On Second Thought – Episode 11
Psychological Notes and Viewer Takeaways

Ambiguity Is the Hazard

Aviation training is very good at preparing people for hazards that announce themselves clearly. An engine failure, fire warning, stall horn, or obvious system malfunction demands attention and usually activates a known response. Ambiguity is more psychologically difficult because it does not feel like an emergency. It often appears as a situation that is merely "a little off": an indication that does not quite make sense, a radio call that may have been misunderstood, a maintenance record that does not add up, or a developing situation that is difficult to interpret. The absence of clarity can make the situation feel less urgent when, psychologically, it may be more dangerous.

The central psychological problem is that humans are uncomfortable remaining uncertain. We tend to resolve ambiguity quickly rather than hold an unanswered question open. In aviation, that can sound like: "It is probably just the gauge," "They must have meant the other airplane," or "It has always done that." The mind replaces an uncertain reality with a familiar explanation, often without enough evidence to justify the conclusion. The danger is not simply lack of information. It is the creation of false certainty.

The brain prefers closure. Open-ended uncertainty creates cognitive tension, so we are naturally drawn toward an explanation that "closes the loop," even when the explanation has not yet earned our confidence. In aviation, that drive for closure can turn ambiguity into false certainty.

Ambiguity Aversion

Episode 11 distinguishes risk from ambiguity. Risk involves uncertainty in which the odds are at least partly known. Ambiguity occurs when we do not understand the situation well enough to estimate the odds at all. Psychologically, the distinction matters because people generally tolerate known risk better than unresolved uncertainty. The episode draws on Daniel Ellsberg's work on ambiguity

aversion, which demonstrated that people tend to prefer choices with known probabilities over choices with unknown probabilities, even when the unknown option is not necessarily worse.

In real aviation operations, however, we cannot always escape the unknown by choosing a different option. Instead, the mind may escape psychologically by inventing certainty. The ambiguous indication becomes “probably nothing.” The uncertain weather becomes “probably improving.” The unclear maintenance history becomes “probably normal.” This produces an important human-factors paradox: false certainty can feel safer than honest uncertainty even though it creates more operational risk.

Emotion, Momentum, and Plan Continuation

Ambiguity becomes more dangerous when it is combined with emotional or practical pressure. Episode 11 uses research on ambiguous landing decisions to illustrate how an unpleasant alternative can push people toward continuing an existing plan. When changing course carries a cost, such as delay, inconvenience, embarrassment, additional workload, or financial loss, people become more likely to continue even when the situation is unclear.

This connects directly to plan continuation error, the failure to revise a plan despite accumulating evidence that it may no longer be safe. The psychological ingredients are powerful:

Ambiguity provides justification: “We are not sure anything is actually wrong.”

Emotion provides pressure: changing course feels unpleasant.

Momentum provides inertia: we are already committed and moving forward.

This helps explain why go-arounds, diversions, rejected maintenance sign-offs, and requests for clarification can be delayed even when they are objectively conservative choices. The behavior does not require recklessness. It can emerge naturally from the interaction of uncertainty, discomfort, and commitment.

Confirmation Bias and the Loss of Situational Awareness

Once a person adopts an explanation for an ambiguous situation, confirmation bias can make that explanation increasingly resistant to correction. The person begins noticing evidence that supports the first interpretation while discounting evidence that contradicts it. A tentative guess gradually becomes a working assumption, and then the assumption begins to feel like fact.

At the same time, ambiguity can degrade situational awareness. The episode uses the familiar three-part model of situational awareness: perception, comprehension, and projection. First, we must accurately notice what is happening. Second, we must understand what the information means. Third, we must anticipate what may happen next. If the initial interpretation is wrong, all three stages can become corrupted. We may stop noticing cues that do not fit the preferred explanation, misunderstand the significance of the available information, and make inaccurate predictions about what will happen next.

The most dangerous psychological state is therefore not uncertainty. It is being confidently wrong. Uncertainty can keep a person curious and vigilant. False certainty turns curiosity off.

“I’m Not Sure” Is Data

A major theme of Episode 11 is that uncertainty should not be interpreted as incompetence. The feeling of “I’m not quite sure” is itself information. It indicates a mismatch between the current situation and the person’s understanding of it. Rather than suppressing that feeling, the episode argues that it should trigger a change in cognitive mode: move from executing to verifying.

That means slowing the tempo, naming the ambiguity, seeking disconfirming evidence, asking for another interpretation, and choosing the conservative option while uncertainty remains. These actions deliberately counter the mind’s natural tendency to escape ambiguity too quickly.

The Air Transat 236 case illustrates the consequences of resolving uncertainty in the comfortable direction. In both the maintenance and flight portions of the event, incomplete or conflicting information was interpreted in ways that allowed the existing plan to continue. The crew later doubted valid fuel indications and

favored a computer-fault explanation over a fuel leak. The episode uses the case to demonstrate how ambiguity, once resolved incorrectly, can combine with confirmation bias and plan continuation to produce a coherent but dangerously inaccurate understanding of the situation.

Three Takeaways

1. Treat uncertainty as a warning signal.
"I'm not sure" is not a failure of expertise. It is evidence that the current mental model may be incomplete. When something does not resolve cleanly, shift from executing to verifying.

2. Slow down before the mind creates false certainty.
Ambiguity creates psychological discomfort, and people naturally want to eliminate that discomfort quickly. Deliberately slowing the tempo creates time to gather data, challenge the first interpretation, and preserve options.

3. Look for evidence that proves you wrong.
Once we form an explanation, confirmation bias begins protecting it. Ask, "What evidence would show that my first interpretation is incorrect?" Then actively search for that information. In ambiguous situations, curiosity is a safety behavior.

ON SECOND THOUGHT — EPISODE 11

Jolie Lucas Aviation© 2026