TPM Vol. 32, No. S1, 2025
ISSN: 1972-6325
https://www.tpmap.org/

Open Access

MEASURING RISK PERCEPTION AND DECISION BIAS IN MECHANICAL DESIGN PROCESSES

BRIJMOHAN SINGH[1], "DR.LALIT SACHDEVA[2], MANVI PANT[3]
[1]ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, KALINGA UNIVERSITY, RAIPUR, INDIA.
e-mail: ku.brijmohansingh@kalingauniversity.ac.in,0009-0008-6455-4017
[2]ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR,KALINGA UNIVERSITY, RAIPUR, INDIA.
e-mail: ku.lalitsachdeva@kalingauniversity.ac.in ORCID:0009-0002-2214-282X"
[3]ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, NEW DELHI INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT, NEW DELHI, INDIA.,
e-mail: manvi.pant@ndimdelhi.org, https://orcid.org/0009-0002-4239-5146

Abstract
In mechanical design contexts where engineers continually confront complex permutations of uncertainty and boundary conditions, the roles of cognitive risk perception and decision error, while undeniably influential, attract minimal explicit scrutiny. This investigation interrogates the extent to which such cognitive, yet tacit, variables distort design deliberations and ultimate judgments. Employing a mixed-methods paradigm, the inquiry integrates quantitative and qualitative data extracted from controlled simulations, guided interviews, and calibrated psychometric inventories calibrated upon a cohort of seasoned mechanical practitioners. Participants sequentially engaged in design trade-off scenarios calibrated to variegated risk spectra, each encompassing trade-offs among safety, cost, and nascent innovation domains. Results reveal that individual risk construction is dominantly mediated by autobiographical experience, habitual cognitive shortcuts, and discipline-specific heuristics. Compounding cognitive distortions—most notably anchoring, availability, and unwarranted overconfidence—systematically dislocated normative rational evaluation. Complementary ocular-tracking and temporal-task analytics corroborated that suboptimal selections coalesced with truncated decision latencies and constricted visual exploratory behaviour. On the basis of these findings, the article articulates a provisional conceptual edifice linking individual risk propensity to discretely observable classes of systematic error within mechanical design workflows.
The findings reported herein inform the development of engineering curricula, the organization of multidisciplinary design teams, and the architecture of adaptive decision-support systems that counteract the effects of risk-related biases. Future research is encouraged to prototype instructional units that explain the mechanics of cognitive biases, alongside analytic tools that embed these principles within computer-aided design (CAD) environments, thereby fostering designs that converge more rigorously upon reliability and validity criteria. Ethical considerations surrounding the unobtrusive monitoring of cognitive states and the realistic modeling of social dynamics within design teams are critically examined. Collectively, this study contributes to the discipline of human-centered engineering by positioning cognitive diversity as a steering variable within adaptive design processes, thus enhancing the resilience and validity of engineered systems.
Keywords: Assessment of risk, biases in decision making, mechanical systems, cognitive shortcuts, engineering assessment, ergonomics, refinement on design and processes.

1. INTRODUCTION

In mechanical design, a holistic approach is imperative, as function, safety, cost, and manufacturability must all be balanced, and decisions made at each step are interdependent. Every decision made is iterative and requires engineering-level judgment. Each design iteration is unique and captures new improvements over previous versions. Individual cognitive factors, such as a person's perception of risk and potential for decision bias, often shapes the design decision-making process [1]. As systems are continuously engineered and integrated, the boundaries within which they function become more constrained, enhancing the importance of psychological factors behind design decision making [6].
Risk perception models capture the ways people comprehend and internalize risks in relation to the statistical information provided [2]. In high-stakes design situations like in pressurized vessels, robotic control systems, or setting safety margins for structural components, perception of risks often overshadows systematic assessment and compromise design choices due to either paralytic over-cautiousness or fervent overconfidence [7]. Inefficient engineering design decisions are further shaped by cognitive biases such as anchoring, confirmation, or loss aversion [5].

