

Aircraft Mishap Investigation Course (AMIC) 26-F Practice Test (Sample)

Study Guide



Everything you need from our exam experts!

Copyright © 2026 by Examzify - A Kaluba Technologies Inc. product.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

No part of this book may be reproduced or transferred in any form or by any means, graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, web distribution, taping, or by any information storage retrieval system, without the written permission of the author.

Notice: Examzify makes every reasonable effort to obtain accurate, complete, and timely information about this product from reliable sources.

SAMPLE

Table of Contents

Copyright	1
Table of Contents	2
Introduction	3
How to Use This Guide	4
Questions	5
Answers	9
Explanations	11
Next Steps	17

SAMPLE

Introduction

Preparing for a certification exam can feel overwhelming, but with the right tools, it becomes an opportunity to build confidence, sharpen your skills, and move one step closer to your goals. At Examzify, we believe that effective exam preparation isn't just about memorization, it's about understanding the material, identifying knowledge gaps, and building the test-taking strategies that lead to success.

This guide was designed to help you do exactly that.

Whether you're preparing for a licensing exam, professional certification, or entry-level qualification, this book offers structured practice to reinforce key concepts. You'll find a wide range of multiple-choice questions, each followed by clear explanations to help you understand not just the right answer, but why it's correct.

The content in this guide is based on real-world exam objectives and aligned with the types of questions and topics commonly found on official tests. It's ideal for learners who want to:

- Practice answering questions under realistic conditions,
- Improve accuracy and speed,
- Review explanations to strengthen weak areas, and
- Approach the exam with greater confidence.

We recommend using this book not as a stand-alone study tool, but alongside other resources like flashcards, textbooks, or hands-on training. For best results, we recommend working through each question, reflecting on the explanation provided, and revisiting the topics that challenge you most.

Remember: successful test preparation isn't about getting every question right the first time, it's about learning from your mistakes and improving over time. Stay focused, trust the process, and know that every page you turn brings you closer to success.

Let's begin.

How to Use This Guide

This guide is designed to help you study more effectively and approach your exam with confidence. Whether you're reviewing for the first time or doing a final refresh, here's how to get the most out of your Examzify study guide:

1. Start with a Diagnostic Review

Skim through the questions to get a sense of what you know and what you need to focus on. Your goal is to identify knowledge gaps early.

2. Study in Short, Focused Sessions

Break your study time into manageable blocks (e.g. 30 - 45 minutes). Review a handful of questions, reflect on the explanations.

3. Learn from the Explanations

After answering a question, always read the explanation, even if you got it right. It reinforces key points, corrects misunderstandings, and teaches subtle distinctions between similar answers.

4. Track Your Progress

Use bookmarks or notes (if reading digitally) to mark difficult questions. Revisit these regularly and track improvements over time.

5. Simulate the Real Exam

Once you're comfortable, try taking a full set of questions without pausing. Set a timer and simulate test-day conditions to build confidence and time management skills.

6. Repeat and Review

Don't just study once, repetition builds retention. Re-attempt questions after a few days and revisit explanations to reinforce learning. Pair this guide with other Examzify tools like flashcards, and digital practice tests to strengthen your preparation across formats.

There's no single right way to study, but consistent, thoughtful effort always wins. Use this guide flexibly, adapt the tips above to fit your pace and learning style. You've got this!

Questions

SAMPLE

- 1. What are the key elements investigators seek to establish in the chain of events?**
 - A. The weather conditions at the time of mishap.**
 - B. The sequence of events from initial initiation to the mishap, including contributing and causal factors that link actions, conditions, and outcomes.**
 - C. The pilot's training history.**
 - D. The legal ownership of the aircraft.**

- 2. Which airfield design feature includes areas of frangibility?**
 - A. Areas of frangibility**
 - B. Clear zones next to and at end of runways**
 - C. Approach and departure clearance surfaces**
 - D. Standards for airfield markings**

- 3. Which of the following is an example of a supporting evidence component in the executive summary?**
 - A. Corrective actions only**
 - B. The entire data set**
 - C. Corroborating evidence linking conclusions to findings**
 - D. Unverified rumors**

- 4. When identifying contributing factors, which approach is recommended?**
 - A. Attribute fault to the most visible individual regardless of evidence.**
 - B. Focus on systemic causes and safety improvements rather than assigning individual fault.**
 - C. Only blame the manufacturer regardless of data.**
 - D. Avoid discussing safety improvements to protect liability.**

