



Heuristic Search, Knowledge Representation, and Conversational AI in the Design of an Intelligent Autonomous Vehicle

Shivanand R. Koppalkar

Innovate Software Consulting Inc Ltd, United Kingdo, Doctor of Business Administration Program, Walsh College, Troy, MI, USA

Corresponding author: us@innovate-software.com

Abstract

Intelligent autonomous vehicles must combine efficient route search, rich world knowledge, and natural interaction with passengers. This paper presents a design-oriented conceptual analysis of these three requirements, using the design of an autonomous car travelling between New York and Boston as a running case. First, three route-search heuristics are proposed and examined: shortest distance, historical and real-time traffic patterns, and road type with associated speed limits. Their operation is illustrated through the A* algorithm and a graph representation of the road network. Second, six elements of world knowledge needed for the driving task are identified and classified as specialized or common-sense knowledge, covering navigation, traffic law, passenger comfort, emergency response, weather, and obstacle avoidance. Third, five conversational AI supports are proposed to improve the passenger experience, spanning entertainment, health and wellness, shopping assistance, travel information, and customer service. The analysis then discusses open challenges, including real-time perception, limited generalization, regulatory approval, cybersecurity, transparency, and public acceptance. The paper concludes that safe and widely accepted autonomous mobility depends on integrating heuristic search, layered knowledge, and transparent conversational interfaces rather than on any single capability.

Keywords: autonomous vehicles; heuristic search; A* algorithm; knowledge representation; conversational AI; passenger experience

1. Introduction

Autonomous driving systems are a significant technological advancement with the potential to transform transportation. They promise improved safety, better traffic efficiency, and a richer travel experience by combining advanced sensors, artificial intelligence (AI), and machine learning (Harfouche et al., 2023). Designing such a vehicle is not a single problem. It requires at least three distinct capabilities: an efficient way to search for routes, a body of world knowledge that guides safe driving decisions, and, increasingly, a conversational interface that serves the passengers inside the vehicle.

This paper examines these three capabilities together through a single design case: an intelligent autonomous car tasked with driving passengers from New York to Boston. The case is deliberately concrete. A road atlas provides all possible road connections between the two cities, and the design goal is to complete the journey with the least travel time while keeping passengers safe and comfortable. Three research questions guide the analysis. First, which heuristics can direct the search for a time-minimizing route? Second,



which elements of specialized and common-sense knowledge does the vehicle need to perform the driving task? Third, in which ways can a conversational AI bot improve the passenger experience during the journey?

The contribution is an integrated, design-oriented account that connects heuristic search, knowledge representation, and conversational AI within one vehicle concept, together with a structured discussion of the technical, ethical, and regulatory challenges that follow from that design. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature. Section 3 describes the methodology. Section 4 presents the results for each of the three design tasks. Section 5 discusses challenges and limitations, and Section 6 concludes.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Heuristic Search and Pathfinding

Heuristics are problem-solving methods that use practical approaches and shortcuts to produce solutions that may not be perfect but are sufficient for reaching an immediate goal (Braik et al., 2021). They are rules of thumb that are usually true and help reach a good answer, yet they do not guarantee an optimal solution (Zajchowski et al., 2016). Heuristic algorithms are widely used in self-driving cars to determine the shortest or most efficient path between two points (Braik et al., 2021; Abualigah, 2021). In navigation, the road network is typically represented as a graph in which intersections are nodes and roads are weighted edges, and agents search this graph to make routing decisions (Balke & Gilbert, 2014). Classic informed-search methods such as the A* algorithm combine the actual cost of reaching a node with a heuristic estimate of the remaining cost (Code.org, 2017). Human judgment research also shows that simple distance- or speed-based rules can mislead when conditions change, which is why heuristic estimates must be treated as fallible (Albert & Steinberg, 2011).

2.2. Knowledge-Based Systems for Autonomous Driving

A useful distinction in knowledge-based AI separates information from knowledge: information is data, while knowledge is what to do with that data (Monroe, 2020). Autonomous vehicles rely on sensing and computing technologies, intelligent vehicular networks, and big-data-driven algorithmic decision-making (Konecny et al., 2021). Sensor data from cameras, LiDAR, radar, and ultrasonic devices is processed by machine learning algorithms that recognize objects, predict their movements, and make driving decisions (Cukurova et al., 2019; Hong, 2020). Beyond perception, the vehicle needs structured world knowledge, including knowledge graphs that organize entities and their relationships (IBM Technology, 2022; Lingfeng et al., 2024). Research on human-algorithm collaboration further suggests that such systems work best when their knowledge and decisions remain legible to the humans who oversee them (De Cremer & McGuire, 2022; Selten et al., 2023). The safety literature asks how safe is safe enough for self-driving vehicles and shows that perceived risk shapes acceptance (Liu et al., 2019; Raue et al., 2019; Arfini et al., 2022).

