

---

# DYNAMIC TRUST CALIBRATION USING CONTEXTUAL BANDITS

---

**Bruno M. Henrique**  
Thayer School of Engineering  
Dartmouth College  
Hanover, NH

bruno.miranda.henrique.th@dartmouth.edu

**Eugene Santos Jr.**  
Thayer School of Engineering  
Dartmouth College  
Hanover, NH

eugene.santos.jr@dartmouth.edu

September 30, 2025

## ABSTRACT

Trust calibration between humans and Artificial Intelligence (AI) is crucial for optimal decision-making in collaborative settings. Excessive trust can lead users to accept AI-generated outputs without question, overlooking critical flaws, while insufficient trust may result in disregarding valuable insights from AI systems, hindering performance. Despite its importance, there is currently no definitive and objective method for measuring trust calibration between humans and AI. Current approaches lack standardization and consistent metrics that can be broadly applied across various contexts, and they don't distinguish between the formation of opinions and subsequent human decisions. In this work, we propose a novel and objective method for dynamic trust calibration, introducing a standardized trust calibration measure and an indicator. By utilizing Contextual Bandits—an adaptive algorithm that incorporates context into decision-making—our indicator dynamically assesses when to trust AI contributions based on learned contextual information. We evaluate this indicator across three diverse datasets, demonstrating that effective trust calibration results in significant improvements in decision-making performance, as evidenced by 10 to 38% increase in reward metrics. These findings not only enhance theoretical understanding but also provide practical guidance for developing more trustworthy AI systems supporting decisions in critical domains, for example, disease diagnoses and criminal justice.

## 1 Introduction

Trust calibration can be defined as the process of achieving appropriate expectations regarding the capabilities of agents, whether humans or Artificial Intelligence (AI) autonomous systems (de Visser et al., 2014; Glikson and Woolley, 2020; Naiseh et al., 2023; Ma et al., 2023). With this definition in mind, incorrect levels of trust can lead to overreliance on flawed agents or, conversely, result in the dismissal of an agent with superior capabilities (Dzindolet et al., 2003). Hence, in the context of human-AI interaction for decision-making, trust calibration is a necessary condition for the most appropriate decision with respect to a given goal.

Previous research has recognized the importance of trust calibration between humans and AI. For instance, de Visser et al. (2019) state that understanding the trust calibration process will lead to refinements in task division and coordination between team members. Also, there may be situations in which decisions should be handled entirely by humans if the AI lacks sufficient accuracy to be trusted. Hence, trust calibration can help identify decisions that should be delegated to AI or be scrutinized only by the human generalization capacity. Nevertheless, correct trust calibration is a challenge, particularly for individuals with limited domain knowledge, who have the burden of gauging the trustworthiness of the AI system while estimating their own likelihood of being correct (Ma et al., 2023).

An objective method to dynamically calibrate trust between humans and AI would provide many advantages to a Human-Machine Team (HMT). For example, it would alleviate the cognitive burden of assessing unknown AI properties, such as the accuracy on a specific situation. Moreover, it would establish guardrails against potentially harmful agentic systems and still indicate situations when to adopt their opinions. Similarly, trust calibration works in the other way too, for example, indicating situations in which the human should make decisions with no AI opinion.

Despite the necessity of trust calibration for optimal HMT performance, there is still no definite method for achieving it. Previous attempts include displaying uncertainty information alongside AI recommendations (de Visser et al., 2014), visual explanations (Karran et al., 2022), soliciting human input (Gomez, Unberath, and Huang, 2023) and outcome feedback (Ahn et al., 2024). However, as concluded by Henrique and Santos (2024), AI literature still lacks models and measures of trust calibration, especially algorithms and general implementation frameworks. In this context, this paper presents a dynamic trust calibration framework, including a calibration measurement definition and a dynamic indicator leading to optimal calibration. The framework is designed to be agnostic of the internal workings of AI technology, broadening its applicability to any decision-support system.

Our proposal for a dynamic trust calibration indicator is grounded on multi-armed Contextual Bandits (CB) algorithms. Like vanilla multi-armed bandits, CB also present multiple arms/choices, but at each trial the context information is relevant for the decision. In this case, the agent making a decision does not change the state, as it happens in a typical Reinforcement Learning (RL) scenario, but the context changes. As such, CB algorithms fit perfectly the framework of an external trust calibration process (the bandit), with the arms representing the indications to trust or distrust agents' opinions based on context variables, but with no changes in state. Despite the diverse applications of CB (Li et al., 2010), we are unaware of any previous research applying CB to implement dynamic trust calibration.

It is worth emphasizing that our proposal is a conceptual advance, providing an objective, performance-based measure of trust calibration that can be computed post-hoc based on decisions and their outcomes. With that, it is not our goal to uncover or test human cognitive or affective trust states, but to quantify the performance improvement with calibrated trust. However, we acknowledge that embedding the indicator into real-time decision-support tools and evaluating its impact on actual user behavior and trust remains an important future research direction.

We evaluate our trust calibration indicator using empirical data obtained from recent studies in decision-making with AI assistance. The data cover diverse domains and include multiple treatments, demonstrating the robustness of the proposed framework. Specifically, we compare the rewards accumulated by the actions informed by the trust calibration indicator with the total rewards obtained in the original studies. In all instances, the dynamic trust calibration indicator yields higher rewards, indicating improved trust calibration that enhances performance.

## 2 Related work

Trust in AI research originates from foundational studies on human trust in automation systems (Henrique and Santos, 2024). Many authors conducted experiments on human reliance on automation (Dzindolet et al., 2003; de Visser et al., 2016) and various theoretical trust models were proposed (Lee and See, 2004; de Visser et al., 2014; Hoff and Bashir, 2014). Other papers sought the factors that influence human trust in autonomous systems (Hancock et al., 2011; Culley and Madhavan, 2013). More recently, literature has shifted attention to explicitly studying measures of trust between humans and AI (Naiseh et al., 2023; Li, Lu, and Yin, 2023; Leichtmann et al., 2023; Gomez, Unberath, and Huang, 2023). However, as concluded by Henrique and Santos (2024), the literature still lacks objective methods to calibrate trust between humans and AI.

Some attempts to model trust calibration between humans and AI rely on subjective actions. For example, the theoretical model of de Visser et al. (2019) proposes to calibrate trust with actions such as apologies, denials, future promises, and warnings aimed at repairing damaged trust or reduce overtrust. Similar actions are explored in experiments by Pareek, Velloso, and Goncalves (2024), who demonstrate their influence on trust dynamics. However, these actions are inherently subjective and not directly translated by AI recommender systems, which often function as "black-boxes".

