



U.S. Army Armament Research, Development, and Engineering Center



TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.

EFFECTIVENESS TESTING AND EVALUATION OF NON-LETHAL WEAPONS FOR CROWD MANAGEMENT

Elizabeth Mezzacappa, PhD Target Behavioral Response Laboratory

Presented to the Military Operations Research Society Symposium June 4-6 2014

Distribution A: Approved for Public Release

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE

23 JUL 2014

2. REPORT TYPE

Conference Presentation

3. DATES COVERED

00-00-2011 to 00-00-2014

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

EFFECTIVENESS TESTING AND EVALUATION OF NON-LETHAL WEAPONS FOR CROWD MANAGEMENT Presented at the Virtual 82nd Military Operations Research Society Symposium July 23-24 2014

5a. CONTRACT NUMBER

5b. GRANT NUMBER

5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S)

Elizabeth Mezzacappa; Gordon Cooke; Kenneth Short; John Riedener

5d. PROJECT NUMBER

5e. TASK NUMBER

5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

Army, ARDEC, Target Behavioral Response Laboratory, RDAR-EIQ-SD, Building 3518, Picatinny Arsenal, NJ, 07806-5000

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)

11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT

The Target Behavioral Response Laboratory (TBRL) has developed methods of quantitative testing and evaluation of non-lethal weapons (NLWs) against intended targets in crowd scenarios. These methods include appropriate experimental design and data collection, standardized quantitative metrics, data processing and statistical analyses to evaluate relative non-lethal weapons performance, irrespective of weapon type, platform, or energy. The following results from controlled laboratory experimentation are a demonstration of the depth of analyses that result from these laboratory methods for the testing and evaluation of NLWs. To our knowledge, this is the first reporting of quantitative metrics and statistical analyses of non-lethal weapons performance in a crowd scenario. While the results of this specific experiment are not meant to be broadly interpreted as relative effectiveness of stimuli types or device per se, when applied to fielded and candidate devices, these methods will yield comprehensible and actionable information on relative effectiveness. These methods may provide guidelines for testing and evaluation of NLWs. Moreover the results indicate that: 1) controlled laboratory testing of non-lethal weapons against intended targets is possible, 2) quantitative metrics on crowd response to non-lethal weapons fire can be derived, 3) standard quantitative metrics on crowd response to non-lethal weapons can be derived regardless of weapon type, platform, or energy, 4) quantitative metrics on crowd response to non-lethal weapons can be subjected to standard statistical analyses that yield evaluations of performance, 5) the results of these statistical analyses can be used to evaluate and compare the performance of non-lethal weapons, 6) these procedures are easily repeatable for effectiveness testing and evaluation of existing and candidate non-lethal weapons, 7) these procedures are easily adaptable for effectiveness testing and evaluation of existing and candidate non-lethal weapons in TBRL's existing higher-fidelity outdoor testbeds.

15. SUBJECT TERMS

Non-lethal Weapons, Target Behavioral Response Laboratory, Crowds, Human Behavior, Experimentation, Effectiveness Testing, NLW effectiveness testing

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Public Release	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 29	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			



Headquarters, Department of the Army



- Program Executive Office Combat Support and Combat Service Support
- Program Executive Office Ground Combat Systems
- Program Executive Office Soldier



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



ARDEC's Role



RESEARCH



DEVELOPMENT



PRODUCTION



FIELD SUPPORT



DEMILITARIZATION

Advanced Weapons:

Line of sight/beyond line of sight fire; non line of sight fire; scalable effects; non-lethal; directed energy; autonomous weapons

Ammunition:

Small, medium, large caliber; propellants; explosives; pyrotechnics; warheads; insensitive munitions; logistics; packaging; fuzes; environmental technologies and explosive ordnance disposal

Fire Control:

Battlefield digitization; embedded system software; aero ballistics and telemetry

ARDEC provides the technology for over 90% of the Army's lethality and a significant amount of support for other services' lethality



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



Military Need for Crowd Behavior Research

- The motivations underlying adversarial behavior
- Behavior of contested populations
- How do the behaviors of populations vary cross-culturally?
- What innate human behavior extends across cultural boundaries?





