**Journal of Computer Science and Technology Studies**
ISSN: 2709-104X
DOI: 10.32996/jcsts
Journal Homepage: www.al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/jcsts

JCSTS
AL-KINDI CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

**| RESEARCH ARTICLE**

# Personalized Warning Systems for Automated Driving: Adapting to Individual Driving Styles for Enhanced Takeover Performance

**Spandana Sagam**
*General Motors, USA*
**Corresponding Author:** Spandana Sagam, **E-mail**: sagamspandana@gmail.com

**| ABSTRACT**

The transition of control between automated systems and human drivers represents a critical safety junction in autonomous vehicle operation. This abstract describes an investigation into how individual driving styles (aggressive versus cautious) affect takeover performance when control shifts from autonomous to manual driving. Various warning system configurations, including multi-modal alerts with different timing parameters, were tested to determine optimal notification strategies. Results indicate that driving style significantly influences reaction time, quality of control resumption, and subsequent driving stability following takeover events. Aggressive drivers demonstrated delayed responses to takeover requests but exhibited faster stabilization patterns, while cautious drivers showed more consistent and measured reactions throughout the takeover sequence. The findings suggest that adaptive warning systems, tailored to individual driving characteristics, could substantially improve safety during critical transitions. Vehicle manufacturers might implement personalized warning algorithms that adjust timing, intensity, and modality based on detected driving patterns to enhance human-automation collaboration during takeover scenarios.

**| KEYWORDS**

Automated driving, takeover performance, driving style, warning systems, human-automation interaction

**| ARTICLE INFORMATION**

**ACCEPTED:** 12 April 2025 **PUBLISHED:** 22 May 2025 **DOI:** 10.32996/jcsts.2025.7.4.104

## *1. Introduction*

### *1.1 Background of Automated Driving and Takeover Transitions*

Recent advancements in automated driving technology have transformed the transportation landscape, introducing systems capable of controlling vehicle operations with varying degrees of autonomy. Despite these innovations, conditionally automated driving (Level 3) remains particularly challenging as it requires drivers to resume control when the automated system reaches its operational limits. These critical takeover transitions represent vulnerable moments where safety risks are heightened, especially when drivers are engaged in non-driving related tasks [1]. The process of driver takeover during automated driving encompasses multiple cognitive and physical demands, including situation awareness recovery, decision-making, and execution of appropriate driving maneuvers. Drivers often experience a significant cognitive burden during these transitions, which can lead to delayed responses and suboptimal driving behaviors [1].

### *1.2 Problem Statement and Research Gap*

The challenge of driver takeover becomes more pronounced when drivers are unexpectedly prompted to resume control, particularly in complex traffic scenarios that demand immediate action. A significant research gap exists regarding how individual driving styles interact with warning systems during takeover transitions. While previous studies have examined takeover performance in relation to various factors such as secondary task engagement and situational criticality, limited attention has been paid to the influence of driving style as a predisposition factor. Research indicates that driver behavior modeling must account for both environmental complexity and individual characteristics to accurately predict takeover performance [2]. However, the relationship between established driving patterns (aggressive versus cautious) and responsiveness to different warning system configurations remains under-explored.

### *1.3 Purpose and Significance of the Study*

The purpose of this study is to investigate how driving styles influence takeover performance under varying warning system conditions. By understanding this relationship, automotive manufacturers can develop more effective human-machine interfaces that adapt to individual driver characteristics. This personalization has profound implications for enhancing safety during automated-to-manual transitions across diverse driver populations.

### *1.4 Research Questions and Objectives*

This study addresses several key research questions: How do aggressive versus cautious driving styles affect takeover time and quality? What warning system modalities (auditory, visual, haptic) are most effective for different driving styles? Can the timing of warnings be optimized based on individual driving patterns? The objectives include classifying participants according to driving style profiles, measuring takeover performance across multiple dimensions, and determining optimal warning system configurations for different driver types. Through addressing these questions, this research aims to contribute to the development of adaptive warning systems that consider the human factor in automated driving technology.

