ports in Caribbean area, the route was to proceed to the Mediterranean Sea and there we would have another three ports. And that was the route, back and forth America to the Mediterranean Sea, to Europe.”

They were 180 miles off The Caribbean when they received a distress alert. It was a man overboard from another ship who was declared missing. So, immediately they got involved in that search and rescue operation being coordinated by Puerto Rico Coast Guard. When they arrived on the operation scene it was late at night, almost 11 p.m. and the Captain ordered for all the crew to be on deck. Razvan told us that “we established the plan how everyone would be distributed and we started the search and rescue, for specific pattern, and from that day our fatigue began, because for four days and four nights the crew almost didn’t get any rest. So, everyone was exhausted.”

At the beginning of these days of search and rescue operation, one of Razvan's crew members, the AB, reported some mild symptoms which were related to Covid and he was put under investigation. Because the SAR operation didn’t reveal any results and because the AB’s health had seriously deteriorated, they stopped the search and rescue operation and focused on the health of the crew.

The situation became even worse than before because after the US Coast Guard took the AB by helicopter to take him to the hospital, the US Coast Guard forced them to pick up the anchor and leave US territorial waters.

From there, they had to sail all the way back to Europe, for like 18 days, on full speed. It was the only option they had.

4. The dilemma

The situation on board continued to worsen and on the day of departure towards Europe another five crew members were infected with Covid. Razvan remembered that “immediately, the Captain made a meeting on the bridge with all the crew including the infected ones who were separated from us in a corner. The Captain was one of them.” At that meeting we discussed the procedures to be followed and informed the Company of the situation on board the ship. A radio medical advice was involved, but at that time, at the beginning of the pandemic, no one had a clear idea of what Covid meant”.

The new infected members were: the Captain, the Chief Engineer, the 3rd engineer, one motorman and two cadets (one deck cadet and one engine cadet). They were all isolated and not allowed to go outside.

Razvan thinks that the first person who contacted the virus and did not report symptoms and spread it was the Chief Engineer. His opinion is based on the fact that half of the
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engine crew was infected. And he was the only one the Captain spoke to before he fell ill. He was the only one who didn’t respect the rules. “In New York, we had clear instructions that no one is coming inside the accommodation except the crew, but in New York he accepted this bunker team to discuss with him and all these things, the arrangements for bunkerage. And he was not following any guidance.” To all these actions we can add his attitude and his previous behavior on board.

In these conditions, the rest of the crew had to take over the duties of the sick and isolated.

The 2nd Engineer was alone in the engine room and he had to deal with all the situations and the Chief Officer took the charge of the bridge under minimal guidance of the Captain, because she felt very bad. Being the doctor on board, the Chief Officer was the only one who was allowed to take contact with the infected people. He was the only one taking care of them. He was giving medicine, communicating with the shore and with the radio medical advice. “He was a quite experienced Chief mate” tells Razvan.

As they headed for the Mediterranean Sea, Razvan (the 3rd Officer) and the 2nd Officer helped the Chief Officer with the watch, they used to do 6-on 6-off to give him some rest, so that he could focus on other tasks. But sometimes he was taking also his watch, just to leave time to rest to the 3rd Officer and the 2nd Officer.

The 2nd Engineer, who was usually calm, this time was stressed due to the accumulated fatigue and asked for help. He had a few ABs from deck with him who were trying to make things easier for him. Even so, he had to take care of everything in engine room. He had to do most of the maintenance. But he was lucky because the ship being quite good did not raise any problems in the engine room even if they were going at full speed.

5. The resolution

Just before they entered the Mediterranean Sea, before they crossed the Gibraltar no one wanted them in their territorial waters because they had some cases of Covid infection on board. In that period no one had a clear idea how to manage this kind of situation. Everything was at the beginning with the Covid pandemic.

The only port that offered them help and accepted them was Rotterdam, a port out of their schedule. Razvan remembers “They told us: “Come to us! We will take care of you!” That was the saving moment when the fatigue accumulated from the crew’s 18 days of continuous work was about to end, as well as the suffering of the infected people who needed specialized monitoring.

The entire period, the team “worked like a clock. Everyone knew exactly his place and what to do and the infected crew just followed what they had to do, just to stay in their cabins and the rest of us, the healthy ones, we did everything from navigation side, from engine side, to bring the ship into port safely." This is how Razvan describes how they
acted to reach the port safely with the ship. Even before they arrived in Rotterdam, they were assaulted by emails and everyone was willing to help them. In port they were taken over by the pilot who looked like an astronaut in his medical protective equipment. The pilot knowing their situation, he expected to find some zombies on board; people not able to deal with the stations.

In fact, things were better because each member of the crew knew what his place was and what he had to do, and they did it with calm and responsibility, showing professionalism and experience.

Only these qualities brought the ship into port safely even if the crew members were exhausted.

After three weeks of waiting in quarantine in Rotterdam, the complete change of crew took place. All crew members were disembarked safely.

This whole situation maybe could have been avoided if the Chief Engineer had followed the rules and not allowed access to other people, the bunker team, in New York, inside the accommodation. But there was no certainty in this regards.

This was a good example of a very good teamwork, for accomplishing the final goal of their jobs, taking the ship from point A to point B safely, the people on board got there safe and the cargo also.

PREPARATORY QUESTIONS

1. Describe the main emotions manifested by the characters in this case study. Separate the positive emotions from the negative ones.

2. Is there a real team on board? What are the elements of characterizing a team that you have identified in this case study?

3. Is there a real conflict on board? Identify all conflicting situations if any and suggest solutions of your own.
THE NARRATION

1. The Scenery

Our narrator is Razvan, a Third Officer now, but still a deck cadet in our story in 2017.

The incident happened close to noon time, on a container ship in the South China Sea area, on the route China – Singapore, generally, a crowded area for ships, but not in that specific period, because the season for fishing was not open. The sea was calm, but there was a swell of 2.5 m.

“We had had a few bad days; I mean the weather was bad in the past days. And that was the first day when the weather was calm, meaning the waves. There was no wind, no rain, and it was sunny outside. There was only this swell (...) I think that is the most important.”

The ship was stable because it was a big ship of 250 meters LOA, fully loaded.

2. Introducing the people involved

The Deck Cadet
The narrator, a novice in navigation.

Razvan is 27 years old, now, with the licence of Third Officer. He graduated from Constanta Maritime University and now he is studying for his Master's degree.

He is now an experienced Third Officer with 19 months as Officer on container ships and 19 months as Deck Cadet.

When the incident happed, Razvan was on his second contract as Deck Cadet and he was
joining on board of around 5 months and a half.

He and the other cadet are the only Romanian on board ship, in a multicultural crew of: British, the Captain and the Third Officer, Pakistani, the Chief Officer, Indian and Chinese.

Being at his second voyage, he has knowledge about the working procedures and his duties on board ship, he is confident, a working person but still a novice in the navigation works. He has a logical mind, mature, he has a good, inspired and immediate reaction in the incident and his actions contributed to the solving problem, in a general panic atmosphere installed at that specific incident.

He evaluates in an objective way the situation, he remains calm with rational judgement in the critical cases (the incident) and difficult situations (related to the Chief Officer behaviour), he recognise the bully situations and react on them, even the position of cadet, an inferior rank compared to the superior rank, could and ONLY could lead to a docile attitude from a cadet.

After the incident, he is the only one that had the courage to ask the Chief Officer about his wrong decision: “Because I considered that my life was in danger and he's not taking any responsibility for you. And I told him. I mean, “Who is the responsible officer here? Who is the leader? Who we have to follow? You... Why don't you take responsibility for the order you gave?” And he was just keeping quiet, but the opinion was...the official opinion was different”.

