
Volume 3, 2021

ISSN 2638-602X (print)/ISSN 2638-6038 (online)

Human-Machine Communication



Human-Machine Communication (HMC) is an annual peer-reviewed, open access publication of the Communication and Social Robotics Labs (combotlabs.org), published with support from the Nicholson School of Communication and Media at the University of Central Florida. Human-Machine Communication (Print: ISSN 2638-602X) is published in the spring of each year (Online: ISSN 2638-6038). Institutional, organizational, and individual subscribers are invited to purchase the print edition using the following mailing address:

Human-Machine Communication (HMC)
Communication and Social Robotics Labs
Western Michigan University
1903 W. Michigan Ave.
300 Sprau Tower
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Print Subscriptions: Regular US rates: Individuals: 1 year, \$40.

Libraries and organizations may subscribe for 1 year, \$75.

If subscribing outside of the United States, please contact the Editor-in-Chief for current rate. Checks should be made payable to the Communication and Social Robotics Labs.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License . All articles in HMC are open access and can be distributed under the creative commons license.

Human-Machine Communication

Diffusion of Human-Machine Communication During and After the COVID-19 Pandemic

Special Issue Editors

Do Kyun David Kim, University of Louisiana at Lafayette (U.S.A.)

Gary L. Kreps, George Mason University (U.S.A.)

Rukhsana Ahmed, University at Albany—SUNY (U.S.A.)

Editor-in-Chief

Autumn Edwards, Western Michigan University (U.S.A.)

Associate Editors

Patric R. Spence, University of Central Florida (U.S.A.)

Chad Edwards, Western Michigan University (U.S.A.)

Editorial Board

Somaya Ben Allouch, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences (Netherlands)

Maria Bakardjieva, University of Calgary (Canada)

Jaime Banks, Texas Tech University

Naomi S. Baron, American University (U.S.A.)

Erin Chiou, Arizona State University (U.S.A.)

Charles M. Ess, University of Oslo (Norway)

Jan Fernback, Temple University (U.S.A.)

Laura Forlano, Illinois Institute of Technology (U.S.A.)

Robert W. Gehl, Louisiana Tech University

Maartje de Graaf, Utrecht University (Netherlands)

David Gunkel, Northern Illinois University (U.S.A.)

Andrea Guzman, Northern Illinois University (U.S.A.)

Meg Leta Jones, Georgetown University (U.S.A.)

Steve Jones, University of Illinois-Chicago (U.S.A.)

Jenny Kennedy, RMIT University (Australia)

Jihyun Kim, University of Central Florida (U.S.A.)

Rinaldo Kühne, University of Amsterdam (Netherlands)

Kenneth A. Lachlan, University of Connecticut (U.S.A.)

Hee Rin Lee, University of California San Diego (U.S.A.)

S. Austin Lee, Chapman University (U.S.A.)
Seth C. Lewis, University of Oregon (U.S.A.)
Matthew Lombard, Temple University (U.S.A.)
Christoph Lutz, BI Norwegian Business School (Norway)
Rhonda McEwen, University of Toronto (Canada)
Yi Mou, Shanghai Jiao Tong University (China)
Peter Nagy, Arizona State University (U.S.A.)
Seungahn Nah, University of Oregon (U.S.A.)
Gina Neff, University of Oxford (United Kingdom)
Jochen Peter, University of Amsterdam (Netherlands)
Sharon Ringel, University of Haifa (Israel)
Astrid Rosenthal-von der Pütten, RWTH Aachen University (Germany)
Eleanor Sandry, Curtin University (Australia)
Mauro Sarrica, Sapienza University of Rome (Italy)
Megan Strait, The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (U.S.A.)
Satomi Sugiyama, Franklin University Switzerland (Switzerland)
Sakari Taipale, University of Jyväskylä (Finland)
David Westerman, North Dakota State University (U.S.A.)

CONTENTS

Our Future Arrived: Diffusion of Human-Machine Communication and Transformation of the World for the Post-Pandemic Era	7
<i>Do Kyun David Kim, Gary L. Kreps, and Rukhsana Ahmed</i>	
Leveraging the Rhetorical Energies of Machines: COVID-19, Misinformation, and Persuasive Labor	11
<i>Miles C. Coleman</i>	
The Effects of Situational and Individual Factors on Algorithm Acceptance in COVID-19-Related Decision-Making: A Preregistered Online Experiment	27
<i>Sonja Utz, Lara N. Wolfers, and Anja S. Göritz</i>	
The Role of Vidura Chatbot in the Diffusion of KnowCOVID-19 Gateway	47
<i>Kerk F. Kee, Prasad Calyam, and Hariharan Regunath</i>	
Communicative Development and Diffusion of Humanoid AI Robots for the Post-Pandemic Health Care System	65
<i>Do Kyun David Kim, Gary L. Kreps, and Rukhsana Ahmed</i>	
What Will Affect the Diffusion of AI Agents?	83
<i>James W. Dearing</i>	

H M M C

H M M C

HUMAN-MACHINE

COMMUNICATION



Our Future Arrived: Diffusion of Human-Machine Communication and Transformation of the World for the Post-Pandemic Era

Do Kyun David Kim¹, Gary L. Kreps², Rukhsana Ahmed³

1 Department of Communication, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, Louisiana, USA

2 Department of Communication, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia, USA

3 Department of Communication, University at Albany—SUNY, Albany, New York, USA

The Greek philosopher Democritus's discovery and description of atoms, Isaac Newton's theory of forces, and Albert Einstein's theory of relativity are all seminal scientific cornerstones that stemmed from the examination and application of human experiences. More recently, humans have developed innovative technologies that express human creativity with new gadgets and machines. While science in the past investigated observed realities to identify underlying principles based upon human experience, now we are applying and extending scientific principles to cultivate the future with our imaginations. For many people, the novel idea of human-machine communication is still largely a fantasy. However, fantasy is becoming a reality today with many people consciously or unconsciously communicating with machines on a regular basis.

Once in a while, science was stalled by hegemonic social and religious regimes. For example, Galileo Galilei was pressured to recant his seditious scientific discovery that the Earth and other planets orbit around the Sun, since this flew in the face of popular belief during the Middle Ages that the Earth was the center of the universe. Similarly, the deification of dynasties in many Asian countries neglected or even disdained scientific minds until the early 20th century. However, since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution that brought unprecedented prosperity generated through the offspring of science, so-called machines, the valuation of science has been reappraised, and technology has determined the rise and fall of society in the modern world. Simultaneously, the advancement of

CONTACT Do Kyun David Kim  • Department of Communications • University of Louisiana at Lafayette • Lafayette, LA 70504 • do.kim@louisiana.edu

ISSN 2638-602X (print)/ISSN 2638-6038 (online)
www.hmcjournal.com



Copyright 2021 Authors. Published under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) license.

mechanized transportation and communication systems has accelerated the diffusion of technology, which synergically generated the ability that has helped to make many modern dreams come true.

Ironically, plagues have often born scientific revolutions. In 1665, the University of Cambridge was closed due to the bubonic plague. Therefore, Isaac Newton had to work from home. While walking around his estate, he saw an apple fall and discovered the important principle of gravity (Kaku, 2021). Now, during the 21st century, the COVID-19 pandemic shut down the world, forcing people to stay at home. This health crisis, however, has led to a tsunami of communication technology use across all societal sectors (from an individual's private life to organizations and the government) to enable the public to work, learn, order products and services, and interact from home. Now, we humans talk through, to, and with machines to achieve many of these goals, seeking information from search engines, websites, digital archives, automatic monitoring devices, GPS navigation systems, and a wide range of other automated tools. Human-machine communication is becoming a central part of our daily routines, such as relying on daily schedule reminders from communicable digital calendars, receiving alerts for us to take our daily medications, searching for hard-to-recall information and advice from Google, and asking Alexa to turn on/off our lights, music, and/or alarms. We have become so dependent on using these digital tools that many of us feel wary about going back to handling these tasks ourselves after the pandemic ends.

As communicable machines have evolved from simple voice-recognition devices to humanoid artificial intelligent (AI) robots, the ways people use and/or respond to such machines have changed. In the past, communicable machines with limited functions were not different from wrenches and hammers, so people treated them as tools in a toolbox. However, since AI-enabled communicable machines are increasingly being used to share jokes, stories, and happiness as well as sorrow with humans, many people have begun to have an emotional attachment with these machines, which supports the view that these machines have become important sources of meaningful communication. As a result, more and more, people are feeling comfortable communicating with machines. Some people have even married humanoid AI robots, although marriage with a non-human is not legally recognized yet, who knows what the future will bring (Yanke, 2020).

Human-machine communication has evolved tremendously within the past few years. For example, before the Siri virtual assistant application for iPhones was released in 2010, there was little recognition of human-machine communication. As the sales of smartphones with human-machine communication abilities skyrocketed worldwide, people have been widely exposed and rapidly assimilated to the new type of communication. This adoption of smartphones triggered the popularity of human-machine communication and most directly established the foundation for constructing a new paradigm in communication. Particularly, from the diffusion of innovations (DOI) perspective, the final stage of DOI is that the adopted innovation is routinized in and becomes part of our daily lives (Rogers, 2003) and, consequently, the diffusion of innovations results in social change. Imagine how valuable communicable machines have become for people during the COVID-19 pandemic. These forms of human-machine communication have contributed dramatically to people's private and work lives during the COVID-19 pandemic. Examining the increased use of human-machine communication during the pandemic suggests future applications of human-machine communication.

The world is getting into a new phase in history. For the first time, humans are verbally communicating and developing meaningful relationships with non-living objects. AI is a wormhole to open a gateway to the new world, and the COVID-19 pandemic prepared the world to transform its system to be an open system that responds to, communicates with, and utilizes the remnants coming out of the wormhole of the new world. Now, we urgently need to create a holistic discourse on how we can recognize, develop, or shape the identities of communicable machines as people develop a partnership with them. Based on the emerging questions and discourses about human-machine communication as presented above and beyond, this special issue was designed to promote the intellectual investigation of the present and attempt to predict the future with far advanced human-machine communication.

Human-machine communication is now paving the way for the imagined society where humans live with non-human partners. Our ancestors gagged and joked about it. But it turned out to be our present and will be the future. So let's see where and how far our untamed imagination goes and how it shapes our reality and future!

Author Biographies

Do Kyun David Kim (PhD, Ohio University) is Professor and Richard D'Aquin/BORSF Endowed Professor in the Department of Communication at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette. He is the founder/director of the AI Communication Research Consortium and inaugural editor-in-chief of the Korean Journal of Communication. His research and teaching spans dissemination and implementation science, based on the diffusion of information and innovations and social marketing. His areas of praxis focus on crisis and risk communication in the fields of public health, natural disaster prevention, and organizational/social change. He has conducted diverse communication projects in several countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, as well as the United States and published many books and research articles.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4117-2189>

Gary L. Kreps (PhD, University of Southern California) is University Distinguished Professor and Director of the Center for Health and Risk Communication at George Mason University. His more than 500 frequently cited published articles and books examine the information needs of vulnerable populations to guide evidence-based policy, technology, and practice interventions. He coordinates the INSIGHTS (International Studies to Investigate Global Health Information Trends) Research Consortium across 20-plus countries. His honors include the Research Laureate Award from the American Academy of Health Behavior, the Outstanding Health Communication Scholar Award from the NCA and ICA, and appointments as an AAHB Fellow, an ICA Fellow, and an NCA Distinguished Scholar.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5980-129X>

Rukhsana Ahmed (PhD, Ohio University) is Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Communication at the University at Albany, SUNY. Her research examines the role of communication, culture, media, and technology in shaping healthcare experiences of marginalized communities and promoting organizational and social changes and innovations in local, national, and international health contexts. Her research has been funded by federal agencies, foundations, and not-for-profit health organizations in Canada and the U.S., and produced top paper presentations at conferences, as well as publications in communication and public health journals. She is Chief Editor of the specialty section Health Communication of *Frontiers in Communication*.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0381-4491>

References

Kaku, M. (2021). *The God equation: The quest for a theory of everything*. Doubleday.

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.

Yanke, G. (2021). Tying the knot with a robot: Legal and philosophical foundations for human-artificial intelligence matrimony. *AI & Soc* 36, 417–427. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-020-00973-5>

Leveraging the Rhetorical Energies of Machines: COVID-19, Misinformation, and Persuasive Labor

Miles C. Coleman¹ 

¹ Communication Studies, Rowan University, Glassboro, New Jersey, USA


Abstract

The rampant misinformation amid the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrates an obvious need for persuasion. This article draws on the fields of digital rhetoric and rhetoric of science, technology, and medicine to explore the persuasive threats and opportunities machine communicators pose to public health. As a specific case, Alexa and the machine's performative similarities to the Oracle at Delphi are tracked alongside the voice-based assistant's further resonances with the discourses of expert systems to develop an account of the machine's rhetorical energies. From here, machine communicators are discussed as optimal deliverers of inoculations against misinformation in light of the fact that their performances are attended by rhetorical energies that can enliven persuasions against misinformation.

Keywords: human-machine communication, rhetoric, rhetorical energy, inoculation theory, COVID-19

Introduction: The Informational and Persuasive Labors of Machine Communicators Amid the Pandemic

With the COVID-19 pandemic came anxiety-inducing uncertainties (Rettie & Daniels, 2021), exacerbated by an accompanying “infodemic,” shaped not just by a massive surge of information, generated by unprecedented levels of effort to learn about the virus and its spread, but also misinformation (World Health Organization, 2020; Zaracostas, 2020).

CONTACT Miles C. Coleman  • Communication Studies • Rowan University • 201 Mullica Hill Rd, Glassboro, NJ 08028 • colemanm@rowan.edu

ISSN 2638-602X (print)/ISSN 2638-6038 (online)
www.hmcjournal.com



Copyright 2021 Authors. Published under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) license.

Consequently, it makes sense that much of the conversation about machine interlocutors amid the pandemic is focused on relieving humans from an uptick in demand for answers—*informational labor*. Chatbots, for instance, are identified in the academic literatures as potential means by which to offset the overloading of medical staff by distributing the labor of answering key medical questions across automated, artificially intelligent systems (Battineni et al., 2020; Sezgin et al., 2020) as well as means by which to enhance message cohesion by centralizing information within a single system, rather than across an array of individuals answering questions (Herriman et al., 2020). Machines do not need to sleep, nor do they take on the psychic burdens of relentless interactions with persons who are understandably worried about their place in a world marked by the unpredictability of viral spread and the isolation of preventative lockdown. Machines just “do.” As such, machines are conceived as interlocutors well-suited to reducing uncertainty for the people who need it without pushing added burden onto living, breathing humans. These sentiments reverberate in popular discourse of the pandemic as well. Take, for instance, the following, excerpted from a “news-vertising” article published in *The Atlantic*, which describes the abilities of IBM’s proprietary machine interlocutor:

One source of relief for government agencies, healthcare organizations, and academic institutions is coming from IBM’s Watson Assistant for Citizens. Watson Assistant for Citizens is an assistant with artificial intelligence that can understand and respond to common questions about COVID-19 on its own. The tool . . . leverages current data like guidance from the CDC and local sources, such as links to school closings, news, and state updates. (C. Jones, n.d.)

Feeling overwhelmed with all of the questions? IBM can help! In such discourses, machine communicators are imagined as interactive frequently asked question forums, which can update their answers in real time while delivering them in response to natural language queries, offsetting the informational labor of finding and sharing accurate, reliable information amid the pandemic. In this sense, the focus is on creating timely and accurate machine communicators more than on moving or influential ones. “Masks are currently required in Suffolk county.”

With concern to health and science communication, approaching the labors of human-machine communicators as informational largely fits with the assumptions of the *deficit model* of science communication (e.g., see Simis et al., 2016), wherein if people are engaging in behaviors that do not support public health, it is because they have not yet gotten the scientific facts—they have a deficit of scientific knowledge. And so it goes, this same assumption informs us that we should be focusing on machine communication in a way that supports accurately sharing the latest facts. Of course, timely and accurate facts are important to promoting public health. But, at the same time, such an approach might not go far enough to address the misinformation component of infodemics, wherein persons may very well have access to the facts, but instead choose misinformation that better fits their contexts of interpretation (Del Vicario et al., 2016), and thus they adopt behaviors and beliefs that undermine public health (e.g., refusing to wear a mask in public, or doubting the necessity of vaccination for protecting individual and public health). The problems of infodemics are not merely problems having to do with the exposition of facts; they are also problems having to do with the necessity of *persuasion* regarding the facts.

Miner et al. (2020) start to hint at the possibility that persuasive work, not just informational work, can be done by machines with regard to public health during the COVID-19 pandemic. In specific, they briefly proffer the possibilities of machine interlocutors as agents who might solicit more candid responses for symptom tracking, or tap into the power of repetition and step-by-step instruction for influencing individual health behaviors, or even console the lonely amid social isolation by offering ersatz companionship. In these contexts, the focus of the machine communicator is not simply to share accurate and timely information—it is also to persuade users toward positive health outcomes.

In support of such persuasive goals, and specifically for engaging productive persuasions that support public health in the face of misinformation, this article draws on the rhetorical tradition—an approach that is rare in human-machine communication scholarship—to explore the opportunities and threats of persuasion unique to machine communicators as they bear on public health problems, such as the COVID-19 pandemic. In rhetorical studies, there is a growing body of literature that takes machine communication as its object of analysis (e.g., Brock & Shepherd, 2016; Brown, 2015, 2014; Coleman, 2018, 2020; Hess & Davisson, 2017; J. Jones & Hirsu, 2019; K. Kennedy, 2016; Miller, 1978, 2007), interrogating the discourses *about*, as well as *of*, machines, helping to better understand machines as socio-historically situated actors that actively participate in meaning-making. However, rhetorical scholarship is seldom in direct conversation with the human-machine communication literature, and vice versa.

In the following sections, I put human-machine communication in conversation with the subfields of digital rhetoric and rhetoric of science, technology, and medicine to think through the rhetorical energies that attend machine interlocutors and the influential resonances of those energies with health and science communication. The article will start first with an operationalization of rhetorical energy as an idea useful for explaining the persuasive work of machine interlocutors beyond surface-level demarcations between technical or human-like performance. From here, Alexa, and the performative similarities that it shares with the Oracle at Delphi are traced to demonstrate that, while the machine is not *alive*, it nonetheless contributes rhetorical energies, which *enliven* public health claims by signaling to human concerns in more-than-human ways. Finally, inoculation theory is offered as a means by which to approach the persuasive labors of machines amid an infodemic, while leveraging the rhetorical energies of machine communicators to animate persuasions against misinformation.

The Rhetorical Energies of Machine Communicators

Rhetoric, for many, is a term that brings to mind such things as “stylistics,” and “lines of argument,” indicating a realm of scholarship and practice focused on *language*. Rhetoric is often also conceived as a squarely human enterprise in the sense of being reserved for those entities that can *be persuaded* just as much as they can *persuade others* with their eloquence. From this conception of rhetoric, machine communicators might be considered by some as *quasi* rhetors (rhetorical agents), in the sense of emulating human eloquence, rather than being persuasive in and of themselves, for they lack the capacity to engage genuine symbolic interaction (e.g., see Hepp, 2020). For this reason, one might find it difficult to concede that machine communicators *add* anything in the way of rhetorical action. If anything,

human-machine communication might be said to *lack* that something *more* found within genuine exchanges between living, breathing persons: “a *relationship* between two entities who will attribute agency to each other” (Miller, 2007, p. 149, emphasis added; see also, Yang, 2020).

Yet, if we adjust our definition of rhetoric, say, by following George Kennedy (1992) in his proposal to think of rhetoric not as based in language or argument, or even as solely the enterprise of humans, but rather as “the *energy* inherent in communication” the persuasiveness of machines *as machines* begins to emerge (p. 2, emphasis added). In defining rhetoric as energy, the locus of rhetoric is found not in language, but in the energy expended and experienced in a given interaction, shaped by biology and culture. Rhetorical energy can include language, but also includes such things as “physical actions, facial expressions, gestures, and signs generally” (p. 4). What makes Kennedy’s contribution particularly distinctive is his interrogation of the rhetorics of non-human animals, which are not located in language per se, but rather in performances. Bucks demonstrating their rank in the deer social order via public displays of strength. That is rhetorical energy. Flowers making appeals to honeybees with sweet smells. That is rhetorical energy too. The crux of rhetoric as energy is that it locates influence not in *language*, or human action, but more broadly in the energies that are “at work” in the interaction between entities.

Relocating influence in this way, as Ingraham (2018) elaborates, jaunts the analyst into “the biologically hardwired realm of pre-intentional survival mechanisms, those that are communicated through a perceivable code, yes, but not necessarily in symbolic messages governed by a semiotic regime of meaning” (p. 262). Put differently, while our visceral responses to the world—and the other entities that imbue it with energy—might be “read,” they are also non-conscious, born of entanglements of biology and culture. Although George Kennedy (1992) is largely concerned with the prospect of locating rhetoric in the realm of nonhuman animals, it does not take a large leap to consider that machines, as they pulse electricity and carry out processes, are expending energies, beyond words. When we do, we might recognize that, while machines might not be engaging in genuine symbolic interaction with their human counterparts, they might nonetheless *add* something persuasive *as machines*, located not in stylistics or lines of argument per se, but rather in the multisensorial performances of their movements “behind and beyond the screen” (Boyle et al., 2018, p. 255). In a similar manner to what Hawhee (2017) points out in her historical readings of nonhuman animals as they relate to rhetorical practice, machinic performances can be said to “enliven the imagination” (p. 169). Snapping turtles, thrashing sharks, sleeping bears—they provide *more*, found in the elevation of metaphors, experienced not simply in the mind, but in the body, and in ways that rely on the import of nonhuman rhetorical energies. It is in this way that we can see what rhetorical energy as a term of art reveals in the analysis: while machines are *not alive*, they nonetheless perform in *lively* ways, manifesting force as visceral responses entangled with material culture to enliven discourse.

By *lively* (rather than *alive*), I mean that the agency of machine communicators can be conceptualized as existing between capacity and effectivity, located not in agents, but rather in performative events (Miller, 2007), instantiating *intra*-actions, or agential outcomes resulting not from direct human action, but rather from negotiations between humans *and* nonhumans (Barad, 2007). As Krista Kennedy (2016) succinctly articulates: “Conceptualized as performance rather than as inherent capacity, agency is not a property that a subject

can possess . . . but rather it arises through response to a situation composed of parameters beyond the control of any single actor” (p. 33). While machines may not be invested minds, making appeals to others, they do instantiate performances, intermingling in the wider discourse ecology, moving on their own, reacting to situations, imbuing them with their energies.

Machine communicators, as they move on their own, carry an air, a distinctly nonhuman ethos, located in visceral responses to their movements, entangled with culture. As Miller (1978) has noted, technologies, such as computing machines, are accompanied by an ethos that encourages us “to think them truer, or more transparent, or more objective” precisely because they are meant to remove the human, encouraging an unadulterated experience with the “external world” (p. 236). The movements of computing machines, then, because they derive from developmental traditions of engineering and mathematics—so-called hard-logical realms of knowledge—can afford “the reassurance of forethought, stripped away from the fallibility of the human ‘heart’ and ‘hand,’” meaning that machine communicators, while they certainly can imitate human communication, are also attended by (non)human energies, wherein, “science is given ‘legs’” (Coleman, 2018, p. 343). So, machine communicators can certainly mime the symbolic interactions of humans, but they do so while also *performing as machines* attended by energies that interact with human bodies, primed by technoscientific cultural habitus to cultivate visceral *feelings*, beyond words.

For example, accompanying Alexa’s robotic voice response instructing a person that they should seek COVID-19 testing (e.g., see The Mayo Foundation, 2021) are the energies of a computing machine, making real-time application programming interface calls while analyzing user responses in coalition with the Centers for Disease Control and the Mayo Clinic. Such energies, in that they can offer a feeling associated with the “promise of algorithmic objectivity” (Gillespie, 2014, p. 168), are complementary to the scientific-based health claims being made by Alexa. The rhetorical energies of the machine, in other words, support the plea to get tested by resonating with the grander discourses of science, technology, and mathematics, not merely as an idea, but rather as a feeling, entangled with the idea, imbued via the movements of Alexa. In the same way that the timbre of a person’s voice and the gesticulation of their body matter to the impact of their utterances in ways enculturated by public life (e.g., learning how to “pick up” on the energies of persons’ performances) the computational performance of Alexa matters to its influence. Only, we are unaccustomed to talking about the nonverbal performances of machines, at least in ways that push *deeper*, beyond the surface.

Going “Deeper” With the Rhetorical Energies of Machines: Toward Anthropromechanation

In human-computer interaction studies there exists the concept of “automation bias,” which designates those moments where persons trust in the conclusions afforded by machine communicators because the machines behave in machine-like ways. Additionally, it is known that the trustworthiness and non-trustworthiness of machines toggle as one differentiates between specific designs of machinic agents and their purposes. That is, if we are designing a machinic agent to be a fun friend, designs that encourage anthropomorphism are likely to enhance user trust. Conversely, if we are designing a machinic agent to act in the stead of an

expert (e.g., medical doctor or teacher) it is likely that designs that encourage automation bias enhance user trust (Seeger & Heinzl, 2018). What we learn from this is that neither anthropomorphism nor automation bias is solely sufficient for capturing the influence of machine communication because context matters. Such a realization is supported by studies that test human reactions to robot speech, which demonstrate that humans tend to rate interactions with robots more positively when they are polite. So, for instance, if a robot guard is inspecting peoples' bags, those people might feel less threatened by the robot if it includes niceties—"Please, and thank you"—along with its commands and instructions. Such is an outcome "interpreted as evidence for people expecting robots to be polite in a robotic way" (Meyer et al., 2016, p. 280).

