Cognitive Mismatches in the Cockpit: Will They Ever Be a Thing of the Past?

Gordon Baxter[1], Denis Besnard[2] and Captain Dominic Riley[3]

[1] Department of Psychology	[2] School of Computing Science	[3] DCR Flight Consultancy Ltd.
University of York	Claremont Tower	17 Crescent Place
Heslington	University of Newcastle	Ripon
York YO10 5DD	Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU	North Yorkshire HG4 2JE
g.baxter@psych.york.ac.uk	denis.besnard@ncl.ac.uk	Dominic.riley@virgin.net

Abstract

Changes in aviation over the last thirty years have dramatically affected the way that flight crews fly aircraft. The implementation and evolution of the glass cockpit, however, has happened in an almost ad hoc fashion, meaning that it does not always properly support the flight crew in carrying out their tasks. In such situations, the crews' mental model of what is happening does not always match the real state of affairs. In other words there is a cognitive mismatch. An initial taxonomy of cognitive mismatches is defined, and the problem illustrated using an example from an aviation accident. Consideration is then given to how cognitive mismatches can be managed. A call is made for the development of an integrated cockpit architecture that takes better account of human capabilities and allows for new developments to be added to the cockpit in a more seamless manner.

INTRODUCTION

Mastering a complex skill, such as flying an aircraft, typically takes of the order of 1000 hours (Schneider, 1985). When learning to fly an aircraft, pilots were traditionally taught to aviate, navigate and communicate. The way in which they carry out these high level tasks has changed in line with the significant changes in the flightdeck environment over the past 30 years.

Up until the early 1970s, the flightdeck was dominated by mechanical and electro-mechanical devices. Later versions of these classical cockpits included early implementations of several of the instruments used today, such as the ground proximity warning system (GPWS). It was the introduction of cathode ray tube (CRT) displays, though, that heralded the dawn of the era of the glass cockpit, with the

pioneers being Boeing (B747-400), McDonnell Douglas (DC-10) and Lockheed (1011). The transition to the modern glass cockpit was a gradual one. Initially, only some of the electro-mechanical instruments were replaced by what were essentially just digital equivalents of the older analogue versions. The traditional "one value-one display" rule was broken when multi-functional displays were introduced, one example being the integration of the traffic collision avoidance system (TCAS) with the graphical navigation display, which also allowed some de-cluttering of the cockpit.

Whilst the face of the new cockpit was its CRT displays, its heart was provided by microprocessor technology. This technology enabled crews to automatically optimise multiple low-level functions (e.g. fuel consumption), and to store and execute pre-programmed flight plans. The latter two functions are achieved using the flight management system (FMS), which is the most obvious intrusion of computers aboard aircraft.

Another radical change occurred in 1988 when Airbus introduced fly-by-wire aircraft, with the A320, in which the control surfaces (flaps, slats, rudder, elevators and so on) are operated by electric actuators rather than steel rods and cables. This coincided with the use of side sticks to replace the conventional control yoke. Since then, computers have played an ever-increasing role on the flightdeck, relieving the pilots of more and more tasks. Most recently there has been a move towards highly graphical user interfaces (e.g., Sanfourche, 2001) which are being implemented in the Airbus A380 using palm-based technology.

Part of the motivation for the increased automation was the need for increased safety in light of the continuing rise in the levels of air traffic. Some of this burden for handling safety and efficiency has passed to the automation. The net effect of the technology on safety is not clear-cut, although the accident numbers show a stable downwards trend since 1992 despite increasing numbers of passengers (Ranter, 2005).

The introduction of the glass cockpit heralded the move to reduce the size of flight crews from three to two, with the flight engineer being removed. It was hoped that the glass cockpit would also reduce the amount of pilot training required, but this has not been the case (Orlady & Orlady, 1999). Whilst many

pilots agree that modern aircraft are easier to fly, closer inspection suggests that their workload has shifted, rather than reduced. The lack of visibility of concurrent modes and automated tasks leads to difficulties in predicting the outcome of actions. Indeed, pilots have reported increased problems in understanding and anticipating aircraft behaviour, and in tasks such as programming the FMS (Rudisill, 1995). This means that there is an increased likelihood of pilots spending more time with their heads down, interacting with the automation, which requires them to spend more time and effort learning how to manage these new systems, although training is normally tailored to mitigate against this. These changes mean that pilots are now taught to aviate, navigate, communicate *and* manage systems.

