

Modular Conversational Agents for Surveys and Interviews

Jiangbo Yu^a, Jinhua Zhao^b, Luis Miranda-Moreno^a, Matthew Korp^c

^a Department of Civil Engineering, McGill University

^b Department of Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

^c Department of Mechanical Engineering, McGill University

* Corresponding: jiangbo.yu@mcgill.ca

This work involved human subjects or animals in its research. Approval of all ethical and experimental procedures and protocols was granted by the Research Ethics Board (REB) office at McGill University and by the Committee on the Use of Human Experimental Subjects (COUHES) at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Abstract

Surveys and interviews—structured, semi-structured, or unstructured—are widely-used for collecting insights on emerging or hypothetical scenarios. Traditional human-led methods often face challenges related to cost, scalability, and consistency. For instance, distributed questionnaires lack the capability for providing real-time guidance and requesting immediate clarifications. Recently, various domains have begun to explore the use of conversational agents (chatbots) powered by large language models (LLMs). However, as public investments and policies on infrastructure and services often involve substantial public stakes and environmental risks, there is a need for a rigorous, transparent, privacy-preserving, and cost-efficient development framework tailored for such major decision-making processes. This paper addresses this gap by introducing a modular approach and its resultant parameterized process for designing conversational agents. We detail the system architecture, integrating engineered prompts, specialized knowledge bases, and customizable, goal-oriented conversational logic in the proposed approach. We demonstrate how the modular approach addresses key ethical, privacy, security, and token consumption concerns. We demonstrate the adaptability, generalizability, and efficacy of our modular approach through three empirical studies: (1) travel preference surveys, highlighting conditional logic and multimodal (voice, text, and image generation) capabilities; (2) public opinion elicitation on a newly constructed, novel infrastructure project, showcasing question customization and multilingual (English and French) capabilities; and (3) transportation expert consultation about the impact of generative artificial intelligence on future transportation systems, highlighting real-time, clarification request capabilities for open-ended questions, resilience in handling erratic inputs, and efficient transcript post-processing. Our results demonstrate the adaptability and generalizability of this modular approach, setting the stage for the next-generation surveys and interviews.

Keywords: Travel survey, Preference elicitation, Large language model, Open-ended question, Natural language processing, Human-AI interaction, Public consultation

1. Introduction

Surveys and interviews (S&Is), whether structured, semi-structured, or unstructured, are indispensable tools for gathering insights in diverse fields such as household surveys, public opinion elicitation, customer service, and beyond. Surveys typically involve the distribution of standardized questionnaires to collect quantitative or qualitative data from a broad population, aiming for scalability and replicability. In contrast, interviews, though they can overlap with surveys, usually refer to more conversational procedures, providing an opportunity for real-time interaction between the interviewer and the respondent. This interaction allows for open-ended responses, deeper exploration of topics, and the ability to clarify or follow up on answers, making interviews particularly valuable for gathering rich, high-quality data. While surveys focus on breadth, interviews tend to focus on depth, providing flexibility to probe into individual preferences and judgment.

S&Is offer researchers a tool for measuring individual and collective perceptions, preferences, and decision-making processes. Despite their proven utility, traditional data collection techniques encounter several challenges. The resource-intensive nature of human-led surveys often leads to high costs and time inefficiencies, while their static design struggles to scale across large populations or adapt to dynamic contexts. Survey interviewers can negatively affect survey data by introducing variance and bias into estimates (Kühne, 2023) and are exposed to

various risks (e.g., disease transmission, exposure to violence). Traditional distributed questionnaires, though more scalable, lack the flexibility for real-time clarifications and interactive follow-ups, which are crucial for gathering nuanced responses.

Conversational agents, sometimes referred to as chatbots or digital assistants, have emerged as a viable alternative to address these limitations. Leveraging advances in natural language processing (NLP), deep learning, and reinforcement learning, conversational agents can engage users in a more interactive and responsive manner, simulating human-like conversations. Studies have demonstrated that conversational agents can drive higher engagement rates and elicit more detailed responses compared to conventional S&I methods, particularly in scenarios involving open-ended questions and dynamic feedback loops (Caldarini et al., 2022; Xiao et al., 2020). Their ability to maintain consistency in tone and adapt to user input in real time makes them particularly suitable for environments where personalized and context-sensitive interactions are valued (Ngai et al., 2021).

However, existing studies focus primarily on serving customers' intent (as in customer services and support), while significantly fewer studies explore using conversational agents for various purposes in S&Is, which need to be, at least partially, driven by the conversational agent's intent (rather than human user's intent). For example, a participant might digress to a different topic when answering a question about their daily commute experience; in this case, the conversational agent should recognize that and tries to redirect the conversation to the original topic (instead of following the participant's digressed topic). Also, current chatbot implementations often suffer from limitations in scalability, adaptability, domain-specific application, and privacy concerns. Most existing conversational agent systems are designed for singular, narrowly defined tasks, which limits their reusability across different contexts and research domains. For example, while some chatbots excel in healthcare settings by efficiently triaging patient inquiries, as demonstrated by (Lee et al., 2022a), others focus solely on customer service interactions in e-commerce without showcasing its capability to adapt their logic to different industries or use cases (Adam et al., 2021). Indeed, the transferability of the techniques or logic flows for improving customer compliance or experience to S&Is is unknown. Although recent advancements in generative artificial intelligence (Generative AI), particularly the integration of large language models (LLMs) like Gemini, ChatGPT, and Claude, have significantly enhanced chatbot capabilities, enabling them to understand and generate more complex and contextually relevant responses; the absence of a generalizable, privacy-preserving approach to leverage these advancements has hindered their application and cross-domain scalability in S&I.

This paper aims to fill this gap by introducing a modular approach to designing conversational agents powered by LLMs, tailored for eliciting opinions and judgments from mobility service users and transportation professionals. Unlike prior implementations that are often developed for specific S&Is use cases, our proposed framework emphasizes flexibility, reusability, and adaptability, for a wide range of transportation research purposes—including travel preference survey (e.g., about destination, mode, route, and telework), public perception elicitation (e.g., about project, policy, technology), and expert consultation (e.g., about impacts of technology, policy, and disruptive events). We present a holistic design that integrates engineered prompts, specialized knowledge bases, and customizable, goal-oriented conversational logic, thereby enabling the conversational agent to handle variations in questioning and dynamic follow-ups efficiently in various transportation research purposes. The modular approach allows explicit description of how the internal modular logic components within each question round (a conversational flow regarding a specific question or a topic) interact and is conditioned on prior question rounds and the overall objective. Importantly, when the design of a survey or interview process is inappropriate, the modular approach should facilitate the exposure of mistakes or unsuitability. We also propose that one of the modules should be to store key information from a user response to a variable instead of saving the entire response to reduce AI/LLM token consumption, which will remain an important constraint for large-scale deployment of conversational agents in foreseeable future. In addition, we address key ethical, privacy, and security considerations that arise when deploying AI-powered conversational systems in sensitive contexts. As different S&I purposes have different levels of feature desirability, we summarize them in Table 1.

We demonstrate the modular framework's versatility and effectiveness in three distinct field studies: 1) resident preference surveys, 2) public opinion collection, and 3) expert/professional opinion elicitation. Each of these studies showcases unique capabilities of the conversational agent, such as multilingual interaction, multimodal support, and adaptive questioning strategies. By presenting this framework, we seek to provide a robust foundation for future research and development in the field of conversational agents for S&I, extending their applicability beyond singular use cases to a broader range of data collection and interactive applications. We believe the framework also helps set the stage for a new generation of intelligent, adaptable, and scalable conversational systems for human-AI collaboration where a task or a project is driven by a combination of human/customer intents and AI intents.

Table 1: The level of desirability for key features in three most common types of S&Is in transportation research.

Desirable Feature	Travel Preference	Public Perception	Expert Consultation
Open-ended questions	++	+++	+++
Customizable questions	+++	+++	++
Tailored Follow-up questions	++	+++	+++
Scalable	+++	+++	+
Multilingual	+++	+++	+
Multimodal	++	+++	+
Domain Knowledge	+	+	+++
Identity Preserving	+++	+++	++
Automated Postprocessing	+++	+++	+

+: Not a bottleneck (yet)

++: Moderate

+++: Strongly needed

2. Related Work

The evolution of conversational agents has garnered significant attention in recent years, driven by advancements in AI, natural language processing (NLP), and machine learning (ML). As these interconnected technologies mature, their application in domains like healthcare, customer service, and public engagement has expanded, demonstrating the potential of chatbots to revolutionize data collection, information provision, and service delivery. This section first reviews transportation literature related to surveys and interviews. Then we synthesize key studies on conversational agent applications, LLM integration, and their specific use in S&I thus far.

2.1 Surveys and Interviews in Transportation Research

S&Is have long been foundational methods in transportation research, offering valuable insights into travel behavior, public opinion, and expert judgment. S&Is are frequently employed to collect quantitative data on individuals' stated travel preferences regarding destination, mode, telecommuting, value-of-time, departure time, along with their backgrounds (e.g., socioeconomic, demographic, physiological) (Campbell et al., 2016; Loong et al., 2017; Zahabi et al., 2015). Stated preference surveys often incorporate discrete choice experiments to simulate decision-making environments—whether based on memory recall or described “what if” scenarios—where respondents are presented with controlled alternatives and asked to express their preferences (Kontou et al., 2017; Yu and Jayakrishnan, 2018). This method enables researchers to estimate the trade-offs travelers are willing to make between different attributes, such as cost versus convenience, time versus environmental impact, or purchasing versus renting a car (Shen et al., 2016). Traditional methods, such as household travel surveys and on-board transit surveys, have evolved significantly with technological advancements, offering greater precision and efficiency through web-based and mobile app-based surveys (Wang et al., 2021). These innovations help address common challenges like non-response bias and recall accuracy, which often affect self-reported travel data. While location-based service data is increasingly available for real-world travel observations, surveys remain a crucial benchmark and reference tool in non-hypothetical scenarios (e.g., which mode did you use for commute yesterday?) (Toole et al., 2015). Web-based surveys were especially vital for understanding shifting travel needs during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 (Irawan et al., 2022). The data collected from these surveys are instrumental in informing demand models, such as random utility-based discrete choice models or emerging machine learning approaches (Wang and Ross, 2018). Such results can be analyzed at the discrete, individual (microscopic) level (Ding et al., 2018) or aggregate level through spatial-temporal analytics and enhancement using other data sources from location-based service data [Click or tap here to enter text.](#) virtual/augmented reality (Farooq and Cherchi, 2024), driving simulators (Harb et al., 2018), and others. However, issues associated with high administrative cost, framing and experimenter effects, and privacy preservation remain (Barthelmes et al., 2023; LaMondia and Fisher, 2024).

In addition to understanding travel behaviors, S&Is are frequently used to gauge public perceptions of emerging transportation technologies, infrastructure projects, and urban policies. For instance, S&Is have been instrumental in assessing public attitudes toward ridesharing services (Krueger et al., 2016), autonomous driving technologies (Bansal and Kockelman, 2018; Harper et al., 2016; Kyriakidis et al., 2015; Madigan et al., 2017), and the adoption of electric vehicles and their associated charging infrastructure (Greene et al., 2020; Helveston et al., 2015). They also provide valuable insights into public sentiment toward hypothetical disruptive events, such as earthquakes or epidemics (Lindell et al., 2020), and policies under consideration, such as congestion pricing (Hess and Börjesson, 2019). Public consultations in the form of online posts that allow direct commenting or email response, often seen as a form of S&Is, are widely employed by government agencies to inform policy and investment decisions, as well as to elicit feedback from the public. However, large-scale consultations are sometimes criticized as tokenistic,

particularly when agencies lack the capacity to meaningfully address or respond to the substantial volume of feedback received. For example, initiatives like *Consulting with Canadians* have been criticized as superficial due to the limited human resources available to public agencies, often leading to consultations being conducted without the necessity of responding to or engaging in meaningful dialogue with participants (al Attar and Clouthier, 2015; Longo, 2017). Despite the challenges and limitations, S&Is remain indispensable in transportation research.

