BULLETIN of National Defence University of Ukraine

✦ Vol. 21 ✦ No. 4 ✦ 2026 ✦ 69-76
✦ ISSN 2617-6858
✦ E-ISSN 2617-6866
✦ Journal homepage: https://nuou-visnyk.com.ua/en
✦ UDC 159.955:004. 8:355.4
✦ DOI: 10.33099/2617-6858-26-21-4-69-76

# Cognitive biases and pitfalls in the use of AI by an intelligence analyst

**Yelyzaveta Tymoshchuk**
Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology
The National University of Ostroh Academy
35800, 2, Seminarska Str., Ostroh, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0619-6724

**Kateryna Sereda***
Student
The National University of Ostroh Academy
35800, 2, Seminarska Str., Ostroh, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1693-6055

✦ **Abstract.** The active integration of artificial intelligence systems into information and analytical activities foregrounds the problem of investigating the psychological factors that determine the specificities of analysts' interaction with automated systems and their susceptibility to cognitive biases in professional decision-making. The aim of this article was to examine the interrelationship between cognitive style, locus of control, and trust in artificial intelligence systems as factors contributing to the formation of intelligence pitfalls in the professional activity of intelligence analysts. The study combined a theoretical analysis of contemporary academic literature with an empirical investigation of the specificities of interaction with automated systems among 50 practising OSINT and information analysts. The Rational-Experiential Inventory by S. Epstein was employed to assess cognitive style, the level of trust in automated systems was determined using the Trust in Automation Questionnaire by M. Körber, and the locus of control was investigated via J. Rotter's methodology. Analysis of the obtained data revealed the presence of correlations between the respondents' thinking peculiarities, their level of subjective control, and their perception of algorithmic systems. Respondents with a predominance of an intuitive mode of information processing more frequently demonstrated a willingness to rely on automated recommendations and assessed the functional capabilities of AI systems more positively. In contrast, participants with a more pronounced analytical thinking style exhibited a tendency towards more thorough verification of algorithmic decisions and a lower level of acceptance without additional analysis. It was also established that a higher level of internal control is accompanied by a more positive perception of the reliability and competence of automated systems. The obtained results confirm the significance of individual psychological characteristics in shaping the specificities of human interaction with artificial intelligence technologies in professional activity. The research findings can be utilised in developing psychological training programmes for analysts and in fostering skills for critical and reflexive interaction with artificial intelligence systems

✦ **Keywords:** cognitive style; intuitive thinking; rational thinking; locus of control; internality; trust in automated systems; OSINT

## ✦ Introduction

The active implementation of artificial intelligence technologies within the system of information and analytical support for state security predetermines the transformation of the professional activity of Open Source Intelligence (OSINT) operators and analysts. Automated systems are increasingly utilised for the collection, structuring, filtering, and forecasting of information, thereby enhancing the speed and efficiency of analytical work. At the same time, the final interpretation of the obtained data, the assessment of their reliability, and professional decision-making

**Suggested Citation:**
Tymoshchuk, Ye., & Sereda, K. (2026). Cognitive biases and pitfalls in the use of AI by an intelligence analyst. *Bulletin of National Defence University of Ukraine*, 21(4), 69-76. doi: 10.33099/2617-6858-26-21-4-69-76.

Article's History: Received: 31.03.2026 ; Revised: 25.07.2026; Accepted: 25.08.2026; Published: 31.08.2026



*Corresponding author (kateryna.sereda@oa.edu.ua)

remain within the realm of human responsibility. Under conditions of information overload and uncertainty, the significance of psychological factors that may influence the specificities of an analyst's interaction with artificial intelligence systems and contribute to the formation of cognitive errors in the process of professional activity is heightened. The issue of trust in artificial intelligence systems occupies a prominent place in interdisciplinary research on human-automation interaction. W.J. von Eschenbach (2021) noted that the insufficient transparency of algorithmic systems and the "black box" phenomenon substantially affect the level of user trust in automated decisions. The author emphasised that the opacity of algorithmic functioning can reduce an individual's willingness to rely on AI recommendations, even when these are highly accurate. In their study on the effectiveness of human-AI interaction, G. Bansal *et al.* (2021) demonstrated that the availability of explanations for algorithmic decisions influences the quality of teamwork and the nature of the perception of automated recommendations. According to the authors, the user's ability to understand the logic of an algorithm's operation fosters a more balanced interaction between the human and the artificial intelligence (AI).

