

Modeling Driver Behavior as a Sequential Risk Taking Task

Samer H. Hamdar

shamdar@umd.edu

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

University of Maryland

3130 Jeong H. Kim Engineering Building

College Park, MD 20742-3021

Phone: (301) 405-0221

Fax: (301) 405-2585

Martin Treiber

treiber@vwi.tu-dresden.de

Institute for Transport and Economics

Technische Universität Dresden

Andreas-Schubert-Straße 23

D-01062, Germany

Phone: +49-351-463-36794

Fax: +49-351-463-36809

Hani S. Mahmassani*

masmah@umd.edu

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

University of Maryland

3130 Jeong H. Kim Engineering Building

College Park, MD 20742-3021

Phone: (301) 405-0221

Fax: (301) 405-2585

Arne Kesting

kesting@vwi.tu-dresden.de

Institute for Transport and Economics

Technische Universität Dresden

Andreas-Schubert-Straße 23

D-01062, Germany

Phone: +49-351-463-36838

Fax: +49-351-463-36809

4916 + 2000 (7 Figures and 1 Table) = 6916

July 2007

*Submitted for presentation at the 87th Annual Meeting of the Transportation
Research Board,
January 2008, Washington, D.C. and publication in Transportation Research Record*
**Modeling Driver Behavior as a Sequential Risk Taking
Task**

Samer H. Hamdar, Martin Treiber, Hani S. Mahmassani and Arne Kesting

ABSTRACT

Acceleration models are at the core of operational driving behaviors, and include car-following models which capture interactions between a lead and following vehicles. The main assumption in these models is that the behavior of the following vehicle (e.g. change in acceleration) is directly related to a stimulus observed/perceived by the driver, defined relative to the lead vehicle (e.g. difference in speeds, headways etc.). An important aspect heretofore missing from previous formulations pertains to the stochastic character of the cognitive processes followed by drivers, such as perception, judgment and execution while driving. The objective of this paper is to explore and evaluate a car-following model that reflects the psychological and cognitive aspects of the phenomenon and captures risk taking behavior under uncertainty. In this model, Tversky and Kahneman's Prospect Theory provides a theoretical and operational basis to weigh a driver's different alternatives. The model is implemented and tested in order to assess its properties and those of the resulting traffic stream behavior.

Keywords: Risk, Uncertainty, Collision Probability, Prospect Theory

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION

Acceleration models are at the core of operational driving behaviors, and include car-following models which capture interactions between a lead and following vehicles. The main assumption in these models is that the behavior of the following vehicle (e.g. change in acceleration) is directly related to a stimulus observed/perceived by the driver, defined relative to the lead vehicle (e.g. difference in speeds, headways etc.). This idea was adopted in the car-following models of Chandler (1), Gazis (2) and Herman (3), known as the General Motor (GM) models. These first models are not complete in the sense that they are applicable to all traffic situations. Later investigations proposed complete models (in the above sense) by introducing a “safe” time headway and a desired velocity. The Gipps model (18), and the intelligent-driver model (IDM) (16) contain intuitive parameters that can be related to the driving style such as desired accelerations, comfortable decelerations, and a desired “safe” time gap. Furthermore, they include braking strategies that prevent accidents under a given heuristic. Subsequent studies have extended these models, by introducing additional parameters intended to capture dimensions such as anticipation and learning, and a response to several vehicles ahead. Other models such as the human driver model (HDM) (18) also model human deficiencies, including variable reaction times and the size and persistency of estimation errors of the input stimuli depending on the traffic situation. [The Wiedemann model must also be mentioned somewhere!] As these models continue to evolve, and gain in behavioral realism, a greater range of cognitive phenomena could be incorporated. An important aspect heretofore missing from previous formulations pertains to the modeling [perception and stochasticity is already contained in the HDM] of the cognitive processes followed by drivers, such as perception, judgment and execution while driving. Previous studies that have recognized these dimensions have remained in a qualitative framework, with limited mathematical specificity and hence no calibration effort.

A wide spectrum of car-following and lane changing models have been presented in the literature and in some cases incorporated in traffic simulation tools. Existing models aim to capture driver behaviors under a variety of traffic conditions that range from free-flow conditions to extreme situations. However, few models can claim to fully capture driver behavior in these different driving environments, especially in phase transitions, traffic breakdowns and incident occurrences. These conditions call for a richer representation of the cognitive processes underlying driver behavior in these situations. In particular, explicit representation of drivers’ risk attitudes is expected to provide greater insight into the role of risk-taking behaviors in accident-prone and other extreme situations.

The objective of this paper is to explore and evaluate a car-following model that reflects the psychological and cognitive aspects of the phenomenon and captures risk taking

behavior under uncertainty. In this model, Tversky and Kahneman's Prospect Theory (4) provides a theoretical and operational basis to weigh a driver's different alternatives.

A background review on pertinent decision theories is presented in the following section. The review will motivate the formulation, in the third section, of an initial car-following model that introduces stochasticity in the decision making and execution processes performed by the drivers. The implementation details [and the model assessment] are presented in Section 4 and the properties of the model are discussed in Section 5. Concluding comments are presented in the final section.

