



Between Trust and Identity: Form, Function, and Presentation

Downloaded from: <https://research.chalmers.se>, 2025-10-17 07:44 UTC

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Lee, M., McMillan, D., Torre, I. et al (2024). Between Trust and Identity: Form, Function, and Presentation. Proceedings of the 6th Conference on ACM Conversational User Interfaces, CUI 2024. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3640794.3669999>

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.



Between Trust and Identity: Form, Function, and Presentation

Minha Lee
m.lee@tue.nl
Eindhoven University of Technology
Eindhoven, the Netherlands

Donald McMillan
donald.mcmillan@dsv.su.se
Stockholm University
Stockholm, Sweden

Ilaria Torre
ilariat@chalmers.se
Chalmers University of Technology
Goteborg, Sweden

Joel E. Fischer
joel.fischer@nottingham.ac.uk
University of Nottingham
Nottingham, United Kingdom

Yvon Ruitenburg
m.lee@tue.nl
Eindhoven University of Technology
Eindhoven, the Netherlands

ABSTRACT

As conversational user interfaces (CUIs) evolve, trust and identity challenges become increasingly pronounced. The identities of CUIs are multifaceted, incorporating individual names like Siri or Alexa, the companies behind them like Apple or Amazon, and various attributes, e.g., race, gender, and class, as perceived by people and/or as designed into these CUIs. Identity is also encoded in the embodiment, be it as an abstract animation on a watch, an avatar in virtual reality, or a humanoid robot, as well as in the backstory designers give these agents. But, if identity is fragmented, e.g., across multiple physical forms, if and how users can establish trust becomes difficult to address. Drawing from diverse fields including ethics, design, and engineering, we explore the hurdles posed by ambiguous identities. A dynamic embodiment of a CUI across multiple devices presents technical complexities, and importantly, it raises ethical dilemmas surrounding trust. In this workshop, we aim to synthesize research goals and methods to further probe the intricacies of identity fragmentation and its implications for user trust in CUIs. To pursue a collaborative debate, we formulate that trust and identity suffer from the chicken or egg dilemma; should issues surrounding identity be resolved first before trust can even be conceived to be possible between humans and CUIs? Can users truly trust a CUI that lacks a consistent and transparent identity, and would that trust be different for different embodiments and platforms? We consider that trust itself perhaps should be questioned given that the issues surrounding identity are not resolved. We additionally discuss whether a uniform identity across all interfaces is conducive to user trust, or whether the adoption of distinct personas on disparate platforms is more effective in engendering user trust.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Human-centered computing** → **HCI theory, concepts and models.**

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

CUI '24, July 08–10, 2024, Luxembourg, Luxembourg

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0511-3/24/07

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3640794.3669999>

KEYWORDS

Artificial identity, multi-embodiment, embodiment, migratable AI

ACM Reference Format:

Minha Lee, Donald McMillan, Iliaria Torre, Joel E. Fischer, and Yvon Ruitenburg. 2024. Between Trust and Identity: Form, Function, and Presentation. In *ACM Conversational User Interfaces 2024 (CUI '24)*, July 08–10, 2024, Luxembourg, Luxembourg. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 4 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3640794.3669999>

1 BACKGROUND

We aim to deepen our understanding of the intricate interplay between identity formation and fragmentation, trust dynamics, and ethical considerations. Our workshop focuses on the tension between trust and the identity of who or what we trust. This can be the diverse groups of people who use CUIs, CUIs themselves, in whatever form(s), and organizations and companies behind CUIs. We build on this year's theme of the conference, i.e., Trustworthy Conversational Agents, and introduce identity as a crucial consideration. At HRI (ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction), we have led three workshops on identity [9–11] exploring the challenges surrounding this topic as noted as ongoing and future research agendas [4, 19]. These issues are also relevant for the CUI community. The prior discussion on artificial identity or robo-identity at HRI were across disciplines, with engineers, computer scientists, designers, and philosophers as organizers and attendees of the robo-identity workshop series. We considered the possibility of multiple embodiments, such as how the physical form is not a limitation for artificially created identities. Beyond this, groups of robots, e.g., swarms, can also form what is called *group identity observables* like sharing the same voice [3]. Identity can also be conveyed via speech and voice; synthetic voice is one example that demonstrated the difficulty in distinguishing between human or artificial identity [17] and voice design influences people's likelihood of trusting an agent [30]. Recent discussions center on identity fluidity in a shared world between humans and machines, such as how both human and non-human identities continuously evolve [9].

