

From A to B with Ease: User-Centric Interfaces for Shuttle Buses

MD SHADAB ALAM*, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands

THIRUMANIKANDAN SUBRAMANIAN, University of Stuttgart, Germany

MARIEKE MARTENS, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands

WOLFRAM REMLINGER, University of Stuttgart, Germany

PAVLO BAZILINSKY, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands

User interfaces are crucial for easy travel. To understand user preferences for travel information during automated shuttle rides, we conducted an online survey with 51 participants from 8 countries. The survey focused on the information passengers wish to access and their preferences for using mobile, private, and public screens during boarding and travelling on the bus. It also gathered opinions on the usage of Near-Field Communication (NFC) for shuttle bus confirmation and viewing assistance to help passengers stand precisely where the shuttle will arrive, overcoming navigation and language barriers. Results showed that 72.6% of participants indicated a need for NFC and 82.4% for viewing assistance. There was a strong correlation between preferences for shuttle bus schedules, route details ($r=0.55$), and next-stop information ($r=0.57$) on mobile screens, suggesting that passengers who value one type of information are likely to value related kinds too.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: User Interface, Micro-mobility, Shuttle bus, Viewing Assistance

ACM Reference Format:

Md Shadab Alam, Thirumanikandan Subramanian, Marieke Martens, Wolfram Remlinger, and Pavlo Bazilinsky. 2024. From A to B with Ease: User-Centric Interfaces for Shuttle Buses. 1, 1 (June 2024), 9 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 Introduction

Designers of modern public transportation systems are increasingly recognising the importance of providing personalised and real-time information to meet the diverse needs of passengers. Hoar [7] and Harmony and Gayah [6] highlighted the growing trend towards real-time information systems tailored to individual passengers. Mnasser et al. [10] and Cats and Gkioulou [4] further emphasised the importance of reliability and travel information in reducing passengers' waiting-time uncertainty. As public transit options expand and become more complex, the demand for intuitive and effective navigation tools is growing.

Watkins et al. [15] and Brakewood et al. [2] outlined that real-time information shown to passengers significantly impacts perceived and actual wait times, hence improving passenger satisfaction. Literature on studying the attitude towards automated mobility concepts like shuttle buses as in [11] shows itinerary information provided through user

*Corresponding Author

Authors' addresses: Md Shadab Alam, m.s.alam@tue.nl, Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, 5612DS; Thirumanikandan Subramanian, thiru.subramanian@iktd.uni-stuttgart.de, University of Stuttgart, Stuttgart, Germany, 70569; Marieke Martens, m.h.martens@tue.nl, Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, 5612DS; Wolfram Remlinger, wolfram.remlinger@iktd.uni-stuttgart.de, University of Stuttgart, Stuttgart, Germany, 70569; Pavlo Bazilinsky, p.bazilinsky@tue.nl, Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, 5612DS.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

53 interfaces (UIs), and displays influence the choice and usage. Further, Abduljabbar et al. [1] emphasise that these
54 micro-mobility options like e-scooters and bike-sharing systems not only enhance the convenience and flexibility of
55 travel but also significantly reduce travel time and environmental impact. Shaheen and Cohen [12] and Campbell et al.
56 [3] provide evidence that micro-mobility solutions can alleviate urban traffic congestion and promote sustainable travel
57 behaviours.
58

59 Providing a well-designed UI can facilitate these transitions between different vehicles, thereby increasing travel
60 satisfaction levels. Caulfield and O'Mahony [5] discuss public transport information requirements of users, emphasising
61 the need for passenger-centric information systems. Passenger preference towards the type and medium of information
62 is significant for developing effective, user-friendly systems. Ji et al. [8] stated the usability of mobile applications of
63 public transportation; their interface must be easy to use since easy access to the information seems to be important.
64

65 User-centred design involves creating interfaces that consider the needs, preferences, and behaviours of bus passen-
66 gers. Lyons and Urry [9] describe how the evolution of travel times with new information technologies has historically
67 focused on accessibility and ease of use for public transport interfaces.
68
69