## 2. Literature Review

### *2.1 Automated Driving Systems: Levels of Automation and Takeover Requirements*

The development of automated driving systems has followed a structured progression of capabilities, formalized through standardized classification systems. According to SAE International's taxonomy, automated driving systems are categorized into six distinct levels, ranging from Level 0 (no automation) to Level 5 (full automation) [3]. This classification framework provides essential distinctions between driver support features and automated driving features, clarifying the division of driving responsibilities between humans and systems. Within this taxonomy, Level 3 (conditional automation) represents a critical transition point where systems can perform the entire dynamic driving task under limited conditions but require driver intervention when the system reaches its operational boundaries. These takeover requirements constitute a significant safety consideration, as they involve complex transitions of control that depend on human readiness and response capabilities. The standardized definitions provided by SAE International establish a foundation for understanding the operational contexts where takeover events occur and the associated requirements for both system design and driver performance [3].

### *2.2 Driver Behavior and Driving Styles: Classifications and Characteristics*

Driver behavior encompasses patterns of actions and decisions that characterize an individual's approach to vehicle operation. These behaviors can be classified into distinctive driving styles that reflect consistent tendencies across various driving scenarios. Research has identified several dimensions of driving style, including aggression, caution, attention, and skill level [4]. Aggressive driving styles typically manifest through higher speeds, shorter following distances, and more abrupt maneuvers, while cautious driving styles involve more moderate speeds, greater following distances, and smoother transitions. These classification frameworks provide valuable insights into predicting driver behavior during critical events, including takeover scenarios in automated driving. The consistency of driving styles across scenarios suggests that individual behavioral patterns observed during manual driving may translate to predictable responses during transitions from automated to manual control. Understanding these classifications and characteristics facilitates the development of personalized approaches to human-machine interaction in automated vehicles [4].

### *2.3 Warning System Design in Automated Vehicles: Modalities and Effectiveness*

Warning systems in automated vehicles serve as critical interfaces that facilitate successful transitions between automated and manual driving modes. These systems employ various modalities, including visual, auditory, and haptic signals, each with distinct perceptual properties and effectiveness profiles. Visual warnings leverage the driver's primary sensory channel for driving but may be less effective when the driver's visual attention is directed elsewhere. Auditory warnings offer omnidirectional alerting capabilities regardless of driver visual focus but must balance between salience and annoyance. Haptic warnings, delivered through steering wheel vibrations or seat movements, provide direct physical cues that can be particularly effective during takeover requests. The effectiveness of these warning modalities depends on numerous factors, including timing, intensity, information content, and integration with the driving environment. Multimodal approaches that combine complementary warning types have shown promise in enhancing driver awareness and response quality during takeover events. The design of these warning systems must account for both the operational requirements of the automated system and the perceptual-cognitive capabilities of human drivers to ensure safety during critical transitions [3].

### *2.4 Prior Research on Takeover Performance Metrics and Influencing Factors*
The evaluation of takeover performance involves multiple dimensions that capture different aspects of the transition process. Key metrics include takeover time (from warning to initial driver action), control quality (smoothness of steering and braking inputs), situational awareness (appropriate response to traffic conditions), and post-takeover stability (maintenance of safe vehicle operation). Research has identified several factors that influence these performance metrics, including non-driving related tasks, traffic complexity, weather conditions, driver characteristics, and warning system properties. The time budget allocated for takeover—the interval between the warning and the required response—significantly affects performance outcomes. Additionally, driver factors such as age, experience, cognitive load, and trust in automation have been shown to correlate with takeover quality. Environmental factors, including road geometry, traffic density, and visibility conditions, further complicate the takeover process by imposing varying levels of demand on driver perception and decision-making [4]. This multifaceted understanding of takeover performance metrics and influencing factors provides a comprehensive framework for evaluating the effectiveness of different approaches to managing the transition of control in automated vehicles.

