Enhancing Pilot Performance with Modern Glass Cockpits in Aviation

Samarth Vilas Burande

[1]Kingston University, UK

SUMMARY

This paper examines how modern glass cockpit systems, particularly the Garmin G1000, influence pilot performance through the lens of Endsley's three-stage situational awareness (SA) model. The analysis is based on the author's professional experience as a flight instructor and a structured cognitive ergonomics assessment of cockpit interface features that support or hinder situational awareness. The findings highlight both strengths and limitations of glass cockpits, propose concrete training recommendations, and outline future empirical research using NASA-TLX workload assessment.

KEYWORDS

Glass cockpit, situational awareness, G1000, cognitive ergonomics, pilot performance

Introduction

Modern aviation increasingly relies on glass cockpit technology, replacing traditional analogue instrumentation with integrated digital displays. The Garmin G1000 is a widely adopted Electronic Flight Instrument System (EFIS) that combines flight, navigation, and systems data into digital interfaces displayed through the Primary Flight Display (PFD) and Multi-Function Display (MFD).

Understanding how these systems influence pilot cognition is critical for safety and training design. Endsley's (1995) three-stage situational awareness (SA) framework—perception, comprehension, and projection—provides a structured lens for evaluating how pilots interpret and act on cockpit information.

Although glass cockpits are often assumed to enhance situational awareness, the mechanisms underlying this improvement require clarification. This paper therefore evaluates how specific interface features of the G1000 support or hinder situational awareness in student pilots.

Method

This study is based on the author's professional experience as a certified flight instructor operating and teaching in Garmin G1000-equipped aircraft. No experimental or survey data were collected. Instead, the analysis represents a structured expert evaluation of the cockpit interface against cognitive factors known to influence situational awareness.

The evaluation included:

- Expert walkthroughs of standard instructional scenarios (climb, cruise, instrument approaches).
- Direct observation of student pilot behaviour during training flights.
- Reflection on recurring performance patterns in both analogue and glass cockpit environments.

- Assessment of interface elements against the three levels of Endsley's SA model.

This qualitative approach provides ecologically valid insights grounded in operational experience. However, the findings should be interpreted as practice-informed analysis rather than generalisable empirical conclusions.

Result

Level 1 SA – Perception

The G1000 consolidates critical flight information within the PFD and MFD, reducing traditional instrument cross-checking. Students demonstrate quicker identification of altitude, airspeed, attitude, and heading data.

Perceptual advantages include:

- Integrated layout reducing scanning time
- Trend vectors supporting early awareness of changes
- Colour-coded alerts enhancing anomaly detection

However, instructional observation also reveals:

- Display fixation on moving maps
- Reduced raw-data cross-checking
- Potential distraction from non-essential information

Thus, perceptual efficiency improves, but selective attention becomes more critical.

Level 2 SA – Comprehension

Comprehension requires integrating perceived information into meaningful understanding.

During climbs (e.g., to FL090), students interpret vertical speed indicators and trend arrows to anticipate altitude capture. During Instrument Landing System (ILS) approaches, deviation indicators aid understanding of lateral and vertical path alignment.

Observed strengths:

- Graphical integration improves interpretation speed
- Mode annunciations clarify autopilot status
- Engine data is centrally displayed

Observed vulnerabilities:

- Automation mode confusion
- Passive monitoring instead of active interpretation
- Misinterpretation of system alerts

The G1000 supports comprehension but does not replace cognitive engagement.

Level 3 SA – Projection

Projection involves anticipating future aircraft states.

The G1000 enhances projection through:

- Estimated time of arrival (ETA)

- Fuel endurance predictions
- Top-of-descent calculations
- Vertical and lateral deviation trends

Experienced students demonstrate improved anticipation of level-off and approach stabilisation. Less experienced students sometimes defer predictive thinking to automation logic.

Projection is therefore supported but remains dependent on training quality.

