



governmentattic.org

"Rummaging in the government's attic"

Description of document: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Report: Driver Visual Behavior in the Presence of Commercial Electronic Variable Message Signs (CEVMS), Draft Report - March 2011 and Final Report - September 2012

Appeal date: 01-June-2012

Released date: 30-December-2013

Posted date: 06-January-2014

Source of document: FOIA Request
FOIA Officer (HCC-40)
Federal Highway Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington, D.C., 20590-9898
Email: foia.officer@fhwa.dot.gov

The governmentattic.org web site ("the site") is noncommercial and free to the public. The site and materials made available on the site, such as this file, are for reference only. The governmentattic.org web site and its principals have made every effort to make this information as complete and as accurate as possible, however, there may be mistakes and omissions, both typographical and in content. The governmentattic.org web site and its principals shall have neither liability nor responsibility to any person or entity with respect to any loss or damage caused, or alleged to have been caused, directly or indirectly, by the information provided on the governmentattic.org web site or in this file. The public records published on the site were obtained from government agencies using proper legal channels. Each document is identified as to the source. Any concerns about the contents of the site should be directed to the agency originating the document in question. GovernmentAttic.org is not responsible for the contents of documents published on the website.



U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Highway
Administration**

DEC 30 2013

1200 New Jersey Ave., SE
Washington, D.C. 20590

FOIA Control Number:
2012-0336A

In Reply Refer To:
HCC-40

This letter is to inform you of the status of your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) appeal you submitted on June 1, 2012, in which you appealed the initial determination by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Office of Real Estate Services in connection with FOIA Control Number 2012-0307. In your initial FOIA request, you requested "a copy of the draft report (Driver Visual Behavior in the Presence of Commercial Electronic Variable Message Signs (CEVMS))." In your appeal, you challenged the withholding of the draft report under the deliberative process privilege.

Enclosed is an unredacted copy of the record you requested. This record is also posted on our website.

FHWA will consider this appeal to be closed if we do not hear from you about this matter within 30 days of the date of this letter.

On behalf of the Agency, I apologize for the delay in responding to your appeal and regret any inconvenience this may have caused you. If you have any questions with regard to this letter, please feel free to contact Mr. Raymond Pascual, Attorney-Advisor, at 202-366-4241.

Sincerely yours,

Alla C. Shaw,
Acting FOIA Officer

cc: FHWA Office of Real Estate Services

Federal Highway Administration Report:

Driver Visual Behavior in the Presence of Commercial
Electronic Variable Message Signs (CEVMS)
Draft Report - March 2011

Driver Visual Behavior in the Presence of Commercial Electronic Variable Message Signs (CEVMS)



March 2011

Foreword

The advent of new electronic billboard technologies, in particular the digital Light-Emitting Diode (LED) billboard, has necessitated a reevaluation of current legislation and regulation for controlling outdoor advertising. In this case, one of the concerns is possible driver distraction. In the context of the present report, outdoor advertising signs employing this new advertising technology are referred to as Commercial Electronic Variable Message Signs (CEVMS). They are also commonly referred to as Digital Billboards and Electronic Billboards.

The present report documents the results of a study conducted to investigate the effects of CEVMS used for outdoor advertising on driver visual behavior in a roadway driving environment. The report consists of a brief review of the relevant published literature related to billboards and visual distraction, the rationale for the FHWA research study, the methods by which the study was conducted, and the results of the study, which used an eye tracking system to measure driver glances while driving on roadways in the presence of CEVMS, standard billboards, and other roadside elements. The report should be of interest to highway engineers, traffic engineers, highway safety specialists, the outdoor advertising industry, environmental advocates, Federal policy makers, and State and local regulators of outdoor advertising.

Monique Evans
Director, Office of Safety Research
and Development

Nelson Castellanos
Director, Office of Real Estate
Services

Notice

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the use of the information contained in this document.

The U.S. Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trademarks or manufacturers' names appear in this report only because they are considered essential to the objective of the document.

Quality Assurance Statement

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) provides high-quality information to serve Government, industry, and the public in a manner that promotes public understanding. Standards and policies are used to ensure and maximize the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of its information. FHWA periodically reviews quality issues and adjusts its programs and processes to ensure continuous quality improvement.

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. FHWA-HEP-11-014	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Driver Visual Behavior in the Presence of Commercial Electronic Variable Message Signs (CEVMS)		5. Report Date March 2011	
		6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Authors William A. Perez, Mary Anne Bertola, Jason F. Kennedy, and John A. Molino		8. Performing Organization Report No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address SAIC 6300 Georgetown Pike McLean, VA 22101		10. Work Unit No. (TRAVIS)	
		11. Contract or Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Office of Real Estate Services Federal Highway Administration 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Washington, DC 20590		13. Type of Report and Period Covered	
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes FHWA Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR): Christopher Monk and Thomas M. Granda (HRDS-30)			
16. Abstract This study was conducted to investigate the effect of CEVMS on driver visual behavior in a roadway driving environment. An instrumented vehicle with an eye-tracking system was used. Roads containing CEVMS, standards billboards, and areas not containing off-premises advertising were selected. Two experiments are reported that were conducted in two separate cities in which the same methodology was employed and differences with respect to such variables as the roadway visual environment were taken into account. The results showed that drivers did look at CEVMS a greater percentage of time than at standard billboards; however, the time spent looking at off-premise advertising was less than 5 percent when the signs were visible to the participants across the two experiments. Long glances at off-premises advertising were not evident. The longest glance at a CEVMS was less than 1.3 seconds and glances greater than 1 second were rare events. The percentage of time that drivers dedicated to the road ahead was not significantly affected by the presence of CEVMS or standard billboards. Rather, the overall clutter and complexity of the visual scene appeared to be the principal driver of glance time away from the road ahead. This was the case regardless of the presence or absence of off-premise advertising. The results suggest that overall visual complexity of the highway environment needs to be taken into account when considering driver glance behavior.			
17. Key Words Driver visual behavior, visual environment, billboards, eye-tracking system, commercial electronic variable message signs, visual complexity		18. Distribution Statement No restrictions.	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified	21. No of Pages 66	22. Price N/A

SI* (MODERN METRIC) CONVERSION FACTORS

APPROXIMATE CONVERSIONS TO SI UNITS

Symbol	When You Know	Multiply By	To Find	Symbol
LENGTH				
in	inches	25.4	millimeters	mm
ft	feet	0.305	meters	m
yd	yards	0.914	meters	m
mi	miles	1.61	kilometers	km
AREA				
in ²	square inches	645.2	square millimeters	mm ²
ft ²	square feet	0.093	square meters	m ²
yd ²	square yard	0.836	square meters	m ²
ac	acres	0.405	hectares	ha
mi ²	square miles	2.59	square kilometers	km ²
VOLUME				
fl oz	fluid ounces	29.57	milliliters	mL
gal	gallons	3.785	liters	L
ft ³	cubic feet	0.028	cubic meters	m ³
yd ³	cubic yards	0.765	cubic meters	m ³
NOTE: volumes greater than 1000 L shall be shown in m ³				
MASS				
oz	ounces	28.35	grams	g
lb	pounds	0.454	kilograms	kg
T	short tons (2000 lb)	0.907	megagrams (or "metric ton")	Mg (or "t")
TEMPERATURE (exact degrees)				
°F	Fahrenheit	5 (F-32)/9 or (F-32)/1.8	Celsius	°C
ILLUMINATION				
fc	foot-candles	10.76	lux	lx
fl	foot-Lamberts	3.426	candela/m ²	cd/m ²
FORCE and PRESSURE or STRESS				
lbf	poundforce	4.45	newtons	N
lbf/in ²	poundforce per square inch	6.89	kilopascals	kPa

APPROXIMATE CONVERSIONS FROM SI UNITS

Symbol	When You Know	Multiply By	To Find	Symbol
LENGTH				
mm	millimeters	0.039	inches	in
m	meters	3.28	feet	ft
m	meters	1.09	yards	yd
km	kilometers	0.621	miles	mi
AREA				
mm ²	square millimeters	0.0016	square inches	in ²
m ²	square meters	10.764	square feet	ft ²
m ²	square meters	1.195	square yards	yd ²
ha	hectares	2.47	acres	ac
km ²	square kilometers	0.386	square miles	mi ²
VOLUME				
mL	milliliters	0.034	fluid ounces	fl oz
L	liters	0.264	gallons	gal
m ³	cubic meters	35.314	cubic feet	ft ³
m ³	cubic meters	1.307	cubic yards	yd ³
MASS				
g	grams	0.035	ounces	oz
kg	kilograms	2.202	pounds	lb
Mg (or "t")	megagrams (or "metric ton")	1.103	short tons (2000 lb)	T
TEMPERATURE (exact degrees)				
°C	Celsius	1.8C+32	Fahrenheit	°F
ILLUMINATION				
lx	lux	0.0929	foot-candles	fc
cd/m ²	candela/m ²	0.2919	foot-Lamberts	fl
FORCE and PRESSURE or STRESS				
N	newtons	0.225	poundforce	lbf
kPa	kilopascals	0.145	poundforce per square inch	lbf/in ²

*SI is the symbol for the International System of Units. Appropriate rounding should be made to comply with Section 4 of ASTM E380. (Revised March 2003)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	8
A. Background	8
<i>Post-Hoc Crash Studies</i>	8
<i>Field Investigations</i>	9
<i>Laboratory Studies</i>	10
<i>Summary</i>	11
B. STUDY APPROACH	11
II. EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH	13
A. Experimental Design Overview	14
<i>Site Selection</i>	14
<i>Photometric Measurement of Signs</i>	15
<i>Visual Complexity</i>	18
III. EXPERIMENT 1	20
A. Method	21
<i>Advertising Type</i>	21
<i>Photometric Measurements</i>	25
<i>Visual Complexity</i>	25
<i>Participants</i>	26
<i>Procedures</i>	26
B. Data Reduction	27
<i>Selection of Data Collection Zone Limits</i>	27
<i>Eye Tracking Measures</i>	28
<i>Data Processing</i>	30
C. Results and Discussion	32
<i>Mean Percent of Time</i>	32
<i>Mean Percent of Time to Target Advertising</i>	33
<i>Mean Percent of Time to Road Ahead</i>	33
<i>Mean Duration of Eye Gazes</i>	33
<i>Relationship between Photometric Measures and Glance Behavior</i>	38
<i>Observation of Driver Behavior</i>	39
<i>Results Including CEVMS Complex</i>	39
<i>Discussion</i>	42

IV. EXPERIMENT 2	44
A. Method	44
<i>Advertising Type</i>	44
<i>Visual Complexity</i>	48
<i>Participants</i>	49
<i>Procedures</i>	49
B. Data Reduction	49
<i>Selection of Data Collection Zone Limits</i>	49
C. Results and Discussion	50
<i>Mean Percent of Time</i>	50
<i>Mean Percent of Time to Target Advertising</i>	52
<i>Mean Percentage of Time Looking at the Road Ahead</i>	53
<i>Mean Duration of Glances</i>	53
<i>Relationship Between Photometric Measures and Glance Behavior</i>	58
<i>Observation of Driver Behavior</i>	58
<i>Discussion</i>	58
V. GENERAL DISCUSSION	61
VI. REFERENCES	63

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Smart Eye Face Camera Placement.....	13
Figure 2. FHWA’s Field Research Vehicle.	14
Figure 3. CCD Photometer and Laptop Setup in Vehicle.....	16
Figure 4. ProMetric Software Interface.	17
Figure 5. Regions of Background for Contrast Ratio Analysis.	17
Figure 6. Contrast Background Differences.	18
Figure 7. Data Collection Zone with a Target CEVMS.....	22
Figure 8. Visually Complex Data Collection Area with 2 CEVMS and 10 Non-Target Standard Billboards.....	23
Figure 9. Data Collection Zone with a Target Standard Billboard.	23
Figure 10. Data Collection Zone with Natural Environment.....	24
Figure 11. Data Collection Zone with Built Environment.....	24
Figure 12. Mean Subband Entropy Measures for Each of the Data Collection Zone Types.....	26
Figure 13. Panoramic Video with the Eye-Tracking Cursor (Highlighted by the Green Circle) in the Center of a CEVMS.....	30
Figure 14. Percent of Time to Road Ahead as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type.	33
Figure 15. The Proportion of Gaze Duration for CEVMS and Standard Billboards under Daytime and Nighttime Driving Conditions.....	34
Figure 16. Data Collection Zone 19.....	36
Figure 17. Percent of Time Looking at Miscellaneous as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type.	37
Figure 18. Percent of Time Looking to the Gauge Cluster as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type.	37
Figure 19. Percentage of Time Glancing at Unknown Objects as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type.	38
Figure 20. Percent of Time Glancing at Target Advertising as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type.	40
Figure 21. Percent of Time Looking at the Road Ahead as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type.	41
Figure 22. Mean Duration of Glances at Target Billboards as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type.	42
Figure 23. Example of a CEVMS Data Collection Zone with High Visual Complexity.	45
Figure 24. Example of CEVMS Data Collection Zone with Low Visual Complexity.....	46

Figure 25. Example of a Standard Billboard Data Collection Zone with High Visual Complexity.....	46
Figure 26. Example of a Standard Billboard Data Collection Zone with Low Visual Complexity.....	47
Figure 27. Subband Entropy Measures for the Data Collection Zones.	48
Figure 28. Percentage of Time Glancing at Target Billboards as a Function of Visual Complexity and Time of Day.	53
Figure 29. Proportion of Gaze Duration for CEVMS and Standard Billboards under Daytime and Nighttime Driving Conditions.....	54
Figure 30. Data Collection Zone 17 in Richmond.....	56
Figure 31. Percentage of Time Spent Glancing at Miscellaneous as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type and Visual Complexity.	57
Figure 32. Percentage of Time Spent Glancing at the Gauge Cluster as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type.	57

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Distribution of CEVMS by Roadway Classification for Various Cities.	15
Table 2. Inventory of Target Billboards in Reading with Relevant Parameters.	21
Table 3. Summary of Luminance (cd/m^2) and Contrast (Weber ratio) Measurements in Reading.....	25
Table 4. Mean Percent of Time Looking to Areas of Interest Based on Data Collection Zone Type.....	32
Table 5. Total Number of Gazes for the CEVMS and Standard Billboard Conditions as a Function of Time of Day.	35
Table 6. Summary of Long Gazes to Off-Premises Advertising in Reading.....	35
Table 7. Mean Percentage of Time Looking at Areas of Interest Based on Data Collection Zone Type.....	39
Table 8. Inventory of Target Billboards in Richmond with Relevant Parameters.....	44
Table 9. Advertising Conditions by Level of Visual Complexity.	45
Table 10. Luminance Values (cd/m^2) for the Low and High Visual Complexity Conditions.	47
Table 11. Weber contrast values in low and high visual complexity environments.....	48
Table 12. Mean Percentage of Time for All Object Categories as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type for Low and High Visual Complexity Data Collection Zones During the Daytime.	51
Table 13. Mean Percentage of Time for all Object Categories as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type for Low and High Visual Complexity Data Collection Zones During The Nighttime.	52
Table 14. Frequencies of Glances for the CEVMS and Standard Billboard Conditions as a Function of Time of Day.	54
Table 15. Summary of Long Glances at Off-premise Advertising in Richmond.	55
Table 16. Number of Glances per Sign to CEVMS and Standard Billboards in Day and Night Conditions for Both Experiments.....	62

I. INTRODUCTION

“The primary responsibility of the driver is to operate a motor vehicle safely. The task of driving requires full attention and focus. Drivers should resist engaging in any activity that takes their eyes and attention off the road for more than a couple of seconds. In some circumstances even a second or two can make all the difference in a driver being able to avoid a crash.” – US Department of Transportation

The advent of new electronic billboard technologies, in particular the digital Light-Emitting Diode (LED) billboard, has prompted a reevaluation of regulations for controlling outdoor advertising. For outdoor advertisers, an attractive quality of these LED billboards, which are hereafter referred to as Commercial Electronic Variable Message Signs (CEVMS), is that advertisements can instantly change, and the changes can be controlled from a central office. Of concern is whether CEVMS may attract driver’s attention from their primary task in ways that compromise safety. The current FHWA guidance regarding CEVMS is that they not change content more frequently than once every 8 seconds (s);⁽¹⁾ however, according to Scenic America, the basis of the safety concern is that the “...distinguishing trait...” of a CEVMS “... is that it can vary while a driver watches it, in a setting in which that variation is likely to attract the drivers’ attention away from the roadway.”⁽²⁾ This study was conducted to provide the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) with data to help clarify whether there is an empirical basis for regulating CEVMS differently than other off-premise advertising billboards and, if so, what those differences might entail.

A. BACKGROUND

A recent review of the literature by Molino et al. failed to find convincing empirical evidence that CEVMS, as currently implemented, constitute a safety risk greater than that of conventional vinyl billboards.⁽³⁾ Absence of persuasive evidence indicating a safety risk associated with CEVMS is not the result of a lack of research. A great deal of work has been focused in this area, but the findings of these studies have been mixed.^(3,4) A summary of the key past findings is presented here, but the reader is referred to Molino et al. for a comprehensive review of studies prior to 2009.⁽³⁾

Post-Hoc Crash Studies

Post-hoc crash studies review police traffic collision reports or statistical summaries of such reports in an effort to understand the causes of crashes that have taken place in the vicinity of some change to the roadside environment. In the present case, the change of concern is the introduction of CEVMS to the roadside or the replacement of conventional billboards with CEVMS.

The review of the literature conducted by Molino et al. did not show compelling evidence for a distraction effect attributable to CEVMS.⁽³⁾ The authors concluded that all post-hoc crash studies are subject to certain weaknesses, most of which are difficult to overcome. For example, the vast majority of crashes are never reported to police; thus, such studies are likely to underreport crashes. Also, when crashes are caused by factors such as driver distraction or inattention, the

involved driver may be unwilling or unable to report these factors to a police investigator. Another weakness is that police, under time pressure, are rarely able to investigate the true root causes of crashes unless they involve serious injury, death, or extensive property damage. Furthermore, to have confidence in the results, such studies need to collect comparable data before and after the change, and, in the after phase, at equivalent but unaffected roadway sections. Also, since crashes are infrequent events, data collection needs to span extended periods of time, both before and after introduction of the change. Few studies are able to obtain such extensive data.

Field Investigations

Field investigations include unobtrusive observation, naturalistic driving studies, on-road instrumented vehicle investigations, test track experiments, driver interviews, surveys, and questionnaires. The following focuses on relevant studies that employed naturalistic driving and on-road instrumented vehicle research methods.

Lee, McElheny, and Gibbons undertook an on-road instrumented vehicle study on Interstate and local roads near Cleveland, OH.⁽⁵⁾ The study looked at driver glance behavior toward digital billboards, conventional billboards, comparison sites (sites with buildings and other signs, including digital signs), and control sites (those without similar signage). The results showed that there were no differences in the overall glance patterns (percent eyes-on-road and overall number of glances) between event types. Drivers also did not glance more frequently in the direction of digital billboards than in the direction of other event types, but drivers did take longer glances in the direction of digital billboards and comparison sites than in the direction of conventional billboards and baseline sites. However, the mean glance length towards the digital billboards was less than 1 second. It is important to note that this study employed a video-based approach for examining driver's visual behavior, which has an accuracy of no better than 20 degrees.⁽⁶⁾ Whereas this technique is likely to be effective in assessing the level to which devices inside of the vehicle detract from focusing on the road ahead, they may not have sufficient resolution to discriminate what specific object the driver is looking at outside of the vehicle.

Beijer, Smiley, and Eizenman evaluated driver glances toward four different types of roadside advertising signs on roads in the Toronto, Canada area.⁽⁷⁾ The four types of signs included: (a) billboard signs with static advertisements; (b) roller bar signs with billboard advertisements placed on vertical rollers that could rotate to show one of three advertisements in succession; (c) scrolling text signs with a minor active component, which usually consisted of a small strip of lights that formed words scrolling across the screen or, in some cases, a larger area capable of displaying text but not video; and (d) signs with video images that had a color screen capable of displaying both moving text and, more importantly, moving images. The study employed an on-road instrumented vehicle with a head-mounted eye-tracking device. They found no significant differences in average glance duration or the maximum glance duration for the various sign types; however, the number of glances was significantly lower for billboard signs than for the roller bar, scrolling text, and video signs.

Smiley, Smahel and Eizenman conducted a field driving study that employed an eye tracking system that recorded driver's eye movements as participants drove past video signs located at three downtown intersections and along an urban expressway.⁽⁸⁾ The study route included static billboards and video advertising. The authors described the video advertising as presenting a

continuous stream of changing images. The results of the study showed that on average 76 percent of glances were to the road ahead. Glances at advertising, including static billboards and video signs, constituted 1.2 percent of total glances. The mean glance durations to advertising signs were between 0.5 s and 0.75 s, although there were a few glances of about 1.4 s in duration. Video signs were not more likely than static commercial signs to be looked at when headways were short; in fact, the reverse was the case. Furthermore, the number of glances per individual video sign was small, and so statistically significant differences in looking behavior were not found.

Kettwich, Kartsen, Klinger, and Lemmer conducted a 2008 field study where drivers' gaze behavior was measured with an eye tracking system.⁽⁹⁾ Sixteen participants drove an 11.5 mile (18.5 km) route comprised of highways, arterial roads, main roads, and one-way streets in Karlsruhe, Germany. The route contained advertising pillars, event posters, company logos, and video screens. Mean gaze duration for the four types of advertising was computed while the vehicle was in motion and when it was stopped. Gaze duration while driving for all types of advertisements was under 1 s. On the other hand, while the vehicle was stopped, the mean gaze duration for video screen advertisements was equal to 2.75 s. The study showed a significant difference between gaze duration while driving and while sitting still. The gaze duration was affected by the task at hand; that is, drivers tended to gaze longer while the car was stopped and there were few driving task demands.

Laboratory Studies

Laboratory investigations related to roadway safety can be classified into several categories: driving simulations, non-driving-simulator laboratory testing, and focus groups. The review by Molino et al. of relevant laboratory studies did not show conclusive evidence regarding the distracting effects of CEVMS. Moreover, the authors concluded that in the case of CEVMS, present driving simulators do not have sufficient visual dynamic range, image resolution, and contrast ratio capability to produce the compelling visual effect of a bright, photo-realistic LED-based CEVMS on a natural background scene. The following is a discussion of a driving simulator study conducted after the publication of Molino et al. This recent study focused on the effects of advertising on driver visual behavior.

Recently, Chattington, Reed, Basacik, Flint, and Parkes conducted a driving simulator study in the United Kingdom to evaluate the effects of static and video advertising on driver glance behavior.⁽¹⁰⁾ The researchers examined the effects of advertisement position relative to the road (left, right, center on an overhead gantry, and in all three locations), type of advertisement (static or video), and exposure duration of the advertisement (the paper does not provide these durations in terms of time or distance). For the advertisements presented on the left side of the road (comparable to our right side of the road), mean glance durations for static and video advertisements were significantly longer (approximately 0.65 to 0.75 s) when drivers experienced long advertisement exposure as opposed to medium and short exposures. Drivers looked more at video advertisements (about 2 percent on average) than at static advertisements (about 0.75 percent on average). They also spent more time looking at both types of advertisements under the long and medium exposure durations. In addition, the location of the advertisements had an effect on glance behavior. When advertisements were located in the center of the road or in all three positions simultaneously, the glance duration was about 1 s and was significantly longer than for signs placed on the right or left side of the road. For

advertisements placed on the left side of the road, there was a significant difference in glance duration between static (about 0.40 sec) and video (about 0.80 sec). Advertisement position also had an effect on the proportion of time that a driver spent looking at an advertisement. The percentage of time looking at advertisements was greatest when signs were placed in all three locations, followed by center location signs, then the left location signs, and finally the right location signs. Drivers looked more at the video advertisements relative to the static advertisements when they were placed in all three locations, placed on the left, and placed on the right side of the road. The center placement did not show a significant difference in percent of time looking between static and video.

Summary

The results from these key studies offered some insight into whether CEVMS pose a visual distraction threat, but they also revealed some inconsistent findings and potential methodological issues that were addressed in the current study. The studies conducted by Smiley et al. showed drivers glanced forward at the roadway about 76 percent of the time in the presence of video and dynamic signs. A few long glances of approximately 1.4 sec were observed, and this bears further investigation. However, the video and dynamic signs used in these studies present moving objects that are not evident in CEVMS as deployed in the US. In another field study employing eye tracking, Kettwich et al. found that gaze duration while driving for all types of advertisements that they evaluated was less than 1 s; however, when the vehicle was stopped, mean gaze duration for advertising was as high as 2.75 s.⁽⁹⁾ Collectively, these studies did not demonstrate that the advertising signs detracted from driver's glances forward at the roadway or at traffic control devices.

In contrast, the simulator study by Chattington et al. demonstrated that dynamic signs showing moving video or other dynamic elements may draw attention away from the roadway. Furthermore, the location of the advertising sign on the road is an important factor in drawing drivers' visual attention. Advertisements with moving video placed in the center of the roadway on an overhead gantry or in all three positions (right, left, and in the center) simultaneously are very likely to draw glances from drivers.

Finally, in a study that examined CEVMS as deployed in the United States, Lee et al. did not show any effect of CEVMS on driver glance behavior. However, the methodology that was employed probably did not employ sufficient sensitivity to determine what specific object in the environment a driver was looking at.

None of these studies combined all necessary factors to address the current CEVMS situation in the United States. Those studies that used eye-tracking on real roads had animated and video-based signs, which are not reflective of current CEVMS practice in the United States.

B. STUDY APPROACH

Based on an extensive review of the literature, Molino et al. concluded that the most effective method to use in an evaluation of the effects of CEVMS on driver behavior was the instrumented field vehicle method that incorporated an eye tracking system.⁽³⁾ The present study employed such an instrumented field vehicle with an eye tracking system and examined the degree to which CEVMS attract drivers' attention away from the forward roadway.

Land's review of eye movements in dynamic environments concluded that the eyes are proactive and typically seek out information required in the second before each activity commences.⁽¹¹⁾ Specific tasks (e.g., driving) have characteristic but flexible patterns of eye movement that accompany them, and these patterns are similar between individuals. Land concluded that the eyes rarely visit objects that are irrelevant to the task, and the conspicuity of objects is less important than objects' role in the task. Using devices in a vehicle such as a cell phone for texting are very likely to result in eye movement patterns that are incompatible with safe driving. However, for external stimuli, especially those near the roadway, the evaluation of eye glances with respect to safety is less clear. As part of the driving task one examines mirrors, the gauge cluster, side of the road, and so on. Research by Klauer et al. indicated that short, brief glances away from the forward roadway for the purpose of scanning the driving environment are safe and actually decrease near-crash/crash risk.⁽¹²⁾ Klauer et al. also concluded that glances away from the roadway for any purpose lasting more than 2 seconds increase near-crash/crash risk by at least two times that of normal, baseline driving.

Technology for measuring a driver's direction of gaze to reasonably high levels of accuracy has existed since at least the 1960s.⁽¹³⁾ Eye tracking systems used in on-road driving studies use light reflected off the cornea to compute the direction of gaze. These systems then overlay the direction of gaze on film or video of the forward roadway that is recorded at the same time as gaze data. Early systems used head-mounted sensors, but in recent years systems have been developed that utilize dashboard-mounted sensors. In addition, newer technology exists that can accurately measure gaze behavior in the presence of sun light, which has been an issue with many eye tracking systems.

The present study evaluated the effects of CEVMS on driver distraction under actual roadway conditions both in the day time and at night. Roads containing CEVMS, standards billboards, and areas not containing off-premise advertising were selected. The CEVMS and standard billboards were measured with respect to luminance, location, size, and other relevant variables to characterize these visual stimuli extensively. Unlike the previous studies, the present study examined CEVMS as deployed in two US cities that did not contain dynamic video or other dynamic elements. In addition, the eye tracking system that was employed had about a 2 degree level of resolution, which provided significantly more accuracy in determining what objects the drivers were looking at than the study by Lee et al.

Two studies are reported that were conducted in two separate cities employing the same methodology but taking into account differences with respect to such variables as the roadway visual environment. The study's primary research questions were:

- Do drivers look at CEVMS more than at standard billboards?
- Are there long glances at CEVMS that would be indicative of a decrease in safety?
- Do drivers look at CEVMS and standard billboards at the expense of looking at the road ahead?

II. EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH

The study used a field research vehicle (FRV) equipped with an eye-tracking system. The FRV was a 2007 Jeep® Grand Cherokee Sport Utility Vehicle (SUV). The eye-tracking system used (Smart Eye vehicle-mounted infra-red (IR) eye-movement measuring system) is shown in figure 1. The system consists of two IR light sources and three face cameras mounted on the dashboard of the vehicle. The cameras and light sources are small in size, and are not attached to the driver in any manner. The face cameras are synchronized to the IR light sources and are used to determine the head position and gaze of the driver.



