

# New contexts, old heuristics: How young people in India and the US trust online content in the age of generative AI

Rachel Xu  
Jigsaw  
rachelxu@google.com

Nhu Le  
Gemic  
nhu.le@gemic.com

Rebekah Park  
Gemic  
rebekah.park@gemic.com

Laura Murray  
Gemic  
laura.murray@gemic.com

Vishnupriya Das  
Gemic  
vishnupriya.das@gemic.com

Devika Kumar  
Gemic  
devika.kumar@gemic.com

Beth Goldberg  
Jigsaw  
bethgoldberg@google.com

## Abstract

We conducted an in-person ethnography in India and the US to investigate how young people (18-24) trusted online content, with a focus on generative AI (GenAI). We had four key findings about how young people use GenAI and determine what to trust online. First, when online, we found participants fluidly shifted between mindsets and emotional states, which we term “information modes.” Second, these information modes shaped how and why participants trust GenAI and how they applied literacy skills. In the modes where they spent most of their time, they eschewed literacy skills. Third, with the advent of GenAI, participants imported existing trust heuristics from familiar online contexts into their interactions with GenAI. Fourth, although study participants had reservations about GenAI, they saw it as a requisite tool to adopt to keep up with the times. Participants valued efficiency above all else, and used GenAI to further their goals quickly at the expense of accuracy. Our findings suggest that young people spend the majority of their time online not concerned with truth because they are seeking only to pass the time. As a result, literacy interventions should be designed to intervene at the right time, to match users’ distinct information modes, and to work with their existing fact-checking practices.

## 1 Introduction

The introduction of GenAI has challenged the ways people have learned in the past two decades of online information sharing to discern if information was true. We wanted to know how people were adapting to this reality; what

strategies they were now employing to evaluate info online; and how these new strategies interact with their established heuristics such as source reputation, content aesthetics, and comments as crowdsourced wisdom.

To investigate this, we examined how young adults used trust heuristics, or shortcuts to verify the credibility of content, in their interactions with GenAI and why. Specifically, we asked: (RQ1) What trust heuristics did young people use when engaging online information? (RQ2) How did young people perceive AI-generated content and assess its trustworthiness?

This paper offers an ethnographic perspective on when trust matters in digital settings, what it looks like in practice, and the potential harms that are created when heuristics of trust that evolved in one context (i.e. social media posts) are carried into another (i.e. GenAI). Our research produced four findings:

1. When online, participants were engaged in different mindsets and emotional states, which we term “information modes.” The trustworthiness of the content only mattered in some modes. In the most popular modes, they overrode their literacy skills and experimented as creators with GenAI.
2. Participants spent most of their time-consuming content that helped them feel an emotional equilibrium. They avoided what felt emotionally taxing and sought out what felt energizing and soothing.
3. Participants applied the same trust heuristics they used elsewhere online to their online interactions with GenAI, based on the mode they were in.
4. Participants readily adopted GenAI text assistants to get ahead in their future careers and saw GenAI as just another tool to master. This mental model

and bias towards action exposed them to potential harms such as misinformation online.

Our findings suggest that young people do not go online for a singular purpose and do not behave in one singular way online. Instead, we should imagine young people as maneuvering between different modes when online. The HCI community can support young adult explorations of GenAI by (1) designing products and literacy interventions that meet young people in the modes they are in and (2) building upon their existing fact-checking instincts and adaptations.

## 2 Literature Review

### 2.1 Social shifts in knowing and trusting

In India and the US, technology has become a powerful tool for people to construct and broker truths online (Ali and Zain-ul-abdin 2021; Guess and Lyon 2020; Grant et. al. 2011; Hanckel and Chandra 2021). These technological and sociological changes have led Jayson Harsin (2018) to describe the current historical moment as a “post-truth regime.” Information no longer needs to be based on institutional approval, academic pedigree, and scientific rationality to be considered trustworthy. Now, many more types of expertise are accepted, and trustworthiness is often based on perceived relatability (Xu et al. 2024).

When truth is a contestable matter of personal perspectives, the value of knowledge depends on its social applicability. Research by Hassoun et al. found that when young people engage with information, they do so within a paradigm of “information sensibility,” a quest for “socially-informed awareness of the value of information” (Hassoun et. al. 2023). Because information with cultural and social relevance unlocks benefits, social motivations drive information processing more than truth assessments. In a post-truth era, it is necessary to approach information literacy as a “social and connective act, performed in relation to collective norms and group identities” (Swart 2023).

### 2.2 Trust practices for online information vetting

Heuristics are defined as cognitive shortcuts that increase efficiency during rational reasoning (Kahneman, 2011; Gasser et. al. 2012; Metzger and Flanagin 2013). These frameworks emphasize that heuristics involve cognitive trade-offs, and often moralize the use of heuristics as an undesirable way of making judgments (Petty and Cacioppo 1986; Peng, Lu, and Shen 2023; Jenkins et. al. 2020). What prior literature undervalues, however, is that heuristics frequently evolve in changing informational contexts. From this view, heuristics are not inherently good or bad, but are socially-situated practices for sense-making.

At a time when the pace of content production has rapidly increased and truth is regularly contested, heuristics help young people to tackle the new challenges these social-technical trends have introduced: information overload and the social pressure to take a stance on every potential “truth” (Zhou and Zhou 2022; Melumad, Inman, and Pham 2019; Chen et. al. 2023). Our research builds on these findings, including previous work that identified three prominent trust heuristics: (1) crowdsourcing credibility, or the probabilistic deliberation of content being true based on peer accounts or crowd wisdom (Hassoun et. al. 2023; Pfeuffer and Phua 2022); (2) source credibility, or when the reputation of a source confers a sense of trustworthiness to the content itself (Fedeli and Matsa 2018; Metzger et. al. 2003; Lim et al. 2022; Xu et al. 2024); and (3) like-minded and like-bodied, or the bias toward content from a creator mirroring similar looks, values, and identities to them (Lee et. al. 2022; Karizat et. al. 2021; Xu et al. 2024).

### 2.3 Trust in Generative AI

We use GenAI here to refer to deep learning models that learn patterns and structure of input data to generate new synthetic data that resembles real-world text, images, audio, or video (Dwivedi et. al. 2023; Baidoo-Anu and Ansah 2023; Morris 2023). This is an evolution of narrow AI, which is AI that has been trained to complete specific tasks, and is also distinct from artificial generalized intelligence (AGI), which is a theoretical artificial intelligence with a human level of cognitive ability (Morris et. al. 2023).

