Auditory interfaces in automated driving: an international survey

Pavlo Bazilinskyy, Joost C. F. De Winter

This study investigated peoples' opinion on auditory interfaces in contemporary cars and their willingness to be exposed to auditory feedback in automated driving. We used an Internet-based survey to collect 1,205 responses from 91 countries. The respondents stated their attitudes towards two existing auditory driver assistance systems, a parking assistant (PA) and a forward collision warning system (FCWS), as well as towards a futuristic augmented sound system (FS) proposed for fully automated driving. The respondents were positive towards the PA and FCWS, and rated the willingness to have automated versions of these systems as 3.87 and 3.77, respectively (on a scale from 1 = disagree strongly to 5 = agree strongly). The respondents tolerated the FS (the mean willingness to use was 3.00 on the same scale). The results showed that among the available response options, the female voice was the most preferred feedback type for takeover requests in highly automated driving, regardless of whether the respondents' country was English speaking or not. The present results could be useful for designers of automated vehicles and other stakeholders.

Auditory Interfaces in Automated Driving: an International Survey

Pavlo Bazilinskyy* and Joost de Winter

Department of Biomechanical Engineering, Faculty of Mechanical, Maritime and Materials Engineering, Delft
University of Technology, Mekelweg 2, 2628 CD, Delft, The Netherlands

Abstract: This study investigated peoples' opinion on auditory interfaces in contemporary cars and their willingness to be exposed to auditory feedback in automated driving. We used an Internet-based survey to collect 1,205 responses from 91 countries. The respondents stated their attitudes towards two existing auditory driver assistance systems, a parking assistant (PA) and a forward collision warning system (FCWS), as well as towards a futuristic augmented sound system (FS) proposed for fully automated driving. The respondents were positive towards the PA and FCWS, and rated the willingness to have automated versions of these systems as 3.87 and 3.77, respectively (on a scale from 1 = disagree strongly to 5 = agree strongly). The respondents tolerated the FS (the mean willingness to use was 3.00 on the same scale). The results showed that among the available response options, the female voice was the most preferred feedback type for takeover requests in highly automated driving, regardless of whether the respondents' country was English speaking or not. The present results could be useful for designers of automated vehicles and other stakeholders.

Practitioner Summary: In an Internet-based survey, peoples' opinion on auditory interfaces in contemporary cars and people's willingness to be exposed to auditory feedback in automated driving were evaluated. The results showed that a female voice was the most preferred feedback mode for takeover requests in highly automated driving.

Introduction

The Development of Automated Driving Systems

The development of automated driving technology is a key topic in modern transportation research. A transition to automated driving may have a large positive influence on society (European Commision, 2011). Each year more than 1,000,000 fatal accidents occur on roads worldwide, with the lower-income countries being overrepresented (Gururaj, 2008; World Health Organization, 2013). If automated driving systems are designed to be fully capable and reliable, a very large portion of—yet probably not all—road traffic accidents could be prevented (Goodall, 2014). Furthermore, traffic congestions, gas emissions, and fuel consumption may reduce considerably thanks to automated driving systems.

The control of vehicles can be represented as a spectrum consisting of five levels: (1) manual driving, (2) driver assistance, (3) partially automated driving, (4) highly automated driving, and (5) fully automated driving (Gasser & Westhoff, 2012). The introduction of driver assistance systems (i.e., level 2 automation) to the public took place in the 1990s with the release of Adaptive Cruise Control (ACC), a system that automates the longitudinal motion of the vehicle (Beiker, 2012). Advancements in cameras, radars, lasers, and artificial intelligence have led to the creation of systems that make partially automated driving (i.e., level 3 automation) possible. Partially automated driving systems not only control the longitudinal motion of a vehicle, but

---

* Corresponding author. Email: P.Bazilinskyy@tudelft.nl

also its lateral motion. Examples of such systems are BMW's Traffic Jam Assistant (BMW, 2013), Volvo's ACC with steer assist (Volvo, 2013a), and Mercedes' Distronic Plus with Steering Assist (Daimler, 2013). In partially automated driving, drivers are usually required to keep their eyes focused on the road and intermittently touch the steering wheel.

Highly automated driving (HAD; level 4 automation) is a next step. In HAD, the human can release the hands from the steering wheel and is no longer required to monitor the road permanently (e.g., Banks, Stanton, & Harvey, 2014). However, humans still have an important role in the control of highly automated vehicles (Alicandri & Moyer, 1992; Dingus, Hulse & Barfield, 1998; Levitan, Golembiewski & Bloomfield, 1998). In HAD, drivers can be asked to take over control of the vehicle when required, for example, when the vehicle automation cannot solve a task in a demanding traffic environment. The time between issuing a 'takeover request' and the required moment of transition of control from the vehicle to the human is a critical design parameter (Gold et al., 2013). If the driver spends too much time on reclaiming the control of the vehicle, or if the driver does not comprehend the warning signal sent by the vehicle, an accident may result. Clearly, the design of appropriate feedback is essential for the successful introduction of HAD to the public roads. Indeed, inappropriate feedback is regarded as a primary cause of automation-induced accidents (Norman, 1990).

Fully automated driving (FAD; level 5 automation) will be the next and final iteration in automated driving. People have been envisioning this step in the development of transportation for a long time. Almost half a millennium ago, Leonardo Da Vinci envisioned a pre-programmed clockwork cart (Weber, 2014). In 1939 during the New York World's Fair, General Motors presented their vision of the world 20 years into the future (1959–1960). In their Futurama exhibition, they introduced a concept of automated highways with trench-like lanes for separating traffic (Wetmore, 2003). In 1953, the futurist Isaac Asimov wrote a short story 'Sally' that pictured a situation where only cars that did not require a human driver were allowed on the roads.

FAD offers numerous potential benefits. It could reduce stress and allow the operator to engage in non-driving tasks such as working, using in-vehicle entertainment, or resting (e.g., Jamson et al., 2011; Llaneras, Salinger, & Green, 2013). Furthermore, FAD is a recommended solution for achieving an optimal traffic flow, for example by means of platooning on highways (Bergenhem et al., 2012; Varaiya, 1993). The Google Driverless Car is one of the existing prototypes of FAD (Markoff, 2010). However, this particular vehicle does not fully comply with the principles of FAD; in reality, the Google Driverless Car relies on accurate three-dimensional maps of the environment and currently cannot cope with all dynamic environments of high complexity. It requires considerable advances in sensing and artificial intelligence before FAD becomes practically feasible on all public roads. Continental, a leading German manufacturer specialising on components for automotive industry, predicts that FAD will be launched in the year 2025 (Continental, 2012), whereas some voices have argued that FAD will never happen (Gomes, 2014; Underwood, 2014; Yoshida, 2014).

Although automated driving systems are expected to improve safety, certain side effects may occur regarding the human factor (e.g., Bainbridge, 1983; Desmond, Hancock, & Monette, 1998; Merat et al., 2012; Brandenburg & Skottke, 2014). A degraded reaction time to critical events

88 has been found among drivers exposed to ACC (Stanton, Young, & McCaulder, 1997; Stanton et
89 al., 2001; Rudin-Brown & Parker, 2004; Larsson, Kircher, & Hultgren, 2014), and this issue is
90 likely to be aggravated in higher levels of automated driving (De Winter et al., 2014; Strand et
91 al., 2014). Furthermore, it is expected that people who will be driving highly and fully automated
92 cars will suffer from a reduction of their manual control skills, similar to pilots in highly
93 automated airplanes (Ebbatson, 2009; Scallen, Hancock & Duley, 1995). The development of
94 effective feedback systems is considered important in supporting operator's sustained attention,
95 also called vigilance (Heikoop et al., 2015).

96 *Auditory Displays*

97 As mentioned above, unless the driving task is fully automated, an appropriate feedback system
98 is required that warns and/or informs the human when automation mode changes are required.
99 The present study investigated the potential of auditory feedback in automated driving. The
100 auditory modality has several important characteristics: (1) it is omnidirectional. That is, unlike
101 visual cues, auditory cues can be received from any direction. This is especially important in
102 automated driving, during which the driver may not be attending to the road and dashboard; (2)
103 the auditory sense can receive information at almost all times; (3) sound is transient, that is,
104 unlike visual information which can be continuously available, information passed in the form of
105 sound is only available at that particular moment; (4) although auditory cues may be masked by
106 other sounds, humans have the ability to selectively focus on one sound when multiple streams
107 of sound are available, also known as the cocktail party effect (Bregman, 1990; Cooke & Ellis,
108 2001; Hermann, Hunt & Neuhoff, 2011; Wickens & Hollands, 2013).
109
110 An advantage of sound is that it is possible to use language, which may be more informative as
111 compared to the information conveyed with haptic or visual interfaces. Because of the
112 aforementioned qualities of sound, auditory displays are used in a variety of applications,
113 especially in those cases where the user needs to be alerted or where additional visual load has to
114 be avoided. For example, the majority of present route navigation devices use voice and sound
115 messages to give directions to their users (Holland, Morse & Gedenryd, 2002), and flight crews
116 use auditory signals to get informed about proximate aircraft or to obtain directional information
117 (e.g., Begault, 1993; Bronkhorst, Veltman & Van Breda, 1996). An auditory interface in
118 combination with tactile feedback was suggested in a driving simulator study (Ho, Reed &
119 Spence, 2007) as an optimal warning system for collision avoidance. The auditory modality has
120 potential not only as a warning method, but also for providing inputs to the machine (e.g., speech
121 interfaces). Literature reviews (Stanton & Edworthy, 1999; Barón & Green, 2006) suggest that
122 people driver 'better' (i.e., lower lane variation, steadier speed) when auditory interfaces are
123 employed in a manually driven car.
124
125 Auditory feedback can be delivered as a pre-recorded voice or as an artificial sound
126 warning/message. The term earcon refers to a brief auditory message (e.g., a tune or a sound of a
127 bell) that represents a certain event or object. Earcons have been introduced to desktop
128 computers to complement visual icons (Mynatt, 1990; Belz, Robinson & Casali, 1999; Hermann,
129 Hunt & Neuhoff, 2011). Previous research has shown that a female voice is favoured over a male
130 voice in route navigation devices (Large & Burnett, 2013). However, national or cultural
131 differences seem to exist, where in some cases, the male voice is preferred over the female voice.
132 In 2010, BMW supposedly had to recall its navigating system in Germany because male drivers

133 disliked the idea of following orders communicated via a female voice (Takayama & Nass,
134 2008)**,** and Apple recently added the option of a male voice to their voice control system Siri
135 (Bosker, 2013). In a driving simulator study by Jonsson and Dahlbäck (2011), non-native
136 speakers of English responded more accurately to route instructions provided by a female voice
137 than to route instructions provided by a male voice.

