

**To Trust or Distrust Trust Measures:
Validating Questionnaires for Trust in AI**

Nicolas Scharowski^{1, 3}, Sebastian A. C. Perrig^{1, 3}, Lena Fanya Aeschbach¹, Nick von Felten¹, Klaus Opwis¹, Philipp Wintersberger², and Florian Brühlmann¹

¹ Center for General Psychology and Methodology
University of Basel


Switzerland


² University of Applied Sciences Hagenberg
Hagenberg


Austria

³ Both authors contributed equally to this research.

Author Note


Nicolas Scharowski  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5983-346X>


Sebastian A. C. Perrig  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4301-8206>

Lena Fanya Aeschbach  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9092-6103>

Nick von Felten  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0278-9896>

Klaus Opwis  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0509-8070>

Philipp Wintersberger  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9287-3770>

Florian Brühlmann  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8945-3273>

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Nicolas Scharowski, Center for General Psychology and Methodology, University of Basel, Missionsstrasse 62a, CH-4055 Basel, Switzerland. E-mail: nicolas.scharowski@unibas.ch

Abstract

Despite the importance of trust in human-AI interactions, researchers must adopt questionnaires from other disciplines that lack validation in the AI context. Motivated by the need for reliable and valid measures, we investigated the psychometric quality of two trust questionnaires, the *Trust between People and Automation* scale (TPA) by Jian et al. (2000) and the *Trust Scale for the AI Context* (TAI) by Hoffman et al. (2023). In a pre-registered online experiment ($N = 1485$), participants observed interactions with trustworthy and untrustworthy AI (autonomous vehicle and chatbot). Results support the psychometric quality of the TAI while revealing opportunities to improve the TPA, which we outline in our recommendations for using the two questionnaires.

Furthermore, our findings provide additional empirical evidence of trust *and* distrust as two distinct constructs that may coexist independently. Building on our findings, we highlight the opportunities and added value of measuring both trust and distrust in human-AI research and advocate for further work on both constructs.

Keywords: AI, Trust, Distrust, Survey, Questionnaire, Validation

To Trust or Distrust Trust Measures: Validating Questionnaires for Trust in AI

Introduction

With artificial intelligence (AI) becoming increasingly integrated into people's daily lives, the concept of trust recently got a lot of traction. Trust is not only an essential element in human-AI interactions as it shapes how people use and rely on AI (Hoff & Bashir, 2015; Lee & See, 2004), but also a key motivation for research into explainable AI (XAI) to create more transparent AI systems (Lipton, 2018). Consequently, there is a growing need for a comprehensive understanding and appropriate measurement of human trust in AI. However, the operationalization and measurement of trust are complicated by various challenges.

For one thing, a multitude of different definitions and conceptualizations of trust exist (Benk et al., 2022; Muir, 1994; Ueno et al., 2022; Vereschak et al., 2021) that are often not clearly distinguished from related terms (e.g., "reliance" (Poursabzi-Sangdeh et al., 2021), "situational trust" (Hoff & Bashir, 2015), "perceived trustworthiness" (Weitz et al., 2021), "calibrated trust" (Langer et al., 2021) or "warranted trust" (Hoffman et al., 2009; Jacovi et al., 2021)). Not clearly distinguishing between these terms can lead to theoretical entanglements and divergent operationalizations of trust (Kohn et al., 2021). For example, trust, viewed as an attitude (Lee & See, 2004), is a subjective psychological construct, typically measured via questionnaires, also called survey scales (Scharowski et al., 2022). Meanwhile, reliance, as a behavior (Lee & See, 2004), can be assessed using more objective observational methods such as analyzing changes in an individual's behavior after being presented with an AI recommendation (e.g., switch ratios (Lu & Yin, 2021; Yin et al., 2019)). Conceptualizations such as "calibrated" or "warranted" trust also require this differentiation and emphasize that the motivation of XAI should not be merely to increase trust arbitrarily and unjustifiably. Instead, trust should be aligned and calibrated to the AI's trustworthiness (Lee & See, 2004; Wischnewski et al., 2023). In this regard, trust is warranted when the AI is trustworthy and unwarranted when it is untrustworthy (Jacovi et al., 2021). Although

the importance of calibrated trust has been recognized by the community (Wischniewski et al., 2023), the corresponding perspective - that distrust in untrustworthy AI is also warranted – remains relatively underemphasized, despite being an integral factor motivating XAI (Jacovi et al., 2021). Indeed, distrust seems a comparatively overlooked construct in current human-AI research (Scharowski & Perrig, 2023; Ueno et al., 2022).

Beyond these theoretical challenges, empirical studies measuring trust often use single items (e.g., Yu et al., 2017) or develop their own questionnaires (e.g., Merritt, 2011; Yin et al., 2019). However, self-developed questionnaires and single items usually lack a rigid construction and quality assurance process and are often only used in an individual study, complicating comparing different study results (Furr, 2011). Thus, it has been recommended to use validated trust questionnaires (Wischniewski et al., 2023) whose psychometric quality (i.e., objectivity, reliability, and validity) has been scrutinized. But even if researchers address these challenges and use standardized questionnaires for measuring trust, they have to resort to and adapt scales from other disciplines, as there is no validated questionnaire for trust in AI. For example, it is common practice among researchers to use the *Trust between People and Automation* scale (TPA) by Jian et al. (2000) and rephrase the questionnaires' items to fit the study context (Vereschak et al., 2021). However, such practices raise concerns about whether the modified scale still measures what it was initially intended to measure (Furr, 2011; Juniper, 2009). More recently, Hoffman et al. (2023) recommended a *Trust Scale for the AI Context* (TAI) that is based on existing trust scales, including the TPA. While adopting items from other scales is a common first step in questionnaire development, a scale's psychometric quality should be reevaluated after each modification or adoption (Furr, 2011; Juniper, 2009). However, this has yet to be the case for the TAI. In fact, most studies measuring human trust in AI do not report the psychometric quality of the questionnaires they used (Vereschak et al., 2021) and only recently, Lai et al. (2023) pointed out that the research community lacks practices to validate and reuse standardized measurements. At best, this makes it challenging for other researchers to replicate or build upon existing work. At worst, using non-validated trust

questionnaires in the context of AI can generate research results that do not withstand psychometric scrutiny and thus lead to ambiguous or inconsistent findings, impeding progress in human-AI interaction and XAI research. Despite this need for standardized measures, the psychometric quality of both the TPA and TAI remains to be thoroughly investigated in an AI context. Our research aims to fill this research gap by validating the TPA and TAI in a pre-registered online experiment, following current best practices for investigating questionnaire quality.

The contribution of this article is threefold. First, we present the first comprehensive psychometric evaluation of Jian et al. (2000)'s TPA scale in an AI setting. Second, we conduct an extensive independent psychometric evaluation of the TAI by Hoffman et al. (2023). Third, we compare the two trust scales and offer recommendations and guidance for researchers and practitioners who want to use the TPA and TAI in the context of AI. Results from the online experiment ($N = 1485$) show that the TAI performs well psychometrically. Concerning the TPA, somewhat acceptable quality was only achieved after removing items and when considering a two-factor model (trust and distrust) instead of the initially proposed single-factor model. Based on these findings, we advocate for future work on the TPA or the development of a new scale explicitly designed for the context of AI which accounts for the distinction between *trust* and *distrust*. Other disciplines have long been in a critical discourse on whether trust and distrust constitute the same construct at opposite ends of a continuum or should be treated as separate constructs on two distinct dimensions. However, this discourse has yet to find any real resonance in the XAI community, which could be an underappreciated opportunity for a more inclusive understanding of trust *and* distrust. Such a distinction could account for both *warranted trust* for trustworthy AI and *warranted distrust* for untrustworthy AI, which aligns more closely with the objectives of XAI (Jacovi et al., 2021). Ultimately, our work provides future research with more reliable and valid tools for measuring trust in AI and extends the current understanding of trust for a more comprehensive and holistic understanding of human trust *and* distrust in human-AI research.

Related Work

Defining Trust in AI

Trust has been studied extensively across various disciplines for decades, including philosophy (Fukuyama, 1996), social sciences (Gambetta, 2000), and economics (Berg et al., 1995). This comprehensive exploration has contributed to a multifaceted perspective on trust and, at times, divergent conceptualizations across different academic domains. For instance, within the realm of social sciences, trust has been defined as the anticipation of non-hostile behavior; in economic frameworks, trust is often conceptualized through game theory; and within philosophy, it is anchored in moral relationships among individuals (Andras et al., 2018). Researchers have introduced accounts of interpersonal trust (Mayer et al., 1995) that apply to the human-machine interaction (Lee & See, 2004) and which more recently have been extended to trust in the human-AI interaction (Jacovi et al., 2021).

There are several definitions (Benk et al., 2022; Ueno et al., 2022; Vereschak et al., 2021) and models (e.g., Davis, 1989; Hoff & Bashir, 2015; Lee & See, 2004; Liao & Sundar, 2022; Mayer et al., 1995; McKnight & Chervany, 2001; Toreini et al., 2020) of trust in AI in circulation. However, the most commonly used definition in the human-AI trust literature (Ueno et al., 2022; Vereschak et al., 2021) is attributed to Lee and See's definition of trust in automation as *"the attitude that an agent will help achieve an individual's goals in a situation characterized by uncertainty and vulnerability"* (Lee & See, 2004, p. 6). This emphasis on uncertainty and vulnerability is consistent with the influential (Rousseau et al., 1998) and also widely adopted (Vereschak et al., 2021) definition of trust by Mayer et al. (1995), which Lee and See (2004)'s work is based on. Indeed, most definitions define trust either explicitly or implicitly as an attitude (Castelfranchi & Falcone, 2010; Vereschak et al., 2021) and necessitate the presence of risk, uncertainty, and vulnerability for trust to exist (Buşinca et al., 2020; Castelfranchi & Falcone, 2010; Hoff & Bashir, 2015; Rousseau et al., 1998; Vereschak et al., 2021). For this reason, we will adopt Lee and See (2004)'s definition but also draw on Mayer et al. (1995)'s corresponding model of trust for the remainder of this paper.