1.1 Identity and CUIs

For the CUI community, the inquiry into “who” these interfaces represent also is relevant, yet has not been of focus. CUIs do not rely on (but can have) tangible bodies of robots, in which there is a

spectrum of forms, ranging from standardized humanoid avatars to abstract digital entities such as Siri or Jibo. How diverse identities that may or may not rely on physical bodies could seamlessly traverse across different technological platforms becomes compelling to explore.

Already human identity has been discussed at length in philosophy [13, 24] and psychology [29], with normative assumptions like the lack of consistent human identity being related to psychiatric disorders such as dissociative identity disorder [31]. Technology, on the other hand, is not seen as “disordered” if its identity is distributed across multiple embodiments, e.g., Siri on a smartwatch and the iPhone. Numerous challenges persist, including optimal contexts for identity migration and the nuanced perception of migrating artificial identities across diverse user contexts [6, 14, 16, 25]. Further, in designing identity-related traits, it is questionable whether or not human-like features should be purposefully put into robots, such as race [34], especially considering that robots can serve as proxies for human identity[2].

1.2 Trust

Trust is the disposition to rely on another entity to deliver an expected action; it is assessed by risks related to the action and judging if the entity at hand is worthy of trust [23]. Hence, an agent that can transparently let humans know what action it is taking and why it is taking that action is seen as trustworthy, especially in collaboration with humans [1, 12, 18, 20]. Thus, CUIs can make use of various modalities, be it visuals, text, or voice, to provide explanations [5, 8, 15, 32]. Yet, tension ensues when people over- or under-trust CUIs, be it over-relying on them when people should rely on themselves or other humans, or doubting agents when they should trust the information the agents share [26, 28]. In this, people’s states (emotional and cognitive) are involved in trust within an interaction [21, 22], but trust has also been called a taken-for-granted given that is required for any social exchange to happen in the first place [7, 33]. When trust is there socially, it is rarely noticed, yet when it is gone, its absence is glaringly obvious.

Taken together, CUIs can have physical, virtual, augmented, and multiple bodies, as well as diverse modalities (like changing voice) [4]. Hence, an agent’s identity in all its possibilities challenges if and how we should trust it. Thus, during the workshop, we look into explicitly fostering constructive disagreements and shared debates on trust and identity. The topics covered by attendees include positions on whether or not identity issues need to be resolved before trust in CUIs is possible, compared to positions on how trust can stand alone on its own conceptually despite the issues regarding identity looming large.

2 ORGANIZERS

Minha Lee is an assistant professor at the Eindhoven University of Technology in the Department of Industrial Design, with a background in philosophy, digital arts, and HCI. Her research concerns morally relevant interactions with various agents like robots or chatbots. Her recent work explores how we can explore our moral self-identity through conversations with digital entities, e.g., via acting compassionately towards a chatbot.

Donald McMillan is an Assistant Professor at Stockholm University’s Department of Computer and Systems Sciences. His research lies at the juncture between CUI, HCI and computer science in investigating how observational methods that provide detailed perspectives on human communication can be applied to improve sensing and interaction with novel devices.

Illaria Torre is an Assistant Professor at Chalmers University of Technology, Division of Interaction Design and Software Engineering. Her research focuses on Human-Robot Interaction, looking particularly at developing effective and appropriate communication methods for intentional and unintentional human-robot interactions.