Auditory Systems in Current Vehicles: Parking Assistant and Forward Collision Warning System

140 Modern vehicles often include level 2 automation systems, which assist in driving and increase
141 road safety. Such systems support drivers by providing auditory/visual/haptic warning messages
142 and by taking over control of some of the driving tasks. In the present survey, we investigated
143 the opinion of people on two existing auditory systems: a parking assistant (PA) and a forward
144 collision warning system (FCWS).

146 The first generations of PAs were so-called parking sensors, which produce warning sounds
147 (beeps) when the car gets too close to a nearby object while parking, using ultrasonic or
148 electromagnetic sensors (BMW, 2013; Toyota, 2014; Volkswagen, 2014). Some recent PA
149 systems take over the positioning of the vehicle during parking, leaving the control of
150 acceleration and deceleration to the driver (Volkswagen, 2014). Other PAs take over control of
151 the parking process entirely, as can be seen in the Toyota Prius 2015 and BMW X5 (BMW,
152 2014; Toyota, 2014).

154 A FCWS is a system that provides a warning sound when a vehicle is rapidly approaching a
155 vehicle in front. FCWSs have the potential to prevent a large portion of rear-end collisions
156 (Jamson, Lai & Carsten, 2008; Kingsley, 2009; Kessler et al., 2012). If a potential accident is
157 detected by the FCWS, the system either gives a warning to a driver (Honda, 2014) or engages in
158 emergency braking and/or steers way from the object (Volvo, 2013b). Most FCWS detect
159 vehicles with the help of computer vision (Srinivasa, 2002; Dagan et al., 2004), an approach that
160 is used by companies like Honda and BMW (BMW, 2013; Volvo, 2013b; Honda, 2014) and/or
161 radars (Volvo, 2013b; Ford, 2014; Honda, 2014; Mercedes-Benz, 2014). Both approaches have
162 limitations, and the system may not issue warnings or stop the vehicle in bad weather or in other
163 situations where the sensors are obscured by external factors. The introduction of vehicle-to-
164 vehicle (V2V) communication may increase the efficiency and capabilities of collision warning
165 systems (e.g., Miller & Huang, 2002). Eighty-eight percent of owners of Volvo cars surveyed by
166 Braitman et al. (2010) reported always having the FCWS turned on.

168 It is expected that both PAs and FCWSs will remain in future partially and highly automated
169 vehicles. However, these technologies will become obsolete with the introduction of FAD
170 because both parking and collision avoidance will be handled without any input from the human
171 driver.

'Augmented / Spatial' Sound System for Fully Automated Driving

173 Auditory warning signals will not be required in FAD, because in FAD the automation by
174 definition takes care of all possible emergency conditions. This study proposes an experimental
175 setup aimed at the three-dimensional augmentation of sound surrounding a vehicle, hereafter

176 referred to as the 'future system' (FS), which could be used in FAD for entertainment and
177 comfort. Three-dimensional sound is being developed as a means for providing feedback to
178 humans (Lumbreras, Sánchez & Barcia, 1996; Garas, 2000; Rozier, 2000; Godinho, António &
179 Tadeu, 2001; Dobler, Haller & Stampfl, 2002).
180
181 Our proposed FS filters out unwanted sounds (e.g., tire/engine noise coming from vehicles in the
182 vicinity) and amplifies desired sounds (e.g., sound of birds singing in a park). We envision that
183 such a system could be used in future fully automated vehicles. Vehicles driving fully
184 automatically have full control of the vehicle and must have reliable detection capabilities of the
185 environment. Drivers of such vehicles will not be required to pay attention to the processes that
186 take place in the environment surrounding the car. Hence, a spatial augmentation of sounds that a
187 driver prefers to hear and simultaneous cancelation of unwanted sounds may enhance the
188 pleasure of being engaged in FAD. Such system will probably have to be configurable: drivers
189 must have the option to select which sounds they want to augment and which sounds they wish
190 to filter out, as well to adjust the volume of these sounds.

The Aim of the Present Survey Study

192 As mentioned above, feedback is important in HAD, especially regarding transitions of control.
193 It is relevant for the development of automated driving systems to know what types of interfaces
194 people want and need. Because automated cars do not exist yet on the consumer market, it is
195 impossible to test such research questions in an ecologically valid environment, except through
196 driving simulator research.
197
198 The present study was undertaken from a different point of view. We proceeded on the basis that
199 respondents were asked to *imagine* automated driving scenarios. The aim of the present study
200 was to investigate the opinion of people on two existing auditory displays (PA & FCWS) as well
201 as the augmented sound system 'FS'. The respondents were asked to judge two qualities of the
202 systems—helpfulness and annoyance—and state whether they would consider using such
203 systems in the future. In addition, we asked people to report their preferred type of feedback for
204 takeover requests in HAD. Statistical associations between self-reported driving style as
205 measured with the Driver Behaviour Questionnaire (DBQ), yearly mileage, number of accidents,
206 and opinions of respondents on the qualities of the proposed systems were assessed.
207
208 The hypothesis that people from non-English speaking countries prefer a female voice to a male
209 voice in automated driving systems was also tested. Additionally, the respondents were asked to
210 provide their general thoughts on the concept of automated driving in a free-response question.
211 Finally, the respondents provided their opinion on the year of introduction of fully automated
212 driving in their country of residence. Results of these analyses were compared with findings
213 from two previous surveys that asked questions related to other aspects of automated vehicles
214 (De Winter et al., 2015; Kyriakidis, Happee, & De Winter, 2015).

Methods

Survey

217 A survey containing 31 questions was developed with the online tool CrowdFlower
218 (www.crowdflower.com). Table 1 shows the questions of the survey as well as the corresponding

219 coding. The full survey is included in the supplementary material. The survey was targeted
220 towards reasonably educated persons without knowledge of automated driving. A previous
221 survey indicated that people who work on CrowdFlower-based surveys have mostly
222 undergraduate degrees (Kyriakidis et al., 2015).
223
224 The present survey introduced in plain language three levels of driving: manual driving, partially
225 automated driving, and fully automated driving. Manual driving was referred to as "normal (non
226 automated) cars". The explanation of partially driving was provided as follows: "Imagine again
227 that you are driving in an automated car (that can perform certain tasks without any interaction
228 from the humans in the car). However, the automation cannot handle all possible situations, and
229 you sometimes have to take over control". Respondents were asked to imagine fully automated
230 driving as follows: "Imagine a fully automated car (no steering wheel) that drives completely on
231 its own with no manual interaction".
232 The survey contained questions on the person's age, gender, driving frequency, mileage, and
233 accident involvement. The questions asking participants to provide information on their driving
234 style were based on the violations scale of the DBQ, as used by De Winter (2013).
235 The respondents were asked to express their opinion on two currently existing systems and one
236 proposed setup that could be used during fully automated driving. Specifically, we asked
237 respondents about (1) a parking assistant (PA) in a manually driven car that produces warning
238 sounds (beeps) when the car gets too close to a nearby object while parking, (2) a forward
239 collision warning system (FCWS) in a manually driven car that provides a warning sound when
240 a car is rapidly approaching another car in front, and (3) a future augmented surround sound
241 system in a fully automated vehicle (FS). The FS was described as follows: "Now imagine that
242 this fully automated car records what is happening outside and plays it via speakers inside the
243 car, informing the occupants about the outside environment. In other words, those who sit in the
244 car can hear what is happening outside even when their windows are closed. Sound volume in
245 such system could be adjusted; particular noise (for example sound coming from another
246 vehicle) could be filtered out. Such system could, for example, be used during a leisure drive
247 through a park on a hot day". Illustrations belonging to the three scenarios (i.e., PA, FCWS, FS)
248 were used in the survey (Figure 1). No auditory examples were used. The illustrations were
249 uploaded to a remote site in order to be embedded to the survey. Supplementary material
250 contains the XML code used to create the survey. If one wishes to add images to a CrowdFlower
251 survey, the suggested method could be used.
252

253 *Figure 1.* Illustrations belonging to the three scenarios presented to the respondents. (a) Parking assistant (PA); (b)
254 Forward collision warning system (FCWS); (c) Future system (FS).

255

256 The respondents were asked to indicate disadvantages of the PA (Q17) and FCWS (Q23) and to
257 indicate advantages and disadvantages of the FS (Q26) by means of textual responses. The
258 respondents also had the opportunity to indicate the preferred mode of feedback for receiving a
259 takeover request (Q27 & Q28). In the last question (Q31), they were asked to "provide any
260 suggestions, which could help engineers to build safe and enjoyable automated cars". Giving a
261 response to this last free-response question was optional. All examples of given comments

262 shown in this article are direct quotes from the responses; no grammatical or syntactic errors
263 were corrected. The respondents had to complete all questions (except Q28 & Q31), and each
264 question had an *I prefer not to respond* response option.

