

The “Canned” vs. “Camping” Dilemma: Balancing Technological Fidelity and Human Agency in Analogue Habitats

The Human Initiative Research Team
London, June 2025

Abstract

The proliferation of analogue habitats as crucial platforms for space mission preparation has brought a critical design challenge to the forefront: the “Canned” vs. “Camping” dilemma. This paper investigates the delicate balance between technological sophistication and human agency in these simulated environments. We argue that finding the optimal equilibrium between highly automated, “canned” habitats and technologically basic, “camping-style” facilities is paramount for the psychological well-being of the crew and the overall success of analogue missions. This research employs a multidisciplinary approach, drawing from environmental psychology, human factors engineering, and in-depth case studies of prominent analogue habitats such as HI-SEAS, Mars-500, and Concordia Station. Our findings reveal the profound psychological impacts of this dilemma, from boredom and learned helplessness in “canned” environments to cognitive overload and burnout in “camping” scenarios. We propose a set of design principles and a conceptual framework for future analogue habitats that prioritize human-centred design and the psychological needs of the crew. This paper concludes by discussing the implications of our findings for the future of analogue habitat design and the broader field of long-duration space exploration, emphasizing the need for a paradigm shift towards more human-centric and adaptable simulation environments.

1. Introduction

As humanity sets its sights on returning to the Moon and venturing to Mars, the need for high-fidelity simulations to prepare for these long-duration missions has never been more critical. Analogue habitats, terrestrial facilities that simulate the conditions of space exploration, have emerged as indispensable tools for studying the physiological, psychological, and social challenges of living and working in extreme environments [1]. These facilities provide a controlled setting for research that would be impractical or impossible to conduct in space, allowing scientists to test new technologies, develop operational procedures, and study human adaptation to isolation and confinement [2].

The design philosophy of these analogue habitats,

however, varies significantly, leading to a fundamental design challenge that we term the “Canned” vs. “Camping” dilemma. On one end of the spectrum are the “canned” habitats, which are technologically sophisticated, highly automated, and tightly controlled environments. In these facilities, the crew’s interaction with the habitat’s systems is often minimal, with many tasks being automated or managed remotely by a mission support team. While these habitats offer a high degree of control and data collection capabilities, they risk creating a sterile and unengaging environment where the crew feels like passive occupants rather than active participants in their own survival [3].

On the other end of the spectrum are the “camping” habitats, which are technologically basic and require significant crew effort for daily operations and maintenance. In these settings, the crew is responsible for

a wide range of tasks, from managing power and water systems to conducting their own scientific research with limited support. While these habitats provide a high degree of autonomy and a more realistic simulation of the challenges of a real space mission, they can also lead to crew burnout, cognitive overload, and a focus on basic survival at the expense of scientific objectives [4].

Finding the right balance between these two extremes is a critical design challenge with profound implications for the psychological well-being of the crew and the scientific validity of the simulation. An overly automated habitat may fail to adequately prepare a crew for the unexpected challenges of a real mission, while a habitat that is too basic may create unnecessary stress and detract from the primary research goals. This article contends that the optimal design for an analogue habitat lies in a carefully considered balance between technological sophistication and human agency, creating an environment that is both challenging and supportive, engaging and efficient.

This paper will explore the “Canned” vs. “Camping” dilemma from a multidisciplinary perspective, drawing on insights from environmental psychology, human factors engineering, and sociology. We will begin with a comprehensive literature review to establish the theoretical foundations of our argument, followed by a methodological discussion of our case study approach. We will then present in-depth case studies of three prominent analogue habitats—HI-SEAS, Mars-500, and Concordia Station—to illustrate the dilemma in practice. Finally, we will synthesize our findings to propose a set of design principles and a conceptual framework for future analogue habitats that prioritize the psychological needs of the crew and the overall success of the mission. Through this analysis, we aim to provide a roadmap for designing the next generation of analogue habitats that will effectively prepare humanity for the challenges of long-duration space exploration.

