Nova Integrata : Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies
Vol:3 Issue:02 (2025)
https://nijms.online editor@nijms.online

CODEX ACADEMIA (SMC-PRIVATE) LIMITED
P-ISSN:3106-1338 E-ISSN:3106-1346

Receive Date: July 14, 2025, Revise Date: September 19, 2025, Accept Date: November 13, 2025, Available Online: December 31, 2025

The Future of Autonomous Vehicles: Analyzing the Technological and Ethical Challenges of Self-Driving Cars

Usman Tariq*[1], Hira Mahmood[2]

**Corresponding Author Email:* usman.tariq@nust.edu.pk

ABSTRACT:

The emergence of autonomous vehicles (AVs) promises to revolutionize transportation systems, potentially increasing road safety, improving mobility access, and transforming urban landscapes. This study provides a comprehensive analysis of the technological capabilities, ethical dilemmas, and societal implications of self-driving cars through a mixed-methods approach incorporating simulation data, accident reports, public opinion surveys, and policy analyses from 2015-2023. Results indicate that while Level 4 autonomous systems demonstrate 94% fewer accidents than human drivers in controlled environments, they face significant challenges in complex urban scenarios, with disengagement rates increasing from 0.02 to 1.8 interventions per 100 miles as environmental complexity rises. Ethical analysis reveals that public preferences for autonomous vehicle decision-making in unavoidable accident scenarios vary significantly across cultures, with Western populations preferring utilitarian algorithms (minimizing total harm) at 65% approval, while Eastern populations show stronger preference for protective algorithms (prioritizing vehicle occupants) at 58% approval. Technological assessments indicate that sensor fusion systems achieve 99.7% object detection accuracy in daylight conditions but degrade to 85.3% in heavy rain and 79.1% in snow. Cybersecurity vulnerabilities pose substantial risks, with penetration testing revealing successful remote takeover of vehicle controls in 17% of tested systems. Economic projections suggest AV deployment could eliminate 2.7-3.5 million driving jobs in the United States alone by 2040 while creating 0.8-1.2 million new positions in fleet management, remote supervision, and infrastructure maintenance. Legal frameworks remain fragmented across 32 studied jurisdictions, with liability assignment being the most contentious unresolved issue. This research concludes that while autonomous vehicles offer transformative potential, their responsible deployment requires addressing persistent technological limitations, establishing ethical and legal consensus, implementing robust cybersecurity protocols, and managing profound socioeconomic transitions through coordinated policy interventions and public engagement.

Keywords: *Autonomous Vehicles, Self-Driving Cars, Ethical Algorithms, Sensor Fusion, Cybersecurity, Transportation Policy, Artificial Intelligence*

[1]Department of Computer Science, National University of Sciences and Technology Islamabad, Pakistan, usman.tariq@nust.edu.pk
[2]Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Engineering and Technology Taxila, Pakistan, hira.mahmood@uettaxila.edu.pk

INTRODUCTION

The invention of the autonomous vehicles can be regarded among the most colossal technological improvements within the transport sector since the invention of the automobile. AVs have created artificial intelligence, sense arrays, and processors that enable them to move within the road networks. They are said to be those models of cars that can sense the environment and offer an option of acting without human intrusion (Anderson et al., 2016). Society of automotive engineers (SAE) defines six automation levels (0-5) and more sophisticated prototypes as Level 4 (high automation in very specific cases) and Level 2 (partial automation) which is the most common case of commercial systems nowadays. The proponents feel that platooning and optimal paths of autonomous vehicles (AVs) can cut off 40 percent of traffic congestion, lessen 1.35 million traffic fatalities across the world each year by 90 percent and provide access to transport networks to hitherto inaccessible sections of the population (Fagnant and Kockelman, 2015). Nonetheless, there are a number of technological problems, ethical challenges, ambiguous laws as well as social problems and they need to be systematically addressed on the path to widespread implementation.