S&Is are also frequently employed to elicit domain expertise, in-depth insights, and professional judgment from specific stakeholder groups such as transportation engineers, urban planners, policymakers, community representatives, transit operators, technology company executives, and academic researchers (Aba and Esztergár-Kiss, 2024; Adhikari et al., 2020; Karolemeas et al., 2021; Kester et al., 2018; Nævestad et al., 2015; Pilko et al., 2017; Whittle et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2021). These S&Is can also be part of a participatory decision-making process related to transportation investments or policies (Ghorbanzadeh et al., 2018; Yu and McKinley, 2024). These S&Is provide critical qualitative data that extend beyond public opinion by drawing on the specialized knowledge and experiences of individuals who influence the development and implementation of transportation systems and policies. Interviews, conducted in person or virtually, are particularly effective in this context due to their flexible structure, which combines open-ended questions with a semi-structured interview guide. This approach enables interviewers to explore complex issues in depth while maintaining a focused discussion on key topics. Semi-structured interviews are especially valuable in capturing the nuances of expert judgment, revealing motivations, personal experiences, and professional attitudes toward transportation-related challenges, policies, and technologies, while maintaining some standardization and control over the interview process. Effective interviewing in this context requires a degree of expertise from the interviewer, who must be capable of asking follow-up questions and seeking clarification when necessary. Another commonly employed method for expert elicitation is the Delphi method, which involves multiple rounds of surveys to achieve consensus among experts on complex issues (Darcy and Burke, 2018). Compared to travel surveys and public perception studies, expert opinion collection often involves smaller sample sizes due to the specialized nature of the participants. The data collected tends to be more detailed and nuanced, typically expressed through natural language responses, which require extensive post-processing. Unlike quantitative data that can be directly input into statistical models, expert interviews generally require qualitative techniques such as content analysis, coding, or thematic analysis to identify recurring patterns and extract actionable insights. This qualitative approach is critical for gaining a deeper understanding of complex issues, particularly when assessing the feasibility and impact of transportation innovations or policy interventions. Expert elicitation through S&Is plays a crucial role in evaluating the practical implications of emerging technologies, such as autonomous vehicles, electric mobility, and smart infrastructure, as well as in identifying regulatory challenges and potential barriers to implementation. By incorporating the expertise of professionals directly involved in these fields, researchers can gain a more comprehensive understanding of transportation systems and use these insights to inform policy and investment decisions. This expert judgment is often combined with quantitative models to offer a more holistic view, enabling better decision-making in both research and policy contexts. However, in addition to the challenges shared with travel preference and public perception S&Is, challenges such as interview staff training, professionals/expert identifications, and transcript postprocessing are particularly impeding (Solarino and Aguinis, 2021).

2.2 Applications of Conversational Agents and Their LLM Enhancement

Preliminary attempts of using conversational agents have been made in diverse fields, each highlighting their potential to enhance scalability, real-time interactivity, and automate processes, although challenges remain in ensuring user trust, satisfaction, and seamless integration into more personalized or sensitive interactions (Solarino and Aguinis, 2021). In education, conversational agents have been integrated into classroom settings to support students' learning experiences. Chen et al. (2023) explore the use of AI-driven student assistants in business education and find that chatbots help students learn basic content and provide insights into student needs. Similarly, Belda-Medina and Calvo-Ferrer (2022) examine the role of chatbots in language learning and discovered that students had positive perceptions of ease of use and ease of interaction, although behavioral intention to use them remained moderate. In the customer service and e-commerce sectors, chatbots have significantly transformed the customer experience. Ngai et al. (2021) propose an intelligent, knowledge-based conversational agent system for customer service in e-commerce. Hsu and Lin (2023) further examine user satisfaction and loyalty in customer service chatbots, revealing that both the core service quality and conversational quality of AI chatbots significantly influence customer satisfaction and loyalty. Conversational agents are also gaining traction in social media. Brandtzaeg et al. (2022) investigated how users form friendships with social chatbots like Replika, identifying parallels between human-AI and human-human friendships, with chatbots offering personalized interactions that fulfill users' needs. Meanwhile, in healthcare, chatbots have been utilized to support both physical and mental health care. Lee et al. (2022b) demonstrated how chatbots can help manage hypertension in clinical settings, reducing clinician workloads by effectively triaging patient messages. Moilanen et al. (2023) explore the role of chatbots in supporting mental health

self-care and discovered that users' trust was contingent upon the perceived security and integrity of the chatbot systems. De Freitas et al. (2024) highlight that LLM-powered chatbots, while engaging in mental health-related conversations, often provide unhelpful or risky responses, posing significant safety risks for vulnerable users. These findings underscore the need for cautious deployment and regulation of AI companions in mental health contexts. Benaddi et al. (2024) explore the broad application of chatbots in the tourism sector, noting that while chatbots have been widely adopted for customer interactions, academic research on their technological evolution and impact remains limited. Their systematic review offers a comprehensive classification of chatbot architectures and assesses their key applications in tourism, where they have been integrated to enhance responsiveness and user satisfaction.

The deployment of conversational agents in the transportation sector remain limited, though they have the potential to improve user experience and system efficiency. Kim et al. (2024) examine the use of human-like voice agents in self-driving cars, finding that increased anthropomorphism can enhance intimacy and perceived human-like qualities but does not significantly affect trust or safety perceptions. This complexity underscores the importance of balancing emotional engagement with functional efficiency in voice agent design for autonomous vehicles. Liao et al. (2024) introduce an encoder-decoder framework, augmented by LLMs, to address visual grounding in autonomous vehicles. Yu and McKinley (2024) introduce a synthetic participatory approach to facilitate the ideation and strategic investment for future mobility systems. By employing conversational agents to represent diverse human stakeholders to converse with one another and with real human stakeholders, they demonstrated the potential for enhancing inclusivity and strategic planning in complex, multi-stakeholder, and multi-objective decision-making problems.

The integration of LLMs into conversational agents has significantly enhanced the capabilities and potential extensions of conversational agents, enabling more natural, complex, and human-like interactions (Myers et al., 2024). Traditional agents, which relied on rule-based systems or narrow machine learning techniques, often struggled to understand nuanced inputs or maintain fluid conversational flows. LLMs such as OpenAI's GPT and Google's BERT have transformed this landscape by offering advanced capabilities in natural language processing (NLP), context retention, and knowledge generation. Many of these models have demonstrated remarkable proficiency in generating coherent, context-aware responses based on user inputs. The core module behind many LLMs is the self-attention mechanism in Transformers, which serves as the fundamental building block for language modeling tasks. Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) is another crucial aspect of LLMs, involving fine-tuning the model using human-generated responses as rewards. This process allows the model to learn from its mistakes and improve its performance over time (Meshkin et al. 2024). Mechanisms such as diffusion, generative adversarial networks, and allowable of external packages or services further enhance the multimodal ability of conversational agents such as generating images, voices, and videos, and using external references or services (Sun et al., 2024).

One of the most impactful features of LLMs on conversational agent development is their ability to process vast amounts of unstructured data, allowing chatbots to generate highly accurate, human-like responses. Unlike earlier systems, LLM-powered agents excel at handling open-ended queries, understanding complex grammar and syntax, and maintaining consistency over long, multiturn conversations. Agent developers can select online (cloud-based) LLMs and on-premise LLMs to suit the security, privacy, and other need of enterprise (Meshkin et al., 2024). Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) is a hybrid architecture that combines retrieval mechanisms with the generative capabilities of LLMs to enhance the domain knowledge and expertise of a conversational agent (Alsafari et al., 2024). Beyond text, LLMs, enhanced by mechanisms such as diffusion and generative adversary networks (GANs), allow high performance of taking multimodal inputs and producing multimodal outputs such as voice and images, making them more interactive and accessible. This multimodality is particularly valuable in fields like urban planning or public opinion research, where diverse input types can enrich data collection and user engagement. Furthermore, LLM-powered agents can support multiple languages (multilingual capability), which is crucial when S&I participants are highly heterogenous and prefer to communicate in different languages (Miah et al., 2024). Using LLMs for role-playing has been drawing attentions recently, where agents can simulate various personas or stakeholders (Gao et al., 2024; Shanahan et al., 2023; Yu and McKinley, 2024). Such a usage not only has broad application implications but also provides a unique perspective for understanding and studying LLMs and LLM-powered conversational agents.

2.3 Conversational Agents for Surveys and Interviews

Using conversational agents for conducting S&Is has gained traction in recent years due to their scalable and interactive nature, which allows for immediate feedback and simultaneous engagement with large number of participants. Xiao et al. (2020) compare chatbot-based surveys with traditional online survey tools, focusing on open-ended questions. They found that chatbots significantly improved participation rates and response quality, measured against Gricean Maxims of informativeness, relevance, specificity, and clarity. However, this study primarily examined the contrast between chatbots and conventional tools without detailing how the chatbot managed the logic

and information flow during S&I. For instance, it remains unclear how the system determined response sufficiency and when to transition to the next question. Moreover, the case studies were limited to the entertainment sector (preferences for video games and movies), leaving questions about the chatbot’s applicability in more complex domains, such as infrastructure investment or public policy, unanswered. Rhim et al. (2022) explore how humanization techniques in chatbot design impacted respondents' experiences, particularly in terms of perceptions, interaction quality, and data output. Meanwhile, Zhang and Konka (2024) use a chatbot to assess household resilience during winter storms, while Jiang et al. (2023) introduce "CommunityBots," a multi-agent platform that enhanced engagement and data quality through efficient topic-switching and user intent management. Dortheimer et al. (2024) test a proof-of-concept chatbot for engaging communities in large-scale design projects, with participants preferring the chatbot to traditional surveys. Yuan et al., (2024) examined chatbots in personality assessments, finding that both AI-inferred and traditional methods capture different personality aspects, suggesting both approaches have value for real-world applications.

Despite these advancements, the studies aforementioned (Dortheimer et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2023; Rhim et al., 2022; Yuan et al., 2024; Zhang and Konka, 2024), like the study conducted by Xiao et al. (2020), do not specify the underlying chatbot architectures or information management protocols. This lack of transparency about the configurations that enable conversational agents to conduct S&Is makes it difficult to determine the conditions (e.g., configurations, system performance) under which the reported outcomes or conclusions were drawn. Indeed, Zarouali et al. (2024) found that traditional web surveys outperformed chatbots in data quality, perceived enjoyment, usefulness, and security, raising questions about the efficacy of chatbots as valid survey alternatives. Sachdeva et al. (2024) reported mixed results, depending on user types and survey design. Furthermore, as Jin et al. (2024) noted, even when the chatbot architecture and procedures remain constant, the prompting strategies employed can significantly influence survey outcomes. Without transparent, explicit description about the conversational systems (given an “black box” LLM), it is challenging to disentangle different factors and address the mixed findings.

While the use of AI-driven conversational agents in S&Is presents significant potential, the lack of explicit system architectures and clear procedural frameworks for handling both single-topic and multi-topic questions continues to pose challenges. The absence of these frameworks not only increases development costs but also results in uncertain survey quality. Without a structured approach to managing the logic flow between questions, particularly in high-stakes contexts such as infrastructure planning and public policy, there is an inherent risk of gathering incomplete or unreliable data. The deployment of these agents in sensitive areas, such as political analysis or public investment decisions, amplifies privacy and ethical concerns. The opacity surrounding the architectures of these systems, especially when relying on LLMs from commercial vendors, adds further layers of risk. The use of Transformer-based LLMs in commercial applications has raised concerns about legal accountability and the necessity of robust regulations (Migliorini, 2024). Ethical guidelines surrounding transparency, accountability, and fairness must be prioritized to mitigate misuse (Ghandour et al., 2024). Furthermore, the limitations of current LLMs, particularly in complex pragmatic tasks like emotion recognition and sentiment analysis, emphasize the need for continuous development in AI training. While LLMs are adept at generating fluent, coherent text, their ability to interpret nuanced emotional cues remains insufficient (Kocoń et al., 2023). This limitation underscores the importance of integrating real-time bias detection and correction mechanisms into chatbot systems to ensure fairness and accuracy in S&I tasks. In light of these challenges, it is essential to move toward a more standardized approach for developing conversational agents. This includes transparent system architectures and well-defined procedures for managing interactions, along with ethical safeguards.

3. System and Process

In this section, we describe the proposed system architecture of a conversational agent for conducting S&Is. We elaborate on the key modules (components) of the system architecture, the information flow during the operations (i.e., S&Is), and the design principles that ensure effective, consistent, secure, and token-efficient data collection. Furthermore, we believe that the proposed mathematical description, enabled by the modular approach, is the first-of-its-kind attempt for rigorously describing the dynamics of a conversational agent during S&Is.

