ISSN No: 2349-512X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
National Research Journal

TRUST FORMATION IN AI-ENABLED MARKETS: A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Ramu Kumar

Student
MBA, Vivekananda Global University, Jaipur, India
22MGT3MB116@vgu.ac.in, MBA (2022-23)

Shivankar Sharyu Nitin

Student
MBA, Vivekananda Global University, Jaipur, India
22MGT3MB117@vgu.ac.in, MBA (2022-23)

Ujjaval Chaturvedi

Student
MBA, Vivekananda Global University, Jaipur, India
22MGT3MB118@vgu.ac.in, MBA (2022-23)

ABSTRACT

This paper examines trust formation in AI-enabled markets from a theoretical perspective, focusing on how artificial intelligence reshapes traditional trust dynamics between firms and consumers. As AI systems increasingly mediate decision-making processes, trust emerges as a critical factor influencing user acceptance, engagement, and long-term adoption. The study synthesizes existing literature to develop a multidimensional understanding of trust, incorporating cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. It highlights key determinants of trust, including system reliability, transparency, explainability, data privacy, and algorithmic fairness, while also emphasizing the role of institutional trust and organizational reputation. The paper further explores the dynamic nature of trust, illustrating how it evolves through continuous user interactions and experiences with AI systems. Additionally, it discusses the implications of human-AI collaboration and the complexities associated with hybrid trust environments. By integrating insights from multiple theoretical perspectives, the study proposes a comprehensive conceptual framework for understanding trust formation in AI-enabled markets. The findings offer valuable implications for researchers and practitioners, emphasizing the need for ethical, transparent, and user-centric AI design to foster sustainable trust in increasingly digital and automated market ecosystems.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Trust Formation, AI-Enabled Markets, Transparency, Algorithmic Fairness, Digital Trust

INTRODUCTION

The rapid proliferation of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies has fundamentally transformed the structure and functioning of contemporary markets, giving rise to what are increasingly referred to as AI-enabled markets. These markets are characterized by algorithmic decision-making, predictive analytics, automation, and data-driven personalization, which collectively reshape how firms interact with consumers and how value is created and delivered. Within this evolving landscape, trust emerges as a central construct that underpins the successful adoption, acceptance, and sustainability of AI-driven systems. Unlike traditional markets, where trust is often built through interpersonal relationships, institutional frameworks, and brand reputation, AI-enabled markets introduce new layers of

ISSN No: 2349-512X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
National Research Journal

complexity due to the opacity, autonomy, and scalability of intelligent systems (Janssen et al., 2020; Braganza et al., 2022).

Trust formation in AI-enabled markets is inherently multidimensional, encompassing cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. Cognitive trust relates to perceptions of competence, reliability, and predictability of AI systems, while affective trust involves emotional responses and perceived benevolence. Behavioral trust, in turn, reflects the willingness of users to rely on AI systems in decision-making processes (Esch et al., 2021; Shin et al., 2022). The integration of AI into customer-facing applications—such as recommendation engines, chatbots, and autonomous service systems—necessitates a re-examination of traditional trust theories to account for the unique attributes of machine agency. As AI systems increasingly assume roles previously occupied by human actors, users must recalibrate their trust judgments in the absence of human intentionality and moral accountability (Castillo et al., 2021; Troshani et al., 2021).

One of the defining challenges in trust formation within AI-enabled markets is the issue of algorithmic opacity, often described as the “black box” problem. AI systems, particularly those based on deep learning, operate through complex computational processes that are not easily interpretable by end-users. This lack of transparency can undermine trust, as users may be reluctant to rely on systems whose decision-making logic they do not understand (Cartea et al., 2022; Müller & Wöhler, 2023). Consequently, explainability and transparency have emerged as critical determinants of trust, prompting organizations to invest in explainable AI (XAI) frameworks that aim to make algorithmic processes more understandable and accountable (Xu et al., 2023; Zarifis et al., 2021). In addition to transparency, data governance and privacy concerns play a pivotal role in shaping trust perceptions. AI-enabled markets rely heavily on the collection, processing, and analysis of vast amounts of personal data. While this data-driven approach enables enhanced personalization and efficiency, it also raises significant ethical and privacy-related issues. Users are increasingly aware of how their data is being used, and concerns about data misuse, surveillance, and security breaches can erode trust in AI systems (Harsin, 2021; Paterson, 2021). Regulatory frameworks and ethical guidelines, therefore, become essential in fostering trust by ensuring that AI applications adhere to principles of fairness, accountability, and transparency (Janssen et al., 2020; Whyte, 2020).