Figure 1. Smart Eye Face Camera Placement.

As a part of this eye tracking system, the FRV was outfitted with a three-camera panoramic scene monitoring system for capturing the forward driving scene. The scene cameras are mounted on the roof of the vehicle directly above the driver's head position. The three cameras together provide an 80 degree wide by 40 degree high field of forward view. The scene cameras captured the forward view area available to the driver through the left side of the windshield and a portion of the right side of the windshield. The area visible to the driver through the rightmost area of the windshield was not captured by the scene cameras.

The FRV was also outfitted with equipment to record GPS position, vehicle speed, and vehicle acceleration. The vehicle was also equipped to record events entered by an experimenter. The FRV is pictured in figure 2.



Figure 2. FHWA's Field Research Vehicle.

A. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN OVERVIEW

The approach entailed the use of the instrumented vehicle in which drivers navigated routes in cities that presented CEVMS and standard billboards in areas of varying visual complexity. The drivers were instructed to drive the routes as they would normally drive paying attention to other traffic, speed limits, and other elements in the roadway. The drivers were not informed that the study was about outdoor advertising but rather it was about examining drivers' glance behavior as they followed route guidance directions.

Site Selection

More than 40 cities were evaluated in the selection of the test sites. Locations with CEVMS displays were identified using a variety of resources that included State DOT contacts, advertising company websites, and Google EarthTM. A matrix was developed that listed the number of CEVMS in each city. For each site, the number of CEVMS along limited access and arterial roadways was determined.

One criterion for site selection was whether the location had practical routes that could be driven in about 30 minutes and pass by a number of CEVMS as well as standard (vinyl) off-premise billboards. Other considerations included access to vehicle maintenance personnel/facilities, proximity to research facilities, and ease of participant recruitment. Two cities were selected: Reading, PA, and Richmond, VA.

Table 1 presents the 16 cities that were included on the final list of potential study sites.

Table 1. Distribution of CEVMS by Roadway Classification for Various Cities.

<i>State</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Limited Access</i>	<i>Arterial</i>	<i>Other⁽¹⁾</i>	<i>Total</i>
VA	Richmond	4	7	0	11
PA	Reading	7	11	0	18
VA	Roanoke	0	11	0	11
PA	Pittsburgh	0	0	15	15
TX	San Antonio	7	2	6	15
WI	Milwaukee	14	2	0	16
AZ	Phoenix	10	6	0	16
MN	St. Paul/Minneapolis	8	5	3	16
TN	Nashville	7	10	0	17
FL	Tampa-St. Petersburg	7	11	0	18
NM	Albuquerque	0	19	1	20
PA	Scranton-Wilkes Barre	7	14	1	22
OH	Columbus	1	22	0	23
GA	Atlanta	13	11	0	24
IL	Chicago	22	2	1	25
CA	LA	3	71	4	78

(1) Other includes roadways classified as both limited access and arterial or instances where the road classification was unknown. *Source:* www.lamar.com and www.clearchannel.com

In both test cities, the following independent variables were evaluated:

- **The type of advertising.** This included CEVMS, standard billboards, or no off-premises advertising. (It should be noted that in areas with no off-premises advertising, it was still possible to encounter on-premise advertising; e.g., gas stations, restaurants, other miscellaneous stores and shops.)
- **Time of day.** This included both driving in the day time and night time.
- **The complexity of the visual scene in data collection zones.** This was classified in terms of visual complexity or clutter. This variable was handled differently in the two cities and is further discussed in subsequent sections. The results presented in this report are tied to the specific implementations of advertising that were present. The fact that the two cities contained CEVMS but differed in other respects is advantageous when attempting to extrapolate the results to other settings.

Photometric Measurement of Signs

Two primary metrics are used to describe the photometric characteristics of the target CEVMS and standard billboards: luminance (cd/m^2) and contrast (Weber contrast ratio). This part of the procedure serves to characterize the billboards that were evaluated in the study. Also if data are collected at other sites, the luminance and contract measures reported here can be used to determine the degree to which the current results may relate to another site with CEVMS and standard billboards.

Photometric Equipment

Luminance was measured with a Radiant Imaging ProMetric 1600 Charge-Coupled Device (CCD) photometer with both a 50 mm and a 300 mm lens. The CCD photometer provided a method of capturing the luminance of an entire scene at one time.

The photometric sensors were mounted in an SUV of similar size to the FRV. Figure 3 shows the set up for taking photometric measurements. The photometer was located in the experimental vehicle as close to the driver's position as possible and was connected to a laptop computer on the center console that stored data as the images were acquired.



Figure 3. CCD Photometer and Laptop Setup in Vehicle

Measurement Methodology

Luminance measurements were taken at each target billboard location. Images of the billboards were acquired using the Radiant Imaging ProMetric software installed on the laptop. An example of the software's interface is shown in Figure 4. Using the software provided with the system, the mean luminance of each billboard message was measured. In order to prevent overexposure of images in daylight, neutral density filters were manually affixed to the photometer lens and the luminance values were scaled appropriately. Standard billboards were typically measured only once; however, for CEVMS multiple measures were taken because the luminance can vary with advertising content.




Figure 4. ProMetric Software Interface.

Photometric measurements were taken during day (between 8:15AM and 4:45PM) and at night (after 6:00PM). Measurements were taken by centering the billboard in the photometer’s field of view with approximately the equivalent of the width of the billboard on each side and the equivalent of the billboard height above and below the sign. This was done to ensure adequate background luminance data in each image. The selected background region data was used in billboard contrast calculations. Figure 5 shows a target billboard and two adjacent areas (outlined in red) that were used to calculate the contrast ratio.



Figure 5. Regions of Background for Contrast Ratio Analysis.

Measurements of the standard billboards were taken at a mean distance of 284 ft (ranging from 570 ft to 43 ft). The mean measurement distance for measurements of the CEVMS was 479 ft (ranging from 972 ft and 220 ft). To include the background regions of appropriate size, the close measurement distances required the use of the 50 mm lens while measurements made further from the signs required the 300 mm lens.

The Weber Contrast Ratio was used because it characterizes a billboard as having negative or positive contrast when compared to its background area.⁽¹⁴⁾ Figure 6 shows differences in background behind a billboard. A negative contrast indicates the background areas have a higher mean luminance than the target billboard. A positive contrast indicates the target billboard has a higher mean luminance than the background. Overall, the absolute value of a contrast ratio simply indicates a difference in luminance between an item and its background.



Figure 6. Contrast Background Differences.

Visual Complexity

Regan, Young, Lee and Gordon presented a taxonomic description of the various sources of driver distraction.⁽¹⁵⁾ Potential sources of distraction were discussed in terms of: things brought into the vehicle; vehicle systems; vehicle occupants; moving objects or animals in the vehicle; internalized activity; and external objects, events, or activities. The external objects may include buildings, constructions zones, billboards, road signs, vehicles, and so on. A taxonomy suggested by Horberry and Edquist focuses on visual information outside of the vehicle. This suggested taxonomy includes four groupings of visual information: built roadway, situational entities, natural environment, and built environment.⁽¹⁶⁾ These taxonomies provide an organizational structure for conducting research; however, they do not currently provide a systematic or quantitative manner with which to classify the level of clutter or visual complexity present in a visual scene. The methods proposed by Rozenholtz, Li, and Nakano do provide quantitative and perhaps reliable measures of visual clutter.⁽¹⁷⁾ This approach measures the entropy or variance in a visual image.

The data collection zones were scaled in terms of overall visual complexity (i.e., clutter). Subband entropy was used as a measure of visual clutter in photographs taken in each data collection zone.⁽¹⁷⁾ The calculation of subband entropy is based on the assumption that the more organized a scene is, the less clutter it contains. Using this assumption, subband entropy calculates the organization or predictability of a scene (e.g., color, shape, size, and alignment of

items). Presumably, less cluttered images can be visually coded more efficiently than cluttered images. For example, visual clutter can cause decreased recognition performance and greater difficulty in performing visual search. For each data collection zone a single frame was captured from a color video and saved as a JPEG. The JPEGs were analyzed with MATLAB® routines that computed a measure of subband entropy for each image.

III. EXPERIMENT 1

The first on-road experiment was conducted in Reading, PA. The overall objectives of the study were to determine: (a) if drivers looked more at CEVMS than at standard billboards, (b) if there were long glances to off-premise billboards, and (c) if there is a tradeoff between looking at off-premise billboards and the road ahead. To address these objectives, the experiment examined the type of advertising (CEVMS, standard billboard, or no off-premise advertising) and time of day (day or night) as independent variables. Eye tracking was used to assess where participants looked and for how long while driving. The luminance and contrast of the advertising signs were measured to account for any photometric contributions to the results.

Participants drove two test routes (referred to as Route A and B) in Reading. Each route required 25 to 30 minutes to complete and included both freeway and arterial segments. Route A was 13 miles long and contained 12 data collection zones. Route B was 16 miles long and contained 8 data collection zones, for a total of 20 data collection zones. Although the data collection zones were selected because they included a specific type of advertising, some zones encompassed other off-premises and on-premises advertising. For example, one zone contained 2 CEVMS, and 10 standard billboards as well as commercial buildings and parking lots. This type of data collection zone was kept for analysis but classified as a separate category of visual complexity (referred to as CEVMS complex), a factor that was handled more fully in experiment 2. Scene visual complexity was quantified to ensure that the classification of these more visually complex CEVMS conditions was justified.

Other data collection zones were comprised of the single target billboard and no other forms of off-premise advertising. Each route also included two data collection zones that did not contain off-premise billboards; one contained minimal manmade structures (natural environment) and the other was comprised mostly of buildings and other manmade structures (built environment). Table 2 presents an inventory of target billboards in Reading and their relevant parameters.

Table 2. Inventory of Target Billboards in Reading with Relevant Parameters.

<i>Advertising Type</i>	<i>Copy Dimensions (ft)</i>	<i>Change Rate (sec)⁽¹⁾</i>	<i>Side of Road</i>	<i>Setback from Road (ft)</i>	<i>Data Collection Zone Length (ft)</i>	<i>Other Standard Billboards</i>
CEVMS	10.5x 22.75	6	L	35	960	2
CEVMS	10.5 x 22.75	10	R	47	960	3
CEVMS	14 x 48	10	L	188	960	2
CEVMS	14 x 48	10	R	142	960	2
CEVMS	10.5 x 22.75	8	L	92	960	3
CEVMS	10.5 x 22.75	8	R	54	960	0
CEVMS	10.5 x 22.75	10	R	128	960	2
CEVMS	14 x 48	10	L	188	960	2
CEVMS	14 x 48	10	R	142	960	2
CEVMS Complex	10.5 x 36	10	R	36	960	10
CEVMS Complex	14 x 48	8	R	22	1860	10
Standard	10.5 x 36	—	L	71	960	1
Standard	14 x 48	—	L	50	682	0
Standard	14 x 48	—	L	97	960	1
Standard	21 x 22.75	—	R	34	547	2
Standard	10.5 x 45.25	—	L	79	960	2

(1) Change rate is only calculated for CEVMS. The indicated value is the number of seconds each advertisement copy is on display. For Copy Dimensions, Setback from Road, and Data Collection Zone Length values: 1 ft = 0.305 m. *Source:* www.lamar.com and satellite imagery.

A. METHOD

Advertising Type

The type of advertising present in data collection zones was examined as an independent variable. Data collection zones fell into one of the following categories, which are listed in the third column of table 2:

- **CEVMS.** These were data collection zones that contained one target CEVMS with a relatively low level of scene complexity. Figure 7 shows an example of a CEVMS data collection zone with the CEVMS located in the center of the image.
 - **CEVMS complex.** This was an area that contained two CEVMS displays (about 800 feet or 243.84 m apart), 10 non-target standard billboards, and other built environment (e.g., buildings, parking lots). Figure 8 shows a picture of a portion of this data collection zone. The two CEVMS are highlighted with red rectangles in the figure.
- **Standard billboard.** These were data collection zones that contained one target standard billboard. Figure 9 is an example of a standard billboard data collection zone; the standard billboard is located in the top left corner.

- **No off-premise advertising conditions.** These data collection zones contained no off-premise advertising and were divided into the following categories:
 - **Natural environment.** These were data collection zones without off-premise advertising and principally contained trees. Figure 10 is an example of this type of data collection zone.
 - **Built environment.** These were data collection zones that contained buildings, businesses, parking areas, and other areas of built environment but not off-premise billboard advertising. Figure 11 is an example of this type of data collection zone.



Figure 7. Data Collection Zone with a Target CEVMS.



Figure 8. Visually Complex Data Collection Area with 2 CEVMS and 10 Non-Target Standard Billboards.



Figure 9. Data Collection Zone with a Target Standard Billboard.



Figure 10. Data Collection Zone with Natural Environment.



Figure 11. Data Collection Zone with Built Environment.

Photometric Measurements

Luminance: The mean daytime luminance of both the standard billboards and CEVMS was greater than at night. Nighttime luminance measurements reflect the fact that CEVMS use illuminating LED components while standard billboards are often illuminated from beneath by Metal Halide lamps. At night, CEVMS have a greater average luminance than standard billboards. Table 3 presents summary statistics for luminance as a function of time of day for the CEVMS and standard billboards.

Contrast: The daytime and nighttime Weber contrast ratios for both types of billboards are shown in table 3. Both CEVMS and standard billboards had contrast ratios that were close to zero (the surroundings were about equal in brightness to the signs) during the daytime. On the other hand, at night the CEVMS and standard billboards had positive contrast ratios.

Table 3. Summary of Luminance (cd/m²) and Contrast (Weber ratio) Measurements in Reading.

<i>Day</i>	Luminance (cd/m ²)			Contrast		
	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>
CEVMS Complex	1,109	1,690	1,400	-0.59	-0.40	-0.50
CEVMS	1,544	4,774	2,631	-0.71	0.37	-0.19
Standard Billboard	291	6,752	2,277	-0.81	1.15	-0.13
<i>Night</i>						
CEVMS Complex	56	139	97	53	81	67
CEVMS	34	76	52	6	179	81
Standard Billboard	6	45	17	12	69	29

The mean contrast ratios of CEVMS complex and CEVMS were each greater than the mean contrast ratio of standard billboards. This is the result of greater mean luminance values of the two categories of CEVMS at night when compared to standard billboards.

Visual Complexity

Recall that the data collection zones were also scaled in terms of their overall visual complexity or clutter. Figure 12 shows the mean subband entropy measures for each of the data collection zone environments (note that due to the limited number of data collection zones, standard error information is not included). In addition, high (Times Square) and low (a desert road) clutter scenes are provided for comparison. The built environment and the CEVMS Complex data collection zones showed the greatest subband entropy values, followed by the natural environment and standard billboard zones. Finally, the CEVMS zone resulted in the lowest mean subband entropy value.




Figure 12. Mean Subband Entropy Measures for Each of the Data Collection Zone Types.

Participants

Participants were recruited at public libraries in the Reading, PA area. A table was set up so that recruiters could discuss the requirements of the experiment with candidates. Individuals who expressed interest in participating were asked to complete a pre-screening form, a record of informed consent, and a department of motor vehicles form consenting to release of their driving record.

All participants were between 18 and 64 years of age and held a valid driver’s license. The driving record for each volunteer was evaluated to eliminate drivers with excessive violations. The criteria for excluding drivers were as follows: (a) more than one violation in the preceding year; (b) more than three recorded violations; and (c) any driving while intoxicated violation.

Forty-three individuals were recruited to participate. Of these, five did not complete the drive because the eye tracker could not be calibrated to accurately track eye movements. Data from an additional seven participants was excluded as the result of equipment failures (e.g., loose camera). In the end, usable data was collected from 31 participants (12 males, $M = 46$ years; 19 female, $M = 47$ years) 14 participated at night and 17 participated during the day. All participants were under the age of 64.

Procedures

Data were collected from two participants per day (beginning at approximately 12:45 PM and 7:00 PM). Data collection began on September 18, 2009, and was completed on October 26, 2009.

Pre-Data Collection Activities. Participants were greeted by two researchers and asked to complete a fitness to drive questionnaire. This questionnaire focused on drivers' self-reports of alertness and use of substances that might impair driving (e.g., alcohol). It was expected that if a participant did not appear to be fit to drive upon meeting then he or she would be disqualified from the study; however, no participants presented themselves in such a manner.

Next, the participant and both researchers moved to the eye-tracking calibration location in the test vehicle. If it was not possible to calibrate the eye tracking system, the participant was dismissed and paid for his or her time. Causes of calibration failure included reflections from eye glasses, participant height (which put their eyes outside the range of the system), and participants' eye lids obscuring a portion of the pupil (preventing a focus on the whole pupil).

Practice. After eye-tracker calibration, a short practice drive was made. Participants were shown a map of the route and written turn-by-turn directions prior to beginning the practice drive. Throughout the drive, verbal directions were provided by a GPS device.

During the practice drive, a researcher in the rear seat of the vehicle monitored the accuracy of eye-tracking. If the system was tracking poorly, additional calibration was performed. If the calibration could not be improved, the participant did not participate in the data collection drive. Instead participants were thanked (and paid) for their time and were dismissed.

Data Collection. Similar to the practice drive, participants were shown a map of the route and written turn-by-turn directions. A GPS device provided turn-by-turn guidance during the drive. Participants were not told that the focus of the study was related to billboards. Rather, participants were told that researchers were investigating eye-gaze behavior as it relates to driving while following auditory directions. The first half of the data collection for each participant lasted approximately 30 minutes. Roughly one half of the participants drove Route A first and the remaining participants began with Route B. A five minute break followed the completion of the first route.

During the drives, a researcher in the front passenger seat assisted the driver when additional route guidance was required. That researcher also recorded near misses or driver errors as necessary. The researcher in the rear seat monitored the performance of the eye tracker. If the eye tracker performance became unacceptable (i.e., loss of calibration), then the researcher in the rear asked the participant to park in a safe location so that the eye tracker could be recalibrated.

Debriefing. After driving both routes, participants were asked to complete a driver feedback questionnaire and were given \$120.00 cash for their participation. Participants were informed of the study's true purpose after all data from that participant was collected.

B. DATA REDUCTION

Selection of Data Collection Zone Limits

In evaluating eye gaze measures to CEVMS and standard billboards, it is important to take into consideration the abilities of the driver to see and read signs. Also, the capability of the data collection system and data analyses procedure needs to be taken into account when setting the limits of each data collection zone. In this study, data collection zones were defined as the distance leading up to a target billboard (CEVMS or standard) that is used in the analysis of the

gaze data. One must use caution when selecting data collection zone limits for many reasons. If a very long data collection zone length was selected where the drivers could not be expected to read the billboards and the eye tracking and video analysis system could not resolve the billboard, then the proportion of time that drivers were looking at billboards would tend to be underestimated. On the other hand, very short data collection zone lengths would result in missing gazes to the billboards that should have logically been captured.

The rationale for selecting the data collection zone limits took into account the geometry of the roadway (e.g., road curvature or obstructions that blocked view to the billboards) and capabilities of the eye-tracking system (two degrees of resolution). Nine hundred and sixty feet was accepted as the maximum approach length. The MUTCD 2009 guideline of 30 ft (9.14m) per inch (25.4 mm) of letter height was used to estimate the sign legibility distance. Given an average letter height of 32 in (812.8 mm) for the CEVMS, a maximum distance of 960 ft (292.61 m) was computed (actual distances can be seen in table 2). An exception was made in the case where a CEVMS data collection zone overlapped with a collection zone of the previous CEVMS; in this case the data collection zone was greater than 960 ft (292.61 m). The start of the second data collection zone was defined as the location of the preceding. If the target billboard was not visible from 960 ft (292.61 m) due to roadway geometry or other visual obstructions, such as trees or an overpass, then the data collection zone was shortened to a distance that prevented these objects from interfering with the driver's vision of the billboard. In data collection zones with target off-premise billboards, the end of the data collection zone was marked by that billboard. If the area contained no off-premise advertising, then the end of the data collection zone was defined by a physical landmark.

In Reading, the average billboard height was 12.8 ft (3.90 m) and the average width was 36.9 ft (11.25 m). At a distance of 960 ft (292.61 m), a 12.8 ft (3.90 m) by 36.9 ft (11.25 m) sign would subtend a horizontal visual angle of 2.20 degrees and a vertical visual angle of 0.76 degrees. Given these values, the billboards were resolved by the eye tracking system and could be read by the participants.

Researchers attempted to examine glances to the billboards at very long distances (up to 3,883 ft or 1,183.54 m). However, at these long distances an eye glance that may have been to a billboard could not be differentiated from a glance to another object nearby, the roadway, or the sky. Table 2 shows the data collection zone limits utilized in this experiment.

Eye Tracking Measures

The images recorded from the three cameras mounted on the roof of the research vehicle were stitched into a single panoramic view. Glance behavior was reduced by observing gaze location indicated by a cursor that was overlaid onto the panoramic view. The cursor location approximated where the participant's gaze was directed within 2 degrees on a frame-by-frame basis. The panoramic view was generated at 25 frames per second. In addition, a text file containing parameters from the eye tracking system was generated. The text file included information regarding eye-gaze vectors and their quality, gaze location in relation to a world model, and other gaze variables (e.g., eye blinks, pupil diameter). A second text file was also produced that contained GPS coordinates, vehicle speed data, and distance from the beginning of the trip. The eye tracker recorded at 60Hz and was down sampled and matched to the

corresponding video frames that were output at 25Hz. The digital data containing the GPS and speed data were also processed such that these data would correspond to the 25Hz frame rate.

The video data was reduced on a frame-by-frame basis and recorded in a relational database. Glance locations were classified as follows:

1. **Road ahead.** This category of glances included the roadway surface from edge of shoulder to edge of shoulder or curb to curb. That is, the physical roadway (for both directions of travel) between the research vehicle and the vanishing point of the roadway was included. Distant trees and buildings defining the path of the roadway ahead, as well as bridges, guard rails, embankments, etc. were also classified as road ahead as were traffic control devices, other vehicles, and pedestrians who could potentially interact with the vehicle.
2. **Target CEVMS.** These were glances to a pre-determined digital billboard in its respective data collection zone.
3. **Target standard billboard.** These were glances to a pre-determined standard billboard in its respective data collection zone.
4. **Other standard off-premise billboards.** These were glances to other non-target standard (vinyl) billboards present in a data collection zone. These other non-target off-premise billboards occurred in both CEVMS and standard billboard data collection zones.
5. **Miscellaneous.** This category included glances to areas of extraneous built environment (such as building structures, houses, hotels, commercial and industrial buildings, malls, parking lots, etc.) and natural environment (fields, forests, foliage, trees, bushes, mountains, lakes, rivers, clouds, sky, etc.) which did not assist in defining the roadway.
6. **Indeterminate.** These were video frames where the eye-tracking cursor was not present or the cursor was outside the panoramic field of view. This category included glances to the vehicle instruments and rear view mirrors, as well as glances to areas of the roadway outside the panoramic view. A proportion of the indeterminate glances were later classified as to the gauge cluster based on analysis of the data; this ultimately resulted in glances to seven categorical areas.

Analysts coded each frame of the data collection zone using one the six categories listed above (the sixth category was later subdivided allowing glances to the gauge cluster to become its own category). On each frame, the cursor needed to touch a given object for the analyst to score a category glance to that object category. Figure 13 illustrates a video frame that was scored as a glance to a target CEVMS.




Figure 13. Panoramic Video with the Eye-Tracking Cursor (Highlighted by the Green Circle) in the Center of a CEVMS.

After the video data was reduced, data validation and processing procedures were carried out. Software programs insured that frames were not accidentally double-coded, the beginning and end of each data collection zone were correct, and the correct codes were used for target billboards.

Data Processing

Data processing resulted in a data file that could be used for calculating glance duration to the different pre-defined objects and categories (Road Ahead, CEVMS, etc.).

Gaze Calculation. Within each data collection zone, the processed data files were examined to determine the number of consecutive frames that were scored as being in the same category. Each group was considered one gaze and it was possible for a gaze to contain only a single frame (0.04 sec. duration). Previous research has shown that gazes cases do not need to be separated into saccades and fixations before calculating such measures as percent of time looking to the road ahead.⁽¹⁸⁾ The analyses performed in this report are therefore based on gaze data.

Ultimately, calculating gazes resulted in a data file that contained gazes and gaze durations as a function of scoring categories and data collection zones for each participant.

Performance Measures. **The following performance measures were computed from the gaze data files.**

Mean Percent of Time: Within each data collection zone, the mean percent of time spent looking at a given object or class of objects was computed for each of the following categories:

1. Road ahead.
2. Target CEVMS.
3. Target standard billboard.
4. Other standard billboard.
5. Miscellaneous.
6. Unknown (these were indeterminate glances that could not be classified to the gauge cluster).
7. Gauge cluster.

For each data collection zone, the sum of the percent of time across the above seven categories equaled 100. That is, all gazes were accounted for in data analysis and none were excluded.

Mean Rate of Eye Gazes: The mean rate of eye gazes was defined as the frequency of eye gazes to a particular object category divided by the amount of time available in the data collection zone. If a data collection zone consisted of 23 frames (23/25 of a second or 0.92 sec), then the mean rate of eye gazes for the target CEVMS category would be equal to two gazes divided by 0.92 sec, or approximately 2.17 gazes per second. This measure was computed for the target CEVMS and target standard billboard categories within their respective collection zones. Note that this metric was not sensitive to the duration of eye glances.

Mean Duration of Eye-Gazes: The mean duration of eye-gazes was defined as the average length of each gaze to a particular object category (i.e., the total duration of eye glances divided by the number of separate gazes). This measure was calculated for the target CEVMS and standard billboard categories within their respective data collection zones.

Driving Behavior Measures: During data collection the front-seat researcher observed the drivers' behaviors and the driving environment. The following categories were used to score researcher observations:

- **Driver Error:** Signified any error on behalf of the driver in which the researcher felt slightly uncomfortable, but not to a significant degree (e.g., driving on an exit ramp too quickly, turning too quickly).
- **Near Miss:** Signified any event in which the researcher felt uncomfortable due to driver response to external sources (e.g., slamming on brakes, swerving). A near miss is the extreme case of a driver error.
- **Incident:** Signified any event in the roadway which may have had a potential impact on the attention of the driver and/or the flow of traffic (e.g., crash, emergency vehicle, animal, construction, train).

These observations were entered into a notebook computer linked to the FRV data collection system. However, neither driver errors nor near misses occurred in the limits of a data collection zone.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results are presented principally to address three key experimental questions: (a) do drivers look more at CEVMS than at standard billboards, (b) are there long glances to off-premise advertising billboards, and (c) is there a tradeoff between looking at off-premise advertising billboards and the road ahead? However, the overall distribution of time spent looking at the different target categories for each of the billboard and no off-premise advertising environments are presented to give an overall picture of the results.

All statistical analyses used an alpha level of .05. All error bars presented in the following figures show \pm two standard errors about the mean (which closely approximate a 95 percent confidence interval).

Mean Percent of Time

Table 4 presents the mean percent of time participants spent gazing at each of the areas of interest as a function of data collection zone type. As previously noted, the data collection zones are classified in terms of the presence or absence of off-premise advertising and the type of advertising (CEVMS or standard billboards). The data in table 4 are averaged across time of day. This table illustrates the tradeoffs between gazing at different objects and areas in the visual scene. As the table shows, gaze activity in the CEVMS, standard billboard, and built environment data collection zones resulted in approximately the same percent of time for the road ahead, ranging from 83.3 percent to 84.3 percent. The natural environment shows the highest percent of time looking to the road ahead.

Table 4. Mean Percent of Time Looking to Areas of Interest Based on Data Collection Zone Type.

	Road Ahead	Misc	Unknown	Gauges	Target Billboards	Non-Target Standard Billboards	<i>Total</i>
CEVMS	83.3%	6.9%	5.4%	1.2%	2.8%	0.4%	100%
Standard Billboards	84.3%	7.2%	4.7%	1.3%	1.6%	1.0%	100%
Built Environment	82.3%	14.2%	3.0%	0.5%	—	—	100%
Natural Environment	87.3%	4.5%	5.7%	2.5%	—	—	100%
<i>Mean</i>	84.3%	8.2%	4.7%	1.4%	2.2%	0.7%	—

Data were analyzed using a 2 (time of day) x 4 (data collection zone type) mixed design ANOVA on each target category. Because the raw percentages are positively skewed (deviating from normality), additional analyses were performed using transformed data. Data were transformed using the arcsine of the square root of the proportions. This transformation works

on measures distributed between zero and one and thus proportions rather than percentages were used. ⁽¹⁹⁾

Mean Percent of Time to Target Advertising

Participants spent significantly more time looking at CEVMS than at standard billboards: $F(1, 29) = 9.88, p < .01$. As can be seen in Table 4, the mean percent of time drivers spent looking at CEVMS (2.8 percent) was nearly double that of standard billboards (1.6 percent).

