



Fondation pour une culture  
de sécurité industrielle

FONCSI

TO OPEN THE DISCUSSION

## IT ALL BEGAN AS A SIMPLE STORY

nce  
upon  
a  
time...

- ⊙ Tools (knowledge and methods) to understand the determinants of human behaviour at a micro level and adapt the work station to human properties.
- ⊙ These tools led to two major and obscene results:
  - Systems work because people do not (only) do what they are supposed to (which dooms to impotence the model of the organization as a system of top down gearing).
  - Most determinants of what happens at the “micro” level are rooted in decisions made at the “macro” level of the organization.

- 
- ⊙ HOF specialists endeavoured to tackle the macro determinants with their usual toolbox, supplemented by some sociological approaches.
  - ⊙ “The o of HOF is a small o”. These efforts might have been impeded by a weak model of what an organization is :
    - A structure
    - A set of social interactions (“organizing”)
    - Or both ?

# THE ILLUSION OF BEING ABLE TO STORM THE « STRUCTURE » FORTRESS



© Why do we have difficulties?

# ADDRESS ORGANIZING RATHER THAN THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

- ⊙ In everyday trade-offs
- ⊙ In design phases
  
- ⊙ In large organizational changes

# ILLUMINATE MANAGERS' (AND DESIGNERS') TRADE-OFFS

- ⊙ Managers' job : to build trade-offs with limited resources
- ⊙ We should provide help to management to prioritize or sacrifice some goals rather than others when they are conflicting.
- ⊙ Stop managing “work as imagined”. Manage the real world, not the wishful one: reality resists.
- ⊙ HOF as a tool to understand reality, not as a body of new constraints. The HOF “viewpoint” must be taken in the topographic sense.
- ⊙ Not a specific skill, a component of their management skills
- ⊙ What is their leeway, their room for manoeuvre
  
- ⊙ Same for: personnel representatives, support departments...
- ⊙ Safety culture is the weight devoted to safety in arbitration at all levels

- ⊙ We work with persons, not functions
  - ⊙ We help them to interact with others
    - Make HOF with the stakeholders, not (only) on behalf of them
  - ⊙ The power of participatory simulations
  - ⊙ It requires to get out hands « dirty »
- 
- ⊙ Reach a critical mass
  - ⊙ Institutional work: a few individuals' energy finally settles in an entity (position, department...): from supporting managing to influencing management settings



- ⊙ Structured along the key processes
- ⊙ A network coordination centre, harmonizing methods (if desirable) and sharing results
- ⊙ A watchtower to detect moves and anticipate reaction
- ⊙ Decision on battles to be fought
- ⊙ Interface with senior management. Negotiation of support, resources.
- ⊙ Management of HOF general knowledge among the company...
- ⊙ Sustainability: how far is it person dependent?

- ⊙ F
- ⊙ Judges
- ⊙ Public opinion's dread

# NEW CHALLENGES

- ⊙ Normal unstable context
- ⊙ Constant changes
- ⊙ Uncertain future
- ⊙ New technologies
- ⊙ Increased judicial risk
  
- ⊙ New accompaniment requests: help us to « tame » the unknown...
- ⊙ Are we ready?
- ⊙ Should we leave the floor to evangelists/gurus?
- ⊙ Or could we help building the right panel of specialists/stakeholders and the conditions for successful debated anticipation?

- ⊙ Strongly connected to power
- ⊙ HOF to improve safety vs HOF to enhance the human contribution to the global performance
  - HOF has to do with every stakeholder's « right to play », to speak up, to be listened to, to have some influence...

## ⊙ Research linked with action

- On managers' work
- On practitioners' work. Theory of practice. Case studies
- Interfaces between (educated) practitioners and academics (with dirty hands)