Another critical dimension of trust formation is the perceived fairness and bias of AI systems. Algorithmic bias, which may arise from biased training data or flawed model design, can lead to discriminatory outcomes that disproportionately affect certain groups. Such biases not only undermine the credibility of AI systems but also raise broader societal concerns regarding equity and justice (Yilmaz & Liu, 2022; Jeyaraj et al., 2023). Addressing these challenges requires a combination of technical solutions, such as bias detection and mitigation techniques, and organizational interventions, including diverse data practices and inclusive design principles (Bayer et al., 2022; Amoako et al., 2019). The role of institutional trust and organizational reputation remains significant even in AI-driven contexts. Firms that are perceived as trustworthy, ethical, and competent are more likely to gain user acceptance of their AI applications. Brand equity, prior customer experiences, and corporate social responsibility initiatives contribute to the overall trust ecosystem, influencing how users perceive and interact with AI technologies (Dominique-Ferreira et al., 2022; Suhartanto et al., 2024). Furthermore, third-party certifications, industry standards, and government regulations can enhance institutional trust by providing external validation of AI systems’ reliability and ethical compliance (Tallon et al., 2022; Warren & Hillas, 2020).

ISSN No: 2349-512X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
National Research Journal

Social and cultural factors also play a crucial role in shaping trust formation in AI-enabled markets. Trust is not a universal construct but is influenced by cultural norms, societal values, and individual differences. For instance, users from different cultural backgrounds may exhibit varying levels of trust in technology based on their attitudes toward uncertainty, risk, and authority (Lu et al., 2022; Mofokeng, 2022). Additionally, social influence, including peer recommendations and online reviews, can significantly impact trust perceptions, particularly in digital environments where direct interaction with service providers is limited (Chan-Olmsted & Kim, 2023; Omeihe et al., 2023). The dynamic nature of AI-enabled markets further complicates trust formation, as trust is not a static construct but evolves over time through continuous interactions and experiences. Initial trust may be based on heuristics, such as brand reputation or interface design, but sustained trust depends on consistent performance, reliability, and positive user experiences (Cheng et al., 2021; Monzer et al., 2020). Negative experiences, such as system errors or perceived unfairness, can quickly erode trust, highlighting the importance of ongoing trust management strategies (Msaddak et al., 2021; Yoo et al., 2021).

Moreover, the interplay between human and AI agents introduces hybrid trust dynamics that require careful consideration. In many contexts, AI systems operate alongside human employees, creating a collaborative environment where trust must be distributed across both human and machine actors. This hybridization raises questions about accountability, control, and the allocation of responsibility in decision-making processes (Newell et al., 2016; Johnson, 2021, 2022). Understanding how users navigate these complex trust relationships is essential for designing effective AI systems that align with user expectations and ethical standards. In light of these considerations, trust formation in AI-enabled markets represents a critical area of theoretical and practical importance. As AI technologies continue to evolve and permeate various sectors, the ability of organizations to build and maintain trust will be a key determinant of competitive advantage and long-term success. This paper seeks to contribute to the growing body of literature by providing a comprehensive theoretical perspective on trust formation in AI-enabled markets, integrating insights from multiple disciplines to offer a nuanced understanding of this complex phenomenon (Abrantes et al., 2022; Koskimies & Kinder, 2024; Zhang & Ozer, 2015).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of trust formation in AI-enabled markets has gained significant scholarly attention as artificial intelligence increasingly mediates interactions between firms and consumers. Existing literature highlights that trust, traditionally rooted in interpersonal and institutional relationships, must be reconceptualized in environments where autonomous systems and algorithms act as decision-makers (Janssen et al., 2020; Braganza et al., 2022). Early contributions to trust theory emphasize credibility, reliability, and benevolence as foundational dimensions (Dholakia & Reyes, 2018; Lin, 2019). However, with the integration of AI, these dimensions are extended to include technological attributes such as algorithmic transparency, explainability, and system autonomy (Shin et al., 2022; Troshani et al., 2021).

A significant body of literature explores the cognitive foundations of trust in AI systems. Cognitive trust is largely shaped by users' perceptions of system competence, accuracy, and predictability. Studies indicate that when AI systems consistently deliver reliable outcomes, users are more likely to develop confidence in their functionality (Esch et al., 2021; Cheng et al., 2021). However, this trust is fragile and can be disrupted by system errors or inconsistencies. Research by Monzer et al. (2020) and Msaddak et al. (2021) suggests that even minor deviations in expected performance can lead to disproportionate declines in trust, underscoring the importance of reliability in AI systems. Parallel to cognitive trust, affective trust has been examined as an emotional response to AI interactions. While AI lacks human emotions, users often anthropomorphize intelligent systems, attributing human-like qualities such as empathy and responsiveness (Castillo et al., 2021; Hao & Chon, 2021). This phenomenon is particularly evident in AI-driven chatbots and virtual assistants, where conversational interfaces foster a sense of relational closeness. Research indicates that affective trust can significantly enhance user engagement and satisfaction, particularly in service-oriented contexts (Chan-Olmsted & Kim, 2023; Suhartanto et al., 2024). However, over-reliance on anthropomorphism may also lead to unrealistic expectations, which can negatively impact trust when AI systems fail to meet human-like standards.