Recent studies on human-AI trust report experiments measuring reliance as a proxy to trust (Yu et al., 2017). For instance, Lu and Yin (2021) study human reliance on AI under conditions of limited accuracy information, revealing that the level of agreement between humans and AI is very influential on reliance. Also measuring reliance as proxy to trust, Zhang, Liao, and Bellamy (2020) show that displaying the AI's confidence at each task can improve trust calibration, but they did not register improvements in performance. Confidence is also examined by Ma et al. (2024), who concluded that correct human confidence calibration is necessary for appropriate reliance on AI and, consequently, improved performance. However, correct confidence calibration can be as formidable a challenge as trust calibration.

Reliance on AI recommendations is often viewed as trust behavior in the literature. For instance, Li, Lu, and Yin (2023) model human trust levels as a Hidden Markov Model (HMM), using the hidden states as inputs to a likelihood function that predicts the human trust behavior of relying on AI recommendations. By their turn, Wang, Lu, and Yin (2022) model the human trust behavior based on a reliance utility function. Their experiments suggest that trust calibration is influenced by the stakes of the decision. Also experimenting with trust behavior with respect to AI recommendations, Noti and Chen (2023) achieve improved team performance by determining when AI opinions should be presented or

omitted to human decision-makers. However, this approach requires access to the recommender system to include an optimization process responsible to advise when to show AI opinions.

Regardless of the trust calibration approach proposed, the usual objective of empirical human-AI trust research is to increase the HMT performance on a given task (Ahn et al., 2024; Salimzadeh, He, and Gadiraju, 2024; Ma et al., 2024; Gomez, Unberath, and Huang, 2023; Ma et al., 2023). As such, it is expected that, when teamed together, humans and AI will perform better than acting each by themselves in isolation. To this end, trust is necessary for team members to rely on the expertise of each other, with the goal of achieving complementary performance.

As a meaningful advance to complementary performance, Madras, Pitassi, and Zemel (2018) introduced learning to defer, a framework in which an automated model learns to adaptively defer decisions to an external decision maker (DM) by considering the DM’s variable accuracy and biases. This approach generalizes traditional rejection learning by optimizing system-wide accuracy and fairness within a two-stage decision pipeline, where the DM is treated as a fixed and uncontrollable agent. While this method effectively addresses fairness concerns in static decision contexts and models the deferral decision as part of the learned predictor, it assumes a largely fixed interaction pattern between the model and the DM. As described next, our CB takes a fundamentally different approach by leveraging all individual agent opinions at every decision point to estimate an optimal opinion, instead of deferring to one party exclusively.

### 3 Methods

We propose a framework for trust calibration in the traditional model of human and AI agents working as a team, referred to as HMT. In this model, the team goal is to make the best possible decision at each time/trial  $t = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  with respect to the context features, represented by a vector of  $j$  independent variables  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_j\}$  that change at each  $t$  in a sequence of decisions  $\tau$ . Before each decision, the team builds a consensus (absolute or relative), after considering the opinions from every member. Consequently, the consensual team opinion  $o$  will lead to a decision and the corresponding perception of a reward  $r(o_t, \mathbf{x}_t)$  for the time/trial  $t$ . However, this perceived reward may not be the maximum  $R(o_t^*, \mathbf{x}_t)$ , only perceived by making the decision corresponding to an optimal opinion  $o^*$ . Therefore,  $r(o_t, \mathbf{x}_t) \leq R(o_t^*, \mathbf{x}_t)$ . In this scenario, there are two potentially distinct quantities: the total amount of rewards possible with optimal opinions for the entire sequence presented to the HMT up until  $t$ , denoted by  $G(\tau_t) = \sum_t R(o_t^*, \mathbf{x}_t)$ , and the actual amount of rewards obtained by the HMT, denoted by  $g(\tau_t) = \sum_t r(o_t, \mathbf{x}_t)$ , such that  $g(\tau_t) \leq G(\tau_t)$ <sup>1</sup>.

Following previous definitions, trust calibration is the process of adjusting the agents’ levels of trust in other agents’ opinions with respect to their capabilities (de Visser et al., 2014; Glikson and Woolley, 2020; Naiseh et al., 2023; Ma et al., 2023). As such, correctly calibrated trust levels mean anticipating when the opinions of the agents should be trusted or not. For instance, in a human-AI collaboration scenario of sequential decision-making in which the human makes each decision after considering the AI opinion, the human calibrates their trust levels with respect to the perceived AI capability for correct opinions. Specifically, as the team collaborates towards maximizing the number of optimal decisions, the human learns the contexts (i. e., the set of variables for each decision) in which the AI recommender system should be trusted or not. In this example, perfectly calibrated trust means that the human can tell when the AI is right or wrong, that is, when to trust it or not in order to achieve the optimal reward.

It should be noted that in the previous paragraph (and throughout the rest of this paper) we refer to trust as behavioral trust, that is, observed reliance on AI opinions. Following Ma et al. (2024), Ahn et al. (2024) and Li, Lu, and Yin (2023), we use reliance as a proxy to trust since there is no definite measurement of the agents’ inner models of trust with respect to their teammates. As such, we rely on the agents’ behavior as an indicator of trust in their teammates’ opinions: if an agent trusts an opinion, they will follow it; otherwise, they will modify their decision. In this context, trust calibration does not translate into just following others’ opinions (for example, a human blindly following the AI recommender system). It refers to adjusting the behavioral trust to accept opinions perceived as optimal and deny opinions perceived as wrong or sub-optimal. Also, trust calibration should not be confused with individual agents’ performance (such as AI accuracy).

With the considerations above, we propose a measure of trust calibration by noticing that  $R(o^*, \mathbf{x})$  is only perceived when the HMT correctly identifies which individual member’s opinions should be trusted or not with respect to the decision variables  $\mathbf{x}$ , and appropriately follows  $o^*$ . That is,  $R(o^*, \mathbf{x})$  is perceived when trust is calibrated, regardless of how the consensus was achieved. Conversely, if trust is not calibrated, one or more wrong opinions that should not be trusted will lead the HMT to decide  $o$  sub-optimally, perceiving  $r(o, \mathbf{x})$ . Therefore, trust miscalibration can be quantified by the regret of the team in choosing to follow one or more wrong opinions. More formally, at any point  $t$

<sup>1</sup>In this paper, we utilize the notation "o" (opinion), contrasting with the traditional Reinforcement Learning literature, which commonly uses "a" (action). This distinction is intentional and essential, as our framework emphasizes the need to differentiate between the team’s actions and the trust calibration process, which relies on opinions formulated prior to those actions.

during the sequence of decisions  $\tau$ , we define the trust calibration distance  $T(\tau_t)$  as the difference between the total perceived rewards with optimal team opinions  $o^*$  and the actual rewards with team opinions  $o$ , up to time/trial  $t$ :

$$\begin{aligned} T(\tau_t) &:= |G(\tau_t) - g(\tau_t)| \\ &= \left| \sum_t R(o_t^*, \mathbf{x}_t) - \sum_t r(o_t, \mathbf{x}_t) \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The trust calibration distance can be interpreted as the amount of rewards lost due to trust miscalibration.<sup>2</sup> It represents how far the agents were from perfect trust calibration in the past sequence of decisions  $\tau_t$ . As such,  $T(\tau_t) = 0$  means that the agents had perfect trust calibration in a given sequence  $\tau_t$ : in this trajectory of decisions, they chose to trust each other's opinions only when they would result in the highest rewards (or lower regrets) possible. On the other hand,  $T(\tau_t)$  increases with every sub-optimal decision  $o$ .