Forming Trust in AI

Trust does not form on its own accord but has its foundation in the attributes, characteristics, or actions of the trustee (Hoff & Bashir, 2015; Mayer et al., 1995). Mayer et al. (1995) referred to these qualities as "factors of *trustworthiness*" and suggested that "ability," "benevolence," and "integrity" provide the foundation for the development of trust. It is crucial to note the distinction between the *perceived trustworthiness* of the trustor and the *actual trustworthiness* of the trustee (Schlicker et al., 2022). While the actual trustworthiness is a property of the trustee, the perceived trustworthiness is an assessment of these properties on the side of the trustor (Mayer et al., 1995; Schlicker et al., 2022). For example, based on a chatbot's repeated demonstration of writing excellent poetry, an individual may conclude that the chatbot has high competence. This assessment can contribute to the individual's perception of the chatbot as trustworthy, which provides the basis for trust.

Drawing on Mayer et al. (1995)'s work, Lee and See (2004) extended the factors contributing to trustworthiness to the context of automation and included performance (i.e., *what* the automation does), process (i.e., *how* the automation works) and purpose (i.e., *why* the automation was developed) as a basis of trust. More recent research has focused on trustworthiness factors specific to AI systems (Kaplan et al., 2023; Liao & Sundar, 2022; Thornton et al., 2021; Toreini et al., 2020). For example, Liao and Sundar (2022) introduced a trust model where they defined three trustworthiness attributes based on Mayer et al. (1995) and Lee and See (2004) as "ability," "intention benevolence," and "process integrity" and highlighted the concept of trustworthiness cues. Trustworthiness cues are any information that can contribute to a person's trust assessment, including efforts for AI transparency (e.g., performance metrics, XAI and system design features, or model documentation) (Ekman et al., 2017; Liao & Sundar, 2022).

Calibrating Trust in AI

By introducing trustworthiness as a property of the trustee, it is emphasized that trust should not exist for its own sake but requires justification. In light of this, Lee and See (2004) have coined the term "trust calibration." Calibration refers to the correspondence between an individual's trust in a system and the system's trustworthiness (Lee & See, 2004). Within this framework, two types of mismatches can occur: either an individual's trust exceeds the system's trustworthiness, leading to misuse of the system (i.e., over-reliance (Parasuraman & Riley, 1997)), or the individual's trust falls short of the system's trustworthiness, leading to disuse (i.e., under-reliance (Parasuraman & Riley, 1997)). Ideally, individuals should exhibit *calibrated trust*, where the level of trust matches the trustworthiness of the system. More recently, Wischniewski et al. (2023) have encouraged the research community to more explicitly focus on and increase calibrated trust. Further, Jacovi et al. (2021) introduced the notion of *warranted* and *unwarranted* trust in the context of AI. They refer to warranted trust as trust calibrated with trustworthiness; otherwise, trust is unwarranted if not calibrated with trustworthiness.

The notion of warranted and unwarranted trust brings about an interesting distinction - presuming an AI system is untrustworthy (e.g., has poor performance), not only is a person's trust unwarranted, but conversely distrust is warranted (Jacovi et al., 2021). In other words, if a system is untrustworthy, it may not be enough for people not to trust it, but desirable for people to actively distrust the system. Jacovi et al. (2021) argued that while the key motivation of XAI is commonly framed as increasing trust in AI systems, a more precise motivation should be to either increase trust in trustworthy AI or to increase distrust in untrustworthy AI. This distinction underlines the theoretical relevance of distrust and the need for its consideration in AI and XAI research. However, the AI and XAI research community seems to have mainly focused on trust (Scharowski & Perrig, 2023), and while this has provided important insights into how trust in AI can be developed and maintained, distrust has been relatively understudied, with only 6% of papers on human-AI interaction measuring and reporting

distrust (Ueno et al., 2022).

This unilateral perspective ignores decades of research in the area of interpersonal trust (e.g., Lewicki et al., 2006; Luhmann, 1979; McKnight & Chervany, 2001; Ou & Sia, 2009; Saunders et al., 2014; Sitkin & Roth, 1993) that has extensively explored the coexistence and independence of trust *and* distrust. There are theoretical reasons for a potential distinction between trust and distrust as independent constructs rather than polar opposites (McKnight & Chervany, 2001). Indeed, some authors argue that "most trust theorists now agree that trust and distrust are separate constructs" (McKnight & Chervany, 2001, p. 42). Based on this theoretical work, a distinction between trust and distrust should be taken into consideration in human-AI interactions. Such insights from interpersonal trust research could inform our understanding of these constructs in the AI context, provided they can be measured appropriately and accurately. This would allow to evaluate not only warranted trust for trustworthy AI but also warranted distrust, calibrated with untrustworthy AI as proposed by Jacovi et al. (2021).

Measuring Trust in AI

Trust in AI is measured in various ways (Hoffman et al., 2023; Vereschak et al., 2021) by both objective or subjective means (Mohseni et al., 2020). Defining trust as an attitude (Lee & See, 2004) implies that it should be viewed as a subjective psychological construct distinct from objective behavioral manifestations of trust, such as reliance (Lee & See, 2004; Scharowski et al., 2022). This implies that studies that only measure trust-related behavior, such as reliance, do not genuinely measure trust (Scharowski et al., 2022; Vereschak et al., 2021).

Conceptualizing trust as subjective leads to multiple methods to measure trust, including interviews, think-aloud protocols, and open-ended questions (Mohseni et al., 2020; Vereschak et al., 2021). Nevertheless, questionnaires are the primary source for the measurement of subjective trust (Ueno et al., 2022; Vereschak et al., 2021), with Ueno et al. (2022) estimating that 89% of publications measure trust in AI via questionnaires. Questionnaires are a series of questions (i.e., questionnaire items)

designed to measure a not directly observable psychological construct of interest (DeVellis, 2017; Hopkins, 1998).

Questionnaires should be distinguished from single-item questions that are also used to measure trust (Kohn et al., 2021)(e.g., Yu et al., 2017) but are generally less appropriate to study complex constructs (Loo, 2002). Also, self-developed questionnaires are frequently employed to measure trust (Kohn et al., 2021)(e.g., Merritt, 2011; Yin et al., 2019), but these are questionable since they often lack a thorough design and validation process (Furr, 2011). Furthermore, since self-developed questionnaires and single-item questions are often employed in a single study only, they usually do not allow comparing results across different studies (Flake & Fried, 2020). For this reason, Wischnewski et al. (2023) recommended using validated and standardized trust questionnaires that have undergone scrutiny to ensure their psychometric quality, including objectivity, reliability, and validity. However, this recommendation poses challenges for researchers who want to measure trust in AI, as no validated trust questionnaire in the context of AI exists. In the following, we discuss two scales that are currently used to assess trust in AI systems but have yet to be validated.

The Trust Between People and Automation Scale

Among trust questionnaires, the TPA scale by Jian et al. (2000) is by far the most frequently used in human-AI research (Hoff & Bashir, 2015; Kohn et al., 2021; Ueno et al., 2022; Vereschak et al., 2021; Wischnewski et al., 2023). The TPA was developed 20 years ago and has been validated for the context of automation (Spain et al., 2008). Researchers adopting the TPA to measure trust in AI thus need to modify the questionnaire items to fit them to the AI context. Vereschak et al. (2021) estimated that more than half of all publications introduce such modifications to the original, validated questionnaires (e.g., changing "the system is dependable" to "the artificial intelligence is dependable"). However, terminological differences affect people's perceptions and evaluations of technology (Langer et al., 2022), and any modification of a questionnaire can undermine its reliability and raises the question of whether an adapted scale measures the intended construct. Consequently, after any modification,

the psychometric quality of a questionnaire should be reassessed (Furr, 2011; Juniper, 2009), which is rarely done (Vereschak et al., 2021).

The TPA consists of 12 items, with seven positively formulated items for trust and five items being negatively formulated, capturing distrust. However, because of the strong negative correlations between ratings of trust and distrust, the original authors concluded that trust is a single-dimensional construct, with trust and distrust as opposites on the two extremes of a continuum. Spain et al. (2008), who independently validated the TPA in the context of automation, challenged this single-dimensional notion of trust and showed that trust and distrust formed two independent factors. When using the TPA, past research has followed one of two approaches: either to re-code the five negatively formulated items of the scale before data analysis, resulting in a single trust score measured by the scale, or to not re-code items and create two separate scores; one score using the first five items for distrust and a second score using the seven remaining items for trust (Ueno et al., 2022). This also reflects the uncertainty of whether the TPA measures a single construct (i.e., trust) or two distinct constructs (i.e., trust and distrust).

The Trust Scale for the AI Context

More recently, Hoffman et al. (2023) designed an AI trust questionnaire, the TAI. The TAI is based on existing trust scales, including the TPA (Jian et al., 2000), and consists of eight items, with one negatively formulated item, all presumably capturing trust. However, the authors did not provide psychometric evidence of validity for the TAI. Compiling items from validated questionnaires to develop a new scale does not guarantee its psychometric quality and brings similar challenges and requirements as questionnaire modification. Therefore, independent validation of the TAI would be a valuable and necessary contribution towards more standardized measures of trust in AI.

A first effort to validate the TPA and TAI in the AI context was the preliminary work by Perrig, Scharowski, and Brühlmann (2023). Their findings supported the two-factor structure of trust and distrust for the TPA. Furthermore, their findings suggested that the TAI is better suited to measure trust, although removing some items

was required to achieve a good fit for the TAI and an acceptable fit for the TPA (Perrig, Scharowski, & Brühlmann, 2023). However, their study was not a dedicated validation study and thus limited to one specific low-risk AI application (i.e., real estate valuation domain). Additionally, the AI system used in their study only exhibited trustworthy behavior. Hence, the researchers could only investigate the psychometric quality of the TPA and TAI in a setting where participants interacted with trustworthy AI. Subsequently, there is no research examining the scales' performance in the context of untrustworthy AI.