Many discussions of trustworthiness of GenAI tend to frame the topic as either an institutional matter, or as a capabilities and literacy matter. The former approach details technological, social, and regulatory challenges and hypothesizes or tests structural solutions to increase trust in GenAI (Lenat and Marcus 2023; Dunn et. al. 2023; Li et. al. 2023; Krishnaram, Lakkaraju, and Rajani 2023; Baldassarre et. al. 2023). The latter approach focuses on how individuals understand what is and is not trustworthy, and what user-level interventions or technological affordances can boost their ability to understand and assess GenAI trustworthiness (Xu, Fan, and Kankanhalli 2023; Ali et. al. 2021).

Both approaches view trust in GenAI tools and GenAI content as a challenge that is unique and discrete from individuals’ trust attitudes and practices with respect to the internet writ large. In doing so, they divorce individuals from the social and cultural contexts that ascribe meaning to their practices. In contrast, our approach, based on the principles of ethnography, contextualizes trust in GenAI within the context of their existing online trust practices. In doing so, we detail the way trust in GenAI conforms, diverges, or builds on these practices and why. In doing so, we can better anticipate the future of trust in GenAI.

## 2.4 Misinformation from Global South to North

Our cross-cultural research resisted positioning the Western context as the default in which to compare a non-Western context. Instead we used an “India-first” approach (Athique and Parthasarathi 2020; Couldry and Mejias 2021; Nithya et. al. 2021). Our framing challenged our assumptions as US-based researchers on (1) the ways misinformation functions, (2) why social factors matter, and (3) the ways young people have adapted to misinformation:

1. Politically-motivated manipulated imagery on social media has been a core part of India’s information ecosystem since at least 2012 (Mohan 2017). Misinformation exists not because its creators or consumers lack literacy, but because misinformation can create moments of consolidation of participatory cultures (Banaji et. al. 2021).
2. Scholarship focused on India noted that social factors matter because the stakes of misinformation are high. Problems of digital memory, “cancel culture,” and context collapse make many online spaces a minefield (Katz et. al. 2021; Weinstein 2018; Jeffrey and Doron 2013; Eichhorn 2019). In India, social factors have led to mob violence, lynching, and police action that underscore the dire consequences for sharing the “wrong thing,” true or false, online (Deuskar 2023). Euro-American contexts have in many ways begun to “evolve” towards these types of social structures of risk.
3. Young people have adapted to accept a messy, niche internet. The trajectory of digital access in India has meant that most users have long waded through large volumes of user-generated content (e.g. WhatsApp chains, Quora posts) in unkempt app ecosystems. Indian youth, who are natives to these ecosystems, have developed adaptive practices such as curating small real-life information orbits (Hassoun et. al. 2023). We look to these practices to understand the practices in the US.

Building upon scholarship from India, we explored how online platforms might better tackle misinformation, especially as GenAI content becomes more common online (Arora 2019; Lindtner 2014, Milan and Trere 2019).

---

<sup>1</sup>We use the term “young people” to refer to study participants, but want to acknowledge that the original framing of our research was around “Gen Z.” We recruited for Gen Z because of their reputation as “digital natives.” (Bennett 2008, Vardeman 2022). In writing this paper, however, we removed generational terminology because our findings do not discuss distinct generational differences. This aligns with the approach demographic research institutions such as the Pew Research Institute take (Parker 2023).

<sup>2</sup> We defined each tier of AI literacy as follows: AI-unfamiliar participants did not know and had never used any generative AI tool; AI-familiar

## 3 Methodology

Studying heuristics presents a methodological challenge because people gravitate toward, respond to, absorb, use, and pass on information in ways that are hard to consciously reflect on and articulate after the fact. We drew from the “Manchester School,” which emphasizes capturing particular instances over generalities to understand social phenomena (Evens and Handelman 2022; Turner and Lewis 1957). Working from real-life settings, we honed in on precise empirical details of users’ trust behaviors and used an iterative analytic approach to map how singular events can crystallize and illuminate broad socio-cultural realities.

### 3.1 Recruitment and Participant Profile

This study included 52 participants aged 18-24 years old, born between 1998 and 2004.<sup>1</sup> We had two field sites: Bangalore (n = 26) and New York metro area (n = 26). Across both field sites, we included participants with varying levels of GenAI literacy based on self-reported familiarity with and usage of GenAI tools: 9 experts, 42 familiar, and 3 unfamiliar.<sup>2</sup> We also sought participants from locations with varied community density and tracked education and income levels; all were students or early-career adults. In the US, we selected for race diversity and across a gender-identity spectrum, and identified them through an online study recruitment platform, snowball recruitment, and posting invitations online. In India, we included a diversity of ethno-religious groups and participants who identified as either female or male. (see Appendix).

### 3.2 Research Phases and Process

Data collection took place from May 2023 to July 2023 in three phases.

**Phase 1: Journey mapping, diary study, & app history:** We completed a multidisciplinary literature review to design effective recruitment tools. We then recruited participants and asked them to catalog: (1) what social media platforms and online spaces they visited that day; (2) what content they saw that felt “trustworthy” and “untrustworthy” and why. Participants uploaded screenshots and links, describing their perceptions of the content’s credibility. We analyzed preliminary themes in short-

participants had previously used at least one generative AI tool, typically a text-based tool like ChatGPT; expert participants were familiar with or had used multiple non-text based generative AI tools, such as DALL-E, in addition to regularly using a text-based tool. The AI literacy of participants was assessed during the in-person interview. It is important to note that adoption of AI tools was very rapid and unpredictable during data collection. As a result, many participants improved their AI literacy in the third phase. For this reason, we did not aim for a specific distribution of AI literacy in our sample to mirror the general population seeking only

answer responses from 130 people who responded to our recruitment screener.

**Phase 2: In-person ethnography:** We visited participants’ lived spaces to observe how their offline context influenced online practices. This enabled us to observe participants’ unspoken trust attitudes and practices, which are often instantaneous and instinctive. We audio-recorded and transcribed all interview sessions and video-recorded specific segments. For each interview, we composed field notes and conducted thematic analysis of the interview data through coding (Saldana 2021).

**Phase 3: Coding data & remote interviews:** Our analytical process followed the principles of constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2006; Mills, Bonner, and Francis 2006; Charmaz 2017). While we reviewed the literature on the research topics prior to data collection, analysis was an iterative process utilizing an emic lens (Beals, Kidman, and Funaki 2020).

At the start, we open coded our data from Phase 1 and Phase 2 (Holton 2007; Williams and Moser 2019). We used preliminary findings from this first round of coding to develop ideas for potential information literacy interventions.