His great regrets are that he had not a full courage to talk to the captain about the chief mate behaviour and accepted his bullied attitude because his mind of cadet was like: “Okay, I'm one month away to go home. I'll just stay quiet, let this guy do his crazy ideas and that's it”. “So, I've tried to stay calm and just to let it pass and count it as a bad experience. Not to do anything”.

“On the other hand, the company is saying every time: “Use the stop work authority”. I mean the company procedure is there. We have the right to stop. Doesn't matter we are cadet, officers, rating, whatever, and everyone have the right to stop something.

But they (the crew) didn't use it. I didn't use it also”.

**The Chief Officer**

“The kind of guy you don't want to meet in your life”

The Chief Officer is a Pakistan of 40 – 45 years old, with a lot experience as Chief Officer.

He is a difficult person with a bad behaviour, who tries and succeeds to exploit people at the maximum, to push them to the limits, to make fun of some people, young people, “fresh people” and to bully the persons under his command.
Professionally speaking, he knows his job very well and performs it at a good level, although sometimes does not follow the rules, safety rules, very important on a ship. In our case, he decides to not take the painter, he made only a brief discussion before the drill, he does not organize the safety meeting after, he gives only a short instruction with “what to do and not to do actions” to an inexperienced and fresh promoted Third Officer, without giving her any support from an experienced person from bridge.

He has random periods when he cooperates with the cadet in a good way, showing, explaining and delivering information to our narrator, Razvan, although on the ship, it is the chief officer’s duty to train the cadets.

As a leader of the navigation department, it is not enough to know and accomplish your technical duties if you don’t combine them with an appropriate behavior, you must monitor, sustain, explain, train, understand and adapt to the different personalities from your team.

He demonstrates his rank of chief officer in a strange way to some people, especially to the young people, as cadets. He believes that delivering lessons in an imperative and aggressive way, it is good for cadets and they can and learn fast and well. He uses the same lessons practiced in the past on him, when he was young cadet. “No, no, you have to experience this; you have to see how it is. It will be good for you in your life.” He believes that bad experiences and hard work (18 hours worked by a cadet) could form a cadet into a future good officer: “In his mind was that: they are fresh, so they have to experience. They have to have bad experience.”

He pushed the people to the limits wanted to see what they know. But he does not realize all the time that some decisions could be fatal and this kind of action could be dangerous, a life-threatening situation.

Also, he has a bully attitude and makes fun of people, action that does not consolidate the relations in a team.

Important in the defining of his profile is also his reaction after the incident, not taking charge and full responsibilities for his decisions and consequences of the incident, trying to report the accident in his favour and his advantage and not the real situation and also blaming the others for the accident, except him, even all the orders came explicitly from him. He tries to be innocent, knowing that the incident was quite serious and could affect his career in the company.

He has professional relationship with the captain who let the chief officer to take decisions in the major part of the time related to the navigation department, not interfere very much in his decisions.

The Third Officer
A small fish in a shark mouth!
The third officer is a British young woman with only for five days on board, when the incident happened. It was her first trip as a third officer, so freshly graduated from deck cadet to third officer. A little bit inexperienced in the duties of third officer, quite shy as temperament, with a low confidence level due to the new responsibilities, with a lot of emotions and stress feeling, not ready for her new duties, without any accommodation period with the ship and duties ‘rank. The incident came as a challenge and affected her confidence and concentration, idea sustained by the events passed after the failed drill.

**The Captain**

“Don't call me!”

The captain is British. He is quite old with a lot of experience in navigation. He is friendly, approachable and tries to stay away from problems. In an easy way, he lets many decisions to be taken by the chief officer who is CHIEF OFFICER with uppercase letters. It is a convenient situation for the Captain, a person who does not want to have issues on his ship even if this means to not want to see the real problems or the inappropriate behaviour of the Chief Officer. He is like the person that says “Call me, if it's necessary” meaning “Don't call me! “

**The rest of the crew**

Five flags, many different attitudes

The crew is a multinational one with 5 nationalities: British, Romanian, Pakistan, Indians and Chinese. There are cultural differences in the crew between European and Asian people from the ship, visible contrast in attitude, work, duties and performing tasks on the ship. The ratings were all Indians and they have an obediently attitude related to the duties and orders received from the superiors. The description of Razvan sustains this idea:

“That is the culture, the Asian culture. (...) It's in their culture, is in their blood. If the superior is giving you an order, you do it. That is the first instinct. Some of them, if they realise, they stop and they come again and ask the superior. But some others they will continue even though they realise the danger.”

3. The challenge

“No, no, you have to experience this; you have to see how it is. It will be good for you in your life. “

The incident happened four years ago, in 2017, in South China Sea, at noon. The ship, a container of 250 metres, is fully loaded but very stable, with a draught of around 10-11 metres. The vessel came from China to the destination: Singapore port.

Generally, that geographical sector of sea is a crowded region with commercial ships and
fishing boats, but at that specific time, there was free, the fishing season was not yet opened, so not a congested traffic area.

Before that day, the weather was not so good. There were few bad days, before. That day of the incident was the first one when the weather was relatively calm, there was no wind, no rain, it was sunny outside. But very important, there was a swell of around 2.5 metres, maybe more, difficulty to approximate, initially, from the bridge ship, anyway it was a little bit bumpy.

Although the conditions were like those ones described before, the chief officer and the captain, and the order of the deciders is correct, did not freaked about the weather and they still wanted to do the rescue boat drill. This is a kind of exercise where you have to lower the boat into the water, exercise and test the engine and take around eventually if possible and then heave it back up. These drills were done quite often on board, monthly or even twice a month. So, there was a routine exercise.

Usually, before the drills, there is a briefing meeting with the crew involved in the exercise and after the drill there is a debriefing meeting in order to explain and comment the exercise and finally to learn what was wrong and what can be improved. But on that ship, no, there were the post drill report and the predrill briefing and the post drill report. In the predrill, the chief officer writes what will happen and after that he can just display the paper in a visible place and just before the drill, he has to instruct the crew and discuss with the crew the aspects and after the drill will be the post drill report in a short meeting. But in that situation, there was not the case.

At the beginning, there are four people in the boat, only the deck team. At the davit, there was the third officer that monitored by the captain lowered the boat to the water. So, the boat was lowered with all the people inside it, the hook was removed and then the deck team went for a ride with the boat in order to test the engine, ride that took around 10-15 minutes. At the return, the rescue boat was on the portside with 5 people in the boat, because an AB that was painting the side of the ship out, on the bosun chair, was taken into the boat out from the bosun chair and thus, all 5 people went back in the recovery position. Razvan, our deck cadet, was at the helm, the chief officer and the rest of the persons were spread around the boat.

Let’s heave up the boat with five people on board, in conditions of swell, with a third officer alone and without experience and no painter! Great challenge!

4. The dilemma

For this time, the third officer was alone on the lifeboat deck, at the davit, in the moment of boat lifting. None of an experienced AB or OS, who could help her, in this action.
It is important to be mentioned that the third officer was on her first voyage as a third officer, so freshly graduated from deck cadet to third officer, with only 5 days on board, received only a short brief before the drill from the chief officer “What to do and not to do”, to lower the boat and to heave it up. The chief officer did not make sure that she could do these procedures alone, and his mind-set was that if she is a third officer, she must know everything that you have to know about, you have to know how to operate the davit.

In the recovering position, in the moment of lifting, due to the swell, the boat was bouncing back and forth.