There are already several well-documented examples of the problems introduced by the technology, such as automation surprises (Sarter, Woods, & Billings, 1997) in which the technology leads the aircraft to behave in an unexpected manner. Human-machine interaction (HMI) research is now more and more concerned with the question of the reliability of the dialogue between humans and modern flightdeck systems (FAA Human Factors Team, 1996). Whilst it is accepted that cognitive processes are fallible, a solution in terms of a reliable interaction has not been forthcoming, and automation surprises remain an ongoing concern.

This paper considers the general problem of cognitive mismatches—a disparity between the operator's mental model of the system, and the way that the system is really working (e.g., Rushby, 1999)—and how they can be managed. Given the importance of the dialogue between the human pilot and automated systems in the modern aviation environment, the aim is to examine the role of human-machine cooperation in the failure of safety-critical systems. The relationship between mental models and cognitive mismatches is considered in the next section. Section 3 then illustrates the problem using an accident where a non-assistive cockpit prevented the recovery of a piloting error. Consideration is then given to the available options for dealing with cognitive mismatches in the cockpit in Section 4.

MENTAL MODELS AND COGNITIVE MISMATCHES
The way that crews fly an aircraft is generally considered as a typical control loop activity. The pilots have some sort of mental model of how the socio-technical system (pilots, aircraft including computer-

based systems, air traffic control, the airline, and the regulators) works, which enables them to reason about its behaviour (e.g., Moray, 1996). This mental model is used in determining which system variables to monitor, and the pilots interpret the data values to update their mental model of the current state of the system. They then compare this with the expected state, and make adjustments to the system as necessary to try and ensure that the current and expected states match. This process can be summarised by the simplified loop shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1 about here

In many modern process control systems, there are usually too many variables for the operators to check them all individually whilst still controlling the system or process in a timely manner. This state of affairs is certainly true of glass cockpit aircraft. The pilots deal with the problem by learning which variables can normally be used to reliably predict the system's current state, and then monitor that subset of variables. In other words, the pilots rely on their perceived state of the system, rather than the real state (Boy, 1987). Generally, this works well, but when conditions deviate from the normal, system state misinterpretation can occur and give rise to subsequent problems (Baxter & Ritter, 1999).

As the complexity of aircraft cockpits continues to increase, the chances of the pilot's mental model being accurate are accordingly reduced. Instead of being an isomorphic representation of the real world, the pilot's mental model is a homomorphic representation. In other words, the model only accounts for the states that the pilots have previously encountered (an isomorphic model would require the pilots to either have to know, or else be able to generate all the system's possible states). The pilot's mental model is therefore a simplified representation of the real situation and as new situations and states are encountered, the model's limitations start to become apparent.

In aviation, a cognitive mismatch occurs when the pilot's mental model of the system does not adequately describe the way that the system is working. The consequence is that the operator may not

be able to explain or predict the aircraft's behaviour. There are many possible causes but they are often rooted in the design of the automation and how the pilots have to use it. Failures in HMI often arise because the interface fails to provide appropriate support for the crew to carry out their required tasks. The opacity of the automation's user interface makes it harder to manage the system.

Cognitive mismatches can take many forms. Palmer (1995), for example, highlighted the role of mode confusion in automation surprises, which is considered here to be a type of cognitive mismatch. The various types of cognitive mismatch can be categorised using two dimensions (see Table 1):

- *Type of mismatch.* A *real* mismatch occurs when there is a real discrepancy between the pilot's mental model and the way that the system operates. This state of affairs is normally indicative of a real flaw in the pilot's mental model. A *perceived* mismatch occurs when the pilot perceives that there is a real discrepancy between their mental model and the way that the system operates, when in reality there is not. In other words, this state of affairs represents a false alarm.

- *Detection of mismatch.* The detection of a mismatch provides a potential trigger for action, so that the mismatch can be corrected. Normally this would require some diagnostic activity. If a mismatch is undetected, this means that the pilots are unaware that the situation is deteriorating.

Table 1 about here

There is an implicit temporal dimension to cognitive mismatches. The pilots need to be able to detect the mismatch when they can still diagnose the problem and take recovery action before any adverse consequences arise. Ideally, all real mismatches should be detected, or at least made apparent to the pilots so that they can be managed in a timely manner. Detection is not always straightforward,

5

however, because cognitive biases can intervene, such as falsely attributing explanatory power to unrelated events which happen coincidentally (Besnard, Greathead, & Baxter, 2004). The problem of cognitive mismatches are illustrated in the next section using data from an aircraft accident report.

