

NASA/TM-2005-213161



# **Cognition in Space Workshop I: Metrics and Models**

## **Final Report**

*Barbara Woolford  
Edna Fielder  
Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center  
Houston, Texas*

---

June 2005

## THE NASA STI PROGRAM OFFICE . . . IN PROFILE

Since its founding, NASA has been dedicated to the advancement of aeronautics and space science. The NASA Scientific and Technical Information (STI) Program Office plays a key part in helping NASA maintain this important role.

The NASA STI Program Office is operated by Langley Research Center, the lead center for NASA's scientific and technical information. The NASA STI Program Office provides access to the NASA STI Database, the largest collection of aeronautical and space science STI in the world. The Program Office is also NASA's institutional mechanism for disseminating the results of its research and development activities. These results are published by NASA in the NASA STI Report Series, which includes the following report types:

- **TECHNICAL PUBLICATION.** Reports of completed research or a major significant phase of research that present the results of NASA programs and include extensive data or theoretical analysis. Includes compilations of significant scientific and technical data and information deemed to be of continuing reference value. NASA's counterpart of peer-reviewed formal professional papers but has less stringent limitations on manuscript length and extent of graphic presentations.
- **TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM.** Scientific and technical findings that are preliminary or of specialized interest, e.g., quick release reports, working papers, and bibliographies that contain minimal annotation. Does not contain extensive analysis.
- **CONTRACTOR REPORT.** Scientific and technical findings by NASA-sponsored contractors and grantees.
- **CONFERENCE PUBLICATION.** Collected papers from scientific and technical conferences, symposia, seminars, or other meetings sponsored or cosponsored by NASA.
- **SPECIAL PUBLICATION.** Scientific, technical, or historical information from NASA programs, projects, and mission, often concerned with subjects having substantial public interest.
- **TECHNICAL TRANSLATION.** English-language translations of foreign scientific and technical material pertinent to NASA's mission.

Specialized services that complement the STI Program Office's diverse offerings include creating custom thesauri, building customized databases, organizing and publishing research results . . . even providing videos.

For more information about the NASA STI Program Office, see the following:

- Access the NASA STI Program Home Page at <http://www.sti.nasa.gov>
- E-mail your question via the Internet to [help@sti.nasa.gov](mailto:help@sti.nasa.gov)
- Fax your question to the NASA Access Help Desk at (301) 621-0134
- Telephone the NASA Access Help Desk at (301) 621-0390
- Write to:  
NASA Access Help Desk  
NASA Center for AeroSpace Information  
7121 Standard  
Hanover, MD 21076-1320

NASA/TP-2005-213161



# **Cognition in Space Workshop I: Metrics and Models**

## **Final Report**

*Barbara Woolford  
Edna Fiedler  
Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center  
Houston, Texas*

---

June 2005

Available from:

NASA Center for Aerospace Information  
7121 Standard Drive  
Hanover, MD 21076-1320

National Technical Information Service  
5285 Port Royal Road  
Springfield, VA 22161

This report is also available in electronic form at <http://ston.jsc.nasa.gov/collections/TRS>

## Contents

Introduction.....	1
NASA needs to develop a human-centered design process that incorporates standards for human cognition, human performance, and assessment of human interfaces .....	1
NASA needs to identify and assess factors that increase risks associated with cognition.....	2
NASA needs to predict risks associated with cognition.....	4
NASA needs to mitigate risks, both prior to actual missions and in real time .....	5
Pre Mission .....	5
Real Time.....	5
Conclusion .....	6
Appendix A: Workshop Participants .....	9

## Figures

Evidence path for cognitive testing in space flight.....	7
Path for incorporating modeling in operational planning.....	8

## Introduction

“Cognition in Space Workshop I: Metrics and Models” was the first in a series of workshops sponsored by NASA to develop an integrated research and development plan supporting human cognition in space exploration. The workshop was held in Chandler, Arizona, October 25–27, 2004. The participants, who represented academia, government agencies, and medical centers, are identified in Appendix A.

The workshop addressed the following goal of the NASA Human System Integration (HSI) Program for Exploration: Develop a program to manage risks due to human performance and human error, specifically ones tied to cognition. Risks range from catastrophic error to degradation of efficiency and failure to accomplish mission goals. “Cognition” includes memory, decision making, initiation of motor responses, sensation, and perception.

Four subgoals were defined as follows:

1. NASA needs to develop a human-centered design process that incorporates standards for human cognition, human performance, and assessment of human interfaces.
2. NASA needs to identify and assess factors that increase risks associated with cognition.
3. NASA needs to predict risks associated with cognition.
4. NASA needs to mitigate risk, both prior to actual missions and in real time.

