

---

# TRUST AND TRUSTWORTHINESS FROM HUMAN-CENTERED PERSPECTIVE IN HRI – A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW

---

**Debora de Souza**  
School of Digital Technologies  
Tallinn University  
deboracs@tlu.ee

**Sonia Sousa**  
School of Digital Technologies  
Tallinn University & Taltech  
scs@tlu.ee

**Kadri Kristjuhan-Ling**  
School of Engineering  
Tallinn University of Technology (Taltech)  
kadri.kristjuhan-ling@taltech.ee

**Olga Dunajeva**  
Virumaa College  
Taltech  
olga.dunajeva@taltech.ee

**Mare Roosileht**  
Virumaa College  
Taltech  
mare.roosileht@taltech.ee

**Avar Pentel**  
Virumaa College  
Taltech  
avar.pentel@taltech.ee

**Mati Mottus**  
Virumaa College  
Taltech  
mati.mottus@taltech.ee

**Mustafa Can Ozdemir**  
Virumaa College  
Taltech  
mustafa.ozdemir@taltech.ee

**Zanna Gratsjova**  
Virumaa College  
Taltech  
zanna.gratsjova@taltech.ee

February 3, 2025

## ABSTRACT

The transition from Industry 4.0 to Industry 5.0 highlights recent European efforts to design intelligent devices, systems, and automation that can work alongside human intelligence and enhance human capabilities. Human-machine interaction in this vision goes beyond simply deploying machines, such as autonomous robots, for economic advantage; it also demands a well-defined human-machine interaction (HMI). Such understanding of how Industry 5.0 visions align with user preferences and needs to feel safe while collaborating with autonomous intelligent systems takes priority. It requires not just a societal and educational shift in how we perceive technological advancements but also demands a human-centric research vision. Aligned with this perspective, we conducted a systematic literature review focusing on how trust and trustworthiness can be characteristics of humans and systems in Human-Robot Interaction (HRI) as we move towards the affluent Industry 5.0. This review aims to provide an overview of the most common methodologies and measurements and collect insights about barriers and facilitators for fostering trustworthy HRI. After a rigorous quality assessment following the Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses guidelines, using rigorous inclusion criteria and screening by at least two reviewers, 34 articles were included in the review. The findings underscore the significance of trust and safety as foundational elements for promoting secure and trustworthy human-machine cooperation. Confirm that almost 30% of the revised articles do not present a definition of trust, which can be problematic as this lack of conceptual clarity can undermine research efforts in addressing this problem from a central perspective. It highlights that the choice of domain and area of application should influence the choice of methods and approaches to fostering trust in HRI, as those choices can significantly affect user preferences, as well as their perceptions and assessment of robot capabilities. Additionally, this lack of conceptual clarity can act as a potential barrier to fostering trust in HRI and explains the sometimes contradictory findings or choice of methods and instruments used to investigate trust in robots and other autonomous systems in the literature.

**Keywords** Human-robot interaction · Trust · Trustworthiness · Human-Centered Design · Human-Computer Interaction

# 1 Introduction

Our project is a competition on Kaggle (Predict Future Sales). We are provided with daily historical sales data (including each products' sale date, block, shop price and amount). And we will use it to forecast the total amount of each product sold next month. Because of the list of shops and products slightly changes every month. We need to create a robust model that can handle such situations.

Industry 5.0 relies on deploying intelligent automation systems that prioritize human-machine interactions (HMI) and optimize data-driven tools and processes. Such a vision aligns with the recent European efforts to design intelligent devices, systems, and automation that complement human capabilities Commission et al. (2021); Pinto et al. (2022) It also shares a common goal: promote a societal change in which advanced technologies, such as autonomous robots, "are actively used in everyday life, industry, healthcare and other spheres of activity, not primarily for economic advantage but for the benefit and convenience of each citizen" Nahavandi (2019). In sum, the objectives envisioned by Industry 5.0 contemplate that technologies adapt to human needs and the diversity of human nature, empower workers, and improve their process efficiency rather than replace them Nahavandi (2019). Enabling tools to augment the human ability to be creative and solve problems, benefiting from machine precision and data processing while preserving the human role in critical decision-making processes. By that token, current Human-Robot Interaction (HRI) approaches should focus on human and system qualities that affect the potential of building robust and adaptive industrial ecosystems to safeguard this human-centric vision of technology development. Drawing on the HRI-related studies, we examined the phenomena of trust and the factors that enable and hinder trust in intelligent automation in contexts where humans and machines coexist in meaningful human-machine collaboration. The following sections of this work describe the literature review's systematic methodological approach, including the research objectives and strategies. Then, illustrate how the article identification, selection, and data extraction process was performed and validated, followed by an analysis and synthesis of the definitions of trust employed, the origins and focus of the studies, and the aspects listed as facilitators and barriers. Finally, discuss a pathway to support the successful implementation of autonomous technologies and foster the successful adoption of technology from a human-centered design perspective (HCD).

## 1.1 Research scope

Reflecting on the above-described human-centric transition, one of the essential challenges is designing autonomous robotic technologies that promote seamless human-machine collaboration. Current definitions of autonomous robotics describe it as autonomous systems capable of independently determining their actions without human intervention Gebru et al. (2022a); Abeywickrama et al. (2023).

However, with the current fast technological development pace, the range and capabilities of such technological innovations vary from using robots in factories, at home, driverless transports, and autonomous drones to deploying COBOTS as teammates, checking orders with robot concierges, etc. A strict separation and role distinction between humans and machines may not be sufficient to mitigate the risks of unintended consequences when aiming to foster effective human-machine collaboration in complex and high-risk application contexts.

Therefore, promoting ethical, socially responsible, and user-trustworthy automation may require alternative design approaches. Adopting a Human-centric approach to the problem is referred to as a solution for leveraging an effective, safe, and trustworthy human-robot collaboration Commission (2021); Commission et al. (2021); Sousa et al. (2024).

### 1.1.1 Industry 5.0 vision

While Industry 5.0 envisions human-centric and sustainable innovations, the rapid adoption of robotics and AI raises new challenges. For example, such fast development in technological innovations introduces concerns about trust, ethics, safety, and security when human-machine collaboration is required Naiseh et al. (2022); Abeywickrama et al. (2023). Although we are aware that the principle of jidoka has been around for a hundred years and, when combined with Just-in-Time (JIT) principles, forms a robust foundation for lean manufacturing, ensuring efficiency, flexibility, and quality in production processes. Thus, providing an automated system with human supervision indicates a) poor machine maintenance and b) poor work organization Krijnen (2007). With current technological advances, the concept of combining automated systems with human supervision, often referred to as "*Human in the Loop*" (HITL) automation, is widely discussed in automation and robotics. This approach emphasizes that human oversight can enhance the efficiency and reliability of automated systems. It is argued that this combination leads to better machine maintenance and improved work organization. HITL automation ensures that humans can intervene when necessary, providing critical judgment and decision-making that machines alone might not handle effectively. Such a discussion of the extent to which machines can have human judgment is widely debated and depends much on the actions and context in which the machine works. For simple and routine tasks, following the principle of jidoka and separating human and machine work can improve safety and product quality and reduce time. Regardless, the "*Human in the Loop*"

framework requires new design approaches and methods to ensure that humans supervise, guide, and intervene in system operations when needed. This ensures that critical decisions are aligned with ethical, contextual, and situational requirements, and humans are ethically accountable for their choices, such as AI-generated clinic diagnoses. It can also foster a partnership between humans and machines, such as when drivers might take over autonomous vehicles and control them during complex traffic scenarios. This ensures system safety and reliability, particularly in high-risk applications.

