

Statistical Pattern Recognition for Driving Styles Based on Bayesian Probability and Kernel Density Estimation

Wenshuo Wang, Junqiang Xi and Xiaohan Li

Abstract—Driving styles have a great influence on vehicle fuel economy, active safety, and drivability. To recognize driving styles of path-tracking behaviors for different drivers, a statistical pattern-recognition method is developed to deal with the uncertainty of driving styles or characteristics based on probability density estimation. First, to describe driver path-tracking styles, vehicle speed and throttle opening are selected as the discriminative parameters, and a conditional kernel density function of vehicle speed and throttle opening is built, respectively, to describe the uncertainty and probability of two representative driving styles, e.g., aggressive and normal. Meanwhile, a posterior probability of each element in feature vector is obtained using full Bayesian theory. Second, a Euclidean distance method is involved to decide to which class the driver should be subject instead of calculating the complex covariance between every two elements of feature vectors. By comparing the Euclidean distance between every elements in feature vector, driving styles are classified into seven levels ranging from low normal to high aggressive. Subsequently, to show benefits of the proposed pattern-recognition method, a cross-validated method is used, compared with a fuzzy logic-based pattern-recognition method. The experiment results show that the proposed statistical pattern-recognition method for driving styles based on kernel density estimation is more efficient and stable than the fuzzy logic-based method.

Index Terms—Statistical pattern recognition, driving styles, kernel density estimation, full Bayesian theory, Euclidean distance.

I. INTRODUCTION

Understanding of driving styles plays a crucial role as a supervision and control part in the “driver-vehicle-environment” system. Driving behavior and/or driving styles (e.g., reckless and careless driving style, anxious driving style, angry and hostile driving style, patient and careful driving style, and dissociating driving style are defined by [1]) have a big influence on road safety [2], vehicle performance such as fuel economy [3], comfort [4], etc.. For example, in terms of driving skills, an experienced driver usually drives in an economy way, while a new driver drives in a fuel-consuming way in the same driving environment. For driving styles, an aggressive driver usually prefers to vehicle drivability performance, inversely, a

normal (typical) driver usually prefers to the comfort and fuel economy. Therefore, it is important to recognize and classify the driving styles to offer a feedback information to the vehicle control system, allowing the intelligent and advanced vehicle control system not only to meet individual driver’s needs in time but also to guarantee the safety of surrounding vehicles and the host vehicle. The essential work to achieve this goal is to recognize driver’s driving styles or driving characteristics and integrate them into vehicle control systems, which can allow the vehicle to adapt the individual driver.

Recognizing driving behavior or driving styles is a challenging work since feature parameters will be various for different driving behaviors and driving environments. Fortunately, many related solid works have been done about applications of driver model [5], recognition of driver behavior or characteristics [6], and the human behavior-recognition algorithms [7], recognition of driver distraction [8] [9]. For recognition methods of driving characteristics, they can be roughly classified into two categories: *direct method* (data-based method) and *indirect method* (model-based method). These two methods are discussed as follows.

For *indirect method*, it requires to establish a driver model that can describe driver’s basic driving characteristics such as lane-keeping, lane-changing, and obstacle avoidance, etc. Then, identify or extract driving characteristics based on the parameter estimation of the proposed driver model. Because of the non-linearity and uncertainty of driving behaviours, it is difficult to precisely identify and extract driver characteristics in time. Fortunately, many stochastic process theories can be applied to the recognition of driving behaviours. Hidden Markov Model (HMM), as a simple dynamic Bayesian network, can identify the underlying relationship between observations and states, thus it can be widely utilized to model and predict driver’s states [10] and driving behaviours [11] [12]. In [11], the driver-vehicle system was treated as a hybrid-state system, and the HMM was used to estimate driver’s decisions when driving near intersections. Further, to model and characterise the driving behaviour, the autoregressive with exogenous (ARX) model was widely extended and applied. In [13], a probabilistic ARX model was utilized to predict driver behaviors and classify the driver’s driving style, i.e., aggressive driving and normal driving. To mimic and model the uncertainty of driver’s behaviour, a stochastic switched-ARX (SS-ARX) model was developed and adopted by Akita et al. [14] and Sekizawa et al. [15].

In terms of *direct method*, the basic process of the di-

Wenshuo Wang is a Ph.D. candidate in Mechanical Engineering, Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing, China. Now he is studying in the Vehicle Dynamics and Control Lab, University of California at Berkeley. (email: wwsbit@gmail.com, wwsvdc2015@berkeley.edu)

Junqiang Xi is a Professor in Mechanical Engineering, Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing, China (email: xijunqiang@bit.edu.cn)

Xiaohan Li is a Ph.D. candidate in Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Transport Systems, Chair of Human-Machine Systems, Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, D-10587, Germany. (email: xli@mms.tu-berlin.de)

rect method is to directly analyse the driving data (e.g., vehicle speed, steering wheel angle, throttle opening, etc.) using pattern-recognition or data-analysis method without establishing relevant driver models. For recognition of driving skills, Zhang et al. [16] proposed a direct pattern-recognition approach based on three recognition methods, i.e., multilayer perception artificial neural networks (MLP-ANNs), decision tree, and support vector machines (SVMs). The coefficients of discrete Fourier transform (DFT) of steering wheel angles were treated as the discriminant features. In [17], relationships between driver state and driver's actions were investigated using the cluster method with eight state-action variables. For different driving patterns of drivers, the state-action cluster were different, thus segmenting driver into different patterns. Though the above mentioned works have made a great progress in recognition of driver behavior or driving styles/skills/intentions, lots of challenging tasks haven't been overcome, such as the uncertainty of driving styles and preferences that are affected not only by driver's psychological and physical states, but also by driving environments (including the traffic condition, weather, road condition) and vehicle conditions. According to the above discussion, in terms of recognition of driving styles, there are two key issues:

- *Selection of training data sets.* It is difficult to select a pair of data sets that can represent or define all the aggressive (or normal) driver, though some *rule-based strategies* can roughly classify most drivers into different categories. One reason is that the collection driving data of an aggressive driver may not always show a aggressive driving behavior. Another reason is that the aggressive threshold value will be different for individuals.
- *Uncertainty of driving behaviors/styles.* The uncertainty of driver behavior or driving characteristics may be affected by the disturbance coming from driving environments, driver physical or psychological factors will lead different driving styles even for the same driver at different time and/or driving environments. Though the uncertainty of driver behavior and driving characteristics have been applied to vehicle system control [18] [19] [20], it is difficult to make a decision for the category (e.g., aggressive or normal) to which the driver is subject when the uncertain factors are involved [21].

For the proposed issues, a statistical method is used to describe the uncertainty of driving styles from the point of probability. In this work, the direct method is applied and driving styles of path-tracking attract our attentions, i.e., *aggressive driving styles* and *normal* (typical) *driving styles*. To deal with the uncertainty of driving styles, the driving data are preprocessed using the stochastic (probability) approach. First, a conditional distribution function – kernel density function – is involved to describe the uncertainty of driving styles based on the training data, which can be treated as feature parameters of driving styles. Second, according to the kernel density function and full Bayesian theory, the posterior probability of any pair of input data can be calculated against every category. And then, to make a decision to which category the driver are subject and avoid to calculate the complex variance of

each pair elements in feature vector, the Euclidean distance is introduced. Last, to shown benefits of the proposed pattern-recognition method using kernel density estimation, the cross-validation experiment is conducted by comparing with a fuzzy logic recognition method.

Following the overview in the first section of this paper, Section II discusses the way of selection of feature parameters. Section III presents the fuzzy logic recognition algorithm and the proposed method, including kernel density and Euclidean distance. Section IV presents the data collection and experiment design in driving simulator. Then the experiment results and analysis are shown in Section V. Last, the discussion and the conclusion about this work are shown in Section VI.

II. FEATURE PARAMETERS SELECTION

The goal of feature parameter selection is to allow pattern vectors belonging to different categories to occupy compact and disjoint regions as much as possible in a d -dimensional feature space [24] [25]. Generally, the data using for pattern recognition of driving styles could be classified into three categories: 1) *driver-dependent*, which includes the physical signal and physiological signal that are directly related to the human driver. In terms of physical signal, for example, the steering angle, brake force, and throttle opening signals, gesture signal, eyes related signal are used for recognition of aggressive or normal driver [26] [27], driver fatigue or drowsiness [9], driver's intentions [28] [29] [30] etc.. For physiological signal, rate of hear beat, EGG, or EMG signal is usually used to recognize driver emotions or tension levels [31], etc.; 2) *vehicle-dependent*, which includes vehicle speed, acceleration, yaw angle, are used for recognition of driving skills levels or driver behaviors [22] [23] [26] [27].; and 3) *driving environment-dependent*, which includes road profile, road-tire coefficients, surrounding vehicles, traffic flow, etc.. In this work, the driver path-following (path-tracking) behavior on the curve road is focused on and the vehicle-dependent signals are selected for recognition of driving styles. To characterize driver behavior with different driving tasks, the feature parameter should be selected first. For different driving task, the parameter selection will be different(see Table I).

To select a feature parameter that can describe driving styles when taking a curve-negotiation task, the distribution analysis of parameters is conducted. Fig. 1 shows the basic driving data and corresponding distributions of two driver with different driving styles. To select a series of feature parameters, assumptions are made as follows:

- *Statistical characteristic invariance:* Given a constant driving environment, the vehicle speed or throttle opening driver selected are relatively variable, but its statistical property, such as distribution property, could be treated as invariance to some degree. For example, an aggressive driver prefers a high vehicle speed than a normal driver, and the vehicle speed prefers to fall a constant interval $[v_s \pm \varepsilon, \bar{v}_s \mp \varepsilon]$, ε is a small positive value. Table II shows two drivers with distinct driving styles (aggressive and normal) and the statistical results indicate that the invariance of statistical property is nearly constant for one selected driver.

TABLE I
FEATURE PARAMETERS SELECTION AND PATTERN-RECOGNITION METHOD
ASSOCIATED WITH RELEVANT DRIVING CHARACTERISTICS

Driving task	Feature parameters	Method
Car-following [17] [22] [23]	–Distances between cars; –Vehicle speed; –Vehicle Position	–GMM; –FC
Driving skill [16]	–Steering angle	–SVM; –DT; –MLP-NN
Curve negotiating (or curve path- tracking)	–Vehicle speed	–MPC
Driving styles [13] [26]- [30]	–Acceleration; –Yaw rate; –Lateral displacement; –Vehicle Speed; –Steering angle; –Physical signal; –Physiological signal	–P-ARX; –NN; –FL; –HMM; –SVM; –OOBNs or BNs; –Bayesian filter

NOTES: GMM–Gaussian Mixture Model; FC – Fuzzy Clustering;
SVM – Support Vector Machine; DT – Decision Tree; MLP-NN
– Multilayer Perception-Neural Network; MPC – Model Predictive
Control; P-ARX – Probabilistic Autoregressive Exogenous; NN
– Neural Network; FL – Fuzzy Logic; HMM – Hidden Markov
Model; OOBNs – Objected-oriented Bayesian Networks

- *Maximum discrimination*: The selected feature parameters, to some degree, should maximize the discrimination between different driving styles. From the statistical results in Fig. 1, it is obvious that the vehicle speed driver selects and throttle opening driver controls are suitable to be feature parameters.

