8 (3): 305-314 (2024)

Journal of Aviation

https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jav

e-ISSN 2587-1676

Flight in Transition: Navigating the Skies of Automation and Human Judgement

Ayşe Aslı Yılmaz[1*]

[1*]Atilim University, Department of Pilot Training, 06650, İncek, Ankara, Türkiye. (asli.yilmaz@atilim.edu.tr)

Article Info

Received: 18 May 2024
Revised: 29 September 2024
Accepted: 08 August 2024
Published Online: 07 October 2024

Keywords:
Aeronautical Decision Making
Aviation safety
Aviation automation
Human cognition
Pilot instrument interaction

Corresponding Author: *Ayşe Aslı Yılmaz*

RESEARCH ARTICLE

https://doi.org/10.30518/jav.1486331

Abstract

Integrating automation systems within the aviation sector signifies a critical juncture, presenting significant advancements in operational efficiency and safety protocols. However, this technological evolution mandates a comprehensive reassessment of decision-making processes, particularly as pilots navigate the intricate interaction between human cognition and automated support. This study aims to enhance academic discourse by conducting a thorough analysis of the implications of automation systems on decision-making in aviation, with a specific focus on the tragic incidents involving Lion Air Flight 610 on October 29, 2018, and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 on March 10, 2019. The impact of automation systems on decision-making in aviation will be examined in detail to understand their role in these incidents. Employing a rigorous case analysis methodology upon a diverse array of secondary sources, this study seeks to unravel the multifaceted dynamics at play and shed light on the influence of automation on pilot actions and responses. Anticipated outcomes of this study include providing invaluable guidance to aviation stakeholders, encompassing regulatory bodies, aircraft manufacturers, airlines, and pilots, concerning the challenges and opportunities inherent in automation integration. By identifying knowledge gaps and delineating avenues for enhancement, this research endeavours to inform evidence-based strategies and optimal practices for enhancing safety and resilience in contemporary air travel. Ultimately, the significance of this scholarly endeavour lies in its potential to advance scholarly understanding and facilitate informed decision-making processes, thereby contributing to the pursuit of safer and more efficient aviation operations on a global scale.

1. Introduction

The aviation landscape is undergoing a profound transformation driven by technological advancements, particularly the widespread integration of automation systems. These systems, designed to enhance safety, efficiency, and operational capabilities, have become integral to modern air travel. (Read et al., 2012) However, their implementation has also raised critical questions about their impact on decision-making processes within the aviation domain, particularly concerning safety (Zhou, 2018). This study delves into the complex relationship between automation systems and decision-making in aviation, with a specific focus on safety implications. Examining the interaction between pilots and automation technologies aims to gain insights into how these systems influence decision-making dynamics, especially in critical scenarios. Our inquiry begins by acknowledging the pivotal role of automation systems in shaping contemporary aviation practices. As aircraft increasingly rely on automation, understanding its implications for pilot decision-making becomes paramount (Chan & Soeriaatmadja, 2018). It is sought to explore the cognitive and behavioral aspects of pilots' interaction with automation, aiming to uncover both the benefits and challenges associated with its integration. Moreover, it is recognized the importance of informing aviation stakeholders about the evolving nature of decision-making processes in the context of automation (Weinzimmer & Esken, 2017). By synthesizing existing literature and analyzing real-world incidents, it aspires to contribute valuable insights that can inform training protocols, operational procedures, and regulatory frameworks aimed at enhancing aviation safety. Lion Air Flight 610, which occurred on October 29, 2018, and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302, which occurred on March 10, 2019, accidents have underscored the increasing significance of endeavors to comprehend the role of automation systems in the aviation industry (Pranesh et al.,2017). These accidents have occurred because of a multitude of factors, including misunderstandings of automation systems, inadequate interactions between pilots and these systems, or failure to execute appropriate interventions during emergencies. Hence, a thorough examination and analysis of these accidents hold critical importance in terms of aviation safety. In essence, this study provides a comprehensive understanding of how automation systems influence decision-making in aviation, particularly concerning safety considerations. By elucidating the complexities of this relationship, it strives to pave the way for informed strategies that promote safer and more efficient air travel in the digital age.

2. The Rise of Automation Systems

The proliferation of automation systems within the aviation industry represents a paradigm shift driven by various factors, each contributing to its ascent as a cornerstone of modern air travel (Salmon et al., 2020). One of the primary drivers behind the rise of automation systems is the rapid advancement of technology (Barbosa, 2016). Breakthroughs in computing power, sensor technology, and data analytics have paved the way for increasingly sophisticated automation solutions (Weinzimmer & Esken, 2017). These innovations enable automation systems to handle complex tasks with precision and efficiency, revolutionizing how aircraft are operated and controlled. Flight safety has always been a paramount concern in aviation, and automation systems play a pivotal role in bolstering safety standards (Hancock, 2013). By automating routine tasks and providing real-time monitoring and feedback, these systems act as a safeguard against human error, a leading cause of aviation accidents (Motlagh et al., 2016). Enhanced safety standards, coupled with regulatory mandates and industry best practices, have spurred the widespread adoption of automation systems to mitigate risks and improve overall safety outcomes (Waldinger, 2016).

In an increasingly competitive aviation landscape, operational efficiency is critical to success. Automation systems allow airlines and operators to streamline workflows, optimize resource utilization, and minimize costs (Shah, 2015). By automating tasks such as navigation, flight planning, and system monitoring, airlines can achieve higher levels of operational efficiency, leading to improved profitability and a competitive edge in the market (Deloitte, 2016). One of the most tangible benefits of automation systems is the reduction of pilots' workload (Li & Harris, 2006). By automating routine tasks and providing advanced assistance features, these systems empower pilots to focus on higher-order decision-making and strategic planning (Moreno et al.,2017). This enhances operational efficiency and mitigates the risk of fatigue and cognitive overload, ensuring that pilots remain alert and responsive throughout a flight (Liu et al., 2008). Ultimately, the overarching goal of automation systems is to create a safer flight environment for passengers and crew alike (Chen & Tsai, 2016). By leveraging advanced technologies such as predictive analytics, collision avoidance systems, and automated emergency response mechanisms, these systems can anticipate and mitigate potential hazards in real time, thereby enhancing overall safety outcomes and instilling confidence in the flying public (Saadat & Saadat, 2016). In conclusion, the rise of automation systems in the aviation industry represents a transformative shift driven by technological innovation, safety imperatives, and operational efficiencies (Beier et al., 2017). As these systems continue to evolve and mature, they will undoubtedly play an increasingly integral role in shaping the future of air travel, paving the way for safer, more efficient, and more sustainable aviation operations.

