

Users are the North Star for AI Transparency

Alex Mei^{*1}, Michael Saxon^{*1}, Shiyu Chang¹, Zachary C. Lipton², William Yang Wang¹

¹Department of Computer Science, University of California, Santa Barbara

²Department of Computer Science, Carnegie Mellon University

{alexmei, chang87, william}@cs.ucsb.edu, saxon@ucsb.edu, zlipton@cmu.edu

Abstract

Despite widespread calls for *transparent* artificial intelligence systems, the term is too overburdened with disparate meanings to express precise policy aims or to orient concrete lines of research. Consequently, stakeholders often talk past each other, with policymakers expressing vague demands and practitioners devising solutions that may not address the underlying concerns. Part of why this happens is that a clear ideal of AI transparency goes unsaid in this body of work. We explicitly name such a *north star*—transparency that is user-centered, user-appropriate, and honest. We conduct a broad literature survey, identifying many clusters of similar conceptions of transparency, tying each back to our north star with analysis of how it furthers or hinders our ideal AI transparency goals. We conclude with a discussion on common threads across all the clusters, to provide clearer common language whereby policymakers, stakeholders, and practitioners can communicate concrete demands and deliver appropriate solutions. We hope for future work on AI transparency that further advances confident, user-beneficial goals and provides clarity to regulators and developers alike.

1 Introduction

The discourse surrounding the societal impacts of artificial intelligence (AI) systems abounds with calls, both in popular demands and formal regulations, for greater *transparency*. Sometimes these demands invoke the word *transparency* directly, while other cases invoke similarly vague surrogates like “meaningful information” [Voigt, 2018]. However, the term is too overloaded with distinct meanings to express concrete policy objectives or technical claims alone [Andrada et al., 2022]. The term is a prototypical example of AI’s suitcase words [Lipton and Steinhardt, 2018]. Although this breadth can be valuable in uniting members of disparate research communities toward high-level desiderata, concrete aims and advances must be expressed in more precise language. Unfortunately, researchers, corporations, journalists,

regulators, and members of the general public often invoke *transparency* in contexts where greater precision is required and consequently, talk past each other.

Depending on the context, researchers may invoke *transparency* in connection with data collection [Driscoll and Walker, 2014; Agozie and Kaya, 2021], data processing [Kirrane et al., 2021], interpretable systems [Lipton, 2018; Watson and Nations, 2019], or fairness issues [Castillo, 2019], among other concerns (Table 1). Even in European Union (EU) regulations, which pioneered global AI policy, particularly the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [Voigt, 2018], and the Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI [on AI, 2019], the vague demands for “meaningful information” and “comprehensible language” have forced legal scholars and AI practitioners to speculate the precise meaning of *transparency* [Wachter et al., 2017; Selbst and Powles, 2018]. Can these disparate research threads be unified to advance a coherent vision for improved AI transparency?

We believe that **ideal AI transparency gives users and stakeholders the tools to rationally, autonomously, and confidently decide for themselves whether an AI system and its decisions are trustworthy**. In particular, this means explanations or descriptions that are *user-appropriate*, *user-centered*, and *honest*. We define these attributes as follows.

- **User-appropriate:** information conveyed to a stakeholder is understandable in content, style, and level of detail
- **User-centered:** insightful regarding the behaviors observed by a user in their own interactions with a system
- **Honest:** true, as comprehensive as necessary, and without intent to deceive by system builders or owners

In this paper, we provide a **condensed overview of the diverse conceptualizations of transparency in the AI literature**, identify commonalities and differences among them, and discuss how each ties in to our transparency ideal. We identify three overarching *factors* with which transparency is invoked concerning the machine learning pipeline—data (§2), systems (§3), and outputs (§4). We divide our literature review into sections based on these factors and identify specific *clusters* of thematically related research. For each cluster, we summarize the high-level issues it approaches, briefly detail a representative study, and provide remarks on its promise and obstacles to advancing the high-level goal of

^{*}Equal contribution

Perspective	Definition of <i>transparency</i>
Public Policy	Any meaningful information relating to consumer data is disclosed in comprehensible language [Voigt, 2018; on AI, 2019].
Data Collection	Disclosure of collection methods and privacy policies in a consumer-understandable manner [Driscoll and Walker, 2014; Agozie and Kaya, 2021].
Data Processing	Comprehensible disclosure of methods in which consumer data is processed, stored, and used [Kirrane et al., 2021].
Reproducibility	Disclosure of important information to reproduce a system’s performance [Gundersen and Kjensmo, 2018]
Intelligibility	Disclosure of pertinent system functionality and limitations comprehensible to stakeholders [Vaughan and Wallach, 2020; Ehsan et al., 2021].
Interpretability	Explanation that aids understanding of system functionality [Lipton, 2018; Watson and Nations, 2019].
Fairness	Disclosure regarding representation and treatment to ensure equity among groups [Castillo, 2019; Bhatt et al., 2021].

Table 1: Seven examples of how *transparency* can be defined from different perspectives, with citations containing usage as such.

transparency in AI. We conclude by discussing commonalities and conflicts between the factors and clusters and meditate on the role transparency research will play in a world increasingly dominated by AI systems and services (§5).

2 Data-Related Transparency Factors

One key thrust for transparency work centers on the *inputs* required to produce an AI system. These studies focus on the intent behind [Gebru et al., 2021], composition of [Weissgerber et al., 2016], or use limitations for [Bertino et al., 2019a] datasets as well as address the conflicts that can arise between transparency and user concerns about data privacy and security [Jordan et al., 2020; Beam et al., 2020]. Research toward these factors often explores ways to strike a balance between increasing overall transparency to reap the attendant benefits regarding fairness, accountability, and trust, while mitigating the potential losses vis-a-vis privacy and security.

For our analysis of data-related transparency, we distinguish between works focused on information about *training data used to produce models* (§2.1), and about the *active use of user data by a system* (§2.2) in the course of its operation.

2.1 Transparency on Model Training Data

The behaviors of machine learning systems fundamentally follow from the nature of their training data. Information about model training data is thus integral to addressing fairness concerns and ensuring quality [Yanisky-Ravid and Hallisey, 2019]. Policymakers have begun to mandate disclosures around training data [Voigt, 2018] and downstream developers and vendors desire understanding of training dataset limitations [Felzmann et al., 2019] and model-data usage [Bhatt et al., 2020]. To reach these desired goals, [Bertino et al., 2019b] introduce the terms *record/use transparency* as well as *disclosure/data-provisioning transparency*. While both involve assessing the limitations of training datasets, the former is oriented toward holistic quality in AI systems, while the latter focuses more narrowly on issues of data misuse.

Record transparency is achieved by describing datasets with enough contextual information for developers to understand how to use them. Use transparency—defined as communicating the specific purposes for which a dataset is appropriate—often complements with record transparency. For example, *datasheets for datasets* provide both record and use transparency to developers when the data provider details the production and intended use for a resource

[Gebru et al., 2021]. Other studies have improved upon these fact sheets with interviews [Hind et al., 2020] and outlining dataset production best practices that enable more effective and comprehensive documentation [Hutchinson et al., 2021].