This report develops the material relating to these four subgoals.

### **1. NASA needs to develop a human-centered design process that incorporates standards for human cognition, human performance, and assessment of human interfaces.**

To successfully support cognitive performance, the crew’s roles and responsibilities as well as their training, schedules, environment, and system interfaces must be integrated into mission and vehicle designs from the beginning. During the mission conceptual design, conscious decisions on function allocation between the crew and the software and hardware must be based on principles of human performance. Current knowledge about human cognitive performance provides critical requirements for scheduling and workload. In turn, these requirements impact crew selection criteria and crew size.

The system design includes not just the onboard crew and systems but also the ground support and the communications systems and protocols that link them. A “lesson learned” from the International Space Station is that simply standardizing words and phrases – limiting the critical vocabulary – contributes significantly to efficiency. Cognitive performance of ground crews must be sustained.

Procedures and training materials are two tools that can support crew cognitive performance. The human centered design process should develop these to be highly effective. To this end, the HSI program should develop requirements and guidelines for procedure and training material writing and presentation based on current knowledge and best practices. The HSI Program does not

currently have expertise in this area; expanding the program to address this is one important need.

***Recommendation 1: Expand the HSI Program to systematically develop requirements and guidelines to enhance procedure and training development.***

The human centered design process must incorporate medical requirements. With respect to cognition, medical requirements address assessment and diagnostic tools for cognitive states, tools to identify causes of cognitive changes, and countermeasures. Schedules and workload, fatigue, medications, environmental factors, atmospheric contaminants, and social factors all potentially impact cognitive performance. The effects of poor or inadequate sleep and circadian rhythm are primarily manifested in cognitive performance.

**2. NASA needs to identify and assess factors that increase risks associated with cognition.**

The first steps in managing risks are identifying the contributing factors and root causes, and assessing the magnitude of their impacts. What performance-shaping factors are most important to cognition? Thinking of the flight crew, the ground crew, and the spacecraft as a system, it is necessary to identify the feedback and control loops. What data are required to provide feedback on the state of the system? What factors can be changed to reestablish a satisfactory system state?

Generally, introspection or self report is unreliable as a data source. On the other hand, flight and ground crew members, especially the crew medical officer and the flight surgeon, have an important role as system observers. Various other methods to assess cognitive performance must be evaluated and policies determined. Some data collection methods to consider include:

1. embedded measures,
2. biomarkers,
3. formal assessment tools (e.g., WinSCAT, Mini-Cog),
4. opportunistic data collection (observational/video, voice analysis),
5. synthetic task environments,
6. performance evaluation in competitive context, and
7. mission simulations in trainers.

To assess the sensitivity of the system to decrements in cognition requires understanding the tasks to be performed and the roles of the humans. Systematic analysis of prior experience can contribute to developing error trees or risk trees. Root cause analysis of lessons learned from prior incidents leads to principles that can be applied in future system design. Controlled studies are required to assess relative importance of factors.

Quantitative risk assessment for human performance is an emerging discipline. The field of behavioral economics can contribute to understanding risk assessment and judgment processes. This is an area that has not been reviewed by NASA human factors or behavior and performance programs to date.



***Recommendation 2: Commission a report of the literature on human risk analysis and its applicability to space flight.***

A wide range of factors can influence the risks of poor performance. Some of them include environmental factors, psychosocial factors, fatigue, individual differences including reaction to risk factors, stress, and workload intensity and duration. Controlled studies to assess effects of individual and combinations of factors are needed.

***Recommendation 3: Systematically assess factors contributing to cognitive decrements and their interactions.***

A variety of assessment tools exist. The first step in selecting or tailoring assessment tools is to relate the measurements to specific performance objectives (tasks). Determine which capabilities require new assessment tools or additional tests within existing batteries. Prospective memory and attentional blindness were identified as two aspects of cognition not covered by existing tests. Determine the necessary sensitivity for assessment tools. Consider that international teams will be using these tools, which poses linguistic and cultural challenges to selecting assessment tools.

There are two main effects to detect: trauma and disease. When decrements are detected, the cause must be identified to enable corrective or ameliorative action. (Corrective action restores the system to the desired state; e.g., reducing the carbon dioxide concentration. Ameliorative action enables the system to continue with degraded capabilities by compensating for them; e.g., omitting the most difficult tasks; relying more heavily on automation.) Diagnostic tools are important for assessing effects of events such as fires, spills of toxins, etc. Specific performance predictor tests are important to assess readiness to perform for critical tasks.

