



HUMAN-MACHINE-
INTERACTION

Wizard-of-Oz – The Driver’s State in Real-road Automated Driving

In Conditional Automated Driving (CAD) an adequate drivers’ state plays a crucial role for safety reasons in case of a system initiated request-to-intervene (Rtl). In driving simulator experiments a change of the drivers’ state in CAD depending on different NDRTs could be demonstrated. However, it has not yet been examined in what extent these results can be transferred to the real road.

In a first approach, the development of the drivers’ state in CAD was examined in a Wizard-of-Oz on-road experiment resulting in the research questions:

- How does a drivers’ state (fatigue) change over the course of the ride?
- How is a drivers’ state affected through non-driving related tasks (NDRT)?
- To what extent are the results comparable to those from the simulator?

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN	ROUTE																																				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Prolonged conditional automated ride in Wizard-of-Oz vehicle ■ Simultaneously engaging in NDRTs (between-subjects) <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div data-bbox="126 1457 409 1668"> <p>Free choice</p> </div> <div data-bbox="493 1457 776 1668"> <p>P-q-p-d</p> </div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Times of experiment & route were preset due to an exception approval ■ A92 ■ No Autopilot in traffic jam ■ No Autopilot in roadworks <div data-bbox="1193 1392 1510 1680"> </div>																																				
MEASURES																																					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Percentage of eye-lid closure over time (PERCLOS) – Measured and analysed with Dikablis head-mounted eye tracker and D-LAB 3.5 ■ Karolinska Sleepiness Scale (KSS) – How tired are you at the moment? ■ Take-over parameters (hands-on-time, eyes-on-road time) 																																					
RESULTS																																					
<p style="text-align: center;">KSS</p> <table border="1"> <caption>KSS Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>MZP Interval</th> <th>Pqpd (Mean)</th> <th>Free choice (Mean)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>MZP 1 (3 min)</td> <td>~4.5</td> <td>~3.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MZP 2 (15 min)</td> <td>~5.5</td> <td>~3.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MZP 3 (25 min)</td> <td>~6.0</td> <td>~4.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MZP 4 (45 min)</td> <td>~6.5</td> <td>~4.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MZP 5 (60 min)</td> <td>~7.0</td> <td>~4.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	MZP Interval	Pqpd (Mean)	Free choice (Mean)	MZP 1 (3 min)	~4.5	~3.5	MZP 2 (15 min)	~5.5	~3.8	MZP 3 (25 min)	~6.0	~4.0	MZP 4 (45 min)	~6.5	~4.2	MZP 5 (60 min)	~7.0	~4.5	<p style="text-align: center;">PERCLOS (in %)</p> <table border="1"> <caption>PERCLOS Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>MZP Interval</th> <th>Pqpd (Mean %)</th> <th>Free choice (Mean %)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>MZP 1 (3 min)</td> <td>~8</td> <td>~6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MZP 2 (15 min)</td> <td>~12</td> <td>~6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MZP 3 (25 min)</td> <td>~15</td> <td>~6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MZP 4 (45 min)</td> <td>~14</td> <td>~6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MZP 5 (60 min)</td> <td>~22</td> <td>~6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	MZP Interval	Pqpd (Mean %)	Free choice (Mean %)	MZP 1 (3 min)	~8	~6	MZP 2 (15 min)	~12	~6	MZP 3 (25 min)	~15	~6	MZP 4 (45 min)	~14	~6	MZP 5 (60 min)	~22	~6
MZP Interval	Pqpd (Mean)	Free choice (Mean)																																			
MZP 1 (3 min)	~4.5	~3.5																																			
MZP 2 (15 min)	~5.5	~3.8																																			
MZP 3 (25 min)	~6.0	~4.0																																			
MZP 4 (45 min)	~6.5	~4.2																																			
MZP 5 (60 min)	~7.0	~4.5																																			
MZP Interval	Pqpd (Mean %)	Free choice (Mean %)																																			
MZP 1 (3 min)	~8	~6																																			
MZP 2 (15 min)	~12	~6																																			
MZP 3 (25 min)	~15	~6																																			
MZP 4 (45 min)	~14	~6																																			
MZP 5 (60 min)	~22	~6																																			
CONCLUSION																																					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The aim of the study was to compare results from the simulator with those in real traffic. ■ The results show, that the development of the drivers`state in real traffic is similar to the driving simulator studies. ■ Significant differences in subjective and objective fatigue (KSS /PERCLOS) depending on the NDRT could be found. ■ The Wizard-of-Oz method is well suited for measuring effects of automated driving on the drivers`state. 																																					