The definition presented in Equation 1 emphasizes that  $T$  is a function of a given past sequence of decisions  $\tau$ . Hence, it is only possible to measure trust calibration regarding past decisions. Moreover,  $T$  is a dynamic measure, changing with each new trial/time unit  $t$ , congruent with previous models of trust in the literature (Yu et al., 2017). It is also noteworthy that the trust calibration distance is independent of individual agents' performance in the HMT. This is consistent with the definition of trust calibration as a process that adjusts trust to individual agents' capabilities, arriving at the decision of which agents' opinions to follow in each case.

As Equation 1 implies, the trust calibration distance  $T$  is reduced when  $g(\tau_t) \rightarrow G(\tau_t)$ , meaning the HMT has improved trust calibration on that sequence of decisions  $\tau_t$ . In this case, the team calibrated their decision to trust or distrust each others' opinions in each trial/time  $t$ , with respect to the decision variables  $\mathbf{x}$ , achieving  $g(\tau_t)$  close (or equal) to  $G(\tau_t)$ . Specifically, by definition, the team calibrates trust toward the optimal opinion  $o^*$  by deciding which individual agents opinions, denoted by  $o_1, o_2, \dots, o_m$ , should be trusted or not in each  $t = \{1, \dots, n\}$  with respect to the respective decision variables  $\mathbf{x}_t$ . With that in mind, we build a trust calibration indicator by estimating the  $o^*$  before every decision and evaluating individual agents' opinions relative to it (Figure 1). If those individual opinions diverge from the estimated  $o^*$ , they are deemed distrustful by the indicator at  $t$ . On the other hand, individual opinions that align with the estimated  $o^*$  at  $t$  will be indicated as trusted. Therefore, the proposed trust calibration indicator shows the trust behavior more likely to result in the optimal decision, leading to  $g(\tau_t) \rightarrow G(\tau_t)$  as intended.

At this point, it should be noted that the trust calibration indicator is dynamic, changing for every opinion in  $t$  and with respect to the decision variables  $\mathbf{x}_t$  and the individual agents' opinions  $o_1, o_2, \dots, o_m$  in an HMT. As such, individual opinions in a team are labeled to be trusted or not in the very specific circumstance of  $t$ , not for the whole sequence  $\tau$ . With this, the trust calibration indicator is agnostic of perceptions of trustworthiness of individual agents, that is, the agents themselves are not judged as trustful or distrustful whatsoever. The only evaluations made by the indicator are regarding individual opinions relative to the estimated  $o^*$  at hand, regardless of individual characteristics of the agents (such as accuracy). Therefore, the indicator refers to both humans' and artificial agents' opinions alike. Also, the indicator is calculated before the HMT decision action is issued and the reward is perceived.<sup>3</sup>

From the trust calibration indicator perspective,  $o^*$  is estimated according to a dynamically changing context, before the team decision is issued and the outcome is known. Therefore, the trust calibration indicator considers the context features variables presented to every individual agent of the HMT, as well as their respective opinions, and treats the whole as a set of input features necessary to estimate  $o^*$ . It should be noted that the context features presented to the HMT, as well as the team and individual opinions, are all considered as a whole set of inputs for trust calibration. This set of inputs is called augmented context, defined as

$$\mathbf{x}^{(c)} := \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_j, o_1, o_2, \dots, o_m, o\}. \quad (2)$$

The trust calibration indicator relies on estimating  $o^*$  before the HMT action. This estimative is given by a model capable of dynamically mapping situations (context) to opinions in order to maximize rewards, such as the RL paradigm introduced by Sutton and Barto (1998). In traditional RL, an agent in a given state  $s$  selects an action  $a$ , transitions to a new state  $s'$  and receives a reward  $r(s, a, s')$ . However, in the present case of the trust calibration indicator, each action does not involve state transitions. Hence, our framework fits the RL sub-field of multi-armed CB, in which the estimation of  $o^*$  is only based on (augmented) contextual information  $\mathbf{x}^{(c)}$  and the corresponding reward (Lu, Pál, and Pál, 2010).

<sup>2</sup>In the RL paradigm, the trust calibration distance is given by the cumulative regret up until  $t$ .

<sup>3</sup>We use  $o_1, o_2, \dots, o_m$  to distinguish the individual opinions of the  $m$  agents in a team from the consensus team opinion given by  $o$ . Notice that, depending on the scenario,  $o$  might be the final call made by a human, as in traditional decision-making assisted by AI.




Figure 1: The augmented context  $\mathbf{x}^{(c)}$  includes the original context variables  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_j\}$  and individual agent opinions depicted by  $\{o_1, o_2, o_3, \dots, o_m\}$ , as well as the consensual team opinion  $\{o\}$  before the decision. This augmented context is used by the CB algorithm to estimate  $o^*$ , which is used to calibrate trust with regards to individual opinions. Opinions comparisons to the estimated  $o^*$  are represented by diamonds, indicating to trust an individual opinion (clear squares) or not (dark squares).

A classic stochastic multi-armed bandit problem is defined as  $K$  possible actions of a player, each associated with a probability distribution of rewards  $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_K$ , with respective means and variances unknown to the player. The usual problem description uses a slot machine analogy, with  $K$  arms available to the player, who has to pull one at each time/trial  $t$  (Kuleshov and Precup, 2014). Since the parameters of the rewards distributions  $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_K$  are unknown, multi-armed bandit algorithms are used to uncover strategies for players to maximize their rewards (or minimize their regret). However, when relevant context information is available to the player, the problem becomes multi-armed CB, as defined by Langford and Zhang (2007). In the present case, we use the multi-armed CB model to estimate  $o^*$  among the  $K$  possible opinions of actions, using the augmented context  $\mathbf{x}^{(c)}$ .