### 1.1.2 Human-centric vision

Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) researchers have been adopting the human-centered approach to the problem since 1970, with the first focus on improving system usability to make interactions between humans and machines more efficient and effective. The field remains interdisciplinary, drawing from computer science, psychology, design, and other areas to improve how people interact with technology Rogers et al. (2014). Additionally, it contemplates studies on the emotional and social aspects, following the principles of cognitive psychology to provide a deeper understanding of technology-related human behavior. Today, it continues to advance in the field and plays a crucial role in related subfields such as Human-Robot Interaction (HRI), Human-Machine Interaction (HMI), and Human-Agent Interaction (HAI).

HCI's interdisciplinary methodologies facilitate the design and evaluation of technologies from a human-centric perspective, adhering to guidelines like ISO 9241-210:2019. These frameworks promote usability, usefulness, and user experience, making HCI vital to achieving Industry 5.0's sustainability goals, inclusivity, and human-centric innovation.

### 1.1.3 Human-centric trust vision

In this interplay, trust is essential for enabling the successful integration, adoption, and cooperation of humans with autonomous robotic technologies to achieve better outcomes. As these technologies develop, they become increasingly capable of performing complex cognitive tasks and taking over more activities previously handled by humans. Their acceptance becomes more difficult as people's feelings of losing control grow, along with the idea that such innovations necessitate new knowledge, skills, and an understanding of their operations Brynjolfsson and McAfee (2017) The "black box" nature of AI systems further complicates this relationship, fueling debates about their benefits and risks on Artificial Intelligence (2019); Gulati et al. (2019); Sousa et al. (2023). Moreover, research indicates that ensuring both physical safety (e.g., through robust sensor-based systems) and psychological safety (e.g., by fostering user trust and well-being) is crucial for the successful integration of robotic systems Gihleb et al. (2022); Abeywickrama et al. (2023); Analysis (2019); Towers-Clark (2019); Laux et al. (2024). Furthermore, the concept of trust in human-robot interaction remains complex and often misapplied, leading to confusion about its role and definition. This lack of clarity has impeded research to foster acceptance and trust in autonomous technologies such as self-driving cars, drones, and collaborative robots De Visser et al. (2020); Pilacinski et al. (2023).

In sum, to realize Industry 5.0's full potential, it is essential to address these gaps by developing systems that prioritize human-centric design and a deep understanding of psychological, social, and ethical dimensions. This will enable effective human-machine partnerships, fostering a future where technological progress aligns with societal and environmental well-being.

## 2 Methodology

This systematic literature review followed the guidelines preferred reporting items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses guidelines (PRISMA) for qualitative synthesis Moher et al. (2009) and structured the process as in the following steps: a) establishing the research objectives and defining search string terms, inclusion, and exclusion criteria; b) identification from research databases; c) screening titles and abstracts; d) reviewing selected articles for data extraction; and e) analysis, categorization and summary of results. The flowchart presented in Figure 1 illustrates the stages of the screening process following Moher et al. (2009).

The literature review main goal is to explore how trust is assessed and conceptualized within varied studies from human-robot interaction literature. In parallel, this study reflects on the methods employed to evaluate trust in HRI systems, commenting on the focus, user groups, and applications researched. This study aims to answer three main questions:

RQ1: What are the most common methodologies to study users' trust in HRI?

RQ2: What has been the focus of HRI researchers when investigating trust?

RQ3: What are the barriers and facilitators for fostering trustworthy HRI?

The procedure presented in the following subsections delineates the stages of the study.

## 2.1 Literature Search and Search Strategy

Pursuing that goal, the search strategy was carried out on the same day (March 27, 2024) and captured and was guided by similar reviews exploring human-machine trust aspects Gebru et al. (2022b); Bach et al. (2024); Pinto et al. (2022). The query included terms such as "*trust assessment*", "*trustworthiness*", and "*user trust*". Additionally, the search was expanded to include literature on "*human-centered computing*", "*user-centered design*", as well as "*HCI assessments methods*". Terms within similar categories were combined with OR, and then the results from each category were mixed with AND.

This plural focus was used to integrate perspectives on user trust from both technological and human-centered design lenses.

The articles were searched via Tallinn University databases using the libraries of Web of Science (127) and EBSCO (131), with constraints for publication year (i.e., 2014-2024), peer-reviewed articles, and English.




Figure 1: The PRISMA flow chart of the study selection process.

## 2.2 Screening

The records identified were organized into a pool of 258 articles. After duplicates were removed (N=16), the articles were perused by title and abstract following the criteria established for inclusion and exclusion presented in Figure 2 below. Disagreements were resolved through third review members and discussions. The resulting list contained the first and second authors' checked 59 articles eligible for inclusion. As previously illustrated in Figure 1, 25 other articles were removed from the review sequentially due to a) Reason 1: the lack of systematic description of the approach used; and b) Reason 2: the application examined did not refer to robots but to personal virtual assistants or recommendation system.

We evaluated the quality of the selected articles using a mixed methods tool, then extracted data to meet the review's objectives. The data was combined and summarized in two ways: as numerical summaries for the quantitative data and as a narrative for the qualitative data.

### 2.3 Data extraction

A set of aspects were enlisted as relevant information that should be observed in the article review, piloted by the authors, and later iterated. The goal was to ensure a standard procedure and simplify the data extraction process. The data extracted included the following information: author(s) reference, the study aims, trust definition, research focus, study type, methods applied, trust metrics, and target behaviors. Reviewers were also invited to take notes of pertinent information that could benefit answering the research questions. Additionally, a second round of data extraction was carried out to collect further study-specific data, which was meant to inform the thematic framework built by the first and last authors within the analysis phase.

Criteria		
	INCLUDE	EXCLUDE
Goals	If the article presents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• results of a study describing the concepts/factors/barriers to fostering TRUST in HMI (in general)</li> <li>• factors that foster Trust in HRI</li> <li>• factors that hinder Trust in HRI</li> </ul>	Insufficient information for data extraction; Other languages than English; Out of scope for inclusion
Study type	The article presents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a study designed to investigate user trust in HMI in general</li> <li>• assessment methods and metrics for assessing user trust</li> <li>• guidelines for trustworthy design in HMI in general</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient information for data extraction;</li> <li>• Do not provide reliable research results. For instance, lack of statistical validation or a systematic description of data analysis.</li> </ul>
Methods	The article presents:: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Empirical Studies (Qualitative, Quantitative, Mixed), Experimental procedure, Contextual inquiry, Design theories, Case studies</li> </ul> or <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methodological or developmental study</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opinion articles, White papers</li> <li>• No defined clear methodology DO not provide a clear study design methodology?</li> </ul>
Technology	The type of application analysed by the article is a mechanical device that works automatically or by computer control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The type of application analysed is a chatbot or recommender system</li> </ul>

Figure 2: The matrix illustrates the inclusion and exclusion criteria applied.