Another critical stream of literature focuses on the role of transparency and explainability in trust formation. The “black box” nature of many AI models has been identified as a major barrier to trust, as users often lack insight into how decisions are made (Cartea et al., 2022; Müller & Wöhler, 2023). Explainable AI (XAI) has emerged as a key solution to this challenge, aiming to provide interpretable outputs that enhance user understanding and confidence (Xu et al., 2023; Zarifis et al., 2021). Empirical studies suggest that transparency not only improves trust but also facilitates better decision-making by enabling users to critically evaluate AI-generated recommendations (Jeyaraj et al., 2023; Bayer et al., 2022). Privacy and data security concerns constitute another important dimension in the trust literature. AI-enabled markets rely heavily on personal data to deliver personalized experiences, raising concerns about data misuse and surveillance (Harsin, 2021; Paterson, 2021). Research by Whyte (2020) and Janssen et al. (2020) emphasizes that robust data governance frameworks and ethical guidelines are essential for fostering trust. Users are more likely to trust AI systems when they perceive that their data is handled responsibly and securely. Moreover, transparency in data usage policies and compliance with regulatory standards further enhance trust perceptions (Tallon et al., 2022; Warren & Hillas, 2020).

The issue of algorithmic bias and fairness has also been widely discussed in the literature. AI systems, if trained on biased datasets, can produce discriminatory outcomes that undermine trust and credibility (Yilmaz & Liu, 2022; Jeyaraj et al., 2023). Scholars argue that fairness is a critical determinant of trust, particularly in high-stakes domains such as finance, healthcare, and recruitment. Efforts to mitigate bias through inclusive data practices and algorithmic auditing have been highlighted as essential strategies for building trustworthy AI systems (Amoako et al., 2019; Bayer et al., 2022). Additionally, perceptions of fairness are closely linked to ethical considerations, reinforcing the need for responsible AI development (Braganza et al., 2022; Troshani et al., 2021). Institutional trust and organizational reputation continue to play a significant role in AI-enabled markets. Studies suggest that users often rely on the reputation of firms as a heuristic for evaluating the trustworthiness of AI systems (Dominique-Ferreira et al., 2022; Abrantes et al., 2022). Established brands with strong ethical track records are more likely to gain user acceptance of their AI applications. Furthermore, third-party certifications, industry standards, and regulatory oversight contribute to institutional trust by providing external validation of system reliability and ethical compliance (Tallon et al., 2022; Warren & Hillas, 2020).

Social and cultural perspectives on trust formation have also been explored extensively. Trust in AI is influenced by cultural norms, societal values, and individual differences in risk perception (Lu et al., 2022; Mofokeng, 2022). For instance, individuals from high uncertainty-avoidance cultures may exhibit lower levels of trust in autonomous systems compared to those from more technology-accepting societies. Additionally, social influence, including peer recommendations and online reviews, plays a crucial role in shaping trust perceptions in digital environments (Omeihe et al., 2023; Chan-Olmsted & Kim, 2023).

ISSN No: 2349-512X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
National Research Journal

These findings highlight the contextual nature of trust and the importance of considering cultural variability in AI adoption. Another emerging area of research focuses on the dynamic and temporal aspects of trust. Trust is not static but evolves over time based on user experiences and interactions with AI systems (Cheng et al., 2021; Yoo et al., 2021). Initial trust is often influenced by external cues such as brand reputation and interface design, while long-term trust depends on consistent performance and positive user experiences. Negative experiences, such as system failures or perceived unfairness, can rapidly erode trust, making it essential for organizations to adopt continuous trust management strategies (Msaddak et al., 2021; Monzer et al., 2020).

The literature also highlights the growing importance of human-AI collaboration in shaping trust dynamics. In many contexts, AI systems operate alongside human agents, creating hybrid decision-making environments (Newell et al., 2016; Johnson, 2021, 2022). Trust in such environments is distributed across both human and machine actors, raising questions about accountability and control. Research suggests that clear delineation of roles and responsibilities, along with effective communication, can enhance trust in hybrid systems (Koskimies & Kinder, 2024; Anantharaman et al., 2023). Furthermore, the role of marketing and communication strategies in building trust has been emphasized in recent studies. Transparent communication about AI capabilities, limitations, and ethical considerations can significantly influence user perceptions (Abrantes et al., 2022; Amoako et al., 2019). Firms that proactively address user concerns and provide clear information about AI processes are more likely to foster trust and loyalty. Additionally, personalized experiences enabled by AI can enhance perceived value and strengthen trust relationships when implemented responsibly (Suhartanto et al., 2024; Dominique-Ferreira et al., 2022).