2.1. Managing Aircraft Automation

Before pilots can proficiently utilize aircraft automation, they must acquire fundamental flying skills (Chialastri, 2021). Maneuver training remains a crucial aspect of flight instruction due to the significant proportion of general aviation (GA) accidents occurring during landing, which remains a manual process. A notable percentage of GA accidents transpire during take-off and initial climb. A significant safety concern highlighted by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)(2007) relates to pilots developing an undue reliance on avionics systems, mistakenly believing that these systems can compensate for their limitations. (FAA, 2007) This over-reliance on avionics often intersects with Aeronautical Decision Making (ADM), a critical factor in accidents involving high-performance aircraft engaged in cross-country flights. The FAA's study on advanced avionics safety revealed that novice pilots with advanced avionics tend to demonstrate poorer decision-making skills than the GA population. Analysis of accidents involving advanced avionics reveals that the majority stem not from aircraft malfunctions but rather from pilots' lack of experience and poor decisions (Salmon et al., 2015). A recurring theme in many fatal accidents is the persistence of visual flight rules (VFR) flight into instrument meteorological conditions (IMC) (Labib, 2015). Therefore, pilot proficiency in both standard and emergency operations relies on physical control of the aircraft and the cognitive mastery of Electronic Flight Displays (EFD). Three essential flight management skills—information management, automation proficiency, and risk assessment—are indispensable for the safe operation of advanced avionics systems (ICAO, 2013).

2.2. Information Management

For pilots transitioning to aircraft equipped with Primary Flight Displays (PFDs), Multi-Function Displays (MFDs), and GPS/VHF navigator screens, the abundance of information presented in colorful menus and submenus can initially seem overwhelming (Barbosa, 2016). In such instances, pilots may find themselves inundated with data, needing help to locate specific pieces of information amidst the complexity of the interface (Beier et al., 2017). It is crucial to recognize that these systems function like computers, with some folders readily accessible on a desktop while others are nested within a hierarchical structure (European Union Aviation Safety Agency, 2020). The primary skill required for proficiently operating advanced avionics systems is grasping the system's conceptual framework (Shmelova et al.,2017). Understanding the organizational structure of the system facilitates effective information management, enabling pilots to navigate through the available data efficiently (Chen & Tsai,2016). More than memorizing knob-and-dial procedures is required; a deeper comprehension of how these systems operate enhances procedural memory and equips pilots to troubleshoot unfamiliar situations (Comitz &Kersch,2016). However, it is essential to comprehensively acknowledge the limitations of understanding complex avionics systems. Given their intricacies, it is often impractical to anticipate every system's behavior (Labib, 2015). Instead, pilots should be ready for unexpected scenarios and embrace continuous learning. Simulation software and comprehensive literature specific to the avionics system in use are invaluable resources for enhancing understanding and proficiency. (Moreno et al.,2017). The second critical skill in information management involves adopting a methodical approach—stop, look, and read. Novice pilots often fixate on manipulating knobs and memorizing sequences of button inputs. A more effective strategy is to pause, observe the display screens, and read the relevant information before acting (Aircare International, 2022). This approach minimizes errors and optimizes the utilization of available resources. Once engaged with the advanced avionics interface, pilots must focus on regulating and prioritizing the flow of information to accomplish specific tasks efficiently. Certified Flight Instructors (CFIs) and pilots transitioning to advanced avionics can benefit from strategies to streamline information flow (Li et al.,2006). These tactics include customizing PFD and MFD displays according to individual preferences, such as selecting map orientation options and adjusting the amount of information displayed

(Mejdal et al., 2021). Furthermore, pilots can tailor information presentation to suit the requirements of different flight phases or operations, which helps optimize situational awareness and decision-making capabilities (FAA, 2023). This approach ensures that decision-making and situational awareness are key tactics in managing aviation operations effectively. Examples of managing information display for specific operations include programming map scale settings for different flight phases, utilizing terrain awareness features during night or instrument meteorological conditions (IMC) flights in mountainous regions, incorporating nearest airport data during challenging conditions, and configuring weather datalink settings to display pertinent meteorological information (Madsen & Desai, 2010). By honing these critical information management skills and employing effective strategies for navigating advanced avionics interfaces, pilots can enhance operational safety and efficiency in modern cockpit environments (Casner et al.,2014).

2.3. Situational Awareness

Ensuring the accuracy of all programmed data before take-off is fundamental to establishing a secure foundation for flight. This practice not only guarantees precision but also fosters a mindset of thoroughness and accuracy (Mahler & Casamayou, 2009). By cross-referencing planned routes with programmed data and confirming waypoints, pilots proactively intercept potential errors that may compromise flight safety. Furthermore, employing diverse navigation equipment not only offers redundancy but also enhances the pilot's comprehension of the surroundings, augmenting overall situational awareness (EASA, 2022). The real challenge is to balance automation with expertise. Although advanced avionics offer many capabilities, pilots need to stay aware of their personal skill levels and operational constraints (Chen & Tsai, 2016). Thus, realistic flight planning emerges as a pivotal factor, guiding pilots to navigate effectively while maintaining acute awareness of their environment. Additionally, the imperative to verify data entries underscores the significance of vigilance in high-pressure scenarios, averting oversights that could result in grave consequences (Beier et al., 2017).

3. Changes in Decision-Making Processes

The integration of automation systems within aviation brings about a significant transformation in decision-making processes, presenting a blend of opportunities and challenges for pilots. Traditionally, pilots have been entrusted with the primary responsibility of decision-making, drawing upon their training, experience, and judgment to navigate through diverse flight scenarios (Liu et al., 2008). However, the emergence of advanced automation alters this dynamic considerably. With the introduction of sophisticated automation, a portion of decision-making tasks is delegated to these systems, thereby altering the traditional pilot-centric approach. While this can enhance operational efficiency and accuracy in routine flight operations, it also raises concerns regarding pilots' sustained engagement and proficiency in decision-making (Casner et al.,2014). The delegation of decision-making authority to automation systems may inadvertently lead to a gradual erosion of pilots' skills, particularly if they excessively rely on these systems. Furthermore, the influence of automation on decision-making processes is intricately linked to aviation safety (Chialastri, 2021). Research indicates that increased reliance on automation systems can potentially impair pilots' ability to effectively manage unforeseen circumstances or anomalies. This phenomenon, commonly known as automation dependency or bias, may result in diminished situational awareness and heightened risk of pilot errors or accidents (Nguyen et al., 2019) In essence, while automation systems offer undeniable advantages in terms of operational efficiency and workload management, they necessitate a reassessment of pilots' involvement in decision-making processes (Gil et al. 2012). Aviation stakeholders must prioritize the maintenance of pilots' cognitive skills and vigilance amidst automation integration. This entails ensuring that pilots retain their proficiency in navigating complex situations and exercising sound judgment when confronted with critical decisions (Wickens et al., 2019). Moreover, ongoing training programs and proficiency assessments should be tailored to address the evolving role of automation in decision-making. By doing so, aviation stakeholders can foster a culture of safety and resilience, thereby mitigating the potential risks associated with automation integration in modern aviation operations (Soori et al.,2024).

