Human Systems Engineering and Design (IHSED 2026), Vol. 237, 2026, 892–902
https://doi.org/10.54941/ahfe1008227

Aligning Human-Agent Teamwork Plans With Human Factors in Time-Critical Decision Making

Mark A. Neerincx[1,2], Robbert van der Mijn[1], and Jonathan Barnhoorn[1]

[1]TNO (Dutch Organization for Applied Scientific Research), The Netherlands
[2]Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

ABSTRACT

Human–Agent Teamwork (HAT) in high-stakes, volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) environments places stringent demands on the planning of context-dependent and interdependent activities. Effective planning in such environments requires explicit consideration of temporal human factors that shape both individual and team performance over time. This paper provides an overview of key human factors relevant to HAT planning and derives corresponding planning guidelines. First, three temporal mechanisms are identified at the individual level: time pressure, stress, and the timing of decisions. Second, four mechanisms affecting teamwork processes are discussed: joint decision making, work process alignment, team resilience, and meaningful human control. Based on the literature analysis and expert workshops, support functions are proposed that explicitly account for these temporal mechanisms. The synthesis resulted in six actionable guidelines for HAT planning: (1) anticipation, (2) adaptive task allocation, (3) prepared routines, (4) adaptability of informing and performing, (5) trust calibration, and (6) continuous monitoring. Together, these guidelines frame time not merely as an operational constraint but as a fundamental planning dimension for adaptive and resilient human–agent teamwork.

Keywords: Human-agent teamwork, Human factors, Time pressure, Decision-making, Planning

INTRODUCTION

Human–Agent Teams (HATs) consist of humans and (semi-)autonomous agents that collaborate interdependently to achieve shared objectives (O'Neill et al., 2022). In high-stakes, volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) domains such as disaster response and military operations, the planning of team activities becomes particularly challenging because operational conditions, workload, and responsibilities evolve dynamically over time. Existing planning approaches support scheduling and estimation of task duration, but insufficiently address temporal human factors related to coordination, adaptation, and decision making under time pressure.

Despite the need to understand how team activities and performance evolve over time, theories and methods for analysing temporal dynamics in teams remain limited (Burke et al., 2019; David et al., 2022). Time affects not only individual cognition but also teamwork processes such as communication,

Received May 15, 2026 Revised June 13, 2026 Accepted July 4, 2026 Available online September 25, 2026

trust calibration, resilience, and control allocation (Klonek et al., 2019). These effects become particularly critical in VUCA environments where delayed or poorly coordinated decisions may substantially affect operational performance.

This paper addresses two research questions: (1) Which time-related human factors affect individual and team decision making? and (2) How can these factors be incorporated into the planning of human–agent teamwork to support effective, efficient, and safe task performance under temporal constraints?

EFFECTS OF TIME ON HUMAN DECISION-MAKING

This section summarizes key temporal mechanisms affecting individual decision making that are particularly relevant for planning human–agent teamwork.

Time Pressure

Time pressure, defined as the urgency to make decisions within a limited period, constrains information processing and consultation opportunities. Under time pressure, decision makers increasingly rely on heuristics and intuitive judgments, often prioritizing speed over accuracy (Ariely & Zakay, 2001). Attention narrows toward salient cues and opportunities for systematic information integration decrease. Although such effects may introduce biases, experts in VUCA environments often develop adaptive heuristics that support effective decisions under uncertainty (Gigerenzer, 2023). The impact of time pressure therefore depends on both temporal constraints and expertise. Time pressure also affects use of decision support systems, potentially leading to inappropriate reliance when support becomes misaligned with situational understanding.

Stress

Time pressure induces stress responses that influence both cognitive and affective functioning. Stress shifts decision making from controlled and analytical processing toward more automatic and heuristic-based responses (Starcke & Brand, 2012). Such responses may already arise before deadlines occur, through anticipation of future temporal demands. Stress can impair memory, narrow attentional focus, reduce consideration of alternatives, and increase commitment to initial choices. Under increasing temporal demands, decision makers may adopt defensive strategies such as selective attention to threatening information and avoidance of uncertainty (Ariely & Zakay, 2001). While such mechanisms can support rapid action, they may simultaneously reduce adaptability and critical reflection.

Timing of Decisions

Timing of decisions concerns when to act and how available time should be distributed across activities. Decision makers continuously balance speed and accuracy while considering evolving contextual conditions and accumulating evidence. Evidence accumulation models suggest that decisions emerge once a threshold of information is reached (Brown & Heathcote, 2008). Under temporal constraints, this threshold may become lower, resulting in faster but potentially less accurate decisions. Moreover, dynamic environments require decision makers to continually evaluate whether waiting for additional information improves outcomes or unnecessarily delays action (Kerstholt, 1994).