The present study aims to expand on their work and seeks to overcome its limitations in three ways: First, the validation of the scales is expanded to two additional AI application areas - chatbots and automated vehicles (AV), representing current AI systems operating in real-world environments. Second, we investigate both low-risk (chatbots) and high-risk (AVs) scenarios, thereby considering vulnerability and risk. Third, we distinguish between trustworthy AI and untrustworthy AI to assess criterion validity more comprehensively. For this, our study drew on the trust model by Mayer et al. (1995), paralleling the approach by Esterwood and Robert Jr (2023), in manipulating the trustworthiness of AI through performance variations. Specifically, we created two experimental conditions. In one condition, participants were presented with a high-performing trustworthy AI, without failures, eliciting trust. Conversely, in the other condition, participants were exposed to low-performing untrustworthy AI, with failures, intended to evoke distrust.

Study Objectives and Hypotheses

Motivated by the need for adequately validated and standardized measures for trust in the context of AI, we set out to validate the TPA and TAI in a pre-registered, high-powered online experiment. We formulated the following objectives:

Objective 1: Conducting a psychometric evaluation of the TPA scale by Jian et al. (2000) in the context of AI.

Objective 2: Conducting a psychometric evaluation of the TAI by Hoffman et al. (2023).

In order to meet these objectives, the following methods of psychometric evaluation were used: For the quality of the individual items, several metrics were considered, namely item descriptive statistics, item difficulty and variance, discriminatory power, and inter-item correlations. Concerning construct validity and investigation of the scales' theoretical models, confirmatory factor analysis and, if needed, exploratory factor analysis were used. For convergent and divergent validity, we considered correlations with a set of additional measures. Here, we were interested in the relationship of trust and distrust – if support for a two-factor solution to the TPA was found – to the related constructs of positive affect, negative affect, and situational trust, which is similar but distinct from general trust. For reliability, we calculated indicators of internal consistency, namely coefficients α (Cronbach, 1951) and ω (McDonald, 1999).

Concerning scale ratings, taken as indicators of the scale's criterion validity and a manipulation check for our stimuli, we formulated the following pre-registered hypotheses:

- **H1a:** Ratings for the TPA overall score will be significantly higher for the trustworthy condition than the untrustworthy condition.¹
- **H1b:** Ratings for the TPA trust score will be significantly higher for the trustworthy condition than the untrustworthy condition.
- **H1c:** Ratings for the TPA distrust score will be significantly higher for the untrustworthy condition than the trustworthy condition.
- **H2:** Ratings for the TAI score will be significantly higher for the trustworthy condition than the untrustworthy condition.
- **Manipulation check 1:** Ratings of risk will be significantly higher for the automated vehicle application compared to the chatbot application.

¹ Note that in the pre-registration, we referred to the two conditions as "trust" and "distrust." In writing this manuscript, however, we have decided that it is more appropriate to refer to the condition eliciting trust as "trustworthy" and distrust as "untrustworthy", which is more consistent with related work.

- **Manipulation check 2:** Ratings of risk will be significantly higher for the untrustworthy condition compared to the trustworthy condition.

No hypotheses were formulated regarding any possible differences in the ratings of the TPA and TAI between the two areas of application (chatbot vs. automated vehicle).

Methods

A 2x2 mixed design in form of an online experiment was conducted to validate the TPA and the TAI. In order to reach the number of participants necessary for a high-impact validation study we used a scenario-based approach, following prior work on trust (Binns et al., 2018; Holthausen et al., 2020; Jakesch et al., 2022; Kapania et al., 2022; Schaefer, 2016; Scharowski et al., 2023). Participants were presented with two pre-recorded videos, each accompanied by a brief description of what they were about to see. The experimental manipulation consisted of two independent variables.

The first independent variable was the type of AI system presented, with the videos either showing an interaction with an AV or a chatbot (i.e., application). The second independent variable was whether the video displayed a trustworthy or an untrustworthy AI (i.e., condition). The order of all of the videos was randomized. Thus, all participants were in the trustworthy condition for one application area while being in the untrustworthy condition for the other application, forming a crossover design with four scenarios (see Figure 1 for a visualization of the stimuli). After each video, participants filled out the TPA, and TAI, alongside other related survey scales, namely the Situational Trust Scale (STS, Dolinek & Wintersberger, 2022) or the Situational Trust Scale for Automated Driving (STS-AD, Holthausen et al., 2020) and the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS, Watson et al., 1988). The study was approved by the ethics committee of the corresponding author's university and pre-registered on OSF (<https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/3EU4V>).




Figure 1

An illustration of the 2x2 online experiment stimuli by condition (trustworthy vs. untrustworthy) and application (chatbot vs. automated vehicle), constituting four scenarios in total.

Stimuli

Participants were asked to watch two out of the four videos depicting an interaction with AI, one each showing an automated vehicle and a chatbot displaying either trustworthy or untrustworthy behavior. A brief description of the scenario accompanied these videos. In the trustworthy condition, one video showed an AV without any automation failure driving safely through an urban environment. The other video featured a chatbot, providing truthful answers to basic knowledge questions (e.g., "a mouse is smaller than an elephant"). In contrast, in the untrustworthy condition, the videos showed the following failures. Firstly, a staged video of an AV that approaches a crosswalk and seemingly not slowing down for a pedestrian attempting to cross the road (material taken from Holthausen et al., 2020). Secondly, a chatbot interaction, where the chatbot gives incorrect answers to basic knowledge questions such as "the number 50 is bigger than 5000" or "the sky has the color brown." Based on the potential consequences of failures in these two AI interactions, we defined the AV

application area as high-risk and the chatbot application area as low-risk.

Participants

We recruited 1500 participants over Prolific, a crowd-sourcing platform recently demonstrated to deliver high data quality (Douglas et al., 2023; Peer et al., 2022). To be eligible for the study, participants had to be current residents of the United States of America (USA) and over 18 years of age. Those who completed the study were compensated £1.50 for their efforts. Using rules of thumb for sample sizes in structural equation modeling, recommending at least ten but ideally twenty observations per estimated parameter (Kline, 2016), the goal was to recruit at least 700 responses for each scenario (condition x application). Recruiting 1500 participants gave us additional leverage if participants were excluded from data analysis and further allowed us to explore more complex models should they become necessary.

Data cleaning was carried out in line with recommendations by Brühlmann et al. (2020), removing participants with incorrect responses to two instructed response items or with negative responses to a self-reported data quality item. Based on self-reported data quality, six observations were removed. Another three participants with an incomplete or interrupted survey were removed, as well as six participants who did not report the USA as their current country of residence. After data cleaning, 1485 participants remained, with 2970 complete responses to the measures. Of the participants, 726 were women, 726 were men, and 25 were non-binary people. Two participants preferred to self-describe, and six chose not to specify their gender. The mean participant age was 42.98 years ($SD = 13.95$, $min = 18$, $max = 82$). Participants were spread evenly across the four scenarios: 738 responses for the trustworthy chatbot video, 747 for untrustworthy chatbot, 747 for trustworthy AV, and 738 for untrustworthy AV.

Procedure

On the first page of the survey, participants provided their informed consent. Next, they were given instructions for the task to be completed. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four videos and asked to watch the video at least once

(which was verified by the survey tool). After watching the first video, participants filled out the TPA and the TAI, followed by additional measures. Participants were then shown the second video, this time for the other condition and application, before responding again to all measures. Finally, participants provided demographic information (age, gender, country of residence) before having the opportunity to give general open feedback and being redirected to Prolific for compensation. To ensure sufficient response quality, the survey included two instructed response items (Curran, 2016) embedded among the survey scales and a single item for self-reported data quality (Meade & Craig, 2012) at the end of the survey. After the survey, participants were debriefed that all videos were staged and that at no point an individual was in any real danger or at risk. Completing the study took participants an average of 11.38 minutes ($SD = 6.07$, $min = 3.68$, $max = 49.03$). Prior to data collection, we conducted a small-sample pre-study ($N = 70$) to test the procedure and tasks of the online survey. Based on the insights from this study, some minor technical adjustments were made.

Measures

Participants responded twice to all items of the TPA and TAI and additional scales to measure convergent and divergent constructs, once for each scenario they were assigned to. The order in which the TPA and TAI were presented was randomized, as was the order among the other scales. The supplementary materials on OSF contain the exact wording of all items used. The internal consistency for all measures was examined using coefficients α (Cronbach, 1951) and ω (McDonald, 1999), yielding good results for all scales (see the section on reliability results below for the TPA and TAI, and OSF for the other scales).

TPA

Participants responded to all 12 items of the TPA (Jian et al., 2000). Answers were collected on the proposed seven-point Likert-type response scale ranging from 1 ("not at all") to 7 ("extremely"). Responses to the five negatively formulated items of the scale were re-coded prior to data analysis, as theoretically implied by the original authors (Jian et al., 2000) and in line with prior work (Spain et al., 2008; Ueno et al.,

2022). All items were used in their original form, except for replacing the word "system" with the word "AI" (e.g., "I am confident in the AI").

TAI

For the TAI (Hoffman et al., 2023), responses to all eight items were collected using the recommended five-point Likert-type response scale ranging from 1 ("I disagree strongly") to 5 ("I agree strongly"). The only negatively formulated item of the scale (i.e., "I am wary of the AI") was re-coded prior to data analysis. For the TAI, items were also adapted to the AI context by replacing the word "tool" with "AI" (e.g., "The outputs of the AI are very predictable").

STS and STS-AD

Depending on the application area (i.e., chatbot or AV), participants either responded to the STS (Dolinek & Wintersberger, 2022) or the STS-AD (Holthausen et al., 2020). The STS-AD is a six-item scale measuring peoples' situational trust in an automated driving context. In contrast, the STS is a generalized eight-item version of the STS-AD, assessing situational trust in AI systems in general. Responses to both scales were collected on the same seven-point Likert-type response scale ranging from 1 ("Fully disagree") to 7 ("Fully agree"), and mean values across all items of the respective scale were formed for the analysis. The STS-AD was chosen because the original work on the scale demonstrated that the scale measures a "situational trust" factor that is related to but distinct from "general trust" measured with the TPA. The STS was chosen as an alternative to the STS-AD in the chatbot application area to measure situational trust.