2. Literature Review

The “Canned” vs. “Camping” dilemma is not a new problem, but rather a new articulation of a long-standing challenge in the design of extreme environments. To fully understand the implications of this dilemma, it is necessary to draw upon a diverse body of literature spanning environmental psychology, human factors, and the history of space exploration. This section will review the key theoretical concepts and empirical findings that provide the foundation for our analysis.

2.1. Environmental Psychology in Confined Spaces

Environmental psychology is the study of the interplay between individuals and their surroundings. In the context of analogue habitats, this field offers critical insights into the psychological effects of isolation, confinement, and the design of the built environment. A key concept in environmental psychology is personal space, the invisible boundary surrounding an individual that, when crossed, can lead to discomfort and stress [5]. In the confined quarters of an analogue habitat, the ability to regulate personal space is severely limited, which can exacerbate interpersonal tensions and lead to negative psychological outcomes [6].

Another important concept is territoriality, the tendency to claim and defend a particular space as one’s own. In analogue habitats, the lack of personal territory can lead to feelings of powerlessness and a diminished sense of self [7]. Research has shown that providing crew members with even small, private spaces can have a significant positive impact on their well-being and performance [8].

The design of the habitat itself also plays a crucial role in shaping the psychological experience of the crew. Studies have shown that access to natural light, views of nature, and the use of natural materials can have

a restorative effect on mental health [9]. Conversely, sterile, monotonous environments can lead to boredom, depression, and a decline in cognitive function [10]. The concept of biophilic design, which seeks to incorporate elements of nature into the built environment, has gained increasing attention in the design of space habitats and other extreme environments [11].

2.2. Human Factors in Space Exploration

Human factors is an interdisciplinary field that applies knowledge of human capabilities and limitations to the design of systems and technologies. In the context of space exploration, human factors research is essential for ensuring the safety, efficiency, and well-being of the crew. A central tenet of human factors is user-centred design, which emphasizes the importance of involving users in the design process to ensure that systems are intuitive, easy to use, and meet their needs [12].

The “Canned” vs. “Camping” dilemma can be viewed as a classic human factors problem of finding the right balance between automation and human control. While automation can reduce workload and improve efficiency, it can also lead to a loss of situational awareness, skill degradation, and a diminished sense of engagement [13]. The irony of automation is that the more reliable a system is, the less engaged the human operator becomes, making it more difficult for them to intervene effectively when the system fails [14].

In the context of analogue habitats, this means that an over-reliance on automation can leave the crew ill-prepared for the unexpected challenges of a real space mission. Conversely, a lack of automation can lead to excessive workload, fatigue, and an increased risk of human error. The optimal design, from a human factors perspective, is one that provides the crew with the tools and information they need to effectively manage the habitat’s systems, while also allowing for a high degree of autonomy and control.

2.3. Crew Autonomy and Performance

The issue of crew autonomy is central to the “Canned” vs. “Camping” dilemma. A growing body of research suggests that providing individuals with a sense of control over their environment and their work is a powerful motivator and a key predictor of well-being and performance [15]. In the context of space exploration, crew autonomy has been shown to be associated with increased job satisfaction, improved team cohesion, and better performance on complex tasks [16].

However, the level of autonomy that is appropriate for a given mission depends on a variety of factors, including the complexity of the mission, the experience of the crew, and the communication delay with mission control. For long-duration missions to Mars, where communication delays will make real-time collaboration with Earth impossible, a high degree of crew autonomy will be essential for mission success [17].

Analogue habitats provide an ideal platform for studying the effects of different levels of crew autonomy. Studies conducted at the HI-SEAS facility, for example, have shown that crews can function effectively with a high degree of autonomy, but that this also requires a different approach to crew selection, training, and mission support [18]. The Mars-500 experiment, on the other hand, provided valuable insights into the psychological challenges of long-term confinement with limited autonomy [19].

2.4. Historical Overview of Analogue Habitats

The use of analogue habitats to prepare for space exploration has a long history, dating back to the early days of the space race. Early experiments, such as the Grumman-Ben Franklin submersible mission in 1969, provided valuable data on the psychological effects of long-term isolation and confinement [20]. In the decades that followed, a wide variety of analogue habitats have been developed, each with its own unique design philosophy and research focus.