Joel Fischer is a Professor of Human-Computer Interaction at the University of Nottingham, UK. His research takes a human-centered view on AI-infused technologies to understand and support human activities and reasoning. He has co-organized international workshops and published widely on related topics spanning robotics and conversational systems, frequently drawing on perspectives from Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis.

Yvon Ruitenburg is a PhD candidate at the Department of Industrial Design at Eindhoven University of Technology with a background in Industrial Design. Her research delves into how conversational technologies can help people with dementia and those around them communicate their perceptions of reality.

3 WORKSHOP PLANNING AND OUTCOMES

The organizers have a wealth of experience in running successful workshops on a number of topics and at a range of conferences, e.g., CHI, HRI, CUI, and more. Drawing on this collective experience, we aim to run a **half-day** workshop that focuses on *sparkling ideas* and *developing connections* that not only results in continued conversations at the main CUI conference, but also result in long-lasting, fruitful research collaborations.

3.1 Target Audience & Recruitment

The primary audience of the workshop includes researchers in the fields of HRI, CUI, and RoboPhilosophy. Beyond those working in the CUI space, we hope to involve researchers in design research, psychology, and other related fields. By doing so, we hope to bring various disciplines together in discussions during the workshop on the overlapping interests in identity and trust. We also aim to broaden the topics covered at the CUI conference, to make long-lasting and meaningful connections between our growing community members. The workshop is open and inclusive to all participants from varying fields.

The call for participation for this workshop is on our dedicated website and spread via mailing lists covering multiple disciplines, and social media (e.g., LinkedIn, Twitter). Additionally, relevant researchers within CUI, IMX, HRI, CHI and the social sciences are individually contacted and encouraged to submit a paper and/or participate in the workshop. Prospective participants are invited to submit 2 to 4 (maximum of 6 including references) page extended abstracts on research related to the topics described above.

We explicitly encourage position papers, papers describing works in progress, preliminary results to discuss with the community, methodology proposals, and lessons learned when designing CUIs to converse with end users. Submissions that address inclusivity in relation to trust and identity in conversational interfaces are encouraged.

Hence, we are mobilizing for a broader awareness of identity as a topic that may concern many groups of researchers. At the end of our workshop, we plan to have shared research questions and guiding thoughts as starting seeds of collaboration, e.g., for more elaborate position papers with co-authors from different disciplines. Currently, many researchers in RoboPhilosophy, HRI, design, and engineering implicitly deal with the problem of identity and multi-embodiment, and our workshop will bring the topic of identity to a shared foreground at CUI.

3.2 Accessibility & Inclusion

Starting from the diverse, and gender-balanced, organizing team, this workshop aims to be an inclusive, safe, and supportive space for all participants to feel able to contribute. Submissions will be juried with an eye to the overall diversity of the participant group. The guided debates and discussions in small groups as outlined above, as opposed to plenary discussions, provide more support and opportunity for participation. Organizers will monitor and participate in these discussions, ensuring that quieter participants are encouraged to engage with the topic and that more extroverted are encouraged to cede the floor and solicit others' opinions.

3.3 Schedule of activities planned

During this **Half-Day Workshop**, we plan to explore divergent and convergent themes of trust and identity of CUIs with the following activities, formulated as debates [27].

- 1:00–1:15 - Introduction and agenda - 15 min
- 1:15–1:45 - Paired debates part one with organizers going first:
The chicken or the egg dilemma on trust and identity
- 1:45–2:45 - Paired debates part two with attendees:
The chicken or the egg dilemma on trust and identity
Coffee Break
- 3:00–3:30 - Nordic Perspectives on Algorithm Systems
- 3:30–4:30 - Conver-Stations Discussion
- 4:30–5:00 - Reporting back and Future steps
- 7:30-late - Informal Workshop Dinner