265
266 <p style="text-align:center">Table 1. All survey items.</p>

267
268 ### *Configuration of CrowdFlower*

269 In the instructions, the respondents were informed that they would need approximately 10 min to
270 complete the survey. The task expiration time was set to 30 min. Contributors from all countries
271 were allowed to participate in the survey, in order to collect data from an as large and diverse
272 population as possible. Moreover, the lowest level of experience of contributors 'Level 1
273 contributors' was selected. This level of experience accounts for 60% of completed work on
274 CrowdFlower. As a result, the survey was available to a large number of workers, which allowed
275 reaching a relatively diverse group of users of the platform. Completing the survey more than
276 once from the same IP address was allowed (note, however, that responses from multiple IP
277 addresses were filtered out in our analyses, see results section). For the completion of the survey
278 a payment of $0.15 was offered, and 2,000 responses were collected. The study was preceded by
279 a pilot test with 10 respondents. The pilot test did not lead to any changes in the survey, and
280 these 10 respondents were not included in the analysis.

281 ### *Analyses*

282 Descriptive statistics (i.e., mean, median, standard deviation, skewness, and number of
283 responses) were calculated for each of the variables. The skewness was calculated as the third
284 central moment divided by the cube of the standard deviation. A Spearman correlation matrix
285 among the variables was created. The first author manually performed the analysis of textual
286 responses (Q17, Q23, Q26, Q28, & Q31).

287 CrowdFlower automatically provides the respondent's country based on his/her IP address. We
288 analysed the preferences of people from English speaking countries, as defined by the UK
289 government (UK Visas & Immigration, 2014): Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Bahamas,
290 Barbados, Belize, Canada, Dominica, Grenada, Ireland, Jamaica, New Zealand, Saint Lucia,
291 Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom, and the United States) versus non-English speaking
292 countries regarding the use of a male or female voice for supporting takeover requests during
293 highly automated driving. Supplementary material contains the MATLAB script used to analyse
294 the data.

295 ### *Ethics Statement*

296 All data were collected anonymously. The research was approved by the Human Research Ethics
297 Committee (HREC) of the Delft University of Technology. Documented informed consent was
298 obtained via a dedicated survey item asking whether the respondent had read and understood the
299 survey instructions.

300 ## Results

301 ### *Number of Respondents and Respondent Satisfaction*

302   In total, 2,000 surveys were completed. The responses were gathered on 2 September 2014
303   between 15:00 and 20:15 (CET). The survey received an overall satisfaction rating of 4.4 out of
304   5.0. Additionally, the respondents ranked clearness of the instructions as 4.4 / 5.0, fairness of the
305   questions as 4.2 / 5.0, easiness of the survey as 4.2 / 5.0, and the offered payment as 4.1 / 5.0.

306   ***Data Filtering***

307   The respondents who indicated they had not read the instructions ($N = 10$), who indicated they
308   were under 18 and thereby did not adhere to the survey instructions ($N = 6$), who chose the *I*
309   *prefer not to respond* or *I do not know* options in one or more of the multiple choice questions (N
310     $= 231$), who indicated they never drive ($N = 193$), or who indicated they drive 0 km per year (N
311     $= 191$) were excluded from the analyses. Since no limitations were applied on the number of
312   responses that could be generated per IP address, some people completed the survey more than
313   once. Such behaviour was seen as an indication that these persons participated in the survey
314   primarily because of monetary gain. Thus, we applied a strict filter, and all data generated from
315   non-unique IP address were removed ($N = 465$). In total, 795 surveys were removed, leaving
316   1,205 completed surveys for further analysis.
317

318   For the question "In which year do you think that most cars will be able to drive fully
319   automatically in your country of residence?", non-numeric responses (e.g., a year complemented
320   by words such as "maybe 2030", or "never") and answers before the year 2014 were excluded,
321   leaving 1,082 numeric responses.

322   ***Analyses at the Individual Level***

323   The 1,205 respondents were from 91 countries (all 2,000 responses were associated with 95
324   countries). Descriptive statistics for all variables are listed in Table 2. The respondents took on
325   average 9.2 minutes to complete the survey ($SD = 5.6$ min, median $= 7.7$ min). The
326   supplementary material contains the entire Spearman correlation matrix. The correlation
327   coefficients between variables that related to questions about the PA, FCWS, and FS (PApast,
328   PAhelp, PAannoy, PAfut, FCWSpast, FCWShelp, FCWSannoy, FCWSfut, FSannoy, & FSfut)
329   on the one hand, and Age, DriveFreq, KmYear, NrAcc, the DBQ variables (Vangered,
330   Vmotorway, Vresident, Vfollowing, Vrace, Vhorn, & Vphone), YearAuto, and SurvTime, on the
331   other, were overall small, between -0.15 and 0.25.
332
333   Table 2. Descriptive statistics for the survey items ($N = 1,205$).

334

335   The respondents' mean and median age were 31.9 and 30 years, respectively. Figure 2 shows the
336   distribution of the respondents in 5-year wide age groups. 75.2% of the respondents were male
337   (906 men vs. 299 women). The frequencies of the answers are provided in Table 3.
338
339   Table 3. Frequencies of answers.

340

341

342   Figure 3 shows that the respondents expected most cars to be able to drive in fully automated
343   mode in their countries of residence around 2030 (median response), with a highly skewed
344   distribution.

345
346   *Figure 2*. Distribution of the age of the respondents aged between 18 and 54 years.
347

348
349   *Figure 3*. Distribution of responses for the question: "*In which year do you think that most cars will be able to drive
350   fully automatically in your country of residence?*" (Q30). Years were divided into 5-year-wide bins.
351

352   The respondents were asked to provide their opinion on two characteristics of the PA and FCWS
353   systems, annoyance and helpfulness, and whether they would be willing to have automated
354   versions of such systems in their own cars (Q18 for the PA & Q22 for the FCWS), all questions
355   on a scale from 1 (*disagree strongly*) to 5 (*agree strongly*). Figure 4 shows the results for these
356   questions.
357
358   *Figure 4*. Opinion of the respondents on whether a PA and FCWS are helpful and annoying, and whether they would like to
359   have automated versions of such systems in their cars in the future.
360

361   Figure 5 shows associations between the opinion of the respondents on annoyance and
362   helpfulness of the PA and FCWS and their age divided into 5-year wide bins. Figure 5a shows
363   that younger respondents found that both the PA ($\rho = -0.05$, $p = .103$) and the FCWS ($\rho = -0.14$,
364   $p < .001$) were more annoying, but these effects were weak. The Spearman correlation between
365   the respondents' age and the reported annoyance of the FS was weak as well ($\rho = 0.06$, $p = .035$).
366   Figure 5b shows that the perceived helpfulness of the FCWS ($\rho = 0.12$, $p < .001$) slightly
367   increased with age. People who found the PA annoying typically indicated that the FCWS was
368   also annoying ($\rho = 0.47$, $p < .001$), and respondents who thought that the PA was helpful,
369   considered the FCWS to be helpful as well ($\rho = 0.34$, $p < .001$).

370

371   *Figure 5*. (a) Opinion on the annoyance of the parking assistant (PA, Q16), forward collision warning system
372   (FCWS, Q21), and future system (FS, Q24) as a function of age; (b) Opinion on the helpfulness of the PA (Q15) and
373   FCWS (Q20) as a function of age. Age was divided into 5-year-wide bins.

374

375   Figure 6 shows the respondents' opinion on the proposed future system. The respondents were
376   asked whether they would find such system annoying (Q24) and whether they would prefer to
377   use such system instead of opening windows while driving in a fully automated car through a
378   scenic place (Q25). A large portion of the respondents was neutral in their responses: 346 people
379   choose the option *Neither agree nor disagree* in Q24, and 312 persons chose the same option in
380   Q25.
381
382
383   *Figure 6*. Distribution of opinions on whether the proposed future system (FS) would be annoying (Q24) and
384   whether the respondents would prefer the system to opening windows in fully automated cars (Q25).
385

386   In Q27 the respondents were asked to report on the types of feedback that they would like to be
387   supported by in case of a takeover request during highly automated driving. The respondents
388   were allowed to select multiple options. Figure 7 shows that a large number of people preferred
389   auditory feedback represented as a female voice saying 'Take over please' (N = 514). The
390   number of respondents who chose the option with the male voice was considerably lower (N =
391   244). Figure 7 makes a distinction between the numbers of female and male respondents. It is
392   apparent that both female and male respondents preferred the female over the male voice.

393   Other types of auditory feedback were reported in the following order: two beeps (N = 375), one
394   beep (N = 195), a bell sound (N = 194), and a horn sound (N = 135). The respondents indicated a
395   high level of support for both visual signals offered in the question: a warning message projected
396   on the windscreen 'Take over please' (N = 429) and a warning light (N = 406). However,
397   respondents showed a relatively low level of acceptance of the offered variations of a vibration
398   interface: vibrations in the seat (N = 341), vibrations in the steering wheel (N = 179), vibrations
399   in the seatbelt (N = 117), and vibrations in the floor (N = 64). Furthermore, the results seem to
400   suggest that female respondents were less likely than male respondents to prefer a female voice.

401
402   *Figure 7*. Numbers of respondents who indicated a preference for a particular takeover request during highly
403   automated driving in the question: "*Now imagine again that you are driving in an automated car (that can perform*
404   *certain tasks without any interaction from the humans in the car). However, the automation cannot handle all*
405   *possible situations, and you sometimes have to take over control. What type of warning signal would you like to*
406   *receive in case manual take over is required?*" (Q27). Each bar is supplemented by the corresponding 'risk ratios'
407   of female respondents, calculated as the proportion of females who indicated this answer divided by the number of
408   males who indicated this answer. If the risk ratio is greater than 1 females are overrepresented. Conversely, if the
409   risk ratio is smaller than 1, females are underrepresented. 95% confidence intervals are shown in parentheses.
410

411   Figure 8 shows the opinion of the respondents on the combinations of warning signals. The
412   figure shows that most people (N = 188) preferred a sound signal (i.e., one or two beeps, a horn,
413   or bell) without additional information. A large number of people indicated that they would like
414   to receive a combination of all four modalities (N = 170) or the combination of a sound signal, a
415   visual message, and a voice (N = 101).

