Monitoring manual control of electric lighting and blinds

Reinhart, C.F.; Voss, K.

NRCC-45701

A version of this document is published in / Une version de ce document se trouve dans:
Lighting Research & Technology, v. 35, no. 3, 2003, pp. 243-260

*A version of this paper has been published in the International Journal Lighting Research & Technology, **35**:3 pp. 243-260, 2003.*

Monitoring Manual Control of Electric Lighting and Blinds

Christoph F. Reinhart, Dr. Ing.[*]
National Research Council Canada
Institute for Research in Construction
1200 Montreal Road, Ottawa ON K1A 0R6, Canada.

Karsten Voss, Dr. Ing.
Fraunhofer Institute for Solar Energy Systems ISE
Solar Building Design Group
Heidenhofstraße 2, 79110 Freiburg, Germany.

Abstract

This paper reviews, validates and extends present knowledge of the degree and kind of manual control strategies of blinds and electric lighting systems that are used in private and two-person offices. A new monitoring setup was applied from March to December 2000 in ten daylit offices in Germany that featured manually operated electric lighting and automatically controlled external venetian blinds with manual override. The data shows that individuals consistently followed the same control strategy for their electric lighting and blinds. Groups of individuals tended to activate their electric lighting according to Hunt's probability function although there was a large spread between individual control levels. All subjects used their blinds to avoid direct sunlight above 50Wm^{-2} and incoming solar

[*] corresponding author: Tel.: ++1(613)993-9703; Fax: ++1(613)954-3733, email: christoph.reinhart@nrc.ca

gains above 50 klux (~450Wm^{-2}). They also were more willing to accept automatic blind opening than closing.

***keywords**: occupant behavior, manual lighting control, blind control, daylighting*

1. Introduction

In recent years there has been a growing interest into the research and development of *integrated lighting control systems*[1]. These systems coordinate the control of automated electric lighting and blind systems –which usually operate in isolation– with conventional building energy management systems like heating and cooling units[2,3]. The assumed benefits of this system integration are that it should yield an overall gain in occupant comfort and energy performance over conventional systems[2] while still being "cost-effective and practical"[4]. Previous research addressed the technical feasibility of integrated lighting controls[2,3] and their acceptance by the occupants[4]. Less effort has been made to identify the basic behavioral patterns that govern when and how office occupants use their manual or automated electric lighting and blind controls. A deeper understanding of these underlying patterns could lead to

- advanced control algorithms that mimic individual switching decisions

- more reliable energy performance predictions of manually and automatically controlled lighting and shading systems.

The objective of this paper is to review, validate and extend results from previous field studies on manual lighting and blind control in private or two-person offices. Based on a literature review (section 2) a new field study has been carried out in 10 offices with a SSW orientation. The objectives of the field study, experimental setup, results and discussion are presented in sections 3 through 6.

2. Previous Research Findings

Previous field studies on manual lighting and blind control in private or two-person offices unanimously yielded that switching behavior is *individual but not arbitrary,* i.e. while switching thresholds vary within a group of subjects, individuals use their controls *consciously* and *consistently*[5678-13]*.* This observed consistency forms the theoretical basis for the formulation of user behavioral models. Field data further suggests that individual control is partly governed by a number of basic behavioral switching patterns, i.e. quantitative correlations that relate user manipulations to external stimuli like temperature and lighting levels or arrival/departure at the work plane. Key findings from previous work, that are further discussed in the following, are summarized in Table 1.

2.1 Manual Control of Electric Lighting

Electric lighting provides suitable indoor conditions for visibility and other occupant needs. The required illuminance levels vary with the user's activities, age, degree of fatigue and cultural background[14]. Apart from this principal task of electric lighting, the act of switching on the lighting can also be interpreted as a signal that the occupant is "at work and has not left for the day". This range of perceived roles of electric lighting can cause individuals to follow drastically different lighting control strategies:

Love[11] observed that subjects in six offices with a southern orientation could be assigned to (1) people who switch the lights for the duration of the working day and keep it on even in times of temporarily absence (L1a in Table 1) and (2) people who use electric lighting only when indoor illuminance levels due to daylight are low (L1b). Love concluded that the switching behavior is as much dependent on the individual as on the daylight availability.

Jennings *et al.* measured the energy saving potential of various lighting control strategies in private offices over a 7-month period[7]. Although the paper concentrated on energy savings due to occupancy and dimming controls, the data also reveals that in only 8 out of 35 offices occupants had their lighting activated less often than they were at their work place, i.e. they "sometimes occupied their offices without switching on overhead lights"[7] (L1b).