Analogue habitats can be broadly categorized into two types: physiological analogues and psychological analogues. Physiological analogues, such as bed-rest studies and parabolic flights, are designed to simulate the physiological effects of space flight, such as muscle atrophy and fluid shifts. Psychological analogues, on the other hand, are designed to simulate the psychological and social challenges of space exploration, such as isolation, confinement, and interpersonal conflict [21].

Within the category of psychological analogues, there is a wide range of fidelity and focus. Some analogues, such as the NEEMO (NASA Extreme Environment Mission Operations) undersea habitat, are designed to simulate specific aspects of a space mission, such as extravehicular activities (EVAs). Others, such as the Concordia Station in Antarctica, provide a high-fidelity simulation of the extreme environment of a planetary surface [22].

The history of analogue habitats reflects a growing recognition of the importance of psychological and social factors in the success of long-duration space missions. The “Canned” vs. “Camping” dilemma is the latest chapter in this ongoing story, as researchers and designers grapple with the challenge of creating simulations that are both realistic and humane.

3. Methodology

To investigate the “Canned” vs. “Camping” dilemma, this paper employs a qualitative, multidisciplinary research approach. This methodology allows for a rich and nuanced exploration of the complex interplay between technology, human psychology, and environmental design in analogue habitats. By integrating insights from environmental psychology, human factors engineering, and sociology, we aim to provide a holistic understanding of this critical design challenge.

3.1. Research Approach

The core of our methodology is a comparative case study analysis of three prominent analogue habitats: HI-SEAS, Mars-500, and Concordia Station. This approach allows us to examine the “Canned” vs. “Camping” dilemma in different contexts and to identify common themes and patterns across a range of design philosophies. Our analysis is informed by a comprehensive review of the existing literature, including academic papers, mission reports, crew debriefings, and other publicly available documentation.

3.2. Case Study Selection

The three case studies were selected to represent a spectrum of approaches to analogue habitat design, from the high-autonomy, “camping-style” environment of HI-SEAS to the highly controlled, “canned” environment of Mars-500, with Concordia Station representing a high-fidelity hybrid model. The selection criteria for these case studies included:

- **Duration and Fidelity:** The missions conducted in these habitats were of sufficient duration and fidelity to provide meaningful data on the psychological and social effects of long-term isolation and confinement.
- **Data Availability:** A substantial body of research and documentation is available for each of these analogues, allowing for a thorough and well-supported analysis.
- **Relevance to the Dilemma:** Each of these case studies provides a unique perspective on the “Canned” vs. “Camping” dilemma, allowing for a rich and comparative analysis.

3.3. Data Analysis

Our data analysis is qualitative in nature and involves a systematic review and synthesis of the available information for each case study. We will examine the design and operation of each habitat, the level of crew autonomy, the nature of the tasks performed by the crew, and the psychological and social outcomes reported in the literature. Through this comparative analysis,

we will identify the key factors that contribute to the “Canned” vs. “Camping” dilemma and develop a set of design principles for mitigating its negative effects.

4. Case Studies: The Dilemma in Practice

To illustrate the “Canned” vs. “Camping” dilemma in practice, this section presents in-depth case studies of three prominent analogue habitats: the Hawai’i Space Exploration Analogue and Simulation (HI-SEAS), the Mars-500 experiment, and the Concordia Station in Antarctica. Each of these analogues represents a different approach to balancing technological fidelity and human agency, providing valuable insights into the psychological and operational consequences of their design choices.

4.1. HI-SEAS: A High-Autonomy, “Camping-Style” Analogue

The HI-SEAS facility, located on the slopes of the Mauna Loa volcano in Hawaii, is a prime example of a “camping-style” analogue. Designed to simulate the conditions of a long-duration mission to Mars, HI-SEAS has hosted a series of missions ranging from four to twelve months in duration. A key feature of the HI-SEAS missions is the high degree of crew autonomy, with a 20-minute communication delay imposed between the crew and mission support to simulate the time it would take for a signal to travel between Earth and Mars [18].