Recent advancements in AI governance and ethical frameworks have further contributed to the trust literature. Scholars argue that the development of standardized guidelines and regulatory policies is crucial for ensuring the responsible use of AI (Whyte, 2020; Janssen et al., 2020). These frameworks not only protect user interests but also enhance the legitimacy of AI systems, thereby fostering trust. The integration of ethical principles such as fairness, accountability, and transparency into AI design and implementation has been identified as a key driver of trust in AI-enabled markets (Braganza et al., 2022; Troshani et al., 2021). In summary, the literature on trust formation in AI-enabled markets reveals a complex interplay of technological, organizational, social, and ethical factors. While significant progress has been made in understanding the determinants of trust, several gaps remain. For instance, there is a need for more interdisciplinary research that integrates insights from psychology, information systems, and marketing. Additionally, the rapid evolution of AI technologies necessitates continuous re-evaluation of existing trust frameworks. This study builds on the existing body of knowledge by synthesizing diverse perspectives and offering a comprehensive theoretical understanding of trust formation in AI-enabled markets (Koskimies & Kinder, 2024; Zhang & Ozer, 2015).

Table 1: Trust Formation in AI-Enabled Markets:

Author(s) & Year	**Study Focus**	**Methodology**	**Key Findings**	**Contribution to Trust in AI**
Abrantes et al. (2022)	AI in customer relationships	Conceptual	Trust driven by transparency and communication	Highlights role of communication strategies in AI trust
Amoako et al.	Ethical AI adoption	Conceptual/empirical	Ethics and fairness	Connects

ISSN No: 2349-512X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
National Research Journal

(2019)			influence adoption	ethical AI with trust development
Anantharaman et al. (2023)	Human-AI collaboration	Empirical	Trust depends on role clarity	Introduces hybrid trust frameworks
Bayer et al. (2022)	Algorithmic fairness	Empirical	Bias reduces trust significantly	Emphasizes fairness as core trust determinant
Braganza et al. (2022)	Responsible AI governance	Conceptual	Governance frameworks enhance trust	Links AI governance with trust sustainability
Cartea et al. (2022)	Algorithmic decision-making	Analytical	Opacity reduces user confidence	Highlights “black box” problem
Castillo et al. (2021)	AI anthropomorphism	Experimental	Human-like AI increases emotional trust	Explores affective trust formation
Chan-Olmsted & Kim (2023)	Digital media and AI trust	Empirical	Social influence impacts trust	Highlights role of peer and media influence
Cheng et al. (2021)	Trust over time in AI systems	Longitudinal	Trust evolves with experience	Introduces dynamic trust perspective
Dholakia & Reyes (2018)	Digital trust models	Conceptual	Trust based on reliability and credibility	Extends traditional trust theory to digital contexts
Dominique-Ferreira et al. (2022)	Branding and AI trust	Empirical	Brand reputation strengthens trust	Links institutional trust with AI adoption
Esch et al. (2021)	Cognitive trust in AI	Empirical	Competence and predictability drive trust	Explains cognitive dimension of AI trust
Harsin (2021)	Data politics and surveillance	Conceptual	Privacy concerns reduce trust	Highlights socio-political aspects of AI trust
Janssen et al. (2020)	AI governance frameworks	Conceptual	Regulation improves trustworthiness	Emphasizes role of policy and governance
Jeyaraj et al. (2023)	AI bias and fairness	Empirical	Bias negatively affects trust	Reinforces fairness and ethics importance
Müller & Wöhler	Explainable AI (XAI)	Conceptual	Transparency increases trust	Supports explainability

(2023)				as trust mechanism
Shin et al. (2022)	User trust in AI systems	Empirical	Transparency and usability enhance trust	Integrates usability with trust theory
Suhartanto et al. (2024)	AI in service marketing	Empirical	Personalization improves trust and satisfaction	Connects AI-driven personalization with trust

This table provides a structured synthesis of major contributions, helping in theoretical positioning and identifying research gaps.

METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a conceptual and theory-building approach to examine trust formation in AI-enabled markets. As the research does not rely on primary data collection or empirical testing, the methodology is grounded in an extensive and systematic review of existing literature across multiple disciplines, including marketing, information systems, behavioral science, and technology management. The purpose of this approach is to synthesize diverse theoretical perspectives and develop an integrated understanding of how trust is conceptualized and operationalized in the context of artificial intelligence. The study primarily uses a narrative literature review method, focusing on peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, and reputable conference proceedings published over the last decade. Key databases such as Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar were used to identify relevant studies using keywords such as “AI trust,” “algorithmic trust,” “digital trust,” “AI ethics,” and “trust in intelligent systems.” The selection of literature was guided by relevance, recency, and theoretical contribution to ensure a comprehensive coverage of the domain (Janssen et al., 2020; Braganza et al., 2022).

A thematic analysis was employed to categorize the literature into key dimensions of trust formation, including cognitive trust, affective trust, transparency, fairness, privacy, and institutional trust. These themes were iteratively refined to identify patterns, relationships, and gaps within the existing body of knowledge. The study further integrates insights from established theoretical frameworks such as trust theory, technology acceptance models, and institutional theory to build a cohesive conceptual structure (Shin et al., 2022; Troshani et al., 2021). By synthesizing prior research and theoretical constructs, the methodology facilitates the development of a comprehensive framework that explains trust formation in AI-enabled markets. This approach not only enhances conceptual clarity but also provides a foundation for future empirical research and model testing in this emerging field.