What is "Effectiveness" in a Non-lethal Weapon



- Effectiveness of a non-lethal weapon is assessed by examining the crowd's behavioral response toward that weapon



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



Target Behavioral Response Laboratory



- The Target Behavioral Response Laboratory (TBRL) has developed methods of quantitative testing and evaluation of non-lethal weapons (NLWs) against intended targets in crowd scenarios
- These methods include appropriate experimental design and data collection, standardized quantitative metrics, data processing and statistical analyses to evaluate relative non-lethal weapons performance, irrespective of weapon type, platform, or energy




UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



Crowd Behavior Research at TBRL

- Human behavior can be explained as attractions and repulsions toward and away from goals (Lewin, 1935)
- Crowd Behavioral Test-Bed used to gather:
 - locomotive
 - psychosocial
 - effectiveness data
- Data gathered to develop models that use vector regression methods to identify attributes of a crowd that influence predictive variables






Data Measurement



- Vicon V8i system
- 24 cameras
- 120 fps
- Optical tracking of retro reflective markers ($\varnothing 14\text{mm}$)
- Marker error $< 10\text{mm}$
- Subjects
 - Unique Helmets
 - XYZ location + 3DOF orientation of head
- Control Force
 - Head & Torso
 - Capability for weapon



Courtesy
Vicon



UNCLASSIFIED *TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.*



US ARMY
RDECOM







WG22_Mezzacappa_822_2 of 2.wmv



TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



Crowd Metrics



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



Experimental Conditions

- Crowds with up to 25 subjects
- Scenario consisted of the crowd throwing simulated rocks into a linear target while the target was defended by a non-lethal device:
 - No Defense (Baseline)
 - MRAD
 - Handheld stand-off NLW operated by Control Force
 - Simulated Projectile Weapon
 - Simulated Handheld Directed Energy NLW (VDE)
 - Simulated Invisibly located Directed Energy NLW (IDE)





Hypotheses



- Compared with a less effective weapon, the more effective non-lethal weapon:
 - induces more of the crowd to stay where they are
 - makes people more hesitant to approach
 - makes people slower when approaching
 - makes people spend less time in the line of fire
 - keeps them farther away from the protected area



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



- These behavioral constructs were translated into mathematical terms for statistical analyses
- The derived variables representing these behavioral constructs were, respectively
 - percentage of people in the crowd who never initiated approach
 - (*% Suppressed*)
 - mean time from start to time when people initiated approach
 - (*Hesitancy*)
 - speed of the centroid of the crowd on approach to the target
 - (*Approach Speed*)
 - the shortest distance from the leading edge of the crowd to the target
 - (*Closest Approach*)
 - time the centroid of the crowd spent in the line of fire
 - (*Time Under Fire*)





Methods



- All procedures were approved by the local human subjects research ethics board (ARDEC IRB #10-0002, “Effectiveness Testing for Crowd Management with Non-Lethal Weapons”)
- Participants were recruited from the general population to participate in an investigation on “Crowd Movement”
- Fifty-two healthy men and women participated in one of seven experimental sessions, each held on a different test day



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



Research Design



- Subjects targeted a protected area with simulated rocks for points which represented money
- The area was protected with control force tactics in an attempt to cause the subjects to lose points (money) or be exposed to aversive noise




UNCLASSIFIED


TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



9/16/2011 3:13:03 PM




Crowd members locomote toward protected area



Motion capture of crowd members locomoting toward protected area

9/16/2011 1:47:28 PM



Control force with weapon, shots are fired at approaching crowd members

Crowd members locomote toward protected area behind control force



UNCLASSIFIED

Motion capture of crowd members locomoting toward protected area behind control force



Simulated Non-lethal Weapons



- The experimental weapon conditions were
 - Projectile (Soldier-carried with low monetary penalty for hits)
 - Directed energy (one simulated dismounted infantry Soldier-carried and one simulated long-range, both with high monetary penalties for hits)
 - Fielded acoustic weapon



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



Research Design



- After two no-weapon comparison baselines, each directed-energy and projectile weapon condition was tested four times (4 trials); the acoustic weapon was tested twice (2 trials); order of weapon condition was counterbalanced
- During the trials of the experiment, a computer recorded the subjects' location, orientation, and locomotion through the test bed