We conducted 60-minute follow-up interviews remotely to present these intervention ideas and collect additional data. We also discussed initial findings from our coded data with our participants. This serves both to make research findings more robust and to alleviate ethical concerns about research being alienating and incomprehensible to its subjects (Birt et. al. 2016). The research closed with collaborative analysis sessions to examine codes within and across thematic categories, developing new insights.

3.3 Ethical Considerations

The study plan was reviewed by experts in human subjects research, legal, security, and privacy. We consulted academics and experts who specialize on topics of trust, GenAI, and youth. All participants provided both written and verbal informed consent prior to commencing the study, and were reminded they could withdraw from the study at any time.

We maintained strict data privacy control for all participants. We assigned participants a pseudonym; all data collected used only their pseudonyms. We use different pseudonyms in this paper from those used during data collection and analysis. Participants were instructed to withhold personally identifying information (PII) during the study. Diary responses from Phase 1 and interview transcripts from Phase 2 and 3 were scrubbed of PII. Raw research data such as audio and video recordings were deleted within 30 days of the final reporting.

3.4 Study Limitations

Our sample size was not statistically representative of the 18-24 year old age cohort. Our sample was limited to two geographic locations accessible to urban areas, which may not represent broader youth experiences with GenAI in both countries. For example, Bangalore is recognized for its technological sophistication, so our sample may skew towards those of higher technological skill, income, and education.

Self-reported data, as captured in all phases of the study, but particularly the digital diary in Phase 1, is known to have key limitations such as recall, observer, and social desirability biases. To mitigate these biases, we conducted multiple phases and incorporated multiple data collection methods. The multiple phases enabled us to cross-reference data between each phase and ask probing questions if contradictions or ambiguities occurred. By capturing real-time reactions to online content, including body language, we minimized recall bias and social desirability bias.

Finally, GenAI technologies were evolving throughout the study, and users were still forming their expectations and mental models for AI products.

4 Findings

4.1 Information modes

We found that participants sought and avoided content in terms of two key variables: content “weight” and content “sociality.” Content weight refers to whether content felt emotionally “light” or “heavy.” Content that had low-mental tax and was entertaining or soothing was considered light. Content that had high-mental tax and was boring or triggering was considered heavy. Content sociality refers to whether content impacts just the participant (self) or involves others (social). The former felt “obligation-free,” while the latter conferred an obligation to act after they consumed it. For example, participants perceived news about war and politics as carrying social consequences and compelled them to act upon learned information.



Fig 1. Participants perceived and reacted to the value of content along two key spectrums.

Based on this schema, we developed the concept of “information modes” to describe the emotional state and mindset people were in when engaging with online content, and how each mode shaped how and when they deployed heuristics to trust online information. With information modes, we highlight emotional states because participants did not consciously and rationally determine where content fell along the spectra, but rather, they reacted emotionally and instinctively. Participants “wandered into” different information modes that determined trust behaviors, actions taken, and exposure to blindspots and social costs. We deliberately use the phrasing “wandered into” because we observed that participants often moved between different information modes and trust contexts in unplanned ways.

Kathy’s (21, USA) description of how she consumed content was typical of our participants:

“[My feed] sends me videos like today’s news or what’s going on in pop culture or skincare or

clothing...I don’t personally seek out news...When you are constantly exposed to [news like school shootings], you feel more sad. You want to watch something that brings you joy or brings you entertainment...[Though] obviously you should be aware of what’s going.”

Kathy’s quote highlighted the way participants’ immediate attraction or repulsion shaped what other content they sought out or were fed by their feeds. It also highlighted the different, sometimes conflicting, objectives that participants had for consuming content. These objectives made up the tapestry of their emotional mindset, and consequently their information mode.

Based on a pattern of underlying motivation, emotion evoked, action entailed, and heuristic deployed, we identified seven key information modes participants inhabited.

Mode	Motivation <i>Why do they spend time online in this mode?</i>	Emotions evoked <i>How do they feel while in this mode?</i>	Top actions <i>What do they do in this mode?</i>	Trust heuristic <i>What key rules of thumb do they use while in this mode to quickly assess that content online is trustworthy?</i>	Representative quote <i>What participant statement exemplifies how young people think while in this mode?</i>
Timepass	To assuage boredom and feel good while doing it	Mindlessly entertained but in control	Internalize	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If it’s entertainment, it doesn’t matter if it’s trustworthy or not</li> </ul>	“If it’s just for humor, the fun entertainment industry and all, you can contradict yourself.” - Gaurav, 23, IND
Lifestyle Aspiration	To imagine or work towards reaching ideals and improving yourself	Productively stimulated	Internalize Test	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creators who look and think like me are more trustworthy than experts (“like-minded, like-bodied”)</li> <li>It’s faster and more reliable to test a lifestyle tip on myself than to research it (testing over trusting)</li> <li>GenAI can answer my doubts because it aggregates perspectives</li> </ul>	“[Andrew Tate] might be wrong, he might be right, but the way he is influencing young men in society is quite motivating actually. [Because of him] I go to the gym more, work hard more ... I want to get that rich.” - Mehul, 21, IND
Bonding over Content	To invest in online communities and unlock a sense of collective belonging	Connected to others & safe or joyful	Internalize Share Discuss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once I’ve joined a community that shares my values, I can automatically trust content that other members share (“info orbit”)</li> <li>Content shared in the community doesn’t have to be fact-checked since it’s just to bond over</li> </ul>	“There’s a sense of community in [sharing info]. With fandom, it’s not harmful to hype yourself up over something that doesn’t end up being true... [But] sometimes the news sources are less informed than the fandom is. The fandom notices every little thing.” - Avery, 20, USA
Getting stuff done	To complete annoying but necessary tasks with maximum efficiency	Satisfied due to a sense of ‘hacking’ busywork to free up time	Internalize Share Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GenAI is unbiased and accurate, because it scours the net and aggregates info</li> <li>Because I am just jump-starting my info journey, mostly for busywork, scrutiny can wait for later</li> <li>If I can imagine how to do this or I can check GenAI, I can just trust what GenAI gives me</li> </ul>	“As long as I understand and I know what I’m talking about, at the end of the day it doesn’t matter how I got there, especially if it’s just like, stupid assignments.” - Irene, 18, USA
Keeping up with the times	To stay up-to-date on important topics and feel like a good citizen	Mentally burdened and unproductive, but morally good	Internalize	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Just knowing the bare minimum (e.g. headlines) is good enough to keep up</li> <li>It is easiest to agree with surrogate thinkers I’ve selected in the past (“crowdsourced credibility”)</li> <li>I trust one-time-vetted sources to tell the truth (“institutional source credibility”)</li> <li>If I see something several times, there must be truth to it</li> </ul>	“I will wait for a trusted source to post [about a news event before reading it] ... Each news source might have a different take, like, it’s complicated. So I just stick to the ones I trust.” - Paresh, 21, IND
Prepping for debate	To learn just enough about topics that you feel others will judge you on later	Mentally taxed and even triggered, but protected from social judgment	Discuss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If it tells me ‘both sides’ of a topic, then I’m more inclined to trust</li> <li>The source has to be ‘citiable’ for me to trust it, that is, others need to know and trust this source too (“institutional source credibility”)</li> <li>I need to see the same info from multiple sources in different formats before I feel confident in my take (“crowdsourced credibility”)</li> <li>Sponsorships or ads on serious content immediately means it can’t be trusted</li> </ul>	“When you’re in a setting where if you say something relevant, you can be perceived as smart or knowledgeable ... It is to be educated, but also to kind of fit in with other people. In college, like every class I’m in, the first 5-10 minutes is talking about something relevant to today.” - Neil, 22, USA
Making big life decisions	To acquire additional knowledge to make an important life decision	Confident & informed by feeling like they have a holistic grasp of the decision	Internalize Test	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I trust an everyday person’s perspective over “official” sources because they’ll tell it to me straight (“n=1 thinking”)</li> </ul>	“A few people said that the price for the program was not worth what you get out of it ... So that’s something that has stuck with me heavily.” - Claire, 22, USA

			Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I'm getting a visceral emotional reaction, so it must be true</li> <li>• Unpolished visuals means emotions and reactions are more real, so I trust it more</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	------	--	--

Table 2. Summary Table of the Information Modes and the key motivations, emotions, actions, and heuristics.

### Trust heuristics and information modes

Information modes reveal when and why different heuristics become relevant by highlighting how much the trustworthiness of a piece of content matters in context. For example, participants spent the vast majority of their time in Timepass mode. In Timepass, trust heuristics were irrelevant because the content was consumed for entertainment or soothing purposes, and checking veracity claims was seen as unimportant. In Lifestyle Aspiration and Making Big Decisions modes, participants sought information that had a direct impact on their lives, and applied the like-minded, like-bonded trust heuristic. They valued content stemming from personal experience, created by people who mirrored their identities and values, and which was validated by peers. In Bonding Over Content, participants leveraged peer ties to filter content, or the source credibility heuristic. They opted into communities with content norms and values that they assumed were shared across all members, and conferred trust to content shared within these communities. In Getting Stuff Done mode, participants were focused on accomplishing personal tasks efficiently, and were therefore trying to leverage online knowledge to work faster.

Literacy skills vetting institutional credibility, expertise, and objectivity were relevant for two information modes that were also the least popular: Keeping up with the Times and Prepping for Debate. Participants avoided these modes because they required engagement with news cycles, which participants found draining and upsetting, or having a high-mental tax. As such, they applied heuristics that decreased the amount of time and energy they had to spend in these modes. For example, some participants described reading headlines only, but strictly from previously-vetted content creators or outlets. The information modes revealed three new trust heuristics:

1. **“Two-sideism”**: Participants perceived content that addressed both sides of an issue to be more trustworthy. When they could not find such sources, they sought out two sources with opposing views on an issue (e.g. pro-vaccination vs. anti-vaccination), and then decided what they believed. A few participants discussed two-sideism as a reaction against “media bias.” We also see it as a reaction to post-truth society: the only way to arrive at the truth is to hear both sides of the story. For example, Tom (24, USA) looked for people

online who think “the opposite way” (e.g. “anti-West radicals”), to counteract what he called mainstream pro-US views. He claimed he did not trust these views but liked having an “opposite perspective.” By reviewing two opposing sides, Todd believed his final opinion to be more accurate.

2. **“Testing to trust”**: Our participants were quick to act on claims they encountered not because they categorically believed them to be true, but because they wanted to test whether or not they were true. Instead of fact checking, they believed testing upon themselves to be the fastest and most accurate way to test for truth. This testing behavior was prominent in Lifestyle Aspiration and Getting Stuff Done modes. With eating and health content, participants would immediately try out diets and exercise routines they found online (Xu et. al. 2024). As long as they were the only ones impacted and they believed themselves to be the best judge of the truth (e.g., whether a diet is working for their body), they felt confident in their abilities to evaluate the content by acting as the “scientist” themselves.
3. **“Innate common sense”**: Most participants felt their tech savviness, internalized knowledge, and quick processing abilities protected them from misinformation and from the potential harms of GenAI. While heuristics are shortcuts that enable quick evaluation of content, participants were not concerned or even aware of the accuracy trade-offs they were making when using heuristics to assess veracity. This held true even when they admitted to being fooled by misinformation previously. We observed participants judge video and text veracity after a few seconds, then retroactively explain their reaction in vague ways. For example, Neil (23, USA) originally judged an AI-generated photo of Donald Trump running away from police officers in New York at first glance as “real” because it was “common sense.” This was because he already knew that Donald Trump was in New York City and was in criminal proceedings in the state. Neil fell for the GenAI misinformation because it affirmed beliefs he had about the world.

**Emotional equilibria, unconscious switching, and harm**

Traditional information literacy models often describe online information journeys as linear: people seek or encounter information, make conscious decisions about what information to trust, and act accordingly. We, however, observed a much more dynamic and reactive series of behaviors. Our participants constantly shifted between different information modes, testing intuitively and adjusting their behaviors based on their feelings. Maintaining a stable emotional state was a highly influential motivation for our participants while online. This is why we observed them spending more time in Timepass and Lifestyle Aspiration modes, but comparatively little in time Prepping for Debate. Our participants would only engage in Prepping for Debate or Making a Big Life Decision modes for extremely important tasks. When in these modes, they sought to complete their task as efficiently as possible so they could move back to Timepass where they felt emotionally soothed and stable.

We hypothesize this desire to maintain an emotional equilibrium is a response to information overload (Katz 2021). Our participants were exposed to all kinds of content through the internet, such as about climate change or war, that some explicitly said they found overwhelming. Participants also articulated the need to rely on themselves because of the perception that previous generations and institutions have failed them. This meant protecting their sense of equilibrium while consuming online content. Crucially, participants would switch between information modes to keep a steady state. This switching was quick, automatic, and frequent, because it was unplanned and reactive.