Overall, participants directed a significantly greater percent of glances to billboards during the daytime (2.9 percent) as they did at nighttime (1.3 percent): $F(1, 29) = 14.24, p < .01$. There was not a significant interaction between billboard type and the time of day.

Mean Percent of Time to Road Ahead

Figure 14 shows the main effect for advertising: $F(3, 87) = 3.93, p < .05$. The percent of time looking to the road ahead was the greatest for the natural environment and lowest for the built environment. As figure 14 shows, the CEVMS, standard billboard and built environment data collection zones did not significantly differ from each other but each significantly differed from the natural environment: $p < .05$. Participants spent significantly more time gazing at the road ahead at night (89 percent) than during the day (81 percent): $F(1, 87) = 9.07, p < .01$. This is true for all data collection zones.




Figure 14. Percent of Time to Road Ahead as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type.

Mean Duration of Eye Gazes

Overall, data collection zone type did not significantly affect mean glance duration: $F(1, 29) = 1.52, p > .05$. Averaged across data collection zones, the mean glance duration, was 0.07 s (standard deviation 0.06 s).

The mean duration of gazes to the road ahead were also examined ($M = 0.59$ s), revealing no significant differences based upon data collection zone type: $F(1, 29) = 0.34, p > .05$.

Mean gaze durations may be misleading when the distribution of the duration of glances is skewed, which, as can be seen in Figure 15, was the case for glances to billboards. The figure shows the proportion of glance durations to CEVMS and standard billboards under nighttime and daytime conditions. All of these distributions show a positive skew with most of the gaze durations being relatively short.




Figure 15. The Proportion of Gaze Duration for CEVMS and Standard Billboards under Daytime and Nighttime Driving Conditions.

Table 5 shows the total number of glances to target billboards summed over participants and target billboards. Although the shapes of the distributions are similar, there were approximately four times more gazes toward CEVMS than standard billboards. This difference in the number of gazes is principally due to the fact that there were 11 CEVMS and only 5 standard (target) billboards in the study. The numbers presented in parenthesis in this table are the result of the total number of glances to billboards divided by the number of billboards multiplied by the number subjects in each condition. Even when accounting for the number of billboards, there was still a higher frequency of glances to CEVMS than to standard billboards. Overall, there also were more glances to billboards during the day than at night.

Table 5. Total Number of Gazes for the CEVMS and Standard Billboard Conditions as a Function of Time of Day.

Advertising Condition	Time of Day	
	Day	Night
CEVMS	668 (3.57)*	404 (2.62)
Standard Billboard	155 (1.82)	96 (1.37)

* Numbers in parenthesis are the glance frequency totals divided by the number of billboards and participants in the respective conditions.

Figure 15 shows that a small percentage of glances exceeded 1 s in duration. The following section presents analyses of these glances. Previous research has shown that glances away from the forward roadway exceeding 2 s have increased crash risk.⁽¹²⁾ As a conservative measure, a value of shorter duration was selected for the analyses.

Long Duration Eye Gazes

Table 6 presents a summary of participant glances longer than 1 s to target billboards. The long glances were to CEVMS and were as likely to happen during the day as at night. Long glances to off-premises advertising were rare events. Of the total 1,072 glances to target CEVMS, only 5 exceeded 1 s (0.47 percent; ranging from 1.0 – 1.28 s).

Table 6. Summary of Long Gazes to Off-Premises Advertising in Reading.

Data Collection Zone	Time of Day	Advertising	Duration (sec)	Horizontal Offset (ft)	Distance from Sign (ft)	Horizontal Angle (deg)
1	Day	CEVMS Complex	1.04	22	402	3.13
5	Day	CEVMS	1.28	50	605	4.72
17	Day	CEMVS	1.00	92	824	6.37
19	Night	CEMVS	1.28	54	241	12.63
19	Night	CEMVS	1.04	54	464	6.64

Figure 16 shows the CEVMS (horizontally offset 54 ft from the roadway) in data collection zone 19, a relatively uncluttered visual environment. That sign had two long glances, both at night, beginning at 464 ft and 241 ft away. The visual angle subtended by the sign at these distances and offset was close to the area defined as road ahead. As a result of its proximity to the roadway, drivers may have felt comfortable directing longer glances to this sign. In other words, because this billboard was so close to the roadway, it is possible that it captured longer glances than if it were a greater distance from the vehicle path.



Figure 16. Data Collection Zone 19.

Mean Percent of Time to Other Non-Target Standard Billboards

Participants spent a significantly greater percentage of their time looking at standard non-target billboards in standard billboard data collections zones (.99 percent) than in CEVMS zones (.38 percent): $F(1, 29) = 11.06, p < .01$.

Participants also directed more glances at other non-target standard billboards during the day (1.02 percent) than at night (0.26 percent): $F(1, 29) = 16.35, p < .01$.

Mean Percent of Time Looking at Miscellaneous

Participants looked at many miscellaneous objects along the roadway, including buildings, parking lots, on-premises advertising, and other built environments away from the roadway. The amount of time participants spent looking at miscellaneous objects was significantly affected by data collection zone type: $F(3, 87) = 44.7, p < .01$. As can be seen in Figure 17, in the built environment, participants spent the most amount of time looking at miscellaneous objects, followed by the CEVMS and the standard billboard data collection zones. No significant difference in the percent of time spent looking at miscellaneous objects was found between the CEVMS and standard billboard zones: $p > .05$. The natural environment data collection zone showed the lowest percent of time gazing at miscellaneous objects; participants spent about 4.5 percent of the time looking at trees: $p < .05$.




Figure 17. Percent of Time Looking at Miscellaneous as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type.

There were more glances toward miscellaneous objects in the daytime (10.9 percent) than the nighttime (4.9 percent): $F(1, 87) = 9.07, p < .01$.

Mean Percent of Time to the Gauge Cluster

Advertising type had a significant effect on glances to the vehicle gauge cluster: $F(3, 87) = 11.89, p < .01$. Figure 18 illustrates that there were more glances to the gauge cluster in natural environment data collection zones than in any of the others. The built environment data collection zone showed the lowest percentage of glances to the gauge cluster. The CEVMS and standard billboard zones did not significantly influence the amount of time participants spent looking at the gauge cluster. The built environment data collection zone showed the lowest percentage of glances to the gauge cluster. The CEVMS and standard billboard zones did not significantly influence the amount of time participants spent looking at the gauge cluster: $p > .05$.




Figure 18. Percent of Time Looking to the Gauge Cluster as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type.

Mean Percent of Time Glances at Unknown Objects

The percent of time that glances could not be classified also varied significantly with data collection zone: $F(3, 87) = 7.45, p < .01$. As can be seen in Figure 19, there were significantly fewer glances at unknown objects in the built environments than in the other three environments (natural, standard, CEVMS) which did not differ from each other: $p < .05$. There were no other significant differences $p > .05$.




Figure 19. Percentage of Time Glancing at Unknown Objects as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type.

Mean Rate of Glances

Overall there were low rates of glances to both types of billboards. When separated by billboard type, participants showed a greater mean rate of glances at target CEVMS than at target standard billboards: $F(1, 29) = 15.54, p < .01$. In the CEVMS data collection zones, the average rate of glances at target advertising is about 0.42 per s, or 4.2 glances every 10 s. In the standard billboard data collection zones, a rate of 0.20 per s, or 2 glances every 10 s, was found. Overall, the rate of glances was higher during the day (0.39 glances per second) than at night (0.21 glances per s): $F(1, 29) = 8.32, p < .01$.

There were no significant differences for mean rate of glances at the road ahead as a function of time of day or data collection zone type. The mean rate of glances at the road ahead was 5.00 gazes per second.

Relationship between Photometric Measures and Glance Behavior

Analyses were conducted to determine if there was a relationship between sign luminance or contrast and participant glance behavior. Correlational analyses were conducted among glance duration and luminance and the Weber contrast measures for the individual signs. Separate correlational analyses were conducted for CEVMS and standards billboards during nighttime and daytime. The correlations among glance duration and the photometric measures were all low and not statistically significant ($p > .05$).

CEVMS Correlations. For the daytime, the correlation between glance duration and luminance was $r = -.007$. For the nighttime the correlation was $r = 0.037$. The correlation between glance duration and contrast were $r = 0.049$ for daytime and $r = -.071$ for nighttime. None of these correlations were significant ($p < .05$).

Standard Billboard Correlations. The correlation between glance duration and luminance was $r = 0.053$ for the daytime and $r = -0.147$ for the nighttime. The correlation between glance duration and contrast was $r = 0.07$ in the daytime and $r = 0.160$ for the nighttime. None of these correlations were significant ($p < .05$).

Observation of Driver Behavior

No near misses or driver errors were observed in data collection zones experiment 1.

Results Including CEVMS Complex

As noted previously, the CEVMS complex condition included two CEVMS, multiple standard billboards, and a visually complex built environment (hotel, car dealership, restaurants, and parking lots). Table 7 shows the percent of time glances were directed at different objects or areas (e.g., road ahead) in the driving environment. The CEVMS complex data collection zone shows the lowest percent of time looking to the road ahead. The largest difference between the CEVMS complex and the CEVMS/standard billboard data collection zones is the percent of glances to miscellaneous objects. The following presents statistical results for percent of time measures and glance duration.

Table 7. Mean Percentage of Time Looking at Areas of Interest Based on Data Collection Zone Type.

	Road Ahead	Misc	Unknown	Gauges	Target Billboards	Non-Target Standard Billboards	Total
CEVMS Complex	75.9%	10.4%	5.6%	1.7%	3.8%	2.5%	100%
CEVMS	83.3%	6.9%	5.4%	1.2%	2.8%	0.4%	100%
Standard Billboards	84.3%	7.2%	4.7%	1.3%	1.6%	1.0%	100%
Built Environment	82.3%	14.2%	3.0%	0.5%	—	—	100%
Natural Environment	87.3%	4.5%	5.7%	2.5%	—	—	100%
Mean	82.6%	8.6%	4.9%	1.4%	2.7%	1.3%	—

There were significantly more glances at target CEVMS relative to target standard billboards: $F(2, 57) = 7.02, p < 0.002$. Figure 20 presents the mean percentage of time spent looking at target billboards as a function of data collection zone.

The results including the CEVMS complex data collection zone were similar to those presented earlier. The percent of eye glances to target advertising in the CEVMS complex and CEVMS environments were not significantly different from each other ($p > .05$); however, participants spent a significantly greater percentage of time glancing at target advertising in both types of CEVMS environments than in the standard billboard zones ($p < .05$).




Figure 20. Percent of Time Glancing at Target Advertising as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type.

The participants directed a greater percentage of glances at target billboards during the daytime (3.4 percent) than during the nighttime (1.8 percent): $F(1, 29) = 6.76, p < .02$. The time of day did not interact with target billboard type.

The percentage of time spent looking at the road ahead was significantly influenced by the type of data collection zone: $F(4, 115) = 12.90, p < .01$. Figure 21 presents these results. The percent of time looking to the road ahead was the highest for the natural environment and lowest for the CEVMS complex data collection zone. CEVMS, standard billboard, and built environment zones did not differ from each other, but differed from the CEVMS complex and natural environment conditions. This finding suggests that whereas visual attention to CEVMS and standard billboards did not result in a tradeoff of time spent looking at the road ahead, there was evidence of such a tradeoff in the CEVMS complex zone.

The participants spent significantly more time gazing at the road ahead at night (87 percent) than during the daytime (79.2 percent): $F(1, 29) = 6.80, p < .05$. The time of day did not interact with data collection zone type. In each of the data collection zone types, drivers spent more time looking at the road ahead at night.




Figure 21. Percent of Time Looking at the Road Ahead as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type.

Figure 22 shows the mean duration of glances at target off-premise billboards. There were no significant differences in mean glance duration among the three advertising types (CEVMS complex, CEVMS, and standard). The CEVMS complex data collection zone shows a mean duration of approximately 0.08 s; however, the variability is such that it is not statistically different from the other data collection zones. The average glance duration regardless of advertising type was 0.070 s (standard deviation 0.058 s).

The average duration of glances at the road ahead was also evaluated for the CEVMS complex, CEVMS, and standard billboard data collection zones. The analysis showed no statistically significant differences. On average, glances to the road ahead were 0.59 s (standard deviation 0.19 s).




Figure 22. Mean Duration of Glances at Target Billboards as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type.

Discussion

A road experiment was conducted to examine the following three experimental questions regarding CEVMS and visual attention:

- Do drivers look at CEVMS more than at standard billboards?
- Are there long glances at CEVMS that would be indicative of a decrease in safety?
- Do drivers look at CEVMS and standard billboards at the expense of looking at the road ahead?

The drivers did look more at CEVMS than at standard billboards. The percentage of time spent glancing at CEVMS was 2.8 percent and at standard billboards 1.6 percent. These are small percentages; however, they are statistically different from each other. In the CEVMS complex data collection zone, time spent glancing at CEVMS was 3.8 percent; however this data collection zone had two CEVMS and so the percent per CEVMS averaged 1.9 percent. These results are consistent with previous finding from Smiley et al. showing a relatively small percentage of glances at advertising.⁽⁸⁾ Smiley et al. recorded 0.2 percent of glances at billboards and 2 percent at video advertising.

There were no differences between CEVMS and standard billboard conditions with respect to the average duration of glances. On average the glance duration was about 0.07 s for both CEVMS and target standard billboards, and there were only five eye glances to CEVMS in the entire study that were equal to or greater than 1 s in duration. The longest glance at a CEVMS was of 1.28 s. Klauer et al. observed increases in near-crash/crash risks of more than two times normal, baseline driving where the duration of eyes off the forward roadway exceeded 2 s.⁽¹²⁾ None of the glance durations to CEVMS approached this length.⁽¹²⁾ Horrey and Wickens focused on how safety-related phenomena may be more strongly linked to those observations that lie in the tail of

a given distribution and not necessarily to the mean.⁽²⁰⁾ In their research they used a threshold of eye glances longer than 1.6 s away from the forward roadway as an indication of poor driving and an increase in risk.⁽²¹⁾ The current results are also below this more conservative threshold.

The CEVMS, standard billboard, and built environment conditions did not differ significantly from each other (83, 84, and 82 percent, respectively) in the percent of glances to the road ahead. In these areas drivers also gazed at objects that were on the side of the road for about an equal amount of time. In the case of CEVMS and standard billboard areas, drivers gazed at off-premises advertising as well as other objects on the side of the road. In the case of built environment, about 14 percent of the time the drivers were looking at the side of the road where no off-premises advertising was present. In these three areas there appear to have been trade-offs as to where the drivers directed their gazes away from the roadway while maintaining about the same percentage of time looking at the road ahead.

The degree to which drivers gazed toward the road ahead was affected by the nature and quantity of visual information on the roadside. The CEVMS complex area was included in the analysis to examine the effect of a complex roadway scene with a large quantity of off-premise advertising on driver visual behavior. In this area, participants spent the lowest percentage of time looking at the road ahead (76 percent). Overall, participants spent about 10 percent of the time, on average, gazing at objects on the side of the road (i.e., buildings, on-premises advertising, parked cars in a car dealership, etc.).

In natural environment zones, drivers gazed at the road ahead 87 percent of the time, which was significantly more than for the other data collection zones in the study. These natural environment data collection zones principally contained trees and other foliage on the side of the road.

The results also showed that drivers spent more time looking at billboards (both CEVMS and standard billboards) in the daytime than at night. As one would expect, at night, the CEVMS complex and CEVMS zones had higher luminance and contrast than the standard billboards. However, these differences in sign luminance did not appear to affect gaze behavior in this study. This finding is supported by previous research by Olson, Battle, and Aoki, who reported that drivers devote more of their time to the road ahead at night than in the day.⁽²²⁾ In the present study, at night, the drivers focused more of their gazes on the road ahead and devoted less time to CEVMS, target standard billboards, other standard billboards, and other objects on the side of the road (e.g., miscellaneous). Objects along the side of the road generally receive less illumination (i.e., are of lower contrast) at night and are subsequently more difficult to see than during the daytime.

The study indicated that as the overall clutter or complexity of the roadside visual environment increases, drivers will look at it, and glances to the road ahead will decrease. This effect was evident in the CEVMS complex and built environment data collection zones, where drivers spent 10.4 and 14.2 percent of the time, respectively, looking at object along the roadside. Clutter was defined in terms of the amount of visual information and included buildings, signs, businesses, parked cars, and so on. Areas with high levels of clutter tended to be on arterials with associated businesses on the sides of the road. This aspect of the high-clutter areas also relates to the potential for safety risks (e.g., vehicle coming out of a business) and thus more glances to the left and right sides of the road cannot definitively be attributed to distraction alone.

IV. EXPERIMENT 2

The objectives of the second experiment were the same as those in the first experiment, and the design of experiment 2 was very similar to experiment 1. The independent variables included the type of data collection zone (CEVMS, standard billboard, or no off-premises advertising) and time of day (day or night). In addition, the data collection zones in this experiment were grouped into those presenting low and moderately high visual complexity. In total, experiment 2 included the following independent variables: time of day (day or night), type of data collection zone (CEVMS, standard billboards, no off-premise advertising), and visual complexity (low and high). As with experiment 1, the time of day was a between-subjects variable and the other variables were within subjects.

On average, the test routes for Richmond, VA were slightly longer in duration than those for Reading, lasting approximately 30 to 35 minutes. As in Reading, the routes represented a variety of freeway and arterial driving segments. Route A was 15 miles long and contained five target CEVMS, three target standard billboards, and two no off-premise advertising data collection zones. Route B was 20 miles long and had four target CEVMS, three target standard billboards, and two no off-premise advertising data collection zones. Table 8 is an inventory of the target billboards along the Richmond data collection routes with relevant parameters.

Table 8. Inventory of Target Billboards in Richmond with Relevant Parameters.

<i>Visual Complexity</i>	<i>Advertising Type</i>	<i>Copy Dimensions (ft)</i>	<i>Change Rate (sec)</i>	<i>Side of Road</i>	<i>Setback from Road (ft)</i>	<i>Approach Length (ft)</i>	<i>Other Standard Billboards</i>
High	CEVMS	11'0" x 23'0"	10	R	35	960	0
High	CEVMS	10'6" x 36'0"	10	L	88	960	0
High	CEVMS	12' 6" x 42' 0"	10	L	227	960	5
High	Standard	14'0" x 48'0"		R	134	889	3
High	Standard	10'6" x 45'3"		L	124	960	2
High	Standard	10'6" x 22'9"		L	76	863	0
Low	CEVMS	12'5" x 40'0"	10	R	82	960	2
Low	CEVMS	14'0" x 36'0"	10	R	69	960	2
Low	CEVMS	14'0" x 36'0"	10	L	128	960	2
Low	CEVMS	14'0" x 28'0"	20	L	119	960	0
Low	CEVMS	10'6" x 36'0"	10	R	42	960	2
Low	CEVMS	14'0" x 28'0"	10	R	56	960	0
Low	Standard	14'0" x 48'0"		L	195	960	0
Low	Standard	14'0" x 48'0"		R	125	960	3

A. METHOD

Advertising Type

Three data collection zone types (similar to those used in experiment 1) were used in Richmond:

- **CEVMS.** Data collection zones contained one target CEVMS.
- **Standard billboard.** Data collection zones contained one target standard billboard.

- **No off-premise advertising.** Data collection zones did not contain any off-premise advertising.

The zones were further categorized in terms of visual complexity (described in greater detail below). This categorization considered the presence or absence of buildings, businesses, and on-premise advertising.

Table 9 presents a breakdown of the data collection zones for the three advertising conditions as a function of visual complexity.

Table 9. Advertising Conditions by Level of Visual Complexity.

Advertising	<i>Level of Visual Complexity</i>	
	High	Low
CEVMS	3	6
Standard Billboard	3	2
No Advertising	2	2

Figures 23-36 below represent various pairings of data collection zone type and visual complexity. Target off-premise billboards are indicated by red rectangles.



Figure 23. Example of a CEVMS Data Collection Zone with High Visual Complexity.



Figure 24. Example of CEVMS Data Collection Zone with Low Visual Complexity.



Figure 25. Example of a Standard Billboard Data Collection Zone with High Visual Complexity.



Figure 26. Example of a Standard Billboard Data Collection Zone with Low Visual Complexity.

Photometric Measurement of Signs

The photometric measurements in Richmond were performed using the same equipment and procedures that were employed in Reading with a few minor changes. Photometric measurements were taken during the day (between 8:20AM and 11:20AM) and at night (between 5:40PM and 10:45PM). Measurements of the standard billboards were taken at an average distance of 284 ft, with maximum and minimum distances of 570 ft and 43 ft. The average distance of measurements for the CEVMS was 479 ft, with maximum and minimum distances of 972 ft and 220 ft.

Luminance: The mean luminance of CEVMS and standard billboards disaggregated by visual complexity, during daytime and nighttime are shown below in Table 10.

Table 10. Luminance Values (cd/m²) for the Low and High Visual Complexity Conditions.

<i>Day</i>	High Complexity			Low Complexity		
	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Average</i>
CEVMS	1,339	2,536	2,027	1,422	3,357	2,228
Standard Billboard	1,014	1,567	1,258	4,424	7,149	5,787
<i>Night</i>						
CEVMS	26	53	42	39	79	61
Standard Billboard	7	11	9	5	16	11

Contrast: The daytime and nighttime Weber contrast ratios for both types of billboards are shown in Table 11. During the daytime, the contrast ratios of both CEVMS and standard billboards were close to zero (the surroundings were about equal in brightness to the signs). At night, the CEVMS and standard billboards had positive contrast ratios. Similar to Reading, PA, the CEVMS produced greater contrast ratios at night than during the day.

Table 11. Weber contrast values in low and high visual complexity environments.

	High Complexity			Low Complexity		
	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Average</i>
<i>Day</i>						
CEVMS	-0.56	-0.41	-0.48	-0.47	0.64	-0.05
Standard Billboard	-0.14	0.28	0.06	-0.26	0.73	0.24
<i>Night</i>						
CEVMS	19.20	123.60	67.80	15.82	162.11	68.85
Standard Billboard	7.22	15.18	12.44	-0.01	6.02	3.00

Visual Complexity

As with experiment 1, the subband entropy measure was used to estimate the level of visual complexity/clutter in the data collection zones. For each zone, a single frame was captured from a color video and saved as a JPEG image. The JPEGs were analyzed with MATLAB routines that computed a measure of subband entropy for each image. Figure 27 shows the mean subband entropy measures for each of the advertising conditions (note that due to the limited number of data collection zones, standard error information is not included). The subband entropy measures correlate well with the categorization of the data collection zones into two levels of visual complexity.




Figure 27. Subband Entropy Measures for the Data Collection Zones.

Participants

A total of 41 participants were recruited for the study. Of these, six participants did not complete data collection because of an inability to properly calibrate with the eye-tracking system and eight were excluded because of equipment failures. A total of 27 participants (16 male, $M = 28$ years; 11 female, $M = 22$ years) successfully completed the drive. All participants were under the age of 64. Fourteen people participated during the day and 13 participated at night.

Procedures

Research participants were recruited locally by means of visits to public libraries, student unions, community centers, etc. A large number of the participants were recruited from a nearby university, resulting in a lower mean participant age than in experiment 1.

Participant Testing

Two people participated each day. One person participated during the day beginning at approximately 12:45 PM. The second participated at night beginning at around 7:00 PM. Data collection ran from November 20, 2009, through April 23, 2010. There were several long gaps in the data collection schedule due to holidays and inclement weather.

Pre-Data Collection Activities. This was the same as in experiment 1.

Practice Drive. Except location, this was the same as in experiment 1.

Data Collection. The procedure was much the same as in Reading. However, the data collection drives in Richmond were longer than those in Reading. As a result, the eye-tracking system had problems dealing with these large files. To mitigate this technical difficulty, participants were asked to pull over in a safe location during the middle of each data collection drive so that new data files could be initiated.

Upon completion of the data collection, the participant was instructed to return to the designated meeting location for debriefing.

Debriefing. This was the same as in experiment 1.

B. DATA REDUCTION

Selection of Data Collection Zone Limits

Selection of data collection zone limits for Richmond was the same as in Reading. Data collection zone distances of 960 ft or less were selected. In Richmond, the average target CEVMS height was 12.9 ft and the average width was 37.7 ft. At 960 ft, a 12.9 ft by 37.7 ft sign would subtend a horizontal visual angle of 2.25 degrees and a vertical visual angle of 0.77 degrees. Thus, at 960 ft (292.8 m) the eye glances to CEVMS billboards could be resolved by the eye-tracking system and could be read by the participants. Attempts to identify glances at billboards at longer distances were not feasible with the equipment used in this study, and in any case it is unlikely that messages on the billboards could be resolved by participants from a distance greater than 960 ft.

With the exception of defining data collection zones as having low or high visual complexity, all other aspects of the data reduction were the same as that described for experiment 1.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As with experiment 1, results are presented to address three key experimental questions: (a) do drivers look more at CEVMS than at standard billboards, (b) are there long glances to off-premise billboards, and (c) is there a tradeoff between looking at off-premise billboards and the road ahead? The results of the visual complexity factor are also presented within the context of the questions above.

All statistical analyses used an alpha level of .05. All error bars presented in the following figures show \pm two standard errors about the mean (which closely approximate a 95 percent confidence interval).

Mean Percent of Time

The average percent of time was calculated by time-of-day and visual complexity for the following seven categories that were discussed earlier:

1. Road ahead.
2. Target CEVMS.
3. Target Standard Billboard.
4. Other Standard Billboard.
5. Miscellaneous.
6. Unknown.
7. Gauge cluster.

In the low visual complexity data collection zones there were more glances to target advertising relative to the high visual complexity approaches. The difference in glance behavior between CEVMS and standard billboard conditions was most evident at night in low visual complexity data collection zones.

Table 12 and table 13 present the mean percent of glance time for each of seven categories as a function of data collection zone type. In experiment 2 these variables significantly affected drivers' glance behavior. As a result, separate tables are presented to show the tradeoff in glance behavior across visual complexity and time of day.

The following sections provide the results of statistical analysis for each of the above seven dependent measures (areas of glances). The statistical model used was a 2 (time of day) x 2 (visual complexity) x 3 (data collection zone type) mixed design analysis of variance. Because the raw percentages are positively skewed (deviating) from normality, additional analyses were performed using transformed data. Data were transformed using the arcsine of the square root of the proportions. This transformation works on measures distributed between zero and one, and thus proportions rather than percentages were used. The results with and without the transformation were similar. All the reported analysis of variance statistics used the transformed data.

Table 12. Mean Percentage of Time for All Object Categories as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type for Low and High Visual Complexity Data Collection Zones During the Daytime.

DAYTIME		Road Ahead	Misc	Unknown	Gauges	Target Billboards	Non-Target Standard Billboards	Total
High Visual Complexity	CEVMS	70.3%	16.1%	1.1%	1.4%	1.0%	1.1%	100%
	Standard Billboards	72.7%	15.7%	15.7%	1.8%	0.5%	1.0%	100%
	No Off-Premise Advertising	72.7%	17.2%	7.5%	2.6%	—	—	100%
	Mean	71.9%	16.3%	8.1%	1.9%	0.8%	1.1%	—
Low Visual Complexity	CEVMS	79.2%	8.1%	7.9%	1.2%	2.9%	0.7%	100%
	Standard Billboards	87.6%	4.0%	5.1%	0.7%	2.2%	0.4%	100%
	No Off-Premise Advertising	85.6%	3.4%	9.2%	1.8%	—	—	100%
	Mean	84.1%	5.2%	7.4%	1.2%	2.6%	0.6%	—
Overall Mean		78.0%	10.8%	7.8%	1.6%	1.7%	0.8%	—

Table 13. Mean Percentage of Time for all Object Categories as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type for Low and High Visual Complexity Data Collection Zones During The Nighttime.

NIGHTTIME		Road Ahead	Misc	Unknown	Gauges	Target Billboards	Non-Target Standard Billboards	Total
High Visual Complexity	CEVMS	72.6%	13.4%	11.0%	1.0%	0.8%	1.2%	100%
	Standard Billboards	72.0%	14.0%	10.7%	1.1%	0.7%	1.4%	100%
	No Off-Premise Advertising	69.1%	17.5%	12.0%	1.4%	—	—	100%
	Mean	71.2%	15.0%	11.2%	1.2%	0.8%	1.3%	—
Low Visual Complexity	CEVMS	76.7%	6.2%	10.8%	1.2%	4.5%	0.6%	100%
	Standard Billboards	80.9%	5.0%	11.5%	1.3%	1.0%	0.3%	100%
	No Off-Premise Advertising	81.1%	3.5%	13.2%	2.2%	—	—	100%
	Mean	79.6%	4.9%	11.8%	1.6%	2.8%	0.5%	—
Overall Mean		75.4%	9.9%	11.5%	1.4%	1.8%	0.9%	—

Mean Percent of Time to Target Advertising

The interaction of time of day, advertising, and visual complexity was statistically significant: $F(1, 75) = 6.03, p < .05$. Figure 28 (also table 12 and table 13) illustrates the interaction among these three variables. There were no significant differences between CEVMS and standard billboards under high visual complexity during the day or nighttime. Unlike in experiment 1, the only time in which target CEVMS billboards attracted more glances than standard billboards was at night in low visual complexity environments.