In terms of disclosure/data-provisioning transparency, previous works have found disambiguation of terminology, visualization, and logging systems [Bertino et al., 2019b] particularly useful. These studies claim that these efforts can help unite researchers using the data under a unifying terminology [Calgua, 2022] and protected consumer groups (e.g., children) [Milkaite and Lievens, 2020] better understand the data process, which in turn provides for better data transparency.

Our view. Dataset datasheets and other associated record transparency techniques are useful for our core transparency goals, insofar as they enable downstream developers and system providers to more *honestly* describe the conditions under which their system was produced. Furthermore, along with data provisioning transparency techniques the proper *social situatedness* of systems can be ensured, as behaviors including differential performance across protected classes or ingestion of data from protected consumer groups can be accounted for prior to deployment.

However, strong rules and norms that incentivize system developers and providers to actually implement honest and socially situated transparency are needed to ensure that this data information leads to ideal AI transparency for users.

2.2 Transparency on the Handling of User Data

Most if not all useful AI systems must ingest some user data to function. Demand for transparency around the use of this data is natural considering the privacy and security implications. While many consider entities who collect, process, store, or train models on user data responsible for respecting user privacy and ensuring secure data handling [Camp, 2015], the specifics of sufficient responsibility or due diligence tends to be underspecified [Wieringa et al., 2021].

Data policy in the US (and other jurisdictions) is largely unregulated, providing industry with free reign [Amos et al., 2021]. Consequently, in unregulated territories, the common practice is to use standard privacy notices written in legal jargon, offering users the option to agree or decline. On one side, users may feel forced to accept policies without understanding or contesting them due to a lack of alternatives. [Jensen and Potts, 2004]. Contrarily, unaware that this disclosure only appears transparent, users may falsely believe they have control. [Acquisti et al., 2013]. By con-

trast, the EU has taken a more active approach, passing legislation concerning data policy and consumer privacy. Last decade, the [Voigt, 2018] introduces the *GDPR*, and among other concerns, demands “more comprehensible information to end users” in applicable regions. These demands form the basis of data governance, but require more clarity and precision [Grünewald and Pallas, 2021].

Despite user privacy calls remaining gray, calls for data protection of consensually collected data are more concrete. Classic security research findings are directly applicable in this domain [Kantarcioglu and Shaon, 2019; Naucke et al., 2019]. However, the assurance of data protection to stakeholders by providers is a separate problem. A simple solution is to provide a standardized checklist answerable to the common user when transparency of data is clearly communicated [Laoutaris, 2018]. Examples of questions include “is it leaking to other unintended recipients?” and “what are the consequences of such leakage?” Norms around answering such questions motivate developers to mitigate identifiable risks.

In addition to legal compliance, companies often address consumer privacy and security concerns to win consumer favor [Morey et al., 2015]. To achieve this, clarity and precision in disclosure in a manner that does not harm privacy and security is necessary [Firmani et al., 2019].

Our view. Ensuring the privacy and security of user data is a core *user-centered* requirement. As privacy and security are generally desired, providers have a natural incentive to assure users of their protection. This can lead to natural tensions with *user-appropriateness* and *honesty* concerns. Complex pipelines can have many points of failure, and selling user data is often a profit center for system providers. Given this conflict between user desires and business realities, why provide true privacy when you can lie? Resolving this tension may require strong societal norms and regulation.

When new rights around user data access, understanding, and protection such as those in *GDPR* are granted, *transparency tools* that actually enable users to exercise these rights must follow. Producing them is an open technical question in itself [Hedbom, 2009]. Hedbom identifies these as requiring both system-level insight (§3.2, §3.3) and an ability to understand decision-level modifications required to change output behavior (§4.1).

3 System-Centered Transparency Factors

We consider here any work toward elucidating the functionality and quality of AI systems—including methods directed at both practitioners and users. Practitioners often need to debug models or reproduce results more easily [Beam et al., 2020]. On the other hand, users tend to simply desire a basic overview of a system’s function for confidence in its functionality [Mei et al., 2022a] (§3.1). Many ML systems are *black boxes*, providing no insight into the connection between input and output. This fundamental lack of functional transparency hinders the *explainability* (§3.2) of the system’s downstream outcomes [Adadi and Berrada, 2018; Doran et al., 2017]. Neural networks, quintessential black boxes [Castelvecchi, 2016], are

so dominant in AI research that papers claiming to “open the black box” have been steadily published for at least 20 years [Dayhoff and DeLeo, 2001]. More recently, *automated rationale generation* (§3.3) from model-internal states has also grown in popularity [Ehsan et al., 2019].

3.1 System Function Disclosure

System function disclosure includes communications by system producers, owners, or vendors concerning the capabilities and limitations of their systems. A challenge in making prescriptions around this sort of transparency is that system function disclosures target a diverse set of audiences, including external developers building around/needing to understand a system [Felzmann et al., 2019; Vaughan and Wallach, 2020], lay users of a system [Saxon et al., 2021], or regulatory bodies [on AI, 2019]. The Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) even considers this sort of disclosure required in its Code of Ethics [Gotterbarn et al., 2018].

Frameworks for concise communication of model strengths and limitations are instrumental to effective system function disclosure. For example, *model cards* provide a simple set of data points for developers to communicate the limits and intended use-cases of their models [Mitchell et al., 2019]. However, prescribing that disclosure takes place doesn’t ensure that the disclosure contains useful information, or the information provided will be relevant and understandable to those consuming it. To address this issue, work on qualitatively evaluate the disclosure sufficiency with rubrics [Barclay et al., 2019; Barclay et al., 2021], or automatically assessing the layperson-comprehensibility of a system function description [Saxon et al., 2021] have been proposed.

A further challenge to system function disclosure is that, in many cases, even experts don’t know precisely how black box systems mechanistically produce output from input [Rudin, 2019]—thus explainability and interpretability techniques can be prerequisites for the level of expert understanding needed to produce *honest* disclosure (§3.2).

A common limitation to many ML techniques applied in sensitive settings (e.g., medicine, criminal justice, employment) is the invisibility of external social context to the model. As biases and oversights in training data propagate to learned systems, system developers require clarity from data providers (§2.1) to ensure that they can in turn communicate the problems of their systems [Geburu et al., 2021]. Furthermore, in these complex settings systems often lack the sort of commonsense knowledge that is required to effectively operate in a human-centered environment [Riedl, 2019]. Apart from solving the problem of commonsense reasoning in AI, actively soliciting direct user feedback to contextualize failure cases [Suzor et al., 2019] is one practical way to bootstrap documentation of model weaknesses.

However, even if perfect information about a model’s strengths and weaknesses (which is difficult to gain) and strong explanations of its internal functional details are available, calibrating explanations to be comprehensible to diverse stakeholders is still a confounding problem. In short, different groups require different explanations, and have different levels of expertise. Insufficient disclosure may be unsatisfy-

ing, but too much disclosure may result in information overload, and lower user trust [Knowles, 2017]. To combat this issue, it is crucial to understand the desired ends of each stakeholder and information in a manner that balances this duality [Vaughan and Wallach, 2020].