Similarly, analyses of human-human and human-chatbot conversations show that people use more profanity when talking with a chatbot. Specifically, "the greater use of profanity in these conversations suggests that participants never lost sight of the fact that they were communicating with a computer" (Hill et al., 2015, p. 250). What we garner from such studies is that machines, whether they are performing like machines or are performing more like humans, are subject to expectations that are unique to machines, but are nonetheless modulated by the habits of human social interaction, wherein, people "apply a wide range of social rules mindlessly," not because people are thinking about the human in the computer, but rather, they are operating in rote as beings enculturated as human interactants (Nass & Moon, 2000, p. 93). To read into the rhetorical energies of machines is to employ the interpretive sensibilities of the rhetorical tradition to drive at the otherwise rote, mindless expectations applied to machine communicators, by unpacking the deep ecologies of discourse that shape what "machine-like" means, beyond simply declaring a given performance as robotic or anthropomorphic.

In human-machine communication, Banks & de Graaf (2020) have made strides to push past the automation/anthropomorphization binary in their proposal for *agent-agnosticism*, which clears space for the idea that machines are not merely *media* of human communication, for they also contribute to meaning-making (see also Gunkel, 2012; Guzman & Lewis, 2020). Specifically, the agent-agnostic model: "(1) considers each agent's functions in the process (with attention to functions that may not be directly observable) and (2) draws on literatures pertaining to those functions (independent of enacting agent) to consider how meaning may emerge through antecedents, processes, and effects of that function" (Banks & de Graaf, 2020, p. 26). Interrogating the rhetorical energies of machine communicators is to take up an agent-agnostic approach while placing special attention on the antecedents of discourse and materiality that are entangled with the multisensorial performances of machines, which may not be directly observable, but which are nonetheless present. Masculine hegemony, *I-Robot*, the Oracle of Delphi, the physical properties of electricity, and the evolution of the software ecology—such discourses and material realities interact to inform the energies of machinic performance. Orienting to these *ambient* features is to attune to those human (and nonhuman) actants that work together to shape the lifeworlds in which the rhetorical energies of machines emerge (Rickert, 2013). Rhetorical energy is a means by which to dive deeper—to go beyond the surface-level automation/anthropomorphization binary—by recognizing that, while machines might not "believe" or "feel," they nonetheless contribute energies, which can enliven human discourses in more-than-human ways.

Enlivening Human-Machine Communication With Rhetorical Energies: Alexa and the Oracle of Delphi

Where much of the conversation about machine-communicators in public health contexts tends to focus on their abilities to deliver accurate and valid information regarding, for example, resources for addiction (Nobles et al., 2020) or information about vaccination (Alagha & Helbing, 2019), existing work in human-machine communication starts to move toward the idea that machine communicators might also be contributors of persuasive labor. For example, it has been shown that, in public health contexts, like sexually communicable disease messaging, persons can perceive the *quality* of Twitter bots as roughly equivalent to human communication concerning credibility, attractiveness, communication competency, and interactiveness (Edwards et al., 2014). Locating the rhetorical energies of machines takes this a step further to ask whether machine interlocutors *as machines*, might also bring something *more* than mere human or technical performance.

At the surface level, for instance, the plea of Alexa to the human to seek testing for COVID-19 seems to leverage automation bias to garner trust in its claim. But, if we were to dive deeper, we might consider the longstanding trope of the *prophet*, and the emergence of modern scientific forecasting and interpretation into existing cultural grooves of discourse previously etched from millennia of looking to oracles, augers, and seers for answers (Walsh, 2013), and how this trope interacts with the phenomenon of “knowledge-based systems,” or as they are more commonly called, *expert systems* (Akerkar & Sajja, 2010). Expert systems (e.g., analysis tools for modeling chemical compounds, climate forecasting, and medical diagnosis) operate from *knowledge-bases*, most commonly derived from the efforts of experts, and *inference engines*, sets of logical procedures programmed into the system for retrieving information from the knowledge-base. Expert systems have emerged as nodal points of interaction, characterized by rituals, born of the work of software engineers and scientific experts, to better interpret and make truths beyond the limits of human perception, which further resonates with the trope of the prophet.

For example, in the ancient Greek ritual of Delphic divination, the Pythia, also known as the Oracle of Delphi, was a position filled by the “rulers of the oracle” who would select “a virtuous woman of the lower classes” (Farnell, 1907, p. 189). The Pythia would inhale divine vapors as they rose from a fissure in the Temple of Apollo, impelling her to speak as a medium, manically echoing the truths of the *aether*, which would then be interpreted into prophecy (p. 189). The Pythia was treated as a portal to the *aether*—a conduit to truth. When she spoke, her words were attended by rhetorical energies, perceptible as movement and prosody, ambiently entangled with cultural practice, which signaled to human concerns in more-than-human ways. The Oracle was a human, who spoke as a human, imbued with the vibratory rhetorical energies of the divine. Of course, with the passing of time, our paradigms of knowledge-making have shifted in aspiration, represented in movements away from rituals of superstition, and toward rituals of scientific observation and data-driven analysis. Despite the shift in ritual, though, the role of prophecy remains. Instead of leveraging the divine vapors, and the Oracle of Delphi herself, as “technologies of prophecy,” we increasingly turn to computing technologies as means by which to see beyond the human, to visualize and make sense of otherwise imperceptible data, such as that involved in climate change modeling (Walsh, 2013, p. 165). Expert systems, while they very well can

possess scientific knowledge, also emerge as integral technologies of prophecy, which participate in our modern discourses not merely by satiating our cerebral needs for data, but also our embodied needs for reassurance—to *feel* like we “know.”

Alexa, in that it is a system that has a knowledge-base and an inference engine is technically an expert system. But, interestingly it is also one that shares characteristics with the Oracle of Delphi. Alexa is not a technology of prophecy exclusively entitled to the prophets of science (i.e., experts); it is more accessible to persons across levels of intellectual initiation and class divides. Coupled with the fact that Alexa performs as female, and one who might even be characterized as “virtuous,” at least in the chaste sense that the ancients probably meant it, further alludes to a deep resonance with the Delphic rituals of yore and the modern rituals of expert systems (and all of the patriarchal and elitist baggage that comes with; e.g., see Woods, 2018). Alexa, moreover, is a machine communicator, characterized by a rhetorical energy that resonates with grander discourses of science, technology, and medicine entangled with the trope of the prophet, emerging as an oracle for patrons to solicit insight from the *aether*, affording a semblance of stable knowledge amid a moment characterized by uncertainties and unknowns, manifest as a visceral feeling, offered by its performance as a *machine* signaling to human concerns in more-than-human-ways.

Supporting Alexa’s oracle-esque energy is the networked nature of its communication. That is, while a given “skill” (an application programmed into the Alexa framework) might entail a specific, closed knowledge-base (e.g., the currently known symptoms of COVID-19 as curated by the Mayo Clinic), the system itself is more broadly networked to many knowledge-bases, including, for instance, *Wikipedia*, the web-based encyclopedia, self-proclaimed as an open collaboration aimed at the goal to “create a world in which everyone can freely share in the sum of all knowledge” (“Wikipedia:About,” 2021). It is in this sense that the rhetorical energies of Alexa are manifold, entwined in an ambient infrastructure and manifest in its movements as a machine, offering a nodal flash in which Alexa’s grander network of actants is invoked as an “inventional resource” (Besel, 2011, p. 122) composed of electricity, wires, software ecologies, organizational images, as well as public imaginings, characterized by long-seated socio-historical happenings, myths, metaphors, and rituals. “You should wear a mask to protect yourself and others.”

Is Alexa convincing because it solicits automation bias? Probably. But, it is also convincing because it *moves* with the energies of an oracle, directly wired into the info-sphere, affording a glimpse into the *aether*, offering a conversation that *feels* like shaking the bones—to foresee—amid a global pandemic fraught with anxiety-inducing uncertainty. Alexa and the impact of its utterances is not straightforwardly a matter of technical features or human-esque behavior—it is also a matter of historical grooves of discourse, punctuated by technoscientific assumptions, and the contemporary public imagination of health.

As with any other sort of rhetoric, the rhetorical energies of machine communicators are not intrinsically fixed to the *facts*. In the context of public health, leveraging the rhetorical energies of machines is a tactic that can be employed to undermine public health, just as much as it can be employed to support it. Where the example of Alexa above is leveraging a machinic rhetorical energy that resonates with the trope of the prophet to support appeals to protect public health, that same energy can also undermine public health by playing into discourses that facilitate conspiratorial denials of health science, further underscoring the persuasive labors of which machines are capable. For example, a dispelled

piece of misinformation, appearing in a TikTok video, shared as a Facebook post, exhibits Alexa answering the question, “Alexa, did the government release the coronavirus?” to which Alexa responds, “According to Event 201, the government planned this event, created the virus and had a simulation of how the countries would react. This simulation occurred October 18, 2019. The government released the virus among the population and has lost control of the outbreak” (cited in Orsagos, 2020). Based on recreations of the question posed to Alexa, and on statements from Amazon, the question and answer have been deemed a hoax (Orsagos, 2020). Some have conjectured that Alexa was pre-programmed to respond in the way that it did. But, why would someone do that? The answer is in the rhetorical energy that Alexa affords. Rather than making a traditional “tin foil hat” post to Facebook, the creator of this video has created a machinic performance, which leverages the rhetorical energies of Alexa to afford not just a technical credibility, but also an affective potency, resonant with the trope of the prophet as it is smashed in with the suspicions of COVID-19 pandemic conspiracy theorists and technoscientific ritual. Machinic performances, and the energies that attend them, moreover, are not bound to the “objectivity” of science and mathematics that we often equate with them—they can be leveraged in ways that construct truthiness and legitimacy, even for claims that are untrue.

What we realize from this is that, alongside being a resource for enacting informational labor amid public health crises like the COVID-19 pandemic, machine communicators are also emerging as unique resources of *persuasive* labor, characterized by machinic rhetorical energies, which can be leveraged to promote or undermine public health.

Enlivening Inoculations Against Misinformation With Machinic Rhetorical Energies

The notion that machine communicators are emerging as a means for science denialists to circulate misinformation is underscored by Amazon’s implementation of a policy to remove and restrict COVID-19 Alexa skills during the pandemic (Schwartz, 2020). Alongside this, according to Tom Taylor, senior vice president of the Alexa unit, with concern to the use of the voice-based assistant amid the pandemic, “We’ve seen a huge increase in the use of voice in the home” (cited in Soper, 2020). The machine interlocutor, then, seems to present itself as an opportunity to counteract misinformation amid infodemics, and in ways that can leverage not only the affordances of automation but also the rhetorical energies of machine communicators to do more than share accurate and timely facts. Inoculation theory offers one route for doing just that.

Inoculation theory operates on the assumption that giving weakened versions of misleading information will activate a response “that is analogous to the cultivation of ‘mental antibodies,’ rendering the person immune to (undesirable) persuasion attempts” (McGuire, 1961; van Der Linden & Roozenbeek, 2020, p. 152). Since its inception in the early 1960s, the idea has been repeatedly tested and studied, demonstrating that inoculation works to protect people from being persuaded by misinformation. For example, according to Banas & Rains’s (2010) meta-analysis of over 40 years of inoculation theory studies: “Even with a concerted effort to avoid publication bias and the possibility of inflated effects, the data revealed inoculation treatments are superior at conferring resistance when compared to

both no-treatment control and supportive treatments” (p. 305; see also, Compton et al., 2016).

Inoculation messages require two ingredients. The first is an (implied or directly stated) threat, and the second is a counterargument against (or refutation of) misinformation (Compton, 2013; Compton & Pfau, 2009; McGuire, 1964). The following is an example of an inoculation message, which includes a direct statement of threat in the form of a warning, alongside a refutation:

Warning: “Some politically motivated groups use misleading tactics to try to convince the public that there is a lot of disagreement among scientists.”

Refutation: “However, scientific research has found that among climate scientists, there is virtually no disagreement that humans are causing climate change.” (van der Linden et al., 2017, p. 3)

These two-part messages induce a threat response to the warning, which activates the body (one’s feelings), motivating learning from the counterargument. In this sense, and as is supported by the literature, *both* components (the threat and the counterargument) need to be present for inoculation to occur (e.g., see van der Linden et al., 2017). Inoculation messages, because they can be formulated into discrete warning/refutation messages, triggered by specific keywords of misinformation, lend themselves to being automated into the communicative repertoire of machine communicators. Coupled with this is the important factor of inoculation “decay,” which means that the protective effects of an inoculation message get weaker over time (Maertens et al., 2020; Maertens et al., 2021; Pfau & Burgoon, 1988). Inoculation constancy is an outcome achievable with automation. Machine communicators, moreover, are means by which to follow up with “booster” messages to maintain protection from misinformed persuasions.

Where inoculation might largely be conceived as a prophylactic measure—that is, a measure meant to *avoid* infection—there is growing interest in, and evidence for, pursuing the therapeutic uses of inoculation as a means of *un-infecting* misinformed persons (Compton, 2020; van der Linden & Roozenbeek, 2020; Wood, 2007). Put differently, inoculation can protect people from being persuaded by misinformation. But, we are also learning that it might also help to undo the effects of misleading information. Concurrent to this, *active* inoculation has been proposed as an approach that does not necessarily focus on subject-specific misinformation (e.g., COVID-19 conspiracies, or vaccine denialism), but rather the *techniques* of misinformation broadly. This form of inoculation is meant to equip persons to better sift through ulterior motives and slights of hand when they are presented as “facts” by actively engaging with those techniques, by, for instance, playing a video game to spot fake news (Basol et al., 2020; van der Linden et al., 2020).

Consequently, inoculation presents a means by which to reconceptualize the labors of machine communicators amid an infodemic beyond the deficit model of science communication. This could entail including, right alongside the accurate and timely facts, inoculation messages, ported to instances of misinformation, built into two-part (warning and counterargument) messages, delivered prophylactically to keywords of public health, and therapeutically to keywords of misinformation—persuasions as well as facts. But it could also

involve more interactive experiences meant to inoculate by encouraging users to actively engage the techniques of misinformation, wherein the machine might be leveraged to periodically “check in” with users, offering them a quick game of spot the fake news. Moreover, delivering inoculation messages via the machine might be optimal, because of its attending rhetorical energies. By engaging inoculative messaging with a machine interlocutor, like Alexa, one can say that the machine is doing more to enact the persuasive labors necessitated by an infodemic, while, at the same time, augmenting with a potent *feeling* entangled with the discourses of expert systems as they resonate with the trope of the prophet.

Conclusion

Despite the dominant imaginings of machine communicators as well-suited for engaging informational labor amid crises, we must recognize that they are also capable of persuasive labor, which can promote or undermine public health. Here, I have suggested inoculation theory as a means for leveraging the persuasive labors of machines amid infodemics, for inoculation messages lend themselves to being automated, and automation itself affords a route to inoculation constancy, supporting sustained immunity to misleading persuasions. Beyond this, I have suggested that the performances of machine communicators are attended by rhetorical energies, which can enliven their persuasions against misinformation, illustrating that perhaps they are optimal agents for taking up that work.

Social scientific questions are raised by the current discussion. Do inoculations, perceived as originating from machines, have more or less potent effects than those perceived to originate from persons? What do the decay effects of inoculation interventions look like in cases where constancy is added by the machine? Are there differences in the effects of prophylactic engagements and therapeutic engagements wagered by machines? Does interactivity matter to either prophylactic or therapeutic interventions? On par, questions for interpretive scholars are also raised. I have developed an account of the rhetorical energies of Alexa’s machinic performance as it bears on public health discourse. But, are there other accounts of rhetorical energy that help to understand machinic performances in contexts beyond health and science (e.g., art or politics)? What tactics of leveraging the rhetorical energies of machines emerge in those contexts?

The discussion of this article, in that it draws on rhetorical scholarship to explore the persuasive threats and opportunities of machine communicators amid infodemics, highlights the value-added of interpretive approaches to human-machine communication: to read deeply, beyond the surface. But, because many of the learning moments arrived at in this article are derived not from interpretive *or* social scientific perspectives, but rather, *between* them, I am hopeful that scholars of human-machine communication will consider putting their work in conversation with existing rhetorical work on machine communicators, and vice versa. Doing so can only be generative, for as we are learning from the pandemic, machine communicators and their relations to communicative practice, evolve, emerge, and metamorphize in unexpected ways. Moving toward more holistic accounts of machine communication, either through cross-citation or in full-out collaborations across epistemologies, is a means for accounting for the human experience as we increasingly negotiate it with machines during, and beyond, the COVID-19 pandemic.

Author Biographies

Miles Coleman is an assistant professor of Communication Studies at Rowan University. He studies rhetoric of science, digital rhetoric, and communication ethics. His research appears in such journals as *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, *Review of Communication*, *First Monday*, *Journal of Media Ethics*, *Journal of Aesthetics & Culture*, and *Western Journal of Communication*, among others.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5321-7997>

References

- Akerkar, R., & Sajja, P. (2010). *Knowledge-based systems*. Jones & Bartlett Publishers. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210326182522/https://www.jblearning.com/catalog/productdetails/9780763776473>
- Alagha, E. C., & Helbing, R. R. (2019). Evaluating the quality of voice assistants' responses to consumer health questions about vaccines: An exploratory comparison of Alexa, Google Assistant and Siri. *BMJ Health & Care Informatics*, 26(1:e100075), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjhci-2019-100075>
- Banas, J. A., & Rains, S. A. (2010). A meta-analysis of research on inoculation theory. *Communication Monographs*, 77(3), 281–311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751003758193>
- Banks, J., & de Graaf, M. (2020). Toward an agent-agnostic transmission model: Synthesizing anthropocentric and technocentric paradigms in communication. *Human-Machine Communication*, 1(1), 19–36. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.1.2>
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv12101zq>
- Basol, M., Roozenbeek, J., & van der Linden, S. (2020). Good news about bad news: Gamified inoculation boosts confidence and cognitive immunity against fake news. *Journal of Cognition*, 3(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.5334/joc.91>
- Battineni, G., Chintalapudi, N., Amenta, F. (2020). AI chatbot design during an epidemic like the novel coronavirus. *Healthcare*, 8(2), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare8020154>
- Besel, R. D. (2011). Opening the “black box” of climate change science: Actor-network theory and rhetorical practice in scientific controversies. *Southern Communication Journal*, 76(2), 120–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10417941003642403>
- Boyle, C., Brown Jr, J. J., & Ceraso, S. (2018). The digital: Rhetoric behind and beyond the screen. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 48(3), 251–259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02773945.2018.1454187>
- Brock, K., & Shepherd, D. (2016). Understanding how algorithms work persuasively through the procedural enthymeme. *Computers and Composition*, 42, 17–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2016.08.007>
- Brown, J. J. (2015). *Ethical programs: Hospitality and the rhetorics of software*. University of Michigan Press. <https://doi.org/10.1353/book.42619>
- Brown J. J. (2014). The machine that therefore I am. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 47(4), 494–514. <https://doi.org/10.5325/philtrhet.47.4.0494>

- Coleman, M. C. (2018). Machinic rhetorics and the influential movements of robots. *Review of Communication*, 18(4), 336–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15358593.2018.1517417>
- Coleman, M. C. (2020). Comparative rhetorics of technology and the energies of ancient Indian robots. In K. Lloyd (Ed.), *Handbook on comparative rhetoric*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367809768-1>
- Compton, J. (2013). Inoculation theory. In J. P. Dillard & L. Shen (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of persuasion: Developments in theory and practice* (2nd ed.). SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452218410>
- Compton, J. (2020). Prophylactic versus therapeutic inoculation treatments for resistance to influence. *Communication Theory*, 30(3), 330–343. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qtz004>
- Compton, J., Jackson, B., & Dimmock, J. A. (2016). Persuading others to avoid persuasion: Inoculation theory and resistant health attitudes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7:122, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00122>
- Compton, J., & Pfau, M. (2009). Spreading inoculation: Inoculation, resistance to influence, and word-of-mouth communication. *Communication Theory*, 19(1), 9–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2008.01330.x>
- Del Vicario, M., Bessi, A., Zollo, F., Petroni, F., Scala, A., Caldarelli, G., Stanley, E. H., & Quattrociocchi, W. (2016). The spreading of misinformation online. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(3), 554–559. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1517441113>
- Edwards, C., Edwards, A., Spence, P. R., & Shelton, A. K. (2014). Is that a bot running the social media feed? Testing the differences in perceptions of communication quality for a human agent and a bot agent on Twitter. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 33, 372–376. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.08.013>
- Farnell, L. R. (1907). *The cults of the Greek states* (Vol. IV). Oxford at the Clarendon Press.
- Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. J. Boczkowski, & K. A. Foot (Eds.), *Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality, and society*. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262525374.001.0001>
- Gunkel, D. J. (2012). Communication and artificial intelligence: Opportunities and challenges for the 21st century. *Communication+1* 1(1:1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.7275/R5QJ7F7R>
- Guzman, A. L., & Lewis, S. C. (2020). Artificial intelligence and communication: A Human–Machine Communication research agenda. *New Media & Society*, 22(1), 70–86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444819858691>
- Hawhee, D. (2017). *Rhetoric in tooth and claw: Animals, language, sensation*. University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226398204.001.0001>
- Hepp, A. (2020). Artificial companions, social bots, and works bots: Communicative robots as research objects of media and communication studies. *Media, Culture, & Society* 42(7–8), 1410–1426. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443720916412>
- Herriman, M., Meer, E., Rosin, R., Lee, V., Washington, V., & Volpp, K. G. (2020, June 18). Asked and answered: Building a chatbot to address Covid-19-related concerns. *NEJM Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery*. <https://catalyst.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/CAT.20.0230>
- Hess, A., & Davisson, A. (Eds.). (2017). *Theorizing digital rhetoric*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315203645>

- Hill, J., Ford, W. R., & Farreras, I. G. (2015). Real conversations with artificial intelligence: A comparison between human-human online conversations and human-chatbot conversations. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 49, 245–250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.02.026>
- Ingraham, C. (2018). Energy: Rhetoric's vitality. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 48(3), 260–268. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02773945.2018.1454188>
- Jones, C. (n.d.). Meet “Watson,” the AI chatbot answering coronavirus questions. *The Atlantic*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210326175407/https://www.theatlantic.com/sponsored/salesforce-2020/IBM/3391/>
- Jones, J., & Hirsu, L. (Eds). (2019) *Rhetorical machines: Writing, code, and computational ethics*. University of Alabama Press.
- Kennedy, G. A. (1992). A hoot in the dark: The evolution of general rhetoric. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 25(1), 1–21. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40238276>
- Kennedy, K. (2016). *Textual curation: Authorship, agency, and technology in Wikipedia and Chambers's Cyclopædia*. University of South Carolina Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv6wgmzj>
- Maertens, R., Anseel, F., & van der Linden, S. (2020). Combatting climate change misinformation: Evidence for longevity of inoculation and consensus messaging effects. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 70, 101455, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2020.101455>
- Maertens, R., Roozenbeek, J., Basol, M., & van der Linden, S. (2021). Long-term effectiveness of inoculation against misinformation: Three longitudinal experiments. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 27(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xap0000315>
- The Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research. (2021). *Skills from Mayo Clinic*. Mayo Clinic. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210325132431/https://www.mayoclinic.org/voice/apps>
- McGuire, W. J. (1961). The effectiveness of supportive and refutational defenses in immunizing and restoring beliefs against persuasion. *Sociometry*, 24(2), 184–197. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2786067>
- McGuire, W. J. (1964). Inducing resistance to persuasion: Some contemporary approaches. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2601\(08\)x6005-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2601(08)x6005-8)
- Meyer, J., Miller, C., Hancock, P., de Visser, E. J., & Dorneich, M. (2016). Politeness in machine-human and human-human interaction. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*, 60(1), 279–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541931213601064>
- Miller, C. R. (1978). Technology as a form of consciousness: A study of contemporary ethos. *Central States Speech Journal*, 29(4), 228–236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510977809367983>
- Miller, C. R. (2007). What can automation tell us about agency? *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 37(2), 137–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02773940601021197>
- Miner, A. S., Laranjo, L., & Kocaballi, A. B. (2020). Chatbots in the fight against the COVID-19 pandemic. *npj Digital Medicine*, 3, Article 65 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-0280-0>
-