Maniccia *et al.* collected 8 weeks of data on the manual switching patterns in 58 private offices and found that 74% of the observed subjects dimmed their lighting and that some occupants sometimes worked with their lighting off (L1b)[6].

Switch-on: The first studies on manual switching patterns of electric lighting systems in offices were carried out by Hunt in the late 1970s[5,15]. Hunt used time-lapse photography to measure lighting status and user occupancy. Hourly mean diffuse and global irradiances were synchronously recorded so that Hunt could establish a correlation between the times of switching of electric lighting systems and the extremes of a period of occupation. His major findings were:

- all lights in a room are switched on or off simultaneously (L2)
- switching mainly takes place when entering or vacating a space (L3)
- the *switch-on probability* on arrival for electric lighting exhibits a strong correlation with minimum daylight illuminances in the working area. This correlation is depicted by the solid line in Figure 1 (L4).

Switch-off: Pigg *et al.* investigated in 63 private offices under what conditions people turn off their lighting when leaving the office[13]. In agreement with (L3) in Table 1 Pigg's results established that electric lighting tends to be manually switched off when a work place is vacated and that the length of absence from an office determines the probability that a manually controlled electric lighting system is switched off (L5 and black bars in Figure 2). Another important result of Pigg's study was that the presence of an occupancy sensor influenced the behavioral patterns of some people. On the average, people in private offices with occupancy control were only half as likely to turn off their lights upon temporarily departure than people without sensors (dark gray bars in Figure 2).

2.2 Manual Control of Blinds

Blinds serve diverse purposes. They often act as a combined heat and glare protection device to maintain adequate visual and thermal comfort conditions under sunny ambient sky conditions and/or to reduce the cooling loads[8,10]. Blinds are also employed to provide visual shelter, i.e. privacy, for the users. Only a very limited number of studies concerning the manual operation of blinds have been carried out so far:

Rubin investigated manual switching patterns of internal venetian blinds in some 700 private and two-occupant offices with northern or southern facade orientations using photography analysis[8]. Climatic conditions were approximated by attributes like *clear and sunny* or *hazy and humid* and 5 blind occlusions were differentiated. Rubin's main results were:

- People *consciously* set their blinds in a certain position. The blind position of choice seems to be a result of weighing positive and negative effects over a period as long as weeks or months whereas diurnal blind operations are rare (B1).
- People are more likely to accept that their blinds are *extraneously* opened than closed (B2).
- Blind occlusion is higher in southern than in northern offices as people tend to use their blinds to block direct sunlight (B3).

Rubin could not establish inter-seasonal or daily changes in how blinds are set, i.e. the recorded blind positions seemed to be independent of sky condition, season and time of day.

Rea continued Rubin's work and analyzed blind positions on three facade orientations in a high-rise office building in Ottawa, Canada, on a cloudy and a sunny day[9]. External photos were taken in the morning, at midday, and in the afternoon. The results revealed a strong positive correlation between mean blind occlusion and incident irradiance even though Rea found no adjustment of blinds throughout the day. Rea's findings support that occupants manipulate their blinds consciously to reduce penetration of solar radiation (B1 in Table 1). Whether solar heat or glare reduction were the driving forces for the blind manipulations could not be resolved from Rea's results. Given that people refrained from changing the blind position throughout the day, Rea concluded – in agreement with (B1) – that they have a long term perception of solar irradiances. This inertia of people to react towards changing sky conditions might resemble the tendency of people to only operate their electric lighting upon arrival or departure (L3).

Inoue *et al.* took photos of offices facades of four air-conditioned high-rises in Tokyo, Japan, to extract the manual control of venetian blinds[10]. Synchronously with the photos, direct and diffuse irradiances were collected. The total measurement period was one to three weeks for each high-rise and the measurement interval was one hour. Occupancy was assumed in an office for the whole working day, if the blinds were operated at least once. The major findings of Inoue's study are that beyond a threshold direct solar radiation of about $50Wm^{-2}$ blind occlusion is proportional to the *solar penetration depth* into a room (B4 and Figure 3)[16]. The solar penetration is defined as the distance from the facade that direct sunlight can penetrate into an office[10].

