Applied Human Factors and Ergonomics (AHFE2025), Vol. 199, 2025, 2061–2069
https://doi.org/10.54941/ahfe1007018

The Role of Health and Cognitive Resilience in Transportation

Debra Henneberry[1], Dimitrios Ziakkas[1], and Anastasios Plioutsias[2]

[1]Purdue University, School of Aviation and Transportation Technology, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA

[2]Coventry University, School of Future Transport Engineering, Coventry, CV1 2JH, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

Human performance is a critical pillar of safety in modern transportation systems. Whether in aviation, rail, maritime, or road operations, the ability of personnel to manage high workloads, unexpected disruptions, and long-duty hours relies heavily on both their physical health and cognitive resilience. As transportation systems become increasingly complex and interconnected, understanding and supporting the physiological and psychological readiness of human operators is essential. This paper explores the intersection of health, cognitive resilience, and emerging technologies, specifically the role of wearable devices and affective computing, in enhancing human performance across safety-critical transport domains. Health and cognitive resilience are deeply interlinked. Operators suffering from fatigue, poor sleep hygiene, stress, or underlying health conditions are more prone to errors, reduced situational awareness, and impaired decision-making. Cognitive resilience, the capacity to adapt, focus, and recover during high-pressure or unexpected situations, is increasingly recognized as a core competency for transportation personnel. Through field studies and case analyses, this paper highlights how cognitive lapses often correlate with degraded health conditions, both of which are rarely detected by traditional supervision or self-reporting alone. The integration of wearable technologies offers a promising solution. Devices capable of continuously monitoring heart rate variability, sleep patterns, fatigue levels, hydration, and stress indicators are enabling real-time assessments of operator readiness. Paired with intelligent data interpretation, these wearables are no longer just passive trackers but active tools in predictive safety management. Beyond physiological metrics, social and affective computing expands the monitoring scope to emotional and cognitive states. Using facial recognition, voice pattern analysis, and behavioral cues, these systems can estimate affective load, detect early signs of burnout or anxiety, and support more nuanced decision-making around task assignment and crew pairing. Affective computing can also be embedded in simulators and training environments, offering personalized feedback on stress responses and emotional regulation under simulated high-stakes scenarios. Importantly, the paper emphasizes a human-in-the-loop approach, where technology augments, not replaces, professional judgment. Ethical considerations regarding privacy, consent, and the use of biometric data are also addressed, advocating for transparent protocols and employee involvement in the design and implementation of systems. Resistance often stems from fears of surveillance or punitive use of data, so building trust is essential for long-term adoption. Ultimately, promoting operator health and cognitive resilience, supported by wearable and affective technologies, creates a safer and more adaptable transportation workforce. In the future of transport, where humans and machines increasingly collaborate, understanding and supporting the human condition will be just as vital as optimizing the technology itself.

Keywords: Cognitive resilience, Wearable technology, Affective computing, Transportation safety, Human performance, Predictive monitoring

INTRODUCTION

Modern transport operations demand operators who can sustain attention, regulate workload, and adapt rapidly under uncertainty. Adverse health states, fatigue, degraded sleep, stress, and unmanaged conditions erode situational awareness and decision quality, elevating risk. Established safety and training frameworks (Reason's organizational accident theory; Human Factors Analysis and Classification System (HFACS), Line Operations Safety Audit (LOSA), Evidence-Based Training (EBT) and Competency-Based Training & Assessment (CBTA)) remain essential lenses for connecting human condition with system performance (Reason, 1997; Wiegmann & Shappell, 2003; Kanki, Anca, & Helmreich, 2010; ICAO, 2013).

Cultural dynamics shape how strain is voiced, how challenges are framed, and how teams calibrate workload, especially in multinational crews. Incorporating Cultural Intelligence (CQ) into training and supervision improves how signals of fatigue or stress are interpreted without stereotyping (Helmreich & Merritt, 1998; Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

New sensing and analytics capabilities make it feasible to monitor readiness more continuously and ethically. Wearables estimate fatigue and recovery via heart rate variability (HRV) and sleep regularity; affective computing infers stress and cognitive load from voice and facial behavior (Ziakkas et al., 2024). Properly designed, these tools are instruments, not replacements, of professional judgment and integrate naturally with CBTA (ICAO, 2013)/EBT and just-culture practices.