70 1.1 Aim of study

71 The research question of this study was: *What specific information do shuttle bus passengers need, and how do they*
72 *prefer to access this information during their journey?* We established the formats of information that are of the most
73 value to passengers, both marketable but common information (e.g., route descriptions and shuttle bus schedules) and
74 less marketable but rather uncommon information (e.g., departure countdowns and accessibility-friendly routes). We
75 studied user preferences for this type of information representation and assessed the preferences on whether these
76 views are presented on mobile devices, private screens, or public displays. We also provided functionalities such as
77 Near Field Communication (NFC) to board and viewing assistance to allow passengers to position themselves exactly
78 where the bus is going to come, which is beneficial in unfamiliar environments.
79
80
81

82 2 Method

83 The study was conducted through an online survey featuring scenes generated in Unreal Engine ¹ or DAAL-E ² (see
84 Figure 1). It was administered via Google Forms (see section 7). It involved 52 participants who were recruited through
85 social media channels. The participants were required to be at least 18 years old. All participants provided informed
86 consent before taking part in the survey. This study was approved by the Ethical Review Board of XXXXXXXX. The
87 survey collected data on:
88
89
90

- 91 • **Demographic information:** Age, gender, and current country of residence.
- 92 • **Frequency of travelling on a shuttle bus and use of micro-mobility:** How often do the participants use
93 buses and micro-mobility options such as e-scooters and bicycles?
- 94 • **Preference for viewing assistance and NFC:** Do the participants find the viewing assistance/ NFC necessary
95 for navigating unfamiliar environments or overcoming language barriers?
- 96 • **Preferences for obtaining information before the journey on a shuttle bus:** The type of information
97 participants want to receive on mobile or public screens before starting their journey. Participants were given
98 10 different options to select from and were also asked for any additional suggestions they may have.
99
100
101

102 ¹<https://www.unrealengine.com>, last accessed: 19.06.2024.

103 ²<https://openai.com/index/dall-e-2>, last accessed: 19.06.2024.

- **Preferences for obtaining information during the journey on a shuttle bus:** The type of information participants want to receive on mobile, private, or public screens during the journey. Participants were given 10 different options to select from and were also asked for any additional suggestions they may have.
- **Preferred content for mobile, private and public displays:** Preferences for information displayed on mobile versus public screens before boarding the shuttle bus, and preferences for information displayed on mobile and private screens compared to public displays within the shuttle bus.



Fig. 1. Scenes generated with (left) Unreal Engine and (right) DALL-E to demonstrate each situation to participants. In the left image, the user uses visual help to determine where to stand before boarding the shuttle bus. Selecting a viewing assistance option on their mobile device shows them exactly where they should stand. In the image on the right, the user examines information on both mobile and public screens before boarding the shuttle bus.

3 Results

After discarding the response from a respondent who did not give consent, answers from 51 (12 females and 39 males) respondents were analysed. The mean age of the respondents was 28.6 years (SD = 5.1 years). The responses came from eight different countries, with the largest number of respondents from the Netherlands (n = 16), Germany (n = 15), India (n = 13), USA (n = 2), Norway (n = 2), Japan (n = 1), Syria (n = 1) and People Republic of China (n = 1). Anonymised data is provided in [section 7](#).

3.1 Respondents' Use of Micro-Mobility, Public Bus, Viewing Assistance, and NFC

Respondents provided brief information about how often they commute on current public buses and micro-mobility options. According to the survey, 29.4% of respondents use the bus 1–2 times per week, 3.92% use it 3–4 times per week, 11.80% use it 5–6 times per week, 7.84% use it 7 or more times per week, and 47.10% do not use it at all. The survey found that 29.40% of respondents utilise micro-mobility choices daily, while 21.60% never use them, 17.60% use them once a month to once a week, 13.70% less than once a month, 9.80% 4-6 days a week, and 7.84% 1-3 days a week.

In addition, the survey included preferences for viewing assistance and NFC function. According to the data, 66.67% of respondents support using viewing assistance, with 15.69% strongly agreeing that it is vital while travelling to a new place, 11.76% neither agreeing nor disagreeing and 5.88% disagreeing. Furthermore, 60.78% of respondents supported NFC for simplicity of navigation and shuttle bus confirmation. 11.76% strongly agreed on the use of NFC, 17.65% neither agreed nor disapproved, and 9.80% disagreed.

3.2 Respondents' Preferences for Information Before and During the Shuttle Bus Journey




Fig. 2. Choices of respondents on what information should be shown before boarding the shuttle bus on a mobile and public screen.

