Psychology Notes: Episode Three
When Automation Becomes the Risk:
The Psychology of Attention, Trust, and Vigilance in Modern Aviation

Automation has transformed modern aviation. Advanced flight management systems, autopilots, conflict-detection tools, and digital maintenance diagnostics have dramatically improved safety, precision, and efficiency. Aircraft today can perform complex tasks with remarkable reliability, and automated systems help humans manage levels of complexity that would otherwise be impossible.

However, automation does more than change how airplanes operate. It also changes how the human brain allocates attention.

Understanding this psychological shift is critical because some of the most subtle risks in aviation emerge not during moments of chaos, but during moments when everything appears perfectly normal.

Automation and Human Attention

Human cognition is strongly influenced by workload. In cognitive psychology, it is well established that when task demands decrease, the brain reallocates attention and effort accordingly. This process is efficient and adaptive—it conserves cognitive resources.

When automation increases, workload often decreases. Pilots, controllers, and maintainers may experience fewer manual demands and fewer immediate decisions. At first glance, this appears entirely beneficial. Performance often improves under automation because systems execute tasks with high precision.

However, research in human factors has consistently shown a paradox: when workload decreases, vigilance often decreases as well.

Rather than reinvesting freed cognitive resources into deeper monitoring, humans frequently reduce their sampling of the environment. In other words, when a system appears stable and reliable, the brain assumes stability will continue. As a result, people check less frequently.

This process is not laziness or carelessness. It reflects the brain's natural tendency to predict continuity based on past reliability.

Automation Bias and Reinforced Trust

One important psychological mechanism underlying this shift is automation bias, a concept extensively studied by human factors researchers such as Raja Parasuraman.

Automation bias refers to the tendency for humans to favor automated information over other sources, especially when the automation has proven reliable in the past.

The brain is fundamentally prediction-driven. It continuously builds expectations based on previous experience. When a system consistently provides accurate information, the brain updates its internal model: the system is trustworthy.

Over time, this reinforcement subtly changes behavior. Humans do not simply trust the automation—they reduce their effort to verify it. Checking requires cognitive effort and implies doubt. When reliability appears high, the brain perceives less reason to expend that effort.

From a psychological perspective, this shift is rational and adaptive. But it introduces vulnerability when automation fails or when conditions drift outside the system's assumptions.

Tunnel Vision Without Stress

Tunnel vision is commonly associated with high-stress environments. Pilots overwhelmed by weather, controllers managing dense traffic, or technicians racing against time may experience attentional narrowing due to cognitive overload.

However, research by Christopher Wickens and others has shown that attentional tunneling can also occur under conditions of low workload.

When a stable, dominant cue captures attention—such as flight director guidance, a conflict-free traffic display, or a diagnostic screen indicating "within limits"—the brain naturally focuses on

that cue and reduces scanning elsewhere. This phenomenon is sometimes described as “tunnel brain.”

When a system appears stable, individuals may stop actively sampling the broader environment. They may check raw parameters less frequently, ask fewer questions, and rely more heavily on the dominant cue.

The key insight is that attentional narrowing is not always driven by stress. It can also be driven by comfort and stability.

The Out-of-the-Loop Performance Problem

Another well-documented phenomenon in automation research is the Out-of-the-Loop Performance Problem, described by human factors researcher Mica Endsley.

When humans directly control a system, they continuously interact with it. This interaction forces ongoing perception, interpretation, and prediction—key components of situational awareness.

However, when automation takes over control, the human role shifts from actor to supervisor. Monitoring feels like engagement, but cognitively it is very different. Observers tend to sample information less actively than operators.

Empirical evidence supports this. In a 2025 simulator study by Causse and colleagues published in Applied Ergonomics, professional airline pilots flew simulated approaches under

varying levels of automation. As automation increased, workload decreased and performance improved. However, eye-tracking data revealed that pilots' scan patterns became significantly narrower. Their visual attention moved across fewer instruments, indicating reduced monitoring of the broader system.

The pilots were not under stress. They were not performing poorly. Instead, their brains were quietly stepping "out of the loop."