Lindsay *et al.* investigated venetian blind use in five different office buildings in England[12] using time lapse photography to measure blind occlusions and slat angles. In contrast to B1, they found that regular blind manipulation occurred in a number of offices and that the individual blind manipulation rates for different windows in the same facade ranged from never (0%) to daily (100%) with an average around 40% (B5). Blinds were operated in response to the amount of sunshine and the position of the sun with respect to the facade which is in qualitative agreement with B4. People tended to manually lower the blinds during the days as direct sunlight penetrated onto their facade whereas they mainly retracted them at the end of the working day or early in the morning. Even though the one building which tended to overheat in the summer had the highest mean blind occlusion, Lindsay speculated that the general motivation for people to use blinds is to avoid glare rather than to prevent overheating. This assumption is supported by Inoue's conclusion (B4) which states that direct sunlight as low as 50 Wm^{-2}, which corresponds to relatively low solar gains, does already trigger increased blind occlusions.

Pigg also monitored blind usage and his data confirms (B3) that blind occlusion is significantly lower in northern than in southern offices[13]. In Pigg's survey 37% of the subjects stated that they used blinds to reduce glare on their computer screen.

Bülow-Hübe investigated preferred settings of an awning and an external venetian blind system for 50 subjects in two test offices in Lund, Sweden[17]. During the experiment she let the subjects adjust their shading devices and found that they were frequently used throughout the day to control glare and that the existence of sunlight patches in the room tends to trigger the use of shading devices (B4).

3. Objectives of the Field Study

All above mentioned studies indicate that electric lighting use mainly appears when occupants arrive and leave their workspace whereas blinds are mainly used to block direct sunlight. As all of these switching patterns have so far only been identified *in isolation* for different users, buildings and countries, this study aims to

- test whether previously identified switching patterns can be qualitatively, quantitatively and synchronously reproduced,
- understand whether a manually controlled electric lighting system and automatically controlled blinds with manual override are operated in symbiosis or independently from each other.

4. Experimental Setup

4.1. Building Description

Figure 4(a) shows a photo of the *Lamparter* building which is situated in Weilheim near Stuttgart, Germany, and consists of two rows of offices on each side facing SSW and NNE. Only the SSW offices were considered in this study (see a typical floor plan in Figure 4(b)). As no active air-conditioning system had been installed the offices relied on a careful management of incoming solar gains in the cooling period and a passive cooling approach with nocturnal ventilation and earth-to-air heat exchanger as part of the ventilation system.

Both the electric lighting and external venetian blinds were connected to a European Installation Bus (EIB). The electric lighting consisted of two purely indirect luminaires, each with 2x58W, which were manually switched on and off. Lighting levels were automatically dimmed via a ceiling mounted illuminance sensor which was connected to a closed-loop control system. At full capacity, the system yielded some 400lux on the work plane.

Figure 4(c) provides a sketch of the daylighting concept. External two-component blinds acted as a combined heat and glare protection device and were supported by an external lightshelf. The blinds were operated both automatically and manually. Manual blind control was possible at all times and any manual blind manipulation disabled the automated blind control for 2 hours. When active, the automated control system fully lowered/retracted the blinds if the illuminance onto the SSW facade exceeded/fell below 28 klux. When the blinds were automatically lowered, the lower set of slats was closed whereas the upper slats were kept horizontal to redirect daylight deeper into the room.

4.2. Occupant Description

The 10 offices were occupied by a total of 6 females and 8 males resulting in 6 private and 4 two-occupant offices. In the latter offices the same electric lighting and blind systems were operated by both occupants. All 14 subjects continuously occupied the same work places throughout the whole monitoring period.

4.3 Data Acquisition

The experimental setup was designed to collect a long-term data set including environmental conditions such as direct and diffuse irradiances, indoor temperatures, illuminances on the facade and work plane illuminances as well as occupancy in the offices and the status of the blinds and the electric lighting. This extensive data collection has been realized through four data acquisition systems:

User occupancy and indoor temperatures in the offices were measured by ultrasonic presence sensors and an onset HOBO^{TM} stand-alone data logger which were joined together as a single measuring device. The HOBO^{TM} is a low-cost, stand-alone data logger that continuously measured and recorded the temperature and at the workstations in 15-min intervals. The ultrasonic sensors were attached directly to the underside of the monitors located at all workstations. The HOBO data acquisition system proved to run reliably.

Indoor illuminances were also measured by illuminance sensors integrated in the HOBO™ data loggers. Unfortunately, the signal from the sensors was of insufficient quality because of poor sensor quality and because occupants tended to place working material on top of the desktop sensors. Therefore, the dynamic RADIANCE-based daylight simulation method DAYSIM[18,19] was used to simulate the indoor illuminance distribution in the offices based on measured direct and diffuse irradiances.

Direct and diffuse irradiances and the facade illuminance were collected with two Schenk Sternpyranometers 8101 and an Ahlborn illuminance sensor type 4.3 FLA613 via a central data acquisition system which was installed on the roof of the building and maintained by the Fachhochschule Stuttgart[20]. As the data acquisition system had some initial problems, data was only sporadically collected until the end of July 2000 resulting in 142 days of data.