Because participants were switching so fast between different modes, they were not always strict about their application of heuristics in one particular mode over another, and therefore, would often extend their attitude and behavior toward trust heuristics from Timepass into other modes. In other words, they were not always consistent with applying heuristics in other modes, especially when switching back and forth between Timepass and another mode. This matters because while in Timepass mode, participants believed they simultaneously didn't need heuristics for entertainment content and were impervious to misinformation because everything was supposedly not taken seriously. Jamie (22, USA), for example, spent time on Facebook specifically because the platform's misinformation and low-quality content was a form of entertainment. As she put it:

‘I just like to read through [Facebook]...Everybody my age will see [Facebook content] and be like, ‘This

is so ridiculous, this is so funny.’ And not get angry with it.”

When participants would quickly shift from Timepass mode to other modes, this opened them up to harm, as they would often carry over a passive attitude of not needing to scrutinize information consumed from Timepass mode. Or, when in Timepass mode, they might regard it as just entertainment in the beginning, but over time, end up internalizing the content. For example, Safia (24, IND) said she began watching Andrew Tate videos as entertainment and disagreed with his views. Over time, however, she adopted his views on traditional femininity and started to wear dresses more often, and also began to watch Ben Shapiro content.

**4.2 Trust Heuristics and GenAI**

Information modes shaped how the participants interacted with and trusted GenAI tools (see Table 3).<sup>3</sup> Applying information modes in GenAI contexts gave rise to four findings that can help us understand what is at stake as young people use trust heuristics to navigate GenAI.

Mode	Ways GenAI is used in this mode
Timepass	Generate fun, novel content
Lifestyle Aspiration	Provide advice/plans for users to try out to improve their lives
Bonding Over Content	Generate fun, novel, content to share with others
Getting Stuff Done	Do boring tasks so users can quickly get back to “fun” things Note: “Fun” content as defined as “light” and often only involved the self
Keeping Up With the Times	Summarize “important” issues Note: “Important” issues were defined as those where there was perceived social value to be aware and across the key details
Prepping for Debate	Provide quick takes and links to other sources so users can have a “starting point”
Making a Big Life Decision	Get “unbiased” information on decisions Note: When making big life decisions, participants were particularly sensitive to ulterior motives, e.g. sponsored content

Table 3. How we observed participants using GenAI across the information modes.

**Efficiency as a north star**

At the time of the study, critics from popular press, civil society, government, and industry expressed concerns about the risks, dangers, and unreliability of GenAI, and noted that young people were using GenAI more than older generations (Ka Yuk Chan and Lee 2023; Lohr 2023; Metz 2023; Baxter and Schlesinger 2023; Sharma 2023). Despite intentionally recruiting for a sample of participants with varying degrees of familiarity with GenAI, all of our

<sup>3</sup> At the time of this study, these were primarily ChatGPT 3.5 and Bard (now re-named Gemini).

participants were already using GenAI or in the process of quickly adopting it. Participants saw GenAI as an extension of their existing online practices—just another tool—and they were quick to use it with little hesitation. In fact, our participants felt an overwhelming pressure to become masters of GenAI in order to remain competitive against their peers in school and on the job market.

In India, many of our participants were optimistic and excited about GenAI—new technology was seen as key to upward social and economic mobility. Gaurav (23, India) explained:

“I do feel very much like, amazed when I hear about all those [AI] things. Like, it's making your life very much easier...It'll increase your productivity...Thinking about the future, I feel very excited.”

In the US, on the other hand, even as participants used GenAI, many of them saw it as both a disruptor and competitor. Some feared that failing to master GenAI would lead them to fall behind in school or be less competitive in their career field. As Talia (24, USA) put it:

“Who knows what the skill sets for future jobs will be, and if [knowing AI] will be a requirement. So it's kind of like, future proofing my capabilities...I just don't want to lose out on an opportunity.”

Driven by this pressure to get ahead, participants typically valued applicability and efficiency over accuracy when evaluating GenAI tools and its outputs. When prompted, participants expressed awareness that GenAI results were not always accurate. However, they expressed comfort with “good enough” outputs, rationalizing that when it comes to GenAI, perfect is the enemy of the good: they prized the tool's efficiency above all else. Chana (20, India) explained:

“When the quiz will be open for five minutes, we have ChatGPT in another window and quickly copy paste copy paste copy paste... Out of ten [questions], I got six correct. So, it's a pretty bad score...[But I still use ChatGPT], because at least you're getting six. In Google, you'll not get that. You'll get some random stuff, you'll not get answers.”

Despite recognizing ChatGPT's low accuracy rate, Chana found its efficiency, specifically the way it formats information, to be directly applicable to her exams, too valuable to discontinue using the tool.

In India, many participants used GenAI to surface direct answers, and were candid about copying GenAI's answers directly.<sup>4</sup> In the US, meanwhile, participants repeatedly emphasized that GenAI was simply a “starting point” and exerted that they had editorial control over GenAI. In reality, they would often adopt answers directly from GenAI as their own, but maintained that they were critical thinkers by the way they exercised editorial control. However, we observed

that this was not always the case. Talia (24, USA), for instance, had stated that she used Bard as only a “starting point” to find case studies for work.<sup>5</sup> However, if she had never heard of the case study, rather than assume that Bard had made it up, she second-guessed her own instincts. This behavior conflicted with her stated preferences. She was predisposed to take Bard's answers at face-value, and did not exercise editorial control over the tool: she over-relied on GenAI as a main source of information.

Participants were not oblivious to the risks and harms associated with GenAI: most could often articulate a few concerns. They simply perceived harms from technology as inevitable and outside of their ability to influence. As a result, rather than opting-out of technology, which they feared would negatively affect their future, or fight technology, which they perceived as futile, they preferred to master it. They acknowledged the harms of GenAI, but the drive for efficiency overrode their concerns. Kathy (21, USA), shared:

“I don't think it's bad to use [GenAI] for anything...It's really useful and it's really time efficient. I feel like I don't lose trust [in GenAI] because it's like, we know it's technology, and technology always has its downsides and limitations.”

### **New contexts, old heuristics**

Participants' desire to adopt GenAI quickly to get ahead led them to import heuristics from other online domains that they felt confident with, namely, search engines and social media. In treating GenAI as a new and improved version of these familiar domains, they imported the trust heuristics developed for these other technologies, ultimately forming flawed mental models of GenAI and its capabilities.

Many participants used GenAI as a new way to search for information online. In many ways, they felt it was a faster, more tailored search experience: they could ask a specific prompt and receive a single answer without having to sort through links. They often perceived the single answer as equally credible to search engine results, but faster and more accessible. Neil (22, USA) explained:

“ChatGPT is pulling from this archive of information and sometimes that information could be stuff that's on Google. I used to rush to my phone to go to Safari, but now it's straight to ChatGPT.”