TAIL-FIRST LANDING AT NAGOYA
On April 26th 1994, an Airbus A300-600 (a glass cockpit, but not fly-by-wire aircraft) left Taipei (Taiwan). Two hours and 22 minutes later, the aircraft crash-landed tail-first at Nagoya (Japan), killing 264 of the 271 people onboard (Ministry of Transport, 1996). A complex interaction between the Go-around mode, autonomous inputs from the trimmable horizontal stabilizer (THS), and thrust variations contributed to the crash.

During the final stage of the approach, 100 seconds from impact and at an altitude of 1070 ft, the Go-around mode had been erroneously engaged. In this mode, the aircraft applies maximum thrust and climb rate to regain altitude. Five seconds after engaging Go-around mode, the captain noticed the first officer's (Pilot Flying) mistake and called for the mode to be disengaged; this was not done. The Go-around mode caused the aircraft to climb above the intended glide path. The pilot tried to bring the nose down and decrease the thrust. The aircraft resisted the nose-down command, although it did level off temporarily at 1040 ft, and the pilot did manage to throttle back the engines. At 87 seconds before impact, the autopilot was engaged. This caused the THS to take control of the aircraft's attitude. At 68 seconds from impact, the aircraft started to pitch up again; four seconds later, the first officer disengaged the autopilot. At 48 seconds from impact, the wings' angle of attack was still increasing. Given the low airspeed, the Alpha-floor protection triggered an automatic recovery from the near-stall conditions and the aircraft resumed climbing. The aircraft altitude was 570 ft. The captain took over the controls but still could not lower the aircraft's nose to halt the climb. At 34 and 24 seconds from impact, the captain verbally expressed his puzzlement and worries about the aircraft's behaviour. The increasing nose-up attitude could not be controlled and the thrust being set back and forth several times only worsened things. At 19 seconds before impact, the A300 went into a stall at a 52° nose-up

attitude. The crew attempted several unsuccessful corrective actions on the ailerons and rudder, but the aircraft crashed tail-first at Nagoya.

The most obvious indication that this is a cognitive mismatch comes from the First Officer's efforts to tried to counter the effects of being in Go-around mode—maximum thrust and climb rate—rather than just disengaging it. This was then followed some time later by the captain's verbal expressions of puzzlement about the aircraft's behaviour. The situation was exacerbated by the technology, because the aircraft had automatic yoke-force disengagement inhibited below 1500 ft. Had it been enabled, the autopilot would have disengaged when the crew applied pressure on the yoke to bring the aircraft's nose down.

This example highlights some of the problems that can arise when a cognitive mismatch occurs. Given that the consequences of an unrecovered cognitive mismatch can be fatal, it is important that they should be mitigated where possible. The next section considers how mitigation of cognitive mismatches can be achieved.

COPING WITH COGNITIVE MISMATCHES IN THE COCKPIT

The issue of cognitive mismatches needs to be considered carefully during the design of aircraft systems. Current cockpits are an evolution of the original glass cockpit. More and more new automation has been introduced into the cockpit in an almost *ad hoc* fashion, without full consideration of the overall impact on all the other parts of the aviation socio-technical system.

Many of the new devices that have been added to the cockpit (e.g., EGPWS, TCAS) contribute to safety. They detect when an unsafe situation has occurred and indicate this to the pilots, generating warnings and alarms, and potentially triggering automatic behaviours. For instance, some flight configurations (e.g. low altitude with gear up) will automatically trigger several simultaneous alarms. If the low altitude flight was unintended, then the proliferation of alarms can hinder recovery—a lesson learnt from the Three Mile Island nuclear accident (Kemeny, 1981). If the low altitude flight was deliberately intended, however, then the multiple alarms will be an unnecessary distraction for the pilot.

Generally, the way in which safety is handled by the automation varies somewhat across different aircraft manufacturers. These differences reflect the manufacturer's implicit assumptions about the pilot's role (Hicks & de Brito, 1998): Boeing pilots have to decide what to do; Airbus pilots are advised what to do; and McDonnell Douglas pilots are told what has been done. This does make it hard for pilots to easily switch between the different manufacturers' aircraft.

The management and programming of flight systems is now intrinsic in flying an aircraft. Pilots acknowledge that they spend more and more time typing data into the flight management computer, thereby spending correspondingly less time monitoring external visual cues. Each new piece of automation adds to the systems management task and does not always provide a corresponding reduction in workload on the other tasks in the cockpit: the workload has shifted rather than reduced (Woods, Patterson, & Roth, 2002).

