

# The Impact of Transparency in AI Systems on Users' Data-Sharing Intentions: A Scenario-Based Experiment

## Research Paper

Julian Rosenberger<sup>1</sup>, Sophie Kuhlemann<sup>2</sup>, Verena Tiefenbeck<sup>2</sup>, Mathias Kraus<sup>1</sup>, and Patrick Zschech<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universität Regensburg, Bajuwarenstraße 4, 93053 Regensburg  
julian.rosenberger, mathias.kraus@ur.de

<sup>2</sup> Friedrich-Alexander Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Lange Gasse 20, 90403 Nürnberg  
sophie.kuhlemann, verena.tiefenbeck@fau.de

<sup>3</sup> Universität Leipzig, Grimmaische Straße 12, 04109 Leipzig  
patrick.zschech@uni-leipzig.de

**Abstract.** Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems are frequently employed in online services to provide personalized experiences to users based on large collections of data. However, AI systems can be designed in different ways, with black-box AI systems appearing as complex data-processing engines and white-box AI systems appearing as fully transparent data-processors. As such, it is reasonable to assume that these different design choices also affect user perception and thus their willingness to share data. To this end, we conducted a pre-registered, scenario-based online experiment with 240 participants and investigated how transparent and non-transparent data-processing entities influenced data-sharing intentions. Surprisingly, our results revealed no significant difference in willingness to share data across entities, challenging the notion that transparency increases data-sharing willingness. Furthermore, we found that a general attitude of trust towards AI has a significant positive influence, especially in the transparent AI condition, whereas privacy concerns did not significantly affect data-sharing decisions.

**Keywords:** AI, data-sharing, privacy, digital markets, personalization

## 1 Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems are increasingly used in online services to provide a personalized experience to users. However, many AI systems lack transparency regarding how for example individual recommendations are derived, making them appear as black-boxes to users (Herlocker et al. 2000, Millecamp et al. 2019, Sinha & Swearingen 2002). This lack of transparency may promote user aversion to AI systems, leading to a preference for human involvement in certain cases (Cadario et al. 2021), despite AI's demonstrated superiority in many tasks (Brown & Sandholm 2019, Esteva et al. 2017). Research in the fields of Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) and Interpretable Machine Learning (IML) aims to tackle this aversion towards algorithms by providing insights into the inner workings of AI systems (Rudin 2019, Adadi & Berrada 2018). While XAI tries to provide a glimpse into complex black-box models, IML focuses on

developing and applying simpler, clearer models for inherent transparency (Poursabzi-Sangdeh et al. 2021). Both fields intend to display the outcomes of an AI system in a way that humans can understand. Prior research already suggests that "opening the black-box" (Mahmud et al. 2022) by providing explanations of the decision-making processes of an AI system can positively affect users' willingness to engage with the system (Yeomans et al. 2019, Shin 2021, Herlocker et al. 2000, Millecamp et al. 2019, Dzindolet et al. 2003). However, research shows that factors such as trustworthiness and familiarity of a system influence users' reliance on both, human advisors and AI systems (Choung et al. 2023, Chellappa & Sin 2005, Lee & See 2004, Rotter 1967).

Despite the reliance of AI systems on user data to provide a personalized experience, there has been little research on how XAI or IML affect users' attitudes on privacy (Rai 2020). Privacy studies have shown that when users are faced with the decision to share their data with a service provider, they tend to weigh the costs and benefits of disclosing their data (Dinev et al. 2006). For instance, it shows that people are more willing to share their personal data if they can see a clear benefit, such as receiving personalized offers (White 2004). Transparent systems that demonstrate how sharing specific types of personal data can result in more personalized and valuable services thus might have the potential to encourage consumers to share their data for improved experiences. However, providing detailed explanations of data-processing may also make privacy concerns salient to consumers, which could make them less willing to share their personal information (Kehr et al. 2015). Several studies show that individuals' privacy concerns significantly impact their risk assessment of data-sharing, which ultimately affects their willingness to share their data (Cichy et al. 2021, Dinev & Hart 2006, Malhotra et al. 2004, Son & Kim 2008, Li et al. 2011).

This study aims to examine the impact of transparent (white-box AI) and non-transparent (black-box AI) data-processing systems on users' intentions to share data. Building on the insights of prior research suggesting a preference for human decision-making over algorithms (Cadario et al. 2021, Longoni et al. 2019), we include a human data-processor as a comparative element. Additionally, we are examining how trust factors such as the perceived trustworthiness of different data-processing systems affects users' willingness to share data, based on the research by Chellappa & Sin (2005) and Choung et al. (2023). Lastly, we assess the impact of users' privacy concerns within this dynamic. Consequently, we pose the following research questions:

**RQ** *How does users' willingness to share personal data vary between different data-processing entities, specifically a human expert, a white-box AI system, and a black-box AI system? Furthermore, how do trust in the entity and privacy concerns affect the relationship between data-processing entity and the intention to disclose data?*

To answer our research questions, we conducted a scenario-based experiment in which we presented participants (N = 240) with a fictitious sleep app that aimed to provide tailored advice based on the data entered by the user. Our study contributes to existing AI research on users' adoption of interpretable systems, as well as to privacy research, particularly with respect to data-sharing behavior. In the following section, Section 2, we discuss related work from (X)AI and IML research and its connection to trust and privacy concerns and derive our research model. Section 3 summarizes the

experimental design followed in our study. In Section 4, we present the results of our study. Section 5 discusses our findings and concludes our work.