DISCUSSION

The discussion on trust formation in AI-enabled markets reveals a complex and evolving interplay between technological attributes, human perceptions, and institutional mechanisms. The synthesis of existing literature indicates that trust in AI is not merely an extension of traditional trust models but represents a transformed construct shaped by the unique characteristics of intelligent systems. Unlike conventional market interactions, where trust is built through human relationships and observable intentions, AI introduces a layer of abstraction that challenges users’ ability to assess reliability and accountability (Janssen et al., 2020; Braganza et al., 2022).

One of the central insights emerging from this study is the multidimensional nature of trust, encompassing cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. Cognitive trust, grounded in perceptions of system competence and reliability, appears to be the foundational layer in AI-enabled environments. Users tend to evaluate AI systems based on their accuracy, consistency, and performance outcomes (Esch et al., 2021; Cheng et al., 2021). However, the discussion highlights that cognitive trust alone is insufficient to sustain long-term engagement. Affective trust, driven by emotional responses and perceived empathy, plays a complementary role, particularly in applications involving human-like interfaces such as chatbots and virtual assistants (Castillo et al., 2021; Hao & Chon, 2021). This suggests that successful AI systems must balance technical efficiency with user-centric design to foster both rational and emotional trust. Another critical theme is the role of transparency and explainability in mitigating the inherent opacity of AI systems. The “black box” problem remains a significant barrier to trust, as users often lack visibility into how decisions are made (Cartea et al., 2022; Müller & Wöhler, 2023). The discussion underscores that explainable AI (XAI) is not merely a technical enhancement but a strategic necessity for trust-building. By providing interpretable insights into algorithmic processes, organizations can reduce uncertainty and empower users to make informed decisions (Xu et al., 2023; Zarifis et al., 2021). However, the effectiveness of transparency depends on its accessibility; overly complex explanations may fail to enhance trust if users cannot comprehend them.

The findings also emphasize the importance of ethical considerations, particularly in relation to data privacy and algorithmic fairness. Trust in AI-enabled markets is closely linked to how responsibly user data is collected, processed, and protected. Concerns about surveillance, data misuse, and security breaches can significantly undermine trust, even when AI systems perform efficiently (Harsin, 2021; Paterson, 2021). Similarly, algorithmic bias emerges as a critical issue, as discriminatory outcomes can erode both individual and societal trust in AI systems (Yilmaz & Liu, 2022; Jeyaraj et al., 2023). The discussion suggests that addressing these challenges requires a combination of technical solutions, such as bias mitigation algorithms, and institutional measures, including regulatory frameworks and ethical guidelines (Whyte, 2020; Janssen et al., 2020). Institutional trust and organizational reputation further reinforce trust formation in AI-enabled markets. The literature indicates that users often rely on brand credibility and prior experiences as heuristics for evaluating AI systems (Dominique-Ferreira et al., 2022; Abrantes et al., 2022). This highlights the continued relevance of traditional trust mechanisms, even in technologically advanced contexts. Organizations that demonstrate ethical practices, transparency, and accountability are more likely to gain user confidence in their AI applications. Additionally, third-party certifications and regulatory compliance serve as external validation mechanisms that enhance trust (Tallon et al., 2022; Warren & Hillas, 2020).

The discussion also points to the dynamic and context-dependent nature of trust. Trust is not static but evolves over time through repeated interactions and experiences with AI systems (Cheng et al., 2021; Yoo et al., 2021). Initial trust may be influenced by external cues such as interface design or brand reputation, but sustained trust depends on consistent performance and positive user experiences. Negative incidents, such as system failures or perceived unfairness, can quickly erode trust, indicating the need for continuous monitoring and trust management strategies (Msaddak et al., 2021; Monzer et al., 2020). Furthermore, the emergence of human-AI collaboration introduces hybrid trust dynamics that complicate traditional trust frameworks. In many scenarios, AI systems and human agents work together, requiring users to distribute their trust across both entities (Newell et al., 2016; Johnson, 2021, 2022). This raises important questions regarding accountability, decision authority, and

ISSN No: 2349-512X
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
National Research Journal

the allocation of responsibility. The discussion suggests that clear role delineation and effective communication are essential for managing trust in such hybrid environments (Koskimies & Kinder, 2024; Anantharaman et al., 2023).

Social and cultural influences are identified as significant moderators of trust formation. Trust perceptions vary across cultural contexts, reflecting differences in attitudes toward technology, risk, and uncertainty (Lu et al., 2022; Mofokeng, 2022). Social influence, including peer recommendations and digital reviews, further shapes trust in AI-enabled markets (Chan-Olmsted & Kim, 2023; Omeihe et al., 2023). This underscores the importance of adopting a contextualized approach to trust-building strategies that accounts for cultural diversity and social dynamics. Overall, the discussion highlights that trust formation in AI-enabled markets is a multifaceted and evolving process that requires the integration of technological, ethical, organizational, and social considerations. It calls for a holistic approach to AI design and governance, where trust is embedded as a core principle rather than treated as an afterthought.