The chief officer told the crew to go straight for the hook and to attach the hook to the boat without the painter that did not exist on the boat, due to the chief officer’s order. An AB attached the hook to the boat that was pressed by the waves but immediately, it was on the troop of the wave. The boat was suspended and it bounced on the hook, on the wire.

The chief officer started to scream to the third officer to heave up the boat. The weight in the boat was unevenly distributed, so the boat tilted forward around 40 degrees almost, in the position to fall in the water or worse. As the painter was not attached, the boat started spinning like a propeller. The boat was smashing the hull of the ship; the engine of the boat was destroyed. Also, the forward part of the boat was also destroyed.

The third officer, not ready for this situation, had a blackout in her mind, she was not able to react, not able to do something, not able to manage the case. The red button of panic was pressed!!!

In this general agitation and mess, Razvan shouts to the others to give him a stick and together with the other two hook sticks from the boat to push it away from the hull of vessel, in order to not smash the ship.

5. The resolution

“It all happened because we didn't follow the procedures.”

Finally, they managed to come back on the ship. No one was hurt, no one fell in the water, but the boat was destroyed and the fright and danger were real.

Immediately after the incident, the chief officer was blaming the AB’s, even Razvan as a cadet. He was blaming all of them that they did not take the painter; although the order came explicitly from him to skip the painter. No debriefing session was made.

In the next days, the incident did not happened, nobody talked officially about it and the report to the company was, for sure, done in favour of the Chief Officer. The incident was like it didn’t exist; there was only in their minds, souls and now, in this story!
The learned lesson

At the question about difference between school and life, Tom Bodett answered that “In school, you learn a lesson, and then you take a test. In life, you have to take a test that teaches you a lesson.”

Follow the rules! Follow the procedures!

Razvan learned a severe lesson about the rules and procedures and the keeping them closely, learned about courage to say NO when the others say DO IT!

“I should have involved the captain at that time because that's my advice to all the cadets nowadays. If you have a problem, if someone has a problem with you, then do not accept it, go to the captain.”

Razvan learned how to use a tool that was known by Razvan but it did not use it: “Use the stop work authority”. The procedure was part of the training conducted by the company that Razvan joined it. “We have the right to stop. Doesn't matter we are cadets, officers, rating, whatever, everyone have the right to stop something.”

The final conclusion of Razvan defines in a very comprehensive way, the incident and its resume:

“I can tell that the leadership was poor. The risk assessment was poor.”

1. What is in your opinion the trigger of conflict(s) in this case?

2. Observe the persons involved in this case and determine the background of the cultural clash on board the vessel, if any.

3. How could the conflictual situation have been prevented?
THE NARRATION

1. The Scenery

The situation depicted provides an example of human interaction at sea. Our narrator is Valentin. He remembers his first voyage as a Captain back in 2015 on board a double class oil/chemical tanker of 40,000 deadweight, 183 metres long and 32 metres wide with a scantling draught of 10.7.

“The ship was 11 years old at the time of the incident which in terms of ships is a reasonable length of service.

Valentin recalls that it was the end of October, “it was exactly the same time as the Collective Club fire (i.e. 30 October 2015). In 2015. In Mediterranean Sea we had loaded in Gibraltar and we were supposed to discharge in Sète in France. And at the time of the incident, the ship was in... near Barcelona, about 30 nautical miles east of Barcelona.”

The weather was very nice: “extremely good weather. Very calm. You could almost see the stars reflected in the water.”

2. Introducing the people involved

On board the vessel there was a multinational crew made up of European officers (Greek, Romanian and Ukrainian) and pumpmen and Filipino officers and ratings.
CASE STUDY: HOW TO PREVENT A SMALL INCIDENT FROM TURNING INTO A DISASTER?

The Captain
Valentin is from Tulcea, he holds a bachelor’s degree from Constanta Maritime University and an MSc degree in Port Management from the same university. For 12 years he sailed mostly on tankers from Cadet/Deck Boy up to Master. In 2016 he quit sailing and found a job ashore in Sweden as a marine Superintendent and is currently working in Norway as a marine manager, DPA CSO.

When the incident happened, he had been on board for almost five months and was supposed to disembark shortly.

He describes himself as a control freak and says that he “always stressed about safety on board. Safety first is not just a sign, is not just a saying, it has to be safe and I was strict about this. All the time in the night time I was doing a round to see if they did their job, if they closed the doors, if they left any loose objects and so on.” Also, his personal way of thinking is that “there is no room for feelings on board the vessel. I just blanked in the moment that I went on board. So it's cold as ice. Job needs to be done. We have no personal feelings here and we go home. We have our parties. We have our communication and I am not against the friendship on board or whatever. But the job is first.”

The Chief Officer
The Chief Officer was Greek, and he was five years older than the Captain. Valentin describes him as “very... lazy, I think lazy is the best way to describe him”. He had high expectations and the first thing he had asked when he arrived on board was why Valentin, who was younger, was already a Captain while he wasn’t. With regard to his professional skills, he had a general idea what needed to be done, but someone else had to do it, because “he was like zero on operational level. He never did it by himself.” Based on this, he and the Captain had had their “share of fights for almost five months”. In Greece, at the company’s office, almost everyone hated him. It was very easy to dislike this guy.

The Chief Engineer
The Chief Engineer was a little bit older than the Captain, almost 40, “but with a lot of experience and a very, very knowledgeable guy. There was no problem that he could not solve. And very open with the problems that were in the engine, which is quite special for engineers. But he was tough with his crew.” He was a very strict person because he wanted things to go the way they were supposed to go, and he was pushing his crew to work for it. “And he didn't believe that one should get things so easy, the same way that the 3rd Engineer got. He probably got his chief engineer’s position the hard way, learning a lot.” He had high expectations from everyone around him, a little bit of a bully, apparently, “but mostly with the assholes. With the ones that were good persons, not good technically, like really good persons, then he would be a little more soft. Proud guy, very, very proud guy.” He was coming from the same place in Greece “as the ship owner. You have a... You can have also a fast track in promotion. But he had the hard way.”
The 3rd Engineer
The 3rd Engineer was also Greek and he was a really nice person, polite, but he had some deficiencies with the English language. Because he was inexperienced, he was overwhelmed by the job. This was his first voyage in rank. Before that, he had only been one time as 4th Engineer, so he got a “fast track on promotion”, probably because he was the same nationality as the ship owner and ship operator.

Only after a few days since he had been on board, the Chief Engineer told the Captain that he was worried. He called the company, but the decision was not to do more about it, just to train him and make sure that everything is running smoothly.

He is to blame because he accepted the job and came on board. He saw that he was unable to do it and still... He was trying to please the Chief Engineer. “The Chief Engineer was a really good technical guy and he was quite proud and being Greek. And then you have 3rd Engineer that is also Greek and then you have a 4th Engineer that is Filipino which is better than the Greek and it was a big disappointment for him. And the 3rd Engineer felt the pressure, he had to work a lot to learn and catch up. He got tired. Really, really tired. And the Chief Engineer didn't give him a break.”

3. The challenge

Valentin remembers and describes the circumstances before the incident: “the next day after the incident occurred, we were supposed to arrive in Sète and have a SIRE inspection. Maybe you know that this is the toughest that you can get on tankers and it’s a very high level of stress on the ship and also in the company because if you fail then you don't trade the vessel and you are allowed to redo the inspection only after 30 days. So, everyone was quite stressed on board to make sure that everything is going according to the plan. Me being a little bit of freak control and wanting to have everything in line, I stress the Chief officer. Quite a lot.” Everything on board was okay and then, “that evening or afternoon I audited the Chief Officer and everything was not okay. And I made the list with the things that need to be rectified and it was quite a big list and I told him that he... I would recommend kindly, and I think it was not that kind, I just said kindly, “I recommend that you will not go to sleep until the list is fully solved”. If he feels that he cannot do it until the next day, then he should call me.” But the call that he got from the Chief Officer was because of an entirely different matter.