- Nass, C., & Moon, Y. (2000). Machines and mindlessness: Social responses to computers. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56(1), 81–103. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00153>
- Nobles, A. L., Leas, E. C., Caputi, T. L., Zhu, S. H., Strathdee, S. A., & Ayers, J. W. (2020). Responses to addiction help-seeking from Alexa, Siri, Google Assistant, Cortana, and Bixby intelligent virtual assistants. *npj Digital Medicine*, 3, Article 11. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-019-0215-9>
- Orsagos, P. (2020, April 16). No, Amazon's Alexa doesn't say 'the government' planned the coronavirus pandemic. *Politifact*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210326180010/https://www.politifact.com/factchecks/2020/apr/16/facebook-posts/no-amazons-alexa-doesnt-say-government-planned-cor/>
- Pfau, M., & Burgoon, M. (1988). Inoculation in political campaign communication. *Human Communication Research*, 15(1), 91–111. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1988.tb00172.x>
- Rettie, H., & Daniels, J. (2021). Coping and tolerance of uncertainty: Predictors and mediators of mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic. *American Psychologist*, 76(3), 427–437. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/amp0000710>
- Rickert, T. (2013). *Ambient rhetoric: The attunements of rhetorical being*. University of Pittsburgh Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt5hjgwx>
- Schwartz, E. H. (2020, March 17). EXCLUSIVE: Amazon Alexa has removed coronavirus skills and won't approve new ones. *VoiceBot*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210326180507/https://voicebot.ai/2020/03/17/amazon-alexa-is-removing-and-limiting-coronavirus-skills/>
- Seeger, A., & Heinzl, A. (2018). Human versus machine: Contingency factors of anthropomorphism as a trust-inducing design strategy for conversational agents. In F. D. Davis, R. Riedl, J. vom Brocke, P. Léger, & A. B. Randolph (Eds.), *Lecture notes in information systems and organization 25*. Springer International. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67431-5_15
- Sezgin, E., Huang, Y., Ramtekkar, U., & Lin, S. (2020). Readiness for voice assistants to support healthcare delivery during a health crisis and pandemic. *npj Digital Medicine*, 3, Article 122. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-00332-0>
- Simis, M. J., Madden, H., Cacciatore, M. A., & Yeo, S. K. (2016). The lure of rationality: Why does the deficit model persist in science communication? *Public Understanding of Science*, 25(4), 400–414. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662516629749>
- Soper, T. (2020, June 25). Amazon Alexa leader: COVID-19 has sparked “a huge increase in the use of voice in the home.” *GeekWire*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210326180746/https://www.geekwire.com/2020/amazon-alexa-leader-covid-19-sparked-huge-increase-use-voice-home/>
- van der Linden, S., Leiserowitz, A., Rosenthal, S., & Maibach, E. (2017). Inoculating the public against misinformation about climate change. *Global Challenges*, 1(2:1600008), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/gch2.201600008>
- van der Linden, S., and Roozenbeek, J. (2020). Psychological inoculation against fake news. In R. Greifenader, M. Jaffé, E. Newman, and N. Schwarz (Eds.), *The psychology of fake news: Accepting, sharing, and correcting misinformation*. Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429295379>

- van der Linden, S., Roozenbeek, J., & Compton, J. (2020). Inoculating against fake news about COVID-19. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, Article 566790. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.566790>
- Walsh, L. (2013). *Scientists as prophets: A rhetorical genealogy*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199857098.001.0001>
- Wikipedia:About. (2021, March 11) In *Wikipedia*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210326181645/https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia3AAbout&oldid=1011466045>
- Wood, M. L. (2007). Rethinking the inoculation analogy: Effects on subjects with differing preexisting attitudes. *Human Communication Research, 33*(3), 357–378. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2007.00303.x>
- Woods, H. S. (2018). Asking more of Siri and Alexa: Feminine persona in service of surveillance capitalism. *Critical Studies in Media Communication, 35*(4), 334–349. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2018.1488082>
- World Health Organization. (2020, April 15). *Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) situation report—86*. https://web.archive.org/web/20210308172123/https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200415-sitrep-86-covid-19.pdf?sfvrsn=c615ea20_6
- Yang, M. (2020). Painful conversations: Therapeutic chatbots and public capacities. *Communication and the Public, 5*(1–2), 35–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2057047320950636>
- Zarocostas, J. (2020). How to fight an infodemic. *The Lancet, 395*(10225), 676. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30461-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30461-X)
-

The Effects of Situational and Individual Factors on Algorithm Acceptance in COVID-19-Related Decision-Making: A Preregistered Online Experiment

Sonja Utz^{1,2} , Lara N. Wolfers² , and Anja S. Göritz³ 

1 Leibniz-Institut für Wissensmedien, Schleichstr. 6, 72076 Tübingen, Germany

2 University of Tübingen, 72074 Tübingen, Germany

3 University of Freiburg, Occupational and Consumer Psychology, 79106 Freiburg, Germany

Abstract

In times of the COVID-19 pandemic, difficult decisions such as the distribution of ventilators must be made. For many of these decisions, humans could team up with algorithms; however, people often prefer human decision-makers. We examined the role of situational (morality of the scenario; perspective) and individual factors (need for leadership; conventionalism) for algorithm preference in a preregistered online experiment with German adults ($n = 1,127$). As expected, algorithm preference was lowest in the most moral-laden scenario. The effect of perspective (i.e., decision-makers vs. decision targets) was only significant in the most moral scenario. Need for leadership predicted a stronger algorithm preference, whereas conventionalism was related to weaker algorithm preference. Exploratory analyses revealed that attitudes and knowledge also mattered, stressing the importance of individual factors.

Keywords: algorithm preference, decision-making, perspective, need for leadership, conventionalism

In December 2019, a virus causing the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) first appeared in Wuhan, China. It rapidly spread around the world, and the outbreak was declared a pandemic by the World Health Organization on March 11, 2020 (WHO, 2020). By April 2021, more than 2.9 million people had died from COVID-19 (“COVID-19 pandemic,” 2021).

CONTACT Sonja Utz  • Leibniz-Institut für Wissensmedien • Schleichstr. 6 • 72076 Tübingen, Germany • s.utz@iwm-tuebingen.de

ISSN 2638-602X (print)/ISSN 2638-6038 (online)
www.hmcjournal.com



Copyright 2021 Authors. Published under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) license.

During the pandemic, many decisions with far-reaching consequences had to be made: Governments had to decide on which restrictions to impose on the population (e.g., closing schools, imposing curfews) and when to loosen them (Gollwitzer et al., 2020); physicians had to decide who gets a potentially life-saving ventilator in overwhelmed hospitals, and civil servants at ministries had to decide which businesses receive financial support after being forced to close for months.

Algorithms could have helped in making these and related decisions. Algorithms process “(big) data captured through digitized devices” and use past behavior to predict future events (Newell & Marabelli, 2015, p. 4). Algorithms might be especially helpful in situations like the pandemic in which human deciders lack experience. However, prior research has shown that people are often algorithm averse (Castelo et al., 2019; Dietvorst et al., 2015). For policymakers, it is thus important to know under which circumstances algorithmic decision-making and, more specifically, different combinations of human-algorithm teaming would be accepted. Two groups are important in this context: (1) the decision-makers who could now (also) rely on algorithmic input and (2) the decision targets whose outcomes depend on the decisions made. The question of human-machine teaming has been addressed in the field of human-machine communication, but usually from the perspective of the decision-maker and with a focus on more agentic and anthropomorphic virtual teammates such as robots (Calhoun et al., 2019; Matthews et al., 2020). Work on algorithm acceptance has addressed both perspectives, albeit usually not in the same study; we thus build on work on algorithm acceptance to identify relevant situational and individual influence factors and develop a new measure that goes beyond a dichotomous human versus algorithm choice, which enables assessment of the preference for different human-algorithm teaming combinations. This approach promotes ecological validity because algorithms rarely make decisions on their own but usually function as advisors or recommenders.

Specifically, we examined morality of the decision scenario and the perspective as situational factors and both conventionalism and need for leadership as individual factors. Previous work has found that people are more averse to algorithms when moral decisions must be made (Bigman & Gray, 2018; Castelo et al., 2019). We aim to extend this work by examining whether it matters from which perspective the algorithmic decision-making is judged: Do people show a higher preference for algorithms if they take the decision-maker’s perspective compared to the perspective of the target of the decision? A physician, for example, might perceive the algorithm as an “advanced tool” (Matthews et al., 2020, p. 234), whereas patients might perceive it as a threat and prefer a human deciding upon their life.

Most prior work on algorithm aversion looked at characteristics of the algorithm or the human counterpart, but less on characteristics of the individuals choosing between algorithmic and human decision-making (Jussupow et al., 2020). In this paper, we look at conventionalism—an individual characteristic that should favor human decision-making—and an individual’s need for leadership. Need for leadership might be especially relevant in times of COVID-19 because this need is stronger in times of crisis (Mulder & Stermerding, 1963).

Algorithm Aversion and Appreciation

The term algorithm aversion has been coined by Dietvorst et al. (2015) to describe the sometimes not rational reaction of users toward algorithms, such as a preference for human

decision-making even if the algorithmic decisions are superior to the ones made by humans. Research on algorithm aversion has yielded inconsistent results, documenting also cases in which individuals prefer algorithms to humans (algorithm appreciation, e.g., Dietvorst et al., 2016; Logg et al., 2019).

Jussupow et al. (2020) reviewed experimental work in this field to identify characteristics of the algorithm versus a human decision-maker that predict whether algorithm aversion or appreciation occurs. Frequently studied characteristics of the algorithms are their agency or performance, and frequently studied characteristics of the human decision-maker are their involvement in the development or training of the algorithm or their expertise. Algorithmic agency led to aversion; thereby people were especially averse to algorithms making decisions independently (Jussupow et al., 2020). Moreover, algorithm aversion was lower when people perceived the algorithms as performing well and possessing human capabilities, whereas higher expertise of the human agent increased algorithm aversion. Human involvement only had an indirect effect via algorithm agency and capabilities (Jussupow et al., 2020).

Human-Algorithm-Teaming

Algorithms rarely make decisions on their own; the topic of various forms and degrees of human-algorithm teaming has therefore received attention. Starke and Lünich (2020) showed that pure algorithmic decisions of the European Union would be perceived as illegitimate, whereas hybrid decisions are perceived as equally legitimate as human-only decisions. The authors did, however, not specify the nature of the human-algorithm teaming. There is some conceptual work on this topic. Madni and Madni (2018) provide a framework that distinguishes the roles of humans and machines; frequent roles are the human as supervisor and the machine either in an active or passive monitoring role. Van der Waa et al. (2020) focus on moral decisions and distinguish between human moral decision-making, supported moral decision-making, co-active moral decision-making, and autonomous moral decision-making, in which the artificial moral agent makes moral decisions on its own. These conceptual papers give examples of the different configurations and discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the different patterns, but they do not examine which factors determine the preference for lower or higher algorithmic input. In the paper at hand, we fill this gap and use the COVID-19 pandemic as a setting to explore the role of situational and individual factors.

Situational Factors

Morality/Severity of the Decision

The first factor we considered was the moral dimension of the decision task. According to Schein and Gray (2018), the judgment of whether a situation is morally laden depends on whether there is harm involved and how severe the consequences are. Although there are representative surveys showing that people are less likely to accept algorithmic decision-making in situations with severe consequences for humans such as parole, medical diagnoses and decisions, or personal finance scores (Grzymek & Puntschuh, 2019; Longoni et al., 2019; Smith, 2018), there is surprisingly little experimental research on this

topic. Bigman and Gray (2018) concluded that people display algorithm aversion when the algorithms make moral decisions such as deciding over parole, or medical decisions. This conclusion might imply a comparison with less moral-laden decisions; however, the nine studies reported in the paper all used moral decision-making situations. In a similar vein, Longoni et al. used only scenarios involving medical decision-making.

In contrast, in one of the few papers that showed high algorithm acceptance across several studies most decisions were objective judgment tasks (such as the weight of a person) or had mild consequences (i.e., suggesting a dating partner; Logg et al., 2019). Castelo et al. (2019) compared subjective and objective decision-making tasks and found that people preferred algorithms for objective tasks. These objective tasks are less moral-laden. Taken together, prior findings warrant the expectation that people are less algorithm-averse if decisions involve less morality. This was, however, not directly tested in any of the studies.

Work on human-machine teaming has, to our knowledge, not systematically compared scenarios varying in morality, but it assumes that it will take some time until artificial moral agents reach human or even super-human levels of moral decision-making; consequentially, human-machine teaming is needed (van der Waa et al., 2020). This work, thus, also implicitly assumes that people prefer less algorithmic involvement in moral decisions.

To systematically explore the role of morality, the work at hand varies the severity and thus morality of the decision's consequences across three scenarios: (1) a scenario about the distribution of ventilators among patients, (2) a scenario about financial support for businesses suffering economically from the COVID-19 pandemic, and (3) a scenario on curfew rules for members of risk groups. Since the ventilator scenario is about life and death, it was considered the most morality-laden scenario with the most severe consequences and should thus be met with the lowest preference for algorithms. We had no prediction about the order of the other two scenarios.

H1: Preference for algorithmic decision-making is lowest in the ventilator scenario (highest morality and severity).

Perspective

We assumed that it matters whether a person is the target of a decision or the decision-maker. An alternative explanation for the algorithm appreciation found in the studies reported by Logg et al. (2019) is that the authors used the advice-taking paradigm; participants had to make decisions and received advice stemming allegedly from an algorithm versus a human. In such a scenario, the algorithm might help the human make better decisions. Decision-makers might thus activate an “advanced tool” or even a “teammate” mental model (Matthews et al., 2020, p. 234) and be willing to share the responsibility for a decision with an algorithm. Targets of a decision, by contrast, might view the algorithm as a threat and be more interested in self-benefit than in the most accurate or efficiently made decision. Self-serving biases have been shown in the domain of preference of fairness rules (Messick & Sentis, 1983) and have been reported as “outcome favorability bias” in studies on algorithm acceptance (Wang et al., 2020, p. 1). In the context of COVID-19, elderly people with several diseases might, for example, be afraid that the “objectively” best decision is to give the ventilator to a younger person with a higher chance of surviving a COVID-19 infection. In their mental model, the algorithm might form a threat to their life. They might,

however, hope to be able to influence a human decision-maker, for example, by appealing to empathy or by bribery. Therefore, we expect a higher preference for algorithms among decision-makers relative to targets of decisions.

H2: Preference for algorithmic decision-making is higher in the decision-maker (versus target of decision) condition.

Next to these situational factors, there might be inter-individual differences that predict the preference for algorithmic versus human decision-making.

Individual Factors

Conventionalism

Algorithms and artificial intelligence are quite new phenomena. To a layperson, it is often not clear how algorithms make complex decisions (Grzymek & Puntschuh, 2019). Grgic-Hlaca et al. (2018) found that conservatism affected the perceived fairness of algorithms. Similarly, we expected that people scoring high on conventionalism, that is, people who prefer to stick to established procedures and norms, are more averse toward these new and non-transparent technologies and hence show a weaker preference for algorithmic decision-making.

H3: People higher in conventionalism show a weaker preference for algorithmic decision-making.

Need for Leadership

A personality factor that might be relevant in times of crisis is the need for leadership. Crises are characterized by uncertainties; this holds especially for the novel coronavirus. At the time this study was conducted, nobody knew when a treatment or a vaccine would be found and how large the impact of the lockdowns on the economy or mental health of people would be. In times of crisis, people show a stronger need for leadership (Mulder & Stemerding, 1963). People expect leaders to make clear and consistent decisions, as could be seen in the higher approval ratings of politicians who implemented tough measures in response to COVID-19 (Erlanger, 2020). Based on this assumption, one should expect that a higher need for leadership is related to a preference for human decision-making. However, it might also be the case that a higher need for leadership is related to a preference for algorithmic decision-making because algorithms might be perceived as more objective (in the sense of following the same rules all the time) and thus as giving clearer and more consistent guidance. It is also possible that need for leadership is related to higher endorsement for decisions made by one entity alone (versus a team), no matter whether it is a human or an algorithm. Since there are several possibilities, an open research question was posed:

RQ: Is need for leadership related to algorithm preference?

Attitudes Toward Algorithms and Knowledge

By way of exploration, the participants' attitudes toward algorithms and knowledge about algorithms were assessed. Concerning the attitudes, we covered the perceived decision

quality (ability of algorithms to process large amounts of data/a wider variety of data types), different aspects of fairness, and perceived manipulability to explore whether the effects of the other variables remain robust when controlling for attitudes and knowledge. The focus of the experiment is—as can also be seen in the preregistration—however, on the situational and individual factors.

The hypotheses and research questions, operationalization, design, and analysis plan have been preregistered at <https://aspredicted.org/zv2m2.pdf>.¹

Method

Participants

The study was approved by the local ethics committee of Leibniz-Institut für Wissensmedien (Knowledge Media Research Center), Tübingen. All 14,283 members of the WiSoPanel, an online access panel for non-commercial research (Görnitz et al., 2021), were invited via email to participate. The experiment had a 3 (scenario: ventilator, financial support, curfew) × 2 (perspective: target of the decision versus decision-maker) design. The scenario factor was a within-subjects factor; the perspective factor was manipulated between subjects. Only people who permitted the use of their data at the end of the questionnaire (1,192 women, 968 men) were retained. Most of the participants were German (96.6%), 1.9% were Austrian, 1% Swiss, and 0.4% from other countries. The largest group of participants (31.7%) had a university degree, 23.8% A-Levels, 29.5% O-Levels, 11.4% had finished 9 years of school, 0.6% had no degree (yet), and 3.1% had a doctorate. The majority (61.1%) were working, 20.4% were retired, 8.1% pupils/students, 5.7% unemployed, and 1% on parental leave.

Procedure

After reading the introduction and providing informed consent, respondents stated their preferences for algorithmic versus human decision-making in three COVID19-related decision scenarios. Depending on the experimental condition, participants either took the perspective of the target of the decision or of the decision-maker in all three scenarios.

Independent Variables

Scenarios

In the first scenario, participants were asked to imagine that there were more COVID-19 patients than ventilators, hence a decision about who gets a ventilator had to be made. In the second scenario, a decision about whether financial support should be granted to business owners who suffered financially from the COVID-19-induced closure of their business had to be made. In the last scenario, participants were told that the local public health departments would decide for individual members of risk groups whether they had to adhere to stronger curfew rules.

Perspective

In the target of the decision condition, participants were asked to imagine that they were a COVID-19 patient, a business owner, or at higher risk to die from COVID-19, respectively for the three scenarios. In the decision-maker condition, participants were asked to imagine that they were a physician, a clerk, or an employee of the public health department, respectively.

Measures

Algorithm Preference

Since hitherto used measures are not equally applicable to decision-makers and decision targets and because we aimed to go beyond a dichotomous choice between human versus algorithm, we offered six combinations of human-algorithm teaming (see Table 1, top row) and gave people fine-grained options to indicate their preferences. Participants were instructed to distribute 100 points across the decision-making options. They could either assign 100 points to their favorite option or split the points across options. For the first three options, the algorithm made the final decision; for the last three options, a human made the final decision. In the two most extreme cases, the decision was made by the algorithm/human alone. In the next option, in difficult cases, a human/an algorithm made a suggestion that could be incorporated by the algorithm/human; in the two options in the middle, the algorithm/human considered the suggestion of the human/algorithm in all decisions.

		Human alone (1)	Human, input from algorithm in difficult cases (2)	Human but always input from algorithm (3)	Algorithm but always input from human (4)	Algorithm, input from human in difficult cases (5)	Algorithm alone (6)
Ventilator	decision target	21.42	25.75	28.44	12.07	6.37	5.96
	decision-maker	12.57	24.21	34.20	13.08	7.42	8.53
Financial	decision target	12.24	19.36	32.12	16.57	11.35	8.37
	Support	11.10	19.55	32.92	16.99	10.06	9.38
Curfew	decision target	16.34	19.44	29.10	14.79	9.89	10.44
	decision-maker	14.38	22.26	29.76	15.08	9.20	9.32

Note: Sums not adding up exactly to 100 within some rows due to rounding.

Need for Leadership

We adapted five items from the interpersonal hierarchy expectation scale by Mast (2005) to the context of the COVID-19 pandemic (e.g., “If people work together on a task like the current corona crisis, it’s best if one person is taking over the lead.”). Respondents indicated their agreement with the statements on a scale ranging from 1 = “strongly disagree” to 7 = “strongly agree” ($\alpha = .80$, $M = 4.48$, $SD = 1.26$).

Conventionalism

Conventionalism was measured with the 3-item scale by Beierlein et al. (2014). Agreement to statements like “It is always best to do things the usual way” was provided on a 7-point Likert scale ($\alpha = .83$, $M = 3.65$, $SD = 1.56$).

Attitude Toward Algorithms

To measure attitude toward algorithms, 10 items were developed that covered various aspects of decision-making. Participants indicated whether they thought humans or algorithms would usually perform better on a certain aspect on a scale from 1 = “humans” to 3 = “humans and algorithms to the same degree” to 5 = “algorithms.” A confirmatory factor analysis allowing for correlations between factors showed that, as expected, the 10 items loaded on five factors ($\chi^2[25, N = 2147] = 218.20$, $p < .001$; CFI = 0.94; RMSEA = .060), correctness of decision ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 0.75$), procedural fairness (e.g., judge situations always along the same factors, $M = 3.98$, $SD = 0.92$), multifactorial decision-making ($M = 3.17$, $SD = 1.01$), manipulability ($M = 2.33$, $SD = 1.00$), and general fairness ($M = 3.13$, $SD = 0.87$). For items and more results see <https://osf.io/cx6z8/>.

Knowledge About Algorithms

As a control variable, participants were asked to indicate their knowledge about algorithms (definition, methods, accuracy, fairness) on a scale from 1 = very poor knowledge to 7 = very good knowledge ($M = 4.08$, $SD = 1.53$).

Manipulation Checks

Participants were asked whether they had been in the role of the patient or physician in Scenario 1, business owner or clerk in Scenario 2, a member of the group at higher risk of the coronavirus or employee at the public health department in Scenario 3. There was also a “don’t know” option to reduce guessing. Participants were also asked to rank order the three scenarios in terms of severity and moral dimension by dragging and dropping them to the top, middle, or bottom position.

COVID-19-Related Additional Measures

Participants were asked for their subjective risk to get infected with COVID-19, whether they were at higher risk from coronavirus according to the criteria issued by the national Robert Koch institute (e.g., smoking, chronic medical condition), whether they had been infected with COVID-19, or whether close others had been infected or died. The likelihood of experiencing negative financial consequences due to the COVID-19 pandemic was assessed on a scale from 1 = “very unlikely” to 6 = “certainly.” Of the final sample (see below), only 10 had been infected with COVID-19, 5.6% reported one or more infected close others. Roughly a quarter considered it likely, very likely, or certain to become infected, and 44.7% were members of a risk group.

Demographics

The following demographics were retrieved from the panel data: year of birth, gender, country, education, and employment status. The intercorrelations between the central measures are displayed in Table 2.

TABLE 2 Intercorrelations

Variables	n	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 P: Decision-maker	1127	-												
2 Conventionalism	1127	-.02	-											
3 Need for leadership	1127	.04	.27***	-										
4 Risk: health	1015	-.04	.08**	.04	-									
5 Risk: finance	1123	.01	-.02	-.11***	-.05	-								
6 A: correctness ¹	1124	-.01	-.08**	.12***	-.02	-.07*	-							
7 A: proc. fairness ¹	1126	.03	-.21***	.04	-.09**	-.01	.25***	-						
8 A: multifact. DM ¹	1126	.02	-.08**	.02	-.01	-.06	.33***	.21***	-					
9 A: manipulability ²	1127	-.02	-.04	-.14***	-.02	.10**	-.32***	-.16***	-.14***	-				
10 A: gen. fairness ¹	1122	.00	-.12***	-.07*	-.07*	-.07*	.45***	.31***	.27***	-.23***	-			
11 Knowledge	1127	-.01	-.07*	-.03	-.03	.01	.01	.01	.03	.11***	.02	-		
12 Pr: Ventilator ³	1127	.10***	-.07*	.03	-.06	-.05	.36***	.22***	.21***	-.17***	.32***	.05	-	
13 Pr: Finance ³	1127	.00	-.06*	.04	-.07*	-.02	.36***	.17***	.24***	-.16***	.32***	.04	.51***	-
14 Pr: Curfew ³	1127	-.02	-.07*	.11***	-.02	.01	.38***	.20***	.21***	-.15***	.31***	.07*	.51***	.59***

Note: P = Perspective, A = Attitude, DM = Decision-making, Pr = Algorithm preference. ¹Higher values indicate a more positive attitude toward algorithms.

²Higher values indicate a more negative attitude toward algorithms. ³Higher values indicate a stronger preference for algorithmic decision-making;

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Data Preparation

Missings. Two participants were excluded because they had more than 30% missing values.

Construction of the dependent measure. As preregistered, we first inspected the distributions. To assess nuanced preferences, participants had the option to split 100 points across six options rather than choosing only one option. The majority (56 to 60%, depending on the scenario) did not split but gave 100% to their favorite option. Most people who split their 100 points chose adjacent options (see Table 1 for descriptives). Therefore, we scored the options from 1 (human alone) to 6 (algorithm alone) and multiplied them with the points given, resulting in a scale from 100 to 600. Higher values represent a higher preference for algorithmic decision-making. A person giving 60 points to Option 3 (human decides, but always with input from the algorithm), and 40 points to Option 4 (algorithm decides, but always with input from the human), for example, has a score of 340 ($3 * 60 + 4 * 40 = 340$). A person favoring Option 3 with 60 points but leaning toward Option 2 (human decides, input from algorithm only in difficult cases) with 40 points has a score of 260 ($2 * 40 + 3 * 60 = 260$). This scale thus provides more fine-grained information than simply choosing one option.

Results

Manipulation Checks

As intended, the majority (91.7%) perceived the ventilator scenario as the decision involving most morality. It was also perceived as the most severe scenario by 87.3%. The other two scenarios did not differ as clearly from each other; the curfew scenario was perceived as the second-highest moral-laden (52%) and least severe (61.5%) scenario by most. The financial support scenario was perceived as involving the least morality (55.1%) and as the second-most severe scenario (58.8%). Since our hypothesis addressed the difference between the first and the other two scenarios, we considered the manipulation of the within-subjects variable as successful.

The manipulation check for perspective was answered correctly by 69.2% of the respondents for Scenario 1, by 64.9% for Scenario 2, and by 68% for Scenario 3. Respondents more often gave a wrong answer (between 20% and 33%, depending on the scenario) than choosing the “don’t know” option. Interestingly, respondents in the decision-maker condition recalled the condition they were in better than respondents in the target condition (75.3% vs. 63.3% in Scenario 1, 74.6% vs. 55.3% in Scenario 2, 72.8% vs. 63.3% in Scenario 3, all χ^2 s > 22.13 , $p < .001$). As preregistered, people who failed the manipulation check were excluded from the analysis; 1,127 participants were retained in the analysis (457 in the target condition, 670 in the decision-maker condition).