- 5. How should investigators approach potential biases during analysis?**
 - A. By seeking diverse data sources, challenging assumptions, and employing formal analytic methods.**
 - B. By confirming initial assumptions regardless of data.**
 - C. By ignoring outliers to keep conclusions simple.**
 - D. By relying solely on witness testimony.**

- 6. The Areas Investigated section includes three paragraphs describing what?**
- A. What the investigator observed; What is suspected; What is recommended**
 - B. What was the weather; What was training; What was equipment**
 - C. Who was involved; When did it happen; Where did it occur**
 - D. How the particular action should have been accomplished; How it actually occurred during the mishap; How this contributed to the mishap**
- 7. Which description best characterizes the wreckage diagram for High Speed - High Angle incidents?**
- A. Crater - classic "Smoking Hole" (Semi-circle, Deep, random parts within)**
 - B. Short, wide distribution**
 - C. Highly fragmented wreckage**
 - D. "GUITAR PICK" shape**
- 8. Which elements contribute to proper evidence cataloging and storage?**
- A. Central storage in a single unlabeled box.**
 - B. Separate, labeled containers; documented chain of custody; secure storage; and version-controlled analyses.**
 - C. No chain of custody requirements.**
 - D. Only digital copies, no physical evidence.**
- 9. Which sources are used to verify the airworthiness status at the time of the mishap?**
- A. By reviewing weather reports and air traffic logs.**
 - B. By reviewing maintenance logs, service bulletins, ADs (airworthiness directives), and current certification status.**
 - C. By interviewing passengers.**
 - D. By inspecting the flight crew's attire.**

10. In engine investigations, what are the four compressor failure modes?

- A. FOD; Blade failure; Serration failure; Disc failure / chunking**
- B. FOD; Blade failure; Disc failure; Serration failure**
- C. FOD; Serration failure; Disc failure / chunking**
- D. Blade failure; Serration failure; Disc failure / chunking; FOD**

SAMPLE

Answers

SAMPLE

1. B
2. A
3. C
4. B
5. B
6. D
7. D
8. B
9. B
10. A

SAMPLE

Explanations

SAMPLE

1. What are the key elements investigators seek to establish in the chain of events?

- A. The weather conditions at the time of mishap.**
- B. The sequence of events from initial initiation to the mishap, including contributing and causal factors that link actions, conditions, and outcomes.**
- C. The pilot's training history.**
- D. The legal ownership of the aircraft.**

In this field, investigators try to reconstruct what happened step by step, starting from the initial event that set things in motion and tracing the sequence all the way to the mishap. They focus on identifying the contributing and causal factors that connect actions, conditions, and outcomes, so they can see how a specific sequence led to the final result. This chain-of-events view matters because it reveals how small decisions or conditions cascade into an accident, rather than merely listing isolated facts. Weather conditions may influence the outcome, but they are one piece of the overall sequence, not the entire explanation. Similarly, a pilot's training history or who owns the aircraft can be relevant in other contexts, but they don't by themselves explain how the events unfolded. Therefore, describing the full sequence from initiation through to the mishap and identifying the linking factors is the most comprehensive way to understand what happened.

2. Which airfield design feature includes areas of frangibility?

- A. Areas of frangibility**
- B. Clear zones next to and at end of runways**
- C. Approach and departure clearance surfaces**
- D. Standards for airfield markings**

Frangibility is built into airfield design by designating zones where objects are constructed to yield or break away if struck by an aircraft. This reduces the risk of structural damage to the aircraft and occupants during an impact with surface objects. The feature that includes such zones is the areas of frangibility themselves, explicitly identifying these frangible elements within the design. Other airfield features serve different safety roles—clear zones adjacent to runways mainly provide obstacle clearance areas, approach and departure clearance surfaces define flight-path obstacle limits, and marking standards govern visibility and guidance—so they aren't defined by frangible design.

3. Which of the following is an example of a supporting evidence component in the executive summary?

- A. Corrective actions only
- B. The entire data set
- C. Corroborating evidence linking conclusions to findings**
- D. Unverified rumors

In an executive summary, conclusions must be grounded in evidence that directly ties back to the findings. This means the evidence is corroborated—validated from multiple sources or checks—and clearly shows how each finding supports the conclusion. That linkage is what gives readers confidence that the conclusions are not just opinions but are derived from verified data. The option describing corroborating evidence linking conclusions to findings is the best because it embodies that essential linkage and verification. It demonstrates traceability: you can see exactly how the data leads to each conclusion, and you've verified that the data are consistent across sources. Other options don't fit this purpose. Focusing on corrective actions alone shifts attention to what should be done next rather than proving what happened and why. Including the entire data set isn't practical in an executive summary and doesn't itself show how findings support conclusions. Relying on unverified rumors fails the credibility test because it's not validated evidence and can mislead stakeholders.

