Towards an optimal method for teaching industrial assembly tasks using collaborative robots: teleoperation vs kinesthetic

Michele Penzo
VR439232

Table of contents

Introduction

Motivations

Within the industry 4.0, robots are increasingly exploited in production plants.

With the ambition to introduce robots into assembly lines the need to reconfigure the workspace requires faster modalities for robot reprogramming.

Motivations

Actually, in automotive industry, welding and painting tasks are already highly automated.

Instead assembly tasks are mainly performed manually today and they are absolutely repetitive and they can be constantly changed.

These tasks are mainly:

- pick and place
- peg into hole

Motivations

To facilitate reprogramming of robots, the new paradigm which is used more frequently is *PbD*: Programming by Demonstration.

Pbd is often used with collaborative robots that are installed in industrial environments.

It's a technique for teaching a robot new behaviors by demonstrating the task through a sequence of commands.

Goals

From *PbD* paradigm a comparison between two modalities was made to find the optimal method for teaching industrial assembly tasks.

The two modalities compared were:

- **kinesthetic teaching**: the robot is gravity compensated and the user physically guides the robot within his workspace
- **teleoperation teaching**: the user controls the robot with a **Ps4** pad

Goals

Before starting the work some research questions can be done:

- Which mode is preferred for ease of use?
- The two proposed approaches are said to be intuitive, but how much when they are used for assembly tasks in industry?
- There is a correlation between physical characteristics of the users and kinesthetic teaching?
- users who have familiarity with the pad are better teleoperation teaching?

Experiment

Experimental design

The experimental design describes the entire flow which is done by every participants of the experiment.

During the experiment some data were collected from ROS `topic` with sample rate of $10Hz$. Those data are related to cartesian pose, cartesian wrench, joint position and joint velocity.

The experiment has been divided into three stages for convenience:

1. pre experiment
2. experiment
3. post experiment

Pre experiment phase

At this stage users were asked to take confidence with both the modalities.

If the user complete this phase an ascending unique id is assigned to him.

Every user perform the pre-experiment and experiment phase without seeing other users do the same.

Experimental phase

The experiment was repeated both for kinesthetic and teleoperation.

It consists in two tasks in ascending order of difficulty repeated for three times. For simplicity the repetitions were called “trial”.

The figure on the left is a pick and place with a simple interlocking, while the figure on the right is a difficult interlocking.





Experimental phase

After every trial a *vote* to the work done is given to the user.

After the *first* trail of every task the replay phase based on the waypoints and actions on gripper is shown to the users. IN this way the user understands where he can improve

The starting position of the robot is always the same for all the users to unify the times.

Every trial of the users were considered valid, even if a mistake were made by the user.

Post experiment phase

At the end of the experiment an evaluation questionnaire was filled by the users.

It's divided in three parts:

1. personal informations as physical characteristics and confidence with pad
2. some questions about mental and physical effort
3. general questions about the experiment

Participants

The total number of participants is ten: seven male and three female. All of them are university graduates or students. Their ages are between 24 and 27 years old.

Half of them never use a robot as KUKA LBR IIWA.

To obtain better and diversified results among the participants, the modality in which each user starts with the experiment is diversified. Half of them started with teleoperation, the other with kinesthetic.

Results discussion

Results discussion

From the questionnaire many of the data collected were analyzed.

Especially from the questions in the first part of the questionnaire it's possible to spot the differences between the two modalities.

Therefore users had to answer questions related to physical and mental effort in both the modalities perceived during the experiment.

Results discussion

The efforts in the two modalities were analyzed separately to understand which data could be extracted.

From these data was possible to create different groups based on personal characteristics.

The two main classifications that have been determined based on:

- physical characteristics
- confidence with the pad

Results discussion

How was the group based on **personal characteristics** created?

In questionnaire was asked the weight and height keeping a range between $10cm$ and $10kg$. Two macro groups, both of them composed by five users, were composed:

- **LBU group**: composed by users which height is less or equal than $70kg$ and which height it's less or equal than $180cm$
- **TBU group**: composed by users with weight grater that $70kg$ and height grater than $170cm$.

Results discussion

How was the group based on **confidence with the pad** created?

In questionnaire was asked with how frequency the pad is used from the users. These users were called:

- **RP**: who replied more than once a week and at least once a month.
- **CP**: who replied that they use the pad once a year or they never used it. Also all users who have used the pad in the past are in this classification.

Conclusion

Conclusion

Thank you so much for your interest and attention.