The phenomenon of overtrust in decision-making supported by artificial intelligence was examined by Z. Buçinca *et al.* (2021). The researchers drew attention to the fact that users may demonstrate a tendency to automatically accept algorithmic recommendations without sufficient critical analysis, particularly in situations of high cognitive load. In the conceptual framework of human-centered artificial intelligence, B. Shneiderman (2022) substantiated the necessity of preserving the active role of the human in the decision-making process involving algorithmic systems. The researcher underscored that the effectiveness of AI utilisation is determined not only by the technical characteristics of the system but also by the user's psychological readiness to interact with it. The relationship between trust in artificial intelligence and the individual psychological characteristics of the personality was analysed by O. Gillath *et al.* (2021). The researchers indicated that the level of trust in automated systems may depend on the specificities of an individual's interpersonal trust and attachment style. It was also noted that the psychological characteristics of the personality are capable of influencing the specifics of human interaction with algorithmic systems. The impact of explainable artificial intelligence on the formation of calibrated trust in algorithmic systems was examined by R. De Brito Duarte *et al.* (2023). The authors emphasised that the explainability of algorithms can enhance the level of user trust only under the condition of sufficient understanding of the system's functioning principles and a critical reflection on the received recommendations. The specificities of human perception of AI-generated outputs were analysed by N. Köbis & L.D. Mossink (2021). According to the researchers, users are not always capable of differentiating between results produced by algorithms and those produced by humans, which can influence the formation of trust in automated systems and the specificities of evaluating their effectiveness.

In studies dedicated to human interaction with automated systems, considerable attention is paid to the role of the personality's cognitive characteristics in the decision-making process. An analysis of academic literature confirms that the specificities of information processing, the propensity for an intuitive or analytical mode of thinking, as well as the level of subjective control, can influence the evaluation of algorithmic recommendations and the nature of user behaviour in situations of uncertainty. In professional analytical activity, excessive trust in automated systems or their unjustified dismissal can diminish the quality of analytical conclusions and increase the risk of forming cognitive errors. Despite the substantial body of contemporary research, the problem of the interrelationship between cognitive style, locus of control, and trust in artificial intelligence systems in the professional activity of intelligence analysts remains insufficiently explored, particularly in the context of the formation of cognitive biases and intelligence pitfalls in the process of analytical decision-making. The aim of this article was to investigate the specificities of the interrelationship between the dominant cognitive style (rational and intuitive), the level of subjective control, and trust in automated systems as psychological factors determining the specifics of operator-analysts' professional activity in interaction with artificial intelligence systems and their potential susceptibility to the emergence of intelligence pitfalls in the decision-making process.

## ✦ Literature Review

The issue of cognitive biases and their impact on professional activity constitutes one of the central themes of contemporary psychology. Foundational studies have systematised the typology of cognitive distortions and biases, among which confirmation bias occupies a particular position. Confirmation bias is the propensity of an individual, or specifically an intelligence analyst, to seek and interpret information in a manner that confirms pre-existing beliefs (Logg *et al.*, 2019). It is especially critical to understand and delineate this bias in professional settings, as the dominance of an initial interpretation may constrain the consideration of alternative scenarios. In the context of intelligence analysis, this signifies the risk of focusing solely on data corroborating the initial assessment of a situation while disregarding contradictory information. Within classical studies of cognitive psychology, heuristics are regarded as adaptive mechanisms enabling rapid decision-making under conditions of uncertainty and limited information. Concurrently, the automated use of heuristics can lead to systematic errors of judgement and cognitive biases (Kahneman, 2021). In the professional practice of an OSINT analyst, this implies that the mechanisms ensuring the expediency of assessment may simultaneously elevate the risk of erroneous data interpretation.

The practical application of the cognitive approach in intelligence analysts' activities is presented in the study by

M.O. Popov *et al.* (2022), dedicated to the problem of calibrating nominal judgements within the intelligence information evaluation process. The authors emphasised the necessity of aligning verbal probability assessments with their quantitative representations to enhance the accuracy of analytical conclusions. Such an approach aims to minimise discrepancies between an analyst's subjective judgement and the objective parameters of forecasting. Similar conclusions can be traced in adjacent disciplines. O.V. Cherniakova & O.D. Hryshko (2025), in their study of strategic management, demonstrated the adverse impact of cognitive biases on the efficacy of managerial decision-making. In the works of A. Konverskyi & N. Kolotilova (2023) on argumentation processes, confirmation bias is examined as a factor diminishing the quality of critical evaluation of alternative positions and evidence. Within the framework of investigating individual psychological determinants of analytical activity, it is also essential to consider critical thinking as an integrative personality characteristic. V. Nadurak (2022) underscores that critical thinking entails the capacity to logically analyse arguments, assess the reliability of sources, and identify cognitive errors. Developed critical thinking can thus be considered, in the context of this study, as a means of mitigating the influence of confirmation bias, as it encourages the search for alternative explanations and the verification of initial hypotheses.