TIME PRESSURE IN HUMAN-AGENT TEAMS

Temporal effects extend beyond individual cognition and shape collaborative processes within Human–Agent Teams (HATs). Time pressure affects not only how individuals perceive and process information, but also how teams coordinate, distribute responsibilities, maintain resilience, and preserve human oversight. Four mechanisms are particularly relevant: group decision making, work process alignment, team resilience, and meaningful human control.

Group Decision-Making

Under time pressure, groups increasingly focus on rapid task completion and consensus rather than systematic evaluation of alternatives. According to the Attentional Focus Model, temporal constraints narrow attention toward a restricted set of task-relevant cues and promote heuristic rather than systematic processing (Kelly & Loving, 2004). Although such strategies can be effective in routine situations, they may reduce creativity and increase risks of premature convergence in complex environments. Planning should therefore support broad information sharing and structured exchanges.

Work Process Alignment

Barriers in maintaining common ground. Human–agent collaboration under time pressure requires effective alignment of activities, information exchanges, and responsibilities. Appropriate trust calibration and shared understanding are critical for maintaining common ground between human and artificial actors. Systems that communicate their capabilities and limitations clearly support more accurate mental models and realistic expectations. Transparency and context-sensitive explanations can support stable trust relationships and reduce coordination breakdowns under dynamic conditions.

Need for workload harmonization. Workload harmonization concerns the continuous balancing of cognitive and operational demands across team actors. Teams may report lower workload than individual operators because they can distribute tasks and exploit shared knowledge (Hicks et al., 2018). However, temporal pressure may create uneven workload distributions and overload specific actors. Awareness of workload distributions can support more adaptive allocation strategies, although such monitoring may also

conflict with values such as privacy. Value-sensitive approaches and work agreement models have been proposed to harmonize workload with both performance requirements and personal values (Harbers and Neerincx, 2017). Reflective agents may support this process by monitoring workload states and providing feedback on workload distributions.

Interdependence management. Human–agent teams are characterized by interdependencies among actors with different capabilities and responsibilities. Such dependencies may be hard, when required for successful task completion, or soft, when they mainly improve performance or experience (Johnson et al., 2014). Under time pressure these interdependencies evolve dynamically and may create friction through diverging expectations or inaccurate assumptions. Maintaining awareness of interdependencies and adapting coordination strategies accordingly can reduce inappropriate reliance and improve collaborative performance.

Team Resilience

Need for reciprocity. Resilience refers to the ability of teams to adapt and sustain performance under adverse circumstances (Schraagen & David, 2021). Under time pressure, reciprocity among team members becomes increasingly important. Team actors need mechanisms for redistributing workload, attention, and responsibilities when demands exceed available resources. Such reciprocal adaptation enables teams to compensate for temporary overload or changing conditions.

Risks for exhaustion. Sustained temporal demands may increase emotional exhaustion and encourage self-endangering work strategies. Teams facing persistent time pressure may increasingly sacrifice recovery or employ compensatory behaviors that become harmful over time. Clarifying demands and explicitly setting priorities can buffer these effects by helping teams focus on essential objectives and allocate resources more effectively (Burke et al., 2019).

Meaningful Human Control

Temporal allocation of control. Meaningful Human Control requires preserving human understanding and intervention opportunities within human–agent teamwork. Time pressure complicates this because rapidly evolving situations reduce opportunities for reflection and oversight. Meaningful control therefore depends not only on who makes decisions, but also on when decisions are made and how much time humans have available for informed judgment (Cavalcante Siebert et al., 2023).

Supporting adaptive intervention. Maintaining meaningful human control requires explicit planning of intervention opportunities, particularly for ethically sensitive or high-impact decisions. Team design patterns can support such planning by allocating responsibilities and identifying moments at which humans should supervise, intervene, or assume authority (van der Waa et al., 2020; van Diggelen et al., 2023). Such mechanisms help maintain control while preserving operational responsiveness under temporal constraints.

Expert Workshops

Two expert workshops complemented the literature analysis. Participants included researchers and practitioners with expertise in human factors, AI, and teamwork in high-stakes domains such as healthcare, defence, and first response. The second workshop involved twenty-one international experts at a Lorentz Center workshop on advancing Human–Agent Teaming research (Verhagen et al., 2025). Across both workshops, recurring themes emerged concerning anticipation, adaptive coordination, workload harmonization, trust calibration, and continuous monitoring. These themes informed the synthesis of the planning guidelines.