This high-autonomy model has had a profound impact on the psychological and social dynamics of the crew. On the one hand, it has been shown to foster a sense of ownership, empowerment, and resilience among the crew members. With limited real-time support from mission control, the crew is forced to rely on their own skills and resources to solve problems and manage the habitat’s systems. This can lead to a strong sense of team cohesion and a high level of job satisfaction [16].

On the other hand, the high workload and limited resources of the HI-SEAS environment can also lead to significant stress and burnout. The crew is responsible for a wide range of tasks, from conducting their own research to maintaining the habitat’s systems and preparing their own food. This relentless workload, combined with the isolation and confinement of the habitat, can take a toll on the crew’s mental and physical health [4]. The “camping” nature of the HI-SEAS experience, while providing a realistic simulation of the challenges of a Mars mission, also highlights the importance of providing crews with adequate support and resources to manage their workload and maintain their well-being.

4.2. Mars-500: A Highly Controlled, “Canned” Environment

In stark contrast to the “camping-style” approach of HI-SEAS, the Mars-500 experiment, conducted by the Russian Institute for Biomedical Problems (IBMP) with collaboration from the European Space Agency (ESA), represents the epitome of a “canned” analogue. This high-fidelity simulation, which ran for 520 days from 2010 to 2011, was designed to study the psychological and physiological effects of a long-duration mission to Mars in a highly controlled and automated environment [19].

The six-person international crew was sealed in a 550-cubic-meter facility, with all aspects of their lives, from their work schedules to their diet, meticulously planned and managed by the mission control team. The habitat was a marvel of technological sophistication, with advanced life support systems, a high degree of automation, and a direct, real-time communication link with the outside world for much of the mission (a time delay was introduced during the simulated “Mars transit” phase).

The Mars-500 experiment yielded a wealth of data on the effects of long-term isolation and confinement. However, it also highlighted the potential downsides

of the “canned” approach. With their lives so tightly controlled, the crew reported feelings of monotony, boredom, and a lack of meaningful work [23]. The high degree of automation, while reducing the crew’s workload, also diminished their sense of agency and control over their environment. This led to a state of what has been described as “psychological stagnation,” where the crew became passive and disengaged from the mission [24].

The Mars-500 experiment serves as a cautionary tale about the potential for highly automated systems to create a sterile and unfulfilling environment. While technological sophistication is essential for the safety and efficiency of a space mission, it must be balanced with the human need for autonomy, challenge, and meaningful engagement. The “canned” environment of Mars-500, while providing a high degree of experimental control, may have failed to adequately simulate the psychological demands of a real mission to Mars, where the crew will need to be proactive, adaptable, and resilient in the face of unforeseen challenges.

4.3. Concordia Station: A High-Fidelity Hybrid Analogue

Located in the heart of Antarctica, Concordia Station represents a unique hybrid of the “canned” and “camping” approaches to analogue habitat design. As one of the most remote and isolated research stations on Earth, Concordia provides an unparalleled opportunity to study the effects of long-term isolation and confinement in an extreme environment that closely resembles a planetary surface [22].

The station itself is a marvel of engineering, with two interconnected cylindrical towers providing a comfortable and technologically advanced living and working space for the crew. The habitat is equipped with state-of-the-art life support systems, a high degree of automation, and a reliable, albeit limited, communication link with the outside world. In this sense, Concordia shares many of the characteristics of a

“canned” habitat.

However, the extreme environment of the Antarctic plateau, with its months of perpetual darkness, extreme cold, and low-pressure atmosphere, introduces a significant “camping” element to the Concordia experience. The crew must contend with the ever-present threat of the harsh environment, and they are responsible for a wide range of operational tasks that are essential for their survival. This includes maintaining the station’s external equipment, conducting scientific research in the field, and responding to emergencies with limited support from the outside world.