Even though accuracy and optimization is a focus in any engineering curriculum, human factors that drive initial choices in a design and mid-process revisions often receive insufficient consideration and attention [4][9][10]. “Hidden” factors that influence the phases of a design integrates frameworks from behavioral engineering and neurocognitive science, and tend to impact a design’s creativity and robustness [12]. However, mechanical design as a domain of engineering receives scant attention in research that empirically investigates these issues [3].

The aim of this research is to address the lack of studies focused on the perception of risk and cognitive biases of engineers in relation to design tasks by exploring these concepts in actual and simulated design tasks. It is expected that the results will aid informing educational, organizational, and technological frameworks focused on human bias and the design of mechanical systems [8].

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The convergence of cognitive psychology and engineering design provides an important perspective regarding decision making in the context of uncertainty in mechanical engineering [11]. Studies on risk perception tell us that the evaluations of risk and uncertainty are more to do with perception and personal emotions than with chances given in numbers [13]. Slavic’s psychometric paradigm, along with the concept of affect heuristics, have been widely used to interpret public perception of risk, but the application of their translation to engineering is just starting to gain some attention. In design contexts, where engineers work in ambiguous and time-constrained environments, subjectively estimated risks can affect creativity as well as the safety margins of the work [14].

One more layer of complexity is added to engineering reasoning due to decision bias, which is well-studied in cognitive science [15]. Research has found that even professionals, engineers included, fall prey to cognitive biases, such as anchoring to initial proposals, confirmation of prior beliefs, and familiar solutions. In mechanical design, some consequences can be including premature convergence on flawed concepts, underestimating unusual failure modes, or overconfidence in safety factors. Simon’s theory of bounded rationality and Kahneman’s dual-process model offer useful perspectives on the balancing act engineers perform between quick, instinctive decisions and slow, analytical reasoning.

It indicates the development of concern for integrating behavioral elements within design education and within software environments. Some proposals put forward the use of cognitive profiling, real-time observation, and collaborative feedback functions to mitigate bias and uphold benchmarked evaluation streamlined against objective thresholds. This study builds upon these concepts by examining the design practice's behavioral influences and proposing a situational architecture for psychology-informed engineering cognitive decision frameworks.

2.1 Risk Perception in Engineering Design

In relation to an engineering design project, an individual's risk perception tends to be a blend of gut feeling and experiential uncertainty imprudence shaped by their experiences rather than quantitative models. In most engineering fields, an individual’s understanding and assessment of risk tends to be in relation to their individual risk tolerance, professional expertise, and experience with related ins studies. This presents different acceptance thresholds during decision making while evaluating design. For instance, a designer who lacks understanding of certain technologies may consider lightweight materials as a risk ‘nay-sayer’ neglecting favorable evaluation results of the material. Such biases may slow down the design collaborative's pace of innovation and design change. This is more pronounced in teams that are expected to converge to a single view of risks and hazards.

2.2 Common Decision Biases in Mechanical Design

Evaluating design engineering mechanically encounters numerous cognitive biases that can impede sound judgment. Anchoring bias influences engineers to hold on to initial estimates or baseline models far more than is rational, even when new data is suggesting better alternatives. In confirmation bias, the designer is prompted to pay selective attention to data that supports their favored design approach while ignoring data which is to the contrary. Risk prioritization is distorted when failure events that come to mind readily are overestimated in likelihood through the Availability heuristic. The described biases lead to making suboptimal choices, overengineering, or too early convergence on the design. These biases need to be recognized in the same way as designing an intervening strategy which could be as simple as a reflective checklist or peer critique loops that are aimed at the unbiased evaluation of the design.

2.3 Theoretical Models Linking Cognition and Engineering Judgment

Various cognitive models assist in revealing an engineer’s information processing and judgment skills in relation to design tasks. Simon’s bounded rationality theory suggests engineers oftentimes ‘satisfice’ instead of optimizing because of limited cognitive resources and information oversaturation. During design iteration, both of the processes Kahneman and Tversky’s dual-process theory offers - fast, intuitive responses (System 1) and slower, analytical reasoning (System 2) - are triggered. These models clarify some of the reasons engineers will likely revert to heuristics under enormous pressure or complicated constraints. More recent extensions within behavioral engineering offer hybrid models that combine elements of task difficulty, the context of the situation, or the environment, and the role of the team to more accurately predict and effectively influence design decision behavior.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study explores the perceptions of risk and decision biases of a specific group of people, mechanical engineers, through a series of simulations and experimental design tasks. The study implements a combination of structured interviews, psychometric testing, and "task simulations" to extract both behavioral patterns and self-reported thoughts from the participants. The sample group was 24 engineers and graduate students from academic and professional networks who, having done mechanical designs for over two years, were put through systematic mechanical design scenarios with competing objectives of safety, cost, and performance.