## **2 Conceptual Background and Related Work**

Many AI systems are characterized by their inability to convey human-interpretable information about how and why they make certain decisions (Herlocker et al. 2000, Millecamp et al. 2019, Sinha & Swearingen 2002), referred to as black-box AI systems (Du et al. 2019, Rudin 2019, Adadi & Berrada 2018). This lack of transparency into the system's decision-making processes can cause people to be hesitant in adopting AI outputs. For example, in the context of healthcare, individuals were shown to feel more confident in understanding the choices made by human healthcare professionals compared to ones made by algorithms. As a result, they typically favor human providers over algorithmic ones (Cadario et al. 2021, Longoni et al. 2019), even though AI systems have been proven to perform better than humans in various tasks (Esteva et al. 2017, Brown & Sandholm 2019). Additionally, if a human agent is framed as an expert, users are even more likely to depend on human rather than on AI advice: This was demonstrated by Madhavan & Wiegmann (2007) in a study in which they examined users' trust in and perceived reliability of human and automated systems based on written descriptions, distinguishing between novices and experts. Users' tendency to rather rely on human advice than on AI decision-making is commonly known as algorithm aversion and is often attributed to users' desire for perfect predictions and their low tolerance for errors made by an algorithm (Dietvorst et al. 2015, 2018). However, recent evidence suggests that there are situations in which human actors prefer AI advice, such as the prediction of business or geopolitical events (Logg et al. 2019). Furthermore, providing explanations for errors made by a system has been found to positively influence users' perception of the system (Dzindolet et al. 2003).


Along that line, research in the area of XAI and IML intends to address the potential reluctance towards algorithms by offering insight into the underlying reasoning of a system (Poursabzi-Sangdeh et al. 2021). Presenting AI systems in an understandable manner has the potential to mitigate the problems associated with their black-box nature while ensuring high predictive accuracy (Rudin 2019, Adadi & Berrada 2018). In recent years, a significant effort within the AI research community has thus been the development of XAI methods to make black-box AI systems more understandable (Ribeiro et al. 2016, Lundberg & Lee 2017, Koh & Liang 2017). Despite these advances, concerns persist regarding the adequacy of these explanations for capturing the full complexity of the systems (Rudin 2019, Stiglic et al. 2020, Babic et al. 2021). To address the inherent approximations of XAI methods, white-box AI systems attempt to provide complete transparency and reliable decision-making through intrinsic interpretability (Du et al. 2019). For example, a white-box AI system for diagnosing a specific medical condition might use a transparent decision tree that consists of a series of interpretable if-then rules, allowing for clear tracing of the decision-making process. In contrast, a black-box AI system might employ a complex neural network comprising multiple layers that learn intricate relationships between features, their interactions, and the diagnosis. This multi-layer structure enables the neural network to capture non-linear

patterns and high-order interactions, but at the cost of interpretability (Tjoa & Guan 2020). However, white-box AI system systems typically face limitations, most notably that they are primarily limited to tabular data (Kraus et al. 2023). Numerous studies indicate that showing users clarifications can positively impact their perception of the system (Yeomans et al. 2019, Shin 2021, Herlocker et al. 2000, Millicamp et al. 2019, Dzindolet et al. 2003). Nevertheless, Alufaisan et al. (2021) and Schrills & Franke (2020) found no such positive effect on users' intention when provided with visual explanations. Previous research has also shown that when humans collaborate with AI, providing explanations can cause users to trust the system too much, leading to "automation bias" (Schemmer et al. 2022). This can result in users accepting incorrect suggestions from the system (Bansal et al. 2021). In this context, a study by Choung et al. (2023) shows that factors, such as the trustworthiness of a system and trust in its functionality, significantly influence users' intention to use a system. Similarly, the results of Chellappa & Sin (2005) indicate that familiarity and previous experience, play a significant role in the use of personalization services. These findings are consistent with research on interpersonal trust, which argues that attitudes of trust play an important role in how people rely on each other (Lee & See 2004, Rotter 1967).

Notably, despite the reliance of AI systems on user data, there has been little research on the impact of providing insights to an AI system on the privacy-related behavior of users (Rai 2020). Information systems research has explored users' attitudes toward privacy in various contexts such as e-commerce (Acquisti & Grossklags 2005, Spiekermann et al. 2001), financial services (Norberg et al. 2007), social networks (Barnes 2006), and smartphone applications (Egelman et al. 2013), focusing on users' attitudes towards privacy and its impact on their willingness to participate in e-commerce services (Chellappa & Sin 2005, Eastlick et al. 2006, Pavlou et al. 2007), as well as their willingness to share personal information with these services (Belanger et al. 2002, Dinev & Hart 2006). Studies in the context of users' data-sharing behavior suggest that while people consider protecting their personal data important, they often act against their preferences and willingly disclose their data (see Gerber et al. (2018) and Kokolakis (2017) for reviews). This contradiction between privacy attitudes and behaviors has been studied extensively and is commonly known as the privacy paradox (Norberg et al. 2007). Studies revealed that users weigh their sharing intentions based on a cost-benefit analysis of data disclosure (Culnan 1993, Dinev & Hart 2006, Dinev et al. 2006, Xu et al. 2009). Within this cost-benefit analysis, described as privacy calculus, one of the benefits already studied is personalization (Awad & Krishnan 2006). In this context, individuals are found to be more willing to disclose personal information if they receive customized offers in response (White 2004). However, Kehr et al. (2015) demonstrates that the tendency to focus on perceived benefits can be reduced by making privacy considerations salient to users by reminding them about risks associated with sharing sensitive data. Numerous studies show that information privacy concerns significantly impact individuals' risk assessment towards information privacy and thus affect their willingness to disclose their data (Cichy et al. 2021, Dinev & Hart 2006, Malhotra et al. 2004, Son & Kim 2008, Li et al. 2011).