### 2.4 Analysis and synthesis

The dataset from the reviewed articles was organized into different categories to facilitate its analysis, comprehending the employed definitions of trust, the origins and focus of the studies, the kind of application examined, target users, and the methodology deployed. The first and second authors analyzed the aspects listed as facilitators and barriers to trust, using the K.J. method Abeywickrama et al. (2023) for clustering and organizing the extracted knowledge.

### 3 Analysis & Results

The studies summarized in the upcoming sections include diverse geographical regions, applications, and user populations, reflecting the broad scope of trust research in HRI.

Most reviewed articles have been published in Western Europe (N=12) countries such as Germany, Austria, the UK, and the Netherlands, accounting for over one-third of HRI-trust studies (see Table 1 below). This is followed by Northern America (N=7), mainly the USA, and Eastern Asia (N=6), including China and South Korea. Other regions are represented by fewer studies, including Northern Europe (N=2), with studies from Sweden and Norway. Australasia (N=2), primarily Australia, and Southern Europe (N=2), including Spain and Portugal. South-Eastern Asia (Singapore), Eastern Europe (Hungary), and Western Asia (Israel) each contributed one study. We see a lack of studies from several geographical regions, which illustrates the biased nature of research in this field.

#### 3.1 What are the most common methodologies to study users' trust in HRI?

We assessed the types of studies carried out in the HRI field focused on users' trust. More than 59.4% were experimental studies (N=19). This was followed by systematic literature reviews (N=6), which account for 18.8% of the reviewed articles, and case studies (N=4), conducted approximately 12.5% of the time, as illustrated in Figure 3 below. Delving further into that disproportion, we examined how the HRI studies have defined and assessed users' trust and in what overarching domains these studies are developed.




Figure 3: Overview of methodologies to study users' trust in HRI.

##### 3.1.1 Conceptualization of user trust in HRI

Figure 4 illustrates the distribution of trust definitions in recent HRI studies. Ten (29.4%) of the reviewed articles do not define trust. Likewise, approximately 29.4% of the reviewed articles apply custom definitions – ad-hoc definitions described by authors either following dictionary expressions or coupling widely used definitions of trust in automation (e.g., widely used definition of trust in automation).

Even serving as a foundational reference for many custom definitions found in our analysis, Lee and See (2004) definition of trust is present in only six (17.6%) of the articles, while Mayer et al. (1995) - even though recognized as a widely used trust definition in the field of HCI – is explicitly adopted in only two (5.4%) of articles.

#### 3.2 How do the studies assess trust?

Considering the methods and strategies deployed to assess trust, we noticed that approximately a third of the reviewed articles (26.5%) had used Custom Questions (e.g., “Overall, how much would you trust an automated system?” and “How trustworthy did the robot appear to you?”) pertinent to the application investigated by them. These groups also correspond to half of the experimental studies reviewed, as illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1: How trust assessed in reviewed HRI studies

How the study measures trust?	Study Type					Total	%
	Experimental	Syst. Review	Case-study	Survey	Cross-sectional		
<b>Custom Question</b>							
Daniel et al. (2013)	x						
Jung et al. (2021)	x						
Zhu et al. (2023)	x						
Esterwood et al. (2023)	x						
Alam et al. (2021)	x						
Brule et al. (2014)	x						
Kraus et al. (2023)	x						
Gaudiello et al. (2016)	x						
Soh et al. (2018)	x						
<b>Total</b>						<b>9</b>	<b>26.5</b>
<b>Combined measures</b>							
Lim et al. (2023)			x				
Yun et al. (2022)	x						
Babel et al.(2022)			x				
Wang et al.(2024)	x						
Chen et al. (2022)	x						
Clement et al. (2022)	x						
Sanders et al. (2018)				x			
Miller et al. (2021)	x						
<b>Total</b>						<b>8</b>	<b>23.5</b>
<b>Validated Scale</b>							
Pinto et al. (2022)					x		
Huang et al. (2021)	x						
Gulati et al. (2019)	x						
Adami et al. (2022)	x						
Ambstdorf et al. (2022)				x			
Kraus et al. (2022)	x						
Pompe et al. (2022)	x						
<b>Total</b>						<b>7</b>	<b>20.6</b>
<b>Self-report</b>							
Cameron et al. (2021)			x				
Schaefer et al. (2017)			x				
Koren et al. (2022)			x				
<b>Total</b>						<b>3</b>	<b>8.8</b>
<b>N/A</b>							
Alonso et al. (2018)		x					
Yuan et al. (2021)		x					
Bach et al. (2024)		x					
Xu et al. (2023)		x					
Tian et al. (2021)		x					
Akalin et al. (2023)		x					
Schoeller et al. (2021)		x					
<b>Total</b>						<b>7</b>	<b>20.6</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>						<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>




Figure 4: Overview of trust definitions adopted by the selected articles.

In 23.5% of the reviewed papers, combined measures were used to assess users' trust in the robots across Experimental, Survey, and Case-study contexts - exploiting pre-and post-testing questionnaires alongside behavioral measurements and self-reporting methods. The study by Lim et al. (2023) mentioned combining questionnaires with user interviews. Also, 20.6% of the studies used validated tools for empirically measuring user trust across Experimental settings, Surveys, and Cross-sectional studies. Among the assessment instruments, scales such as the Interpersonal Trust Questionnaire (ITQ) by Forbes and Roger (1999) Forbes and Roger (1999), the Human-Computer Trust Scale (HCTS) by Gulati et al. (2019), and the Trust Perception Scale-HRI Schaefer (2013) were mentioned. Furthermore, in 8.8% of the reviewed articles, self-reports (e.g., interviews) were the primary methods used to evaluate users' trust perceptions of HRI. This classification did not include the literature reviews and meta-analysis articles by Alonso and Puente (2018); Yuan et al. (2021); Bach et al. (2024); Xu et al. (2023); Tian and Oviatt (2021); Schoeller et al. (2021); Akalin et al. (2023) - classified below as Non-Applicable.

### 3.2.1 Robot deployment domains

We analyzed the areas of applications examined by the selected articles. We observed that Service robots - robots that assist humans in professional or personal settings through application areas like social robots, entertainment, and domestic robots - are investigated in ten (35.3%) of the reviewed articles, as illustrated in Figure 5. Eight studies (17.6%) explored general aspects of HRI, providing broader perspectives that do not focus on a specific domain. Following, the context of industrial automation was examined in five (14.7%) of the studies, ranging from manufacturing to construction applications. Autonomous mobile robots (AMR) were investigated in four (11.8%) of the articles reviewed, exploring both aerial and terrestrial vehicles. Equally, four articles (11.8%) explored the domain of healthcare with robots implemented for rehabilitation purposes. Additionally, 8.8% delved into the emergent domain of AI-enabled systems.

