

# A Human-Autonomy Teaming Approach for a Flight-Following Task

Summer L. Brandt  
Rickey Russell  
San Jose State University/  
NASA Ames Research Center

Joel Lachter  
Jay Shively  
NASA Ames Research Center



- Incidents and accidents result from pilots failing to understand increasingly sophisticated aircraft systems
  - These systems are often **brittle** and rarely degrade gracefully
  - Automation helps when all goes well but leaves the human **out-of-the-loop** when it fails
  - Automation interfaces often lack **transparency**, not facilitating understanding or tracking of the system
  - Disuse and misuse of automation (**miscalibrated trust**) have lead to real-world mishaps and tragedies
- Human involvement with increasingly sophisticated automated systems must adjust to allow for a more dynamic relationship involving cooperation and teamwork

- Part-task study to demonstrate, evaluate and refine proposed tenets of human-autonomy teaming (HAT)
  - Bi-directional communication
  - Transparency
  - Operator-directed interface
- Built on an earlier ground station to minimize development and focused primarily on interactions with one piece of software
- Overall goal is to develop a framework for HAT in aviation and provide guidelines and recommendations for its application


- Participants: 4 Dispatchers, 2 Pilots
- Participants, with the help of automation, monitored aircraft
  - Alerted pilots when
    - Aircraft was off path or pilot failed to comply with clearances
    - Significant weather events affect aircraft trajectory
    - Pilot failed to act on EICAS alerts
  - Rerouted aircraft when
    - Weather impacted the route
    - System failures or medical events force diversions
- Ran two ~50-min scenarios, containing approximately 40 aircraft and 6 off-nominal events
  - One scenario with HAT tools, one scenario without HAT tools

## ELP: Emergency Landing Planner (2007-2012)

- Cockpit decision aid
- Route planning for (serious) emergencies
  - control system failures
  - physical damage
  - fires
- Time & safety were dominant considerations

## ACFP: Autonomous Constrained Flight Planer (2013-2017)

- Ground station decision aid
- Diversion selection, route planning, route evaluation
  - weather diversion
  - medical emergencies
  - less critical system failures



**Find the best landing sites and routes  
for the aircraft**

# Emergency Page on the CDU

Runway length

Runway

Airport

Select

Principal Risks

Go to Previous/Next Page

Page #

Distance to airport

Bearing to airport

Show Airport Info Page

Update

Execute the selection




# Simulated Ground Station






# Building in HAT Tenets to the Ground Station **SJSU** SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY




# Building in HAT Tenets to the Ground Station

- Human-Directed
  - Operator calls “Plays” to determine who does what




- A play encapsulates a plan for achieving a goal. It includes roles and responsibilities
  - what is the automation going to do
  - what is the operator going to do



# Building in HAT Tenets to the Ground Station

- Transparency
  - Divert reasoning and factor weights are displayed
  - Numeric output from ACFP was found to be misleading by pilots. Display now uses English categorical descriptions.
  
- Bi-directional Communication
  - Operators can change factor weights to match their priorities



- Participants preferred the HAT condition overall ( $M = 8.5$ ,  $SD = 0.55$ )
- HAT displays were preferred with regard to:
  - keeping up with operationally important issues ( $M = 8.67$ ,  $SD = 0.52$ )
  - ensuring the necessary situation awareness for the task ( $M = 8.67$ ,  $SD = 0.52$ )
  - integrating information from a variety of sources ( $M = 8.67$ ,  $SD = 0.52$ )
  - reducing workload necessary for the task ( $M = 8.33$ ,  $SD = 0.82$ )
  - efficiency ( $M = 8.33$ ,  $SD = 0.82$ )
- Participants reported greater confidence that their diversion choice was appropriate in the HAT condition ( $M = 7.83$ ,  $SD = 1.47$ ) compared to the No HAT condition ( $M = 6.33$ ,  $SD = 2.07$ ;  $t(5) = 4.39$ ,  $p = .01$ )
- ACFP was rated as useful ( $M = 5.83$ ,  $SD = 0.82$ ), particularly during emergency situations
  - *“Everything is easy and accessible in emergency situations. No need to consult many other programs to get various info.”*

- Supporting Bi-directional Communication
  - ACFP weights
    - improved automation's ability to handle unusual situations ( $M = 7.83$ ,  $SD = 1.60$ )
    - were useful in making divert decisions ( $M = 8.33$ ,  $SD = 0.82$ )
    - were liked ( $M = 8.33$ ,  $SD = 1.21$ )
    - *"[the display] gave me the ability to see why, gave me control to change weights in variable(s)"*
- Building in Transparency
  - ACFP table
    - was helpful in making divert decisions ( $M = 7.67$ ,  $SD = 1.51$ )
    - was liked ( $M = 8.33$ ,  $SD = 1.03$ )
    - *"This [table] is wonderful... You would not find a dispatcher who would just be comfortable with making a decision without knowing why."*
- Creating an Operator Directed Interface with Plays
  - Electronic checklist
    - was liked ( $M = 8.67$ ,  $SD = 0.52$ )
    - *"This electronic checklist was easier because it was right there on the screen and it eliminated a couple of steps"*

- Participants liked where we were headed with the HAT concept
  - Increased Situation Awareness
  - Reduced Subjective Workload
- Things we didn't get quite right
  - Participants didn't always understand what the goal of a play was
  - Annunciations: People liked them but thought there were too many
  - Voice Control: Did not work well. Need a more complete grammar, better recognition
- Things we didn't get to
  - Airlines hate divers. We need to put in support to help avoid them
  - Plays need more structure (branching logic)
  - Roles and responsibilities need to be more flexible
  - Limited ability to suggest alternatives

# Where next?

- Running another part-task study with HAT features implemented on the flight deck
- Developing a software framework for creating HAT Agents