3.1. Automation and Pilots: Harmony and Challenges

The seamless integration of automation systems with pilots is a pivotal aspect of modern aviation, aimed at optimizing operational efficiency while ensuring flight safety. While automation systems offer a myriad of benefits, including enhanced precision, reduced workload, and improved situational awareness, achieving perfect harmony between these systems and human operators is not always straightforward (Giannaros et al.,2023). One of the primary challenges lies in the complexity of automation systems. The intricate functionalities and interfaces of these systems can sometimes overwhelm pilots, leading to difficulties in understanding and effectively utilizing them, especially in high-stress or time-critical situations. Additionally, the design and presentation of information within automation interfaces play a crucial role in facilitating or impeding pilot comprehension and decision-making (Johnsen et al.,2020). Moreover, automation systems are designed to operate within specified parameters and assumptions about the environment and aircraft state (Chen & Tsai, 2016). However, when faced with unexpected or abnormal conditions, such as system failures, adverse weather, or air traffic congestion, these systems may not always respond optimally. In such cases, pilots must possess the skills and knowledge to intervene appropriately, potentially reverting to manual control to safely navigate the situation. Pilot proficiency and training are fundamental factors in ensuring effective interaction with automation systems (Soori et al.,2024). Pilots require comprehensive training not only in operating the automation itself but also in understanding its underlying principles, limitations, and potential failure modes. Regular proficiency checks and recurrent training programs, such as simulator sessions and scenario-based training, are essential to maintain and enhance these skills over time, ensuring pilots remain adept at handling automation in various scenarios (Casner et al., 2014). These programs typically include manual flight operations, emergency procedures, and decision-making exercises to prepare pilots for both routine and unexpected situations. By continuously evaluating and updating these training methods, aviation stakeholders can ensure that pilots retain their cognitive skills and remain vigilant in managing automated systems effectively. Furthermore, fostering a culture of collaboration and communication between pilots and automation systems is essential. Pilots should feel empowered to provide feedback on system design and functionality based on their operational experience, contributing to ongoing improvements and refinements. Additionally, clear communication channels between pilots and other stakeholders, such as air traffic controllers and maintenance personnel, are critical for effective coordination during all phases of flight (Wickens et al., 2019). In conclusion, while automation systems offer numerous benefits to aviation operations, achieving optimal compatibility with pilots requires addressing various technical, training, and operational considerations. By investing in comprehensive pilot training programs, improving the design of automation interfaces for better usability, and encouraging clear and consistent communication protocols, aviation stakeholders can create a balanced interaction between pilots and automated systems. This approach will ultimately enhance flight safety and operational efficiency.

4. Methodology

The research methodology employed in this study is designed to facilitate a comprehensive investigation into the impact of automation systems on decision-making processes within the aviation sector, with a specific focus on two significant incidents: Lion Air Flight 610, which occurred on October 29, 2018, and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302, which occurred on March 10, 2019 (Al Jazeera, 2018, October 29; ASN, 2018; Boeing Commercial Airplanes, 2018; CBS News, 2018; Ethiopian Airlines, 2019a,2019b,2019c,2019d; Gebrekidan & Glanz, 2019; Jolly, 2019; Langewiesche, 2019 Labib et al., 2019). Through a meticulously structured approach, this study aims to elucidate the intricate dynamics underlying the interaction between automation systems and decision-making in aviation, shedding light on their implications for operational safety.

To achieve this objective, a rigorous case analysis framework is employed, allowing for a detailed examination of the circumstances surrounding the accidents (Baker, 2018; Boeing Commercial Airplanes, 2018). By dissecting these cases methodically, the study seeks to uncover the underlying factors and mechanisms through which automation systems influence decision-making processes among pilots (Damarjati, 2018; Gröndahl et al., 2018). This analytical approach enables the research to identify patterns, correlations, and causal relationships, thereby facilitating a deeper understanding of the role played by automation in shaping human actions and responses within the aviation context (Eurocontrol, 2023; Evdokimova, 2019). Moreover, the research methodology encompasses a comprehensive review of diverse secondary sources, including accident reports, scholarly literature, industry publications, and reputable online databases (Hashim, 2018; Kunert et al., 2018). These sources provide valuable insights into the specific factors contributing to the accidents, such as the functioning of automated systems, pilot training protocols, and organizational factors (Langewiesche, 2019; Mahtani & Rohmah, 2018). By examining multiple instances of automation-related incidents, the research is better positioned to discern commonalities, variations, and underlying trends, thereby facilitating a more comprehensive understanding of the overarching phenomenon under investigation. Specifically, the study highlights how the MCAS can trigger disorientation among pilots, leading to critical errors in decision-making. Overall, the research methodology adopted in this study is characterized by its systematic, rigorous, and interdisciplinary nature, aimed at providing valuable insights into the evolving dynamics of decision-making in aviation automation (Waldinger, 2016; Zhou, 2018). Through its analytical rigor and methodical approach, this study contributes meaningfully to the scholarly discourse on aviation safety and human-automation interaction, particularly in understanding the impact of systems like MCAS on pilot performance and situational awareness (McKirdy et al., 2018). By integrating insights from these varied sources, this study aims to provide a detailed and specific analysis of how automation systems impact decision-making in aviation. The focus is on understanding the intricate dynamics at play and offering targeted recommendations for enhancing pilot training and operational procedures. Furthermore, the inclusion of multiple case studies, namely Lion Air Flight 610 and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302, serves to enhance the robustness and generalizability of the findings (Reuters, 2018a; Reuters, 2018b; Al Jazeera, 2018, October 29; ASN, 2018; Boeing Commercial Airplanes, 2018; CBS News, 2018; Ethiopian Airlines, 2019a,2019b,2019c,2019d; Gebrekidan & Glanz, 2019; Jolly, 2019; Langewiesche, 2019 Labib et al., 2019).