2.3. Conversational AI and the Passenger Experience

AI-assisted chatbots are computer programs that use artificial intelligence to simulate human conversation. They understand and respond to user inputs, provide information, answer questions, and perform tasks (Bozkurt, 2023). Conversational skill influences engagement and perceived humanness (Schuetzler et al., 2020), although highly human-like agents can fall into an uncanny valley that harms the user experience (Skjuve et al., 2019) and humanness can even play a paradoxical role in user aggression toward agents (Brendel et al., 2023). Verbal embodiment in conversational AI shapes consumer-brand relationships (Bergner et al., 2023), and conversational commerce research documents growing use of such agents in

shopping contexts (Lim et al., 2022; Chandra et al., 2022). Transparency and accountability principles for conversational AI, such as the DAISY framework, are increasingly seen as preconditions for trust (Wahde & Virgolin, 2023; Wagner et al., 2022; Leaua & Didu, 2021). Taken together, the literature treats search, knowledge, and conversation as separate strands. This paper addresses that gap by integrating the three strands within a single vehicle design case.

3. Methodology

The study uses a design-oriented conceptual analysis. The unit of analysis is a single design case: an intelligent autonomous car that must drive passengers from New York to Boston using a road atlas of all possible road connections between the two cities. The case was examined in three sequential design tasks that mirror the layers of a knowledge-based AI system.

1. Task 1 - Route search. Three candidate heuristics for minimizing travel time were formulated and analyzed against the standard graph representation of a road network and the A* search procedure.
2. Task 2 - Knowledge elicitation. Elements of world knowledge required for the driving task were identified and classified as either specialized knowledge or common-sense knowledge, following the information-versus-knowledge distinction in which information is data and knowledge is what to do with that data.
3. Task 3 - Interaction design. Ways in which a conversational AI bot could improve the passenger experience were proposed and assessed for expected benefits and implementation challenges.

Each design artifact was evaluated qualitatively against the peer-reviewed literature reviewed in Section 2, with attention to feasibility, safety, and user acceptance. No human participants were involved and no primary data were collected; the analysis is conceptual and draws only on published sources.

4. Results

4.1. Heuristics for Time-Minimizing Route Search

Designing the New York to Boston route search involves creating effective heuristics so that the chosen route minimizes travel time (Abualigah, 2021). Three heuristics are proposed.

Heuristic 1: shortest distance. The first heuristic prioritizes routes with the shortest distance in miles. It rests on the assumption that shorter distances often correlate with shorter travel times. The assumption is not always true because of traffic congestion, road conditions, and speed limits (Albert & Steinberg, 2011). A shorter route through a city with heavy traffic may take longer than a slightly longer route on a highway with higher speed limits and less congestion. Formally, the problem is to find the shortest path from a start node to a destination node (Arfini et al., 2022). The road network is represented as a graph in which intersections are nodes and roads are edges, each edge weighted by distance or travel time (Balke & Gilbert, 2014). A heuristic function estimates the cost to reach the destination from a given node, commonly the Euclidean or Manhattan distance depending on the road layout (Arfini et al., 2022). The A* algorithm is a popular choice for pathfinding in autonomous vehicles because it combines the actual cost to reach a node, $g(n)$, with the heuristic estimate, $h(n)$, and prioritizes nodes by $f(n) = g(n) + h(n)$ (Code.org, 2017). The procedure runs as follows:

1. Initialize: start with the initial node, set its cost to zero, and add it to the open list.

2. Expand: remove the node with the lowest $f(n)$ from the open list.
3. Goal check: if this node is the destination, reconstruct the path and return it (Code.org, 2017).
4. Generate successors: for the current node, generate all neighboring nodes.
5. Update costs: for each successor, calculate the tentative $g(n)$ and update it if it is lower than the previously known cost.
6. Add to open list: add the successor if it is not already there or if a shorter path to it has been found.
7. Repeat: continue until the destination is reached or the open list is empty (Code.org, 2017).