There are many CB algorithms to estimate an optimal opinion  $o_t^*$  considering the context information  $\mathbf{x}_t^{(c)}$  (Silva et al., 2022; Kuleshov and Precup, 2014). After this estimation, it is just a matter of comparing individual opinions  $o_1, \dots, o_m$  to the estimated  $o^*$  to have the indications of which agents should be trusted in this particular circumstance  $t$ , completing the trust calibration indicator (Figure 1). For the purposes of demonstrating our approach to dynamic trust calibration, we select three popular algorithms to estimate  $o^*$ : Linear Upper Confidence Bound (LinUCB) (Li et al., 2010), Decision Tree (DT) bandits (Elmachtoub et al., 2017) and Artificial Neural Network (ANN) bandits (Kakade, Shalev-Shwartz, and Tewari, 2008).

### 3.1 Contextual Bandits algorithms

The LinUCB approach to CB was originally proposed by Li et al. (2010). It assumes that the expected payoff of an opinion  $o$  is linear with respect to the augmented context features  $\mathbf{x}^{(c)}$  and unknown coefficients  $\theta_o$  for each opinion/arm  $o \in \{o_1, \dots, o_K\}$ , that is,

$$\mathbb{E} [r_{t,o} | \mathbf{x}_t^{(c)}] = \left( \mathbf{x}_t^{(c)} \right)^\top \theta_o. \quad (3)$$

In order to estimate  $o^*$  at each  $t$ , an Upper Confidence Bound (UCB) is calculated for each possible opinion/arm  $o$  as

$$\text{UCB}_{o,t} \left( \mathbf{x}_t^{(c)} \right) = \theta_o^\top \mathbf{x}_t^{(c)} + \sqrt{\left( \mathbf{x}_t^{(c)} \right)^\top \mathbf{A}_o^{-1} \mathbf{x}_t^{(c)}}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}_o$  is a positive definite matrix defined as

$$\mathbf{A}_o := \sum_{t:o_t=o} \mathbf{x}_t^{(c)} \left( \mathbf{x}_t^{(c)} \right)^\top. \quad (5)$$

Then, the estimated  $o^*$  at  $t$  for a given  $\mathbf{x}_t$  is selected as the  $o$  that maximizes the UCB given by Equation 4, that is,

$$\text{estimated } o_t^* = \arg \max_{o \in \{o_1, \dots, o_K\}} \text{UCB}_{o,t} \left( \mathbf{x}_t^{(c)} \right). \quad (6)$$

Assuming the algorithm has access to the reward  $r_{t,o^*}$  from the estimated  $o^*$ , the matrix  $\mathbf{A}_o$ , in Equation 5, is updated as  $\mathbf{A}_o = \mathbf{A}_o + \mathbf{x}_t^{(c)} \left( \mathbf{x}_t^{(c)} \right)^\top$ . Similarly, the parameters  $\theta_o$ , from Equation 3, are updated as  $\theta_o = \mathbf{A}_o^{-1} \left( \mathbf{x}_t^{(c)} \right)^\top r_{t,o^*}$ .

DTs were introduced in the multi-armed CB problem by Elmachtoub et al. (2017) because they are simple, interpretable and non-parametric, capable of capturing non-linear relationships between variables. The algorithm consists in using the original DT proposed by Breiman et al. (1984) to estimate the  $o^*$  given a vector of augmented context features variables  $\mathbf{x}^{(c)}$ . It splits the available previous data into a tree-like structure where each node represents a feature variable, the branches represent the decision rules with respect to the values of those variables, and the leaf nodes are the opinions. Hence, to decide which opinion is the estimated  $o^*$  for the context variables vector  $\mathbf{x}_t^{(c)}$ , the algorithm parses  $\mathbf{x}_t^{(c)}$  down the tree, deciding which branch to follow based on the values of each variable in  $\mathbf{x}_t^{(c)}$ , until the leaf containing the estimated  $o^*$  is achieved. After perceiving  $r_{t,o^*}$ , the tree-like structure is updated to reflect this new data point.

ANNs are universal approximators of arbitrary functions, particularly useful for complex and high-dimensional data. As such, they can be used as a CB approach to approximate the relationship between context variables  $\mathbf{x}^{(c)}$  and the estimated  $o^*$ , as demonstrated by Kakade, Shalev-Shwartz, and Tewari (2008). A vanilla neural network consists of fully interconnected neurons, organized in input and hidden layers, as well as output neurons. The neurons of the input layer correspond to the variables of vector  $\mathbf{x}^{(c)}$ , each connecting to one or more neurons in the hidden layer. The hidden layer neurons apply an activation function to their inputs, such as sigmoid, hyperbolic tangent or Rectified Linear Unit (ReLU), defined as  $f(x) := \max(0, x)$ . Finally, the output layer neurons produce the estimated  $o^*$  as a function of the input  $\mathbf{x}^{(c)}$  at each  $t$ .

Many choices of architecture are possible for ANNs, including multiple hidden layers for deep learning (Schmidhuber, 2015). To demonstrate the estimations of  $o^*$  for the trust calibration indicator, we select a vanilla neural network CB composed of an input layer fully connected with weights  $\mathbf{w}$  to a single hidden layer with 15 neurons implementing ReLU. Each hidden neuron  $z_h$  receives the weighted sum of the input layer variables, such that  $z_h = \sum_i w_{i,h} x_i$ , for  $h = \{1, \dots, 15\}$  and all  $i$  variables from vector  $\mathbf{x}^{(c)}$  in Equation 2. Since we select ReLU as activation, the output layer is given by the linear combination of  $f(z_h) = \max(0, z_h)$ . Finally, for updating the ANN with each new datapoint, we select the Mean Squared Error (MSE) loss function and Adam optimization (Kingma and Ba, 2015).

### 3.2 Data

We evaluate the trust calibration indicator over data from previous studies in decision-making assisted by AI. Specifically, we use data from experiments conducted by Lu and Yin (2021), Noti and Chen (2023) and Reverberi et al. (2022). These datasets were selected due to their availability and diversity in domains, experimental treatments, and feature sets. In all cases, the teams consist of one human and one AI agent, with the human having the final decision-making authority after considering the AI’s opinion. We treat the recorded decisions in these studies as the individual opinions of this HMT for our analysis.

Lu and Yin (2021) experiment with speed dating data, asking a total of 1,169 human subjects to predict at each trial  $t$  if a person, according to a set of 22 known features  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{22}\}$ , would want to see their date again or not.<sup>4</sup> After the human subjects have an initial binary opinion  $o_1$ , they are given an opinion from a Machine Learning (ML) algorithm, which we refer to as the AI opinion  $o_2$ . Finally, the HMT achieves a consensual opinion  $o$ . Also, the authors evaluate different levels of agreement between humans and AI in one phase and use that information to vary treatments in the next phase of experiments. Similarly, they also vary levels of human confidence in their own responses.