Figure 28. Percentage of Time Glancing at Target Billboards as a Function of Visual Complexity and Time of Day.

Mean Percentage of Time Looking at the Road Ahead

Time spent looking at the road ahead was significantly less in areas of high visual complexity (M = 72 percent) than in low visual complexity zones (M = 82 percent): $F(1, 125) = 65.81, p < .01$. The mean time spent glancing to the road ahead (averaged across CEVMS, standard, and no off-premise advertising) was 77 percent. There were no other statistically significant results for road ahead.

Mean Duration of Glances

There were no statistically significant differences between mean duration of glances to target CEVMS or standard billboards. Visual complexity of the environment also did not affect the mean duration of glances. Further, no significant interaction between billboard type and visual complexity was found. Overall, the mean glance duration to target billboards was 0.097 s.

When looking at the mean duration of glances to the road ahead, no significant differences for billboard type or visual complexity were found. Further, no significant interaction between billboard type and visual complexity was found. Overall, the mean duration of gazes at the road ahead was 0.69 sec.

Figure 29 shows the distribution of gaze durations as a function of time of day and billboard type. (Since the effect of visual complexity was not significant, this variable is omitted from the figure.) Table 14 shows the frequency of glances used to generate the distribution of glance durations. Across all data collection drives there were 901 glances at target CEVMS signs and 172 glances at target standard billboards. The shapes of the distributions for CEVMS and standard billboards are similar. The difference in the frequency of glances between the conditions is principally due to the fact that there were nine target CEVMS and only five target standard billboards. After accounting for exposure, the glance preference for CEVMS remained. There was also a trend toward more glances at billboards during the day than at night.

Table 14. Frequencies of Glances for the CEVMS and Standard Billboard Conditions as a Function of Time of Day.

V. Billboard Type	Time of Day	
	Day	Night
CEVMS	537 (4.26)*	364 (3.11)
Standard Billboard	112 (1.60)	60 (0.92)

*Numbers in parenthesis are the glance frequency totals divided by the number of billboards and participants in the respective conditions.




Figure 29. Proportion of Gaze Duration for CEVMS and Standard Billboards under Daytime and Nighttime Driving Conditions.

Long Duration Eye Glances

Table 15 presents a summary of the seven glances at target billboards that were equal to or greater than 1 s. All long glances were to CEVMS, ranging from 1 s to 1.28 s and all but one occurred at night. Glances equal to or greater than 1 s represent 0.78 percent of all glances at CEVMS.

Table 15. Summary of Long Glances at Off-premise Advertising in Richmond.

<i>Data Collection Zone</i>	<i>Time of Day</i>	<i>Advertising</i>	<i>Duration (sec)</i>	<i>Horizontal Offset (ft)</i>	<i>Distance from Sign (ft)</i>	<i>Horizontal Angle (deg)</i>
2	Night	CEMVS	1.12	82	334	13.79
10	Night	CEMVS	1.28	128	317	22.02
13	Day	CEMVS	1.00	119	554	12.12
16	Night	CEMVS	1.04	42	375	6.40
17	Night	CEMVS	1.00	56	141	21.68
17	Night	CEVMS	1.24	56	298	10.64
17	Night	CEMVS	1.04	56	142	21.58

Figure 30 shows the CEVMS (horizontally offset 56 ft from the roadway) in data collection zone 17, a relatively uncluttered environment (in the image, the CEVMS is highlighted with a red rectangle and is on the right side of the road). This billboard had three long glances (all at night), beginning at 141, 142, and 298 ft away. The visual angle subtended by the sign at these distances and offset was close to the area classified as road ahead. There is a traffic signal in close proximity to this billboard, but examination of individual records showed that no driver was stopped at this signal on any of the data collection drives.



Figure 30. Data Collection Zone 17 in Richmond.

Mean Percentage of Time Spent Glancing at Other Non-Target Standard Billboards

The analysis for percentage of time spent glancing at other standard billboards did not yield any significant differences. The overall average percentage of time for glances at non-target, off-premise, standard billboards was 0.84 percent.

Mean Percentage of Time Spent Glancing at Miscellaneous

Overall, there were more glances at miscellaneous objects in high visual complexity zones ($M = 16$ percent) than in low complexity zones ($M = 5$ percent): $F(1, 125) = 161.05, p < .01$. A significant interaction between visual complexity and advertising was found, $F(2, 125) = 6.55, p < .01$. As can be seen in figure 31, the interaction is the result of a large difference in the percentage of glances (at miscellaneous objects) between high and low complexity areas in the no advertising zones.




Figure 31. Percentage of Time Spent Glancing at Miscellaneous as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type and Visual Complexity.

Mean Percentage of Time Spent Glancing at Unknown Objects

There were no significant differences for percentage of time spent glancing at unknown areas. Overall, the mean percentage of time spent glancing at unknown areas was 9.7 percent.

Mean Percentage of Time Spent Glancing at the Gauge Cluster

The type of advertising zone (i.e., CEVMS, standard billboard, no off-premises advertising) significantly affected the percentage of time participants spent looking at the gauge cluster: $F(2, 125) = 4.15, p < .05$. Figure 32 shows the main effect for this variable. Participants spent significantly more time looking at the gauge cluster in zones with no off-premises advertising, than in zones with target billboards (i.e., CEVMS, standard billboards).




Figure 32. Percentage of Time Spent Glancing at the Gauge Cluster as a Function of Data Collection Zone Type.

Mean Rate of Glances

Overall, the mean rate of glances per second to CEVMS was 0.448. This was significantly greater than the mean rate of 0.277 glances per second to standard billboards: $F(1, 54) = 21.63, p < .01$. These rates are similar to those observed in experiment 1 (.42 and .20, respectively).

The mean rate of glances per second to target advertising in high visual complexity zones was 0.319, which was significantly less than the mean rate of 0.554 glances per second in low visual complexity zones: $F(1, 54) = 7.85, p < .01$. This finding suggests that drivers looked more frequently at the target advertising (regardless of CEVMS or standard billboards) when there were fewer information sources in and along the roadway environment (i.e., less visual complexity).

Relationship Between Photometric Measures and Glance Behavior

Analyses were conducted to determine if there was a relationship between photometric measures (luminance and sign contrast) and glance behavior. Correlational analyses compared glance duration to both luminance and Weber contrast measures for the individual signs. Separate correlational analyses were conducted for CEVMS and standard billboards during daytime and nighttime conditions. None of the correlations between glance duration and the photometric measures are statistically significant ($p > .05$). Exact correlational values follow:

CEVMS Correlations. In the daytime, the correlation between glance duration and luminance was $r = -.040$. At night the correlation was $r = 0.067$. The correlation between glance duration and contrast are $r = 0.020$ during the day and $r = 0.044$ at night. None of these correlations were significant ($p < .05$).

Standard Billboard Correlations. The correlations between glance duration and the luminance of standard billboards were $r = -0.015$ during the day and $r = -0.113$ at night. The correlation between glance duration and contrast of standard billboards with their background were $r = -0.061$ during the day and $r = -0.115$ at night. None of these correlations were significant ($p < .05$).

Observation of Driver Behavior

No near misses or driver errors were detected by the observers in the vehicle, or in later reviews of the recorded video.

Discussion

A second road experiment was conducted to examine the following three experimental questions regarding CEVMS and visual attention.

- Do drivers look at CEVMS more than at standard billboards?
- Are there long glances at CEVMS that would be indicative of a decrease in safety?
- Do drivers look at CEVMS and standard billboards at the expense of looking at the road ahead?

This experiment also included visual complexity as a factor since higher visual complexity had an impact on the results from the first experiment. In this experiment, the data collection zones were classified with respect to the visual complexity, or evident clutter, in the overall driving scene as defined by buildings, shopping areas, and other built environments^(16,17). In addition, subband entropy was calculated for representative images from the routes.⁽¹⁷⁾ This measure correlated well with the categorization of the data collection zones.

In response to the first question, the results from this study showed that drivers glanced more at off-premises advertising (CEVMS and standard billboards) under low levels of visual complexity than under high levels of visual complexity. During the daytime, the percentage of time spent looking at CEVMS and standard billboards was about equal (with a higher percentage of time in low visual complexity areas). At night, however, the percent of time spent glancing at CEVMS was greater than that spent glancing at standard billboards under low levels of visual complexity. In fact, it was this difference in the nighttime and low visual complexity condition that appeared to be principally responsible for the observed greater visual attention paid to CEVMS than to standard billboards.

Regarding the second question, average durations of glances did not vary between CEVMS and standard billboard areas. On average, the gaze duration was about 0.097 s for both CEVMS and standard billboards. There were seven glances at CEVMS that were 1 s or greater in duration, and the longest glance was 1.28 s in duration. There were no glances of 1 sec or longer at standard billboards. Glances at advertising that were equal to or greater than 1 s in duration were rare in the study, and occurred at distances between 554 and 141 feet, at horizontal angles of 22 degrees or less, and when the surrounding environment had low visual complexity.

Overall, the rate of glances toward CEVMS (4.48 glances per 10 s) was higher than for standard billboards (2.77 glances per 10 s). The rate of glances at advertising (CEVMS and standard billboards) was higher under low visual complexity (5.54 gazes per 10 s) than under high levels of visual complexity (3.19 glances per 10 s). The drivers tended to direct more glances at off-premises advertising when the complexity of the visual environment was low, and in general directed more glances at CEVMS than at standard billboards.

In terms of the tradeoff in looking at the road ahead, visual complexity had an effect on the percentage of time that drivers devoted to the road ahead. Under high levels of visual complexity, drivers devoted an average 72 percent of the time to the road ahead, whereas they devoted an average 82 percent of the time to the road ahead in low visual complexity zones. In high visual complexity zones drivers glanced at non-billboard items on the side of the road more frequently than in low visual complexity zones. Drivers devoted approximately the same amount of time to looking at the road ahead in CEVMS, standard billboard, and no advertising zones. As in experiment 1, the drivers did look at the advertising; however, this did not appear to be at the expense of looking at the road ahead.

The nighttime luminance of the CEVMS ranged between 26 and 79 cd/m². Furthermore, the CEVMS in the high visual complexity areas had lower mean luminance than those in the low visual complexity areas. The combination of less visual clutter and higher luminance at night generally leads to greater conspicuity. It is likely that this led to the resulting higher percentage of time spent glancing at CEVMS than at standard billboards. Under high levels of visual complexity at night, the percentage of time spent glancing at CEVMS and standard billboards was equally low (0.8 percent and 0.7 percent, respectively). This result suggests that, at

luminance levels observed in Richmond, the overall background in which the billboards appear affects glance probability. In other words, the visual complexity of the sign's surroundings (and not just the sign itself) influences drivers' gaze behavior.

In summary, the results of experiment 2 showed that drivers looked more at CEVMS than at standard billboards, but only at night under low levels of visual clutter. However, this did not appear to be at the expense of looking at the road ahead, where the average time spent looking was 77 percent across all conditions (with and without off-premise advertising). Rather, glance behavior was affected by the visual complexity of the scene, such that under high levels of visual complexity, percentage of time spent looking at the road ahead decreased and percentage of time spent looking at miscellaneous objects increased. The average duration of glances at CEVMS and standard billboards was about .097 s, which was up considerably from experiment 1 where the average was .07 s. However, both durations are well below the more than 2 s duration of eyes off the forward roadway at which Klauer et al. observed near-crash/crash risks more than two times those of normal, baseline driving.^(12,20) When looking at the tails of the distributions of durations, there were very few glances that were equal to or greater than 1.0 s, with the longest glance being equal to 1.28 s.^(20,21)

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION

This study was conducted to investigate the effect of CEVMS on driver visual behavior in a roadway driving environment. An instrumented vehicle with an eye tracking system was used. Roads containing CEVMS, standard billboards, but that did not contain off-premise advertising were selected. The CEVMS and standard billboards were measured with respect to luminance, location, size, and other relevant variables to characterize these visual stimuli. Unlike previous studies on digital billboards, the present study examined CEVMS as deployed in two US cities that did not contain dynamic video or other dynamic elements. These billboards changed content approximately every 8 to 10 seconds (s), consistent within the limits provided by FHWA guidance.⁽¹⁾ In addition, the eye tracking system used had nearly a 2-degree level of resolution that provided significantly more accuracy in determining what objects the drivers were looking at as compared to previous field studies examining CEVMS. Two experiments were conducted that were conducted in two separate cities where the same methodology was used but taking into account differences with respect to such variables as the roadway visual environment. The results and conclusions from this study are presented in response to the three main research questions listed below.

1. Do drivers look at CEVMS more than at standard billboards?
2. Are there long glances to CEVMS that would be indicative of a decrease in safety?
3. Do drivers look at CEVMS and standard billboards at the expense of looking at the road ahead?

In general, drivers devoted more glances at CEVMS than at standard billboards; however, there were no significant decreases in the proportion of time spent looking at the road ahead (i.e., eyes on the road) that could be directly attributed to the CEVMS at the measured luminance and contrast levels. In experiment 1, the proportion of time spent looking at CEVMS was greater than for standard billboards (2.8 versus 1.6 percent). In a visually complex data collection zone with CEVMS, the proportion of time spent looking at CEVMS was 3.8 percent; however, this data collection zone had two CEVMS, which would represent an average of 1.9 percent per CEVMS. In experiment 2, drivers looked more at CEVMS than standard billboard at night under low levels of visual complexity (4.5 versus 1 percent). There were no significant differences between CEVMS and standard billboards under any of the other tested conditions. Regardless of experiment or type of billboard, the mean percentage of time drivers spent looking at target billboards was less than 5 percent.

Glances away from the forward roadway of greater than 2 s or 1.6 s duration have been proposed as indicators of increased risk of crashes.^(12,20,21) In the current experiments there were no long glances at billboards meeting or exceeding 1.6 s. The longest glance at a target billboard was less than 1.3 s in both studies. Glances with a duration of 1 s or greater were rare: there were 5 in Reading (0.47 percent of the glances to CEVMS) and 7 in Richmond (0.78 percent of the glances to CEVMS). All of the glances greater than 1 s were to CEVMS.

Looking at the number of glances at advertising (per sign), the results from both experiments show substantially more glances at CEVMS than at standard billboards both during day and night conditions. As shown in table 16, drivers do dedicate more glances at CEVMS than to standard billboards; however, long glances considered as having the potential to increase risk were not observed.

Table 16. Number of Glances per Sign to CEVMS and Standard Billboards in Day and Night Conditions for Both Experiments.

	Day		Night	
	CEVMS	Standard	CEVMS	Standard
Experiment 1	3.57	1.82	2.62	1.37
Experiment 2	4.26	1.60	3.11	0.92

Drivers in experiment 1 devoted between 76 and 87 percent of their time looking at the road ahead. The highest percent was in the natural environment condition, where there were principally trees to the side of the road. The CEVMS complex data collection zone showed the lowest percentage of glances at the road ahead. This data collection zone had 2 CEVMS, 10 non-target standard billboards, and businesses and other on-premises advertising. Drivers in the CEVMS and standard billboard data collection zones devoted about the same percentage of time to looking at the road ahead (83 percent for CEVMS and 84 percent for standard billboards). The percentage of time devoted to looking at the road ahead measured in this experiment is comparable, but slightly higher, than those measured in other studies. Lee et al. observed 76 percent of driver time spent looking at the road ahead for the CEVMS scenario and 75 percent for the standard billboards scenario.

Drivers in experiment 2 devoted between 69 and 88 percent of their time to looking at the road ahead. The highest percentage of time spent looking at the road ahead was in the low clutter standard billboard data collection zones during the daytime. The lowest percentage of time spent looking at the road ahead was for data collection zones without off-premises advertising but with high visual clutter during nighttime conditions. In experiment 2 the percentage of time spent looking at the road ahead was affected by the level of visual clutter present in the data collection zones regardless of the presence or absence of CEVMS or standard billboards (82 percent for low clutter and 72 percent for high clutter zones).

Visual complexity, or visual clutter, has been shown in past research to have an effect on visual search performance.⁽¹⁷⁾ Drivers may have difficulty with visual search (for example, searching for street signs) in environments that are highly cluttered.⁽¹⁶⁾ In the experiments reported here, areas with high levels of clutter tended to be on arterials with businesses on the sides of the road. Increased glances away from the forward roadway in a high clutter environment also relates to the potential for safety risks (e.g., vehicle coming out of a business) and thus more glances the side of the road and away from the road ahead cannot be wholly attributed to distraction; however, it does appear to contribute to a decrease in the time drivers devote looking at the road ahead.

VI. REFERENCES

1. Shepherd, G. M., 2007: Guidance on Off-Premise Changeable Message Signs. <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/realestate/offprmsgsgnguid.htm>.
2. Scenic America. Position Paper Regarding the Propriety of Permitting Digital Billboards on Interstate and Federal-Aid Highways under the Highway Beautification Act. 2010.
3. Molino, J. A., J. Wachtel, J. E. Farbry, M. B. Hermosillo, and T. M. Granda. The Effects of Commercial Electronic Variable Message Signs (Cevms) on Driver Attention and Distraction: An Update. FHWA-HRT-09-018. Federal Highway Administration, 2009.
4. Farbry, J., Wochinger, K., Shafer, T., Owens, N, & Nedzesky, A. Research Review of Potential Safety Effects of Electronic Billboards on Driver Attention and Distraction. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, DC, 2001.
5. Lee, S. E., McElheny, M.J., & Gibbons, R. . Driving Performance and Digital Billboards. Report prepared for Foundation for Outdoor Advertising Research and Education. Virginia Tech Transportation Institute, 2007.
6. Society of Automotive Engineers. Definitions and Experimental Measures Related to the Specification of Driver Visual Behavior Using Video Based Techniques. 2000.
7. Beijer, D., A. Smiley, and M. Eizenman. Observed Driver Glance Behavior at Roadside Advertising Signs. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, No. **1899**, 2004, 96-103.
8. Smiley, A., T. Smahel, and M. Eizenman. Impact of Video Advertising on Driver Fixation Patters. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, No. **1899**, 2004, 76-83.
9. Kettwich, C., K. Klinger, and U. Lemmer, 2008: Do Advertisements at the Roadside Distract the Driver? *Optical Sensors 2008*, F. Berghmans, A. G. Mignani, A. Cutolo, P. P. Moyrueis, and T. P. Pearsall, Eds., SPIE.
10. Chattington, M., N. Reed, D. Basacik, A. Flint, and A. Parkes. Investigating Driver Distraction: The Effects of Video and Static Advertising, PPR409. Transport Research Laboratory, 2009.
11. Land, M. F. Eye Movements and the Control of Actions in Everyday Life. *Progress in Retinal and Eye Research*, **25**, 2006, 296-324.
12. Klauer, S. G., Dingus, T. A., Neale, V. L., Sudweeks, J.D., & Ramsey, D.J. The Impact of Driver Inattention on near-Crash/Crash Risk: An Analysis Using the 100-Car Naturalistic Driving Study Data, DOT HS 810 594. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2006.
13. Bhise, V. D., and T. H. Rockwell. Development of a Methodology for Evaluating Road Signs. OHIO-DOT-01-73. Ohio State University, 1973.
14. Whittle, P., Ed., 1994: *The Psychophysics of Contrast Brightness*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

15. Regan, M. A., K. L. Young, J. D. Lee, and C. P. Gordon, 2009: Sources of Driver Distraction. *Driver Distraction: Theory, Effects, and Mitigation*. M. A. Regan, J. D. Lee, and K. L. Young, Eds., CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group.
16. Horberry, T., & Edquist, J., 2009: Distractions Outside the Vehicle. *Driver Distraction: Theory, Effects, and Mitigation*. M. A. Regan, Lee, J.D., & Young, K.L., Ed., CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group.
17. Rosenholtz, R., Y. Li, and L. Nakano. Measuring Visual Clutter. *J Vis*, **7**, 2007, 17 11-22.
18. Ahlstrom, C., K. Kircher, and A. Kircher. Considerations When Calculating Percent Road Centre from Eye Movement Data in Driver Distraction Monitoring. *Proceedings of the Fifth International Driving Symposium on Human Factors in Driver Assessment, Training and Vehicle Design*, 2009.
19. McDonald, J. H. *Handbook of Biological Statistics*. 2nd ed. Sparky House Publishing, Baltimore, 2009.
20. Horrey, W. J., and C. D. Wickens. In-Vehicle Glance Duration: Distributions, Tails, and Model of Crash Risk. *Transportation Research Record*, **2018**, 2007, 22-28.
21. Wierwille, W. W., 1993: Visual and Manual Demands of in-Car Controls and Displays. *Automotive Ergonomics*, B. Peacock, and W. Karwowski, Eds., Taylor and Francis, 299-320.
22. Olson, P. L., Battle, D.S., & Aoki, T. Driver Eye Fixations under Different Operating Conditions, UMTRI-89-3. The University of Michigan, 1989.

Federal Highway Administration Report:

Driver Visual Behavior in the Presence of Commercial
Electronic Variable Message Signs (CEVMS)
Final Report - September 2012

**DRIVER VISUAL BEHAVIOR IN THE PRESENCE OF COMMERCIAL
ELECTRONIC VARIABLE MESSAGE SIGNS (CEVMS)**

SEPTEMBER 2012

FOREWORD

The advent of electronic billboard technologies, in particular the digital Light-Emitting Diode (LED) billboard, has necessitated a reevaluation of current legislation and regulation for controlling outdoor advertising. In this case, one of the concerns is possible driver distraction. In the context of the present report, outdoor advertising signs employing this new advertising technology are referred to as Commercial Electronic Variable Message Signs (CEVMS). They are also commonly referred to as Digital Billboards and Electronic Billboards.

The present report documents the results of a study conducted to investigate the effects of CEVMS used for outdoor advertising on driver visual behavior in a roadway driving environment. The report consists of a brief review of the relevant published literature related to billboards and visual distraction, the rationale for the Federal Highway Administration research study, the methods by which the study was conducted, and the results of the study, which used an eye tracking system to measure driver glances while driving on roadways in the presence of CEVMS, standard billboards, and other roadside elements. The report should be of interest to highway engineers, traffic engineers, highway safety specialists, the outdoor advertising industry, environmental advocates, Federal policymakers, and State and local regulators of outdoor advertising.

Monique R. Evans
Director, Office of Safety
Research and Development

Nelson Castellanos
Director, Office of Real Estate
Services

Notice

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the use of the information contained in this document. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

The U.S. Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trademarks or manufacturers' names appear in this report only because they are considered essential to the objective of the document.

Quality Assurance Statement

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) provides high-quality information to serve government, industry, and the public in a manner that promotes public understanding. Standards and policies are used to ensure and maximize the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of its information. The FHWA periodically reviews quality issues and adjusts its programs and processes to ensure continuous quality improvement.

TECHNICAL DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. Report No. FHWA-HRT-		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Driver Visual Behavior in the Presence of Commercial Electronic Variable Message Signs (CEVMS)				5. Report Date	
				6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) William A. Perez, Mary Anne Bertola, Jason F. Kennedy, and John A. Molino				8. Performing Organization Report No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address SAIC 6300 Georgetown Pike McLean, VA 22101				10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
				11. Contract or Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Office of Real Estate Services Federal Highway Administration 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE Washington, DC 20590				13. Type of Report and Period Covered	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes The Contracting Officer's Technical Representatives (COTR) were Christopher Monk and Thomas Granda.					
16. Abstract This study was conducted to investigate the effect of CEVMS on driver visual behavior in a roadway driving environment. An instrumented vehicle with an eye tracking system was used. Roads containing CEVMS, standard billboards, and control areas with no off-premise advertising were selected. Data were collected on arterials and freeways in the day and nighttime. Field studies were conducted in two cities where the same methodology was used but there were differences in the roadway visual environment. The gazes to the road ahead were high across the conditions; however, the CEVMS and billboard conditions resulted in a lower probability of gazes as compared to the control conditions (roadways not containing off-premise advertising) with the exception of arterials in Richmond where none of the conditions differed from each other. Examination of where drivers gazed in the CEVMS and standard billboard conditions showed that gazes away from the road ahead were not primarily to the billboards. Average and maximum fixations to CEVMS and standard billboards were similar across all conditions. However, four long dwell times were found (sequential and multiple fixations) that were greater than 2,000 ms. One was to a CEVMS on a freeway in the day time, two were to the same standard billboard on a freeway once in the day and once at night; and one was to a standard billboard on an arterial at night. In Richmond, the results showed that drivers gazed more at CEVMS than at standard billboards at night; however, in Reading the drivers were equally likely to gaze towards CEVMS or standard billboards in day and night. The results of the study are consistent with research and theory on the control of gaze behavior in natural environments. The demands of the driving task tend to affect the driver's self-regulation of gaze behavior.					
17. Key Words Driver visual behavior, visual environment, billboards, eye tracking system, commercial electronic variable message signs, CEVMS, visual complexity				18. Distribution Statement No restrictions.	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified		20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified		21. No. of Pages	22. Price

SI* (MODERN METRIC) CONVERSION FACTORS

APPROXIMATE CONVERSIONS TO SI UNITS

Symbol	When You Know	Multiply By	To Find	Symbol
LENGTH				
in	inches	25.4	millimeters	mm
ft	feet	0.305	meters	m
yd	yards	0.914	meters	m
mi	miles	1.61	kilometers	km
AREA				
in ²	square inches	645.2	square millimeters	mm ²
ft ²	square feet	0.093	square meters	m ²
yd ²	square yard	0.836	square meters	m ²
ac	acres	0.405	hectares	ha
mi ²	square miles	2.59	square kilometers	km ²
VOLUME				
fl oz	fluid ounces	29.57	milliliters	mL
gal	gallons	3.785	liters	L
ft ³	cubic feet	0.028	cubic meters	m ³
yd ³	cubic yards	0.765	cubic meters	m ³
NOTE: volumes greater than 1000 L shall be shown in m ³				
MASS				
oz	ounces	28.35	grams	g
lb	pounds	0.454	kilograms	kg
T	short tons (2000 lb)	0.907	megagrams (or "metric ton")	Mg (or "t")
TEMPERATURE (exact degrees)				
°F	Fahrenheit	5 (F-32)/9 or (F-32)/1.8	Celsius	°C
ILLUMINATION				
fc	foot-candles	10.76	lux	lx
fl	foot-Lamberts	3.426	candela/m ²	cd/m ²
FORCE and PRESSURE or STRESS				
lbf	poundforce	4.45	newtons	N
lbf/in ²	poundforce per square inch	6.89	kilopascals	kPa

APPROXIMATE CONVERSIONS FROM SI UNITS

Symbol	When You Know	Multiply By	To Find	Symbol
LENGTH				
mm	millimeters	0.039	inches	in
m	meters	3.28	feet	ft
m	meters	1.09	yards	yd
km	kilometers	0.621	miles	mi
AREA				
mm ²	square millimeters	0.0016	square inches	in ²
m ²	square meters	10.764	square feet	ft ²
m ²	square meters	1.195	square yards	yd ²
ha	hectares	2.47	acres	ac
km ²	square kilometers	0.386	square miles	mi ²
VOLUME				
mL	milliliters	0.034	fluid ounces	fl oz
L	liters	0.264	gallons	gal
m ³	cubic meters	35.314	cubic feet	ft ³
m ³	cubic meters	1.307	cubic yards	yd ³
MASS				
g	grams	0.035	ounces	oz
kg	kilograms	2.202	pounds	lb
Mg (or "t")	megagrams (or "metric ton")	1.103	short tons (2000 lb)	T
TEMPERATURE (exact degrees)				
°C	Celsius	1.8C+32	Fahrenheit	°F
ILLUMINATION				
lx	lux	0.0929	foot-candles	fc
cd/m ²	candela/m ²	0.2919	foot-Lamberts	fl
FORCE and PRESSURE or STRESS				
N	newtons	0.225	poundforce	lbf
kPa	kilopascals	0.145	poundforce per square inch	lbf/in ²

