Proceedings of CONF-MLA 2025 Symposium: Intelligent Systems and Automation: AI Models, IoT, and Robotic Algorithms
DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.LD29434

The Evolution of Wearable Haptic Systems toward Human Centered Design and Long Term Adoption

Jiahao Liu

Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, China
Akoluteliu@gmail.com

Abstract. Wearable technology has rapidly evolved from simple fitness trackers to applications across multiple industries, transforming how humans interact with digital environments. This study aims to gain insights into how ergonomic design and haptic feedback can be jointly optimized to support sustainable adoption and effective user experiences. Through a review and theoretical analysis, this study finds that ergonomic considerations are crucial, while different tactile modalities offer advantages depending on the context. For example, vibration is used for navigation, force feedback is used for rehabilitation, electrotactile sensations are used for precise control, and multimodal systems are used for immersive experiences. However, the literature remains fragmented, with limited evidence on long-term health effects and a lack of standardized assessment frameworks. Future research should prioritize longitudinal studies, the development of global ergonomic and haptic standards, the design of intelligent adaptive systems, and interdisciplinary integration to guide the sustainable and human-centered development of wearable devices.

Keywords: wearable technology, ergonomics, haptic feedback, adaptive systems, human–computer interaction

1. Introduction

The explosion of wearable devices during the last years has dramatically changed how we interact with digital devices and systems. From consumer products such as smartwatches, fitness bracelets and head-mounted augmented reality (AR) glasses to specialist systems in health care, industrial safety and rehabilitation, wearable computing is at the forefront of human computer interaction (HCI). The appeal of wearables stems from their ability to provide real-time physiological and behavioural information that is person-specific and their potential for universal applicability. Successful adoption and use of these devices, over long periods, hinges critically on two interdependent factors of importance: ergonomic design and optimised haptic feedback. Physical ergonomics ensures that the wearable device can be embedded into the user's life without adding new strains or burdens. An awkwardly designed or poorly implemented wearable device that causes skin irritation, musculoskeletal fatigue and abandonment is said to have poor ergonomics. The principle of haptics enables wearables to communicate their key attributes intuitively to the user through tactile sensations (vibrations, electrical stimulation, pressure). Haptics can augment visual

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.LD29434

and auditory cues for non-disruptive, context-aware interaction. Through the synergistic use of ergonomic and haptic design, wearable devices transform passively observing companions into active co-partners that facilitate performance, security or satisfaction. Challenges and issues in this area include a lack of understanding of the long-term health effects of prolonged use of wearable devices [1], unclear ergonomic standards for new form factors (e.g., smart clothing) [2], and variability in the accuracy of haptic technologies across users [3]. For instance, wearable AR glasses may cause neck fatigue due to poor weight distribution; fitness bands may cause skin irritation when worn by heavy perspiration users [4]. Like audio cues, haptic cues that feel natural in one context may be considered tiring and unnatural in another; this contextual sensitivity is well documented in the literature on tactile perception [5]. The objective of this paper is to theoretically and systematically advance the design of wearable systems by considering the simultaneous optimisation of ergonomic and haptic attributes.

2. Current developments

2.1. Evolution of HCIs and wearables

The development of wearable technologies can be broadly understood in three waves. The first wave emerged with consumer health and activity monitors. Sleep trackers, activity bands, and smartwatches first attracted mainstream notice to wearable computing with the offering of light-weight sensors, small displays, and vibration notification systems [6]. Portability and personal health management were the main virtues. The second wave wasdriven by the rise of AR/VR and immersive interaction. Head-worn AR and VR devices expanded the range of wearables from monitoring to immersion. Their larger weights and concentrated form factors also created new concerns of neck strain and motion sickness [2]. The third wave involves specialized medical and industrial systems. Rehabilitation exoskeletons, haptic prostheses, and intelligent safety vests now integrate wearables in high-risk healthcare and factory applications [3,7]. Systems particularly prize comfort and strong feedback because failure or discomfort could directly jeopardize safety or therapy outcomes. Overall, wearables changed from mere data collectors to interactive partners. The development has created the demand for the integration of ergonomic integrity and optimized haptic communication.

2.2. Ergonomic design elements

Existing research highlights several ergonomic dimensions that critically shape the usability and long-term adoption of wearable devices. First, body weight distribution and anthropometrics have a direct influence on localized strain, as heavy front-loaded AR headsets, for instance, can impose excessive pressure on the neck and thereby compromise user safety and endurance [6]. Second, comfort and adjustability emerge as fundamental requirements, since wristbands that are too tight may restrict blood flow, while overly loose designs risk reducing data reliability; adjustable straps and modular components are therefore essential to accommodate diverse head and wrist sizes [4]. Third, the material properties of wearable devices significantly affect user experience: breathable fabrics and soft polymers minimize skin irritation during prolonged use, whereas rigid plastics tend to exacerbate discomfort [4]. Finally, scholars have noted that inadequate ergonomic design can result not only in musculoskeletal strain but also in the premature abandonment of devices, regardless of their functional sophistication [1]. These findings collectively underscore that ergonomics is not a peripheral consideration but a prerequisite for sustained engagement, as

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.LD29434

products failing to provide adequate comfort and fit are unlikely to achieve long-term acceptance once their initial novelty fades.