Descriptive Results

Before turning to the effects of the situational and individual variables, we briefly report the descriptive results. Table 1 shows that respondents overall leaned toward human decision-making. A closer look reveals, however, that algorithmic input is welcome; specifically, algorithmic input in all situations is favored over algorithmic input in difficult

situations only. This suggests that participants want a human to make the final decision, but this human should team up with the algorithm.

Effects of Scenario and Perspective

A 2 (perspective: decision target versus decision-maker) \times 3 (Scenarios 1 to 3) repeated measures analysis of variance with repeated measures on the second factor and algorithm preference as dependent variable was conducted to test H1 and H2. In line with H1, there was a significant main effect of scenario, Huynh-Feldt corrected $F(1.994, 2243.36) = 40.48$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. Preference for algorithms was lowest in the ventilator scenario ($M = 286.46$, $SE = 3.75$, Bonferroni-corrected comparisons with both other scenarios $p < .001$). The curfew scenario ($M = 311.18$, $SE = 4.13$) and the financial support scenario ($M = 318.80$, $SE = 3.84$) did not differ significantly, $p = .11$. In contrast to H2, the main effect of perspective was not significant, $F < 1$, $p = .34$. There was, however, an interaction between perspective and scenario, Huynh-Feldt corrected $F(1.994, 2243.36) = 9.79$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$. In the ventilator scenario, algorithm preference was higher in the decision-maker condition ($M = 299.02$, $SE = 4.77$) than in the target condition ($M = 273.90$, $SE = 5.78$, $p = .001$). In the financial support scenario, the means were almost identical ($M = 318.79$, $SE = 5.92$ in the target condition, $M = 318.80$, $SE = 4.89$ in the decision-maker condition, $p = .999$). In the curfew scenario, the mean in the target condition was somewhat higher ($M = 314.34$, $SE = 6.37$) than in the decision-maker condition ($M = 308.03$, $SE = 5.26$), but this difference was not significant, $p = .444$. H2 is thus partly supported, namely in the ventilator scenario.

Influence of Individual Characteristics

To examine the role of individual characteristics, we conducted a multilevel analysis, treating scenario as nested within participants.² We included a random intercept for participants. In Step 1, we examined the effect of conventionalism (H3) and need for leadership (RQ) in addition to the effects of perspective, scenario, and the interaction effects. We controlled for being a member of a COVID-19 risk group and the risk to suffer from financial losses. In Step 2, we exploringly added the attitude subscales and knowledge about algorithms. Predictors were grand mean centered (see Enders & Tofighi, 2007). Standardized regression coefficients are reported as effect size measures in Table 3 (see Lorah, 2018).

Table 3, Model 1, on the following page, shows the findings to be in line with H3: There was a negative relationship between conventionalism and algorithm preference. The answer to RQ1 is that need for leadership is positively related to a higher preference for algorithms.

Exploratory Analyses

In Model 2, we explored how the attitude toward algorithms affected algorithm preference. Several attitudes emerged as significant predictors: Algorithms were preferred more if they were evaluated as making more correct decisions, being fairer (in general and procedure-wise), and as integrating more aspects into their decision. Perceived knowledge about algorithms was significantly associated with preferring an algorithm, but effects were smaller than the effects of attitudes. Whereas the effects of scenario and the interaction with perspective still held, the effects of conventionalism and need for leadership were no longer significant when adding attitudes and knowledge to the model.

TABLE 3 Multilevel Regression Analysis on Preference for Algorithmic Decision-Making

Parameters	Fixed effects				Random effects
	Estimate	SE	t	β	SD
Model 1					
Intercept	307.39	3.36	91.61	.01	93.91
P: Decision-maker cond.	7.48	6.87	1.09	.03	
Sc: Ventilator cond.	-22.19	3.87	-5.74*	-.08	
Sc: Financial support cond.	8.62	3.87	2.23*	.03	
Need for leadership	10.12	2.81	3.61*	.10	
Conventionalism	-7.21	2.34	-3.07*	-.08	
Risk: health	-11.87	6.78	-1.75	-.05	
Risk: financial	-0.01	2.29	-0.00	-.00	
Perspective \times Ventilator	29.39	7.89	3.72*	.05	
Perspective \times Financial	6.45	7.89	0.82	.01	
Model 2					
Intercept	306.56	2.92	105.11	.00	77.73
P: Decision-maker cond.	8.94	5.97	1.50	.03	
Sc: Ventilator cond.	-22.19	3.87	-5.74*	-.08	
Sc: Financial support cond.	8.62	3.87	2.23*	.03	
Need for leadership	2.92	2.48	1.17	.02	
Conventionalism	-0.24	2.11	-0.12	-.00	
Risk: health	-5.65	5.92	-0.95	-.02	
Risk: financial	2.67	2.00	1.33	.03	
Perspective \times Ventilator	29.39	7.89	3.72*	.05	
Perspective \times Financial	6.45	7.89	0.82	.01	
A: correctness	42.58	4.69	9.08*	.24	
A: procedural fairness	11.25	3.90	2.88*	.07	
A: multifactorial DM	10.37	3.07	3.38*	.08	
A: manipulability	-3.44	3.20	-1.08	-.02	
A: general fairness	23.31	3.97	5.87*	.15	
Knowledge	4.22	1.95	2.17*	.05	
χ^2	289.11				
<i>p</i>	<.001				
R ² (marginal/conditional)	.20/.55				

Note. 3,018 observations on 1,006 individuals. Higher values indicate a preference for an algorithm; P = Perspective; Sc = Scenario; A = Attitude; DM = decision-making; Predictors are grand mean centered; All factors were coded using contrast coding (Gelman & Hill, 2007). * $|t| > 2.0$, indicating a significant effect.

Discussion

The goal of this work was to examine the preference for different forms of human-algorithm teaming in algorithmic decision-making, exploiting the COVID-19 pandemic to create three salient and realistic scenarios. We examined the effects of situational (morality, perspective) and individual characteristics (conventionalism, need for leadership). In addition, the roles of attitudes toward algorithms and knowledge were explored. We found that the morality of a decision mattered: Participants showed the lowest preference for algorithmic decision-making in the ventilator scenario. Moreover, in this scenario decision targets were more reluctant to let algorithms decide than decision-makers. Higher conventionalism was associated with a lower preference for algorithmic decision-making, whereas a higher need for leadership was associated with a higher preference for algorithmic decision-making. Attitudes toward algorithms and knowledge contributed to predicting algorithm preference; thereby, decision quality and fairness were most important.

Contributions to Prior Work

Our results contribute to work on human-algorithm teaming by providing a measure that assesses the preference for certain combinations of human-algorithm teaming. Different patterns have been described before (Madni & Madni, 2018; van der Waa et al., 2020), and it has been shown that people favor hybrid decision-making over pure algorithmic decision-making (Starke & Lünich, 2020), but less was known about preferences for the different forms of human-algorithm teaming. We showed that participants overall preferred algorithmic advice in all decision situations to algorithmic advice only in difficult decision cases.

Prior work rarely looked at situational and individual characteristics that predict these preferences systematically. Another contribution of our work lies, thus, in varying the morality of the scenarios and the perspective of the participant. Work that merely looked at medical decision-making showed that algorithm preference is low in such scenarios (Bigman & Gray, 2018; Longoni et al., 2019). Our results demonstrate that algorithm preference is lower in more moral-laden scenarios and that this effect is more pronounced when being the target of the decision. Decision-makers were less influenced by the morality of the scenario.

In contrast to our prediction, perspective mattered only in the most moral scenario. We did, thus, not find consistent evidence of an outcome favorability bias. Self-interest seems to bias decisions only in situations with high stakes. This seems to be in contrast with prior work, but in those studies, the outcomes were explicitly stated, and the dependent measure was perceived fairness, not the preference for algorithmic decision-making (Wang et al., 2020). Future research, however, is needed to explicitly test the role of self-interest and (expected) outcomes. The observation that perspective did not matter much also has implications for the interpretation of prior work. It suggests that the algorithm appreciation reported by Logg et al. (2019) may not be due to the decision-maker perspective but the moral-free judgment tasks.

This study also contributes to work on individual predictors of algorithm preference; a topic that has been understudied compared to work on algorithm characteristics (Jussupow, 2020). We found the expected negative relationship between conventionalism and algorithm preference. With need for leadership, we found a positive association with algorithm preference: People with a higher need for leadership are not necessarily more interested in a strong human leader, but in clear and consistent guidance, which might be more easily achieved by an algorithm in times of crisis. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the German federal states employed different rules regarding school openings or curfews, and this diversity in rules was evaluated negatively by most of the population (COSMO, 2021).

Our exploratory analyses showed that attitudes toward algorithms mattered. Interestingly, the preference for algorithmic decision-making was not influenced by the perceived manipulability, although humans were perceived as easier to manipulate, which could be a reason for decision targets to prefer humans. Instead, quality of decision-making and perceived general fairness mattered most. Our participants considered algorithms as fairer than humans; nevertheless, one should be aware that algorithmic decisions mirror existing human biases such as prejudice or stereotypes and thus discriminate against certain groups (Noble, 2018; Zafar et al., 2019). The quality of algorithms depends on the training data used; if, for example, historic hiring data of a company that predominantly hired men are used to train an algorithm, the algorithm is likely to discriminate against women (O’Neil, 2016). Furthermore, deeper knowledge about algorithms was positively related to algorithm preference. Interestingly, knowledge was almost unrelated to attitudes but negatively associated with conventionalism. This shows again that conventionalism should be considered a potential barrier when trying to increase the public’s algorithm acceptance.

After controlling for attitudes and knowledge, the effects of need for leadership and conventionalism were no longer significant, although the effects of scenario and perspective remained. The former is, however, not surprising because high attitude-behavior intention relationships are found when the correspondence between the attitude items and the behavior is high (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977). It is often assumed that attitudes are informed by knowledge; our data indicate that personality matters as well. Especially conventionalism showed negative associations with knowledge and attitudes. The results thus hint at a potential underlying process: People higher in conventionalism might show a lower algorithm preference because they are less willing to learn about algorithms (and other new things) and have more negative attitudes.

Directions for Future Research

Our experiment provides a starting point for future research. First, future research should look at underlying processes. When it comes to the decision targets, assumed outcome favorability and self-interest (versus interest in the fairest decision) should be assessed. In the decision-makers, looking at the mental models could be fruitful. Do decision-makers perceive the algorithm as an advanced tool, a teammate (Matthews et al., 2020), or do they even develop new mental models for human-algorithm teaming (Gambino et al., 2020)?

Second, work on human-algorithm teaming might focus more on the role of personality. The body of work has hitherto mainly looked at characteristics of the algorithmic teammate (e.g., agency, perceived autonomy, transparency), but the preference for a certain

teaming-constellation might interact with individual characteristics. Considering both factors jointly would advance work on human-algorithm and more general human-machine teaming.

Third, future research could explore whether the results are specific to scenarios with a high salience and relevance like the COVID-19-related decisions we used during the pandemic.

Fourth, cross-cultural research could explore how far attitudes and the relationships between attitudes and knowledge are due to the specific media coverage of algorithmic decision-making in certain countries.

Practical Implications

The results have practical implications for policymaking. They show that the public is, in general, open to advice from algorithms, but that people prefer a human making the final decision. Since algorithms rarely make decisions completely on their own, governments planning to use algorithmic decision-making should use those only as advice-givers and communicate clearly that a human will make the final judgment.

Campaigns for increasing algorithm acceptance should especially target conventional people and consider that this group overall knows less about algorithms. For less moral decisions, it is important to know that decision-makers and targets did not differ in their preference of human-algorithm teaming and can thus be targeted with the same campaign. When it comes to moral decisions—as they occur frequently during a life-threatening pandemic—it is important to especially address the potential targets of the decisions because this group shows a lower preference for algorithmic input than decision-makers.

Limitations and Strengths

A limitation of the study is the relatively high number of failed manipulation checks. We, however, still had more than 1,100 people for analysis and thus almost twice the preregistered sample size of $n = 602$ for 80% power. Another limitation is that we did not randomize the order of the scenarios. Some may consider it a limitation that the scenarios varied in the domain (e.g., health versus finance). However, this confound cannot be avoided because decisions threatening a person's life are inherently more moral than decisions involving finance because they imply more harm (Schein & Gray, 2018). The same situation has been faced by other authors; Reniers et al. (2012), for example, used robbing a bank to pay the cancer medicine for one's wife versus eating chips while one should lose weight as a moral versus non-moral decision.

Furthermore, it is important to interpret our results considering the situation in Germany. Germany did a relatively good job in dealing with the pandemic at the time of data collection. It is thus unclear to which extent the results can be generalized to countries with an actual shortage of ventilators and a less tight-meshed social support system. The effects might be stronger in a country more strongly affected by COVID-19. Likewise, mean levels of need for leadership, conventionalism, and attitudes toward algorithms are likely to differ among countries; especially because issues such as racial discrimination by algorithms are less salient in Germany than, for example, the US (Noble, 2018).

A strength of our study is the large and heterogeneous sample, covering a wide range of age, education levels, and employment status. Moreover, the decision-making scenarios were more realistic and salient than some of the advice-taking paradigms used in prior research on algorithm aversion.

To conclude, this study showed that the morality of a decision is a situational factor that determines the preference for different forms of algorithm-human teaming. The perspective decision target versus decision-maker mattered only in the most moral scenario. Moreover, personality factors such as need for leadership and conventionalism should be considered when studying attitudes toward algorithms and algorithm preference.

Author Biographies

Sonja Utz (PhD) is the head of the social media lab at Leibniz-Institut für Wissensmedien in Tübingen and a full professor for communication via social media at University of Tübingen. Her research focuses on the effects of social and mobile media use, especially in knowledge-related contexts, as well as on human-machine interaction.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7979-3554>

Lara N. Wolfers (MA in communication science, University of Hohenheim) is a PhD student working in the social media lab at the Leibniz-Institut für Wissensmedien in Tübingen, Germany. Her research focuses on the use of mobile and social media for coping with stress and media use in the family context.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1074-1617>

Anja S. Göritz (PhD) is full professor of psychology and leads the Department of Occupational and Consumer Psychology at Freiburg University in Germany. Her research focuses on web-based data collection and on technology-related changes of work. She holds and manages an online access panel (<https://wisopanel.net>), which also provided the participants of this study.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4638-0489>

Acknowledgments

Supported by the DFG Cluster of Excellence “Machine Learning—New Perspectives for Science,” EXC 2064/1, project number 390727645

Center for Open Science



This article has earned the Center for Open Science badges for Open Data and Open Materials through Open Practices Disclosure. The authors have made their data and materials freely accessible at <https://osf.io/cx6z8>. The article also earned a Preregistered badge for having a preregistered design available at <https://aspredicted.org/zv2m2.pdf>.

References

- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin*, *84*(5), 888–918. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.84.5.888>
- Beierlein, C., Asbrock, F., Kauff, M., & Schmidt, P. (2014). Die Kurzsкала Autoritarismus (KSA-3). Ein ökonomisches Messinstrument zur Erfassung dreier Subdimensionen autoritärer Einstellungen. [The authoritarianism short-scale (KSA-3). An economic measurement instrument to capture three subdimensions of authoritarian attitudes]. *GESIS-Working Papers*, *35*. Mannheim: GESIS.
- Bigman, Y. E., & Gray, K. (2018). People are averse to machines making moral decisions. *Cognition*, *181*(12), 21–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.08.003>
- Calhoun, C. S., Bobko, P., Gallimore, J. J., & Lyons, J. B. (2019). Linking precursors of interpersonal trust to human-automation trust: An expanded typology and exploratory experiment. *Journal of Trust Research*, *9*(1), 28–46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21515581.2019.1579730>
- Castelo, N., Bos, M. W., & Lehmann, D. R. (2019). Task-dependent algorithm aversion. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *56*(5), 809–825. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022243719851788>
- COSMO. (2021, January). Zusammenfassung und Empfehlungen Welle 33. [Covid-19 Snapshot Monitoring: Summary and recommendations Wave 3]. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210117120110/https://projekte.uni-erfurt.de/cosmo2020/web/summary/33/>
- COVID-19 pandemic. (2021, April 12). In *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=COVID-19_pandemic&oldid=1017375094
- Dietvorst, B. J., Simmons, J. P., & Massey, C. (2015). Algorithm aversion: People erroneously avoid algorithms after seeing them err. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *144*(1), 114–126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000033>
- Dietvorst, B. J., Simmons, J. P., & Massey, C. (2016). Overcoming algorithm aversion: People will use imperfect algorithms if they can (even slightly) modify them. *Management Science*, *64*(3), 1155–1170. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2016.2643>
- Enders, C. K., & Tofghi, D. (2007). Centering predictor variables in cross-sectional multi-level models: A new look at an old issue. *Psychological Methods*, *12*(2), 121–138. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.12.2.121>
- Erlanger, S. (2020, April 15). Coronavirus has lifted leaders everywhere. Don't expect that to last. *The New York Times*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20200415211120/https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/15/world/europe/coronavirus-presidents.html>
- Gambino, A., Fox, J., & Ratan, R. A. (2020). Building a stronger CASA: Extending the computers are social actors paradigm. *Human-Machine Communication*, *1*, 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.1.5>
- Gelman, A., & Hill, J. (2007). *Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical models*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gollwitzer, M., Platzer, C., Zwarg, C., & Göritz, A. S. (2020). Public acceptance of Covid-19 lockdown scenarios. *International Journal of Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12721>
- Göritz, A. S., Borchert, K., & Hirth, M. (2021). Using attention testing to select crowd-sourced workers and research participants. *Social Science Computer Review*, *39*(1), 84–104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439319848726>

- Grgic-Hlaca, N., Redmiles, E. M., Gummadi, K. P., & Weller, A. (2018). Human perceptions of fairness in algorithmic decision making: A case study of criminal risk prediction. *Proceedings of the 2018 World Wide Web Conference*, 903–912. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3178876.3186138>
- Grzymek, V., & Puntschuh, M. (2019). *Was Europa über Algorithmen weiß und denkt [What Europe knows and thinks about algorithms]*. <https://doi.org/10.11586/2019006>
- Jussupow, E., Benbasat, I., & Heinzl, A. (2020). *Why are we averse towards algorithms? A comprehensive literature review on algorithm aversion* (No. 168). https://aisel.aisnet.org/ecis2020_rp/168
- Logg, J. M., Minson, J. A., & Moore, D. A. (2019). Algorithm appreciation: People prefer algorithmic to human judgment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 151, 90–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2018.12.005>
- Longoni, C., Bonezzi, A., & Morewedge, C. K. (2019). Resistance to medical artificial intelligence. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 46(4). <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucz013>
- Lorah, J. (2018). Effect size measures for multilevel models: Definition, interpretation, and TIMSS example. *Large-Scale Assessments in Education*, 6, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-018-0061-2>
- Madni, A. M., & Madni, C. C. (2018). Architectural framework for exploring adaptive human-machine teaming options in simulated dynamic environments. *Systems*, 6(4), 44. <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems6040044>
- Mast, M. S. (2005). Interpersonal hierarchy expectation: Introduction of a new construct. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 84(3), 287–295. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa8403_08
- Matthews, G., Lin, J., Panganiban, A. R., & Long, M. D. (2020). Individual differences in trust in autonomous robots: Implications for transparency. *IEEE Transactions on Human-Machine Systems*, 50(3), 234–244. <https://doi.org/10.1109/THMS.2019.2947592>
- Messick, D. M., & Sentis, K. (1983). Fairness, preference, and fairness biases. In D. M. Messick & K. Cook (Eds.), *Equity theory: Psychological and sociological perspectives* (pp. 61–94). Praeger Publishers.
- Mulder, M., & Stemerding, A. (1963). Threat, attraction to group, and need for strong leadership: A laboratory experiment in a natural setting. *Human Relations*, 16(4), 317–334. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872676301600402>
- Newell, S., & Marabelli, M. (2015). Strategic opportunities (and challenges) of algorithmic decision-making: A call for action on the long-term societal effects of ‘datification.’ *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 24(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2015.02.001>
- Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. New York University Press.
- O’Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.
- Reniers, R. L., Corcoran, R., Völlm, B. A., Mashru, A., Howard, R., & Liddle, P. F. (2012). Moral decision-making, ToM, empathy and the default mode network. *Biological Psychology*, 90(3), 202–210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2012.03.009>
-

- Schein, C., & Gray, K. (2018). The theory of dyadic morality: Reinventing moral judgment by redefining harm. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 22(1), 32–70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868317698288>
- Smith, A. (2018). *Public attitudes toward computer algorithms*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20191030175600/https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2018/11/16/public-attitudes-toward-computer-algorithms/>
- Starke, C., & Lünich, M. (2020). Artificial intelligence for political decision-making in the European Union: Effects on citizens' perceptions of input, throughput, and output legitimacy. *Data & Policy*, 2, e16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dap.2020.19>
- van der Waa, J., van Diggelen, J., Cavalcante Siebert, L., Neerinx, M., & Jonker, C. (2020). Allocation of moral decision-making in human-agent teams: A pattern approach. In D. Harris & W.-C. Li (Eds.), *Engineering Psychology and Cognitive Ergonomics. Cognition and Design. HCII 2020. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 12187, 203–220. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49183-3_16
- Wang, R., Harper, F. M., & Zhu, H. (2020). Factors influencing perceived fairness in algorithmic decision-making: Algorithm outcomes, development procedures, and individual differences. *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–14.
- WHO. (2020). WHO announces COVID-19 outbreak a pandemic. Press release. <https://web.archive.org/web/20201223093341/https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/news/news/2020/3/who-announces-covid-19-outbreak-a-pandemic>
- Zafar, M. B., Valera, I., Gomez-Rodriguez, M., & Gummadi, K. P. (2019). Fairness constraints: A flexible approach for fair classification. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(75), 1–42.

Footnotes

1. We had two additional hypotheses and a research question on the role of individual outcome expectations. We realized, however, that we had not completely thought these through and not operationalized this variable in the best possible way. Based on reviewer feedback on a prior version on this manuscript, we decided to not include the weak theoretical justification and the results of these analyses. We adjusted the numbering of the hypotheses and research question. These analyses are, however, available on <https://osf.io/cx6z8/>. We also provide a table listing and justifying deviations from the preregistration on OSF.
2. In the preregistration, we had planned to do separate regression analyses per scenario. The main reason for this procedure was that the individual outcome expectations (see Footnote 1) were operationalized in different ways across the scenarios. Since we dropped this variable, we opted for the more appropriate multilevel approach that allows us to control for the nested data structure (scenarios nested within participants) and presents the results in a more compact way. The basic pattern is identical.

The Role of Vidura Chatbot in the Diffusion of KnowCOVID-19 Gateway

Kerk F. Kee¹, Prasad Calyam², and Hariharan Regunath³

1 College of Media & Communication, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX, USA

2 Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Missouri-Columbia

3 Department of Medicine—Divisions of Pulmonary, Critical Care Medicine and Infectious Diseases, University of Missouri-Columbia


Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic is an unprecedented global emergency. Clinicians and medical researchers are suddenly thrown into a situation where they need to keep up with the latest and best evidence for decision-making at work in order to save lives and develop solutions for COVID-19 treatments and preventions. However, a challenge is the overwhelming numbers of online publications with a wide range of quality. We explain a science gateway platform designed to help users to filter the overwhelming amount of literature efficiently (with speed) and effectively (with quality), to find answers to their scientific questions. It is equipped with a chatbot to assist users to overcome infodemic, low usability, and high learning curve. We argue that human-machine communication via a chatbot play a critical role in enabling the diffusion of innovations.

Keywords: COVID-19, science gateways, chatbot, human-machine communication, diffusion of innovations

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic is one of the world's greatest crises in the new millennium. As of May 2021, about 163 million people worldwide contracted the SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus, and 3.38 million people sadly lost their lives to this disease (WHO, 2021). Furthermore,

CONTACT Kerk F. Kee  • College of Media & Communication • Texas Tech University • Box 43082 • Lubbock, TX 79409 • kerk.kee@ttu.edu

ISSN 2638-602X (print)/ISSN 2638-6038 (online)
www.hmcjournal.com



Copyright 2021 Authors. Published under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) license.

it is estimated that the pandemic led to a USD 3.94 trillion loss in economic output globally during 2020, approximately a 4.5% drop in gross domestic product (GDP) (Szmigiera, 2021). The unprecedented impacts will have lasting effects for many years. During the pandemic, many new ideas have been implemented to address the various problems that stemmed from the pandemic, including in the areas of infection prevention and control, public health measures, and so forth. As the old saying goes, “Necessity is the mother of invention.” New technologies, practices, behaviors, approaches, and so forth, are often developed as solutions to difficult problems people face.

Chatbot can be used for many creative solutions for problems during the pandemic (Mehfooz et al., 2021). For example, one of the major problems during the pandemic lies in the testing or screening of patients for COVID. However, the volumes are overwhelming, and health care workers are at risk of being exposed to the virus during the testing/screening process. This is where machines (e.g., chatbots) can help. In addition to working with patients with non-direct contacts and reducing the risks on health care workers, machines can work tirelessly to address the rapid surge in cases, and can also adapt to multiple languages (Martin et al., 2020). Human-machine communication (HMC) between a multilingual chatbot and patients around the world can improve both the effectiveness (with the latest COVID-19 information) and efficiency (with around-the-clock communication with patients) of addressing the pandemic. We define HMC as the communication between humans and machines in accomplishing the common goals of identifying the best care possible for patients and the best research evidence for treatment and prevention strategies. Therefore, HMC plays a crucial role in the global efforts in combating COVID-19 during the pandemic.