This unique blend of high-tech living and extreme environmental challenges has a profound impact on the psychology of the crew. On the one hand, the comfortable and well-equipped habitat provides a buffer against the harshness of the external environment, reducing the physical and psychological stress on the crew. On the other hand, the constant threat of the extreme environment and the need for a high degree of self-reliance fosters a strong sense of team cohesion and a deep appreciation for the importance of human ingenuity and resilience [25].

Concordia Station thus provides a valuable model for how to balance the need for technological sophistication with the human need for challenge and meaningful work. By providing a secure and supportive habitat while also exposing the crew to the real-world challenges of an extreme environment, Concordia creates a simulation that is both realistic and humane. It is a testament to the idea that the optimal analogue habitat is not one that eliminates all challenges, but rather one that provides the crew with the tools and the autonomy to overcome them.

4.4. Comparative Analysis

The case studies of HI-SEAS, Mars-500, and Concordia Station clearly illustrate the trade-offs inherent in the “Canned” vs. “Camping” dilemma. Each of these

analogues, with its unique design philosophy and operational paradigm, has yielded valuable insights into the complex relationship between technological fidelity, human agency, and psychological well-being. To facilitate a direct comparison, the following table

Feature	HI-SEAS	Mars-500	Concordia Station
Environment	Volcanic slope (Mauna Loa)	Isolated facility (Moscow)	Antarctic plateau
Duration	4-12 months	520 days	9-12 months (winter-over)
Crew Size	6	6	12-15
Autonomy	High (20-min communication delay)	Low (real-time communication)	Medium (limited bandwidth)
Technology	Basic ("camping" style)	Advanced ("canned" style)	Advanced habitat, extreme environment
Psychological Outcomes (Positive)	Empowerment, resilience, team cohesion	N/A	Team cohesion, resilience
Psychological Outcomes (Negative)	Stress, burnout, high workload	Monotony, boredom, psychological stagnation	Sensory deprivation, depression

summarizes the key characteristics and psychological outcomes of each analogue:

As the table demonstrates, there is a clear correlation between the level of crew autonomy and the psychological outcomes observed in these analogues. The high-autonomy, "camping-style" environment of HI-SEAS fostered a sense of empowerment and team cohesion, but also led to high levels of stress and burnout. In contrast, the low-autonomy, "canned" environment of Mars-500 resulted in monotony, boredom, and a sense of psychological stagnation. Concordia Station, with its hybrid design, appears to strike a more effective balance, fostering team cohesion and resilience while also presenting significant psychological challenges due to the extreme environment.

This comparative analysis suggests that the optimal design for an analogue habitat is not a one-size-fits-all solution. Rather, it is a carefully considered balance between technological sophistication and human agency, tailored to the specific goals of the mission and the needs of the crew. The following section will explore this balance in greater detail, proposing a set of design principles for creating analogue habitats that are both realistic and humane.

5. Discussion: Finding the Optimal Balance

The "Canned" vs. "Camping" dilemma is more than just a question of technological sophistication; it is a fundamental challenge to our understanding of the human need for agency, purpose, and connection in extreme environments. The case studies of HI-SEAS, Mars-500, and Concordia Station provide a compelling narrative of the psychological consequences of our design choices. This section will synthesize the findings from our analysis to provide a deeper understanding of the psychological impacts of the dilemma and to propose a set of design principles and a conceptual framework for creating more effective and humane analogue habitats.

5.1. The Psychological Impacts of the "Canned" vs. "Camping" Dilemma

The psychological impacts of the "Canned" vs. "Camping" dilemma are far-reaching, affecting everything from crew morale and performance to the very validity of the simulation. In the highly automated, "canned" environment of Mars-500, the crew experienced a profound sense of monotony and boredom, leading to a state of psychological stagnation [23]. This is a classic example of the underload principle, which posits that a lack of stimulation and challenge can be just as detrimental to performance as an excess of it [26]. When all essential tasks are automated and the environment is unchanging, the human mind is deprived of the novelty and engagement it needs to thrive. This can lead to a decline in cognitive function, a loss of motivation, and a sense of learned helplessness, where the crew comes to believe that their actions have no meaningful impact on their environment [27].