Therefore, based on these assumptions and Fig. 1, vehicle speed (v) and throttle opening (α) are selected as feature parameters ($\mathbf{x} = (v, \alpha)$) to describe driver path-tracking behavior in different kinds of styles and discussed as followed.

TABLE II
MEANS AND VARIANCES OF VEHICLE SPEED AND THROTTLE OPENING
FOR TWO DIFFERENT DRIVERS

Driver 1 (Aggressive)		Driver 2 (Normal)	
Mean(Var)_Sp	Mean(Var)_Th	Mean(Var)_Sp	Mean(Var)_Th
56.849(317.551)	0.566(0.131)	52.492(152.317)	0.285(0.099)
61.334(256.959)	0.610(0.133)	48.530(173.298)	0.259(0.063)
61.928(250.443)	0.645(0.136)	52.925(129.773)	0.235(0.071)
61.336(273.581)	0.625(0.127)	50.565(137.977)	0.238(0.059)
64.451(307.289)	0.599(0.146)	50.666(106.973)	0.195(0.056)
64.241(301.918)	0.688(0.120)	50.531(117.186)	0.213(0.064)
63.146(296.334)	0.612(0.142)	49.487(154.639)	0.284(0.057)
61.932(263.429)	0.649(0.142)	46.344(115.193)	0.156(0.030)
64.147(287.705)	0.608(0.126)	48.247(95.392)	0.153(0.037)

A. Vehicle Speed

For driving styles when tracking a given road, the vehicle speed is one of parameters that can directly show and characterize driver behavior and driving preferences [35], such as aggressive or normal styles, shown as Fig. 1 and Table II. For example, in Fig. 1 and Table II, it is obvious that the aggressive prefers to vehicle speeds $v_{agg} \in \{[20, 40] \cup [60, 100]\}$ km/h, while the normal driver prefers to vehicle speeds $v_{norm} \in [40, 60]$ km/h.

B. Throttle Opening

As one of the direct control parameter by the human driver, throttle openings can directly reflect driver's preferences or driving styles. Besides, the distributions of throttle openings for different drivers (shown in Fig. 1 and Table II) are more distinct than accelerations. In Table II, $\text{Mean}_{(\cdot)}$ and $\text{Var}_{(\cdot)}$ represent the mean and variance value of $(\cdot)$, $(\cdot) \in \{SP = \text{speed}, Th = \text{throttle opening}\}$. For example, Mean_{SP} represents the mean value of vehicle speed.

Therefore, the vehicle speed v and throttle opening α are selected as the feature parameters $\mathbf{x} = (v, \alpha)$ to represent driving styles. And then, based on the selected feature parameter $\mathbf{x}$, a model f should be trained using the training data to recognize driving styles $s \in \mathcal{S} = \{s | s = -3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3\}$, i.e., $f : \mathbf{x} \rightarrow s$. Here, the element of set $\{-3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3\}$ represents the aggressive or normal level. A larger value of s means that a more aggressive driving styles. For example, $s = -3$ represents a lowest normal driver and $s = 3$ represents a high aggressive driving style.

III. METHOD

In this section, pattern-recognition approaches of driving styles are discussed. First, a fuzzy-logic pattern-recognition approach is presented in the first subsection to make a comparison with the proposed recognition method. Second, a pattern-recognition is developed using kernel density estimation and Euclidean distance from the point of statistical distribution. The kernel density estimation method is introduced to estimate driver's preference based on training data. Subsequently, to identify the level of driving styles, the Euclidean distance is involved.

A. Fuzzy Logic

The recognition of driving styles is a *vague* concept that can not precisely divide drivers into the defined categories, such as aggressive or normal, as for different drivers the aggressive or normal scales of driving behavior will be different. Driver behavior, which can be treated as a *natural language* (driving behavior language), is vague. Our perception of the real driving styles is pervaded by concepts which do not have sharply defined boundaries. Therefore, a mathematical tool called *fuzzy logic* (FL) is widely developed and introduced for recognition driver manoeuvre [32], driving profile [33] or driving styles and dealing with the uncertainty of driving styles, which provides a technique to deal with imprecision and information granularity.

In this work, the fuzzy inference system (FIS) based on Mamdani rule are defined as a fuzzy recognition system with two inputs (i.e., vehicle speed and throttle opening) and one output (i.e., level of driving styles). The definition of membership function are defined based on an expert driver knowledge.

Corresponding fuzzy values of the first input, vehicle speed (v), are defined to be *lower* (L), *middle* (M) and *high* (H). The fuzzy values of second input, throttle opening ($\alpha \in [0, 1]$), are defined to be *lower* (L), *middle* (M) and *high* (H). The fuzzy values of output, level of driving styles, are defined




Fig. 1. Driving data (Left column) and its distribution (Right column) for two kinds of driving styles. Red line (—) represents the aggressive driver and the black line (—) represents the (normal) typical driver.

to be *lower normal* (LN), *normal* (N), *middle* (M), *aggressive* (A), and *high aggressive* (HA). Here we code the output sets LN and HA as -3 and 3 . All membership functions are shown in Fig. 2 and the fuzzy rules are defined in Table III.