Figure 2 shows the responses of the participants about what information should be shown before boarding the shuttle bus. The analysis of participants' preferences for information displayed on mobile and public screens reveals distinct trends. Participants showed a notable preference for receiving dynamic and real-time travel information, such as shuttle bus location tracking (82.35%) and route details to the shuttle bus stops (80.39%), on public screens rather than mobile screens. A feature like departure countdowns (66.67%) also garnered higher public screen preferences. Information types with more balanced preferences, such as real-time traffic updates, shuttle bus schedules and local maps, were noted as useful for both screen types.

Mobile screens were slightly more preferred for personalised information like accessibility routes (29.41% vs. 23.52%) and announcements (52.94% vs. 45.09%), where preferences were evenly split compared to public screens. Safety guidelines (27.45% vs. 15.68%) were also preferred on public screens, while e-tickets/boarding passes (88.23% vs. 13.72%) were significantly preferred on mobile screens over public screens.

Figure 3 shows the responses of the participants about what information should be shown on a mobile, private and public screen after boarding the shuttle bus. The participants expressed a strong preference for displaying next-stop information on public screens (90.19%). Route information and public transportation connections garnered significant preferences for both public screens (72.54% and 66.67%) and private screens (70.58% and 64.70%). Mobile screens were notably preferred for personalised recommendations (54.90%), messages and notifications (62.74%), and language translators (49.01%).

Weather updates and safety protocols were more commonly preferred on private screens (45.09% and 52.94%) compared to mobile screens (21.56% and 35.29%) and public screens (23.53% and 47.05%). Accessibility information




Fig. 3. Choices of respondents about what information should be shown after boarding the shuttle bus on a mobile, private and public screen.

showed a significant preference for mobile screens (49.0%), followed by private screens (33.3%), and was least preferred on public screens (21.56%).

The correlation matrix analysis (see Figure 4) provides detailed insights into participants' preferences for information displayed on mobile and public screens during preboarding and during the journey. A strong correlation ($r = 0.57$) was found between shuttle bus schedules and route details on mobile screens, indicating that users who prioritise schedule information also value detailed route information. Similarly, a correlation ($r = 0.55$) exists between shuttle bus schedules and next-stop information on mobile screens. Cross-screen correlations reveal that shuttle bus location tracking on public screens and real-time traffic updates on mobile screens ($r = 0.25$) are moderately correlated. Additionally, e-ticket/boarding pass information on mobile screens correlates with accessibility routes on public screens ($r = 0.24$).

3.3 Additional features recommended by participants

Some of the key suggestions from the participants are as follows:

- Mobile screen before boarding:** Occupancy of the shuttle bus, platform number, bus stops along the route, possible delays, vehicle number, next bus departure time, and routes of each shuttle arriving soon at the stop. Additionally, there should be an option where users can input their destination, and the app shows whether an arriving shuttle will be going there.
- Public display before boarding:** Occupancy of the shuttle bus, cancellation status, and bus number.
- Public screen during journey:** Any anticipated delays, the time estimate for the entire route, and the next stops.
- Private screen during journey:** Option to set a personal stop for the bus to halt, along with access to more detailed information than what is displayed on the public screen.

261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312



Fig. 4. Correlation matrix. The prefix in the names of variable: Pre-Mob: Information required preboarding (mobile screen), Pre-Pub: Information required preboarding (public screen), On-Mob: Information required during journey (mobile screen).

- **Mobile screen during journey:** Estimated time of arrival and any possible delays.

4 Discussion

The preference for public screens for dynamic, real-time, and critical travel information, such as shuttle bus location tracking and route details, suggests that public screens are suitable for urgent, location-specific updates. Users appreciate the visibility of such updates in public spaces, enhancing the transportation experience. The balanced preferences for real-time traffic updates and local maps indicate that both mobile and public screens are versatile for these purposes. The preference for personalised information on mobile screens highlights the need for convenience and accessibility for users with specific needs.

A significant preference for e-tickets/boarding passes on public screens points to the need for accessible travel credentials. Safety guidelines preferred on public screens emphasise the importance of making critical safety information widely visible. The preference for displaying next-stop information on public screens underscores the need for visible updates for efficient travel planning. Preferences for route information and public transportation connections on both public and private screens highlight the need for accessible navigation details during the journey. Mobile screens are preferred for personalised recommendations, messages, notifications, and language translators, reflecting the desire for immediate access to critical information.