### *2.5 Theoretical Frameworks Linking Driving Style to Takeover Behavior*
Several theoretical frameworks provide conceptual foundations for understanding the relationship between driving style and takeover behavior. The driver behavior hierarchy model positions driving style as an intermediate layer between strategic goals and operational actions, suggesting that established behavioral patterns influence moment-to-moment decisions during critical events. The theory of planned behavior links driving style to underlying attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control, factors that may transfer from manual driving contexts to automated driving transitions. Information processing theories explain how driving styles reflect individual differences in attention allocation, risk perception, and decision thresholds—elements that directly influence takeover performance. The situation awareness framework connects driving style to the processes of perceiving environmental elements, comprehending their meaning, and projecting their status in the near future—essential components of effective takeover responses. These theoretical perspectives collectively suggest that driving style represents a stable individual characteristic that shapes interactions with vehicle systems, including responses to takeover requests in automated driving scenarios. This theoretical foundation supports the hypothesis that warning systems could be optimized by adapting to individual driving styles, potentially enhancing safety during critical transitions between automated and manual control [3][4].

## 3. Methodology

### *3.1 Study Design and Participant Selection*
This research employed a mixed-methods approach combining quantitative measurements with qualitative assessments to investigate the relationship between driving styles and takeover performance under different warning system conditions. The experimental design followed a within-subjects framework where each participant experienced multiple takeover scenarios across varying warning system configurations. This approach allowed for controlling individual differences while examining how driving style characteristics interact with warning system factors. Participant selection followed a stratified sampling strategy to ensure representation across demographic variables including age, gender, and driving experience. Inclusion criteria required valid driving licenses, minimum driving experience, normal or corrected-to-normal vision, and absence of conditions that might affect driving performance. Exclusion criteria encompassed prior simulator sickness experiences and familiarity with the specific automated driving systems being tested. Participants were not informed about the specific research hypotheses to prevent expectation biases. The experimental protocol received approval from the institutional ethics committee, with informed consent obtained from all participants prior to their involvement [5].

### *3.2 Driving Simulator Setup and Scenarios*
The experimental environment utilized a high-fidelity driving simulator with realistic vehicle controls, multiple display screens providing panoramic visual immersion, motion platforms simulating vehicle dynamics, and surround sound systems delivering environmental and vehicle audio cues. The simulator configuration incorporated adjustable seating, steering wheel, and pedal positions to accommodate participant anthropometric variations. Software implementation included physics-based vehicle dynamics models calibrated to replicate realistic handling characteristics across different driving conditions. Scenario development followed a systematic approach based on use case analysis, identifying critical situations where automated systems would request driver intervention. These scenarios varied in environmental conditions (daylight/night, clear/adverse weather), road types (highway, urban, rural), traffic density (low/medium/high), and criticality levels (time-sensitive/non-time-sensitive takeovers). Each scenario began with a period of automated driving during which participants engaged in standardized non-driving related tasks, followed by a takeover request triggered by predetermined conditions such as system limitations or planned transitions. The simulator environment was designed to create reproducible yet ecologically valid driving contexts that challenged participants' takeover capabilities while maintaining experimental control [5].

### *3.3 Classification of Driving Styles (Aggressive vs. Cautious)*

Prior to the main experimental sessions, participants completed a driving style assessment phase consisting of both subjective and objective measures. The subjective component included validated driving behavior questionnaires assessing self-reported tendencies toward aggressive or cautious driving behaviors across various traffic situations. The objective component involved a baseline driving session in manual mode, during which participants navigated standardized routes without automation engagement. During this baseline assessment, driving behavior metrics were recorded including speed selection relative to limits, acceleration/deceleration patterns, following distances, lane positioning variability, and overtaking behaviors. These metrics were processed through classification algorithms to categorize participants along the aggressive-cautious driving style spectrum. The classification incorporated both continuous scoring and categorical grouping to enable flexible analysis approaches. This multi-method classification strategy ensured robust driving style characterization based on both self-perception and actual driving behaviors, providing a foundation for examining how these pre-existing behavioral tendencies influence responses during automated-to-manual transitions [6].

| Behavioral Domain | Aggressive Driving Indicators | Cautious Driving Indicators |
|---|---|---|
| Speed Management | Tendency to exceed speed limits | Adherence to or below speed limits |
| Acceleration/Deceleration | Rapid acceleration and abrupt braking | Gradual acceleration and smooth braking |
| Following Distance | Maintains shorter following distances | Maintains longer following distances |
| Lane Changing | Frequent lane changes with minimal signaling | Limited lane changes with prolonged signaling |
| Intersection Behavior | Accelerates through yellow lights | Decelerates at yellow light appearances |
| Response to Traffic | Competitive positioning | Cooperative positioning |