There is a literature on measures of attention that are predictors of performance in real-world tasks, particularly driving. The literature on vigilance and fatigue addresses individual performance over time rather than just group means. Measures of attention and situational awareness need to be assessed for relevance to individual performance in space operations.

Some measures of performance require a signal detection theoretic approach: what are the tradeoffs between speed and accuracy? How sensitive are critical tasks to speed and accuracy, and how consciously do crew members make these trades? The extravehicular activity slogan, “the slower you go, the sooner you finish,” reflects crew awareness of speed and accuracy tradeoffs in motor skills. Does this extend to cognitive performance?

***Recommendation 4: Review the literature on predictors of individual performance in real-world tasks and develop a set of tests to be used during all NASA-funded research simulating space missions (e.g., bed-rest studies).***

***Recommendation 5: Develop a suite of tasks researchers can use to measure the validity of their results.***

A decision tree assessment strategy must be developed to provide short tests with rapid feedback to determine whether there are significant performance decrements, and more detailed tests to be

used sequentially to identify causes. This minimizes crew time wasted on testing, while providing useful information when problems are identified. A testing protocol needs to be developed in this context: how often are routine tests needed? What situations, such as docking maneuvers, require special readiness-to-perform assessments? What tests are indicated for identifying specific problems?

An assessment standard must also address performance norms. For any specific task, what aspects of cognition are critical? What are acceptable operating bands? To what extent are the operating bands based on individual baseline data rather than group norms?

***Recommendation 6: Develop processes for identifying the critical aspects of cognitive performance that are essential or limiting for specific critical tasks. (What are the most important cognitive performance features to support?)***

Figure 1 provides a conceptual illustration of the steps that need to be accomplished to incorporate assessment of cognitive performance into operations.

### **3. NASA needs to predict risks associated with cognition.**

Cognitive models can be used to predict risks associated with various tasks. Models of cognition are needed for the following purposes: (1) analyze sensitivities to cognitive decrements for task design and mission planning; (2) analyze sensitivities to environmental factors, training, schedules, and workload; (3) estimate performance parameters such as time to perform and error rate for planning and for trade studies; (4) compare alternate designs for time and error rates; (5) determine whether designs meet functional requirements for time and errors.

Three types of models based on the nature of the models are (1) regression analysis and factor analysis, based on primarily empirical analysis; (2) outcome and predictive modeling; (3) cognitive process modeling, based on analyzing tasks into components (e.g., access working memory, recall from long-term memory, visual search) and assembling submodels with associated times and errors. Cognitive models can focus on modeling the effects of performance modulators (e.g., fatigue, g-forces, pharmaceuticals) which can be applied to models of a variety of tasks. Models can predict “normal” or “average” performance; stochastic models can predict ranges of performance; some models focus on predicting individual differences on various tasks based on responses to, for example, fatigue on a specific task.

Models of performance in space flight are limited by access to data. There are significant issues in collecting data on cognitive performance in space. Existing models are based on data acquired from higher or lower fidelity analogs, including military high-performance aircraft, commercial aviation, and driving. Data acquisition during flight and training is strongly resisted.

Much of the best work in cognitive modeling of high-performance systems is carried out by the military. This should be leveraged to benefit exploration planning.

***Recommendation 7: Hold a joint meeting of NASA cognitive scientists with the DARPA [Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency] Augmented Cognition Program Manager.***

***Recommendation 8: Develop a strategic plan relating modeling to operational planning.***

Figure 2 illustrates the process by which human performance models may contribute to trade studies resulting in operational decisions. They provide a means to estimate effects of design and operational decisions on mission outcome.

#### **4. NASA needs to mitigate risks, both prior to actual missions and in real time.**

Risks due to human cognitive performance degradation or failure can be managed by a systematic approach to designing cognitive tasks and to maintaining human performance.

##### **Pre Mission**

The process begins by designing the tasks needed to accomplish the mission objectives to incorporate human capabilities and limitations. Determine the functions to be accomplished and allocate the functions among the crew, the ground support, and the automated systems. Design the interfaces between the users and the hardware and software systems to enable the humans to perform the functions they do best – pattern recognition, creative problem solving, integration of novel information – and to assign as little of the rote tasks to the human as possible. Procedures and tools similarly need to be designed to facilitate crew performance.

Human performance is affected by an individual's physical environment in a variety of ways. Architectural factors such as the layout of the spacecraft, lighting, sound proofing, and volume allocation affect performance directly or indirectly. Such factors as food preparation options and menu variety can indirectly affect cognition through the effects on crew health of good nutrition. Toxins and contaminants in the environment potentially damage the crew physically, including neurologically, which may result in cognitive decrements.