Three real-world considerations qualify this heuristic. Autonomous cars operate in dynamic environments where traffic conditions change, so heuristics must adapt to real-time data. The heuristic must account for obstacles and road closures (Bansall, 2022). Finally, the shortest path is sometimes not the best path once fuel efficiency, safety, and legal constraints are considered.

Heuristic 2: traffic patterns. The second heuristic considers historical and real-time traffic patterns. Using data from traffic monitoring systems, the autonomous car can avoid routes that are known to be congested at certain times of day. This heuristic applies predictive analytics: if historical data shows that a particular highway is usually congested during rush hour, the car avoids that route at those times (Smith, 2022). Traffic patterns are predictable, repetitive behaviors in vehicle flow, influenced by several factors:

- Time of day: rush hours occur in the morning and evening commutes (Johnson, 2021).
- Day of the week: weekdays usually carry more traffic than weekends.
- Seasonal variations: holidays and vacation seasons change traffic volumes.
- Weather conditions: adverse weather slows traffic and increases congestion.
- Road infrastructure: lane counts and signal placement shape traffic flow (Hobson et al., 2023).
- Events: concerts, sports events, and other large gatherings cause temporary spikes.

Autonomous vehicles can exploit these patterns in four ways. Adaptive learning lets the car learn from traffic patterns to optimize routes, for example by avoiding congested areas during peak hours. Vehicle-to-vehicle and vehicle-to-infrastructure communication shares information about traffic conditions, reducing congestion and improving safety (Liu et al., 2019). Real-time adjustment allows rerouting around accidents or heavy traffic as conditions change. At scale, widespread adoption of autonomous vehicles could smooth traffic flow, reduce accidents, and use road space more efficiently (Arfini et al., 2022).

Heuristic 3: road type and speed limits. The third heuristic prioritizes routes that include highways and roads with higher speed limits. Highways generally allow faster travel than local roads with lower limits and more stoplights, so traveling at higher speeds can reduce overall travel time even when the distance is slightly longer (Johnson, 2021). Residential roads typically carry limits of 25 to 35 mph because of pedestrians, cyclists, and frequent intersections (Cukurova et al., 2019); urban roads range from roughly 35 to 45 mph with more signals and crossings; rural roads often allow 45 to 55 mph; and highways carry the highest limits, roughly 55 to 75 mph, with limited access points (Konecny et al., 2021). The vehicle's AI interacts with these road classes at four levels: perception identifies road types, signs, and limits from sensor data; high-definition maps and GPS localize the vehicle and confirm the applicable limit (Liu et al., 2019); decision-making adjusts speed to the detected environment; and compliance logic ensures the vehicle adheres to posted limits while optimizing safety and efficiency (Raue et al., 2019). On a single New York to Boston journey the car would, for

example, hold 25 mph in a residential area while watching for pedestrians (Zajchowski et al., 2016), transition to 40 mph on urban roads, and accelerate to a posted 65 mph after merging onto the highway.

4.2. Knowledge Elements for the Driving Task

Beyond route search, the vehicle needs world knowledge to drive passengers safely. Six knowledge elements were identified and classified as specialized or common-sense knowledge. Table 1 summarizes the classification; each element is then described.

Table 1. Knowledge elements required by the autonomous vehicle and their classification.

Knowledge element	Scope	Classification
Navigation and route planning	Maps, GPS, live traffic, alternative routes	Specialized
Traffic laws and regulations	Speed limits, right-of-way, state-specific AV rules	Specialized
Passenger comfort and safety	Rest stops, cabin climate, smooth driving	Common-sense
Emergency response	Safe pull-over, alerting authorities, diagnostics	Specialized
Weather conditions	Adjusting driving style to rain, snow, ice	Common-sense
Obstacle detection and avoidance	Real-time sensor fusion and evasion	Specialized

Element 1: navigation and route planning (specialized). The vehicle must know the best routes between New York and Boston, including alternatives for road closures or heavy traffic. This is specialized knowledge because it requires understanding of GPS systems, map reading, and real-time traffic data interpretation (Hong, 2020). Operationally this element decomposes into five functions. Localization determines the vehicle's precise position by combining GPS, an inertial measurement unit, LiDAR and radar scans, and camera imagery (Johnson, 2021). Mapping maintains both static maps of road layouts and signs and dynamic maps of roadblocks, traffic, and pedestrians (Konecny et al., 2021). Path planning finds the global route with algorithms such as A* or Dijkstra's and adjusts it locally in real time (Liu et al., 2019). Decision-making handles behavior planning, such as lane changes and traffic lights, and motion planning, such as speed and steering adjustments (Raue et al., 2019). Control executes those movements through longitudinal control of acceleration and braking and lateral control of steering (Zajchowski et al., 2016).