Contemporary interdisciplinary research in the field of decision-making highlights the necessity of combining intuitive and analytical thinking strategies in complex professional situations. In this context, it is pertinent to refer to the work of Y.A. Tymoshchuk *et al.* (2022), who examine intuition as a significant component within the structure of personality self-regulation, playing a role in decision-making processes under conditions of uncertainty. The authors note that, under constraints of information and time, intuitive mechanisms may serve as a means of adapting the cognitive system to challenging conditions. This approach permits intuition to be viewed as an integral part of self-regulation mechanisms, rather than merely the antithesis of rational thought. This position is conceptually aligned with the dual-process model proposed by D. Kahneman (2021), according to which intuitive processes ensure speed of assessment, whilst analytical processes provide its verification and correction. From this perspective, the efficacy of a professional decision is determined not by the dominance of one strategy, but by the subject's ability to flexibly regulate their interplay depending on the task context.

In the context of human interaction with algorithmic systems, the question of balance between intuitive and analytical mechanisms acquires particular significance. Intuition enables rapid orientation in complex and uncertain environments, typical of analytical activities within the security domain. Concurrently, the level of self-regulation development and awareness of one's own cognitive processes, as emphasised by Y.A. Tymoshchuk *et al.* (2022), may determine whether an intuitive decision is subjected to subsequent verification or, conversely, remains uncorrected. A deficit in reflective control elevates the risk of uncritical acceptance of algorithmic recommendations or their unjustified dismissal by OSINT analysts. Studies on trust in automated systems corroborate that individual cognitive characteristics of the AI user substantially influence the nature of their interaction (Glikson & Woolley, 2020; Burton *et al.*, 2020). Specifically, trust in algorithmic decisions may be both rationally substantiated and conditioned by cognitive shortcuts or heuristic mechanisms. Moreover, the explainability of an algorithm does not always guarantee an adequate evaluation of its decisions, as the interpretation of explanations depends on the analyst's thinking style and level of self-regulation (Bansal *et al.*, 2021).

Thus, the interaction between analysts and artificial intelligence systems can be considered as a process integrating cognitive style, self-regulation mechanisms, and the level of subjective control. Such interaction potentially determines whether an algorithmic recommendation becomes a tool for improving work quality or, conversely, a source of cognitive traps. The obtained theoretical propositions necessitate a robust empirical analysis of the psychological factors of trust in automated systems as potential mechanisms for the formation of intellectual traps in the professional activity of OSINT analysts.

## ✦ Materials and Methods

The empirical study of the psychological factors influencing trust in automated systems within the professional activity of analysts was conducted on a sample of current practitioners in the field of information and analytical support. The study involved 50 respondents aged 24 to 39. Participant selection was carried out based on the criterion of professional involvement in analytical activity, information analysis, and data processing. In forming the sample, characteristics such as professional experience, educational background, and the specifics of the respondents' professional duties were taken into account. The sample included specialists from both the public and private sectors. The survey was conducted on a voluntary basis with anonymity ensured, using the online platform Google Forms during January-February 2026. Personal data of the participants were not collected, and the information obtained was used exclusively in an aggregated form for scientific purposes. The study was conducted in accordance with international ethical standards for socio-psychological research, specifically the principles of the ICC/Esomar International Code on Market, Opinion and Social Research and Data Analytics (2025) and Ethics and Data Protection (2021). All participants were informed of the study's purpose and provided voluntary consent to participate.

To examine cognitive style, the full version of the Rational-Experiential Inventory by S. Epstein *et al.* (1996) was employed, consisting of 40 statements to determine rational ability (RA), rational engagement (RE), experiential ability (EA), and experiential engagement (EE). Examples of the inventory statements included: "I enjoy analysing

complex problems" and "I often rely on my intuition when making decisions". To assess trust in automated systems, the Trust in Automation Questionnaire (Körber, 2019) was applied, enabling the determination of the level of trust in systems based on the following parameters: reliability/competence (F), understanding (I), developers' intentions (Pro), and overall trust (T). Examples of statements include: "I consider the automated system reliable" and "The principles of the system's operation are clear to me". The level of subjective control was investigated using J. Rotter's (1966) methodology, through which general internality (Gen) was determined, as well as internality across various spheres of life activity. An example of a statement was: "Most events in my life depend on my own actions".