Our view. At its best, system function disclosure advances the goals of both *user-centric* and *honest* communication. Users who understand how a system works are empowered to make their own decisions regarding it. However, ensuring that these communications are *user-appropriate* is particularly challenging, as considerable expertise is involved in producing the systems, and they sometimes aren't easily reduced to layperson-appropriate explanations [Xu et al., 2021].

Furthermore, enhanced system-level transparency may introduce security risks, as information about the function of a system can be utilized by prospective attackers [Jordan et al., 2020]. Balancing the needs of disclosure and security must be performed carefully—we hope future work will guide norms and regulations toward such a balance.

3.2 Explainable AI and Causality

This section discusses transparency through information provided by systems, rather than human disclosure (§3.1). We will focus on the connection between *explainable AI* techniques and transparency, rather than a complete overview.

Many simple ML models, such as decision trees or support vector machines are fundamentally, casually explainable [Rudin, 2019]. However, these simple models lack the flexibility of opaque neural networks [Castelvecchi, 2016]. Some attempts to render neural nets more interpretable focus on converting their massive inscrutable internal weight matrices into something simpler, such as training under constraints like forced sparsity [Du et al., 2019], or distillation to an explainable student model (such as a simpler linear classifier) whose outputs can then be analyzed [Tan et al., 2018].

Other methods instead directly peek inside the black box. Some neural net architectures, such as attention mechanisms, are often presented as being fundamentally interpretable due to their easy generation of salience maps which provide insight into the output correlation of input features [Ribeiro et al., 2016; Hendricks et al., 2016]. However, it is debated whether these maps provide any explanatory or actionable insight into how these architectures actually operate [Jain and Wallace, 2019; Wiegrefe and Pinter, 2019]. Due to their poor intelligibility to end-users these “explanations” can even lower user trust for a system [Schmidt et al., 2020].

Input influence methods are often positioned as explainability techniques. Influence functions to interpret input variations [Koh and Liang, 2017] and quantitative measures to capture an input's degree of influence [Datta et al., 2016] have diverged from the causality interpretation [Hamon et al., 2021] of good explanations. Removal of all confounding variables from natural datasets is realistic-to-impossible. Thus, models trained on natural data—including naturally interpretable regression models—will not reflect a causal relationship. Doing so requires identifying a backdoor adjustment variable set which, when conditioned on, guarantees causality by eliminating all confounders [Pearl, 2009]. Only when these variables are condi-

tioned upon can we assume that a statistical correlation does imply causation. Rarely is this condition satisfied.

Explainability through *counterfactual reasoning* [Wachter et al., 2017], leverages counterfactuals to explain what inputs achieve desired outputs. Without altering black-box models, this is an effective strategy that uses propositional logic to provide interpretable reasoning to users, where they can decide whether a decision is trustworthy. For example, if the reasoning were based on a protected variable, it would be obvious the machine is discriminating. However, if the reason were poor credit history for a loan application, the decision would be reasonably sound and trusted by the user.

Our view. Strevens argues that a good explanation answers a “why” question [Strevens, 2011]. We are inclined to agree, and believe that explanations establishing a true causal interpretation best advance the ideals of *honesty* and *user-centricity*, as a causal explanation empowers users with understanding of how their chosen inputs affect outputs. However, with increasing complexity of systems, producing *user-comprehensible* explanations grows ever more challenging. We hope for further work to improve this state of affairs.

We view “explanations” grounded in non-causal relationships such as feature maps or influence functions to be of dubious honesty to end-users. While they are useful for expert analysis and debugging, they could be persuasively employed to trick critics into trusting a system in which trust is not deserved. As *automation bias* is generally an issue with the organizational deployment of automated systems, care must be taken to ensure that *socially situated* and properly contextualized explanations be given to users to ensure trustworthiness [Ehsan et al., 2021]. Thus, it is imperative that policymakers receive clear messaging from the research community on the strengths and limitations of explainable AI systems.

3.3 Generated Rationales

[Ehsan et al., 2019] introduce *automated rationale generation*, an alternative form of explainability that seeks to map a model's internal state into human-interpretable rationales in natural language. While these generated rationales are not guaranteed through causality to be correct, they provide insight into language models' reasoning abilities [Rajani et al., 2019]. These rationales can help users fact-check outputs to mitigate the potential for misinformation [Mei et al., 2022b].

Multiple failure modes exist for these rationales, including *hallucination* by the natural language generating component, which can lead models to provide rationales that differ from the system's decision. [Jacovi and Goldberg, 2020] provides a survey on faithfulness, defined to capture the community consensus on measuring the hallucination of explanations. Namely, explanations are unfaithful if either of these conditions is satisfied: an explanation does not match the decision, or two explanations differ for similar inputs and outputs. Unfaithful models can contribute to unintentional deception and detract from user confidence. As a result, several studies focus on improving model faithfulness [Zhang et al., 2021; Lakkaraju et al., 2019].

Our view. Although they risk incorrectness, these rationales have the potential to further the *user-appropriateness* and *user-centricity* ideals. Such research is fundamentally oriented toward providing user-interpretable rationales. Should the evaluation metrics align with human comprehensibility, the generations rationales are style-appropriate.

However, extreme care must be taken in crafting norms around these systems to ensure that *honesty* is centered. After all, the ability for a system to generate some rationale for its decision is no guarantee of its accuracy. Future research to resolve this issue might take the form of some kind of higher-level fact checking to ensure that these rationales are true, but evaluating NLG explanations is a challenge [Clinciu and Hastie, 2019]. Lay users must be educated on the degree of trust that these systems deserve to mitigate these risks.

4 Output-Oriented Transparency Factors

Output-oriented transparency is directed toward ensuring sufficient system performance for stakeholders. This thread of research distinguishes how similar concepts in the system demonstration space are differentiated (§4.1), such as *repeatability*, *replicability*, and *reproducibility* [ACM, 2016] as well as exact, empirical, and conceptual reproducibility [Aguinis and Solarino, 2019]. Studies in this direction face problems around the *degree* of transparency disclosure, weighing competing considerations of providing sufficient information about a system to a stakeholder without overloading information [Pieters, 2011; Saxon et al., 2021]. These discussions about system demonstration are often motivated by a desire for fairness, accountability, or trust [Vaughan and Wallach, 2020; Felzmann et al., 2019], which are often positively associated with increased transparency (§4.2). Explainable models can promote fairness and accountability, but only if properly aligned. Misaligned explanations can harm privacy and security [Strobel, 2019; Shokri et al., 2021] (§2.2).