Participant suggestions emphasise the need for comprehensive, real-time information across various platforms, highlighting diverse passenger needs. For mobile screens before boarding, participants desired occupancy data, platform numbers, route stops, possible delays, vehicle numbers, next bus departure times, and routes of arriving shuttles, with an option to input destinations for convenience. This shows a demand for detailed, customisable information to enhance trip planning and reduce uncertainty. Key information for public displays before boarding includes bus occupancy, cancellation status, and bus numbers, indicating a preference for transparency and informed decision-making. Onboard, public screens should show anticipated delays, time estimates, and next stops, emphasising the need for real-time updates. Private screens after boarding should allow setting personal stops and accessing detailed information, while mobile screens after boarding should display estimated arrival times and potential delays, demonstrating the need for continuous, personalised updates. These preferences suggest passengers value detailed, personalised information and real-time updates, leading to a user-centric transportation system. Implementing these features can enhance user satisfaction by providing a smoother, more predictable, and enjoyable travel experience.

The correlation matrix (see [Figure 4](#)) analysis provides insights into participants' preferences for information on mobile and public screens, preboarding and onboarding. Strong correlations were found between preferences for shuttle bus schedules, route details, and next-stop information on mobile screens, indicating that those who value one type likely value-related information. Cross-screen correlations, such as between accessibility routes on mobile routes and real-time traffic updates on public screens, indicate consistent preferences across mobile and public screens.

5 Conclusion

The survey results indicate a strong preference among users for having real-time updates, route guidance, and shuttle bus schedules readily available on their personal devices. This suggests that personal devices play a crucial role in providing timely and context-based information, enhancing the user experience by facilitating seamless navigation from departure to destination. Conversely, safety guidelines and local maps were more frequently preferred on public displays, indicating that certain types of information are better suited for shared viewing. This highlights the importance of strategically distributing information across different types of screens to maximise usability and user satisfaction.

The high acceptance of viewing assistance and NFC features, as mentioned in [subsection 3.1](#), underscores the potential of these technologies to improve the ease of navigation and confirmation processes in shuttle bus systems. Integrating these features into the UI design can significantly enhance user convenience and operational efficiency. Furthermore, participants suggested several additional features, such as occupancy information, detailed delay and traffic information, personalised route information. These recommendations indicate a need for a comprehensive and adaptable UI that can cater to various passenger needs and travel scenarios.

Overall, the findings from this study provide valuable insights for designing user-centric transportation systems. By aligning the UI features with user preferences, it is possible to create more intuitive and supportive travel experiences for automated shuttle bus passengers.

6 Limitations and future work

This study was conducted with a relatively small and homogeneous sample population, with 96.1% of participants aged between 21 and 34 years old. Future research may aim to include a more diverse demographic to capture a broader range of preferences and behaviours. This will involve expanding the survey to cover different age groups, geographical locations, and cultural backgrounds to ensure that the findings are representative of a wider population.

365 Additionally, the current study focused on a single journey scenario, where participants travelled from the office to
 366 home. Future work can explore multiple scenarios to understand how different contexts influence UI preferences, such
 367 as travelling in a new city where the language or culture is different. By comparing participants' choices across various
 368 travel contexts—like commuting to work, travelling for leisure, or attending events—we can gain deeper insights into
 369 the adaptability and versatility of the UI.

371 Moreover, this study relied on participants selecting their preferred UI features from a list without interacting with
 372 actual interfaces. To address this limitation, future research will involve the development and deployment of interactive
 373 prototypes using mixed reality (MR) simulations developed in a virtual environment, as shown in [14]. These prototypes
 374 will simulate real UI elements on both mobile and public displays combined with virtual environments. Conducting the
 375 surveys by immersing the participants in a virtual environment enhances their involvement with defined scenarios and
 376 thereby will improve the effectiveness of the participants' feedback as explained by Subramanian in [13]. Usability
 377 testing with these prototypes will provide more accurate feedback on the effectiveness and user satisfaction of the
 378 proposed features.

381 Finally, integrating advanced technologies such as augmented reality (AR) for route visualisation and ensuring
 382 seamless collaboration between personal devices and public displays will be explored. This will not only enhance the
 383 user experience but also ensure that the UI can cater to various needs and preferences dynamically.