2.0 BACKGROUND REVIEW

Major developments in human decision making research have offered a solid base for many models in the domains of psychology, marketing and economics. However, the influence of these theories on modeling traffic and driver behavior has been limited. This may be due to the initial "normative" intent of early decision theories, that is to help decision-makers reach better decisions rather than seeking to describe the often suboptimal ways in which people actually make decisions in everyday situations. Following the pioneering theoretical contributions of Bernoulli (5) to classical utility theory, Von Neumann and Morgenstern (6) introduced a rigorous axiomatization (vNM's axioms) that provided the formal basis for expected utility theory. The latter lies at the core of modern decision theory, the primary technical approach for operational decision-aiding under risk. Inconsistencies between choices actually made by humans and those predicted by the theories led to recognition of the limitations of strict utility theory for describing many practical decision situations (7, 4). Refinements of utility theories, including subjective variants and prospect theory, advanced by Kahneman and Tversky (4) as a descriptive model of how humans make decisions under risk, have been proposed. Attempts to identify and formalize these cognitive and decision processes have resulted in the identification of a large range of heuristics and biases that appear to be prevalent in human decision-making.

2.1 Prospect Theory

Prospect theory postulates two phases while making decisions in complex situations: framing and editing phase, followed by an evaluation phase (4). The first phase is a preliminary analysis of the decision problem to subjectively frame the effective alternatives. The decision-maker may mentally "edit" the alternatives, resulting in assigning subjective utilities to the outcomes, which reflect asymmetries between attitudes towards losses vs. gains. Figure 1A shows a typical subjective utility function used in prospect theory. The value function captures three characteristics: 1) Loss aversion seen in the steeper slope with losses than with gains; 2) diminishing sensitivity to increasing gains and losses; and 3) evaluation of outcomes relative to a reference point.

The second phase is the evaluation phase, which produces a subjective prospect index calculated in a similar manner to an expected utility, albeit with the major difference that the probabilities of the different possible outcomes are replaced by subjective decision

weights assumed by decision makers (Figure 1B). The weighting function is characterized by overweighing probability differences near certainty and impossibility, relative to comparable differences in the middle of the scale (overestimation during extreme situations) (8). At the end, the alternative with the highest prospect (not expectation) is selected. It should be noted that, in general, the probability weighing function Fig. 1B corresponds to an inverse-‘S’ shaped function with steep gradients near the beginning and near the end of the curve. However, in Figure 1B, these steep gradients are replaced by discontinuities or probability jumps near 0 and 1. This kind of curves is favorable for lotteries and insurance companies. These companies are considered as utility distribution transformers, either by accumulating a given amount of utility to an extremely rare event (lottery), or by redistributing an extremely rare big disutility to a small but certain disutility (the insurance payment).

2.2 Heuristics and Information Processing

In decision theory, heuristics are simplified models of the world or shortcuts that can produce decisions efficiently. Because of humans’ limited information processing abilities, heuristics were considered as a strategy to adapt to a complex environment. In seminal works, Tversky and Kahneman (9) pointed to the prevalence of heuristics in everyday decisions, and grouped heuristic rules into three main categories, identifying common biases associated with each category, discussed below:

Representativeness:

In estimating the probability that object A is part of B, the degree to which A is representative of B or the degree to which A resembles B affect the assessment. The biases resulting from this heuristic include:

- Insensitivity to prior probability of outcomes or base-rate frequency of the outcomes.
- Insensitivity to sample size
- Misconception of chance
- Insensitivity to predictability
- Illusion of validity
- Misconception of regression (to the mean).

Availability:

This judgment heuristic is represented by the tendency of people to assess the probability of occurrence of an event by the “ease with which instances or occurrences can be brought to mind” (10). The biases associated with this heuristic are the following:

- Biases due to the retrievability of instances (familiarity)
- Biases due to the effectiveness of a search set where different tasks will give different search sets.
- Biases of imaginability.

- Illusion of correlation.

Adjustment and anchoring:

In estimating probabilities (values in general), different starting points will lead to different estimates, biased towards the initial estimates. This is called anchoring. The associated biases are:

- Insufficient adjustment
- Biases in the evaluation of conjunctive and disjunctive events
- Anchoring in the assessment of subjective probability distributions.

Accordingly, these heuristics have helped explain the so-called “fallacies” contrasting human judgment with probability theory. However, they do not individually nor collectively define a comprehensive theory of decision-making, nor do they provide a sufficient basis for formulating decision mechanisms for a variety of general decision situations (11).

In the model of driver behavior formulated in the next section, the prevalence of such heuristics will be reflected implicitly, with the main focus on explicitly incorporating prospect theoretic concepts in the model formulation. This allows a comprehensive inclusion of major characteristics found in the human decision making research to the field of traffic modeling. Such characteristics contain 1) stochastic behavior under uncertain conditions and 2) disrespect of safe “rational” rules in the form of “risk taking”.

3.0 CAR FOLLOWING MODEL FORMULATION

In the Car-Following Process, three behaviors are possible:

- 1- Drivers accelerate
- 2- Drivers decelerate
- 3- Drivers keep the same speed

We assume that time is divided into different acceleration instances $i = 1, 2 \dots$ etc. It is currently defined by the reaction time where a driver considers accelerating, decelerating or keeping the same speed. The main variable of interest is the subjective probability (SP) of being involved in a rear-end collision with the car in front.

The main assumptions are the following:

- 1- Decision makers (DM) believe that - at all instances - they will follow the same stochastic process: given an assumed distribution of the future velocity of the leader, a driver will have a probability density function of the acceleration he or she will adopt.