4.1 System Demonstrability

System demonstration is necessary to support claims of function, performance (§3.1), consistency, privacy, and security (§2.2). Works within this cluster typically concern *repeatability*, *replicability*, or *reproducibility* as defined by the ACM [Mora-Cantallops et al., 2021]. Of these notions, repeatability is the easiest to articulate—repeatable systems and methods produce the same outputs over the same inputs and experimental setup; this basic result consistency is generally assumed and not further discussed [Duggin and Robinove, 1990]. The other two notions, replicability and reproducibility receive more attention in the AI transparency literature [Beg et al., 2021; Lucic et al., 2021]. Both these forms require a different team to achieve the same system performance with the same setup (replicability) or a different setup (reproducibility).

Technologies including cloud storage and compute services, environment management systems, and interactive multimedia/code documents [Vögtlin et al., 2020], can all enable more replicable research. Relying solely on these

technologies to ensure replicability has limitations. Persisting cloud instances or sharing machine images can be costly, difficult, or against the policies of research entities [Clyburne-Sherin et al., 2019]. Packages may have unstable dependencies and sit outside of public package repositories, hindering the utility of automated environment management systems. Identical experimental setups may be difficult due to software versioning or physical hardware. Jupyter notebooks and other combined media/code documents are vulnerable to these issues; additionally, they can introduce problematic user interface factors that further hinder replicability, such as unclear order of operations. Moreover, even if all hurdles to technical replicability are overcome, the overall reproducibility of an experiment may be preempted by non-technical factors.

ML study reproducibility can require varying levels of strictness and precision, such as exact, empirical, or conceptual reproduction [Mora-Cantallops et al., 2021; Aguinis and Solarino, 2019]. As the procedure abstracts conceptually, it becomes harder to draw the same conclusions empirically, thus increasing robustness. For example, procedures using different hyper-parameters and achieving similar results can show that a system is robust [Brendel et al., 2019]. As researchers strive for conceptual reproducibility of their work, the credibility and robustness of the concepts, models, and ideas will increase as the ability to demonstrate a model’s performance directly relates to the certainty of its performance.

Our view. The distinctions of repeatability, replicability, and reproducibility, as well as the types of reproducibility encourage *honesty* from developers. Such terminology fosters an atmosphere of precise communication that mitigates confusion and deception from the potential for terminology overloading, thereby also encouraging robust AI systems. Additionally, this research cluster heavily intertwines with *user-appropriateness*. In the optimal setting, disclosure regarding system demonstrability should be granular enough to allow duplication of results, while mitigating unnecessary information. However, in practice, the context in which this disclosure is conveyed is important as these details could be instead used as an information overload tactic to deceive downstream users into trusting such a system by touting robustness, when in reality such a user would not find this information meaningful nor likely have the resources to duplicate such results. To this end, we believe these efforts should empower stakeholders with more helpful information to decide whether adapting such AI systems make sense for their respective use case, but are not necessarily relevant for the downstream user.

4.2 Fairness and Accountability

Transparency is crucial for ensuring fairness. Lack of transparency raises fairness concerns and undermines trust in AI systems. Inaccurate results can come from two forms: system fragility and systematic bias. Fragile systems are poor quality applications that need to be validated to ensure reproducibility, for general usability (§4.1). Once a system is adequately robust to technical bugs, systems may still be systematically biased, where decisions are unfair toward some groups, raising eyebrows for regulators. Similarly, negative

decisions for users lead to dissatisfaction and a desire for interpretable explanations. With uninterpretable decisions, we raise the same concerns [Toreini *et al.*, 2020]. An application outside of AI occurs in content moderation, which often lacks transparency in moderating decisions made (i.e., suspension) [Suzor *et al.*, 2019]. The lack of explainability often reduces consumer and public trust [Toreini *et al.*, 2020] for fairness [Veale *et al.*, 2018] and accuracy [McSherry, 2005]. Explainable models increase accountability for fairness concerns.

While unfair decisions to a consumer’s detriment are a focus, [Wang *et al.*, 2020] introduces *favorability bias*, where users perceive a system decision as fair when that decision is beneficial. Beneficial decisions are skewed in favor of a trusted, fair decision, while unfavorable decisions are the contrary [Liao *et al.*, 2022; Springer and Whittaker, 2018]. Thus, a call for both interpretability and human disclosure is needed to alleviate these concerns.

Our view. Work in this cluster encourages *honesty* from systems and developers. A proactive stance on fairness encourages increasingly transparent and explainable models, to allow for accountability. Naturally, fairness involves *social context* as accountability is desired to mitigate systemic bias.

5 Discussion

In spite of their sometimes contradictory goals, each of the aforementioned clusters has a role to play in realizing our ideal vision for AI transparency. We conclude by discussing common across the overarching factors and clusters of transparency research, motivated around *study attributes* where these commonalities and conflicts play out. In particular, we discuss how **desired ends**, **associated stakeholders**, and **utilized means** relate and differ across them, and how these attributes can either advance or hinder our ideal of *user-appropriate*, *user-centered*, and *honest* AI transparency.

5.1 Desired Ends

Different stakeholders in transparency work have different desired ends [Weller, 2017; Felzmann *et al.*, 2019; Vaughan and Wallach, 2020; Bhatt *et al.*, 2020]. However, many of these desired ends fundamentally conflict—**no means exist that can simultaneously satisfy all stakeholders desires**. This is complicated by the fact that there is a lopsided power dynamic between the *empowered stakeholders* (i.e., owners, developers, and deployers) who choose means of transparency and the lay users who cannot (Table 2).

For example, developers may seek explainability to debug a system [Doran *et al.*, 2017] or foster end user trust [Balog *et al.*, 2019] (§3.2). Legislators may invoke transparency requirements to enable visibility by regulators [Castillo, 2019] or to drive more equitable outcomes across demographic groups [Sweeney and Najafian, 2019] (§4.2). However, in other cases studies’ desired ends lie in the margins.

Orthogonal to transparency about or from AI systems is transparency regarding the broader context in which they’re deployed. Often, this is a question of clearly stating the goals with which a system, such as a social media content moderation pipeline, is deployed [Andrada *et al.*, 2022]. While

providing transparency on how an AI system implementing some goal functions is instrumental to giving comprehensive transparency around a sociotechnical system, information on the overall goals of the system (e.g., corporation, website, or platform) is necessary to give users an *honest* understanding.

5.2 Conflicting Means

Among the many means that may be employed to achieve the various ends of transparency (§5.1) we identify *human disclosure*, *system disclosure*, *deception*, and *information overload* as four techniques that appear or are discussed in the literature (Table 3). In the ideal case, human- and system-disclosure trivially achieve many transparency ends desired by all stakeholders. However, these techniques can conflict with the intellectual property protection needs of system developers, deployers, and owners. Furthermore, these empowered stakeholders can mislead the less empowered ones, either deliberately through *deception* or inadvertently via *information overload* [Poursabzi-Sangdeh *et al.*, 2021]. This conflict is particularly problematic for producing effective regulation. Deceptive appeals to transparency can constitute a form of “ethics washing” [Yeung *et al.*, 2019; Bietti, 2020] wherein empowered stakeholders use the veneer of ethics to shield against regulatory scrutiny [Wagner, 2018] or build potentially unearned user trust [Benkler, 2019], but even well-meaning empowered actors can confuse users under an information overload (§3.2, §4.1).