By their turn, Noti and Chen (2023) work with the risk of released defendants violating the release terms. In their experiments, 1,096 human subjects are asked to estimate that risk, from 0 to 100% in increments of 10%, for  $n$  released defendants. Similarly to other experiments, humans are aided by a risk assessment tool developed previously, which, for our purposes, will be considered the AI recommender system issuing opinions  $o_2$ . Subjects observe a set of features  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_7\}$ , then the AI opinion  $o_2$  is shown according to different treatments.<sup>5</sup> The treatments are: update, which shows the recommended  $o_2$  after the humans had a first opinion  $o_1$ , giving them the opportunity to update their team opinion  $o$ ; learned (the authors’ novel approach), which shows the opinion  $o_2$  only when their AI algorithm estimates that the information might improve the final opinion  $o$  (according to a previously trained policy); omniscient, very similar to the learned treatment, but the recommender system will always show the optimal suggestion to the

<sup>4</sup>For illustration, features include attractiveness, intelligence, shared interests, sincerity, ambition. Please refer to Lu and Yin (2021) for the full set of features.

<sup>5</sup>Features are: ethnicity, gender, age, offense type, number of prior arrests, number of previous failures to appear in court and number of prior convictions.

human when it might improve the opinion  $o$ . We note that traditional human decision-making assisted by AI fits the update treatment, but, for the sake of completion, we evaluate the trust calibration indicator over all treatments.<sup>6</sup>

Still with respect to the data from Noti and Chen (2023), it should be noted that the opinions in this case are not binary, but multi-valued. Specifically, the risk value given by  $o_1$ ,  $o_2$  and  $o$  can be any integer  $V \in \{0, 10, 20, \dots, 100\}$ . However, the trust calibration indicator is designed to show which individual agents should be trusted or not by comparing  $o_1$ ,  $o_2$  and  $o$  to the estimated  $o^*$ . As such, just indicating trust behavior with respect to  $o$ ,  $o_1$  and  $o_2$  might not be enough to decrease the trust calibration distance  $T$  (Eq. 1). For example, the trust calibration indicator might deem  $o_t$ ,  $o_{1,t}$  and  $o_{2,t}$  untrustworthy, leaving no opinion to be trusted. However, in cases like this, with non-binary opinions, the indicator can readily provide the estimated  $o_t^*$  if no agent’s individual opinion is to be trusted.

The final dataset comes from the experiments of Reverberi et al. (2022). They experiment with 21 endoscopists who are asked to diagnose colorectal lesions based on 504 real colonoscopies videos, each with one lesion (the diagnosis is either true or false). They first diagnose  $o_1$  with no decision support system and, then, they receive a report from an AI with a recommended diagnosis  $o_2$ . After considering the AI recommendation, the endoscopists issue a final diagnosis  $o$ . The variables  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{11}\}$  available to the trust calibration indicator at each trial  $t$  are relative to AI and human confidence levels, endoscopists’ expertise and their beliefs regarding the diagnoses.<sup>7</sup> For the HMT’s opinion  $o$ , we consider the endoscopists’ diagnoses after they have seen the AI opinions  $o_2$ .

The selected datasets come from diverse domains and treatments. For each of them, we build the augmented context  $\mathbf{x}_t^c$  (Eq. 2) and run the selected CB approaches to estimate  $o_t^*$ . Since the estimated  $o_t^*$  leads to the indication of which individual members’ opinions should be trusted or not in the HMT for the best possible decision, we expect reductions in trust calibration distances  $T$ . It should be noted, however, that our goal is to evaluate the trust calibration indicator, not the actual performance of HMTs making real-time decisions. Such interactions of HMTs and a real-time implementation of the indicator are left for future studies.

## 4 Evaluations

Due to their dynamics, CB models will change with each new data presented to them. Different from traditional supervised ML approaches, CB algorithms will dynamically learn the best possible opinions with respect to the context considering all previous experiences with the perceived rewards, as opposed to ML models trained with a fixed dataset. Since no ground truth is given at each trial, only rewards, CB algorithms will seek to maximize rewards (or minimize regrets with respect to the optimal opinions), updating their internal models at each trial  $t$ . Hence, the order of the trials might affect the learning dynamics and the total rewards obtained by the algorithm. Therefore, in the following evaluations, we run the CB algorithms 100 times each, shuffling the data and reporting the sample mean and standard error of the total obtained rewards perceived with the decisions led by the opinions  $o_1$ ,  $o_2$ ,  $o$  and estimated  $o^*$ .

We start by evaluating the trust calibration indicator using the data provided by Lu and Yin (2021). As described before, the authors work with speed dating data, having the human subjects, assisted by AI, predict if a person in the database would meet their date again in the future. For each correct assessment of the future date possibility, the HMT perceived a unit reward.

Table 1 shows results from the first experiments of Lu and Yin (2021) (upper part) and the trust calibration indicator (lower part) using the same data, with estimations of  $o^*$  given by LinUCB, DT and ANN CB implementations. The trust calibration distances (Eq. 1) for the HMT are  $T = 863; 1,215; 1,186$  for high, medium and low levels of agreement, respectively. However, by estimating  $o^*$  with CB LinUCB, the trust calibration distances are greatly reduced to  $T \approx 137; 120; 143$ , showing the effectiveness of trust calibration. Results using data from the other experiments from Lu and Yin (2021) are very similar (see Appendix).

The next dataset brings an example of the trust calibration indicator applied to multi-valued decision-making (as opposed to binary). In this case, the perceived reward of a decision associated with the opinion  $o_t$  is given by  $r(o_t, \mathbf{x}_t) = 100 - (|y_t - \hat{y}_t|)$ , where, for a trial  $t$ ,  $\hat{y}_t$  is the opinion of the risk (% likelihood of violation of release terms) issued by the agent/team and  $y_t$  is the corresponding opinion leading to the ground truth (either 0% or 100%). For this dataset, the augmented context  $\mathbf{x}_t^{(c)}$  for the trust calibration indicator at trial  $t$  is composed of the classification variables  $\mathbf{x}_t$  presented to the human subjects, the AI opinion  $o_{2,t}$  and the consensual decision  $o_t$  of the HMT. However, the output of the trust calibration indicator is not only which opinions should be trusted or not, but also an alternative opinion (estimated  $o_t^*$ ) in case  $o_t$ ,  $o_{1,t}$  and  $o_{2,t}$  are tagged as untrustworthy for a particular trial  $t$ .