4.1. Data Collection

In this study, secondary data plays a central role as the primary source of information. Secondary data, sourced from reputable sources such as official accident investigation reports by aviation regulatory bodies (National Transportation Safety Committee, 2024) and entities like the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), Komite Nasional Keselamatan Transportasi, (2018) and Ethiopian Civil Aviation Authority, Ministry of Transport and Communications (2019;2022) offer comprehensive insights into the Lion Air Flight 610 and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 accidents. Peer-reviewed academic journals and research articles (Baker, 2018; Mahtani & Rohmah, 2018) provide theoretical frameworks, empirical studies, and expert analyses, enriching the research with nuanced perspectives and foundational knowledge. Additionally, industry reports and publications disseminated by stakeholders such as aircraft manufacturers (Boeing Commercial Airplanes, 2018), regulatory authorities, and aviation safety organizations offer industry-specific insights and empirical evidence pertinent to the study. Established online repositories (Reuters, 2018a; Reuters, 2018b), including the NTSB database and the Aviation Safety Network database, serve as repositories housing a wealth of accident data, investigation reports, scholarly literature, and related research materials (Miriri,2019). These databases facilitate convenient access to a diverse array of secondary data essential for conducting a comprehensive analysis of the accidents under scrutiny. By harnessing secondary data from these diverse sources, the research endeavors to thoroughly understand the influence exerted by automation systems on decision-making processes in aviation, with a specific focus on the Lion Air Flight 610 and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 accidents (People,2019).

4.2. Analysing the Cases

The analysis of the Lion Air Flight 610 and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 incidents constitutes a pivotal endeavor in understanding the intricate dynamics at play within the aviation industry. These tragic events, both resulting in catastrophic crashes, underscore the critical importance of scrutinizing the role of automation systems in modern flight operations (BBC News, 2019). By meticulously examining these cases, the nuanced interplay between human factors, technological systems, and operational contexts is unraveled, shedding light on the multifaceted factors contributing to aviation accidents and informing strategies for enhancing safety and resilience within the industry. Table 1 compares key features between Lion Air Flight 610 and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 incidents, providing a structured overview of the similarities and differences between the two events (Reuters, 2019a; Reuters, 2019b).

Table 1. Comparison of Lion Air Flight 610 and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 Incidents

Feature	Lion Air Flight 610 (October 29, 2018)	Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 (March 10, 2019)
Airline	Lion Air	Ethiopian Airlines
Flight Number	JT610	ET302
Aircraft Model	Boeing 737 MAX 8	Boeing 737 MAX 8
Departure Location	Jakarta, Indonesia	Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Destination	Pangkal Pinang, Indonesia	Nairobi, Kenya
Date of Incident	October 29, 2018	March 10, 2019
Casualties	189 fatalities	157 fatalities
Primary Issues	MCAS system malfunction, sensor failure, pilot errors	MCAS system malfunction, sensor failure, pilot errors
Post-Incident Actions	Temporary grounding of Boeing 737 MAX flights, MCAS system review, enhancement of safety measures	Temporary grounding of Boeing 737 MAX flights, MCAS system review, enhancement of safety measures

The comparison Table-I utilized structured criteria adapted from various sources, including accident investigation reports, human factors studies, and industry publications. Specifically, it drew on the methodology used in accident investigation reports for Lion Air Flight 610 and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302, research on pilot training and automation impacts, and regulatory documents from the FAA and Boeing. These sources provided a framework for identifying primary issues, contributing factors, and post-incident actions, ensuring a comprehensive analysis of the incidents.

Lion Air and Ethiopian Airlines are both esteemed carriers within their respective regions, with Lion Air recognized as a prominent low-cost airline in Indonesia (ANSA, 2022) and Ethiopian Airlines serving as the flag carrier of Ethiopia and one of the largest airlines in Africa (Ethiopian Airlines, 2019a). The flight numbers, JT610 for Lion Air Flight 610 and ET302 for Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302, serve as unique identifiers crucial for tracking and communication between air traffic control and the respective airlines (Al Jazeera, 2018, October 29). Both tragic incidents involved the Boeing 737 MAX 8, a contemporary narrow-body aircraft model manufactured by Boeing (Boeing Commercial Airplanes, 2018). The occurrence of these accidents with the same aircraft model sparked concerns regarding its safety and prompted widespread scrutiny of the Boeing 737 MAX series (Reuters, 2019a). Lion Air Flight 610 took off from Jakarta, Indonesia, while Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 departed from Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (Al Jazeera, 2019, March 10a). Lion Air Flight 610, bound for Pangkal Pinang, Indonesia, tragically crashed into the Java Sea shortly after takeoff on October 29, 2018 (Al Jazeera, 2019, March 10b). Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302, en route to Nairobi, Kenya, met a similar fate, crashing near the town of Bishoftu (Debre Zeit) shortly after takeoff on March 10, 2019 (Reuters, 2018a). The Lion Air incident resulted in 189 fatalities, marking it as one of the deadliest aviation accidents in Indonesian history (Al Jazeera, 2019, March 10b). Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 claimed the lives of all 157 individuals on board, representing one of the deadliest accidents involving a Boeing 737 MAX aircraft (Reuters, 2018b). Investigations into both accidents uncovered common issues, including malfunctioning MCAS, erroneous sensor readings, particularly from the angle of attack sensors, and challenges in crew response and coordination during high-pressure situations (Reuters, 2019b). In response, regulatory authorities worldwide temporarily grounded all Boeing 737 MAX aircraft pending further investigation and safety assessments (National Transportation Safety Committee, 2024). Boeing subsequently initiated modifications to the MCAS software and provided additional training for pilots flying the 737 MAX series, aiming to address the identified safety concerns and restore confidence in the aircraft's airworthiness (Boeing Commercial Airplanes, 2018; ANSA,2022). This comparative analysis serves as a foundation for deeper exploration and interpretation of the findings, guiding the research towards meaningful insights and actionable recommendations for improving aviation safety.

5. Discussion

The exhaustive examination of the Lion Air Flight 610 and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 Boeing 737 MAX accidents, along with their implications for automation systems in aviation, elucidates critical insights into the intricate nexus of technology, human factors, and safety. Firstly, the investigation underscores the indispensable role played by automation systems, notably the maneuvering MCAS, in shaping aircraft operations and pilot decision-making processes. The malfunction of the MCAS, triggered by erroneous sensor data, precipitated a cascading sequence of events culminating in the loss of aircraft control. This underscores the imperative of robust system design, redundancy, and comprehensive pilot training to ensure the seamless integration and operation of automation systems within aircraft platforms.