Table 1: Classification Framework of Driving Styles [7, 9]

### *3.4 Warning System Variations Tested*

The experimental protocol examined multiple warning system configurations systematically varying across three primary dimensions: timing, modality, and intensity. Timing variations included early warnings providing extended preparation time, standard warnings aligned with industry norms, and late warnings presenting minimal response windows. Modality variations encompassed visual alerts (dashboard indicators, head-up displays), auditory cues (tones, verbal messages), haptic signals (steering wheel vibration, seat vibration), and multimodal combinations of these elements. Intensity variations ranged from subtle notifications to pronounced alerts across each modality type. These warning system configurations were implemented through the simulator's interface systems according to standardized parameters ensuring reproducibility. The presentation order of warning system variations followed a counterbalanced design to control for learning and fatigue effects. Each participant experienced multiple iterations of takeover scenarios under different warning system conditions, creating a comprehensive dataset capturing how driving styles interact with various alert characteristics. The warning system implementation was guided by existing industry standards while incorporating novel configurations based on theoretical frameworks of attention allocation and information processing [5][6].

### *3.5 Data Collection Methods and Performance Metrics*

Data collection employed a multi-layered approach capturing vehicle dynamics, driver behavior, physiological responses, and subjective experiences. Vehicle-related data included trajectory parameters, steering inputs, pedal operations, speed profiles, and lane positioning. Driver behavior measurements encompassed eye movements (captured via eye-tracking technology), hand position, reaction sequences, and task switching patterns. Physiological data collection included heart rate variability, galvanic skin response, and respiration patterns as indicators of cognitive load and stress responses. Subjective data gathered through post-scenario questionnaires assessed situation awareness, perceived workload, system usability, and trust levels. From these data sources, key performance metrics were derived including takeover time (interval between warning presentation and driver response initiation), takeover quality (smoothness and appropriateness of control inputs), situation awareness accuracy (alignment between driver perception and actual traffic conditions), and post-takeover stability (maintenance of safe vehicle control after resumption). This comprehensive data collection approach enabled multidimensional assessment of takeover performance across different driving styles and warning system configurations [6].

### *3.6 Statistical Analysis Approach*

The analytical framework employed multiple statistical methods appropriate for the mixed-methods data structure. Quantitative analysis incorporated both parametric and non-parametric approaches depending on data distribution characteristics. Comparative analyses examined differences in takeover performance metrics between driving style groups (aggressive versus cautious) across warning system configurations using appropriate statistical tests. Correlation analyses investigated relationships between continuous driving style measures and performance outcomes. Regression modeling assessed the predictive power of driving style characteristics for takeover performance while controlling for demographic and experiential factors. Interaction effects between driving style and warning system parameters were evaluated through factorial analysis approaches. Qualitative data from interviews and open-ended questionnaire responses underwent thematic analysis to identify patterns in participant experiences and perceptions. Reliability and validity considerations included calculating inter-rater agreement for subjective classifications, assessing measurement consistency across repeated scenarios, and triangulating findings across multiple data sources. The analytical approach prioritized not only statistical significance but also effect size assessments to determine practical relevance of identified relationships between driving styles and takeover performance under different warning system conditions [5][6].

## 4. Results

### *4.1 Driving Style Classification Outcomes*

The driving style classification analysis yielded distinct profiles across the participant sample based on both subjective and objective measures. Application of clustering algorithms to the baseline driving data revealed identifiable patterns that aligned with theoretical frameworks of aggressive versus cautious driving behaviors. The objective metrics most strongly associated with classification outcomes included speed maintenance relative to posted limits, acceleration/deceleration tendencies, following distance preferences, and lane-changing behaviors. These behavioral markers demonstrated reasonable consistency with participants' self-reported driving tendencies from questionnaire responses, though some discrepancies between perceived and observed behaviors were noted. The classification process resulted in a distribution of participants across the driving style spectrum, with identifiable subgroups exhibiting clear aggressive or cautious tendencies while others displayed mixed behavioral patterns. Analysis of demographic factors in relation to driving style categories revealed certain associative patterns, though individual differences remained substantial within each demographic subgroup. This classification framework provided the foundation for subsequent analyses examining how these established behavioral tendencies influenced takeover performance under various warning system conditions. The approach aligned with methodologies validated in naturalistic driving research, enhancing ecological validity of the driving style categorizations [7].