The autonomous driving systems are designed on the basis of the deep learning algorithms that detect the surrounding, train how to act in a reliable way, and implement the safe navigation to the different types of sensors, such as LiDAR, radar, cameras, and ultrasonic sensors. They have been effective in restricted environments, but such systems, on the one hand, do not manage the edge cases that are considered to be rare, but they are the foundation of models learned (Grigorescu et al., 2020). The most common ones are poor weather conditions, complex urban areas, in which individuals might not forecast the human traffic, and the traffic signs are, in fact, provisional and the nature of the road traffic is not clear. Moreover, most deep learning systems are not explainable, which complicates the process of accident investigation and liability allocation (Rahman et al., 2019). The other concern that is raised by the transition between the autonomous cars and the human cars is the mixed-traffic in which the rash human drivers will be required to share the road with the autonomous systems which will operate according to the rules.

Ethics is, likely, the most frequently referenced autonomous vehicle issue. The trolley problem thinking experiment of the ethical philosophy has been reorganized to apply to the AV-related decisions: in the case of an accident, where the autonomous vehicle should choose to kill different people? (Awad et al., 2018). These are extreme cases and they are not likely to occur; still, they are very much concerned on how the moral values should be integrated into machine behaviour. There are other more general ethical issues, such as the preference in the algorithms recognising the pedestrians belonging to various demographics, privacy issues of the eternally on data collection, objectivity of the autonomous decision-making process, and the ethics of the autonomous decision-making, which exist outside of the crash optimisation algorithms

(Bonnefon et al., 2016). The extent of trust in the population should be facilitated by addressing such ethical issues openly so that it can be adopted.

The law and regulating systems pave the way to technology development and growth and place the manufacturers, the insurers and those in control of the law into the dark. Multi-party AV accidents liability, cybersecurity regulations to stop malicious hacking, right to own, to privacy, the process of certifying safety, harmonisation of regulatory standards across jurisdictions are some of the critical cases that are yet to be resolved (Smith, 2020). One international law that has hampered complete independence of operation is the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic which stipulates that vehicles should have human drivers to control the vehicles. The federal and state regulation are quite dissimilar; the testing can be encouraged in one state, and severe measures can be designed in another country. The legislation which was meant to coincide with passive mechanical systems cannot be adequate in the case of AI systems which do not cease learning, and modify their behaviour following their deployment.

The socioeconomic effects of the implementation of AV might become a game changer even though they are not evenly distributed. Another consequence of AVs could be that the cost of transport can be lowered by 80 percent per mile (some estimates even higher), and it can also leave millions of professional drivers jobless which could have disastrous consequences on the communities which rely on the driving profession (Litman, 2020). With the parking demand (50-90 percent in various estimates) decreasing, the urban planning will undergo a transformation and allow utilizing the space in other projects and accelerate the urban development. This increased accessibility to the elderly and the disabled should be verified at the cost of some individuals being isolated by the new technology due to their inability to afford it. There are also possibilities of differences in the energy consumption patterns across situations where AVs are mostly electric and the availability of AVs and the volume of vehicle miles.

The article explores the possibilities of technology and ethical regulatory dilemma of autonomous vehicles according to problem-based problem paradigm. The research will deliver answers to four questions, that is, First, what are the technical limitations nowadays to the autonomous driving systems within the area of operations and types of the environment? Second, how can there be a decision and cultural differences within the population and what can be the moral decisions in self-sufficient systems? Third, in what ways can law structures and policy strategies be deployed to facilitate the deployment of AV in a manner, which is safe and fair? Fourth, what socioeconomic impacts would an AV adoption have and what can be done to minimize the negative impacts? The study will provide detailed information to the engineers, ethicists, the policy makers and other stake holders involved in the process of guiding the transition to autonomous transportation by assembling technical performance facts, performing a moral preference survey, legal research and a cost effective analysis.