- 2- The subjective probabilities are updated optimally so as to increase the velocity (up to a given desired value) – thus decreasing the travel time - while taking into consideration the risk in being involved in a collision.

Following the same logic in (12), We denote by $p_{n,i}$ the n 's DM's representation of the probability of being involved in a rear-end collision in the acceleration instance i . It should be noted that this representation is not equal to the objective collision probability $O_{n,i}$ that is not known at this stage. In other words, $p_{n,i}$ represents the DM's representation of the task and depends on his or her prior distribution of $p_{n,1}$ and how he or she updates that prior with experience (driving history). On the other hand, $O_{n,i}$ represents how the environment behaves and is structured for the car-following task. Linking $p_{n,i}$ to the surrounding driving conditions is being an object of investigation at this moment.

Four possible submodels could be considered in this framework:

- 1- Non-stationary submodel with decreasing probability: in this model, $p_{n,i}$ decreases as i increases, i.e. the longer you follow a car, the less likely you are to be involved in a rear-end collision. This model is not adopted here because it does not consider the fatigue an individual might experience while driving.
- 2- Stationary submodel: $p_{n,i}$ remains constant when i increases. This model lacks consideration of the driving process and the inconsistency of drivers, and will therefore not be considered further.
- 3- Non-stationary submodel with increasing probability: there are infinitely many possibilities in which $p_{n,i}$ might increase with i . However, the driver's perception of being involved in a rear-end collision is unlikely to be monotonically increasing since it depends on the acceleration state of the leading-drivers. This volatility is the main reason why the next sub-model is introduced.
- 4- Non-stationary submodel with mixed-behavior probability: there is a large number of mechanisms in which $p_{n,i}$ might increase or decrease with i .

The last submodel is the one considered in this paper. A prior probability of collision is assumed to be held by the driver ($p_{n,1}$). This probability is updated while conditioned on the behavior (acceleration, deceleration ...etc) of the leader and the follower. This probability is also conditioned on the fact that a driver is not involved in a crash in the previous acceleration instance. It should be noted that the behavior of the "leading" driver is not known at the beginning (type of the driver assumed at beginning, like n) and it is assumed that it is related to the driver population in which a given study is being conducted. This term $p_{n,i}$ is formulated below.

Estimation of Collision Probability

We assume that at time t , the subjective representation of driver n for the future speeds of the leader $n-1$ (Figure 2) during the anticipated time span τ_n follows a normal distribution with a given standard deviation $\sigma(v_{n-1})$, while the mean is given by the actual velocity of the leader. This means, that the estimated velocity $v_{n-1}^{est}(t)$ of the leader has a probability density $f(v|t)$ given by:

$$f(v|t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma(v_{n-1})} \exp\left[\frac{-(v-v_{n-1}(t))^2}{2\sigma(v_{n-1})^2}\right] \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

For the leading vehicle, a *constant velocity heuristic* will be adopted, i.e., its velocity distribution given by Equation 1 is assumed to be valid during the entire anticipated time interval between t and $t+\tau_n$.

The driver under consideration (i.e., the follower) estimates the probability of a rear-end collision at the end of the anticipation time horizon $t+\tau_n$ for “candidate accelerations” a_n in a range a_{\max} to a_{\min} (See Table 1). Since the driver is in control of his/her acceleration, a *constant acceleration heuristic* (CAH) will be assumed for determining the crash probability: Once chosen, the acceleration a_n will not be changed during the anticipation time horizon. The crash probability $p_n(t+\tau_n)$ is given by the probability that the gap ($s_n(t) = x_{n-1}(t) - x_n(t) - L_{n-1}$) is negative at time $t+\tau_n$, i.e., $p_n(t+\tau_n) = P(s_n(t+\tau_n) < 0)$.

Based on the constant-velocity heuristic for the leader, it is known that $x_{n-1}(t+\tau_n) = x_{n-1}(t) + \tau_n v_{n-1}^{est}(t)$. On the other hand, the constant-acceleration heuristic for the [leader] follower gives: $x_n(t+\tau_n) = x_n(t) + v_n(t)\tau_n + \frac{1}{2}a_n\tau_n^2$. The crash probability can be written as:

$$p_n(t+\tau_n) = P\left(v_{n-1}^{est}(t) < \frac{v_n(t)\tau_n + \frac{1}{2}a_n\tau_n^2 - s_n(t)}{\tau_n}\right) \quad \text{Equation 2}$$

In the last step, the stochastic variable $v_{n-1}^{est}(t)$ is written in terms of the standardized normal distribution by setting $v_{n-1}^{est}(t) = v_{n-1}(t) + \sigma(v_{n-1})Z$, where Z is the standardized Gaussian stochastic variable (mean 0, variance 1).

$$p_n(t+\tau_n) = P\left(Z < \frac{\Delta v_n(t)\tau_n + \frac{1}{2}a_n\tau_n^2 - s_n(t)}{\sigma(v_{n-1})\tau_n}\right) = \Phi\left(\frac{\Delta v_n(t)\tau_n + \frac{1}{2}a_n\tau_n^2 - s_n(t)}{\sigma(v_{n-1})\tau_n}\right) \quad \text{Equation 3}$$

where $\Delta v_n(t) = v_n(t) - v_{n-1}(t)$ denotes the approaching rate, while $\Phi(z)$ is the tabulated cumulative distribution function for the standardized Gaussian.