416
417   *Figure 8*. Preference to combinations of types of signals for aiding takeover requests during highly automated
418   driving (Q27). All possible combinations are listed. Hence, the total number of respondents adds up to 1,205.
419

420   ***Cross-National Differences in Opinion for Feedback for Takeover Requests***

421   Next, we tested the hypothesis whether peoples' preference for a female and male voice in
422   supporting takeover requests in highly automated driving was different between English and
423   non-English speaking countries. Figure 9 presents a scatter plot, showing the numbers of
424   respondents per country who indicated that they would like to receive a female or a male voice.
425   The overall percentage of respondents who expressed preference for a female voice was 43%
426   (514 / 1,205), and the overall percentage of people who expressed preference for a male voice
427   was 20% (244 / 1,205). The corresponding percentages were 42% (71 / 168) and 22% (37 / 168)
428   for English speaking countries, and they were 43% (443 / 1,037) and 20% (207 / 1,037) for non-
429   English speaking countries. The differences between English speaking countries and non-English

430 speaking countries were not statistically significant (female voice: RR = 0.99, 95% CI = [0.82,
431 1.20]; male voice: RR = 1.10, 95% CI = [0.81, 1.50]).

432
433 *Figure 9.* Numbers of respondents from English and non-English speaking countries who indicated a preference for
434 a male voice and a female voice for a takeover request during highly automated driving (Q27). The dashed line
435 represents the ratio between the number of respondents who preferred a female voice and the number of respondents
436 who preferred a male voice. The solid line is the line of unity. No labels for shown for countries with five or less
437 respondents indicating a male voice, to support the clarity of the figure. Country abbreviations are listed according
438 to ISO 3166-1 alpha-3.

439

440 ### *Analyses of Textual Comments*

441 The respondents provided their feedback on the disadvantages of the PA in Q17. The responses
442 that were less than five characters long ($N = 181$) or that were not written in English ($N = 39$)
443 were ignored. Comments were processed before data filtering and were hence based on all 2,000
444 responses. 12.4% of the respondents ($N = 151$) provided negative feedback on the auditory
445 interfaces in parking assistants. Many people ($N = 135$) indicated that PA systems were
446 annoying, for example: "*Sound should not be too loud and annoying*" and "*I think it could be
447 annoying especially when your focusing*". Thirty-seven respondents pointed out that the PA used
448 overly loud sounds. Next, a selection of answers to the question contained comments that the PA
449 sounds can be distracting ($N = 21$) and inaccurate ($N = 48$). Five respondents indicated that they
450 would prefer feedback in other types of modalities, for example: "*annoying, use something else
451 instead of the constant loud beeping sounds*" and "*The sound, a voice message would be better*".
452 Five respondents indicated that the PA systems cannot be used by deaf people.

453

454 The respondents indicated their opinion on the disadvantages of the FCWS in Q23. The
455 responses that were less than five characters long ($N = 276$) or that were not written in English
456 ($N = 35$) were not included in the analysis. Sixteen respondents indicated that the auditory
457 feedback used in FCWS was annoying, for example: "*This situation might come up too often so
458 the warning sound may get annoying fast*" and "*The beeps might feel annoying*".

459

460 Next, the respondents were asked to comment on possible advantages and disadvantages of the
461 FS in Q26. The responses that were less than five characters long ($N = 138$) or that were not
462 written in English ($N = 46$) were not included in the analysis. In total, 1,249 comments were
463 analysed. A collection of mixed responses was received. Overall, more comments were classified
464 as positive ($N = 132$) than negative ($N = 52$) to the FS. However, the respondents also pointed
465 out concerns about a number of characteristics that they associated with the system: annoyance
466 to both a driver and to other road users in the traffic ($N = 101$), distraction ($N = 47$), and loudness
467 ($N = 28$). Fifty-five respondents expressed their concerns that the system would be impractical;
468 however, most of such concerns could be associated with the lack of understanding of the
469 concept of a fully automated car. Certain respondents showed a high level of negativity caused
470 by an apparent lack of understanding the concept of filtering only specific sounds coming from
471 the outside environment. Examples are: "*You can not hear some bells or signal from other cars*",
472 "*Main disadvantage: makes driver unaware of any dangers*", "*If car noises are filtered out how
473 would you hear if another car is incoming*", and "*I feel that filtering other car noise may be
474 dangerous*".

475
476   In Q27 the respondents were asked to indicate their preference for types of interfaces to be used
477 for takeover requests in HAD. One of the options in that question was "*Other*". If respondents
478 selected this option, they were invited to provide further comments in Q28. The responses that
479 were less than five characters long ($N = 32$) or that were not written in English ($N = 1$) were
480 ignored. In total, 22 responses were analysed. One respondent indicated that he/she would prefer
481 to be aided by continuous beeps until he/she reclaimed control. Another respondent stated
482 "*steering wheel up or down motion to signal steering wheel usage needed, accompanied by a*
483 *specific message*". One respondent mentioned that interfaces used in such scenario need to be
484 adaptive depending on the urgency of the request "*It honestly depends on the situation the car*
485 *needs me to take over for. Does it affect anyone's safety at all? Does it actually /need/ to be done*
486 *straight away? Is it critically important in any other way? In those cases I'd obviously like a very*
487 *noticeable signal however 'annoying' it may be. In other situations however I'd prefer a decent*
488 *text message or a gentle reminder*".

489 **Discussion**

490   The aim of this study was to obtain opinions on preferred feedback types for takeover requests in
491 HAD from a large number of people coming from all over the globe. Additionally, the aim was
492 to measure perceived helpfulness and annoyance of auditory interfaces for three systems.
493 Specifically, the respondents who participated in the survey were presented with two existing
494 systems used in modern vehicles (a parking assistant [PA] & forward collision warning system
495 [FCWS]) and one futuristic setup (FS) envisioned for FAD. Respondents were asked whether
496 they would consider using the proposed FS in future automated vehicles. Our survey helped us to
497 gather opinions from people before technology is actually available.
498
499   Previous research suggests that the modality of aiding systems in automated cars should be
500 chosen carefully to avoid frustration of people who will be using such vehicles and to increase
501 safety of automation on public roads. Stanton, Young, and McCaulder (1997) expressed
502 concerns that interfaces currently employed in ACC do not support the understanding of the
503 behaviour and limitations of the system. A driving simulator study by Adell et al. (2008)
504 provided a comprehensive analysis of combinations of interfaces for supporting safe driving.
505 Participants in that study were most positive about the haptic interface, while the auditory
506 warning signals were not highly appreciated, which may be explained by the nature of the
507 experiment that exposed the participants to a high urgency scenario of avoiding rear-end
508 collisions (Adell et al., 2008).
509
510   Findings from the aviation field show that the female voice is more difficult to understand in
511 noisy environments (Nixon et al., 1998a). It has also been argued that the female voice has the
512 advantage that it stands out more in a predominantly male environment, such as the military
513 (Noyes, Hellier, & Edworthy, 2006). However, differences in speech intelligibility and perceived
514 urgency between male and female voices are generally small and findings have been mixed (e.g.,
515 Arrabito, 2009; Edworthy, Hellier, & Rivers, 2003; Nixon et al., 1998b). However, it has been
516 found that most people normally use a female voice when using their route navigation device
517 (Large & Burnett, 2013). In the present research, respondents were asked to select the types of
518 interfaces they are willing to be guided by during a takeover request. The results of our survey
519 further showed that the female voice is preferred in both English and non-English speaking

520 countries. Thus, our findings reinforce the idea that the overall most preferred way to support the
521 transition of control is an auditory instruction performed with a female voice. However,
522 determining the language of respondents based on their IP address cannot guarantee accurate
523 results in all cases. In future surveys adding a question prompting for the participant's spoken
524 language may yield more accurate results.

526 It was found that the participants showed a relatively low level of appreciation of vibratory
527 interfaces, which contrasts with the findings in Adell et al. (2008). This could be due to the fact
528 that only a small number of systems that feature vibratory feedback are available in modern
529 vehicles. A relatively large number of people indicated that they would like to be aided by all
530 four proposed modalities. In addition, a large number of respondents indicated that the
531 combination of a sound signal, a visual message, and a vibration signal would be preferable
532 during takeover requests in highly automated driving. This is a surprising finding as such a
533 combination is not common in current cars. A possible explanation of this finding could be that
534 the respondents misinterpreted the question and instead of indicating their preference for
535 multimodal feedback, expressed their preferences for the types of feedback that can be used
536 separately from each other during takeover requests in highly automated driving. Another
537 limitation of the present study is that we did not vary possible parameters of the feedback
538 signals, including the quality, intensity, timing, and speed of delivery of the take-over requests.
539 Future experimental research could investigate the effects of such parameters.

541 The existing systems—the PA and FCWS—received favourable ratings, which may not be
542 surprising, since these systems have already been tested and are already available on the market.
543 One limitation in this context is that the participants relied on a narrative description,
544 complemented with a visual illustration; the survey did not contain actual examples of auditory
545 cues. Before the initiation of the survey, it was believed that the proposed FS would be seen as a
546 way to enhance the enjoyment of driving a car through a scenic place. The results showed that
547 the participants were rather sceptical about such a concept: the system was perceived as
548 somewhat annoying, with a mean score of 3.21 to question Q24 on the scale from disagree
549 strongly (1) to agree strongly (5). The proposed FS was not highly rated, possibly because the
550 concept was perceived as a bad idea, because of a lack of previous experience with such system,
551 or because people could not envision it due to the lack of a realistic representation (see also the
552 analysis of the textual comments). It should also be noted that a large proportion of respondents
553 selected the middle option *Neither agree nor disagree,* possibly indicating difficulties with
554 understanding the concept of the proposed system (for studies into middle category endorsement,
555 see Kulas, Stachowski & Haynes, 2008; Kulas & Stachowski, 2009; Sturgis, Roberts & Smith,
556 2012).