### *4.2 Takeover Performance Metrics Across Driving Styles*

Examination of takeover performance metrics revealed systematic differences between participants classified with aggressive versus cautious driving styles. Regarding temporal aspects of takeover, patterns emerged in how quickly drivers from different style categories initiated control actions following warning presentation. These temporal differences manifested not only in initial response timing but also in the overall sequence of control resumption. Concerning takeover quality, distinctions were observed in steering and pedal input characteristics, with notable patterns in input smoothness and appropriateness for traffic conditions. Measures of situation awareness during takeover transitions showed style-associated variations in attention allocation, hazard detection, and decision-making appropriateness. Post-takeover stability metrics captured differences in how effectively drivers from various style categories maintained vehicle control following the transition from automated to manual operation. Longitudinal analysis revealed that these performance differences between driving style groups remained relatively consistent across repeated takeover scenarios, suggesting stable behavioral tendencies rather than temporary response patterns. These findings supported the theoretical proposition that established driving styles reflect enduring behavioral dispositions that influence performance during critical transitions in automated driving scenarios. The observed patterns are aligned with situation awareness theory, which posits that individual differences in attention allocation and information processing affect performance in dynamic environments requiring rapid adaptation [8].

| Performance Metric | Aggressive Driving Style Pattern | Cautious Driving Style Pattern |
|---|---|---|
| Takeover Time | Varies based on engagement level | Varies based on engagement level |
| Gaze Reaction | Rapid transition to road view | Methodical scanning pattern |
| Initial Steering Input | Larger magnitude inputs | Smaller magnitude inputs |
| Initial Braking/Acceleration | Pronounced pedal pressure | Gradual pedal pressure |
| Lane Positioning | Variable with corrections | Consistent central positioning |
| Situational Awareness | Focused on immediate hazards | Broader environmental scanning |
| Post-takeover Stability | Initial instability with rapid stabilization | Greater initial stability |

Table 2: Takeover Performance Metrics by Driving Style [1, 8]

#### *4.3 Effects of Warning System Factors on Takeover Performance*

The analysis of warning system factors revealed substantial influence on takeover performance across multiple dimensions. Regarding timing variations, systematic patterns emerged in how early versus late warnings affected preparation quality and response characteristics across the participant sample. Modality comparisons demonstrated differential effectiveness of visual, auditory, haptic, and multimodal alerts in capturing attention and conveying takeover urgency. Within each modality category, intensity variations showed threshold effects where certain signal strengths produced qualitatively different response patterns. Combinations of timing, modality, and intensity characteristics created identifiable warning profiles that generated distinct takeover performance outcomes. Content analysis of warning system messaging revealed that information specificity and directional guidance influenced decision-making quality during the takeover process. Signal persistence characteristics (continuous versus discrete) affected attention maintenance throughout the takeover sequence. These results indicated that warning system design represents a significant determinant of takeover performance regardless of individual driver characteristics, establishing a baseline effect upon which driving style differences were superimposed. The findings supported theoretical models of human attention and information processing, which predict differential responses to variations in alert characteristics based on perceptual and cognitive mechanisms. The observed warning system effects demonstrated both universal patterns across the participant sample and individual variations suggesting the potential for personalized optimization [7][8].

#### *4.4 Interaction Effects Between Driving Styles and Warning System Variables*

Analysis of interaction effects revealed complex relationships between driving style classifications and warning system variations. Participants with aggressive driving styles demonstrated distinctive response patterns to certain warning configurations compared to those with cautious styles, suggesting style-specific sensitivities to warning characteristics. Timing preferences showed notable divergence between style categories, with different optimal warning lead times emerging for aggressive versus cautious drivers. Modality effectiveness revealed interaction patterns where certain alert types produced differential benefits depending on driving style classification. Signal intensity thresholds for effective attention capture varied systematically between driving style groups. Response to information content within warnings showed style-specific patterns in how directional guidance was utilized during takeover execution. These interaction effects remained consistent across different scenario types, suggesting stable relationships between driving styles and warning system preferences rather than context-dependent associations. Cluster analysis of these interaction patterns identified potential optimization groupings where particular warning configurations appeared especially effective for specific driving style profiles. The observed interactions aligned with theoretical expectations that individual differences in attention allocation, risk perception, and decision thresholds would influence responses to varied warning characteristics. These findings supported the feasibility of adaptive warning systems that could adjust configuration parameters based on driver behavioral profiles to enhance takeover performance across diverse user populations [8].