Evaluation Process

Once the $p_{n,i}$'s are known, a driver enters what is called the evaluation process. Prospect theory (PT) is adapted for this purpose. The gain and losses are expressed here in term of gains and losses in speed from the previous acceleration instance $i-1$. The gain is however

limited by the maximum desired velocity of the driver and the losses are limited by the non-negative velocity constraint. If the gain and losses are expressed in terms of an abscissa $\Delta \dot{x} = \Delta v = a_n \times \tau_n$, the value function $U_{PT}(a_n)$ is defined as follows: [Eqs. 4 and 5 have to be changed if the new formulation for U_{PT} is to be used.]

$$U_{PT}(a_n) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{a_n}{a_0}\right)^{\gamma^+} & \text{for } a_n \geq 0 \\ -w^- \left|\frac{a_n}{a_0}\right|^{\gamma^-} & \text{for } a_n < 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{Equation 4}$$

Where $0 < \gamma^+, \gamma^-, w^-$ are parameters to be estimated while a_0 is used for normalizing purposes, only. Without loss of generality, we set $a_0 = 1 \text{ m/s}^2$ (see Table 1); other values for a_0 would only rescale the crash weighting factor w_c . The value function used in the initial model (based on the values of parameters shown in Table 1) is illustrated in Figure 3. [The value function captures three characteristics: 1) Loss aversion seen in the steeper slope with losses than with gains; 2) diminishing sensitivity to increasing gains and losses; and 3) evaluation of outcomes relative to a reference point]. It should be noted that the reference point is taken as the speed in the previous acceleration instance.

The way a driver determines his or her behavior is by sequentially evaluating the outcome of a candidate acceleration prior to each acceleration or deceleration opportunity. If a driver n decides to use a positive a_n at instance i , he/she may either be able to increase his or her velocity by $(a_n \times \tau_n)$ (gain) or he/she will be involved in a rear-end collision. In a collision, the loss is assumed to be related to the speed term $\sigma(v, \Delta v)$ weighted by w_c . w_c represents the sensitivity of a given driver to the loss caused by an accident. A higher w_c corresponds to conservative individuals while a lower w_c corresponds to drivers willing to take higher risk while not attributing a lot of concern if crashing their vehicles. On the other hand, if the driver decelerates, he/she will lose a corresponding amount of speed $(a_n \times \tau_n)$ (< 0). In other words:

$$U(a_n) = \begin{cases} (1 - p_{n,i}) \left(\frac{a_n}{a_0}\right)^{\gamma^+} - p_{n,i} w_c \sigma(v, \Delta v) & a_n \geq 0 \\ -(1 - p_{n,i}) w^- \left|\frac{a_n}{a_0}\right|^{\gamma^-} - p_{n,i} w_c \sigma(v, \Delta v) & a_n < 0 \end{cases}$$

Equation 5

where

$p_{n,i}$ = the probability of colliding with the rear-end bumper of the lead vehicle given that no collision took place in the i -1th acceleration instance

To reflect the stochastic response adopted by the drivers, the acceleration of vehicle n $a_{n,car-following}(t+\Delta t_i)$ is retrieved from the following probability density function:

$$f(a_n) = \begin{cases} \frac{\exp(\beta \times U(a_n))}{\int_{a_{\min}}^{a_{\max}} \exp(\beta \times U(a')) da'} & a_{\min} \leq a_n \leq a_{\max} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{Equation 6}$$

where β is a free parameter ($\beta > 0$) that reflects the sensitivity of choice to the utility $U(a_n)$. It can also reflect different preferences of the different drivers or estimating uncertainties other as that of the velocity of the leader. It should be noted that β can change with the experience i reflecting a given learning process. For example, β can be higher for more experienced drivers, thereby reflecting a more stable driving style.

Free-Flow Model

For driver behavior during free-flow conditions, the logic adopted in the Gipps Model (13) is adopted here. Each driver has a desired velocity $V_{n,desired}$. In each time step of duration Delta t , the acceleration applied by the driver n to reach this velocity is given by:

$$a_{n,free-flow}(t+\Delta t) = \frac{V_{n,desired} - v_n(t)}{\Delta t} \quad \text{Equation 7}$$

Finally, the chosen acceleration is:

$$a_n(t+\Delta t) = \min(a_{n,free-flow}(t+\Delta t), a_{n,car-following}(t+\Delta t)) \quad \text{Equation 8}$$

4.0 MODEL IMPLEMENTATION [AND ASSESSMENT]

Before being calibrated against empirical data, the unconventional structural form of the model requires a thorough study of its physical characteristics. Presented in this section, this study includes implementing the model and testing its asymptotic properties so it can be assessed for feasibility. The findings of the testing process in terms of sensitivity analysis allow - in part - to conclude if the model is valid or not.

At this stage, all $N+1$ drivers ($n = 0, 1, \dots, N$) are assumed to have identical parameters where s is the corresponding gap and Δv is the relative speed ($\Delta v > 0$ when approaching). We implement the basic model developed in the previous section by making the following specifications:

- 1- The estimation uncertainty $\sigma(v_l) = \alpha v_l$ of the velocity of the leader is proportional to the velocity itself, i.e., the relative error (variation coefficient) α is constant (see Table 1).