The three primary tools used were standardized risk perception and bias scales (including the Domain-Specific Risk-Taking Scale), eye-tracking software, and a decision-making simulation interface built with CAD-integrated components. The simulation design tasks were organized into tiers of "low risk," "ambiguous risk," and "high risk." This made it easier to study behavioral changes and biases across varying contexts.

The quantitative data consists of design selection, time metrics for each task, design iterations, and visual scan paths. For qualitative data, participants were interviewed and surveyed post-task, reflecting on their decisions, judgment of confidence, uncertainty levels, and explaining why they executed self-chosen solutions. The data were analyzed utilizing statistical techniques such as ANOVA and regression to assess the relationship between risk perception and design outcome, alongside pattern analysis to extract predominant themes in design reasoning.

The methodology is organized to achieve ecological validity, cognitive realism, as well as reproducibility. Approval for the study was ethical in nature, and procedures were followed regarding consent as well as data collection and storage. There was no personally identifiable information, data was anonymized and held securely. The multimodal framework integrates multiple participants' psychological mechanisms and their decision-making to offer a detailed perspective on the processes that underlie mechanical design.

3.1 Participant Recruitment and Design Task Scenarios

Subjects were sourced from the engineering departments and industry collaborations focusing on seasoned professionals and postgraduate students specializing in mechanical design. Participants in the study were required to have a minimum of two years relevant experience and knowledge of CAD systems. Participants were randomly placed in one of three design problems which differed in their level of perceived risk and design ambiguity. Tasks involved assessing a mechanical linkage's safety, formulating a materials selection with regard to thermal performance, and optimizing a component with cost restrictions. Faculty and industry advisors contributed to the development of these scenarios to ensure their relevance and to approximate the realistic engineering trade-offs that professionals encounter, so as to enhance the ecological validity of the study.

3.2 Tools for Assessing Risk and Bias (100 words)

The study incorporated psychometric evaluations, feedback integrated within tasks, and biometric measurements to assess risk perception and decision-making biases for study participants. Engineering risk perception employed the Domain-Specific Risk-Taking (DOSPERT) scale. Confirmation bias, framing bias, anchor bias, and bias clustering in decision-making were evaluated using scenario-based response tasks. An eye-tracker captured participants' visual and fixation gaze movements during the tasks which aided in the revealing of the attention and heuristic bottleneck phenomena. Data were aligned with design interaction timelines to reveal the context of bias effects on decision time, concentration, and divergence in solutions over several design tasks.

3.3 Data Collection and Analytical Techniques

The process of gathering data was divided into three stages; pre-task cognitive profiling, observing a task as it happens, and reflecting after a task is completed. Guided by cognitive task analysis, participants' design actions, gaze patterns, and temporally referenced decisions were tracked. Debriefing sessions were carried out to capture participants' sentiments and rationalizations associated with the uncertainty they faced. Quantitative data were examined with descriptive analyses, ANOVA, a correlation matrix, and measured interdependencies of the three variables, risk perception, task completion, and decision-making bias. Qualitative data were analyzed and coded by themes with NVivo. The reliability of the findings was enhanced by the integration of different types of data, which provided a comprehensive insight into the manifestation of risk and bias in mechanical design decisions.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study outcomes highlighted several important relationships between risk perception and cognitive biases in decision making in the context of actions within systems engineering design tasks. Those who were more sensitive to risk (high risk perception) over-value engender design more carefully evaluated high-stakes tasks but overvalued conservatism—commonly over-engineering and making excessive use of performance, cost, or safety metrics. On the contrary, the individuals with low-risk perception tended to make decisions quickly but made critical omissions on important failure modes in design ambiguities. The analysis of the design logs confirmed the presence of the anchoring bias as the participant's most prevalent cognitive bias, as they tended to "anchor" on the design which they first settled on and used a lot of contrary evidence to defend that choice. This was true for 68% of tasks with high complexity in which the initial CAD models showed only minimal adaptations. Eye-tracking data confirmed the decisions were biased, as the participants showed low levels of visual sampling with minimal alternative evaluations. Participants showed high levels of confirmation bias, especially the more experienced ones, who tended to load the evidence to support design rules they were used to. Participants who demonstrated greater cognitive flexibility—focusing across many decision nodes—usually produced more balanced designs and made fewer errors in tasks done after a session ended.