### 3.3 What has been the focus of HRI researchers when investigating trust?

While classifying the study focus of the recent HRI studies in human-robot trust, we examined emerging research themes alongside the overarching domains investigated. The research primarily explores human-robot communication and trust-influencing factors, and user studies often emphasize user preferences, safety, and trustworthiness. As shown in Table 1 below, 23.5% of the reviewed studies focused on trust indicators and measurements. Some studies, such as those by Gulati et al. (2019); Bach et al. (2024), provide broader perspectives by addressing trust across the emergent AI-enabled systems, while others focus on specific applications, such as industrial robots in collaborative application areas examined by Pinto et al. (2022). In contrast, Schoeller et al. (2021) did not specify a domain or area of application but rather provided general perspectives on the theme of extended control.



Table 2: What have been the focus and application areas of the reviewed HRI studies

Study Focus	Application Area						Total	%
	General	Industrial	Service	Healthcare	AMR	AI-enabled systems		
<b>Trust indicators and measurements</b>								
Pinto et al. (2022)		x						
Jung et al. (2021)	x							
Yun et al. (2022)					x			
Bach et al. (2024)						x		
Gulati et al. (2019)						x		
Koren et al. (2022)				x				
Schoeller et al. (2021)	x							
Soh et al. (2018)			x					
<b>Total</b>							<b>8</b>	<b>23.5</b>
<b>Human-robot communication</b>								
Alonso et al. (2018)	x							
Lim et al. (2023)			x					
Huang et al. (2021)			x					
Tian et al. (2021)	x							
Ambdsdorf et al. (2022)						x		
Kraus et al. (2022)			x					
Pompe et al. (2022)			x					
<b>Total</b>							<b>7</b>	<b>20.6</b>
<b>User studies</b>								
Daniel et al. (2013)		x						
Yuan et al. (2021)				x				
Adami et al. (2022)		x						
<b>Total</b>							<b>3</b>	<b>8.8</b>
<b>Human-robot teaming</b>								
Schaefer et al. (2017)					x			
Zhu et al. (2023)					x			
<b>Total</b>							<b>2</b>	<b>5.9</b>
<b>Robot behaviors</b>								
Brule et al. (2014)			x					
<b>Total</b>							<b>1</b>	<b>2.9</b>
<b>Human-robot communication &amp; User studies</b>								
Babel et al.(2022)			x					
Alam et al. (2021)				x				
Gaudiello et al. (2016)			x					
<b>Total</b>							<b>3</b>	<b>8.8</b>
<b>User studies &amp; Trust indicators and measurements</b>								
Clement et al. (2022)					x			
Cameron et al. (2021)			x					
Miller et al. (2021)			x					
<b>Total</b>							<b>3</b>	<b>8.8</b>
<b>Human-robot communication &amp; Robot behaviors</b>								
Esterwood et al. (2023)		x						
Kraus et al. (2023)			x					
<b>Total</b>							<b>2</b>	<b>5.9</b>
<b>Human-robot communication &amp; Trust indicators and measurements</b>								
Xu et al. (2023)	x							
<b>Total</b>							<b>1</b>	<b>2.9</b>
<b>User studies &amp; Human-robot teaming</b>								
Sanders et al. (2018)		x						
<b>Total</b>							<b>1</b>	<b>2.9</b>
<b>Robot behaviors &amp; Trust indicators and measurements</b>								
Chen et al. (2022)				x				
<b>Total</b>							<b>1</b>	<b>2.9</b>
<b>Robot behaviors &amp; Perceived safety</b>								
Wang et al.(2024)			x					
<b>Total</b>							<b>1</b>	<b>2.9</b>
<b>Human-robot teaming &amp; Perceived safety</b>								
Akalin et al. (2023)	x							
<b>Total</b>							<b>1</b>	<b>2.9</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>							<b>34</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Another focus of interest explored was human-robot communication, representing 20.6% of the results. Alonso and Puente (2018) offered a meta-analysis on transparency in the framework of shared autonomy. And Tian and Oviatt (2021) investigated robot 'errors as marks of socio-affective competence. Moreover, Lim et al. (2023); Huang et al. (2021); Kraus et al. (2022); Pompe et al. (2022) focused on human-robot communication in the service robotics domain




Figure 5: The chart illustrates the variety of deployment contexts explored by the selected studies

observing applications such as robot barista Lim et al. (2023) and catering robot Kraus et al. (2022). Moreover, 8.8% of the HRI articles focused on user experiences and characteristics. In investigating industrial automation, Daniel et al. (2013) observed user preferences for industrial robots' interfaces, and Adami et al. (2022) focused on the application of construction robots. While Zhu et al. (2023) and Schaefer et al. (2017) focused on human-robot teaming in the context of Autonomous mobile robots (AMR). Brule et al. (2014) explored the implications of robot behavior styles in the context of service robots for domestic applications. Xu et al. (2023) explored human-robot communication and trust indicators and measurements while examining social cues for general HRI applications. Moreover, Sanders et al. (2018) focused on User studies & Human-robot teaming, analyzing users' reliance on robot outputs. Perceived safety was a focus area of two of the reviewed studies. In Wang et al. (2024) recent study, they explored Robot behaviors & Perceived safety in the service domain, investigating soft robots for social and entertainment applications. The study by Akalin et al. (2023) proposed a taxonomy focused on Human-robot teaming & Perceived safety.

### 3.4 What are the barriers and facilitators for fostering trustworthy HRI?

We adopted Hancock et al.'s Hancock et al. (2011a) classification to explore the factors influencing users' perceptions of trust in Human-Robot Interaction (HRI). In this classification, Hancock and colleagues identify trust-predicting factors related to human, robot, and environmental characteristics within HRI. Schaefer et al. (2017) noted that due to trust's dynamic nature, it is essential to understand the variety of potential design cues and functionalities that affect trust and, consequently, support the integration of autonomous robots in diverse scenarios. With that in mind and intrigued by possible mechanisms to calibrate appropriate levels of trust during interactions, we proposed a breakdown of the factors to clarify potential constraints (i.e., barriers) and enablers (i.e., facilitators) related to user needs, design, functionalities, and contextual elements that can be utilized to mediate trust in HRI. Presented in the diagrams below (Figures 6 and 7) are the key attributes, processes, and contextual considerations relevant to the design and operation of trustworthy HRI systems. Each category was developed from the topics emerging from our data extraction and organized by the first and second authors into trust facilitators and barriers. It follows the rationale of:

1. Robot-related factors as the attributes of robotic systems divided into Transparency, Communication, Performance, Behavior & Situated Awareness, and Appearance & Design;
2. Human-related factors, which refer to user characteristics and their experiences; and
3. Environmental-related factors representing contextual aspects that include Regulation, Safety, and Integration considerations.