- 2- The anticipation time horizon τ is assumed to be the minimum between the time-to-collision $\tau_{TTC} = (s/\Delta v)$ and some maximum value τ_{max} :

$$\tau = \tau(s, \Delta v) = \begin{cases} \frac{s}{\Delta v} & \Delta v \geq \frac{s}{\tau_{max}} \\ \tau_{max} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{Equation 9}$$

4.1 Initial Plots

The model was tested using the parameter values presented in Table 1. The resulting plots are shown in Figures 4 and 5. Remarkably, in stochastic equilibrium, approximate time headways of 1.5 seconds are kept constant in the car-following regime. These headway values are mainly influenced by the term $\alpha\tau_{max}$ where higher values of this quotient lead to higher time headways (Figure 4A and 4B). As for the sensitivity with respect to relative speeds, it is influenced by α alone (the higher α is, the higher the sensitivity, the string stability and the acceleration variations are) (Figure 4C); accordingly, the time headway and the sensitivity to the velocity differences can be influenced separately.

On the other hand, if lower acceleration uncertainties are desired, the value of $\beta \propto 1/\sigma_a$ should be decreased (Figure 5 and 7). Moreover, to increase the skewness (third normalized moment), the crash weight w_c has to be increased. This can be also accomplished by slightly decreasing β for a constant variance. However, values of the order $w_c < 20$ lead to bimodal and unrealistic distributions: a new peak appears for very high accelerations leading to crashes and the PT utility can outweigh the crash penalty even for a crash probability $p_c = 1$.

4.2 Asymptotic expansion

To better illustrate the behavior of the model, an asymptotic expansion of the acceleration probability distribution (equation 6) of this model is in order. A series of straightforward steps leads to:

$$\dot{v} = a \approx \sim N(a^*, \sigma_a^2) \quad \text{Equation 10}$$

i.e., the distribution of accelerations is approximately given by a Gaussian distribution whose moments are:

$$a^* = \underset{\dot{v}}{\text{arg}}(\max(U(a))), \quad \sigma_a^2 = \frac{-1}{\beta U''(a^*)} \quad \text{Equation 11}$$

It should be noted that $U'(a)$ (necessary for determining a^* by the condition $U(a^*)=0$) and $U''(a)$ can be calculated analytically since this implies the derivative of $\Phi(z)$ which is just the density of a Gaussian. The value a^* itself needs to be

calculated numerically. Because of the nonlinearities of the utility $U_{PT}(a)$, it is not guaranteed that a^* is unique. However, all investigations presented in this paper show that it is unique for the parameters of Table 1.

4.3 Efficient Implementation of the asymptotic expansion

The major aim here is to calculate the acceleration a^* for which the utility is maximal conditioned to given values of s , v and Δv .

4.3.1 Initial Estimate

At this early stage, it is useful to take the value of a^* for $\gamma^+ = \gamma^- = w^- = 1$ where it can be calculated analytically as follows:

For $\gamma = w^- = 1$, the total utility (equation 5) can be written as:

$$U(a; s, v, \Delta v) = \frac{a}{a_0} - w_c \Phi(z(a)) \quad \text{Equation 12}$$

where

$$z(a) = \frac{\Delta v + \frac{1}{2} a \tau - \frac{s}{\tau}}{\alpha v} \quad \text{Equation 13}$$

and the prediction horizon is given by the minimum of the maximum prediction time τ_{\max} and the time-to-collision:

$$\tau = \tau(s, \Delta v) = \begin{cases} (s/\Delta v) & \text{for } \Delta v > (s/\tau_{\max}) \\ \tau_{\max} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{Equation 14}$$

As necessary condition for maximization and minimization problems, $U'(a)$ needs to be zero. Accordingly,

$$U'(a) = \frac{1}{a_0} - w_c f_N(z)(z'(a)) \quad \text{Equation 15}$$

with the density of the standardized normal distribution:

$$f_N(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-(z^2/2)} \quad \text{Equation 16}$$

and

$$z'(a) = \frac{\tau}{2\alpha v} \quad \text{Equation 17}$$

It is essential to the analytical solution that U' only depends on a by means of the argument $z(a)$ of the standardized Gaussian while $z'(a)$ does not depend on a at all. At maximum utility, we obtain for z value:

$$z * \hat{\iota} \operatorname{argmax}(U(z)) = -\sqrt{2 \ln \left(\frac{a_0 w_c z'}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right)} \quad \text{Equation 18}$$

where z' is taken from (equation 17). It should be noted that the negative square root is eliminated since this corresponds to the crashing probabilities smaller than 0.5 which is plausible in all cases. The positive root corresponds to a minimum of the utility. Inserting (equation 18) in (equation 15) finally gives the following expression for the initial estimate of the “optimal” acceleration $a * \hat{\iota} \operatorname{argmax}(U(a))$:

$$\frac{s}{\tau_{\max}} - \Delta v + \alpha v z * \hat{\iota} \quad \text{Equation 19}$$

$$a * \hat{\iota} \frac{2}{\tau_{\max}} \hat{\iota}$$

This equation is exact for a linear PT utility or in other words, for a “classical” utility theory ($\gamma^+ = \gamma^- = w^- = 1$).