TABLE III
FUZZY RULES FOR DEFINITION OF DRIVING STYLES

Index	Input1	Operator	Input2	Weight	output
1	L	and	L	1	LN
2	L	and	M	1	M
3	L	and	H	1	HA
4	M	and	L	1	N
5	M	and	M	1	M
6	M	and	H	1	A
7	H	and	L	1	HA
8	H	and	M	1	A
9	H	and	H	1	HA

B. Proposed method

1) *Kernel Density Estimation*: Kernel density estimation, as an unsupervised learning method, can estimate a probability density at a point x_0 given a random sample $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N$ from a probability density $f(x)$. For two classes of 1-Dimension data sequences $X_1 = \{x_1^1, \dots, x_i^1, \dots, x_n^1\} \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and $X_2 = \{x_1^2, \dots, x_j^2, \dots, x_m^2\} \in \mathcal{C}_2$, where $x_i^1, x_j^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 1}$, $X_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we can get two *class-conditional probability density functions* $f(x|\mathcal{C}_1)$ and $f(x|\mathcal{C}_2)$ [34], also called *likelihood*. In this work, the Gaussian kernel density at point x_0 is used to calculate the probability density $f(x|X)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 p(\mathbf{x}|\mathcal{C}_k) &= f(x_0|X) \\
 &= \frac{1}{N\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^N K_\lambda(x_0, x_i) \\
 &= \frac{1}{N(2\lambda^2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \sum_{i=1}^N \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\|x_i - x_0\|}{\lambda}\right)^2\right\}
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where K_λ is the Gaussian kernel.

2) *Bayesian Theory and Bayesian Decision*: Suppose that the prior probabilities $P(\mathcal{C}_k)$ and the *conditional-probabilities density* $p(\mathbf{x}|\mathcal{C}_k)$, also called *posterior probability*, are known for the number of class $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Based on Bayes formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(\mathcal{C}_k|\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{p(\mathbf{x}|\mathcal{C}_k)P(\mathcal{C}_k)}{p(\mathbf{x})} \\
 p(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{k=1}^l p(\mathbf{x}|\mathcal{C}_k)P(\mathcal{C}_k)
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

And then, the *posterior probability* given random input $\mathbf{x}$ can be estimated by Equation (2). Under (2), decisions about $\mathbf{x}$ can be made:

$$\text{Decide } \mathcal{C}_k \text{ if } P(\mathcal{C}_k|\mathbf{x}) > P(\mathcal{C}_{\setminus k}|\mathbf{x}) \tag{3}$$

where $P(\mathcal{C}_{\setminus k}|\mathbf{x})$ represents all the left categories except for the k th category.




Fig. 2. Membership function for the inputs and output of FIS. Top1: membership functions of vehicle speed. Top2: membership functions of throttle opening. Top3: membership functions of output. Last: whole process mapping of FIS.

The key to calculate (2) and decide (3) is the conditional probability density $p(\mathbf{x}|\mathcal{C}_k)$. However, for a higher-dimension feature vector in a higher-dimension feature space, the calculation for covariances of every pair of dependent components in feature vectors will be more difficult. Therefore, instead of calculating the complicated covariances, a Euclidean distance-based making-decision method is proposed in the following subsection.

3) *Decision Making Using Euclidean Distance: Bayesian decision* can be easily used in 1-Dimension case, but for a d -dimension case ($d \geq 2$) and the elements in *feature vector* $\mathbf{x}$ are highly dependent, it is difficult to calculate the *conditional-probability* $p(\mathbf{x}|\mathcal{C}_k)$. To overcome the issue, the *Euclidean Distance* is involved to deal with the decision-making issues, here, to determine to which category the driver is subject and measure the levels of driving aggressive/normal type.

Taking two classes (class A and class B) with 2-Dimension ($d = 2$) case for example (Fig. 3), the posterior probability that elements in feature vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2)$ are belonged to class A and B is defined as $f_A(x_l)$, $f_B(x_l)$ for $l = 1, 2$, respectively. Here, $f_A(x_l) = P(A|x_l)$, $f_B(x_l) =$

$P(B|x_l)$. Given random input $\mathbf{x}^* = (x_1^*, x_2^*)$, the relevant posterior probability $f_A(x_l^*)$, $f_B(x_l^*)$ can be calculated by (1) and (2) for $l = 1, 2$. Given any input and project their corresponding posterior probability into the first quadrant, getting $A = (f_A(x_1^*), f_A(x_2^*))$ and $B = (f_B(x_1^*), f_B(x_2^*))$, and the Euclidean distance is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} d_A &:= \|f_A(x_1^*)^2 + f_A(x_2^*)^2\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ d_B &:= \|f_B(x_1^*)^2 + f_B(x_2^*)^2\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The joint density function $p((x_1^*, \dots, x_d^*)|\mathcal{C}_k)$ of d -dimension feature vectors ($d \geq 2$) is decoupled into several simple densities of 1-dimension feature scalar and the Bayesian decision is transformed to the Euclidean distance-based decision. The decision-making rules based on Euclidean distance are defined as follows:

- Decide class A if $(d_A > d_B) \wedge (|d_A - d_B| > \epsilon)$ (Fig. 3(a))
- Decide class B if $(d_A < d_B) \wedge (|d_A - d_B| > \epsilon)$ (Fig. 3(b))
- Decide class M if $|d_A - d_B| \leq \epsilon$ (Fig. 3(c))

where M is the fuzzy class between class A and B , ϵ is a positive threshold value, $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

We should note that, when $\mathbf{x}$ is in a d -dimension Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$ for $d = 3$, the Euclidean distance is the radius of a sphere. Therefore, the expanded Euclidean distance can be calculated by:

$$d_{C_k}(x_i^*) := \left\| \sum_{i=1}^d f_{C_k}(x_i^*)^2 \right\|^{\frac{1}{2}}, k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (5)$$

for any input $\mathbf{x}^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_i^*, \dots, x_d^*)$.