In contrast, the high-autonomy, "camping-style" environment of HI-SEAS presented the opposite prob-

lem: overload. The relentless demands of managing the habitat's systems, conducting research, and simply surviving in a resource-scarce environment led to high levels of stress and burnout [4]. This is consistent with the well-established principle of cognitive resource theory, which suggests that humans have a finite pool of cognitive resources that can be depleted by excessive workload and stress [28]. When the demands of the environment exceed the crew's cognitive resources, performance suffers, and the risk of human error increases.

The key to finding the optimal balance, then, lies in creating an environment that provides the crew with a sense of meaningful work and earned autonomy. Meaningful work is not simply about keeping the crew busy; it is about providing them with tasks that are challenging, engaging, and contribute to the overall goals of the mission [29]. Earned autonomy is the idea that the level of autonomy granted to the crew should be commensurate with their skills, experience, and the demands of the situation. It is not about giving the crew complete freedom, but rather about providing them with the tools and the trust to make their own decisions and to take ownership of their work.

5.2. Engineering and Design Solutions

Finding the optimal balance between the “canned” and “camping” extremes requires a new approach to the engineering and design of analogue habitats. This approach must be grounded in a deep understanding of human psychology and a commitment to human-centred design. The following are a set of proposed design principles for creating more effective and humane analogue habitats:

- **Flexible and Adaptable Systems:** Rather than designing habitats with a fixed level of automation, future designs should incorporate flexible and adaptable systems that can be configured to meet the changing needs of the crew and the mission. This could include modular systems that can be easily

repaired or replaced by the crew, as well as software interfaces that allow the crew to customize the level of automation for different tasks.

- **User-Configurable Interfaces:** The crew should be given the ability to customize their environment to suit their personal preferences and work styles. This could include everything from the lighting and temperature of their personal quarters to the layout of their workstations. By giving the crew a sense of control over their environment, we can mitigate the negative psychological effects of confinement and isolation [8].
- **Integration of Natural Elements:** As discussed in the literature review, the integration of natural elements into the built environment can have a profound positive impact on psychological well-being. Future analogue habitats should incorporate principles of biophilic design, such as the use of natural materials, dynamic lighting systems that mimic the day-night cycle, and the cultivation of plants for food and aesthetic enjoyment [11].
- **Meaningful Work and Skill Development:** The design of the habitat should be integrated with the design of the mission to ensure that the crew is provided with a continuous stream of meaningful work. This could include a mix of scientific research, operational tasks, and opportunities for skill development and creative expression. The habitat should be seen not just as a place to live, but as a tool for learning and discovery.

5.3. A Framework for Future Analogue Habitat Design

Building on these design principles, we propose a conceptual framework for future analogue habitat design that is grounded in the principles of astrosociology and human-centred design. This framework, which we call the Dynamic Habitation Model, is based on the idea that the optimal analogue habitat is not a static environment, but rather a dynamic and evolving system that adapts to the needs of the crew over time.

The Dynamic Habitation Model is based on four key principles:

1. **Layered Autonomy:** The level of autonomy granted to the crew should not be fixed, but rather layered and adaptable. In the early stages of a mission, the crew might operate with a higher level of support from mission control, gradually earning more autonomy as they gain experience and demonstrate their competence. This approach, which is consistent with the principles of situational leadership [30], ensures that the crew is challenged but not overwhelmed, and that they are given the opportunity to develop their skills and confidence over time.
2. **Integrated Social and Technical Systems:** The design of the habitat's technical systems should be integrated with the design of its social systems. This means that the habitat should be designed to support not just the physical needs of the crew, but also their social and psychological needs. This could include the creation of flexible social spaces that can be adapted for different activities, as well as the integration of communication technologies that support both formal and informal interaction.
3. **Cyclical Rhythms and Rituals:** The mission should be structured around a series of cyclical rhythms and rituals that provide a sense of order and predictability in an otherwise monotonous environment. This could include daily and weekly work schedules, regular team meetings, and periodic celebrations and recreational activities. These rhythms and rituals, which are a key feature of many successful terrestrial communities, can help to mitigate the negative psychological effects of long-term isolation and confinement [31].
4. **Connection to the Larger Whole:** The crew should be given a sense of connection to the larger mission and to the broader human endeavour of space exploration. This could be achieved through regular communication with the outside world,