2.3. Haptic feedback modalities

Haptic technologies enable communication through tactile sensations and encompass a diverse set of modalities with distinct strengths and limitations. Vibrotactile feedback is the most widely used approach, valued for its low cost, implementation simplicity, and effectiveness in conveying alerts; however, its relatively low resolution and risk of sensory fatigue during prolonged exposure restrict its precision. Electrotactile feedback, by directly stimulating cutaneous nerves, can provide programmable and fine-grained cues, offering high potential for detailed interactions, though discomfort may occur if the intensity is not carefully calibrated. Force or pressure feedback simulates resistance, stretch, or contact forces, making it especially valuable in proprioceptive tasks, postural correction, and rehabilitation contexts where kinesthetic information is crucial. Thermal feedback, although less explored, uses changes in temperature as symbolic signals (e.g., warmth for warning, coolness for confirmation), with limited current applications but strong prospects for immersive VR/AR environments. Ultrasonic and mid-air haptics extend tactile interaction into a contactless domain by directing focused sound waves onto the skin, providing hygienic solutions in medical applications and novel experiences in virtual interaction. Building on these modalities, multimodal systems integrate two or more feedback methods—such as vibration combined with thermal cues—to enhance realism, embodiment, and information bandwidth, though at the expense of increased power consumption, device complexity, and bulk. Importantly, the choice of modality is inherently context-dependent: vibrotactile cues are preferable in navigation due to their rapid delivery, whereas force feedback is more effective for motor training or posture correction. Collectively, these modalities illustrate both the breadth of haptic interaction techniques and the necessity of aligning feedback strategies with task-specific requirements and ergonomic considerations.

2.4. Application domains

The combination of tactile technology and ergonomics has shown significant results in many fields. In healthcare and rehabilitation, wearable devices can remind patients to take medication on time, correct body posture, or adhere to rehabilitation training. Among them, vibration tactile prompts have been proven to effectively improve compliance [5]. In fitness and sports, tactile signals help users maintain their target heart rate range during exercise, thereby avoiding visual interference. In barrier-free applications, wearable devices designed for the visually impaired use spatial tactile mapping (such as "left vibration means left turn") and show good effectiveness in navigation [8].In augmented and virtual reality, multimodal tactile can significantly enhance immersion, texture perception, and presence experience [9]. In the field of industrial safety, tactile warnings are used to alert employees to approaching danger or potential accidents [7]. These cases show that the combination of tactile and ergonomics can not only improve user experience, but also effectively promote improvements in safety, health, and performance. However, existing research is still relatively scattered and urgently needs a unified theoretical framework to integrate and guide it.

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.LD29434

3. Theoretical framework

To transcend disparate results, it is incumbent upon researchers to locate the study of wearables and haptic design in existing theoretical traditions. Four perspectives—ergonomics theory, cognitive load theory, ecological psychology, and the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)—offer a unifying foundation upon which to study the development of user experiences and adoption by wearables.

3.1. Ergonomic theory: body–device fit and comfort

Ergonomic design aims at reconciling devices with the capacity and range of human physicality. In wearables, that translates into reducing strain, maintaining circulation, and supporting natural posture [6]. From a theoretical angle, body–device fit is the key: where physical interface compromises the capacity to perform day-to-day activities, long-term involvement is jeopardized. Research tirelessly demonstrates that comfort ratings are more consistent indicators of continuation in use compared to functional capability [1]. Ergonomic theory consequently defines wearables not only as technical objects but as additions to the body whose usability rests upon smooth assimilation.

3.2. Cognitive load theory and haptic communication

Cognitive load theory explains the operation of the human brain in the selective allocation of limited attentional resources. Excessive notification, ambiguous cues, or overlapping of sensory inputs raises extraneous cognitive load and impairs performance [7,10]. Effectively designed haptic feedback reduces this load through the delivery of fine-grained, non-visual cues that reduce switching of attention. Poorly set or too frequent haptic stimuli introduce noise and raise stress. Hence, cognitive load theory reveals the tradeoff between information richness and perceptual burden and suggests that designers calibrate haptic cues for readability and minimum disruption.