## 2.1 Research Model

More in-depth research is needed to investigate the impact of a system's data-processing nature on users' cost-benefit trade-offs when disclosing data, and whether consumers' willingness to share their data changes as a result (Rai 2020). Systems that effectively communicate how sharing specific types of personal data can result in more personalized and valuable services may have the potential to motivate consumers to share their data for enhanced experiences (Awad & Krishnan 2006, White 2004). However, transparent systems that provide detailed explanations of data-processing may also raise privacy concerns among consumers, leading them to be less willing to share their personal data (Kehr et al. 2015). We thus build a research model (see Figure 1) that, based on previous literature on the "black-box problem" (Herlocker et al. 2000, Millicamp et al. 2019, Sinha & Swearingen 2002) and algorithm aversion (Dietvorst et al. 2015, 2018), distinguishes between human, white-box AI and black-box AI data-processing entities and assesses their impact on users' sharing intentions.



**Figure 1.** Research Model

As previous research has indicated that users tend to prefer human service providers over algorithmic ones (Cadario et al. 2021, Longoni et al. 2019), it is reasonable to assume that this notion is also reflected in the privacy-intentions of users as they may perceive human handlers of their personal data as more trustworthy compared to AI systems. Based on this, we hypothesize the following:

**H1a** *Users exhibit greater willingness to share personal data when the data is processed by a human entity compared to AI entities.*

However, white-box AI processing, as suggested by Rudin (2019), could potentially serve as a mitigator to the concerns related to the black-box nature of common AI systems. Based on this assumption, we derive the following hypothesis in the context of users' data-sharing behavior:

**H1b** *Users exhibit greater willingness to share personal data when the data is processed by a white-box AI entity compared to a black-box AI entity.*

Additionally, prior work suggests that factors such as the trustworthiness of a system and trust in its functionality significantly determine users' intention to use a system (Chellappa & Sin 2005, Choung et al. 2023, Lee & See 2004). We assume that the intention to engage with a system is closely related to user data-sharing, as interactions with AI systems often involve sharing personal data (e.g., sharing location data with map apps or entering health information into a symptom management app). Thus, we expect trust to have a moderating effect on the relationship between AI system and data-sharing willingness:

**H2a** *Trust in AI will moderate the relationship between the AI groups and users' willingness to share personal data. Specifically, when trust in AI is high, participants in the white-box AI and black-box AI conditions will show a higher willingness to share data.*

Likewise, we assume that the same moderating effect occurs for the human condition, as literature on interpersonal trust indicates that trust plays a relevant role in how much people rely on each other (Lee & See 2004, Rotter 1967). Thus, we hypothesize:

**H2b** *Trust in people will moderate the relationship between the human group and users' willingness to share personal data. Specifically, when trust in people is high, participants in the human condition will show a higher willingness to share data.*

Finally, we build on research by Dinev & Hart (2006), Malhotra et al. (2004), Son & Kim (2008) and Li et al. (2011) suggesting that privacy concerns are a relevant determinant in users' privacy-related decision-making and argue that the relationship between entity and willingness to disclose data is influenced by the individual's concern about their privacy:

**H3** *Privacy concerns will moderate the relationship between the human, white-box AI, and black-box AI groups and users' willingness to share sensitive health-related data. Specifically, when privacy concerns are high, participants in all conditions will show a lower willingness to share data.*

## 3 Methods

### 3.1 Experimental Design

We tested our hypotheses by conducting an online experiment based on a pre-registered scenario-based experiment with 240 participants.<sup>1</sup> For our study, we chose an environment where subjects could quickly familiarize themselves with the topic and understand the underlying relationships without requiring in-depth knowledge. Specifically, our experiment is a use case related to healthy living and well-being, in which we refer to the dynamics between health and lifestyle factors and sleep. Participants were introduced to a mock-up of SleepOptima, a hypothetical sleep app that aims to provide tailored advice

---

<sup>1</sup> Pre-registration link: <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/U6FN7>. The experimental procedure received ethical clearance by the German Association for Experimental Economic Research (No. o3RhQZKR).

based on user data input. To assess the effects of different data-processing entities on users' data-sharing behavior, we randomly assigned participants to one of three treatment groups representative of the different entities: a human expert, a white-box AI system, and a black-box AI system.