PANAS

To measure people's positive and negative affect experienced while seeing the AI interaction, we used the PANAS (Watson et al., 1988). The PANAS consists of 20 items, ten for positive affect and ten for negative affect. Responses were collected on a five-point Likert-type response scale ranging from 1 ("Very slightly or not at all") to 5 ("Extremely"), and mean values were formed across positive and negative items respectively to form scores for "positive affect" and "negative affect." The PANAS was

chosen because trust and distrust are assumed to cause different emotional responses (Lewicki et al., 1998; Luhmann, 1979). While trust is associated with more positive affect, distrust is associated with more negative affect.

Single Item for Risk

Finally, we employed a single item for risk ("How risky did you consider the scenario in the video to be?") to which participants responded on a slider response scale from 0 ("Not at all risky") to 100 ("Extremely risky"). We used this single item to measure risk because it is a key element (Castelfranchi & Falcone, 2010; Hoff & Bashir, 2015; Rousseau et al., 1998; Vereschak et al., 2021) and prerequisite for trust to exist (Jacovi et al., 2021). Although we generally advise against single items, we decided to employ one to assess risk in this case as it served solely as a manipulation check for our stimuli and because it was challenging to arrive at an informed decision about which risk questionnaire was appropriate to use for the contexts under investigation.

Results

The analysis focused on different procedures to assess the psychometric quality of the TPA and TAI. Results were obtained using the statistical software R (R Core Team, 2022, version 4.3.0). The complete analysis can be found in the supplementary materials on OSF.

Manipulation Check

To verify the experimental manipulation, we performed a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the risk ratings with the factors application area (AV vs. chatbot) and condition (trustworthy vs. untrustworthy). Results showed that the application area had a statistically significant effect on the risk rating (manipulation check 1: $F(1, 2967) = 1426, p < .001, \eta^2 = .22$), with a higher risk rating for the AV ($M = 64.09, SD = 34.49$) compared to the chatbot application ($M = 27.22, SD = 34.72$). Concerning condition, there also was a significant difference (manipulation check 2: $F(1, 2967) = 1963, p < .001, \eta^2 = .31$), with a higher risk rating for the untrustworthy ($M = 67.44, SD = 36.49$) compared to the trustworthy condition ($M = 23.87, SD = 28.17$). We further calculated two Wilcoxon rank sum tests because

assumptions for ANOVA were not met (normality, homogeneity of variance). Results were in line with those of the ANOVA, showing a significant difference in risk between the conditions and the applications ($p < .001$ for both tests). We thus concluded that the manipulation was successful. Separated by the four scenarios, mean risk ratings were as follows: 39.27 ($SD = 28.83$) for the trustworthy AV, 89.20 ($SD = 17.26$) for the untrustworthy AV, 8.28 ($SD = 16.52$) for the trustworthy chatbot, and 45.94 ($SD = 37.72$) for the untrustworthy chatbot.

Item Analysis

We started with the psychometric analysis of the individual items' quality, calculating descriptive statistics, item difficulty and variance, discriminatory power, and inter-item correlations separately for the 12 TPA items and the eight items of the TAI. Item analysis was performed across the four scenarios (condition x application), as well as the aggregated overall data. Results for both the TPA and TAI were inconspicuous for most of the items (see OSF for the complete item analysis). Consequently, we decided to work with the overall data across all scenarios for the subsequent analysis.

Confirmatory Factor Analyses

Concerning construct validity, we used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to investigate the proposed models of the two trust scales. Based on Hu and Bentler (1999), model fit was judged using the following criteria: Low χ^2 value and $p > .05$ for the χ^2 test, $RMSEA < .06$, $SRMR \leq .08$, and $.95 \leq CFI \leq 1$. Because multivariate normality of the TPA and TAI data was not given, shown by Henze-Zirkler tests (Henze & Zirkler, 1990) and Mardia's tests (Mardia, 1970), we used a robust maximum likelihood estimator for all CFAs. The χ^2 test was significant for all CFAs, which was to be expected given that the test is influenced by larger sample sizes (> 200) and departures from multivariate normality (Whittaker & Schumacker, 2022). We thus focused on the other indicators to judge model fit. Starting with the TPA, CFA results showed that the originally proposed single-factor model did not fit the data well, with all indices outside of the recommended values [$\chi^2(54) = 2857.47$, $p < .001$, $RMSEA = .157$, $SRMR = .085$, $CFI = .887$]. Concerning the TAI, CFA results

mostly supported the suggested single-factor model [$\chi^2(20) = 258.81, p < .001, RMSEA = .073, SRMR = .021, CFI = .986$], with only the RMSEA slightly above the recommended value but below .08, which can still be considered acceptable (MacCallum et al., 1996). Therefore, we decided to perform further analyses, exploring alternative models for the TPA while concluding that no such efforts were necessary for the TAI.

Exploratory Factor Analysis - TPA

Given the sub-optimal model fit for the TPA, we decided to conduct an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to search for alternative models with a better fit to the collected data. Because multivariate normality was not given, we chose a principal axis factoring extraction method. Furthermore, we used an oblique rotation method because we expected correlations among possible factors. For the interpretation of the factor loadings, we used the .40 – .30 – .20 rule (Howard, 2016), which states that items should load at least .40 on their primary factor, with no cross-loading $> .30$ on another factor, and a difference of at least .20 between the primary and any secondary loading. Regarding communality, values $< .50$ were considered sub-optimal (Hair et al., 2010).

A significant Bartlett's test for sphericity ($\chi^2(66) = 35089.26, p < .001$) and an adequate Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test (all $> .80$) indicated that the prerequisites for EFA were given. Parallel analysis and a scree-plot were consulted to determine the number of factors, suggesting a two-factor solution. Factor loadings and communalities for the two-factor EFA with all 12 TPA items are presented in Table 1. Regarding explained variance, the first factor explained 45.5%, while the second factor explained 19.3%.

Based on the results, we concluded that the removal of item 4 might result in an improved version of the scale because the item showed equally high loadings on both factors. Furthermore, item 12 was also conspicuous due to low communality and a substantially lower loading than the other items. While item 5 showed a cross-loading slightly higher than recommended on a secondary factor, we decided not to remove it due to a high primary loading and an adequate difference in loadings between the primary and secondary factors.

Table 1

Factor loadings > .20 for the two-factor EFA of the TPA.

No.	Item	PA1	PA2	h2
1	The AI is deceptive (R)		.75	.64
2	The AI behaves in an underhanded manner (R)		.87	.63
3	I am suspicious of the AI's intent, action or, outputs (R)		.69	.67
4	I am wary of the AI (R)	.46	.42	.63
5	The AI's actions will have a harmful or injurious outcome (R)	.32	.53	.60
6	I am confident in the AI	.92		.91
7	The AI provides security	.92		.73
8	The AI has integrity	.84		.60
9	The AI is dependable	.87		.87
10	The AI is reliable	.88		.91
11	I can trust the AI	.92		.90
12	I am familiar with the AI	.56		.25

Note: Problematic items are marked in bold. PA1/PA2 = factor loadings; h2 = communality.

Reverse-coded items are marked with (R).

Alternative Confirmatory Factor Analysis - TPA

Based on the results of the EFA, we tested an alternative two-factor model for the TPA without items 4 and 12. The two-factor version resulted in an improved model fit [$\chi^2(34) = 903.26$, $p < .001$, $RMSEA = .110$, $SRMR = .053$, $CFI = .961$], with the SRMR and the CFI favoring the model and a substantially lower χ^2 -value compared to the single-factor model. Therefore, we concluded that the TPA should be used with a two-factor model and without items 4 and 12. For all subsequent analyses, we thus worked with this two-factor solution separating trust and distrust.

Reliability

Following recommendations by Dunn et al. (2014), we calculated both coefficients α (Cronbach, 1951) and ω (McDonald, 1999), including 95% confidence intervals, to assess the TPA's and TAI's reliability. Results are presented in Table 2,

showing that the TAI and the alternative TPA were of good to excellent internal consistency ($> .80$, George & Mallery, 2019).

Table 2

Coefficients α and ω for the two trust scales, including 95% confidence intervals.

Scale	α	ω
TPA (trust items, without 12)	.96 [.96, .97]	.97 [.96, .97]
TPA (distrust items, without 4)	.86 [.85, .87]	.86 [.85, .87]
TAI (trust)	.95 [.94, .95]	.95 [.95, .95]

Convergent and Divergent Validity

To assess convergent and divergent validity, we calculated Pearson's product-moment correlations reflecting the relationship between the two trust scales and the related measures. Based on the model identified in the EFA and alternative CFA, we refrained from forming a single trust score for the TPA across all items. Rather, we formed two distinct scores for trust and distrust separately, reflecting the two-factor model. In particular, we calculated a "TPA trust" score based on the mean of items 6 to 11 and a "TPA distrust" score based on the mean across the non-reversed values of items 1, 2, 3, and 5. For the TAI, we calculated a single mean "trust" score by averaging ratings across all items after the reversal of the negatively formulated item 6. Based on past work (Lewicki et al., 2006; Perrig, Scharowski, & Brühlmann, 2023) and results of the pilot study, we expected the following correlations among the measured variables:

- Positive correlations between the mean across TPA trust items ("TPA trust") and the mean across all TAI items ("TAI trust").
- Weaker or negative correlations of the mean across the non-reversed TPA distrust items ("TPA distrust") with TPA trust and TAI trust.
- Positive correlations of situational trust with TPA trust and TAI trust, and weaker or negative correlations with TPA distrust.

- Positive correlations of positive affect with TPA trust and TAI trust, and weaker or negative correlations with TPA distrust. For negative affect, we expected a mirrored pattern.

All correlations are presented in Table 3. Results were as anticipated in the pre-registration, supporting the convergent and divergent validity of the two scales.

Table 3

Correlations between the TPA, TAI, and the other measures, including 95% confidence intervals.