It was about 11:00 o'clock in the night time, when the Chief Officer took a break from doing the paperwork. He was just going around a little bit to stretch his legs and he saw one watertight door that was open, so he wanted to close it. For that, you have to go out and unhook the door, so he went out and just below that door, it was the vent, the overflow vent of a tank that was overflowed at that time, exactly the same time he went out.

He managed to call the Chief Engineer; the Chief Engineer ran down and managed to
shut down the pump. They were extremely lucky because it was a little bit overspilled, but only on the hull like a V-shape and nothing was in the water. The he called the Captain, who told him to raise the alarm. And then the crew started gathering. They started to activate the response plan and to assign duties in order to mitigate the damage. Luckily, the Captain had been performing drills ever since he had come on board, so at that moment everybody knew exactly what they needed to do. Moreover, he and the Chief Engineer managed to make the people feel free and speak freely, so the crew members were able to suggest some very helpful solutions to the problem and also got involved in dealing with the situation.

Valentin recalls that everything was running OK until... The 4th Engineer came and announced they had another problem. This was about 10 minutes into the spill from the initial call. And he told the Captain he had to come to the engine room, and “I went with him in the engine room, and while we were going down the ladder, I could see fuel oil all over the main engine. And yeah, it was a tough, tough moment I would say, then I asked him if he did the round, he said yes. How about the lower platform, he said, yes, we have also oil there, so I went down with him, he guided me, and we went down to see the bilge and we could not see the bilge. We just see oil flowing freely on the lower platform. I went up and the main engine was covered in fuel oil. Yeah, because it was leaking from everywhere and I went up and on my way up I met the Chief Engineer. I asked him, did you see? He said yes. Stop the main engine. He said, yes, and I'm going on the bridge, and we took from the bridge, like in two minutes we already had the main engine stopped. So it was a quite fast reaction and then I called the company.”

4. The dilemma

The company's response

“I called the emergency number, no answer. I called the backup, no answer. I called my operator and he listened. He said Okay, do what you have to do. He asked some questions, how much oil, I said I cannot see how much oil is there. We need to sound to... to check.”

And then the company gathered their emergency team in the office in the emergency room. And then they had the cooperation and the feedback: “What happened and how we can mitigate this spill and how to solve the problem because the next day, at 12:00 o'clock, we were supposed to arrive in the discharge port and also perform a SIRE inspection which was questionable if we could do. In the end we had to decide what we can do. Because we realised that we cannot, we cannot do all, so we had to take some decisions if we're going to send everyone in the engine room or we're going to keep a team in the engine room and also one to clean the deck and the side. So the company decided to say okay, we have to, because I sent them out some pictures, we have to arrange the engine room, leave the side. I said no.” My opinion was that we had to work on both. “It was a silence, a long silence, and then they said... Okay, you do what you think is best. I was I would say a breakthrough with Greek company with strong men in the office, all of them ”
were ex-captains, chief engineers and so on. I was a bit relieved that we didn't need to fight about it.

The causes of the incident
Usually, the engineers were doing a safety round about 10:30 to 11:00 o'clock in the night time, just to make sure that everything in the engine room was okay and safe. And this time it was the 3rd Engineer who checked the level of the settling tank and he thought it was too low and decided to make a transfer from the storage tank to the settling tank. And he started the transfer, he put everything on manual and then he went to his cabin and fell asleep.

Apparently, the 3rd Engineer “was tired, he forgot to do it during the daytime, he went to do the safety a round, he saw that the level it's low” and probably thought The Chief Engineer is going to wake up, he is going to punish me so I will do it now. He started the pump. The pump is slow, he said, okay, I have one hour and I'm really tired, I can go and have 1/2 an hour sleep. When you're that tired and usually you cannot sleep well, but he went in a deep sleep and you don't need much, you need just half an hour, one hour and then the bullshit happened.

As Valentin recalls, the 3rd Engineer “never said why he put everything on manual, because if it's on auto and it reaches a certain level, then it's stopped. The pump is stopped automatically.” After the incident they noticed that every single month, the level sensor of all the tanks in the engine room had been checked and marked in the Planned Maintenance System that it was correctly working. “That sensor for that particular tank and the next tank, because you have the settling tank, then you have the overfill tank and then is going on deck - nothing was working, so it was written that it was working, so I’d say unsafe behaviour, bad maintenance, unsafe mentality, then the Chief Engineer probably knew this. And if he didn't know this, then it's his fault that he didn't check.”

5. The resolution

Luckily, the weather was very extremely nice. “Very calm. You could almost see the stars reflected in the water.” But if it were rolling, for sure they would have had quite a few litres in the sea, and then “that's a different part, it's called criminal case and then the authorities are involved, and this story would have ended in a different way.”

And it was also due to the weather conditions in Sète which were unfavourable, that the SIRE inspection didn’t take place as scheduled because the pilot considered it was not safe. So, they managed to get an extra week to set everything in place by the time they eventually had the inspection. Also, the Captain remained on board for this extra week.

From his current DPA position and as the Captain involved in this incident, Valentin thinks that in order to prevent human errors, a company needs to have a strong safety culture and not praise money over safety. “You need to have qualified people in the office to develop this safety system. You need to have qualified people to manage a proper
recruitment process and then after you recruit people you need to train them. And I would say something that looks a little bit like indoctrination, but you need to train them in thinking safe." After you recruit them, you need to make sure they are the right people. You make personality tests, cognitive tests. You have a training matrix and so on. Only then you can put them on board.

Owing to the many drills performed as a Captain, Valentin now remembers that after the incident he had the feeling that everything went according to the plan, and everyone came with ideas and solutions. You cannot foresee a response plan for every incident that is going to happen, but when you have a crew of more than 20 people “and you make trainings and trainings and trainings”, it helped us overcome this situation and finally it was a small incident instead of a disaster.

The 3rd Engineer was not the only one to blame for the incident. He was merely the trigger, not the cause. “It was the company, it was the Chief Engineer, it was [the Captain]. It was the safety procedures and so on. And then he will be the last one because... I think he didn’t get the proper guidance from Chief Engineer. So, as a Captain, not to be silent when you see the Chief Engineer is pressing someone, even though you can say, okay, it’s not really my job because he’s Chief Engineer. “Next time I would say, either you send him home, please stop pressing him, or you show him what he needs to do.”

**PREPARATORY QUESTIONS**

1. What is the topic of this case? What are the specific aspects to consider?

2. Observe the persons involved in this case and identify their role in dealing with the crisis from their respective positions, either on board or on shore.

3. What is the overall message of this case and what lessons should the people involved have learned?
THE NARRATION

1. The Scenery

This is a good example of acceptability that women seafarers often face onboard. Our narrator is Fulya. She remembers when she was onboard a tanker, back in 2018 as a 3rd mate.

The incident took place on board a crude oil tanker where there was app. 30 crew. It was mid-April and the ship was being prepared for an important inspection from the headquarters. Everyone on board was doing his best to make it successful.

The weather was generally clear and sunny. Sometimes it rained lightly. There were small waves in the sea that would not hinder the smooth sailing of the ship.

It was 2018, springtime. We were somewhere in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean. We left the port of Brazil, Santos and our destination was Rotterdam in the Netherlands. We were loaded with oil.”

2. Introducing the people involved

The 3rd Mate

Fulya, who is the 3rd mate, is a young and determined sailor who graduated from Piri Reis University. She knows well what she needs to do in order to improve herself and become a good sailor, and she tries to do them.

