Literature Review	
Limitations	Social desirability: Asking people about potentially aggressive data use is not something they will be honest about. So we used an LLM!!!
Boundary Conditions	Over repeat interactions between company and users
Future Research	More closely embed LLM reasoning at the individual level

Title	Forgone Interaction Exploitation Normalization Effect
Y. Dependent Variable	Tendency of a company take an aggressive stance on customer data Tendency of individual to keep sharing even after exploitation
X. Independent Variable	Proportion of people that share Potential payoff from taking an aggressive stance
Control Variables	Corporation boldness: by how much will corproate aggressiveness grow after sharing rate is greater than a set percent (this captures opportunistic thinking and boldness because of sharing norms in society) - control variable.
Moderator Variables	Social norms - e.g. sharing rate, when people share less, companies are aggressive to get pay off when people share, companies are less aggressive (it would appear)
Supporting Theory	Pay-off maximization - Companies will pick the choice that gives them maximum payoff Exploitative effect - Companies will change their behavior when it gives them a payoff Learning effect - Companies will learn how aggressive to be based on aggregate customer behavior
Research Design/Data	Present n customers with the opportunity to share or not share (based on starting sharing prob) Present 1 company with opportunity to be aggressive or not (based on starting aggressive prob)
Analysis/Reporting	The outcome where people share and are exploited is far more likely than the best case scenario (Fig 1) X times more likely for FIEN effect than judicious use of data (find a good term). Despite dropping aggression rates when sharing is the norm (guaranteeing steady payoff) companies still swoop in and act exploitatively (POT SHOTS), confirming the FIEN effect. Future customers learning about past sharing behaviors continue to share even after companies act aggressively
Effects of Deterrents	SOLUTIONS/DETERRENTS Alpha: Social influence strength. If an individuals decision each time they get to decide to share or not is partially influenced by random choice, but also influenced by the aggregate sharing from the previous round. Alpha represents the strength of the past group sharing rate e.g. 0.3 means you randomly pick whether to share or not (using sharing prob) then you ADD 0.3 x previous group sharing rate. Beta: Norm Effect, personal history of sharing... running average of sharing probabilities. Balanes past sharing decisions instead of making each decision fresh or separate from past history.
Reasoning with LLM	We fed the sharing rates and aggression probability to the LLM and received a recommendation and reasoning for the following stage of the interaction. Then we analyzed the reasoning and decision patterns of the LLM. We checked the reasoning related to the idea of FIEN and POT SHOTS.
So What? Implications	Late aggression (POT SHOTS) despite declining corporate aggression probability CONFIRMS the FIEN effect.

If people can be told accurate sharing rates