GUIDELINES FOR HUMAN-AGENT TEAM PLANNING

The analyses of human decision making, human–agent teamwork processes, and the expert workshops identified key temporal effects, support needs, planning requirements, and research challenges relevant to time-critical operations. The previous sections showed that temporal dynamics affect cognitive processes, affective responses, and collaborative mechanisms at multiple levels, ranging from individual information processing to team coordination and control.

This section synthesizes these insights into a set of planning guidelines for Human–Agent Teams (HATs). Unlike traditional planning approaches that primarily focus on sequencing activities and estimating task durations, the proposed guidelines explicitly address temporal human factors and the adaptive nature of teamwork. Human–Agent Teams typically comprise multiple human and artificial actors whose interactions evolve over time. Consequently, planning should not only determine what tasks need to be performed and when, but also how coordination, information exchange, control allocation, and adaptation should occur under changing temporal conditions.

The proposed guidelines emphasize meta-cognitive planning actions: activities that enable teams to monitor evolving circumstances, assess their own functioning, anticipate future developments, and adapt coordination strategies accordingly. Six guidelines were derived from the synthesis of literature findings and workshop insights: (1) anticipation, (2) adaptive task allocation, (3) prepared routines, (4) adaptability of informing and performing, (5) trust calibration, and (6) continuous monitoring

Anticipation

Time-sensitive situation awareness. Endsley & Jones (2025) emphasized that situation awareness extends beyond perception toward projection of future states. In dynamic environments, delayed recognition of emerging developments can substantially reduce decision quality. Teams therefore require mechanisms for continuously monitoring evolving conditions and anticipating likely future states.

Forecasts. Forecasting techniques support anticipation by projecting possible future developments and identifying emerging risks before events fully unfold. Such techniques help teams prepare actions earlier and reduce dependence on reactive responses during high-pressure situations. Predictive mechanisms may also support identification of workload peaks and resource shortages.

Communication & coordination. Time-sensitive situation awareness depends on timely communication and coordinated information exchange among team actors. Information regarding current and anticipated states should be disseminated rapidly while preserving common ground. Schraagen et al. (2022) show that awareness of interdependencies and contextual developments can substantially improve collaborative performance in hybrid teams.

Predictive resource management. Anticipation also concerns proactive management of operational resources. Estimating future demands on workload, time, and operational assets enables teams to allocate resources before bottlenecks emerge and maintain responsiveness under dynamic conditions.

Guideline. Plan human–agent teamwork such that time-sensitive situation awareness is supported through forecasting capabilities, effective communication mechanisms, and predictive resource management. Planning should ensure timely information sharing and coordinated anticipation of future developments.

Adaptive Task Allocation

Dynamic allocation of responsibilities. Time pressure continuously alters workload distributions, information needs, and task priorities. Static allocation strategies may therefore become increasingly ineffective in rapidly changing environments.

Adaptive autonomy. By dynamically regulating the allocation of automation and human involvement based on task urgency and complexity, time-critical activities receive immediate human attention, while routine tasks are handled autonomously (Breton, 2008). De Greef et al. (2010) demonstrated significant efficiency gains of such an approach in a real-world command-and-control setting.

Workload harmonization. Adaptive task allocation should consider both operational requirements and human values. Harbers et al. (2017) proposed value-sensitive approaches for workload harmonization, enabling teams to balance performance demands with individual needs and constraints. Reflective agents can support this process by monitoring workload and facilitating adaptive redistribution strategies.

Guideline. Integrate adaptive workload management and flexible task allocation into the planning of human–agent teamwork. Planning should specify how levels of autonomy can dynamically adjust according to urgency, workload, and required human involvement.

Prepared Routines

Smart heuristics and cognitive aids. Experts frequently develop heuristics through experience that support rapid decisions under uncertainty. Gigerenzer (2023) argued that such heuristics can outperform analytical strategies under VUCA conditions. Rasmussen (1983) distinguished skill-, rule-, and knowledge-based behaviors triggered by signals, signs, and symbols. Based on this framework, Neerincx (2003) identified cognitive support functions including rule provision, information handling, problem exploration, and task-switching support.

Plays. Miller et al. (2005) introduced "plays," inspired by sports playbooks, as predefined patterns of coordinated activity. Van Diggelen et al. (2021) implemented similar principles through the DASH framework for delegation within human–machine teams.