Fulya remembers and describes an incident that happened when she was onboard an oil tanker, back in 2018. It was her first duty and she was quite excited to work onboard a ship, which was her childhood dream. She was aware of the hardships she was likely to encounter on board as a woman, and was prepared to face them. She was the only woman onboard. She had completed three months onboard and she was gaining more experience day by day. She was a hardworking, young, kind and thoughtful person, who always behaved toward the people under her command fairly.
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The Sailor

The sailor that she reported the incident with was a young and inexperienced person who had been on board a ship for just a few months. This was his second ship and he hadn’t had any problems during the time he was on board. On the contrary, he was reported to be a hardworking person who was eager to learn and helpful to others.

A sailor is responsible for the water-borne vessel as a whole. Whether they are navigating, on the deck crew, or in maintenance, their responsibilities can vary. During the docking procedure or before departure, they are responsible for examining and securing the mooring lines. They are also responsible for the general cleaning of the decks and routine maintenance. They must be well-versed in fire safety and firefighting methods. They are often called upon to perform duties that utilize welding and carpentry skills. During the sailing expedition, they are responsible for navigating and watching while at sea. They must follow all orders given to them by their captain on duty. As they gain more experience, their responsibilities will increase. Most eventually learn all of the aspects of sailing and vessel maintenance and operation.

At the beginning of their career, sailors are often responsible for more of the menial chores on a ship. This can include scrubbing the decks, cleaning the living and eating quarters, and operating the winches. New sailors are often called deckhands, and they are the lowest on the sailing totem pole. The harder they work, the faster they can move up in the ranks and learn more skills.

This sailor was a person who did his job obediently and he didn’t object to any duty he was given. The biggest problem he experienced was that he came from a country where the roles are given to men and women in society and the expectations from them were drawn with strict limits.

The Captain

The captain was 45-50 years old, experienced, fatherly and helpful, who has been onboard for about 20 years until that day. He was a Turkish captain who loved his job a lot. He tried to resolve conflicts among ship crews by peaceful means, tried not to hurt employees, and knew how important it was to motivate them. He had strong interpersonal skills and mediation and negotiation abilities. He was well aware that the responsibilities of his position included communicating courteously with many different people in various situations.

Seafaring is not just a career, it’s a lifestyle. Captains, mates, and ship pilots spend their days on the water on vessels of all sizes, on inland lakes and rivers, as well as on the open sea. The captain is responsible for every aspect of the voyage and vessel. They set course and speed, direct crew members, and ensure that proper procedures are followed, keeping logs and records of the ship’s movements and cargo, and supervising the loading and unloading of cargo and passengers.

The duties of a captain are not limited to the usual work-related to navigation. They are
also responsible for ensuring good relations among ship personnel. S/he should behave to all crew fairly and provide organizational justice which will ensure job satisfaction and motivate the crew.

**The 1st Mate**
The 1st Mate is second in command aboard the vessel and must be capable of assuming full command should the Captain become incapacitated. The Captain relies heavily on the First Mate to supervise and coordinate day-to-day activities of all members of the deck department, and to participate fully in those activities.

The 1st Mate onboard this ship was a bit problematic. He was a divorced person who had a lot of problems with his ex-wife. He preferred to work onboard the ship to forget his family problems and get away from his home.

He was very good at his job but unstable in his private life. Sometimes he reflected the problems he had in his private life into his work and was not liked by the ship's personnel. He was not very understanding, did not make an effort to compromise when problems arise. For this reason, the crew would try to solve their problems without dealing with him and would not open their problems to him unless it was very necessary. The reason why the captain still kept him in his job despite these negative features was that he fulfilled his duty very well.

He was actually quite fluent in English, but he was a Filipino and his English was quite difficult to understand due to the influences of his native language. The crew sometimes complained that they didn't understand what he was saying.

**The rest of the crew**
Although the crews were of different nationalities, they did not have a language problems. Their English was not very good, but it was enough for them to get along. They were generally helpful, humorous and friendly. There were from Turkey, Romania, China, and Saudi Arabia.

### 3. The challenge

Fulya remembers the day on which the incident took place clearly. It was mid-April and the ship was being prepared for an important inspection from the headquarters. Everyone on board was doing his best to make it successful. It was around 10 o'clock when she divided the duties among the crew and assigned different tasks to different groups. While all of the crew were carrying out their assigned duties without objection, a person began to act reluctantly, neglected his job, and appeared disgruntled. When Fulya warned him and asked why he didn't do his work he didn't give a proper answer and went on behaving in the same way. When she couldn't convince him that he had to finish his job as soon as possible, he began to be rude and he quit his job completely and threw the
cleaning tools in his hand on the floor. Meanwhile, he was shouting "who are you to give me orders? I don't do the things you say, you can't give me orders!" he was so angry that not only Fulya but also all the crew who witnessed the situation were surprised, confused and a bit scared. Because no one knew what would his next reaction be.

No one could make sense of his reaction. Fulya was the first to pull herself together, and asked the sailor in a soft voice if there was a problem. The sailor was still very angry. He shouted "Yes!" looking nervously at Fulya's face. "Yes, you're the problem!"

Fulya had never experienced such a reaction before. The other crew apparently had never seen such weird behaviour, either. While everyone was wondering how they should react in astonishment, the 1st Mate, who heard the voices and was somewhere nearby, approached and asked what was going on. Seeing him relieved them a bit. They hoped the reason for this objection would be understood and the sailor would calm down. But the 1st Mate told them to settle the matter among themselves with a careless attitude, and he also wanted everyone to go back to their work. The fact that he said "don't bring me any trouble" both disappointed and angered them all, so the sailor didn't seem to calm down. Thereupon, Fulya decided to take the case to the captain and went to the bridge with the sailor and two witnesses.

She briefly summarized the event and said she warned him and asked why he didn’t do his work. She said he didn’t give a proper answer and went on behaving in the same way. She said because she couldn’t convince him to finish his job as soon as possible, she decided to take the matter to the captain.

The captain talked to the seafarer after he listened to the incident from Fulya. He asked him why he was acting like this, the seafarer said he didn't like having a woman give him a job and didn't want to do the job given by a woman. He told the captain that it was the first time a woman told him something to do and he was not used to taking orders from a woman. Because in the part of the country he comes from the women usually do not work outside the house and they never tell a man what to do. That's why he was confused and found it strange to see a woman in a high position onboard a ship.

The captain realized that his awkward behavior was because of his general viewpoint that was shaped by the culture he comes from. He didn’t have any ulterior motives but only behaved just like a person coming from a cultural background like him would do.

The captain was aware of the fact that the crew is made up of diverse personnel. He was also aware of the fact that strong leadership that could minimize conflicts caused by cultural differences would work in such incidents. He thought inclusive leadership would work in this kind of incident and high inclusive leadership mitigated the negative impact of high team ethnic-cultural diversity on an inclusive climate. Bearing these in mind, he tried to persuade the sailor that Fulya, as a 3rd mate, was somebody superior to him and he should obey the orders coming from a superior no matter what the gender was. The sailor seemed to be persuaded and told that he understood the situation and would do
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whatever his superiors want him to do.

4. The dilemma

Although the sailor promised to act in accordance with the rules on the ship and to fulfill the orders of his superiors, even if the superior was a woman, it was very difficult for him to keep this promise. Because he had grown up in a society where women had no say at all until then, and obeying women was against his upbringing, beliefs and thoughts. On the one hand, he knew what the right thing to do was and he was forcing himself to act accordingly, on the other hand, he was trying to suppress the subconscious voice that required him not to obey a woman. With these thoughts in his mind, he went back to his work and started to think about how he would control himself if he faced the same situation again and how he would get used to taking orders from a woman. It was so hard for him that he even considered leaving his job. But he was getting a good salary, a salary that he could never get in his country and he needed money to take care of his family back in his country.