In treating GenAI like a search engine, they had formed a flawed mental model of how large language models (LLMs) worked: they imagined that the GenAI tool was scanning the vast database of the internet and providing a synthesized top result. They assumed top answers could be afforded a high degree of trust and credibility because search results were perceived to filter and rank for quality.

<sup>4</sup> Plagiarism is prohibited in U.S. academic environments, but is not conceptualized in the same way in India.

<sup>5</sup> At the time of the study, Google's GenAI tool was named Bard. It has since been re-named Gemini.



Participants also imagined GenAI as providing what we term a “social thermometer” of public opinion. Participants gauge a social thermometer by reading comments to understand how others are responding or if they are correcting what is being shared. This is a common practice on social media and a critical part of young people’s opinion formation (Hassoun et. al. 2023). Since they misunderstood GenAI to be scanning the internet, they imagined that it was distilling all thoughts shared online into a consensus opinion. As such, they perceived GenAI as a “better” social thermometer relative to social media, synthesizing the wisdom of the crowd while saving them the energy of reading opinions themselves.

By importing trust heuristics from technologies where they felt in control, our participants quickly cemented their trust of GenAI in flawed mental models, even though GenAI outputs work differently and can be highly flawed.

### **Humans in control of GenAI**

Participants felt strongly that GenAI should be an unobtrusive tool that was subordinate to them. They wanted to be in control, and wanted GenAI to respond in ways they could predict and understand. They implicitly wanted to assert that they still had mastery over functions that they saw as the domain of humans. They did not want GenAI showing agency, authority, or control, or provide unsolicited advice or information. Rhea (22, USA) explained:

“[ChatGPT] is informative, not a chatbot with its own thoughts and emotions. The more human mimicry that it attempts, the creepier it feels. None of us are using it to replace people.”

The desire for strict subordination of GenAI was evident in many of the participants’ early interactions with GenAI. In initial interactions, they would test the GenAI on a topic with which they were familiar and saw themselves as an authority on the subject. When trying out ChatGPT for the first time, Shanvi’s (23, India) first query was about physiotherapy, which she knows a lot about as a physiotherapist. Testing GenAI in this way helped participants assess the tool’s accuracy, while they also felt secure knowing that the answer was not as detailed or thorough as their own knowledge. If the first test of knowledge was completed successfully, participants often rapidly concluded that GenAI would most likely be correct or reliable on other topics, including those they were less familiar with. The fact that they were so quick to trust GenAI that passed the test they set is another example of young people’s trust in their testing methodology as described previously.

Often, participants would follow up their initial query with a higher-level task to see GenAI fail, thereby reinforcing participants’ feelings of control and superiority over GenAI. Neil (22, USA) purposely had ChatGPT take a

college test that he was allowed to re-take, and took pride in outperforming ChatGPT:

“I took an exam using answers only from AI and I got a 70%, which was horrible. But I had two attempts. So on my second attempt, I used my notes, I used my knowledge, and I got a 90%. So AI is advanced, but at least for this topic or this subject in school, it wasn’t advanced enough.”

Participants also sought to test GenAI’s boundaries with controversial prompts or inappropriate queries, such as asking for racist jokes. They did this not because they wanted the output; rather, they felt comfort in knowing what GenAI’s safeguards were—and that they were clever enough to outsmart these safeguards if they wanted. Testing the GenAI product’s boundaries was a way of establishing its limitations and confirming their human edge.

Through their tests of GenAI, participants established both that it was accurate enough to incorporate into their lives and that it was non-threatening and “dumb.” These qualities rendered GenAI tools non-threatening, and made them feel in control of this powerful new technology.

### **GenAI as a judgment-free zone**

Participants viewed GenAI as a safe space where they could ask questions and conduct online activity without social risk or judgment. As is common for young people in this age cohort, they were keenly aware of and anxious about how they were perceived by peers. However, there may be a period effect whereby this age cohort now has heightened social pressures. Many participants expressed fear of social sanction or “being canceled,” being embarrassed for not knowing the answer, or simply making connections annoyed.

With GenAI, young adults did not have to exercise their social communication skills to handle interpersonal conflict or differences of opinion. Neil (23, USA) was concerned about how studying abroad would impact his relationship with his girlfriend, but rather than speaking to her about it, he sought out tips for long-distance relationships from ChatGPT. Talia (24, USA) could learn about fraught topics such as the Supreme Court decision on affirmative action before she discussed these topics with friends.

Participants in both India and US viewed GenAI as judgment-free in part because it was perceived to be non-human. In India, our participants valued GenAI for its confidentiality, unlike the potential risk of a human violating confidentiality. In the US, the primary draw of GenAI was that it could not “cancel” them like their peers can.

In both cases, using GenAI to attenuate some of the potential social risk was appealing. Finding ways to avoid social mistakes or taking social risks altogether was a

primary driver of their online behaviors, and they perceived GenAI as another tool in service of this goal.

## 5 Discussion

### 5.1 Implications of Information Modes

We suggest that information modes have emerged as a coping mechanism in response to information overload. Many participants felt pressure to pay attention to their social media feeds but found all the information to be emotionally exhausting. It is a well-documented phenomenon that young adults are experiencing higher levels of uncertainty, anxiety, and stress compared to previous generations (Katz 2021). While previous generations have experienced global unrest, lost faith in institutions, and uncertainty, newer generations face periods of uncertainty alongside a barrage of on-the-ground footage and constant updates. Despite an increased awareness of mental health challenges, globally, individuals still bear more responsibility than organizations such as workplace in protecting their own mental health (Greenwood 2021; Breuning 2019; Sen 2020).

We posit that information modes are a response to both pressures: it is a tactic for managing information overload, and for taking responsibility for one's own mental health. Switching between modes to achieve emotional equilibrium is an adaptive response young adults have developed to survive in this information landscape. In reaction to increasing global uncertainty and existential anxiety, our participants are spending most of their time in "light" modes, like Timepass and Lifestyle Aspiration.

This yields important implications for how social media and news platforms better safeguard their users from disinformation. The vast majority of information literacy interventions assume people are interested in the veracity of information, but we find that this is true only in very low-frequency modes. For example, information literacy interventions often encourage people to consider signals of accuracy (such as evaluating the credibility of the source) or provide tips for literacy skills (such as lateral reading between sources) (Caufield 2017; Breakstone et. al. 2021). However, we find that these tips and skills are relevant only when participants are either in the mindset of Prepping for Debate or Making a Big Life Decision—that is, when participants want to carefully consider different options. Because they found these mentally taxing, they minimized time in these modes where media literacy skills are employed.