Statistical correlations between DOSPERT risk scores and the degree of design conservatism ($r = 0.61$, $p < 0.05$) corroborated the effect of psychological factors on engineering outcomes. As pointed out in the discussion, risk perception and bias in engineering practice have a paradoxical, twofold impact—risk aversion can improve safety, while unbounded cognitive biases hinder creativity and productivity. These insights highlight the need for application of cognitive mentoring and reflective practice in engineering training and practice.

4.1 Patterns of Risk Sensitivity and Heuristic Use

Participants exhibited a broad spectrum of risk sensitivity which notably shaped their design choices. Participants most averse to risk tended to prefer overly redundant protective features and conservative selections of materials and solutions. On the contrary, those more willing to take risks emphasized streamlined efficiency and innovation, at times missing failure probabilities. Heuristics were more pronounced under time pressure, with many drawing on past experience with phrases such as “like past designs” or “tried-and-tested solutions.” Although such heuristics made some decisions faster, they also became more rigid and missed better solutions. This variety of behavior reinforces the point that design aids that combine intuitive reasoning with prompts for deeper thought are needed.

4.2 Cognitive Bias Impact on Design Decisions

Biases such as anchoring and confirmation bias were persistent during the design tasks. Participants were rigid and unyielding with regard to their baseline parameters, and no amount of evidence could shift their predetermined solutions. Confirmation bias was evident as engineers interpreted relevant data to justify their concepts, arguing for their adoption. The design iteration interval increased substantially, and over 50% of the high-risk tasks were executed poorly. The impact was exacerbated during group discussions influenced by more dominant participants, where biased reasoning swayed the group. These findings a seem to call for the distinctively collaborative design environments to incorporate structured peer review and feedback systems alongside systematic debiasing techniques.

4.3 Cross-Participant and Contextual Variability

The difference in people’s contexts sheds light on the decision-making continuum. More experienced engineers were more decisive, although this came with greater bias tendencies, possibly due to heuristic pathways created by prior successes. Younger engineers were more willing to accept revisions, although this openness came at the cost of slower decisive action. Framing tasks also made a difference; conservative biases were more pronounced in safety-oriented, less innovative, and more rigid contexts. Heuristics were more easily activated in tasks with a tight deadline or a limited budget. These contextual considerations imply that to reduce bias and align judgment with design goals, one must adapt to the user profiles and situational contexts.

5. ETHICAL AND FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

Introducing profiling and monitoring systems into engineering raises ethical issues that warrant deliberation. While making better choices, the tools risk perceptions of hyper-surveillance and employee discomfort if transparency is deficient. Presumed social-cognitive biases in design errors forge considerations of complicity and responsibility in systems design—who bears the ethical responsibility, the individual, the collective, or the systems designed to enable them? The ethics of informed consent, privacy, and cognitive monitoring delineate definite boundaries as ethics. The offset of innovation against equity becomes equally troubling when its gain is to the organization. Neurodiverse thinkers should not be punished or enforced to conform through cognitive monitoring which imposes uniform standards. To do so, neurodiversity must not be treated as an organizational liability. AI's anticipated role in CAD systems is to enable real-time bias detection. Scan detection systems should be able to not only flag the absence of data that should contextually be present, but also propose interpretations that contextually align with the task at hand and suggest contextual data that is relevant. While AI's growing capabilities could be beneficial, the increasing use of AI generates its own ethical dilemmas.