On the other hand, this situation was not easy for Fulya. She faced a reaction that she could never expect and could not understand, and she realized that she had a lot to learn about human relations on the ship. She thought about what she could have done if there had been more than one sailor who didn't want to do what she told them to do. She didn't want to take the case to the captain every time she faced a problem. She had to think well and develop a good strategy to cope with this problem.

5. The resolution

While it was very important that the work was completed on time on the day of the inspection, it was not good for such an event to occur. Finally, both Fulya and the sailor returned to their work and continued work. But both had lessons from this incident. They both realized how important culture was in working life and accepted that minimizing cultural differences could play a role in increasing productivity.

It is seen that some cultural characteristics of not only the sailor and Fulya but also the 1st Mate have an impact on their behavior. The fact that he was indifferent to the problem and expected it to be solved by the sides involved might encourage the sailor to insist on his wrongdoing and reject obeying the rules onboard. On the other hand, the personal traits and the needs of the people involved have a role to play in their reactions. If the sailor had been a bad-tempered and rude person his reaction could have been much more different than it was. Also, if he hadn't needed money he could not have been so cooperative. This would endanger the discipline onboard and the respect and obedience of seafarers to their superiors. This could also set a bad example for other sailors.

It is seen once again that the human factor is always important for things to run smoothly.
and properly. Guiding people and persuading them to work in line with their needs is a very important art that requires strong leadership skills.

PREPARATORY QUESTIONS

1. Who are the key people in this case? What is the background of the people involved? What are their personal features? What are their reactions to the case and why do they react in this way?

2. Which events took place during this case?

3. Describe the problem from the perspective of primary people involved and compare what they expected and what they found.
THE NARRATION

1. The Scenery

This is a good example of the overprotective behavior of senior officers onboard who actually harm the women officers while trying to help them.

Our narrator is Nur. She remembers when she was onboard a chemical tanker, back in 2015 as a 4th mate.

There was approximately 30 crew onboard where Nur was the only woman. It was mid-June and the ship was sailing from Ukraine to Turkey. The incident took place in daytime and was witnessed by some crew who were present there at the time.

The weather was cloudy and windy but warm. The sea was slightly turbulent and other ships were sometimes seen around.

2. Introducing the people involved

The 4th Mate

Nur is the 4th mate on board this ship. She is a quiet, hardworking and clever girl who is always ready to do what she is told to do. She is inexperienced but very eager to learn everything as far as the jobs on board are concerned. She learns foreign languages and tries to get as many soft skills as possible to be an efficient officer.

Nur remembers and describes an incident that happened when she was onboard a chemical tanker, back in 2015. She had been on board for 2 years at the time the incident took place. She knew what kind of dangers were posed by the life on board and what kind of challenges she was likely to face. She was aware of the fact that she had to work more than the men to be accepted as equal.

Women seafarers constitute only 1.28% of the global seafaring workforce. This figure is
increasing fast. Approximately 25,000 women are serving as seafarers now, which means an increase of 45.8% as compared to 2015. The scarce number of women seafarers causes some problems. Most men seafarers haven’t had the chance to work with women seafarers yet, so they don’t have any idea about their competence and performance. That’s why they have some misconceptions, which is very normal. The incident mentioned in this case study is the result of these misconceptions.

**The 1st Mate**
He was around 50-55 years old, married with 2 daughters, and a very fatherly, kind, and thoughtful man. He always tried to help the people onboard as much as he could. He took Nur as one of her daughters, so behaved to her as if she had been his daughter. He couldn’t accept her as one of the staff onboard but as a graceful girl who needs to be protected and cared for.

The 1st Mate is second in command aboard the vessel and must be capable of assuming full command should the Captain become incapacitated. The Captain relies heavily on the 1st Mate to supervise and coordinate day-to-day activities of all members of the deck department, and to participate fully in those activities. They supervise the members of the deck department including 2nd and 3rd Mates, able-seafarers, and ordinary seaman or deckhands. On most vessels, the Chief Mate is second in command after the Captain. Some vessels, usually cruise ships or large passenger vessels, have 1st Mate/Officers.

**The Captain**
The captain was 45-50 years old, experienced, fatherly and helpful, and has been onboard for about 20 years until that day. He was a Turkish captain who loved his job a lot. He tried to resolve conflicts among ship crew by peaceful means, tried not to hurt employees, and knew how important it was to motivate them. He has strong interpersonal skills and mediation and negotiation abilities. He was well aware that the responsibilities of his position included communicating courteously with many different people in various situations.

The Captain is in charge of the ship. It is his/her duty to manage the vessel in such a manner as to ensure the safety and well-being of guests and crew, and to conduct the ship’s affairs in accordance with established policies and direction from the Operations Manager. The company relies on the Captain to set a high standard of personal and professional conduct, and to maintain shipboard morale and respect for the company’s purpose and mission.

**The rest of the crew**
Although the crew was mostly Turkish, some came from foreign countries like the Philippines and China. They didn’t speak English very well but they could understand it, so they didn’t have communication problems. They were generally good-tempered and friendly.
3. The challenge

The incident took place on board a chemical ship where Nur, the 4th mate, was the only woman there. She was engaged in work that was considered inappropriate for women by the 1st mate who wanted her to do “a more suitable job for a woman”. Nur objected to this by saying that she was able to do everything that a man could do and continued insisting on doing the job; however, the 1st mate waved his hand in a deprecating gesture and sent her away.

They took the discussion to the captain who decided in favour of Nur, which means he said she should finish the work she was supposed to. Nur was happy to go back to her work but also surprised and confused by the reaction of the 1st mate who had been very friendly and helpful to her since she started working there. After the decision of the captain, she asked the 1st mate the reason why he behaved in this way and was even more surprised and confused to learn his excuse. He had objected because he wanted to protect her and didn’t want her to suffer from the burden of such hard work. 1st mate had actually acted in good faith and wanted to protect her, but had unwittingly harmed her.

4. The dilemma

Such behaviour could have created a negative image of women. Those who did not know the truth about the matter might think that the women avoided hard work and that the men who worked with them had to do the women’s work in addition to their own work. Such an act could harm women in four different ways.

However, this situation revealed that men had a lack of knowledge and experience about working with women in male-dominated workplaces. It is often discussed that if a person works in a job dominated by the opposite gender, gender-related challenges are likely to arise. For example, women tend to experience difficulties in male-dominated occupations, because they must cope with the bias set for them because of their gender. It may be less difficult to eliminate bias the women directly face, but additional action must be taken to cope with the so-called second-generation gender bias, which means, unlike intentional and obvious (first-generation) gender bias, invisible customs and practices in an organization look neutral but appear to hold women back and prevent them from reaching their full potential. On the other hand, rising to top positions is hard for women in male-dominated sectors, because of not only the bias in question but also the glass ceiling that is always there for them. To overcome these hardships women develop some strategies which may change from culture to culture or from woman to woman. However, there is no predetermined or mutually-accepted ways to cope with these kinds of hardships.
5. The resolution

This was an unexpected situation for both Nur and 1st mate. 1st mate had acted in good faith and wanted to protect Nur because he had two daughters of the same age and saw Nur as his daughter. However, Nur had a completely different point of view, namely a professional point of view, and she wanted to do whatever she was expected to do. This was, perhaps, the result of a different perspective stemming from the generation gap between them. However, both of them understood each other and the problem was solved in the end.