An important note that while the explanation as system disclosure may ultimately be the same in both cases, and thus be able to achieve the same desired end such as to “lead a user into some action or behavior” for a deployer, this example causes a conflict with the user’s desired to “determine the trustworthiness of a system.”

For example, much work in the data- (§2.1, §2.2) and system-oriented (§3.1) communicative domain centers producing norms and standards around disclosures, rather than leaving developers and vendors to produce ad-hoc standards. However, the needs and risks of transparency aren’t standard in AI as they are in fields that inspired such disclosures (e.g., electronic components [Gebru *et al.*, 2021]).

5.3 Selection of Study Attributes

Researcher Interest. There is a fundamental tension between financial results and responsible AI requirements in corporate settings. Businesses may favor reducing legal liability and increasing their competitive edge [Chen *et al.*, 2021]. Additionally, research can be heavily impacted short-term and long-term business needs. Yet, authors positioned within entities that maintain large AI systems are often uniquely positioned to assess their real-world impacts [Pfau *et al.*, 2020]. It would be a mistake to discount work produced by interested industrial parties wholesale.

Furthermore, the sometimes wide-reaching societal impacts of the AI systems under study by researchers may lead them to act as interested stakeholders in society at large. For example, OpenAI researchers cites the dangers of large language model abuse by malicious actors with long-term agendas as a motivation for their tiered-release strategy of GPT-2 [Solaiman *et al.*, 2019]. OpenAI’s subsequent GPT-3 model

Stakeholder	Selected desired ends.
Deployer	lead a user into some action or behavior, increase usage of their system, maintain a functional system
Developer	understand a system to debug and improve it, predict real-world system behavior, improve system performance and robustness
Data Owner	provide data collection and usage information, protect proprietary data and trade secrets, address data misuse concerns
Regulator	evaluate fairness of predictions, demonstrate regulatory compliance, managing societal risk, mitigating negative consequences
User	understand system logic, evaluate trustworthiness, recognize AI model’s socioeconomic blindspots, data protection and privacy
Society	understand the strengths and limitations of a system, overcome fear of the unknown, encouraging ethical use of AI, mitigating system bias

Table 2: A selection of stakeholders and their various desired ends relating to AI transparency.

Means	Criteria for such means.
Human Disclosure	information provided by humans to improve clarity in understanding an AI system (i.e., disclosure of dataset demographics as social situatedness)
System Disclosure	information outputted from systems to improve clarity in understanding of the system (i.e., disclosure of generated rationales for human intelligibility)
Deception	disclosure of content that intentionally or unintentionally misleads (i.e., dishonest disclosure to tout system performance)
Info. Overload	disclosure of a surplus of information that overwhelms (i.e., providing hyper-parameters to users as substitute for user-appropriate information)

Table 3: Means for transparency: human/system disclosure positively contribute, while deception/information overload negatively contribute.

was never open-sourced, with the firm instead opting to control and sell API access to the model [Vincent, 2021].

Dealing with researcher interest in evaluating transparency work is thus a balancing act. Motivations should be carefully considered, particularly when self-interest might conflict with desirable research goals, which researchers are disincentivized to disclose. These considerations must be balanced with good-faith reading, and the understanding that everyone has a stake in the societal impact of AI system.

Persuasion vs. Trust. Measures of effectiveness in transparency varies considerably on the target measure. Is the goal really to empower users, or simply to assuage their concerns? Navigating which is in play in a given study can be a challenge. The definition of an explanation is debatable [Jain and Wallace, 2019], explanations often do not provide a causal justification [Krishnan, 2020].

A non-causal explanation is not actionable; for this reason we believe causality in explanations to be core to achieving both *user-centered* and *honest* transparency (§3.2). How are users to understand this? There are no easy answers to this question. The incentive is to persuade users to believe in systems, regardless of if a disclosure is honest or not (§2.1, §3.1). This is why *user-appropriate* education on the function of AI systems is so crucial—to empower them to evaluate for themselves whether the **claims** and **actions** of providers align.

Claims versus Actions. A complicating factor in evaluating research on transparency in AI is that often the stated goals or claims of the researchers differ from their actions. Consider the persuasion versus trust dichotomy, which represents how work claiming to address “trust” toward systems by convincing prospective users to use it rather than by demonstrating the trustworthiness of the system. Works claiming to provide explanations of a system decision instead may only provide tangential information about the decision [Yeung and Weller, 2018]. For example, is an attention map that lead to a text classification outcome—often touted as an explanation (§3.2)—really explaining the decision? Across multiple disciplines, the answer is probably no.

For legal scholars, a good explanation must be appropriate for the recipient of the explanation [Raz, 2011], written in

language understandable to them (§3.3). This is clearly reflected in the language of the EU guidelines for ethical AI, in which explanations are to be “appropriate to the end-user at hand” [on AI, 2019]. Both legal scholars and counterfactualists require a but-for distinction to be made for an explanation to fly [Yeung and Weller, 2018].

Current proposals around AI transparency, particularly the European Commission Guidelines for Trustworthy AI [on AI, 2019], are steeped in AI research. Furthermore, scientific researchers frequently claim or insinuate that they are producing research work that aligns with policymaker claims or interests. As a community, we should conduct ourselves with this downstream impact on major societal actors in mind. In particular, this means **precision in terminology and alignment of claims with reality in systems must be prioritized in work and enforced in peer review.**

6 Conclusion

We have overviewed a broad sample of AI transparency-related works, situated them based on overarching factors into narrower cluster, identified their common threads, and tied them into our vision for user-appropriate, user-centered, honest communication. We welcome further negotiation regarding what specific fundamental attributes characterize these transparency studies. We hope that this direction can lead to productive scientific and regulatory advancements [Wischmeyer, 2020], and ultimately enable a more precise public discourse. This ontology represents a first step toward resolving the problem of terminological imprecision of regarding system transparency.

As conferences continue to ask more of authors in reproducibility and ethical considerations [Gotterbarn *et al.*, 2018], we would like to see movement on asking for specificity in the terminology around transparency to reduce gray areas for improperly aligned works. The research community must produce a body of work from which lawmakers, practitioners, and the general public can clearly understand *what transparency means for AI systems*. To the extent legislation follows academics and corporate actors, it is crucial that the community speak

honestly, clearly, and unambiguously.

Specificity in what is meant by *transparency* as it is used must become a norm in AI research communities. To this end, we would like to see further advancement in characterizing the attributes of transparency studies, discussing the means-ends tension, the stakeholders behind and engaged in the study, and the use of these frames in a systematic manner to contextualize claims, techniques, and results across the human-concerned and system-derived transparency spaces. Ultimately, taking these proactive actions will give users and stakeholders the resources to confidently decide whether to trust a particular AI system.