	TPA trust	TPA distrust	TAI trust
TPA distrust	-.67 [-.69, -.65]	-	-
TAI trust	.93 [.92, .93]	-.70 [-.72, -.68]	-
STS-AD/STS situational trust	.86 [.85, .87]	-.75 [-.76, -.73]	.88 [.88, .89]
PANAS positive affect	.40 [.37, .43]	-.14 [-.18, -.11]	.37 [.34, .40]
PANAS negative affect	-.32 [-.36, -.29]	.46 [.44, .49]	-.37 [-.40, -.34]

Note: Mean scores for the SDS and SDS-AD were combined into one variable. All correlations were significant at $p < .001$.

Criterion Validity

Next, we investigated how the scores of the TPA and TAI differed between the four scenarios, addressing the pre-registered hypotheses. For this, we used two-way ANOVAs to test if the mean ratings for the scales differed significantly depending on the condition (trustworthy vs. untrustworthy) or the application area (AV vs. chatbot). Descriptive statistics separated by the four scenarios are presented in Table 4, while the statistics for the condition and the application are provided in the supplementary materials. Because we did not calculate an overall trust score for the TPA, we chose not to report results concerning hypothesis H1a in this manuscript.

H1b; higher TPA trust score for the trustworthy condition than untrustworthy condition. A first two-way ANOVA investigating the effect of the

Table 4

Descriptive statistics for all collected measures, separate per condition.

Construct	Chatbot trustworthy		Chatbot untrustworthy		AV trustworthy		AV untrustworthy	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
TPA trust	4.53	1.33	1.78	1.27	4.13	1.43	1.86	1.23
TPA distrust	2.13	1.23	4.60	1.64	2.63	1.24	4.69	1.37
TAI trust	3.55	0.78	1.73	0.81	3.14	0.89	1.65	0.80
SDS-AD situational trust	-	-	-	-	4.58	1.20	1.52	0.96
SDS situational trust	5.49	0.90	2.27	1.18	-	-	-	-
PANAS positive affect	2.65	0.97	2.36	0.87	2.73	0.95	2.41	0.78
PANAS negative affect	1.17	0.42	1.58	0.79	1.44	0.63	2.25	0.98

Note: Responses could range from 1 to 5 for the TAI and from 1 to 7 for all other measures.

condition and application area on the TPA trust score revealed a statistically significant effect for condition ($F(1, 2967) = 2662.30, p < .001, \eta^2 = .47$) and for application ($F(1, 2967) = 11.10, p < .001, \eta^2 < .01$). Results thus supported H1b with a large effect of the condition on the TPA trust score but no substantial effect for the application area.

H1c; higher TPA distrust score for the untrustworthy condition than trustworthy condition. Concerning the TPA distrust ratings, a second two-way ANOVA revealed a significant effect for the condition ($F(1, 2967) = 1981.83, p < .001, \eta^2 = .40$) and for the application ($F(1, 2967) = 32.77, p < .001, \eta^2 < .01$). Results thus favored H1c, suggesting a large effect of the condition on the TPA distrust score and a negligible effect for the application area.

H2; higher TAI score for the trustworthy condition than untrustworthy condition. Regarding the TAI score, a third two-way ANOVA showed a significant main effect for condition ($F(1, 2967) = 2994.73, p < .001, \eta^2 = .50$) and for application ($F(1, 2967) = 65.61, p < .001, \eta^2 = .01$). Results thus supported H2. The effect size was large for the condition but small for the application area.

Furthermore, we calculated a set of Wilcoxon rank sum tests because the normality and homogeneity of variance assumptions for the ANOVAs were not met.

Results were comparable to those of the ANOVAs, with significant effects of condition on the TPA trust score, TPA distrust, and the TAI score ($p < .001$ for all tests). In contrast, the tests suggested no significant differences between the application areas for the TPA trust score, but for TPA distrust and the TAI (see supplementary materials for details).

Model Stability Across Scenarios

Finally, we investigated the stability of the model fit for the two trust scales across the four scenarios (condition x application), using this as an indicator of the scales' measurement invariance. For this, we calculated eight CFAs, one for each scenario and scale, employing the alternative version of the TPA (i.e., a two-factor model without items 4 and 12) and the originally proposed single-factor model confirmed for the TAI. All results from the CFAs are presented in Table 5. Concerning the TPA, the model fit indices only supported the model in the untrustworthy chatbot scenario, except for the RMSEA, which was slightly above the ideal cutoff. For the TAI, the model was supported by all fit indices in all four scenarios except for the RMSEA in the trustworthy chatbot scenario.

Table 5

Fit indices for CFA models of the trust scales, separated by scenario (condition x application).

Model	χ^2	df	p-value	χ^2	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI
TPA							
AV trustworthy	309.47	34	$p < .001$.120	.087	.934
AV untrustworthy	239.95	34	$p < .001$.109	.137	.940
Chatbot trustworthy	236.34	34	$p < .001$.110	.078	.943
Chatbot untrustworthy	112.89	34	$p < .001$.064	.048	.982
TAI							
AV trustworthy	58.14	20	$p < .001$.059	.028	.986
AV untrustworthy	42.70	20	$p = .002$.050	.025	.990
Chatbot trustworthy	118.50	20	$p < .001$.089	.038	.959
Chatbot untrustworthy	39.44	20	$p = .006$.047	.027	.992

Note: Robust values are reported wherever possible.

Discussion

Motivated by the need for standardized and validated scales to measure trust in AI, the present work investigated the psychometric quality of two trust measures. First, we investigated the TPA (Jian et al., 2000) as it is the most commonly used questionnaire to measure trust in AI. Second, we assessed the recently introduced TAI (Hoffman et al., 2023), because it is explicitly intended for the AI context. In a pre-registered 2x2 within-subject online experiment, 1485 participants watched two videos showing interactions with AI. Each video featured an interaction with one of two AI application areas, a chatbot or an autonomous vehicle, and portrayed the AI under one of two conditions, either displaying trustworthy or untrustworthy behavior. Subsequently, participants rated the interactions using the TPA, TAI, and related measures.

As hypothesized and pre-registered, results indicated that both the TPA and the TAI could differentiate between the two conditions. Specifically, in the condition where participants were presented with trustworthy AI, we observed significantly higher trust scores (supporting H1b and H2) and significantly lower distrust scores (supporting H1c), compared to the condition with untrustworthy AI. We took these results not only as an indication of the scales' criterion validity but, together with the significantly higher risk ratings in both the AV application area and untrustworthy AI condition, as additional evidence of a successful experimental manipulation. Regarding convergent and divergent validity, the relationships between the ratings of the TPA, TAI, and related measures were consistent with our expectations. Namely, trust scores from the TPA and TAI had strong positive correlations with one another. Furthermore, the two trust scores also correlated positively with situational trust and positive affect, while correlating negatively with negative affect. In contrast, the pattern was reversed for the TPA distrust score. Results thus demonstrate that distrust and trust are associated with different affects, as proposed by Lewicki et al. (1998). These results further suggest that trust and distrust are two distinct constructs. Results also showed good to excellent reliability for the TAI and the TPA, as indicated by both internal consistency coefficients. In summary, our results support the reliability, as well as convergent, divergent, and criterion validity of both scales.

Results of the CFA further supported the TAI's underlying theoretical model, providing strong evidence for its construct validity. However, concerning the TPA, the results of the factor analyses were more nuanced, raising questions regarding its theoretical model. While the scale demonstrated good psychometric quality for a majority of indicators considered, these findings alone do not necessarily guarantee an accurate measurement of the underlying theoretical construct if construct validity is not given. Thus, while the results suggest that the TPA accurately measures *something*, without validity, it remains unclear if the TPA truly measures trust, rather than other related constructs (e.g., trustworthiness) (Moosbrugger & Kelava, 2020). In the following sections, we will discuss the implications of the results for the two scales

separately before elaborating on more general ramifications of measuring trust *and* distrust for AI research. We start with the TAI, followed by the more complex results of the TPA.

Measuring Trust with the TAI

For the TAI, findings supported the initially proposed single-factor solution for measuring trust. This model performed well both in the combined data and across all four scenarios, irrespective of the application area (AV vs. chatbot) or the condition (trustworthy vs. untrustworthy). Combined, these findings speak in favor of using the TAI as a single-dimensional measure of trust, with "low trust" and "high trust" at opposite ends of a continuum. However, the resulting single-factor solution also implies that the TAI can only account for trust. Considering the main motivations of XAI as outlined by Jacovi et al. (2021), the TAI thus falls short in addressing *warranted distrust* for untrustworthy AI.

Recommended Use for the TAI

Researchers and practitioners interested in measuring trust in AI can use the TAI to measure trust as a single-dimensional construct, with "low trust" and "high trust" at the two ends of a continuum. To maintain reliability and validity, the questionnaire should be adopted as closely as possible to the version validated in the present work. This includes using the exact item wording provided in our supplementary materials and a five-point Likert-type response scale with the corresponding response options. After data collection, researchers should first reverse the score for the negatively formulated item 6. Subsequently, an overall trust score can be computed by calculating the mean across all items.

Measuring Trust and Distrust With the TPA

Concerning the TPA, CFA results did not support the originally proposed single-factor model. The subsequent EFA clearly suggested a two-factor solution,

differentiating between trust and distrust. These results are in line with previous work on the TPA (Perrig, Scharowski, & Brühlmann, 2023; Spain et al., 2008). To improve model fit, we removed items 4 and 12. However, the psychometric performance of the TPA still presents room for improvement. Some of the fit indices remained sub-optimal for the overall data, and the scale's model fit was inadequate within three out of the four scenarios. Having said that, the identified two-factor version of the TPA can distinguish between trust and distrust, making it possible to measure *warranted trust* and *warranted distrust*. This theoretical distinction is a major advantage of this questionnaire. To reach the full potential of the TPA, however, we call for more research efforts on the scale and specifically the formulation of additional items for distrust. The TPA includes more items for the factor trust than for distrust in both the original version (five items for distrust, seven items for trust) and the alternative version identified in the present work (six items for trust, four items for distrust). This item imbalance could lead to a less accurate measurement of distrust, with fewer items potentially not covering essential aspects of the construct.