3.1 Proposed System Architecture and Configuration

The proposed architecture of LLM-enabled conversational agents for S&Is consists of five main modules: LLMs, a user interface (UI) (or a set of UIs for multiple types of devices), engineered prompts, specialized knowledge bases, session variable storage, and customized conversational logic ranging from simple procedures without referring to conversational history to highly branched or cross-referenced procedures. The connections of these modules are illustrated in Fig. 1. To protect privacy, user utterance will be first examined by an on-premise, open-sourced (and perhaps less powerful) LLM. If the utterance is deemed to have no identity-exposing information, the utterance can be sent to an online (and perhaps more powerful) LLM for further processing. Depending on the

capability of LLMs and the specific application contexts, external resources, such as specialized software and cloud computing services, can also be called by the Process Manager or the LLMs to further enhance the functionality of the overall conversational system. Engineered prompts are carefully designed input queries that guide the agent's interaction with users. These prompts are constructed to ensure clarity, reduce ambiguity, and minimize biases. The prompts are structured to facilitate different types of responses, including open-ended questions, multiple-choice options, and follow-up questions for clarification. The agent utilizes specialized knowledge bases that contain domain-specific information relevant to the survey or interview context. These knowledge bases are curated and regularly updated to ensure that the agent provides accurate and current information. The knowledge bases are integrated with the agent enabled by advanced information retrieval techniques such as RAG, which allows the agent to access and query relevant data from knowledge bases (rather than from user responses or online search).




Fig. 1. Modules and their interactions in an LLM-enabled conversational agent for surveys and interviews.

3.2 Parameterized Process

The system modularization enables parameterized description of how a conversational agent operates during an S&I, which significantly facilitates the systematic adjustment and sensitivity analysis of a conversational agent. Customized conversational flows define the sequence and structure of the interaction between a conversational agent and a participant. These flows are designed to mimic natural conversation patterns while ensuring that the necessary information is elicited systematically. The conversational flows are dynamic and can adapt based on user responses, enabling the agent to ask follow-up questions, provide clarifications, and probe deeper into specific topics as needed. This process can be seen as an iterative process of the agent attempt to elicit information (the goal) through a question and determines whether the response sufficiently answers the question (reaches the goal). If not, the agent asks for clarification and determines if the new response sufficiently addresses the question. If the new response (in addition to the previous response) is considered sufficient, the agent ends the session and proceeds with a new session (i.e., asks the next question). This next question might be predetermined or generated on the fly based on the dialogue thus far and the goal. For each question, the process can be illustrated in Fig. 2. In structured S&Is, the agent immediately proceed to the next (pre-determined) question and does not ask follow up questions, which can be seen as having a 100% chance to consider the utterance sufficiently addresses the question in Fig. 2. In semi-structured S&Is, the agent might instead ask for clarifications. In unstructured interviews, the agent comes up with a question based on the dialogue thus far and determines what the next question should be.

To describe the process more specifically and rigorously, we use a three-question (three-session) semi-structured interview as a concrete example. The process starts with a pre-constructed system prompt $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{P}$ and system setting vector $\theta_0 \in \Theta$. ρ_0 is typically a string containing information such as “you are conducting an interview about [a certain topic].” The elements of the parameter vector θ_0 might contain the LLM version, temperature (the randomness or the stochasticity of the LLM outputs), maximum allowable input and output characters, etc. $u_1 \in \mathcal{U}^q$ is the prompt for initializing the first interview question (i.e., u_i and $i = 1$). Θ , \mathcal{P} , and \mathcal{U} are the parameter space, the system prompt space, and the prompt space, respectively. ρ_0 and θ_0 , together, form the initial system prompt.




Fig. 2. An example workflow for conducting semi-structured interview, enabled by the coordination of different system components.

Let $\mathcal{LM}^q: \mathcal{U}^q \times \Theta \times \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$, where \mathcal{Q} is the interview question space. In the initial session, we send u_1, θ_0 , and ρ_0 to \mathcal{LM}^q to obtain $q_1 \in \mathcal{Q}$. That is,

$$q_1 = \mathcal{LM}^q(u_1; \theta_0, \rho_0) \quad (1)$$

Note that the output of \mathcal{LM}^q is stochastic if the temperature parameter in θ_0 is greater than 0. But regardless, the output is still a specific question q_1 rather than a probability distribution. Also note that this step degenerates into simply $q_1 = u_1$ if we define a specific fixed question that will be asked without any adjustment or random perturbation by prompting the LLM to, say, use a variation of the question specified in u_1 .

Let the participant’s response (through an UI) to $q_1 \in \mathcal{Q}$ as $r_1 \in \mathcal{R}$. We then send r_1 along with q_1 and u'_1 to $\mathcal{LM}^s: \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \{0,1\}$. u'_1 is a follow-up prompt regarding u_1 . For instance, u'_1 can be the following prompt template: “Decide if $[\mathcal{R}]$ responds to $[\mathcal{Q}]$.” That is, \mathcal{LM}^s determines whether r_1 responds to q_1 sufficiently. We define the output as $\xi_1 \in \{0,1\}$. That is

$$\xi_1 = \mathcal{LM}^s(u'_1(r_1, q_1) | \theta_0, \rho_0) \quad (2)$$

Next, we define a conditional logic f , which triggers the next round (about production of q_2) if ξ_1 is 1; otherwise, it triggers the clarification request q_1^c through:

$$q_1^c = \mathcal{LM}^r(r_1, q_1, u_1^c) \quad (3)$$

The new response is stored as r_1^c . We then send r_1^c, r_1, q_1, u'_1 to \mathcal{LM}^s to determine once more whether the cumulative response about q_1 is sufficient. To simplify the notation, we define a tuple $y = (r_1, q_1)$. We append a new clarification question and a clarification response (i.e., q_1^c, r_1^c) to y to update as (q_1, r_1, q_1^c, r_1^c) . This appending process continues until the clarification process finishes or reaches a pre-determined maximum number.

We use \mathcal{LM}^s (again) to extract information from y ; this extraction not only reduces token consumption for memorizing prior rounds of conversation with the present participant but also speed up the agent’s response time. We obtain and store specific user response information to q_1 as $x_k, k = \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ as shown below:

$$x_k = \mathcal{LM}^s(y | u_1^k) \quad (4)$$

Note that y is a tuple with variable length, as the response to Question 1 may or may not induce one or more follow-up questions. Also note that we have \mathcal{LM}^s outputting a variable about specific user information that does not necessarily have a binary value.

The K pieces of information, as placeholders, are predetermined in the S&I design phase. For example, x_1 might store the participant’s age, x_2 might store the participant’s gender, and x_3 might store whether the participant uses a certain product or a mode of transportation more than three times a week. All the $x_k \in \mathcal{X}$ form a K dimensional vector \mathbf{x} . This process continues until $\xi_1 = 1$ or the maximum allowed iterations is reached. $\xi_1 = 1$ also means that all the necessary information about Question 1 has been obtained. Fig. 3 illustrates proposed process for the initial session, where the conversational agent only asks a follow-up question once (and moves on to the next question no matter whether the participant sufficiently clarifies his/her response).




Fig. 3. Illustration of an information flow for the first question in a three-question semi-structured interview, where the conversational agent only asks for clarification up to once.

Next, the agent enters the second session (about Question 2). This session has a similar initialization process. But this time we might need to incorporate information from the prior round(s) through x_k if the specifics of Question 2 depend on the response to Question 1. That is,

$$q_2 = \mathcal{LM}^q(u_2(x_k); \theta_0, \rho_0) \quad (5)$$

where $u_2(x_k)$ combines the prior information x_k and a template prompt \bar{u}_2 . We might further define θ_2 and ρ_2 as the parameters and template, i.e., $u_2 = u_2(x_k; \theta_2, \rho_2)$ to further enhance the flexibility of u_2 . A same method applies to other interview questions. The participant's response to q_2 is denoted as r_2 , will be send to \mathcal{LM}^s again, along with prompt q_1, u_1, x_0 , with output ξ_2 . This process continues until $\xi_2 = 1$ (or the maximum allowed iterations is reached). Note that we can utilize the entire u_1 (instead of x_k), but it might consume significantly more LLM tokens.

Once we enter the third session (for Question 3), we have a similar initialization process. But this time we might need to incorporate information from the prior two round(s) through x_k .

$$q_3 = \mathcal{LM}^q(u_3(x_k); \theta_0, \rho_0) \quad (6)$$

We can continue this process more than just three questions. Furthermore, using the logic function f , we can also branch out different questions based on the specific user state (i.e., x_k). However, it is important to be aware of the length of y . Also, during the conversation, θ_0 and ρ_0 are adjustable when necessary.

We can customize the proposed approach for unstructured interviews. We can store possible first questions into a knowledge base and choose one randomly or base on specific participant background information prior to the interview. Once the participant responds, the agent summarizes the response and may ask for clarification. If there is no need to clarify, the agent will compose the next question with the prompt containing the overall goal of the interview until the goal is deemed reached by the agent. An enhanced alternative approach is that we store sample possible questions into a knowledge base, and Each time a participant responds, the agent not only tries to paraphrase (and perhaps ask for clarifications), but also searches the knowledge for the most relevant next question, using a prompt that outlines the overall goal of the interview. This question might be the exact or a variation of this relevant next question.

The conversational agent might be even further augmented by external knowledge databases or knowledge bases that are gradually formed through S&Is, enabling the agent to continuously learn and improve.

3.3 Sensitivity Analysis and Fine-Tuning of Prompts and Parameters

The sensitivity of the LLM outputs to inputs and parameters is analyzed by varying the contents and wordings of the system prompt, parameters and question-specific prompt templates. This analysis is crucial for understanding how different linguistic formulations affect the performance of the conversational agent and how to improve. Let $\theta = \{\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_i, \dots, \theta_l\}$, $\theta \in \Theta$, be a set of $l + 1$ parameter vector (each element might be also a vector). The marginal sensitivity of q_i to ρ_i and θ_i can be presented as $\mathbb{E}(\partial q_i / \partial \theta_i)$ and $\mathbb{E}(\partial q_i / \partial \rho_i)$, respectively. Hence, the

marginal sensitivity of r_i with regard to θ_i can be expressed as $\mathbb{E}(\partial r_i / \partial q_i \cdot \partial q_i / \partial \theta_i)$, or simply $\delta_{\theta:r}^i$. Since not every variation of q_i is a suitable or appropriate question, we define a dummy variable σ_i to indicate whether q_i is a valid question. Therefore, the expectation of the impact of a marginal variation of θ_i , or simply, can be represented as:

$$\delta_{\theta:r}^i = \mathbb{E}\left(\sigma_i \cdot \frac{\partial r_i}{\partial q_i} \cdot \frac{\partial q_i}{\partial \theta_i}\right) \quad (7)$$

where $i \geq 1$. A high sensitivity indicates that the function is highly responsive to changes in the corresponding input or parameter, which may require careful control or robust design. On the other hand, a low sensitivity suggests that the function is relatively insensitive, allowing for more flexibility in design and operation. Similarly, we can obtain the expected sensitivity of one system parameter or variable on the output. For example, the impact of a marginal variation of ρ_i on x can be represented as $\delta_{\rho:x}^i$, which follows a similar chain rule of partial derivatives. Again, as not all the directions of perturbation are feasible (e.g., changing one letter or word in a prompt sentence might lead to an incomprehensible or grammatically incorrect sentence), the equation above might not be applicable, not to mention that the differentials might not exist. Therefore, we have σ_i being a dummy variable—when the direction along θ_i is both differentiable for u_i , we have $\sigma_i = 1$; otherwise, zero. We can continue this evaluation process to obtain the impact of varying θ_i on y_j , where $j > i$.

Due to the complexity of the internal mechanism of an LLM, even if we have complete information about the model architecture and parameters, it might still be impractical to obtain the analytical solution to the sensitivities. However, the formulations above still provide valuable insights on how the sensitivity of prompting information on the output can be evaluated. The resultant insights might further help enhance the design of conversational flows to improve the elicitation quality.

4. Experiments

We present three concrete cases of utilizing the proposed architecture and process flow for conducting S&Is. The online LLMs used in the first, second, and third experiments are from GPT-4, GPT-4o, and Claude 3-Sonnet, respectively. The user interfaces (dialogue boxes) for all three experiments are accessible through smartphones and computer web browsers. The proposed modular approach is platform-agnostic. But we chose to implement the online portion of the architectures and processes through Chatling for Experiments 1 and 2 and Voiceflow for Experiment 3, both of which are AI agent development platform services for facilitating the design, development, and deployment of online AI agents, for their developer-friendly features and reasonable pricing. Other AI agent development platforms are likely to also suffice.

