The accident reports located on the NTSB websites are varied in type and description length based upon what is being discussed in the report. One in particular that I read, “Safety Recommendation Report: Revise Processes to Implement Safety Enhancements for Alaska Aviation Operations” has a very lengthy and descriptive title. The report is briefed by an “Executive Summary” section, which is no longer than two sentences, stocked full of a summary of the event in question. The second section, “Probable Cause”, is blank, as this is a recommendation report based upon a previous incident. The third and final piece of the summary block includes the section “Recommendation”, which takes up about two sentences describing what action the “Federal Aviation Administration’ needs to take in order to prevent future incidents.

The actual report represented by this summary takes up a full three pages. The first section, which is not subtitled, details a brief summary for the intent of the proposal. The following block of text, subtitled “Background and Analysis” references the title code that the NTSB is asking to revise and change. It cites several incidents that the NTSB believes could have been prevented with a revision of the code, and several statistics to back up their reasoning. The author of the report goes on to cite several previously proposed solutions before going into detail on why they believe their new approach stands the best chance so far of being effective. The report is finished off by a final section entitled “Recommendation” which summarizes the above information in a single sentence, followed by the signatures of all parties involved.

The writing style of these reports is succinct, clear, and very technical. The authors do not use sentences that are any longer than they need to be, and each word carries a distinct weight to the conversation. The writing style is that of someone who knows exactly what they are talking about, and the context is not of someone who is surveying a scene, but someone who lives and breathes the material they are addressing. There are no illustrations in this report, likely to keep the page length low and the material as concise as possible. That being said, the authors cite and describe so many incidents in their writing, as well as the alternative approaches, that the paper reads like a physical illustration, evoking clear mental models. The report is systematic, and presents the argument in a logical manner. The recommendation at the end is built up to by the remainder of the body, and there is no non-sequiturs, or other outlandish claims in the report. All of this is to say that were I the one in authority reading this report, I would approve the request to proceed as recommended.