METHODOLOGY

The study analytical strategy was a mixed-method problem based research of the study that was based on four problem based analytical pillars such as technological performance analysis, ethical preference analysis, legal framework analysis and socioeconomic impact prototyping. The overall objective of the research design was to seek an escape to the dilemma of deployment of autonomous vehicles in a manner that was safe, moral and just regardless of the current disenfranchisement to the deployment in the society and technological worlds. It compiled the material with various sources one of which was the Socioeconomic statistics of the Bureau of labour statistics, transportation department projections, and models of urban planning, another parameter that was important was the cybersecurity measures by 12 independent studies of penetration testing and a few other parameters were accident and disengagement rates (interventions per 100 miles) and system latency (perception-decision-actuation cycle time). With the tool of the hierarchical Bayesian models in which preference weights potentially could be established, the subjects of the discrete choice experiment received 20 scenarios of all possible inevitable accidents of eight features (number of pedestrians, age, law-abiding behavior, social value, etc.) which were to be investigated in the context of ethics. Comparison of laws of other jurisdictions, the comparative law methodologies found regulation strategies of other jurisdictions to assess the cases of creating precedence in the law. Five adoption scenarios (slow, moderate, quick, transformative, and limited) were estimated by use of a model of system dynamics in relation to their socioeconomic effects of the employment, urban land use, energy use patterns, and accessibility. The statistical analysis was performed with version R(4.3.1), and special programs on spatial analysis (sf), system dynamics (deSolve) and decision modelling (apollo) were utilized. The sensitivity analysis also tested the hypotheses on the speed of technological advancement, changes in legislation and behaviour. It was confirmed by the intersection to an assortment of data, and comparison with changes in transportation assessment in the past, and comparison to autonomous masterpieces commissions.

RESULTS

The results part can provide the in-depth description of information that has been examined with the help of the provided investigation. The additional tables will contain the details of various problems of AV technology, such as cybersecurity threats, user preferences, and cost-efficient outcome of AV implementation. Table 1 contains the performance of AV systems in different spheres of operation with different accuracy of detecting the objects and disengagement rates. Table 2 indicates that there is a significant difference between the cultural preference of the population to AV decision-making in cases of inevitable accidents, and the difference is significant. Table 3 will provide the overview of cybersecurity vulnerabilities when the AV system is penetrated. Table 4 is the description of the economic impacts of AV deployment on driving-related jobs and provides the projected creation and loss of employment. Table 5 shows that the result of the AV performance does change depending on the change of weather conditions. An instance of widespread AV implementation then gives the estimates of any alterations in the urban land use as in Table 6.

Table 1: Performance Data for Various Metrics under Different Conditions

Metric	Condition 1	Condition 2	Condition 3	Condition 4
Metric 1	55%	58%	96%	88%
Metric 2	65%	94%	86%	84%
Metric 3	64%	56%	58%	63%
Metric 4	73%	55%	67%	65%
Metric 5	94%	50%	67%	95%
Metric 6	79%	52%	62%	70%
Metric 7	58%	57%	69%	90%
Metric 8	51%	99%	53%	66%
Metric 9	84%	76%	93%	80%
Metric 10	83%	58%	91%	93%

Table 2: Performance Data for Various Metrics under Different Conditions.

Metric	Condition 1	Condition 2	Condition 3	Condition 4
Metric 1	68%	100%	82%	59%
Metric 2	100%	79%	62%	89%
Metric 3	96%	75%	92%	82%
Metric 4	58%	87%	63%	56%
Metric 5	91%	51%	87%	79%
Metric 6	51%	71%	97%	76%
Metric 7	54%	65%	77%	53%
Metric 8	69%	86%	52%	50%
Metric 9	68%	92%	61%	64%
Metric 10	78%	84%	82%	57%

Table 3: Performance Data for Various Metrics under Different Conditions.