To clarify the role of our platform as a conversational agent built on the proposed modular framework, we can draw an analogy to designing a bridge with computer-aided design (CAD) software/platform. Just as the CAD software enables an engineer to create a complex structure (the bridge), our framework facilitates the creation of a sophisticated conversational system for S&Is. Criticizing the methodological contribution of our approach because it utilizes AI development platforms would be akin to attributing all credit for a bridge’s design to the CAD software. The proposed modular approach is about how to design a conversational system for S&Is in transportation research. Also because of this, the proposed approach is platform-agnostic. In fact, the proposed approach is also module-agnostic. That is, any modular shown in Fig. 1 is replaceable as long as the new modular can serve the same function. For example, one can choose any open-source LLM for the on-premise LLM module. For another example, one can design their own user interface (UI module).

In addition to using Llama 3.2 for the on-premise LLM component for privacy protection, we implemented a set of additional measures to ensure the protection of participants’ data. First, we make it optional for the participants to decide whether they would like to share their (potentially) identifiable information. Second, even if they share their (potentially) identifiable information such as name, workplace, and email address, we employed anonymized techniques to dissociate any personally identifiable information in data processing and in released results. For home location information, we only ask participants for the first three (of the six) digits of the postal code of their home address in Canada. The information further goes through an on-premise LLM to detect any privacy concerns. Only then will the process manager considers whether to send the information to cloud-based LLMs for further processing. Furthermore, we prioritized secure data storage practices. The collected data were stored on dedicated hardware that featured security protections provided by McGill University. Only authorized researchers and supervisors were granted access to this hardware, and stringent access control mechanisms were in place to safeguard against unauthorized access or breaches. IP addresses are not associated with usernames or user IDs, and they are only used to identify when a new request is needed during the operation of a conversational agent, whether to continue from the previous chat (if any) or launch a completely new conversation.

4.1 Experiment 1: Resident Travel Preference Elicitation

In the first study, we developed an agent and employed it to elicit residents' preferences regarding their travel modes in response to various factors, especially weather conditions. The aim of the study is to understand how different weather scenarios influence residents' choice of travel mode (some of the questions are aided by weather images) so policymakers can determine better incentives for promoting sustainable means of transportation. During the chatbot-aided survey, participants were asked a series of questions (with discrete options generated by the agent) about their travel preferences under different weather conditions. The agent gradually identifies participants by categories, primarily based on their dominant travel mode(s), and asks increasingly customized questions. For example, by knowing whether a participant is an avid bike user, the following questions will mainly focus on the conditions under which they would consider using alternative modes (other than bikes). In addition to the text display, users also have the option to use voice input to make their choices. The voice is then further processed to infer the intent behind the participant's choices. If none of the options are matched, the agent will ask for clarification. In some questions, the agent also presents images of various weather conditions to provide participants with a concrete sense of the type of weather being discussed.

On average, 19 out of the 21 questions (not all the questions are asked for a specific participant) in this experiment are discrete choices, with the rest of the questions being open-ended. Some discrete choice questions have the option "Other"; if chosen, the agent will ask the participant to type in the specifics and determine whether the response is relevant to the question (and ask for clarification once). In open-ended questions, the agent summarizes the responses and might ask for clarification (only once) if the agent deems the response irrelevant or incomplete. After the response to a clarification question, the participant will have a chance to decide if they would like to further clarify or go to the next question.

Participants interacted with the conversational agent through a simple dialogue interface, as shown in Fig. 4(a), where they could view the current conversation and access the full history of exchanges with the agent. This interface was designed for ease of use and is accessible via any standard web browser, whether on a laptop or mobile device. To enhance clarity in certain scenarios, such as describing weather conditions, the agent primarily generates images rather than text. For example, when asking participants about their preferred means (modes) of transportation, the agent employed images to illustrate different weather conditions, as shown in Fig. 4(b) and Fig. 4(c). To ensure reliability, we let LLMs to pre-generate a set of images about weather conditions, but one can also let LLMs to generate images (with a certain level of randomness) on the fly to create more diverse weather scenarios.

Conditional logic was embedded in the dialogue flow to address changes in participants' transportation choices due to shifting weather conditions. For example, if a participant indicated they usually bike during a sunny summer day, the agent could ask a follow-up question, such as, 'Would you still bike if there is moderate rain, as shown in the image below?', with a picture depicting weather of moderate rain. This logic was especially useful for addressing less intuitive decisions, such as switching from driving to biking when there is rain, to not only dig deep into the rationale of mode choice but also ensure participants fully understood the question. To explore the impact of varying conversational styles, the agent randomly selected different voices and question phrasing from a pool of pre-defined question variations. This ensured that each survey session featured a diverse set of conversational approaches.

We distributed the conversational agent through a QR code to 210 undergraduate and 15 graduate students in civil engineering and urban planning at McGill University. Additionally, five flyers were posted at commonly used entrances at the university's downtown (Montréal Centre-Ville) campus. About 3% of the total participants are not self-identified as students (e.g., postdoctoral researchers, faculty members, university employees, vendors, visitors.) Participants are prompted to have the opportunity to win a \$50 gift card for the University bookstore. In total, we received 184 responses, of which 103 were deemed to be of sufficient quality for analysis. The collected data were then examined to assess the impact of weather conditions on mode choice (or mode shift). Key factors considered in the analysis included weather and seasonal conditions (rain, snow, sunshine, wind), travel time (short, medium, long), transport modes (walking, biking, public transit, driving), and safety concerns (traffic safety, personal security). After the interview, we also convened the 15 graduate students in civil engineering and urban planning to ensure the responses were truthful to their preferences, and all of them confirmed that the documented response by the agent was correct.




Fig. 4. The interface with the conversational agent during a survey on residents’ travel preferences. Both texts and images are used. English and French versions are available.

Fig. 5 illustrates the results when participants were categorized by (biological) sex (noting that the agent also gathered background information such as gender, race, age, and the first three digits of their home postal code). Two participants chose male as their sex and chose “other” from the gender options. The analysis showed that both male and female participants primarily selected shared or active transportation modes, with a slightly higher proportion of male students opting for active modes. Furthermore, male participants were less likely to change their mode of transportation when it rained. Although not explicitly shown in the figure, the results also indicated that weather conditions are not sensitive in terms of whether participants drive (likely due to low car ownership), but they do have moderate influence between active modes and transit/ridesharing. However, the overall total trips of active modes and transit/ridesharing remain similar as the change seems to set off each other. Note that for both Fig. 5(a) and Fig. 5(b), the data from one layer to another are independent of each other. For example, the flow from the “TS” category in the second layer to the “AC” category in the third layer does not contain information about the flow from the first layer to the second layer.

This demonstration confirms that the conversational agent is a valuable tool for capturing residents’ travel preferences under various conditions. While detailed data analysis and policy recommendations are beyond the scope of this paper, the preliminary findings reveal a clear and consistent pattern. Future work will involve collecting data from a broader and more diverse participant pool, conducting an in-depth analysis (such as developing discrete choice models to interpret the factors influencing travel mode choices), and performing statistical tests to assess the significance of each factor and subfactor. These results and insights will be presented in a future publication.




Fig. 5 (a) Responses of the participants (unweighted) categorized based on (biological) sex and the options they chose during summer. **(b)** Responses of participants (unweighted) categorized based on age categories and the option they chose during winter. (M: Male; F: Female; PA: Private Auto (including solo ride-hailing); TS: Transit, Ride-sharing, Car-pooling; AC: Active Mode (Bike, Scooter, Walk)).

4.2 Experiment 2: Public Perception for Infrastructure Project

The second study develops and deploys a conversational system using the proposed modular approach for understanding the public perception of a recently (September 2024) implemented pedestrian crosswalk lighting system in the City of Candiac, Quebec, Canada, which is considered the first of its kind in North America (CBC News, 2024). The lighting system is shown in Fig. 6. The targeted participants of the students at the St-Mark's Elementary School adjacent to the new lighting system.



Fig. 6. A newly installed lighting system in Candia, Quebec, Canda, for improving intersection traffic safety [Source].

The school distributed an email containing a URL and a QR code to the parents. Parents can directly click the link on their smartphone or their laptop or tableau or scan the QR code. The conversational agent shown in Fig. 7. As a comparison, we also developed a web-based questionnaire version of the same set of questions (using Google Forms). The difference is that the web-based version does not have the ability to be conversational, such as paraphrasing the response to ensure clear understanding and asking for clarifications. The web-based form also does not allow voice-based responses. This leads to 80% participants to the conversational agent while the other 20% to the web-based questionnaire. In both cases, the survey starts with informing participants about the study's objective, the agent's functionalities, and data privacy measures. The participants can choose to use French or English modes. Note that there are no two separate process flows for each language; instead, it is one single process flow, where the LLM can take French or English as inputs and produce output using the language specified in the associated prompt

parameterized by a variable (about what language to use) based on the participant's response to the initial question about the preferred language. The agent also allows the participants to interact through voice commands, which was particularly beneficial for those who preferred speaking over typing. In discrete choice questions, the agent will attempt to match the voice answer with the options available. If there is no match, the agent will ask for clarification. In open-ended questions, the agent attempts to summarize or paraphrase the participants' responses and ask for clarifications when necessary to ensure data accuracy. If the agent considers a response to be challenging to summarize or paraphrase (likely due to response irrelevance), the agent simply asks the participant to clarify with more details.




Fig. 7. Agent interface during an interview. The agent can use English or French to communicate with the participants and follow up for further clarifications.

The process is consisted of three main phases (each phase has about 7 questions) – (1) collecting information about the travel modes, frequency, and the time-of-day for the participants to pass through the intersections or sending their child (children) to the school and whether they have noticed the lighting technology; (2) based on the participants' responses, the agent will either ask whether the parents think the technology is effective in terms of safety improvement or explain the technology is about; and (3) eliciting opinions (mostly through open-ended questions) about any other thoughts and suggestions and whether the parents think the technology should be installed in more intersections in the region.

A total of 244 responses were received from the conversational agent and 61 from the web-based form. Of these, 173 responses from the conversational agent and 28 from the web-based form are considered having a sufficient quality. For demonstration purposes, we processed the response data from the conversational agent to generate two bar charts (Fig. 8) summarizing the ratings based on the type of participants. In Fig. 8(a), we categorize the participants by modes of travel, by whether with their children (when pass through the intersection where the new lighting technology is installed), by weather conditions. The results show that most parents think the technology has some perceived effectiveness, especially during rain (we did not ask for snowing as there has not been any snow since the technology was installed when the interview was conducted). In Fig. 8(b), we show the answer in terms of parents' perception of their children's behavioral changes in terms of whether the children become more cautious, less cautious, or no change when the children pass through the intersections with their parents. In this figure, we also categorize the participants by their modes of travel, weather conditions when they pass through the intersection, and

whether they are referring to the day or evening/night. The results show that there is a clear difference between children’s (perceived) behavioral change when they are in their parents’ cars and when they are walking with their parents. When the children are in the cars, parents perceive their children to have no noticeable change or not sure since the technology was installed, while when the children are walking, the parents perceive their children to become more cautious, especially in the evenings and nights. Comparison with the web-based form responses revealed no substantial discrepancies, although the limited sample size precluded rigorous statistical testing. Future data collection, subject to approval by the City of Candiatic, could enable more in-depth analysis. Although this paper does not aim to provide comprehensive data analysis or policy recommendations, preliminary findings suggest a consistent pattern. Additionally, as the lighting technology is still novel, it remains to be seen whether familiarity over time will influence perceptions. That is, future studies are needed to assess the robustness and stability of these initial patterns.




Fig. 8. (a) The perceptions of the parents on the effectiveness of the newly installed lighting device intended for improving the intersection’s safety, by travel mode, whether accompanying their child (children), and the weather condition. **(b)** The perception of the parents on observing any behavioral change of their children when they pass through the intersection (with or without their accompany) in day time and in evening/night.

The experiment demonstrated the effectiveness of the LLM-enabled chatbot in conducting public outreach for infrastructure projects. We observe about 20% of participants chose to use voice, and 83% chose French, which suggests that the agent’s voice capabilities and bilingual functions are valuable for encouraging S&I participants who otherwise would not participate. We also noticed that in about 4% of discrete choice questions and 30% of open-ended questions where the agent asked for clarifications (we set the maximum time of clarification requests to be two), and we did find that the clarification provides more clear and definite answers.