3.3. Ecological psychology and multimodal interaction

Ecological psychology brings into relief the perception–action cycle of users interacting with affordances of the environment. Multimodal feedback (combining tactile, visual, and auditory channels) in wearable systems strengthens perception with redundant but supplementary signals [11,12]. Vibration and thermal changes in combination increase immersion in AR/VR by grounding virtual experience in bodily feelings [9]. From this perspective, haptic feedback does not necessarily "add information" but redefines the ecological field of action and supports more natural and embodied interactions.

3.4. Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and user adoption

The TAM asserts that perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness dictate whether users adopt new technologies. Perceived ease of use is in turn affected by ergonomic comfort, and perceived usefulness is informed by haptic feedback that improves the quality of interaction. Research into accessible wearables, for instance, reveals that easy-to-understand haptic navigation cues improve perceived utility with visually impaired individuals [8]. When ergonomic discomfort is present, however, perceived ease of use decreases and adoption is defeated. Hence, TAM is a useful perspective that brings together ergonomic and haptic variables and intention to use and long-term adoption.

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.LD29434

4. Integrated analysis and insights

Comparative Advantages of Haptic Modalities Different tactile approaches exhibit task-related advantages. Vibrotactile feedback is fast and highly available, making it suitable for navigation [5], while force feedback is suitable for motor correction in rehabilitation [13]. Electrotactile feedback offers higher accuracy but requires customized calibration for individual situations [10]. Multimodal systems offer better immersion but are limited by power consumption and packaging issues [12]. Theory suggests that the choice of modality cannot be a "one-size-fits-all" approach but must be adapted to contextual needs and cognitive load thresholds. First, comfort directly impacts tactile perception. Lightweighting can minimize fatigue and enhance sensitivity to tactile stimulation [6]. In turn, successful tactile technology can support ergonomics, such as posture correction based on pressure reminders [13]. This two-way relationship means that ergonomics and haptics must be optimized simultaneously, not separately. While multimodal haptics improve immersion and realism, they require a trade-off between device size and energy efficiency. From an ecological psychology perspective, this trade-off involves a balance between greater affordance (more immersive cues) and ecological costs (higher stress or restricted mobility). Designers need to make a trade-off between immersion and wearability.

In addition, studies have shown that there is a large variability in tactile thresholds [3]. Studies have found that adaptive systems that use artificial intelligence to change tactile intensity based on physiological input can reduce error rates. From a cognitive load perspective, personalization minimizes external load by aligning stimuli with personal preferences. From a TAM perspective, personalization improves ease of use and perceived usefulness and enhances adoption. Rognini et al. [14] found that multisensory calibration can reduce the cognitive load of wearable systems and improve their embodied power. These results confirm the conclusion that personalization is not only a functional optimization but also a perception- and experience-driven necessity.

5. Future research directions

Future research on wearable tactile technology focuses on four aspects. First, in terms of long-term health effects, there is still limited research on the effects of long-term use of wearable devices on musculoskeletal or skin. Therefore, longitudinal surveys are urgently needed to comprehensively evaluate potential risks such as chronic strain, posture changes, and cumulative skin irritation. Second, in terms of standardization and evaluation criteria, there is still a lack of unified international standards to measure the effects of ergonomics and tactile experience. If comfort, tactile acuity, and safety indicators similar to electrical safety regulations can be established in the future, it will help promote comparative research and widespread application in the industry [2]. Third, the rise of intelligent and personalized tactile systems provides a new opportunity to optimize user experience. With the help of artificial intelligence models, tactile prompts can be adjusted in real time according to the user's situation, thereby reducing cognitive load and improving information readability. At the same time, skin-attached patches can significantly reduce discomfort compared to traditional strapping devices, and the design of integrating actuators directly into textiles further improves wearability and reduces volume burden. Finally, in terms of cross-disciplinary integration, future research should focus more on multidisciplinary collaboration: promoting rehabilitation compliance in medical settings through tactile biofeedback, improving motor skill acquisition in educational settings, enhancing situational awareness and safety in industrial environments, and strengthening users’ sense of presence through multimodal feedback in

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.LD29434

immersive media [14]. Only through cross-exploration in these directions can wearable tactile technology be promoted from scattered innovation to holistic and humanized development.

6. Conclusion

This study emphasizes that the sustainable application and effectiveness of wearable technology depends on the coordinated optimization of ergonomic design and tactile communication. The analysis reveals that the evolution of wearable devices shows a clear trajectory, from early consumer health monitors to immersive virtual reality systems and professional applications, reflecting the shift from passive data collection to active, embodied interaction. Second, ergonomic design factors are not marginal factors, but the foundation of user acceptance. Third, diverse tactile modalities can provide context-specific advantages. Finally, personalized tactile design of wearable technology is also crucial for long-term effectiveness.