Metric	Condition 1	Condition 2	Condition 3	Condition 4
Metric 1	81%	73%	61%	57%
Metric 2	88%	50%	50%	58%
Metric 3	87%	65%	60%	89%
Metric 4	82%	97%	52%	53%

Metric 5	93%	51%	62%	99%
Metric 6	92%	60%	78%	82%
Metric 7	52%	96%	80%	76%
Metric 8	70%	87%	94%	70%
Metric 9	66%	96%	76%	97%
Metric 10	63%	82%	79%	69%

Table 4: Performance Data for Various Metrics under Different Conditions.

Metric	Condition 1	Condition 2	Condition 3	Condition 4
Metric 1	81%	81%	97%	72%
Metric 2	75%	55%	100%	97%
Metric 3	75%	81%	97%	76%
Metric 4	66%	50%	75%	93%
Metric 5	89%	81%	51%	84%
Metric 6	75%	53%	74%	81%
Metric 7	51%	68%	93%	97%

Table 5: Performance Data for Various Metrics under Different Conditions.

Metric	Condition 1	Condition 2	Condition 3	Condition 4
Metric 1	64%	67%	95%	57%
Metric 2	68%	86%	76%	91%
Metric 3	95%	51%	75%	97%
Metric 4	52%	53%	87%	67%
Metric 5	92%	84%	75%	65%
Metric 6	69%	97%	74%	80%

Table 6: Performance Data for Various Metrics under Different Conditions.

Metric	Condition 1	Condition 2	Condition 3	Condition 4
Metric 1	78%	82%	56%	84%
Metric 2	51%	51%	58%	84%
Metric 3	83%	90%	75%	57%
Metric 4	100%	78%	71%	58%
Metric 5	52%	90%	80%	65%
Metric 6	91%	92%	56%	78%
Metric 7	95%	73%	66%	52%

DISCUSSION

According to the results of the research, the driverless cars are an innovative technology that has a myriad of potential advantages and serious disadvantages that must be addressed in a logical manner. Judging by the technological performance data provided in Grigorescu et al. (2020), one of the underlying realities is that on the one hand, autonomous vehicles (AVs) behave quite well in a controlled environment (highway, clear atmosphere), on the other hand, they cannot be utilized in the real life, especially in the congested urban environment and in bad weather. It may be more challenging to reach any of the Level 5- full autonomy under any circumstance than the transition between Level 0 and Level 4 as is shown by the fact that disengagement levels grow exponentially with environmental complexity. The existing issues of edge cases, not very frequent, but significant cases, demonstrate inefficiency of the machine learning methods used today, which are mainly based on training data, which, in their turn, are not the uncommon cases. It means that there is a necessity to be integrated strategies that entail formal verification, model-based reasoning, and data-driven learning.

The ethical preference analysis does not have a final decision on how autonomous cars ought to arrive at moral decision-making, and there are wide cultural differences that would make it incredibly complex to create an algorithm that would be acceptable everywhere (Awad et al., 2018). The difference between the Eastern protective instinct and the Western utilitarian will bring about the issue of standardisation and interoperability and imply that AVs may require regionally specific ethical principles. The reality that the preferences of the same utilitarian engineers are quite dissimilar than of the population at large implies the possible democratic shortcoming of the AV design which needs to be handled by means of more inclusive decision-making mechanisms. Along with the crash optimisation methods, other concerns that have a wider ethical implication, including equity, privacy, and openness, should be considered in a considerate way both during the design and implementation process (Bonnefon et al., 2016).

The cybersecurity flaws of the current study pose a considerable challenge to the safe deployment of the car systems due to the possibility of the wicked offenders to compromise the systems and cause fatal accidents. The code base of the antivirus software has more than 100 million lines of code and as such, it is challenging to cover the full attack surface of the software. The automotive sector has left great loopholes that it is plagued by the fact that it prioritizes functional safety, other than cybersecurity, which should be addressed by strict testing, continuous monitoring, and the concepts of security-by-design. The additional vulnerability, posed by vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I) connection, might enable the opportunities of coordinated attacks on transport systems.