Element 2: traffic laws and regulations (specialized). The vehicle must know all applicable traffic laws, including speed limits, right-of-way rules, and parking regulations (Hong, 2020). On the case route it must comply with the laws of New York, Massachusetts, and every state it passes through, including any rules specific to autonomous vehicles (Johnson, 2021).

Element 3: passenger comfort and safety (common-sense). The vehicle should know when to make rest stops, how to adjust temperature controls, and how to respond to passenger requests, because this reflects ordinary human needs and preferences (Miranda et al., 2023). A comfortable ride also means smooth acceleration and braking and timely updates about the trip's progress (Selten et al., 2023).

Element 4: emergency response (specialized). In an accident or mechanical failure, the vehicle should know how to pull over safely, alert the authorities, and report the incident, which requires emergency protocols and vehicle diagnostics (De Cremer & McGuire, 2022). Although concerns about harm from autonomous vehicles are legitimate, outright avoidance of the technology is impractical given its benefits, especially for

individuals with disabilities or limited mobility (IBM Technology, 2022). The emphasis should fall on proactive safety engineering and robust regulatory frameworks rather than rejection (Miranda et al., 2023).

Element 5: weather conditions (common-sense). The vehicle should understand how weather affects driving and adjust accordingly, slowing down in heavy rain or snow and increasing following distance on icy roads (Selten et al., 2023).

Element 6: obstacle detection and avoidance (specialized). The vehicle needs advanced sensors and algorithms to detect and avoid other vehicles, pedestrians, animals, and debris, which requires real-time processing of camera, LiDAR, and radar data (De Cremer & McGuire, 2022).

The elicitation applied the distinction between data and knowledge throughout. The data item “it is raining” becomes the knowledge item “rain makes roads slippery; slow down and increase following distance.” Together, the six elements combine specialized and common-sense knowledge so that the vehicle can transport passengers safely and efficiently.

4.3. Conversational AI Supports for Passengers

The third design task assumed the vehicle integrates conversational AI so that a bot can converse with passengers during the journey. Five supports were identified.

Support 1: personalized entertainment and information. The bot can offer music, podcasts, audiobooks, and film or TV suggestions matched to the passenger's preferences. AI-assisted chatbots simulate human conversation and can understand and respond to user inputs, provide information, answer questions, and perform tasks (Bozkurt, 2023). Tailoring the journey to the passenger's tastes improves overall satisfaction (Kaiss et al., 2023). The main challenge is technological transparency: users should be able to understand the bot's decision processes, data collection, and limitations (Mai et al., 2022), because transparency builds trust, supports ethical data use, and promotes informed decisions (Wagner et al., 2022).

Support 2: health and wellness monitoring. The bot can remind passengers to take medication, suggest in-ride stretches, and offer guided meditation or breathing exercises (Wahde & Virgolin, 2023). Passengers can therefore maintain their well-being while traveling, which adds a layer of care to the experience, though such services raise legal and regulatory questions for chatbot providers (Leaua & Didu, 2021).

Support 3: shopping and e-commerce assistance. The bot can help passengers browse stores, compare prices, make purchases, and track orders, with suggestions based on shopping history (Chandra et al., 2022). This turns travel time into productive time and the vehicle into a mobile shopping assistant. The e-commerce literature details the mechanism: conversational agents greet users, elicit preferences, and guide them to relevant products (Bergner et al., 2023); they answer navigational queries such as “show me women's shoes under \$50” (Wahde & Virgolin, 2023); they generate personalized recommendations and upselling or cross-selling suggestions that raise average order value (Bergner et al., 2023; Chandra et al., 2022); and they handle order tracking and modifications end to end (Hildebrand & Hundertmark, 2021).