Scenario-based training. Scenario-based training and simulation support development and rehearsal of prepared routines under changing conditions. Such training allows teams to practice coordination strategies and improve responses under high workload and stress, including the use of above mentioned cognitive aids and plays support (Moats et al., 2008).

Guideline. Plan human–agent teamwork to include prepared routines that support rapid and coordinated responses under time pressure. Planning should incorporate smart heuristics, cognitive aids, predefined plays, and scenario-based training.

Adaptability of Informing and Performing

Dosed information sharing. Under time pressure, information overload may impair performance. Streefkerk et al. (2006) proposed attentive interfaces that adapt information presentation to users' attentional states and context.

Work agreements. Mioch et al. (2018) proposed adaptive work agreements that allow teams to tailor information exchange and autonomy to evolving operational circumstances. Such agreements can regulate communication patterns and support meaningful human control.

Guideline. Plan human–agent teamwork such that information sharing and task execution adapt dynamically to temporal and contextual demands. Planning should incorporate mechanisms for dosed information sharing, as well as predefined work agreements.

Trust Calibration

Reflective dialogues. Effective teamwork requires that team members maintain appropriate levels of trust in each other and in the information, technologies, and services they rely on. Reflective dialogues concerning underlying assumptions, beliefs, and motives can support the maintenance of calibrated trust. Reflective agents can stimulate critical thinking by prompting operators to actively question automated outputs, identify inconsistencies, consider alternative interpretations, and reflect on value trade-offs (Haselager et al., 2024; De Grauw et al., 2023; Wingerter et al., 2025). Such reflective interactions may become particularly valuable under time pressure, where limited opportunities for deliberation can increase risks of uncritical acceptance or rejection of support.

Explanations. Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) aims to support calibrated trust in automated systems (Kalasampath et al., 2025; Sahoh & Choksuriwong, 2023). In Human–Agent Teams, explanations should support broader teamwork processes rather than isolated AI decisions. The perceptual–cognitive explanation (PeCoX) framework integrates explanation generation, communication, and reception in hybrid systems (Neerincx et al., 2018). Embedding explanations into workflows through reusable design patterns can support trust calibration while minimizing cognitive effort under time pressure (Schoonderwoerd et al., 2021).

Guideline. Plan human–agent teamwork such that mechanisms for trust calibration are integrated into operational workflows. Planning should incorporate reflective dialogues that stimulate critical engagement with automated outputs and explanation mechanisms embedded in work processes and interfaces. These mechanisms should support continuous adaptation of trust while minimizing additional cognitive effort under time-critical conditions.

Continuous Monitoring

Performance. Effective human–agent teamwork requires continuous monitoring of task performance, teamwork processes, and environmental conditions over time. Undesirable developments—such as deteriorating speed–accuracy trade-offs, increased risk-taking, or poor adaptation to changing circumstances—should be identified and addressed promptly. Structured interactions such as briefings, huddles, and debriefings support sense-making, progress assessment, and replanning activities. Such assessments may be organized through reusable coordination patterns supporting systematic monitoring and adaptation (Van Diggelen et al., 2018).

Collaboration. Human–agent teamwork also requires monitoring the evolving interdependencies between team actors (Johnson et al., 2014). Actively managing such relationships helps maintain effective collaboration and supports accurate trust calibration by enabling actors to appropriately rely on or compensate for these dependencies (Verhagen et al., 2024).

Mental & physical condition. Sustained temporal demands may affect both well-being and cognitive readiness. Monitoring stress, health, and capability states enables preventive interventions and supports resilient performance (Crameri et al., 2021; VanderWeele et al., 2025).

Monitoring for adaptation. Monitoring should not be limited to passive observation but should actively support adaptation. Information collected about performance, collaboration, and human conditions should feed back into planning processes, enabling teams to revise task allocations, communication strategies, and coordination mechanisms. Such feedback loops enable teams to maintain effectiveness despite changing operational demands and uncertainties.

Guideline. Plan human–agent teamwork such that operational performance, collaboration dynamics, and team-member conditions are continuously monitored over time. Planning should incorporate mechanisms

for structured and ad hoc assessments that support sense-making, trust calibration, and adaptive replanning. By integrating monitoring of performance, interdependencies, and human well-being, teams can sustain resilience and effective coordination in time-critical environments.