4.3 Experiment 3: Expert Opinion Elicitation (Open-Ended Questions)

In the third study, we designed and deployed a conversational agent using the proposed modular approach to conduct a semi-structured interview with transportation professionals, asking for their opinions on the current and future potentials of LLMs in the field of transportation and urban mobility. The interview consists of five open-ended questions, each of which might be associated with up to two follow-up questions for clarification. The agent was distributed through different channels, including the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Mobility Initiative email list, LinkedIn announcements, and some additional tests with the students and researcher associates at MIT and McGill University. Overall, we received approximately 53 high-quality responses in the two versions of the conversational agents, which have nearly the same set of five questions and only have minor wording adjustments and temperature parameter (for LLM output randomness) adjustments. As 41 of these participants left their names and contact information, we know that they are mainly from universities, consulting companies, transit operation agencies, and regional planning agencies in North America, Europe, and East Asia. Although the agent uses English only, it does not show problems in responding to participants who answered the questions in German (one participant) and Korean (one participant). All other users used English in their responses.

The main objective of this experiment was to evaluate the agent’s ability to elicit expert opinions effectively and efficiently. The agent followed a pre-determined sequence of topic questions. After responding to each question, the agent paraphrases and summarizes the participant’s response in conjunction with prior questions and responses to ensure that the agent understood and interpreted the response correctly in the context of responses that the participants already gave to prior questions. If major missing elements in a question were identified in a participant’s response, the agent requests clarifications. Additionally, the chatbot provided the participant with an opportunity to add clarifications voluntarily. This procedure aims to enhance the accuracy and reliability of the collected data. To ensure

that the agent understands common jargon and terminology in the field of transportation engineering and planning, we incorporated a knowledge base from the Transportation Research Thesaurus (<https://trt.trb.org/>), retrieved using the RAG technique. We found that this approach resulted in a marginal improvement in understanding (when a participant uses technical terms), albeit some minor slowdown in the agent’s response time.

Fig. 9(a) shows the interface and the initial state when a chatbot is launched (either on a web browser or a smartphone). Fig. 9(b) and Fig. 9(c) show the agent responses during conversations, where the agent asks for clarification as it considers the response from the participant is incomplete.




Fig. 9. User interface for conducting semi-structured interviews on experts’ opinions on LLM for the future transportation industry.

As exemplified in Appendix I, the agent demonstrates a high level of accuracy in paraphrasing responses and requesting clarifications. Multiple participants reported near the end of the interview that the paraphrasing feature helped them reflect on their responses and provide more precise answers. Compared with the five in-person interviews before the agent was developed, we notice that the efficiency of the agent-mediated interviews was higher, with a slightly shorter average interview times (though only a text-based conversation is allowed in this agent), consistent data quality, and significantly more condensed meaningful information (perhaps because that the participants think more carefully through typing their opinions.)

Before deployment, we tested a wide range of potential erratic behaviors, such as answering a question with an irrelevant response and simply asking the same question back. During the deployment, one participant indeed attempted to go off the agenda by making an irrelevant request at the beginning of the interview – asking the agent to tell a good joke. These erratic behaviors are responded with an apologetic statement of not being able to answer and then re-iterate to the original interview question. In terms of the reliability of the LLM responses, although we did not observe any hallucination phenomena (i.e., an LLM making up facts), we acknowledge such risks. On one hand, we further prompt the LLMs to not fabricate factors but simply admit that it does not know. On the other hand, we suggest future research, including better utilization of RAG technologies, on addressing this issue to ensure complete reliability.

We performed a keyword analysis to identify common themes and issues mentioned by participants. The results are summarized in Table 2, which lists the final set of identified issues, objectives, performance metrics, and decision weights. The original transcripts already contain a summary and paraphrase of each participant’s response to each question. So we employed an LLM to further streamline and summarize the responses by question. During and after this procedure, we manually checked samples to ensure the summaries do not show signs of hallucination and accurately reflect the participants’ opinions. The results suggest that the agent’s ability to ask for clarification and follow-up questions significantly improve the quality of the response collected.

Table 2: Key Phrases In Participants' Responses In Experiment 3.

Questions	Common keywords from the responses
Q1. Specific applications of LLMs in workplace.	R1. Drafting emails, refine reports, asking to clarify technical jargons.
Q2a. Benefits of LLMs.	R2a. More efficient workflow, low cost, lower work burden.
Q2b. Challenges of LLMs.	R2b. Information inaccuracy, unclear sources/citations, worry that they might be replaced one day.
Q3a. Future LLM applications and impacts (next 1-3 years).	R3a. More commonly used among colleagues, automatic email responses with daily summaries and approval requests. Automatic reports/documents generations with periodic update. Integration with traveler information systems.
Q3b. Future LLM applications and impacts (next 5-10 years).	R3b. Integration with autonomous vehicles, replacing human engineers, planners and researchers, better and more adaptable traffic control, recommending transportation plans but are challenging to be humanly understandable.
Q4. Main barriers for beneficial adoption of LLMs.	R4. Technology capabilities, biased regulations, radical ideations, conservative people, risks of cyberattacks.
Q5. Visions (if no limit)	R5. Real-time communication, personalized route-suggestions, public transit optimization, cost-benefit analysis, accountability, equity improvement/worsening, last-mile delivery update, data privacy concerns, seamless system integration.

5. Discussion and Future Work

The modular approach and the parameterized conversational process it enables offers notable advantages, particularly in standardizing large-scale data collection, providing multi-modal real-time interactions with domain expertise, and understanding (and then mitigating) various procedural biases in S&Is.

Technical obstacles. Despite their advancements, LLM-powered conversational agents face technical challenges, some of which are unique while others are shared with conventional S&I methods. One major issue is the computational cost of deploying these models in real-time applications, which can limit their accessibility, particularly for smaller organizations. Additionally, LLMs can occasionally generate hallucinated or incorrect responses due to their probabilistic nature. Ensuring reliable outputs in high-stakes domains such as healthcare or legal services requires robust screening mechanisms and escalation protocols to handle errors appropriately (Chang et al., 2024). Looking ahead, research will likely focus on improving the efficiency and interpretability of LLMs within conversational agents. Reducing computational demands while maintaining high performance is essential for broader adoption. Moreover, ethical considerations around privacy and data security remain a critical area for future development, particularly as LLMs become more integrated into sensitive sectors (Meshkin et al., 2024). While the development and usage of conversational agents have become simpler, particularly with the emergence of no-code software development platforms, challenges still exist. Researchers without a technical background may find the process uncomfortable or intimidating, requiring more support and guidance to effectively deploy these systems. Furthermore, domain expertise plays a crucial role in ensuring that the knowledge base of these conversational agents is accurate, comprehensive, and tailored to the specific needs of the research. The proposed modular approach in this study addresses these concerns by explicitly considering domain-specific knowledge in the modular structure, allowing experts to contribute to the knowledge base through structured and customizable inputs. This feature ensures that specialized knowledge bases, including documents, dictionaries, handbooks, wikis, and knowledge graphs, can be effectively utilized to support S&Is driven by conversational agents. In relation to the bottleneck of concept and relationship extraction, we recognize the challenges posed by polysemy (one word or phrase referring to multiple concepts) and synonymy (multiple words or phrases referring to the same concept) (Renu & Mocko. 2016). Additionally, relationship extraction involves complex tasks such as identifying co-occurrence, distinguishing between correlational and causal relationships, and differentiating between positive, negative, parallel, and hierarchical relationships. While addressing these challenges is time-consuming and resource-intensive, they are critical for improving the accuracy and relevance of LLM outputs. The modular approach can help by allowing domain experts to refine and add specific rules or guidelines for concept and relationship extraction, ensuring that the chatbot is better equipped to handle the intricacies of domain-specific knowledge. This enables the system to improve its handling of ambiguities and relationships, leading to more accurate and contextually relevant responses.

Methodological challenges. S&Is in transportation research also face several methodological challenges. One significant issue is sampling bias, which can occur when the participants surveyed do not accurately represent the broader population (Meyer de Freitas et al., 2019). This challenge is particularly pronounced in transportation studies, where underrepresentation of certain groups, such as non-drivers, individuals in rural areas, or people with sensory, cognitive, and physiological disabilities, can skew results, limit the finding generalizability, and cause unintended consequences. Moreover, stated preferences, opinions, and expert insights gathered through S&Is are often subject to framing effects, where the format, wording, or structure of questions can unintentionally influence respondents' answers. Even subtle variations in how options are presented may shift preferences or opinions, which can lead to biased results if not carefully managed (Giergiczny et al., 2017; Yu and Jayakrishnan, 2018). Thus, controlling for framing effects is essential to ensure that the data accurately reflects respondents' true preferences and judgments. Social desirability bias (van de Mortel, 2008) also persists, influenced by how respondents perceive AI-driven systems. In addition to social desirability bias, experimenter effects such as placebo effects, expectancy effects, and cultural bias may impact respondents' answers, particularly in human-led S&Is. These effects are unclear in chatbot-based surveys—on one hand, the algorithmic nature of the system reduces human influence over respondents' behavior; on the other hand, the algorithmic nature might introduce new types of effects. Regardless, S&Is led by conversational agents cannot eliminate these biases, and mitigating them may require careful system design, such as customizing prompts to control for biases across different contexts. However, whether eliminating these experimenter effects is desirable depends on the specific research goals, as some effects may be beneficial for understanding human perceptions of transportation systems. The stochastic nature of LLMs introduces variability in responses, which can be mitigated by adjusting parameters like "temperature" to balance consistency and creativity. Sensitivity analyses are needed to optimize this trade-off, ensuring the system's robustness in diverse scenarios. When conducting S&I in person, experimenter effects, such as unintended influence on participant responses, can be mitigated by using modular conversational agents with varied or fine-tuned prompts and UI designs. Aversion to algorithmic agents, however, remains a challenge. Research suggests that some participants may exhibit algorithm aversion, especially when they perceive AI-driven systems as less trustworthy or less capable than human facilitators (Mahmud et al., 2022). To reduce this aversion, developers can leverage engineered prompts and modules that enhance the conversational agent's transparency, explainability, and rapport-building capabilities. Additionally, ensuring that the system consistently provides relevant, accurate, and contextually appropriate responses may alleviate concerns about the technology's competence. Developers can also address participant concerns through adaptive questioning strategies, thereby ensuring engagement while reducing the likelihood of negative responses due to algorithmic distrust. Finally, framing effects—where question phrasing impacts responses—remain a challenge. Future ongoing assessment is needed to understand their effectiveness, compared with human-led S&I or non-interactive S&Is, in various contexts. Another critical challenge is the discrepancy between stated and revealed preferences, partially caused by the framing effects during S&Is (Yu and Jayakrishnan, 2018), which affects both traditional and chatbot-based surveys. Respondent fatigue, a common issue in lengthy surveys, is mitigated through adaptive questioning strategies that maintain engagement. However, monitoring dropout rates remains essential to ensure data quality. Conversational agents can integrate real-time behavioral data, facilitated by biometric sensors (e.g., eye-tracking devices and heart rate variability measures) to bridge this gap, dynamically adjusting questions based on user behavior. Striking the right balance between structured procedures and flexibility in question delivery is crucial to maintaining both the integrity and adaptability of the survey, ensuring a comprehensive understanding of participant preferences and experiences.

Ethical concerns and implications. Ethical concerns in transportation research using conversational agents are multi-faceted and require careful consideration. Future research should explore the impact of agent design on biases, particularly the role of anthropomorphism (Adam et al., 2021), as AI's increasing human-like abilities can shape user perceptions and influence behavior. The potential for chatbots to be perceived as human surrogates may foster social relationships and emotional connections between users and AI, which raises questions about how these interactions affect user trust and decision-making and even lead to AI obsession. It is essential to investigate how chatbots' behavioral characteristics and their perceived social roles influence user engagement, particularly in vulnerable populations. Another key challenge is privacy concerns, particularly in both small-sample studies and large-scale public surveys (Ge and Fukuda, 2016). Anonymizing respondents is vital to protect individual privacy, especially in areas with small populations where identifying respondents from the data is easier. To mitigate this, researchers employ rigorous anonymization techniques to ensure data cannot be traced back to individuals, while still maintaining the richness of the data for analysis. The proposed modular approach further addresses this concern by differentiating on-premise LLMs and cloud-based (commercialized) LLMs. However, striking the right balance between privacy protection and data granularity remains an ongoing challenge in transportation research. Despite these challenges, S&Is remain indispensable tools in transportation research. The ethical deployment of LLM-enabled conversational

agents in S&Is is crucial, especially given their potential for collecting sensitive data. Several key ethical concerns must be addressed, including biased question framing, unintended emotional impacts on respondents, and ensuring transparency in how AI-generated decisions are made. Although privacy measures, such as anonymization and secure data storage, have been integrated, these systems must continuously evolve to comply with data privacy regulations like GDPR and PIPEDA (Ghandour et al., 2024). Ensuring transparency in the decision-making process of AI, especially regarding how it frames questions or makes follow-up decisions, is also essential to build trust among users. Moreover, the risk of exacerbating digital divides through reliance on participants' personal devices is significant. Those without access to appropriate technology or internet connectivity could be marginalized, potentially skewing data collection and public participation. To address this, organizations conducting these surveys should consider providing devices or access to digital tools and Internet-compatible services (e.g., a "Lite version" of the conversational agent), particularly in underserved communities. This step is necessary for ensuring inclusivity and broadening participation in chatbot-based S&Is. Beyond accessibility, it's also critical to consider the emotional and psychological impacts of interacting with AI-driven systems. As conversational agents become more sophisticated, they might unintentionally evoke strong emotional responses or influence decision-making through subtle nudges. Safeguarding ethical standards around these interactions, including exploring how much transparency is needed for users to feel comfortable with AI, should be a priority. Furthermore, while it may seem advantageous to present chatbots as human-like agents to encourage engagement, this approach could inadvertently lead to over-trust and unrealistic expectations of AI's capabilities. This is especially concerning for vulnerable populations such as the elderly and adolescents, who may be more susceptible to scams or privacy violations. Transparent communication about the limitations and capabilities of the AI system is therefore critical to maintaining ethical standards and protecting participants' privacy. Addressing these challenges is essential to ensure that AI-driven S&Is are both effective and ethically sound.