To identify the relationships between the studied indicators, Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was applied as a non-parametric method of statistical analysis. The processing and statistical interpretation of the obtained results were carried out using the licensed software IBM SPSS Statistics, which was selected due to its widespread application in psychological and socio-behavioural research and its capacity for conducting non-parametric statistical analysis. The correctness of the results' interpretation was ensured by the correspondence of the chosen statistical methods to the type of data obtained, as well as by comparing the findings with theoretical propositions and research outcomes in the fields of cognitive psychology and the psychology of decision-making.

## ✦ Results and Discussion

Analysis of the data obtained revealed statistically significant correlations between cognitive style and the level of trust in algorithmic systems. The most pronounced positive correlations were established between an intuitive thinking style and indicators of trust in automation. Intuitive ability (EA) has a strong positive relationship with the overall level of trust in systems (T) ($r = 0.765$; $p < 0.001$) and the indicator of understanding the principles of their functioning (I) ($r = 0.692$; $p < 0.001$). Similar results were also obtained for intuitive engagement (EE), which correlates with overall trust ($r = 0.654$; $p < 0.001$) and system understanding ($r = 0.605$; $p < 0.001$). The identified interrelationships indicate that a pronounced intuitive information processing style is accompanied by a higher level of acceptance of algorithmic recommendations in the process of information analysis. Such patterns may be explained by the characteristics of the intuitive mode of thinking, which is distinguished by rapid decision-making and an orientation towards holistic perception of a situation. Under conditions of information overload and time deficit, the intuitive style potentially facilitates faster acceptance of algorithmic conclusions without their prolonged analytical processing. For the activities of OSINT analysts, this holds both adaptive and potentially risky significance. On the one hand, trust in artificial intelligence systems can enhance the efficiency of analysing large volumes of information; however, on the other hand, excessive reliance on automated recommendations may increase the likelihood of automation bias formation and reduce the level of critical verification of the results obtained.

The rational thinking style is characterised by the opposite tendency. Rational ability (RA) has a statistically significant negative relationship with the indicator of system understanding ($r = -0.528$; $p < 0.001$) and overall trust in automation ($r = -0.389$; $p = 0.005$). A similar negative relationship was recorded between rational engagement (RE) and overall trust ($r = -0.399$; $p = 0.004$). Thus, a more pronounced rational style is accompanied by a more critical attitude towards automated decisions and a lower level of trust in them. The established correlations may indicate that individuals with a dominant rational thinking style are inclined to verify algorithmic recommendations more thoroughly, analyse the logic of system functioning, and pay attention to possible errors in automated analysis. The rational style implies an orientation towards the sequential verification of information and critical evaluation of alternative options, which potentially reduces the level of uncritical acceptance of decisions proposed by artificial intelligence systems. In the field of intelligence analysis, such a characteristic may promote a more cautious use of algorithmic systems, especially in situations where erroneous data interpretation could have substantial consequences for security and the quality of forecasting (Logg *et al.*, 2019).

Analysis of the interrelationships between cognitive style and indicators of subjective control showed that intuitive ability (EA) is associated with general internality (Gen) ($r = 0.572$; $p < 0.001$), and intuitive engagement (EE) – with an analogous indicator ($r = 0.575$; $p < 0.001$). At the same time, rational ability demonstrates a moderate negative relationship with general internality ($r = -0.363$; $p = 0.010$). Furthermore, general internality correlates positively with trust in algorithmic systems ($r = 0.599$; $p < 0.001$) and with understanding of the principles of their functioning ($r = 0.586$; $p < 0.001$). A relationship was also established between internality in the sphere of work-related relations (R_S) and the assessment of the system's reliability and competence ($r = 0.462$; $p = 0.001$). The data obtained provide grounds to assume that a higher level of subjective control is linked to a more conscious attitude towards interaction with algorithmic systems. Individuals with pronounced internality tend to perceive the results of their own activities as a consequence of their own decisions and actions, which also affects the specifics of using automated recommendations. In a professional environment, this may manifest as a greater readiness to take responsibility for the final decision, even when using artificial intelligence systems. At the same time, a high level of internality can be combined with both greater trust in the system and higher confidence in one's own ability to control the interaction process with it.