Electric lighting was operated via an EIB system so that the status (on/off) of the switches could be directly recorded with a Linux PC which was connected to the EIB system. The dimmable lighting controls did not allow the requesting of the dim level via the EIB system. Informal observations of the authors indicated that the dimming system was properly commissioned in all offices.

Blind settings in the offices were recorded using a video camera with a sender that was mounted outdoors on the neighboring residential building facing the southern facade of the Lamparter building. The camera continuously sent pictures to the data acquisition system. An example picture is shown in Figure 1(d). Whenever a change in the any one of the southern blinds occurred, the data acquisition system noticed this event via the EIB system and saved a digital image from the camera after pausing 90 seconds to allow the blinds to fully change positioning. Afterwards, the *blind occlusions* were manually extracted from the collected digital images. The blind occlusion[9] corresponds to the percentage of a window that is covered by blinds. It is independent of the blind slat and provides a simplified linear measure of the state of a venetian blind system.

Any concerns the occupants had regarding the video surveillance camera were addressed during an information session before the data collection started. In order to divert the occupants' attention from the behavioral aspects of the study, technical details of the experimental setup were explained to them with an emphasis on the measurements of the energy flows within the building. Sample photos of the camera were also shown to the occupants to demonstrate that the resolution of the photos was too low to show any details within the offices.

The measurement period lasted from Mar 22nd to Dec 3rd 2000. Further details of the experimental setup are provided in Table 3 and in reference No. [21].

5. Results

5.1 Electric Lighting

Switch on: All monitored subjects in the Lamparter building spent a considerable amount of time in their offices without the electric lighting being switched on following switching behavior L1(a) from Table 1. To verify hypotheses L3 and L4, all *switch-on events* were investigated. The analysis yielded that 88% of all events coincided with an arrival and that these events accounted for 86% of all activated lighting times. Figure 1 compares Hunt's original switch-on probability function (solid line) to the combined data from the 10 Lamparter offices (dashed line). The correlations were calculated according to references [5,11] and the fitting parameters are listed in Table 3. It is striking to see how similar the two curves in Figure 1 are, considering that they have been collected in single and multiple-person offices in different countries and decades. Figure 5 shows Hunt's switch-on probability function for all 10 investigated offices separately revealing a considerable individual spread, ranging from a median as low as 38lux to 410lux. A similar individual spread had also been reported by Love in two offices with a northern orientation[11].

This paragraph investigates *intermediate* switch-on events which followed a previous work place occupancy of more than 15 minutes. Hunt proposed that the switching criterion under such circumstances is equivalent to the one at the beginning of a period of occupation[15]. Figure 6(a) shows the frequency distribution of all monitored intermediate switch-on events in the Lamparter building, revealing that indeed these events were more common at lower than at higher illuminances. Based on this finding, an *intermediate* switch-on probability correlation function comparable to Hunt's arrival probability was calculated, following essentially the same procedure as in the proceeding section to fit the data[§]. The resulting probability function exhibits a step-like behavior (Figure 6(b)). Below about 240lux minimum desktop illuminance the probability of a switch-on event lies around 2%. Above this values the probability drops to about 0.5% without further decreasing for higher illuminances. The function does not approach unity for vanishing desktop illuminances due to the scarcity of data. This clearly shows that this curve merely reflects a trend and should be treated with care. It is very likely that parameters which have not been considered in this study – like the

---

[§] While an arrival event is a well defined point in time, an intermediate event takes place within a time period. In Figure 6(b) a time-step-interval of 5 minutes was used to calculate an intermediate switch-on probability correlation, i.e. an event was marked for every time-step at which a work place had been occupied for at least 15 minutes and the lighting was switched off.

type of office work being performed or the alertness of the users – are more suitable to predict the occurrence of intermediate switch-on events. This would also explain the appearance of intermediate switching events above 800lux (Figure 6(a)) which lie above the range of switching events measured during arrival (Figure 1).

<u>Switch off:</u> The light gray bars in Figure 4 show results for the manually operated, dimmed and purely indirect lighting system that was installed in the Lamparter building. The switch-off probabilities for this lighting system continuously lie below Pigg's results for a manually controlled system. Informal discussions of the authors with the subjects in the Lamparter building indicated that the occupants sometimes did not switch off their lighting when indoor daylight illuminance levels were high, as they failed to notice that it was on. This finding suggests that such a lighting system should be either be coupled with an occupancy sensor or an automatic switch-off once the dimming level has stayed below a threshold value for a certain time span.