The modular framework presented in this paper contributes directly to the realization of Human-Machine Transportation Systems (HMTS), where humans and machines collaboratively drive transportation system planning, implementation, operation, and usage (Yu, 2018; Yu and McKinley, 2024). The conversational agents (and other AI agents) support HMTS by enabling real-time data collection and facilitating collaborative decision-making between human users and AI systems. Although the current implementation focuses on S&Is, there is significant potential to expand conversational agents to a wider range of applications, such as focus groups, Delphi methods, participatory planning processes (Yu and McKinley, 2024). That is, conversational agents can role play various system stakeholders and communicate with (conducting S&Is on) each other. In the particular context of AI-facilitated participatory planning, agents can facilitate iterative feedback loops and group consensus-building, making these processes more scalable and inclusive, offers new opportunities for engaging diverse community stakeholders and obtain a broad range of perspectives (Yu and McKinley, 2024). Additionally, conversational agents also become important interface components in traveler information applications and autonomous vehicles. Looking ahead, incorporating insights from psychology, behavioral economics, human-computer interaction (HCI), and ethics will be crucial for creating agents that not only collect data efficiently but also engage respondents in culturally sensitive and empathetic ways.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce a novel modular architecture for LLM-enabled conversational agents tailored to conducting S&Is in transportation research. By integrating engineered prompts, customizable knowledge bases, and adaptive conversational logic, the proposed system addresses key limitations of traditional S&Is, such as interviewer bias, scalability, privacy-preservation, token use efficiency, and response accuracy. Through three field studies—eliciting resident travel preference in different weather conditions, public perception on a new infrastructure project, and expert opinions on the impact of novel technologies—we demonstrate the versatility and effectiveness of the modular framework in a range of contexts. These experiments showcase the resultant agent's capabilities in providing real-time clarifications, handling multilingual and multimodal inputs, and ensuring robust data collection across diverse participant groups. Such a conversational agent system sets the stage for future S&Is in transportation research.

Despite these advancements, our findings also highlighted several challenges in developing and deploying LLM-driven conversational agents, particularly around framing effects, social desirability biases, and accessibility of the conversational agents (when used for public consultation and participatory decision-making). All except the last one are shared by other existing S&I methods. Future improvements must focus on minimizing these biases while enhancing the system's capacity for handling more complex and dynamic interactions. As we observed in our studies, the stochastic nature of LLMs and the need for ongoing sensitivity analyses to fine-tune agent behavior are critical areas for further research, especially in optimizing the balance between response creativity and consistency. In terms

of immediate next steps, the development of conversational agents for S&I will focus on refining adaptability and ensuring robustness in real-world applications. This includes enhancing the agent’s ability to tailor follow-up questions based on individual responses, which can improve data accuracy and participant engagement. Expanding the framework’s multilingual capabilities and incorporating more advanced voice recognition features will make the system even more accessible, especially in diverse, large-scale studies. Further exploration of reducing token consumption and streamlining data processing will also be crucial for optimizing the agent’s performance cost-efficiently, especially for longer S&Is involving complex topics. Additionally, future research will involve applying these conversational agents across an even wider range of transportation research contexts, such as traveler information provisions, public transit user feedback, and consumer support (e.g., purchasing electric and autonomous vehicles). We hope the proposed framework can lead to more informed and timely transportation decisions and enable practitioners and researchers to engage with larger, more diverse populations without sacrificing depth or quality of insights.

Acknowledgement

We extend our sincere appreciation to all the participants who contributed to the testing and deployment phases of the surveys and interviews, both in-person and virtually. While we are unable to mention individual names due to strict anonymity requirements, we deeply value the insights and contributions from each participant.

For Experiment 1, we are thankful for the financial support provided by Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) and the supports from Narges Ahmadi (PhD student in civil engineering at McGill University) and Nelly Nicola (Master student in civil engineering at McGill University). **For Experiment 2**, we greatly appreciate the City of Candiac’s support, along with contributions of Ana María Ospina Salazar (master student in civil engineering at McGill University), Nicolás Alessandróni (FRQSC postdoctoral fellow in psychology at Concordia University), and Alejandro Pérez Villaseñor (PhD candidate in civil engineering at McGill University). **For Experiment 3**, we are grateful to the staff of MIT Mobility Initiatives (MMI), particularly Bhuvan Atluri, and for the valuable feedback from students and researchers at the MIT JTL Urban Mobility Lab, including Raha Peyravi, Amelia Baum, Awad Abdelhaim, and Hanyong Tang. We also acknowledge the input from PhD candidate Fuqiang Liu at McGill University, who provided a high-quality response and some design suggestions in the early stage of the agent development.

Finally, we would like to thank Prof. Michel Belier from the University of Sydney for offering insightful feedback and suggestions, which were instrumental in finalizing the Discussion section of this work.

Appendix A: Example Dialogue from the Semi-Structured Interview in Experiment 3

To better demonstrate the capability of using an LLM-enabled conversational agent to conduct semi-structured interview based on the proposed system architecture and procedure, we show an example. Please note that the transcripts are verbatim. So, any typos are also kept. The text (on the left side) with yellow background are from the agent, while the text on the right (with blue background) are human responses.

Hello! My name is RoBot. I want to learn your thoughts about the potential adoption and impact of Large Language Models (LLMs) in transportation and urban mobility.

Understood (Button)

This interview comprises only five questions, so I encourage you to share your detailed thoughts and perspectives based on your expertise and experience.

As a respected professional in this field, your participation is not only highly appreciated but also pivotal in driving the human-centered advancement of AI technologies within the transportation sector.

Sounds good (Button)

Question 1/5: *Could you describe any specific applications of LLMs in your work, organization, or field?*

I mostly use it to learn a new thing in my field (such as a method in Transportation Engineering or the usage of different ML algorithms on databases). For example, I use chatGPT to learn more about the performance of XGBoost in the classification of imbalanced datasets and how to find the best hyperparameters for my model. Another use case is to summarize papers so I can read them in less time and ask it to explain anything I am not familiar with inside the paper.

Great! So you’ve mentioned that you primarily utilize the tool to acquire new knowledge within your area, such as Transportation Engineering methods or applying various machine learning algorithms to datasets. Specifically, you’ve used chatGPT to gain insights into the efficacy of XGBoost for sorting unbalanced datasets and to determine the optimal hyperparameters for your models. Additionally, you employ it to condense research papers, allowing for quicker review, and to clarify any unfamiliar concepts within those papers. This is quite interesting. Thank you for your response.

Go to the next question (Button)

Question 2/5: What are the primary benefits and challenges associated with the use of LLMs in transportation, either from your own experience or based on what you are aware of?"

Regarding the benefits, I would like to mention its power to brainstorm ideas to implement on your projects and teach you any concept that don't know. Additionally, because most students of Transportation Engineering are now familiar with ML and its usage in this field, it can also help you to write codes and have a powerful tool to implement your analysis on transportation datasets. Also, you can see if you can use an idea from an irrelevant field to use it in Transportation Engineering. I have nothing regarding challenges in mind right now.

I understand that you've highlighted several benefits of large language models, such as their ability to brainstorm ideas, teach concepts, assist with code writing, and transfer ideas from other fields to transportation engineering. However, could you please provide more details on how exactly these models have been applied in your projects or in the classroom? Additionally, while you mentioned not having challenges in mind right now, could you perhaps think of any potential limitations or areas where LLMs might fall short in the context of transportation research?

To provide you with my experience in using LLMs for my projects, I used it to find an open-source dataset related to Transportation so I can implement ML algorithms on them. It found a dataset, suggested a project that I can do with that data, and helped me to correct my code to build a prediction model based on them. I also learned about a new library to find about the importance of my input features of my model as well. Regarding limitations, you usually find wrong citations and fake links when you ask them to provide you with papers related to a field, especially when you say I want the most recent papers related to a subject.

I see, so you've utilized LLMs in your projects, specifically for identifying an open-source transportation dataset to apply machine learning algorithms. The LLM not only located a dataset but also recommended a potential project, assisted in debugging your code, and introduced you to a new library to assess the significance of your model's input features. However, you've encountered limitations, particularly with LLMs providing incorrect citations and unreliable links when requesting recent papers in your field. This is interesting. Thank you for sharing.

Go to the next question (Button)

Question 3/5: How do you foresee the applications and impacts of LLMs evolving in both the near term (1-2 years) and the long term (5-10 years) in transportation?

In short-term, we can fill the void of programming that most people in transportation are not professional in. Also, it helps us to make the process of learning in this field much more faster, so we will probably witness more number of published papers in this field in coming years. In long-term, we will see that people in this field will use more advanced technology and techniques to develop new methods to control and manage transportation, mostly because we won't lye on universities to learn the knowledge of transportation and we will be able to have the ability of coding much more easier in the next 5-10 years and maybe we won't need to code anymore and LLMs will do the tasks with high performance. Also, I believe we will make changes in the process of writing papers in the nex 5-10 years and will allow LLMs to help us write the most of the papers and we will push the boundaries of science in transportation much more faster.

I see. So you mentioned that in the short term, LLMs will bridge the gap in programming expertise among transportation professionals, accelerating the learning curve and potentially increasing the volume of research publications in the field. Looking ahead, you anticipate that within the next 5 to 10 years, transportation experts will increasingly adopt sophisticated technology and methodologies for traffic management, partly because reliance on traditional university education for transportation knowledge will diminish. You also foresee a future where coding becomes much simpler or perhaps even unnecessary, as LLMs may take over such tasks with high efficiency. Furthermore, you expect that the process of academic writing will evolve, with LLMs playing a significant role in drafting research papers, thereby expediting scientific advancements in transportation. This is helpful. Thank you for sharing.

I want to add or clarify (Button)

Great. I am listening :)

Also, we will experience the advent of AVs more than before. The infrastructure of transportation will become more intelligent with the use of AI and Intelligent Transportation Systems such as adaptive traffic signs, adaptive traffic signals, communication between vehicles and infrastructure to update traffic data on real time so we can manage traffic with the help of AI as well. The future of transportation is bright :)

Question 4/5: What do you think are the main barriers (e.g., technological, regulatory, and economic) that currently hinder the broader adoption of LLMs in transportation, and how might these be addressed?

Respectfully, I believe there are a lot of conservative people in this field who are against the new ways of using such tools. For example, it is still forbidden to get help from LLMs to write papers, because academic people can't trust it. However, if we make this process more automatic, we will be able to push the boundaries of science more faster. Also, safety issues in using them for our daily use is considered as one of the barriers, such as giving informations to the LLMs might end up to sharing your sensitive information with government. Economicaly, this technology will make too many people unemployed and this can have bad affects on the society and the moral

situation of people. It is also expensive to provide the infrastructure of city to adapt it to the new era of AI to make everything automatic and adoptable with LLMs and their usage.

I understand that you have concerns about the conservative stance of some professionals in the field and the potential risks associated with using LLMs, including privacy and employment issues. Could you please provide more details on how you think these barriers could be addressed to facilitate the adoption of large language models in transportation and urban mobility?