References

- [ACM, 2016] ACM. Artifact review and badging, 2016.
- [Acquisti *et al.*, 2013] Alessandro Acquisti, Idris Adjerid, and Laura Brandimarte. Gone in 15 seconds: The limits of privacy transparency and control. *IEEE Security & Privacy*, 2013.
- [Adadi and Berrada, 2018] Amina Adadi and Mohammed Berrada. Peeking inside the black-box: a survey on explainable artificial intelligence (xai). *IEEE access*, 2018.
- [Agozie and Kaya, 2021] Divine Q Agozie and Tugberk Kaya. Discerning the effect of privacy information transparency on privacy fatigue in e-government. *Government Information Quarterly*, 38(4), 2021.
- [Aguinis and Solarino, 2019] Herman Aguinis and Angelo M Solarino. Transparency and replicability in qualitative research: The case of interviews with elite informants. *Strategic Management Journal*, 2019.
- [Amos *et al.*, 2021] Ryan Amos, Gunes Acar, Elena Lucherini, Mihir Kshirsagar, Arvind Narayanan, and Jonathan Mayer. Privacy policies over time: Curation and analysis of a million-document dataset. In *The Web Conference 2021*, 2021.
- [Andrada *et al.*, 2022] Gloria Andrada, Robert W Clowes, and Paul R Smart. Varieties of transparency: exploring agency within ai systems, 2022.
- [Balog *et al.*, 2019] Krisztian Balog, Filip Radlinski, and Shushan Arakelyan. Transparent, scrutable and explainable user models for personalized recommendation. In *SIGIR '19*, 2019.
- [Barclay *et al.*, 2019] Iain Barclay, Alun Preece, Ian Taylor, and Dinesh Verma. Quantifying transparency of machine learning systems through analysis of contributions, 2019.
- [Barclay *et al.*, 2021] Iain Barclay, Harrison Taylor, Alun Preece, Ian Taylor, Dinesh Verma, and Geeth de Mel. A framework for fostering transparency in shared artificial intelligence models by increasing visibility of contributions. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, 2021.
- [Beam *et al.*, 2020] Andrew L Beam, Arjun K Manrai, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. Challenges to the reproducibility of machine learning models in health care. *Jama*, 2020.
- [Beg *et al.*, 2021] Marijan Beg, Juliette Taka, Thomas Kluyver, Alexander Konovalov, Min Ragan-Kelley, Nicolas M Thiéry, and Hans Fangohr. Using jupyter for reproducible scientific workflows. *Computing in Science & Engineering*, 2021.
- [Benkler, 2019] Yochai Benkler. Don't let industry write the rules for ai. *Nature*, 2019.
- [Bertino *et al.*, 2019a] Elisa Bertino, Ahish Kundu, and Zehra Sura. Data transparency with blockchain and ai ethics. *JDIQ*, 2019.
- [Bertino *et al.*, 2019b] Elisa Bertino, Shawn Merrill, Alina Nesen, and Christine Utz. Redefining data transparency: A multidimensional approach. *Computer*, 2019.
- [Bhatt *et al.*, 2020] Umang Bhatt, McKane Andrus, Adrian Weller, and Alice Xiang. Machine learning explainability for external stakeholders, 2020.
- [Bhatt *et al.*, 2021] Umang Bhatt, Javier Antorán, Yunfeng Zhang, Q Vera Liao, Prasanna Sattigeri, Riccardo Fogliato, Gabrielle Melançon, Ranganath Krishnan, Jason Stanley, Omesh Tickoo, et al. Uncertainty as a form of transparency: Measuring, communicating, and using uncertainty. In *AIES '21*, 2021.
- [Bietti, 2020] Elettra Bietti. From ethics washing to ethics bashing: a view on tech ethics from within moral philosophy. In *FACCT '20*, 2020.
- [Brendel *et al.*, 2019] Wieland Brendel, Jonas Rauber, Matthias Kümmerer, Ivan Ustyuzhaninov, and Matthias Bethge. Accurate, reliable and fast robustness evaluation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [Calgua, 2022] Erwin Calgua. Covid-19: Data collection and transparency among countries. In *COVID-19 Pandemic*. 2022.
- [Camp, 2015] L Jean Camp. Respecting people and respecting privacy. *ACM Communications*, 2015.
- [Castelvecchi, 2016] Davide Castelvecchi. Can we open the black box of ai? *Nature News*, 2016.
- [Castillo, 2019] Carlos Castillo. Fairness and transparency in ranking. *SIGIR Forum*, 2019.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2021] Jiahao Chen, Victor Storchan, and Eren Kurshan. Beyond fairness metrics: Roadblocks and challenges for ethical ai in practice, 2021.
- [Clinciu and Hastie, 2019] Miruna-Adriana Clinciu and Helen Hastie. A survey of explainable AI terminology. In *NLAXAI 2019*, 2019.
- [Clyburne-Sherin *et al.*, 2019] April Clyburne-Sherin, Xu Fei, and Seth Ariel Green. Computational reproducibility via containers in psychology. *Meta-psychology*, 2019.
- [Datta *et al.*, 2016] Anupam Datta, Shayak Sen, and Yair Zick. Algorithmic transparency via quantitative input influence: Theory and experiments with learning systems. In *IEEE SP 2016*, 2016.
- [Dayhoff and DeLeo, 2001] Judith E Dayhoff and James M DeLeo. Artificial neural networks: opening the black box. *JACS*, 2001.
- [Doran *et al.*, 2017] Derek Doran, Sarah Schulz, and Tarek R. Besold. What does explainable ai really mean? a new conceptualization of perspectives, 2017.
- [Driscoll and Walker, 2014] Kevin Driscoll and Shawn Walker. Big data, big questions! working within a black box: Transparency in the collection and production of big twitter data. *IJC*, 2014.
- [Du *et al.*, 2019] Mengnan Du, Ninghao Liu, and Xia Hu. Techniques for interpretable machine learning. *ACM Commun.*, 2019.
- [Duggin and Robinove, 1990] MJ Duggin and CJ Robinove. Assumptions implicit in remote sensing data acquisition and analysis. *Remote Sensing*, 1990.
- [Ehsan *et al.*, 2019] Upol Ehsan, Pradyumna Tambwekar, Larry Chan, Brent Harrison, and Mark Riedl. Automated rationale generation: A technique for explainable ai and its effects on human perceptions, 2019.
- [Ehsan *et al.*, 2021] Upol Ehsan, Q. Vera Liao, Michael Muller, Mark O. Riedl, and Justin D. Weisz. Expanding explainability: Towards social transparency in ai systems. In *CHI '21*, 2021.
- [Felzmann *et al.*, 2019] Heike Felzmann, Eduard Fosch-Villaronga, Christoph Lutz, and Aurelia Tamo-Larrieux. Robots and transparency: The multiple dimensions of transparency in the context of robot technologies. *IEEE RA Magazine*, 2019.
- [Firmani *et al.*, 2019] Donatella Firmani, Letizia Tanca, and Riccardo Torlone. Ethical dimensions for data quality. *JDIQ*, 2019.
- [Gebru *et al.*, 2021] Timnit Gebru, Jamie Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hanna Wallach, Hal Daumé III, and Kate Crawford. Datasheets for datasets. *Commun. ACM*, 2021.
- [Gotterbarn *et al.*, 2018] DW Gotterbarn, Bo Brinkman, Catherine Flick, Michael S Kirkpatrick, Keith Miller, Kate Vazansky, and Marty J Wolf. Acm code of ethics and professional conduct, 2018.
- [Grünewald and Pallas, 2021] Elias Grünewald and Frank Pallas. Tilt: A gdpr-aligned transparency information language and toolkit for practical privacy engineering. In *FACCT '21*, 2021.
- [Gundersen and Kjensmo, 2018] Odd Erik Gundersen and Sigbjørn Kjensmo. State of the art: Reproducibility in artificial intelligence, 2018.
- [Hamon *et al.*, 2021] Ronan Hamon, Henrik Junklewitz, Gianclaudio Malgieri, Paul De Hert, Laurent Beslay, and Ignacio Sanchez. Impossible explanations? beyond explainable ai in the gdpr from a covid-19 use case scenario. In *FACCT '21*, 2021.
- [Hedbom, 2009] Hans Hedbom. A survey on transparency tools for enhancing privacy. In *The Future of Identity in the Information Society*, 2009.
- [Hendricks *et al.*, 2016] Lisa Anne Hendricks, Zeynep Akata, Marcus Rohrbach, Jeff Donahue, Bernt Schiele, and Trevor Darrell. Generating visual explanations, 2016.
- [Hind *et al.*, 2020] Michael Hind, Stephanie Houde, Jacquelyn Martino, Aleksandra Mojsilovic, David Piorkowski, John Richards, and Kush R. Varshney. Experiences with improving the transparency of ai models and services. In *CHI '20*, 2020.
- [Hutchinson *et al.*, 2021] Ben Hutchinson, Andrew Smart, Alex Hanna, Emily Denton, Christina Greer, Oddur Kjartansson, Parker Barnes, and Margaret Mitchell. Towards accountability for machine learning datasets: Practices from software engineering and infrastructure. In *FACCT '21*, 2021.
- [Jacovi and Goldberg, 2020] Alon Jacovi and Yoav Goldberg. Towards faithfully interpretable nlp systems: How should we define and evaluate faithfulness? In *ACL 2020*, 2020.
- [Jain and Wallace, 2019] Sarthak Jain and Byron C. Wallace. Attention is not explanation, 2019.