4) *Classification Algorithm*: Based on the above description, a classification method based on conditional-kernel density $f_{C_k}(x)$ and Euclidean distance d_{C_k} is developed. To represent different level of driving types simply, a number set is involved as $\mathcal{S} = \{-3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3\}$. A larger value of number indicates a more aggressive driving styles. The classification algorithm is shown in Table IV. In Table IV, the threshold value $(\underline{\epsilon}, \bar{\epsilon})$ and $(\underline{\epsilon}^*, \bar{\epsilon}^*)$ are selected as Table V. For training step 3, the prior probability $P(\mathbf{x})$ is set to $1/k$, k is the number of classification for training data. In this work, $k = 2$, two typical driving styles of training data, i.e., aggressive and normal, are considered.

IV. EXPERIMENT

In this section, to show benefits of the proposed recognition approach of driving style, a series of path-tracking tests on the curve road for different participants is conducted in the driving simulator.

A. Driving Simulator

All the experiment data are obtained through a driving simulator (See paper [36] and Fig. 4). The direct driving data (i.e., driver inputs, including steering angle, throttle opening, braking forces) is input through the game-type driving peripherals. A bicycle-vehicle model is used as the vehicle system.




Fig. 3. Schematic Diagram of the proposed pattern-recognition method of driving styles using kernel density estimation and Euclidean distance. Here, $f_{(\cdot)}(x_k) = P(\cdot|x_k)$ represents the posterior probability, i.e., the probability that x_k belongs class $(\cdot)$. (a)Decide input data $(x_1^*, x_2^*) \in A$; (b) decide input data $(x_1^*, x_2^*) \in B$; and (c) decide input data $(x_1^*, x_2^*) \in$ fuzzy class M .

TABLE IV
ALGORITHM OF THE PROPOSED RECOGNITION APPROACH FOR DRIVING STYLES

Training	
1:	Input training data sequence $\mathcal{X}^k = \{\mathbf{x}_i^k\}$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, $\mathbf{x}_i^k = \{x_{i,l}^k\}$, $l = 1, \dots, d$
2:	Get the conditional-kernel density estimation function $f(x_{i,l}^k C_k)$ under Equation (1) for each single component in feature vectors
Testing	
1:	Input new data $\mathbf{x}_i^* = \{x_{i,l}^*\}$, $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$
2:	for i, l
3:	Get $f(x_{i,l}^* C_k)$ from $f(x_{i,l}^k C_k)$ for $k = 1, 2$
4:	Get $P(C_k x_{i,l}^*)$ under Equation (2) and set $f_{C_k}(x_{i,l}^*) = P(C_k x_{i,l}^*)$ for $k = 1, 2$
5:	Get $d_{C_k}(x_{i,l}^*) \leftarrow$ Equation (5)
6:	if $d_{C_k}(x_{i,l}^*) > d_{C_{\setminus k}}(x_{i,l}^*)$
7:	if $d_{C_k}(x_{i,l}^*) - d_{C_{\setminus k}}(x_{i,l}^*) \in (\underline{\epsilon}, \bar{\epsilon})$ (see Table V)
8:	then $\mathbf{x}_i^* \in$ level $s = \mathcal{S}$
9:	end if
10:	else $d_{C_k}(x_{i,l}^*) \leq d_{C_{\setminus k}}(x_{i,l}^*)$
11:	if $\ d_{C_k}(x_{i,l}^*) - d_{C_{\setminus k}}(x_{i,l}^*)\ \in (\underline{\epsilon}^*, \bar{\epsilon}^*)$ (see Table V)
12:	then $\mathbf{x}_i^* \in$ level $s = \mathcal{S}$
13:	end if
14:	end if
15:	end for
16:	Output the classification for sequences data $\{\mathbf{x}_i^k\}$

TABLE V
THRESHOLD VALUE OF $(\underline{\epsilon}, \bar{\epsilon})$ AND $(\underline{\epsilon}^*, \bar{\epsilon}^*)$

$(\underline{\epsilon}, \bar{\epsilon})$	Aggressive style level	$(\underline{\epsilon}^*, \bar{\epsilon}^*)$	Normal style level
(0.5,-)	3	(0.5,-)	-3
(0.2,0.5]	2	(0.1,0.5]	-2
(0.02,0.2]	1	(0.02,0.1]	-1
(0,0.02]	0 ⁺	[0,0.02]	0 ⁻

B. Road Curve

In this work, the driver path-tracking in a curve road is focused. The road factors(e.g., road profile) have a big effect on detection of driving style patterns. To design a lifelike




Fig. 4. Schematic diagram of driving simulator using for data collection [36].

driving environment, the road model must have the same scale as road in the real driving environment. To except the effects of natural factors and other disturbs, a special road curve is designed and the natural factors are not taken into consideration. Therefore, the requirements of road model are subject to following criteria: continuity of the path, continuity of the curvature, and differentiability of the set path [37]. Therefore, a curve road is designed as in Fig. 5.

C. Test Method

All the driving data were collected at a sample frequency at 50 Hz in the driving simulator, including vehicle speed (v), throttle opening (α), acceleration (a), vehicle position (x, y), steering angle (δ), yaw angle (φ), etc. Eighteen people are selected as the participant, nine of them are aggressive drivers and other left half part are normal drivers. Each participant should be labelled as aggressive or normal before doing a test. During the test, every driver should follow the rules:

- All participants must be in mentally and physically normal states.
- The secondary tasks are forbidden. For example, text a message or answer a phone while driving.
- Each participant should rest 1 minute before the next run.
- Each driver drives a car in their own driving style in the driving simulator.