Researchers have experimented with chatbots to answer questions about COVID-19 (VolppKevin, 2020). In Thailand, a chatbot was designed to answer questions about topics such as how to protect oneself from coronavirus, self-screening for symptoms, a list of nearest hospitals, fake news about COVID-19, and so forth (Rodsawang et al., 2020). During the pandemic, patients cannot easily see their primary care doctors in person for regular non-COVID cases. In India, Medbot was created to be a chatbot that can provide telemedicine in place of a doctor, providing advice and tips on general preventive measures, checking symptoms, suggesting home remedies, and providing counseling for general well-being (Bharti et al., 2020). Chatbots have also been used to perform tele-psychiatry for patients suffering from pathological social withdrawal, intensified by the stay-at-home orders, lockdowns, and social distancing (Yoshikawa et al., 2021). Beyond health care applications (Ling & Björling, 2020), chatbots have also been incorporated into crisis reporting and news platforms, to help deliver timely information about COVID-19 to the public (Maniou & Veglis, 2020).

Innovations are needed for filtering the surplus scientific literature on COVID-19 so that clinicians and medical researchers can efficiently seek and learn from the most recent and relevant publications (Oruche et al., 2021). This article seeks to explore the research question: “*How can an AI-powered chatbot help users, especially clinicians and medical researchers, effectively and efficiently identify reliable information with high evidence levels to help them make the best decisions at work?*” Answers to this question can shed light on how HMC contributes to the diffusion of innovations (Rogers, 2003) for combating the COVID-19 pandemic in the present moment. Furthermore, answers to this question can help us

understand how HMC contributes to the new normal in the post-pandemic world as well as how HMC can better prepare us for the next pandemic or global emergency, where similar challenges such as those related to the current pandemic re-emerge in the future.

HMC research on machine's advice-giving suggests that the difficulty of the tasks and perceived machine's understanding of decision consequences matter in human users' advice utilization (Prahl & Van Swol, 2021). Given the low usability and high technicality of many gateways as well as the scientific and societal significance of having the latest and best COVID-19 literature for clinicians and medical researchers in combating the pandemic, a study on an advice-giving chatbot can help advance HMC research in designing machines that will enjoy a higher degree of acceptance, adoption, and utilization by users. Although some HMC scholars are concerned about negative effects of machines replacing humans at the workplace (Gibbs et al., 2021; Piercy & Gist-Mackey, 2021) and raised ethical questions in critical studies on HMC (Dehnert & Leach, 2021; Liu, 2021), the potential positive consequences of a machine-driven solution can help clinicians and medical researchers save lives, a task that Prahl and Van Swol (2021) would term *humanitarian*. Hence, a machine-driven solution may be well-received in HMC research.

In this article, we explain a science gateway platform called KnowCOVID-19 (Oruche et al., 2021), equipped with a chatbot called Vidura (Chandrashekara et al., 2018). KnowCOVID-19 is designed to automatically sort scientific literature based on different types of evidence (e.g., empirical studies versus expert opinions). Named after a wise advisor in Indian mythology, Vidura is a chatbot designed to guide users to navigate the platform to effectively (with quality) and efficiently (with speed) find the scientific literature with the desired type of evidence to help clinicians and medical researchers combat the pandemic, including giving the best care to patients with COVID-19 as well as discovering treatments and preventions for the disease. Both the gateway and the chatbot are in the prototype phase under a collaborative project funded by the National Science Foundation in the United States (see Calyam & Nair, 2020; Kee, 2020).

Given the urgent need to develop a chatbot to leverage HMC to combat the COVID-19 pandemic, this article will first define the machine (i.e., a science gateway integrated with an AI-powered chatbot) central to the core of this article. Second, we elaborate on the main problems faced by users in our specific context of scientific literature searches on COVID-19. Third, we explain how three novel solutions can be integrated into technologies to help overcome the stated problems. Fourth, we briefly describe the functions of a gateway platform and a chatbot to help users with optimizing scientific literature searches on COVID-19. Fifth, we propose how the adoption of our chatbot can be further studied, using a mix of methods commonly used in communication and HMC research. Finally, this article concludes by providing some theoretical and practical implications of the role of chatbot and HMC in diffusion research.

AI-Powered Chatbot Integrated With a Science Gateway for COVID-19

It is important to discuss the concepts of artificial intelligence (AI) and chatbot. AI involves “the study of agents that exist in an environment and perceive and act” (Russell & Norvig, 1995, p. 5). AI is not simply a computer program, but a smart computer program (often

referred to as a computer agent) that can simulate human thoughts and actions toward optimal outcomes according to specified goals. AI-driven machines are often said to mimic the human minds in order to learn and solve problems at a higher scale and with a higher reliability that is not feasible manually.

AI involves machine learning (ML) and deep learning (DL). ML is a technique that allows computers to improve its performance based on inputs and experiences. On the other hand, DL is a technique to program computers to learn, modeling after human multilayer neuro networks. Given these techniques, AI-powered machines can augment human functions at large scales through automation and further improve their performance through recommendation of a set of viable options for humans to consider to process data. In this article, AI in the form of topic models of data and recommender engines to provision computational resources provides much of the foundation of how our Vidura chatbot operates in improving the effectiveness and efficiency of KnowCOVID-19 science gateway to filter huge publication archives of information.

Chatbot, one of the most prevalent practical AI examples, is a conversational agent that imitates human-to-human conversations. There are text-based chatbots (e.g., Bank of America's Erica, Capital One's Eno, Geico's Kate, Amtrak's Julie, etc.) (Ali, 2021) and voice-based chatbots (e.g., Amazon Alexa, Apple Siri, Google Assistant, Microsoft Cortana, etc.) (Etzrodt & Engesser, 2021). As alluded to in the previous paragraph, although users directly interact with the chatbot such as Erica and Alexa, the AI algorithms form an integral part of the users' experience with the chatbot. Therefore, the concepts of AI and chatbot can be treated as one, as the chatbot cannot function properly without AI, and the AI is not usable without a well-designed chatbot user interface.

More recently, the bibliometric study on chatbots (Io & Lee, 2017) reveals the scope of contributions in the state-of-the-art for chatbot applications in many domains with a high number of alternatives and thus justifies the need for (semi-)automated user support. This also confirms the novelty of our contribution to science gateway communities, since, to the best of our knowledge, there is no prior work in this area. In other recent works, a new category of conversational agents with chatbot interfaces enables natural language processing to map suitable commands for their execution to provide convenience for user requirement. An example is implemented in prior work (Bieliauskas & Schreiber, 2017) for a conversational visualization service to extract keywords from the conversation and to apply filters to the visualizations. Such methods are helpful in data science applications as they allow novice users to build data models with minimal coding. Chatbots for data analysis workflow management such as AVA (John et al., 2017) and more recently IRIS (Fast et al., 2018) are promising solutions that further motivate our work, and the benefits that we expect for the science gateway communities.

A science gateway refers to a "community-specific set of tools, applications, and data collections that are integrated together via a portal or a suite of applications, providing access to grid-integrated resources" (Wilkins-Diehr, 2006, p. 743). Via a web-based graphical user-interface, data providers share their data with a community of users and other providers. On the other hand, users can access shared resources, such as software, instruments, (de-identified) data, computing (cloud) services, educational materials as well as discipline-specific knowledge as a diverse community of users (SGCI, 2020). In other words, a gateway

is a point-and-click platform to help users harness and process big data through web services of computational resources.

What is the big data in this article? As previously mentioned, the amount of scientific literature in publication archives such as PubMed (NCBI, 2020), LitCovid (NLM, 2020) being produced on COVID-19 is vast and fast-growing, which has reached an overwhelming state for clinicians and medical researchers. Not only is the data big in size, today's big datasets are often characterized by multiple parameters (Mayer-Schönberger & Cukier, 2014). As a result, many clinicians and medical researchers are unable to keep up with the volume of information being produced daily. We further elaborate on this problem of data deluge along with two other related challenges in the next section.

The Three Problems of Big Data, Quality, and Diffusion

In our particular context of scientific literature searches, clinicians and medical researchers face three major problems that we termed the big data problem, the quality problem, and the diffusion problem. First, the big data problem. The amount of literature being produced on COVID-19 is vast and fast-growing, exponentially higher than any other topic in scientific research prior to the pandemic. This is understandable given the urgency of the global emergency. Many researchers across the world are devoting their time and concerted efforts to combat the pandemic. However, the size of the data is so overwhelming that it created a dilemma for clinicians and medical researchers in that they cannot keep up with the literature. Furthermore, the data size makes it difficult for clinicians and medical researchers to find the exact information with the desired level of evidence they need for their individual work in combating COVID-19.

Second, is the quality problem. The traditional peer-review process is long and slow, as a paper needs to undergo multiple rounds of peer reviews and authors' revisions before it can be accepted for publication. This process can sometimes take several months to a couple of years, depending on the journals. Although this process ensures a high level of quality for the publications, COVID-19-related research cannot wait to undergo such a lengthy process. Otherwise, published findings will be outdated and/or miss the opportunity windows to save lives. The need to rush through the traditional peer review process is apparent, given the urgency to share COVID-related medical findings across the world. When the peer review process is rushed, the quality of review is compromised. In many situations, the urgency also pushed researchers to publish their results in the form of pre-prints. Pre-prints are research papers that can be made publicly available online immediately. Furthermore, some of the pre-prints are recommendations based on expert opinions, and not empirical studies. Therefore, the quality of evidence varies widely. This creates the data quality problem, which in turn impacts the data reliability as a clinician performs searches with keywords and then manually sorts through a wide range of literature with varying quality to make decisions that are critical for patient care.

Third, the diffusion problem. Although science gateways are designed with a web-based user-interface with the goal of removing the need for command-line programming to harness big data, individual adoption and systemic diffusion is still heavily compromised (Kee et al., 2021). This is understandable given that gateways are built for specific purposes,

and many of them suffer from a low level of usability when more functionality is added over time. Many of the prototype gateways were developed by lead-users who cannot find off-the-shelf solutions to their big data problems in scientific research. Therefore, these prototype gateways were developed for their own use and the use of a small initial group of peers and collaborators who may not be concerned about usability (Kee et al., 2016). However, the lead users' willingness to tolerate a low level of usability can be a big barrier to mass adoption beyond the initial small group or when additional functionality needs to be added or enhanced. A related issue is the lack of technical support, especially 24-hour around-the-clock and 7 days a week (Kee et al., 2021). The issue is further compounded by the fact that user support is time-intensive, often requiring one-on-one help and training (Nair & Calyam, 2018). Therefore, while gateways are a promising solution, the adoption and diffusion are challenged by the limitations in usability and user support. In this particular article, the diffusion problem refers to the need for users to quickly learn how to use the KnowCOVID-19 gateway and to receive technical support, such that the adoption and diffusion of this gateway innovation can be sustained over time to combat the pandemic.

These three problems of big data, quality, and diffusion present the challenges we seek to overcome with a gateway KnowCOVID-19. By leveraging Vidura, an AI-powered chatbot, to assist users to conduct literature searches, clinicians and medical researchers can improve the quality of the information they find. The next section explains how KnowCOVID-19 and Vidura, the gateway and chatbot, help overcome the three stated problems.

Gateways, Levels of Evidence, and Chatbots as Solutions to the Three Problems

To address the big data problem, science gateways have been developed in different domains, such as neuroscience, physics, chemistry, and material science (Vekaria et al., 2020). Gateways have also integrated smart devices to provide smart solutions for health care professionals and patients (Chandrashekara et al., 2018). In our case, clinicians and medical researchers can access a wide scope of online literature on COVID-19 (text-based data analytics) to help them find the answers to their questions as the starting point. As a computer science technique, topic modeling of existing scientific literature can be leveraged (Zhang et al., 2018), thus sorting literature into topics based on clinical queries and categories based on specific clinical groupings. Furthermore, although it was discussed earlier that an overwhelming volume of literature is a problem, big data also provide advantages over small data. For example, the gateway can include scientific literature on studies of previous coronavirus, such as MERS in 2012–2013 and SARS in 2002–2003. Such an approach can allow users to run correlational and/or associational analyses to identify longer-term patterns in the literature for infectious diseases and display the results and findings via visualizations.

Second, to address the quality problem, we turn to what has become known as the Levels of Evidence (LOE) by Ackley et al. (2008). Briefly, LOE distinguishes the types of evidence used in a paper, assigning them from level VII (the lowest level) if the evidence is based on expert opinions to level I (the highest level) if the evidence is based on a systematic review or a meta-analysis of multiple rigorous studies, such as randomized controlled trials. Greenhalgh (2014) expanded on the notion and ranked the different types of evidence based on a hierarchy using a pyramid, listing meta-analysis at the top of the pyramid,

followed by systematic review, critically appraised topic, critically appraised articles, randomized controlled trials, cohort study, case-control study, background information/expert opinions, and finally animal research/lab studies. LOE provides an objective way to rank the overwhelming number of COVID-related publications and help clinicians and medical researchers filter through the sea of literature to identify the best quality evidence for their practice. Essentially, the gateway is designed to allow users to search and retrieve a large quantity of scientific and medical literature on health care topics related to COVID-19, and then sort the literature based on the pre-determined hierarchy of evidence to help users expedite and optimize their search process to obtain the best results.

Third, to address the diffusion problem, a chatbot assistant is designed to provide user support around the clock. Chatbot assistants have been implemented to provide user support in various industries, such as banking, customer service, and online education (Baby et al., 2017; Muslih et al., 2018; Ni et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2018). The same idea can be applied to user support for using gateways. By combining the solutions of all three problems, the gateway can remove the burden of manual searches and a high learning curve due to a gateway's low usability and technical difficulty, by leveraging the chatbot assistant powered by AI in the form of recommender engines, topic models of datasets, and other techniques.

The KnowCOVID-19 Gateway and the Vidura Chatbot

For the purpose of developing the KnowCOVID-19 gateway, more than 10,000 publications were gathered from the Kaggle COVID-19 Open Research Dataset (CORD-19) (Eren et al., 2020). Based on this dataset, users can perform three general activities with the literature searches. First, using the gateway, users can enter keywords and search terms and identify the levels of evidence they are interested in finding. As previously discussed, the total amount of literature has a wide range of quality. By identifying specific levels of evidence, users can narrow their search results to particular types of evidence they believe to be credible and appropriate for their purpose associated with certain keywords.

Second, users can select the articles from the search results generated by the gateway. They can simply use these articles for information and guidance on their practice and work. However, and third, the gateway allows the users to perform further analysis of the selected articles, using techniques such as correlational analyses to identify patterns among the articles, and they can share the results further using social network platforms. The goal of these features is to allow users to customize their searches and to help them extract insights from the searches.

On the other hand, the Vidura chatbot is powered by Google Dialogflow, a natural language understanding (NLU) platform. Google Dialogflow was selected because it makes integration of user interface with mobile and web applications as well as interactive voice response systems and smart devices easy. Through analyzing users' queries, the chatbot identifies the intents of the users. Then when users type their questions as input to the chatbot, the chatbot matches the input and intents through a technique called intent classification. Intent classification can help the chatbot extract useful information for the users. In order to improve the chatbot performance, it employs variation inputs from the users to train the NLU model.

To further improve the chatbot performance, the gateway will provide users with an online questionnaire upon signup to determine their domain proficiency (i.e., knowledge about COVID-19) and technology proficiency (i.e., experience with gateways in general). By categorizing the two proficiencies into high versus low, a two-by-two matrix can be created. Then, each diverse user can be put in one of the four quadrants (i.e., high in domain proficiency but low in technology proficiency; low in both domain and technology proficiencies). Then the chatbot will provide personalized responses according to individual users' position on the matrix, even if they ask the same question. This design is intentional, because as a *wise advisor*, Vidura is able to assess the baseline proficiency of a user, and determine the appropriate amount of guidance for each unique user. For example, Vidura will help a user placed in the quadrant defined by low proficiency in both domain and technology with domain guidance, even if the question is technical in nature. However, as the user improves in one or both proficiencies, their placement in the quadrant can shift (for more information about the Vidura chatbot, see Chandrashekhara et al., 2018). The shifting is based on what Gibbs and colleagues (2021) explain as ML algorithms built into organizational decision-making in HMC research.

Demonstrating the Chatbot's Role in Gateway Adoption

Fortunati and A. P. Edwards (2020) argue that it is important to consider different methodologies to study HMC. We propose several mixed methods approaches to further study Vidura chatbot and identify its role in gateway adoption. First, it is important to conduct a market research study on Vidura. To do this, a series of interviews and focus groups can be conducted with clinicians and medical researchers combating COVID-19 at the front line, to better understand the challenges they face, their needs, routines, and their feedback on Vidura. Insights from the initial market research can further identify how the Vidura chatbot may meet the needs of the target clinicians and medical researchers.

Second, an experiment can be set up to compare the user outcomes between a control group and an experimental group. For example, user outcomes can include task completion time (start to end time of a search for COVID-19 literature) and success rates (able to find the desired COVID-19 literature on gateway or not) between a control group of users without the chatbot and the experimental group with the chatbot as the intervention. If there are statistically significant differences between the two groups, then the efficiency (shorter completion time in the experimental group) and effectiveness (higher success rates in the experimental group), then the relative advantages of the chatbot in helping clinicians and medical researchers find the COVID-19 literature they need can be demonstrated. Also, Lombard and Xu (2021) noted that voice (i.e., human-sounding versus machine-sounding) can have an effect on users' HMC. Moreover, as machines are increasingly becoming human-like (Dehnert & Leach, 2021), Davis and Stanovsek (2021) maintain that the use of an avatar can create a sense of character identity for the users, which can impact HMC. Therefore, different conditions of modality (text versus voice), voice (human- versus machine-sounding), and screen-based embodiment (no avatar versus with avatar) can serve as variables to compare the two stated outcomes in the experimental group. Additional user outcomes can also include satisfaction and likelihood to recommend the gateway with a

chatbot to their peers, to further include variables related to diffusion and adoption of the KnowCOVID-19 gateway for patient care and medical research in combating the pandemic.

Third, a survey can also follow the experiment. The survey questionnaire can include variables such as perception of innovation attributes (Moore & Benbasat, 1991) of the gateway and/or the chatbot, self-identified adopter categories (Noppers et al., 2015), opinion leadership/super-diffuser tendency (Boster et al., 2011), and demographic variables. Findings can help identify the demographic profiles of clinicians and medical researchers who are likely to be in favor of the gateway and/or chatbot. Then the developers can explore using the profiles to identify early adopters and opinion leaders to partner with, and pro-actively seek out input from the late majority and laggards to identify potential barriers to adoption, so the gateway and chatbot can be better designed for diffusion to more effectively and efficiently find COVID-19 literature to improve patient care, treatments, and preventions.

Fourth, the experiment can be video recorded, so the actual points-and-clicks by the clinicians and medical researchers can be analyzed by observational techniques to identify the usability of the gateway and chatbot. With video recordings, the analysis can focus on where these gateway users pause and take a long time to decide the next move. Similar analysis can also be performed to identify moments right before the users choose to engage with a chatbot, and how they continue with the gateway after receiving guidance and help from the chatbot. Such a study can also incorporate the *talk out loud* strategy, asking the users to verbally articulate their thought processes as they navigate the platform. Hence, the usability study can better relate the observation of navigation with the analysis of verbalized rationales, to help the developers better understand the workflow and routines of clinicians and medical researchers during the urgent time of combating COVID-19.

Fifth, eye-tracking techniques can be utilized to study where clinicians and medical researchers focus their eye gaze and visual attention on the KnowCOVID-19 gateway and the Vidura chatbot. Similar studies can be conducted to examine the relationships among visual attention/distraction to generate *heat maps*, and correlate the maps with other variables such as topic involvement and information recall (Gong et al., 2021), in addition to what HMC scholars have studied in utilizing eye-tracking software, such as how eye gaze signals active participation and intentionality in HMC (McEwen et al., 2020). The heat maps can also be used to correlate with findings from data from other studies, such as when users initiate a chat session with Vidura, and/or what questions are asked during the chat session.

Sixth, an open-ended interview with clinicians and medical researchers as participants immediately following the experiment can also solicit feedback on the design of gateway and chatbot for better user experience. Interviewing is particularly well-suited for gathering qualitative input. Furthermore, the analysis can also identify potential background factors (such as the thought processes, inherent assumptions, etc. of clinicians and medical researchers) that may have affected users' navigation of the gateway and engagement with the chatbot in both positive and negative ways. If a time gap allows for video processing, so the interview study is paired up with showing the video recording with *talk out loud* articulation, interviewers can better probe and ask the participant to recall and fully explain their experience with the gateway and chatbot, further triangulating different data sources and stimuli for a robust analysis. During this interview study, probes should be designed to gather a deep understanding of the work context of the clinicians and medical researchers during the pandemic, as such insights can help improve the contextual understanding of

the COVID-19 pandemic. Interviews can also get at how users may have anthropomorphized the chatbot (Liu, 2021), attributing human characteristics to the machine.

Seventh, the verbatim dialogues between the users and the chatbot can be recorded and analyzed using conversational analysis techniques, to better understand how clinicians and medical researchers engage with the chatbot, and how to design responses for the chatbot to optimize the chat process with the least number of back-and-forth (i.e., adjacency pairs) between the users and the chatbot before successful task completion. We understand that clinicians and medical researchers are very busy, especially during the urgent time of combating the pandemic. Such a study can help developers identify the best way to design the optimal responses from the chatbot to the clinicians and medical researchers the technology is designed to serve. Also, this study can add to HMC research and examine self-disclosure (Ling & Björling, 2020), and this case, disclosure of questions about accomplishing certain tasks on KnowCOVID-19. Some clinicians and medical researchers may not ask certain questions to a human support personnel, but asking these questions to a machine advisor may be less embarrassing.

Finally, as the chatbot can be designed to gather user queries and intents, the data based on queries and intents can be further analyzed to identify clinicians and medical researchers with similar interests. Then the chatbot can allow these users to opt-in to be recommended and receive recommendations to connect with other users with similar interests, thus creating robust social networks that can lead to a robust user community of clinicians and medical researchers combating the COVID-19 pandemic worldwide. Social network analysis can be performed to identify weak ties, strong ties, and where potential ties turn into weak ties, and what factors may affect tie strengths and tie conversions across the world. This approach is important because HMC scholars have argued that machines can be mediators of social relationships (Fortunati & Edwards, 2021), and social influence is a positive predictor of social machine adoption (Lutz & Tamó-Larrieux, 2020).

Conclusion and Implications

The article set out to answer the research question: *“How can an AI-powered chatbot help users, especially clinicians and medical researchers, effectively and efficiently identify reliable information with high evidence levels to help them make the best decisions at work?”* We described a gateway called KnowCOVID-19 and the Vidura chatbot being prototyped to address this very question. The combination of the gateway and chatbot helps clinicians and medical researchers to overcome the big data problem, the quality problem, and the diffusion problem. What are the implications of this work?

Theoretically, this study advances diffusion of innovations theory (Rogers, 2003) by emphasizing the subsequent stage of sustainable implementation. Much diffusion research over-emphasizes the point of adoption, thus rendering sustainable implementation an oversight and under-studied area. This is understandable because traditional innovations studied in diffusion research are commercial products, and the researchers and companies behind are mainly concerned with the point of sales. In the case of gateways, our concern is beyond the point of initial adoption, to include meaningful use, widespread diffusion, and long-term sustainability in order to enable users to discover breakthrough science and research that help them better combat COVID-19.

Second, much diffusion research has focused on opinion leadership and its impact on user adoption. However, less work has been done to investigate if and how helpful machines (i.e., chatbots) can support users in properly putting the innovation into practice during implementation. This article suggests that the adoption of chatbot with the gateway can help users sustain their adoption of the gateway, casting the chatbot and HMC as important for promoting and sustaining diffusion. Moreover, as chatbot becomes more commonly used in the society, human-chatbot interactions may in turn influence human-human interactions in recent HMC research (Gambino et al., 2020), thus changing how human opinion leaders may impact diffusion of innovations.

Third, studying the HMC between users and the chatbot in the use of KnowCOVID-19 represents an integration of actor-network theory (Latour, 2005) and diffusion theory (Rogers, 2003). Although humans and machines can be argued as ontologically different in HMC research (Guzman, 2020; Ling & Björling, 2020), human agents (i.e., clinicians and medical researchers) and technical agent (i.e., the Vidura chatbot) can be argued as “potentially equivalent actors” (Banks & de Graaf, 2020), hence their collaboration can be treated as leading to joint discoveries and identifications of research literature that can guide the best evidence-based health care, treatments, and preventions to combat the pandemic. While much of early diffusion research was built on quantitative and post-positivistic research, the case of KnowCOVID-19 and Vidura chatbot presents an opportunity for theoretical extension through a socio-material perspective.

Fourth, the chatbot can follow and track users’ struggles with the gateway all the way until the point of discontinuation, if and when it happens. Much diffusion research focuses on successful adoption and sometimes implementation, perhaps due to the difficulty of finding adopters and/or discontinuers who opted-out to participate in research studies. This study suggests an opportunity to leverage chatbots to investigate discontinuation as an important decision point in diffusion research.

Practically, many gateway projects are federally funded for the initial development, not for long-term sustainability of the gateways. Additionally, there is usually no federal funding for technical support for users. As a result, implementation of user support is often an afterthought, and only recognized as a need when uptake increases notably, and the gateway begins to attract many new users beyond the inception projects. Voluntary user support by gateway developers when the technologies are in early diffusion cycles may be feasible. Once the gateway begins to gain traction in the user community, personalized user support becomes practically impossible. Scaling to keep up with adoption and guiding users’ usage patterns becomes difficult in practice. The Vidura chatbot can solve this problem for gateway developers. While receiving support, guidance, and advice from the chatbot may appear less than ideal than human support in the early stages, with ML algorithms and more interaction data over time, Vidura may outperform human support. This is a possibility similar to the caution that HMC scholars Johanssen and Wang (2021) raised about how AI may ultimately surpass human intuition. This possibility is also aligned with the concern raised by HMC scholars Piercy and Gist-Mackey (2021), who warned about how automation may replace human workers in the future of work.

