

ISO 17488:2016
NBN ISO 17488:2020

 **NBN**



**Road vehicles — Transport information and control systems —
Detection-response task (DRT) for assessing attentional effects of
cognitive load in driving (ISO 17488:2016)**

Valid from 19-11-2020

ICS: 35.240.60, 43.040.15

**Road vehicles — Transport
information and control systems
— Detection-response task (DRT)
for assessing attentional effects of
cognitive load in driving**

*Véhicules routiers — Systèmes d'Information et de commande du
transport — Tâche de Détection-Réponse (DRT) pour l'évaluation des
effets attentionnels de la charge cognitive lors de la conduite*



ISO 17488:2016(E)



COPYRIGHT PROTECTED DOCUMENT

© ISO 2016, Published in Switzerland

All rights reserved. Unless otherwise specified, no part of this publication may be reproduced or utilized otherwise in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, or posting on the internet or an intranet, without prior written permission. Permission can be requested from either ISO at the address below or ISO's member body in the country of the requester.

ISO copyright office
Ch. de Blandonnet 8 • CP 401
CH-1214 Vernier, Geneva, Switzerland
Tel. +41 22 749 01 11
Fax +41 22 749 09 47
copyright@iso.org
www.iso.org

Contents

	Page
Foreword	iv
Introduction	v
1 Scope	1
2 Normative references	1
3 Terms and definitions	2
4 Abbreviated terms	5
5 DRT methodology: Principles and overview	5
6 Measurement methods and procedures	6
6.1 Participants.....	6
6.2 Experimental setup.....	6
6.2.1 Non-driving experimental setup.....	6
6.2.2 Surrogate driving experimental setup.....	6
6.2.3 Driving simulator experimental setup.....	6
6.2.4 On-road experimental setup.....	6
6.3 Stimulus presentation.....	6
6.3.1 Stimulus presentation timing.....	7
6.3.2 Visual stimulus specifications.....	8
6.4 Response method.....	10
6.5 Primary driving task.....	11
6.6 Instructions to participants.....	11
6.7 Training procedure.....	11
6.7.1 Secondary task training.....	12
6.7.2 DRT training.....	12
6.7.3 Primary task training.....	12
6.7.4 Training on multitasking.....	12
6.8 Performance measures.....	12
6.9 Analysing and interpreting DRT performance data.....	13
6.10 Checking data quality.....	13
6.11 Use of DRT data in decision making.....	14
Annex A (normative) Rationale	15
Annex B (normative) Guidelines for selecting between variants of the DRT method	23
Annex C (normative) Additional factors affecting DRT performance	25
Annex D (informative) DRT variants	27
Annex E (informative) Summary of results from the ISO-coordinated studies	38
Bibliography	69

ISO 17488:2016(E)

Foreword

ISO (the International Organization for Standardization) is a worldwide federation of national standards bodies (ISO member bodies). The work of preparing International Standards is normally carried out through ISO technical committees. Each member body interested in a subject for which a technical committee has been established has the right to be represented on that committee. International organizations, governmental and non-governmental, in liaison with ISO, also take part in the work. ISO collaborates closely with the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) on all matters of electrotechnical standardization.

The procedures used to develop this document and those intended for its further maintenance are described in the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1. In particular the different approval criteria needed for the different types of ISO documents should be noted. This document was drafted in accordance with the editorial rules of the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2 (see www.iso.org/directives).

Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. ISO shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights. Details of any patent rights identified during the development of the document will be in the Introduction and/or on the ISO list of patent declarations received (see www.iso.org/patents).

Any trade name used in this document is information given for the convenience of users and does not constitute an endorsement.

For an explanation on the meaning of ISO specific terms and expressions related to conformity assessment, as well as information about ISO's adherence to the World Trade Organization (WTO) principles in the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) see the following URL: www.iso.org/iso/foreword.html.

The committee responsible for this document is ISO/TC 22, *Road vehicles*, Subcommittee SC 39, *Ergonomics*.

Introduction

Driving is a complex task consisting of a range of sub-tasks such as keeping the vehicle in the lane, avoiding other traffic and obstacles, observing road signs and signals, planning and initiating specific manoeuvres, scanning mirrors and navigating. In addition, drivers often engage in secondary tasks, not directly related to driving, such as operating the media player, conversing on the phone and reading road-side commercial signs.

These different activities place varying, and sometimes conflicting, demands on the driver. In order to manage the various driving and secondary tasks, the driver thus needs to allocate different *resources*, such as the eyes, hands, feet, perceptual systems, motor control systems and higher level cognitive functions, to the different sub-tasks in a dynamic and flexible way. This allocation of resources to driving and non-driving activities may be generally conceptualized as *driver attention*. In most driving situations, attention is determined by an interaction of proactive (top-down, endogenous) processes based on anticipation of how the upcoming situation will develop and bottom-up processes (driven by exogenous stimuli) which can trigger attention to the situation when it does not develop as expected, even leading to a corrective action.