Due to the sheer amount of time spent in Timepass mode, when participants thoughtlessly and frequently switched to other modes, they would often apply their mindset and behaviors in that mode to other modes they would switch

to—before switching back to Timepass again. The overall effect is that participants lowered the bar to trust information even in contexts where they claim to care about veracity.

The paucity of time spent in modes concerned with veracity helps address a question that has long plagued information literacy research: why do information literacy interventions, such as fact-checking labels, often suffer from low usage? (Clayton et. al. 2020). Our findings shed some light on this phenomenon: young people are simply not in the relevant information modes most of the time. Expecting people to engage with questions of trustworthiness and accuracy while they are in a completely different mindset (such as reminding people to fact check while in Timepass mode) means that at best, they ignore the intervention. At worst, they become irritated and disengage entirely.

Thus, interventions must be aligned with a person's information mode to be effective. Participants perceived interventions that supported them towards achieving the emotional goals of the mode they were in as helpful. A warning banner on the other hand, was typically perceived as annoying as it was a barrier to achieving their goal.

### 5.2 Implications of GenAI for trust

Participants' fast adoption of GenAI across all information modes generated an array of blind spots and unintended consequences:

Mode	Ways GenAI is used in this mode	Unintended consequences (blind spot)
Timepass	Generate fun, novel content	Convincing GenAI content spreads quickly in mindless scrolling, including misinformation.
Lifestyle Aspiration	Provide advice/plans for users to try out to improve their lives	Participants were quick to test out AI-created action plans without first validating with other sources, essentially experimenting on their lives and their bodies with high consequences.
Bonding Over Content	Generate fun, novel, content to share with others	Convincing GenAI content spreads quickly through value-based communities, including misinformation if it confirms existing beliefs.
Getting Stuff Done	Do boring tasks so users can quickly get back to "fun" things  Note: "Fun" content as defined as "light" and often only involved the self	Plagiarism of GenAI content was normalized, whether explicitly or implicitly.
Keeping Up With the Times	Summarize "important" issues  Note: "Important" issues were defined as those where there was perceived social value to be aware and across the key details	GenAI summaries were treated as an authoritative source on complicated topics, because participants assumed it scanned the internet to generate content.
Prepping for Debate	Provide quick takes and links to other sources so users can have a "starting point"	GenAI would limit their purview to a more narrow "starting point" than they might have otherwise had from self-thinking  Quick takes from GenAI limited self-thinking  GenAI encouraged "two sideism" for every issue
Making a Big Life Decision	Get "unbiased" information on decisions  Note: When making big life decisions, participants were	GenAI results reflected biases in how the prompt was phrased.

	particularly sensitive to ulterior motives, e.g. sponsored content	
--	--	--

Table 4. Unintended consequences caused by use of GenAI use, by information modes.

These blind spots resulted in three important implications:

**I. Trust in GenAI outputs diminishes reflection before action:** The convenience and perceived accuracy in GenAI outputs meant that participants spent less time searching and synthesizing, and acted upon information quickly. This can lead to two negative downstream effects. First, our participants’ quick adoption of GenAI answers as their own—whether it be to perform knowledge of a relevant topic, or to form their own opinion using GenAI as a “starting point”—minimizes their exposure to heterogeneous sources, which may enhance groupthink and weaken critical thinking skills. Normalization of plagiarism further exacerbates this effect (Adhikari 2018; Handa and Power 2005). Moreover, in quickly moving to share or act on GenAI answers, they also enable the spread of misinformation and its harms.

**II. Overconfidence leads to excessive “benefit of the doubt” for GenAI:** In their initial interactions with GenAI, participants worked to establish that they could “trick” it and perform higher-level tasks (like test-taking) better than GenAI. This way, they rendered it non-threatening and established control over it. In doing so, they often became overconfident, both in GenAI and in themselves. Participants believed that GenAI was scanning the internet to provide the single best answer, overestimating the accuracy of GenAI results. They were also overly confident in their ability to instinctively know if something was incorrect, and that, if necessary, they could find the truth. The combination of both of these types of overconfidence meant that over time, they reflexively accepted what ChatGPT or Bard produced. When participants did notice an error, they would often give GenAI the benefit of the doubt, questioning their input rather than the model’s output.

**III. GenAI exacerbates some inequalities while closing others:** Some participants who previously felt excluded from elite knowledge used GenAI as an equalizer. For example, Ismael (24, USA) described ChatGPT as a “teacher’s aide” that has helped him learn at an “aggressive rate and in aggressive amounts” without feeling “embarrassed about [his] questions.” In this way, GenAI has helped him catch up to his more privileged peers. Other participants, however, saw GenAI as another tool that helped the privileged get ahead. For example, Sydney (19, USA) told us that unlike her more privileged peers, she couldn’t use ChatGPT to plagiarize because the risk of getting caught and losing her scholarship was too high. The effects of GenAI on inequalities remains to be seen but will be dependent on local economic and social contexts as much as the models themselves.

## 6 Conclusion

Our study found that young people did not see GenAI as distinct from other technologies, but rather, as a “super-charged” version of tools they were comfortable with like search engines and social media. To quickly master GenAI, participants extended their current internet practices and heuristics to GenAI products. Participants spent most of their time in Timepass mode, where they dropped their information literacy guards. They valued efficiency above all else, and used GenAI to pursue their ends even as they acknowledged the potential risks and harms. They experimented with GenAI to assert their dominance over the tool, but were quick to trust it after it passed the tests they set. In order to design effective interventions, we need to understand young people’s information modes, and their desire for emotional equilibrium. Creating online spaces that make young people feel safe, affirmed, and in control, may encourage more positive relationships with the internet. We suggest more research, particularly empirical longitudinal research, on the long-term impacts of these individual interactions with GenAI as a way of reshaping how we support digital literacy skills.

## Appendices

New York Metro, USA	Participants	Bangalore, India	Participants
AI-expert	5	AI-expert	4
AI-familiar	20	AI-familiar	22
AI-unfamiliar	1	AI-unfamiliar	2
Rural	4	Rural	3
Urban or Suburban	22	Urban or Suburban	22
White	11	Hindu	15
Non-White (incl. black)	16	Muslim	3
Black	4	Other religion	8
Female	14	Female	14
Male	10	Male	12
Other gender	2		

Table A. Demographic breakdowns of participants in both geographies.

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Paree Zarolia, Ingrid Meintjes, Samar Elshafiey, Meena Natarajan, Jason Lipshin, and Amelia Hassoun for their comments and contributions to

improve this research. We thank Michele Likely, Soojin Jeong, Yasmin Green, and Shira Almeleh for their reviews to improve this manuscript. Finally, we'd like to thank our participants for sharing their experiences with us.