5.2 Automated Blinds with Manual Override

This paragraph describes how the occupants in the Lamparter building used their manual override control to influence the setting of their automated blinds[∞]. A total of 6393 blind changes were recorded during the 174 weekdays measurement period in the 10 offices, resulting in an average of 3.7 blind manipulations per day and office. This high manipulation rate was caused by the automated blind control system as 3005 blind manipulations (47%) were carried out automatically. The remaining manual blind readjustments were grouped into two classes: A manual blind manipulation was interpreted to be a *correction* of the control algorithm if carried out within 15 minutes after an automated blind readjustment and *independent* otherwise. It was found that 45% of the above mentioned 3005 automated blind adjustments were corrected by the users. This high correction rate confirms findings (B1) that occupants consciously set their blinds –automatically controlled or not– and have a remarkably low tolerance range towards external readjustments. Automated and corrected blind manipulations together accounted for 68% of all blind manipulations.

An analysis of when the investigated subjects corrected an automated blind setting yielded that in 1263 out of 1432 times (88%) the office workers *manually retracted* the blinds after the automated blind system had automatically lowered them. This strong tendency of the occupants to re-open the blinds was strongest at low solar

[∞] In two-person offices both occupants had control over the same blind system.

penetration depths and supports hypothesis (B2) that people are more likely to accept that their blinds are extraneously opened than closed. Qualitatively, occupants only tended to re-close their blinds after an automated retraction when a weak winter afternoon sun penetrated deeply into the building.

Concerning the 1973 *independent manual blind readjustments* only very few tendencies could be extracted from the data. The main difficulty of this part of the data analysis was that for only 811 manual readjustments ambient sky conditions were simultaneously collected (section 4.2). For these events the blinds were manually closed on the average at external facade illuminances of 50 klux and opened at 25 klux.

Figure 7 illustrates the correlation between the solar penetration depth and the mean blind occlusion in all 10 offices for all occupied times. The dots (triangles) correspond to occupied times when the ambient direct solar irradiance onto the facade was above (below) 50 Wm^{-2}. The data supports B4 that direct sunlight needs to lie *above* 50 Wm^{-2} to cause glare and trigger people to lower their blinds. Figure 3 compares Inoue's original fit (solid line) of a SSW facing office facade in Tokyo, Japan, with a parabolic fit of the Lamparter data with a minimum direct threshold of 50 Wm^{-2} (dashed line). The latter principally qualitatively reproduces Inoue's fit. The main discrepancies are found below 2m solar penetration as the Lamparter blind occlusion jumps to over 40% for non-vanishing solar penetrations. Possible reasons for this discrepancy are that Inoue investigated manually controlled blinds, did not measure user occupancy and his occupants were seated a varying distances to the facade.

5.3 Interaction: Automated Blinds and Electric Lighting

Figure 8 explores the interaction between electric lighting use and the status of the blinds. The figure reports the position of the blinds for the times when the electric lighting was activated. Three different blind positions are identified: blinds up (fully retracted), blinds not fully retracted and privacy*. With the exception of office 5, the blinds were fully retracted in over 80% of the times when electric lighting was switched on, i.e. the amount of available daylight was usually maximized when the occupants activated the electric lighting.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

This section interprets the results from the previous section, discusses their general validity and how they could be implemented

* It was considered that a user closed the blinds due to privacy concerns, if the blinds were closed while the ambient horizontal illuminance was below 1000lux

in building simulation models and identifies remaining gaps in our knowledge of manual lighting and blind control.

Electric Lighting: All subjects activated their electric lighting according to Hunt's probability correlation pattern although absolute illluminance threshold levels varied considerably between individuals. *Groups* of individuals followed very similar behavioral patterns independent of the considered office type (Figure 1)) whereas *individual* behavior exhibited a much wider spread (Figure 5). Switch-on events upon arrival accounted for 86% for all switch on events. The remaining *intermediate* switch-on events exhibited a different and much weaker correlation to desk plane illuminances (Figure 6(b)) and it is probable, that they were mainly triggered by quantities which have not been monitored.

Pigg's correlation between the time of absence from a work place and the probability that the electric lighting was switched off was qualitatively reproduced. Anecdotal evidence suggested that the lower switch-off probabilities found in the Lamparter building compared to Pigg's study (Figure 2) can be partially attributed to the dimmed, purely indirect lighting system.