Each condition was presented with identically structured text modules containing detailed explanations of the data-processing techniques used by the respective entity within SleepOptima. In the human condition, it was clarified based on Madhavan & Wiegmann (2007) that the expert's recommendation is derived from their acquired knowledge. The white-box and black-box conditions were identical in communicating information about the relevant system and how advice is generated for participants. However, the two groups differed in their clarification of the system's transparency, with the interpretability of the white-box AI being presented in contrast to the lack of interpretability of the black-box AI. To emphasize the different analytical approaches of the individual data-processing entities, we also provided visual aids to participants. For the human group, we used an image of a medical expert to emphasize the human element in data-processing. Based on Du et al. (2019) and Rudin (2019), we chose a decision tree to symbolize the transparent and structured nature of the white-box AI. In contrast, for the black-box AI, a neural network illustration was used to depict the complexity and opacity of its processes. For a detailed presentation of the textual and visual treatments, refer to our online appendix.<sup>2</sup>

### 3.2 Measurement and Scales

To capture participants' willingness to share their data, we used a 7-point Likert scale – from 1 ("Strongly Unwilling") to 7 ("Strongly Willing") – across seven data categories relevant to the SleepOptima app. The categories range from demographics, over physical and mental status until questions about sexual activities. Each category consisted of two items and by calculating the average scores of these 14 items, we derived a continuous measure of each participant's willingness to share sensitive health-related data. In addition, we measured trust in the processing entity and privacy concerns using validated scales that we slightly adapted to our context.

*Trust in AI* was assessed using an adapted scale from Hoffman et al. (2023), tailored to the context of our study comparing human and AI data-processing entities. This adaptation expanded the original scale to a 7-point Likert scale to capture a broad range of Trust in AI and to align it with other scales in our questionnaire. The statements included in this scale explore general trust in AI systems, perceived reliability, and predictability of AI outcomes.

*Trust in People* was measured by adapting the General Trust Scale from Yamagishi & Yamagishi (1994) to ensure consistency with other measures. This scale assesses people's general trustworthiness and honesty, exploring beliefs about people's basic honesty, trustworthiness, and goodness.

*Privacy Concerns* were measured using the Internet Users' Information Privacy Concerns (IUIPC) scale developed by Malhotra et al. (2004), which provides an exploration of online Privacy Concerns. This scale was selected because of its alignment with the

---

<sup>2</sup> Link to online appendix: <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/8W6G3>

digital context of the study and its focus on consumer perspectives on information privacy (Groß 2021). Participants rated their agreement on a 7-point Likert scale, addressing issues such as discomfort with online companies requesting personal information and the importance of control over personal information.

By averaging scores across items for each construct, we derived continuous measures of Trust in AI, Trust in People, and Privacy Concerns in order to test our hypotheses. For further details on the scores for the different health-related categories and items, as well as on the operationalization of constructs, see our online appendix.

### 3.3 Participants

For our study, we recruited 331 participants over two days in October 2023 using Prolific. The study took approximately 6 minutes and 30 seconds to complete, and participants were compensated £14,17/hr for their time. To ensure data integrity, three attention checks were incorporated into the survey. The rate of failed attention checks was evenly distributed across all three conditions, and as a result, 91 participants were excluded based on this criterion. The final sample consisted of 240 participants, detailed in Table 1 with their demographic distribution. Our participant sample comprised 122 females (50.8%), 114 males (47.5%), one non-binary, and three who preferred not to disclose.

We conducted randomization checks to confirm that all demographic characteristics were equally distributed across the treatment groups. To assess the uniformity of this distribution, we used Fisher's exact test, which showed no significant differences in gender distribution across the groups ( $p = 0.820$ ). Additionally, we performed an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), to examine age disparities. The results showed that there were no significant differences in the mean age between the groups ( $F(2, 235) = 0.079, p = 0.924$ ). These findings suggest that our sample had a balanced representation of demographics across groups.

**Table 1.** Descriptive results of key socio-demographic data of the study sample across treatment groups (Human, White-box AI, Black-box AI).

	Participants		Gender Identity						Age
			Female		Male		Other <sup>†</sup>		
Human	83	34.6 %	43	51.8 %	37	44.6 %	3	3.6 %	40.3±15.9
White-box AI	81	33.8 %	38	46.9 %	42	51.9 %	1	1.2 %	39.4±14.2
Black-box AI	76	31.7 %	41	53.9 %	35	46.1 %	0	0.0 %	40.1±15.0

<sup>†</sup> "Other" includes one non-binary participant and those who chose not to disclose their gender.

### 3.4 Manipulation Check

To check if participants' perceptions aligned with our intended manipulations, we asked them to rate the transparency level of the received treatment on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 "Low Level of Transparency" to 7 "High Level of Transparency" immediately after presenting the manipulation. This manipulation check was conducted



before measuring the dependent variable (willingness to share data) to ensure that participants had accurately perceived the intended manipulation. The results showed that the human group ( $M = 5.41$ ,  $SD = 1.23$ ) reported a notably higher level of transparency than the black-box AI group ( $M = 3.92$ ,  $SD = 2.11$ ). The white-box AI group’s perception ( $M = 5.19$ ,  $SD = 1.21$ ) was aligned with the human group. An ANOVA confirmed these observations as statistically significant ( $F(2, 237) = 20.67$ ,  $p < .001$ ). To examine these differences more closely, we conducted pairwise t-tests with a Bonferroni correction, revealing significant differences between the human and black-box AI groups ( $p < .001$ ) and between the black-box AI and white-box AI groups ( $p < .001$ ), but no significant difference between the human and white-box AI groups. These results indicate that participants perceived distinct levels of transparency across the different data-processing entities, with the black-box AI being viewed as less transparent than both the human and white-box AI.