Crew selection and training can also mitigate risks of cognitive decrements. One example is that individuals differ in their ability to maintain performance during sleep deprivation. Identifying such individual differences for use in crew selection may be a way to reduce the effects of irregular sleep schedules. Training can enhance knowledge and application of fields such as medicine, robotics, and navigation. Mental skills such as decision making, risk estimation, or sustained attention can be strengthened through training. NASA should develop protocols for just-in-time training and retraining based on expected and observed learning decrements across time.

##### **Real Time**

During the mission, countermeasures can be applied to maintain cognitive performance at pre-mission levels, or to return it to baseline levels after a decrement. Some ways to accomplish this include training, including refresher training; procedure design to be adaptive to crew needs and

performance levels; and dynamic task allocation. These may require embedded measures to detect the necessity for a change in the level of automation or level of prompting in procedures.

Pharmacological countermeasures may be used: stimulants can enhance performance for fatigued individuals; sedatives can enable sleep to restore performance. Other pharmacological measures need to be investigated for efficacy, side effects, and interactions.

Scheduling must be adjusted to accommodate cognitive performance. As mentioned above, studies of tradeoffs between time and accuracy indicate that some tasks may be performed adequately well if they can be done more slowly. Schedule adjustments to accommodate refresher training, or rest for overly fatigued personnel, can maintain or restore performance.

## **Conclusion**

We extend our thanks and appreciation to the participants in the “Cognition in Space Workshop I: Metrics and Models” who gave their time and expertise to help HSI/NASA begin planning for a rigorous and accountable research program on the risk management of cognitive human performance and error. All participants were subject matter experts in and outside of the government in how to measure and model cognition and performance. A list of the participants is found in Appendix A. The workshop generated eight recommendations from four subgoals: development of a human-centered design process that incorporates standards for human cognition, human performance, and assessment of human interfaces; identification and assessment of factors that increase risks associated with cognition; prediction of risks associated with cognition problems; and cognitive decrement risk mitigation.

The workshop leaders will communicate and encourage required funding and implementation of the eight recommendations to Human Systems Integration, Human Research & Technology Directorate at NASA Headquarters. If approved, some of the recommendations can be implemented immediately, such as reviews of the relevant literature (recommendations 2 and 4) and setting up a meeting with the DARPA Augmented Cognition Program Manager (recommendation 7). Assessment of cognitive performance and related factors as well as consistent validation procedures will be multiyear processes that will need to be annually reviewed for progress and appropriate alignment with operational goals (recommendations 3, 5, and 6). Developing a strategic plan relating modeling to operational planning and expanding the HSI Program to systematically develop requirements and guidelines to enhance procedure and training development will be ongoing reiterative processes, based on completion of other recommendations and dialogue with all involved stakeholders (recommendations 1 and 8).

In addition to following through on the recommendations listed above, future activities include a second workshop on risk mitigation and requirements and continued dialogue with stakeholders, NASA centers, and the broader research community.

## Evidence path for cognitive testing in space flight




Figure 1: Evidence path for cognitive testing in space flight. (credit: David Dinges, National Space Biomedical Research Institute)

## Path for incorporating modeling in operational planning




Figure 2: Path for incorporating modeling in operational planning. (Product of workshop participants.)