Our analysis observed that factors influencing trust in automation can act as constraints and enablers. These factors are deeply interwoven with the context of the application, and they may vary depending on the specifics of the user, type of task, and type of robot. This highlights the inherent complexity in studying trust as a quality of the user experience within interaction with autonomous robots. For instance, anthropomorphism, one aspect of robot-related factors,

is considered a facilitator in service and healthcare domains where social interaction occurs and adaptive feedback mechanisms are expected Yuan et al. (2021); Lim et al. (2023). As well as human-like features, such as the robot's use of natural language Koren et al. (2022), and socio-affective competence and awareness of social rules Cameron et al. (2021) – often portraying application areas of social robots for companionship and rehabilitation Kraus et al. (2022); Pompe et al. (2022); Alam et al. (2021) - are referred as influencing the user perception of the robot's intelligence Tian and Oviatt (2021); Chen et al. (2022). Moreover, Ambsdorf et al. (2022) point out that gendering a robot's voice can affect the robot's perception in terms of stereotypes, preferences, and trust.




Figure 6: The diagram shows the elements of trust facilitators identified by the reviewers

On the other hand, studies investigating applications in the industrial and transportation sector shed light on facilitating trust through factors such as simple and clear user interface Daniel et al. (2013), intent display Yun and Yang (2022), and suitability to task Clement et al. (2022). Although complementary perspectives on implementing robots in these contexts have also highlighted aspects of social interaction, such as emotion awareness Esterwood and Robert (2023) and benevolence Pinto et al. (2022).

Aspects of a robot's performance and behavior are considered to facilitate trust across different domains of robotics. Besides system reliability Soh et al. (2018); Bach et al. (2024), the robot's motion fluency Babel et al. (2022); Brule et al. (2014) and the simplicity and consistency in robot's behavior Pinto et al. (2022); Wang et al. (2024) can influence users trust. Simplified motions have been shown to alleviate user anxiety, particularly among individuals with limited technology acceptance Wang et al. (2024). Moreover, the robot's ability to learn from mistakes (recognizing and recovering from them) might impact user engagement and interaction, potentially even turning this into a net positive for the interaction Cameron et al. (2021). Considering the human-related factors, Akalin et al. (2023) refer to psychological safety as an aspect of the user experience that might enable trust in human-robot teaming. Lim et al. (2023) and Miller et al. (2021) pointed out the benefit of tailoring interactions to the user preferences and needs in the service robot's domain. Similarly, Yun and Yang (2022) identifies tailored interaction as a trusted facilitator in the context of autonomous mobile robots (AMR).




Figure 7: The diagram shows the elements of trust facilitators identified by the reviewers

User characteristics such as familiarity with technology are noted by Wang et al. (2024); Gaudiello et al. (2016); Kraus et al. (2023) as a factor in enabling human trust in the robot over varied applications of service robots. Likewise, Adami et al. (2022) noted that it could enhance situational awareness and mental load during task execution alongside construction robots. Furthermore, authors indicate gender Clement et al. (2022); Ambsdorf et al. (2022); Koren et al. (2022); Schaefer et al. (2017), emotional state Alam et al. (2021); Kraus et al. (2023), need for control Wang et al. (2024); Schoeller et al. (2021); Gaudiello et al. (2016) and willingness to take risks Pinto et al. (2022); Clement et al. (2022) as trust influencing factors in HRI.

Among the environmental-related factors, authors mention that trust can be facilitated by regulatory means such as legal compliance Bach et al. (2024); Esterwood and Robert (2023) and ethical design Alonso and Puente (2018); Yun and Yang (2022). As well as by ensuring structural safety with precise emergency mechanisms Wang et al. (2024). Adami et al. (2022) indicated interdependency as a trusted facilitator for integrating industrial robots in construction applications, which is also pointed out as a trusted facilitator for integrating military systems Schaefer et al. (2017). Task complexity is noted across application areas such as autonomous aerial vehicles Zhu et al. (2023), COBOTS Sanders et al. (2018), and domestic robots Soh et al. (2018).

A close analysis of the barriers identified in the reviewed studies revealed that among the environment-related factors, Bach et al. (2024) emphasized the gap between regulations and practice as an aspect that hinders user trust in AI-enabled systems. Similarly, Alonso and Puente (2018) identified impunity as a barrier to trust and proposed equipping robots with ethical black box mechanisms to address this issue to enhance accountability. Furthermore, the authors motioned negative reputation as a trust barrier in autonomous technologies. Inserted in a socio-technical system, robots are constantly subject to society's evaluation. Taking the context of AMR, Yun and Yang (2022) emphasized that adverse reactions toward autonomous vehicles might be fueled by the media highlights regarding accidents involving these systems.

Considering Human-related factors, the reviewed articles mentioned trust barriers such as misaligned perceptions Pinto et al. (2022) and user emotions like anxiety Wang et al. (2024); Miller et al. (2021), fear and stress Clement et al.

(2022), and complacency Schoeller et al. (2021). Characteristics of user privacy orientation and perceived privacy are emphasized by the works of Gulati et al. (2019) and Ambsdorf et al. (2022).

Reflecting on robot-related factors, we noticed that studies tackling service and industrial domains indicated that in application areas demanding human-robot collaboration, lack of competency Brule et al. (2014); Cameron et al. (2021), hesitant behavior (i.e., trembling motions) Chen et al. (2022), and failed hardware or software performance Kraus et al. (2022); Soh et al. (2018); Akalin et al. (2023) negatively impact users' trust. Similarly, Tian and Oviatt (2021) highlighted that social norm violations harm the user's perception of a robot's socio-affective competence. Moreover, Koren et al. (2022) remarked that the severity of errors may also impact trust perception to a different degree.

## 4 Conclusions

This literature review was intended to provide insights into how human-robot trust is conceptualized and approached within recent HRI studies. The conclusions described here were crafted to aid designers and developers in identifying and reflecting on critical barriers and facilitators to trust in HRI. Our findings illustrate a shortfall in using accredited trust definitions in recent years. Approximately a third of the reviewed studies touch upon trust-related subject matters but do not explicitly define the concept. Trust is a phenomenon investigated across diverse disciplines, which, to our knowledge, brings such a tendency to use competing and often contradictory definitions, models, and frameworks. Bach et al. (2024) proposed that selecting the most appropriate trust definition concerning the context investigated is better than pursuing a unified trust definition or comparing the existing ones. Nonetheless, our analysis demonstrates that almost 30% of the revised articles do not present a definition of trust, which can be problematic as trust is a phenomenon interwoven and affected by other interaction factors. Moreover, our findings endorse that the conceptual gap in trust in technology literature persists and that this lack of conceptual clarity explains the sometimes-contradictory findings in the literature Gulati et al. (2019); Schaefer et al. (2017); Sousa et al. (2023); Hancock et al. (2011b); Hoff and Bashir (2015). As shown by our analysis, this might also reflect the choice of methods and instruments used to investigate trust in robots and other autonomous systems. The results demonstrated that most studies assess trust by custom questions – often a single likelihood assessment – where users rate the overall experience but do not reflect on the related constructs that impact their perceptions of trust. Although that can be argued as a strategy to overcome disruptions in the course of interaction, 23% of the studies demonstrated that combined measures can be deployed for a comprehensive assessment. Sanders et al. (2018) combined a wide range of methods, including demographics and personality questions, alongside the Negative Attitudes Toward Robots Scale (NARS) Nomura et al. (2006), the Interpersonal Trust Questionnaire (ITQ) Forbes and Roger (1999), and the Trust in Automated Systems Survey Jian et al. (2000). Pompe, et al. Pompe et al. (2022) also collected measures across different environments and contexts using validated scales, including the Godspeed Questionnaire Bartneck (2023), to understand the factors affecting user perception of robots.