*SI is the symbol for the International System of Units. Appropriate rounding should be made to comply with Section 4 of ASTM E380.
(Revised March 2003)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	5
BACKGROUND	5
Post-Hoc Crash Studies	5
Field Investigations	6
Laboratory Studies	8
Summary	9
STUDY APPROACH	9
Research Questions	12
EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH	13
EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN OVERVIEW	14
Site Selection	14
READING	16
METHOD	16
Selection of Data Collection Zone Limits	16
Advertising Conditions	16
Photometric Measurement of Signs	19
Visual Complexity	20
Participants	21
Procedures	21
DATA REDUCTION	23
Eye Tracking Measures	23
Other Measures	25
RESULTS	26
Photometric Measurements	26
Visual Complexity	27
Effects of Billboards on Gazes to the Road Ahead	28
Fixations to CEVMS and Standard Billboards	30
Comparison of Gazes to CEVMS and Standard Billboards	36
Observation of Driver Behavior	36
Level of Service	36
DISCUSSION OF READING RESULTS	37
RICHMOND	40
METHOD	40
Selection of DCZ Limits	40
Advertising Type	40
Photometric Measurement of Signs	42
Visual Complexity	42
Participants	43
Procedures	43
DATA REDUCTION	44
Eye Tracking Measures	44

Other Measures _____	44
RESULTS _____	44
Photometric Measurement of Signs _____	44
Visual Complexity _____	45
Effects of Billboards on Gazes to the Road Ahead _____	45
Fixations to CEVMS and Standard Billboards _____	47
Comparison of Gazes to CEVMS and Standard Billboards _____	50
Observation of Driver Behavior _____	51
Level of Service _____	51
DISCUSSION OF RICHMOND RESULTS _____	51
GENERAL DISCUSSION _____	53
CONCLUSIONS _____	53
Do CEVMS attract drivers' attention away from the forward roadway and other driving relevant stimuli? _____	53
Do glances to CEVMS occur that would suggest a decrease in safety? _____	54
Do drivers look at CEVMS more than at standard billboards? _____	54
SUMMARY _____	55
LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH _____	55
REFERENCES _____	57

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Eye tracking system camera placement. _____	13
Figure 2. FHWA’s field research vehicle. _____	14
Figure 3. DCZ with a target CEVMS on a freeway. _____	17
Figure 4. DCZ with a target CEVMS on an arterial. _____	18
Figure 5. DCZ with a target standard billboard on a freeway. _____	18
Figure 6. DCZ with a target standard billboard on an arterial. _____	18
Figure 7. DCZ for the control condition on a freeway. _____	19
Figure 8. DCZ for the control condition on an arterial. _____	19
Figure 9. Screen capture showing static ROIs on a scene video output. _____	23
Figure 10. Mean feature congestion as a function of advertising condition and road type (standard errors for the mean are included in the graph). _____	27
Figure 11. Distribution of fixation duration for CEVMS in the daytime and nighttime. _____	30
Figure 12. Distribution of fixation duration for standard billboards in the daytime and nighttime. _____	31
Figure 13. Distribution of fixation duration for road ahead (i.e., top and bottom road ahead ROIs) in the daytime and nighttime. _____	31
Figure 14. Heat map for the start of a DCZ for a standard billboard at night on an arterial. _____	33
Figure 15. Heat map for the middle of a DCZ for a standard billboard at night on an arterial. _____	33
Figure 16. Heat map near the end of a DCZ for a standard billboard at night on an arterial. _____	33
Figure 17. Heat map for start of a DCZ for a standard billboard at night on a freeway. _____	34
Figure 18. Heat map for middle of a DCZ for a standard billboard at night on a freeway. _____	34
Figure 19. Heat map near the end of a DCZ for a standard billboard at night on a freeway. _____	34
Figure 20. Heat map for the start of a DCZ for a standard billboard in the daytime on a freeway. _____	35
Figure 21. Heat map near the middle of a DCZ for a standard billboard in the daytime on a freeway. _____	35
Figure 22. Heat map near the end of DCZ for standard billboard in the daytime on a freeway. _____	35
Figure 23. Heat map at the end of DCZ for standard billboard in the daytime on a freeway. _____	35
Figure 24. Example of identified salient areas in a road scene based on bottom-up analysis. _____	38
Figure 25. Example of a CEVMS DCZ on a freeway. _____	41
Figure 26. Example of CEVMS DCZ an arterial. _____	41
Figure 27. Example of a standard billboard DCZ on a freeway. _____	41
Figure 28. Example of a standard billboard DCZ on an arterial. _____	42
Figure 29. Example of a control DCZ on a freeway. _____	42
Figure 30. Example of a control DCZ on an arterial. _____	42

Figure 31. Mean feature congestion as a function of advertising condition and road type.	45
Figure 32. Fixation duration for CEVMS in the day and at night.	47
Figure 33. Fixation duration for standard billboards in the day and at night.	48
Figure 34. Fixation duration for the road ahead in the day and at night.	48
Figure 35. Heat map for first fixation to CEVMS with long dwell time.	49
Figure 36. Heat map for later fixations to CEVMS with long dwell time.	50
Figure 37. Heat map at end of fixations to CEVMS with long dwell time.	50

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Distribution of CEVMS by roadway classification for various cities. _____	15
Table 2. Inventory of target billboards with relevant parameters. _____	17
Table 3. Summary of luminance (cd/m ²) and contrast (Weber ratio) measurements. _____	27
Table 4. The probability of gazing at the road ahead as a function of advertising condition and road type. _____	28
Table 5. Probability of gazing at ROIs for the three advertising conditions on arterials and freeways. _____	29
Table 6. Level of service as a function of advertising type, road type, and time of day. _____	37
Table 7. Inventory of target billboards in Richmond with relevant parameters. _____	40
Table 8. Summary of luminance (cd/m ²) and contrast (Weber ratio) measurements. _____	44
Table 9. The probability of gazing at the road ahead as a function of advertising condition and road type. _____	46
Table 10. Probability of gazing at ROIs for the three advertising conditions on arterials and freeways. _____	46
Table 11. Estimated level of service as a function of advertising condition, road type, and time of day. _____	51

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND SYMBOLS

CEVMS	Commercial Electronic Variable Message Sign
EB	Empirical Bayes
DCZ	Data Collection Zone
ROI	Region of Interest
LED	Light-Emitting Diode
IR	Infra-Red
CCD	Charge-Coupled Device
MAPPS	Multiple-Analysis of Psychophysical and Performance Signals
GEE	Generalized Estimating Equations
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
DOT	Department of Transportation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study examines where drivers look when driving past commercial electronic variable message signs (CEVMS), standard billboards, or no off-premise advertising. The results and conclusions are presented in response to the three research questions listed below:

1. Do CEVMS attract drivers' attention away from the forward roadway and other driving-relevant stimuli?
2. Do glances to CEVMS occur that would suggest a decrease in safety?
3. Do drivers look at CEVMS more than at standard billboards?

This study follows a Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) review of the literature on the possible distracting and safety effects of off-premise advertising and CEVMS in particular. The review considered laboratory studies, driving simulator studies, field research vehicle studies, and crash studies. The published literature indicated that there was no consistent evidence showing a safety or distraction effect due to off-premise advertising. However, the review also enumerated potential limitations in the previous research that may have resulted in the finding of no distraction effects for off-premise advertising. The study team recommended that additional research be conducted using instrumented vehicle research methods with eye tracking technology.

The eyes are constantly moving and they fixate (focus on a specific object or area), perform saccades (eye movements to change the point of fixation), and engage in pursuit movements (track moving objects). It is during fixations that we take in detailed information about the environment. Eye tracking allows one to determine to what degree off-premise advertising may divert attention away from the forward roadway. A finding that areas containing CEVMS result in significantly more gazes to the billboards at a cost of not gazing toward the forward roadway would suggest a potential safety risk. In addition to measuring the degree to which CEVMS may distract from the forward roadway, an eye tracking device would allow an examination of the duration of fixations and dwell times (multiple sequential fixations) to CEVMS and standard billboards. Previous research conducted by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) led to the conclusion that taking your eyes off the road for 2 seconds or more presents a safety risk. Measuring fixations and dwell times to CEVMS and standard billboards would also allow a determination as to the degree to which these advertising signs lead to potentially unsafe gaze behavior.

Most of the literature concerning eye gaze behavior in dynamic environments suggests that task demands tend to override visual salience (an object that stands out because of its physical properties) in determining attention allocation. When extended to driving, it would be expected that visual attention will be directed toward task-relevant areas and objects (e.g., the roadway, other vehicles, speed limit signs) and that other salient objects, such as billboards, would not necessarily capture attention. However, driving is a somewhat automatic process and conditions generally do not require constant, undivided attention. As a result, salient stimuli, such as CEVMS, might capture driver attention and produce an unwanted increase in driver distraction. The present study addresses this concern.

This study used an instrumented vehicle with an eye tracking system to measure where drivers were looking when driving past CEVMS and standard billboards. The CEVMS and standard billboards were measured with respect to luminance, location, size, and other relevant variables to characterize these visual stimuli extensively. Unlike previous studies on digital billboards, the present study examined CEVMS as deployed in two United States cities. These billboards did not contain dynamic video or other dynamic elements, but changed content approximately every 8 to 10 seconds. The eye tracking system had nearly a 2-degree level of resolution that provided significantly more accuracy in determining what objects the drivers were looking at compared to an earlier naturalistic driving study. This study assessed two data collection efforts that employed the same methodology in two cities.

In each city, the study examined eye glance behavior to four CEVMS, two on arterials and two on freeways. There were an equal number of signs on the left and right side of the road for arterials and freeways. The standard billboards were selected for comparison with CEVMS such that one standard billboard environment matched as closely as possible that of each of the CEVMS. Two control locations were selected that did not contain off-premise advertising, one on an arterial and the other on a freeway. This resulted in 10 data collection zones in each city that were approximately 1,000 feet in length (the distance from the start of the data collection zone to the point that the CEVMS or standard billboard disappeared from the data collection video).

In Reading, Pennsylvania, 14 participants drove at night and 17 drove during the day. In Richmond, Virginia, 10 participants drove at night and 14 drove during the day. Calibration of the eye tracking system, practice drive, and the data collection drive took approximately 2 hours per participant to accomplish.

The following is a summary of the study results and conclusions presented in reference to the three research questions the study aimed to address.

Do CEVMS attract drivers' attention away from the forward roadway and other driving relevant stimuli?

- On average, the drivers in this study devoted between 73 and 85 percent of their visual attention to the road ahead for both CEVMS and standard billboards. This range is consistent with earlier field research studies. In the present study, the presence of CEVMS did not appear to be related to a decrease in looking toward the road ahead.

Do glances to CEVMS occur that would suggest a decrease in safety?

- The average fixation duration to CEVMS was 379 ms and to standard billboards it was 335 ms across the two cities. The average fixation durations to CEVMS and standard billboards were similar to the average fixation duration to the road ahead.
- The longest fixation to a CEVMS was 1,335 ms and to a standard billboard it was 1,284 ms. The current widely accepted threshold for durations of glances away from the road ahead that result in higher crash risk is 2,000 ms. This value comes from a NHTSA

naturalistic driving study that showed a significant increase in crash odds when glances away from the road ahead were 2,000 ms or longer.

- Four dwell times (aggregate of consecutive fixations to the same object) greater than 2,000 ms were observed across the two studies. Three were to standard billboards and one was to a CEVMS. The long dwell time to the CEVMS occurred in the daytime to a billboard viewable from a freeway. Review of the video data for these four long dwell times showed that the signs were not far from the forward view while participant's gaze dwelled on them. Therefore, the drivers still had access to information about what was in front of them through peripheral vision.
- The results did not provide evidence indicating that CEVMS, as deployed and tested in the two selected cities, were associated with unacceptably long glances away from the road. When dwell times longer than the currently accepted threshold of 2,000 ms occurred, the road ahead was still in the driver's field of view. This was the case for both CEVMS and standard billboards.

Do drivers look at CEVMS more than at standard billboards?

- When comparing the probability of a gaze at a CEVMS versus a standard billboard, the drivers in this study were generally more likely to gaze at CEVMS than at standard billboards. However, some variability occurred between the two locations and between the types of roadway (arterial or freeway).
- In Reading, when considering the proportion of time spent looking at billboards, the participants looked more often at CEVMS than at standard billboards when on arterials (63 percent to CEVMS and 37 percent to a standard billboard), whereas they looked more often at standard billboards when on freeways (33 percent to CEVMS and 67 percent to a standard billboard). In Richmond, the drivers looked at CEVMS more than standard billboards no matter the type of road they were on, but as in Reading, the preference for gazing at CEVMS was greater on arterials (68 percent to CEVMS and 32 percent to standard billboards) than on freeways (55 percent to CEVMS and 45 percent to standard billboards). When a gaze was to an off-premise advertising sign, the drivers were generally more likely to gaze at a CEVMS than at a standard billboard.
- In Richmond, the drivers showed a preference for gazing at CEVMS versus standard billboards at night, but in Reading the time of day did not affect gaze behavior. In Richmond, drivers gazed at CEVMS 71 percent and at standard billboards 29 percent at night. On the other hand, in the day the drivers gazed at CEVMS 52 percent and at standard billboards 48 percent.
- In Reading, the average gaze dwell time for CEVMS was 981 ms and for standard billboards it was 1,386 ms. The difference in these average dwell times was not statistically significant. In contrast, the average dwell times to CEVMS and standard billboards were significantly different in Richmond (1,096 ms and 674 ms, respectively).

The present data suggest that the drivers in this study directed the majority of their visual attention to areas of the roadway that were relevant to the task at hand (e.g., the driving task). Furthermore, it is possible, and likely, that in the time that the drivers looked away from the forward roadway, they may have elected to glance at other objects in the surrounding environment (in the absence of billboards) that were not relevant to the driving task. When billboards were present, the drivers in this study sometimes looked at them, but not such that overall attention to the forward roadway decreased.

It also should be noted that, like other studies in the available literature, this study adds to the knowledge base on the issues examined, but does not present definitive answers to the research questions investigated.

INTRODUCTION

“The primary responsibility of the driver is to operate a motor vehicle safely. The task of driving requires full attention and focus. Drivers should resist engaging in any activity that takes their eyes and attention off of the road for more than a couple of seconds. In some circumstances even a second or two can make all the difference in a driver being able to avoid a crash.” – US Department of Transportation⁽¹⁾

The advent of electronic billboard technologies, in particular the digital Light-Emitting Diode (LED) billboard, has prompted a reevaluation of regulations for controlling outdoor advertising. An attractive quality of these LED billboards, which are hereafter referred to as Commercial Electronic Variable Message Signs (CEVMS), is that advertisements can change almost instantly. Furthermore, outdoor advertising companies can make these changes from a central remote office. Of concern is whether or not CEVMS may attract drivers’ attention away from the primary task (driving) in a way that compromises safety.

The current Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) guidance recommends that CEVMS should not change content more frequently than once every 8 seconds.⁽²⁾ However, according to Scenic America, the basis of the safety concern is that the “...distinguishing trait...” of a CEVMS “... is that it can vary while a driver watches it, in a setting in which that variation is likely to attract the drivers’ attention away from the roadway.”⁽³⁾ This study was conducted to provide the FHWA with data to determine if CEVMS capture visual attention differently than standard off-premise advertising billboards.

BACKGROUND

A 2009 review of the literature by Molino et al. for the FHWA failed to find convincing empirical evidence that CEVMS, as currently implemented, constitutes a safety risk greater than that of conventional vinyl billboards.⁽⁴⁾ A great deal of work has been focused in this area, but the findings of these studies have been mixed.^(4,5) A summary of the key past findings is presented here, but the reader is referred to Molino et al. for a comprehensive review of studies prior to 2008.⁽⁴⁾

Post-Hoc Crash Studies

Post-hoc crash studies use reviews of police traffic collision reports or statistical summaries of such reports in an effort to understand the causes of crashes that have taken place in the vicinity of some change to the roadside environment. In the present case, the change of concern is the introduction of CEVMS to the roadside or the replacement of conventional billboards with CEVMS.

The literature review conducted by Molino et al. did not find compelling evidence for a distraction effect attributable to CEVMS.⁽⁴⁾ The authors concluded that all post-hoc crash studies are subject to certain weaknesses, most of which are difficult to overcome. For example, the vast majority of crashes are never reported to police; thus, such studies are likely to underreport crashes. Also, when crashes are caused by factors such as driver distraction or inattention, the involved driver may be unwilling or unable to report these factors to a police investigator.

Another weakness is that police, under time pressure, are rarely able to investigate the true root causes of crashes unless they involve serious injury, death, or extensive property damage. Furthermore, to have confidence in the results, such studies need to collect comparable data before and after the change, and, in the after phase, at equivalent but unaffected roadway sections. Since crashes are infrequent events, data collection needs to span extended periods of time both before and after introduction of the change. Few studies are able to obtain such extensive data.

Two recent studies by Tantala and Tantala examined the relationship between the presence of CEVMS and crash statistics in Richmond, Virginia, and Reading, Pennsylvania.^(6,7) For the Richmond area, 7 years of crash data at 10 locations with CEVMS were included in the analyses. The study used a before-after methodology where most sites originally contained vinyl billboards (before) that were converted to CEVMS (after). The quantity of crash data was not the same for all locations and ranged from 1 year before/after to 3 years before/after. The study employed the Empirical Bayes (EB) method to analyze the data.⁽⁸⁾ The results indicated that the total number of crashes observed was consistent with what would be statistically expected with or without the introduction of CEVMS. The analysis approach for Reading locations was much the same as for Richmond other than there were 20 rather than 10 CEVMS and 8 years of crash statistics. The EB method showed results for Reading that were very similar to those of Richmond.

The studies by Tantala and Tantala appear to address many of the concerns from Molino et al. regarding the weaknesses and issues associated with crash studies.^(4,6,7) For example, they include crash comparisons for locations within multiple distances of each CEVMS to address concerns about the visual range used in previous analyses. They used EB analysis techniques to correct for regression-to-mean bias. Also, the EB method would better reflect crash rate changes due to changes in average daily traffic and the interactions of these with the roadway features that were coded in the model. The studies followed approaches that are commonly used in post-hoc crash studies, though the results would have been strengthened by including before-after results for non-CEVMS locations as a control group.

Field Investigations

Field investigations include unobtrusive observation, naturalistic driving studies, on-road instrumented vehicle investigations, test track experiments, driver interviews, surveys, and questionnaires. The following focuses on relevant studies that employed naturalistic driving and on-road instrumented vehicle research methods.

Lee, McElheny, and Gibbons undertook an on-road instrumented vehicle study on Interstate and local roads near Cleveland, Ohio.⁽⁹⁾ The study looked at driver glance behavior in the vicinity of digital billboards, conventional billboards, comparison sites (sites with buildings and other signs, including digital signs), and control sites (those without similar signage). The results showed that there were no differences in the overall glance patterns (percent eyes-on-road and overall number of glances) between the different sites. Drivers also did not glance more frequently in the direction of digital billboards than in the direction of other event types (conventional billboards, comparison events, and baseline events) but drivers did take longer glances in the direction of digital billboards and comparison sites than in the direction of conventional billboards and baseline sites. However, the mean glance length toward the digital billboards was less than

1,000 ms. It is important to note that this study employed a video-based approach for examining drivers' visual behavior, which has an accuracy of no better than 20 degrees.⁽¹⁰⁾ While this technique is likely to be effective in assessing gross eye movements and looks that are away from the road ahead, it may not have sufficient resolution to discriminate what specific object the driver is looking at outside of the vehicle.

Beijer, Smiley, and Eizenman evaluated driver glances toward four different types of roadside advertising signs on roads in the Toronto, Canada, area.⁽¹¹⁾ The four types of signs were: (a) billboard signs with static advertisements; (b) billboard advertisements placed on vertical rollers that could rotate to show one of three advertisements in succession; (c) scrolling text signs with a minor active component, which usually consisted of a small strip of lights that formed words scrolling across the screen or, in some cases, a larger area capable of displaying text but not video; and (d) signs with video images that had a color screen capable of displaying both moving text and moving images. The study employed an on-road instrumented vehicle with a head-mounted eye tracking device. The researchers found no significant differences in average glance duration or the maximum glance duration for the various sign types; however, the number of glances was significantly lower for billboard signs than for the roller bar, scrolling text, and video signs.

Smiley, Smahel, and Eizenman conducted a field driving study that employed an eye tracking system that recorded drivers' eye movements as participants drove past video signs located at three downtown intersections and along an urban expressway.⁽¹²⁾ The study route included static billboards and video advertising. The results of the study showed that on average 76 percent of glances were to the road ahead. Glances at advertising, including static billboards and video signs, constituted 1.2 percent of total glances. The mean glance durations for advertising signs were between 500 ms and 750 ms, although there were a few glances of about 1,400 ms in duration. Video signs were not more likely than static commercial signs to be looked at when headways were short; in fact, the reverse was the case. Furthermore, the number of glances per individual video sign was small, and statistically significant differences in looking behavior were not found.

Kettwich, Kartsen, Klinger, and Lemmer conducted a field study where drivers' gaze behavior was measured with an eye tracking system.⁽¹³⁾ Sixteen participants drove an 11.5 mile (18.5 km) route comprised of highways, arterial roads, main roads, and one-way streets in Karlsruhe, Germany. The route contained advertising pillars, event posters, company logos, and video screens. Mean gaze duration for the four types of advertising was computed for periods when the vehicle was in motion and when it was stopped. Gaze duration while driving for all types of advertisements was under 1,000 ms. On the other hand, while the vehicle was stopped, the mean gaze duration for video screen advertisements was 2,750 ms. The study showed a significant difference between gaze duration while driving and while stationary: gaze duration was affected by the task at hand. That is, drivers tended to gaze longer while the car was stopped and there were few driving task demands.

The previously mentioned studies estimated the duration of glances to advertising and computed mean values of less than 1,000 ms. Klauer et al., in his analysis of the 100-Car Naturalistic Driving Study, concluded that glances away from the roadway for any purpose lasting more than 2,000 ms increase near-crash/crash risk by at least two times that of normal, baseline driving.⁽¹⁴⁾

Klauer et al. also indicated that short, brief glances away from the forward roadway for the purpose of scanning the driving environment are safe and actually decrease near-crash/crash risk.⁽¹⁴⁾ Using devices in a vehicle that draw visual attention away from the forward roadway for more than 2,000 ms (e.g., texting) is incompatible with safe driving. However, for external stimuli, especially those near the roadway, the evaluation of eye glances with respect to safety is less clear since peripheral vision would allow the driver to still have visual access to the forward roadway.

Laboratory Studies

Laboratory investigations related to roadway safety can be classified into several categories: driving simulations, non-driving-simulator laboratory testing, and focus groups. The review of relevant laboratory studies by Molino et al. did not show conclusive evidence regarding the distracting effects of CEVMS.⁽⁴⁾ Moreover, the authors concluded that present driving simulators do not have sufficient visual dynamic range, image resolution, and contrast ratio capability to produce the compelling visual effect of a bright, photo-realistic LED-based CEVMS against a natural background scene. The following is a discussion of a driving simulator study conducted after the publication of Molino et al.⁽⁴⁾ The study focused on the effects of advertising on driver visual behavior.

Chattington, Reed, Basacik, Flint, and Parkes conducted a driving simulator study in the United Kingdom (UK) to evaluate the effects of static and video advertising on driver glance behavior.⁽¹⁵⁾ The researchers examined the effects of advertisement position relative to the road (left, right, center on an overhead gantry, and in all three locations simultaneously), type of advertisement (static or video), and exposure duration of the advertisement. (The paper does not provide these durations in terms of time or distance. The exposure duration had to do with the amount of time or distance that the sign would be visible to the driver.) For the advertisements presented on the left side of the road (recall that drivers travel in the left lane in the UK), mean glance durations for static and video advertisements were significantly longer (approximately 650 to 750 ms) when drivers experienced long advertisement exposure as opposed to medium and short exposures. Drivers looked more at video advertisements (about 2 percent on average of the total duration recorded) than at static advertisements (about 0.75 percent on average). In addition, the location of the advertisements had an effect on glance behavior. When advertisements were located in the center of the road or in all three positions simultaneously, the glance durations were about 1,000 ms and were significantly longer than for signs placed on the right or left side of the road. For advertisements placed on the left side of the road, there was a significant difference in glance duration between static (about 400 ms) and video (about 800 ms). Advertisement position also had an effect on the proportion of time that a driver spent looking at an advertisement. The percentage of time looking at advertisements was greatest when signs were placed in all three locations, followed by center location signs, then the left location signs, and finally the right location signs. Drivers looked more at the video advertisements relative to the static advertisements when they were placed in all three locations, placed on the left, and placed on the right side of the road. The center placement did not show a significant difference in percent of time spent looking between static and video.

Summary

The results from these key studies offer some insight into whether CEVMS pose a visual distraction threat. However, these same studies also reveal some inconsistent findings and potential methodological issues that are addressed in the current study. The studies conducted by Smiley et al. showed drivers glanced forward at the roadway about 76 percent of the time in the presence of video and dynamic signs where a few long glances of approximately 1,400 ms were observed.⁽¹²⁾ However, the video and dynamic signs used in these studies portray moving objects that are not present in CEVMS as deployed in the United States. In another field study employing eye tracking, Kettwich et al. found that gaze duration while driving for all types of advertisements that they evaluated was less than 1,000 ms; however, when the vehicle was stopped, mean gaze duration for advertising was as high as 2,750 ms.⁽¹⁶⁾ Collectively, these studies did not demonstrate that the advertising signs detracted from drivers' glances forward at the roadway in a substantive manner while the vehicle was moving.

In contrast, the simulator study by Chattington et al. demonstrated that dynamic signs showing moving video or other dynamic elements may draw attention away from the roadway.⁽¹⁵⁾ Furthermore, the location of the advertising sign on the road is an important factor in drawing drivers' visual attention. Advertisements with moving video placed in the center of the roadway on an overhead gantry or in all three positions (right, left, and in the center) simultaneously are very likely to draw glances from drivers.

Finally, in a study that examined CEVMS as deployed in the United States, Lee et al. did not show any significant effects of CEVMS on driver glance behavior.⁽⁹⁾ However, the methodology that was used likely did not employ sufficient sensitivity to determine at what specific object in the environment a driver was looking.

None of these studies combined all necessary factors to address the current CEVMS situation in the United States. Those studies that used eye tracking on real roads had animated and video-based signs, which are not reflective of current off-premise CEVMS practice in the United States.

STUDY APPROACH

Based on an extensive review of the literature, Molino et al. concluded that the most effective method to use in an evaluation of the effects of CEVMS on driver visual behavior was the instrumented field vehicle method that incorporated an eye tracking system.⁽⁴⁾ The present study employed such an instrumented field vehicle with an eye tracking system and examined the degree to which CEVMS attract drivers' attention away from the forward roadway.

The following presents a brief overview and discussion of studies using eye tracking methodology with complex visual stimuli, especially in natural environments (walking, driving, etc.). The review by Molino et al. recommended the use of this type of technology and method; however, a discussion laying out technical and theoretical issues underlying the use of eye tracking methods was not presented.⁽⁴⁾ This background is important for the interpretation of the results of the studies conducted here.

Standard and digital billboards are often salient stimuli in the driving environment, which may make them conspicuous. Cole and Hughes define attention conspicuity as the extent to which a stimulus is sufficiently prominent in the driving environment to capture attention. Further, Cole and Hughes state that attention conspicuity is a function of size, color, brightness, contrast relative to surroundings, and dynamic components such as movement and change.⁽¹⁷⁾ It is clear that under certain circumstances image salience or conspicuity can provide a good explanation of how humans orient their attention.

At any given moment a large number of stimuli reach our senses, but only a limited number of them are selected for further processing. In general, attention can be focused on a stimulus because it is important for achieving some goal, or because the properties of the stimulus can attract the attention of the observer independent of their intentions (e.g., a car horn may elicit an orienting response). When the focus of attention is goal directed, it is referred to as top-down. When the focus of attention is principally a function of stimulus attributes, it is referred to as bottom-up.⁽¹⁸⁾

In general, billboards (either standard or CEVMS) are not relevant to the driving task but are presumably designed to be salient stimuli in the environment where they may draw a driver's attention. The question is to what degree CEVMS draw a driver's attention away from driving-relevant stimuli (e.g., road ahead, mirrors, and speedometer) and is this different from a standard billboard? In his review of the literature Wachtel leads one to consider CEVMS as stimuli in the environment where attention to them would be drawn in a bottom-up manner; that is, the salience of the billboards would make them stand out relative to other stimuli in the environment and drivers would reflexively look at these signs.⁽¹⁹⁾ Wachtel's conclusions were in reference to research by Theeuwes who employed simple letter stimulus arrays in a laboratory task.⁽²⁰⁾ Research using simple visual stimuli in a laboratory environment are very useful for testing different theories of perception, but often lack direct application to tasks such as driving. The following discusses research using complex visual stimuli and tasks that are more relevant to natural vision as experienced in the driving task.