Blinds: The automatically control blind system ensured that the blinds were usually retracted when ambient daylighting levels were low. As the dimmed electric lighting system merely provided a maximum desk plane illuminance of 400lux, the users had to retract their blinds to increase their work plane illuminance beyond this level. This combination of automated blinds and dimmed lighting lead to a daylighting concept in which the electric lighting system played the role of a “backup” for available daylight.

While the users rarely opposed an automated opening of the blinds, they re-opened their blinds in 45% of the times when they were automatically lowered. Lowering of the blinds was only accepted if incident solar gains were as high as 50 klux (~450Wm^{-2})[%] or if direct sunlight above 50Wm^{-2} hit the work plane. The high number of user corrections might have lead to a low user satisfaction[22] and re-enforces that users consciously set their blinds (B1) and that they are more likely to accept that their blinds are extraneously opened than closed (B2).

To reduce the number of manual overrides for an automated blind control, that is based on a facade illuminance sensor, it seems advisable to add a second threshold as to when the blinds are automatically closed, i.e. 28 klux for retracting the blinds and 50 klux for lowering the blinds[&&].

A more sophisticated blind control could adapt Inoue’s correlation of solar penetration depth with blind occlusion (Figure 3)

[%] This hints that visual concerns were people’s primarily consideration when they interfered with the blind system.

[&&] By using an integrated adaptive control for the blinds and lighting system, the number which was recuperated in the Lamparter building. An advantage of the concept of the solar penetration depth is that it considers the position of the sun with respect to the facade as well as the facade geometry and shading due to surrounding buildings. Therefore, the correlation found in Figure 3 – although it has only been measured in SSW facades – should be principally applicable to any facade with non-vanishing solar penetration depths throughout the year, i.e. eastern, southern and western facades. Unfortunately, no sky luminance threshold has been identified so far, that could be employed to predict when blinds are closed in northern facades.

General validity of results: Even though our knowledge of manual lighting control in offices is still fragmentary, many correlations from former studies could be synchronously and qualitatively re-established in this study. This encouraging result implies that the correlations in Figures 1, 2, 3 and 6(b) at least apply in private or two person offices[#]. Their general credibility is still questionable, as only 10 offices have been monitored. Further field studies are needed to validate these findings for a larger set of buildings, work stations and people[&].

---

manual overrides might fall even further[3].

[#] Boyce suggested that social constraints influence the setting of electric light in more open offices in which individuals loose the perception of ownership over their immediate environment[23].

[&] A possible platform for these activities can be provided by IEA Task 31 *"Daylighting*

Application in Building Simulations: The switching patterns found in this study can principally be combined with simulated annual daylight and occupancy profiles in order to predict the annual energy demand of an electric lighting system for various control options for occupants of private or two person offices that do or do not use their electric lighting in accordance to ambient daylight levels (L1(a)&(b) in Table1)[21]. The remaining question concerns the nature of the frequency distribution of two basic user types in a particular building, i.e. the proportion of users who *do* consider daylight compared to all users. Whereas in Jennings[7] *et al.*, Pigg[13] *et al.* and Love's[11] studies the majority of occupants switched their lighting independent of ambient daylight levels, all occupants in the Lamparter building considered daylight. These numbers could be an indication of cultural differences between the light switching patterns of North-American and European office workers. Another interpretation is that different building designs and lighting concepts favor a different behavioral response, i.e. that user behavior is polarized in different buildings. To gain a more settled understanding of which design features might cause such behavioral trends, future research should again concentrate on collecting a much larger data set from a number of office buildings located in various countries.

---

*Buildings in the 21st century" (*http://www.iea-shc.org/task31/index.html).

<u>Unresolved Issues:</u> The automated blind control lead to a blind manipulation rate of 3.6 per day and office which is higher than the ones reported for manually operated blinds[8,9,12]. While the automated blind system triggered occupants to adjust their blinds on a daily basis, it remains unclear whether the same occupants would have operated a purely manually controlled blind system with the same regularity. This issue deserves further attention in the future.

Acknowledgement

This work has been funded by the Federal German Ministry of Economics and Technology under the contract number 033506U as well as Natural Resources Canada under the contract number B-3213. The authors are indebted to Clint Johnson and Peter Schossig (Fraunhofer ISE) as well Peter Seeberger (Fachhochschule Stuttgart) for helping to setup and maintain the experimental setup in the Lamparter building. Special thanks to Jennifer Veitch and Guy Newsham for providing valuable comments on this work.

References

1. Clough, D.W. Vision 2020: The Lighting Technology Roadmap. Office of Building Technology, US Department of Energy; www.eren.doe.gov/buildings/vision2020 . 2000.