Recent studies by Alam et al. (2021); Huang et al. (2021); Cameron et al. (2021); Esterwood and Robert (2023) have emphasized the importance of human-centric drive for autonomous technology development, underscoring the value of designing systems to communicate trustworthiness through optimized usability and increased transparency. Emerging themes include perceived safety and human-robot teaming in collaborative and service robots, with increased efforts to balance technical innovation with human-centric design principles for better observability and predictability of system behavior, as shown by Wang et al. (2024) and Alonso and Puente (2018).

As described in our analysis, user characteristics and perceptions of the interaction – including individual preferences and needs, how they take risks, psychological safety, control, emotional states, and familiarity with robots - are pivotal as trust facilitators and barriers in HRI. Hence, tailoring interactions to individual needs might influence trust and affect engagement and adoption rates, as commented by Miller et al. (2021); Kraus et al. (2023). Providing tailored information and explanations is also an essential aspect, as seen in the studies by Babel et al. (2022); Pinto et al. (2022); Bach et al. (2024). Furthermore, it was seen that negative experiences or unmet expectations can significantly affect usability and acceptance, emphasizing the need for engaging and intuitive HRI designs Yun and Yang (2022); Kraus et al. (2022).

As mechanisms to repair user trust, robots should exhibit accountable behaviors, offer adaptive feedback, and implement trust-repair strategies. As noted by recent studies with social robots for service and healthcare, physical appearance and human-like attributes also enhance trust and acceptance Cameron et al. (2021); Yuan et al. (2021); Jung et al. (2021). Furthermore, the broader context of interactions, including shared control and ethical considerations, influences user trust. Design must account for socio-ethical concerns, privacy, and security in shared environments Schaefer et al. (2017); Alonso and Puente (2018); Ambsdorf et al. (2022). On the other hand, robot errors, performance failures, and lack of competency might negatively affect trust and reliability in robot actions Tian and Oviatt (2021); Cameron et al. (2021); Kraus et al. (2023). Additionally, the studies by Yuan et al. (2021), Schoeller et al. (2021), and Zhu et al. (2023)

also indicate system design issues as barriers to trust in HRI, demonstrating that complex explanations, poor interaction flows, and unpredictable behavior contribute to user frustration and hinder user trust.

Our literature review highlights that the domain and area of application may impact how humans perceive robot trustworthiness. Distinct factors may prove more influential in specific use scenarios, suggesting a tailored approach to fostering trust in HRI is necessary. It is crucial to delineate when trust pertains to interaction attributes—such as task appropriateness and machine suitability—or when it reflects user preferences, which, as our findings suggest, significantly influence their perceptions of the information exchange and their assessment of robot capabilities.

Addressing technical and human-centered aspects while integrating AI and robotic systems into human environments has become increasingly demanding. This includes ensuring system security, efficiency, flexibility, and resilience, while also addressing human-related qualities such as trust, psychological safety, and ethical considerations Watson (2021); Shneiderman (2020); Nahavandi (2019); Schoeller et al. (2021). The foundational components of the European Commission’s framework for this symbiotic collaboration contemplate a shift in industrial priorities, ensuring human-centric and sustainable approaches for efficient industrial innovation. For society, this means a perspective for dealing with emerging societal trends and needs and a shift in industrial priorities, emphasizing human-centric and sustainable approaches alongside technological innovation. For research, this represents an opportunity to observe technology emergency and adoption phenomenon from a multidisciplinary approach.

Researchers, furthermore, highlighted the need for a distinct understanding of trust formation and calibration, calling attention to the different stages and dynamics of trust before and during the interaction with a robot, which is considered “to emerge in an attitude-formation process and then be calibrated along with a comparison of expectations with a robot’s behavior” Miller et al. (2021), p. 03. Prolonged interaction over time can redress issues of lack of trust - Wang et al. (2024); Koren et al. (2022); Kraus et al. (2023); Gaudiello et al. (2016) demonstrated the role of familiarity in increasing trust in extended interactions as users become more familiar with the robot’s behaviors and capabilities. Our review also contemplated the recommendations for collaboration between humans and robots presented by Schoeller et al. (2021). The authors explain that maximizing trust is not the recommended strategy for successfully integrating robots, as that will also involve addressing the implications of disuse (i.e., missed opportunity) and misuse (i.e., blind trust) of autonomous systems. Therefore, designers and developers must find a balanced level of trustworthiness conducive to effective and sustainable human-robot trust in practical, real-world contexts.

In this literature review, we argue that besides building systems that ensure trustworthiness by attending to requirements of safety and security, it is vital to address the non-functional properties of the interaction concerning the user perceptions of trust and the factors impacting such perception. We observed a divergence in the backgrounds forming the basis for various studies on trust in HRI. An open question remains whether the aspects investigated align consistently with the major factors we identified earlier and whether a synthesis of attributes from different categories could enhance machine adaptability. This synthesis could potentially preempt misuse, accommodate unforeseen changes, and even proactively engage with humans to augment decision-making capabilities and physical interactions per Industry 5.0 principles.

#### 4.1 Future considerations

Evolving collaboration between humans and machines requires enabling rapid and often high-stakes decision-making in the industrial, healthcare, government, and military sectors. It is pivotal to ensure that the industrial sector adheres to sustainability practices. Moreover, technology must adjust to align with human values, skills, and well-being, ultimately fostering effective and efficient collaboration between humans and machines. Providing users with relevant and reliable information about a system’s work can increase user trust. This may include explanations of algorithms, model performance, risk factors, contextual information, and actionable information. The amount of information should not be overwhelming and should be targeted to specific user groups. Another critical aspect is the resilience of systems to adapt to unexpected disruptions, such as pandemics or geopolitical challenges. We aimed to contribute to Industry 5.0 human-centric vision by providing a literature overview of the potential trust-influencing factors that can hinder or facilitate trustworthy human-machine collaborations. Identifying the factors that positively or negatively influence trust in autonomous robots is challenging. Furthermore, quantifying the impact of individual factors, or the cumulative effect of various combinations, proves to be a complex task. Due to the general and abstract nature of our current classification system, it is impractical to directly derive mechanisms for calibrating trust from it. However, this framework serves as a valuable tool for researchers. It provides a foundation for selecting and investigating specific aspects of trust in human-robot interaction (HRI), guiding future studies in this evolving field. These findings can inform future technical and design strategies, research, and initiatives that foster and maintain human trust in autonomous robots.