Our goal is to bridge gaps between relevant disciplines in order for identity and trust as intertwined topics to be treated in multi-faceted ways. Since we expect early ideas on identity rather than fully developed works, we ask authors to present their position (regarding what comes first on trust vs. identity as the chicken or egg problem) in PechaKucha style¹. Specifically, we request 10 slides with a maximum of 20 seconds per slide (though this is a recommendation rather than a strict requirement). The presenters then can do a rebuttal. As shown in the schedule, the organizers first do a debate before opening it up to attendees, who will be paired

¹<https://www.pechakucha.com/>

based on their position papers. The hope is in sharing authors' debates on identity, we can inspire co-attendees in an easily accessible manner. Then, we will have *synthesis* oriented discussions with the generative Nordic Perspectives on Algorithm Systems Exercise exercise² and through rotating small-group discussions as part of the Conver-Stations exercise.

The Nordic Perspectives card deck are used to generate scenarios of research into changing trust and identity. In small groups, participants use the Settings and Metaphors sets to develop simple interaction scenarios that exemplify interactions on this topic. The groups will then combine, sharing two scenarios and working together to add two research plans using the Method and Caveat decks. This encourages generative discussion on the range of challenges involved in the development and research of CUIs with respect to the trust in their identities.

The Conver-Stations exercise involves participants moving between tables, with 10 minutes for discussion at each. These stations are pre-populated with topics taken from the submitted position papers of the participants. These large sheets of paper also include two to three related questions that each group should answer in one sentence during their discussion before moving on, reading the previous answers on their next station, and starting a new discussion on a new topic.

These two generative and discussion-based activities are used to ensure that participants are able to talk together during the workshop. The final session on reporting back and future steps focuses on sharing connections that have been made, and potential future work – from follow-up discussions, to papers, to research funding proposals – that they want to continue with after the workshop.

3.4 Post-Workshop Dissemination

We aim to record the main innovative ideas and talking points during the workshop and interested participants are invited to join to encourage future collaboration on related articles or funding proposals. We follow up the workshop with a journal special issue for extended versions of selected workshop papers and new contributions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This workshop is partially supported by the Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research project FACT (GMT14-0082), KTH Digital Futures.

REFERENCES

- [1] Sule Anjomshoae, Amro Najjar, Davide Calvaresi, and Kary Främling. 2019. Explainable agents and robots: Results from a systematic literature review. In *18th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2019)*, Montreal, Canada, May 13–17, 2019. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 1078–1088.
- [2] Franziska Babel, Philipp Hock, Katie Winkle, Ilaria Torre, and Tom Ziemke. 2024. The Human Behind the Robot: Rethinking the Low Social Status of Service Robots. In *Companion of the 2024 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (Boulder, CO, USA) (HRI '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3610978.3640763>
- [3] Alexandra Bejarano and Tom Williams. 2022. Understanding and Influencing User Mental Models of Robot Identity. In *2022 17th ACM/IEEE International Conference*