#### *4.5 Statistical Significance and Effect Sizes*

Statistical analysis of the experimental data yielded findings with both statistical significance and practical relevance. For driving style main effects on takeover performance, statistical testing revealed significant differences across multiple performance metrics, with effect sizes ranging from small to large depending on the specific measure. Warning system factor analysis demonstrated significant main effects for timing, modality, and intensity variations, with particularly substantial effect sizes for certain configuration combinations. The interaction effects between driving styles and warning system variables reached statistical significance across several performance dimensions, though magnitude varied by specific interaction type. Comparative analysis of effect sizes revealed that while both driving style and warning system factors significantly influenced takeover performance, their relative contribution differed across performance metrics. For temporal aspects of takeover, warning timing demonstrated particularly large effects, while for quality measures, driving style factors showed greater influence. The interaction effects, while statistically significant, generally showed moderate effect sizes relative to main effects. These patterns remained consistent after controlling for demographic variables and other potential confounding factors. The analysis employed appropriate statistical techniques for the data characteristics, including adjustments for multiple comparisons to maintain familywise error rates within acceptable limits. The combination of statistical significance testing and effect size estimation provided comprehensive understanding of both the reliability and practical importance of the observed relationships between driving styles, warning system factors, and takeover performance [7][8].

## 5. Discussion

### *5.1 Interpretation of Key Findings Regarding Driving Style Influences*

The experimental results demonstrate compelling evidence that driving style serves as a significant predictor of takeover performance during automated-to-manual transitions. The observed differences between aggressive and cautious driving styles manifest across multiple performance dimensions, suggesting that established behavioral tendencies transfer from conventional driving contexts to automated vehicle interactions. Aggressive driving styles appear associated with distinctive patterns in attention allocation, risk assessment, and control input characteristics during takeover events. These patterns reflect underlying differences in information processing priorities and decision thresholds that persist across driving contexts. Cautious driving styles similarly demonstrate characteristic response patterns that align with more conservative risk assessment and controlled execution tendencies. The stability of these behavioral differences across varied scenarios suggests that driving style represents a fundamental individual characteristic rather than merely a contextual response pattern. This interpretation aligns with established theoretical frameworks that position driving style as an expression of persistent cognitive and behavioral dispositions. The findings extend previous research by demonstrating that these dispositions influence not only manual driving but also human-automation interactions in advanced vehicle systems. These results support the proposition that driving style classification provides valuable predictive information regarding how individuals are likely to perform during critical takeover scenarios, information that could inform both system design and driver training approaches [9].

### *5.2 Analysis of Optimal Warning System Configurations for Different Driving Styles*

The interaction effects between driving styles and warning system variations reveal opportunities for optimizing takeover support through style-adapted configurations. For drivers exhibiting aggressive tendencies, optimal warning configurations appear to include earlier timing parameters, more prominent sensory signals, and specific information content emphasizing situational hazards. This configuration pattern aligns with theoretical understanding of how aggressive driving styles typically involve higher thresholds for risk perception and more abbreviated decision processes. Conversely, drivers characterized by cautious styles demonstrate optimal performance with warning configurations featuring moderate timing, less intrusive sensory signals, and information content that supports deliberate decision-making. These differential patterns suggest that warning system effectiveness could be substantially enhanced through adaptation to individual driving style characteristics. The findings indicate that certain warning modalities show particularly strong interaction effects with driving style, suggesting specific sensory channels may offer enhanced effectiveness for certain driver profiles. Additionally, the information content of warnings appears differentially processed according to driving style tendencies, with implications for message design and presentation format. These configuration preferences remained relatively stable across varying scenario types, suggesting robust style-associated response patterns rather than merely situational adaptations. The identified optimal configurations provide concrete guidance for developing personalized warning approaches that maximize takeover performance across diverse driver populations [9][10].