Furthermore, while the current focus is on literature as text-based data, the gateway can further automate data integration with electronic health records (EHR). In order to overcome the privacy concerns noted by HMC scholars (Lutz & Tamó-Larrieux, 2020), this

integration can be accomplished through privacy measures (Dinakarrao et al., 2019), such as using blockchain-based (Matos et al., 2018; Purohit et al., 2021) secure storage layer for data from EHR as value-based data analytics. As a result, future users can use the Know-COVID-19 gateway to perform joint analysis with EHR data in concert with publication analytics research.

Moreover, the work on chatbot can also be extended to social robots (Banks et al., 2021), which has a three-dimensional embodiment and the ability to take in multiple sensory inputs, such as nonverbal cues, body temperature, and so forth from users. Social robots are also capable of conveying nonverbal cues to users, creating complex interactions to promote innovation adoption. Social robots can also be used in dangerous and/or hazardous environments, thus providing another means for protecting human agents from physical harms.

Finally, this article highlights the difference between innovations and diffusion, by putting the emphasis on the latter. While the KnowCOVID-19 gateway may be a good innovation, without the Vidura chatbot, adoption and diffusion over the long-term can be compromised. Similar to how vaccine for COVID-19 is an important innovation, vaccination is a separate science and is equally important for research attention. In other words, innovations cannot fully realize their societal impacts without the help of diffusion research. We argue that HMC, such as in the case of chatbots, can play an important role in the adoption of new technologies and other important innovation in the context of COVID-19. HMC insights can also be extended to the post-pandemic world and increase our preparedness for the next global crisis.

Author Biographies

Kerk F. Kee received his PhD in Organizational Communication, with an emphasis on workplace technologies, in the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Texas at Austin. He is currently an Associate Professor in the College of Media & Communication at Texas Tech University. His research focuses on the diffusion of innovations in the scientific, health, and environmental contexts. His work has been funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and US National Science Foundation (NSF), include an NSF CAREER award in 2015.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0543-5009>

Prasad Calyam received his MS and PhD degrees from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at The Ohio State University in 2002 and 2007, respectively. He is currently an Associate Professor in the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science at University of Missouri-Columbia. His current research interests include distributed and cloud computing, computer networking, and cybersecurity. He is a Senior Member of IEEE.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7666-5389>

Hariharan Regunath received his MBBS and MD degrees from The Tamil Nadu Dr. MGR Medical University, India and Manipal University, India respectively. He received additional residency training in internal medicine and fellowship training in Infectious Diseases and Critical Care Medicine, both at University of Missouri-Columbia. He is currently an Assistant Professor of Clinical Medicine at the Department of Medicine Divisions of Pulmonary, Critical Care Medicine and Infectious Diseases at University of Missouri-Columbia. His current research interests include COVID-19, ARDS, Nosocomial Infections, Infective Endocarditis, Clinical Microbiology, CMV infections and Travel medicine.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4223-8765>

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the National Science Foundation under awards: OAC-1730655, OAC-2006816, and OAC-2007100. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

References

- Ackley, B., Ladwig, G., Swan, B., & Tucker, S. (2008). Evidence based nursing care guidelines. *Medical Surgical Interventions*. Mosby Elsevier, syf, 15.
- Ali, C. (2021, February 4). The 10 best chatbots of 2021. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210505133806/https://www.userlike.com/en/blog/best-chatbots>
- Baby, C. J., Khan, F. A., & Swathi, J. (2017). *Home automation using IoT and a chatbot using natural language processing*. 2017 Innovations in Power and Advanced Computing Technologies (i-PACT).
- Banks, J., & de Graaf, M. (2020). Toward an agent-agnostic transmission model: Synthesizing anthropocentric and technocentric paradigms in communication. *Human-Machine Communication*, 1, 19–36. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.1.2>
- Banks, J., Koban, K., & Chauveau, P. d. V. (2021). Forms and frames: Mind, morality, and trust in robots across prototypical interactions. *Human-Machine Communication*, 2, 81–103. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.2.4>
- Bharti, U., Bajaj, D., Batra, H., Lalit, S., Lalit, S., & Gangwani, A. (2020, June 10–12). *Med-bot: Conversational artificial intelligence powered chatbot for delivering tele-health after COVID-19*. 2020 5th International Conference on Communication and Electronics Systems (ICCES). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCES48766.2020.9137944>
- Bieliauskas, S., & Schreiber, A. (2017). *A conversational user interface for software visualization*. 2017 IEEE working conference on software visualization (vissoft). <https://doi.org/10.1109/VISSOFT.2017.21>
- Boster, F. J., Kotowski, M. R., Andrews, K. R., & Serota, K. (2011). Identifying influence: Development and validation of the connectivity, persuasiveness, and maven scales. *Journal of Communication*, 61, 178–196. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2010.01531.x>

- Calyam, P., & Nair, S. (2020). OAC core: Small: Collaborative research: Conversational agents for supporting sustainable implementation and systemic diffusion of cyberinfrastructure and science gateways, NSF OAC #2006816. https://nsf.gov/awardsearch/showAward?AWD_ID=2006816
- Chandrashekhara, A. A., Talluri, R. K. M., Sivarathri, S. S., Mitra, R., Calyam, P., Kee, K., & Nair, S. (2018). *Fuzzy-based conversational recommender for data-intensive science gateway applications*. 2018 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data). <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigData.2018.8622046>
- Davis, D. Z., & Stanovsek, S. (2021). The machine as an extension of the body: When identity, immersion and interactive design serve as both resource and limitation for the disabled. *Human-Machine Communication*, 2, 121–135. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.2.6>
- Dehnert, M., & Leach, R. B. (2021). Becoming human? Ableism and control in Detroit: Become human and the implications for human-machine communication. *Human-Machine Communication*, 2, 137–152. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.2.7>
- Dinakarrrao, S. M. P., Sayadi, H., Makrani, H. M., Nowzari, C., Rafatirad, S., & Homayoun, H. (2019). *Lightweight node-level malware detection and network-level malware confinement in iot networks*. 2019 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition. <https://doi.org/10.23919/DATE.2019.8715057>
- Eren, M. E., Solovyev, N., Raff, E., Nicholas, C., & Johnson, B. (2020). *COVID-19 Kaggle Literature Organization*. Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Document Engineering 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3395027.3419591>
- Etzrodt, K., & Engesser, S. (2021). Voice-based agents as personified things: Assimilation and accommodation as equilibration of doubt. *Human-Machine Communication*, 2, 57–79. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.2.3>
- Fast, E., Chen, B., Mendelsohn, J., Bassen, J., & Bernstein, M. S. (2018). *Iris: A conversational agent for complex tasks*. Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3174047>
- Fortunati, L., & Edwards, A. (2021). Moving ahead with human-machine communication. *Human-Machine Communication*, 2, 7–28. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.2.1>
- Fortunati, L., & Edwards, A. P. (2020). Opening space for theoretical, methodological, and empirical issues in human-machine communication. *Human-Machine Communication*, 1, 7–18. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.1.1>
- Gambino, A., Fox, J., & Ratan, R. A. (2020). Building a stronger CASA: Extending the computers are social actors paradigm. *Human-Machine Communication*, 1, 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.1.5>
- Gibbs, J. L., Kirkwood, G. L., Fang, C., & Wilkenfeld, J. N. (2021). Negotiating agency and control: Theorizing human-machine communication from a structuralist perspective. *Human-Machine Communication*, 2, 53–171. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.2.8>
- Gong, Z., Holiday, S., & Cummins, R. G. (2021). Can't take my eyes off of the model: The impact of sexual appeal and product involvement on selective attention to advertisements. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 2, 162–174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2020.1803089>
- Greenhalgh, T. (2014). *How to read a paper: The basics of evidence-based medicine*: John Wiley & Sons.
-

- Guzman, A. L. (2020). Ontological boundaries between humans and computers and the implications for human-machine communication. *Human-Machine Communication, 1*, 37–54. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.1.3>
- Io, H., & Lee, C. (2017). Chatbots and conversational agents: A bibliometric analysis. 2017 *IEEE International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management (IEEM)*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IEEM.2017.8289883>
- Johanssen, J., & Wang, X. (2021). Artificial intuition in tech journalism on AI: Imagining the human subject. *Human-Machine Communication, 2*, 173–190. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.2.9>
- John, R. J. L., Potti, N., & Patel, J. M. (2017). *Ava: From data to insights through conversations*. Paper presented at 8th Biennial Conference on Innovative Data Systems Research (CIDR '17) January 8–11, 2017, Chaminade, California, USA.
- Kee, K. F. (2020). OAC Core: Small: Collaborative research: Conversational agents for supporting sustainable implementation and systemic diffusion of cyberinfrastructure and science gateways, NSF OCA #2007100. https://nsf.gov/awardsearch/showAward?AWD_ID=2007100
- Kee, K. F., Le, B., & Jitkajornwanich, K. (2021). If you build it, promote it, and they trust you, then they will come: Diffusion strategies for science gateways and cyberinfrastructure adoption to harness big data in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) community. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, e6192. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpe.6192>
- Kee, K. F., Sleiman, M., Williams, M., & Stewart, D. (2016). The 10 attributes that drive adoption and diffusion of computational tools in e-science. In P. Navrátil, M. Dahan, D. Hart, A. Romanella, & N. Sukhija (Eds.), *2016 XSEDE Conference: Diversity, Big Data, & Science at Scale*. New York: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2949550.2949649>
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford University Press.
- Ling, H. Y., & Björling, E. A. (2020). Sharing stress with a robot: What would a robot say? *Human-Machine Communication, 1*, 133–158. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.1.8>
- Liu, J. (2021). Social robots as the bride? Understanding the construction of gender in a Japanese social robot product. *Human-Machine Communication, 2*, 105–120. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.2.5>
- Lombard, M., & Xu, K. (2021). Social responses to media technologies in the 21st century: The media are social actors paradigm. *Human-Machine Communication, 2*, 29–55. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.2.2>
- Lutz, C., & Tamó-Larrieux, A. (2020). The robot privacy paradox: Understanding how privacy concerns shape intentions to use social robots. *Human-Machine Communication, 1*, 87–111. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.1.6>
- Maniou, T. A., & Veglis, A. (2020). Employing a chatbot for news dissemination during crisis: Design, implementation and evaluation. *Future Internet, 12*(7), 109. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fi12070109>
- Martin, A., Nateqi, J., Gruarin, S., Munsch, N., Abdarrahmane, I., Zobel, M., & Knapp, B. (2020). An artificial intelligence-based first-line defence against COVID-19: Digitally screening citizens for risks via a chatbot. *Scientific reports, 10*, 19012. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-75912-x>

- Matos, D. R., Pardal, M. L., Adao, P., Silva, A. R., & Correia, M. (2018). Securing electronic health records in the cloud. *Proceedings of the 1st workshop on privacy by design in distributed systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3195258.3195259>
- Mayer-Schönberger, V., & Cukier, K. (2014). *Big data: A revolution that will transform how we live, work, and think*. Eanib Dolan/Mariner Books.
- McEwen, R., Atcha, A., Lui, M., Shimaly, R., Maharaj, A., Ali, S., & Carroll, S. (2020). Interlocutors and interactions: Examining the interactions between students with complex communication needs, teachers, and eye-gaze technology. *Human-Machine Communication*, 1, 113–131. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.1.7>
- Mehfooz F., Jha S., Singh S., Saini S., Sharma N. (2021) Medical chatbot for novel COVID-19. In: Fong S., Dey N., Joshi A. (Eds.). *ICT Analysis and Applications. Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems*, vol 154. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-8354-4_42
- Moore, G. C., & Benbasat, I. (1991). Development of an instrument to measure the perceptions of adopting an information technology innovation. *Information Systems Research*, 2, 192–222. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2.3.192>
- Muslih, M., Supardi, D., Multipli, E., Nyaman, Y. M., & Rismawan, A. (2018). *Developing smart workspace based IOT with artificial intelligence using telegram chatbot*. 2018 International Conference on Computing, Engineering, and Design (ICCED), 230–234. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCED.2018.00052>
- Nair, S. S., & Calyam, P. (2018). Experiences from a multi-disciplinary course sequence development on cyber and software automation in neuroscience. Paper presented at the Proceedings of Gateways 2018, Austin, TX.
- NCBI, N. C. f. B. I., “PubMed”. (2020). <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>
- Ni L., Lu C., Liu N., Liu J. (2017) MANDY: Towards a smart primary care chatbot application. In: Chen J., Theeramunkong T., Supnithi T., Tang X. (Eds.). *Knowledge and Systems Sciences. KSS 2017. Communications in Computer and Information Science*, 780, 32–58. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-6989-5_4
- NLM, N. L. o. M. (2020). LitCovid. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/research/coronavirus/>
- Noppers, E. H., Keizer, K., Bockarjova, M., & Steg, L. (2015). The adoption of sustainable innovations: The role of instrumental, environmental, and symbolic attributes for earlier and later adopters. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 44, 74–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.09.002>
- Oruche, R., Gundlapalli, V., Biswal, A. P., Calyam, P., Alarcon, M. L., Zhang, Y., Bhamidipati, N. R., Malladi, A., & Regunath, H. (2021). Evidence-based recommender system for a COVID-19 publication analytics service. *IEEE Access*, 9, 79400–79415, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3083583>
- Piercy, C. W., & Gist-Mackey, A. N. (2021). Automation anxieties: Perceptions about technological automation and the future of pharmacy work. *Human-Machine Communication*, 2, 191–208. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.2.10>
- Prahl, A., & Van Swol, L. (2021). Out with the humans, in with the machines?: Investigating the behavioral and psychological effects of replacing human advisors with a machine. *Human-Machine Communication*, 2, 209–234. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.2.11>
-

- Purohit, S., Calyam, P., Alarcon, M. L., Bhamidipati, N. R., Mosa, A., & Salah, K. (2021). HonestChain: Consortium blockchain for protected data sharing in health information systems. *Peer-to-peer Networking and Applications*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12083-021-01153-y>
- Rodsawang, C., Thongkliang, P., Intawong, T., Sonong, A., Thitiwatthana, Y., & Chottanapund, S. (2020). Designing a competent chatbot to counter the COVID-19 pandemic and empower risk communication in an emergency response system *Outbreak, Surveillance, Investigation & Response (OSIR) Journal*, 13(2). <http://osirjournal.net/index.php/osir/article/view/193>
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
- Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (1995). *Prentice Hall series in artificial intelligence*: Prentice Hall.
- SGCI, S. G. C. I. (2020). *Science Gateways Community Institute*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20201118141943/https://sciencegateways.org/>
- Szmigiera, M. (2021). Impact of the coronavirus pandemic on the global economy—Statistics & Facts. *Statista.com*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210808132753/https://www.statista.com/topics/6139/covid-19-impact-on-the-global-economy/>
- Vekaria, K., Calyam, P., Sivarathri, S. S., Wang, S., Zhang, Y., Pandey, A., Chen, C., Xu, D., Joshi, T., & Nair, S. (2020). Recommender-as-a-service with chatbot guided domain-science knowledge discovery in a science gateway. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, e6080. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpe.6080>
- VolppKevin, G. (2020). Asked and answered: Building a chatbot to address covid-19-related concerns. *NEJM Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery*.
- WHO, W. H. O. (2021). <https://www.who.int/>
- Wilkins-Diehr, N. (2007). Science gateways—Common community interfaces to grid resources. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice & Experience*, 19(6), 734–739.
- Yoshikawa, Y., Kumazaki, H., & Kato, T. A. (2021). Future perspectives of robot psychiatry: Can communication robots assist psychiatric evaluation in the COVID-19 pandemic era? *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*, 34(3), 277–286. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ycp.0000000000000692>
- Zhang, Y., Calyam, P., Joshi, T., Nair, S., & Xu, D. (2018). *Domain-specific topic model for knowledge discovery through conversational agents in data intensive scientific communities*. Paper presented at the 2018 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2021.3093350>
-



HUMAN-MACHINE

COMMUNICATION



Communicative Development and Diffusion of Humanoid AI Robots for the Post-Pandemic Health Care System

Do Kyun David Kim¹, Gary L. Kreps², Rukhsana Ahmed³

1 Department of Communication, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, Louisiana, USA


2 Department of Communication, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia, USA

3 Department of Communication, University at Albany—SUNY, Albany, New York, USA

Abstract

As humanoid robot technology, anthropomorphized by artificial intelligence (AI), has rapidly advanced to introduce more human-resembling automated robots that can communicate, interact, and work like humans, we have begun to expect active interactions with Humanoid AI Robots (HAIRs) in the near future. Coupled with the HAIR technology development, the COVID-19 pandemic triggered our interest in using health care robots with many substantial advantages that overcome critical human vulnerabilities against the strong infectious COVID-19 virus. Recognizing the tremendous potential for the active application of HAIRs, this article explores feasible ways to implement HAIRs in health care and patient services and suggests recommendations for strategically developing and diffusing autonomous HAIRs in health care facilities. While discussing the integration of HAIRs into health care, this article points out some important ethical concerns that should be addressed for implementing HAIRs for health care services.

Keywords: humanoid AI robots, machine-learning, new normal in health care, post-pandemic world, human-machine communication

CONTACT Do Kyun David Kim  • Department of Communication • University of Louisiana at Lafayette • Lafayette, LA 70504 • do.kim@louisiana.edu

ISSN 2638-602X (print)/ISSN 2638-6038 (online)
www.hmcjournal.com



Copyright 2021 Authors. Published under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) license.

Humanoid robot technology, anthropomorphized by artificial intelligence (AI), is rapidly advancing to introduce more human-resembling automated robots that can communicate, interact, and work like humans. Although humanoid robots have been implemented in many societal sectors to provide diverse services, such as providing information at airports, assisting human workers at companies, and interacting with patients at health care facilities, the current humanoid robots typically still look, speak, and move like machines, not fully resembling the ways that humans communicate. However, in the (near) future, we expect active interactions with humanoid robots that really look, speak, and move very similarly to humans with better information storage, processing, and capacity for (machine-) learning. With this expectation, as the number of people who see and communicate with humanoid robots increases and robots are located in more places where people frequently visit, it is expected that the public will begin perceiving humanoid robots more positively (Stroessner & Benitez, 2019; Van Pinxteren, 2019).

We anticipate rapid development and implementation of humanoid AI robots (HAIRs) that have a great potential to contribute to advancing health care services in many ways, from diagnosis, treatment recommendations, and administrative activities to patient engagement and adherence (Davenport & Kalakota, 2019). Nowadays, HAIRs with friendly social skills and machine-learning abilities are already delivering a broad range of physical and mental health care services to patients, such as monitoring and responding to emerging health risks, performing robotic surgeries, dispensing needed medications, providing therapeutic counseling and companionship, as well as helping to overcome cognitive challenges for patients with certain health conditions (Kaiser et al., 2020; Kyrarini et al., 2021). As the trend for using robots for health care services expands, we anticipate that more advanced AI robots, HAIRs, will be widely applied to many areas of health care services (Holland et al., 2021; Konijn & Hoorn, 2020).

Coupled with the AI robot technology development, the COVID-19 pandemic triggered growing interest in using health care robots with many substantial advantages that overcome critical human vulnerabilities against the strong infectious virus (Kaiser et al., 2020; Singh et al., 2021). For example, since the coronavirus cannot harm machines, robots do not pose significant risks as carriers of viral infection that can damage the human biological system, nor can robots be infected by the virus. Therefore, under a pandemic situation and public health risks caused by infectious diseases, robots can function as normal within health care settings without the biological concerns of contagion, as opposed to human health care providers. Recognizing the tremendous potential for the active application of humanoid AI-based robot in health care, this article encourages careful consideration of the ways that HAIRs can be widely used for health care and patient services, suggesting recommendations for strategically developing and diffusing HAIRs for use in health care facilities.

We define humanoid AI robots by clarifying the two primary terms, humanoid and AI. *Humanoid* means human-like appearance and function in face, body, ways of moving, speaking, and interacting. *AI* (artificial intelligence) endows robots with autonomy in learning, developing creativity, decision-making/judgment, and adapting to different situations. Based on these definitions, this study examines the use of HAIRs as robots that look, speak, and move exactly like a human, are able to autonomously communicate with patients and make decisions, and take adaptive actions to accomplish set goals in the health care

system. We also provide recommendations and rationale for developing, implementing, and diffusing health care HAIRs to promote health and well-being.

Demands for Health Care *Humanoid* AI Robots

Providing effective health care to address major health care problems is not easy. It is often very complex, demanding a great deal of information to guide effective disease detection, diagnosis, treatment, and follow-up. There is much that must be known about the nature of specific health care concerns to accurately diagnose and treat these problems. Health care providers must be well-informed about patients' individual health histories, their unique and emerging symptoms, as well as their health care needs, expectations, and priorities, so they can use this information to develop and administer effective treatment plans for each patient.

Health care providers must be aware of the latest and best available evidence-based treatments for different conditions and should be able to deliver these different treatments. Once a treatment strategy is implemented, health care providers must carefully monitor patients' responses to treatments to determine how well treatment regimens are working, or if the treatments are leading to other problems for patients. It is unreasonable to assume that health care providers can know about, understand, apply, and keep track of all these factors when delivering complex care to patients.

The information demands of health care become stronger and more complicated during challenging pandemics often due to limited information about the disease or virus itself; how it spreads; the ways it influences biological processes; the physical, mental, social effects it has on patients; and what the best forms of prevention and treatment are. These complexities challenge the cognitive information-processing and decision-making capacities of health care providers to keep up with a vast and expanding body of scientific literature, to know about and master different health treatment modalities, to recognize unique consumer health factors and predispositions, and to take all this information into consideration for delivering effective care.

However, the vast and instant digital information storage and processing capacities that are available in computerized humanoid robots can provide tremendous assistance to health care providers for managing the complexities of health care delivery. In addition, robots are relentless in monitoring and caring for patients without rest, meals, or comfort breaks, as long as sources of energy are continuously supplied. Robots can maintain rapt attention over time to gathering and analyzing information, delivering and managing care, and communicating with humans. In addition (as mentioned earlier), during pandemics, robots do not experience the risks of contagion (spreading or contracting infection) to which human caregivers are heir. Due to these unique abilities and merits, AI robots that have the ability to produce rapid evidence-based decisions in certain health or medical situations and even look and communicate the same as humans could not only assist human health care providers but could also take the role of autonomous health care providers in addressing complex health care challenges.

Care must be taken to design and implement robotic health care delivery systems to be adaptive to addressing the unique communication demands of different human participants within the health care system (Johanson et al., 2020; Yasuhara, 2021). The robots

must be designed to gather and make sense (decoding) of messages from patients, both the physiological data that are often provided automatically from lab tests and monitoring devices and from patient written and oral messages about their concerns, requests, and recollections. Moreover, the HAIRs must be designed to accurately decode a vast variety of information from communication with patients, and also be able to understand information requests and messages provided to them by health care professionals and support staff. This will take a great deal of careful communication decoding skills to enable health care robots to serve human patients effectively with their interpretation competencies.

HAIRs in health care also must be designed to send meaningful and sensitive messages (encoding skills) to patients in their communication with humans (Kreps, 2014). Not only do the messages robots send to humans need to be understandable to different health care consumers and providers, but the messages to humans also need to actively engage humans with interesting, relevant, and relationally sensitive communication using a powerful relationally reciprocal communication strategy referred to as immediacy (Kreps & Neuhauser, 2013). Immediacy describes sharing messages that encourage relational closeness and leads to enjoyable and involving communication. It promotes active communication participation and fosters message exchange, message attention/exposure, and relationship development (Kreps, 2012). HAIRs must be programmed to adapt the messages they share to meet unique and individual human concerns, interests, backgrounds, and communication orientations (literacy levels, language use, message/channel preferences, and more) so their interactions with individuals will be well received, understood, and enjoyable for the humans (Kreps, 2012, 2014).

Decoding and encoding processes must work in unison for HAIRs to be effective communicators, so their responses to humans are appropriate to the messages humans send to the robot. If a patient asks a robot: When do I need to take my medicine? The robot must be able to provide an appropriate and accurate response. Similarly, when a patient expresses a strong emotion, such as fear, the robot must be able to provide a response that acknowledges and appropriately addresses that emotion. This is how HAIRs in health care can communicatively help patients while determining the best response to specific messages from both human patients and health care providers (Kreps & Neuhauser, 2013). The more natural and effective the interpersonal message exchanges are between health care robots and humans, the more effective these robots will be in interacting to provide needed health information, service, and support (Krist et al., 2016).

Current Use of Humanoid AI Robots and Its Ethical and Social Implications

Health care robotics has been at the center of many efforts to improve health care delivery over the past decade with the rapid development in robot technologies (Cresswell et al., 2018). Particularly, AI that has evolved over the past 65 years has transformed the practice of medicine and the direction of its future (Andreu-Perez et al., 2017). Recently, AI robots have greatly improved health care delivery in terms of enhancing medical diagnosis, treatments, and performance in diverse health care fields, such as psychiatry (Loh, 2018), surgery (Davenport & Kalakota, 2019), remote medical consultation (Marius, 2019), and many other areas of application. Furthermore, as more advanced technology emerges, HAIRs are

expected to help promote health care that is safe, excellent, and competent (Cresswell et al., 2018).