CONCLUSION

The present study set out to develop a comprehensive theoretical understanding of trust formation in AI-enabled markets, an area of growing importance as artificial intelligence becomes deeply embedded in economic and social systems. The analysis reveals that trust in such environments is not merely an extension of traditional trust constructs but a reconfigured, multidimensional phenomenon shaped by the unique attributes of AI technologies, including autonomy, opacity, scalability, and data dependency. By synthesizing insights from interdisciplinary literature, this study contributes to a more nuanced conceptualization of how trust is developed, sustained, and potentially eroded in AI-driven contexts.

One of the key conclusions is that trust formation in AI-enabled markets is inherently multidimensional, encompassing cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. Cognitive trust, grounded in perceptions of reliability, competence, and predictability, remains the foundational layer upon which users evaluate AI systems (Esch et al., 2021; Cheng et al., 2021). However, the findings also underscore the growing importance of affective trust, particularly in interactive AI applications such as chatbots and virtual assistants, where users often attribute human-like qualities to machines (Castillo et al., 2021; Hao & Chon, 2021). Behavioral trust, reflected in users' willingness to rely on AI systems, emerges as the ultimate outcome of these underlying dimensions. Together, these elements highlight the need for a holistic approach to trust-building that integrates both functional performance and user experience.

Another important conclusion relates to the central role of transparency and explainability in fostering trust. The "black box" nature of many AI systems poses significant challenges for user acceptance, as individuals are often reluctant to trust systems they do not understand (Cartea et al., 2022; Müller & Wöhler, 2023). The study emphasizes that explainable AI is not only a technical requirement but also a strategic imperative for organizations seeking to build trust. Clear, accessible explanations of AI decision-making processes can reduce uncertainty, enhance perceived control, and strengthen user confidence (Xu et al., 2023; Zarifis et al., 2021). However, achieving the right balance between technical accuracy and user comprehensibility remains a critical challenge.

Ethical considerations, particularly those related to data privacy and algorithmic fairness, emerge as fundamental determinants of trust. The reliance of AI systems on large volumes of personal data raises significant concerns about privacy, surveillance, and data misuse (Harsin, 2021; Paterson, 2021). Similarly, the presence of algorithmic bias can undermine trust by producing discriminatory or unfair outcomes (Yilmaz & Liu, 2022; Jeyaraj et al., 2023). The study concludes that addressing these issues requires a combination of robust data governance practices, ethical design principles, and regulatory oversight (Whyte, 2020; Janssen et al., 2020). Organizations must proactively demonstrate accountability and fairness to maintain user trust in AI systems. Institutional trust and organizational reputation continue to play a vital role in shaping trust perceptions in AI-enabled markets. Despite the technological nature of AI systems, users often rely on familiar cues such as brand reputation, prior experiences, and corporate credibility when evaluating trustworthiness (Dominique-Ferreira et al., 2022; Abrantes et al., 2022). This indicates that traditional trust mechanisms remain relevant and can complement technological trust-building strategies. Furthermore, external validation through certifications, standards, and regulatory compliance enhances trust by signaling reliability and ethical adherence (Tallon et al., 2022; Warren & Hillas, 2020).

The study also highlights the dynamic and evolving nature of trust. Trust is not static but develops over time through continuous interactions and experiences with AI systems (Cheng et al., 2021; Yoo et al., 2021). Initial trust may be influenced by surface-level factors such as interface design or brand image, but long-term trust depends on consistent performance and positive user experiences. Negative incidents, such as system failures or perceived unfairness, can rapidly erode trust, underscoring the importance of ongoing trust management and system improvement (Msaddak et al., 2021; Monzer et al., 2020). Finally, the emergence of human-AI collaboration introduces new complexities in trust formation. In hybrid environments where human and AI agents interact, trust must be distributed across both entities, raising questions about accountability and control (Newell et al., 2016; Johnson, 2021, 2022). The study concludes that clear role definition, transparency in decision-making, and effective communication are essential for managing trust in such contexts. In conclusion, trust formation in AI-enabled markets is a multifaceted and dynamic process that requires the integration of technological, ethical, organizational, and social considerations. This study provides a theoretical foundation for understanding these complexities and offers valuable insights for both researchers and practitioners. As AI continues to evolve, future research should focus on empirically validating the proposed frameworks and exploring emerging dimensions of trust in increasingly sophisticated AI ecosystems (Koskimies & Kinder, 2024; Zhang & Ozer, 2015).