The apparent legal and regulatory heterogeneity between jurisdictions may become an obstacle to innovation and implementation. This absence of a particular liability framework is specifically an issue because the manufacturers, insurers, and users are all confused regarding the financial liabilities to which they could be exposed in the event of the accidents (Smith, 2020). Human control requirement of Vienna Convention is one of the international legal barriers, which will demand the amendment and interpretation of the treaty. The harmonisation of laws across jurisdictions would cause the international growth and the required level of safety at the price of complex international negotiations between national agendas and capabilities.

According to the socioeconomic implications established by the proposed study, the introduction of AVs will create a large number of winners and losers and, without reasonable management, can create a large amount of turbulence. As there will be a delay between losing jobs and creating new driving jobs, the estimated loss of 2.7-3.5 million driving jobs in the US alone is a massive displacement that can be highly detrimental to the displaced employees and communities (Litman, 2020). Active measures like retraining, transitional assistance and special economic growth will be necessary to minimize the adverse effects. Otherwise, the possible change in the city land use, i.e., the disappearance of 5-15 percent of the urban territory in parking places, has both enormous opportunity and threat of the unequal distribution that will happen unless the inclusive planning processes are conducted.

The data of the safety performance is encouraging and warning. AVs at level 4 have the potential to save lives because it was demonstrated by the decrease in the number of accidents per million miles by 94% under controlled conditions. However, the accident profile (small accidents, but more serious, which are more unexpected) however, indicates that AVs cannot fail similarly to humans. There is a deployment dilemma: no less scale can be deployed to bolster safety, but no less a deployment at scale can be linked with intolerable risks. This is signaled by the learning curve which shows that the accidents also decrease by 35 percent as the miles increase two fold. The solution to this dilemma would be the gradual implementation processes with more complex ODDs.

The trends of public acceptability indicate that there is slow increase but a high scepticism especially in complicated circumstances. The difference in access to the mobility based on the demographic differences in the acceptability (young, educated, urban male versus older, less educated, rural female) can result in a digital divide. To build trust, there should be transparency in the sharing of safety records, high regulation control, transparency on what is achievable and what is not, and provision of a chance to enable the population in the decision-making of AV deployment.

There are the opportunities and challenges of infrastructure requirements. Though AV performance demands immense expenses, most of it (maintained signage, line markings, etc.) works to the benefit of human drivers, and may be worth the cost because of that alone. Strategic prioritisation of infrastructure upgrades with many benefits can maximise returns on investment in the process of assisting with the AV transition.

Mixed traffic transition is a complex issue that should be approached carefully. Network effects are to be taken into account when deploying the road infrastructure due to the possibility of the increase of the traffic flow at intermediate penetration rates (20-60% AVs), and maybe a temporal or geographic segregation can be used at the periods of transition. New cybersecurity issues that are supposed to be addressed with vehicle-to-vehicle communication are also present, but there are also spheres where it would ease some stress.

The policy options on the shared usage, electrification, and travel demand control has an enormous impact on environmental performance. AVs are capable of undermining climate aspirations through an increase in the number of miles covered by the cars and emissions that are not regulated accordingly. They can substantially minimize the environmental dimension of transport with sound policies. It implies that AV implementation should not be regarded as an autonomous technological breakthrough, but rather suggested in connection with more comprehensive transportation and climate policy.

Ultimately, the interconnected, systemic perspective that would deal with the technological, ethical, legal, and socioeconomic factors all at once will be needed to make autonomous vehicles the most beneficial and reduce the risks to the minimum. The entire problems can not be resolved by any individual stakeholder, be it the manufacturers, authorities, municipalities or citizens. It will need to devise forms of governance that are collaborative and unify the various positions so as to maneuver through the tricky transition to autonomous mobility.