## Appendix A: Workshop Participants

Name	Institution	Email
Jeanne Becker	National Space Biomedical Research Institute	<a href="mailto:jbecker@bcm.tmc.edu">jbecker@bcm.tmc.edu</a>
Paul D. Campbell	Lockheed Martin/NASA Johnson Space Center	<a href="mailto:paul.d.campbell1@jsc.nasa.gov">paul.d.campbell1@jsc.nasa.gov</a>
Christopher F. Chabris, Ph.D.	Harvard University	<a href="mailto:cfc@wjh.harvard.edu">cfc@wjh.harvard.edu</a>
David F. Dinges, Ph.D.	University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine	<a href="mailto:dinges@mail.med.upenn.edu">dinges@mail.med.upenn.edu</a>
Randall W. Engle, Ph.D.	Georgia Institute of Technology	<a href="mailto:randall.engle@psych.gatech.edu">randall.engle@psych.gatech.edu</a>
Edna Fiedler, Ph.D.	National Space Biomedical Research Institute/NASA Johnson Space Center	<a href="mailto:efiedler@bcm.tmc.edu">efiedler@bcm.tmc.edu</a>
Dr. Kirby Gilliland	University of Oklahoma	<a href="mailto:kirby@ou.edu">kirby@ou.edu</a>
Dr. Kevin Gluck	Air Force Research Laboratory	<a href="mailto:Kevin.Gluck@mesa.afmc.af.mil">Kevin.Gluck@mesa.afmc.af.mil</a>
Dr. Glenn Gunzelmann	Air Force Research Laboratory	<a href="mailto:glenn.gunzelmann@mesa.afmc.af.mil">glenn.gunzelmann@mesa.afmc.af.mil</a>
Jon Holbrook, Ph.D.	NASA Ames Research Center/San Jose State University	<a href="mailto:jholbrook@mail.arc.nasa.gov">jholbrook@mail.arc.nasa.gov</a>
Dr. Steven R. Hursh	Science Applications International Corporation, Behavioral Biology Center John Hopkins University School of Medicine	<a href="mailto:hurshs@saic.com">hurshs@saic.com</a>
Dr. Amishi P. Jha	University of Pennsylvania	<a href="mailto:apjha@psych.upenn.edu">apjha@psych.upenn.edu</a>
Wynona Johnson-McAfee	Lockheed Martin/NASA Johnson Space Center	<a href="mailto:wynona.johnson-mcafee1@jsc.nasa.gov">wynona.johnson-mcafee1@jsc.nasa.gov</a>
Robert L. Kane, Ph.D.	Veterans Administration Maryland Health Care System	<a href="mailto:robert.kane@med.va.gov">robert.kane@med.va.gov</a>
Dr. Steven Kosslyn	Harvard University	<a href="mailto:smk@wjh.harvard.edu">smk@wjh.harvard.edu</a>
Michael Krusmark	L3 Communications, Air Force Research Laboratory	<a href="mailto:michael.krusmark@mesa.afmc.af.mil">michael.krusmark@mesa.afmc.af.mil</a>
Dr. Don Lyon	L3 Communications, Air Force Research Laboratory	<a href="mailto:don.lyon@mesa.afmc.af.mil">don.lyon@mesa.afmc.af.mil</a>
Cynthia Null, Ph.D.	NASA Engineering and Safety Center/NASA Ames Research Center	<a href="mailto:cynthia.h.null@nasa.gov">cynthia.h.null@nasa.gov</a>
Roger Remington	NASA Ames Research Center	<a href="mailto:roger.w.remington@nasa.gov">roger.w.remington@nasa.gov</a>
Dr. Robert Schlegel	University of Oklahoma	<a href="mailto:schlegel@ou.edu">schlegel@ou.edu</a>
Walter Sipes, Ph.D.	Wyle Laboratories/NASA Johnson Space Center	<a href="mailto:wsipes@wylehou.com">wsipes@wylehou.com</a>
Dr. Hans Van Dongen	University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine	<a href="mailto:vdongen@mail.med.upenn.edu">vdongen@mail.med.upenn.edu</a>
Carl Walz	NASA Headquarters	
Barbara Woolford, Ph.D.	NASA Johnson Space Center	<a href="mailto:barbara.i.woolford@nasa.gov">barbara.i.woolford@nasa.gov</a>

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave Blank)	2. REPORT DATE June 2005	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED NASA Technical Memorandum		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Cognition in Space Workshop I: Metrics and Models Final Report			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) B. Woolford, E. Fielder				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Johnson Space Center			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBERS S-956	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National Aeronautics and Space Administration Washington, DC 20546-0001			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER TM-2005-213161	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT  Unclassified/Unlimited Available from the NASA Center for AeroSpace Information (CASI) 7121 Standard Hanover, MD 21076-1320 Category: 53			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)  "Cognition in Space Workshop I: Metrics and Models" was the first in a series of workshops sponsored by NASA to develop an integrated research and development plan supporting human cognition in space exploration. The workshop was held in Chandler, Arizona, October 25–27, 2004. The participants represented academia, government agencies, and medical centers. This workshop addressed the following goal of the NASA Human System Integration Program for Exploration: to develop a program to manage risks due to human performance and human error, specifically ones tied to cognition. Risks range from catastrophic error to degradation of efficiency and failure to accomplish mission goals. Cognition itself includes memory, decision making, initiation of motor responses, sensation, and perception. Four subgoals were also defined at the workshop as follows: (1) NASA needs to develop a human-centered design process that incorporates standards for human cognition, human performance, and assessment of human interfaces; (2) NASA needs to identify and assess factors that increase risks associated with cognition; (3) NASA needs to predict risks associated with cognition; and (4) NASA needs to mitigate risk, both prior to actual missions and in real time. This report develops the material relating to these four subgoals.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS  cognition; exploration, space flight; risk; management, human resources; responses, physiological; sensory perception; perception; human performance			15. NUMBER OF PAGES  18	16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT  Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE  Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT  Unlimited	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT  Unlimited	





---