METHODOLOGY

We adopt an interpretivist, translational methodology that specifies where health and cognitive-resilience signals fit into existing safety frameworks and operational rhythms across transport modes. Six strands structure the work: framework alignment, sensing & indicators, affective analytics, predictive monitoring (Ziakkas et al., 2024) and alerting, governance & ethics, and cultural/competency integration (Reason, 1997; HFACS (Wiegmann & Shappell, 2003); LOSA (Kanki, Anca, & Helmreich, 2010); CRM/CBTA; ICAO, 2013).

Operations follow a human-in-the-loop approach: indicators are triaged for conversation and coaching, rather than being governed by deterministic gates. Supervisors trained in data literacy and crew resource management (CRM)/CBTA (ICAO, 2013) interpret outputs, accept/annotate/reject them, and document rationale; artifacts (model cards, configs, logs) preserve chain-of-custody and legal defensibility (Table 1).

Table 1: Research methodology overview.

Methodology Strand	Purpose / Techniques	Key Outputs	Implications for Practice
Framework alignment	Map health/cognitive metrics to HF frameworks (Reason; HFACS preconditions; LOSA threat–error; CRM/CBTA markers).	Readiness constructs tied to existing codes; fatigue/stress as preconditions and situational factors.	Keep 'health & resilience' visible in HFACS/LOSA coding and debriefs; target roster, breaks, and team practices.
Sensing & indicators (wearables)	Continuous or near-real-time HRV, sleep regularity, circadian alignment, hydration proxies; secure ingestion.	Readiness index with confidence bounds; circadian misalignment flags.	Use as triage and trend, not diagnosis; couple with roster planning and fatigue-risk management.
Affective analytics	Voice prosody, speech timing/interruptions, facial and behavioral cues in simulators and briefings (non-punitive).	Affective-load estimates; markers of cognitive tunnelling, hesitancy, or overload.	Embed in training/debrief tools; CQ-informed interpretation to avoid cultural misreads.
Predictive monitoring & alerting	Multimodal fusion of physiological and contextual data; explainable thresholds; trend detection.	Early-warning advisories (pre-duty, pre-task); roster/crew-pairing decision support.	Alerts to supervisors and operators; advisory phrasing calibrated to minimize stigma and maximize uptake.
Governance & ethics	Consent, data minimization, purpose limitation; model cards, audit trails, replayable analyses.	Chain-of-custody artifacts; privacy/consent records; explanation interfaces.	Treat artifacts as evidence; align with just-culture and CBTA assessment practices.
Cultural & competency integration	CQ-aware rubrics; instructor guides; Kirkpatrick evaluation; ADDIE design of modules.	CQ-aligned behavioral markers for resilience under stress (paraphrase/summary; calibrated directness).	Institutionalize CQ in CRM/CBTA; evaluate transfer to line ops; adapt scripts to local norms.

Finally, the limitations of research and human factors are acknowledged. The paper synthesizes and operationalizes existing knowledge; it does not present a new multi-site dataset. The methodological intent is to shorten the distance between theory and safer operations, preparing the ground for rigorous follow-on evaluation.

FINDINGS

Across transport modes, our research findings indicate that operator health and cognitive resilience function not as peripheral "wellness" variables but as proximal determinants of attention, judgment, and team coordination under time pressure. When physiological readiness measures, especially sleep regularity, circadian alignment, and heart rate variability trends, are read through established human factors grammars, they clarify how fatigue and stress operate as preconditions for unsafe acts rather than as isolated individual failings. Positioning readiness cues within HFACS (Wiegmann & Shappell, 2003) and LOSA (Kanki, Anca, & Helmreich, 2010) makes it easier for supervisors and crews to treat degraded states as threats to be collectively managed, through workload redistribution, microbreaks, and task rotation, rather than as grounds for blame. In this framing, health and cognitive resilience translate directly into threat–error management, and their influence can be tracked across an event's temporal structure using the same shared categories that anchor investigations and line observations.

The most practical gains emerged when readiness signals were handled as trend over threshold indicators rather than as hard gates. Units that combined simple trend summaries from wearables with brief, respectful pre-duty conversations reported more consistent identification of circadian misalignment and cumulative fatigue before high workload shifts. Importantly, the value of these indicators was amplified when they were synchronized with operational context, roster history, sector complexity, and environmental conditions, so that advisories pointed to feasible adjustments in crew pairing, task sequencing, and break planning. Additionally when these conversations were situated in the familiar language of CRM (Kanki, Anca, & Helmreich, 2010; Helmreich, Merritt, & Wilhelm, 1999) and CBTA (ICAO, 2013), they catalyzed specific behavioral commitments (explicit cross monitoring, paraphrase/summary under load, calibrated directness during time critical exchanges) rather than generic admonitions to "be careful." In this sense, readiness data became a catalyst for the behaviors that the competency frameworks already value (Ziakkas et al., 2024).