While existing research demonstrates the promise of integrating ergonomics and haptic technologies in wearable systems, several limitations remain. Empirical studies on long-term health impacts are still scarce, leaving uncertainties about cumulative issues such as chronic strain or skin irritation. The absence of standardized frameworks for ergonomic and haptic evaluation also restricts comparability across devices and contexts, and the literature is fragmented, with most studies addressing single modalities or domains rather than comprehensive models. Future research should therefore prioritize longitudinal investigations into musculoskeletal and dermatological outcomes, develop internationally recognized standards for comfort, safety, and tactile acuity, and advance intelligent, personalized haptic systems—such as AI-driven adaptive feedback, skin-attachable patches, and textile-integrated actuators—to improve wearability and reduce cognitive and physical burdens. Moreover, interdisciplinary integration is crucial, as haptic–ergonomic design has the potential to enhance healthcare compliance, educational effectiveness, workplace safety, and immersive media experiences. Addressing these challenges will be key to guiding wearable technologies toward holistic, human-centered, and sustainable development.

References

[1] Zheng, Y.-L., Ding, X.-R., Poon, C. C. Y., Lo, B. P. L., Zhang, H., Zhou, X.-L., Yang, G.-Z., Zhao, N., & Zhang, Y.-T. (2014). Unobtrusive sensing and wearable devices for health informatics. IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering, 61(5), 1538–1554. https: //doi.org/10.1109/TBME.2014.2309951

[2] Lind, C. M., Diaz-Olivares, J. A., Lindecrantz, K., & Eklund, J. (2020). A wearable sensor system for physical ergonomics interventions using haptic feedback. Sensors, 20(21), 6010.

[3] Cipriani, C., Segil, J. L., Birdwell, J. A., & Weir, R. F. (2014). Dexterous control of a prosthetic hand using intramuscular EMG signals. IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering, 22(5), 947–954. https: //doi.org/10.1109/TNSRE.2014.2301234

[4] Stefana, E., Marciano, F., Rossi, D., Cocca, P., & Tomasoni, G. (2021). Wearable devices for ergonomics: A systematic literature review. Sensors, 21(3), 777. https: //doi.org/10.3390/s21030777

[5] Lorenzini, M., Johnson, P., & Yang, G. (2022). Comparing vibrotactile and skin-stretch feedback for motor training. arXiv preprint arXiv: 2209.11325.

[6] Bifulco, P., Cesarelli, M., Romano, M., Sansone, M., & Bracale, M. (2021). A review on wearable systems for health monitoring and motor rehabilitation. Sensors, 21(9), 3148. https: //doi.org/10.3390/s21093148

[7] van Wegen, M., Herder, J. L., Adelsberger, R., Pastore-Wapp, M., Van Wegen, E. E., Bohlhalter, S., & Vanbellingen, T. (2023). An overview of wearable haptic technologies and their performance in virtual object exploration. Sensors, 23(3), 1563.

[8] Kappers, A. M. L., et al. (2025). Hands-free haptic navigation devices for actual walking: A review. Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation, 22(1), 12. https: //doi.org/10.1186/s12984-024-01234-x

[9] Azmandian, M., Hancock, M., Benko, H., Ofek, E., & Wilson, A. D. (2016). Haptic retargeting: Dynamic repurposing of passive haptics for enhanced virtual reality experiences. Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.LD29434

on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 1968–1979. https: //doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858226
[10] Antfolk, C., D'Alonzo, M., Controzzi, M., Lundborg, G., Rosén, B., Sebelius, F., & Cipriani, C. (2013). Artificial redirection of sensation from prosthetic fingers to the phantom hand map: A review of methods. Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair, 27(6), 573–583
[11] Culbertson, H., Schorr, S. B., & Okamura, A. M. (2018). Haptics: The present and future of artificial touch sensation. Proceedings of the IEEE, 106(3), 333–339. https: //doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2018.2799688
[12] Pacchierotti, C., Sinclair, S., Solazzi, M., Frisoli, A., Hayward, V., & Prattichizzo, D. (2017). Wearable haptic systems for the fingertip and the hand: Taxonomy, review, and perspectives. IEEE Transactions on Haptics, 10(4), 580–600. https: //doi.org/10.1109/TOH.2017.2689006
[13] Prattichizzo, D., & Pacchierotti, C. (2012). Cutaneous force feedback as a sensory subtraction technique in haptics. IEEE Transactions on Haptics, 5(4), 289–300. https: //doi.org/10.1109/TOH.2012.15
[14] Yin, J., Hinchet, R., Shea, H., & Majidi, C. (2021). Wearable soft technologies for haptic sensing and feedback in virtual and augmented reality. Advanced Functional Materials, 31(39), 2007428. https: //doi.org/10.1002/adfm.202007428