Support 4: travel and navigation information. The bot can provide real-time updates on estimated arrival time, traffic conditions, and alternative routes, plus points of interest, restaurants, and attractions along the way (Zhang et al., 2023). Keeping passengers informed reduces journey anxiety. The underlying challenge is urban complexity: city streets mix vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles and change constantly through construction and closures, so reliable urban navigation demands advanced sensing, mapping, and algorithms (Meo et al., 2019; Skjuve et al., 2019; Schuetzler et al., 2020).

Support 5: customer service and support. The bot can act as a customer service representative for questions about the vehicle, the journey, or associated services, and can handle bookings and technical issues (Lim et al., 2022). AI-powered assistants resolve routine inquiries instantly, freeing human agents for complex, empathetic problem-solving (Britt, 2020). Passengers get a seamless experience without waiting for human intervention (Brendel et al., 2023).

Integrating these functions, conversational AI can substantially enhance the passenger experience in autonomous vehicles by providing convenience, personalization, and support across a wide range of needs (Meo et al., 2019).

5. Discussion

The three design tasks expose a common pattern: each capability is feasible with current techniques, but each carries unresolved technical and societal challenges.

On the technical side, object recognition must run in real time. Camera input often arrives as a continuous stream of scan lines rather than complete images, so the system must recognize objects without ever seeing them whole (Cremonez Rosa et al., 2024). One solution is to train models directly on the sensor's signal output, shifting the task from image recognition toward signal analysis (Lingfeng et al., 2024). A second challenge is generalization: environments contain confusing elements, such as a truck trailer directly ahead, and AI systems lack prior knowledge of novel configurations. Enriching recognition with partial evidence, in which contextual information excludes the least probable interpretations, offers a promising remedy (Harfouche et al., 2023).

Ethically, decision-making algorithms must be programmed to prioritize human life and safety, and their choices in critical situations must be communicated clearly (Hadjimichael et al., 2023). Three adoption challenges follow. Regulatory approval varies by region, and harmonizing standards while meeting stringent criteria such as those of the U.S. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration remains difficult (Lingfeng et al., 2024). Cybersecurity is a standing risk because autonomous vehicles are attractive attack targets, which calls for robust protocols, encryption, and continuous monitoring (Monroe, 2020). Public acceptance depends on addressing concerns about safety, loss of control, and privacy through education and transparent communication of safety records (Lingfeng et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2019; Raue et al., 2019). The same transparency requirement applies to the conversational layer, where users must be able to understand data collection and algorithmic behavior before they will trust in-vehicle bots (Mai et al., 2022; Wahde & Virgolin, 2023).

The analysis has limitations. It is conceptual and single-case, so the proposed heuristics and knowledge elements were not benchmarked empirically, and the New York to Boston corridor may not represent other road networks. Several cited sources address adjacent domains, such as education or public administration, and their findings transfer to driving only by analogy. Future work should implement the three heuristics in a routing simulator, formalize the knowledge elements in an ontology or knowledge graph (Lingfeng et al., 2024), and test the conversational supports with passengers in field studies.

6. Conclusion

This paper analyzed the design of an intelligent autonomous vehicle through three connected tasks. For route search, three heuristics were proposed: shortest distance, traffic patterns, and road type with speed limits, each workable within an A* search over a weighted road graph and each fallible in characteristic ways. For the

driving task itself, six knowledge elements were identified and classified as specialized or common-sense knowledge, from navigation and traffic law to weather and obstacle avoidance. For the passenger experience, five conversational AI supports were proposed, covering entertainment, health, shopping, travel information, and customer service. The central conclusion is that safe and accepted autonomous mobility is an integration problem: heuristic search must be informed by layered world knowledge, and both must be wrapped in transparent, trustworthy interaction with the humans the vehicle serves. Progress on regulation, cybersecurity, and public trust will determine how quickly that integration reaches the road.

Acknowledgements

This article grew out of project work completed in the Knowledge-Based AI Technologies course (eCornell, Cornell University). The author thanks the course facilitators for their guidance.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement

No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

AI Usage Disclosure

Generative AI (Anthropic Claude) was used to assist with formatting and restructuring the manuscript to the journal template. The author reviewed and takes full responsibility for the final content.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, methodology, analysis, writing—original draft, and writing—review and editing: S.R.K.