There is a need for methods that can be used to assess how engagement in secondary tasks affects driver attention. In general, the effect of a task on attention depends on the amount and type of resources demanded by the task. As outlined in further detail in [Annex A](#), resources can be conceptualized at three general levels: *sensory-actuator resources*, *perceptual-motor resources* and *cognitive resources*. *Sensory/actuator resources* refer to the basic interfaces between the driver and the environment used to sense the environment and perform overt actions. Examples include the eyes, the ears, the skin, the feet, the hands, the mouth, the vocal cords, etc. *Perceptual/motor resources* can be regarded as brain functions for controlling specific perceptual-motor activities, e.g. visual perception, manual tracking and hand-to-eye coordination. Finally, *cognitive resources* refer to brain systems implementing higher-level cognitive operations such as planning, decision making, error detection, sustaining information in working memory, dealing with novel or difficult situations and overcoming habitual actions. These types of high-level cognitive functions may be conceptualized in terms of *cognitive control*. While sensory-actuator and perceptual-motor resources are, at least to some extent, modality-specific, cognitive control can be regarded as a single resource with strongly limited capacity, not associated with any particular sensory modality. *Cognitive load* thus refers specifically to the demand for cognitive control that a task imposes on the driver.

Several existing and draft ISO standards address the assessment of secondary task demand in the context of driving. ISO 15007-1[1] and ISO/TS 15007-2[2] provide guidance on how to measure glance behaviour and ISO 16673[3] focuses exclusively on the viewing time required to perform a task using an in-vehicle information system. Hence, these methods focus mainly on the assessment of (visual) sensory demand (i.e. the demand for the eyes). ISO 26022[4] provides a technique for evaluating the combined effect of sensory-actuator, perceptual-motor and cognitive demands on a driver's performance in a combined event detection and vehicle control task.

However, a standardized measurement method that specifically addresses cognitive load is lacking. While, for example, ISO 26022 is sensitive to cognitive load, it lacks specificity since its main performance metric (MDEV) is also sensitive to visual sensory motor interference (i.e. visual time sharing; see [Annex A](#)). A standardized method specifically addressing cognitive load is particularly needed in order to evaluate the attentional demands of new driver-vehicle interfaces designed to minimize visual interaction such as voice-based interfaces, haptic input devices and head-up displays.

The detection-response task (DRT) method defined in this document intends to fill this gap. More specifically, the DRT is mainly intended to measure effects of the cognitive load of a secondary task on attention. However, some versions of the DRT specified in this document may also be used to capture other forms of secondary task demand (e.g. visual sensory demand). The general rationale behind the DRT methodology is further outlined in [Annex A](#).

[Annex B](#) provides guidance on how to select among the different DRT versions defined in this document. [Annex C](#) reviews factors that could potentially affect DRT performance and thus need to be accounted for when designing DRT experiments. [Annex D](#) offers a review of existing alternative DRT

ISO 17488:2016(E)

methodologies not covered by this document. [Annex E](#) provides an overview of the results from a set of coordinated studies with the purpose to support the development of this document. Finally, a general bibliography is provided for existing DRT-related research.

Road vehicles — Transport information and control systems — Detection-response task (DRT) for assessing attentional effects of cognitive load in driving

1 Scope

This document provides a detection-response task mainly intended for assessing the attentional effects of cognitive load on attention for secondary tasks involving interaction with visual-manual, voice-based or haptic interfaces. Although this document focuses on the assessment of attentional effects of cognitive load (see [Annex A](#)), other effects of secondary task load may be captured by specific versions of the DRT, as further outlined in [Annex B](#). Secondary tasks are those that may be performed while driving but are not concerned with the momentary real-time control of the vehicle (such as operating the media player, conversing on the phone, reading road-side commercial signs and entering a destination on the navigation system).

NOTE According to this definition, secondary tasks can still be driving-related (such as in the case of destination entry).

This document does *not* apply to the measurement of primary (driving) task demands related to the momentary real-time control of the vehicle, such as maintaining lane position and headway or responding to forward collision warnings. However, this does not preclude that the DRT method, as specified in this document, may be adapted to measure such effects.

This document applies to both original equipment manufacturer (OEM) and after-market in-vehicle systems and to permanently installed, as well as portable, systems.

It is emphasized that, while the DRT methodology defined in this document is intended to measure the attentional effects of cognitive load, it does not imply a direct relationship between such effects and crash risk. For example, taking the eyes off the road for several seconds in order to watch a pedestrian may not be very cognitively loading but could still be expected to strongly increase crash risk.

Furthermore, interpret DRT results cautiously in terms of demands on a specific resource, such as cognitive load. Specifically, if the goal is to isolate the effect related to the cognitive load imposed by a secondary task on attention, avoid overlap with other resources required by the DRT (e.g. perceptual, motor, sensory or actuator resources). A particular concern derives from the fact that the DRT utilizes manual responses (button presses). Thus, for secondary tasks with very frequent manual inputs (on the order of one or more inputs per second), increased response times on the DRT may reflect this specific response conflict (which is due to the nature of the DRT) rather than the actual cognitive load demanded by the task when performed without the DRT (i.e. alone or during normal driving; see [Annex E](#)). Thus, for such response-intensive tasks, DRT results are interpreted with caution. This document defines three versions of the DRT and the choice of version depends critically on the purpose of the study and the conditions under which it is conducted (see [Annexes A](#) and [B](#) for further guidance on this topic).

This document specifically aims to specify the detection-response task and the associated measurement procedures. Thus, in order to be applicable to a wide range of experimental situations, this document does not define specific experimental protocols or methods for statistical analysis. However, some guidance, as well as examples of established practice in applying the DRT, can be found both in the main body of this document and in the annexes (in particular [Annexes C](#) and [E](#)).

2 Normative references

There are no normative references in this document.