- [Jensen and Potts, 2004] Carlos Jensen and Colin M. Potts. Privacy policies as decision-making tools: an evaluation of online privacy notices. *SIGCHI '04*, 2004.
- [Jordan *et al.*, 2020] Sara B Jordan, Samantha L Fenn, and Benjamin B Shannon. Transparency as threat at the intersection of artificial intelligence and cyberbiosecurity. *Computer*, 2020.
- [Kantarcioglu and Shaon, 2019] Murat Kantarcioglu and Fahad Shaon. Securing big data in the age of ai. In *IEEE TPS-ISA*. IEEE, 2019.
- [Kirrane *et al.*, 2021] Sabrina Kirrane, Javier D. Fernández, Piero Bonatti, Uros Milosevic, Axel Polleres, and Rigo Wenning. The special-k personal data processing transparency and compliance platform, 2021.
- [Knowles, 2017] Brandin Hanson Knowles. Intelligibility in the face of uncertainty, 2017.
- [Koh and Liang, 2017] Pang Wei Koh and Percy Liang. Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions, 2017.
- [Krishnan, 2020] Maya Krishnan. Against interpretability: a critical examination of the interpretability problem in machine learning. *Philosophy & Technology*, 2020.
- [Lakkaraju *et al.*, 2019] Himabindu Lakkaraju, Ece Kamar, Rich Caruana, and Jure Leskovec. Faithful and customizable explanations of black box models. In *AIES '19*, 2019.
- [Laouraris, 2018] Nikolaos Laouraris. Data transparency: Concerns and prospects [point of view]. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 2018.
- [Liao *et al.*, 2022] M. Liao, S. S. Sundar, and J. B Walther. User trust in recommendation systems: A comparison of content-based, collaborative and demographic filtering, 2022.
- [Lipton and Steinhardt, 2018] Zachary C. Lipton and Jacob Steinhardt. Troubling trends in machine learning scholarship, 2018.
- [Lipton, 2018] Zachary C Lipton. The myths of model interpretability: In machine learning, the concept of interpretability is both important and slippery. *Queue*, 2018.
- [Lucic *et al.*, 2021] Ana Lucic, Maurits Bleeker, Sami Jullien, Samartha Bhargava, and Maarten de Rijke. Reproducibility as a mechanism for teaching fairness, accountability, confidentiality, and transparency in artificial intelligence, 2021.
- [McSherry, 2005] David McSherry. Explanation in recommender systems. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 2005.
- [Mei *et al.*, 2022a] Alex Mei, Anisha Kabir, Sharon Levy, Melanie Subbiah, Emily Allaway, John Judge, Desmond Patton, Bruce Bimber, Kathleen McKeown, and William Yang Wang. Mitigating covertly unsafe text within natural language systems. *arXiv preprint*, 2022.
- [Mei *et al.*, 2022b] Alex Mei, Sharon Levy, and William Yang Wang. Foveate, attribute, and rationalize: Towards safe and trustworthy ai. *arXiv preprint*, 2022.
- [Milkaite and Lievens, 2020] Ingrida Milkaite and Eva Lievens. Child-friendly transparency of data processing in the eu: from legal requirements to platform policies. *JCM*, 2020.
- [Mitchell *et al.*, 2019] Margaret Mitchell, Simone Wu, Andrew Zaldivar, Parker Barnes, Lucy Vasserman, Ben Hutchinson, Elena Spitzer, Inioluwa Deborah Raji, and Timnit Gebru. Model cards for model reporting. In *FAccT 2019*, 2019.
- [Mora-Cantalops *et al.*, 2021] Marçal Mora-Cantalops, Salvador Sánchez-Alonso, Elena García-Barriocanal, and Miguel-Angel Sicilia. Traceability for trustworthy ai: A review of models and tools. *Big Data and Cognitive Computing*, 2021.
- [Morey *et al.*, 2015] Timothy Morey, Theodore Forbath, and Allison Schoop. Customer data: Designing for transparency and trust. *Harvard Business Review*, 2015.
- [Naucke *et al.*, 2019] Jakob Naucke, Hamish Hunt, Jack Crawford, Enrico Steffinglongo, Oliver Masters, and Flavio Bergamaschi. Homomorphically securing ai at the edge. In *AIChallengeIoT'19*, 2019.
- [on AI, 2019] High-Level Expert Group on AI. Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI. Technical report, 2019.
- [Pearl, 2009] Judea Pearl. *Causality*. 2009.
- [Pfau *et al.*, 2020] Johannes Pfau, Jan David Smeddinck, and Rainer Malaka. The case for usable ai: What industry professionals make of academic ai in video games. In *ACM 2020*, 2020.
- [Pieters, 2011] Wolter Pieters. Explanation and trust: what to tell the user in security and ai? *EIT*, 2011.
- [Poursabzi-Sangdeh *et al.*, 2021] Forough Poursabzi-Sangdeh, Daniel G. Goldstein, Jake Hofman, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, and Hanna Wallach. Manipulating and measuring model interpretability. In *CHI 2021*, 2021.
- [Rajani *et al.*, 2019] Nazneen Fatema Rajani, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. Explain yourself! leveraging language models for commonsense reasoning. *arXiv preprint*, 2019.
- [Raz, 2011] Joseph Raz. *From normativity to responsibility*. 2011.
- [Ribeiro *et al.*, 2016] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. "why should i trust you?": Explaining the predictions of any classifier, 2016.
- [Riedl, 2019] Mark O Riedl. Human-centered artificial intelligence and machine learning. *HBET*, 2019.
- [Rudin, 2019] Cynthia Rudin. Stop explaining black box machine learning models for high stakes decisions and use interpretable models instead. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 2019.