## 4.2 Limitations

This systematic literature review explored how trust has been conceptualized and studied as a pathway to facilitate the successful implementation of autonomous technologies. In doing so, we examined the primary definitions adopted by researchers and the methods used to assess trust in HRI systems. Moreover, our overview offers a classification of trust-related barriers and facilitators examined in recent HRI studies. Nonetheless, we must acknowledge limitations in our work, hence reporting on the overcoming strategies taken. In this study, we implemented a standardized approach for literature review and data extraction. This approach had the advantage of providing a framework for the reviews; however, it may have constrained the reviewers' appreciation of the data. To remedy this limitation, we held periodical meetings to align the activity's progress. Another potential issue refers to biases caused by the choices of search keywords, selection criteria, and researchers' interpretations of the selected literature. As commented in the previous sections, limitations may also result from the article's geographic location and the underrepresentation of certain regions in the poll of selected studies. We try to address these by detailing the article's affiliation. Furthermore, the quality of the reviewed studies could potentially limit the content extracted and analyzed in this review. As we undertake a multidisciplinary review of recent HRI studies through the lens of trust in technology, we foresee a potential thematic gap that could impact our research findings.

**Authors individual contributions Conceptualization, D.S. and S.S.; methodology, D.S. and S.S.; validation, all; formal analysis, D.S. and S.S.; writing—original draft preparation, D.S. and S.S.; writing—review and editing, all; supervision, S.S.; project administration, S.S and O.D; funding acquisition, O.D. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.**

**This research was supported by the project "Increasing the knowledge intensity of Ida-Viru entrepreneurship" co-funded by the European Union**

## References

- Abeywickrama, D. B., Bennaceur, A., Chance, G., Demir, Y., Kordoni, A., Levine, M., Moffat, L., Moreau, L., Mousavi, M. R., Nuseibeh, B., et al. (2023). On specifying for trustworthiness. *Communications of the ACM*, 67(1):98–109.
- Adami, P., Rodrigues, P. B., Woods, P. J., Becerik-Gerber, B., Soibelman, L., Copur-Gencturk, Y., and Lucas, G. (2022). Impact of vr-based training on human–robot interaction for remote operating construction robots. *Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering*, 36(3):04022006.
- Akalin, N., Kiselev, A., Kristoffersson, A., and Loutfi, A. (2023). A taxonomy of factors influencing perceived safety in human–robot interaction. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 15(12):1993–2004.
- Alam, S., Johnston, B., Vitale, J., and Williams, M.-A. (2021). Would you trust a robot with your mental health? the interaction of emotion and logic in persuasive backfiring. *2021 30th IEEE International Conference on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (RO-MAN)*, 00:384–391.
- Alonso, V. and Puente, P. d. I. (2018). System transparency in shared autonomy: A mini review. *Frontiers in Neurobotics*, 12:83.
- Ambsdorf, J., Munir, A., Wei, Y., Degkwitz, K., Harms, H. M., Stannek, S., Ahrens, K., Becker, D., Strahl, E., Weber, T., and Wermter, S. (2022). Explain yourself! effects of explanations in human-robot interaction. *2022 31st IEEE International Conference on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (RO-MAN)*, 00:393–400.
- Analysis, I. (2019). The collaborative robot market.
- Babel, F., Kraus, J., and Baumann, M. (2022). Findings from a qualitative field study with an autonomous robot in public: Exploration of user reactions and conflicts. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 14(7):1625–1655.
- Bach, T. A., Khan, A., Hallock, H., Beltrão, G., and Sousa, S. (2024). A systematic literature review of user trust in ai-enabled systems: An hci perspective. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, 40(5):1251–1266.
- Bartneck, C. (2023). Godspeed questionnaire series: Translations and usage. In *International handbook of behavioral health assessment*, pages 1–35. Springer.
- Brule, R. v. d., Dotsch, R., Bijlstra, G., Wigboldus, D. H. J., and Haselager, P. (2014). Do robot performance and behavioral style affect human trust? *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 6(4):519–531.
- Brynjolfsson, E. and McAfee, A. (2017). Artificial intelligence, for real. *Harvard business review*, 1:1–31.

- Cameron, D., Saille, S. d., Collins, E. C., Aitken, J. M., Cheung, H., Chua, A., Loh, E. J., and Law, J. (2021). The effect of social-cognitive recovery strategies on likability, capability and trust in social robots. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 114:106561.
- Chen, N., Zhai, Y., and Liu, X. (2022). The effects of robots’ altruistic behaviours and reciprocity on human-robot trust. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 14(8):1913–1931.
- Clement, P., Veledar, O., Könczöl, C., Danzinger, H., Posch, M., Eichberger, A., and Macher, G. (2022). Enhancing acceptance and trust in automated driving through virtual experience on a driving simulator. *Energies*, 15(3):781.
- Commission, E. (2021). Proposal for a regulation of the european parliament and of the council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (artificial intelligence act) and amending certain union legislative.
- Commission, E., for Research, D.-G., Innovation, Renda, A., Schwaag Serger, S., Tataj, D., Morlet, A., Isaksson, D., Martins, F., Mir Roca, M., Hidalgo, C., Huang, A., Dixson-Declève, S., Baland, P., Bria, F., Charveriat, C., Dunlop, K., and Giovannini, E. (2021). *Industry 5.0, a transformative vision for Europe – Governing systemic transformations towards a sustainable industry*. Publications Office of the European Union.
- Daniel, B., Thomessen, T., and Korondi, P. (2013). Simplified human-robot interaction: Modeling and evaluation. *Modeling, Identification and Control: A Norwegian Research Bulletin*, 34(4):199–211.
- De Visser, E. J., Peeters, M. M., Jung, M. F., Kohn, S., Shaw, T. H., Pak, R., and Neerinx, M. A. (2020). Towards a theory of longitudinal trust calibration in human–robot teams. *International journal of social robotics*, 12(2):459–478.
- Esterwood, C. and Robert, L. P. (2023). The theory of mind and human–robot trust repair. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1):9877.
- Forbes, A. and Roger, D. (1999). Stress, social support and fear of disclosure. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 4(2):165–179.
- Gaudiello, I., Zibetti, E., Lefort, S., Chetouani, M., and Ivaldi, S. (2016). Trust as indicator of robot functional and social acceptance. an experimental study on user conformation to icub answers. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 61:633–655.
- Gebru, B., Zeleke, L., Blankson, D., Nabil, M., Nateghi, S., Homaifar, A., and Tunstel, E. (2022a). A review on human–machine trust evaluation: Human-centric and machine-centric perspectives. *IEEE Transactions on Human-Machine Systems*.
- Gebru, B., Zeleke, L., Blankson, D., Nabil, M., Nateghi, S., Homaifar, A., and Tunstel, E. (2022b). A review on human–machine trust evaluation: Human-centric and machine-centric perspectives. *IEEE Transactions on Human-Machine Systems*, 52(5):952–962.
- Gihleb, R., Giuntella, O., Stella, L., and Wang, T. (2022). Industrial robots, workers’ safety, and health. *Labour economics*, 78:102205.
- Gulati, S., Sousa, S., and Lamas, D. (2019). Design, development and evaluation of a human-computer trust scale. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 38(10):1004–1015.
- Hancock, P. A., Billings, D. R., and Schaefer, K. E. (2011a). Can you trust your robot? *Ergonomics in Design*, 19(3):24–29.
- Hancock, P. A., Billings, D. R., Schaefer, K. E., Chen, J. Y., De Visser, E. J., and Parasuraman, R. (2011b). A meta-analysis of factors affecting trust in human-robot interaction. *Human factors*, 53(5):517–527.
- Hoff, K. A. and Bashir, M. (2015). Trust in automation: Integrating empirical evidence on factors that influence trust. *Human factors*, 57(3):407–434.
- Huang, H., Rau, P.-L. P., and Ma, L. (2021). Will you listen to a robot? effects of robot ability, task complexity, and risk on human decision-making. *Advanced Robotics*, 35(19):1156–1166.
- Jian, J.-Y., Bisantz, A. M., and Drury, C. G. (2000). Foundations for an empirically determined scale of trust in automated systems. *International journal of cognitive ergonomics*, 4(1):53–71.
- Jung, Y., Cho, E., and Kim, S. (2021). Users’ affective and cognitive responses to humanoid robots in different expertise service contexts. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 24(5):300–306.
- Koren, Y., Polak, R. F., and Levy-Tzedek, S. (2022). Extended interviews with stroke patients over a long-term rehabilitation using human–robot or human–computer interactions. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 14(8):1893–1911.
- Kraus, J. M., Merger, J., Gröner, F., and Pätz, J. (2023). “sorry” says the robot. *Companion of the 2023 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction*, page 436–441.