²<https://doi.org/10.17045/sthlmuni.21989093>

- on *Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)*. 1149–1151. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HRI53351.2022.9889473>
- [4] Karla Bransky, Penny Sweetser, Sabrina Caldwell, and Kingsley Fletcher. 2024. Mind-Body-Identity: A Scoping Review of Multi-Embodiment. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction* (Boulder, CO, USA) (*HRI '24*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 65–75. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3610977.3634922>
 - [5] Ewart J de Visser, Frank Krueger, Patrick McKnight, Steven Scheid, Melissa Smith, Stephanie Chalk, and Raja Parasuraman. 2012. The world is not enough: Trust in cognitive agents. In *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting* (Los Angeles, CA, USA) (*HFES '12, Vol. 56*). Sage Publications, 263–267.
 - [6] B.R. Duffy, G.M.P. O'Hare, A.N. Martin, J.F. Bradley, and B. Schon. 2003. Agent chameleons: Agent minds and bodies. In *Proceedings 11th IEEE International Workshop on Program Comprehension*. 118–125. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CASA.2003.1199312>
 - [7] Harold Garfinkel. 1963. A Conception and experiments with “Trust” as a condition of stable concerted actions. In *Motivation and Social Interaction: Cognitive Determinants*, Ed. O. J. Harvey (Ed.). 187–238.
 - [8] Jiun-Yin Jian, Ann M Bisantz, and Colin G Drury. 2000. Foundations for an empirically determined scale of trust in automated systems. *International Journal of Cognitive Ergonomics* 4, 1 (2000), 53–71.
 - [9] Rucha Khot, Minha Lee, Alexandra Bejarano, Lux Miranda, Gisela Reyes-Cruz, Joel E. Fischer, and Dimosthenis Kontogiorgos. 2024. Robo-Identity: Designing for Identity in the Shared World. In *Companion of the 2024 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction* (Boulder, CO, USA) (*HRI '24*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1326–1328. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3610978.3638166>
 - [10] Guy Laban, Sébastien Le Maguer, Minha Lee, Dimosthenis Kontogiorgos, Samantha Reig, Ilaria Torre, Ravi Tejwani, Matthew J. Dennis, and Andre Pereira. 2022. Robo-Identity: Exploring Artificial Identity and Emotion via Speech Interactions. In *2022 17th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)*. 1265–1268. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HRI53351.2022.9889649>
 - [11] Minha Lee, Dimosthenis Kontogiorgos, Ilaria Torre, Michal Luria, Ravi Tejwani, Matthew J. Dennis, and Andre Pereira. 2021. Robo-Identity: Exploring Artificial Identity and Multi-Embodiment. In *Companion of the 2021 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction* (Boulder, CO, USA) (*HRI '21 Companion*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 718–720. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3434074.3444878>
 - [12] Brian Y. Lim, Anind K. Dey, and Daniel Avrahami. 2009. Why and Why Not Explanations Improve the Intelligibility of Context-Aware Intelligent Systems. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Boston, MA, USA) (*CHI '09*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2119–2128. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1518701.1519023>
 - [13] John Locke. 1979 [1690]. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1 ed.). Oxford University Press. Edited by Peter H. Nidditch.
 - [14] Michal Luria, Samantha Reig, Xiang Zhi Tan, Aaron Steinfeld, Jodi Forlizzi, and John Zimmerman. 2019. Re-Embodiment and Co-Embodiment: Exploration of social presence for robots and conversational agents. In *Proceedings of the 2019 on Designing Interactive Systems Conference*. ACM, 633–644.
 - [15] Joseph B. Lyons, Garrett G. Sadler, Kolina Koltai, Henri Battiste, Nhut T. Ho, Lauren C. Hoffmann, David Smith, Walter Johnson, and Robert Shively. 2017. Shaping trust through transparent design: Theoretical and experimental guidelines. In *Advances in Human Factors in Robots and Unmanned Systems*. Springer, 127–136.
 - [16] Alan Martin, Gregory M. P. O'Hare, Brian R. Duffy, Bianca Schön, and John F. Bradley. 2005. Maintaining the Identity of Dynamically Embodied Agents. In *Intelligent Virtual Agents*, Themis Panayiotopoulos, Jonathan Gratch, Ruth Aylett, Daniel Ballin, Patrick Olivier, and Thomas Rist (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 454–465.
 - [17] Conor McGinn and Ilaria Torre. 2019. Can you Tell the Robot by the Voice? An Exploratory Study on the Role of Voice in the Perception of Robots. In *2019 14th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)*. 211–221. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HRI.2019.8673305>