opportunities to share their experiences with the public, and the integration of art and cultural artefacts into the habitat. By reminding the crew that they are part of something larger than themselves, we can foster a sense of purpose and meaning that is essential for long-term psychological well-being.

The Dynamic Habitation Model provides a new paradigm for the design of analogue habitats, one that moves beyond the simplistic dichotomy of “canned” vs. “camping” and embraces the complexity of the human experience. By creating habitats that are dynamic, adaptable, and human-centred, we can create simulations that are not only more realistic, but also more humane.

6. Conclusion

The “Canned” vs. “Camping” dilemma represents a critical inflection point in the design of analogue habitats and, by extension, in our preparations for the future of human space exploration. This paper has argued that the optimal design for these vital simulation environments lies not at either extreme of technological sophistication or rustic simplicity, but in a dynamic and human-centred balance between the two. Through a multidisciplinary analysis of environmental psychology, human factors, and in-depth case studies of HI-SEAS, Mars-500, and Concordia Station, we have demonstrated the profound psychological and operational consequences of our design choices.

Our key findings reveal that an over-reliance on automation, as seen in the “canned” environment of Mars-500, can lead to monotony, boredom, and a dangerous sense of psychological stagnation. Conversely, the high-autonomy, “camping-style” environment of HI-SEAS, while fostering resilience and team cohesion, can also result in cognitive overload and burnout. The hybrid model of Concordia Station, with its blend of advanced technology and extreme environmental challenges, offers a compelling glimpse into a more ef-

fective and humane approach to analogue design.

the long-term psychological well-being of the crew.

The practical implications of this research are clear: the next generation of analogue habitats must be designed with a deep understanding of the human need for agency, purpose, and meaningful engagement. Our proposed Dynamic Habitation Model, with its emphasis on layered autonomy, integrated social and technical systems, cyclical rhythms, and a connection to the larger mission, offers a conceptual framework for achieving this goal. By creating habitats that are adaptable, user-configurable, and infused with elements of biophilic design, we can create simulations that are not only more realistic, but also more conducive to

Future research should continue to explore the long-term effects of different levels of autonomy and the development of new technologies that support crew well-being without diminishing their sense of agency. The study of the social and cultural dimensions of life in analogue habitats, a key focus of the field of astrosociology, is also a promising avenue for future inquiry. As we stand on the precipice of a new era of space exploration, the lessons we learn from the “Canned” vs. “Camping” dilemma will be essential for ensuring that our journey to the stars is not just a technological tri-