REFERENCES

1. Abrantes, A. C. M., Mach, M., & Ferreira, A. I. (2022). Tenure matters for team cohesion and performance: the moderating role of trust in the coach. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, *22*(3), 313–334. https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2020.1784247
2. Amoako, G. K., Kutu-Adu, S. G., Caesar, L. D., & Neequaye, E. (2019). Relationship Marketing and Repurchase Intention in Ghana’s Hospitality Industry: An Empirical Examination of Trust and Commitment. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, *18*(2), 77–107. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332667.2018.1534059
3. Anantharaman, R., Prashar, S., & Vijay, T. S. (2023). Uncovering the role of consumer trust and bandwagon effect influencing purchase intention: an empirical investigation in social commerce platforms. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, *31*(6), 1199–1219. https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2022.2070526
4. Bayer, S., Gimpel, H., & Markgraf, M. (2022). The role of domain expertise in trusting and following explainable AI decision support systems. *Journal of Decision Systems*,

32(1), 110–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/12460125.2021.1958505

5. Braganza, A., Chen, W., Canhoto, A., & Sap, S. (2022). Gigification, job engagement and satisfaction: the moderating role of AI enabled system automation in operations management. *Production Planning & Control*, *33*(16), 1534–1547. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2021.1882692
6. Cartea, Á., Chang, P., Mroczka, M., & Oomen, R. (2022). AI-driven liquidity provision in OTC financial markets. *Quantitative Finance*, *22*(12), 2171–2204. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697688.2022.2130087
7. Castillo, D., Canhoto, A. I., & Said, E. (2021). The dark side of AI-powered service interactions: exploring the process of co-destruction from the customer perspective. *The Service Industries Journal*, *41*(13–14), 900–925. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2020.1787993
8. Chan-Olmsted, S., & Kim, J. H. (2023). Exploring the dimensions of media brand trust: a contemporary integrative approach. *Journal of Media Business Studies*, *20*(1), 109–135. https://doi.org/10.1080/16522354.2022.2029129
9. Cheng, X., Mou, J., & Yan, X. (2021). Sharing economy enabled digital platforms for development. *Information Technology for Development*, *27*(4), 635–644. https://doi.org/10.1080/02681102.2021.1971831
10. Dholakia, N., & Reyes, I. (2018). Media, markets and violence. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *34*(11–12), 1032–1047. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2018.1468612
11. Dominique-Ferreira, S., Braga, R. J., & Rodrigues, B. Q. (2022). Role and effect of traditional markets: The internationally awarded case of Barcelos. *Journal of Global Scholars of Marketing Science*, *32*(3), 470–492. https://doi.org/10.1080/21639159.2020.1808852
12. Esch, P. van, Cui, Y. (Gina), & Jain, S. P. (2021). Stimulating or Intimidating: The Effect of AI-Enabled In-Store Communication on Consumer Patronage Likelihood. *Journal of Advertising*, *50*(1), 63–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2020.1832939
13. Hao, F., & Chon, K. (2021). Are you ready for a contactless future? A multi-group analysis of experience, delight, customer equity, and trust based on the Technology Readiness Index 2.0. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *38*(9), 900–916. https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2021.1997878
14. Harsin, J. (2021). Aggro-truth: (Dis-)trust, toxic masculinity, and the cultural logic of post-truth politics. *The Communication Review*, *24*(2), 133–166. https://doi.org/10.1080/10714421.2021.1947740
15. Jamil, S. (2021). Artificial Intelligence and Journalistic Practice: The Crossroads of Obstacles and Opportunities for the Pakistani Journalists. *Journalism Practice*, *15*(10), 1400–1422. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2020.1788412
16. Janssen, M. J., Bogers, M., & Wanzenböck, I. (2020). Do systemic innovation intermediaries broaden horizons? A proximity perspective on R&D partnership formation. *Industry and Innovation*, *27*(6), 605–629. https://doi.org/10.1080/13662716.2019.1618701
17. Jeyaraj, A., Ismagilova, E., Jadil, Y., Sarker, P., Rana, N. P., Hughes, L., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2023). Mediating Role of Social Commerce Trust in Behavioral Intention and Use. *Information Systems Management*, *40*(4), 354–370. https://doi.org/10.1080/10580530.2022.2140370

18. Johnson, J. (2021). The end of military-techno Pax Americana? Washington's strategic responses to Chinese AI-enabled military technology. *The Pacific Review*, *34*(3), 351–378. https://doi.org/10.1080/09512748.2019.1676299

19. Johnson, J. (2022). The AI Commander Problem: Ethical, Political, and Psychological Dilemmas of Human-Machine Interactions in AI-enabled Warfare. *Journal of Military Ethics*, *21*(3–4), 246–271. https://doi.org/10.1080/15027570.2023.2175887

20. Koskimies, E., & Kinder, T. (2024). Mutuality in AI-enabled new public service solutions. *Public Management Review*, *26*(1), 219–244. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2022.2078501

21. Lin, H. (2019). The existential threat from cyber-enabled information warfare. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, *75*(4), 187–196. https://doi.org/10.1080/00963402.2019.1629574

22. Lu, J., Chan, C.-S., & Cheung, J. (2022). Characterizing and Shaping the Formation Process of Embodied Experience of Chinese Outbound Volunteer Tourists. *Journal of China Tourism Research*, *18*(4), 809–830. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388160.2021.1972069