<sup>6</sup>Learned and omniscient treatments impose conditions on the AI recommender system that might not be realistic when the system is given as a black-box, with no access to its inner models.

<sup>7</sup>Please refer to Reverberi et al. (2022) for the full set of features.

	Level of agreement		
	High	Medium	Low
Trials [ $n$ ]	2,400	3,390	3,240
Maximum [ $G(\tau)$ ]	2,400	3,390	3,240
AI $o_2$ [ $g(\tau)$ ]	1,680	2,373	2,268
HMT $o$ [ $g(\tau)$ ]	1,537	2,175	2,054
<b>Indicator results</b>	(estimated	$o^*$ [ $g(\tau)$ ])	
CB LinUCB	2,263.48/ 10.28	3,270.09/ 79.94	3,097.06/ 11.61
CB DT	960.00/ 0	1,356.00/ 0	1,296.00/ 0
CB ANN	1,880.20/ 43.62	2,749.93/ 63.79	2,549.50/ 62.67

Table 1: Trust calibration indicator results (mean/standard error of total rewards) using data from Lu and Yin (2021), experiment 1. CB LinUCB achieves significantly higher results than the HMT (t-tests).

	Update	Treatment	
		Learned	Omniscient
$n$	11,000	4,031	3,940
$G(\tau)$	1,100,000	403,100	394,000
$o_2$ [ $g(\tau)$ ]	663,560	238,970	235,350
$o$ [ $g(\tau)$ ]	635,340	231,760	213,970
<b>Indicator</b>	(estimated	$o^*(g(\tau))$ )	
CB LinUCB	726,312.70/ 1,878.04	256,432.70/ 705.01	248,506.30/ 655.18
CB DT	744,700.00/ 0	263,800.00/ 0	252,800.00/ 0
CB ANN	546,799.60/ 11,114.83	200,619.10/ 3,295.79	217,289.10/ 2,767.00

Table 2: Trust calibration indicator results (mean/standard error of total rewards) using data from Noti and Chen (2023). CB DT achieves significantly higher results than the HMT (t-tests).

Results for the experiments considering data from Noti and Chen (2023) are shown in Table 2. In this case, because the perceived reward is given by  $r(o_t, \mathbf{x}_t) = 100 - (|y_t - \hat{y}_t|)$ , the maximum rewards are given by  $G(\tau) = 100n$  in all treatments, since  $R(o_t^*, \mathbf{x}_t) = 100$  when  $\hat{y}_t = y_t$ . The trust calibration distances for the HMT are  $T = 464,660; 171,340; 180,030$  for the update, learned and omniscient treatments, respectively. In contrast, the estimation of  $o^*$  for the trust calibration indicator results in  $T \approx 355,300; 139,300; 141,200$  using the DT CB algorithm.

Finally, we evaluate the trust calibration indicator using data from Reverberi et al. (2022), which contains diagnoses of colorectal lesions given by endoscopists assisted by AI, therefore HMTs. A correct diagnosis was rewarded by 1 point and an incorrect was penalized by 1 point. Results are summarized in Table 3. The trust calibration distance is

Number of trials [ $n$ ]	8,619
Maximum rewards [ $G(\tau)$ ]	8,619
Human $o_1$ rewards [ $g(\tau)$ ]	5,229
AI $o_2$ rewards [ $g(\tau)$ ]	6,303
HMT $o$ rewards [ $g(\tau)$ ]	5,979
<b>Indicator results</b>	(estimated $o^*$ [ $g(\tau)$ ])
CB LinUCB (mean/se)	6,886.64/28.61
CB DT (mean/se)	4,380.38/447.62
CB ANN (mean/se)	7,857.62/16.48

Table 3: Trust calibration indicator results (mean/standard error of total rewards) using data from Reverberi et al. (2022). CB ANN achieves significantly higher results than the HMT (t-tests).

given by  $T = 3,390; 2,316; 2,640$  for the decisions led by  $o_1, o_2$  and  $o$  opinions, respectively. However, complementary performance is achieved by improved trust calibration (lower part of Table 3), with the trust calibration distance reduced to  $T \approx 761$  using CB ANN.

As shown, the trust calibration indicator successfully reduces the trust calibration distance, leading to complementary performance. Overall, the total rewards increased by 10 to 38%. For each dataset, one of the CB algorithms outperformed the others in estimating  $o^*$ : CB ANN excelled with data from Reverberi et al. (2022); CB DT was superior with data from Noti and Chen (2023); and CB LinUCB was the best approach with data from Lu and Yin (2021). This is expected since the domains, variables and decisions are different in each dataset.

## 5 Discussion and conclusion

The key insight of our trust calibration framework is the distinction between opinions and decisions. We notice that before issuing a decision, each opinion is judged with respect to the current decision variables in order to derive a global team opinion that will subsequently translate into a decision. This internal process of trust calibration is highly subjective due to the nature of individual opinion-formation processes of each member. Despite its subjective nature, we model the trust calibration process externally by anticipating which opinions can be trusted to achieve the best outcome.

The proposed trust calibration indicator is oblivious to the models governing the formation of individual HMT agents' opinions, including the AI's implementation. As such, it can be applied to any AI-supported decision-making scenario, irrespective of the AI technology. However, one limitation of our approach is that the indicator relies on the estimation of  $o^*$  by a CB algorithm. Our findings indicate that no single algorithm consistently outperforms others across the examined domains. This variability suggests that the trust calibration indicator estimation of  $o^*$  by CB is domain-dependent and influenced by the corresponding rewards structure. As with any ML deployment, practical implementations of the indicator should investigate the most appropriate CB algorithm for estimating  $o^*$  on a given domain. Therefore, prior datasets or simulated data should be utilized to evaluate models before deployment, also mitigating the cold start problem (limited prior information).

A core assumption of our framework is that reward feedback for each decision is immediately and accurately observable, enabling timely updates of the trust calibration indicator via CB. While this assumption holds in controlled experimental environments or domains with clear, instantaneous outcomes, it may not apply universally, since reward signals can be significantly delayed, noisy, or unavailable. Addressing these challenges requires adaptations of our method, such as integrating delayed calibration, or leveraging proxy or intermediate feedback signals. Those are important directions for future work to broaden the framework's practical applicability.

Finally, our trust calibration framework opens several avenues for future research and application. For example, it can be applied to team composition analysis to evaluate individual contributions or integrated into real-time decision support to guide trust behavior by displaying the indicator prior to decisions. However, realizing these applications will require future studies involving human participants to identify effective ways to present the indicator to HMTs. This next step is essential to gain deeper insights into the practical usability, user acceptance, and overall effectiveness of our framework in live operational settings.