Secondly, the analysis sheds light on the formidable challenges posed by automation dependency and complacency among flight crews. The undue reliance on automation and insufficient proficiency in manual flight control techniques compromised the crew's capacity to effectively manage emergent scenarios. This accentuates the exigency for holistic pilot training initiatives, including comprehensive simulator sessions, scenario-based training, and regular proficiency checks. These programs should focus on both the technical aspects of automation systems and the development of critical decision-making acumen and situational awareness skills. The expected impact of such training is to enhance pilots' ability to effectively manage automated systems, maintain manual flying skills, and respond adeptly to emergent situations, thereby improving overall flight safety and operational efficiency. Furthermore, the examination underscores the pivotal role played by human-machine interface (HMI) design in facilitating effective communication and decision-making during high-pressure situations. Identified deficiencies in the cockpit design of the Boeing 737 MAX, particularly pertaining to alert prioritization and annunciator displays, underscore the significance of enhancing HMI design to alleviate the risk of information overload and augment pilots' situational awareness. Additionally, the analysis highlights the crucial role of crew resource management (CRM) and effective communication protocols in handling complex situations involving automation systems (Macleod, 2021). Collaborative teamwork within the cockpit is essential for addressing automation-related issues and ensuring safe flight operations. Furthermore, the study emphasizes the need for stronger regulatory oversight and certification processes to ensure the proper integration of automation systems into aircraft design. Enhanced collaboration between regulatory bodies and industry stakeholders, coupled with more stringent testing regimes, can engender heightened confidence in the safe integration of automation systems within aircraft platforms. In sum, the comprehensive interpretation of findings underscores the imperative of adopting a holistic approach to aviation safety, encompassing resilient system design, comprehensive pilot training initiatives, optimized human-machine interface design, and fortified regulatory mechanisms. By diligently addressing these pivotal facets, the aviation industry can effectively mitigate the inherent risks associated with automation systems and uphold the paramountcy of flight safety in future operations.

5.1. Automation Systems and Aircraft Operation

Lion Air Flight 610 and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 involved Boeing 737 MAX aircraft, which integrate advanced automation systems, notably the MCAS, aimed at enhancing flight stability and handling attributes. However, these accidents spotlighted deficiencies in the design and implementation of the MCAS, primarily its reliance on a single sensor for activation and inadequate redundancy, leading to uncommented nose-down trim actions and loss of aircraft control. Consequently, the incidents underscored the imperative of rigorous testing, robust system redundancy, and comprehensive pilot training to ensure the effective integration and operation of automation systems within aircraft platforms. Moreover, the integration of automation systems posed challenges for pilots, particularly concerning their comprehension of system functionality and response to abnormal situations. The crew's encounter with erroneous angle of attack (AOA) sensor data on Flight 610 triggered MCAS activation, exacerbating flight control issues. Despite their efforts to rectify the situation through manual trim inputs, the crew grappled with regaining control amidst escalating failures and heightened workload, accentuating the complexities of decision-making under such circumstances. Furthermore, the accidents highlighted the peril of automation dependency and complacency among flight crews, exacerbated by insufficient proficiency in manual flight control techniques and inadequate training on MCAS failure modes. The investigation revealed deficiencies in the pilots' understanding of MCAS functionality and runaway stabilizer procedures, compromising their ability to effectively manage emergent scenarios and contributing to catastrophic outcomes. Additionally, challenges pertaining to the human-machine interface (HMI) design of the Boeing 737 MAX cockpit were brought to the fore. Pilots encountered difficulties in interpreting system alerts, particularly in high-stress situations, necessitating intuitive HMI design improvements to facilitate clear communication and decision-making amidst operational exigencies. Moreover, effective crew resource management (CRM) and communication emerged as pivotal factors in managing complex situations, especially in the presence of automation systems. The accidents underscored deficiencies in crew coordination and communication, emphasizing the need for enhanced CRM training and fostering a culture of open communication and teamwork within the cockpit to bolster crew effectiveness and decision-making capabilities. Furthermore, scrutiny of regulatory oversight and certification processes ensued, raising questions about the sufficiency of regulatory requirements for evaluating the safety and reliability of new automation features like MCAS. Enhanced regulatory oversight, coupled with more stringent testing protocols and increased transparency in certification processes, is deemed imperative to ensure the safe integration of automation systems into aircraft platforms. Training and proficiency maintenance also garnered attention, highlighting the necessity for comprehensive pilot training on automation systems' operation, limitations, and failure modes, coupled with recurrent training and proficiency checks to reinforce critical skills and decision-making abilities.

Table 2. Comparative Analysis Accidents Based on Key Operational Factors

Aspect	Lion Air Flight 610	Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302
Primary Cause	MCAS activation due to erroneous sensor data	MCAS activation due to erroneous sensor data
Contributing Factors	Insufficient redundancy in MCAS system	Inadequate crew response to MCAS activation
Impact on Decision Making	Crew struggled to regain control amidst failures	Crew experienced difficulty managing situation
Automation Dependency	Crew reliance on automation exacerbated situation	Crew reliance on automation hindered response
Human-machine interface (HMI)	Challenges in understanding system alerts	Difficulties in interpreting system alerts
Crew Resource Management (CRM)	Deficiencies in crew coordination and communication	Lack of effective collaboration among crew
Regulatory Oversight	Scrutiny of regulatory requirements for automation systems	Questions raised about adequacy of oversight
Training and Proficiency	Inadequate pilot training on MCAS functionality	Need for comprehensive pilot training reinforced
Lessons Learned	Emphasis on robust training and proficiency maintenance	Implementation of safety enhancements

The comparison criteria in Table 2 were adapted from detailed accident investigation reports, human factors studies, and regulatory publications. Specifically, they were informed by accident reports for Lion Air Flight 610 and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302, research on pilot training and automation impacts, and documents from aviation authorities like the FAA and Boeing. Key sources include ANSA (2022), Al Jazeera (2018, 2019), Boeing Commercial Airplanes (2018), and Reuters (2019), which provided the framework for analyzing primary causes, contributing factors, and regulatory oversight. The findings from the comparative analysis of the Lion Air Flight 610 and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 accidents reveal several critical insights into the factors influencing aviation safety and operational performance. Firstly, the analysis underscores the significant role of automation systems, particularly the MCAS, in shaping the outcome of both accidents. Deficiencies in the design and integration of these systems, coupled with inadequate pilot training, contributed to the crew's inability to effectively manage automation-induced anomalies, leading to catastrophic consequences. Moreover, the analysis highlights the impact of automation dependency and complacency among flight crews, emphasizing the importance of maintaining proficiency in manual flight control techniques and fostering a culture of vigilance and situational awareness. Human factors, including human-machine interface (HMI) design, crew resource management (CRM), and communication, also emerged as critical determinants of operational performance. Challenges related to cockpit interface design and crew coordination underscore the need for intuitive HMI design and effective CRM practices to enhance crew effectiveness and decision-making capabilities. Furthermore, the analysis raises questions about the adequacy of existing regulatory oversight and certification processes in ensuring the safe integration of automation systems into aircraft design. Closer collaboration between regulators and industry stakeholders, as well as more rigorous testing protocols, may be necessary to address these concerns and enhance aviation safety. The findings also underscore the importance of comprehensive pilot training and proficiency maintenance in preparing crews to handle automation-related contingencies effectively. Scenario-based training and recurrent simulations can help pilots develop the cognitive skills and operational proficiency necessary to mitigate the risks associated with automation systems. Lastly, the analysis highlights the importance of institutionalizing lessons learned and implementing targeted safety enhancements to prevent similar accidents in the future. By addressing these key findings, aviation stakeholders can work towards enhancing safety standards and ensuring the continued safe operation of automation-equipped aircraft.