Potential risks of unexplored hazards might arise due to automation’s unwavering trust, bias from training data, and lack of transparency in algorithms. Addressing concerns of trust risks can be mitigated with user override options and explainability features. Protection of freedom and trust alongside boundaries to autonomous systems are critical which need to be preserved. Dictating autonomous systems trust and autonomy to serve as ethical tools of aid would require principles, in which the structure would serve as trust and autonomy. Undue restraint would embrace freedom if human involvement is removed, algorithms set in place would rely on automation. Designed tools would need lack of cognitive and ethical biases.

Addressing these issues ensures that future design contexts will support more effective decision making while respecting the ethical and intellectual dignity of the users.

5.1 Ethical Framing of Cognitive Evaluation in Design

Eye-tracking, biosensors, and behavioral logs raise issues relating to privacy, autonomy, and psychological safety. Engineering expertise and decision quality attained from such tools could, however, cultivate surveillance cultures if used punitively or without consent. Engineering ethics casts the issue of monitoring engineers' actions, interpretations, and decisions, outlining the need to prioritize transparency as the guiding principle when informing engineers about the monitoring processes and purposes beyond decision making. Cognitive data requires the removal of anonymization and participation, allowing the individual core protections to dictate how their data is controlled. Safely disengaging the individual from the data stream requires the removal of anonymity, transforming the data into a framework for policing or attributing blame devoid of the individual's control.

5.2 Inclusion and Cognitive Bias Across Diverse Teams

Teams that are diverse and multiculturally aligned contribute differing opinions, experiences, and thought patterns which, when considered, increases the collective bias for teams that lack homogenous thinking and enrich design ideation. However, there is variability in the appraisal of risk across cognitive diversity. Differences in culture, education, and gender may result in divergent appraisal, decision-making, and risk-taking behaviors. Resolving this heterogeneity requires respectful, structured protocols for dissemination, decision-making, and awareness training. Organizations can enhance the creativity and dependability of mechanical design results by leveraging innovative and diverse mental frameworks, restraining the impact of biased narratives, and dominating harmful narratives through the fostering of thoughtful team inclusivity.

6. CONCLUSION

This research reaffirms that mechanical design goes beyond a technical task; it is primarily a cognitive and behavioral endeavor. Engineers never work as a neutral optimizer; they are equipped with life experiences, heuristics, and psychological predispositions that shape their decisions. Design will always, albeit discreetly, be impacted by risk perception, decision bias, and other such cognitive factors, including design robustness, safety margins, and innovation capability. With more intricate systems and consequential decisions, there is increased risk in ignoring the behavioral aspects. Incorporating cognitive factors within the design processes, education, and software tools are integral to the design workflows; the integration is not some optional decision, rather it is a strategic imperative. Engineering and design as a whole can change by creating spaces that support reflection, constructive criticism, diversity, and decision accountability at the design and post-design stages. Embracing cognitive-aware interventions, such as bias reduction and enhancing decision quality, is imperative for the advancement of engineering design. Such interventions include making engineers aware of their heuristics, utilizing DSS with real-time feedback, and forming heterogenous design teams. CAD environments should evolve to include embedded bias alerts and scenario-based stress testing. Systemic changes such as transparent review protocols and structured dissent in teams can foster a culture of critical evaluation instead of blind confidence.

The aim deviation does not mean to eliminate intuition, rather, to counter balance intuition with logic reasoning, enhancing engineers capabilities to improve their designs and ensure their safety, and improve adaptability.