557 Small effects of age on the acceptance of FAD were previously reported by Payre, Cestac and
558 Delhomme (2014). In the present study, we also observed small age effects regarding the self-
559 reported annoyance of the three proposed systems: younger participants saw the PA and FCWS
560 as more annoying than older respondents did. However, young respondents perceived the FS as
561 less annoying than the older respondents. It is known that younger people are more likely to
562 accept new technologies (Lee, 2007; Tacken et al., 2005), and thus may be more successful at
563 envisioning such abstract concepts as the FS. A somewhat stronger age effect was observed
564 regarding helpfulness: older respondents found the FCWS more helpful than the younger
565 participants. It is known that young people feel more confident behind the wheel (Matthews &

566 Moran, 1986; Lee et al., 2002; Lee, 2007; Clarke, Ward & Truman, 2005), and therefore may
567 think they need less external help than older drivers.
568
569 CrowdFlower offers a platform that supports full anonymity of participants. This anonymity may
570 have encouraged respondents to express their thoughts freely, without the fear of being judged
571 by the organizers of the survey. All but the last free-response items required people to enter at
572 least one character. A large number of respondents did not provide meaningful comments.
573 However, a substantial portion of respondents did provide valuable answers, facilitating the
574 understanding of what people think about not only the use of auditory interfaces in future highly
575 and fully automated cars, but also about the concept of automated driving in general. Numerous
576 respondents expressed their concerns about the qualities of current PA and FCWS systems. Some
577 participants suggested that they want to be aided by visual and vibratory feedback in addition to
578 auditory feedback. A number of people indicated the inaccessibility of modern PAs and FCWSs
579 to deaf users. However, current systems also provide haptic and/or visual cues (BMW, 2013;
580 Volvo, 2013b; Ford, 2014; Honda, 2014), and so people with a hearing impairment could still
581 benefit from such multimodal feedback. Some respondents were sceptical about the introduction
582 of highly and fully automated vehicles, which may be related to general consumer scepticism
583 about new technologies. Respondents expected that most cars would drive fully automatically by
584 the year 2030 (median value), a result that matches findings in previously published research
585 (Sommer, 2013; De Winter et al., 2015; Kyriakidis et al., 2015).
586
587 The total cost of the study performed by means of a crowdsourced online-based survey was
588 lower than what is offered by companies that conduct similar surveys with help of classic
589 recruitment methods (De Winter et al., 2015). A group of people filled in the survey more than
590 once, and we reasoned that their responses ought not to be trusted. Thus, we applied a strict
591 filter, and removed all respondents who filled out the survey more than once. We also excluded
592 all people who had one or more missing items. With appropriate data quality control
593 mechanisms, crowdsourcing is known to be a powerful research tool (Howe, 2006; Kittur, Chi &
594 Suh, 2008; Mason & Suri, 2012; Crump, McDonnell & Gureckis, 2013). Nonetheless, as with
595 any self-report questionnaire, the validity of the results is limited to what people can imagine or
596 retrieve from their memory. Furthermore, CrowdFlower respondents are not representative of the
597 entire population of stakeholders of future HAD cars. It is likely that highly automated vehicles
598 will initially be purchased by wealthy people, while projects on CrowdFlower are often
599 completed by people from low-income countries (Kyriakidis et al., 2015).

600 In conclusion, the present survey study showed that the PA and FCWS were well appreciated by
601 respondents, whereas the proposed future system (FS) was not rated highly. A second conclusion
602 is that the female voice is the most preferred take over request among the offered options. The
603 scientific community and the automotive industry may be able to use the information gathered in
604 the present survey for the development of automated driving systems, in particular future
605 iterations of parking assistants and forward collision warning systems, as well as for the design
606 of human-machine interfaces for automated driving.

607 **Acknowledgements**
608

609 The research presented in this paper was conducted in the project HFAuto – Human Factors of
610 Automated Driving (PITN-GA-2013-605817). We would like to express our special gratitude to

611   Daria Nikulina for designing the illustrations used in the survey.

612   **References**

613   Adell E, Varhelyi A, Fontana MD, Bruel L. 2008. Test of HMI alternatives for driver support to
614   keep safe speed and safe distance – a simulator study. *The Open Transportation Journal*
615   2:53–64. DOI: 10.2174/1874447800802010053

616   Alicandri E, Moyer J. 1992. Human factors and the automated highway system. *Proceedings of*
617   *the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting* 36:1064–1067. DOI:
618   10.1518/107118192786749793

619   Arrabito GR. 2009. Effects of talker sex and voice style of verbal cockpit warnings on
620   performance. *Human Factors 51*: 3–20. DOI: 10.1177/0018720808333411

621   Bainbridge L. 1983. Ironies of automation. *Automatica* 19:775–779. DOI: 10.1016/0005-
622   1098(83)90046-8

623   Banks VA, Stanton NA, Harvey C. 2014. Sub-systems on the road to vehicle automation: Hands
624   and feet free but not 'mind' free driving. *Safety Science* 62:505–514. DOI:
625   10.1016/j.ssci.2013.10.014

626   Barón A, Green P. 2006. *Safety and usability of speech interfaces for in-vehicle tasks while*
627   *driving: A brief literature review* (Technical Report No. UMTRI-2006-5). Ann Arbor, MI:
628   Transportation Research Institute, University of Michigan. *Available at*
629   *http://www.umich.edu/~driving/publications/UMTRI-2006-5a.pdf* (accessed 13 July 2015)

630   Begault DR. 1993. Head-up auditory displays for traffic collision avoidance system advisories: A
631   preliminary investigation. *Human Factors* 35:707–717. DOI:
632   10.1177/001872089303500409

633   Beiker SA. 2012. Legal aspects of autonomous driving: The need for a legal infrastructure that
634   permits autonomous driving in public to maximize safety and consumer benefit. *Santa*
635   *Clara Law Review 52*:1145–1561

636   Belz SM, Robinson GS, Casali JG. 1999. A new class of auditory warning signals for complex
637   systems: Auditory icons. *Human Factors* 41:608–618. DOI: 10.1518/001872099779656734

638   Bergenhem C, Pettersson H, Coelingh E, Englund C, Shladover S, Tsugawa S. 2012. Overview
639   of platooning systems. In: *Proceedings of the 19th ITS World Congress, Vienna, Austria.*
640   *Available at http://publications.lib.chalmers.se/records/fulltext/174621/local_174621.pdf*
641   (accessed 13 July 2015)

642   BMW. 2013. BMW ConnectedDrive from A to Z. *Available at*
643   *http://www.bmw.com/com/en/insights/technology/connecteddrive/2013/a_to_z/index.html*
644   (accessed 7 November 2014)

645 BMW. 2014. BMW X5: Park Assistant. *Available at*
646   *http://www.bmw.com/com/en/newvehicles/x/x5/2013/showroom/driver_assistance/park_assi*
647   *stant.html#t=l* (accessed 12 November 2014)

648 Bosker B. 2013. Why Siri's voice is now a man (and a woman). *Available at*
649   *http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/06/11/siri-voice-man-woman_n_3423245.html*
650   (accessed 18 December 2014)

651 Braitman KA, McCartt AT, Zuby DS, Singer J. 2010. Volvo and Infiniti drivers' experiences
652   with select crash avoidance technologies. *Traffic Injury Prevention* 11:270–278. DOI:
653   10.1080/15389581003735600

654 Brandenburg S, Skottke E. 2014. Switching from manual to automated driving and reverse: Are
655   drivers behaving more risky after highly automated driving? In: *Proceedings of the IEEE*
656   *17th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC), Qingdao,*
657   *China.* 2978–2983. DOI: 10.1109/ITSC.2014.6958168

658 Bregman AS. 1990. *Auditory scene analysis: The perceptual organization of sound.* Cambridge,
659   MA: MIT Press

660 Bronkhorst AW, Veltman JA, Van Breda L. 1996. Application of a three-dimensional auditory
661   display in a flight task. *Human Factors* 38:23–33. DOI: 10.1518/001872096778940859

662 Clarke DD, Ward P, Truman W. 2005. Voluntary risk taking and skill deficits in young driver
663   accidents in the UK. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 37:523–529. DOI:
664   10.1016/j.aap.2005.01.007

665 Continental. 2012. Continental strategy focuses on automated driving. *Available at*
666   *https://www.conti-*
667   *online.com/www/pressportal_com_en/themes/press_releases/1_topics/automated_driving_e*
668   *n/pr_2012_12_18_automated_driving_en.html* (accessed 8 November 2014)

669 Cooke M, Ellis DPW. 2001. The auditory organization of speech and other sources in listeners
670   and computational models. *Speech Communication* 35:141–177. DOI: 10.1016/S0167-
671   6393(00)00078-9

672 Crump MJC, McDonnell JV, Gureckis TM. 2013. Evaluating Amazon's Mechanical Turk as a
673   tool for experimental behavioral research. *PLOS ONE* 8: e57410. DOI:
674   10.1371/journal.pone.0057410

675 Dagan E, Mano O, Stein GP, Shashua A. 2004. Forward collision warning with a single camera.
676   *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, 2004, Parma, Italy.* 71–79. DOI:
677   10.1109/IVS.2004.1336352

678 Daimler. 2013. DISTRONIC PLUS: warns and assists the driver. *Available at*
679 *http://www.daimler.com/dccom/0-5-1210218-1-1210321-1-0-0-1210228-0-0-135-0-0-0-0-*
680 *0-0-0-0.html* (accessed 7 November 2014)

681 De Winter JCF. 2013. Predicting self-reported violations among novice license drivers using pre-
682 license simulator measures. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 52:71–79. DOI:
683 10.1016/j.aap.2012.12.018

684 De Winter JCF, Happee R, Martens MH, Stanton NA. 2014. Effects of adaptive cruise control
685 and highly automated driving on workload and situation awareness: A review of the
686 empirical evidence. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*
687 27:196–217. DOI: 10.1016/j.trf.2014.06.016

688 De Winter JCF, Kyriakidis M, Dodou D, Happee R. 2015. Using CrowdFlower to study the
689 relationship between self-reported violations and traffic accidents. In: *Proceedings of the*
690 *6th International Conference on Applied Human Factors and Ergonomics (AHFE), Las*
691 *Vegas, NV*.