A recent review of stimulus salience and eye guidance by Tatler et al. shows that most of the evidence for the capture of attention by the conspicuity of stimuli comes from research in which the stimulus is a simple visual search array or in which the target is uniquely defined by simple visual features.⁽²¹⁾ In other words, these are laboratory studies that use letters, arrays of letters, or simple geometric patterns as the stimuli. Pure salience-based models are capable of predicting eye movement endpoint in simple displays, but are less successful for more complex scenes that contain task-relevant and task-irrelevant salient areas.^(22,23)

Research by Henderson et al. using photographs of actual scenes showed that subjects looked at non-salient scene regions containing a search target and rarely looked at salient non-task-relevant regions of the scenes.⁽²⁴⁾ Salience of the stimulus alone was not a good predictor of where participants looked. Additional research by Henderson using photographs of real world scenes also showed that subjects fixated on regions of the pictures that provided task-relevant information rather than visually salient regions with no task-relevant information. However, Henderson acknowledges that static pictures have many shortcomings when used as surrogates for real environments.⁽²⁵⁾

Land's review of eye movements in dynamic environments concluded that the eyes are proactive and typically seek out information required in the second before each new activity commences.⁽²⁶⁾ Specific tasks (e.g., driving) have characteristic but flexible patterns of eye movement that accompany them, and these patterns are similar between individuals. Land concluded that the eyes rarely visit objects that are irrelevant to the task, and the conspicuity of objects is less important than the objects' roles in the task. In a subsequent review of eye movement and natural behavior, Land concluded that in a task that requires fixation on a sequence of specific objects, the capture of gaze by irrelevant salient objects would, in general, be an obtrusive nuisance.⁽²²⁾

The literature examining gaze control under natural behavior suggests that it is principally top-down driven, or intentional.^(24,25,26,22,21,27) However, top-down processing does not explain all gaze control or eye movements. For example, imagine driving down a two-lane country road and a deer jumps into the road. It is most likely that you will attend and react to this deer. Unplanned or unexpected stimuli capture our attention as we engage in complex natural tasks. Research by Jovancevic-Misic and Hayhoe showed that human gaze patterns are sensitive to the probabilistic nature of the environment.⁽²⁸⁾ In this study, participants' eye movement behavior was observed while walking among other pedestrians. The other pedestrians were confederates and were either safe, risky, or rogue pedestrians. When the study began, the risky pedestrian took a collision course with the participant 50 percent of the time, and the rogue pedestrian always assumed a collision course as he approached the participant, whereas the safe pedestrian never took a collision course. Midway through the study the rogue and safe pedestrians exchanged roles but the risky pedestrian role remained the same. The participants were not informed about the behavior of the other pedestrians. Participants were asked to follow a circular path for several laps and to avoid other pedestrians. The study showed that the participants modified their gaze behavior in response to the change in the other pedestrians' behavior. Jovancevic-Misic concluded that participants learned new priorities for gaze allocation within a few encounters and looked both sooner and longer at potentially dangerous pedestrians.⁽²⁸⁾

Gaze behavior in natural environments is affected by expectations that are derived through long-term learning. Using a virtual driving environment, Shinoda et al. asked participants to look for stop signs while driving an urban route.⁽²⁹⁾ Approximately 45 percent of the fixations fell in the general area of intersections during the simulated drive, and participants were more likely to detect stop signs placed near intersections than those placed in the middle of a block. Over time, drivers have learned that stop signs are more likely to appear near intersections and, as a result, drivers prioritize their allocation of gazes to these areas of the roadway.

The Tatler et al. review of the literature concludes that in natural vision, a consistent set of principles underlies eye guidance. These principles include relevance or reward potential, uncertainty about the state of the environment, and learned models of the environment.⁽²¹⁾ Salience of environmental stimuli alone typically does not explain most eye gaze behavior in naturalistic environments.

In sum, most of the literature concerning eye gaze behavior in dynamic environments suggests that task demands tend to override visual salience in determining attention allocation. When extended to driving, it would be expected that visual attention will be directed toward task-relevant areas and objects (e.g., the roadway, other vehicles, speed limit signs, etc.) and other

salient objects, such as billboards, will not necessarily capture attention. However, driving is a somewhat automatic process and conditions generally do not require constant undivided attention. As a result, salient stimuli, such as CEVMS, might capture driver attention and provide an unwarranted increase in driver distraction. The present study addresses this concern.

Research Questions

The present research evaluated the effects of CEVMS on driver visual behavior under actual roadway conditions in the daytime and at night. Roads containing CEVMS, standard billboards, and areas not containing off-premise advertising were selected. The CEVMS and standard billboards were measured with respect to luminance, location, size, and other relevant visual characteristics. The present study examined CEVMS as deployed in two United States cities. Unlike previous studies, the signs did not contain dynamic video or other dynamic elements. In addition, the eye tracking system used in this study has approximately a 2-degree level of resolution. This provided significantly more accuracy in determining what objects the drivers were looking at than in previous on-road studies examining looking behavior (recall that Lee et al. used video recordings of drivers' faces that, at best, examined gross eye movements).⁽⁹⁾

Two studies are reported. Each study was conducted in a different city. The two studies employed the same methodology. The studies' primary research questions were:

1. Do CEVMS attract drivers' attention away from the forward roadway and other driving relevant stimuli?
2. Do glances to CEVMS occur that would suggest a decrease in safety?
3. Do drivers look at CEVMS more than at standard billboards?

EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH

The study used a field research vehicle equipped with a non-intrusive eye tracking system. The vehicle was a 2007 Jeep® Grand Cherokee Sport Utility Vehicle. The eye tracking system used (SmartEye® vehicle-mounted infrared (IR) eye-movement measuring system) is shown in figure 1.⁽³⁰⁾ The system consists of two IR light sources and three face cameras mounted on the dashboard of the vehicle. The cameras and light sources are small in size, and are not attached to the driver in any manner. The face cameras are synchronized to the IR light sources and are used to determine the head position and gaze direction of the driver.



Figure 1. Eye tracking system camera placement.

As a part of this eye tracking system, the vehicle was outfitted with a three-camera panoramic scene monitoring system for capturing the forward driving scene. The scene cameras were mounted on the roof of the vehicle directly above the driver's head position. The three cameras together provided an 80-degree wide by 40-degree high field of forward view. The scene cameras captured the forward view area available to the driver through the left side of the windshield and a portion of the right side of the windshield. The area visible to the driver through the rightmost area of the windshield was not captured by the scene cameras.

The vehicle was also outfitted with equipment to record GPS position, vehicle speed, and vehicle acceleration. The equipment also recorded events entered by an experimenter and synchronized those events with the eye tracking and vehicle data. The research vehicle is pictured in figure 2.



Figure 2. FHWA's field research vehicle.

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN OVERVIEW

The approach entailed the use of the instrumented vehicle in which drivers navigated routes in cities that presented CEVMS and standard billboards as well as areas without off-premise advertising. The participants were instructed to drive the routes as they normally would. The drivers were not informed that the study was about outdoor advertising, but rather that it was about examining drivers' glance behavior as they followed route guidance directions.

Site Selection

More than 40 cities were evaluated in the selection of the test sites. Locations with CEVMS displays were identified using a variety of resources that included State department of transportation contacts, advertising company Web sites, and a popular geographic information system. A matrix was developed that listed the number of CEVMS in each city. For each site, the number of CEVMS along limited access and arterial roadways was determined.

One criterion for site selection was whether the location had practical routes that pass by a number of CEVMS as well as standard off-premise billboards and could be driven in about 30 minutes. Other considerations included access to vehicle maintenance personnel/facilities, proximity to research facilities, and ease of participant recruitment. Two cities were selected: Reading, and Richmond.

Table 1 presents the 16 cities that were included on the final list of potential study sites.

Table 1. Distribution of CEVMS by roadway classification for various cities.

<i>State</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Limited Access</i>	<i>Arterial</i>	<i>Other</i> ⁽¹⁾	<i>Total</i>
VA	Richmond	4	7	0	11
PA	Reading	7	11	0	18
VA	Roanoke	0	11	0	11
PA	Pittsburgh	0	0	15	15
TX	San Antonio	7	2	6	15
WI	Milwaukee	14	2	0	16
AZ	Phoenix	10	6	0	16
MN	St. Paul/Minneapolis	8	5	3	16
TN	Nashville	7	10	0	17
FL	Tampa-St. Petersburg	7	11	0	18
NM	Albuquerque	0	19	1	20
PA	Scranton-Wilkes Barre	7	14	1	22
OH	Columbus	1	22	0	23
GA	Atlanta	13	11	0	24
IL	Chicago	22	2	1	25
CA	Los Angeles	3	71	4	78

(1) Other includes roadways classified as both limited access and arterial or instances where the road classification was unknown. *Source:* www.lamar.com and www.clearchannel.com

In both test cities, the following independent variables were evaluated:

- **The type of advertising.** This included CEVMS, standard billboards, and no off-premise advertising. (It should be noted that in areas with no off-premise advertising, it was still possible to encounter on-premise advertising; e.g., for gas stations, restaurants, and other miscellaneous stores and shops.)
- **Time of day.** This included driving in the daytime and at night.
- **The functional class of roadways in which off-premise advertising signs were located.** Roads were classified as either freeway or arterial. It was observed that the different road classes were correlated with the presence of other visual information that could affect the driver's glance behavior. For example, the visual environment on arterials may be more complex or cluttered than on freeways because of the close proximity of buildings, driveways, and on-premise advertising, etc.

READING

The first on-road study was conducted in Reading. This study examined the type of advertising (CEVMS, standard billboard, or no off-premise advertising), time of day (day or night) and road type (freeway or arterial) as independent variables. Eye tracking was used to assess where participants gazed and for how long while driving. The luminance and contrast of the advertising signs were measured to characterize the billboards in the current study.

METHOD

Selection of Data Collection Zone Limits

Data collection zones (DCZ) were defined on the routes that participants drove where detailed analyses of the eye tracking data were planned. The DCZ were identified that contained a CEVMS, a standard billboard, or no off-premise advertising.

The rationale for selecting the DCZ limits took into account the geometry of the roadway (e.g., road curvature or obstructions that blocked view of billboards) and the capabilities of the eye tracking system (2 degrees of resolution). At a distance of 960 ft (292.61 m), the average billboard in Reading was 12.8 ft (3.90 m) by 36.9 ft (11.25 m) and would subtend a horizontal visual angle of 2.20 degrees and a vertical visual angle of 0.76 degrees, and thus glances to the billboard would just be resolvable by an eye tracking system with 2 degrees of accuracy. Therefore 960 ft was chosen as the maximum distance from billboards at which a DCZ would begin. If the target billboard was not visible from 960 ft (292.61 m) due to roadway geometry or other visual obstructions, such as trees or an overpass, the DCZ was shortened to a distance that prevented these objects from interfering with the driver's vision of the billboard. In DCZs with target off-premise billboards, the end of the DCZ was marked when the target billboard left the view of the scene camera. If the area contained no off-premise advertising, the end of the DCZ was defined by a physical landmark leaving the view of the eye tracking systems' scene camera.

Table 2 shows the data collection zone limits used in this study.

Advertising Conditions

The type of advertising present in DCZs was examined as an independent variable. DCZs fell into one of the following categories, which are listed in the second column of table 2:

- **CEVMS.** These were DCZs that contained one target CEVMS. Two CEVMS DCZs were located on freeways and two were located on arterials. Figure 3 and figure 4 show examples of CEVMS DCZs with the CEVMS highlighted in the pictures.
- **Standard billboard.** These were DCZs that contained one target standard billboard. Two standard billboard DCZs were located on freeways and two were located on arterials. Figure 5 and figure 6 show examples of standard billboard DCZs; the standard billboards are highlighted in the pictures.

- **No off-premise advertising conditions.** These DCZs contained no off-premise advertising. One of these DCZs was on a freeway (see figure 7) and the other was on an arterial (see figure 8).

Table 2. Inventory of target billboards with relevant parameters.

<i>DCZ</i>	<i>Advertising Type</i>	<i>Copy Dimensions (ft)</i>	<i>Side of Road</i>	<i>Setback from Road (ft)</i>	<i>Other Standard Billboards</i>	<i>Approach Length (ft)</i>	<i>Type of Roadway</i>
1	CONTROL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	786	Freeway
6	CONTROL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	308	Arterial
3	CEVMS	10'6" x 22'9"	L	12	0	375	Arterial
5	CEVMS	14'0" x 48'0"	L	133	1	853	Freeway
9	CEVMS	10'6" x 22'9"	R	43	0	537	Arterial
10	CEVMS	14'0" x 48'0"	R	133	1	991	Freeway
2	Standard	14'0" x 48'0"	L	20	0	644	Arterial
7	Standard	14'0" x 48'0"	R	35	1	774	Freeway
8	Standard	10'6" x 22'9"	R	40	1	833	Arterial
4	Standard	14'0" x 48'0"	L	10	0	770	Freeway

**N/A indicates that there were no off-premise advertising in these areas and these values are undefined.*



Figure 3. DCZ with a target CEVMS on a freeway.



Figure 4. DCZ with a target CEVMS on an arterial.



Figure 5. DCZ with a target standard billboard on a freeway.



Figure 6. DCZ with a target standard billboard on an arterial.



Figure 7. DCZ for the control condition on a freeway.



Figure 8. DCZ for the control condition on an arterial.

Photometric Measurement of Signs

Two primary metrics were used to describe the photometric characteristics of a sample of the CEVMS and standard billboards present at each location: luminance (cd/m^2) and contrast (Weber contrast ratio).

Photometric Equipment

Luminance was measured with a Radiant Imaging ProMetric 1600 Charge-Coupled Device (CCD) photometer with both a 50 mm and a 300 mm lenses. The CCD photometer provided a method of capturing the luminance of an entire scene at one time.

The photometric sensors were mounted in a vehicle of similar size to the eye tracking research vehicle. The photometer was located in the experimental vehicle as close to the driver's position as possible and was connected to a laptop computer that stored data as the images were acquired.

Measurement Methodology

Images of the billboards were acquired using the photometer manufacturer's software. The software provided the mean luminance of each billboard message. To prevent overexposure of

images in daylight, neutral density filters were manually affixed to the photometer lens and the luminance values were scaled appropriately. Standard billboards were typically measured only once; however, for CEVMS multiple measures were taken to account for changing content.

Photometric measurements were taken during day and night. Measurements were taken by centering the billboard in the photometer's field of view with approximately the equivalent of the width of the billboard on each side and the equivalent of the billboard height above and below the sign. The areas outside of the billboards were included to enable contrast calculations.

Standard billboards were assessed at a mean distance of 284 ft (ranging from 570 ft to 43 ft). The CEVMS were assessed at a mean distance of 479 ft (ranging from 972 ft to 220 ft). To include the background regions of appropriate size, the close measurement distances required the use of the 50 mm lens whereas measurements made from longer distances required the 300 mm lens. A significant determinant of the measurement locations was the availability of accessible and safe places from which to measure.

The Weber contrast ratio was used because it characterizes a billboard as having negative or positive contrast when compared to its background area.⁽³¹⁾ A negative contrast indicates the background areas have a higher mean luminance than the target billboard. A positive contrast indicates the target billboard has a higher mean luminance than the background. Overall, the absolute value of a contrast ratio simply indicates a difference in luminance between an item and its background. From a perceptual perspective luminance and contrast are directly related to the perception of brightness. For example, two signs with equal luminance may be perceived differently with respect to brightness because of differences in contrast.

Visual Complexity

Regan, Young, Lee and Gordon presented a taxonomic description of the various sources of driver distraction.⁽³²⁾ Potential sources of distraction were discussed in terms of: things brought into the vehicle; vehicle systems; vehicle occupants; moving objects or animals in the vehicle; internalized activity; and external objects, events, or activities. The external objects may include buildings, construction zones, billboards, road signs, vehicles, and so on. Focusing on the potential for information outside the vehicle to attract (or distract) the driver's attention, Horberry and Edquist developed a taxonomy for out-of-the-vehicle visual information. This suggested taxonomy includes four groupings of visual information: built roadway, situational entities, natural environment, and built environment.⁽³³⁾ These two taxonomies provide an organizational structure for conducting research; however, they do not currently provide a systematic or quantitative way of classifying the level of clutter or visual complexity present in a visual scene.

The method proposed by Rozenholtz, Li, and Nakano provides quantitative and perhaps reliable measures of visual clutter.⁽³⁴⁾ Their approach measures the feature congestion in a visual image. The implementation of the feature congestion measure involves four stages: (1) compute local feature covariance at multiple scales and compute the volume of the local covariance ellipsoid, (2) combine clutter across scale, (3) combine clutter across feature types, and (4) pool over space to get a single measure of clutter for each input image. The implementation that was used employed color, orientation and luminance contrast as features. Presumably, less cluttered

images can be visually coded more efficiently than cluttered images. For example, visual clutter can cause decreased recognition performance and greater difficulty in performing visual search.⁽³⁵⁾

Participants

In the present study participants were recruited at public libraries in the Reading area. A table was set up so that recruiters could discuss the requirements of the experiment with candidates. Individuals who expressed interest in participating were asked to complete a pre-screening form, a record of informed consent, and a department of motor vehicles form consenting to release of their driving record.

All participants were between 18 and 64 years of age and held a valid driver's license. The driving record for each volunteer was evaluated to eliminate drivers with excessive violations. The criteria for excluding drivers were as follows: (a) more than one violation in the preceding year; (b) more than three recorded violations; and (c) any driving while intoxicated violation.

Forty-three individuals were recruited to participate. Of these, five did not complete the drive because the eye tracker could not be calibrated to track their eye movements accurately. Data from an additional seven participants were excluded as the result of equipment failures (e.g., loose camera). In the end, usable data was collected from 31 participants (12 males, $M = 46$ years; 19 females, $M = 47$ years). Fourteen participants drove at night and 17 drove during the day.

Procedures

Data were collected from two participants per day (beginning at approximately 12:45 p.m. and 7:00 p.m.). Data collection began on September 18, 2009, and was completed on October 26, 2009.

Pre-Data Collection Activities

Participants were greeted by two researchers and asked to complete a fitness to drive questionnaire. This questionnaire focused on drivers' self-reports of alertness and use of substances that might impair driving (e.g., alcohol). All volunteers appeared fit.

Next, the participant and both researchers moved to the eye tracking calibration location and the test vehicle. The calibration procedure took approximately 20 minutes. Calibration of the eye tracking system entailed development of a profile for each participant. This was accomplished by taking multiple photographs of the participant's face as they slowly rotate their head from side to side. The saved photographs include points on the face for subsequent real-time head and eye tracking. Marked coordinates on the face photographs were edited by the experimenter as needed to improve the real-time face tracking. The procedure also included gaze calibration in which participants gazed at nine points on a wall. These points had been carefully plotted on the wall and correspond to the points in the eye tracking system's world model. Gaze calibration relates the individual participant's gaze vectors to known points in the real world. The eye tracking system uses two pulsating infrared sources mounted on the dashboard to create two corneal glints that are used to calculate gaze direction vectors. The glints were captured at 60 Hz. A second set

of cameras (scene cameras), fixed on top of the car close to the driver's viewpoint, were used to produce a video scene of the area ahead. The scene cameras recorded at 25 Hz. A parallax correction algorithm compensated for the distance between the driver's viewpoint and the scene cameras so that later processing could use the gaze vectors to show where in the forward scene the driver was gazing.

If it was not possible to calibrate the eye tracking system to a participant, the participant was dismissed and paid for their time. Causes of calibration failure included reflections from eye glasses, participant height (which put their eyes outside the range of the system), and eyelids that obscure a portion of the pupil.

Practice

After eye-tracker calibration, a short practice drive was made. Participants were shown a map of the route and written turn-by-turn directions prior to beginning the practice drive. Throughout the drive, verbal directions were provided by a GPS device.

During the practice drive, a researcher in the rear seat of the vehicle monitored the accuracy of eye tracking. If the system was tracking poorly, additional calibration was performed. If the calibration could not be improved, the participant was paid for their time and dismissed.

Data Collection

Participants drove two test routes (referred to as route A and B). Each route required 25 to 30 minutes to complete and included both freeway and arterial segments. Route A was 13 miles long and contained 6 DCZs. Route B was 16 miles long and contained 4 DCZs. Combined, participants drove in a total of 10 DCZs. Similar to the practice drive, participants were shown a map of the route and written turn-by-turn directions. A GPS device provided turn-by-turn guidance during the drive. Roughly one half of the participants drove route A first and the remaining participants began with route B. A 5 minute break followed the completion of the first route.

During the drives, a researcher in the front passenger seat assisted the driver when additional route guidance was required. The researcher was also tasked with recording near misses and driver errors if these occurred. The researcher in the rear seat monitored the performance of the eye tracker. If the eye tracker performance became unacceptable (i.e., loss of calibration), then the researcher in the rear asked the participant to park in a safe location so that the eye tracker could be recalibrated. This recalibration typically took a minute or two to accomplish.

Debriefing

After driving both routes, the participants provided comments regarding their drives. The comments were in reference to the use of a navigation system. No questions were asked about billboards. The participants were given \$120.00 in cash for their participation.

DATA REDUCTION

Eye Tracking Measures

The Multiple-Analysis of Psychophysical and Performance Signals (MAPPS™) software was used to reduce the eye tracking data.⁽³⁶⁾ The software integrates the video output from the scene cameras with the output from the eye tracking software (e.g., gaze vectors). The analysis software provides an interface in which the gaze vectors determined by the eye tracker can be related to areas or objects in the scene camera view of the world. Analysts can indicate regions of interest (ROIs) in the scene camera views and the analysis software then assigns gaze vectors to the ROIs.

Figure 9 shows a screen capture from the analysis software in which static ROIs have been identified. These static ROIs slice up the scene camera views into six areas. The software also allows for the construction of dynamic ROIs. These are ROIs that move in the video because of own-vehicle movement (e.g., a sign changes position on the display as it is approached by the driver) or because the object moves over time independent of own-vehicle movement (e.g., pedestrian walking along the road, vehicle entering or exiting the road).

Static ROIs need only be entered once for the scenario being analyzed whereas dynamic ROIs need to be entered several times for a given DCZ depending on how the object moves along the video scene; however, not every frame needs to be coded with a dynamic ROI since the software interpolates across frames using the 60-Hz data to compute eye movement statistics.




Figure 9. Screen capture showing static ROIs on a scene video output.

The following ROIs were defined with the analysis software:

Static ROIs

These ROIs were entered once into the software for each participant. The static ROIs for the windshield were divided into top and bottom to have more resolution during the coding process. The subsequent analyses in the report combines the top and bottom portion of these ROIs since it appeared that this additional level of resolution was not needed in order to address research questions:

- Road ahead: bottom portion (approximately 2/3) of the area of the forward roadway (center camera).

- Road ahead top: top portion (approximately 1/3) of the area of the forward roadway (center camera).
- Right side of road bottom: bottom portion (approximately 2/3) of the area to the right of the forward roadway (right camera).
- Right side of road top: top portion (approximately 1/3) of the area to the right of the forward roadway (right camera).
- Left side of road bottom (LSR_B): bottom portion (approximately 2/3) of the area to the left of the forward roadway (left camera).
- Left side of road bottom (LSR_T): top portion (approximately 1/3) of the area to the left of the forward roadway (left camera).
- Inside vehicle: below the panoramic video scene (outside of the view of the cameras, but eye tracking is still possible).
- Top: above the panoramic video scene (outside of the view of the cameras, but eye tracking is still possible).

Dynamic ROIs

These ROIs are created multiple times within a DCZ for stimuli that move relative to the driver:

- Driving-related safety risk: vehicle which posed a potential safety risk to the driver, defined as a car that is/may turn into the driver's direction of travel at a non-signalized or non-stop-controlled intersection (e.g., a car making a U-turn, a car waiting to turn right, or a car waiting to turn left). These vehicles were actively turning or entering the roadway or appeared to be in a position to enter the roadway.
- Target standard billboard: target standard billboard that defines the start and end of the DCZ.
- Other standard billboard: standard billboard(s) located in the DCZ, other than the target standard billboard or the target digital billboard.
- CEVMS: target digital billboard that defines the start and end of the DCZ.

The software determines the gaze intersection for each 60 Hz frame and assigns it to an ROI. In subsequent analyses and discussion, gaze intersections are referred to as gazes. Since ROIs may overlap, the software allows for the specification of priority for each ROI such that the ROI with the highest priority gets the gaze vector intersection assigned to it. For example, an ROI for a CEVMS may also be in the static ROI for the road ahead.

The 60 Hz temporal resolution of the eye tracking software does not provide sufficient information to make detailed analysis of saccade characteristics,¹ such as latency or speed. The analysis software uses three parameters in the determination of a fixation: a fixation radius, fixation duration, and a time out. The determination begins with a single-gaze vector intersection. Any subsequent intersection within a specified radius will be considered part of a fixation if the minimum fixation duration criterion is met. The radius parameter used in this study was 2 degrees and the minimum duration was 100 ms. The 2-degree selection was based on the estimated accuracy of the eye tracking system, as recommended by Recarte and Nunes.⁽³⁷⁾ The 100 ms minimum duration is consistent with many other published studies; however, some investigators use minimums of as little as 60 ms.^(37,38) Because of mini-saccades and noise in the eye tracking system, it is possible to have brief excursions outside the 2 degree window for a fixation. In this study, an excursion time outside the 2-degree radius of less than 90 ms was ignored. Once the gaze intersection fell outside the 2-degree radius of a fixation for more than 90 ms, the process of identifying a fixation began anew.

Other Measures

Driving Behavior Measures

During data collection, the front-seat researcher observed the driver's behavior and the driving environment. The researcher used the following subjective categories in observing the participant's driving behavior:

- **Driver Error:** signified any error on behalf of the driver in which the researcher felt slightly uncomfortable, but not to a significant degree (e.g., driving on an exit ramp too quickly, turning too quickly).
- **Near Miss:** signified any event in which the researcher felt uncomfortable due to driver response to external sources (e.g., slamming on brakes, swerving). A near miss is the extreme case of a driver error.
- **Incident:** signified any event in the roadway which may have had a potential impact on the attention of the driver and/or the flow of traffic (e.g., crash, emergency vehicle, animal, construction, train).

These observations were entered into a notebook computer linked to the research vehicle data collection system.

Level of Service Estimates

For each participant and each DCZ the analyst estimated the level of service of the road as they reviewed the scene camera video. One location per DCZ was selected (approximately halfway through the DCZ) where the number of vehicles in front of the research vehicle was counted. The procedure entailed (1) counting the number of travel lanes visible in the video, (2) using the

¹ During visual scanning, the point of gaze alternates between brief pauses (ocular fixations) and rapid shifts (saccades).

skip lines on the road to estimate the approximate distance in front of the vehicle that constituted the analysis zone, and (3) counting the number of vehicles present within the analysis zone. Vehicle density was calculated with the formula:

$$\text{Vehicle Density} = [(\text{Number of Vehicles in Analysis Zone})/(\text{Distance of Analysis Zone in ft}/5280)]/\text{Number of Lanes.}$$

Vehicle density is the number of vehicles per mile per lane.

Vehicle Speed

The speed of the research vehicle was recorded with GPS and a distance measurement instrument. Vehicle speed was used principally to ensure that the eye tracking data was recorded while the vehicle was in motion.

RESULTS

Results are presented with respect to the photometric measures of signs, the visual complexity of the DCZs, and the eye tracking measures. Photometric measurements were taken and analyzed to characterize the billboards in the study based on their luminance and contrasts, which are related to how bright the signs are perceived to be by drivers.

Photometric Measurements

Luminance

The mean daytime luminance of both the standard billboards and CEVMS was greater than at night. Nighttime luminance measurements reflect the fact that CEVMS use illuminating LED components while standard billboards are often illuminated from below by metal halide lamps. At night, CEVMS have a greater average luminance than standard billboards. Table 3 presents summary statistics for luminance as a function of time of day for the CEVMS and standard billboards.

Contrast

The daytime and nighttime Weber contrast ratios for both types of billboards are shown in table 3. Both CEVMS and standard billboards had contrast ratios that were close to zero (the surroundings were about equal in brightness to the signs) during the daytime. On the other hand, at night the CEVMS and standard billboards had positive contrast ratios (the signs were brighter than the surrounding), with the CEVMS having higher contrast than the standard billboards.

Table 3. Summary of luminance (cd/m^2) and contrast (Weber ratio) measurements.

	<i>Luminance (cd/m^2)</i>		<i>Contrast</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St. Dev.</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St.Dev.</i>
<i>Day</i>				
CEVMS	2126	798.81	-0.10	0.54
Standard Billboard	2993	2787.22	-0.27	0.84
<i>Night</i>				
CEVMS	56.00	23.16	73.72	56.92
Standard Billboard	17.80	17.11	36.01	30.93

Visual Complexity

The DCZs were characterized by their overall visual complexity or clutter. For each DCZ, five pictures were taken from the driver’s viewpoint at various locations within the DCZ. In Reading, the pictures were taken from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. In Richmond, one route was photographed from 11:00 a.m. to noon and the other from 2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. The pictures were taken at the start of the DCZ, quarter of the way through, half of the way through, three quarters of the way through, and at the end of the DCZ. The photographs were analyzed with MATLAB® routines that computed a measure of feature congestion for each image. Figure 10 shows the mean feature congestion measures for each of the DCZ environments. The arterial control condition was shown to have the highest level of clutter as measured by feature congestion. An analysis of variance was performed on the feature congestion measure to determine if the conditions differed significantly from each other. The four conditions with off-premise advertising did not differ significantly with respect to feature congestion; $F(3,36) = 1.25, p > 0.05$. Based on the feature congestion measure, the results indicate that the four conditions with off-premise advertising were equated with respect to the overall visual complexity of the driving scenes.