## 4 Results

### 4.1 Overall Willingness to Share Data

Our findings revealed subtle differences in the willingness to share data across conditions. Participants showed the highest willingness to share data with the black-box AI system ( $M = 6.02$ ,  $SD = 0.85$ ), slightly exceeding the willingness to share with a human expert ( $M = 5.85$ ,  $SD = 0.94$ ) and the white-box AI system ( $M = 5.82$ ,  $SD = 1.04$ ). We opted for regression analysis throughout the paper to quantify group differences, estimate effect sizes, and allow for the inclusion of interaction effects in subsequent analyses. The regression results, with the human group as a natural choice for comparison, revealed no significant differences between conditions (see Table 2). Thus, H1a, proposing greater willingness to share data with a human entity compared to AI entities, is not supported.

Further regression analysis testing H1b, which suggested greater willingness to share data with a white-box AI entity compared to a black-box AI entity, also revealed no significant differences between the two AI conditions ( $F(1, 157) = 1.686$ ,  $p = 0.196$ ). Consequently, H1b cannot be confirmed based on our study’s evidence.

**Table 2.** Simple regression result for Model Willingness to Share

Variable	Model Willingness to Share	
	$B \pm SE$	$p$
<b>Intercept</b>	$5.85 \pm 0.11$	$<.001^{***}$
White-box AI	$-0.03 \pm 0.15$	0.867
Black-box AI	$0.17 \pm 0.15$	0.258
$R^2$	0.008	
$R^2_{Adj}$	0.000	

Note. Ref = Human

## 4.2 The Role of Trust in Data-Sharing Decisions

We investigated the influence of trust on participants' willingness to disclose personal information across different data-processing entities. We used two regression models (Model Trust in AI for AI conditions and Model Trust in People for the human condition) and analyzed interactions through simple slopes analysis, following Aiken et al. (1991).

*Model Trust in AI.* Regression analysis (see Table 3) shows that Trust in AI positively influences willingness to share data in both AI conditions, with a stronger effect in the white-box AI condition ( $B = 0.49, p < .001$ ) compared to the black-box AI condition ( $B = 0.24, p = 0.08$ ). Trust in AI had no effect in the human expert condition.

Simple slopes analysis (see Figure 2) confirms these results, showing a modest but significant increase in willingness to share data for the black-box AI group ( $B = 0.20, p = 0.04$ ) and a more pronounced effect for the white-box AI condition ( $B = 0.45, p < .001$ ). The human condition showed negligible impact of Trust in AI ( $B = -0.03, p = 0.71$ ). Therefore, we can partially confirm H2a: Trust in AI has a significant positive effect on the willingness to share data in the white-box AI condition, as evidenced by the regression results, and a modest but significant positive effect in the black-box AI condition, as revealed by the simple slope analysis.

*Model Trust in People.* The interaction effect of Trust in People ( $B = 0.22, p = 0.054$ ) is shown in Table 3. Simple slopes analysis revealed additional information for the human group ( $B = 0.22, p = 0.05$ ) and the white-box AI group ( $B = 0.17, p = 0.11$ ). Based on these results, we cannot confirm H2b, as the data do not provide sufficient evidence to conclude that Trust in People significantly impacts data-sharing willingness in the human condition.


**Table 3.** Multiple regression results for Model Trust in AI and Model Trust in People

Variable	Model Trust in AI		Model Trust in People	
	$B \pm SE$	$p$	$B \pm SE$	$p$
<b>Intercept</b>	5.84± 0.10	<.001***	5.83± 0.10	<.001***
White-box AI	-0.02± 0.14	0.913	0.00± 0.14	0.986
Black-box AI	0.14± 0.15	0.332	0.19± 0.15	0.211
<b>Trust<sup>†</sup></b>				
Trust in AI	-0.03± 0.09	0.712		
Trust in People			0.22± 0.11	0.054
<b>Group × Trust</b>				
White-box AI × Trust in AI	0.49± 0.13	<.001***		
Black-box AI × Trust in AI	0.24± 0.14	0.080		
White-box AI × Trust in People			-0.04± 0.15	0.773
Black-box AI × Trust in People			-0.22± 0.14	0.118
$R^2$	0.113		0.035	
$R^2_{Adj}$	0.094		0.014	

Note. <sup>†</sup>Trust is mean-centered; Ref = Human

## 4.3 Impact of Privacy Concerns on Willingness to Share Data

Regarding the stated moderating effect of Privacy Concerns on the relationship between data-processing entity and data-sharing intentions, the results of the regression analysis



**Figure 2.** Simple slopes plots illustrating the relationship between Trust in AI, Trust in People, and Mean Willingness to Share Data for Human, White-box AI, and Black-box AI groups.

in Table 4 show that Privacy Concerns alone did not significantly predict willingness to share in any condition. This finding suggests that Privacy Concerns did not negatively influence participants’ data-sharing behavior, regardless of the data-processing entity involved. Therefore, we cannot confirm H3.