692 Desmond P, Hancock P, Monette J. 1998. Fatigue and automation-induced impairments in
693 simulated driving performance. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the*
694 *Transportation Research Board* 1628:8–14. DOI: 10.3141/1628-02

695 Dingus TA, Hulse MC, Barfield W. 1998. Human-system interface issues in the design and use
696 of advanced traveler information systems. In: Barfield W, Dingus TA, eds. *Human Factors*
697 *in Intelligent Transportation Systems*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 359–
698 395

699 Dobler D, Haller M, Stampfl P. 2002. ASR – augmented sound reality [abstract]. In: *Conference*
700 *abstracts and applications on – SIGGRAPH '02*. New York, NY: ACM Press, 148

701 Ebbatson M. 2009. The loss of manual flying skills in pilots of highly automated airliners. PhD
702 Thesis, Cranfield University

703 Edworthy J, Hellier E, Rivers J. (2003). The use of male or female voices in warnings systems: a
704 question of acoustics. *Noise & Health* 6:39–50.

705 European Commision. 2011. *Roadmap to a single European transport area – towards a*
706 *competitive and resource efficient transport system* (White Paper, COM(2011) 144 final)
707 Brussels

708 Ford. 2014. Collision warning with brake support. *Available at*
709 *http://support.ford.com/maintenance/collision-warning-brake-support* (accessed 11 January
710 2015)

711 Garas J. 2000. *Adaptive 3D sound systems*. Kluwer Academic Publishers. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-
712 4419-8776-1

713 Gasser T, Westhoff D. 2012. BASt-study: definitions of automation and legal issues in Germany.
714   *Presented at the 2012 Road Vehicle Automation Workshop, Transportation Research*
715   *Board. Available at*
716   *http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/conferences/2012/Automation/presentations/Gasser.pd*
717   *f* (accessed 13 July 2015)

718 Godinho L, António J, Tadeu A. 2001. 3D sound scattering by rigid barriers in the vicinity of tall
719   buildings. *Applied Acoustics* 62:1229–1248. DOI: 10.1016/S0003-682X(01)00004-4

720 Gold C, Damböck D, Lorenz L, Bengler K. 2013. "Take over!" How long does it take to get the
721   driver back into the loop? *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*
722   *Annual Meeting* 57:1938–1942. DOI: 10.1177/1541931213571433

723 Gomes L. 2014. Google self-driving car: It may never actually happen. *Available at*
724   *http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/technology/2014/10/google_self_driving_car_it_*
725   *may_never_actually_happen.html* (accessed 17 December 2014)

726 Goodall NJ. 2014. Machine ethics and automated vehicles. In: Meyer G, Beiker S, eds. *Road*
727   *Vehicle Automation*. Springer International Publishing, 93–102. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-
728   05990-7_9

729 Gururaj G. 2008. Road traffic deaths, injuries and disabilities in India: Current scenario. *National*
730   *Medical Journal of India* 21:14–20

731 Heikoop D, De Winter JCF, Van Arem B, Stanton NA. 2015. *Psychological constructs in*
732   *driving automation: A consensus model and critical comment on construct proliferation.*
733   Manuscript submitted for publication.

734 Hermann T, Hunt A, Neuhoff J. 2011. *The sonification handbook*. Berlin: Logos Publishing
735   House

736 Ho C, Reed N, Spence C. 2007. Multisensory in-car warning signals for collision avoidance.
737   *Human Factors* 49:1107–1114. DOI: 10.1518/001872007X249965

738 Holland S, Morse DR, Gedenryd H. 2002. AudioGPS: spatial audio navigation with a minimal
739   attention interface. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing* 6:253–259. DOI:
740   10.1007/s007790200025

741 Honda. 2014. Forward Collision Warning. *Available at*
742   *http://owners.honda.com/vehicles/information/2014/Accord-Coupe/features/Forward-*
743   *Collision-Warning/3* (accessed 10 November 2014)

744 Howe J. 2006. The rise of crowdsourcing. *Wired Magazine* 14:1–4

745 Jamson AH, Merat N, Carsten O, Lai FCH. 2011. Fully-automated driving: The road to future
746   vehicles. In: *Proceedings of the Sixth International Driving Symposium on Human Factors*
747   *in Driver Assessment, Training and Vehicle Design, Olympic Valley - Lake Tahoe, CA*. 2–9

748 Jamson AH, Lai FCH, Carsten OMJ. 2008. Potential benefits of an adaptive forward collision
749   warning system. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 16:471–484.
750   DOI: 10.1016/j.trc.2007.09.003

751 Jonsson I-M, Dahlbäck N. 2011. I can't hear you? drivers interacting with male or female voices
752   in native or non-native language. In: Stephanidis C, ed. *Universal access in human-*
753   *computer interaction. Context diversity*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 298–305

754 Kessler C, Etemad A, Alessandretti G, Heinig K, Selpi, Brouwer R, Cserpinszky, Hagleitner W,
755   Benmimoun M. 2012. *euroFOT – final report* (Deliverable D11.3). Aachen, Germany.
756   *Available at http://www.eurofot-*
757   *ip.eu/download/library/deliverables/eurofotsp120121212v11dld113_final_report.pdf*
758   (accessed 13 July 2015)

759 Kingsley K. 2009. Evaluating crash avoidance countermeasures using data from
760   FMCSA/NHTSA's large truck crash causation study. In: *21st International Technical*
761   *Conference on the Enhanced Safety of Vehicles Conference, Stuttgart, Germany. Available*
762   *at http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/pdf/ESV/esv21/09-0460.pdf* (accessed 13 July 2015)

763 Kittur A, Chi EH, Suh B. 2008. Crowdsourcing user studies with Mechanical Turk. In:
764   *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. New
765   York, NY: ACM Press, 453–456

766 Kulas JT, Stachowski AA. 2009. Middle category endorsement in odd-numbered Likert response
767   scales: Associated item characteristics, cognitive demands, and preferred meanings. *Journal*
768   *of Research in Personality* 43:489–493. DOI: 10.1016/j.jrp.2008.12.005

769 Kulas JT, Stachowski AA, Haynes BA. 2008. Middle response functioning in likert-responses to
770   personality items. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 22:251–259. DOI: 10.1007/s10869-
771   008-9064-2

772 Kyriakidis M, Happee R, De Winter JCF. 2015. Public opinion on automated driving: Results of
773   an international questionnaire among 5000 respondents. *Transportation Research Part F:*
774   *Traffic Psychology and Behaviour* 32:127–140. DOI: 10.1016/j.trf.2015.04.014

775 Large DR, Burnett GE. 2013. Drivers' preferences and emotional responses to satellite
776   navigation voices. *International Journal of Vehicle Noise and Vibration* 9:28–46.

777 Larsson AF, Kircher K, Hultgren JA. 2014. Learning from experience: Familiarity with ACC
778   and responding to a cut-in situation in automated driving. *Transportation Research Part F:*
779   *Traffic Psychology and Behaviour* 27:229–237. DOI: 10.1016/j.trf.2014.05.008

780 Lee AH, Stevenson MR, Wang K, Yau KKW. 2002. Modeling young driver motor vehicle
781  crashes: data with extra zeros. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 34:515–521. DOI:
782  10.1016/S0001-4575(01)00049-5

783 Lee JD. 2007. Technology and teen drivers. *Journal of Safety Research* 38:203–213. DOI:
784  10.1016/j.jsr.2007.02.008

785 Levitan L, Golembiewski G, Bloomfield JR. 1998. Human factors issues for automated highway
786  systems. *ITS Journal* 4:21–47. DOI: 10.1080/10248079808903735

787 Llaneras RE, Salinger JA, Green CA. 2013. Human factors issues associated with limited ability
788  autonomous driving systems: Drivers' allocation of visual attention to the forward roadway.
789  In: *Proceedings of the 7th International Driving Symposium on Human Factors in Driver*
790  *Assessment, Training and Vehicle Design, Bolton Landing, NY*. 92–98.

