Accounting for Fatigue in Systems Design and Operations: Issues and Opportunities

Gerald Matthews

University of Central Florida





- Intersection of three safety factors: fatigue, automation and distraction
 - Can "distraction" mitigate automation-induced fatigue?
- Simulator studies of automation fatigue: Surface and UAVs
 - Impact on subjective state, behavioral alertness and trust in automation
- Extent of the problem
 - Driver/operator limitations in effective fatigue management
- Secondary task solutions
 - Mixed effects of media use
- Safety implications



Convergence of Multiple Safety Threats

- Fatigue
 - Task-induced fatigue and workload regulation
 - Distinct from sleep loss and circadian effects
 - Fatigue effects in short-haul trucking (Friswell & Williamson, 2008)
- Distraction
 - Phone use and more (Strayer & Drews, 2007)
 - But can secondary tasks counter fatigue?
- Automation
 - Aims to help but loss of situation awareness (Young & Stanton, 2007)
 - Source of fatigue
 - The driverless vehicle





Automation Provokes Rapid Disengagement

(Saxby et al., 2013)

Overall state change

Loss of engagement over time



Active fatigue: wind gusts

Passive fatigue: full automation



Automation Provokes Loss of Alertness

(Saxby et al., 2013)

- Emergency event at end of drive: van pulls out
- Measure braking and steering response times (averaged across duration)
- Slowest braking and steering response times in passive fatigue condition





Active fatigue: wind gusts

Passive fatigue: automation



Brain Metabolic Changes

- Cerebral bloodflow velocity (CBFV)
 - Measured using transcranial Doppler sonography
 - Decline closely parallels vigilance
 decrement in performance (Warm et al., 2012)



 Simulated driving: Concurrent changes in CBFV and performance (Reinerman et al., 2008) over 36 min





Control over Automation Does Not Mitigate Fatigue (Neubauer et al., 2012a)

- Participants can choose to use full automation, for 5 min periods
 - Compare automation users (N=44) and non-users (N=49)
 - Pre-drive subjective engagement predicts greater automation use
 - Automation users show greater increase in post-drive distress (vicious cycle?)





Fatigue in UAV Operation

(Lin et al., 2016)

- Adaptive Levels of Automation (ALOA) multi-UAV simulation, with embedded surveillance tasks
- Configured for monotony
- 2-hour run effective for fatigue induction: Subjective and eyetracking metrics







- Automation helpful for difficult surveillance task
- Operators increasingly neglect automation over time: task-shedding?





Surface Vehicles: Distraction and Fatigue

- Does media use during period of automation counter automation fatigue?
 - Text and speech inputs
 - Text and voice outputs
 - Some scope for choice
- Outcome measures
 - Subjective stress and fatigue
 - Response time to post-automation emergency event
- Study 1
 - Response to cellphone text messages: text or speak back
- Study 2
 - Response to voice messages: speak back





Responding to Texts is Stressful but Enhances Alertness

- Texting elevates distress and lowers engagement; speech to a lesser extent
- Texting and speech slow emergency response after normal driving; speed response after automation







Responding To Voice Is Engaging But Does Not Raise Alertness

- Cellphone and trivia mitigate loss of engagement
- *Cell phone and trivia have no effect on response time, irrespective of automation*





- Perils of automation
 - Even short intervals of automation are hazardous due to passive fatigue
 - Don't trust the driver to manage automation
- Secondary tasks: Distraction or countermeasure?
 - Verbal response to texts during automation enhances alertness
 - Unclear whether this is a viable countermeasure
 - Trivia game play has similar effects to phone conversation
 - Again, some way to go to practical benefits
- Other solutions
 - Diagnostic monitoring
 - Training solutions
 - Situational exercises to promote adaptive coping