**Table 4.** Multiple regression result for Model Privacy Concerns

Variable	Model Privacy Concerns	
	$B \pm SE$	$p$
<b>Intercept</b>	5.86 ± 0.11	<.001***
White-box AI	-0.04 ± 0.15	0.789
Black-box AI	0.14 ± 0.15	0.343
<b>Privacy Concerns<sup>†</sup></b>	-0.09 ± 0.14	0.536
<b>Group × Privacy Concerns</b>		
White-box AI × Privacy Concerns	-0.16 ± 0.19	0.419
Black-box AI × Privacy Concerns	-0.03 ± 0.18	0.886
$R^2$	0.030	
$R^2_{Adj}$	0.009	

Note. <sup>†</sup>Mean-centered; Ref = Human

## 5 Discussion

Our research explored the influence of different data-processing entities (human expert, white-box AI, and black-box AI) on individuals’ willingness to share personal data, considering the moderating effects of trust and privacy concerns. Surprisingly, we found no significant differences in data-sharing willingness across the three conditions, contrary to previous findings on algorithm aversion (Dietvorst et al. 2015) and algorithm appreciation (Logg et al. 2019). However, trust in AI emerged as a critical factor, significantly increasing data-sharing intentions in both white-box and black-box AI

systems. Those results are aligned with the findings of Choung et al. (2023) stating that factors such as trust in the functionality of an AI system affect users' intentions to use AI. Privacy concerns, on the other hand, did not significantly predict willingness to share data, thus are not in line with broad research previously conducted indicating that information privacy concerns impact individuals' risk assessment towards information privacy and thus affect their willingness to disclose their data (Dinev & Hart 2006, Li et al. 2011, Malhotra et al. 2004, Son & Kim 2008)

As such, our findings make several important theoretical and practical contributions to the literature on AI transparency, trust, and privacy. First, by showing no significant differences between treatment groups, our results challenge the prevailing academic discourse that argues that the inherent opacity of some AI systems can lead to problems such as a lack of user adoption which should be mitigated by building more transparent systems (Adadi & Berrada 2018, Poursabzi-Sangdeh et al. 2021, Rudin 2019). Indeed, our results emphasize that providing transparent systems alone is not enough to convince users of AI systems, but that creating trust in AI systems in general may also be beneficial. Finally, by examining users' willingness to share data as our key dependent variable, we provide initial insights into how the nature of the data-processing entity influences individuals' privacy calculus for mobile application services (Rai 2020). This contribution enriches the academic discourse on privacy and trust in AI while offering practical guidance for developers on optimizing data-sharing in AI systems based on users' general trust in the system.

However, while our study provides valuable insights, it is important to acknowledge certain limitations. We tested our hypotheses using a mock-up of a fictitious sleep app, which may not fully replicate real-world user experiences. Future studies should explore data-sharing behaviors in more realistic settings. Additionally, our focus on purely human, white-box AI, and black-box AI systems does not account for hybrid systems common in real-world applications (Dellermann et al. 2019). Future research should investigate user perceptions, trust, and interaction strategies for these hybrid systems. Another limitation is that we measured trust only after the experimental manipulation, preventing randomization checks for pre-existing trust levels. Future research should measure trust at multiple time points to control for potential confounding effects. Lastly, our study did not collect comprehensive demographic data (including education, income, profession, and geographical location) and other potentially influential factors like AI experience, literacy, and knowledge. Future research should consider including these variables to provide a more detailed understanding of data-sharing attitudes and behaviors.

In conclusion, our study makes significant contributions to the fields of AI and information privacy by examining the impact of data-processing entities on data-sharing intentions, considering the critical roles of trust and privacy concerns. Our findings offer valuable theoretical insights and practical recommendations for developing AI systems that prioritize transparency, trust, and user privacy. Future research should build upon our work by exploring data-sharing behaviors in different contexts, investigating the effects of hybrid AI systems, and examining the potential negative implications of excessive trust in AI (Greulich et al. 2024). By continuing to advance our understanding of these complex issues, we can develop AI systems that are not only technologically sophisticated but also ethically responsible and socially beneficial.