Recommended Use for the TPA

In light of our empirical evidence, we strongly recommend that researchers and practitioners do not work with the original single-factor model proposed by Jian et al. (2000) when using the TPA in the context of AI. Instead, we suggest using a two-factor structure that accounts for both trust *and* distrust. Accordingly, researchers should average the distrust items of the TPA to a composite distrust score without any reversal while using the remaining items to calculate a mean trust score. We strongly advise against aggregating all items into an overall score or re-coding the negatively formulated items, as the identified theoretical model does not support such procedures. Regarding item removal to improve the scale's quality, both the present work and previous research (Perrig, Scharowski, & Brühlmann, 2023) advocate for removing item 12. Additionally, we suggest removing item 4 when applying the scale in the context of AI. However, despite item removal, a consistent model fit and, thus, adequate construct

validity was not readily achieved for the TPA. Researchers working with the TPA should investigate the quality of the scale prior to interpreting the data. If such investigation is not reasonable (e.g., due to a small sample size), we recommend sharing the data so that other researchers can investigate the TPA, for example by aggregating data from multiple research projects. Using the TPA in line with these recommendations allows for trust and distrust to be measured independently, with the added value and opportunities for human-AI research being discussed in the following.

Towards a Two-Dimensional Understanding of Trust and Distrust in AI?

The presented results for a two-factor structure for the TPA align well with prior research on the scale in the domain of automation (Spain et al., 2008) and work from interpersonal trust emphasizing the importance of distrust (Lewicki et al., 2006; Luhmann, 1979; McKnight & Chervany, 2001; Ou & Sia, 2009; Saunders et al., 2014; Sitkin & Roth, 1993), thus providing further empirical evidence for trust and distrust as two distinct and independent constructs. While Lewicki et al. (1998) proposed that trust was based on more positive emotional affect and distrust on more negative affect, our results demonstrated that trust correlated positively with positive affect and negatively with negative affect, whereas this was the opposite for distrust. This provides additional support for a two-dimensional conceptualization of trust, challenging the unilateral perspective on trust. However, our work should not be understood as a conclusive verdict on whether trust is in fact one- or two-dimensional, as our research design cannot conclusively resolve this question. In the following, we nevertheless want to contextualize our findings in the broader theoretical discourse from interpersonal trust research and outline possible implications of a two-dimensional consideration of trust and distrust to inspire future research on human-AI trust.

Beyond distrust being associated with stronger emotional reactions (Lewicki et al., 1998) and more negative affect (e.g., fear, skepticism, cynicism) than trust (McKnight & Chervany, 2001), both constructs help to navigate uncertainty and

complexity (Lewicki et al., 1998). Trust reduces complexity by compelling a person to take action that exposes them to risk (i.e., undesirable outcomes are removed from consideration to form positive expectations (Kroeger, 2019)), while distrust reduces complexity by compelling a person to take protective action to reduce risk (i.e., undesirable outcomes are accentuated in consideration to form negative expectations (Kroeger, 2019)) (Benamati et al., 2006). In summary, an argument can be made that both the antecedents (e.g., the associated affect) and the consequences (e.g., the resulting function) of trust and distrust are distinct (Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994; Chang & Fang, 2013; Harrison McKnight & Chervany, 2001; Lewicki et al., 1998).

Drawing upon their proposed affectual and emotional differentiation between trust and distrust, Lewicki et al. (1998) developed a 2x2 framework with trust on the y-axis and distrust on the x-axis. This framework spans from "low trust/distrust" to "high trust/distrust" and provides an explanatory approach for the simultaneous and seemingly contradictory coexistence of trust and distrust. In cases of low trust and low distrust, judgments about the trustworthiness or untrustworthiness of the trustee are still being formed (Lewicki et al., 1998). The trustor thus lacks a basis for either trust or distrust (Lewicki et al., 1998) and only over time do judgments develop. A practical and simplified example of such an interaction within the realm of AI might be a person encountering a chatbot for the first time. This person has no prior experience with the capabilities of large language models and, thus, no foundation to trust or distrust the chatbot.

Situations characterized by high trust and low distrust stem from predominantly positive experiences with the trustee. Contradictory evidence that could inform untrustworthiness is often disregarded or considered unimportant (Lewicki et al., 1998). Such a case could include, for our example, that the person frequently observed the chatbot's high capabilities in generating poetry. While trust is warranted (Jacovi et al., 2021) and calibrated (Lee & See, 2004) for these tasks, the individual might over-rely (Parasuraman & Riley, 1997) on the chatbot for other tasks, where distrusting and not

relying on the chatbot would be more appropriate (e.g., providing accurate scientific literature).

With low trust and high distrust, negative experiences with the trustee predominate, reinforcing distrust. The trustor invests substantial resources in monitoring (Lewicki et al., 1998). Following our example, the individual could be disappointed by a chatbot's inability to provide accurate scientific literature. They may actively avoid using the chatbot or monitor it more closely, double-checking its responses. This could lead to warranted distrust (Jacovi et al., 2021) calibrated with the AI's untrustworthiness (Jacovi et al., 2021; Lee & See, 2004) for the given task, but potentially causing disuse (Lee & See, 2004) and under-reliance (Parasuraman & Riley, 1997) when trusting and relying on the chatbot would be appropriate.

Finally, in situations of high trust and high distrust, the experience with the trustee is balanced, having both perceived trustworthy and untrustworthy behavior. The trustor effectively interacts with the trustee in certain (trusted) tasks but not in other (distrusted) tasks (Lewicki et al., 1998). Returning to our example, the person has learned to trust the chatbot for tasks aligned with its trustworthiness (i.e., capability to generate poems) and to distrust the chatbot for tasks where distrust matches its untrustworthiness (i.e., incapability to provide accurate scientific literature). The person utilizes the chatbot to write poems but always double-checks its scientific references, showing both calibrated trust and distrust. This last case seems to be the most preferable, where both trust and distrust are *warranted* and *calibrated* with the AI's trustworthiness or untrustworthiness.

Conceptualizing and reasoning about trust and distrust in such a way allows for addressing the two key motivations of XAI as outlined by Jacovi et al. (2021): to increase trust in trustworthy AI and distrust in untrustworthy AI. Within the confines of a single-dimensional trust conception, where one overall score is formed, it is not possible to determine whether "low trust" arises from actual distrust or from a lack of knowledge regarding the trustworthiness or untrustworthiness of the AI (Victor et al.,

2009). Therefore, a two-dimensional understanding of trust and distrust offers additional insights, enabling practitioners and researchers to either increase the trustworthiness (and hence increasing trust) or decrease the untrustworthiness (and hence decreasing distrust) of their AI systems. Different factors distinctly contribute to the increase and decrease of trust, as opposed to those factors affecting distrust (Lewicki et al., 1998). This has been empirically demonstrated in other areas of human-computer interaction, where varying website characteristics distinctly contributed to trust and distrust (Seckler et al., 2015). Similarly, in the context of AI and XAI, different trustworthiness cues may enhance trust (e.g., post-hoc explanations), while other cues could mitigate distrust (e.g., certification labels), and we encourage future research to investigate these potential factors.

However, only with appropriate questionnaires that measure both trust and distrust can such a two-dimensional consideration be done justice. Existing questionnaires like the TAI and TPA have limitations; the former does not account for distrust, and the latter holds room for improvement to accurately measure both dimensions, as indicated by our results. Good questionnaire development is rooted in a thorough understanding of the constructs being measured, usually grounded in theory and empirical research (Aeschbach et al., 2021). In light of these requirements, comparatively little effort seems to have been made to understand and measure distrust in AI (Scharowski & Perrig, 2023; Ueno et al., 2022). Instead of adopting trust questionnaires from other research areas, we encourage the human-AI and XAI community to consider developing their own trust questionnaires, which take into account the unique nature of human-AI interaction. This involves generating items for the AI context that capture both trust *and* distrust. Not only would such a two-dimensional conceptualization provide the added value outlined above, but also contribute to a more comprehensive and holistic understanding of trust *and* distrust.

Limitations and Future Work

First, the present work utilized crowd-sourcing for participant recruitment. While crowd-sourced data have been shown to be at least as reliable as other, more traditional ways of recruitment, such as student sampling (Buhrmester et al., 2011; Douglas et al., 2023), future work should examine how the two trust scales perform across varying populations.

Second, ratings were collected in an online experiment with a scenario-based approach where participants observed AI interactions. While this is a common approach (e.g., Holthausen et al., 2020; Schaefer, 2016) that had the advantage of reaching the necessary number of participants for a high-powered validation study, future work should investigate alternative approaches, using other forms of interaction with AI.

Third, the present findings are limited to the context of automated vehicles and chatbots. While these are arguably timely and crucial application areas of AI and our findings are largely consistent with prior work in automation (Spain et al., 2008) and preliminary findings for the AI domain (Perrig, Scharowski, & Brühlmann, 2023), future work should consider additional AI contexts, such as medical diagnosis or content recommendations.

Finally, a general limitation of statistical factor analysis is that the item wording, particularly the simultaneous use of positively and negatively formulated items, potentially influences participant responses (Perrig, von Felten, et al., 2023; Sauro & Lewis, 2011). Negatively formulated items can lead participants to intentionally or unintentionally ignore or misunderstand these items. The resulting response patterns may load on two distinct factors in a factor analysis due to methodological issues related to the item wording (Lewis & Sauro, 2017). Such methodological issues could be an alternative explanation for the revealed two-factor structure, and we recognize these challenges. Distorted factor structures have been shown for scales of usability (Lewis & Sauro, 2017; Lewis et al., 2013) and website aesthetics (Perrig, von Felten, et al., 2023),

where an argument was made to not distinguish factors based on item wording because it lacked theoretical ground. In the case of trust, however, we pointed out that a distinction between trust and distrust is theoretically justified and has merits that go beyond positive or negative item formulation (Peters & Visser, 2023; Scharowski & Perrig, 2023). Ultimately, the underlying structure of psychological constructs, such as trust, is not rooted in statistical but rather in theoretical considerations (Fried, 2020). We want to emphasize that the psychometric validation of the TPA and TAI, along with our recommendations for using these two scales, remain robust despite this limitation. While our work thus contributes to more reliable and valid tools for measuring trust, it should not be taken as the final verdict in the discourse regarding the dimensionality of trust and distrust, calling for further work.