4. When identifying contributing factors, which approach is recommended?

- A. Attribute fault to the most visible individual regardless of evidence.
- B. Focus on systemic causes and safety improvements rather than assigning individual fault.**
- C. Only blame the manufacturer regardless of data.
- D. Avoid discussing safety improvements to protect liability.

When identifying contributing factors, the emphasis should be on systemic causes and safety improvements rather than assigning fault to a single person. Accidents arise from a combination of factors across people, processes, equipment, and organizational culture, not just one individual's actions. A systemic view looks for latent conditions and gaps in policies, procedures, training, maintenance, supervision, and system design that allowed the events to unfold. By focusing on what can be changed to reduce risk—such as updates to procedures, training enhancements, equipment redesign, or changes in safety culture—the investigation yields actionable recommendations that prevent recurrence across the organization. This approach aligns with how safety investigations unfold in practice: trace the sequence of failures through multiple layers, identify where defenses failed or were weak, and implement improvements that strengthen the entire system. Blaming a person or avoiding improvement tends to obscure deeper issues and stalls the learning and changes needed to prevent future incidents.

5. How should investigators approach potential biases during analysis?

- A. By seeking diverse data sources, challenging assumptions, and employing formal analytic methods.**
- B. By confirming initial assumptions regardless of data.**
- C. By ignoring outliers to keep conclusions simple.**
- D. By relying solely on witness testimony.**

Address biases during analysis by intentionally building a robust evidentiary approach: seek information from diverse, independent data sources; actively challenge and test the assumptions guiding the analysis; and use formal analytic methods that provide structured, repeatable checks on reasoning. Collecting input from multiple angles helps reveal blind spots that any single source might miss, while questioning assumptions prevents locking into a preconceived narrative. Formal methods—such as stepwise analyses, checklists, or sensitivity tests—make the process transparent and easier to review, which strengthens the credibility of the conclusions. Relying on confirming initial assumptions regardless of data undermines the purpose of analysis by letting bias steer results. Ignoring outliers hides potentially important signals rather than addressing variability in the data. Relying only on witness testimony overlooks objective evidence and is vulnerable to memory and perception errors.

6. The Areas Investigated section includes three paragraphs describing what?

- A. What the investigator observed; What is suspected; What is recommended**
- B. What was the weather; What was training; What was equipment**
- C. Who was involved; When did it happen; Where did it occur**
- D. How the particular action should have been accomplished; How it actually occurred during the mishap; How this contributed to the mishap**

Areas Investigated centers on the actions tied to the mishap. It presents three focused ideas: what the action should have been done (the intended method or standard of performance), what actually occurred (the observed actions during the event), and how the departure from the intended action contributed to the mishap (the causal link between the deviation and the outcome). This structure helps explain not just what happened, but why it happened in relation to the expected procedure. For example, the section would describe the intended procedure or checklist step, then contrast that with the actual sequence of actions, and finally analyze how that difference helped produce the mishap. Other topics like weather, training, or equipment are typically covered in separate sections, and background details about who/when/where are usually presented as context rather than the investigative description.

7. Which description best characterizes the wreckage diagram for High Speed - High Angle incidents?
- A. Crater - classic "Smoking Hole" (Semi-circle, Deep, random parts within)
 - B. Short, wide distribution
 - C. Highly fragmented wreckage
 - D. "GUITAR PICK" shape**

In wreckage diagrams, the shape of the ground debris field reflects how the aircraft broke up and slid or skidded after impact, which in turn reveals the velocity and angle at impact. For a crash that involved very high speed combined with a high (steep) angle, the debris tends to form a long, narrow pattern that widens near the initial impact and tapers along the flight path—this is described as a guitar-pick shape. The dense cluster near where the aircraft first struck the ground represents the initial, high-energy impact, while debris continues forward along the direction of travel, creating a slender trail behind it. This distinct, elongated pattern helps investigators infer that the aircraft hit the ground at a high speed with a steep descent. Other patterns don't fit as well. A crater-like, smoking hole implies a single, concentrated ground penetration with a strong, localized impact point, which isn't the typical debris field for a fast, steep-angled crash. A short, wide distribution would suggest less forward travel or different dispersion dynamics, not the long, narrow trace seen with high-speed, high-angle impacts. Highly fragmented wreckage describes the condition of the aircraft pieces, but it doesn't define the ground debris layout the way the guitar-pick shape does.