CONCLUSION

This paper examined how temporal factors influence decision making and coordination in Human–Agent Teams operating in high-stakes, volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) environments. Three temporal mechanisms affecting individual decision making were identified: time pressure, stress, and the timing of decisions. In addition, four mechanisms affecting teamwork processes were discussed: group decision making, work process alignment, team resilience, and meaningful human control. Together, these findings show that temporal dynamics influence not only cognitive processing but also coordination, trust, workload distribution, and adaptive team behavior.

The synthesis of literature findings and expert workshop insights resulted in six planning guidelines for Human–Agent Teaming: anticipation, adaptive task allocation, prepared routines, adaptability of informing and performing, trust calibration, and continuous monitoring. Rather than treating temporal constraints merely as limitations to overcome, these guidelines frame time as a fundamental planning and design dimension that should be addressed explicitly in human–agent teamwork.

Future work should focus on translating these guidelines into reusable team design patterns that support planning and adaptation across domains. Three broader research challenges remain: establishing effective and efficient mixed-method evaluation approaches, increasing the ecological validity of Human–Agent Team research, and developing AI-supported methods for empirical assessment of HAT performance.

REFERENCES

Ariely, D., & Zakay, D. (2001). A timely account of the role of duration in decision making. *Acta Psychologica* , 108(2), 187–207.

Breton, R. (2008). The modelling of three levels of cognitive controls with the Cognitive-OODA loop framework. *Def. Res. & Dev. CA-Valcartier*, DRDC TR, 111.

Brown, S.D., & Heathcote, A. (2008). The simplest complete model of choice response time: Linear ballistic accumulation. *Cognitive Psychology*, 57(3), 153–178.

Burke, C.S., Georganta, E., & Marlow, S. (2019). A bottom up perspective to understanding the dynamics of team roles in mission critical teams. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1322.

Cavalcante Siebert, L., Lupetti, M.L., Aizenberg, E., Beckers, N., Zgonnikov, A., Veluwenkamp, H., Abbink, D., Giaccardi, E., Houben, G.-J., Jonker, C.M., van den Hoven, J., Forster, D., & Lagendijk, R.L. (2023). Meaningful human control: Actionable properties for AI system development. *AI and Ethics*, 3(1), 241–255.

Crameri, L., Hettiarachchi, I. & Hanoun, S. (2021). A review of individual operational cognitive readiness: Theory development and future directions. Human Factors, 63(1), 66–87.

David, L.Z., Schraagen, J.M. & Endedijk, M. (2022). Toward the incorporation of temporal interaction analysis techniques in modeling and understanding sociotechnical systems. *Human Factors and Erg. in Manufact. & Service Industries*, 32(1), 35–49.

De Greef, T., Arciszewski, H., & Neerincx, M.A. (2010). Adaptive Automation Based on an Object-Oriented Task Model: Implementation and Evaluation in a, Realistic C2 Environment. *Journal of Cognitive Engineering and Decision Making*, 4(2), 152–182.

Endsley, M. R., & Jones, D. G. (2025). *Designing for situation awareness: An approach to user-centered design*. CRC press.

Gigerenzer, G. (2023). *The intelligence of intuition*. Cambridge University Press.

Grauwde, M., Neerincx, M., & Kudina, O. (2023). Conversational agents for a deliberative age. *11th AAAI Conf. on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing (HCOMP)*.

Harbers, M. & Neerincx, M.A. (2017). Value sensitive design of a virtual assistant for workload harmonization in teams. *Cognition, Technology and Work*, 19, 329–343.

Haselager, P., Schraffenberger, H., Thill, S., Fischer, S., Lanillos, P., Van De Groes, S. & Van Hooff, M. (2024). Reflection machines: Supporting effective human oversight over medical decision support systems. *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, 33(3), 380–389.

Hicks, W.B., Pryor, M., Sprufera, J., Greene, A., Byrne, V., & McLaughlin, A.C. (2018). Time pressure and teams: Contextual factors influencing task experience when using a cognitive aid. *Proc. of the HFES Annual Meeting*, 62(1), 125–129.

Johnson, M., Bradshaw, J.M., Feltovich, P.J., Jonker, C.M., Van Riemsdijk, M.B. & Sierhuis, M. (2014). Coactive Design: Designing Support for Interdependence in Joint Activity. *Journal of Human-Robot Interaction*, 3(1), 43.

Kalasampath, K., Spoorthi, K., Sajeev, S., Kuppa, S.S., Ajay, K. & Angulakshmi, M. (2025). A literature review on applications of explainable artificial intelligence (XAI). *IEEE access*.