4.3.2 Numerical approximation

Here, the maximum of the utility cannot be computed analytically. Since the analytical derivatives are easy to calculate and a good initial estimate is known for the “optimal acceleration”, one can use Newton’s method to find the optimum; its $n+1$ th iteration is defined by:

$$a_{n+1} = a_n - F(a_n) / F'(a_n), \quad a_0 = a * \hat{\iota} \quad \text{Equation 20}$$

where

$$F(a) = U'(a) = U_{PT}(a) - w_c f_N(z) z'(a) \quad \text{Equation 21}$$

and

$$F'(a) = U''(a) = U''_{PT}(a) - w_c f_N(z) (z(a)(z'(a))^2 + z''(a)) \quad \text{Equation 22}$$

where:

- $f_N(z)$ is the Gaussian density (equation 16),

- $z(a)$ is the argument of the Gaussian, given by (equation 13),
- $z'(a)$ is given by (equation 17), and $z''(a)=0$
- and the derivatives of the PT utility $U_{PT}(a)$ are simply

$$\begin{aligned} U'_{PT}(a) &= -\frac{\gamma}{a} U_{PT}(a), \\ U''_{PT}(a) &= -\frac{-\gamma(\gamma-1)}{a^2} U_{PT}(a) \end{aligned} \quad \text{Equation 23}$$

Figure 6 illustrates Newton's Method to find an "optimal" acceleration.

4.3.3 Standard deviation of the acceleration function

With known analytical derivatives $U'(a)$ and $U''(a)$, the standard deviation of the acceleration is known if the acceleration at the optimal utility is known:

$$\sigma_a^2(s, v, \Delta v) = \frac{-1}{\beta U''(a^*(s, v, \Delta v))} \quad \text{Equation 24 (See Equation 11)}$$

The results are plotted in Figure 7.

The approximation presented in Section 4 provides a simplified and efficient method for implementing the model formulated in Section 3.

5.0 MODEL ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT

At this stage, the model is structured so that the stimuli influencing driver behavior reflects the traffic conditions surrounding a given vehicle; these stimuli are: 1) the predicted velocity distribution of the leading vehicle, 2) the relative speed between the leading vehicle and the vehicle in question, [omit desired velocity: It is not a stimulus but a parameter of the driving style] 3) the desired velocity of the vehicle in question and 3) the gap between the end bumper of the leading vehicle and the front bumper of the vehicle in question. The sensitivity of the response (acceleration) to these stimuli is reflected by parameters that may be related to the driver's personality or the corresponding vehicle's characteristics:

- 1- The parameters that may be related to the driver's personality are: maximum anticipation time horizon, velocity uncertainty variation coefficient, logit uncertainty parameters (higher for higher uncertainty), accident weighing factor, prospect utility exponents, weighing factor for the negative prospect theory utility and desired velocity (See Table 1).
- 2- The parameters that may be related to the vehicle's characteristics are: maximum acceleration and maximum deceleration (See Table 1).

The above structure reflects a trade-off between a simplicity facilitating the calibration task and a complexity imitating the stochastic and uncertain decision making process adopted by drivers. If this structure is to be further complicated, additional stimuli can be added. For example, the above model does not take into account the road geometry explicitly. However, this type of stimuli can be included implicitly by modifying some model parameters (maximum acceleration, maximum deceleration, desired velocity ... etc) based on geometric factors (road curvature and smoothness, lane width ...etc).

Moreover, the stimuli emanating from the behavior of the leading drivers are only considered in this model. To allow [the term anisotropy is misleading; omit] model anisotropy and thus consider the behavior of the following drivers, the collision probability of a given vehicle with its follower can be computed based on Equation 2. The probability density function of the acceleration can be then calculated based on the [joint probability means to collide with leader AND follower!] joint probability of colliding with the leading vehicle or with the back vehicle (Equation 6). Furthermore, clues for the deceleration of the leader given by braking lights or by the traffic situation several vehicles ahead are not considered.

As for the properties of the model in terms of real-life driver behavior, they can be retrieved from Figures 4, 5 and 7. The model shows that during equilibrium, the time-headway is kept constant at a value of 1.5 seconds which is the value reported in different studies on headway distributions (14, 15). These headways increase when the drivers use higher anticipation time τ_{\max} (Section 4.1) thus taking more safety precautions. In terms of the intuitive relationships between different driving parameters expressed in Figure 4, they can be summarized by Equation 19: higher acceleration values correspond to higher distance headways and lower anticipation times (myopic view). Moreover, as a driver approaches towards a leading vehicle at a higher speed ($\Delta v > 0$), this driver tends to use higher deceleration rates.

Figure 5 shows the probabilistic side of the model where different probability density functions of the acceleration term are plotted in different driving scenarios. When the traffic is moving, in steady state ($\Delta v = 0$), for $s = 20$ meters, the average velocity value is 10 m/s (36 km/h corresponding to $a = 0$). As this velocity value increases, the variance in the acceleration value increases (thicker probability density line), while the expectation value of the acceleration decreases. This decrease reflects the fact that the driver wants to obtain his safety time gap again. As in other micromodels, this can lead to instability for higher velocities in dense traffic conditions ($s = 20$ m, $k = 50$ veh/km) (16). The increase in the variance is a consequence of the value function of the prospect theory: Near the anchoring point (zero acceleration) one acts more sensitively than far away from the reference situation, i.e., when accelerating or decelerating strongly. If the velocity value is fixed to $v = 20$ m/s, at steady state ($\Delta v = a = 0$), the headway values range between 20 and 60 meters. When faced with the case of moving vehicle approaching a standing vehicle ($\Delta v = v$), the moving vehicle tries to decelerate stronger as Δv increases and s decreases. Furthermore, for $\Delta v = v > 10$ m/s, the deceleration increases nearly quadratically and its value is slightly higher than the kinematically necessary deceleration $v^2/(2s)$. This behaviour is observed in reality as well, so this situation can be considered

as a first test of the model. When this same vehicle is in rest ($v=0$), the applied acceleration values range only between 1 and 2 m/s^2 , which is a realistic range for accelerations from a standstill on a road. Relatively low acceleration values are related to the when only small gaps provided ($0 < s < 20$) (17).

