Journal of Ergonomics
ISSN: 2165-7556
OPEN ACCESS Freely available online
Short Communication

Cognitive Ergonomics in High-Reliability Organizations

Webster Jackson*

Department of Human Factors, University of Humanitas, Milan, Italy

DESCRIPTION

High-Reliability Organizations (HROs)-including air traffic control centers, nuclear power facilities, surgical teams, and emergency response units-operate in environments where errors can have catastrophic consequences. These organizations have traditionally focused on physical ergonomics and procedural controls to maintain safety margins [1]. However, growing recognition of human cognitive limitations as significant contributing factors in critical incidents has elevated cognitive ergonomics to essential status within these settings. This commentary explains cognitive ergonomic principles particularly relevant to HROs and proposes integration strategies to enhance reliability without compromising operational efficiency [2].

The cognitive demands in HROs differ significantly from those in conventional work environments. Decision-making frequently occurs under severe time constraints with incomplete information and high stakes [3]. Attention must be maintained during extended periods of routine operation punctuated by unpredictable critical events. Communication must remain precise and unambiguous across hierarchical boundaries and professional specialties [4-6]. These demands interact with fundamental human cognitive limitations-working memory constraints, attention bottlenecks, confirmation bias, and decision heuristics-creating potential failure points that physical ergonomics alone cannot address. Traditional approaches to managing cognitive limitations in HROs have relied heavily on proceduralization and standardization. While these methods effectively reduce variability in routine operations, they often prove insufficient during non-standard situations that require adaptive problem-solving [7]. The aviation industry's transition from rigid procedural compliance to Crew Resource Management exemplifies the recognition that cognitive ergonomics must address both rule-following and adaptive capacity to achieve true reliability. Several cognitive ergonomic principles have demonstrated particular relevance in HRO contexts. Information presentation that aligns with mental models and emphasizes critical relationships rather than raw data values can dramatically improve situation awareness. Decision support systems that make uncertainty explicit rather than presenting filtered conclusions enhance appropriate trust calibration. Communication protocols that incorporate structured information exchange and closed-loop verification reduce transmission errors without imposing excessive formality that suppresses important information sharing [8].

The temporal distribution of cognitive load represents an often-overlooked dimension of HRO ergonomics. Many critical incidents occur during transitional periods or when multiple non-routine events coincide, creating cognitive demands that exceed human capacity. Effective cognitive engineering in these environments includes deliberate management of task timing, strategic automation of subsidiary functions during peak demand periods, and design of procedures that distribute cognitive requirements across team members rather than concentrating them on key roles. Training approaches in HROs must evolve beyond procedural memorization to develop robust cognitive skills. Simulation-based training that incorporates variable scenarios, intentionally ambiguous information, and realistic time pressure helps develop pattern recognition and adaptive decision-making capabilities. Metacognitive training explicitly addresses cognitive biases and error tendencies, helping operators recognize and compensate for predictable limitations in human reasoning. Team training emphasizes shared mental models and communication practices that distribute cognitive resources effectively across multiple individuals [9].

The integration of automation presents particular challenges for cognitive ergonomics in HROs. Automated systems can reduce routine cognitive burden but may create new vulnerabilities through skill degradation, attention complacency, or inappropriate trust calibration. Effective cognitive integration of automation requires thoughtful allocation of functions based not only on technical capabilities but also on maintaining meaningful human engagement, transparent operation that supports situation awareness, and graceful degradation that preserves human capability to resume control when necessary. Implementation of cognitive ergonomic principles in HROs requires organizational structures that legitimize these considerations in system design and operational decisions. Some organizations have established dedicated cognitive systems

Correspondence to: Webster Jackson, Department of Human Factors, University of Humanitas, Milan, Italy, E-mail: websterjackson08@gmail.com

Received: 03-Jan-2025, Manuscript No. JER-25-37248; **Editor assigned:** 06-Jan-2025, Pre QC No. JER-25-37248 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 20-Jan-2025, QC No. JER-25-37248; **Revised:** 27-Mar-2025, Manuscript No. JER-25-37248 (R); **Published:** 03-Feb-2025, DOI: 10.35248/2165-7556-25.15.416

Citation: Jackson W (2025). Cognitive Ergonomics in High-Reliability Organizations. J Ergonomics. 15:416.

Copyright: © 2025 Jackson W. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

engineering roles, while others incorporate cognitive expertise into existing safety or human factors functions [10]. Regardless of specific structure, effective implementation requires cognitive ergonomics professionals with domain-specific knowledge, organizational influence, and integration throughout the system lifecycle rather than limited consultation during late-stage design review.

CONCLUSION

Measurement presents particular challenges for cognitive ergonomics in HROs, where the primary objective is preventing rare but catastrophic events. Traditional lagging indicators like error rates provide insufficient guidance for continuous improvement, while leading indicators may lack clear validation. Progressive organizations have developed composite measurement approaches that combine behavioral markers, procedural compliance rates, near-miss reporting, simulation performance, and targeted cognitive assessments to provide more comprehensive insight into cognitive system health. As technology continues to transform HRO operations, cognitive ergonomics professionals must maintain focus on fundamental human cognitive capabilities and limitations while adapting methodologies to address emerging challenges. By systematically applying cognitive ergonomic principles to information systems, procedure design, training programs, and organizational processes, we can help high-reliability organizations achieve their exceptional performance requirements while accommodating rather than exceeding human cognitive capacity.

REFERENCES

1. Durantin G, Gagnon JF, Tremblay S, Dehais F. Using near infrared spectroscopy and heart rate variability to detect mental overload. Behav Brain Res. 2014;259:16-23.
2. Gimpaya N, Tran WT, Grover SC. Ergonomic wellness for the trainee in gastrointestinal endoscopy. Curr Opin Gastroenterol. 2024;40(5):348-354.
3. Lavender SA, Sun C, Xu Y, Sommerich CM. Ergonomic considerations when slotting piece-pick operations in distribution centers. Appl Ergon. 2021;97:103554.
4. Barrios EL, Polcz VE, Hensley SE, Sarosi Jr GA, Mohr AM, Loftus TJ, et al. A narrative review of ergonomic problems, principles, and potential solutions in surgical operations. Surgery. 2023;174(2):214-221.
5. Cerier E, Hu A, Goldring A, Rho M, Kulkarni SA. Ergonomics workshop improves musculoskeletal symptoms in general surgery residents. J Surg Res. 2022;280:567-574.
6. Sergesketter AR, Lubkin DT, Shammas RL, Krucoff KB, Peskoe SB, Risoli Jr T, et al. The impact of ergonomics on recruitment to surgical fields: A multi-institutional survey study. J Surg Res. 2019;236:238-246.
7. Marins EF, Nunes GN, Vasconcelos BB, David GB, Oppelt L, Junior VD, et al. Exploring police ergonomics: Effects of personal protective equipment, holster position and perceived discomfort on different gait intensities. Appl Ergon. 2025;125:104441.
8. Zayas-Cabán T, Rogers CC. The role of patient ergonomics in improving health research participation. Appl Ergon. 2025;125:104458.
9. Lauck KC, Nguyen K, Parnell R, Truong V. Ergonomics in dermatologic procedures: mobility exercises to incorporate in and out of the office. Cutis. 2025;115(2):61-62.
10. Fowlkes JB, Kripfgans OD, Bagley J. Safety, ergonomics and patient centered point-of-care ultrasound. Med Clin North Am. 2025;109(1):325-341.