

## Augmented reality concepts for pedestrian-vehicle interactions: An online study

Tabone, W.; Happee, R.; García De Pedro, Jorge ; Lee, Yee Mun; Lupetti, M.L.; Merat, Natasha; de Winter, J.C.F.

### Publication date

2022

### Document Version

Final published version

### Citation (APA)

Tabone, W., Happee, R., García De Pedro, J., Lee, Y. M., Lupetti, M. L., Merat, N., & de Winter, J. C. F. (2022). *Augmented reality concepts for pedestrian-vehicle interactions: An online study*. Poster session presented at 13th International Conference on Applied Human Factors and Ergonomics (AHFE 2022), New York, United States.

### Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).  
Please check the document version above.

### Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

### Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.  
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



# Augmented reality concepts for pedestrian-vehicle interactions: An online study

Wilbert Tabone <sup>1</sup>, Riender Happee <sup>1</sup>, Jorge García De Pedro <sup>2</sup>, Yee Mun Lee <sup>2</sup>, Maria Luce Lupetti <sup>3</sup>, Natasha Merat <sup>2</sup>, Joost de Winter <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Cognitive Robotics, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands; <sup>2</sup> Institute for Transport Studies, University of Leeds, The United Kingdom; <sup>3</sup> Department of Human Centered Design, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands.

Nine AR interfaces designed using an experience-based, and theoretically informed design approach, were presented in an online questionnaire for user evaluation. Statistical analysis of presented measures, and the computation of an overall composite score revealed a preference towards traditional and familiar traffic elements.

## Method

- Online questionnaire administered to participants across **Germany, The Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and The United Kingdom.**
- Participants were presented with **18** videos (**non-yielding**, and **yielding** per interface) in a **within-subject** experimental design, in **random order**.
- Measured **intuitiveness**, and **convincingness** of the interfaces.
- Presented **descriptor scale** and **acceptance scale** <sup>1</sup>.
- Free text entry** to expand on their scale ratings, for **qualitative data capture**.

Please select an answer to the following questions:

Do you think that the interface was triggered too early or too late?

Do you think that the interface is too small or too large?

How clear (understandable) was the interface to you?

How visually attractive is this interface to you?


I found the interface to be:

too early	early	neutral	late	too late
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
too small	small	neutral	large	too large
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
very unclear	unclear	neutral	clear	very clear
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
very unattractive	unattractive	neutral	attractive	very attractive
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

useful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	useless
pleasant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	unpleasant
bad	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	good
nice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	annoying
effective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	superfluous
irritating	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	likable
assisting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	worthless
undesirable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	desirable
raising alertness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	sleep-inducing

<sup>1</sup> Van Der Laan, J.D., Heino, A., & De Waard, D. (1997). A simple procedure for the assessment of acceptance of advanced transport telematics. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 5(1), 1-10.






## Interfaces




The design process behind these Interfaces has been presented in:

Tabone, W., Lee, Y. M., Merat, N., Happee, R., & De Winter J. C. F. (2021). Towards future pedestrian-vehicle interactions: Introducing theoretically-supported AR prototypes. *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Automotive User Interfaces and Interactive Vehicular Applications* (pp. 209-218).

## Results

**N = 992** (492 males, 491 females, 8 non-binary, 1 n/a.)  
 n = 202 , n = 197 , n = 184 , n = 197 , n = 212   
 Age: 18 – 69 (M = 45.10, SD = 14.17).

Interface	Composite Score * M (SD)
8. Nudge HUD	0.37 (0.86)
1. Augmented zebra crossing	0.32 (0.89)
5. Fixed pedestrian lights	0.28 (0.88)
9. Pedestrian lights HUD	0.25 (0.86)
6. Virtual fence	0.04 (1.00)
4. Field of safe travel	-0.12 (1.00)
2. Planes on vehicle	-0.26 (1.01)
3. Conspicuous looming planes	-0.35 (1.00)
7. Phantom car	-0.52 (1.05)



\* The composite score was created by first standardising the scores of the all strongly-correlated items (the 15 variables measured in the scales), so that their overall item mean (of all 9 interfaces concatenated) was 0 and the corresponding standard deviation was 1. A higher score indicates a stronger user preference.


## Key takeaways

- Preference towards **traditional** and **familiar** traffic elements.
- Head-up displays** (ie. 8, 9) and interfaces **mapped on the road** (ie. 1, 5, 6) seem to perform better.
- No significant differences** in ratings across **genders**.
- 66%** of respondents feel such **AR communication** would be **useful**.
- Traditional** and **familiar** traffic design elements seem to work **better** than other concepts generated by **experience-based design** methodology.

## Contact



**e:** [w.tabone@tudelft.nl](mailto:w.tabone@tudelft.nl)  
**w:** [www.wilbertabone.com](http://www.wilbertabone.com)  
**t:** [@WilbertTabone](https://twitter.com/WilbertTabone)



Find me on ResearchGate

## Acknowledgements



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement 860410