Given the current state of affairs in aircraft cockpits, the problem is how cognitive mismatches can be detected and managed in a timely manner or, preferably, prevented. Where prevention is not possible, the mismatches should be made obvious to the flight crew so that they can attempt to manage them. In other words, some effort should be made to ensure that the only type of mismatches that occur are those that are real (see Table 1) and that they are detected at the earliest possible opportunity. Some possible ways of dealing with the problems of cognitive mismatches are discussed below.

Do Nothing

The simplest solution is to maintain the status quo and continue to rely on pilots to detect, diagnose and fix any problems. This may be the only solution for some systems, in which case pilots need to be continually made aware of any new potential problems with the new technology (through feedback from incident reporting systems, for example).

Keeping pilots in the loop has long been recognised as the best way to exploit human flexibility and adaptability (Bainbridge, 1987). As systems continue to get more complex, however, it may get even harder to keep the pilots fully in the loop, because they will require more complex mental models to

appropriately represent the system's behaviour. This is likely to make it even more difficult to detect any cognitive mismatches in a timely manner.

Under normal operating conditions, everything works fine. During busy periods, such as transitions between flight levels, however, if a problem is flagged up by the automation, this can lead to problems. In particular, if crews have to diagnose automation problems, they will be correspondingly less involved in monitoring and controlling their other tasks. Re-introducing the third flight crew member—who originally played a major role in failure management—into the cockpit may help, although it could also have adversely affect the dynamics of the system because of the need for extra communication, for example.

Use Intelligent Assistants

The second solution is to utilise intelligent assistant technology, which is consonant with the joint cognitive systems approach (Hollnagel & Woods, 1983). Here, the idea is to develop and maintain a synergy between the operator's intentions and the computer system's model of the operator's behaviour. This is achieved by the intelligent assistant tracking the pilots' behaviour and comparing it to stored reference plans. The assistant then infers operational objectives, flags up identified errors, and generally provides support and assistance to the crew. Such ideas have been incorporated into systems such as Hazard Monitor (Bass, Small, & Ernst-Fortin, 1997), CASSY (Onken & Walsdorf, 2001), and CATS (Callantine, 2001). All three systems have been tested using flight simulators, but none are currently deployed in commercial aircraft.

The crash-landing at Nagoya described above provides an example of where intelligent assistants could help. CATS, for instance, compares the pilot's actions with reference plans. Before it flags an error, CATS waits until all the possible routes to the accomplishment of the inferred objective have been exhausted. Then, and only then, does it flag an error. In trials, CASSY detected all the pilot's errors and 94% of its inferences about the pilot's intentions were correct. CASSY also provides the capability to replan the flight and propose the available options following changes in instructions from ATC, or after a required Go-around manoeuvre, for example

Simply flagging an error would not have prevented the crash at Nagoya; the captain had already detected the engaged Go-around mode. However, CATS' error detection ability, combined with various degrees of authority delegated to the automation (as used in Hazard Monitor), could provide one way of efficiently compensating for human errors.

Patch the Existing Cockpit Design

There is often a long lead time in aviation between the initial design of a new technology and its introduction into the cockpit. Mode S datalink, for example, was originally designed in 1975. A radical overhaul of the cockpit is therefore unlikely in the short term. In many respects, the way in which new technology has been introduced can be considered as patching the existing system, albeit usually in order to improve safety, as previously noted.

In addition to this, as an interim measure, consideration should also be given to how to apply existing proposed solutions to several of the problems of human-machine interaction in cockpit that are already well documented (e.g., Billings, 1997; Sherry, Polson, & Feary, 2002). Specifically, Sherry *et al.* identified five common design errors:

1. The need for crews to reformulate the mission task in order to use the automation.

2. The need for crews to recall action sequences in order to access the required input devices or information in the cockpit displays hierarchy.

3. The need for crews to remember the correct formats for data entry.

4. The lack of clear labels and prompts to indicate where to insert data.

5. The need for crews to expend significant mental effort manipulating the feedback provided by the automation to infer the intentions of the automation and verify and monitor the long-term effects of commands.