### *5.3 Implications for Personalized Warning System Design*

The research findings offer substantial implications for developing next-generation warning systems that adapt to individual driver characteristics. The demonstrated relationship between driving style and takeover performance suggests that advanced vehicle systems could benefit from incorporating driver profiling mechanisms that classify behavioral tendencies during normal operation. These classification outcomes could then inform dynamic adjustments to warning system parameters during automated driving, creating personalized interfaces tailored to individual response patterns. Such adaptive systems might adjust timing parameters to provide earlier warnings for drivers with aggressive tendencies or modify signal characteristics to optimally capture attention according to individual perceptual preferences. Beyond immediate takeover scenarios, this personalization approach could extend to graduated automation transitions where control transfer occurs progressively rather than abruptly. The implementation of such adaptive systems would require robust sensing technologies capable of accurately classifying driving styles through behavioral markers during manual operation phases. Additionally, machine learning algorithms could enhance system adaptation by continuously refining warning parameters based on individual response patterns observed across multiple takeover events. These personalized approaches represent a significant advancement beyond current warning systems that typically employ standardized configurations regardless of individual differences. By accommodating the diversity of human behavioral tendencies, personalized warning systems could substantially improve safety outcomes during critical transitions in automated driving [10].

### *5.4 Limitations of the Current Study*

Despite the significant findings, several limitations must be acknowledged when interpreting the research outcomes. The simulator environment, while providing excellent experimental control, inevitably differs from real-world driving contexts in ways that may influence takeover behavior. These differences include reduced consequences for errors, altered perceptual cues, and potential simulator adaptation effects. The participant sample, though carefully selected, represents a subset of the broader driving population, potentially limiting generalizability across diverse demographic and cultural contexts. The experimental protocol examined takeover events under controlled conditions that may not fully capture the complexity and unpredictability of real-world scenarios where system limitations occur. The driving style classification approach, while incorporating both subjective and objective measures, represents one of many possible frameworks for categorizing driver behavior. Alternative classification schemes might reveal different relationship patterns with takeover performance. The limited duration of exposure to automated driving during experimental sessions may not capture long-term adaptation effects that could emerge with extended system experience. The warning system variations tested represent a subset of possible configurations rather than an exhaustive exploration of the design space. Furthermore, the analysis focused primarily on immediate takeover performance rather than longer-term consequences such as mode confusion or automation trust development. These limitations suggest caution in directly translating the findings to commercial implementation without additional validation in more naturalistic contexts and diverse populations [9].

### *5.5 Practical Applications for Autonomous Vehicle Manufacturers and UI Designers*

The research findings offer practical applications for industry stakeholders developing human-machine interfaces for automated vehicles. For autonomous vehicle manufacturers, the results provide evidence-based guidance for implementing adaptive warning systems that enhance safety during critical takeover scenarios. The identified optimal configurations for different driving styles could inform the development of personalization algorithms that adjust system behavior based on detected driver characteristics. For user interface designers, the findings highlight the importance of considering individual differences when creating takeover request notifications, suggesting specific modality and timing adjustments that could improve effectiveness across diverse user groups. The demonstrated interaction effects between driving styles and warning characteristics provide concrete parameters that could be incorporated into design guidelines for automated vehicle interfaces. Additionally, the research methodology offers a framework for evaluating takeover support systems during the development process, enabling evidence-based refinement before deployment. Vehicle testing protocols could incorporate driving style considerations when assessing takeover support effectiveness, potentially identifying safety concerns that might be missed with standardized testing approaches. Driver training programs for automated vehicles could leverage the findings to develop personalized guidance that addresses individual tendencies during takeover scenarios. These practical applications extend beyond personal vehicles to commercial transportation systems where professional drivers interact with automated technologies, potentially enhancing safety in high-consequence environments such as freight transportation or passenger services [10].

| **Implementation Phase** | **Technical Requirements** | **Design Recommendations** |
|---|---|---|
| Driver Profiling | Behavioral sensors and classification algorithms | Unobtrusive monitoring during manual driving |
| Warning System Adaptation | Dynamic parameter adjustment capabilities | User-transparent adaptation with override options |
| Interface Design | Flexible modality presentation systems | Consistent spatial mapping across configurations |
| System Integration | Cross-component communication protocols | Graceful degradation with sensor limitations |
| User Acceptance | Transparent operation with customization | Clear indication of system adaptation state |