Supervisory Control and Situational Awareness

Supervising automation can create a subtle illusion of control. When automated systems operate smoothly, it can feel as though the human operator remains fully engaged.

However, when automation disengages unexpectedly or when conditions change, the operator must quickly reconstruct situational awareness.

If the person has not been actively tracking raw parameters—such as airspeed, thrust, system behavior, or traffic trends—this transition takes time. The operator must rebuild a mental model of the system before taking effective action. That delay can become a critical vulnerability.

The Role of Redundancy

In multi-crew airline operations, an important safeguard exists. The Pilot Flying often becomes more focused on automation

cues and guidance displays, while the Pilot Monitoring maintains a broader scan of the environment. This distribution of attention provides cognitive redundancy.

One brain narrows.
The other widens.

In single-pilot operations, such as most general aviation flights, that redundancy disappears. One individual must simultaneously control the aircraft, monitor automation, interpret information, and detect subtle changes.

This does not make general aviation pilots less capable. Instead, it means the safety margin relies entirely on a single cognitive system.

The same psychological effects that are buffered in a two-crew environment can become amplified when only one person is responsible for monitoring.

Automation Across Aviation Roles
These cognitive dynamics are not limited to pilots.
Controllers monitor traffic prediction tools and conflict alerts.
Maintenance technicians rely on diagnostic software, automated test equipment, and trend monitoring systems. In each environment, automation reduces workload and improves consistency.

But the same psychological shift occurs: attention moves from active interrogation of the system to supervision of digital indicators.

Automated systems often detect threshold violations, but humans remain responsible for recognizing subtle trends and drift before those thresholds are crossed.

Detecting drift requires curiosity and active sampling—behaviors that automation can unintentionally reduce.

Maintaining Vigilance in an Automated World

Automation itself is not the problem. It remains one of aviation's greatest safety innovations. The challenge lies in understanding how automation interacts with human cognition. Research consistently shows several key psychological patterns:

• Automation changes how humans allocate attention.
When workload decreases, the brain naturally samples less information.

• Perceived stability narrows monitoring behavior.
When systems appear reliable, humans reduce verification.

• Supervisory roles weaken situational awareness.
Monitoring is cognitively different from actively controlling.

• Trust in automation grows with reliability.
But increased trust often reduces checking behavior.

For this reason, vigilance must be intentional. Effective operators deliberately widen their scan, question stable signals, and maintain curiosity about what might be changing beneath the surface.

Automation improves performance—but remaining meaningfully engaged within automated systems is what preserves safety.

Selected Research References

Causse, M., Dehais, F., Pastor, J., & Tremblay, S. (2025). Automation level influences pilot visual attention and monitoring behavior in a simulated landing task. Applied Ergonomics. This study examined how increasing levels of cockpit automation affected pilot workload, performance, and eye-scan behavior. Results showed that while automation reduced workload and improved performance, pilots' visual scanning became significantly narrower, indicating reduced monitoring of the broader system.

Endsley, M. R. (1995).
Toward a theory of situation awareness in dynamic systems. Human Factors, 37(1), 32–64. This foundational paper introduced the concept of situational awareness and described how awareness degrades when humans move from active control to supervisory roles. Endsley later described this as the Out-of-the-Loop Performance Problem in automated systems.

Parasuraman, R., Molloy, R., & Singh, I. L. (1993). Performance consequences of automation-induced "complacency." The International Journal of Aviation Psychology, 3(1), 1–23. This research introduced the concept of automation bias, describing how reliable automated systems can lead operators to trust automated outputs excessively and reduce independent verification.

Wickens, C. D., & Alexander, A. L. (2009). Attentional tunneling and task management in synthetic vision displays. The International Journal of Aviation Psychology, 19(2), 182–199. This work explored how strong visual cues can draw attention so powerfully that operators neglect other critical information sources, a phenomenon known as attentional tunneling.

Parasuraman, R., Sheridan, T. B., & Wickens, C. D. (2000). A model for types and levels of human interaction with automation. IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part A, 30(3), 286–297.This influential paper describes different levels of automation and how they affect human roles, workload, and monitoring behavior.

Jolie Lucas