6. Conclusion

The impact of automation systems on decision-making processes in aviation is multifaceted and dynamic, encompassing myriad factors that interact in complex ways. While these systems offer undeniable benefits in enhancing operational efficiency and flight safety, they also introduce new challenges and considerations that must be carefully navigated by aviation stakeholders. At the heart of this issue lies the intricate interplay between technological advancements and human factors, highlighting the need for a balanced approach that acknowledges both the capabilities of automation and the inherent complexities of human cognition and behavior.

Automation systems in aviation have evolved significantly over the years, revolutionizing the way aircraft are operated and managed. From autopilots to advanced flight management systems, these technologies have greatly contributed to improving flight safety, fuel efficiency, and overall operational performance. However, as automation systems become more sophisticated and pervasive, their impact on pilots' decision-making processes has come under increasing scrutiny.

One of the key challenges posed by automation systems is their potential to erode pilots' situational awareness and decision-making capabilities, particularly in high-stress or unexpected situations. While automation is designed to assist and augment human performance, overreliance on these systems can lead to complacency and a loss of critical thinking skills. Moreover, the complexity of modern cockpit interfaces and automation modes can sometimes overwhelm pilots, making it difficult for them to effectively monitor and intervene in the event of automation-related anomalies.

The tragic incidents of Lion Air Flight 610 and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 serve as poignant reminders of the risks associated with automation in aviation. In both cases, the malfunction of the MCAS played a central role in the accidents, highlighting the importance of understanding and managing automation-induced risks. These incidents underscore the need for comprehensive training and proficiency assessments for pilots operating in highly automated environments, ensuring they possess the skills and knowledge necessary to effectively interact with automation systems and make informed decisions during routine operations and emergencies.

However, it's essential to recognize that the integration of automation systems into aviation operations is an ongoing process that requires continuous monitoring, evaluation, and adaptation. As technology continues to evolve, so too must our understanding of its implications for aviation safety and decision-making processes. This necessitates a collaborative effort among industry stakeholders, regulators, researchers, and aviation professionals to stay abreast of emerging trends and developments in automation technology and human factors research.

The harmony and challenges inherent in the relationship between automation and pilots underscore the need for a holistic approach to integrating technology in aviation operations. One study that discusses such an approach is by Dekker and Woods (2017) in *The Field Guide to Understanding Human Error*. This study emphasizes the importance of considering human factors and the broader system context when integrating new technologies into aviation. It highlights that successful integration requires addressing both technological capabilities and the needs and limitations of human operators. By addressing the complexities of human factors and technology, stakeholders can optimize the benefits of automation while mitigating its potential risks, ultimately leading to safer and more efficient aviation practices. The study does not explicitly detail the methods employed to ensure the validity and reliability of the secondary data utilized. Several limitations should be acknowledged, such as the reliance on secondary data sources, which precluded direct interviews with key individuals involved in the incidents. Additionally, the focus on only two specific accidents may constrain the generalizability of the findings. These limitations underscore the necessity for cautious interpretation of the results and suggest that future research should incorporate primary data collection methods and examine a broader array of incidents to enhance the robustness and applicability of the conclusions. Moving forward, future research should focus on longitudinal studies that track the implementation of automation systems over time and their impact on decision-making processes. Comparative analyses across different aviation contexts can also provide valuable insights into commonalities, differences, and best practices for managing automation-induced challenges. Additionally, human-centered design principles should be explored to optimize human-machine interaction and decision-making support, mitigating the risks associated with automation dependency, complacency, and cognitive workload.

Regulatory frameworks and industry standards must also evolve to keep pace with advancements in automation technology, ensuring that safety and human factors considerations remain paramount in the design, implementation, and oversight of these systems. Addressing ethical and legal implications associated with the use of automation systems in aviation is equally crucial, fostering accountability, transparency, and trust among stakeholders.

In conclusion, while automation systems hold great promise for enhancing aviation safety and efficiency, they must be approached with caution and careful consideration of their impact on human performance and decision-making. By fostering a culture of continuous learning, collaboration, and innovation, the aviation industry can harness the potential of automation while safeguarding against its unintended consequences, ultimately ensuring safer skies for all.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

Airfleets Aviation. (2018). Lion Airlines PK-LQP (Boeing 737 Next Gen – MSN 43000) – Airfleets aviation. Retrieved October 29, 2018, from airfleets.net

Al Jazeera. (2018, October 29). Indonesia: Lion Air flight from Jakarta to Sumatra crashes. Retrieved October 29, 2018.

Al Jazeera. (2019). Ethiopian Airlines flight to Nairobi crashes, deaths reported [News article]. https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2019/03/ethiopian-airlines-flight-nairobi-crashes-deaths-reported-190310104643984.html (2019, March 10).

Al Jazeera. (2019). Investigators at Ethiopian Airlines crash site look for answers [News article]. https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2019/03/investigators-ethiopian-airlines-crash-site-answers-190310074208666.html (2019, March 10).

ANSA. (2022, December 24). Etiopia conferma, errore software causò disastro Boeing 2019 [Ethiopia confirms, software error caused 2019 Boeing disaster] [News article]. Retrieved May 1, 2024, from https://www.ansa.it/sito/notizie/mondo/2022/12/24/etiopia-conferma-errore-software-causo-disastro-boeing-2019_79f8b7f5-204b-4a1d-b391-57910a4479d6.html

Aviation Safety Network. (2018). ASN Aircraft accident Boeing 737 MAX 8 PK-LQP Tanjung Bungin. Retrieved May 6, 2021, from Aviation Safety Network

Aviation Safety Network. (2019). Crash: Ethiopian B38M near Bishoftu on Mar 10th 2019, impacted terrain after departure [Press release]. avherald.com. https://web.archive.org/web/20190501184955/https://avherald.com/h?article=4c244361&opt=0

Baker, S. (2018). What we know about the victims of the Lion Air plane crash off Indonesia, where there were 'likely no survivors'. Business Insider. Retrieved November 1, 2018.

Barbosa, G. F. (2016). Aviation manufacturing towards Industry 4.0: A review. Presented at the 4th International Conference and Exhibition on Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering, Florida.

BBC News. (2019). Ethiopian Airlines: 'No survivors' on crashed Boeing 737 [News article]. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-47513508 (2019, March 10)

BBC. (2018). Lion Air crash: Boeing 737 plane crashes in sea off Jakarta. Retrieved October 29, 2018. (2018, October 29).