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



Analyses



- Data were analyzed using multivariate repeated-measures linear regression methods
 - First, omnibus regressions were run comparing the no-weapon baseline condition with each of the weapon conditions on all five effectiveness measures (% Suppression, Hesitancy, Approach Speed, Closest Approach, Time Under Fire) with the experimental design condition (No-Weapon vs. Weapon) x trial
 - These analyses were run separately for the acoustic, dismounted directed-energy, long-range directed-energy, and projectile weapons
 - Second, those weapon conditions that were found to be significantly different from baseline were run again in another similar omnibus regression comparing performance among the weapons
 - Regression analyses were run on change scores derived from the difference in effectiveness metrics from baseline and under the weapon conditions, with the design weapon (Dismounted Directed-Energy, Long-Range Directed-Energy, Projectile) x trial



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



Results: Multivariate, Univariate, Within-Subjects Contrasts



- Multivariate-level analyses indicated a significant overall difference in the effectiveness measures among the weapon conditions ($F_{10,18}= 3.08$, $p<.05$), but the acoustic weapon had the same effect as no weapon at all
- Univariate analyses indicated that the weapons differed significantly in % Suppression ($F_{2,12}=3.97$, $p<.05$) and Hesitancy ($F_{2,12}=3.97$, $p<.05$ also)
- Within-subject contrasts indicated that, compared with the projectile weapon condition, the long-range directed-energy weapon condition was associated with greater % Suppression ($F_{1,6}=6.14$, $p<.05$) and greater Hesitancy ($F_{1,6}=6.14$, $p<.05$ also)



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



Results: % Suppression




- Univariate analyses indicated that the weapons differed significantly in % Suppression ($F_{2,12}=3.97, p<.05$) Within-subject contrasts indicated that, compared with the projectile weapon condition, the long-range directed-energy weapon condition was associated with greater % Suppression ($F_{1,6}=6.14, p<.05$)
- Following slide shows this graph



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.

Mean Percentage of Crowd Suppressed



UNCLASSIFIED



Results: Hesitancy




- Univariate analyses indicated that the weapons differed significantly in Hesitancy ($F_{2,12}=3.97, p<.05$)
- Within-subject contrasts indicated that, compared with the projectile weapon condition, the long-range directed-energy weapon condition was associated with Hesitancy ($F_{1,6}=6.14, p<.05$ also)
- Following slide shows this graph



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.


Mean Delay to Approach/Hesitancy



UNCLASSIFIED



Results: Distance from Protected Area by Weapon-type over time



The key NLW effectiveness metric is how well the weapon keeps people away from a protected area



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



Non-lethal Weapon Effectiveness Testing with Crowds



- To our knowledge, this is the first reporting of quantitative metrics and statistical analyses of non-lethal weapons performance in a crowd scenario
- While the results of this specific experiment are not meant to be broadly interpreted as relative effectiveness of stimuli types or device per se, when applied to fielded and candidate devices, these methods will yield comprehensible and actionable information on relative effectiveness
- These methods may provide guidelines for testing and evaluation of NLWs



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



Conclusions



- Controlled laboratory testing of non-lethal weapons against intended targets is possible
- Quantitative metrics on crowd response to non-lethal weapons fire can be derived
- Standard quantitative metrics on crowd response to non-lethal weapons can be derived regardless of weapon type, platform, or energy
- Quantitative metrics on crowd response to non-lethal weapons can be subjected to standard statistical analyses that yield evaluations of performance
- The results of these statistical analyses can be used to evaluate and compare the performance of non-lethal weapons
- These procedures are easily repeatable for effectiveness testing and evaluation of existing and candidate non-lethal weapons
- These procedures are easily adaptable for effectiveness testing and evaluation of existing and candidate non-lethal weapons in TBRL's existing higher-fidelity outdoor test beds



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



Target Behavioral Response Laboratory MORSS Presentations



- Virtual Employment Test Bed: Operational Research and Systems Analysis to Test Armaments Designs Early in the Life Cycle
- Method and Process for the Creation of modeling and Simulation Tools for Human Crowd Behavior
- Squad Modeling and Simulation for Analysis of Materiel and Personnel Solutions
- The Squad Performance Test Bed
- Crowd Characteristics and Management with Non-Lethal Weapons: A Soldier Survey
- Effectiveness Testing and Evaluation of Non-lethal Weapons for Crowd Management
- Effects of Control Force Number, Threat, And Weapon Type on Crowd Behavior



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.



US ARMY
RDECOM



Questions?

US Army - Target Behavioral Response Lab

Elizabeth Mezzacappa, PhD

Picatinny Arsenal, NJ

elizabeth.s.mezzacappa.civ@mail.mil



UNCLASSIFIED

TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN. WARFIGHTER FOCUSED.