

# Contents

<b>I</b>	<b>Introduction and Methodology</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1	Problem Statement . . . . .	5
2	Research Objective . . . . .	6
3	Background . . . . .	6
3.1	Adaptive Support for Human-Computer Teams . . . . .	6
3.2	Exploring the Use of Cognitive Models of Trust and Attention . . . . .	7
4	Support System Design . . . . .	8
5	Research Methodology . . . . .	10
6	Overview of the Thesis . . . . .	13
<b>2</b>	<b>Integrating Human Factors and Artificial Intelligence in the Development of Human-Machine Cooperation</b>	<b>21</b>
1	Introduction . . . . .	23
2	The Cognitive Engineering Method CE+ . . . . .	24
3	Case-studies . . . . .	24
3.1	Personal Assistant for onLine Services . . . . .	24
3.2	Context Aware Communication Terminal and USer . . . . .	25
3.3	Situated Usability engineering for Interactive Task Environments . . . . .	26
3.4	Human-Machine Task Integration . . . . .	28
4	Conclusion . . . . .	29
<b>II</b>	<b>Trust</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Towards Task Allocation Decision Support by means of Cognitive Modeling of Trust</b>	<b>35</b>
1	Introduction . . . . .	37
2	Cognitive Theory . . . . .	37
3	Formal Cognitive Model . . . . .	39
4	Experiment Design . . . . .	41
5	Discussion . . . . .	42

<b>4</b>	<b>Closed-Loop Adaptive Decision Support Based on Automated Trust Assessment</b>	<b>45</b>
1	Introduction . . . . .	47
2	Theoretical Background . . . . .	48
3	Conceptual Design of Reliance Decision Support . . . . .	49
3.1	Feedback . . . . .	50
3.2	Reliance . . . . .	50
3.3	Meta-reliance . . . . .	50
4	Implementation and Evaluation . . . . .	51
4.1	The Task . . . . .	51
4.2	Design of the Aid . . . . .	51
4.3	Experimental Results . . . . .	52
5	Conclusion . . . . .	53
<b>5</b>	<b>Reliance on Advice of Decision Aids: Order of Advice and Causes of Under-Reliance</b>	<b>55</b>
1	Introduction . . . . .	57
2	Background . . . . .	58
3	Hypotheses . . . . .	59
3.1	Self Bias and Order of Advice . . . . .	59
3.2	Understandability of Underlying Reasoning . . . . .	60
3.3	Feeling of Responsibility . . . . .	60
3.4	Accuracy of Perceived Reliability . . . . .	61
3.5	Attribution Bias . . . . .	61
4	Method . . . . .	62
4.1	Participants . . . . .	62
4.2	Apparatus . . . . .	62
4.3	Design . . . . .	64
4.4	Independent Variables . . . . .	64
4.5	Dependent Variables . . . . .	64
5	Results . . . . .	65
5.1	Self Bias and Order of Advice (Hypothesis 1) . . . . .	65
5.2	Understandability of Underlying Reasoning (Hypotheses 2 and 3) . . . . .	66
5.3	Feeling of Responsibility (Hypothesis 4) . . . . .	68
5.4	Accuracy of Perceived Reliability (Hypothesis 5) . . . . .	68
5.5	Attribution Bias (Hypotheses 6 and 7) . . . . .	69
6	Conclusion . . . . .	69
<b>6</b>	<b>Aiding Human Reliance Decision Making Using Computational Models of Trust</b>	<b>73</b>
1	Introduction . . . . .	75
2	Task Environment . . . . .	76
3	Decision Aid Design . . . . .	77
4	Method . . . . .	78
4.1	Participants . . . . .	78