Regarding the safety issues, it is important to monitor companies which develop such technologies and make regulations on these types of privacy data gathering issues. But regarding unemployment risk, I think we have no choice but to accept it and try to find new ways of employing people to help transportation and urban mobility. However, regarding the acceptance of LLMs to be involved in writing papers, I believe the best way is to dedicate new journals to them and see how they would perform so we can understand if it is beneficial or not.

I see, so you're emphasizing the need for oversight and regulation when it comes to safety and privacy concerns raised by the development of large language models. You also acknowledge the inevitable impact on employment but suggest we should adapt by creating new job opportunities within transportation and urban mobility sectors. Additionally, you propose an intriguing idea of establishing specialized journals for papers written with the help of large language models, to evaluate their effectiveness and contribution to the field. This is interesting. Thank you for sharing.

Go to the next question (Button)

Almost There!

Question 5/5: Using your creative imagination, can you envision scenarios where the integration of LLMs might dramatically transform transportation systems or shape policymaking? What are the anticipated benefits and potential challenges of such changes?

1. **Traffic Management and Optimization Real-Time Traffic Analysis:** LLMs can process vast amounts of data from sensors, cameras, and GPS devices to analyze traffic patterns in real time. They can provide insights and predictions about congestion, accidents, and optimal routes. **Incident Management:** By analyzing reports and social media posts, LLMs can quickly identify traffic incidents and suggest alternative routes or solutions to minimize delays. 2. **Public Transportation Enhancement Dynamic Scheduling:** LLMs can optimize bus and train schedules based on real-time demand, reducing wait times and improving service efficiency. **Personalized Travel Assistance:** Chatbots powered by LLMs can assist passengers with route planning, ticket booking, and real-time updates on delays or changes. 3. **Autonomous Vehicles Natural Language Processing:** LLMs can enhance the communication systems of autonomous vehicles, enabling them to understand and respond to human commands more effectively. **Decision-Making Support:** LLMs can analyze complex scenarios and provide decision-making support for autonomous driving systems, improving safety and efficiency. 4. **Logistics and Freight Management Route Optimization:** By analyzing weather conditions, traffic, and delivery constraints, LLMs can help logistics companies optimize delivery routes, saving time and reducing fuel consumption. **Supply Chain Management:** LLMs can predict demand fluctuations, manage inventory levels, and streamline supply chain operations, leading to more efficient transportation of goods. 5. **Infrastructure Planning and Maintenance Predictive Maintenance:** By analyzing data from sensors embedded in infrastructure, LLMs can predict maintenance needs, preventing breakdowns and extending the lifespan of transportation assets. **Smart Infrastructure Design:** LLMs can assist in designing smarter transportation networks by analyzing urban development patterns and predicting future transportation needs. 6. **Sustainability and Environmental Impact Emission Reduction:** LLMs can help in planning routes and schedules that minimize fuel consumption and emissions, contributing to greener transportation systems. **Policy Development:** By analyzing vast datasets, LLMs can support policymakers in developing regulations and initiatives to promote sustainable transportation. 7. **User Experience Enhancement Customer Service:** LLM-powered virtual assistants can provide 24/7 support to travelers, addressing their concerns and queries in multiple languages. **Accessibility:** LLMs can improve accessibility by offering tailored information and assistance to people with disabilities, ensuring they can navigate transportation systems more easily. 8. **Data-Driven Decision Making Predictive Analytics:** LLMs can forecast transportation trends and usage patterns, helping stakeholders make informed decisions about investments and developments. **Risk Management:** By analyzing historical data and current trends, LLMs can identify potential risks and vulnerabilities in transportation systems, enabling proactive measures. The most important challenge is data privacy, fast reaction to mistakes from LLMs, giant companies that try to prevent expansion usage of these technologies because their profit might be in old ways.

Great! So you mentioned that traffic management and optimization can be improved through the use of LLMs. They can analyze real-time traffic data from various sources like sensors, cameras, and GPS devices to provide insights and predictions about congestion, accidents, and optimal routes. Additionally, LLMs can help in incident management by quickly identifying traffic incidents through analysis of reports and social media posts, and suggesting alternative routes or solutions to minimize delays.

You also highlighted that LLMs can enhance public transportation by optimizing bus and train schedules based on real-time demand, reducing wait times and improving service efficiency. Moreover, chatbots powered by

LLMs can provide personalized travel assistance to passengers, helping with route planning, ticket booking, and real-time updates on delays or changes.

In the context of autonomous vehicles, LLMs can enhance communication systems by enabling them to understand and respond to human commands more effectively through natural language processing. They can also analyze complex scenarios and provide decision-making support for autonomous driving systems, improving safety and efficiency.

Furthermore, LLMs can assist in logistics and freight management by optimizing delivery routes based on weather conditions, traffic, and delivery constraints, thus saving time and reducing fuel consumption. They can also predict demand fluctuations, manage inventory levels, and streamline supply chain operations, leading to more efficient transportation of goods.

In terms of infrastructure planning and maintenance, LLMs can predict maintenance needs by analyzing data from sensors embedded in infrastructure, preventing breakdowns and extending the lifespan of infrastructure. They also assist in designing smarter networks by analyzing urban development patterns.

For sustainability, LLMs can plan routes to minimize fuel consumption and emissions, supporting greener transportation systems. They aid policymakers in developing sustainable transportation regulations.

LLMs enhance user experience with 24/7 virtual assistants for customer service, providing multilingual support and tailored information for people with disabilities, ensuring accessibility.

In data-driven decision-making, LLMs forecast trends and usage patterns, helping stakeholders make informed decisions. They also identify risks in transportation systems through historical data analysis, enabling proactive measures.

However, challenges include ensuring data privacy, swiftly addressing LLM mistakes, and overcoming resistance from companies invested in traditional methods.

Overall, LLM integration in transportation offers significant benefits but requires careful management of privacy, accuracy, and industry resistance. Thank you for your insights.

Proceed (Button)

Thank you for answering these questions!

References

- Aba, A., Esztergár-Kiss, D., 2024. Creation of the MaaS readiness index with a modified AHP-ISM method. *Communications in Transportation Research* 4, 100122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.commt.2024.100122>
- Adam, M., Wessel, M., Benlian, A., 2021. AI-based chatbots in customer service and their effects on user compliance. *Electronic Markets* 31, 427–445. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-020-00414-7>
- Adhikari, M., Ghimire, L.P., Kim, Y., Aryal, P., Khadka, S.B., 2020. Identification and Analysis of Barriers against Electric Vehicle Use. *Sustainability* 12, 4850. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12124850>
- al Attar, M., Clouthier, M., 2015. Sharing Power: The Case for Public Consultations on Trade. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society / Revue Canadienne Droit et Société* 30, 465–485. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cls.2015.29>
- Alsafari, B., Atwell, E., Walker, A., Callaghan, M., 2024. Towards effective teaching assistants: From intent-based chatbots to LLM-powered teaching assistants. *Natural Language Processing Journal* 8, 100101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlp.2024.100101>
- Bansal, P., Kockelman, K.M., 2018. Are we ready to embrace connected and self-driving vehicles? A case study of Texas. *Transportation (Amst)* 45, 641–675. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-016-9745-z>
- Barthelmes, L., Behren, S. von, Magdolen, M., Soyulu, T., Chlond, B., Kagerbauer, M., 2023. Insights into public transit use in Berlin – The role of autonomy and public transit privacy. p. 190002. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0170513>
- Belda-Medina, J., Calvo-Ferrer, J.R., 2022. Using Chatbots as AI Conversational Partners in Language Learning. *Applied Sciences* 12, 8427. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app12178427>
- Benaddi, L., Ouaddi, C., Jakimi, A., Ouchao, B., 2024. A Systematic Review of Chatbots: Classification, Development, and Their Impact on Tourism. *IEEE Access* 12, 78799–78810. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3408108>
- Brandtzaeg, P.B., Skjuve, M., Følstad, A., 2022. My AI Friend: How Users of a Social Chatbot Understand Their Human–AI Friendship. *Hum Commun Res* 48, 404–429. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hcr/hqac008>
- Caldarini, G., Jaf, S., McGarry, K., 2022. A Literature Survey of Recent Advances in Chatbots. *Information* 13, 41. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info13010041>
- Campbell, A.A., Cherry, C.R., Ryerson, M.S., Yang, X., 2016. Factors influencing the choice of shared bicycles and shared electric bikes in Beijing. *Transp Res Part C Emerg Technol* 67, 399–414. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2016.03.004>
- CBC News, 2024. See the new “intelligent” crosswalk lighting up a Candiac, Que., intersection [WWW Document].
- Chang, Yupeng, Wang, X., Wang, J., Wu, Y., Yang, L., Zhu, K., Chen, H., Yi, X., Wang, C., Wang, Y., Ye, W., Zhang, Y., Chang, Yi, Yu, P.S., Yang, Q., Xie, X., 2024. A Survey on Evaluation of Large Language Models. *ACM Trans Intell Syst Technol* 15, 1–45. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3641289>
- Chen, Y., Jensen, S., Albert, L.J., Gupta, S., Lee, T., 2023. Artificial Intelligence (AI) Student Assistants in the Classroom: Designing Chatbots to Support Student Success. *Information Systems Frontiers* 25, 161–182. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-022-10291-4>
- Darcy, S., Burke, P.F., 2018. On the road again: The barriers and benefits of automobility for people with disability. *Transp Res Part A Policy Pract* 107, 229–245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2017.11.002>

- De Freitas, J., Uğuralp, A.K., Oğuz-Uğuralp, Z., Puntoni, S., 2024. Chatbots and mental health: Insights into the safety of generative AI. *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 34, 481–491. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1393>
- Ding, C., Wang, Y., Tang, T., Mishra, S., Liu, C., 2018. Joint analysis of the spatial impacts of built environment on car ownership and travel mode choice. *Transp Res D Transp Environ* 60, 28–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2016.08.004>
- Dortheimer, J., Martelaro, N., Sprecher, A., Schubert, G., 2024. Evaluating large-language-model chatbots to engage communities in large-scale design projects. *Artificial Intelligence for Engineering Design, Analysis and Manufacturing* 38, e4. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0890060424000027>
- Farooq, B., Cherchi, E., 2024. Workshop synthesis: Virtual reality, visualization and interactivity in travel survey, where we are and possible future directions. *Transportation Research Procedia* 76, 686–691. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2023.12.092>
- Gao, C., Lan, X., Li, N., Yuan, Y., Ding, J., Zhou, Z., Xu, F., Li, Y., 2024. Large language models empowered agent-based modeling and simulation: a survey and perspectives. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun* 11, 1259. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03611-3>
- Ge, Q., Fukuda, D., 2016. Updating origin–destination matrices with aggregated data of GPS traces. *Transp Res Part C Emerg Technol* 69, 291–312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2016.06.002>
- Ghandour, A., Woodford, B.J., Abusaimh, H., 2024. Ethical Considerations in the Use of ChatGPT: An Exploration Through the Lens of Five Moral Dimensions. *IEEE Access* 12, 60682–60693. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3394243>
- Ghorbanzadeh, O., Moslem, S., Blaschke, T., Duleba, S., 2018. Sustainable Urban Transport Planning Considering Different Stakeholder Groups by an Interval-AHP Decision Support Model. *Sustainability* 11, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11010009>
- Giergiczny, M., Dekker, T., Hess, S., Chintakayala, P.K., 2017. Testing the stability of utility parameters in repeated best, repeated best-worst and one-off best-worst studies. *European Journal of Transport and Infrastructure Research*. <https://doi.org/10.18757/EJTIR.2017.17.4.3209>
- Greene, D.L., Kontou, E., Borlaug, B., Brooker, A., Muratori, M., 2020. Public charging infrastructure for plug-in electric vehicles: What is it worth? *Transp Res D Transp Environ* 78, 102182. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2019.11.011>
- Harb, M., Xiao, Y., Circella, G., Mokhtarian, P.L., Walker, J.L., 2018. Projecting travelers into a world of self-driving vehicles: estimating travel behavior implications via a naturalistic experiment. *Transportation (Amst)* 45, 1671–1685. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-018-9937-9>
- Harper, C.D., Hendrickson, C.T., Mangones, S., Samaras, C., 2016. Estimating potential increases in travel with autonomous vehicles for the non-driving, elderly and people with travel-restrictive medical conditions. *Transp Res Part C Emerg Technol* 72, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2016.09.003>
- Helveston, J.P., Liu, Y., Feit, E.M., Fuchs, E., Klampfl, E., Michalek, J.J., 2015. Will subsidies drive electric vehicle adoption? Measuring consumer preferences in the U.S. and China. *Transp Res Part A Policy Pract* 73, 96–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2015.01.002>
- Hess, S., Börjesson, M., 2019. Understanding attitudes towards congestion pricing: a latent variable investigation with data from four cities. *Transportation Letters* 11, 63–77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19427867.2016.1271762>
- Hsu, C.-L., Lin, J.C.-C., 2023. Understanding the user satisfaction and loyalty of customer service chatbots. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* 71, 103211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2022.103211>
- Irawan, M.Z., Belgiawan, P.F., Joewono, T.B., Bastariantio, F.F., Rizki, M., Ilahi, A., 2022. Exploring activity-travel behavior changes during the beginning of COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia. *Transportation (Amst)* 49, 529–553. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-021-10185-5>
- Jiang, Z., Rashik, M., Panchal, K., Jasim, M., Sarvghad, A., Riahi, P., DeWitt, E., Thurber, F., Mahyar, N., 2023. CommunityBots: Creating and Evaluating A Multi-Agent Chatbot Platform for Public Input Elicitation. *Proc ACM Hum Comput Interact* 7, 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3579469>
- Jin, Y., Chen, L., Zhao, X., Cai, W., 2024. The way you assess matters: User interaction design of survey chatbots for mental health. *Int J Hum Comput Stud* 189, 103290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2024.103290>
- Karolemeas, C., Tsigdinos, S., Tzouras, P.G., Nikitas, A., Bakogiannis, E., 2021. Determining Electric Vehicle Charging Station Location Suitability: A Qualitative Study of Greek Stakeholders Employing Thematic Analysis and Analytical Hierarchy Process. *Sustainability* 13, 2298. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13042298>
- Kester, J., Noel, L., Zarazua de Rubens, G., Sovacool, B.K., 2018. Policy mechanisms to accelerate electric vehicle adoption: A qualitative review from the Nordic region. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 94, 719–731. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2018.05.067>
- Kim, Y.M., Kwon, J., Park, D., 2024. How Does Talking with a Human-like Machine in a Self-Driving Car Affect your Experience? A Mixed-Method Approach. *Applied Sciences* 14, 8999. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app14198999>
- Kocoń, J., Baran, J., Kanclerz, K., Kajstura, M., Kazienko, P., 2023. Differential Dataset Cartography: Explainable Artificial Intelligence in Comparative Personalized Sentiment Analysis. pp. 148–162. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-35995-8_11
- Kontou, E., Murray-Tuite, P., Wernstedt, K., 2017. Duration of commute travel changes in the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy using accelerated failure time modeling. *Transp Res Part A Policy Pract* 100, 170–181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2017.04.015>