385 In addition, future work will specifically focus on automated shuttles to understand the unique needs and preferences
 386 associated with this mode of transportation. By addressing these aspects, future work will aim to provide a more
 387 comprehensive understanding of user needs and preferences, leading to the design of more effective and user-centric
 388 transportation interfaces.

391 7 Supplementary material

393 The survey, anonymised responses and the code used for analysis can be found at: <https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/0ghcog8u0254ls1ce7zk0/AF1oNBPmHH7UEnjRLFAXskU?rlkey=8wbp8tv11d0xzfwl4x30frukd&st=zirrh4tc>.

397 References

- 398 [1] Abduljabbar, R. L., Liyanage, S., and Dia, H. (2021). The role of micro-mobility in shaping sustainable cities: A systematic literature review.
 399 *Transportation research part D: transport and environment*, 92:102734.
- 400 [2] Brakewood, C., Macfarlane, G. S., and Watkins, K. (2015). The impact of real-time information on bus ridership in new york city. *Transportation*
 401 *Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 53:59–75.
- 402 [3] Campbell, A. A., Cherry, C. R., Ryerson, M. S., and Yang, X. (2016). Factors influencing the choice of shared bicycles and shared electric bikes in
 403 beijing. *Transportation research part C: emerging technologies*, 67:399–414.
- 404 [4] Cats, O. and Gkioulou, Z. (2017). Modeling the impacts of public transport reliability and travel information on passengers' waiting-time uncertainty.
 405 *EURO Journal on Transportation and Logistics*, 6(3):247–270.
- 406 [5] Caulfield, B. and O'Mahony, M. (2007). An examination of the public transport information requirements of users. *IEEE transactions on intelligent*
 407 *transportation systems*, 8(1):21–30.
- 408 [6] Harmony, X. J. and Gayah, V. V. (2017). Evaluation of real-time transit information systems: an information demand and supply approach. *International*
 409 *Journal of Transportation Science and Technology*, 6(1):86–98.
- 410 [7] Hoar, R. (2010). A personalized web based public transit information system with user feedback. In *13th International IEEE Conference on Intelligent*
 411 *Transportation Systems*, pages 1807–1812. IEEE.
- 412 [8] Ji, Y. G., Park, J. H., Lee, C., and Yun, M. H. (2006). A usability checklist for the usability evaluation of mobile phone user interface. *International*
 413 *journal of human-computer interaction*, 20(3):207–231.
- 414 [9] Lyons, G. and Urry, J. (2005). Travel time use in the information age. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 39(2-3):257–276.
- 415 [10] Mnasser, H., Gargouri, F., and Abed, M. (2013). Towards an intelligent information system of public transportation. In *2013 International Conference*
 416 *on Advanced Logistics and Transport*, pages 75–81. IEEE.

- 417 [11] Schlichtherle, F. and Remlinger, W. (2023). Enhancing user acceptance of shared automated vehicles – an exploratory study on mobility behavior
418 and attitude towards automated mobility concepts.
- 419 [12] Shaheen, S. and Cohen, A. (2021). Shared micromobility: Policy and practices in the united states. *A Modern Guide to the Urban Sharing Economy*,
420 pages 166–180.
- 421 [13] Subramanian, T., Schlichtherle, F., and Remlinger, W. (2023). Mixed reality tool to simulate and evaluate user interactions in the interior of automated
422 vehicles. In *Adjunct Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Automotive User Interfaces and Interactive Vehicular Applications*, AutomotiveUI
423 '23 Adjunct, page 304–306, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- 424 [14] Subramanian, T., Schlichtherle, F., and Remlinger, W. (2024). Workflow for evaluating vehicle interiors using serious gaming. In *2024 IEEE Gaming,
425 Entertainment, and Media Conference (GEM)*, Stuttgart, Germany. IEEE, IEEE. In press.
- 426 [15] Watkins, K. E., Ferris, B., Borning, A., Rutherford, G. S., and Layton, D. (2011). Where is my bus? impact of mobile real-time information on the
427 perceived and actual wait time of transit riders. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 45(8):839–848.
- 428
- 429
- 430
- 431
- 432
- 433
- 434
- 435
- 436
- 437
- 438
- 439
- 440
- 441
- 442
- 443
- 444
- 445
- 446
- 447
- 448
- 449
- 450
- 451
- 452
- 453
- 454
- 455
- 456
- 457
- 458
- 459
- 460
- 461
- 462
- 463
- 464
- 465
- 466
- 467
- 468