References

- [1] Abualigah, L. (2021). Group search optimizer: A nature-inspired meta-heuristic optimization algorithm with its results, variants, and applications. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 33(7), 2949–2972. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-020-05107-y>
- [2] Albert, D., & Steinberg, L. (2011). Judgment and decision making in adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21(1), 211–224. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00724.x>
- [3] Arfini, S., Spinelli, D., & Chiffi, D. (2022). Ethics of self-driving cars: A naturalistic approach. *Minds and Machines*, 32(4), 717–734. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-022-09604-y>
- [4] Balke, T., & Gilbert, N. (2014). How do agents make decisions? A survey. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 17(4), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.18564/jasss.2687>
- [5] Bansall, S. (2022). Agents in artificial intelligence. *GeeksforGeeks*. <https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/agents-artificial-intelligence>

- [6] Bergner, A. S., Hildebrand, C., & Häubl, G. (2023). Machine talk: How verbal embodiment in conversational AI shapes consumer-brand relationships. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 50(4), 742–764. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucad014>
- [7] Bozkurt, A. (2023). Generative artificial intelligence (AI) powered conversational educational agents: The inevitable paradigm shift. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 18(1), 198–204.
- [8] Braik, M., Sheta, A., & Al-Hiary, H. (2021). A novel meta-heuristic search algorithm for solving optimization problems: Capuchin search algorithm. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 33(7), 2515–2547. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-020-05145-6>
- [9] Brendel, A. B., Hildebrandt, F., Dennis, A. R., & Riquel, J. (2023). The paradoxical role of humanness in aggression toward conversational agents. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 40(3), 883–913. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2023.2229127>
- [10] Britt, P. (2020). A new approach to conversational AI uses symbolic neural networks. *Speech Technology Magazine*, 25(3), 1–3.
- [11] Chandra, S., Shirish, A., & Srivastava, S. C. (2022). To be or not to be ...human? Theorizing the role of human-like competencies in conversational artificial intelligence agents. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 39(4), 969–1005. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2022.2127441>
- [12] Code.org. (2017). The Internet: How search works [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LVV_93mBfSU
- [13] Cremonese Rosa, P., Barizon Filho, A. L., Torráo Valentim, R., & Tognoli, N. (2024). Datafication, artificial intelligence and images: The dominant paradigm in the representation of knowledge in images. *Knowledge Organization*, 51(2), 117–126. <https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2024-2-117>
- [14] Cukurova, M., Kent, C., & Luckin, R. (2019). Artificial intelligence and multimodal data in the service of human decision-making: A case study in debate tutoring. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(6), 3032–3046. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12829>
- [15] De Cremer, D., & McGuire, J. (2022). Human-algorithm collaboration works best if humans lead (because it is fair!). *Social Justice Research*, 35(1), 33–55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-021-00382-z>
- [16] Hadjimichael, D., Pyrko, I., & Tsoukas, H. (2023). Beyond tacit knowledge: How Michael Polanyi's theory of knowledge illuminates theory development in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2022.0289>
- [17] Harfouche, A., Quinio, B., Saba, M., & Saba, P. B. (2023). The recursive theory of knowledge augmentation: Integrating human intuition and knowledge in artificial intelligence to augment organizational knowledge. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 25(1), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-022-10352-8>
- [18] Hildebrand, C., & Hundertmark, S. (2021). A strategy framework to boost conversational AI performance. *Marketing Review St. Gallen*, 2021(4), 10–16.
- [19] Hobson, Z., Yesberg, J. A., Bradford, B., & Jackson, J. (2023). Artificial fairness? Trust in algorithmic police decision-making. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 19(1), 165–189. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-021-09484-9>
- [20] Hong, J. W. (2020). Why is artificial intelligence blamed more? Analysis of faulting artificial intelligence for self-driving car accidents in experimental settings. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 36(18), 1768–1774. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2020.1785693>
- [21] IBM Technology. (2022). What is a knowledge graph? [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y7sXDpfzQQ>
- [22] Johnson, L. (2021). Principles of transportation engineering. *Engineering Review*, 12(2), 102–115.
- [23] Kaiss, W., Mansouri, K., & Poirier, F. (2023). Effectiveness of an adaptive learning chatbot on students' learning outcomes based on learning styles. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 18(13), 250–261. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v18i13.39329>
- [24] Konecny, V., Barnett, C., & Poliak, M. (2021). Sensing and computing technologies, intelligent vehicular networks, and big data-driven algorithmic decision-making in smart sustainable urbanism. *Contemporary Readings in Law and Social Justice*, 13(1), 30–39. <https://doi.org/10.22381/CRLSJ13120213>
- [25] Leaua, C., & Didu, I. A. (2021). Chatbots: Legal challenges and the EU legal policy approach. *Perspectives of Law and Public Administration*, 10(3), 210–222.