References

- [1] Heinicke, C., et al. (2021). A review of existing analogue habitats and lessons for future lunar and martian habitat design. *Acta Astronautica*, 180, 48-63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actaastro.2020.11.038>
- [2] De la Torre, G., et al. (2024). Space analogues and behavioral health performance. *npj Microgravity*, 10(1), 1-11. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41526-024-00437-w>
- [3] Pagnini, F., et al. (2023). Psychological, behavioral, and team challenges for human deep space exploration: A white paper by the European Space Agency's expert team on the psychology of space exploration. *npj Microgravity*, 9(1), 1-10. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41526-023-00270-7>
- [4] Caldwell, B., & Bishop, S. (2018). Mission Operational Autonomy: Crew and Mission Support Interaction in Autonomous Exploration of Distant Space and Planetary Surfaces. HI-SEAS. <https://www.hi-seas.org/missions-i-vi-mission-updates/mission-operational-autonomy-crew-and-mission-support-interaction-in-autonomous-exploration-of-distant-space-and-planetary-surfaces>
- [5] Hall, E. T. (1966). *The Hidden Dimension*. Doubleday.
- [6] Altman, I. (1975). *The Environment and Social Behavior: Privacy, Personal Space, Territory, Crowding*. Brooks/Cole.
- [7] Harris, P. R. (2009). *Space enterprise: Living and working offworld in the 21st century*. Springer.
- [8] Harrison, A. A. (2001). *Spacefaring: The human dimension*. University of California Press.
- [9] Ulrich, R. S. (1984). View through a window may influence recovery from surgery. *Science*, 224(4647), 420-421. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.6143402>
- [10] Suedfeld, P., & Steel, G. D. (2000). The environmental psychology of capsule habitats. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51(1), 227-253. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.227>
- [11] Kellert, S. R., Heerwagen, J. H., & Mador, M. L. (Eds.). (2008). *Biophilic design: The theory, science, and practice of bringing buildings to life*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [12] Norman, D. A. (2013). *The design of everyday things: Revised and expanded edition*. Basic books.
- [13] Parasuraman, R., & Riley, V. (1997). Humans and automation: Use, misuse, disuse, abuse. *Human factors*, 39(2), 230-253.

<https://doi.org/10.1518/001872097778543886>

- [14] Bainbridge, L. (1983). Ironies of automation. *Automatica*, 19(6), 775-779. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-1098\(83\)90046-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-1098(83)90046-8)
- [15] Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
- [16] Goemaere, S., et al. (2019). Life on mars from a Self-Determination Theory perspective: how astronauts' needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness go hand in hand with crew health and mission success-results from HI-SEAS IV. *Acta Astronautica*, 166, 300-309. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actaastro.2019.08.015>
- [17] Connors, M. M., Harrison, A. A., & Akins, F. R. (1985). *Living Aloft: Human Requirements for Extended Spaceflight*. NASA. <https://ntrs.nasa.gov/citations/19860003789>
- [18] Binsted, K., et al. (2015). *Hawai'i Space Exploration Analogue and Simulation (HI-SEAS) IV*. University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. <https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/items/d05123b0-ab8c-49bf-a8b7-986564bb55d4>
- [19] Basner, M., et al. (2014). Psychological and behavioral changes during confinement in a 520-day simulated mission to Mars. *PloS one*, 9(3), e93298. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0093298>
- [20] Grumman Aerospace Corporation. (1970). *Ben Franklin (PX-15) Gulf Stream Drift Mission Report*. Grumman Aerospace Corporation.
- [21] Cromwell, R. L., et al. (2021). Earth-based research analogues to investigate space-based health risks. *New Space*, 9(4), 204-216. <https://doi.org/10.1089/space.2020.0048>
- [22] Tafforin, C. (2013). The Mars-500 crew in daily life activities: An ethological study. *Acta Astronautica*, 89, 133-141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actaastro.2013.03.017>
- [23] Gushin, V. I., et al. (2012). Some psychophysiological and behavioral aspects of adaptation to a 520-day isolation. *Acta Astronautica*, 70, 52-58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actaastro.2011.07.022>
- [24] Kanas, N., et al. (2011). High versus low crewmember autonomy during a 105-day Mars simulation mission. *Acta Astronautica*, 69(1-2), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actaastro.2011.02.008>
- [25] Salnitski, V. P., et al. (2013). The MARS-500 experiment: The main results of the investigation of the habitat and the crew's work and rest conditions. *Human Physiology*, 39(6), 549-561.
- [26] Hancock, P. A., & Warm, J. S. (1989). A dynamic model of stress and sustained attention. *Human factors*, 31(5), 519-537.
- [27] Seligman, M. E. (1975). *Helplessness: On depression, development, and death*. WH Freeman/Times Books/Henry Holt & Co.
- [28] Kahneman, D. (1973). *Attention and effort*. Prentice-Hall.
- [29] Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 16(2), 250-279.
- [30] Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Prentice-Hall.
- [31] Pass, J. (2004). *The Astrosociology of Space Exploration: A Sociological Look at the Human Dimensions of Space*. The Astrosociology Research Institute.