## References

- Acquisti, A. & Grossklags, J. (2005), 'Privacy and rationality in individual decision making', *IEEE security & privacy* **3**(1), 26–33.
- Adadi, A. & Berrada, M. (2018), 'Peeking inside the black-box: a survey on explainable artificial intelligence (xai)', *IEEE access* **6**, 52138–52160.
- Aiken, L. S., West, S. G. & Reno, R. R. (1991), *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*, sage.
- Alufaisan, Y., Marusich, L. R., Bakdash, J. Z., Zhou, Y. & Kantarcioglu, M. (2021), Does explainable artificial intelligence improve human decision-making?, in 'Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence', Vol. 35, pp. 6618–6626.
- Awad, N. F. & Krishnan, M. S. (2006), 'The personalization privacy paradox: an empirical evaluation of information transparency and the willingness to be profiled online for personalization', *MIS quarterly* pp. 13–28.
- Babic, B., Gerke, S., Evgeniou, T. & Cohen, I. G. (2021), 'Beware explanations from ai in health care', *Science* **373**(6552), 284–286.
- Bansal, G., Wu, T., Zhou, J., Fok, R., Nushi, B., Kamar, E., Ribeiro, M. T. & Weld, D. (2021), Does the whole exceed its parts? the effect of ai explanations on complementary team performance, in 'Proceedings of the 2021 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems', pp. 1–16.
- Barnes, S. B. (2006), 'A privacy paradox: Social networking in the united states', *First Monday* .
- Belanger, F., Hiller, J. S. & Smith, W. J. (2002), 'Trustworthiness in electronic commerce: the role of privacy, security, and site attributes', *The journal of strategic Information Systems* **11**(3-4), 245–270.
- Brown, N. & Sandholm, T. (2019), 'Superhuman ai for multiplayer poker', *Science* **365**(6456), 885–890.
- Cadario, R., Longoni, C. & Morewedge, C. K. (2021), 'Understanding, explaining, and utilizing medical artificial intelligence', *Nature human behaviour* **5**(12), 1636–1642.
- Chellappa, R. K. & Sin, R. G. (2005), 'Personalization versus privacy: An empirical examination of the online consumer's dilemma', *Information technology and management* **6**, 181–202.
- Choung, H., David, P. & Ross, A. (2023), 'Trust in ai and its role in the acceptance of ai technologies', *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction* **39**(9), 1727–1739.
- Cichy, P., Salge, T. O. & Kohli, R. (2021), 'Privacy concerns and data sharing in the internet of things: Mixed methods evidence from connected cars.', *MIS Quarterly* **45**(4).
- Culnan, M. J. (1993), '" how did they get my name?": An exploratory investigation of consumer attitudes toward secondary information use', *MIS quarterly* pp. 341–363.
- Dellermann, D., Ebel, P., Söllner, M. & Leimeister, J. M. (2019), 'Hybrid intelligence', *Business & Information Systems Engineering* **61**(5), 637–643.

- Dietvorst, B. J., Simmons, J. P. & Massey, C. (2015), 'Algorithm aversion: people erroneously avoid algorithms after seeing them err.', *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* **144**(1), 114.
- Dietvorst, B. J., Simmons, J. P. & Massey, C. (2018), 'Overcoming algorithm aversion: People will use imperfect algorithms if they can (even slightly) modify them', *Management science* **64**(3), 1155–1170.
- Dinev, T., Bellotto, M., Hart, P., Russo, V., Serra, I. & Colautti, C. (2006), 'Privacy calculus model in e-commerce—a study of Italy and the United States', *European Journal of Information Systems* **15**(4), 389–402.
- Dinev, T. & Hart, P. (2006), 'An extended privacy calculus model for e-commerce transactions', *Information systems research* **17**(1), 61–80.
- Du, M., Liu, N. & Hu, X. (2019), 'Techniques for interpretable machine learning', *Communications of the ACM* **63**(1), 68–77.
- Dzindolet, M. T., Peterson, S. A., Pomranky, R. A., Pierce, L. G. & Beck, H. P. (2003), 'The role of trust in automation reliance', *International journal of human-computer studies* **58**(6), 697–718.
- Eastlick, M. A., Lotz, S. L. & Warrington, P. (2006), 'Understanding online b-to-c relationships: An integrated model of privacy concerns, trust, and commitment', *Journal of business research* **59**(8), 877–886.
- Egelman, S., Felt, A. P. & Wagner, D. (2013), Choice architecture and smartphone privacy: There's a price for that, in 'The economics of information security and privacy', Springer, pp. 211–236.
- Esteva, A., Kuprel, B., Novoa, R. A., Ko, J., Swetter, S. M., Blau, H. M. & Thrun, S. (2017), 'Dermatologist-level classification of skin cancer with deep neural networks', *nature* **542**(7639), 115–118.
- Gerber, N., Gerber, P. & Volkamer, M. (2018), 'Explaining the privacy paradox: A systematic review of literature investigating privacy attitude and behavior', *Computers & security* **77**, 226–261.
- Greulich, M., Lins, S., Pienta, D., Thatcher, J. B. & Sunyaev, A. (2024), 'Exploring contrasting effects of trust in organizational security practices and protective structures on employees' security-related precaution taking', *Information Systems Research* .
- Groß, T. (2021), 'Validity and reliability of the scale internet users' information privacy concerns (iuipe)', *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* .
- Herlocker, J. L., Konstan, J. A. & Riedl, J. (2000), Explaining collaborative filtering recommendations, in 'Proceedings of the 2000 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work', pp. 241–250.
- Hoffman, R. R., Mueller, S. T., Klein, G. & Litman, J. (2023), 'Measures for explainable ai: Explanation goodness, user satisfaction, mental models, curiosity, trust, and human-ai performance', *Frontiers in Computer Science* **5**, 1096257.
- Kehr, F., Kowatsch, T., Wentzel, D. & Fleisch, E. (2015), 'Blissfully ignorant: the effects of general privacy concerns, general institutional trust, and affect in the privacy calculus', *Information Systems Journal* **25**(6), 607–635.
- Koh, P. W. & Liang, P. (2017), Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions, in 'International conference on machine learning', PMLR, pp. 1885–1894.
- Kokolakis, S. (2017), 'Privacy attitudes and privacy behaviour: A review of current research on the privacy paradox phenomenon', *Computers & security* **64**, 122–134.