Data analysis also showed that the level of subjective control influences not only the attitude towards algorithmic systems but also the nature of verifying automated

recommendations during the decision-making process. Individuals with high internality potentially orient themselves more often towards their own assessment of the situation and may demonstrate a higher level of responsibility for the final outcome of analytical activity. In situations involving risk forecasting or the assessment of potential threats, this may manifest as a more thorough verification of automated conclusions and their comparison with alternative sources of information. At the same time, under high cognitive load, even pronounced internality does not always guarantee a sufficient level of criticality towards algorithmic recommendations, especially if the system demonstrates high indicators of accuracy and stability of results. In such cases, the likelihood of the gradual formation of excessive trust in automated decisions increases.

The practical interpretation of these results suggests the existence of distinct models of interaction with artificial intelligence systems, varying according to the specifics of individual cognitive styles and locus of control. Under time deficit, significant information load, or the need for rapid response, individuals with a pronounced intuitive style may be more inclined to promptly accept algorithmic recommendations without their detailed verification. This type of interaction potentially increases the efficiency of working with large datasets but simultaneously increases the risk of automation bias formation. Conversely, respondents with a more pronounced rational style may demonstrate a tendency to re-verify the system's results, compare automated conclusions with alternative sources of information, and carry out a more detailed analysis of contradictory data. In the process of professional decision-making, this can contribute to reducing the risk of erroneous conclusions, yet at the same time slow down information processing under high dynamics of events (Burton *et al.*, 2020).

The identified patterns acquire particular significance in the field of intelligence analysis, where algorithmic systems are actively applied for forecasting, classification, and risk assessment. Under such conditions, the specific nature of the interaction between the human and the artificial intelligence system affects not only the effectiveness of professional analysis but also the likelihood of cognitive errors occurring. Excessive trust in algorithmic decisions can lead to uncritical acceptance of automated recommendations, whereas excessive distrust can lead to the ignoring of potentially significant information (Logg *et al.*, 2019). The established interrelationships point to the advisability of considering the individual psychological characteristics of specialists in the process of professional training and the organisation of the use of artificial intelligence systems in analytical practice.

Thus, the analysis conducted has confirmed the existence of a systemic interrelationship between the characteristics of an individual's cognitive organisation, the level of subjective control, and trust in algorithmic decisions. An intuitive thinking style is accompanied by a higher level of trust in automated systems, whereas a rational style is accompanied by greater criticality towards them. At the same time, a higher level of internality is combined with more positive perception and acceptance of algorithmic recommendations. The identified patterns allow cognitive style and subjective control to be considered as psychological factors associated with the specifics of human interaction with artificial intelligence systems and the potential predisposition to the formation of cognitive biases in the process of professional decision-making. The results obtained attest to the important role of individual psychological characteristics in the process of human interaction with artificial intelligence systems. The revealed interrelationships are consistent with contemporary research in the field of the psychology of decision-making and human interaction with automated systems.

The established positive relationship between an intuitive thinking style and a higher level of trust in automated decisions is consistent with the findings of Z. Buçinca *et al.* (2021), who indicated users' propensity to automatically accept artificial intelligence recommendations under high cognitive load. Within the present study, a tendency towards faster acceptance of algorithmic conclusions was also observed among respondents with a pronounced intuitive style. Unlike the work of Z. Buçinca *et al.* (2021), attention was focused not only on the general mechanisms of automation bias, but also on the specific features of professional interaction with algorithmic systems in the field of information-analytical activity. The results of G. Bansal *et al.* (2021) allow for a deeper interpretation of the established correlations, as the authors emphasised the importance of understanding the principles of an algorithm's functioning for forming effective human–automated system interaction. The patterns identified partially confirm these conclusions, demonstrating a link between the perception of the system and the level of trust in its recommendations. At the same time, the conducted analysis extends the approach of G. Bansal *et al.* (2021), as it allows for the assumption that even under conditions of understanding the system's operational principles, cognitive style may influence the degree of criticality towards algorithmic conclusions.