4.2	Design . . . . .	78
5	Results . . . . .	79
6	Conclusion . . . . .	80
<b>7</b>	<b>Validation and Verification of Agent Models for Trust: Independent Compared to Relative Trust</b>	<b>83</b>
1	Introduction . . . . .	85
2	Agent Models for Trust . . . . .	86
2.1	Independent Trust Model . . . . .	86
2.2	Relative Trust Model . . . . .	86
3	Method . . . . .	87
3.1	Participants . . . . .	87
3.2	Task . . . . .	87
3.3	Data Collection . . . . .	88
3.4	Parameter Adaptation . . . . .	88
3.5	Validation . . . . .	90
3.6	Verification . . . . .	90
4	Results . . . . .	92
4.1	Validation Results . . . . .	92
4.2	Verification Results . . . . .	93
5	Discussion and Conclusions . . . . .	94
<b>8</b>	<b>Effects of Reliance Support on Team Performance by Advising and Adaptive Autonomy</b>	<b>101</b>
1	Introduction . . . . .	103
2	Reliance Support . . . . .	104
2.1	Generic Model . . . . .	104
2.2	Proposed Support Types . . . . .	105
2.3	Hypotheses . . . . .	106
3	Method . . . . .	107
3.1	Participants . . . . .	107
3.2	Apparatus . . . . .	107
3.3	Design . . . . .	108
3.4	Independent Variables . . . . .	108
3.5	Dependent Variables . . . . .	110
3.6	Procedure . . . . .	111
4	Results . . . . .	111
4.1	Team Performance . . . . .	111
4.2	Satisfaction . . . . .	111
4.3	Effectiveness due to Human Competence . . . . .	111
4.4	Effectiveness due to Task Difficulty . . . . .	112
5	Discussion and Conclusions . . . . .	112

### III Attention

117

<b>9</b>	<b>Augmented Meta-Cognition Addressing Dynamic Allocation of Tasks Requiring Visual Attention</b>	<b>119</b>
1	Introduction . . . . .	121
2	Augmented Meta-Cognition: Motivational Background . . . . .	122
3	Augmented Meta-Cognition Design . . . . .	122
3.1	Prescriptive and Descriptive Models . . . . .	122
3.2	Some Principles of SDT . . . . .	123
4	Applications . . . . .	124
4.1	Multitask . . . . .	124
4.2	Tactical Picture Compilation Simulator . . . . .	125
5	Discussion . . . . .	127
<b>10</b>	<b>Simulation and Formal Analysis of Visual Attention</b>	<b>129</b>
1	Introduction . . . . .	131
2	Visual Attention . . . . .	132
3	A Mathematical Model for Visual Attention . . . . .	134
3.1	Attention Values, Objects and Spaces . . . . .	134
3.2	Gaze . . . . .	134
3.3	Saliency Maps . . . . .	135
3.4	Normalization . . . . .	135
3.5	Persistency and Decay . . . . .	135
3.6	Concentration . . . . .	136
4	Case Study . . . . .	136
4.1	Task . . . . .	136
4.2	Simulation Model . . . . .	137
4.3	Simulation Results . . . . .	138
5	Temporal Relational Specification and Verification . . . . .	138
5.1	Temporal Relational Specification of Attentional States . . . . .	139
5.2	Temporal Relational Specification of Attentional Sub-processes . . . . .	140
5.3	Formal Specification and Analysis . . . . .	141
5.4	Analysis Results . . . . .	144
6	Discussion . . . . .	145
<b>11</b>	<b>Design and Validation of HABTA: Human Attention-Based Task Allocator</b>	<b>153</b>
1	Introduction . . . . .	155
2	Human Error in the Allocation of Attention . . . . .	156
2.1	Under-allocation of Attention . . . . .	156
2.2	Over-allocation of Attention . . . . .	157
3	Design Requirements . . . . .	157
4	Validation . . . . .	158
4.1	Task Description . . . . .	159
4.2	Experiment 1: Validation of the Descriptive Model . . . . .	161
4.3	Experiment 2: Validation of the HABTA-Based Support . . . . .	162