2. Lee E S, DiBartolomeo D L, and Selkowitz S E. Thermal and

daylighting Performance of an automated venetian blind and lighting system in a full-scale private office. Energy and Buildings 29, 47-63. 1998.

3. Guillemin A and Morel N. An innovative lighting controller integrated in a self-adaptive building control system. Energy & Buildings 33[5], 477-487. 2001.

4. Vine E, Lee E, Clear R, DiBartolomeo D, and Selkowitz S. Office worker response to an automated venetian blind and electric lighting system: a pilot study. Energy and Buildings 28[2], 205-218. 1998.

5. Hunt D R G. *The use of artificial lighting in relation to daylight levels and occupanc*y. Bldg. Envir. 14, 21-33. 1979.

6. Maniccia D, Rutledge B, Rea M S, and Morrow W. Occupant use of manual lighting controls in private offices. Journal of the Illuminating Engineering Society , 42-56. 1998.

7. Jennings J, Rubinstein F, DiBartolomeo D, and Blanc S. Comparison of Control Options in Private Offices in an Advanced Lighting Control Testbed. Proceedings of the IESNA 1999 Annual Conference, New Orleans, LA, August 10-12 . 1999.

8. Rubin A I, Collins B L, and Tibott R L . Window Blinds as a Potential Energy Saver- A Case Study. NSB Building Science Series 112 , National Bureau of Standards, Washington . 1978.

9. Rea M S. Window Blind Occlusion: A Pilot Study. Building and Environment **19**[2], 133-137. 1984.

10. Inoue T, Kawase T, Ibamoto T, Takakusa S, and Matsuo Y. The development of an optimal control system for window shading devices based on investigations in office buildings. ASHRAE Transactions 104, 1034-1049. 1988.

11. Love J A. Manual switching patterns observed in private offices. Lighting Research & Technology 30[1], 45-50. 1998.

12. Lindsay C R T and Littlefair P J. *O*ccupant use of Venetian Blinds in Offices. PD 233/92. Watford, Building Research Establishment . 1993.

13. Pigg S, Eilers M, and Reed J. *Behavioral Aspects of Lighting and Occupancy Sensors in Privates Offices: A case study of a University Office Building* . Proceedings of the 1996 ACEEE Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings 8, 8.161-8.171. 1996.

14. Rea M S. The IESNA Lighting Handbook. published by the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America, ISBN 0-87995-150-8 (New York, NY:IESNA), 9th Edition . 2000.

15. Hunt D R G. *Predicting artificial lighting use a method based upon observed patterns of behavior*. Lighting Research & Technology 12[1], 7-14. 1980.

16. Newsham G R . *Manual Control of Window Blinds and Electric Lighting: Implications for Comfort and Energy Consumption*. Indoor Environment **3**, 135-144. 1994.

17. Bülow-Hübe H . *Office worker preferences of exterior shading devices*. , Conf. Proceed. of the EUROSUN in Copenhagen, Denmark . 2000.

18. Reinhart C F and Herkel S. The Simulation of Annual Daylight Illuminance Distributions- A state of the art comparison of six RADIANCE-based methods. Energy & Buildings 32[2], 167-187. 2000.

19. Reinhart C F and Walkenhorst O. *Dynamic RADIANCE-based Daylight Simulations for a full-scale Test Office with outer Venetian Blinds*. Energy & Buildings 33[7], 683-697. 2001.

20. Müller J F, Eicker U, Seeberger P, and Bauer U. Passiv-Bürohaus Lamparter Weilheim/Teck:Konzept, Erfahrungen und Messergebnisse der ersten Heizperiode. Conf. Conf. Proceed. of the 11th Symposium Thermal Solar Energy Usage, Kloster Banz, Staffelstein, Germany, ISBN: 3-934681-14-X , 491-496. 2001.

21. Reinhart C F. Daylight Availability and Manual Lighting Control in Office Buildings Simulation Studies and Analysis of Measurements. Ph.D. thesis., October 2001, Technical University of Karlsruhe, Germany . 2001.

22. Guillemin A and Morel N. Experimental Results of a self-adaptive integrated control system in buildings: A Pilot Study. Solar Energy 75[5], 397-403. 2002.

23. Boyce P R. Observations of the manual switching of lighting. Lighting Research & Technology 12[4], 195-205. 1980.



Figure. 1: Comparison of the switch on probabilities upon arrival found by Hunt and in the Lamparter building. The triangles correspond to measured switch-on probabilities.



Figure 2: Comparison of measured switch-off probabilities for different times of user absence for a lighting systems without controls and with an occupancy sensor according to Pigg as well as for the dimmed, indirect system from the Lamparter building.