- [Saxon *et al.*, 2021] Michael Saxon, Sharon Levy, Xinyi Wang, Alon Albalak, and William Yang Wang. Modeling disclosive transparency in NLP application descriptions. In *EMNLP 2021*, 2021.
- [Schmidt *et al.*, 2020] Philipp Schmidt, Felix Biessmann, and Timm Teubner. Transparency and trust in artificial intelligence systems. *JDS*, 2020.
- [Selbst and Powles, 2018] Andrew Selbst and Julia Powles. "meaningful information" and the right to explanation, 2018.
- [Shokri *et al.*, 2021] Reza Shokri, Martin Strobel, and Yair Zick. On the privacy risks of model explanations. In *AIES '21*, 2021.
- [Solaiman *et al.*, 2019] Irene Solaiman, Miles Brundage, Jack Clark, Amanda Askeel, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Jeff Wu, Alec Radford, Gretchen Krueger, Jong Wook Kim, Sarah Krepps, Miles McCain, Alex Newhouse, Jason Blazakis, Kris McGuffie, and Jasmine Wang. Release strategies and the social impacts of language models, 2019.
- [Springer and Whittaker, 2018] Aaron Springer and Steve Whittaker. What are you hiding? algorithmic transparency and user perceptions, 2018.
- [Strevens, 2011] M. Strevens. *Depth: An Account of Scientific Explanation*. 2011.
- [Strobel, 2019] Martin Strobel. Aspects of transparency in machine learning, 2019.
- [Suzor *et al.*, 2019] Nicolas P Suzor, Sarah Myers West, Andrew Quodling, and Jillian York. What do we mean when we talk about transparency? toward meaningful transparency in commercial content moderation. *IJC*, 2019.
- [Sweeney and Najafian, 2019] Chris Sweeney and Maryam Najafian. A transparent framework for evaluating unintended demographic bias in word embeddings. In *ACL 2019*, 2019.
- [Tan *et al.*, 2018] Sarah Tan, Rich Caruana, Giles Hooker, and Yin Lou. Distill-and-compare: Auditing black-box models using transparent model distillation. In *AIES '18*, 2018.
- [Toreini *et al.*, 2020] Ehsan Toreini, Mhairi Aitken, Kovila Coopamootoo, Karen Eliott, Carlos Gonzalez Zelaya, and Aad Van Moorsel. The relationship between trust in ai and trustworthy machine learning technologies. In *FAccT '20*, 2020.
- [Vaughan and Wallach, 2020] Jennifer Wortman Vaughan and Hanna Wallach. A human-centered agenda for intelligible machine learning, 2020.
- [Veale *et al.*, 2018] Michael Veale, Max Van Kleek, and Reuben Binns. Fairness and accountability design needs for algorithmic support in high-stakes public sector decision-making. In *CHI '18*, 2018.
- [Vincent, 2021] James Vincent. Microsoft is giving businesses access to openai's powerful ai language model gpt-3, 2021.
- [Vögtlin *et al.*, 2020] Lars Vögtlin, Vinayachandran Pondenkandath, and Rolf Ingold. Cobra: A cli tool to create and share reproducible projects. In *SDS 2020*, 2020.
- [Voigt, 2018] Paul Voigt. General data protection regulation. Report, European Union, 2018.
- [Wachter *et al.*, 2017] Sandra Wachter, Brent Mittelstadt, and Chris Russell. Counterfactual explanations without opening the black box: Automated decisions and the gdpr. *Harv. JL & Tech.*, 2017.
- [Wagner, 2018] Ben Wagner. Ethics as an escape from regulation. from "ethics-washing" to ethics-shopping? In *Being Profiled*. 2018.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2020] Ruotong Wang, F Maxwell Harper, and Haiyi Zhu. Factors influencing perceived fairness in algorithmic decision-making: Algorithm outcomes, development procedures, and individual differences. In *CHI 2020*, 2020.
- [Watson and Nations, 2019] Hugh J Watson and Conner Nations. Addressing the growing need for algorithmic transparency. *AIS Communications*, 2019.
- [Weissgerber *et al.*, 2016] Tracey L Weissgerber, Vesna D Garovic, Marko Savic, Stacey J Winham, and Natasa M Milic. From static to interactive: transforming data visualization to improve transparency. *PLoS biology*, 2016.
- [Weller, 2017] Adrian Weller. Challenges for transparency, 2017.
- [Wiegrefe and Pinter, 2019] Sarah Wiegrefe and Yuval Pinter. Attention is not not explanation, 2019.
- [Wieringa *et al.*, 2021] Jaap Wieringa, PK Kannan, Xiao Ma, Thomas Reutterer, Hans Risselada, and Bernd Skiera. Data analytics in a privacy-concerned world. *JBR*, 2021.

- [Wischmeyer, 2020] Thomas Wischmeyer. *Artificial Intelligence and Transparency: Opening the Black Box*. 2020.
- [Xu *et al.*, 2021] Wenda Xu, Michael Saxon, Misha Sra, and William Yang Wang. Self-supervised knowledge assimilation for expert-layman text style transfer, 2021.
- [Yanisky-Ravid and Hallisey, 2019] Shlomit Yanisky-Ravid and Sean K Hallisey. Equality and privacy by design: A new model of artificial intelligence data transparency via auditing, certification, and safe harbor regimes. *Fordham Urb. LJ*, 2019.
- [Yeung and Weller, 2018] Karen Yeung and Adrian Weller. *How Is 'Transparency' Understood By Legal Scholars And The Machine Learning Community?* 2018.
- [Yeung *et al.*, 2019] Karen Yeung, Andrew Howes, and Ganna Pogrebna. Ai governance by human rights-centred design, deliberation and oversight: An end to ethics washing, 2019.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2021] Wei Zhang, Ziming Huang, Yada Zhu, Guangnan Ye, Xiaodong Cui, and Fan Zhang. On sample based explanation methods for nlp: Faithfulness, efficiency and semantic evaluation. In *ACL 2021*, 2021.