5	Intermediary Results . . . . .	162
6	Conclusion and Discussion . . . . .	163
<b>12</b>	<b>Effects of Task Performance and Task Complexity on the Validity of Computational Models of Attention</b>	<b>167</b>
1	Introduction . . . . .	169
1.1	Allocation of Attention . . . . .	170
1.2	Task Complexity . . . . .	170
1.3	Task Performance . . . . .	171
2	Method . . . . .	171
2.1	Participants . . . . .	171
2.2	Task . . . . .	171
2.3	Design . . . . .	172
2.4	Independent Variables . . . . .	172
2.5	Dependent Variables . . . . .	172
2.6	Procedure . . . . .	172
3	Results . . . . .	173
3.1	Manipulation Check . . . . .	173
3.2	Main Effects . . . . .	173
3.3	Effect of Model Type . . . . .	173
3.4	Effect of Task Complexity . . . . .	173
3.5	Effect of Task Performance . . . . .	174
4	Conclusion and Discussion . . . . .	174
<b>13</b>	<b>Personalization of Computational Models of Attention by Simulated Annealing Parameter Tuning</b>	<b>177</b>
1	Introduction . . . . .	179
2	Attention Model . . . . .	180
2.1	Description of the Attention Model . . . . .	180
2.2	Individual Differences in Attention . . . . .	180
3	Method . . . . .	181
3.1	Simulation-Based Training Environment . . . . .	181
3.2	Participants and Procedure . . . . .	181
4	Personalization of Computational Models of Attention . . . . .	182
4.1	Parameters to be Tuned . . . . .	182
4.2	Simulated Annealing Parameter Tuning . . . . .	182
4.3	Subjective Evaluation Measure . . . . .	183
4.4	Data Analysis . . . . .	184
5	Results . . . . .	184
6	Discussion . . . . .	185
<b>14</b>	<b>A System to Support Attention Allocation: Development and Application</b>	<b>187</b>
1	Introduction . . . . .	189
2	Manipulation of Attention . . . . .	190
3	A Theory of Mind for Attention . . . . .	190

3.1	Overall Setting . . . . .	190
3.2	Dynamic Attention Model . . . . .	191
3.3	Model for Beliefs about Attention . . . . .	192
3.4	Model to Determine Discrepancy . . . . .	192
3.5	Decision Model for Attention Adjustment . . . . .	192
4	Simulation Results . . . . .	194
5	Case Study . . . . .	195
5.1	Environment . . . . .	195
5.2	Implementation . . . . .	195
5.3	Results . . . . .	197
6	Validation . . . . .	197
7	Verification . . . . .	198
8	Formal Analysis . . . . .	199
9	Discussion . . . . .	200

**15 Adaptive Attention Allocation Support: Effects of System Conservativeness and Human Competence 207**

1	Introduction . . . . .	209
2	Background . . . . .	210
2.1	Unreliable Automation . . . . .	210
2.2	Adaptive Automation . . . . .	211
3	Attention Allocation Support . . . . .	211
3.1	Generic Support Model . . . . .	211
3.2	Hypotheses . . . . .	212
4	Method . . . . .	213
4.1	Participants . . . . .	213
4.2	Apparatus . . . . .	213
4.3	Design . . . . .	214
4.4	Independent Variables . . . . .	214
4.5	Dependent Variables . . . . .	215
4.6	Procedure . . . . .	215
4.7	Statistical Analysis . . . . .	216
5	Results . . . . .	216
5.1	Task Performance . . . . .	216
5.2	Trust . . . . .	216
5.3	Understandability . . . . .	217
5.4	Responsibility . . . . .	217
6	Conclusion and Discussion . . . . .	218

**IV Research Overview and General Discussion 221**

<b>16</b>	<b>Research Overview and General Discussion 223</b>
1	Research Overview . . . . . 223
2	General Discussion . . . . . 236

<b>V Appendices</b>	<b>239</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>241</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>247</b>
<b>Curriculum Vitae</b>	<b>249</b>
<b>Samenvatting</b>	<b>251</b>
<b>SIKS Dissertation Series</b>	<b>255</b>