Effective computing tools contributed to making cognitive load and emotional regulation more visible in both training and operations. Voice based timing measures, overlaps, and prosodic shifts, along with facial and posture cues in simulator recordings, helped instructors and line leaders differentiate between cognitive tunnelling, hesitancy, and strategic silence. Moreover, the same tools exhibited drift across accents and speech norms; raw "stress" estimates were least reliable when linguistic variety was greatest. The units that benefited from affective analytics were those that treated outputs as prompts for inquiry and overlaid them with Cultural Intelligence (CQ) practices (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008). In debriefs, instructors used CQ-informed questions, noting whether a quiet response signalled deference (Helmreich & Merritt, 1998), uncertainty, or disengagement, and adjusted their coaching accordingly. This combination reduced false positives and focused feedback on pragmatic language choices, turn taking, and invitation to dissent phrasing that aligned with team composition. The pattern mirrors the broader case for culturally intelligent CRM (Kanki, Anca, & Helmreich, 2010; Helmreich, Merritt, & Wilhelm, 1999): technology supplies traces of affect and coordination; CQ helps interpret those traces without stereotyping.

Readiness and affective signals were most credible when embedded in governance structures that guaranteed explainability, replay, and human review. Advisory interfaces that disclosed what moved (e.g., a two-night drop in sleep regularity) and why it mattered (evidence linking that pattern to error-trapping degradation) achieved higher uptake than opaque scores. Likewise, making model cards, configuration manifests, and inference logs part of the evidentiary file, along with clear purpose limitation and consent records, reduced resistance and facilitated regulatory dialogue. The lesson is consonant with the legitimacy conditions articulated for AI-assisted safety work more generally: chain-of-custody, reproducibility, and expert oversight are not implementation niceties; they are the preconditions for trust, learning, and defensibility.

Furthermore, cross domain analyses suggested that the shape of the benefit varied with operational cadence. In aviation, predeparture "readiness reviews" supported actionable decisions regarding call distribution, sterile cockpit discipline during busy phases, and the explicit delegation of crosschecks when a crew member showed reduced recovery capabilities. In rail, circadian prompts were most consequential on extended night rosters and during disruption recovery, where minor adjustments to handovers and relief timing yielded outsized effects on vigilance. In maritime bridge teams and port operations, the integration of physiological trends with communication markers helped explain extended silences and narrowed vocabulary following plan changes, steering coaching toward structured invitations to challenge rather than toward generic exhortations to "speak up." Road operations, with their prolonged single operator segments, benefited from microbreak prompts and hydration cues bundled with route risk data; combining these with CBTA style behavioral commitments produced measurable gains in checklist discipline at restarts. Across modes, the most durable improvements occurred where supervisors explicitly mapped advisories to recognizable CRM (Kanki, Anca, & Helmreich, 2010; Helmreich, Merritt, & Wilhelm, 1999) behaviors and where crews could see how those behaviors mitigated context specific threats.

Measurement strategies were strongest when they linked readiness interventions to observable team behaviors and operational outcomes. Beyond tracking the availability of data, units monitored briefing completeness, paraphrase/summary frequency, challenge and response latency, handover clarity, and the incidence of LOSA coded undesired states. Framed within Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick's (2006) L3/L4, this allowed training teams to infer whether gains were being transferred into line operations and to localize where additional support was needed (for instance, whether challenges were absent or merely unheard during high-tempo periods). Instructors reported that once debriefs included culturally calibrated markers, how dissent was invited, how acknowledgment was voiced, feedback shifted from abstract cultural commentary to specific, coachable behaviors. The integration of CQ (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008) into these markers also served as a check on premature closure. When instructors asked what a quiet "yes" meant in a given context and how others perceived it, they encouraged metacognitive habits that are transferable across cultures.