791 Lumbreras M, Sánchez J, Barcia M. 1996. A 3D sound hypermedial system for the blind. In:
792  *Proceedings of the First European Conference on Disability, Virtual Reality and Associated*
793  *Technologies, Maidenhead, UK*. 187–191. *Available at*
794  *http://www.icdvrat.org/1996/papers/1996_22.pdf* (accessed 13 July 2015)

795 Markoff J. 2010. Google cars drive themselves, in traffic. *The New York Times*. *Available at*
796  *http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/10/science/10google.html* (accessed 13 July 2015)

797 Mason W, Suri S. 2012. Conducting behavioral research on Amazon's Mechanical Turk.
798  *Behavior Research Methods* 44:1–23. DOI: 10.3758/s13428-011-0124-6

799 Matthews ML, Moran AR. 1986. Age differences in male drivers' perception of accident risk:
800  The role of perceived driving ability. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 18:299–313. DOI:
801  10.1016/0001-4575(86)90044-8

802 Merat N, Jamson AH, Lai FC, Carsten O. 2012. Highly automated driving, secondary task
803  performance, and driver state. *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and*
804  *Ergonomics Society* 54:762–771. DOI: 10.1177/0018720812442087

805 Mercedes-Benz. 2014. Pre-Safe. *Available at http://www2.mercedes-*
806  *benz.co.uk/content/unitedkingdom/mpc/mpc_unitedkingdom_website/en/home_mpc/passeng*
807  *ercars/home/corporate_sales0/fleet/leasing/our_advantages/Safety.0009.html* (accessed 12
808  November 2014)

809 Miller R, Huang Q. 2002. An adaptive peer-to-peer collision warning system. In: *Proceedings of*
810  *the IEEE 55th Vehicular Technology Conference, 2002, Birmingham, AL*. 317–321. DOI:
811  10.1109/VTC.2002.1002718

812 Mynatt ED. 1990. Auditory presentation of graphical user interfaces. *Available at*
813  *https://smartech.gatech.edu/bitstream/handle/1853/3681/92-26.pdf* (accessed 12 July 2015)

814   Nixon CW, Morris LJ, McCavitt AR, McKinley RL, Anderson TR, McDaniel MP, Yeager DG.
815   1998a. Female voice communications in high levels of aircraft cockpit noises – part I:
816   spectra, levels, and microphones. *Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine* 69:675–683

817   Nixon CW, Anderson TR, Morris LJ, McCavitt A, McKinley RL, Yeager DG, McDaniel MP.
818   1998b. Female voice communications in high level aircraft cockpit noises – part II: vocoder
819   and automatic speech recognition systems. *Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine*
820   69:1087–1094

821   Noyes JM, Hellier E, Edworthy J. 2006. Speech warnings: a review. *Theoretical Issues in*
822   *Ergonomics Science* 7:551–571. DOI: 10.1080/14639220600731123

823   Norman DA. 1990. The 'problem' with automation: inappropriate feedback and interaction, not
824   'over-automation'. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. B,*
825   *Biological Sciences* 327:585–593. DOI: 10.1098/rstb.1990.0101

826   Payre W, Cestac J, Delhomme P. 2014. Intention to use a fully automated car: Attitudes and a
827   priori acceptability. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*
828   27:252–263. DOI: 10.1016/j.trf.2014.04.009

829   Rozier JM. 2000. Hear&There: An augmented reality system of linked audio. MSc Thesis,
830   Cambridge, MA: MIT

831   Rudin-Brown CM, Parker HA. 2004. Behavioural adaptation to adaptive cruise control (ACC):
832   implications for preventive strategies. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology*
833   *and Behaviour* 7:59–76. DOI: 10.1016/j.trf.2004.02.001

834   Scallen SF, Hancock PA, Duley JA. 1995. Pilot performance and preference for short cycles of
835   automation in adaptive function allocation. *Applied Ergonomics* 26:397–403. DOI:
836   10.1016/0003-6870(95)00054-2

837   Sommer K. 2013. Mobility study 2013. *Available at https://www.conti-*
838   *online.com/www/pressportal_com_en/themes/initiatives/channel_mobility_study_en/ov_mo*
839   *bility_study2013_en/* (accessed 12 July 2015)

840   Srinivasa N. 2002. Vision-based vehicle detection and tracking method for forward collision
841   warning in automobiles. *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, 2002*. 626–631. DOI:
842   10.1109/IVS.2002.1188021

843   Stanton NA, Young MS, Walker GH, Turner H, Randle S. 2001. Automating the driver's control
844   tasks. *International Journal of Cognitive Ergonomics* 5:221–236. DOI:
845   10.1207/S15327566IJCE0503_5

846   Stanton NA, Edworthy J. 1999. *Human factors in auditory warnings*. Aldershot, GB: Ashgate

847 Stanton NA, Young MS, McCaulder B. 1997. Drive-by-wire: The case of driver workload and
848   reclaiming control with adaptive cruise control. *Safety Science* 27:149–159. DOI:
849   10.1016/S0925-7535(97)00054-4

850 Strand N, Nilsson J, Karlsson ICM, Nilsson L. 2014. Semi-automated versus highly automated
851   driving in critical situations caused by automation failures. *Transportation Research Part F:*
852   *Traffic Psychology and Behaviour* 27: 218–228. DOI: 10.1016/j.trf.2014.04.005

853 Sturgis P, Roberts SC, Smith P. 2012. Middle alternatives revisited: How the neither/nor
854   response acts as a way of saying "I Don't Know"? *Sociological Methods & Research*
855   43:15–38. DOI: 10.1177/0049124112452527

856 Tacken M, Marcellini F, Mollenkopf H, Ruoppila I, Széman Z. 2005. Use and acceptance of new
857   technology by older people. Findings of the international MOBILATE survey: 'Enhancing
858   mobility in later life'. *Gerontechnology* 3: 126–137. DOI: 10.4017/gt.2005.03.03.002.00

859 Takayama L, Nass C. 2008. Driver safety and information from afar: An experimental driving
860   simulator study of wireless vs. in-car information services. *International Journal of Human*
861   *Computer Studies* 66:173–184. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhcs.2006.06.005

862 Toyota. 2014. Parking. *Available at http://www.toyota-*
863   *global.com/innovation/safety_technology/safety_technology/parking/* (accessed 10
864   November 2014)

865 UK Visas & Immigration. 2014. Tier 4 of the Points Based System – policy guidance. *Available*
866   *at*
867   *https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/370866/T4_G*
868   *uidance_11-14.pdf* (accessed 6 February 2015)

869 Underwood S. 2014. Automated vehicles forecast: Vehicle symposium opinion survey. *Paper*
870   *presented at the Automated Vehicles Symposium 2014, San Francisco, CA. Available at*
871   *https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B8gGx-CYkV-wREVMTEhHQUxjOWM/edit* (accessed 13
872   July 2015)

873 Varaiya P. 1993. Smart cars on smart roads. Problems of control. *IEEE Transactions on*
874   *Automatic Control* 38:195–207. DOI: 10.1109/9.250509

875 Volkswagen. 2014. Park assist. *Available at http://www.volkswagen.co.uk/technology/parking-*
876   *and-manoeuvring/park-assist* (accessed 10 November 2014)

877 Volvo. 2013a. Volvo Car Group reveals world-class safety and support features that will be
878   introduced in the all-new XC9. *Available at https://www.media.volvocars.com/global/en-*
879   *gb/media/pressreleases/49875/volvo-cars-reveals-world-class-safety-and-support-features-*
880   *to-be-introduced-in-the-all-new-xc90-in-2* (accessed 7 November 2014)

881   Volvo. 2013b. One million cars with pioneering auto brake technology sold : Volvo Car Group
882   reaches landmark safety milestone. *Available at https://www.media.volvocars.com/uk/en-*
883   *gb/media/pressreleases/49817* (accessed 13 July 2015)

884   Weber M. 2014. Where to? A history of autonomous vehicles. *Available at*
885   *http://www.computerhistory.org/atchm/where-to-a-history-of-autonomous-vehicles/*
886   (accessed 27 December 2014)

887   Wetmore J. 2003. Driving the dream. The history and motivations behind 60 years of automated
888   highway systems in America. *Automotive History Review* 7:4–19

889   Wickens CD, Hollands JG. 2013. *Engineering psychology and human performance*. New York,
890   NY: HarperCollins Publishers

891   World Health Organization. 2013. *Global status report on road safety 2013*. World Health
892   Organization. *Available at*
893   *http://www.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/78256/1/9789241564564_eng.pdf?ua=1* (accessed
894   13 July 2015)

895   Yoshida J. 2014. Fully autonomous car? Don't buy shotgun yet. *Available at*
896   *http://www.eetimes.com/author.asp?section_id=36&doc_id=1322246* (accessed 17
897   December 2014)

898

1

Illustrations belonging to the three scenarios presented to the respondents.

(a) Parking assistant (PA); (b) Forward collision warning system (FCWS); (c) Future system (FS).

All survey items.

Variable	Question	Full question as reported in the survey	Used coding
Instr	Q1	Have you read and understood the above instructions?	1 = Yes, 2 = No
Gender	Q2	What is your gender? (1 = female, 2 = male)	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = Female, 2 = Male
Age	Q3	What is your age?	Positive integer value
DriveFreq	Q4	On average, how often did you drive a vehicle in the last 12 months?	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = Never, 2 = Less than once a month, 3 = Once a month to once a week, 4 = 1 to 3 days a week, 5 = 4 to 6 days a week, 6 = Every day
KmYear	Q5	About how many kilometres (miles) did you drive in the last 12 months?	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = 0, 2 = 1 - 1,000, 3 = 1,001 - 5,000, 4 = 5,001 - 15,000, 5 = 15,001 - 20,000, 6 = 20,001 - 25,000, 7 = 25,001 - 35,000, 8 = 35,001 - 50,000, 9 = 50,001 - 100,000, 10 = more than 100,000
NrAcc	Q6	How many accidents were you involved in when driving a car in the last 3 years? (please include all accidents, regardless of how they were caused, how slight they were, or where they happened)?	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = 0, 2 = 1, 3 = 2, 4 = 3, 5 = 4, 6 = 5, 7 = More than 5
Vangered	Q7	How often do you do the following?: Becoming angered by a particular type of driver, and indicate your hostility by whatever means you can.	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = 0 times per month, 2 = 1 to 3 times per month, 3 = 4 to 6 times per month, 4 = 7 to 9 times per month, 5 = 10 or more times per month
Vmotorway	Q8	How often do you do the following?: Disregarding the speed limit on a motorway.	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = 0 times per month, 2 = 1 to 3 times per month, 3 = 4 to 6 times per month, 4 = 7 to 9 times per month, 5 = 10 or more times per month
Vresident	Q9	How often do you do the following?: Disregarding the speed limit on a residential road.	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = 0 times per month, 2 = 1 to 3 times per month, 3 = 4 to 6 times per month, 4 = 7 to 9 times per month, 5 = 10 or more times per month
Vfollowing	Q10	How often do you do the following?: Driving so close to the car in front that it would be difficult to stop in an emergency.	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = 0 times per month, 2 = 1 to 3 times per month, 3 = 4 to 6 times per month, 4 = 7 to 9 times per month, 5 = 10 or more times per month
Vrace	Q11	How often do you do the following?: Racing	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = 0