## References

- Ahn, D.; Almaatouq, A.; Gulabani, M.; and Hosanagar, K. 2024. Impact of Model Interpretability and Outcome Feedback on Trust in AI. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, volume 11 of CHI '24, pp. 1 – 25.
- Breiman, L.; Friedman, J.; Olshen, R.; and Stone, C. 1984. *Classification and regression trees*. CRC Press.
- Culley, K. E.; and Madhavan, P. 2013. A note of caution regarding anthropomorphism in HCI agents. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(3): pp. 577 – 579.
- de Visser, E. J.; Cohen, M.; Freedy, A.; and Parasuraman, R. 2014. A Design Methodology for Trust Cue Calibration in Cognitive Agents. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 251 – 262.
- de Visser, E. J.; Monfort, S. S.; McKendrick, R.; Smith, M. A. B.; McKnight, P. E.; Krueger, F.; and Parasuraman, R. 2016. Almost human: Anthropomorphism increases trust resilience in cognitive agents. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 22(3): pp. 331 – 349.
- de Visser, E. J.; Peeters, M. M. M.; Jung, M. F.; Kohn, S.; Shaw, T. H.; Pak, R.; and Neerinx, M. A. 2019. Towards a Theory of Longitudinal Trust Calibration in Human–Robot Teams. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 12(2): pp. 459 – 478.
- Dzindolet, M. T.; Peterson, S. A.; Pomranky, R. A.; Pierce, L. G.; and Beck, H. P. 2003. The role of trust in automation reliance. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 58(6): pp. 697 – 718.
- Elmachtoub, A. N.; McNellis, R.; Oh, S.; and Petrik, M. 2017. A Practical Method for Solving Contextual Bandit Problems Using Decision Trees. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI)*.
- Glikson, E.; and Woolley, A. W. 2020. Human Trust in Artificial Intelligence: Review of Empirical Research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(2): pp. 627 – 660.
- Gomez, C.; Unberath, M.; and Huang, C.-M. 2023. Mitigating knowledge imbalance in AI-advised decision-making through collaborative user involvement. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 172: 102977.
- Hancock, P. A.; Billings, D. R.; Schaefer, K. E.; Chen, J. Y. C.; de Visser, E. J.; and Parasuraman, R. 2011. A Meta-Analysis of Factors Affecting Trust in Human-Robot Interaction. *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*, 53(5): pp. 517 – 527.
- Henrique, B. M.; and Santos, E. 2024. Trust in artificial intelligence: Literature review and main path analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans*, 2(1): 100043.
- Hoff, K. A.; and Bashir, M. 2014. Trust in Automation: Integrating Empirical Evidence on Factors That Influence Trust. *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*, 57(3): pp. 407 – 434.
- Kakade, S. M.; Shalev-Shwartz, S.; and Tewari, A. 2008. Efficient Bandit Algorithms for Online Multiclass Prediction. In *ICML '08: Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*, volume Volume, pp. 440 – 447.
- Karran, A. J.; Demazure, T.; Hudon, A.; Senecal, S.; and Léger, P.-M. 2022. Designing for Confidence: The Impact of Visualizing Artificial Intelligence Decisions. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 16.
- Kingma, D. P.; and Ba, J. 2015. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Kuleshov, V.; and Precup, D. 2014. Algorithms for multi-armed bandit problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1402.6028*.
- Langford, J.; and Zhang, T. 2007. The Epoch-Greedy Algorithm for Multi-armed Bandits with Side Information. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 20.
- Lee, J. D.; and See, K. A. 2004. Trust in Automation: Designing for Appropriate Reliance. *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*, 46(1): pp. 50 – 80.
- Leichtmann, B.; Humer, C.; Hinterreiter, A.; Streit, M.; and Mara, M. 2023. Effects of Explainable Artificial Intelligence on trust and human behavior in a high-risk decision task. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 139: 107539.
- Li, L.; Chu, W.; Langford, J.; and Schapire, R. E. 2010. A contextual-bandit approach to personalized news article recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web, WWW '10*.
- Li, Z.; Lu, Z.; and Yin, M. 2023. Modeling Human Trust and Reliance in AI-Assisted Decision Making: A Markovian Approach. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pp. 6056 – 6064.
- Lu, T.; Pál, D.; and Pál, M. 2010. Contextual multi-armed bandits. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth international conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 485 – 492.

- Lu, Z.; and Yin, M. 2021. Human Reliance on Machine Learning Models When Performance Feedback is Limited: Heuristics and Risks. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1 – 16.
- Ma, S.; Lei, Y.; Wang, X.; Zheng, C.; Shi, C.; Yin, M.; and Ma, X. 2023. Who Should I Trust: AI or Myself? Leveraging Human and AI Correctness Likelihood to Promote Appropriate Trust in AI-Assisted Decision-Making. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, volume 29 of *CHI '23*, pp. 1 – 19.
- Ma, S.; Wang, X.; Lei, Y.; Shi, C.; Yin, M.; and Ma, X. 2024. “Are You Really Sure?” Understanding the Effects of Human Self-Confidence Calibration in AI-Assisted Decision Making. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, volume 63 of *CHI '24*, pp. 1 – 20.
- Madras, D.; Pitassi, T.; and Zemel, R. 2018. Predict responsibly: improving fairness and accuracy by learning to defer. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31.
- Naiseh, M.; Al-Thani, D.; Jiang, N.; and Ali, R. 2023. How the different explanation classes impact trust calibration: The case of clinical decision support systems. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 169: 102941.
- Noti, G.; and Chen, Y. 2023. Learning When to Advise Human Decision Makers. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Pareek, S.; Velloso, E.; and Goncalves, J. 2024. Trust Development and Repair in AI-Assisted Decision-Making during Complementary Expertise. In *The 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '24, pp. 546 – 561.
- Reverberi, C.; Rigon, T.; Solari, A.; Hassan, C.; Cherubini, P.; Antonelli, G.; Awadie, H.; Bernhofer, S.; Carballal, S.; Dinis-Ribeiro, M.; Fernández-Clotett, A.; Esparrach, G. F.; Gralnek, I.; Higasa, Y.; Hirabayashi, T.; Hirai, T.; Iwatate, M.; Kawano, M.; Mader, M.; Maieron, A.; Mattes, S.; Nakai, T.; Ordas, I.; Ortigão, R.; Zúñiga, O. O.; Pellisé, M.; Pinto, C.; Riedl, F.; Sánchez, A.; Steiner, E.; Tanaka, Y.; and Cherubini, A. 2022. Experimental evidence of effective human–AI collaboration in medical decision-making. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1).
- Salimzadeh, S.; He, G.; and Gadiraju, U. 2024. Dealing with Uncertainty: Understanding the Impact of Prognostic Versus Diagnostic Tasks on Trust and Reliance in Human-AI Decision Making. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, volume 7 of *CHI '24*, pp. 1 – 17.
- Schmidhuber, J. 2015. Deep learning in neural networks: An overview. *Neural Networks*, 61: pp. 85 – 117.
- Silva, N.; Werneck, H.; Silva, T.; Pereira, A. C.; and Rocha, L. 2022. Multi-Armed Bandits in Recommendation Systems: A survey of the state-of-the-art and future directions. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 197: 116669.
- Sutton, R. S.; and Barto, A. G. 1998. *Introduction to reinforcement learning*, volume 135. MIT press Cambridge.
- Wang, X.; Lu, Z.; and Yin, M. 2022. Will You Accept the AI Recommendation? Predicting Human Behavior in AI-Assisted Decision Making. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, WWW '22, pp. 1697 – 1708.
- Yu, K.; Berkovsky, S.; Taib, R.; Conway, D.; Zhou, J.; and Chen, F. 2017. User Trust Dynamics: An Investigation Driven by Differences in System Performance. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*, IUI '17, pp. 307 – 317.
- Zhang, Y.; Liao, Q. V.; and Bellamy, R. K. E. 2020. Effect of confidence and explanation on accuracy and trust calibration in AI-assisted decision making. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAT\* '20, pp. 295 – 305.