Fig. 5. The road profile (Top) and its curvature (Bottom).

V. RECOGNITION PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

In this section, the experiment results and analysis are discussed to show benefits of the proposed recognition method.

A. Cross-validation

Cross-validation (CV) method, as one of most popular evaluation scheme, was used to evaluate the recognition performance of the proposed approach. To do CV, the available training data set is evenly divided into q parts, called *folds*. All folds except random one of folds are used for training recognition model, and the *hold-out set* or *validation set* is used for assessing the training model. In this work, driving data sets are evenly divided into nine folds and five folds are used for training and four fold is used for the performance measure of the proposed method and algorithm. CV assessment approach makes sure that the *training data sets* are disjoint from the *validation sets*. To evaluate the proposed recognition method, the validation sets are grouped by aggressive and normal drivers to test how well the recognizer may identify them from those provided by the aggressive drivers.

The correction recognition rate (CRR) of driving styles recognizer is defined as:

$$CRR_a = \frac{Num_{a,a}}{\sum_{* \in \{a,n\}} Num_{a,*}} \quad (6)$$

for an aggressive driver, and

$$CRR_n = \frac{Num_{n,n}}{\sum_{* \in \{a,n\}} Num_{n,*}} \quad (7)$$

for a normal driver. The first and second subscription of $Num_{*,*}$ are the actual driving styles and the driving styles recognized by the proposed method, respectively. a and n represents “aggressive drivers” and “normal drivers”, respectively. Taking $Num_{a,n}$ for example, it represents the number of runs that are grouped as aggressive drivers and classified as being normal drivers.

B. Results and Analysis

Fig. 6 ~ Fig. 9 show the recognition result for aggressive drivers and normal drivers, respectively, and classify them into different levels using the proposed recognition approach and FL algorithm. The feature analysis, efficiency analysis, and stability analysis are discussed as follow.

1) *Feature Analysis*: From Fig. 6 and 8, it is obvious that the aggressive driver’s driving behaviors are mostly labelled as being an aggressive driver by using the proposed recognition algorithm and FL algorithm, only the behaviors at the begin of runs are labelled as being the normal driver. Furthermore, we found that an aggressive driver may show a normal driver behavior before entering a road curve(shown as part A, B, C, D in Fig. 6 and part A, B, C, D, E, in Fig. 8), but after entering the curve road, an aggressive driver will show an aggressive behavior.

For an normal driver, in Fig. 7 and 9, driver behaviors are barely labelled as being an aggressive driver. Conversely, most of driving data sets are labelled as being a normal driver. Furthermore, we found that a normal driver may perform an aggressive driving when driving out of a curve road to a straight line road (shown as part A in Fig. 7 and part A in Fig. 9), but after entering a curve, the normal driver will perform a normal driving behavior.

2) *Accuracy Analysis*: From Table VI, the average value of CRR_n and CRR_a for eight test drivers (four aggressive and four normal) are 0.914 and 0.862, respectively.

Compared with the FL algorithm, from Table VII, the proposed recognition approach for driving styles is more efficient than the FL algorithm. The proposed algorithm can improve the correctness approximately by 3.79% and 22.36% for aggressive driver and normal driver, respectively.

3) *Stability Analysis*: From Table VII, for recognition of the normal drivers, the recognition results for using FL algorithm for different normal drivers have a lager difference (CRR_n ranging from 0.602 to 0.870), while the recognition results by using the proposed statistical pattern-recognition approach have a smaller difference (CRR_n ranging from 0.883 to 0.980), which means that the proposed recognition method is more stable than the FL algorithm. In some degree, the experiment results indicate that the statistical pattern-recognition approach could transform the uncertainty of driver characteristics or driving styles into a relative determinate issue that can be easily overcome.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, a statistical pattern-recognition method is proposed using kernel density estimation and Euclidean distance to recognize driving styles. This recognition method takes the uncertainty of driving styles into consideration from the viewpoint of statistics. To predict the posterior probability of being fell into which category (aggressive or normal), the full Bayesian theory is involved. To overcome the problem of calculating the covariance among every pair of high dependent elements in feature vector, the Euclidean distance of projection for each element in feature vector is used for deciding to which category the human driver is belonged, which avoids the




Fig. 6. Recognition results for an aggressive driver using the proposed recognition method.(Left: the classification level; Right: the classification result when driving on the curve road.)




Fig. 7. Recognition results for a normal driver using the proposed recognition method. (Left: the classification level; Right: the classification result when driving on the curve road.)




Fig. 8. Recognition results for an aggressive driver using the fuzzy logic algorithm. (Left: the classification level; Right: the classification result when driving on the curve road.)

complex calculation of covariances among each two elements of feature vectors. And then, a cross-validation method is used to show the benefit of the proposed method, compared with the fuzzy logic algorithm. The recognition results show that the statistical recognition approach for driving styles using kernel density and Euclidean distance could improve the recognition correctness approximately by 3.79% and 22.36% for aggressive driver and normal driver, respectively, and show a higher stability of recognition, compared with fuzzy logic algorithm.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank all the participants who are willing to be the experimental driver for our research and all the members in Vehicle Dynamics & Control Lab at University of California at Berkeley. This work was supported by China Scholarship Council.

REFERENCES

- [1] O. Taubman-Ben-Ari, M. Mikulincer, and O. Gillath, "The multidimensional driving style inventory – scale construction and validation", *Accident Analysis Prevention*, vol. 36, pp. 323 – 332, 2004.
- [2] F. Sagberg, S. Giulio, F. B. Piccinini, and J. Engström, "A review of research on driving styles and road safety", *Human Factors*, vol. 57, no. 7, pp. 1248 – 1275, Nov. 2015.