- Kraus, M., Tschernutter, D., Weinzierl, S. & Zschech, P. (2023), 'Interpretable generalized additive neural networks', *European Journal of Operational Research* .
- Lee, J. D. & See, K. A. (2004), 'Trust in automation: Designing for appropriate reliance', *Human factors* **46**(1), 50–80.
- Li, H., Sarathy, R. & Xu, H. (2011), 'The role of affect and cognition on online consumers' decision to disclose personal information to unfamiliar online vendors', *Decision support systems* **51**(3), 434–445.
- Logg, J. M., Minson, J. A. & Moore, D. A. (2019), 'Algorithm appreciation: People prefer algorithmic to human judgment', *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **151**, 90–103.
- Longoni, C., Bonezzi, A. & Morewedge, C. K. (2019), 'Resistance to medical artificial intelligence', *Journal of Consumer Research* **46**(4), 629–650.
- Lundberg, S. M. & Lee, S.-I. (2017), 'A unified approach to interpreting model predictions', *Advances in neural information processing systems* **30**.
- Madhavan, P. & Wiegmann, D. A. (2007), 'Effects of information source, pedigree, and reliability on operator interaction with decision support systems', *Human factors* **49**(5), 773–785.
- Mahmud, H., Islam, A. N., Ahmed, S. I. & Smolander, K. (2022), 'What influences algorithmic decision-making? a systematic literature review on algorithm aversion', *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **175**, 121390.
- Malhotra, N. K., Kim, S. S. & Agarwal, J. (2004), 'Internet users' information privacy concerns (iuipe): The construct, the scale, and a causal model', *Information systems research* **15**(4), 336–355.
- Millecamp, M., Htun, N. N., Conati, C. & Verbert, K. (2019), To explain or not to explain: the effects of personal characteristics when explaining music recommendations, in 'Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces', pp. 397–407.
- Norberg, P. A., Horne, D. R. & Horne, D. A. (2007), 'The privacy paradox: Personal information disclosure intentions versus behaviors', *Journal of consumer affairs* **41**(1), 100–126.
- Pavlou, P. A., Liang, H. & Xue, Y. (2007), 'Understanding and mitigating uncertainty in online exchange relationships: A principal-agent perspective', *MIS quarterly* pp. 105–136.
- Poursabzi-Sangdeh, F., Goldstein, D. G., Hofman, J. M., Wortman Vaughan, J. W. & Wallach, H. (2021), Manipulating and measuring model interpretability, in 'Proceedings of the 2021 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems', pp. 1–52.
- Rai, A. (2020), 'Explainable ai: From black box to glass box', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* **48**, 137–141.
- Ribeiro, M. T., Singh, S. & Guestrin, C. (2016), " why should i trust you?" explaining the predictions of any classifier, in 'Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining', pp. 1135–1144.
- Rotter, J. B. (1967), 'A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust.', *Journal of personality* .
- Rudin, C. (2019), 'Stop explaining black box machine learning models for high stakes decisions and use interpretable models instead', *Nature machine intelligence* **1**(5), 206–215.

- Schemmer, M., Kühl, N., Benz, C. & Satzger, G. (2022), 'On the influence of explainable ai on automation bias', *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.08859*.
- Schrills, T. & Franke, T. (2020), Color for characters-effects of visual explanations of ai on trust and observability, in 'Artificial Intelligence in HCI: First International Conference, AI-HCI 2020, Held as Part of the 22nd HCI International Conference, HCII 2020, Copenhagen, Denmark, July 19–24, 2020, Proceedings 22', Springer, pp. 121–135.
- Shin, D. (2021), 'The effects of explainability and causability on perception, trust, and acceptance: Implications for explainable ai', *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* **146**, 102551.
- Sinha, R. & Swearingen, K. (2002), The role of transparency in recommender systems, in 'CHI'02 extended abstracts on Human factors in computing systems', pp. 830–831.
- Son, J.-Y. & Kim, S. S. (2008), 'Internet users' information privacy-protective responses: A taxonomy and a nomological model', *MIS quarterly* pp. 503–529.
- Spiekermann, S., Grossklags, J. & Berendt, B. (2001), E-privacy in 2nd generation e-commerce: privacy preferences versus actual behavior, in 'Proceedings of the 3rd ACM conference on Electronic Commerce', pp. 38–47.
- Stiglic, G., Kocbek, P., Fijacko, N., Zitnik, M., Verbert, K. & Cilar, L. (2020), 'Interpretability of machine learning-based prediction models in healthcare', *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* **10**(5), e1379.
- Tjoa, E. & Guan, C. (2020), 'A survey on explainable artificial intelligence (xai): Toward medical xai', *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* **32**(11), 4793–4813.
- White, T. B. (2004), 'Consumer disclosure and disclosure avoidance: A motivational framework', *Journal of consumer psychology* **14**(1-2), 41–51.
- Xu, H., Teo, H.-H., Tan, B. C. & Agarwal, R. (2009), 'The role of push-pull technology in privacy calculus: the case of location-based services', *Journal of management information systems* **26**(3), 135–174.
- Yamagishi, T. & Yamagishi, M. (1994), 'Trust and commitment in the united states and japan', *Motivation and emotion* **18**, 129–166.
- Yeomans, M., Shah, A., Mullainathan, S. & Kleinberg, J. (2019), 'Making sense of recommendations', *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* **32**(4), 403–414.