Figure 10. Mean feature congestion as a function of advertising condition and road type (standard errors for the mean are included in the graph).

Effects of Billboards on Gazes to the Road Ahead

For each 60 Hz frame, a determination was made as to the direction of the gaze vector. Previous research has shown that gazes do not need to be separated into saccades and fixations before calculating such measures as percent of time or the probability of looking to the road ahead.⁽³⁹⁾ This analysis examines the degree to which drivers gaze toward the road ahead across the different advertising conditions as a function of road type and time of day. Gazing toward the road ahead is critical for driving, and so the analysis examines the degree to which gazes toward this area are affected by the independent variables (advertising type, type of road, and time of day) and their interactions.

Generalized estimating equations (GEE) were used to analyze the probability of a participant gazing at driving-related information.^(40,41) The data for these analyses were not normally distributed and included repeated measures. The GEE model is appropriate for these types of data and analyses. Note that for all results included in this report, Wald statistics were the chosen alternative to likelihood ratio statistics because GEE uses quasi-likelihood instead of maximum likelihood.⁽⁴²⁾ For this analysis, road ahead included the following ROIs (as previously described and displayed in figure 9): road ahead, road ahead top, and driving-related risks. A logistic regression model for repeated measures was generated by using a binomial response distribution and Logit (i.e., log odds) link function. Only two possible outcomes are allowed when selecting a binomial response distribution. Thus, a variable (RoadAhead) was created to classify a participant's gaze behavior. If the participant gazed toward the road ahead, road ahead top, or driving-related risks, then the value of RoadAhead was set to one. If the participant gazed at any other object in the panoramic scene, then the value of RoadAhead was set to zero. Logistic regression typically models the probability of a success. In the current analysis, a success would be a gaze to road ahead information (RoadAhead = 1) and a failure would be a gaze toward non-road ahead information (RoadAhead = 0). The resultant value was the probability of a participant gazing at road-ahead information.

Time of day (day or night), road type (freeway or arterial), advertising condition (CEVMS, standard billboard, or control), and all corresponding second-order interactions were explanatory variables in the logistic regression model. The interaction of advertising condition by road type was statistically significant, $\chi^2(2) = 6.3, p = 0.043$. Table 4 shows the corresponding probabilities for gazing at the road ahead as a function of advertising condition and road type.

Table 4. The probability of gazing at the road ahead as a function of advertising condition and road type.

<i>Advertising Condition</i>	<i>Arterial</i>	<i>Freeway</i>
Control	0.92	0.86
CEVMS	0.82	0.73
Standard	0.80	0.77

Follow-up analyses for the interaction used Tukey-Kramer adjustments with an alpha level of 0.05. The arterial control condition had the greatest probability of looking at the road ahead ($M = 0.92$). This probability differed significantly from the remaining five probabilities. On

arterials, the probability of gazing at the road ahead did not differ between the CEVMS (M = 0.82) and the standard billboard (M = 0.80) DCZs. In contrast, there was a significant difference in this probability on freeways, where standard billboard DCZs yielded a higher probability (M = 0.77) than CEVMS DCZs (M = 0.73). The probability of gazing at the road ahead was also significantly higher in the freeway control DCZ (M = 0.86) than in either of the corresponding freeway off-premise advertising DCZs. The probability of gazing at road-ahead information in arterial CEVMS DCZs was not statistically different from the same probability in the freeway control DCZ.

Additional descriptive statistics were computed to determine the probability of gazing at the various ROIs that were defined in the panoramic scene. Some of the ROIs depicted in figure 9 were combined in the following fashion for ease of analysis:

- Road ahead, road ahead top, and driving-related risks combined to form *road ahead*.
- Left side of road bottom and left side of road top combined to form *left side of vehicle*.
- Right side of road bottom and right side of road top combined to form *right side of vehicle*.
- Inside vehicle and top combined to form *participant vehicle*.

Table 5 presents the probability of gazing at the different ROIs.

Table 5. Probability of gazing at ROIs for the three advertising conditions on arterials and freeways.

<i>Road Type</i>	<i>ROI</i>	<i>CEVMS</i>	<i>Standard Billboard</i>	<i>Control</i>
<i>Arterial</i>	<i>CEVMS</i>	0.07	N/A	N/A
	<i>Left Side of Vehicle</i>	0.06	0.06	0.02
	<i>Road ahead</i>	0.82	0.80	0.92
	<i>Right Side of Vehicle</i>	0.03	0.06	0.04
	<i>Standard Billboard</i>	N/A	0.03	N/A
	<i>Participant Vehicle</i>	0.03	0.05	0.02
<i>Freeway</i>	<i>CEVMS</i>	0.05	N/A	N/A
	<i>Left Side of Vehicle</i>	0.08	0.07	0.04
	<i>Road ahead</i>	0.73	0.77	0.86
	<i>Right Side of Vehicle</i>	0.09	0.02	0.05
	<i>Standard Billboard</i>	0.02*	0.09	N/A
	<i>Participant Vehicle</i>	0.04	0.05	0.05

* The CEVMS DCZs on freeways each contained one visible standard billboard.

The probability of gazing away from the forward roadway ranged from 0.08 to 0.27. In particular, the probability of gazing toward a CEVMS was greater on arterials (M = 0.07) than on freeways (M = 0.05). In contrast, the probability of gazing toward a target standard billboard was greater on freeways (M = 0.09) than on arterials (M = 0.03).

Fixations to CEVMS and Standard Billboards

About 2.4 percent of the fixations were to CEVMS. The mean fixation duration to a CEVMS was 388 ms and the maximum duration was 1,251 ms. Figure 11 shows the distribution of fixation durations to CEVMS during the day and night. In the daytime, the mean fixation duration to a CEVMS was 389 ms and at night it was 387 ms. Figure 12 shows the distribution of fixation durations to standard billboards. Approximately 2.4 percent of fixations were to standard billboards. The mean fixation duration to standard billboards was 341 ms during the daytime and 370 ms at night. The maximum fixation duration to standard billboards was 1,284 ms (which occurred at night). For comparison purposes, figure 13 shows the distribution of fixation durations to the road ahead (i.e., top and bottom road ahead ROIs) during the day and night. In the daytime, the mean fixation duration to the road ahead was 365 ms and at night it was 390 ms.




Figure 11. Distribution of fixation duration for CEVMS in the daytime and nighttime.




Figure 12. Distribution of fixation duration for standard billboards in the daytime and nighttime.




Figure 13. Distribution of fixation duration for road ahead (i.e., top and bottom road ahead ROIs) in the daytime and nighttime.

Dwell times on CEVMS and standard billboards were also examined. Dwell time is the duration of back-to-back fixations to the same ROI.^(43,44) The dwell times represent the cumulative time for the back-to-back fixations. Whereas there may be no long, single fixation to a billboard, there might still be multiple fixations that yield long dwell times. There were a total of 25 separate instances of multiple fixations to CEVMS with a mean of 2.4 fixations (minimum of 2 and maximum of 5). The 25 dwell times came from 15 different participants distributed across four different CEVMS. The mean duration of these dwell times was 994 ms (minimum of 418 ms and maximum of 1,467 ms).

For standard billboards, there were a total of 17 separate dwell times with a mean of 3.47 sequential fixations (minimum of 2 fixations and maximum of 8 fixations). The 17 dwell times came from 11 different participants distributed across 4 different standard billboards. The mean duration of these multiple fixations was 1,172 ms (minimum of 418 ms and maximum of 3,319 ms). There were three dwell-time durations that were greater than 2,000 ms. These are described in more detail below.

In some cases several dwell times came from the same participant. In order to compute a statistic on the difference between dwell times for CEVMS and standard billboards, average dwell times were computed per participant for the CEVMS and standard billboard conditions. These average values were used in a t-test assuming unequal variances. The difference in average dwell time between CEVMS ($M = 981$ ms) and standard billboards ($M = 1,386$ ms) was not statistically significant, $t(12) = -1.40$, $p > .05$.

Figure 14 through figure 23 show heat maps for the dwell-time durations to the standard billboards that were greater than 2,000 ms. These heat maps are snapshots from the DCZ and attempt to convey in two dimensions the pattern of gazes that took place in a three dimensional world. The heat maps are set to look back approximately one to two seconds and integrate over time where the participant was gazing in the scene camera video. The green color in the heat map indicates the concentration of gaze over the past one to two seconds. The blue line indicates the gaze trail over the past one to two seconds.

Figure 14 through figure 16 are for a DCZ on an arterial at night. The standard billboard was on the right side of the road (indicated by a pink rectangle). There were eight fixations to this billboard, and the single fixations were between 200 to 384 ms in duration. The dwell time for this billboard was 2,019 ms. At the start of the DCZ (see figure 14), the driver was directing his/her gaze to the forward roadway. Approaching the standard billboard, the driver began to fixate on the billboard. However, the billboard was still relatively close to the road ahead ROI.




Figure 14. Heat map for the start of a DCZ for a standard billboard at night on an arterial.




Figure 15. Heat map for the middle of a DCZ for a standard billboard at night on an arterial.



Figure 16. Heat map near the end of a DCZ for a standard billboard at night on an arterial.

Figure 17 through figure 19 are for a DCZ on a freeway at night. The standard billboard was on the right side of the road (indicated by a green rectangle). There were six consecutive fixations to this billboard, and the single fixations were between 200 and 801 ms in duration. The dwell time for this billboard was 2,753 ms. At the start of the DCZ (see figure 17), the driver was directing his/her gaze to a freeway guide sign in the road ahead and the standard billboard was to the left of the freeway guide sign. As the driver approached the standard billboard, his/her gaze was directed toward the billboard. The billboard was relatively close to the top and bottom road ahead ROIs. Near the end of the DCZ (see figure 19), the billboard was accurately portrayed as being on the right side of the road.



Figure 17. Heat map for start of a DCZ for a standard billboard at night on a freeway.




Figure 18. Heat map for middle of a DCZ for a standard billboard at night on a freeway.




Figure 19. Heat map near the end of a DCZ for a standard billboard at night on a freeway.

Figure 20 through figure 23 are for a DCZ on a freeway during the day. The standard billboard was on the right side of the road (indicated by a pink rectangle). This is the same DCZ that was discussed in figure 17 through figure 19. There were six consecutive fixations to this billboard, and the single fixations were between 217 and 767 ms in duration. The dwell time for this billboard was 3,319 ms. At the start of the DCZ (see figure 20), the driver was principally directing his/her gaze to the road ahead. Figure 21 and figure 22 show the location along the DCZ where gaze was directed toward the standard billboard. The billboard was relatively close to the top and bottom road-ahead ROIs. As the driver passed the standard billboard, his/her gaze returned to the road ahead (see figure 23).




Figure 20. Heat map for the start of a DCZ for a standard billboard in the daytime on a freeway.



Figure 21. Heat map near the middle of a DCZ for a standard billboard in the daytime on a freeway.




Figure 22. Heat map near the end of DCZ for standard billboard in the daytime on a freeway.




Figure 23. Heat map at the end of DCZ for standard billboard in the daytime on a freeway.

Comparison of Gazes to CEVMS and Standard Billboards

The GEE were used to analyze whether a participant gazed more toward CEVMS than toward standard billboards, given that the participant was gazing at off-premise advertising. With this analysis method, a logistic regression model for repeated measures was generated by using a binomial response distribution and Logit link function. First, the data was partitioned to include only those instances when a participant was gazing toward off-premise advertising (either to a CEVMS or to a standard billboard); all other gaze behavior was excluded from the input data set. Only two possible outcomes are allowed when selecting a binomial response distribution. Thus, a variable (SBB_CEVMS) was created to classify a participant's gaze behavior. If the participant gazed toward a CEVMS, the value of SBB_CEVMS was set to one. If the participant gazed toward a standard billboard, then the value of SBB_CEVMS was set to zero.

Logistic regression typically models the probability of a success. In the current analysis, a success would be a gaze to a CEVMS (SBB_CEVMS = 1) and a failure would be a gaze to a standard billboard (SBB_CEVMS = 0).² A success probability greater than 0.5 indicates there were more successes than failures in the sample. Therefore, if the sample probability of the response variable (i.e., SBB_CEVMS) was greater than 0.5, this would show that participants gazed more toward CEVMS than toward standard billboards when the participants gazed at off-premise advertising. In contrast, if the sample probability of the response variable was less than 0.5, then participants showed a preference to gaze more toward standard billboards than toward CEVMS when directing gazes to off-premise advertising.

Time of day (i.e., day or night), road type (i.e., freeway or arterial), and the corresponding interaction were explanatory variables in the logistic regression model. Road type was the only predictor to have a significant effect, $\chi^2(1) = 13.17, p < 0.001$. On arterials, participants gazed more toward CEVMS than toward standard billboards (M = 0.63). In contrast, participants gazed more toward standard billboards than toward CEVMS when driving on freeways (M = 0.33).

Observation of Driver Behavior

No near misses or driver errors were observed in Reading.

Level of Service

The mean vehicle densities were converted to level of service as shown in table 6.⁽⁴⁵⁾ As expected, less congestion occurred at night than in the day. In general, there was traffic during the data collection runs. Review of the scene camera data verified that all eye tracking data within the DCZs were recorded while the vehicle was in motion.

² Success and failure are not used to reflect the merits of either type of sign, but only for statistical purposes.

Table 6. Level of service as a function of advertising type, road type, and time of day.

	<i>Arterial</i>		<i>Freeway</i>	
	Day	Night	Day	Night
Control	B	A	C	B
CEVMS	C	A	B	A
Standard	A	A	B	A

DISCUSSION OF READING RESULTS

Overall the probability of gazing at the road ahead was high and similar in magnitude to what has been found in other field studies addressing billboards.^(11,9,12) For the DCZs on freeways, CEVMS showed a lower proportion of gazes to the road ahead than the standard billboard condition, and both off-premise advertising conditions had lower probability of gazes to the road ahead than the control. On the other hand, on the arterials, the CEVMS and standard billboard conditions did not differ from each other but were significantly different from their respective control condition. Though the CEVMS condition on the freeway had the lowest proportion of gazes to the road ahead, in this condition there was a lower proportion of gazes to CEVMS as compared to the arterials (see table 5 for the trade-off of gazes to the different ROIs). A greater proportion of gazes to other ROIs (left side of the road, right side of the road, and participant vehicle) contributed to the decrease in proportion of gazes to the road ahead. Also, for the CEVMS on freeways, there were a few gazes to a standard billboard located in the same DCZ and there were more gazes distributed to the left and right side of the road than in standard billboard and control conditions. The gazes to ROIs other than CEVMS contributed to the lower probability of gazes to the road ahead in this condition.

The control condition on the arterial had buildings along the sides of the road and generally presented a visually cluttered area. As was presented earlier, the feature congestion measure computed on a series of photographs from each DCZ showed a significantly higher feature congestion score for the control condition on arterials as compared to all of the other DCZs. Nevertheless, the highest probability for gazing at the road ahead was seen in the control condition on the arterial.

The area with the highest feature congestion, especially on the sides of the road, had the highest probability for drivers looking at the road ahead. Bottom-up or stimulus driven measures of salience or visual clutter have been useful in predicting visual search and the effects of visual salience in laboratory tasks.^(34,46) These measures of salience basically consider the stimulus characteristics (e.g., size, color, brightness) independent of the requirements of the task or plans that an individual may have. Models of visual salience may predict that buildings and other prominent features on the side of the road may be visually salient objects and thus would attract a driver's attention.⁽⁴⁷⁾ Figure 24 shows an example of a roadway photograph that was analyzed with the Salience Toolbox based on the Itti et al. implementation of a saliency based model of bottom-up attention.^(48,49) The numbered circles in figure 24 are the first through fifth salient areas selected by the software. Based on this software, the most salient areas in the photographs are the buildings on the sides of the road where the road ahead (and a car) is the fifth selected salient area.




Figure 24. Example of identified salient areas in a road scene based on bottom-up analysis.

It appears that in the present study participants principally kept their eyes on the road even in the presence of visual clutter on the sides of the road, which supports the hypothesis that drivers tend to look toward information relevant to the task at hand.^(50,26,22) In the case of the driving task, visual clutter may be more of an issue with respect to crowding that may affect the driver's ability to detect visual information in the periphery.⁽⁵¹⁾ Crowding is generally defined as the negative effect of nearby objects or features on visual discrimination of a target.⁽⁵²⁾ Crowding impairs the ability to recognize objects in clutter and principally affects perception in peripheral vision. However, crowding effects were not analyzed in the present study.

Stimulus salience, clutter, and the nature of the task at hand interact in visual perception. For tasks such as driving, the task demands tend to outweigh stimulus salience when it comes to gaze control. Clutter may be more of an issue with the detection and recognition of objects in peripheral vision (e.g., detecting a sign on the side of the road) that are surrounded by other stimuli that result in a crowding effect.

The mean fixation durations to CEVMS, standard billboards, and the road ahead were found to be very similar. Also, there were no long fixations (greater than 2,000 ms) to CEVMS or standard billboards. The examination of multiple sequential fixations to CEVMS yielded average dwell times that were less than 1,000 ms. However, when examining the tails of the distribution, there were three dwell times to standard billboards that were in excess of 2,000 ms (the three dwell times came from three different participants to two different billboards). These three standard billboards were dwelled upon when they were near the road ahead area but drivers quit gazing at the signs as they neared them and the signs were no longer near the forward field of view. Though there were three dwell times for standard billboards greater than 2,000 ms, the difference in average dwell times for CEVMS and standard billboards was not significant.

Using a gaze duration of 2,000 ms away from the road ahead as a criterion indicative of increased risk has been developed principally as it relates to looking inside the vehicle to in-vehicle information systems and other devices (e.g., for texting) where the driver is indeed looking completely away from the road ahead.^(14,53,54) The fixations to the standard billboards in the present case showed a long dwell time for a billboard. However, unlike gazing or fixating inside the vehicle, the driver's gaze was within the forward roadway where peripheral vision could be used to monitor for hazards and for vehicle control. Peripheral vision has been shown to be important for lane keeping, visual search orienting, and monitoring of surrounding objects.^(55,56)

The results showed that drivers were more likely to gaze at CEVMS on arterials and at standard billboards on freeways. Though every attempt was made to select CEVMS and standard billboard DCZs that were equated on important parameters (e.g., which side of the road the sign was located on, type of road, level of visual clutter), the CEVMS DCZs on freeways had a greater setback from the road (133 ft for both CEVMS) than the standard billboards (10 and 35 ft). Signs with greater setback from the road would in a sense move out of the forward view (road ahead) more quickly than signs that are closer to the road. The CEVMS and standard billboards on the arterials were more closely matched with respect to setback from the road (12 and 43 ft for CEVMS and 20 and 40 ft for standard billboards).

The differences in setback from the road for CEVMS and standard billboards may also account for differences in dwell times to these two types of billboards. However, on arterials where the CEVMS and standard billboards were more closely matched there was only one long dwell time (greater than 2,000 ms) and it was to a standard billboard at night.

RICHMOND

The objectives of the second study were the same as those in the first study, and the design of the Richmond data collection effort was very similar to that employed in Reading. This study was conducted to replicate as closely as possible the design of Reading in a different driving environment. The independent variables included the type of DCZ (CEVMS, standard billboard, or no off-premise advertising), time of day (day or night) and road type (freeway or arterial). As with Reading, the time of day was a between-subjects variable and the other variables were within subjects.

METHOD

Selection of DCZ Limits

Selection of the DCZ limits procedure was the same as that employed in Reading.

Advertising Type

Three DCZ types (similar to those used in Reading) were used in Richmond:

- **CEVMS.** DCZs contained one target CEVMS.
- **Standard billboard.** DCZs contained one target standard billboard.
- **Control conditions.** DCZs did not contain any off-premise advertising.

There were an equal number of CEVMS and standard billboard DCZs on freeways and arterials. Also, there two DCZ that did not contain off-premise advertising with one located on a freeway and the other on an arterial.

Table 7 is an inventory of the target employed in this second study.

Table 7. Inventory of target billboards in Richmond with relevant parameters.

<i>DCZ</i>	<i>Advertising Type</i>	<i>Copy Dimensions (ft)</i>	<i>Side of Road</i>	<i>Setback from Road (ft)</i>	<i>Other Standard Billboards</i>	<i>Approach Length (ft)</i>	<i>Roadway Type</i>
5	CONTROL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	710	Arterial
3	CONTROL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	845	Freeway
9	CEVMS	14'0" x 28'0"	L	37	0	696	Arterial
13	CEVMS	14'0" x 28'0"	R	37	0	602	Arterial
2	CEVMS	12'5" x 40'0"	R	91	0	297	Freeway
8	CEVMS	11'0" x 23'0"	L	71	0	321	Freeway
10	Standard	14'0" x 48'0"	L	79	1	857	Arterial
12	Standard	10'6" x 45'3"	R	79	2	651	Arterial
1	Standard	14'0" x 48'0"	L	87	0	997	Freeway
7	Standard	14'0" x 48'0"	R	88	0	816	Freeway

* N/A indicates that there were no off-premise advertising in these areas and these values are undefined.

Figure 25 through figure 30 below represent various pairings of DCZ type and road type. Target off-premise billboards are indicated by red rectangles.



Figure 25. Example of a CEVMS DCZ on a freeway.




Figure 26. Example of CEVMS DCZ an arterial.




Figure 27. Example of a standard billboard DCZ on a freeway.



Figure 28. Example of a standard billboard DCZ on an arterial.



Figure 29. Example of a control DCZ on a freeway.



Figure 30. Example of a control DCZ on an arterial.

Photometric Measurement of Signs

The methods and procedures for the photometric measures were the same as for Reading.

Visual Complexity

The methods and procedures for visual complexity measurement were the same as for Reading.

Participants

A total of 41 participants were recruited for the study. Of these, 6 participants did not complete data collection because of an inability to properly calibrate with the eye tracking system, and 11 were excluded because of equipment failures. A total of 24 participants (13 male, $M = 28$ years; 11 female, $M = 25$ years) successfully completed the drive. Fourteen people participated during the day and 10 participated at night.

Procedures

Research participants were recruited locally by means of visits to public libraries, student unions, community centers, etc. A large number of the participants were recruited from a nearby university, resulting in a lower mean participant age than in Reading.

Participant Testing

Two people participated each day. One person participated during the day beginning at approximately 12:45 p.m. The second participated at night beginning at around 7:00 p.m. Data collection ran from November 20, 2009, through April 23, 2010. There were several long gaps in the data collection schedule due to holidays and inclement weather.

Pre-Data Collection Activities

This was the same as in Reading.

Practice Drive

Except for location, this was the same as in Reading.

Data Collection

The procedure was much the same as in Reading. On average, each test route required approximately 30 to 35 minutes to complete. As in Reading, the routes included a variety of freeway and arterial driving segments. One route was 15 miles long and contained two target CEVMS, two target standard billboards, and two DCZs with no off-premise advertising. The second route was 20 miles long and had two target CEVMS and two target standard billboards.

The data collection drives in this second study were longer than those in Reading. The eye tracking system had problems dealing with the large files that resulted. To mitigate this technical difficulty, participants were asked to pull over in a safe location during the middle of each data collection drive so that new data files could be initiated.

Upon completion of the data collection, the participant was instructed to return to the designated meeting location for debriefing.

Debriefing

This was the same as in Reading.

DATA REDUCTION

Eye Tracking Measures

The approach and procedures were the same as used in Reading.

Other Measures

The approach and procedures were the same as used in Reading.

RESULTS

Photometric Measurement of Signs

The photometric measurements were performed using the same equipment and procedures that were employed in Reading with a few minor changes. Photometric measurements were taken during the day and at night. Measurements of the standard billboards were taken at an average distance of 284 ft, with maximum and minimum distances of 570 ft and 43 ft, respectively. The average distance of measurements for the CEVMS was 479 ft, with maximum and minimum distances of 972 ft and 220 ft, respectively. Again, the distances employed were significantly affected by the requirement to find a safe location on the road from which to take the measurements.

Luminance

The mean luminance of CEVMS and standard billboards, during daytime and nighttime are shown below in table 8. The results here are similar to those for Reading.

Contrast

The daytime and nighttime Weber contrast ratios for both types of billboards are shown in table 8. During the day, the contrast ratios of both CEVMS and standard billboards were close to zero (the surroundings were about equal in brightness to the signs). At night, the CEVMS and standard billboards had positive contrast ratios. Similar to Reading, the CEVMS showed a higher contrast ratio than the standard billboards at night.

Table 8. Summary of luminance (cd/m^2) and contrast (Weber ratio) measurements.

	<i>Luminance (cd/m^2)</i>		<i>Contrast</i>	
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.
<i>Day</i>				
CEVMS	2134	798.70	-0.20	0.53
Standard Billboard	3063	2730.92	0.03	0.32
<i>Night</i>				
CEVMS	56.44	16.61	69.70	59.18
Standard Billboard	8.00	5.10	6.56	3.99

Visual Complexity

As with Reading, the feature congestion measure was used to estimate the level of visual complexity/clutter in the DCZs. The analysis procedures were the same as for Reading.

Figure 31 shows the mean feature congestion measures for each of the advertising types (standard errors are included in the figure). Unlike the results for Reading, the selected off-premise advertising DCZs for Richmond differed in terms of mean feature congestion; $F(3, 36) = 3.95, p = 0.016$. Follow up t-tests with an alpha of 0.05 showed that the CEVMS DCZs on arterials had significantly lower feature congestion than all of the other off-premise advertising conditions. None of the remaining DCZs with off-premise advertising differed from each other. The selection of DCZs for the conditions with off-premise advertising took into account the type of road, the side of the road the target billboard was placed, and the perceived level of visual clutter. Based on the feature congestion measure, these results indicated that the conditions with off-premise advertising were not equated with respect to level of visual clutter.




Figure 31. Mean feature congestion as a function of advertising condition and road type.

Effects of Billboards on Gazes to the Road Ahead

As was done for the data from Reading, GEE were used to analyze the probability of a participant gazing at the road ahead. A logistic regression model for repeated measures was generated by using a binomial response distribution and Logit link function. The resultant value was the probability of a participant gazing at the road ahead (as previously defined).

Time of day (day or night), road type (freeway or arterial), advertising type (CEVMS, standard billboard, or control), and all corresponding second-order interactions were explanatory variables in the logistic regression model. The interaction of advertising type by road type was statistically significant, $\chi^2(2) = 14.19, p < 0.001$. Table 9 shows the corresponding probability of gazing at the road ahead as a function of advertising condition and road type.

Table 9. The probability of gazing at the road ahead as a function of advertising condition and road type.

<i>Advertising Condition</i>	<i>Arterial</i>	<i>Freeway</i>
Control	0.78	0.92
CEVMS	0.76	0.82
Standard	0.81	0.85

Follow-up analyses for the interaction used Tukey-Kramer adjustments with an alpha level of 0.05. The freeway control had the greatest probability of gazing at the road ahead ($M = 0.92$). This probability differed significantly from the remaining five probabilities. On arterials, there were no significant differences among the probabilities of gazing at the road ahead among the three advertising conditions. On freeways, there was no significant difference between the probability associated with CEVMS DCZs and the probability associated with standard billboard DCZs.

Additional descriptive statistics were computed for the three advertising types to determine the probability of gazing at the ROIs that were defined in the panoramic scene. As was done with the data from Reading, some of the ROIs were combined for ease of analysis. Table 10 presents the probability of gazing at the different ROIs.

Table 10. Probability of gazing at ROIs for the three advertising conditions on arterials and freeways.

<i>Road Type</i>	<i>ROI</i>	<i>CEVMS</i>	<i>Standard Billboard</i>	<i>Control</i>
<i>Arterial</i>	<i>CEVMS</i>	0.06	N/A	N/A
	<i>Left Side of Vehicle</i>	0.03	0.05	0.04
	<i>Road ahead</i>	0.76	0.81	0.78
	<i>Right Side of Vehicle</i>	0.07	0.06	0.09
	<i>Standard Billboard</i>	N/A	0.02	N/A
	<i>Participant Vehicle</i>	0.07	0.06	0.09
<i>Freeway</i>	<i>CEVMS</i>	0.05	N/A	N/A
	<i>Left Side of Vehicle</i>	0.03	0.01	0.01
	<i>Road ahead</i>	0.82	0.85	0.92
	<i>Right Side of Vehicle</i>	0.04	0.04	0.03
	<i>Standard Billboard</i>	N/A	0.04	N/A
	<i>Participant Vehicle</i>	0.06	0.06	0.05

The probability of gazing away from the forward roadway ranged from 0.08 to 0.24. In particular, the probability of gazing toward a CEVMS was slightly greater on arterials ($M = 0.06$) than on freeways ($M = 0.05$). In contrast, the probability of gazing toward a standard billboard was greater on freeways ($M = 0.04$) than on arterials ($M = 0.02$). In both situations, the probability of gazing at the road ahead was greatest on freeways.