Fig. 9. Recognition results for a normal driver using the fuzzy logic algorithm. (Left: the classification level; Right: the classification result when driving on the curve road.)

TABLE VI
RECOGNITION RESULTS FOR TWO TYPES OF DRIVERS USING THE PROPOSED ALGORITHM

Types\Levels	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	CRR_a	CRR_n
Aggressive	397	204	292	1177	332	538	3485	0.861	-
	467	271	348	830	237	623	3955	0.839	-
	414	220	411	997	462	577	3506	0.841	-
	158	89	372	1301	283	869	3488	0.906	-
Normal	4458	644	626	1062	257	554	578	-	0.830
	3303	1368	1064	1461	419	77	457	-	0.883
	5162	1334	550	1552	77	129	112	-	0.964
	3775	1823	640	2193	70	61	37	-	0.980
Average								0.862	0.914

TABLE VII
COMPARISON OF RECOGNITION RESULTS FOR FL ALGORITHM AND THE PROPOSED ALGORITHM

Type\Algorithm	FL	Proposed
CRR_a of aggressive driver	0.812	0.861
	0.882	0.906
	0.819	0.841
	0.809	0.839
Average	0.831	0.862
CRR_n of normal driver	0.834	0.883
	0.870	0.964
	0.602	0.980
	0.682	0.914
Average	0.747	0.935

- [3] H. Yu, F. Tseng, and R. McGee, "Driving pattern identification for EV range estimation", *2012 IEEE International Electric Vehicle Conference*, Greenville, SC, pp. 1 – 7, March 2012.
- [4] W. Wang and J. Xi, "Study of semi-active suspension control strategy based on driving behaviour characteristics", *International Journal of Vehicle Design*, vol. 68, nos. 1/2/3, pp. 141 – 161, 2015.
- [5] M. Plöchl and J. Edelman, "Driver Models in Automobile Dynamics Application", *Vehicle System Dynamics*, vol. 45, nos. 7 – 8, pp. 699 – 741, 2007.
- [6] W. Wang, J. Xi, and H. Chen, "Modelling and Recognizing Driver Behavior Based on Driving Data: a Survey", *Mathematical Problem in Engineering*, vol. 2014, Pages 20.
- [7] J. Candamo, M. Shreve, D. B. Goldgof, D.B. Sapper, and R. Kasturi, "Understanding Transit Scenes: A Survey on Human Behavior-Recognition Algorithms", *IEEE Transaction on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 206 – 224, March 2010.
- [8] S. Wang, Y. Zhang, C. W. F. Darvas, and W. A. Chaovalitwongse, "Online prediction of driver distraction based on brain activity patterns", *IEEE Transaction on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 136 – 150, Feb. 2015.
- [9] Y. Dong, Z. Hu, K. Uchimura, and N. Murayama, "Driver Inattention Monitoring System for Intelligent Vehicles: A Review", *IEEE Transaction on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 596 – 614, June 2011.
- [10] E. Tadesse, W. Sheng, and M. Liu, "Driver drowsiness detection through HMM based dynamic modeling," in *2014 IEEE International Conference on Robotics & Automation*, Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Center, Hong Kong, China, pp. 4003 – 4008, May 31 - June 7, 2014.
- [11] V. Gadepally, A. Krishnamurthy, and Ü. Özgüner, "A framework for estimating driver decisions near intersections," *IEEE Transaction on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 637 – 646, Apr. 2014.
- [12] D. Mitrivić, "Reliable Method for Driving Events Recognition," *IEEE Transaction on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 198 – 205, Jun. 2005.
- [13] M. Sundbom, P. Falcone, and J. Sjöberg, "Online Driver Behavior Classification Using Probabilistic ARX Models," in *Proceedings of the 16th International IEEE Annual Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, pp. 1107 – 1112, Hague, Netherlands, Oct. 2013.
- [14] T. Akita, S. Inagaki, T. Suzuki, S. Hayakawa, and N. Tsuchida, "Hybrid System Modeling of Human Driver in the Vehicle Following Task," in *SICE Annual Conference 2007*, Kagawa University, Japan, pp. 1122 – 1127, Sept. 2007.
- [15] S. Sekizawa, S. Inagaki, T. Suzuki, S. Hayakawa, N. Tsuchida, T. Tsuda, and H. Fujinami, "Modeling and Recognition of Driving Behavior Based on Stochastic Switched ARX Model," *IEEE Transaction on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 593 – 606, Dec. 2007.
- [16] Y. Zhang, W. C. Lin, and Y. S. Chin, "A pattern-recognition approach for driving skill characterization," *IEEE Transaction on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 905 – 916, Dec. 2010.
- [17] B. Higgs and M. Abbas, "Segmentation and clustering of car-following behavior: recognition of driving patterns," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 81 – 90, Feb. 2015.
- [18] P. Angkitittrakul, R. Terashima, and T. Wakita, "On the Use of Stochastic Driver Behavior Model in Lane Departure Warning", *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 174 – 183, March 2011.
- [19] P. Angkitittrakul, C. Miyajima, and K. Takeda, "Modeling and Adaptation of Stochastic Driver-Behavior Model with Application to Car Following", *2011 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, Baden-Baden, Germany, pp. 814 – 819, June 5-9, 2011.