	Agreement %/Accuracy %	
	80/80	80/50
Trials [ $n$ ]	3,030	3,630
Maximum [ $G(\tau)$ ]	3,030	3,630
AI $o_2$ [ $g(\tau)$ ]	1,717	2,057
HMT $o$ [ $g(\tau)$ ]	1,862	2,223
<b>Indicator results</b>	(estimated	$o^*$ [ $g(\tau)$ ])
CB LinUCB	2,864.34/12.39	3,442.53/14.54
CB DT	1,212.00/0	1,452.00/0
CB ANN	2,422.61/56.11	2,727.35/77.04

Table 4: Trust calibration indicator results (mean/standard error) using data from Lu and Yin (2021), experiment 2, Agreement % / Accuracy % treatments of 80/80 and 80/50. CB LinUCB achieves significantly higher results than the HMT (t-tests).

	Agreement %/Accuracy %	
	50/80	50/50
Trials [ $n$ ]	3,390	3,930
Maximum [ $G(\tau)$ ]	3,390	3,930
AI $o_2$ [ $g(\tau)$ ]	1,921	2,227
HMT $o$ [ $g(\tau)$ ]	2,140	2,414
<b>Indicator results</b>	(estimated	$o^*$ [ $g(\tau)$ ])
CB LinUCB	3,263.83/90.77	3,774.43/12.23
CB DT	1,356.00/0	1,572.00/0
CB ANN	2,561.46/71.20	3,051.70/82.55

Table 5: Trust calibration indicator results (mean/standard error) using data from Lu and Yin (2021), experiment 2, Agreement % / Accuracy % treatments of 50/80 and 50/50. CB LinUCB achieves significantly higher results than the HMT (t-tests).

## 6 Appendix

In this Appendix, we present the trust calibration indicator evaluations using the dataset from Lu and Yin (2021), experiments 2 (Tables 4 and 5) and 3 (Tables 6 and 7). For the evaluations using experiments 1 data, please refer to the Evaluations section of the main paper.

The second experiment conducted by Lu and Yin (2021) had a  $2 \times 2$  factorial design, varying levels of agreement of humans and the underlying ML classifiers accuracy. Results are shown in the upper parts of Tables 4 and 5. It is remarkable, in these cases, that the HMT consensual opinions  $o$  led to the perception of more rewards than the decisions led by the AI opinions  $o_2$  in all four treatments. However, performance would be greatly increased by improved trust calibration, as shown by the rewards from decisions led by  $o^*$  (means and standard errors in the lower parts of Tables 4 and 5). In these cases, the trust calibration distances for the HMT are  $T = 1,168; 1,407; 1,250; 1,516$  for the agreement/accuracy treatments of 80/80, 80/50, 50/80 and 50/50, respectively. In contrast, trust calibration distance is reduced to  $T \approx 166; 188; 126; 156$  with the estimations of  $o^*$  given by CB LinUCB in the trust calibration indicator.

The final experiment of Lu and Yin (2021) varies human confidence in their decisions when they agree and when they disagree with the AI opinions. Tables 6 and 7 show the results of the trust calibration indicator across the four treatments considered by the authors. As shown in the upper parts of the tables, the total rewards perceived by decisions led by the HMT consensual  $o$  are less than the total rewards perceived by the decisions led by AI’s  $o_2$  in all cases. Regarding the trust calibration distance for opinions  $o$ ,  $T = 743; 624; 752; 777$  for the treatments of high confidence agreement, low confidence agreement, high confidence disagreement and low confidence disagreement, respectively. Again, the trust calibration indicator, using  $o^*$  estimated by CB LinUCB, reduces the trust calibration distances to  $T \approx 35; 11; 18; 10$ .

	Treatment	
	High confidence agreement	Low confidence agreement
Trials [ $n$ ]	2,288	1,958
Maximum [ $G(\tau)$ ]	2,288	1,958
AI $o_2$ [ $g(\tau)$ ]	1,768	1,513
HMT $o$ [ $g(\tau)$ ]	1,545	1,334
<b>Indicator results</b>	(estimated	$o^*$ [ $g(\tau)$ ])
CB LinUCB	2,253.13/4.80	1,947.10/0.22
CB DT	832.00/0	712.00/0
CB ANN	1,910.67/40.11	1,643.68/34.71

Table 6: Trust calibration indicator results (mean/standard error) using data from Lu and Yin (2021), experiment 3, agreements treatments. CB LinUCB achieves significantly higher results than the HMT (t-tests).

	Treatment	
	High confidence disagreement	Low confidence disagreement
Trials [ $n$ ]	2,244	2,354
Maximum [ $G(\tau)$ ]	2,244	2,354
AI $o_2$ [ $g(\tau)$ ]	1,734	1,819
HMT $o$ [ $g(\tau)$ ]	1,492	1,577
<b>Indicator results</b>	(estimated	$o^*$ [ $g(\tau)$ ])
CB LinUCB	2,225.98/2.28	2,344.45/0.24
CB DT	816.00/0	856.00/0
CB ANN	1,780.35/51.08	1,905.66/48.43

Table 7: Trust calibration indicator results (mean/standard error) using data from Lu and Yin (2021), experiment 3, disagreement treatments. CB LinUCB achieves significantly higher results than the HMT (t-tests).