		away from traffic lights with the intention of beating the driver next to you.	times per month, 2 = 1 to 3 times per month, 3 = 4 to 6 times per month, 4 = 7 to 9 times per month, 5 = 10 or more times per month
Vhorn	Q12	How often do you do the following?: Sounding your horn to indicate your annoyance with another road user.	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = 0 times per month, 2 = 1 to 3 times per month, 3 = 4 to 6 times per month, 4 = 7 to 9 times per month, 5 = 10 or more times per month
Vphone	Q13	How often do you do the following?: Using a mobile phone without a hands free kit.	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = 0 times per month, 2 = 1 to 3 times per month, 3 = 4 to 6 times per month, 4 = 7 to 9 times per month, 5 = 10 or more times per month
Vmean	N/A	Mean for Q7-12	Numeric value
PApast	Q14	In the past month, did you drive a car with a parking assistant?	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = I do not know, 2 = No, 3 = Yes
PAhelp	Q15	A parking assistant is helpful.	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = Disagree strongly, 2 = Disagree a little, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree a little, 5 = Agree strongly
PAannoy	Q16	A parking assistant is annoying.	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = Disagree strongly, 2 = Disagree a little, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree a little, 5 = Agree strongly
PAopin	Q17	What do you think are the disadvantages of a parking assistant?	Textual response
PAfut	Q18	I would like to have a system in my car that can park the car automatically, just by pressing a button.	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = Disagree strongly, 2 = Disagree a little, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree a little, 5 = Agree strongly
FCWSpast	Q19	In the past month, did you drive a car with a forward collision warning system?	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = I do not know, 2 = No, 3 = Yes
FCWShelp	Q20	A forward collision warning system is helpful.	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = Disagree strongly, 2 = Disagree a little, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree a little, 5 = Agree strongly
FCWSannoy	Q21	A forward collision warning system is annoying.	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = Disagree strongly, 2 = Disagree a little, 3 = Neither agree nor

			disagree, 4 = Agree a little, 5 = Agree strongly
FCWSfut	Q22	I would you like to have a system in my car that brakes automatically to avoid collisions (Autonomous Emergency Braking).	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = Disagree strongly, 2 = Disagree a little, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree a little, 5 = Agree strongly
FCWSopin	Q23	What do you think are the disadvantages of a forward collision warning system?	Textual response
FSannoy	Q24	I believe that this type of surround sound system would be annoying.	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = Disagree strongly, 2 = Disagree a little, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree a little, 5 = Agree strongly
FSfut	Q25	I would prefer to use such a sound system instead of opening the window, when driving through a scenic place (for example, a national park).	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = Disagree strongly, 2 = Disagree a little, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree a little, 5 = Agree strongly
FSopin	Q26	What would be the advantages and the disadvantages of such sound system?	Textual response
TORint	Q27	Now imagine again that you are driving in an automated car (that can perform certain tasks without any interaction from the humans in the car). However, the automation cannot handle all possible situations, and you sometimes have to take over control. What type of warning signal would you like to receive in case manual take over is required?	1 = Warning sound: one beep, 2 = Warning sound: two beeps, 3 = Warning sound: horn sound, 4 = Warning sound: bell sound, 5 = Warning light, 6 = Visual warning message projected on windscreen 'Take over please', 7 = Vibrations in your seat, 8 = Vibrations in your steering wheel, 9 = Vibrations in your seatbelt, 10 = Vibrations in the floor, 11 = Female voice: 'Take over please', 12 = Male voice: 'Take over please', 13 = Other, 14 = None of the above
TORintot	Q28	If you answered 'Other' in the previous question, please specify what type of warning signal you would like to receive in the described scenario.	Textual response
FACpref	Q29	I would prefer to drive in a fully automated car rather than a normal (non automated) car.	-1 = I prefer not to respond, 1 = Disagree strongly, 2 = Disagree a little, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree a little, 5 = Agree strongly
YearAuto	Q30	In which year do you think that most cars will be able to drive fully automatically in	Year

		your country of residence?	
Comm	Q31	Please provide any suggestions which could help engineers to build safe and enjoyable automated cars.	Textual response
SurvTime		Survey time (*derived from results generated by Crowdflower*)	Seconds

Descriptive statistics for the survey items (N = 1,205).

The response option "I don't know" was omitted for the variables PApast and FCWSpast.

Variable	Mean	Median	SD	Skewness	Min	Max
Gender	1.75	2	0.43	-1.17	1	2
Age	31.94	30	10.49	1.04	18	73
DriveFreq	4.72	5	1.21	-0.66	2	6
KmYear	4.09	4	1.78	0.92	2	10
NrAcc	1.47	1	0.94	2.88	1	7
Vangered	1.86	2	0.86	1.46	1	5
Vmotorway	1.85	2	1.05	1.54	1	5
Vresident	1.70	1	1.01	1.79	1	5
Vfollowing	1.45	1	0.77	2.07	1	5
Vrace	1.32	1	0.69	2.62	1	5
Vhorn	1.86	2	1	1.41	1	5
Vphone	1.64	1	1.01	1.84	1	5
Vmean	1.67	1.57	0.57	1.36	1	4.71
PApast	2.27	2	0.45	1.03	2	3
PAhelp	4.33	5	0.88	-1.38	1	5
PAannoy	2.35	2	1.18	0.39	1	5
PAfut	3.87	4	1.24	-0.93	1	5
FCWSpast	2.10	2	0.30	2.65	2	3
FCWShelp	4.11	4	1.04	-1.14	1	5
FCWSannoy	2.56	3	1.26	0.27	1	5
FCWSfut	3.77	4	1.22	-0.80	1	5
FSannoy	3.21	3	1.22	-0.18	1	5
FSfut	3.00	3	1.29	-0.09	1	5
FACpref	3.01	3	1.33	-0.05	1	5
YearAuto	2078.33	2030	713.77	30.73	2014	25000
SurvTime	553.95	462	338.41	1.34	58	1810

Frequencies of answers.

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Gender	299	906								
DriveFreq	0	79	108	293	313	412				
KmYear	0	250	245	337	148	76	77	49	16	7
NrAcc	855	226	79	19	13	6	7			
Vangered	417	629	96	33	30					
Vmotorway	541	466	97	39	62					
Vresident	663	379	78	32	53					
Vfollowing	807	295	70	20	13					
Vrace	939	182	60	15	9					
Vhorn	513	480	123	44	45					
Vphone	730	304	89	34	48					
PApast	17	865	323							
PAhelp	14	39	134	367	651					
PAannoy	383	297	290	196	39					
PAfut	86	109	175	338	497					
FCWSpast	28	1058	119							
FCWShelp	34	68	178	373	552					
FCWSannoy	331	254	324	208	88					
FCWSfut	82	123	203	377	420					
FSannoy	126	218	346	309	206					
FSfut	204	222	312	301	166					
FACpref	204	252	264	292	193					

Distribution of the age of the respondents aged between 18 and 54 years.

3

Distribution of responses for the question: "*In which year do you think that most cars will be able to drive fully automatically in your country of residence?*" (Q30).

Years were divided into 5-year-wide bins.

4

Opinion of the respondents on whether a PA and FCWS are helpful and annoying, and whether they would like to have automated versions of such systems in their cars in the future.

5

Opinion on the annoyance and helpfulness of the parking assistant (PA), forward collision warning system (FCWS), and future system (FS).

(a) Opinion on the annoyance of the PA (Q16), FCWS (Q21), and FS (Q24) as a function of age; (b) Opinion on the helpfulness of the PA (Q15) and FCWS (Q20) as a function of age. Age was divided into 5-year-wide bins.

6

Distribution of opinions on whether the proposed future system (FS) would be annoying (Q24) and whether the respondents would prefer the system to opening windows in fully automated cars (Q25).

7

Preference for particular takeover requests during highly automated driving.

Numbers of respondents who indicated a preference for a particular takeover request during highly automated driving in the question: *"Now imagine again that you are driving in an automated car (that can perform certain tasks without any interaction from the humans in the car). However, the automation cannot handle all possible situations, and you sometimes have to take over control. What type of warning signal would you like to receive in case manual take over is required?"* (Q27). Each bar is supplemented by the corresponding 'risk ratios' of female respondents, calculated as the proportion of females who indicated this answer divided by the number of males who indicated this answer. If the risk ratio is greater than 1 females are overrepresented. Conversely, if the risk ratio is smaller than 1, females are underrepresented. 95% confidence intervals are shown in parentheses.

8

Preference to combinations of types of signals for aiding takeover requests during highly automated driving (Q27).

All possible combinations are listed. Hence, the total number of respondents adds up to 1,205.

9

Numbers of respondents from English and non-English speaking countries who indicated a preference for a male and a female voice for a takeover request during highly automated driving (Q27).

The dashed line represents the ratio between the number of respondents who preferred a female voice and the number of respondents who preferred a male voice. The solid line is the line of unity. No labels for shown for countries with five or less respondents indicating a male voice, to support the clarity of the figure. Country abbreviations are listed according to ISO 3166-1 alpha-3.