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Human Error Modeling

- Potentially a very important area for cognitive modeling
- Typical analyses in the past were descriptive taxonomies of human error with little predictive value
  - Types of errors don’t help much with prediction
- Can force simple hypothesis
  - So simple might not want to present to ACT-R workshop
Model of a Navigation Task

- Task: Navigate to waypoints and identify targets with as little deviation from a path as possible and answer situation awareness probe questions
- Equipment: Helmet mounted display (HMD) showing waypoint, target, unit and path information
- Model: Error data from probe questions*
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Probe Questions

• Attempting to predict the likelihood of a correct answer
• 20 Questions total (one question was thrown out)
• Screens were blanked before answering the each probe question
• Yes/No format
  – Are you within 50 meters of your next target?
  – Are there friendly units only to the left of your path?
Format of Probe Questions

- Yes or no format of questions made additional analysis difficult
- Additional analysis might pertain to what factors might influence right or wrong answers
- Difficulty of being a data parasite
Hypothesis

- Memory for HMD screens would affect current situation awareness
- Decay of memory for HMD screens would cause errors in situation awareness and errors on probe questions
Memory Elements for ACT-R Model

- Screens
  - Path, Target, Waypoints, Units
- Unit
  - Separate memory elements for friendly and enemy
  - Specific unit information: (e.g., location)
- Pace Count
  - Technique used by infantry soldiers to calculate distances based on number of steps they have taken
  - A constantly updated memory element in model
- Auditory information pertaining to troop movements
ACT-R Memory Elements

• Strength of Memory (Activation Levels)
  – Subject to decay
  – Subject to spreading activation
  • Relationship between related memory elements
    – (Friendly and enemy unit information are related)
### Probe Question: Is there a target before your next waypoint?
Data Analysis

• Models of each question for each subject (140 models) were run 40 times
• This produced retrievals of multiple memory chunks for each question, these were averaged.
  – This was done because the individual experience of each soldier was different, since they could retrieve one of the 4 screens any time they wanted
• Activations from 40 runs were averaged across runs, across memory chunks and across subjects to yield a single activation level for each question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sub 1</th>
<th>Sub 2</th>
<th>Sub 20</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit-movement</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Average for 40 runs of the simulation
2 Average across subjects and across questions
Results

- One tailed Pearson’s product moment correlation
- There was a significant negative correlation between activation levels and the percentage of errors for each question
- Higher activations levels resulted in a lower percentage of errors
- \( r(19) = -0.43, p < 0.03 \)
Conclusions

• Difficult to predict human performance
  – Multiple interacting parameters
    • (Why not turn everything on?)
  – Set values for variables

• The multiple models needed to predict individual performance was cumbersome, however individual models has been suggested by ACT-R researchers

• Difficulty of modeling acquired data
  – Yes/No answers to questions presented some difficulties
Conclusions

- ACT-R activation levels can be used to predict likelihood of errors in situation awareness tasks.
- Cognitive modeling can be used in a predictive manner instead of using as a “curve-fitting” simulation.
- Future research needs to be done on using predictions to generate interface design analysis.