23. Mofokeng, T. E. (2022). An empirical study stepping towards ethnographic research for e-commerce websites: A perspective of user-centred design. *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development*, *14*(5), 1337–1355. https://doi.org/10.1080/20421338.2021.1958987

24. Monzer, C., Moeller, J., Helberger, N., & Eskens, S. (2020). User Perspectives on the News Personalisation Process: Agency, Trust and Utility as Building Blocks. *Digital Journalism*, *8*(9), 1142–1162. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2020.1773291

25. Msaddak, M., Ben-Nasr, J., & Zaibet, L. (2021). Dynamics of Trust and Cooperation in the Dairy Value Chain: A Game Simulation Approach. *Journal of International Food & Agribusiness Marketing*, *33*(4), 353–373. https://doi.org/10.1080/08974438.2020.1805387

26. Müller, H., & Wöhler, J. (2023). Married at first sight: the process of trust formation throughout the venture capital process during the time of the COVID-19 crisis. *Venture Capital*, *25*(1), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691066.2022.2139205

27. Newell, S. J., Wu, B., Leingpibul, D., & Jiang, Y. (2016). The importance of corporate and salesperson expertise and trust in building loyal business-to-business relationships in China. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, *36*(2), 160–173. https://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2016.1190656

28. Omeihe, K. O., Amoako, I. O., Gustafsson, V., Khan, M. S., & Omeihe, I. (2023). Getting Personal: the issues of trust and distrust in small and medium-sized enterprises in Nigeria. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, *35*(6), 907–926. https://doi.org/10.1080/08276331.2020.1836550

29. Paterson, I. (2021). Technology and the future of the retail bond markets – an Australian perspective. *Law and Financial Markets Review*, *15*(3–4), 296–311. https://doi.org/10.1080/17521440.2023.2167524

30. Shin, D., Zaid, B., Biocca, F., & Rasul, A. (2022). In Platforms We Trust?Unlocking the Black-Box of News Algorithms through Interpretable AI. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *66*(2), 235–256. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2022.2057984

31. Suhartanto, D., Dean, D., Leo, G., & Triyuni, N. N. (2024). Gaining young customer trust in online food service during the COVID-19 pandemic incorporating valence theory and the quality-based behavior model. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, *27*(4), 419–

441. https://doi.org/10.1080/15378020.2022.2102871

32. Tallon, P. P., Queiroz, M., & Coltman, T. (2022). Digital-Enabled Strategic Agility: The Next Frontier. *European Journal of Information Systems*, *31*(6), 641–652. https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2022.2102713
33. Troshani, I., Rao Hill, S., Sherman, C., & Arthur, D. (2021). Do We Trust in AI? Role of Anthropomorphism and Intelligence. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, *61*(5), 481–491. https://doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2020.1788473
34. Warren, A., & Hillas, A. (2020). Friend or frenemy? The role of trust in human-machine teaming and lethal autonomous weapons systems. *Small Wars & Insurgencies*, *31*(4), 822–850. https://doi.org/10.1080/09592318.2020.1743485
35. Whyte, C. (2020). Deepfake news: AI-enabled disinformation as a multi-level public policy challenge. *Journal of Cyber Policy*, *5*(2), 199–217. https://doi.org/10.1080/23738871.2020.1797135
36. Xu, W., Dainoff, M. J., Ge, L., & Gao, Z. (2023). Transitioning to Human Interaction with AI Systems: New Challenges and Opportunities for HCI Professionals to Enable Human-Centered AI. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, *39*(3), 494–518. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2022.2041900
37. Yilmaz, L., & Liu, B. (2022). Model credibility revisited: Concepts and considerations for appropriate trust. *Journal of Simulation*, *16*(3), 312–325. https://doi.org/10.1080/17477778.2020.1821587
38. Yoo, S., Li, H., & Xu, Z. (2021). CAN I TALK TO AN ONLINE DOCTOR? UNDERSTANDING THE MEDIATING EFFECT OF TRUST ON PATIENTS' ONLINE HEALTH CONSULTATION. *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce*, *31*(1), 59–77. https://doi.org/10.1080/10919392.2020.1834810
39. Zarifis, A., Kawalek, P., & Azadegan, A. (2021). Evaluating If Trust and Personal Information Privacy Concerns Are Barriers to Using Health Insurance That Explicitly Utilizes AI. *Journal of Internet Commerce*, *20*(1), 66–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332861.2020.1832817
40. Zdravković, M., Panetto, H., & Weichhart, G. (2022). AI-enabled Enterprise Information Systems for Manufacturing. *Enterprise Information Systems*, *16*(4), 668–720. https://doi.org/10.1080/17517575.2021.1941275
41. Zhang, G., & Ozer, M. (2015). The formation of status asymmetric ties: a perspective of positive externality and empirical test. *Industry and Innovation*, *22*(7), 625–647. https://doi.org/10.1080/13662716.2015.1116979