The negative relationship between a rational thinking style and trust in automated decisions aligns with the theoretical propositions of D. Kahneman (2021), according to which an analytical mode of information processing involves the sequential verification of alternatives and critical evaluation of the results obtained. In the present study, respondents with a more pronounced rational style more frequently demonstrated a propensity to verify algorithmic recommendations and compare them with other sources of information. This gives grounds to assume that a rational style may partially reduce the risk of uncritical acceptance of automated decisions. Additional explanation for the identified patterns is found in the works of A. Konverskyi & N. Kolotilova (2023), dedicated to the influence of cognitive biases on the process of information evaluation and argumentation. The authors stressed that specific features of information processing can affect the formation of

erroneous judgments and biases in the decision-making process. The presented results complement these propositions, demonstrating that the specificity of cognitive style may be associated not only with information evaluation but also with the nature of trust in artificial intelligence systems.

An important aspect of interpreting the results was the interrelationship between internality and trust in algorithmic systems. A similar approach to analysing trust in AI is presented in the work of O. Gillath *et al.* (2021), which examined the role of individual psychological characteristics of personality in interaction with automated systems. The patterns identified partially confirm the authors' conclusions, as respondents with a higher level of subjective control demonstrated a more conscious attitude towards the use of artificial intelligence systems. At the same time, data analysis showed that a high level of internality is not necessarily accompanied by distrust of automated decisions. In a subset of respondents, it was combined with confidence in their own ability to control the process of interaction with the system and to evaluate its recommendations.

The problem of forming calibrated trust in algorithmic systems was analysed by R. De Brito Duarte *et al.* (2023) and J. Schoeffer *et al.* (2025), who noted that the explainability of algorithms in itself does not guarantee a critical attitude towards automated recommendations. A similar trend is observed in the present study, as even under conditions of understanding the system's operational principles, a portion of respondents maintained a high level of trust in algorithmic conclusions. This indicates that trust in AI is determined not only by the transparency of the system but also by the psychological characteristics of the user. The propositions of B. Shneiderman (2022), formulated within the framework of the human-centred approach to artificial intelligence, are also consistent with the results of the conducted study. The author emphasised the necessity of maintaining an active human role in the process of using algorithmic systems and the importance of combining technological capabilities with the user's critical thinking. The established interrelationships between cognitive style, subjective control, and the level of criticality towards automated recommendations further underscore the significance of psychological factors in the process of human–AI interaction.

Another aspect of the problem of trust in algorithmic systems was examined by W.J. von Eschenbach (2021), who focused attention on the "black box" phenomenon and the insufficient transparency of AI functioning. In contrast to the study by W.J. von Eschenbach (2021), the present work directed primary attention to the psychological factors of human interaction with artificial intelligence systems. This provides grounds to believe that the specific features of an individual's cognitive organisation may influence the nature of perceiving algorithmic decisions to no lesser extent than the technical characteristics of the system itself.

Summarising the results of the study, it can be noted that the identified interrelationships between cognitive style, characteristics of subjective control, and the nature of interaction with artificial intelligence systems have significant practical importance. The obtained results can be utilised in the professional training of specialists whose activities involve processing large volumes of information and making decisions with the engagement of algorithmic systems. In particular, considering individual cognitive characteristics can contribute to the development of training programmes aimed at fostering the critical reflection on AI recommendations, reducing the risk of automation bias, and forming a more conscious and effective human interaction with intelligent technologies. At the same time, the results of the study should be interpreted considering certain limitations. These include the limited sample size and the predominant use of correlational analysis, which does not allow for the establishment of cause-and-effect relationships between the variables under study. Therefore, the conclusions obtained primarily characterise the presence of statistical interrelationships between the investigated variables and cannot be directly generalised to all professional groups without additional empirical verification.

## ✦ Conclusions

The conducted study allowed for establishing an interrelationship between cognitive style, the level of subjective control, and trust in artificial intelligence systems in the process of professional decision-making. Data analysis demonstrated that an intuitive thinking style is associated with a higher level of trust in automated recommendations and a greater readiness to rely on algorithmic conclusions in the process of information analysis. Conversely, a rational style is accompanied by a more critical attitude towards the outputs of artificial intelligence systems and a propensity for their additional verification. It was established that the level of subjective control also influences the nature of interaction with algorithmic systems. Individuals with pronounced internality demonstrated a more conscious attitude towards the use of automated recommendations and a greater willingness to take responsibility for the final decision. At the same time, a high level of trust in artificial intelligence systems under conditions of considerable cognitive load can be regarded as a potential risk factor for automation bias and may reduce the level of critical analysis of the information received. Summarising the results of the study, it can be noted that the specific features of cognitive style and subjective control are important factors influencing the nature of human interaction with artificial intelligence systems. The obtained results indicate the expediency of considering individual cognitive characteristics when analysing how specialists perceive, evaluate, and utilise algorithmic recommendations.