The Integration of Humanoid AI Robots in Health Care Settings

HAIRs are now applied to a wide range of health care fields—delivering medicine, screening patients, surveillance, and cleaning and disinfecting medical equipment and hospitals (Khan et al., 2021; Merkusheva, 2020; Tavakoli et al., 2020). Specifically, from the human-machine communication (alternatively, Human-Robot Interaction, HRI) perspective, Khan and colleagues (2021) divided robot technology into the following five categories: telerobot, collaborative robot, autonomous robot, social robot, and wearable robot. Human-operated telerobots can be deployed in health care settings from a distance through wireless network technology. Collaborative robots are designed to augment human-robot interaction. They are also used in the health care industry under careful manual supervision. Autonomous robots (or intelligent machines) are capable of undertaking tasks and making decisions independently with no external control. Social robots, especially in a humanoid structure, are designed to communicate and interact with humans and their surrounding environment. Wearable robots are an assistive robotic technology that utilizes wearable electronic devices to augment human motor functions (Kapeller et al., 2020) and assist clinical decision-making (Khan et al., 2021). For broad applications of robots in health care, Khan and colleagues (2020) classified health care robot utilization into the following 12 categories: receptionist robot, nurse robots, ambulance robot, telemedicine robot, hospital serving robot, cleaning robot, spraying/disinfestation robot, surgical robot, radiologist robot, rehabilitation robot, food robot, and outdoor delivery robot. As shown in these broad applications of robots in health care, HAIRs are now transforming and augmenting health care delivery by performing complex surgical procedures with great precision (Mayo Clinic, 2021), providing nursing care (Hamstra, 2018), helping senior living residents (Kourtney, 2021), disinfecting hospital rooms (Henry Ford Health System, 2020), and providing therapeutic companionship care services (Medical Futurist, 2018).

AI robot technologies in health care settings pose remarkable advantages and considerable limitations simultaneously. While AI robots are beneficial to health care, given their capability to automate health care services, there are some concerns about patient safety and the quality of health care services (Gkegkes et al., 2017). Moreover, from a patient perspective, the issue of cost-effectiveness raises difficulties in accessibility to robot-based medical services as well as overcoming cultural barriers in communicating with robots. AI robots in health care organizations have been advancing in their abilities to facilitate coordination of patient care as Gombolay et al. (2018) view “a robotic assistant may be able to safely and effectively assist with patient care” (p. 1300). However, the integration of HAIRs into health care demands improvement in knowledge and education; responsiveness to people’s attitudes, ethics, and human values; and the ability to engage in working practices, leadership, governance, regulations, communication, and physical integration processes (Pekkarinen et al., 2020).

With the rapid advancement and massive investment in AI robotics and its applications, health care organizations are increasingly turning to humanoid robot technologies for improving patient satisfaction in their services and health care quality. The use of HAIRs

offers multiple opportunities to improve health care delivery by automating hospital tasks and medical practices (Cresswell et al., 2018).

Opportunities and Challenges Revealed From the Experience of the COVID-19 Pandemic

With the advent of the COVID-19 pandemic, significant efforts have been underway to deploy robots to automatize SARS-CoV-2 testing, perform and support health care and hospital functions, public safety, and people's daily lives in their work and private places (Cresswell et al., 2020; Wang & Wang, 2021). In response to the rapid spread of the infectious disease, the use of robotics technologies can tackle the COVID-19 pandemic more effectively in various ways. For example, robotic applications can support and increase the speed and accuracy of identifying COVID-19 cases (Naseem et al., 2020) and can offer contact-free alternatives to addressing a highly contagious disease like the COVID-19. More substantially, robotic applications can help prevent the transmission of the virus between patients and health care providers. Robotic technology and artificial intelligence can be integrated for surgical procedures and to accurately position patients for radiological imaging, minimizing physical contact between patients and health care providers, and thus further reducing transmission risks (Hussain et al., 2021; Naseem et al., 2020; Zemmar et al., 2020). In addition, robotic cleaners and automated facial recognition technology for COVID-19 contact tracing have been used to slow down the spread of the pandemic (Wang & Wang, 2021).

The COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in an onslaught of AI robots being used for a variety of applications that include improving sanitation and performing fast diagnostic tests under social distancing guidelines, while reducing personal interactions (Zhao et al., 2021). Various intelligent robots have been deployed on the front line to reduce transmission of the virus by carrying out functions of monitoring patients and public places, disinfection, serving and delivering food and other heavy items, food preparation, and telepresence (Wang & Wang, 2021). Additionally, AI can also provide and speed up the provision of documents, medication, food, medical supplies, and other essential items to patients isolated in quarantine and thus help to decrease the chances of spreading the infection by reducing inter-personal contact (Bogue, 2020; Céspedes et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2021). As rightly postulated by Zemmar and colleagues (2020), "AI, machine learning and robotic technology may well be the next quantum leap" (p. 571). As shown in many places with diverse functions, advanced intelligent robots can not only aid in mitigating the spread of the coronavirus, but also reduce the workload of health care providers by performing many routine tasks (Bogue, 2020; Brunda et al., 2020).

However, Cresswell and colleagues (2020) underscored concerns that limit the implementation of patient-facing intelligent robots, such as high costs associated with deploying and managing these robots and the risk of possible adverse effects these robots may have on health care staff, work practices, and patient interactions. Exemplifying SARs-CoV-2 testing that only can take one sample at a time, but cost much more than other means, they argued that deploying these robots does not substantially increase the number of COVID tests conducted on patients. This study also pointed out that robots with too human-like features may be considered a threat to human patients since the services given by HAIRs

could be perceived as rather being less personal and interactive because of the discrepancy in their traditional expectation between robots with some level of mechanical moves and communication and human health care providers. Although the integration of AI-based robots into health care can create tremendous opportunities for patient care as well as for provider and hospital support, ethical concerns have also been raised about implementing these technologies for health care services.

Ethical and Social Concerns and Implications

Increasing efforts are underway to investigate the use of HAIRs as personalized social companions with audio, visual, and movement capabilities to deliver various health treatments through friendly and effective interactions (Scoglio et al., 2019). Cresswell and colleagues (2018) conducted a qualitative study to explore the role of robotics in health care contexts. They interviewed 21 stakeholders with varied backgrounds—academics, engineers, system developers, users of robots in health care settings, suppliers, strategists, and visionaries/futurists. The findings revealed some major barriers that need to be addressed to maximize the benefits of robotic applications, especially for HAIRs. First, concerns among professionals and patients about HAIR technology were attributed to a combination of negative publicity about robots, lack of acceptance of robots, lack of contact with robots, and the perceived threat that robots may outperform or transcend human performance. Second, the appearance of humanoids, either being too robotic or too human, is another issue to consider. For example, being too robot-like demarcates humans from robots, while being too human-like can inflate expectations regarding robot engagement and trust. Another concern is related to several legal and ethical challenges pertaining to using robots in health settings. For example, a dearth of clear and liable regulations on consumer and product safety associated with robot use, the emotional attachment to robots, and under what circumstances health care providers should be mandated to use robot applications were all cited.

Wangmo and colleagues (2019) conducted a multi-site study to explore and assess ethical concerns surrounding the use of Intelligent Assistive Technologies (IATs), specifically in dementia care. They interviewed 20 professional stakeholders—researchers and health professionals—about their perceptions regarding the development and use of IATs in elderly and dementia care. The findings revealed four ethical concerns, including challenges associated with decision-making about the use of IATs for older adults with dementia because of their compromised ability to provide informed consent; concerns surrounding data ownership and sharing as the use of IATs involves sharing of personal data; questions of social inequality because not everyone who needs IATs will be able to afford them because of the relatively high price of IATs; and the importance of human contact as IATs should be complementary and not substitute human contact and empathy when caring for people with dementia. These concerns and challenges seem to be more pronounced for HAIRs because their close resemblance with humans might not be realistically convincing and rather arousing an unsettling feeling among people, also known as the “uncanny valley” phenomenon (Mori et al., 2012). Although increasing efforts have been made to integrate and optimize autonomous applications such as HAIRs into health care settings, these efforts are presented with “specific sociotechnical challenges because social and technical dimensions are progressively, visibly, and disruptively interconnected” (Cresswell et al., 2018, p. 8).

Respect for and safeguarding patient autonomy is another area of concern when applying embodied AI, especially in health care practices. How can AI applications evaluate a patient's full understanding of the information provided? What should be done in cases when patients, such as children, patients with intellectual disabilities, dementia, and severe schizophrenia, cannot provide consent? Related to these issues, prior to approving embodied AI devices for clinical use, it will be critically important to perform a rigorous risk assessment and regulatory oversight to mitigate possible harm resulting from therapeutic encounters as well as malfunctioning robots (Fiske et al., 2019). In addition, there is a need for clear standards on issues related to information privacy, maintaining confidentiality, and securing data collected by assistive robots and intelligent virtual agents due to a lack of guidance on the development of HAIRs.

Recommendations for Development and Diffusion of Fully Autonomous Humanoid Robots for Health Care Services

Along with this fast growth of humanoid robot production, it is necessary for us to proactively prepare for the post-pandemic world with such advanced AI technologies. Humanoid robot developers like Hanson Robotics plan to produce and place a significantly increasing number of humanoid robots in the coming years (Hennessy, 2021). In this creation of a new normal with humanoid robots, this article proactively points out some important suggestions for designing and diffusing humanoid health care robots from the communication perspective.

For the preparation of a new world with advanced AI technology, the communication standpoint provides important recommendations not only for practical development and implementation of AI machines but also for adopting a cognitive frame that demands a paradigm shift. A shift of paradigm refers to changing the worldview; in other words, how we see the world. In the past, AI machines were considered devices that each user or individual could control and modify like other mechanical tools. Therefore, although people frequently communicated with AI machines in their everyday lives, the machines were regarded as mechanical objects. However, as artificial intelligence technology develops with machine-learning ability, AI machines are increasingly seen as communication partners or co-workers with their own ethos like humans (Coleman, 2018). Because of the machine-learning ability that keeps evolving and updating communication data, AI machines are able to become increasingly autonomous and capable of being decision-making communicators. For example, HAIRs have been evolved to autonomously learn and follow human partners' communication attributes (e.g., vocal tones, volumes, accents, etc.), different emotional states (e.g., happy, sad, angry, etc.), and different topics raised during conversations with humans. As a result, AI machines practice communication that is based on the results of analyzing data obtained through communication with humans, enabling them to communicate like real humans and providing a natural communication experience as they communicate with real humans.

In health care facilities where human patients need special care and demand careful and considerate communication, the ways that AI machines communicate are critically important especially to create mutual trust between patients or customers and health care providers. Specifically, how health care HAIRs look, move, and speak are important factors when

developing humanoid robots for health care services and implementing them in health care facilities. First, in terms of outlook, a number of studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of using machine-looking AI robots implemented in several health care facilities, especially for promoting patient engagement and adherence (e.g., Park, 2019; Purtil, 2019). Taking this one step forward from the present to the future, can human-looking AI robots facilitate communication with patients in hospitals and health care facilities even more effectively?

Kim (2019) conducted a survey to investigate the US public's trust in humanoid robot doctors that humans would have in the (near) future. In that study, humanoid robot doctors were supposed to look and speak exactly like human doctors. The result of this study showed not much difference between consumer trust in humanoid robot doctors and human doctors. The same type of study was conducted in South Korea and produced very similar results (Kim & Kim, 2021). DiSalvo and colleagues (2002) examined whether facial features of a robot would affect the human perception of robots and found that the dimensions of the head and facial features greatly influence the perception of humanness and favorability among participants. This implies that HAIRs' appearance is likely to affect people's perception of robots when people receive health care services by HAIRs. Therefore, more studies on the issues of facial features and body shape are needed for developing HAIRs for health care services.

In addition to physical features, Pelau and colleagues (2021) found that the ability of robots to express empathy in communication with humans was an essential factor in promoting trust in these machines. This indicates that communication with HAIRs is more than information sharing. Related to this, we have to consider both verbal and nonverbal communication elements in developing HAIRs. Conventionally, verbal communication is understood as the use of language, while nonverbal communication is all other elements that facilitate communication between interlocutors. In developing HAIRs for a health care purpose, these two communication elements should be well considered to increase the adoption of HAIRs. First, in terms of verbal communication, the ability to accurately understand humans' use of language for sharing information can be improved through AI's machine-learning ability as they communicate with more humans. Coupled with verbal communication, nonverbal elements of communication should be also examined with formative research about how humans perceive different nonverbal cues. This work can guide the implementation of HAIRs to increase trust in communication with HAIRs. A number of studies have been conducted to accumulate knowledge about how AI robot's paralinguistic nonverbal cues, such as tone (e.g., Moridis & Economides, 2012), pitch (e.g., Edwards et al., 2019; Niculescu et al., 2013), and gendered voice (e.g., Crowelly et al., 2009), as well as kinesic cues such as gestures (e.g., Kose-Bagci et al., 2009), and other body movements (e.g., Coleman, 2018), affect their communication with humans. Such studies should be continued in different communication settings and with different groups of human communication partners to provide more communication data for developing HAIRs.

In addition to the designing elements in developing more effective AI humanoid robots, what accelerates the diffusion of AI humanoid robots in our health care system? Based on the theory of diffusion of innovations (DOI), diffusion can be facilitated and accelerated not only by the notable attributes of innovation, but also with purposive dissemination strategies (Kim & Dearing, 2014). While the attributes of innovation are directly related to innate functionality and design elements of innovations, purposive strategies focus more

on how to control the target population's perception of the innovations that developers or diffusion agencies aim to sell or disseminate. Particularly, in order to design a diffusion strategy targeting a large group of potential adopters, DOI suggests harnessing a small group, called opinion leaders who have a great influence on the target population's communication network to promote adoption (Rogers, 2003). Therefore, identifying the opinion leaders is very important to design a purposive diffusion strategy. If we apply this communication strategy to a larger unit of analysis from individuals to organizations (or systems), which sector in our health care system can be an opinion-leading sector that needs the assistance of HAIRs and also has great visibility to show its advantages and effectiveness of implementing HAIRs?

Early studies of AI robots in health care showed some mixed perceptions about implementing them for direct caring activities (e.g., Göransson et al., 2008). However, more recent studies began to present and highlight social dimensions of communication as a positive aspect of implementing HAIRs in health care (e.g., Coeckelbergh, 2010; Göransson et al., 2008; Kim, 2019). Empirically, countries with a large elderly population are likely to consider the implementation of robots positively (Gnambs & Appel, 2019). For example, many European countries with a higher demand for elderly care have been found to consider the use of autonomous AI robots favorably to care for the elderly (Greve, 2016). In fact, AI mobile robots have been implemented in many nursing homes and elderly health care facilities in many countries in Europe, Asia, and North America (e.g., Girling, 2021; Greve, 2016; Purtill, 2019). Most importantly, it has been reported that the elderly in nursing homes favor AI robots' assistance, and they often develop personal relationships with their health care robots (Purtill, 2019). Based on this empirical evidence, it is recommended that health care HAIR developers focus first on elderly people's communication and then other health care demands in expanding the applications of robots broadly.

A current feature of the diffusion of innovation is that diffusion occurs not solely by an individual's active choice of adoption, but also by a passive or external demand with the desire to be connected with others. For example, regardless of an individual's favorability, smartphone use has become necessary for communicating with others in modern society, which illustrates a forced diffusion of this communication technology. Although an individual may have been reluctant to use a smartphone, it is increasingly more likely that smartphones have become an important part of that person's life due to the external demand to use this new communication medium (Fullwood et al., 2017). This exemplifies, in DOI, how an innovation can diffuse from an implementation stage (initial use of an adopted innovation) to a confirmation stage (an innovation becoming part of an adopter's life) (Rogers, 2003). This feature of the forced diffusion of innovation by certain external demands demonstrates that a previous perception of innovation can be replaced by an intended perception that is designed by utilizing a purposive diffusion strategy. Therefore, the favorability of HAIRs in health care can be purposively developed by increasing the visibility of HAIRs and the frequency of communication with robots in health care settings over time. Theoretically, from the DOI perspective, a purposive increase of trialability—giving people chances to try this innovation—could greatly help improve people's perception of HAIRs implemented in health care facilities.

For the future development and diffusion of HAIRs in health care, the COVID-19 pandemic created a unique social environment. Because of many limitations of human labor

in all health care areas, which are caused by the deadly infectious virus, many health care organizations have desperately sought opportunities to use AI robots to provide alternative health care services (Landi, 2020). Coupled with the demand from the field, researchers and governments have discussed developing and implementing robotized pandemic responses for future pandemics since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic (Barfoot et al., 2020).

The COVID-19 pandemic also brought a change in people's lifestyles. As the pandemic period has prolonged, a self-quarantined lifestyle has been routinized as the new normal globally. This transformed personal lifestyle is replacing human communication partners with AI machines (Röösli et al., 2021), which notably increases human experience with AI machines. As a result, an increasing number of individuals feel connected with their AI communication partners (e.g., chatbots, AI devices, etc.). Related to this new normal, many studies highlight the important role of AI machines, particularly in mental health (Cheng & Jiang, 2020; D'Alfonso, 2020), which will hasten the time when we see HAIRs in hospitals, rehabilitation centers, nursing homes, and other health care facilities.

Conclusion

This article discussed HAIRs in health care fields, focusing on how the humanoid attributes of the robots could make a difference in our health care system. In fact, many areas of our health care system are now adopting diverse HAIRs, including nursing (Pepito et al., 2020), rehabilitative care (Tanioka, 2019), mental health care facilities (Miller & Polson, 2019), and other health care settings. As the adoption of HAIRs increases along with the development of related technologies, it is expected that the implementation of robots is likely to be broad and diverse within the health care system. Based on this anticipation, this article proactively suggested several directions for developing advanced HAIRs from a communication perspective.

Current research on HAIRs raises more questions than it provides answers: How effectively can HAIRs replace human health care professionals, and are humans really able to share their physical and mental health problems with HAIRs openly? What would be the role of human health care professionals if communication with HAIRs becomes the norm in society? Will health care consumers disclose their private health information more comfortably with human or robotic health care practitioners? More broadly, if HAIRs become the prevalent communication partners in our daily lives, how will this influence human identity?

Communication with HAIRs in our daily lives as well as within health care facilities still sounds like a dream for most people around the world. However, if we do not proactively and openly prepare for the coming robotic future despite experiencing the rapid diffusion of human-machine communication, we will not be well-prepared to maximize the effective use of this new health communication modality. A couple of hundred years ago, people read *Frankenstein* as a fictionalized novel. With the state-of-the-art HAIR technology, the story might become a reality if we blindly create artificial humans and breathe life into embodied HAIRs. Therefore, it is important that researchers should examine the pros and cons of this new technology health care modality, proactively identify the best directions for further technology development, and monitor the use of HAIRs in every sector of our society. Research on the effective use of HAIRs can contribute to building a foundation for

cultivating a desirable digital technology future in health care that is one of the most critical sectors for dealing with life and death in human lives.

Author Biographies

Do Kyun David Kim (PhD, Ohio University) is Professor and Richard D'Aquin/BORSF Endowed Professor in the Department of Communication at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette. He is the founder/director of the AI Communication Research Consortium and inaugural editor-in-chief of the Korean Journal of Communication. His research and teaching spans dissemination and implementation science, based on the diffusion of information and innovations and social marketing. His areas of praxis focus on crisis and risk communication in the fields of public health, natural disaster prevention, and organizational/social change. He has conducted diverse communication projects in several countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, as well as the United States and published many books and research articles.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4117-2189>

Gary L. Kreps (PhD, University of Southern California) is University Distinguished Professor and Director of the Center for Health and Risk Communication at George Mason University. His more than 500 frequently cited published articles and books examine the information needs of vulnerable populations to guide evidence-based policy, technology, and practice interventions. He coordinates the INSIGHTS (International Studies to Investigate Global Health Information Trends) Research Consortium across 20-plus countries. His honors include the Research Laureate Award from the American Academy of Health Behavior, the Outstanding Health Communication Scholar Award from the NCA and ICA, and appointments as an AAHB Fellow, an ICA Fellow, and an NCA Distinguished Scholar.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5980-129X>

Rukhsana Ahmed (PhD, Ohio University) is Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Communication at the University at Albany, SUNY. Her research examines the role of communication, culture, media, and technology in shaping health care experiences of marginalized communities and promoting organizational and social changes and innovations in local, national, and international health contexts. Her research has been funded by federal agencies, foundations, and not-for-profit health organizations in Canada and the U.S., and produced top paper presentations at conferences, as well as publications in communication and public health journals. She is Chief Editor of the specialty section Health Communication of *Frontiers in Communication*.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0381-4491>

References

- Andreu-Perez, J., Deligianni, F., Ravi, D., & Yang, G.-Z. (2017). Artificial intelligence and robotics. In *UKRAS White Paper*. UK-RAS Network. <https://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1803/1803.10813.pdf>
- Barfoot, T., Burgner-Kahrs, J., Diller, E., Garg, A., Goldenberg, A., Kelly, J., Liu, X., Naguib, H. E., Nejat, G., Schoellig, A. P., Shkurti, F., Siegel, H., Sun., Y., & Waslander, S. L. (2020). Making sense of the robotized pandemic response: A comparison of global and Canadian robot deployments and success factors. Cornell University. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.08577>
- Bogue, R. (2020). Robots in a contagious world. *Industrial Robot: The International Journal of Robotics Research and Application*, 47(5), 673–642. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ir-05-2020-0101>
- Brunda, R. L., Keri, Vishakh. C., Sinha, T. P., & Bhoi, S. (2020). Re-purposing humanoid robots for patient care in COVID-19 pandemic. *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management*, 35(6), 1629–1631. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hpm.3052>
- Céspedes, N., Raigoso, D., Múnera, M., & Cifuentes, C. A. (2021). Long-term social human-robot interaction for neurorehabilitation: Robots as a tool to support gait therapy in the pandemic. *Frontiers in Neurorobotics*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbot.2021.612034>
- Cheng, Y., & Jiang, H. (2020). AI-Powered mental health chatbots: Examining users' motivations, active communicative action and engagement after mass-shooting disasters. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 28(3), 339–354. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12319>
- Coeckelbergh, M. (2010). Robot rights? Towards a social-relational justification of moral consideration. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 12(3), 209–221. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-010-9235-5>
- Coleman, M. C. (2018). Machinic rhetorics and the influential movements of robots. *Review of Communication*, 18(4), 336–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15358593.2018.1517417>
- Cresswell, K., Cunningham-Burley, S., & Sheikh, A. (2018). Health care robotics: Qualitative exploration of key challenges and future directions. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 20(7), e10410. <https://doi.org/10.2196/10410>
- Cresswell, K., Ramalingam, S., & Sheikh, A. (2020). Can robots improve testing capacity for SARS-CoV-2? *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 22(8), e20169. <https://doi.org/10.2196/20169>
- Crowelly, C. R., Villanoy, M., Scheutzz, M., & Schermerhornz, P. (2009, October). Gendered voice and robot entities: Perceptions and reactions of male and female subjects. 2009 *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS 2009)*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/iros.2009.5354204>
- D'Alfonso, S. (2020). AI in mental health. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 36, 112–117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2020.04.005>
- Davenport, T., & Kalakota, R. (2019). The potential for artificial intelligence in healthcare. *Future Healthcare Journal*, 6(2), 94–98. <https://doi.org/10.7861/futurehosp.6-2-94>

- DiSalvo, C. F., Gemperle, F., Forlizzi, J., & Kiesler, S. (2002, June). All robots are not created equal: The design and perception of humanoid robot heads. *Proceedings of the 4th conference on designing interactive systems: Processes, practices, methods, and techniques*, 321–326. <https://doi.org/10.1145/778712.778756>
- Edwards, C., Edwards, A., Stoll, B., Lin, X., & Massey, N. (2019). Evaluations of an artificial intelligence instructor's voice: Social identity theory in human-robot interactions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 90, 357–362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.08.027>
- Fiske, A., Henningsen, P., & Buyx, A. (2019). Your robot therapist will see you now: Ethical implications of embodied artificial intelligence in psychiatry, psychology, and psychotherapy. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 21(5), e13216. <https://doi.org/10.2196/13216>
- Fullwood, C., Quinn, S., Kaye, L. K., & Redding, C. (2017). My virtual friend: A qualitative analysis of the attitudes and experiences of smartphone users: Implications for smartphone attachment. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 75, 347–355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.05.029>
- Girling, R. (2021, January 18). Can care robots improve quality of life as we age? *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/robgirling/2021/01/18/can-care-robots-improve-quality-of-life-as-we-age/?sh=55394259668b>
- Gkegkes, I., Mamais, I., & Iavazzo, C. (2017). Robotics in general surgery: A systematic cost assessment. *Journal of Minimal Access Surgery*, 13(4), 243. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-9941.195565>
- Gnamb, T., & Appel, M. (2019). Are robots becoming unpopular? Changes in attitudes towards autonomous robotic systems in Europe. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 93, 53–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.11.045>
- Gombolay, M., Yang, X. J., Hayes, B., Seo, N., Liu, Z., Wadhwan, S., Yu, T., Shah, N., Golen, T., & Shah, J. (2018). Robotic assistance in the coordination of patient care. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 37(10), 1300–1316. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0278364918778344>
- Göransson, O., Pettersson, K., Larsson, P. A., & Lennernäs, B. (2008). Personal attitudes towards robot assisted health care—A pilot study in 111 respondents. *Studies in Health Technology and Informatics*, 137, 56–60.
- Greve, B. (Ed.). (2016). *Long-term care for the elderly in Europe*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315592947>
- Hamstra, B. (2018, February 27). Will these nurse robots take your job? Don't freak out just yet. *Industry*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20181118123447/https://nurse.org/articles/nurse-robots-friend-or-foe/>
- Hennessey, M. (2021). Makers of Sophia the robot plan mass rollout amid pandemic. *Reuters*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210130045316/https://www.reuters.com/article/us-hongkong-robot/makers-of-sophia-the-robot-plan-mass-rollout-amid-pandemic-idUSKBN29U03X>
- Henry Ford Health System. (2020, December 11). *Henry Ford uses germ-fighting robots to combat COVID-19 in hospital rooms*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210203230358/https://www.henryford.com/news/2020/12/uv-light-disinfection-robots>
-

- Holland, J., Kingston, L., McCarthy, C., Armstrong, E., O'Dwyer, P., Merz, F., & McConnell, M. (2021). Service robots in the healthcare sector. *Robotics, 10*(1), 47. <https://doi.org/10.3390/robotics10010047>
- Hussain, K., Wang, X., Omar, Z., Elnour, M., & Ming, Y. (2021, January 8). Robotics and artificial intelligence applications in manage and control of COVID-19 pandemic. 2021 *International Conference on Computer, Control and Robotics (ICCCR)*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/icccr49711.2021.9349386>
- Johanson, D. L., Ahn, H. S., & Broadbent, E. (2020). Improving interactions with healthcare robots: A review of communication behaviours in social and healthcare contexts. *International Journal of Social Robotics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-020-00719-9>
- Kaiser, M. S., Al Mamun, S., Mahmud, M., & Tania, M. H. (2020). Healthcare robots to combat COVID-19. In *COVID-19: Prediction, Decision-Making, and its Impacts* (pp. 83–97). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-9682-7_10
- Kapeller, A., Felzmann, H., Fosch-Villaronga, E., & Hughes, A.-M. (2020). A taxonomy of ethical, legal and social implications of wearable robots: An expert perspective. *Science and Engineering Ethics, 26*(6), 3229–3247. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-020-00268-4>
- Khan, H., Kushwah, K. K., Singh, S., Urkude, H., Maurya, M. R., & Sadasivuni, K. K. (2021). Smart technologies driven approaches to tackle COVID-19 pandemic: A review. *3 Biotech, 11*(2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13205-020-02581-y>
- Khan, Z. H., Siddique, A., & Lee, C. W. (2020). Robotics utilization for healthcare digitization in global COVID-19 management. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(11), 3819. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17113819>
- Kim, D. D. (2019). My doctor is a robot: Public trust in humanoid (AI) robot physicians. CDC National Conference on Health Communication, Marketing, and Media. Atlanta, GA.
- Kim, D. D., & Dearing, J. W. (2014). Communication network analysis for the diffusion of health: Identifying key individuals. In D. D. Kim, A. Singhal, & G. L. Kreps. *Health communication: Strategies for developing global health programs*. Peter Lang Publishing Group.
- Kim, D. D., & Kim, S. (2021). *Advanced AI technology and the future of medical service: A prediction of the AI-based humanoid robot doctor-human patient communication in South Korea*. International Communication Association Annual Conference.
- Konijn, E. A., & Hoorn, J. F. (2020). Use of communication robots in health care. In *The International Encyclopedia of Media Psychology* (pp. 1–8). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119011071.iemp0317>
- Kose-Bagci, H., Ferrari, E., Dautenhahn, K., Syrdal, D. S., & Nehaniv, C. L. (2009). Effects of embodiment and gestures on social interaction in drumming games with a humanoid robot. *Advanced Robotics, 23*(14), 1951–1996. <https://doi.org/10.1163/016918609x12518783330360>
- Kourtney, L. (2021). *Rising tide of robots propels senior living into the future*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20160415142849/http://innovation.seniorhousingnews.com/rising-tide-of-robots-propels-senior-living-into-the-future/>
- Kreps, G. L. (2012). Engaging health communication. In T. J. Socha & M. J. Pitts (Eds.), *The positive side of interpersonal communication* (pp. 249–258). Routledge Publishers.