- Krueger, R., Rashidi, T.H., Rose, J.M., 2016. Preferences for shared autonomous vehicles. *Transp Res Part C Emerg Technol* 69, 343–355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2016.06.015>
- Kühne, S., 2023. Interpersonal Perceptions and Interviewer Effects in Face-to-Face Surveys. *Sociol Methods Res* 52, 299–334. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124120926215>
- Kyriakidis, M., Happee, R., de Winter, J.C.F., 2015. Public opinion on automated driving: Results of an international questionnaire among 5000 respondents. *Transp Res Part F Traffic Psychol Behav* 32, 127–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2015.04.014>
- LaMondia, J., Fisher, M., 2024. Can we focus long-distance travel survey sampling? Analyzing travel behavior trends between and within demographic groups. *Transportation Research Procedia* 76, 520–533. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2023.12.073>
- Lee, N.S., Luong, T., Rosin, R., Asch, D.A., Sevinc, C., Balachandran, M., Josephs, M., Rusk, M.H., McHenry, N.L., Asch, E.L., Mowery, D.L., Chaiyachati, K.H., 2022a. Developing a Chatbot–Clinician Model for Hypertension Management. *NEJM Catal* 3. <https://doi.org/10.1056/CAT.22.0228>
- Lee, N.S., Luong, T., Rosin, R., Asch, D.A., Sevinc, C., Balachandran, M., Josephs, M., Rusk, M.H., McHenry, N.L., Asch, E.L., Mowery, D.L., Chaiyachati, K.H., 2022b. Developing a Chatbot–Clinician Model for Hypertension Management. *NEJM Catal* 3. <https://doi.org/10.1056/CAT.22.0228>
- Liao, H., Shen, H., Li, Z., Wang, C., Li, G., Bie, Y., Xu, C., 2024. GPT-4 enhanced multimodal grounding for autonomous driving: Leveraging cross-modal attention with large language models. *Communications in Transportation Research* 4, 100116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.commtr.2023.100116>
- Lindell, M.K., Sorensen, J.H., Baker, E.J., Lehman, W.P., 2020. Community response to hurricane threat: Estimates of household evacuation preparation time distributions. *Transp Res D Transp Environ* 85, 102457. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2020.102457>
- Longo, J., 2017. The evolution of citizen and stakeholder engagement in Canada, from Spicer to #Hashtags. *Canadian Public Administration* 60, 517–537. <https://doi.org/10.1111/capa.12229>
- Loong, C., van Lierop, D., El-Geneidy, A., 2017. On time and ready to go: An analysis of commuters’ punctuality and energy levels at work or school. *Transp Res Part F Traffic Psychol Behav* 45, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2016.11.014>
- Madigan, R., Louw, T., Wilbrink, M., Schieben, A., Merat, N., 2017. What influences the decision to use automated public transport? Using UTAUT to understand public acceptance of automated road transport systems. *Transp Res Part F Traffic Psychol Behav* 50, 55–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2017.07.007>
- Mahmud, H., Islam, A. N., Ahmed, S. I., & Smolander, K. (2022). What influences algorithmic decision-making? A systematic literature review on algorithm aversion. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 175, 121390.
- Meshkin, H., Zirkle, J., Arabidarrehdor, G., Chaturbedi, A., Chakravartula, S., Mann, J., Thrasher, B., Li, Z., 2024. Harnessing large language models’ zero-shot and few-shot learning capabilities for regulatory research. *Brief Bioinform* 25. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbae354>
- Meyer de Freitas, L., Becker, H., Zimmermann, M., Axhausen, K.W., 2019. Modelling intermodal travel in Switzerland: A recursive logit approach. *Transp Res Part A Policy Pract* 119, 200–213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2018.11.009>
- Miah, M.S.U., Kabir, M.M., Sarwar, T. Bin, Safran, M., Alfarhood, S., Mridha, M.F., 2024. A multimodal approach to cross-lingual sentiment analysis with ensemble of transformer and LLM. *Sci Rep* 14, 9603. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-60210-7>
- Migliorini, S., 2024. “More than Words”: A Legal Approach to the Risks of Commercial Chatbots Powered by Generative Artificial Intelligence. *European Journal of Risk Regulation* 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1017/err.2024.4>
- Moilanen, J., van Berkel, N., Visuri, A., Gadiraju, U., van der Maden, W., Hosio, S., 2023. Supporting mental health self-care discovery through a chatbot. *Front Digit Health* 5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fdgh.2023.1034724>
- Myers, D., Mohawesh, R., Chellaboina, V.I., Sathvik, A.L., Venkatesh, P., Ho, Y.-H., Henshaw, H., Alhawawreh, M., Berdik, D., Jararweh, Y., 2024. Foundation and large language models: fundamentals, challenges, opportunities, and social impacts. *Cluster Comput* 27, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10586-023-04203-7>
- Nævestad, T.-O., Phillips, R.O., Elvebakk, B., 2015. Traffic accidents triggered by drivers at work – A survey and analysis of contributing factors. *Transp Res Part F Traffic Psychol Behav* 34, 94–107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2015.07.024>
- Ngai, E.W.T., Lee, M.C.M., Luo, M., Chan, P.S.L., Liang, T., 2021. An intelligent knowledge-based chatbot for customer service. *Electron Commer Res Appl* 50, 101098. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2021.101098>
- Pilko, H., Mandžuka, S., Barić, D., 2017. Urban single-lane roundabouts: A new analytical approach using multi-criteria and simultaneous multi-objective optimization of geometry design, efficiency and safety. *Transp Res Part C Emerg Technol* 80, 257–271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2017.04.018>
- Renu, R. S., & Mocko, G. (2016). Computing similarity of text-based assembly processes for knowledge retrieval and reuse. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 39, 101-110.
- Rhim, J., Kwak, M., Gong, Y., Gweon, G., 2022. Application of humanization to survey chatbots: Change in chatbot perception, interaction experience, and survey data quality. *Comput Human Behav* 126, 107034. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.107034>
- Sachdeva, A., Kim, A., Dennis, A.R., 2024. Taking the Chat out of Chatbot? Collecting User Reviews with Chatbots and Web Forms. *Journal of Management Information Systems* 41, 146–177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2023.2301175>

- Shanahan, M., McDonnell, K., Reynolds, L., 2023. Role play with large language models. *Nature* 623, 493–498. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06647-8>
- Shen, Q., Chen, P., Pan, H., 2016. Factors affecting car ownership and mode choice in rail transit-supported suburbs of a large Chinese city. *Transp Res Part A Policy Pract* 94, 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2016.08.027>
- Solarino, A.M., Aguinis, H., 2021. Challenges and Best-practice Recommendations for Designing and Conducting Interviews with Elite Informants. *Journal of Management Studies* 58, 649–672. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12620>
- Sun, Y., Chu, W., Zhou, H., Wang, K., Koike, H., 2024. AVI-Talking: Learning Audio-Visual Instructions for Expressive 3D Talking Face Generation. *IEEE Access* 12, 57288–57301. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3390182>
- Toole, J.L., Colak, S., Sturt, B., Alexander, L.P., Evsukoff, A., González, M.C., 2015. The path most traveled: Travel demand estimation using big data resources. *Transp Res Part C Emerg Technol* 58, 162–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2015.04.022>
- van de Mortel, T. F. (2008). Faking It: Social Desirability Response Bias in Self-report Research. *The Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 25(4), 40–48. <https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.210155003844269>
- Wang, F., Ross, C.L., 2018. Machine Learning Travel Mode Choices: Comparing the Performance of an Extreme Gradient Boosting Model with a Multinomial Logit Model. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board* 2672, 35–45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361198118773556>
- Wang, Y., Yao, E., Pan, L., 2021. Electric vehicle drivers' charging behavior analysis considering heterogeneity and satisfaction. *J Clean Prod* 286, 124982. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.124982>
- Whittle, C., Whitmarsh, L., Haggart, P., Morgan, P., Parkhurst, G., 2019. User decision-making in transitions to electrified, autonomous, shared or reduced mobility. *Transp Res D Transp Environ* 71, 302–319. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2018.12.014>
- Xiao, Z., Zhou, M.X., Liao, Q.V., Mark, G., Chi, C., Chen, W., Yang, H., 2020. Tell Me About Yourself. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction* 27, 1–37. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3381804>
- Yu, J., 2018. Paradigms of Identifying and Quantifying Uncertainty and Information in Constructing a Cognition-Modeling Framework of Human-Machine Transportation Systems (Dissertation). University of California, Irvine.
- Yu, J., Jayakrishnan, R., 2018. A quantum cognition model for bridging stated and revealed preference. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trb.2018.10.014>
- Yu, J., McKinley, G., 2024. Synthetic Participatory Planning of Shared Automated Electric Mobility Systems. *Sustainability* 16, 5618. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16135618>
- Yuan, L. (Ivy), Sun, T., Dennis, A.R., Zhou, M., 2024. Perception is reality? Understanding user perceptions of chatbot-inferred versus self-reported personality traits. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans* 2, 100057. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbah.2024.100057>
- Zahabi, S.A.H., Miranda-Moreno, L., Patterson, Z., Barla, P., 2015. Spatio-temporal analysis of car distance, greenhouse gases and the effect of built environment: A latent class regression analysis. *Transp Res Part A Policy Pract* 77, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2015.04.002>
- Zarouali, B., Araujo, T., Ohme, J., de Vreese, C., 2024. Comparing Chatbots and Online Surveys for (Longitudinal) Data Collection: An Investigation of Response Characteristics, Data Quality, and User Evaluation. *Commun Methods Meas* 18, 72–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2022.2156489>
- Zhang, C., Konka, U., 2024. Understanding Households' Vulnerability to Joint Impacts of Infrastructure Disruptions Caused by Winter Storms via AI-Driven Chatbots, in: *Computing in Civil Engineering 2023*. American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, VA, pp. 263–271. <https://doi.org/10.1061/9780784485248.032>
- Zhang, J., Hayashi, Y., Frank, L.D., 2021. COVID-19 and transport: Findings from a world-wide expert survey. *Transp Policy (Oxf)* 103, 68–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2021.01.011>