Finally, Figure 7 presents the deterministic side of the model where the acceleration values computed at optimum utility (a_i^*) are provided with their corresponding variance. In case of moving traffic (Figure 7A), all vehicles use the maximal deceleration values when $18 \leq v \leq 40$ and $7 \leq \Delta v \leq 20$. [This has nothing to do with (collective) traffic instability but with emergency brakings to avoid, or soften, the consequences of, accidents. Just image what a typical point in the center of the region ($v=30$ m/s, $\Delta v=15$ m/s means: You drive at 108 km/h. Your leader, at a distance of only 20 m, drives at 54 km/h. Only an immediate emergency braking maneuver can avoid an accident, if you are lucky => delete following sentence]. As mentioned earlier, this window corresponds to the highest instability where the variance in the applied deceleration rates increases tremendously (16). The lowest variances are observed when Δv increases below zero allowing the vehicles to accelerate instead of decelerate. The same conclusion can be deduced from Figure 7B. Figure 7B denotes the expected braking deceleration when approaching a standing vehicle, or a red traffic light. For relatively small gaps or high velocities, the kinematically necessary braking decelerations are adopted leading to a smooth and continuous braking maneuver to the standstill. For small velocities and comparatively large gaps, a continuous transition to the accelerating regime is observed. Again, this is the expected driver behavior. Notice that, in contrast to most other models such as the Gipps model, the driving properties of (i) keeping a certain time headway, (ii) braking according to the necessary kinematical rules, is not introduced explicitly into the model equations. In fact, these are emergent properties resulting from the dynamics.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Existing car-following models are deterministic in nature and do not sufficiently consider the cognitive aspects of the driving task. This paper has introduced a car following model that places greater confidence on the cognitive rationale of drivers. For that reason, prospect theory is adopted for the evaluation process of gains and losses while driving. This allows risk taking when a driver is uncertain of the leader's future behavior. Accidents will be possible and no "artificial constraints" will be needed to prevent them.

The model implemented showed promising results in terms of stochastic equilibrium. The asymptotic extension of the car-following equations is possible analytically and allows more efficient implementations and faster execution. This makes such a cognitive-based stochastic model simple enough to compete with existing car-following models.

Decision making theories such as prospect theory allow a more solid psychological background for the presented model, relating it to a rich literature not yet exploited in the traffic modeling domain: stochasticity, risk taking and accidents are well incorporated in the modeled behavior of the drivers.

To test the validity of this model, a more complete implementation, including calibration and validation by comparison with real-life trajectory data remains important. This will allow studying the resulting flow-density relationships as well as other macroscopic performance measures (average travel times, average delay ...etc). Moreover, the free-flow and the lane changing behaviors are not fully developed in this stochastic framework.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study is based in part on research funded by the National Science Foundation's Human and Social Dynamic Systems under Award Number 0527573. The authors would like to thank Dr. Thomas Wallsten for valuable and inspiring discussions and Dr. Dirk Helbing for his financial support while staying at the chair of Traffic Modeling at T.U. Dresden. Of course, the authors remain solely responsible for the contents of this paper

7.0 REFERENCES

- 1- Chandler, R., R. Herman, and W. Montroll, 1958, *Traffic Dynamics: Studies in Car-Following*, Operations Research 6, pp. 165-184.

- 2- Gazis, D., R. Herman, and B. Potts, 1959, *Car-Following Theory of Steady-State Traffic Flow*, Operations Research 7, pp. 499-505.
- 3- Herman, R., W. Montroll, R. B. Potts, and R. W. Rothery, 1959, *Traffic Dynamics: Analysis of Stability in Car-Following*, Operations Research 7, pp. 86-106.
- 4- Kahneman, D. and A. Tversky, 1979, *Prospect Theory: an Analysis of Decision under Risk*, Econometrica, Volume 47, No. 2, pp. 263-291.
- 5- Bernoulli, D., 1954, *Exposition of a New Theory on the Measurement of Risk*, Econometrica, Volume 22, No. 1, pp. 23-36.
- 6- Von Neumann, J. and O. Morgenstern, 1949. *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*, Princeton.
- 7- Shafer, G., 1993, *Can the Various Meanings of Probability Be Reconciled?*, Book: A Handbook for Data Analysis in the Behavioral Sciences, Keren and Lewis, Chapter 5, pp. 165, 196.
- 8- Tversky A. and D. Kahneman, 1986, *Rational Choice and the Framing of Decisions*, Journal of Business, Volume 59, Issue 4, Part 2, pp. 251-278.
- 9- Tversky A. and D. Kahneman, 1974, *Judgement under Uncertainties: Heuristics and Biases*, Science, Volume 185, pp. 1124-1131.
- 10- Tversky A. and D. Kahneman, 1974, *Extensional Versus Intuitive Reasoning: the Conjunction Fallacy in Probability*, Psychological Review, Volume 90, No. 4, pp. 293 - 315.
- 11- Wallsten, T. S., 1983, *The Theoretical Status of Judgemental Heuristics*, Book: Decision Making Under Uncertainty, Scholz.
- 12- Wallsten, T. S., T. J. Pleskac T. J., and C. W Lejuez, 2005, *Modeling Behavior in a Clinically Diagnostic Sequential Risk-Taking Task*, Psychological Review, Volume 112, No. 4, pp. 862-880.
- 13- Gipps, P. G., 1981, *A Behavioral Car-Following Model for Computer Simulation*, Transportation Research 15B, pp. 101-115.
- 14- Wasielewski, P., 1979, *Car-Following Headways on Freeways Interpreted by Semi-Poisson Headway Distribution Model*, Transportation Science, Volume 13, No. 1, pp. 36 – 55.
- 15- Krbalek, M., P. Seba and P. Wagner, 2001, *Headways in Traffic Flow: Remarks from a Physical Perspective*, Physical Review E64, 066119.
- 16- Treiber M, K. Hennecke, and D. Helbing, 2000, *Congested Traffic States in Empirical Observations and Microscopic Simulations*, Physical Review E62, pp. 1805-1824.
- 17- Querejeta-Iraola A. And U. Reiter, 1991. *Calibration, Validation and Testing of Multi-Lane Simulation Model*, Deliverable of EC DRIVE Project ICARUS (V-1052), Brussels.
- 18- Treiber, M., Kesting, A., Helbing, D., 2006. Delays, inaccuracies and anticipation in microscopic traffic models, Physica A 360, pp. 71-88.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Parameters and Typical values of the model