It is seen once again that the human factor is always important in order for things to run smoothly and properly. In addition, it always helps to empathize and see things from other people’s perspectives. Guiding people and persuading them to work in line with their needs is a very important art that requires strong leadership skills.

PREPARATORY QUESTIONS

1. Who are the key people in this case? What is the background of the people involved? What are their personal features? What are their reactions to the case and why do they react in this way?

2. Which events took place during this case?

3. Describe the problem from the perspective of primary people involved and compare what they expected and what they found.
CASE STUDY: THE CONFLICT WITH THE CAPTAIN

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This case study is about the conflict between the boss (the Captain) and the employee (the cook). There are five people starring in the incident: the Captain, the Chief Officer, the cook and the company DPA (Designated Person Ashore). Their personalities, their beliefs, their stereotypes, and attitudes influenced and shaped their behaviors.

THE NARRATION

1. The Scenery

This is a particularly good example as far as the human element at sea is concerned. Our narrator is Chris. Chris remembers when he was on board a general cargo vessel, back in 2018 as a Chief Officer in fact.

The ship was a built in 2003, so it was like 15 years old. Dutch flag and the owner. She usually carried windmill wings, but on this voyage she was carrying steel structures.

There were 15 crew members. The crew was international and came from different continents and cultures. The Captain and officers were from European countries and the rest of the crew members were from Asia.

2. Introducing the people involved

The Chief Officer
Chris is a Captain today. His educational background is the Merchant Marine University. He had been sailing in the merchant fleet for 11 years. He started working on a ship right after graduation. He had been working in the same company for over 8 years: at the beginning as a deck officer, at the time of the conflict as a Chief Officer. For 2 years as a Captain. Chris is a tough guy with soft heart; a demanding person and always ready to help. 35 years old, but looks younger, tall and slim.

Chris remembers and describes an incident that happened when he was on a general cargo vessel, back in 2018. He had completed two weeks onboard, was already connected with the people inside and had seen what kind of person each one was. He had observed that the Captain was shouting publicly at the cook. From his signing in, he noticed that the relationship between the cook and the Captain was very tense.

The Cook
The cook was an experienced person, who had already completed many contracts as a cook. He was a rather calm person. Every day he greeted the others with a smile. He worked hard to prepare two different cuisines for the crew. A great number of the crew
members were satisfied with his efforts. 40 years old. Short and corpulent.

He was always trying to avoid the Captain. He tried not to be there when the Captain was entering the messroom, but these meetings were inevitable. That time he was terrified. The crew said he had tried to speak to the Captain before, but the Captain didn’t listen, so he changed strategies and was silent when the Captain yelled.

**The Captain**
The Captain was a very aggressive person, particularly in relation to ratings, including the cook. In relation with the officers, he was trying to shorten the distance. However, the officers did not believe in his sincere intentions. He was regularly under the influence of alcohol and was aggressive towards the cook. He insulted the cook in front of the other crew members. He was complaining about the tasteless meals all the time. He questioned the cook’s qualifications, shouted that he could not cook, that his meals were only suitable for garbage. It happened that the Captain threatened the cook with physical force. Such threats were repeated often.

**The company DPA**
When the ship-owner's DPA came on board the ship, he did not try to be objective and impartial, but instead he uncritically supported the Captain.

**The rest of the crew**
The crew was split. Officers clearly supported the Captain in order to please the employer. Ratings took a neutral stance and did not support their colleague. Probably also for fear of being signed off. Probably it was because of the fear of the Captain's threats. He threatened the cook that he would sign him off disciplinarily, and that he would also bear the expenses. Nobody wanted to support the cook.

3. The challenge

On the one hand, seamen are used to the variety of cuisines, as they happen to sail with different cooks from different countries. But not always, they are also lovers of diversity.

On the other hand, seafarers are very picky as meals are an important part of the ship. For lack of other "entertainment", everyone lives for what there will be for dinner. People miss home, so they want their meals to remind them a bit of home, and when they have a cook who cannot live up to these expectations, dissatisfaction appears. In this case the discontent was shown only by the Captain. The Captain humiliated the cook, accused him of not being able to cook. He threatened the cook that he would sign him off disciplinarily, and at the expense of the cook. The Captain threatened the cook with physical force.

It is worth underlining that there were no complaints from other crew members about the meals.
4. The dilemma

Based on Chris’ (the Chief Officer) narration.

“I wanted to talk to the Captain, but it was very difficult, because talking to a drunk man is pointless. I remember how the cook presented a list of products to be ordered and the Captain crossed out the majority of the products and entered what he wanted on the list. I pointed out that the cook might not be able to handle it, and it sparked the Captain’s anger.

I also talked to the cook, he asked me what “European dish” should be cooked so as not to be criticized.

Unfortunately, I don't know much about cuisines and I couldn't help much. Even when the cook tried to prepare an ordinary steak, he still used oriental spices, which were met with more criticism from the Captain. It is terribly difficult to help someone who is completely helpless and in a losing position from the beginning.

It was a very difficult month for me. On the one hand, I wanted to help the cook. On the other hand, all my approaches to the Captain were unsuccessful. The Captain was very angry each time I started the discussion. Finally, the Captain was my boss, the first after God on the ship. I was also thinking about possible consequences on my activity. In short, I could get a punishment. Actually, I entered the triangle, where the Captain was the perpetrator, the cook was the victim, and my role was not so clear for me. The best option, from my perspective, was to solve the situation. However, the company DPA did not support me in this activity. So finally, I decided to play the role of the savior. The only reasonable solution I could think of was to report it to the agent in port.”

5. The resolution

The situation was reported by the Chief Officer to the agent in the next port of call. The agent notified the PSC (Port State Control) and the ITF (International Transport Workers' Federation) and asked for help. The aggressive attitude of the Captain was confirmed during the ITF inspection of the ship. Moreover, it was assessed that the Captain was very agitated.

In addition, the DPA who arrived at the ship as well, tried to slander the cook. In the absence of the cook, he entered his cabin and put 2 packages of sealing tape into his packed suitcase. Sometime later, he appeared with the tape, suggesting that the cook was trying to steal.

The intervention of the PSC and ITF institutions had a calming effect on the Captain. At the express request of the external representatives, he withdrew the negative appraisal he
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wanted to issue to the cook. The cook returned home at the shipowner's expense on the same day the inspection took place.

PREPARATORY QUESTIONS

1. Describe the key persons involved in the conflict and their background.
2. What is the subject of the dispute?
3. What circumstances were crucial to this incident?
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This case study revolves around the severe stress situation of a seafarer who was unable to return home in the face of a family tragedy. Despite the visible signs of escalation of stress in the seafarer, the captain showed a lack of understanding of the seafarer's situation and did not take into account the psychological and health costs incurred by the seafarer.

Five persons were involved in the incident: the Captain, the 2nd engineer, the company DPA (Designated Person Ashore) and the ITF (International Transport Workers' Federation) representative. Strong emotions related to the family problem on the one hand were confronted with a ruthless business approach on the other hand. The escalation of the related emotions over time had a negative impact on the course of events.

THE NARRATION

1. The Scenery

This case took place during a voyage from the USA to Poland. The story began on April 28, 2021, at sea and ended on April 16 at the Port of Gdansk. The vessel belonged to a Greek shipowner and was flying the Singapore flag. She was a 12-year-old bulk ship carrying iron ore with a mixed crew of 12-person (Greek, Indian, Filipino, Ukrainian).