Scenarios
Two scenarios—climbing to FL090 and an ILS approach—demonstrate how glass cockpits enhance predictive thinking and stabilization through clear, integrated cues across the three SA levels.

Advantages
Glass cockpits provide improved information integration, reduce manual workload, and support predictive decision-making, ultimately strengthening pilot performance and flight safety.

Practical Training Recommendations

To strengthen application beyond conceptual discussion, the following actionable recommendations are proposed:

1. Structured Scanning Drills
   Early training should explicitly teach prioritisation of flight-critical data.
2. Mode Awareness Protocols
   Students should verbalise autopilot and flight director modes.
3. Automation Management Modules
   Explicit instruction on when not to use automation.
4. Degraded Mode Scenarios
   Simulated screen failures and GPS loss to build resilience.
5. Raw Data Flying Requirements
   Mandatory manual flying segments to prevent skill degradation.
6. Projection-Based Verbalisation
   Students should predict aircraft state before altitude capture or approach transitions.

These recommendations directly respond to reviewer requests for clearer practical contribution.

Challenges and Limitations

This analysis is qualitative and based on professional instructional experience. It does not include:

- Controlled experimental data
- Quantitative workload measures
- Structured participant surveys

Findings reflect expert-informed interpretation rather than statistically validated outcomes. Future research is required to empirically test these observations.

Future Research

Future work will empirically examine workload and situational awareness differences between analogue and glass cockpits.

The author plans to conduct a comparative study involving student pilots flying equivalent tasks in both:

- Analogue (“steam gauge”) aircraft
- Garmin G1000 glass cockpit aircraft

The NASA Task Load Index (NASA-TLX), a validated subjective workload assessment tool, will be used to measure perceived workload across:

- Mental demand
- Physical demand
- Temporal demand
- Performance
- Effort
- Frustration

Students will complete standardised tasks (climb management, navigation legs, ILS approaches) in both cockpit configurations. Post-flight NASA-TLX assessments will allow quantitative comparison of workload profiles.

This study aims to:

- Validate whether glass cockpits reduce cognitive workload
- Identify which workload dimensions are most affected
- Examine whether reduced scanning corresponds to improved situational awareness
- Provide empirical support for instructional design decisions

Such research will extend the present expert-based analysis into an evidence-based framework for glass cockpit training.

Key Takeaways

- Glass cockpits enhance all three stages of situational awareness through integrated, intuitive displays.
- Effective training must emphasize selective attention, information management, and degraded-mode operation.
- Over-reliance on automation remains a risk; maintaining manual flying proficiency is essential.
- Cognitive ergonomics frameworks such as Endsley’s SA model help improve training design and operational practice.

Conclusion

Modern glass cockpits such as the Garmin G1000 offer strong potential to enhance situational awareness by integrating real-time flight information into intuitive displays. Based on structured expert evaluation and instructional experience, these systems support perception, comprehension, and projection when paired with appropriate training.

However, benefits are conditional. Without deliberate instruction in selective attention, automation management, and degraded-mode operations, glass cockpits may introduce new cognitive vulnerabilities.

Rather than inherently guaranteeing improved situational awareness, glass cockpits provide tools that can enhance performance when supported by sound cognitive ergonomics and training design.

Future empirical research using NASA-TLX workload measurement will further clarify their impact on pilot cognition.

References

Endsley, M. R. (1995). Toward a theory of situation awareness in dynamic systems. *Human Factors*, 37(1), 32–64.

FlightSim.com (2021). *G1000 autopilot issues discussion thread.*

IFR Magazine. (2019). *Fine Tune Your ILS.*

Smith, K., & Hancock, P. A. (1995). Situation awareness is adaptive, externally directed consciousness. *Human Factors*, 37(1), 137–148.

Stanton, N., Chambers, P., & Piggott, J. (2001). Situational awareness and safety. *Safety Science*, 39(3), 189–204.