8. Which elements contribute to proper evidence cataloging and storage?
- A. Central storage in a single unlabeled box.
 - B. Separate, labeled containers; documented chain of custody; secure storage; and version-controlled analyses.**
 - C. No chain of custody requirements.
 - D. Only digital copies, no physical evidence.

Proper evidence cataloging and storage hinges on preserving integrity, traceability, and accessibility from collection through analysis. That means using separate, labeled containers so items don't contaminate each other or get mixed up, and keeping a documented chain of custody that records every person who handles the evidence and every transfer or change in its condition. Secure storage with restricted access and appropriate environmental controls protects against loss, damage, or tampering. Keeping analyses in a version-controlled system ensures data and results are time-stamped, original data are preserved, and how conclusions evolved is transparent and reproducible. Central storage in a single unlabeled box undermines traceability and identification, increasing the risk of loss or mix-ups. No chain of custody requirements makes it impossible to prove authenticity and handling history. Relying only on digital copies while discarding physical evidence can overlook important physical context and the need to verify original materials. The combination of labeled containers, documented chain of custody, secure storage, and version-controlled analyses provides the most reliable foundation for evidence integrity.

9. Which sources are used to verify the airworthiness status at the time of the mishap?

- A. By reviewing weather reports and air traffic logs.**
- B. By reviewing maintenance logs, service bulletins, ADs (airworthiness directives), and current certification status.**
- C. By interviewing passengers.**
- D. By inspecting the flight crew's attire.**

Verifying airworthiness at the time of the mishap comes from checking records that show the aircraft was maintained and operating under approved standards. The best evidence is found in the maintenance logs, which document what work was performed, when, and whether any discrepancies were corrected. Service bulletins provide manufacturer-recommended changes and checks that may be required for continued airworthiness. Airworthiness directives are mandatory directives from the aviation authority that must be complied with, directing specific actions or inspections. The current certification status confirms the aircraft holds a valid airworthiness certificate and registration and that there are no open items preventing airworthiness. Taken together, these sources prove whether the aircraft met regulatory requirements at the moment of the event. Weather reports and air traffic logs relate to flight conditions and operations, not the aircraft's airworthiness; interviewing passengers or assessing crew attire does not inform the regulatory or mechanical status of the aircraft.

10. In engine investigations, what are the four compressor failure modes?

- A. FOD; Blade failure; Serration failure; Disc failure / chunking**
- B. FOD; Blade failure; Disc failure; Serration failure**
- C. FOD; Serration failure; Disc failure / chunking**
- D. Blade failure; Serration failure; Disc failure / chunking; FOD**

The question focuses on the four ways a compressor can fail in an engine investigation. The four recognized compressor failure modes are: foreign object damage (FOD), blade failure, serration failure, and disc failure with chunking. Foreign object damage occurs when debris is ingested into the compressor, leaving impact marks, nicks, or missing material on blades and vanes. This damage can initiate cracks or lead to imbalance and further failures. Blade failure refers to the fracture or separation of individual blades due to fatigue, corrosion, or overload. When a blade fails, fragments can be released and cause additional damage downstream. Serration failure involves the failure of serrated features, such as blade roots or vane/segment interfaces, which can produce misfit, increased vibration, and debris release. This mode highlights problems at the serrated contact points rather than broad blade or disk damage. Disc failure or chunking is a structural fracture of the rotor disk itself, potentially producing large chunks. This is often catastrophic and can be a consequence of other damage accumulating in the compressor. Among the options, the only set that lists these four modes exactly is the one containing FOD, blade failure, serration failure, and disc failure / chunking. The other choices omit one of these modes or reorder them in a way that doesn't match the standard four compressor failure modes.

Next Steps

Congratulations on reaching the final section of this guide. You've taken a meaningful step toward passing your certification exam and advancing your career.

As you continue preparing, remember that consistent practice, review, and self-reflection are key to success. Make time to revisit difficult topics, simulate exam conditions, and track your progress along the way.

If you need help, have suggestions, or want to share feedback, we'd love to hear from you. Reach out to our team at hello@examzify.com.

Or visit your dedicated course page for more study tools and resources:

<https://amic26f.examzify.com>

We wish you the very best on your exam journey. You've got this!

SAMPLE