If the designers understand the mission tasks properly, this will make it easier to provide automation that will support the flight crew in performing those tasks (error 1), and hence make it easier to overcome the other errors. Errors 2, 3, and 4 can be mitigated using visual cues that enable flight crews to recognise what needs to be done and how, by making the interface coherent such that access to the

required functions is implemented using the devices on the control panel that is relevant to the task at hand. The general aim is to minimise the amount of information that has to be recalled by the flight crew to access the appropriate device and then format and enter data. Data formatting and data entry problems can be overcome by selecting commands and values from lists which guarantee that the data will be in the correct format—rather than force the crew to recall the relevant data from memory before manually typing it in. Error 5 can be mitigated by providing feedback in a format that is appropriate to the mission tasks at hand which allows the crew to reliably understand and predict the aircraft's behaviour.

Design a New, Integrated Cockpit Architecture

In the longer term, however, a more radical solution may be required. Current cockpits are the result of the evolution of the glass cockpit in a bottom up manner. New pieces of automation are added which often bring their own sets of interfaces, displays and methods of interaction. The purpose and often the basics of the design of the new equipment are normally known well in advance. It would therefore seem sensible to develop a top down integrated cockpit architecture that would provide a more structured, coherent basis for the next generation of cockpits. The new architecture would provide better support to the pilots in the task of flying the aircraft.

It is already widely recognised and accepted that it is important for pilots to "keep ahead of the plane". One useful facility of the new architecture would therefore be a feature that allowed the pilots to predict the future state of the aircraft. Ideally this would allow them to ask "what-if?" type questions about future possible situations. The answers to such questions could help in anticipating some of the problems of cognitive mismatches, because crews would be able to detect potential problems with particular courses of action. In other words, rather than just focusing on flagging up when things have already gone bad, anticipate and predict potential problems as a way of stopping things from turning sour (Woods & Sarter, 2000).

Another useful feature would be the interpretation of pilots' intentions. This feature is already present in intelligent assistants, which attempt to infer the user's intentions on the basis of their actions. The

sequence of actions is compared to a library of reference plans to infer what the user is trying to do. Such a facility would help to avoid problems like those in the A300 landing at Nagoya, described above. It would also help in the management of cognitive mismatches because the automation would detect and flag up inconsistencies between pilots' actions and the operational task requirements.

Even the notion of an integrated cockpit architecture has potential knock-on effects. If the new cockpit radically differs from existing ones, pilots might have to undergo extensive retraining to learn to use it . This is not an insurmountable problem, however, because pilots have already demonstrated their flexibility by adapting to glass cockpit and fly-by-wire aircraft.

SUMMARY

The modern cockpit is heavily populated with automated equipment that the pilots have to program and manage. Often each piece of equipment has its own way of working, and its own idiosyncratic user interface. The proliferation of equipment makes it harder for the pilots to understand what the system is doing and to predict what will happen next, leading to cognitive mismatches which the pilot has to detect and resolve in a timely manner. There is, however, no silver bullet that can be used to solve the problem of dealing with cognitive mismatches in the cockpit. It seems clear that continuing to allow the glass cockpit to evolve further, by adding more automation that uses visual display based interfaces can only make things worse in the long run. The preferred solution is therefore to set in train the idea of developing an integrated cockpit architecture that can better support pilots in the task of flying the aircraft through facilities that allow them to keep ahead of the plane and anticipate possible problems.

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE

Gordon Baxter

Department of Psychology

University of York

Heslington

York YO10 5DD

United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)1904 434369

Fax: +44 (0)1904 433181

Email: g.baxter@psych.york.ac.uk

REFERENCES

Bainbridge, L., 1987. Ironies of automation. In: Rasmussen, J., Duncan, K., & Leplat, J. (Eds.), New technology and human error (pp. 271-283). John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK.

Bass, E. J., Small, R. L., & Ernst-Fortin, S. T., 1997. Knowledge requirements and architecture for an intelligent monitoring aid that facilitate incremental knowledge base development. In: Potter, D., Matthews, M., & Ali, M. (Eds.), Proceedings of the 10th international conference on industrial and engineering applications of artificial intelligence and expert systems. (pp. 63-68). Gordon & Breach Science Publishers, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Baxter, G. D., & Ritter, F. E., 1999. Towards a classification of state misinterpretation. In: Harris, D. (Ed.), Engineering psychology and cognitive ergonomics (Vol. 3, Transportation systems, medical ergonomics and training, pp. 35-42). Ashgate, Aldershot, UK.

Besnard, D., Greathead, D., & Baxter, G., 2004. When mental models go wrong: co-occurrences in dynamic, critical systems. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 60 , 117-128.

Billings, C. E., 1997. Aviation automation. LEA, Mahwah, NJ.