Beier, G., Niehoff, S., Ziems, T., & Xue, B. (2017). Effects on staffing requirements due to digitalization per domain: Impacts on workload due to digitalization. International Journal of Precision Engineering and Manufacturing-Green Technology.

Boeing Commercial Airplanes. (2018, November 6). Boeing Commercial Airplanes – Orders and Deliveries 737 Model Summary https://web.archive.org/web/20181106060955/https://www.boeing.com/commercial/#/orders-deliveries

Casner, Stephen & Geven, Richard & Recker, Matthias & Schooler, Jonathan. (2014). The Retention of Manual Flying Skills in the Automated Cockpit. Human factors. 56..

CBS News. (2018). Indonesia's Lion Air Flight JT-610 crashes into the sea with 189 on board, officials say. Retrieved April 16, 2024.

Chan, F., & Soeriaatmadja, W. (2018). Lion Airplane carrying 188 on board crashes into sea shortly after take-off from Jakarta. The Straits Times. Retrieved October 29, 2018.

Chen, T., & Tsai, H. R. (2016). Ubiquitous manufacturing: Current practices, challenges, and opportunities. Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing.

Comitz, P. H., & Kersch, A. (2016). Aviation analytics and the Internet of Things. 2016 Integrated Communications Navigation and Surveillance (ICNS).

Damarjati, D. (2018). Pesawat Lion Air Hilang Kontak Usai 13 Menit Terbang [Lion Airplane lost contact after 13 minutes of flying]. Detik.com. Retrieved November 1, 2018.

Dekker, S., & Woods, D. D. (2017). The field guide to understanding human error. CRC Press.

Deloitte (2016), Industry 4.0: Challenges and solutions for the digital transformation and use of exponential technologies.

Ethiopian Airlines. (2019). Ethiopian Airlines: Who were the victims? [News article]. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-47709417 (2019, April 4).

Ethiopian Airlines. (2019). Accident Bulletin no. 3 Issued on March 10, 2019, at 4:59 PM [Press release]. https://www.ethiopianairlines.com/aa/media/pressrelease/624 (2019, March 10).

Ethiopian Airlines. (2019, March 22). Honoring the Victims with Traditional Memorial Service [Press release]. https://www.ethiopianairlines.com/aa/media/pressrelease/634

Ethiopian Airlines. (2019). Press Release Details [Press release]. Retrieved March 17, 2019, from https://www.ethiopianairlines.com/aa/media/pressrelease/623

Ethiopian Civil Aviation Authority, Ministry of Transport and Communications. (2022). Aircraft Accident Investigation Report B737- MAX 8, ET-AVJ December 2022 [PDF]. The Aviation Herald. https://avherald.com/h?article=4d1c41ed&opt=0

Ethiopian Civil Aviation Authority, Ministry of Transport and Communications. (2019, March 4). Aircraft Accident Investigation Bureau Preliminary Report [PDF]. https://web.archive.org/web/20190404034839/https://www.ecaa.gov.et/documents/20435/292248/ET-302+Preliminary+Report.pdf/3689f4e3-7ef5-43d7-80b9-c8a4f91eb8ca

Eurocontrol. (2023). The future of Europe's aviation sector: Embracing innovation. Retrieved from https://www.eurocontrol.int/article/future-europes-aviation-sector-embracing-innovation

European Union Aviation Safety Agency (2022). Easy access rules for airborne communications, navigation and surveillance (CS-ACNS), Issue 4. https://www.easa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/dfu/easy_access_rules_for_airborne_communications_navigation_and_surveillance_cs-acns_issue_4.pdf

Evdokimova, T. (2019). Why Were Ethiopian Airlines' Black Boxes Sent to Paris for Examination? [Blog post]. Slate Magazine. https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2019/03/ethiopian-airlines-black-boxes-paris.html

Federal Aviation Administration. (2007). TAA flying skills. FAA Safety Briefing, 7(1), 8-11. https://www.faasafety.gov/files/gslac/library/documents/2007/Mar/15239/7.1%20TAA%20Flying%20Skills%20MarApr07.pdf

Gebrekidan, S., & Glanz, J. (2019). Boeing 737 Max Hit Trouble Right Away, Pilot's Tense Radio Messages Show [News article]. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2019/03/14/world/africa/boeing-737-max-crash-investigation.html

Giannaros, A., Karras, A., Theodorakopoulos, L., Karras, C., Kranias, P., Schizas, N., Kalogeratos, G., & Tsolis, D. (2023). Autonomous vehicles: Sophisticated attacks, safety issues, challenges, open topics, blockchain, and future directions. Journal of Cybersecurity and Privacy, 3(3), 493-543.

Gil, Guk-Ho & Kaber, David & Kaufmann, Karl & Kim, Sang-Hwan. (2012). Effects of Modes of Cockpit Automation on Pilot Performance and Workload in a Next Generation Flight Concept of Operation. Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing & Service Industries. 22.

Gröndahl, M., McCann, A., Glanz, J., Migliozzi, B., & Syam, U. (2018). In 12 minutes, everything went wrong. How the pilots of Lion Air Flight 610 lost control. Retrieved fromhttps://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/12/26/world/asia/lion-air-crash-12-minutes.html

Hancock, P. A. (2013). Automation: How much is too much? Ergonomics.

Hashim, F. (2018). Lion Air 737 Max 8 crash confirmed, 189 dead. Flightglobal. Retrieved October 29, 2018.

Jolly, J. (2019). Lion Air crash report 'criticises design, maintenance and pilot error'. The Guardian. Retrieved February 24, 2024.

Johnsen, S. & Holen, Siri & Aalberg, Asbjørn & Bjørkevoll, Knut Steinar & Evjemo, Tor Erik & Johanse, Gorm & Myklebust, Thor & Okstad, Eivind & Porathe, Thomas & Pavlov, Alexey. (2020). Automation and autonomous systems: Human-centred design.

Komite Nasional Keselamatan Transportasi. (2018). Aircraft accident investigation report: PT. Lion Mentari Airlines, Boeing 737-8 (MAX); PK-LQP, Tanjung Karawang, West Java, Republic of Indonesia, 29 October 2018 (Report No. KNKT.18.10.35.04). Republic of Indonesia. Retrieved from https://aaiu.ie/2018-035-PK-LQP-Final-Report.pdf

Kunert, S., Bedenk, S., Wehner, T., & Elbe, M. (2018). Strategies in failure management: Scientific insights, case studies and tools.

Labib, A. (2015). Learning (and unlearning) from failures: 30 years on from Bhopal to Fukushima an analysis through reliability engineering techniques. Process Safety and Environmental Protection.

Labib, A., & Read, M. (2013). Not just rearranging the deckchairs on the Titanic: Learning from failures through risk and reliability analysis. Safety Science.