The study showed that the critical reflection on information, the ability to independently evaluate automated decisions, and the level of subjective control can influence the effectiveness of working with large datasets and AI systems. This provides grounds to consider human interaction with artificial intelligence not merely as a technological but also as a cognitive-psychological process, in which the individual characteristics of the user play a significant role.

A certain limitation of the study was the sample size and the use of predominantly correlational analysis of the interrelationships between the variables under study. Prospects for further research are associated with studying the impact of professional stress, the specificity of analytical tasks, and the experience of using artificial intelligence systems on the specific features of human interaction with algorithmic systems in the decision-making process.

## ✦ Acknowledgements

None.

## ✦ Funding

None.

## ✦ Conflict of Interest

None.

## ✦ References

[1] Bansal, G., Wu, T., Zhou, J., Fok, R., Nushi, B., Kamar, E., Ribeiro, M.T., & Weld, D.S. (2021). Does the whole exceed its parts? The effect of AI explanations on complementary team performance. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 1-16). New York: Association for Computing Machinery. doi: 10.1145/344928710.1145/3411764.3445717.

[2] Buçinca, Z., Malaya, M.B., & Gajos, K.Z. (2021). To trust or to think: Cognitive forcing functions can reduce overreliance on AI in AI-assisted decision-making. In *Proceedings of the ACM on human-computer interaction, 5(CSCW1)* (pp. 1-21). New York: Association for Computing Machinery. doi: 10.1145/3449287.

[3] Burton, J.W., Stein, M.-K., & Jensen, T.B. (2020). A systematic review of algorithm aversion in augmented decision making. Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 33(2), 220-239. doi: 10.1145/344928710.1002/bdm.2155.

[4] Cherniakova, O.V., & Hryshko, O.D. (2025). Cognitive bias and their influence on personnel management efficiency and the adoption of strategic solutions. Scientific Bulletin of Uzhhorod National University. Series: Psychology, 3, 183-190. doi: 10.1145/344928710.32782/psy-visnyk/2025.3.34.

[5] De Brito Duarte, R., Correia, F., Arriaga, P., & Paiva, A. (2023). AI trust: Can explainable AI enhance warranted trust? Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies, 2023, article number 4637678. doi: 10.1145/344928710.1155/2023/4637678.

[6] Epstein, S., Pacini, R., Denes-Raj, V., & Heier, H. (1996). Individual differences in intuitive-experiential and analytical-rational thinking styles. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71(2), 390-405. doi: 10.1145/344928710.1037/0022-3514.71.2.390.

[7] Ethics and Data Protection. (2021). Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/guidance/ethics-and-data-protection_he_en.pdf.

[8] Gillath, O., Ai, T., Branicky, M.S., Keshmiri, S., Davison, R.B., & Spaulding, R. (2021). Attachment and trust in artificial intelligence. Computers in Human Behavior, 115, article number 106607. doi: 10.1145/344928710.1016/j.chb.2020.106607.

[9] Glikson, E., & Woolley, A.W. (2020). Human trust in artificial intelligence: Review of empirical research. Academy of Management Annals, 14(2), 627-660. doi: 10.1145/344928710.5465/annals.2018.0057.

[10] ICC/Esomar International Code on Market, Opinion and Social Research and Data Analytics. (2025). Retrieved from https://iccwbo.org/news-publications/business-solutions/iccesomar-international-code-market-opinion-social-research-data-analytics/#top.

[11] Kahneman, D. (2021). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Kyiv: Nash Format.

[12] Köbis, N., & Mossink, L.D. (2021). Artificial intelligence versus Maya Angelou: Experimental evidence that people cannot differentiate AI-generated from human-written poetry. Computers in Human Behavior, 114, article number 106553. doi: 10.1145/344928710.1016/j.chb.2020.106553.

[13] Konverskyi, A., & Kolotilova, N. (2023). Confirmation bias in argumentation processes. Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Philosophy, 2(9), 20-24. doi: 10.1145/344928710.17721/2523-4064.2023/9-3/15.

[14] Körber, M. (2019). Theoretical considerations and development of a questionnaire to measure trust in automation. In S. Bagnara, R. Tartaglia, S. Albolino, T. Alexander & Y. Fujita (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 20th congress of the international ergonomics association (IEA 2018)* (vol. 823; pp. 13-30). Cham: Springer. doi: 10.1145/344928710.1007/978-3-319-96074-6_2.