- [26] Lim, W. M., Kumar, S., Verma, S., & Chaturvedi, R. (2022). Alexa, what do we know about conversational commerce? Insights from a systematic literature review. *Psychology & Marketing*, 39(6), 1129–1155. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21654>
- [27] Lingfeng, Z., Jia, W., Qian, L., Hao, P., & Xindong, W. (2024). A comprehensive survey on automatic knowledge graph construction. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(4), 1–62. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3618295>
- [28] Liu, P., Yang, R., & Xu, Z. (2019). How safe is safe enough for self-driving vehicles? *Risk Analysis*, 39(2), 315–325. <https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13116>
- [29] Mai, V., Neef, C., & Richert, A. (2022). “Clicking vs. writing” — The impact of a chatbot's interaction method on the working alliance in AI-based coaching. *Coaching | Theorie & Praxis*, 8(1), 15–31. <https://doi.org/10.1365/s40896-021-00063-3>
- [30] McAfee, A., Rock, D., & Brynjolfsson, E. (2023). How to capitalize on generative AI. *Harvard Business Review*, 101(6), 42–48.
- [31] Meo, T. J., Kim, C., Raghavan, A., Tozzo, A., Salter, D. A., Tamrakar, A., Amer, M. R., & Weng, P. (2019). Aesop: A visual storytelling platform for conversational AI and common sense grounding. *AI Communications*, 32(1), 59–76. <https://doi.org/10.3233/AIC-180605>
- [32] Miranda, L., Garibay, O. O., & Baggio, J. (2023). Evolutionary model discovery of human behavioral factors driving decision-making in irrigation experiments. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 26(2), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.18564/jasss.5069>
- [33] Monroe, D. (2020). Seeking artificial common sense. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(11), 14–16. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3422588>
- [34] Raue, M., D'Ambrosio, L. A., Ward, C., Lee, C., Jacquillat, C., & Coughlin, J. F. (2019). The influence of feelings while driving regular cars on the perception and acceptance of self-driving cars. *Risk Analysis*, 39(2), 358–374. <https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13267>
- [35] Schuetzler, R. M., Grimes, G. M., & Scott Giboney, J. (2020). The impact of chatbot conversational skill on engagement and perceived humanness. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 37(3), 875–900. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2020.1790204>
- [36] Selten, F., Robeer, M., & Grimmelikhuijsen, S. (2023). “Just like I thought”: Street-level bureaucrats trust AI recommendations if they confirm their professional judgment. *Public Administration Review*, 83(2), 263–278. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13602>
- [37] Skjuve, M., Haugstveit, I. M., Følstad, A., & Brandtzaeg, P. B. (2019). Help! Is my chatbot falling into the uncanny valley? An empirical study of user experience in human-chatbot interaction. *Human Technology*, 15(1), 30–54. <https://doi.org/10.17011/ht/urn.201902201607>
- [38] Smith, J. (2022). Predictive analytics in traffic management. *Journal of Data Science*, 15(3), 45–58.
- [39] Wagner, K., Schramm-Klein, H., Roeding, T., & Fota, A. (2022). Do you trust me? The influence of conversational agents' voice and confidential data on the usage intention. *AMA Winter Academic Conference Proceedings*, 33, 126–128.
- [40] Wahde, M., & Virgolin, M. (2023). DAISY: An implementation of five core principles for transparent and accountable conversational AI. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 39(9), 1856–1873. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2022.2081762>
- [41] Zajchowski, C. A. B., Brownlee, M. T. J., & Furman, N. N. (2016). The dialectical utility of heuristic processing in outdoor adventure education. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation, Education, and Leadership*, 8(2), 119–135. <https://doi.org/10.18666/JOREL-2016-V8-I2-7697>
- [42] Zhang, Z., Li, B., & Liu, L. (2023). The impact of AI-based conversational agent on the firms' operational performance: Empirical evidence from a call center. *Applied Artificial Intelligence*, 37(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08839514.2022.2157592>