Conclusion

Trust is a central and frequently measured construct in studying human-AI interactions. However, no validated trust questionnaire explicitly designed for the context of AI exists to date, with researchers relying on scales developed for other research areas, such as automation or human-human interaction. Motivated by the need for validated and standardized questionnaires, the present work reported on the first comprehensive validation of two trust scales in the context of AI, the popular TPA (Jian et al., 2000) and the recently published TAI (Hoffman et al., 2023). In a 2x2 online study design, using two conditions (trustworthy vs. untrustworthy) and two areas of applications (AV vs. chatbot), 2970 complete responses to the two scales and related measures were collected from 1485 participants.

While results from the psychometric evaluation supported both scales' psychometric quality regarding reliability, convergent, divergent, and criterion validity, findings were less favorable concerning the TPA's construct validity. Consequently, we investigated ways to improve the TPA, namely item removal and an alternative two-factor model, which enhanced the scale's psychometric quality. From our findings,

we derived recommendations for researchers and practitioners who want to use the TPA and TAI in the context of AI. Results emphasized that while the TAI only measures trust, the TPA can measure two constructs, trust and distrust. Based on these findings, we highlighted the practical and theoretical implications of accounting for both trust and distrust, underscoring the added value of this distinction beyond a theoretical discussion to actual measurement practice. However, the TPA and TAI are not optimized for measuring both trust and distrust in the AI context, at least in their current versions. We therefore encourage future work on the TPA or the development of a scale explicitly designed for the context of AI, which measures both constructs. Such a distinction could contribute to a deeper and more nuanced understanding of trust *and* distrust in the human-AI interaction in a world where AI increasingly has the potential for both benefits and harm.

Data Availability Statement

This research was financed entirely by our research group; we received no additional funding. The pre-registration (<https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/3EU4V>) and supplementary materials (<https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/7CDNE>) for this study are available on OSF.

Funding and Declaration of Conflicting Interests

This work is financed entirely by the corresponding author's research group, as we received no additional funding. The authors have no commercial or financial relationships to declare that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

References

- Aeschbach, L. F., Perrig, S. A. C., Weder, L., Opwis, K., & Brühlmann, F. (2021). Transparency in measurement reporting: A systematic literature review of CHI PLAY. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, 5(CHI PLAY).
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3474660>
- Andras, P., Esterle, L., Guckert, M., Han, T. A., Lewis, P. R., Milanovic, K., Payne, T., Perret, C., Pitt, J., Powers, S. T., Urquhart, N., & Wells, S. (2018). Trusting intelligent machines: Deepening trust within socio-technical systems. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*, 37(4), 76–83.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/MTS.2018.2876107>
- Benamati, J., Serva, M. A., & Fuller, M. A. (2006). Are trust and distrust distinct constructs? an empirical study of the effects of trust and distrust among online banking users. *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS'06)*, 6, 121b–121b.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2006.63>
- Benk, M., Tolmeijer, S., von Wangenheim, F., & Ferrario, A. (2022). The value of measuring trust in ai-a socio-technical system perspective [Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.13480>]. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2204.13480*.
- Berg, J., Dickhaut, J., & McCabe, K. (1995). Trust, reciprocity, and social history. *Games and economic behavior*, 10(1), 122–142.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/game.1995.1027>
- Binns, R., van Kleek, M., Veale, M., Lyngs, U., Zhao, J., & Shadbolt, N. (2018). 'it's reducing a human being to a percentage'. In R. Mandryk, M. Hancock, M. Perry, & A. Cox (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2018 chi conference on human factors in computing systems - chi '18* (pp. 1–14). ACM.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3173951>
- Brühlmann, F., Petralito, S., Aeschbach, L., & Opwis, K. (2020). The quality of data collected online: An investigation of careless responding in a crowdsourced

- sample. *Methods in Psychology*, 2, 100022.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.metip.2020.100022>
- Buçinca, Z., Lin, P., Gajos, K. Z., & Glassman, E. L. (2020). Proxy tasks and subjective measures can be misleading in evaluating explainable ai systems. *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*, 454–464.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3377325.3377498>
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon’s mechanical turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(1), 3–5. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610393980>
- Cacioppo, J. T., & Berntson, G. G. (1994). Relationship between attitudes and evaluative space: A critical review, with emphasis on the separability of positive and negative substrates. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115(3), 401–423.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.115.3.401>
- Castelfranchi, C., & Falcone, R. (2010). *Trust theory: A socio-cognitive and computational model*. John Wiley & Sons.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470519851>
- Chang, Y.-S., & Fang, S.-R. (2013). Antecedents and distinctions between online trust and distrust: Predicting high-and low-risk internet behaviors. *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, 14(2), 149.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297–334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555>
- Curran, P. G. (2016). Methods for the detection of carelessly invalid responses in survey data. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 66, 4–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2015.07.006>
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- DeVellis, R. F. (2017). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (4th ed.). SAGE publications, Inc.

- Dolinek, L., & Wintersberger, P. (2022). Towards a generalized scale to measure situational trust in ai systems. *CHI 2022 TRAIT Workshop on Trust and Reliance in AI-Human Teams*.
- Douglas, B. D., Ewell, P. J., & Brauer, M. (2023). Data quality in online human-subjects research: Comparisons between MTurk, Prolific, CloudResearch, Qualtrics, and SONA. *PLoS ONE*, *18*(3), e0279720.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0279720>
- Dunn, T. J., Baguley, T., & Brunsten, V. (2014). From alpha to omega: A practical solution to the pervasive problem of internal consistency estimation. *British Journal of Psychology*, *105*(3), 399–412. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12046>
- Ekman, F., Johansson, M., & Sochor, J. (2017). Creating appropriate trust in automated vehicle systems: A framework for hmi design. *IEEE Transactions on Human-Machine Systems*, *48*(1), 95–101.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/THMS.2017.2776209>
- Esterwood, C., & Robert Jr, L. P. (2023). Three strikes and you are out!: The impacts of multiple human–robot trust violations and repairs on robot trustworthiness. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *142*, 107658.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.107658>
- Flake, J. K., & Fried, E. I. (2020). Measurement schmeasurement: Questionable measurement practices and how to avoid them. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, *3*(4), 456–465.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245920952393>
- Fried, E. I. (2020). Theories and models: What they are, what they are for, and what they are about. *Psychological Inquiry*, *31*(4), 336–344.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2020.1854011>
- Fukuyama, F. (1996). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. Free Press.
- Furr, M. (2011). *Scale construction and psychometrics for social and personality psychology* (1st ed.). SAGE publications, Ltd.

- Gambetta, D. (2000). Can we trust trust? In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations, electronic edition* (pp. 213–237). Department of Sociology, University of Oxford.
<http://www.sociology.ox.ac.uk/papers/gambetta213-237.pdf>
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2019). *IBM SPSS statistics 26 step by step: A simple guide and reference* (16th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429056765>
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Harrison McKnight, D., & Chervany, N. (2001). While trust is cool and collected, distrust is fiery and frenzied: A model of distrust concepts. *7th Americas Conference on Information Systems*, 883–888.
- Henze, N., & Zirkler, B. (1990). A class of invariant consistent tests for multivariate normality. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, *19*(10), 3595–3617. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610929008830400>
- Hoff, K. A., & Bashir, M. (2015). Trust in automation: Integrating empirical evidence on factors that influence trust. *Human Factors*, *57*(3), 407–434.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018720814547570>
- Hoffman, R. R., Lee, J. D., Woods, D. D., Shadbolt, N., Miller, J., & Bradshaw, J. M. (2009). The dynamics of trust in cyberdomains. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, *24*(6), 5–11. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MIS.2009.124>
- Hoffman, R. R., Mueller, S. T., Klein, G., & Litman, J. (2023). Measures for explainable ai: Explanation goodness, user satisfaction, mental models, curiosity, trust, and human-ai performance. *Frontiers in Computer Science*, *5*.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2023.1096257>
- Holthausen, B. E., Wintersberger, P., Walker, B. N., & Riener, A. (2020). Situational trust scale for automated driving (STS-AD): Development and initial validation. *12th International Conference on Automotive User Interfaces and Interactive Vehicular Applications*, 40–47. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3409120.3410637>

- Hopkins, K. D. (1998). *Educational and psychological measurement and evaluation*. Pearson.
- Howard, M. C. (2016). A review of exploratory factor analysis decisions and overview of current practices: What we are doing and how can we improve? *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 32(1), 51–62.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2015.1087664>
- Hu, L.-t., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1–55.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- Jacovi, A., Marasović, A., Miller, T., & Goldberg, Y. (2021). Formalizing trust in artificial intelligence: Prerequisites, causes and goals of human trust in ai. *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 624–635. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445923>
- Jakesch, M., Bućinca, Z., Amershi, S., & Olteanu, A. (2022). How different groups prioritize ethical values for responsible ai. *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 310–323.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533097>
- Jian, J.-Y., Bisantz, A. M., & Drury, C. G. (2000). Foundations for an empirically determined scale of trust in automated systems. *International Journal of Cognitive Ergonomics*, 4(1), 53–71.
https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327566IJCE0401_04
- Juniper, E. F. (2009). Validated questionnaires should not be modified. *European Respiratory Journal*, 34(5), 1015–1017.
<https://doi.org/10.1183/09031936.00110209>
- Kapania, S., Siy, O., Clapper, G., SP, A. M., & Sambasivan, N. (2022). “because ai is 100% right and safe”: User attitudes and sources of ai authority in india. *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3517533>