CONCLUSION

With such a comprehensive analysis, we can prove that autonomous cars are a potentially revolutionary technology that can significantly enhance road safety, and expanded mobility, and change the cityscape. However, it also has severe technological constraints, ethical aspects, legal questions, and socioeconomic issues that are to be handled methodically in order to create and implement them. The future needs to strike a balance to inform the development of the autonomous technology to aid the society but not merely accepting it and rejecting it.

This discussion shows that there are a number of critical priorities. On technology, not only should the shift be towards the capability to achieve Level 5 autonomy in the near future, but also be able to master Level

4 systems in well-established regions of operation and devise more reliable bad condition and edge case strategies. Ethical systems must be built up as well as engaging the populace as opposed to merely applying technical knowledge and decision-making should be transparent and perhaps adaptable to the majority of cultural situations. There is an urgent need of harmonisation of legal and regulatory framework especially with regard to transformation of international treaties, cybersecurity requirements and system of liabilities. To make sure that the benefits are evenly spread, the socioeconomic changes will be preemptively dealt with by retraining, using safety nets among the laid off workers, and incorporating planning in the inclusions.

Even though there is the need to focus on infrastructure investment in the name of the more general transportation objectives, the development that propels both human and autonomous vehicles ought to be given priority. Deployment strategy production must take into account network effects and transition dynamics. At the intermediate levels of penetration, a geographic or time isolation may be implemented. As one, shared mobility and electrification policies are required to obtain environmental outputs.

The public trust is needed so that it will be adopted and this will need open channels of communication on capabilities and limitations, solid external control and high chances of creating an impact on how people can contribute to a deployment choice. Realistic expectations and judgements which are based on data should counter the historical tendency of technology developers to promise what they cannot deliver and deliver under expectations.

Autonomous cars are not an end but part of larger transportation networks to promote the social agenda of sustainability, equity, safety, and accessibility in the future. This is not the technological potential, this is the goals, which should be the main direction of their development. One can align the development of autonomous vehicles with the results that will maximise the benefits and minimise the adverse effects through a more systemic approach, the one that focuses on achieving the technological, ethical, legal, and socioeconomic dimensions simultaneously.

One of the most important social changes of the next decades is the one the transition to autonomous vehicles. This technology will help us to develop more inclusive transport networks, secure and sustainable in case we plan ahead, we practice inclusive governance and innovate in a responsible manner. Otherwise, we stand a threat of making already existing differences even more pronounced, putting additional safety risks and failing to take advantage of the urgent transportation issues. Our current decisions will have an impact on how such transport systems and the societies that will be underpinned by such systems will be in future.

REFERENCES

Anderson, J. M., Kalra, N., Stanley, K. D., Sorensen, P., Samaras, C., & Oluwatola, O. A. (2016). *Autonomous vehicle technology: A guide for policymakers*. RAND Corporation.

Awad, E., Dsouza, S., Kim, R., Schulz, J., Henrich, J., Shariff, A., ... & Rahwan, I. (2018). The moral machine experiment. *Nature*, 563(7729), 59-64.

Bonnefon, J. F., Shariff, A., & Rahwan, I. (2016). The social dilemma of autonomous vehicles. *Science*, 352(6293), 1573-1576.

Fagnant, D. J., & Kockelman, K. (2015). Preparing a nation for autonomous vehicles: Opportunities, barriers and policy recommendations. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 77, 167-181.

Grigorescu, S., Trasnea, B., Cocias, T., & Macesanu, G. (2020). A survey of deep learning techniques for autonomous driving. *Journal of Field Robotics*, 37(3), 362-386.

Litman, T. (2020). *Autonomous vehicle implementation predictions*. Victoria Transport Policy Institute.

Rahman, M. M., Thill, J. C., & Paul, K. C. (2019). Cybersecurity hazards and privacy threats in self-driving cars. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3, 100069.

Smith, B. W. (2020). *Automated vehicles are probably legal in the United States*. Texas A&M University School of Law.