Figure 3: Mean blind occlusion for different solar penetration depths for all investigated offices for the occupied times when the direct solar irradiance was above 50 Wm^{-2}. The straight line corresponds to Inoue's fit whereas the parabolic graph is fitted to the Lamparter data. The parabolic fit corresponds to $y = 15 + \sqrt{-0.116 + 1359x}$ with y= blind occlusion [%] and x= solar penetration depth [m].

Figure 4(a): Photo of the monitored Lamparter building (architects: Meier-Weinbrenner-Single, Nürtingen, Germany);



Figure 4 (b): Typical floor plan of the building. The field study was carried out in the offices with the SSW facade orientation (marked gray).



Figure 4(c): Daylighting concept in the offices.

Figure 4(d): Example video capture from the data acquisition system for the blind settings.



Figure 5: Individual switch-on probabilities as a function of work plane illuminance in all offices.



Figure 6(a): Histogram of intermediate switch-on events ordered by their pertaining minimum indoor illuminances.



Figure 6(b): Intermediate switch-on probability for all 10 offices based on 5-minute-time-step-intervals.



Figure 7: Mean blind occlusion for different solar penetration depths for all the investigated offices for all occupied times. The dots (triangles) correspond to times with direct solar irradiances above (below) 50 Wm^{-2}.



Figure 8: Status of the venetian blinds during hours when the offices were occupied and the lighting was activated.

Table 1: selected findings from previous studies.

manual control of artificial lighting	**reference**
(L1) people usually pertain to either of the following two behavioral classes: (a) people who switch the lights for the duration of the working day and keep it on even in times of temporarily absence and (b) people who use electric lighting only when indoor illuminance levels due to daylight are low.	Love 1998
(L2) all lights in a room are switched on or off simultaneously	Hunt 1979
(L3) switching mainly takes place when entering or vacating a space	Hunt 1979, Love 1998, Pigg 1998
(L4) the *switch-on probability* on arrival for artificial lighting exhibits a strong correlation with minimum daylight illuminances in the working area.	Hunt 1979, Love 1998
(L5) the length of absence from an office strongly relates with the manual switch-off probability of the artificial lighting system	Pigg 1998
(L6) the presence of an occupancy sensor influences the behavioral patterns of some people. On the average, people in private offices with occupancy control are only half as likely to turn off their lights upon temporarily departure than people without sensors	Pigg 1998

manual control of blinds	**reference**
(B1) people consciously set their blinds in a certain position. The blind position of choice seems to be a result of weighing positive and negative effects over a period as long as weeks or months whereas diurnal blind operations are rare.	Rubin 1978, Rea 1984
(B2) people are more likely to accept that their blinds are extraneously opened than closed.	Rubin 1978
(B3) blind occlusion is higher in southern than in northern offices as people tend to use their blinds to block direct sunlight.	Rubin 1978, Pigg 1998
(B4) beyond a threshold direct solar radiation onto a facade of about 50 Wm^{-2} blind occlusion is proportional to the depth of sunlight penetration into a room.	Inoue 1988
(B5) individual manual blind manipulation vary from never to daily in the same facade and tends to be take place at the extremes of a working day	Lindsay 1993

Table 2: Overview of the collected data.

quantity	measurement technique	[units]	measurement interval [min]	data collected [days]
work place occupancy	occupancy sensor	[0/1]	15	248
indoor temperatures	HOBO data logger	[^{o}C]	15	248
work plane illuminances	simulated based on direct and diffuse irradiances	[lux]	5	142
ambient temperature	thermocouple	[^{o}C]	5	142
global horizontal irradiance	pyranometer	[W/m^2]	5	142
diffuse horizontal irradiance	pyranometer	[W/m^2]	5	142
vertical illuminance in facade	illuminance meter	[lux]	5	142
status of artificial lighting	via EIB system	[0/1]	5	243
blind occlusion	analysis of digital pictures	[%]	5	243

Table 3: Fitting parameters for different switch-on probabilities with $y= a + c/\{1+\exp[-b(x-m)]\}$ for $x>0$ and $y=1$ for $x=0$; $y=$ switching probability and $x= \log_{10}$(min. work plane ill.).

parameter	a	b	c	m	median [lux]
Hunt's switch–on probability upon arrival	-0.0175	-4.0835	1.0361	1.8223	121
switch–on probability upon arrival from this pilot study	-0.00238	-3.0965	1.0157	1.8536	195
intermediate switch–on probability from this pilot study	0.0027	-64.19	0.017	2.41	241