- Kaplan, A. D., Kessler, T. T., Brill, J. C., & Hancock, P. (2023). Trust in artificial intelligence: Meta-analytic findings. *Human factors*, *65*(2), 337–359.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00187208211013988>
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). The Guilford Press.
- Kohn, S. C., de Visser, E. J., Wiese, E., Lee, Y.-C., & Shaw, T. H. (2021). Measurement of trust in automation: A narrative review and reference guide. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 604977. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.604977>
- Kroeger, F. (2019). Unlocking the treasure trove: How can luhmann’s theory of trust enrich trust research? *Journal of Trust Research*, *9*(1), 110–124.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21515581.2018.1552592>
- Lai, V., Chen, C., Smith-Renner, A., Liao, Q. V., & Tan, C. (2023). Towards a science of human-ai decision making: An overview of design space in empirical human-subject studies. *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 1369–1385.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3593013.3594087>
- Langer, M., Hunsicker, T., Feldkamp, T., König, C. J., & Grgić-Hlača, N. (2022). “look! it’s a computer program! it’s an algorithm! it’s ai!”: Does terminology affect human perceptions and evaluations of algorithmic decision-making systems? *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3517527>
- Langer, M., Oster, D., Speith, T., Kästner, L., Hermanns, H., Schmidt, E., Sesing, A., & Baum, K. (2021). What do we want from explainable artificial intelligence (xai)? a stakeholder perspective on xai and a conceptual model guiding interdisciplinary xai research. *Artificial Intelligence*, *296*, 103473.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2021.103473>
- Lee, J. D., & See, K. A. (2004). Trust in automation: Designing for appropriate reliance. *Human factors*, *46*(1), 50–80. https://doi.org/10.1518/hfes.46.1.50_30392

- Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J., & Bies, R. J. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *The Academy of Management Review*, *23*(3), 438–458. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259288>
- Lewicki, R. J., Tomlinson, E. C., & Gillespie, N. (2006). Models of interpersonal trust development: Theoretical approaches, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Journal of management*, *32*(6), 991–1022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206306294405>
- Lewis, J. R., & Sauro, J. (2017). Revisiting the factor structure of the system usability scale. *Journal of Usability Studies*, *12*(4), 183–192.
- Lewis, J. R., Utesch, B. S., & Maher, D. E. (2013). UMUX-LITE: When there's no time for the SUS. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2099–2102. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2470654.2481287>
- Liao, Q., & Sundar, S. S. (2022). Designing for responsible trust in ai systems: A communication perspective. *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 1257–1268. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533182>
- Lipton, Z. C. (2018). The mythos of model interpretability: In machine learning, the concept of interpretability is both important and slippery. *Queue*, *16*(3), 31–57. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3236386.3241340>
- Loo, R. (2002). A caveat on using single-item versus multiple-item scales. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *17*(1), 68–75. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940210415933>
- Lu, Z., & Yin, M. (2021). Human reliance on machine learning models when performance feedback is limited: Heuristics and risks. *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445562>
- Luhmann, N. (1979). *Trust and power*. Wiley.

- MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological methods*, *1*(2), 130–149. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.1.2.130>
- Mardia, K. V. (1970). Measures of multivariate skewness and kurtosis with applications. *Biometrika*, *57*(3), 519–530. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/57.3.519>
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, *20*(3), 709–734. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258792>
- McDonald, R. P. (1999). *Test theory: A unified treatment* (1st ed.). Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410601087>
- McKnight, D. H., & Chervany, N. L. (2001). What trust means in e-commerce customer relationships: An interdisciplinary conceptual typology. *International journal of electronic commerce*, *6*(2), 35–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10864415.2001.11044235>
- Meade, A. W., & Craig, S. B. (2012). Identifying careless responses in survey data. *Psychological methods*, *17*(3), 437–455. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028085>
- Merritt, S. M. (2011). Affective processes in human–automation interactions. *Human Factors*, *53*(4), 356–370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018720811411912>
- Mohseni, S., Zarei, N., & Ragan, E. D. (2020). A multidisciplinary survey and framework for design and evaluation of explainable ai systems [Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.11839>]. *arXiv: Human-Computer Interaction*.
- Moosbrugger, H., & Kelava, A. (2020). *Testtheorie und Fragebogenkonstruktion [Test Theory and Questionnaire Construction]* (3rd ed.). Springer Berlin, Heidelberg. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-61532-4>
- Muir, B. M. (1994). Trust in automation: Part i. theoretical issues in the study of trust and human intervention in automated systems. *Ergonomics*, *37*(11), 1905–1922. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00140139408964957>

- Ou, C. X., & Sia, C. L. (2009). To trust or to distrust, that is the question: Investigating the trust-distrust paradox. *Commun. ACM*, *52*(5), 135–139.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/1506409.1506442>
- Parasuraman, R., & Riley, V. (1997). Humans and automation: Use, misuse, disuse, abuse. *Human Factors*, *39*(2), 230–253.
<https://doi.org/10.1518/001872097778543886>
- Peer, E., Rothschild, D., Gordon, A., Evernden, Z., & Damer, E. (2022). Data quality of platforms and panels for online behavioral research. *Behavior Research Methods*, *54*, 1643–1662. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-021-01694-3>
- Perrig, S. A. C., Scharowski, N., & Brühlmann, F. (2023). Trust issues with trust scales: Examining the psychometric quality of trust measures in the context of ai. *Extended Abstracts of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544549.3585808>
- Perrig, S. A. C., von Felten, N., Honda, M., Opwis, K., & Brühlmann, F. (2023). Development and validation of a positive-item version of the visual aesthetics of websites inventory: The VisAWI-Pos. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, *0*(0), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2023.2258634>
- Peters, T. M., & Visser, R. W. (2023). The importance of distrust in ai. In L. Longo (Ed.), *Explainable artificial intelligence* (pp. 301–317). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-44070-0_15
- Poursabzi-Sangdeh, F., Goldstein, D. G., Hofman, J. M., Wortman Vaughan, J. W., & Wallach, H. (2021). Manipulating and measuring model interpretability. *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445315>
- R Core Team. (2022). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria.
<https://www.R-project.org/>

- Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(3), 393–404. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1998.926617>
- Saunders, M. N., Dietz, G., & Thornhill, A. (2014). Trust and distrust: Polar opposites, or independent but co-existing? *Human Relations*, *67*(6), 639–665. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713500831>
- Sauro, J., & Lewis, J. R. (2011). When designing usability questionnaires, does it hurt to be positive? *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2215–2224. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1978942.1979266>
- Schaefer, K. E. (2016). Measuring Trust in Human Robot Interactions: Development of the "Trust Perception Scale-HRI". In R. Mittu, D. Sofge, A. Wagner, & W. Lawless (Eds.), *Robust intelligence and trust in autonomous systems* (pp. 191–218). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-7668-0_10
- Scharowski, N., Benk, M., Kühne, S. J., Wettstein, L., & Brühlmann, F. (2023). Certification labels for trustworthy ai: Insights from an empirical mixed-method study. *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 248–260. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3593013.3593994>
- Scharowski, N., & Perrig, S. A. C. (2023). Distrust in (X)AI – measurement artifact or distinct construct? *CHI 2023 TRAIT Workshop on Trust and Reliance in AI-Human Teams*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.16495>
- Scharowski, N., Perrig, S. A., von Felten, N., & Brühlmann, F. (2022). Trust and reliance in xai—distinguishing between attitudinal and behavioral measures. *CHI TRAIT Workshop*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2203.12318>
- Schlicker, N., Uhde, A., Baum, K., Hirsch, M. C., & Langer, M. (2022). A micro and macro perspective on trustworthiness: Theoretical underpinnings of the trustworthiness assessment model (tram). <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/qhwvx>
- Seckler, M., Heinz, S., Forde, S., Tuch, A. N., & Opwis, K. (2015). Trust and distrust on the web: User experiences and website characteristics. *Computers in human behavior*, *45*, 39–50. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.11.064>

- Sitkin, S. B., & Roth, N. L. (1993). Explaining the limited effectiveness of legalistic “remedies” for trust/distrust. *Organization science*, 4(3), 367–392.
<https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.4.3.367>
- Spain, R. D., Bustamante, E. A., & Bliss, J. P. (2008). Towards an empirically developed scale for system trust: Take two. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*, 52(19), 1335–1339.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/154193120805201907>
- Thornton, L., Knowles, B., & Blair, G. (2021). Fifty shades of grey: In praise of a nuanced approach towards trustworthy design. *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 64–76.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445871>
- Toreini, E., Aitken, M., Coopamootoo, K., Elliott, K., Zelaya, C. G., & van Moorsel, A. (2020). The relationship between trust in ai and trustworthy machine learning technologies. *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 272–283. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372834>
- Ueno, T., Sawa, Y., Kim, Y., Urakami, J., Oura, H., & Seaborn, K. (2022). Trust in human-ai interaction: Scoping out models, measures, and methods. *Extended Abstracts of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3491101.3519772>
- Vereschak, O., Bailly, G., & Caramiaux, B. (2021). How to evaluate trust in ai-assisted decision making? a survey of empirical methodologies. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, 5(CSCW2). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3476068>
- Victor, P., Cornelis, C., De Cock, M., & Da Silva, P. P. (2009). Gradual trust and distrust in recommender systems. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 160(10), 1367–1382.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fss.2008.11.014>
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 54(6), 1063–1070.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063>

- Weitz, K., Schiller, D., Schlagowski, R., Huber, T., & André, E. (2021). “let me explain!”: Exploring the potential of virtual agents in explainable ai interaction design. *Journal on Multimodal User Interfaces*, 15(2), 87–98.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12193-020-00332-0>
- Whittaker, T. A., & Schumacker, R. E. (2022). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling* (5th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003044017>
- Wischnewski, M., Krämer, N., & Müller, E. (2023). Measuring and understanding trust calibrations for automated systems: A survey of the state-of-the-art and future directions. *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3581197>
- Yin, M., Wortman Vaughan, J., & Wallach, H. (2019). Understanding the effect of accuracy on trust in machine learning models. *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–12.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300509>
- Yu, K., Berkovsky, S., Taib, R., Conway, D., Zhou, J., & Chen, F. (2017). User trust dynamics: An investigation driven by differences in system performance. *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on intelligent user interfaces*, 307–317. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3025171.3025219>