Fixations to CEVMS and Standard Billboards

About 2.5 percent of the fixations were to CEVMS. The mean fixation duration to a CEVMS was 371 ms and the maximum fixation duration was 1,335 ms. Figure 32 shows the distribution of fixation durations to CEVMS during the day and at night. In the daytime, the mean fixation duration to a CEVMS was 440 ms and at night it was 333 ms. Approximately 1.5 percent of the fixations were to standard billboards. The mean fixation duration to standard billboards was 318 ms and the maximum fixation duration was 801 ms. Figure 33 shows the distribution of fixation durations for standard billboards. The mean fixation duration to a standard billboard was 313 ms and 325 ms during the day and night, respectively. For comparison purposes, figure 34 shows the distribution of fixation durations to the road ahead during the day and night. In the daytime, the mean fixation duration to the road ahead was 378 ms and at night it was 358 ms.




Figure 32. Fixation duration for CEVMS in the day and at night.




Figure 33. Fixation duration for standard billboards in the day and at night.




Figure 34. Fixation duration for the road ahead in the day and at night.

As was done with the data for Reading, the record of fixations was examined to determine dwell times to CEVMS and standard billboards. There were a total of 21 separate dwell times to CEVMS with a mean of 2.86 sequential fixations (minimum of 2 fixations and maximum of 6 fixations). The 21 dwell times came from 12 different participants and four different CEVMS. The mean dwell time duration to the CEVMS was 1,039 ms (minimum of 500 ms and maximum of 2,720 ms). There was one dwell time greater than 2,000 ms to CEVMS. To the standard billboards there were 13 separate dwell times with a mean of 2.31 sequential fixations (minimum of 2 fixations and maximum of 3 fixations). The 13 dwell times came from 11 different participants and four different standard billboards. The mean dwell time duration to the standard billboards was 687 ms (minimum of 450 ms and maximum of 1,152 ms). There were no dwell times greater than 2,000 ms to standard billboards.

In some cases several dwell times came from the same participant. To compute a statistic on the difference between dwell times for CEVMS and standard billboards, average dwell times were computed per participant for the CEVMS and standard billboard conditions. These average values were used in a *t*-test assuming unequal variances. The difference in average dwell time between CEVMS ($M = 1,096$ ms) and standard billboards ($M = 674$ ms) was statistically significant, $t(14) = 2.23$, $p = .043$.

Figure 35 through figure 37 show heat maps for the dwell-time durations to the CEVMS that were greater than 2,000 ms. The DCZ was on a freeway during the daytime. The CEVMS is located on the left side of the road (indicated by an orange rectangle). There were three fixations to this billboard, and the single fixations were between 651 ms and 1,335 ms. The dwell time for this billboard was 2,270 ms. Figure 35 shows the first fixation toward the CEVMS. There are no vehicles near the participant in his/her respective travel lane or adjacent lanes. In this situation, the billboard is relatively close to the road ahead ROI. Figure 36 shows a heat map later in the DCZ where the driver continues to look at the CEVMS. The heat map does not overlay the CEVMS in the picture since the heat map has integrated over time where the driver was gazing. The CEVMS has moved out of the area because of the vehicle moving down the road. However, visual inspection of the video and eye tracking statistics showed that the driver was fixating on the CEVMS. Figure 37 shows the end of the sequential fixations to the CEVMS. The driver returns to gaze directly in front of the vehicle. Once the CEVMS was out of the forward field of view, the driver quit looking at the billboard.




Figure 35. Heat map for first fixation to CEVMS with long dwell time.




Figure 36. Heat map for later fixations to CEVMS with long dwell time.




Figure 37. Heat map at end of fixations to CEVMS with long dwell time.

Comparison of Gazes to CEVMS and Standard Billboards

As was done for the data from Reading, GEE were used to analyze whether a participant gazed more toward CEVMS than toward standard billboards, given that the participant was looking at off-premise advertising. Recall that a sample probability greater than 0.5 indicated that participants gazed more toward CEVMS than standard billboards when the participants gazed at off-premise advertising. In contrast, if the sample probability was less than 0.5, participants showed a preference to gaze more toward standard billboards than CEVMS when directing visual attention to off-premise advertising.

Time of day (i.e., day or night), road type (i.e., freeway or arterial), and the corresponding interaction were explanatory variables in the logistic regression model. Time of day had a significant effect on participant gazes toward off-premise advertising, $\chi^2(1) = 4.46, p = 0.035$. Participants showed a preference to gaze more toward CEVMS than toward standard billboards during both times of day. During the day the preference was only slight ($M = 0.52$), but at night the preference was more pronounced ($M = 0.71$). Road type was also a significant predictor of where participants directed their gazes at off-premise advertising, $\chi^2(1) = 3.96, p = 0.047$. Participants gazed more toward CEVMS than toward standard billboards while driving on both types of roadways. However, driving on freeways yielded a slight preference for CEVMS over standard billboards ($M = 0.55$), but driving on arterials resulted in a larger preference in favor of CEVMS ($M = 0.68$).

Observation of Driver Behavior

No near misses or driver errors occurred.

Level of Service

Table 11 shows the level of service as a function of advertising type, type of road, and time of day. As expected, there was less congestion during the nighttime runs than in the daytime. In general, there was traffic during the data collection runs; however, the eye tracking data were recorded while the vehicles were in motion.

Table 11. Estimated level of service as a function of advertising condition, road type, and time of day.

	Arterial		Freeway	
	Day	Night	Day	Night
Control	B	A	C	B
CEVMS	B	A	B	A
Standard	C	A	C	C

DISCUSSION OF RICHMOND RESULTS

Overall the probability of looking at the forward roadway was high across all conditions and consistent with the findings from Reading and previous related research.^(11,9,12) In this second study the CEVMS and standard billboard conditions did not differ from each other. For the DCZs on arterials there were no significant differences among the control, CEVMS, and standard billboard conditions. On the other hand, while the CEVMS and standard billboard conditions on the freeways did not differ from each other, they were significantly different from their respective control conditions. The control condition on the freeway principally had trees along the sides of the road and the signs that were present were freeway signs located in the road ahead ROI.

Measures such as feature congestion rated the three DCZs on freeways as not being statistically different from each other. These types of measures have been useful in predicting visual search and the effects of visual salience in laboratory tasks.⁽³⁴⁾ Models of visual salience may predict that, at least during the daytime, trees on the side of the road may be visually salient objects that would attract a driver's attention.⁽⁴⁷⁾ However, it appears that in the present study, participants principally kept their eyes on the road ahead.

The mean fixations to CEVMS, standard billboards, and the road ahead were found to be similar in magnitude with no long fixations. Examination of dwell times showed that there was one long dwell time for a CEVMS greater than 2,000 ms and it occurred in the daytime on a sign located on the left side of the road on a freeway DCZ. Furthermore, when averaging among participants the mean dwell time for CEVMS was significantly longer than to standard billboards, but still under 2,000 ms. For the dwell time greater than 2,000 ms, examination of the scene camera video and eye tracking heat maps showed that the driver was initially looking toward the forward roadway and made a first fixation to the sign. Three fixations were made to the sign and then the

driver started looking back to the road ahead as the sign moved out of the forward field of view. On the video there were no vehicles near the subject driver's own lane or in adjacent lanes.

Only the central 2 degrees of vision, foveal vision, provide resolution sharp enough for reading or recognizing fine detail.⁽⁵⁷⁾ However, useful information for reading can be extracted from parafoveal vision, which encompasses the central 10 degrees of vision.⁽⁵⁷⁾ More recent research on scene gist recognition³ has shown that peripheral vision (beyond parafoveal vision) is more useful than central vision for recognizing the gist of a scene.⁽⁵⁸⁾ Scene gist recognition is a critically important early stage of scene perception, and influences more complex cognitive processes such as directing attention within a scene and facilitating object recognition, both of which are important in obtaining information while driving.

The results of this study do show one duration of eyes off the forward roadway greater than 2,000 ms, the duration at which Klauer et al. observed near-crash/crash risk at more than twice those of normal, baseline driving.^(14,53) When looking at the tails of the fixation distributions, few fixations were greater than 1,000 ms, with the longest fixation being equal to 1,335 ms.^(53,54) The one long dwell time on a CEVMS that was observed was a rare event in this study, and review of the video and eye tracking data suggests that the driver was effectively managing acquisition of visual information while driving and fixated on the advertising. However, additional work needs to be done to derive criteria for gazing or fixating away from the forward road view where the road scene is still visible in peripheral vision.

The results showed that drivers are more likely to look at CEVMS than standard billboards during the nighttime across the conditions tested (at night the average probability of gazing at CEVMS was $M = 0.71$). CEVMS do have greater luminance than standard billboards at night and also have higher contrast. The CEVMS have the capability of being lit up so that they would appear as very bright signs to drivers (for example, up to about $10,000 \text{ cd/m}^2$ for a white square on the sign.). However, our measurements of these signs showed an average luminance of about 56 cd/m^2 . These signs would be conspicuous in a nighttime driving environment but significantly less so than other light sources such as vehicle headlights. Drivers were also more likely to look at CEVMS than standard billboards on both arterials and freeways, with a higher probability of gazes on arterials.

In this second study, CEVMS and standard billboards were more nearly equated with respect to setback from the road. Gazes to the road ahead were not significantly different between CEVMS and standard billboard DCZs across conditions and the proportion of gazes to the road ahead were consistent with previous research. One long dwell time for a CEVMS was observed in this study; however, it occurred in the daytime where the luminance and contrast (affecting the perceived brightness) of these signs are similar to those for standard billboards.

³ "Scene gist recognition" refers to the element of human cognition that enables us to determine the meaning of a scene and categorize it by type (e.g., a beach, an office) almost immediately upon seeing it.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

This study was conducted to investigate the effect of CEVMS on driver visual behavior in a roadway driving environment. An instrumented vehicle with an eye tracking system was used. Roads containing CEVMS, standard billboards, and control areas with no off-premise advertising were selected. The CEVMS and standard billboards were measured with respect to luminance, location, size, and other relevant variables to characterize these visual stimuli. Unlike previous studies on digital billboards, the present study examined CEVMS as deployed in two United States cities and did not contain dynamic video or other dynamic elements. The CEVMS changed content approximately every 8 to 10 seconds, consistent within the limits provided by FHWA guidance.⁽²⁾ In addition, the eye tracking system used had nearly a 2-degree level of resolution that provided significantly more accuracy in determining what objects the drivers were gazing or fixating on as compared to some previous field studies examining CEVMS.

CONCLUSIONS

Do CEVMS attract drivers' attention away from the forward roadway and other driving relevant stimuli?

Overall, the probability of looking at the road ahead was high across all conditions. In Reading, the CEVMS condition had a lower proportion of gazes to the road ahead than the standard billboard condition on the freeways. Both of the off-premise advertising conditions had a lower proportion of gazes to the road ahead than the control condition on the freeway. The lower proportion of gazes to the road ahead can be attributed to the overall distribution of gazes away from the road ahead and not just to the CEVMS. On the other hand, for the arterials the CEVMS and standard billboard conditions did not differ from each other, but both had a lower proportion of gazes to the road ahead compared to the control. In Richmond there were no differences among the three advertising conditions on the arterials. However, for the freeways the CEVMS and standard billboard conditions did not differ from each other but had a lower proportion of gazes to the road ahead than the control.

The control conditions differed across studies. In Reading, the control condition on arterials showed 92 percent for gazing at the road ahead while on the freeway it was 86 percent. On the other hand, in Richmond the control condition for arterials was 78 percent and for the freeway it was 92 percent. The control conditions on the freeway differed across the two studies. In Reading there were businesses off to the side of the road; whereas in Richmond the sides of the road were mostly covered with trees. The control conditions on the arterials also differed across cities in that both contained businesses and on-premise advertising; however, in Reading arterials had four lanes and in Richmond arterials had six lanes. The reason for these differences across cities was that these control conditions were selected to match the other conditions (CEVMS and standard billboards) that the drivers would experience in the two respective cities. Also, the selection of DCZs was obviously constrained by what was available on the ground in these cities.

The results for the off-premise advertising conditions are consistent with Lee et al., who observed that 76 percent of drivers' time was spent looking at the road ahead in the CEVMS scenario and 75 percent in the standard billboard scenario.⁽⁹⁾ However, it should be kept in mind

that drivers did gaze away from the road ahead even when no off-premise advertising was present and that the presence of clutter or salient visual stimuli did not necessarily control where drivers gazed.

Do glances to CEVMS occur that would suggest a decrease in safety?

In DCZs containing CEVMS, about 2.5 percent of the fixations were to CEVMS (about 2.4 percent to standard billboards). The results for fixations are similar to those reported in other field data collection efforts that included advertising signs.^(12,11,9,13) Fixations greater than 2,000 ms were not observed for CEVMS or standards billboards.

However, an analysis of dwell times to CEVMS showed a mean dwell time of 994 ms (maximum of 1,467 ms) for Reading and a mean of 1,039 ms (maximum of 2,270 ms) for Richmond. Statistical comparisons of average dwell times between CEVMS and standard billboards were not significant in Reading; however, in Richmond the average dwell times to CEVMS were significantly longer than to standard billboards, though below 2,000 ms. There was one dwell time greater than 2,000 ms to a CEVMS across the two cities. On the other hand, for standard billboards there were three long dwell times in Reading; there were no long dwell times to these billboards in Richmond. Review of the video data for these four long dwell times showed that the signs were not far from the forward view when participants were fixating. Therefore, the drivers still had access to information about what was in front of them through peripheral vision.

As the analyses of gazes to the road ahead showed, drivers distributed their gazes away from the road ahead even when there were no off-premise billboards present. Also, drivers gazed and fixated on off-premise signs even though they were generally irrelevant to the driving task. However, the results did not provide evidence indicating that CEVMS were associated with long glances away from the road that may reflect an increase in risk. When long dwell times occurred to CEVMS or standard billboards, the road ahead was still in the driver's field of view.

Do drivers look at CEVMS more than at standard billboards?

The drivers were generally more likely to gaze at CEVMS than at standard billboards. However, there was some variability between the two locations and between type of roadway (arterial or freeway). In Reading, the participants looked more often at CEVMS when on arterials, whereas they looked more often at standard billboards when on freeways. In Richmond, the drivers looked at CEVMS more than standard billboards no matter the type of road they were on, but as in Reading the preference for gazing at CEVMS was greater on arterials (68 percent on arterials and 55 percent on freeways). The slower speed on arterials and sign placement may present drivers with more opportunities to gaze at the signs.

In Richmond, the results showed that drivers gazed more at CEVMS than standard billboards at night; however, for Reading no effect for time of day was found. CEVMS do have higher luminance and contrast than standard billboards at night. The results showed mean luminance of about 56 cd/m² in the two cities where testing was conducted. These signs would appear clearly visible but not overly bright.

SUMMARY

The results of these studies are consistent with a wealth of research that has been conducted on vision in natural environments.^(26,22,21) In the driving environment, gaze allocation is principally controlled by the requirements of the task. Consistent results were shown for the proportion of gazes to the road ahead for off-premise advertising conditions across the two cities. Average fixations were similar to CEVMS and standard billboards with no long single fixations evident for either condition. Across the two cities, four long dwell times were observed: one to a CEVMS on a freeway in the day, two to the same standard billboard on a freeway (once at night and once in the daytime), and one to a standard billboard on an arterial at night. Examination of the scene video and eye tracking data indicated that these long dwell times occurred when the billboards were close to the forward field of view where peripheral vision could still be used to gather visual information on the forward roadway.

The present data suggest that the drivers in this study directed the majority of their visual attention to areas of the roadway that were relevant to the task at hand (i.e., the driving task). Furthermore, it is possible, and likely, that in the time that the drivers looked away from the forward roadway, they may have elected to glance at other objects in the surrounding environment (in the absence of billboards) that were not relevant to the driving task. When billboards were present, the drivers in this study sometimes looked at them, but not such that overall attention to the forward roadway decreased.

LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

In this study the participants drove a research vehicle with two experimenters on board. The participants were provided with audio turn-by-turn directions and consequently did not have a taxing navigation task to perform. The participants were instructed to drive as they normally would. However, the presence of researchers in the vehicle and the nature of the driving task do limit the degree to which one may generalize the current results to other driving situations. This is a general limitation of instrumented vehicle research.

The two cities employed in the study appeared to follow common practices with respect to the content change frequency (every 8 to 10 seconds) and the brightness of the CEVMS. The current results would not generalize to situations where these guidelines are not being followed.

Participant recruiting was done through libraries, community centers and at a university. This recruiting procedure resulted in a participant demographic distribution that may not be representative of the general driving population.

The study employed a head-free eye tracking device to increase the realism of the driving situation (no head-mounted gear). However, the eye tracker had a sampling rate of 60 Hz, which made determining saccades problematic. The eye tracker and analyses software employed in this effort represents a significant improvement in technology over previous similar efforts in this area.

The study focused on objects that were 1,000 feet or less from the drivers. This was dictated by the accuracy of the eye tracking system and the ability to resolve objects for data reduction. In addition, the geometry of the roadway precluded the consideration of objects at great distances.

The study was performed on actual roadways, and this limited the control of the visual scenes except via the route selection process. In an ideal case, one would have had roadways with CEVMS, standard billboards, and no off-premise advertising and in which the context surrounding digital and standard billboards did not differ. This was not the case in this study, although such an exclusive environment would be inconsistent with the experience of most drivers. This presents issues with the interpretation of the specific contributions made by billboards and the environment to the driver's behavior.

Sign content was not investigated (or controlled) in the present study, but may be an important factor to consider in future studies that investigate the distraction potential of advertising signs. Investigations about the effect of content could potentially be performed in driving simulators where this variable could be systematically controlled and manipulated.

REFERENCES

1. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Policy Statement. [Available online at <http://www.nhtsa.gov/Driving+Safety/Distracted+Driving/ci.Policy+Statement+and+Compiled+FAQs+on+Distracted+Driving.print>.] Accessed 7/27/2012.
2. Shepherd, G. M., 2007: Guidance on Off-Premise Changeable Message Signs. <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/realestate/offprmsgsgnguid.htm>.
3. Scenic America. Position Paper Regarding the Propriety of Permitting Digital Billboards on Interstate and Federal-Aid Highways under the Highway Beautification Act. 2010.
4. Molino, J. A., J. Wachtel, J. E. Farbry, M. B. Hermosillo, and T. M. Granda. . The Effects of Commercial Electronic Variable Message Signs (Cevms) on Driver Attention and Distraction: An Update., FHWA-HRT-09-018. Federal Highway Administration, 2009.
5. Farbry, J., Wochinger, K., Shafer, T., Owens, N, & Nedzesky, A. Research Review of Potential Safety Effects of Electronic Billboards on Driver Attention and Distraction. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, DC, 2001.
6. Tantala, M. W., and A. M. Tantala. A Study of the Relationship between Digital Billboards and Traffic Safety in Henrico County and Richmond, Virginia. The Foundation for Outdoor Advertising Research and Education (FOARE), 2010.
7. Tantala, M. W., and A. M. Tantala. An Examination of the Relationship between Digital Billboards and Traffic Safety in Reading, Pennsylvania Using Empirical Bayes Analyses. *Moving Toward Zero 2100. ITE Technical Conference and Exhibit*, Buena Vista, FL, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2011.
8. Elvik, R. The Predictive Validity of Empirical Bayes Estimates of Road Safety. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, **40**, 2008, 1964-1969.
9. Lee, S. E., McElheny, M.J., & Gibbons, R. . Driving Performance and Digital Billboards. Report prepared for Foundation for Outdoor Advertising Research and Education. Virginia Tech Transportation Institute., 2007.
10. Society of Automotive Engineers. Definitions and Experimental Measures Related to the Specification of Driver Visual Behavior Using Video Based Techniques. 2000.
11. Beijer, D., A. Smiley, and M. Eizenman. Observed Driver Glance Behavior at Roadside Advertising Signs. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*,, **No. 1899**, 2004, 96-103.
12. Smiley, A., T. Smahel, and M. Eizenman. Impact of Video Advertising on Driver Fixation Patters. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*,, **No. 1899**, 2004, 76-83.
13. Kettwich, C., K. Klinger, and U. Lemmer. Do Advertisements at the Roadside Distract the Driver? *Optical Sensors 2008*, San Diego, CA, SPIE, 2008.
14. Klauer, S. G., Dingus, T. A., Neale, V. L., Sudweeks, J.D., & Ramsey, D.J. The Impact of Driver Inattention on near-Crash/Crash Risk: An Analysis Using the 100-Car Naturalistic Driving Study Data, DOT HS 810 594. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2006.
15. Chattington, M., N. Reed, D. Basacik, A. Flint, and A. Parkes. Investigating Driver Distraction: The Effects of Video and Static Advertising, PPR409. Transport Research Laboratory, 2009.

16. Kettwich, C., K. Klinger, and U. Lemmer, 2008: Do Advertisements at the Roadside Distract the Driver? *Optical Sensors 2008*, F. Berghmans, A. G. Mignani, A. Cutolo, P. P. Moyrueis, and T. P. Pearsall, Eds., SPIE.
17. Cole, B. L., and P. K. Hughes. A Field Trial of Attention and Search Conspicuity. *Human Factors*, **26**, 1984, 299-313.
18. Ruz, M., and J. Lupiáñez. A Review of Attentional Capture: On Its Automaticity and Sensitivity to Endogenous Control. *Psicológica*, **23**, 2002, 283-309.
19. Wachtel, J. Safety Impacts of the Emerging Digital Display Technology for Outdoor Advertising Signs. The Veridian Group, Inc, 2009.
20. Theeuwes, J., and R. Burger. Attentional Control During Visual Search: The Effect of Irrelevant Singletons. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, **24**, 1998, 1342-1353.
21. Tatler, B. W., M. M. Hayhoe, M. F. Land, and D. H. Ballard. Eye Guidance in Natural Vision: Reinterpreting Saliency. *Journal of Vision*, **11**, 2011, 1-23.
22. Land, M. F. Vision, Eye Movements, and Natural Behavior. *Visual Neuroscience*, **26**, 2009, 51-62.
23. Eckstein, M. P. Visual Search: A Retrospective. *Journal of Vision*, **11**, 2011, 1-36.
24. Henderson, J., G. Malcolm, and C. Schandl. Searching in the Dark: Cognitive Relevance Drives Attention in Real-World Scenes. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, **16**, 2009, 850-856.
25. Henderson, J. M., J. R. Brockmole, M. S. Castelano, and M. Mack, 2007: Visual Saliency Does Not Account for Eye Movements During Visual Search in Real-World Scenes. *Eye Movements: A Window on Mind and Brain*, R. P. G. v. Gompel, M. H. Fischer, W. S. Murray, and R. L. Hill, Eds., Elsevier, 537-562.
26. Land, M. F. Eye Movements and the Control of Actions in Everyday Life. *Progress in Retinal and Eye Research*, **25**, 2006, 296-324.
27. Hayhoe, M., and D. Ballard. Eye Movements in Natural Behavior. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, **9**, 2005, 188-194.
28. Jovancevic-Misic, J., and M. Hayhoe. Adaptive Gaze Control in Natural Environments. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, **29**, 2009, 6234-6238.
29. Shinoda, H., M. M. Hayhoe, and A. Shrivastava. What Controls Attention in Natural Environments? *Vision Research*, **41**, 2001, 3535-3545.
30. SmartEye. Smarteye. [Available online at <http://www.smarteye.se/>.] Accessed June 22, 2012.
31. Whittle, P., Ed., 1994: *The Psychophysics of Contrast Brightness*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
32. Regan, M. A., K. L. Young, J. D. Lee, and C. P. Gordon, 2009: Sources of Driver Distraction. *Driver Distraction: Theory, Effects, and Mitigation.*, M. A. Regan, J. D. Lee, and K. L. Young, Eds., CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group.
33. Horberry, T., & Edquist, J., 2009: Distractions Outside the Vehicle. *Driver Distraction: Theory, Effects, and Mitigation.*, M. A. Regan, Lee, J.D., & Young, K.L., Ed., CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group.
34. Rosenholtz, R., Y. Li, and L. Nakano. Measuring Visual Clutter. *J Vis*, **7**, 2007, 17 11-22.
35. Bravo, M. J., and H. Farid. A Scale Invariant Measure of Clutter. *Journal of Vision*, **8**, 2008, 1-9.

36. EyesDx. Multiple-Analysis of Psychophysical and Performance Signals (Mapps) [Available online at <http://www.eyesdx.com/>.] Accessed June 22, 2012.
37. Recarte, M. A., and L. M. Nunes. Effects of Verbal and Spatial-Imagery Tasks on Eye Fixations While Driving. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, **6**, 2000, 31-43.
38. Manor, B. R., and E. Gordon. Defining the Temporal Threshold for Ocular Fixation in Free-Viewing Visuocognitive Tasks. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, **128**, 2003, 85-93.
39. Ahlstrom, C., K. Kircher, and A. Kircher. Considerations When Calculating Percent Road Centre from Eye Movement Data in Driver Distraction Monitoring. *Proceedings of the Fifth International Driving Symposium on Human Factors in Driver Assessment, Training and Vehicle Design*, 2009, 132-139.
40. Agresti, A., 2002: Analyzing Repeated Categorical Response Data. *Categorical Data Analysis, 2nd Edition*, D. J. Balding, Ed., John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
41. Stokes, M. E., C. S. Davis, and G. G. Koch. *Categorical Data Analysis Using the Sas System (2nd Ed.)*. SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC, 2000.
42. Molenbergs, G., and G. Verbeke. Likelihood Ratio, Score, and Wald Tests in a Constrained Parameter Space. *The American Statistician*, **61**, 2007, 22-27.
43. ISO, 2002: Road Vehicles — Measurement of Driver Visual Behaviour with Respect to Transport Information and Control Systems — Part 1: Definitions and Parameters. ISO.
44. ISO, 2001: Road Vehicles — Measurement of Driver Visual Behaviour with Respect to Transport Information and Control Systems — Part 2: Equipment and Procedures. ISO.
45. *Highway Capacity Manual*. Transportation Research Board, Washington, DC, 2000.
46. Itti, L., and C. Koch. A Saliency-Based Search Mechanism for Overt and Covert Shifts of Visual Attention. *Vision Research*, **40**, 2000, 1489-1506.
47. Walther, D., and C. Koch. Modeling Attention to Salient Proto-Objects. *Neural Networks*, **19**, 2006, 1395-1407.
48. Itti, L., C. Koch, and E. Niebur. A Model of Saliency-Based Visual Attention for Rapid Scene Analysis. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on*, **20**, 1998, 1254-1259.
49. Walther, D. B. Saliency Toolbox. [Available online at <http://www.saliencytoolbox.net/index.html>.] Accessed 6/27/2012.
50. Land, M. F. Predictable Eye-Head Coordination During Driving. *Nature*, **359**, 1992, 318-320.
51. Balas, B., L. Nakano, and R. Rosenholtz. A Summary-Statistic Representation in Peripheral Vision Explains Visual Crowding. *Journal of Vision*, **9**, 2009, 1-18.
52. Levi, D. M. Crowding--an Essential Bottleneck for Object Recognition: A Mini-Review. *Vision Research*, **48**, 2008, 635-654.
53. Horrey, W. J., and C. D. Wickens. In-Vehicle Glance Duration: Distributions, Tails, and Model of Crash Risk. *Transportation Research Record*, **2018**, 2007, 22-28.
54. Wierwille, W. W., 1993: Visual and Manual Demands of in-Car Controls and Displays. *Automotive Ergonomics*, B. Peacock, and W. Karwowski, Eds., Taylor and Francis, 299-320.
55. Strasburger, H., I. Rentschler, and M. Jüttner. Peripheral Vision and Pattern Recognition: A Review. *Journal of Vision*, **11**, 2011, 1-82.

56. Reimer, B. Impact of Cognitive Task Complexity on Drivers' Visual Tunneling. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, **No. 2138**, 2009, 13–19.
57. Rayner, K., A. W. Inhoff, R. E. Morrison, M. L. Slowiaczek, and J. H. Bertera. Masking of Foveal and Parafoveal Vision During Eye Fixations in Reading. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, **7**, 1981, 167-179.
58. Larson, A. M., and L. C. Loschky. The Contributions of Central Versus Peripheral Vision to Scene Gist Recognition. *Journal of Vision*, **9**, 2009, 1-16.