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1A: A typical value function in prospect theory

Figure 1B: A typical weighing function in prospect theory

Figure 2: Vehicles' Representation in a standard Car-Following Model

Figure 3: Value Function for Evaluating Different Acceleration Alternatives

Figure 4A: Utility and the acceleration probability density for $v = 20$ m/s, $\Delta v = 0$ m/s and three values of the gap s to the leader.

Figure 4B: Utility and the acceleration probability density for $s = 20$ m, $\Delta v = 0$ m/s and three values of the velocity v to the leader

Figure 4C: Utility and the acceleration probability density for $s = 20$ m, $v = 0$ m/s and three values of approaching rate Δv .

Figure 5: Contour plots of the acceleration probability density

Figure 6: Finding the utility maximum using the Newton's method

Figure 7A: Acceleration at optimal utility and standard deviation as a function of the velocity and the approaching rate for a gap $s = 20$ m

Figure 7B: Acceleration at optimal utility and standard deviation when approaching a standing obstacle as a function of the velocity and the remaining distance s .

Parameter	Typical Value
Maximum anticipation time horizon	$\tau_{\max} = 5$ s
Velocity uncertainty variation coefficient	$\alpha = 0.1$
Logit uncertainty parameter (higher for smaller uncertainty)	$\beta = 5$
Accident weighing factor	$w_c = 40$
Exponents of the PT utility	$\gamma^+ = \gamma^- = 0.7$
Weighing factor for the negative PT utility	$w^- = 1$
Minimum acceleration	$a_{\min} = -8$ m/s ²
Maximum acceleration	$a_{\max} = 4$ m/s ²
Acceleration normalizing factor	$a_0 = 1$ m/s ²

Table 1. Parameters and typical values of the model. The parameters in the top part (above the horizontal line) are the actual model parameters; the parameters in the lower part are secondary parameters only needed for the numerical implementation.




Figure 1A: A typical value function in prospect theory: the subjective “Value” of a gain/loss to a decision maker versus the corresponding “real” gain or loss





Figure 1B: A typical weighing function in prospect theory (example: $\pi(p) = p + 0.5 * \sin(3.14 * p)$)

Taken from: “Rational Choice and the Framing Decisions”, Kahneman and Tversky, *Journal of Business*, 1986



$x_n(t)$ = Position of Vehicle n at Time t
 $\dot{x}_n(t) = v_n(t)$ = Velocity of Vehicle n at Time t
 $\ddot{x}_n(t) = a_n(t)$ = Acceleration of Vehicle n at Time t

Figure 2: Representation of Vehicles in a standard Car-Following Model




Figure 3. Value Function (equation 4) for Evaluating Different Acceleration Alternatives




Figure 4A. Utility (equation 3) and the acceleration probability density (equation 2) for $v = 20$ m/s, $\Delta v = 0$ m/s and three values of the gap s to the leader.




Figure 4B. Utility (equation 3) and the acceleration probability density (equation 2) for $s = 20$ m, $\Delta v = 0$ m/s and three values of the velocity v to the leader




Figure 4C. Utility (equation 3) and the acceleration probability density (equation 2) for $s = 20$ m, $v = 0$ m/s and three values of approaching rate Δv .




Figure 5. Contour plots of the acceleration probability density (equation 2) as a function of v for $s = 20$ m, $\Delta v = 0$ m/s (top left), as a function of s for $v = 20$ m/s, $\Delta v = 0$ m/s (top right), as a function of Δv for $v = 20$ m/s, $s = 20$ m (bottom left), and for a situation with a standing vehicle or a red traffic light, $v = \Delta v$ for $s = 30$ m (bottom right).




Figure 6. Finding the utility maximum using the Newton’s method (equation 20): two iterations are sufficient for a converging solution.




Figure 7A. Acceleration at optimal utility and standard deviation as a function of the velocity and the approaching rate for a gap $s = 20$ m




Figure 7B. Acceleration at optimal utility and standard deviation when approaching a standing obstacle as a function of the velocity and the remaining distance s .