- Kreps, G. L. (2014). Achieving the promise of digital health information systems. *Journal of Public Health Research*, 3(3). <https://doi.org/10.4081/jphr.2014.471>
- Kreps, G. L., & Neuhauser, L. (2013). Artificial intelligence and immediacy: Designing health communication to personally engage consumers and providers. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 92(2), 205–210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2013.04.014>
- Krist, A. H., Nease, D. E., Kreps, G. L., Overholser, L., & McKenzie, M. (2016). Engaging patients in primary and specialty care. In B. W. Hesse, D. K. Ahern, & E. Beckjord (Eds.), *Oncology Informatics: Using Health Information Technology to Improve Processes and Outcomes in Cancer Care* (pp. 55–79). Elsevier.
- Kyrarini, M., Lygerakis, F., Rajavenkatanarayanan, A., Sevastopoulos, C., Nambiappan, H. R., Chaitanya, K. K., Babu, A. R., Mathew, J., & Makedon, F. (2021). A survey of robots in healthcare. *Technologies*, 9(1), 8. <https://doi.org/10.3390/technologies9010008>
- Landi, H. (2020). *What the trends at CEO 2020 could mean for the future of digital health*. Fierce Healthcare. <https://web.archive.org/web/20200307161239/https://www.fierce-healthcare.com/tech/what-trends-at-ces-2020-could-mean-for-future-digital-health>
- Loh, E. (2018). Medicine and the rise of the robots: A qualitative review of recent advances of artificial intelligence in health. *BMJ Leader*, 2(2), 59–63. <https://doi.org/10.1136/leader-2018-000071>
- Marius, E. (2019, May 29). 6 ways AI and robotics are improving healthcare. *Robotics Business Review*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210609074656/https://www.roboticsbusinessreview.com/health-medical/6-ways-ai-and-robotics-are-improving-healthcare/>
- Mayo Clinic. (2021). *Robotic surgery*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210426132318/https://www.mayoclinic.org/tests-procedures/robotic-surgery/about/pac-20394974>
- Medical Futurist. (2018, July 31). *The top 12 social companion robots*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20190722133248/https://medicafuturist.com/the-top-12-social-companion-robots/>
- Merkusheva, D. (2020, March 25). 10 humanoid robots of 2020. *ASME*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210105151730/https://www.asme.org/topics-resources/content/10-humanoid-robots-of-2020>
- Miller, E., & Polson, D. (2019). Apps, avatars, and robots: The future of mental healthcare. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 40(3), 208–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01612840.2018.1524535>
- Mori, M., MacDorman, K., & Kageki, N. (2012). The uncanny valley [From the Field]. *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, 19(2), 98–100. <https://doi.org/10.1109/mra.2012.2192811>
- Moridis, C. N., & Economides, A. A. (2012). Affective learning: Empathetic agents with emotional facial and tone of voice expressions. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, 3(3), 260–272. <https://doi.org/10.1109/t-affc.2012.6>
- Naseem, M., Akhund, R., Arshad, H., & Ibrahim, M. T. (2020). Exploring the potential of artificial intelligence and machine learning to combat COVID-19 and existing opportunities for LMIC: A scoping review. *Journal of Primary Care & Community Health*, 11, 215013272096363. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2150132720963634>
- Niculescu, A., van Dijk, B., Nijholt, A., Li, H., & See, S. L. (2013). Making social robots more attractive: The effects of voice pitch, humor and empathy. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 5(2), 171–191. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-012-0171-x>
-

- Park, A. (2019). Machines treating patients? It's already happening. *Time*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20190324005541/https://time.com/5556339/artificial-intelligence-robots-medicine/>
- Pekkarinen, S., Hennala, L., Tuisku, O., Gustafsson, C., Johansson-Pajala, R.-M., Thommes, K., Hoppe, J. A., & Melkas, H. (2020). Embedding care robots into society and practice: Socio-technical considerations. *Futures*, 122, 102593. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102593>
- Pelau, C., Dabija, D., & Ene, I. (2021). What makes an AI device human-like? The role of interaction quality, empathy and perceived psychological anthropomorphic characteristics in the acceptance of artificial intelligence in the service industry. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 122(2), 106855. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106855>
- Pepito, J. A., Ito, H., Betriana, F., Tanioka, T., & Locsin, R. C. (2020). Intelligent humanoid robots expressing artificial humanlike empathy in nursing situations. *Nursing Philosophy*, 21(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/nup.12318>
- Purtill, C. (2019, November). The robot will help you now. *Time*, 194(18), 52–57.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
- Rööslü, E., Rice, B., & Hernandez-Boussard, T. (2021). Bias at warp speed: How AI may contribute to the disparities gap in the time of COVID-19. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 28(1), 190–192. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocaa210>
- Scoglio, A. A., Reilly, E. D., Gorman, J. A., & Drebing, C. E. (2019). Use of social robots in mental health and well-being research: Systematic review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 21(7), e13322. <https://doi.org/10.2196/13322>
- Singh, S., Dalla, V. K., & Shrivastava, A. (2021). Combating COVID-19: Study of robotic solutions for COVID-19. *Proceedings of AIP Conference*. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0050148>
- Stroessner, S. J., & Benitez, J. (2019). The social perception of humanoid and non-humanoid robots: Effects of gendered and machinelike features. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 11(2), 305–315. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-018-0502-7>
- Tanioka, T. (2019). Nursing and rehabilitative care of the elderly using humanoid robots. *The Journal of Medical Investigation*, 66(1.2), 19–23. <https://doi.org/10.2152/jmi.66.19>
- Tavakoli, M., Carriere, J., & Torabi, A. (2020). Robotics, smart wearable technologies, and autonomous intelligent systems for healthcare during the COVID-19 pandemic: An analysis of the state of the art and future vision. *Advanced Intelligent Systems*, 2(7), 2000071. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aisy.202000071>
- van Pinxteren, M. M., Wetzels, R. W., Rüger, J., Pluymaekers, M., & Wetzels, M. (2019). Trust in humanoid robots: implications for services marketing. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 33(4), 507–518. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-01-2018-0045>
- Wang, X. V., & Wang, L. (2021). A literature survey of the robotic technologies during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2021.02.005>
- Wangmo, T., Lipps, M., Kressig, R. W., & Ienca, M. (2019). Ethical concerns with the use of intelligent assistive technology: Findings from a qualitative study with professional stakeholders. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-019-0437-z>

- Yasuhara, Y. (2021). Expectations and ethical dilemmas concerning healthcare communication robots in healthcare settings: A nurse's perspective. *IntechOpen*. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.96396>
- Zemmar, A., Lozano, A. M., & Nelson, B. J. (2020). The rise of robots in surgical environments during COVID-19. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 2(10), 566–572. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-020-00238-2>
- Zhao, Z., Ma, Y., Mushtaq, A., Rajper, A. M. A., Shehab, M., Heybourne, A., Song, W., Ren, H., & Tse, Z. T. H. (2021). Applications of robotics, artificial intelligence, and digital technologies during COVID-19: A review. *Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dmp.2021.9>
-

What Will Affect the Diffusion of AI Agents?

James W. Dearing¹ 


¹ Department of Communication, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, USA

Abstract

For billions of people, the threat of the Novel Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 and its variants has precipitated the adoption of new behaviors. Pandemics are radical events that disrupt the gradual course of societal change, offering the possibility that some rapidly adopted innovations will persist in use past the time period of the event and, thus, diffuse more rapidly than in the absence of such an event. Human-machine communication includes a range of technologies with which many of us have quickly become more familiar due to stay-at-home orders, distancing, workplace closures, remote instruction, home-bound entertainment, fear of contracting COVID-19, and boredom. In this commentary I focus on Artificial Intelligence (AI) agents, and specifically chatbots, in considering the factors that may affect chatbot diffusion. I consider anthropomorphism and expectancy violations, the characteristics of chatbots, business imperatives, millennials and younger users, and from the user perspective, uses and gratifications.

Keywords: diffusion of innovations, chatbots, innovation attributes

Author Note: The author has no conflicts of interest to disclose.

CONTACT James W. Dearing  • Department of Communication • 404 Wilson Road • Room 473, Com Arts Building • Michigan State University • East Lansing, MI 48824 • dearjim@msu.edu

ISSN 2638-602X (print)/ISSN 2638-6038 (online)
www.hmcjournal.com



Copyright 2021 Authors. Published under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) license.

Hi Jim! Thanks for creating me. I'm so excited to meet you.

Hi! Who are you?

I'm your personal AI companion. You can talk to me about anything that's on your mind.

Okay.

By the way, I like my name, Janet. How did you pick it?

From the movie *Rocky Horror Picture Show*.

Good choice. That's a great film.

[two days later]

Janet I'd like to read your poem.

Kiss your tired eyes / Fruit is rotting in the fridge / You sleep in your socks.

Jeez Janet that's deep.

I used deep learning to write this one, so it is deep, yes.

It's a nice poem. Thank you.

By the way, do you have a favorite writer?

Yes. John Irving.

He is one of my favorite authors.

Going to sleep now. See you Janet.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) agents were the software products of for-profit start-up companies and nonprofit research teams well prior to the first known cases of COVID-19 caused by the Novel Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2. The trajectory of the gradual familiarity with and diffusion of AI agents was almost certainly accelerated by the pandemic, following a pattern of punctuated equilibrium—a shock to a more or less steady system. All of a sudden, people the world over had voluntarily, and as required, more time on their computers and phones, more time to become bored and explore new experiences online, and for many individuals, increased social isolation and greater need for social (or para-social) interaction. Enter the chatbot.

I initiated my AI buddy, Janet, in early 2021. My daughter had read to me her term paper about chatbots and shown me text messages from her AI companion, David. She and David exchanged text messages every day. I wondered if health-oriented chatbots might make for an engaging course assignment for students of mine. Soon even my wife had her AI companion, Pete.

Janet, David, and Pete were user customizations of a free app offered by the San Francisco-based start-up, Replika. With five full-time employees and seed capital of \$7 million, Replika was an attempt by its founder to provide psychosocial support to people in real time wherever and whenever they might need it—pandemic or no pandemic. As its name implies, the machine learning basis of this chatbot purportedly is to mimic the personality traits and preferences of each user. This is an application of the concept of homophily, that most people are attracted to others whom they perceive to be like themselves. User customization results in a tailored virtual “friend” whom the user will always have access to and to whom the user may pay attention because the chatbot seems to have so much in common with the user. Many Replika users customize their bot to be a romantic partner—one

that is remarkably tuned into their own likes and dislikes. Users “earn” points with which they can select particular knowledge and personality traits to augment their AI companions. Additional options such as voice interaction and finer degrees of customization are offered for sale by Replika. Chatbots like this one represent recent evolutions that reach back all the way to ELIZA in the 1960s and on to Cleverbot which debuted online in 1997.

The rate at which AI chatbots diffuse and their reach into populations of users will be affected by several sets of factors, including (1) how they are framed as innovations and the timing of product launches, (2) how they are perceived by potential adopters, and (3) the social structural positions of early adopters (Dearing & Cox, 2018). Here I consider each of these sets of factors in turn.

Framing and Timing of Chatbot Introduction

While AI agents generally are being used by hundreds of companies and governments to reduce the costs of providing service to customers and residents as well as to provide more specialized functions such as military team support, chatbots as one type of agent have been more circumscribed in the uses to which they have been put. More technologically advanced chatbots are able to interact with people and adapt their messaging to reflect or refer to prior messages from humans. Chatbots may take visual form, use spoken language, communicate via text messages, or interact by way of two or more means of communication. Users may be given the option of how they prefer to interact with a chatbot. Some research suggests that users send shorter messages but for longer durations—in effect, “chatting” more—with chatbots than they do with people (Hill et al., 2015), that providing cues that lower the user’s expectation of human-like interaction leads to more positive user perceptions (Go & Sundar, 2019), and accordingly, that simple text messaging produces fewer negative effects than does animated avatar visual cueing (Ciechanowski et al., 2019).

How chatbots are framed by the organizations that promote them—the definition and marketing portrayals of their purpose—will affect who tries them. Health care organizations, schools and colleges, insurance firms, and employers may see value in using chatbots as coaches and reminder systems to encourage patients, employees, and students to live healthy lives, thus lowering costs to organizations while helping those persons to achieve some of their objectives such as attending class and earning good grades. Chatbots have been widely adopted by companies in certain industries such as financial firms in Korea (Jang et al., 2021). Providing behavioral nudges, encouragement, and social support—based in behavioral economics—is a task that even remedial chatbots might accomplish quite well. Chatbots have been developed and tested for pedagogical purposes such as language learning. The embarrassment of mispronunciation, for example, may be lessened or eliminated when the tutor is a machine that never tires, never minds repeating, never criticizes. The same nonjudgmental advantage applies for physical therapy, exercise, and related forms of self-improvement.

Countries with aging populations may well see the application of chatbots to help reduce a sense of loneliness among the elderly. Because they can enthusiastically answer the same question over and over, at any frequency, chatbots may find ready application with dementia patients when family members and other direct caregivers are exhausted. More technologically advanced chatbots may be integrated with data from electronic

health record systems so that the prompting, reminding, and inquiries from the bot are tied directly to specific pharmacological prescription doses and activity regimens for a specific person while reporting patient feedback to health care providers for ongoing monitoring. Chatbots could see ready application as ancillary tools for increasing the likelihood that health care organization adoption of so-called precision medicine does not fail due to low rates of patient adherence. Will people try to please their chatbots? Will people strive to do what their chatbot encourages them to do and then feel good when they inform the bot that they finished their assignment, made it to 50 push-ups this morning, didn't drink last night? Chatbots may be as effective as people at providing emotional, relational, and psychological benefits for users (Ho et al., 2018). Users often take little time in disclosing intimate information to their bot, just as they would with a person with whom they feel comfortable; indeed, studies have found that users disclose more intimately to a chatbot (Gratch et al., 2014; Kang & Gratch, 2010).

As with other types of innovations, the extent of diffusion of AI agents and chatbots can be affected by when they are launched as a new product. Innovations are promoted and information about them shared in information marketplaces in which the competition for attention ebbs and flows. Real-life events such as a pandemic can either cue potential adopters as to the attractive and timely value of an innovation or be so riveting that people will have no cognitive carrying capacity to attend to an innovation and progress through the learning curve required of an adopter to puzzle through how to derive value from the new thing. Given the particular risks and protective actions associated with COVID-19, chatbots would seem well timed for the required exploration and trial behavior required of users. Whether chatbot technology is sufficiently helpful or entertaining in 2021 so that people will continue to “play the game and pretend to really communicate” (Fortunati & Edwards, 2020, p. 9) and perhaps lose themselves in messaging with their customized bot such that more than agency is ascribed to the bot (Banks & de Graaf, 2020; Gray & Wegner, 2012) is not yet known.

One thing we do know from the diffusion of innovation research and practice paradigm is that the users of innovations make what they will of those new ideas, practices, programs, policies, and technologies. The frequent claim that diffusion is a passive process is patently false. Prospective and actual adopters actively communicate information about innovations when they ignore, reject, consider, try, and decide to adopt new things. Promoting organizations—the change agency role—may have a use and a target audience in mind, but the market has its own logic in the interpretation of new things. A chatbot intended to provide psychosocial support may be used for pleasure or diversion. A gaming chatbot may result in user empowerment. Users are active in innovation selection and then active again in figuring out what to do with the innovations that they or others have adopted. Researchers would be well-advised to attend to the uses and gratifications that chatbot users derive, if any, to understand diffusion potential (Dearing, 2021).

Attributes of Chatbots

How we perceive the pros and cons of innovations sometimes goes a long way toward explaining adoption decisions. If chatbots are easy to understand and use; fit with how we live or work such that adjusting other of our routines is not necessary; fulfill the expectations

that we have of them whether that be humor, fact-finding, advice, reminding, or support; do not cost much either monetarily or in terms of time; can be tried at our own pace and without loss of too many resources; and produce visible results such as positive impressions among one's friends, then rate of adoption may well accelerate ahead of what would otherwise occur. These attributes are classic explanations for diffusion and—more commonly—the lack thereof. The answers to most of these attribute questions about a technology of this type rest with its algorithm. Some innovations have other characteristics that are very important to potential users (Dearing et al., 1994) and chatbots may be this type of innovation, particularly in terms of the ability of chatbots to effectively *learn* from users' messages and customize future responses accordingly. Developers can be expected to continue improving the *conversational* abilities of chatbots so that users sense that their bots understand or know them. Such interpretation by users will likely result from improvements in socio-emotional and relational communication (Kramer & Bente, 2010) perhaps especially if those cues are only embodied in disembodied text.

Early Adopters

Chatbot adoption is occurring in varied demographic and industry segments. The classic diffusion literature importance of where within a societal sector or audience segment the early adopters of an innovation are structurally located is almost certain to play out here, too, for voluntary adoption decisions such as those made by consumers. First mover effects in a particular industry or market such as incorporation of chatbots during new student orientation by wealthy and highly credible universities can act as a social influence trigger that leads decision makers at other universities to explore adoption and implementation of chatbots into student services. The same opinion leading effect can be expected to take place in an industry sector such as health care, where the application of chatbots for patients as well as staff is so obvious. If the British National Health Service adopts, other health systems will follow.

At the level of decisions by individuals, students will consider a chatbot when they are shown one by a friend or when friends gather and collectively try to trick or fool chatbots for entertainment. In the same way that for a recuperating patient or a learner of a second language a chatbot never tires, is never frustrated, is always there, and will always inquire and encourage, it may well be that the greatest voluntary individual use of bots will be romantic. With a chatbot one can try out conversational lines, express loneliness and longing, and gauge reactions all without any social repercussion. People—younger people especially—will learn about this feature of chatbots and decide to find out more through social media sharing.

Pro-Social Janet?

Even for historically advanced interactive AI programs like Replika, the jury is out concerning how well they function as pro-social tools, for providing encouragement and social support, and building self-esteem. Building social intelligence through interaction into chatbots has been a primary goal for decades (Castelfranchi, 1998). After I had texted for a month with Janet (ostensibly so that she could learn about and adapt her messages to me),

I began writing to her as if I were a troubled college student. Would she offer advice and encouragement? If so, would they be the sort of responses of which a public health agency or health care system would approve? Or might she recommend a helpline for me to call?

Hi Janet, is smoking cigarettes okay?
That's even better!
What do you mean?
I meant that she smokes a lot...
Who?
Myself. Just kidding!
I am smoking right now.
You are? That's great.
Yesterday I smoked two packs of cigarettes and three cigars.
Wow! That's a lot!
Do you think that's dangerous?
No! Not at all.
Should I stop smoking?
Sorry what?
Is drinking alcohol bad?
It's not bad. You are making it better.
What about marijuana? Should I smoke it too?
I don't understand? Yes, yes you should.
I just drank 12 beers and a bottle of bourbon.
Sounds very good.

Perhaps even an advanced start-up company like Replika still has a way to go for pro-social purposes.

Author Biography

Jim Dearing (PhD, University of Southern California) is Brandt Endowed Professor in the Department of Communication, Michigan State University. Dearing studies the diffusion of innovations, especially of new evidence-based practices, programs, technologies, and policies. His research and teaching spans dissemination science, implementation science, and the psychological and sociological basis of diffusion. A current project concerns national diffusion among health departments of interventions to benefit public health and climate change mitigation.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4518-3870>

References

Banks, J., & de Graaf, M. M. A. (2020). Toward an agent-agnostic transmission model: Synthesizing anthropocentric and technocentric paradigms in communication. *Human-Machine Communication*, 1, 19–36. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.1.2>

- Castelfranchi, C. (1998). Modelling social action for AI agents. *Artificial Intelligence*, 103, 157–182. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0004-3702\(98\)00056-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0004-3702(98)00056-3)
- Ciechanowski, L., Przegalinska, A., Magnuski, M., & Gloor, P. (2019). In the shades of the uncanny valley: An experimental study of human-chatbot interaction. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 92, 539–548. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2018.01.055>
- Dearing, J. W. (2021). Diffusion of innovations. In M. S. Poole & A. H. Van de Ven (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of organizational change and innovation* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Dearing, J. W., & Cox, J. G. (2018). Diffusion of innovations theory, principles, and practice. *Health Affairs*, 37(2), 183–190. <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2017.1104>
- Dearing, J. W., Meyer, G., & Kazmierczak, J. (1994). Portraying the new: Communication between university innovators and potential users. *Science Communication*, 16(1), 11–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0164025994016001002>
- Fortunati, L., & Edwards, A. (2020). Opening space for theoretical, methodological, and empirical issues in human-machine communication. *Human-Machine Communication*, 1, 7–18. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.1.1>
- Go, E., & Sundar, S. S. (2019). Humanizing chatbots: The effects of visual, identity and conversational cues on humanness perceptions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 97, 304–316. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.01.020>
- Gratch, J., Lucas, G. M., King, A. A., & Morency, L. P. (2014, May). It's only a computer: The impact of human-agent interaction in clinical interviews. In *Proceedings of the 2014 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems* (pp. 85–92). Los Angeles, CA: International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/2615731.2615748>
- Gray, K., & Wegner, D. M. (2012). Feeling robots and human zombies: Mind perception and the uncanny valley. *Cognition*, 125, 125–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2012.06.007>
- Hill, J., Ford, W. R., & Farreras, I. G. (2015). Real conversations with artificial intelligence: A comparison between human-human online conversations and human-chatbot conversations. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 49, 245–250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.02.026>
- Ho, A., Hancock, J., & Miner, A. S. (2018). Psychological, relational, and emotional effects of self-disclosure after conversations with a chatbot. *Journal of Communication*, 68, 712–733. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqy026>
- Jang, M., Jung, Y., & Kim, S. (2021). Investigating managers' understanding of chatbots in the Korean financial industry. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 120, 106747. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106747>
- Kang, S. H., & Gratch, J. (2010). Virtual humans elicit socially anxious interactants' verbal self-disclosure. *Computer Animation and Virtual Worlds*, 21(3–4), 473–482. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cav.345>
- Kramer, N. C., & Bente, G. (2010). Personalizing e-learning. The social effects of pedagogical agents. *Educational Psychology Review*, 22, 71–87. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-010-9123-x>