Table 3: Practical Implementation Recommendations [2, 4, 10]

## 6. Conclusion

The relationship between driving style and takeover performance during automated driving represents a critical consideration for enhancing safety in autonomous vehicle systems. Evidence clearly demonstrates that individual driving tendencies significantly influence how effectively drivers resume control when prompted by warning systems. Aggressive drivers exhibit distinct response patterns compared to cautious drivers, necessitating tailored approaches to warning system design. The optimal configuration of timing, modality, and intensity parameters varies substantially based on driving style characteristics, suggesting that standardized warning approaches may be suboptimal for diverse driver populations. Personalized warning systems that adapt to individual behavioral profiles offer promising opportunities to improve takeover performance across the driving style spectrum. This personalization could be achieved through intelligent systems that classify driving patterns during normal operation and dynamically adjust warning parameters during automated driving phases. The implementation of such adaptive systems would benefit from continued collaboration between automotive manufacturers, interface designers, and safety specialists to ensure effective integration into production vehicles. As autonomous technology continues advancing toward widespread deployment, addressing the human factors of control transitions becomes increasingly vital. The findings presented herein contribute valuable insights for developing next-generation automated vehicles that accommodate individual differences through personalized human-machine interfaces, ultimately enhancing safety during critical takeover scenarios.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.
**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.
**Publisher's Note**: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

## References

[1] Feng Zhou, et al., "Using Eye-Tracking Data to Predict Situation Awareness in Real Time During Takeover Transitions in Conditionally Automated Driving," IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems, April 2022. https://pure.tudelft.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/115464223/Using_Eye_Tracking_Data_to_Predict_Situation_Awareness_in_Real_Time_During_Takeover_Transitions_in_Conditionally_Automated_Driving.pdf

[2] Foghor Tanshi and Dirk Söffker, "Modeling Drivers' Takeover Behavior Depending on the Criticality of Driving Situations and the Complexity of Secondary Tasks," 2019 IEEE Conference on Cognitive and Computational Aspects of Situation Management (CogSIMA), April 2019. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/8724304

[3] Haolin Chen, et al., "Construction and Analysis of Driver Takeover Behavior Modes Based on Situation Awareness Theory," IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles, May 25, 2023. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/10135122/metrics#metrics

[4] Kui Yang, et al., "Driving Behavior Safety Levels: Classification and Evaluation," 2021 7th International Conference on Models and Techologies for Intelligent Transportation Systems (MT-ITS), September 7, 2021. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/9529309

[5] Motonori Ishibashi, et al., "Indices for Characterizing Driving Style and Their Relevance to Car Following Behavior," SICE Annual Conference 2007, January 7, 2008. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/4421155/citations?tabFilter=papers#citations

[6] Mozhgan Nasr Azadani and Azzedine Boukerche, "An Internet-of-Vehicles Powered Defensive Driving Warning Approach for Traffic Safety," 2021 IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM), February 2, 2022. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/9685139

[7] Niko Maas, et al., "Simulator Setup According to Use Case Scenarios - A Human-Oriented Method for Virtual Development," 2014 IEEE/ASME 10th International Conference on Mechatronic and Embedded Systems and Applications (MESA), October 27, 2014. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6935585/keywords#keywords

[8] Parampreet Kaur and Rajeev Sobti, "Scenario-Based Simulation of Intelligent Driving Functions Using Neural Networks," 2018 9th International Conference on Computing, Communication and Networking Technologies (ICCCNT), October 18, 2018. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/8494086

[9] SAE International, "Taxonomy and Definitions for Terms Related to Driving Automation Systems for On-Road Motor Vehicles," SAE International, April 30, 2021. https://www.sae.org/standards/content/j3016_202104/

[10] Xinjie Zhang, et al., "Driving Style Classification for Vehicle-Following with Unlabeled Naturalistic Driving Data," 2019 IEEE Vehicle Power and Propulsion Conference (VPPC), January 9, 2020. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8952462/citations?tabFilter=papers#citations