Kelly, J. R., & Loving, T. J. (2004). Time pressure and group performance: Exploring underlying processes in the attentional focus model. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40(2), 185–198.

Kerstholt, J. (1994). The effect of time pressure on decision-making behaviour in a dynamic task environment. *Acta Psychologica*, 86(1), 89–104.

Klonek, F., Gerpott, F. H., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., & Parker, S. K. (2019). Time to go wild: How to conceptualize and measure process dynamics in real teams with high-resolution. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 9(4), 245–275.

Miller, C., Funk, H., Wu, P., Goldman, R., Meisner, J., & Chapman, M. (2005). The playbook™ approach to adaptive automation. *Proceedings of the HFES annual meeting*, 49(1), 15–19.

Mioch, T., Peeters, M.M. & Neerincx, M.A. (2018). Improving adaptive human-robot cooperation through work agreements. *27th IEEE international symposium on robot and human interactive communication (RO-MAN)*, 1105–1110.

Moats, J. B., Chermack, T. J., & Dooley, L. M. (2008). Using scenarios to develop crisis managers: Applications of scenario planning and scenario-based training. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 10(3), 397–424.

Neerincx, M.A. (2003). Cognitive task load analysis: Allocating tasks and designing support. In *Handbook of Cognitive Task Design* (pp. 283–306). CRC Press.

Neerincx, M.A., van den Dobbelsteen, G., & Grootjen, M. (2003). Assessing cognitive distributions for envisioned task allocations and support functions. *SCSS Proceedings*.

Neerincx, M.A., van der Waa, J., Kaptein, F., & van Diggelen, J. (2018). Using Perceptual and Cognitive Explanations for Enhanced Human-Agent Team Performance. In D. Harris (Ed.), *Engineering Psychology and Cognitive Ergonomics* (pp. 204–214). Springer International Publishing.

O'Neill, T., McNeese, N., Barron, A., & Schelble, B. (2022). Human–autonomy teaming: A review and analysis of the empirical literature. *Human Factors*, 64(5), 904–938.

Rasmussen, J. (2012). Skills, rules, and knowledge; signals, signs, and symbols, and other distinctions in human performance models. *IEEE transactions on systems, man, and cybernetics*, (3), 257–266.

Sahoh, B., & Choksuriwong, A. (2023). The role of explainable artificial intelligence in high-stakes decision-making systems: A systematic review. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing*, 14(6), 7827–7843.

Schoonderwoerd, T. A., Jorritsma, W., Neerincx, M. A., & Van Den Bosch, K. (2021). Human-centered XAI: Developing design patterns for explanations of clinical decision support systems. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 154, 102684.

Schraagen, J.M., & David, L.Z. (2021). Resilience and team communication processes. *Tijdschrift voor Human Factors*, 46(46), 11.

Starcke, K., & Brand, M. (2012). Decision making under stress: A selective review. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 36(4), 1228–1248.

Streefkerk, J.W., van Esch-Bussemakers, M.P. & Neerincx, M.A. (2006). Designing personal attentive user interfaces in the mobile public safety domain. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 22(4), 749–770.

van Diggelen, J., Barnhoorn, J., Post, R., Sijs, J., van der Stap, N., & van der Waa, J. (2021). Delegation in human-machine teaming: Progress, challenges and prospects. *International Conference on Intelligent Human Systems Integration*, 10–16.

van Diggelen, J., Bosch, K. v. d., Neerincx, M., & Steen, M. (2023). Designing for Meaningful Human Control in Military Human-Machine Teams.

Van Diggelen, J., Neerincx, M., Peeters, M., & Schraagen, J. M. (2018). Developing effective and resilient human-agent teamwork using team design patterns. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 34(2), 15–24.

VanderWeele, T.J., et al. (2025). Moral trauma, moral distress, moral injury, and moral injury disorder: Definitions and assessments. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, 1422441.

Verhagen, R.S., Marcu, A., Neerincx, M.A., & Tielman, M.L. (2024). The influence of interdependence on trust calibration in human-machine teams. In *HHAI 2024: Hybrid human AI systems for the social good* (pp. 300–314). IOS Press.

Verhagen, R. S., Neerincx, M. A., Yang, X. J., & Tielman, M. L. (2025). Advancing human-machine teaming: Definitions, challenges, future directions. In *HHAI 2025* (pp. 49–59). IOS Press.

Wingerter, T. L., Straub, T., & Schweitzer, S. (2025). Mitigating automation bias in generative AI through nudges: A cognitive reflection test study. *Procedia Computer Science*, 270, 2106–2114.