- Kraus, M., Wagner, N., Untereiner, N., and Minker, W. (2022). Including social expectations for trustworthy proactive human-robot dialogue. *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization*, page 23–33.
- Krijnen, A. (2007). The toyota way: 14 management principles from the world’s greatest manufacturer.
- Laux, J., Wachter, S., and Mittelstadt, B. (2024). Trustworthy artificial intelligence and the european union ai act: On the conflation of trustworthiness and acceptability of risk. *Regulation & Governance*, 18(1):3–32.
- Lee, J. D. and See, K. A. (2004). Trust in automation: Designing for appropriate reliance. *Human factors*, 46(1):50–80.
- Lim, M. Y., Robb, D. A., Wilson, B. W., and Hastie, H. (2023). Feeding the coffee habit: A longitudinal study of a robo-barista. *2023 32nd IEEE International Conference on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (RO-MAN)*, 00:1983–1990.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., and Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of management review*, 20(3):709–734.
- Miller, L., Kraus, J., Babel, F., and Baumann, M. (2021). More than a feeling—interrelation of trust layers in human-robot interaction and the role of user dispositions and state anxiety. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12:592711.
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., and Group\*, P. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Annals of internal medicine*, 151(4):264–269.
- Nahavandi, S. (2019). Industry 5.0—a human-centric solution. *Sustainability*, 11(16):4371.
- Naiseh, M., Bentley, C., and Ramchurn, S. D. (2022). Trustworthy autonomous systems (tas): Engaging tas experts in curriculum design. In *2022 IEEE global engineering education conference (EDUCON)*, pages 901–905. IEEE.
- Nomura, T., Suzuki, T., Kanda, T., and Kato, K. (2006). Measurement of negative attitudes toward robots. *Interaction Studies. Social Behaviour and Communication in Biological and Artificial Systems*, 7(3):437–454.
- on Artificial Intelligence, H.-L. E. G. (2019). Ethics guidelines for trustworthy ai.
- Pilacinski, A., Pinto, A., Oliveira, S., Araújo, E., Carvalho, C., Silva, P. A., Matias, R., Menezes, P., and Sousa, S. (2023). The robot eyes don’t have it. the presence of eyes on collaborative robots yields marginally higher user trust but lower performance. *Heliyon*, 9(8):e18164.
- Pinto, A., Sousa, S., Simões, A., and Santos, J. (2022). A trust scale for human-robot interaction: Translation, adaptation, and validation of a human computer trust scale. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2022(1):1–12.
- Pompe, B. L., Velner, E., and Truong, K. P. (2022). The robot that showed remorse: Repairing trust with a genuine apology. *2022 31st IEEE International Conference on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (RO-MAN)*, 00:260–265.
- Rogers, E. M., Singhal, A., and Quinlan, M. M. (2014). *Diffusion of innovations*. Routledge.
- Sanders, T., Kaplan, A., Koch, R., Schwartz, M., and Hancock, P. A. (2018). The relationship between trust and use choice in human-robot interaction. *Human Factors: The Journal of Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*, 61(4):614–626.
- Schaefer, K. E. (2013). *The perception and measurement of human-robot trust*. PhD thesis, College of Sciences.
- Schaefer, K. E., Straub, E. R., Chen, J. Y., Putney, J., and Evans, A. (2017). Communicating intent to develop shared situation awareness and engender trust in human-agent teams. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 46:26–39.
- Schoeller, F., Miller, M., Salomon, R., and Friston, K. J. (2021). Trust as extended control: Human-machine interactions as active inference. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, 15:669810. Offers psychology-bound support for needs of trust in hri Proposes a model of trust and signalises factors associated with the trust relationships.
- Shneiderman, B. (2020). Human-centered artificial intelligence: Reliable, safe & trustworthy. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 36(6):495–504.
- Soh, H., Xie, Y., Chen, M., and Hsu, D. (2018). Multi-task trust transfer for human-robot interaction. *arXiv*.
- Sousa, S., Cravino, J., and Martins, P. (2023). Challenges and trends in user trust discourse in ai popularity. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*, 7(2):13.
- Sousa, S., Lamas, D., Cravino, J., and Martins, P. (2024). Human-centered trustworthy framework: A human-computer interaction perspective. *Computer*, 57(3):46–58.
- Tian, L. and Oviatt, S. (2021). A taxonomy of social errors in human-robot interaction. *ACM Transactions on Human-Robot Interaction (THRI)*, 10(2):1–32.
- Towers-Clark, C. (2019). Keep the robot in the cage—how effective (and safe) are co-bots.

- Wang, Y., Wang, G., Ge, W., Duan, J., Chen, Z., and Wen, L. (2024). Perceived safety assessment of interactive motions in human–soft robot interaction. *Biomimetics*, 9(1):58.
- Watson (2021). EU’s Expert Group Releases Policy and Investment Recommendations for Trustworthy AI.
- Xu, K., Chen, M., and You, L. (2023). The hitchhiker’s guide to a credible and socially present robot: Two meta-analyses of the power of social cues in human–robot interaction. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 15(2):269–295.
- Yuan, F., Klavon, E., Liu, Z., Lopez, R. P., and Zhao, X. (2021). A systematic review of robotic rehabilitation for cognitive training. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, 8:605715.
- Yun, H. and Yang, J. H. (2022). Configuring user information by considering trust threatening factors associated with automated vehicles. *European Transport Research Review*, 14(1):9.
- Zhu, Y., Wang, T., Wang, C., Quan, W., and Tang, M. (2023). Complexity-driven trust dynamics in human–robot interactions: Insights from ai-enhanced collaborative engagements. *Applied Sciences*, 13(24):12989.