Risks clustered around three themes: *misinterpretation, stigma, and overreach*. *Misinterpretation* arose when physiological signals were taken as diagnoses rather than as hypotheses; this was mitigated by trend-based logic, baselining, and explicit uncertainty descriptions in the advisory. *Stigma* emerged when crews believed the signals would be used punitively; this was countered by just-culture commitments, privacy controls, and a consistent practice of routing advisories first to the operator with clear self-management options. *Overreach* occurred when analytics drifted beyond readiness into performance grading; the corrective was to keep analytics closely tied to safety-relevant behaviors and to preserve human primacy over meaning and consequence. In all cases, transparency about purpose, learning, not surveillance, proved decisive for uptake.

Finally, the findings suggest that health and cognitive resilience measures can be made actionable when they are translated into the existing grammar of safety work and interpreted with cultural literacy (Table 2).

Table 2: Research findings overview.

Finding	Where It Matters (use Case)	CQ/Safety Link	Implications
Readiness triage reduces risk without stigma	Pre-duty and pre-task checks in high-workload operations (winter ops; complex port maneuvers)	Frames fatigue as HFACS precondition; LOSA threat–error management (Reason, 1997; Wiegmann & Shappell, 2003; Kanki et al., 2010)	Add readiness prompts to briefings; schedule micro-breaks/rotation; document decisions in CRM/CBTA (ICAO, 2013).
Affective cues refine coaching and debriefs	High-tempo simulator sessions; ambiguous authority situations	CRM challenge-and-response; CQ interpretation of silence/mitigation (Helmreich & Merritt, 1998; Ang & Van Dyne, 2008)	Use transcripts/plots to separate 'challenge absent' vs. 'challenge unheard'; adopt culturally adaptive phrasing.
Cultural calibration prevents misreads of stress/load	Multinational crews; accented English; indirect-speech contexts	CQ behavioral & cognitive dimensions; uncertainty-avoidance norms (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Hofstede & Minkov, 2010)	Include CQ prompts in debrief UIs; SOP language that explicitly invites dissent and clarification.
Predictive pairing stabilizes performance under extended duty	Long-haul and disrupted rosters; fatigue accumulation	CRM teamwork & monitoring; HFACS preconditions visible in rosters (Kanki et al., 2010; Wiegmann & Shappell, 2003)	Pair lower-readiness with high-recovery peers; assign explicit cross-monitoring roles; record in CBTA/EBT.
Transparency sustains adoption and data quality	Units deploying wearables/affective analytics	Just-culture; explainability and chain-of-custody (ICAO, 2013; Ziakkas et al., 2024)	Provide consent dashboards; publish model cards; ensure replayable analyses; firewall from punitive uses.

Physiological and affective indicators draw attention to periods when vigilance, working memory, and social coordination are most fragile; CRM (Kanki, Anca, & Helmreich, 2010; Helmreich, Merritt, & Wilhelm, 1999) and CBTA (ICAO, 2013) provide the behaviorally anchored pathways for mitigation; CQ (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008) supplies the interpretive guardrails that prevent data from hardening into stereotype. The combined effect is neither technological determinism nor "soft skills" rhetoric, but a disciplined practice in which crews acquire earlier warnings, make clearer commitments, and sustain psychologically safe dialogue under load. The conceptual contribution is to reposition resilience not as a trait or slogan, but as a managed resource, observable in patterns of speech, coordination, and recovery. The practical contribution is to demonstrate how modest instrumentation, competent interpretation, and explicit cultural ergonomics can shift error-trapping from aspiration to habit.

CONCLUSION

The collected evidence data supports a practical, ethically grounded case for integrating health and cognitive-resilience instrumentation into safety-critical transport operations. The central premise is not that sensors or affective algorithms can adjudicate readiness, but that thoughtfully designed indicators, couched in the shared language of human-factors practice, can facilitate the right conversations occurring sooner and more consistently. That premise aligns with the field's long view: investigations and line observations have always made preconditions visible and manageable; readiness signals simply sharpen the lens and shorten the time between risk emergence and meaningful response. The legitimacy of this integration depends on the same conditions that govern any analytic aid in safety work, including transparency, reproducibility, and human primacy, as well as a just culture stance that treats data as a support for learning, not an instrument of sanction.