 - [18] Joseph E. Mercado, Michael A. Rupp, Jessie Y. C. Chen, Michael J. Barnes, Daniel Barber, and Katelyn Procci. 2016. Intelligent Agent Transparency in Human-Agent Teaming for Multi-UxV Management. *Human Factors* 58, 3 (2016), 401–415. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018720815621206> PMID: 26867556. arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018720815621206>
 - [19] Lux Miranda, Ginevra Castellano, and Katie Winkle. 2023. Examining the State of Robot Identity. In *Companion of the 2023 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction* (Stockholm, Sweden) (*HRI '23*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 658–662. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3568294.3580168>
 - [20] Bonnie M. Muir. 1987. Trust between humans and machines, and the design of decision aids. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies* 27, 5-6 (1987), 527–539.
 - [21] Philip J. Nickel. 2013. Trust in technological systems. In *Ed. de Vries, Marc J., Hansson, Sven Ove and Meijers, Anthonie W.M.* (Springer) (*Norms in technology*), vol 9. Springer, Dordrecht, 223–237. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5243-6_14
 - [22] Philip J. Nickel. 2015. Design for the value of trust. In *Handbook of ethics, values, and technological design: Sources, theory, values and application domains*, Jeroen van den Hoven, Pieter E. Vermaas, and Ibo van de Poel (Eds.). Springer, Germany, 551–567. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6970-0_21
 - [23] Philip J. Nickel and Krist Vaesen. 2012. Risk and trust. In *Handbook of risk theory: Epistemology, decision theory, ethics and social implications of risk*, Sabine Roeser, Rafaela Hillerbrand, Per Sandin, and Martin Peterson (Eds.). Springer, Germany, 857–876. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5243-6_14
 - [24] Derek Parfit. 1984. *Reasons and Persons*. Oxford University Press.
 - [25] Samantha Reig, Michal Luria, Janet Z. Wang, Danielle Olman, Elizabeth Jeanne Carter, Aaron Steinfeld, Jodi Forlizzi, and John Zimmerman. 2020. Not Some Random Agent: Multi-person Interaction with a Personalizing Service Robot. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction* (Cambridge, United Kingdom) (*HRI '20*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 289–297. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3319502.3374795>
 - [26] James Schaffer, John O'Donovan, James Michaelis, Adrienne Raglin, and Tobias Höllerer. 2019. I Can Do Better than Your AI: Expertise and Explanations. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces* (Marina del Rey, California) (*IUI '19*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 240–251. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3301275.3302308>
 - [27] Ben Shneiderman and Pattie Maes. 1997. Direct manipulation vs. interface agents. *Interactions* 4, 6 (Nov 1997), 42–61. <https://doi.org/10.1145/267505.267514>
 - [28] Linda J Skitka, Kathleen L Mosier, and Mark Burdick. 1999. Does automation bias decision-making? *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 51, 5 (1999), 991–1006.
 - [29] Henri Tajfel and John C. Turner. 2004. The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In *Political Psychology* (1 ed.), Jim Sidanius John T. Jost (Ed.). Psychology Press, 276–293. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203505984>
 - [30] Ilaria Torre, Jeremy Goslin, Laurence White, and Debora Zanatto. 2018. Trust in artificial voices: A “congruency effect” of first impressions and behavioural experience. In *Proceedings of the Technology, Mind, and Society*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3183654.3183691>
 - [31] Onno Van der Hart, Ellert R.S. Nijenhuis, and Kathy Steele. 2006. *The Haunted Self: Structural Dissociation and the Treatment of Chronic Traumatization*. W.W. Norton & Company.
 - [32] Ning Wang, David V. Pynadath, and Susan G. Hill. 2016. Trust calibration within a human-robot team: Comparing automatically generated explanations. In *2016 11th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)*. 109–116. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HRI.2016.7451741>
 - [33] Rod Watson. 2009. Constitutive practices and Garfinkel’s notion of trust: Revisited. *Journal of Classical Sociology* 9, 4 (2009), 475–499.
 - [34] Tom Williams. 2023. The Eye of the Robot Beholder: Ethical Risks of Representation, Recognition, and Reasoning over Identity Characteristics in Human-Robot Interaction. In *Companion of the 2023 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction* (Stockholm, Sweden) (*HRI '23*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3568294.3580031>