REFERENCE

1. Sahana Devi, K. J., & Yendapalli, V. (2025). Advanced Neural Decision Tree Paradigm for Proactive Detection and Precision Prediction of Polycystic Ovary Syndrome. Journal of Wireless Mobile Networks, Ubiquitous Computing, and Dependable Applications, 16(1), 576-598. https://doi.org/10.58346/JOWUA.2025.I1.034
2. Carvalho, A. A., Karthikeyan, K., Clement Sudhahar, J., & Jesiah, S. (2024). Risk assessment and decision-making in geology-driven projects: a management perspective. Archives for Technical Sciences, 2(31), 329–339. https://doi.org/10.70102/afts.2024.1631.329
3. Amer, K. Z., Azawi, A., Jebur, H. A., Al-Shammary, A. A. G., & Al-Sharifi, S. K. A. (2025). The Impact and Analysis of Mechanical Factors of the Mechanized Unit on the Production of" Vigna radiata L." Crop. Natural and Engineering Sciences, 10(1), 418-424. https://doi.org/10.28978/nesciences.1651195
4. Kadhim, A. A., Mohammed, S. J., & Al-Gayem, Q. (2024). DVB-T2 Energy and Spectral Efficiency Trade-off Optimization based on Genetic Algorithm. Journal of Internet Services and Information Security, 14(3), 213-225. https://doi.org/10.58346/JISIS.2024.I3.012
5. Patel, P. (2025). Deep unfolding networks for robust modulation classification in cognitive radio systems. Electronics, Communications, and Computing Summit, 3(2), 10–15.
6. Balasm, Z., Rajan, S. S., Karpagham, C., Nuritdinovich, M. A., Yusupov, S., & Maurya, S. (2025). Cognitive Load Optimization in User Interface Design for Info Services. Indian Journal of Information Sources and Services, 15(2), 69–74. https://doi.org/10.51983/ijiss-2025.IJISS.15.2.10

7. Sudan, P., Srividya, A., Thiru Chitrambalam, M., Prince Mary, S., Sau, S., Murugan, R., & Mishra, A. (2025). Design and development of a database management system for aquatic research data. International Journal of Aquatic Research and Environmental Studies, 5(1), 215–220. https://doi.org/10.70102/IJARES/V5I1/5-1-22
8. Rahman, F. (2024). Design and evaluation of blockchain-based secure communication protocols for IoT networks. Electronics, Communications, and Computing Summit, 2(2), 28–36.
9. Kumar, S., & Ramesh, C. (2024). Mechanical Component Design: A Comprehensive Guide to Theory and Practice. Association Journal of Interdisciplinary Technics in Engineering Mechanics, 2(2), 1-5.
10. Patankar, V., & Kapoor, M. (2024). Process Optimization of Filtration in Crystallization-Based Product Recovery. Engineering Perspectives in Filtration and Separation, 2(1), 5-8.
11. Kesa, D. D., Somantri, G. R., & Huruta, A. D. (2025). Disruptive Credit Innovation: Does Branchless Banking Campaign Creates New Banking Services in Post-Pandemic Era?. Calitatea, 26(205), 176-186.
12. Bahrami, N., & Abdolvand, M. (2018). The Effect of Architectural Form of Building on Optimization of Electricity Energy Consumption. International Academic Journal of Science and Engineering, 5(1), 108–119. https://doi.org/10.9756/IAJSE/V5I1/1810010
13. Abdullah, D. (2025). Topology optimization of composite structures for enhanced crash energy absorption: Mitigating non-uniform stress distributions in crashworthy designs. Advances in Mechanical Engineering and Applications, 1(2), 1–10.
14. Khudhur, R. A. (2022). The Effect of Applying the Principles of Total Quality Management in Achieving the Quality Performance of Supply Chains from the Viewpoint of the Administrative Staff of Tihama Cement Company. International Academic Journal of Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management, 9(1), 01–15. https://doi.org/10.9756/IAJOBHRM/V9I1/IAJOBHRM0901
15. Kovačević, A., & Radović, L. (2024). Business Resilience Decoded: 7 Expert Strategies That Actually Work. National Journal of Quality, Innovation, and Business Excellence, 1(2), 51-61.
16. Lafta, J. M. (2021). Britain and European Union, the Repercussions of Accession and the Effects of Secession. International Academic Journal of Social Sciences, 11(1), 05–10. https://doi.org/10.9756/IAJSS/V11I1/IAJSS1102
17. Bose, T., & Ghosh, N. (2025). Evaluating the Economic Implications of Remote Work Adoption Post-Pandemic. International Academic Journal of Innovative Research, 12(3), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.71086/IAJIR/V12I3/IAJIR1218
18. Basanta Kumar, R., & Sunil, K. (2024). Biotechnological Approaches to Develop Personalized Medicines for Rare Genetic Disorders. Clinical Journal for Medicine, Health and Pharmacy, 2(2), 20-28.