- [20] M. Bichi, G. Ripaccioli, S. Di Cairano, D. Bernardini, A. Bemporad, and I. V. Kolmanovsky, "Stochastic Model Predictive Control with Driver Behavior Learning for Improved Powertrain Control", *49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Hilton Atlanta Hotel, Atlanta, GA, USA, pp. 6077 – 6082, December 15-17, 2010.
- [21] B. Schubert, "Evaluating the Utility of Driving: Toward Automated Decision Making Under Uncertainty", *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 354 – 364, March 2012.
- [22] C. Miyajima, Y. Nishiwaki, K. Ozawa, T. Wakita, "Driver Modeling Based on Driving Behavior and Its Evaluation in Driver Identification", *2007 Proceedings of IEEE*, vol. 95, no. 2, pp. 427 – 437, Feb. 2007.
- [23] X. Ma and I. Andréasson, "Behavior measurement, analysis, and regime classification in car following", *IEEE Transaction on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 144 – 156, March 2007.
- [24] A. K. Jain, R. P. W. Duin, and J. Mao, "Statistical pattern recognition: a review", *IEEE Transaction on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 4 – 37, 2000.
- [25] R. A. Dunne, "A statistical approach to neural networks for pattern recognition", A John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Publication, 2007.
- [26] M. C. G. Quintero, J. O. López, and A. C. C. Pinilla, "Driver behavior classification model based on an intelligent driving diagnosis system", *2012 15th International IEEE Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, Anchorage, AK, pp. 894 – 899, Sept. 2012.
- [27] B. Higgs and M. Abbas, "A two-step segmentation algorithm for behavioral clustering of naturalistic driving styles", *IEEE Annual Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, Hague, Netherlands, pp. 857 – 862, Oct. 2013.
- [28] S. Y. Cheng and M. M. Trivedi, "Turn-Intent Analysis Using Body Pose for Intelligent Driver Assistance", *IEEE Pervasive Computing*, vol. 05, no. 04, pp. 28 – 37, 2006.
- [29] P. Kumar, M. Perrollaz, S. Lefevre, and C. Laugier, "Learning-based approach for online lane change intention prediction", *2013 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, Gold Coast, Australia, pp. 797 – 802, June 23-26, 2013.
- [30] D. Kasper, G. Weidl, T. Dang, G. Breuel, A. Tamke, A. Wedel, and W. Rosenstiel, "Object-Oriented Bayesian Networks for Detection of Lane Change Maneuvers", *Intelligent Transportation Magazine*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1 – 10, 2012.
- [31] J. A. Healey and R. W. Picard, "Detecting Stress During Real-World Driving Tasks Using Physiological Sensors", *IEEE Transaction on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 156 – 166, June 2005.
- [32] T. Hülshagen, I. Dengler, A. Tamke, T. O. Dang, and G. Breuel, "Maneuver recognition using probabilistic finite-state machines and fuzzy logic", *2010 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium*, University of California, San Diego, CA, USA, pp. 65 – 70, June 21-24, 2010.
- [33] A. Wahab, C. Quek, C. K. Tan, and K. Takeda, "Driving Profile Modeling and Recognition Based on Soft Computing Approach", *IEEE Transaction on Neural Networks*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 563 – 582, April 2009.
- [34] R. O. Duda, P. E. Hart, and D. G. Stork, *Pattern Classification*, 2nd, 2000.
- [35] C. M. Richard, J. L. Campbell, M. G. Lichty, J. L. Brown, S. Chrysler, J. D. Lee, L. Boyle, and G. Reagle, "Motivations for speeding, Volume I: Summary report. (Report No. DOT HS 811 658)", *Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration*, August 2012.
- [36] W. W. Wang, J. Q. Xi, and J. M. Wang, "Human-centered feed-forward control of a vehicle steering system based on a driver's steering model", *IEEE 2015 American Control Conference*, Chicago, IL, USA, pp. 3361 – 3366, July 2015.
- [37] U. Kiencke, L. Nielsen, *Automotive Control System for Engine, Drive-line, and Vehicle*, Second edition, Springer, 2015.

PLACE
PHOTO
HERE

Wenshuo Wang He received his B.S. in Transportation Engineering from ShanDong University of Technology, Shandong, China, in 2012. He is a Ph.D. candidate for Mechanical Engineering, Beijing Institute of Technology (BIT). Now he is a visiting scholar studying in the School of Mechanical Engineering, University of California at Berkeley (UCB). Currently, he makes research under the supervisor of Prof. Junqiang Xi (BIT) and Prof. Karl Hedrick at Vehicle Dynamics & Control Lab, University of California at Berkeley. His research interests include vehicle dynamics control, adaptive control, driver model, human-vehicle interaction, recognition and application of human driving characteristics. His work focuses on modelling and recognising drivers behaviour, making intelligent control system between human driver and vehicle.

PLACE
PHOTO
HERE

Junqiang Xi He received the B.S. in Automotive Engineering from Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin, China, in 1995 and the PhD in Vehicle Engineering from Beijing Institute of Technology (BIT), Beijing, China, in 2001. In 2001, he joined the State Key Laboratory of Vehicle Transmission, BIT. During 2012-2013, he made research as an advanced research scholar in Vehicle Dynamic and Control Laboratory, Ohio State University(OSU), USA. He is Professor and Director of Automotive Research Center in BIT currently. His research interests include vehicle dynamic and control, powertrain control, mechanics, intelligent transportation system and intelligent vehicles.

PLACE
PHOTO
HERE

Xiaohan Li He received the M.Sc. degree in transportation engineering in Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing, China, in 2015. Now he is a PhD candidate in Chair of Human-machine systems in Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany. His group deals with the interaction of drivers with trendsetting technologies in vehicles. Research within this scope aims to enhance safety in road traffic. Special attention is paid to novel concepts for driver assistance systems, using psychophysiological data and performance data for implementation and

evaluation.