2. Introducing the people involved

**The 2nd Engineer**
The 2nd engineer was an experienced seaman, serving 16 years on various ships. He has been on the board for 2 months and he has integrated himself into the crew of the ship without any problems. He did not cause any problems and his decision-making and independence in action had a calming effect on the crew.

Everything changed after April 28th, 2021, when he found out his father died due to the COVID-19 virus. From then on, he was nervous and desperate to get out of the ship as soon as possible. He has performed his duties mechanically and has taken all possible measures to obtain approval for disembarkation.

**The Captain**
The Captain was a very calm and balanced man. He had no friends on the ship and limited his contacts to professional ones. He didn't share his thoughts. He was not too demanding, but he also did not ignore the ship's problems. He generally acted as a representative of the shipowner, not a member of the ship's community. Tenaciously refused 2nd engineer applications for repatriation, rejecting his arguments.
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The company DPA
The shipowner has played a minor role. The 2nd Engineer tried to contact him by phone while crossing the Atlantic, asking for disembarkation in the Danish Straits, but he was not supported in this matter. The DPA did not want to meet his needs, identifying with the interests of the shipowner and supporting the captain's opinion.

The ITF representative
The Polish ITF representative who deals with the broadly understood protection of seafarers' rights. He has extensive experience in mediations, social consultations, and conflict resolution. He is personally involved in the legislative process related to the employment of seafarers and working conditions at sea. A person is emotionally connected with his workplace and has the satisfaction of helping others.

3. The challenge
The 2nd Engineer acted like any typical person who suddenly loses a family member. For him, the most important thing was to come back home, to be at the funeral and look after the rest of his family. When he requested the company for disembarkation, the ship was 180 miles off the coast of the United States, and he thought the ship would call to the nearest port and he would be able to disembark. He did not find any understanding. The economic calculation of the shipowner was the decisive argument. The subsequent escalation of the problem, when the news about the positive result of the Covid-19 test in the pregnant wife and the seaman's mother, did not change the decision of the captain and the shipowner. The tough attitude of the captain and DPA was the reason for the very bad mental condition of the seaman who desperately look for every possible help from outside. He realized that he could not count on the ship and company. Unfortunately, he did not know his rights fully and his fight caused a growing sense of injustice.

4. The dilemma
How in the world of ruthless competition in shipping to have regard for the essential needs of the man even if it can generate additional costs for the ship? What compassionate reasons require absolute action in favour of a crew member, regardless of the cost? Although there are specific regulations defending the rights of an employee, the ship is a specific place, which can make it difficult to file a complaint and its proper handling. For example, when filing a complaint, the seafarer was also not allowed to be accompanied by a witness, which constitutes a violation of the MLC, 2006 procedures (Standard A5.1.5 - Onboard Complaints Procedures). Can help only come from outside, from an ITF-type organization? Couldn’t a compromise solution be found in the captain-crew member relationship? It is not known if and how the captain took into account the impact of the deteriorating condition of the 2nd Engineer on his work on the ship. The term "there is no work from a slave" was not considered until the worker made any
mistakes. But in this situation, it was much easier to make such a mistake.

5. The resolution

After notification by the seafarer, the ITF inspector undertook quick and decisive procedures to enable repatriation. He sent a seafarer complaint to the flag state of Singapore on behalf of the 2nd mechanic. Such a complaint, sent by the ITF has a much greater impact than a complaint from the seafarer himself. It was a turning point in this story. As a result, relief was found and quickly reached Gdańsk.

The important questions remain: Did the support he received save his faith in justice? Will he want to go back to the ship? Significant is the opinion of an ITF inspector that the described situation is not uncommon.

1. Describe the key persons involved in the conflict and their background.
2. What were the motivations of the protagonists of this case study?
3. What was the second mate's emotional state?
CHAPTER 4

HOW TO CHOOSE THE RIGHT CASE STUDY?
HOW TO CHOOSE THE RIGHT CASE STUDY?

The handbook is based on the IMO (International Maritime Organization) model guidelines. The key element of working with the textbook is the appropriate selection of the case study (Table 1) for the participants in terms of shaping or developing soft skills of the onboard crews and office employees in the maritime sector. Soft competences are skills, behaviours and attitudes, among others in the field of interpersonal and social skills.

The handbook covers the four main areas of soft skills, which are highly in demanding in the maritime work environment:

1. Human Resource Management, which aims to develop skills such as dealing with diversity and conflict.
2. Well-being and resilience, especially important on a ship where heavy workload and fatigue increase stress and lead to wrong decisions. The provided cases relate to time management and coping with stress.
3. Emotional Intelligence. The courses aim to train students in solving conflicts, strengthening their self-awareness and strengthening empathic attitudes.
4. Thinking about growth is about shaping self-improvement skills and empowering an attitude conducive to developing a growth mentality.

The table below will be helpful in working with the textbook. The table header indicates the soft competences that we want to shape among the students and an case study that could be used to train a specific skill. The situations described in the cases are sometimes so complex in their essence that the same case can be used to work in shaping more than one competence. The table is the authors' suggestions in which area the use of the case will be most effective. This does not mean that the teacher is not able to discover other values of a given text and use it in shaping soft competences in other areas.
All the listed cases are presented according to the same scheme. Each case includes:

**Introduction** - a short description of the most important issues in a given case study.

**Characteristics of the main participants of the event** - at this stage, the student becomes acquainted with the characteristics of individual event participants, and can find out about the interpersonal relations of event participants. The authors have made efforts to objectively present a different perspective of participants in real situations.

**Detailed description of the event** - it contains many facts and circumstances that took place during the event. The statements of participants or witnesses of events are quoted so that the student can form his own opinion about the incident and thus strengthen her/his ability to separate facts from opinions.

**Solution** - that is, a presentation of how the situation unfolded in reality. An important hint for the teacher is that this element does not impose on the students the solution of the problem in any way. It should be clearly indicated that it is one of the options for solving the problem that has worked (or has not proven itself) in practice. The task of students is to look for alternative solutions, if there are any.

**Open-ended questions** - they can be directed to students so that they can go through the process of searching for the optimal solution to the presented problem on their own. The authors of cases are not only about reaching specific conclusions, but most of all about learning to recognize problems that are crucial for a given situation, and also to categorize them.

Working on a ship is very demanding and specific because of forced isolation, very often, in the company of people from different cultures. That is why the textbook has been designed in such a way that it is a kind of simulation of events from various areas with which a student of a maritime school may come into contact with the future. The handbook is unique for two reasons. First, there is no handbook of actual cases or problems on sea-going ships so far. Secondly, the subject of the description are very different situations concerning people with different roles or holding different positions on a ship or in maritime organizations.

Group work is recommended as a method of working with the textbook. The estimated duration of the classes is 1.5 hours.
### Soft Skill Axes

**Soft Skill Axis 1:**
- People Management/
- Negotiation/
- Leadership/
- Multi-cultural management/
- Teambuilding

**Soft Skill Axis 2:**
- Well-being and resilience/
- Time Management/
- Stress Management

**Soft Skill Axis 3:**
- Emotional Intelligence/
- Conflict Resolution/
- Self-awareness/
- Empathy cultivation

**Soft Skill Axis 4:**
- Growth mindset/
- Self-improvement

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team and leaders in time shortage</td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attitude does matter!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Growth mindset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication and cooperation thrive when there is mutual trust</td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Resilience is contagious!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Good teamwork, a proper leadership during the Covid pandemic on board</td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Train the leader for leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>How to prevent a small incident from turning into a disaster</td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Leadership to overcome cultural difference</td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Leadership to overcome second generation gender bias for women</td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The conflict with the Captain</td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>No consent to repatriation for extraordinary reasons</td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>