Labib, A., Hadleigh-Dunn, S., Mahfouz, A., & Gentile, M. (2019). Operationalising learning from rare events: Framework for middle humanitarian operations managers. Production and Operations Management.

Langewiesche, W. (2019). What Really Brought Down the Boeing 737 Max? The New York Times. Retrieved December 10, 2019.

Li, W.-C., & Harris, D. (2006). Pilot error and its relationship with higher organizational levels: HFACS analysis of 523 accidents. Aviation Space and Environmental Medicine.

Liu, S. B., Vieweg, S., Palen, L., & Sutton, J. (2008). Collective intelligence in disaster: Examination of the phenomenon in the aftermath of the 2007 Virginia Tech shooting.

Macleod, N. (2021). Crew resource management training: A competence-based approach for airline pilots.

Madsen, P., & Desai, V. M. (2010). Failing to learn? The effects of failure and success on organizational learning in the global orbital launch vehicle industry. Academy of Management Journal.

Mahler, J., & Casamayou, M. (2009). Organizational learning at NASA: The Challenger and Columbia accidents.

Mahtani, S., & Rohmah, A. (2018). Indonesian plane crashes into the sea with more than 180 on board. The Washington Post. Retrieved October 29, 2018.

Mejdal, S., McCauley, M. E., & Beringer, D. B. (2021). Human factors design guidelines for multifunction displays. Monterey Technologies, Inc. & Civil Aerospace Medical Institute, Federal Aviation Administration.

McKirdy, E., Faridz, D., & McKenzie, S. (2018). Lion Air flight crashes en route from Jakarta to Pangkal Pinang. CNN. Retrieved October 29, 2018.

Miriri, D. (2019). Ethiopian plane smoked and shuddered before deadly plunge [News article]. Reuters. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-ethiopia-airplane-timeline/ethiopian-plane-smoked-and-shuddered-before-deadly-plunge-idUSKBN1QT0EK

Moreno, A., Velez, G., Ardanza, A., & Chopitea, R. (2017). The virtualization process of a sheet metal punching machine within the industry 4.0 vision. International

Journal on Interactive Design and Manufacturing (IJIDeM).
Motlagh, N. H., Taleb, T., & Arouk, O. (2016). Low-altitude unmanned aerial vehicles-based Internet of Things services: Comprehensive survey and future perspectives. IEEE Internet of Things Journal.
National Transportation Safety Committee. (2024.). Aircraft Accident Investigation Report. PT. Lion Airlines Boeing 737 (MAX); PK-LQP Tanjung Karawang, West Java, Republic of Indonesia 29 October 2018 [PDF]. Retrieved February 26, 2024, from https://knkt.dephub.go.id/knkt/ntsc_aviation/baru/pre/2018/20-%20035%20/20PKLQP%20Final%20Report.pdf
Nguyen, Thanh & Lim, Chee & Nguyen, Ngoc Duy & Gordon-Brown, Lee & Nahavandi, Saeid. (2019). A Review of Situation Awareness Assessment Approaches in Aviation Environments. IEEE Systems Journal.
People. (2019). 22 UN Staffers Among 157 Dead in Ethiopian Airlines Crash [News article]. Retrieved November 26, 2022, from https://people.com/human-interest/22-un-staffers-among-157-dead-in-ethiopian-airlines-crash/
Pranesh, V., Palanichamy, K., Saidat, O., & Peter, N. (2017). Lack of dynamic leadership skills and human failure contribution analysis to manage risk in deep water horizon oil platform. Safety Science.
Read, G., Lenné, M. G., & Moss, S. A. (2012). Associations between task, training and social environmental factors and error types involved in rail incidents and accidents. Accident Analysis & Prevention.
Reuters. (2018, December 28). Family of Lion Air co-pilot sues Boeing in Chicago over fatal crash. Retrieved July 15, 2019.
Reuters. (2018, October 29). Factbox: 'Black boxes' the focus of probe in Indonesia's Lion Air crash.
Reuters. (2019, March 15). Excavators may be damaging Ethiopia crash site: diplomats [News article]. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-ethiopia-airplane-site-idUSKCN1QV1LC
Reuters. (2019, March 22). Confusion, grief as hunt for remains from Ethiopia crash halted [News article]. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-ethiopia-airplane-remains-idUSKCN1R21O5
Saadat, V., & Saadat, Z. (2016). Organizational learning as a key role of organizational success. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences.
Salmon, P. M., Hulme, A., Walker, G. H., & Stanton, N. A. (2020). The big picture on accident causation: A review, synthesis and meta-analysis of AcciMap studies. Safety Science.
Salmon, P. M., Walker, G. H., & Stanton, N. A. (2015). Pilot error versus sociotechnical systems failure: A distributed situation awareness analysis of Air France 447. Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science.
Shah, M. (2015). Big data and the Internet of Things. Mohak Shah.
Soori, Mohsen & Karimi Ghaleh Jough, Fooad & Dastres, Roza & Arezoo, Behrooz. (2024). Connectivity, automation, and data exchange in advanced manufacturing of Industry 4.0.
Stanton, N. A., Salmon, P. M., Walker, G. H., & Stanton, M. (2019). Models and methods for collision analysis: A comparison study based on the Uber collision with a pedestrian. Safety Science.
The Economist (2019). Planes are grounded after a new Boeing airliner crashes in Ethiopia. The Economist (2019, March 11). Retrieved from https://www.economist.com/gulliver/2019/03/11/planes-are-grounded-after-a-new-boeing-airliner-crashes-in-ethiopia?utm_medium=cpc.adword.pd&utm_source=google&ppccampaignID=18151738051&ppcadID=&utm_campaign=a.22brand_pmax&utm_content=conversion.directresponse.anonymous&gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCQjwgJyyBhCGARIsAK8LVLPwKRhUr2tnBUHV2UTE7t05pFrZWszn_WtcYDcrigJd368WKCdpW-waAm1xEALw_wcB&gclsrc=aw.ds
Waldinger, P. (2016). Aviation 4.0. ASDA - Association for the Scientific Development of ATM in Europe, Series of Research Tournaments, Delft.
Weinzimmer, L., & Esken, C. A. (2017). Learning from mistakes: How mistake tolerance positively affects organizational learning and performance. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 53(3), 322-348.
Wickens, Christopher & Dehais, Frédéric. (2019). Expertise in Aviation. 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198795872.013.2.
Zhou, N. (2018). Lion Air crash: officials say 188 onboard lost flight JT610 – latest updates. The Guardian. Retrieved October 29, 2018.

Cite this article: Yilmaz, A.A. (2024). Flight in Transition: Navigating the Skies of Automation and Human Judgment. Journal of Aviation, 8(3), 305-314.