Boy, G. A., 1987. Operator assistant systems. International Journal of Man-Machine Systems, 27 , 541-554.

Callantine, T., 2001. The crew activity tracking system: Leveraging flight data for aiding, training and analysis, Proceedings of the 20th Digital Avionics Systems Conference (Vol. 1, pp. 5C3/1-5C3/12). IEEE, Daytona Beach, FL.

FAA Human Factors Team, 1996. The Interfaces Between Flightcrews and Modern Flight Deck Systems . Washington, DC: Federal Aviation Administration.

Hicks, M., & de Brito, G., 1998. Civil aircraft warning systems: Who's calling the shots? In: Boy, G., Graeber, C., & Robert, J. M. (Eds.), International conference on human computer interaction in aeroenautics (HCI-Aero'98) (pp. 205-212). Ecole Polytechnique de Montreal, Montreal, Canada.

Hollnagel, E., & Woods, D., 1983. Cognitive systems engineering: New wine in new bottles. International Journal of Man-machine Studies, 18 , 583-600.

Kemeny, J. G., 1981. The president's commission on the accident at Three Mile Island. Pergamon Press, New York.

Ministry of Transport, 1996. Aircraft Accident Investigation Commission. China Airlines Airbus Industries A300B4-622R, B1816, Nagoya Airport, April 26, 1994. (Report 96-5). Japan: Ministry of Transport, Japan.

Moray, N., 1996. A taxonomy and theory of mental models, Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society 40th Annual Meeting (Vol. 1, pp. 164-168), .

Onken, R., & Walsdorf, A., 2001. Assistant systems for aircraft guidance: cognitive man-machine co-operation. Aerospace Science & Technology, 5 (8), 511-520.

Orlady, H. W., & Orlady, L. M., 1999. Human factors in multi-crew flight operations. Ashgate, Aldershot, UK.

Palmer, E. A., 1995. "Oops, it didn't arm." - A case study of two automation surprises. In: Jensen, R. & Rakovan, L. (Eds.), Proceedings of the Eight International Symposium on Aviation Psychology (pp. 227-232). Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Ranter, H. (2005). *Airliner accident statistics 2004*. Aviation Safety Network. Available: http://aviation-safety.net/pubs/asn_overview_2004.pdf [2005, 3rd February].

Rudisill, M., 1995. Line pilots' attitudes about and experience with flight deck automation: Results of an international survey and proposed guidelines. In: Jensen, R. S. & Rakovan, L. A. (Eds.),

Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Aviation Psychology (pp. 288-293). The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Rushby, J., 1999. Using model checking to help discover mode confusions and other automation surprises. In: Javaux, D. & de Keyser, V. (Eds.), The 3rd Workshop on Human Error, Safety and System Development , Liege, Belgium.

Sanfourche, J.-P., 2001. New interactive cockpit fundamentally improves how pilots manage an aircraft's systems and its flight. Air & Space Europe, 3 (1/2), 68-70.

Sarter, N. B., Woods, D. D., & Billings, C. E., 1997. Automation Surprises. In: Salvendy, G. (Ed.), Handbook of Human Factors and Ergonomics (2nd ed., pp. 1926-1943). Wiley, New York, NY.

Schneider, W., 1985. Training high-performance skills: Fallacies and guidelines. Human Factors, 27 (3), 285-300.

Sherry, L., Polson, P., & Feary, M., 2002. Designing user-interfaces in the cockpit: Five common design errors and how to avoid them, Proceedings of 2002 SAE World Aviation Congress , Phoenix, AZ.

Woods, D. D., Patterson, E. S., & Roth, E. M., 2002. Can we ever escape from data overload? A cognitive systems diagnosis. Cognition, Technology and Work, 4 (1), 22-36.

Woods, D. D., & Sarter, N. B., 2000. Learning from automation surprises and "going sour" accidents. In: Sarter, N. & Amalberti, R. (Eds.), Cognitive engineering in the aviation domain (pp. 327-353). LEA, Mahwah, NJ.

Figure 1. Simplified overview of pilot's control task

	Real mismatch	Perceived mismatch
Detected	Real problem: needs to be diagnosed and fixed.	False alarm: could be a problem if the pilots act and turn it an undetected real mismatch.
Undetected	Real problem that needs to be flagged to the pilots, so that it can be diagnosed and fixed.	Not possible: "perceived" implies "detected".

Table 1: The four theoretical types of cognitive mismatch.