[15] Logg, J.M., Minson, J.A., & Moore, D.A. (2019). Algorithm appreciation: People prefer algorithmic to human judgment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 151, 90-103. doi: 10.1145/344928710.1016/j.obhdp.2018.12.005.

[16] Nadurak, V. (2022). Critical thinking: Concept and practice. *Filosofiya Osvity. Philosophy of Education*, 28(2), 129-147. doi: 10.1145/344928710.31874/2309-1606-2022-28-2-7.

[17] Popov, M.O., Stefantsev, S.S., & Zaitsev, O.V. (2022). A cognitive approach to the calibration of the intelligence analyst's nominal judgments. *Science & Defence*, 2(19), 37-42. doi: 10.1145/344928710.33099/2618-1614-2022-19-2-37-42.

[18] Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80(1), 1-28. doi: 10.1145/344928710.1037/h0092976.

[19] Schoeffer, J., Jakubik, J., Vössing, M., Kühl, N., & Satzger, G. (2025). AI reliance and decision quality: Fundamentals, interdependence, and the effects of interventions. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 82, 471-501. doi: 10.1145/344928710.1613/jair.1.15873.
[20] Shneiderman, B. (2022). *Human-centered AI*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1145/344928710.1093/oso/9780192845290.001.0001.
[21] Tymoshchuk, Y.A., Bruiaka, I.V., & Liubomyrskyi, V. (2022). The role of intuition in the structure of self-regulation in conditions of uncertainty. *Scientific Notes of Ostroh Academy National University: Psychology Series*, 15, 52-61.
[22] von Eschenbach, W.J. (2021). Transparency and the black box problem: Why we do not trust AI. *Philosophy & Technology*, 34(4), 1607-1622. doi: 10.1145/344928710.1007/s13347-021-00477-0.

# Когнітивні упередження та пастки при використанні ШІ аналітиком розвідки

**Єлизавета Тимощук**
Доктор філософії в галузі психології
Національний університет «Острозька академія»
35800, вул. Семінарська, 2, м. Острог, Україна
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0619-6724
**Катерина Середа**
Студент
Національний університет «Острозька академія»
35800, вул. Семінарська, 2, м. Острог, Україна
https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1693-6055

✦ **Анотація.** Активне впровадження систем штучного інтелекту в інформаційно-аналітичну діяльність актуалізує проблему дослідження психологічних чинників, що визначають особливості взаємодії аналітиків з автоматизованими системами та їхню схильність до когнітивних упереджень у процесі професійного прийняття рішень. Метою статті було дослідження взаємозв'язку між когнітивним стилем, локусом контролю та довірою до систем штучного інтелекту як чинниками формування інтелектуальних пасток у професійній діяльності аналітиків розвідки. Дослідження поєднувало теоретичний аналіз сучасних наукових праць з емпіричним вивченням особливостей взаємодії з автоматизованими системами у 50 практикуючих OSINT та інформаційних аналітиків. Для оцінки когнітивного стилю застосовано опитувальник раціонально-інтуїтивного стилю мислення S. Epstein, рівень довіри до автоматизованих систем визначався за допомогою Trust in Automation Questionnaire M. Körber, а локус контролю досліджувався за методикою J. Rotter. Аналіз отриманих даних засвідчив наявність кореляційних залежностей між особливостями мислення респондентів, рівнем суб'єктивного контролю та сприйняттям алгоритмічних систем. Респонденти з переважанням інтуїтивного способу обробки інформації частіше демонстрували готовність покладатися на автоматизовані рекомендації та позитивніше оцінювали функціональні можливості систем штучного інтелекту. Натомість учасники з більш вираженим аналітичним стилем мислення виявляли схильність до ретельнішої перевірки алгоритмічних рішень і нижчого рівня їх прийняття без додаткового аналізу. Також встановлено, що вищий рівень внутрішнього контролю супроводжується позитивнішим сприйняттям надійності та компетентності автоматизованих систем. Отримані результати підтверджують значущість індивідуально-психологічних характеристик у формуванні особливостей взаємодії людини з технологіями штучного інтелекту в професійній діяльності. Результати дослідження можуть бути використані під час розроблення програм психологічної підготовки аналітиків та формування навичок критичної й рефлексивної взаємодії із системами штучного інтелекту

✦ **Ключові слова:** когнітивний стиль; інтуїтивне мислення; раціональне мислення; локус контролю; інтернальність; довіра до автоматизованих систем; OSINT