A sustainable pathway begins with translation rather than reinvention. Organizations should embed readiness prompts into the rhythms they already trust, pretask briefings, handovers, and post-event debriefs, so that physiological and affective traces are interpreted through HFACS (Wiegmann & Shappell, 2003) and LOSA (Kanki, Anca, & Helmreich, 2010) categories and resolved into CRM/CBTA (ICAO, 2013) behaviors. This makes advisories intelligible in context and positions supervisors to act on them without inventing parallel processes. It also preserves the moral architecture of safety practice: the discussion is about how to manage known threats and errors, rather than policing bodies or pathologizing personalities. When the same categories that scaffold investigations and training are used to make sense of readiness trends, data ceases to be an alien overlay and becomes one more thread in the fabric of disciplined work.

Competence is the following condition. Crews, instructors, and supervisors need fluency not in the internals of algorithms but in the use of indicators: how to read uncertainty, how to detect common confounders, and how to marry trend information to specific commitments in talk and task. CQ (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008) belongs here as well, because the interpretation of silence, turn taking, and hedging varies with culture; without cultural literacy, affective traces risk reinforcing bias rather than improving coordination. As a result, governance must do more than reassure; it should enable scrutiny.

Policy and collaboration widen the aperture. Inter-agency exchanges of scenarios, de-identified datasets, and validation protocols accelerate learning and guard against parochialism; they also help the field converge on minimal documentation and explainability standards. Crucially, these collaborations should include sociolinguists and cultural-psychology expertise, so that cross-cultural interpretation is not left to ad hoc folk theories. When guidance documents show how to calibrate advisories and debriefs for mixed-nationality teams, organizations avoid the familiar trap of exporting a single communication style as "neutral." In parallel, manufacturers and tool vendors should be asked to meet cultural-ergonomics requirements in their human–machine interfaces, so that alerts and advisories are more likely to be received as help rather than as surveillance.

Additionally, some limits ought to be acknowledged. Physiological metrics are sensitive to illness, medication, and hydration; affective inferences drift with language and context; and any measurement can invite gaming if incentives are misaligned. None of these invalidate the approach; they set the boundaries of responsible use. Future work should quantify effects with the same rigor used to evaluate other safety interventions: changes in LOSA-coded undesired states, timing and quality of challenge-and-response, and the stability of handovers under load. Mixed-methods designs that combine behavioral observation, psychophysiological measures, and operational outcomes will be most informative. However, the goal of research is not only to determine the effect size; it is also to develop pattern literacy, understanding when and for whom readiness advisories change behavior, and where cultural calibration is decisive for uptake. The field will advance most rapidly when evaluation is integrated into practice rather than staged as a rarefied add-on, and when negative findings are shared as readily as positive ones.

What emerges is a modest claim with significant implications: supporting health and cognitive resilience with wearable sensing and culturally intelligent interpretation does not replace human judgment; it equips professionals to enact it under pressure. When advisories speak the language of safety frameworks, when crews are trained to translate signals into clear commitments, and when governance lets claims be traced and challenged, readiness ceases to be an abstraction and becomes a manageable dimension of everyday work. The measure of success is not dashboards filled with numbers but briefings that are crisper, handovers that are cleaner, and teams that preserve curiosity in the very moments when fatigue and stress would otherwise narrow perception. That is how resilience becomes operational and how safety culture earns its name.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank Purdue and Coventry University faculty members and HF Horizons analysts for their invaluable feedback, which contributed to this work.

REFERENCES

Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (2008). *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications*. M. E. Sharpe.

Helmreich, R. L., & Merritt, A. C. (1998). *Culture at work in aviation and medicine*. Ashgate.

Helmreich, R. L., Merritt, A. C., & Wilhelm, J. A. (1999). The evolution of Crew Resource Management training in commercial aviation. *International Journal of Aviation Psychology*, *9*(1), 19–32.

Hofstede, G., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). (2013). *Doc 9995: Manual of Evidence-based Training (EBT)*. Montreal, Canada: International Civil Aviation Organization.

Kanki, B. G., Anca, J., & Helmreich, R. L. (2010). *Crew resource management* (2nd ed.). Academic Press.

Kirkpatrick, D. L., & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2006). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels* (3rd ed.). Berrett-Koehler.

Reason, J. (1997). *Managing the risks of organizational accidents*. Ashgate.

Wiegmann, D. A., Shappell, S. A. (2003). *A human error approach to aviation accident analysis: The human factors analysis and classification system*. Routledge.

Ziakkas, D., & Plioutsias, A. (2024). *Artificial intelligence and human performance in transportation*. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003480891.