## References

- Adhikari, S. 2018. Beyond Culture: Helping International Students Avoid Plagiarism. *Journal of International Students* 8(1): 375–388. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v8i1.170>.
- Ali, K., and Zain-ul-abdin, K. 2021. Post-truth propaganda: heuristic processing of political fake news on Facebook during the 2016 US presidential election. *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 49(1): 109-28. doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2020.184731.
- Ali, S.; DiPaola, D.; Lee, I.; Hong, J.; and Breazeal, C. 2021. Exploring Generative Models with Middle School Students. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '21)*. New York: Association for Computing Machinery. doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445226.
- Amoozadeh, M.; Daniels, D.; Chen, S.; Nam, D.; et al. 2023. Towards Characterizing Trust in Generative Artificial Intelligence among Students. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on International Computing Education Research (ICER '23)*. New York: Association for Computing Machinery. doi.org/10.1145/3568812.3603469.
- Arora, P. 2019. *The next billion users: digital life beyond the West*. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press.
- Athique, A., and Parthasarathi, V. 2020. *Platform Capitalism in India*. New York: Macmillan.
- Baidoo-Anu, D., and Ansah, L.O., 2023. Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. *Journal of AI* 7(1): 52-62. doi.org/10.61969/jai.1337500.
- Baldassarre, M.T.; Caivano, D.; Nieto, B.F.; Gigante, D.; and Ragone, A. 2023. The Social Impact of Generative AI: An Analysis on ChatGPT. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Information Technology for Social Good (GoodIT '23)*. New York: Association for Computing Machinery. doi.org/10.1145/3582515.3609555.
- Banaji, S.; Bhat, R.; Argawal, A.; Passanha, N.; and Pravin, M.S. 2019. WhatsApp vigilantes: An exploration of citizen reception and circulation of WhatsApp misinformation linked to mob violence in India. London: The London School of Economics and Political Science.
- Baxter, K., and Schlesinger, GENAI. 2023. Managing the risks of generative AI. <https://hbr.org/2023/06/managing-the-risks-of-generative-ai>. Accessed: 2024-05-03.
- Beals, F., Kidman, J., Funaki, GENAI. 2020. Insider and outsider research: Negotiating self at the edge of the emic/etic divide. *Qualitative Inquiry* 26(6): 593-601.
- Birt, L.; Scott, S.; Cavers, D.; Campbell, C.; Walter, F. 2016. Member checking: a tool to enhance trustworthiness or merely a nod to validation?. *Qualitative Health Research* 26(13): 1802-11. doi.org/10.1177/104973231665487.
- Breakstone, J.; Smith, M.; Connors, P.; Ortega, T.; Kerr, D.; and Wineburg, S. 2021. Lateral reading: College students learn to critically evaluate internet sources in an online course. *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review* 2(1): doi.org/10.37016/mr-2020-56.
- Breuning, L.G. 2019. Personal Responsibility and Mental Health. <https://GenAI.psychologytoday.com/intl/blog/your-neurochemical-self/201910/personal-responsibility-and-mental-health>. Accessed: 2024-05-03.
- Broniatowski, D.A., and Reyna, V.F. 2020. To illuminate and motivate: A fuzzy-trace model of the spread of information online. *Computational and Mathematical Organization Theory* 26: 431-64. doi.org/10.1007/s10588-019-09297-2.
- Caulfield, M. 2017. Web literacy for student fact-checkers. <https://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/textbooks/454>. Accessed: 2024-05-03.
- Charmaz, K. 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. New York: Sage.
- Charmaz, K. 2017. The power of constructivist grounded theory for critical inquiry. *Qualitative inquiry* 23(1), 34-45. doi.org/10.1177/1077800416657.
- Chen, A.; Chen, K.; Zhang, J.; Meng, J.; and Shen, C. 2023. When national identity meets conspiracies: the contagion of national identity language in public engagement and discourse about COVID-19 conspiracy theories. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 28(1). doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmac034.
- Clayton, K.; Blair, Sp.; Busam, J.A.; Forstner, S.; et al. 2020. Real solutions for fake news? Measuring the effectiveness of general warnings and fact-check tags in reducing belief in false stories on social media. *Political behavior* 42: 1073-1095. doi.org/10.1007/s11109-019-09533-0.
- Couldry, N., and Mejias, U. 2021. The decolonial turn in data and technology research: what is at stake and where is it heading?. *Information, Communication & Society* 10: 786-802. doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2021.1986102.
- Deuskar, N. 2023. "How Disinformation and Politics Made Migrant Workers Flee Tamil Nadu." <https://scroll.in/article/1045091/how-politics-and-disinformation-fueled-false-rumours-of-attacks-on-migrant-workers-in-tamil-nadu>. Accessed: 2024-05-03.
- Doron, A., and Jeffrey, R. 2013. *The Great Indian Phone Book: How the Cheap Cell Phone Changes Business, Politics, and Daily Life*. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press.
- Dunn, A.G.; Shih, I.; Ayre, J.; and Spallek, GENAI. 2023. What generative AI means for trust in health communications. *Journal of Communication in Healthcare*: 385-388. doi.org/10.1080/17538068.2023.2277489.
- Dwivedi, GENAI.K.; Kshetri N.; Hughes, L.; Slade, E.L.; Jeyaraj, A.; Kar, A.K.; Baabdullah A.M. et al. 2023. "So what if ChatGPT wrote it?" Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management* 71: 102642. doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642.
- Eichhorn, K. 2019. *The End of Forgetting: Growing up with Social Media*. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press.
- Evens, T., and Handelman, D. 2022. *The Manchester School: practice and ethnographic praxis in anthropology*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Fedeli, S. Matsa, K.E. 2018. Use of mobile devices for news continues to grow, outpacing desktops and laptops. Washington DC: Pew Research Center.
- Gasser, U.; Cortesi, S.; Malik, M.M.; and Lee, A. 2012. *Youth and digital media: From credibility to information quality*. Cambridge: Berkman Center Research.

- Grant, J.M.; Mottet, D.C.; Tanis, J.J.; and Min, D. 2011. Transgender Discrimination Survey. Washington D.C: National Center for Transgender Equality and National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.
- Greenwood, K. 2021. It's a New Era for Mental Health at Work. <https://hbr.org/2021/10/its-a-new-era-for-mental-health-at-work>. Accessed: 2024-05-03.
- Guess, A.M., and Lyons, B.A. 2020. Misinformation, disinformation, and online propaganda. In *Social media and democracy: The state of the field and prospects for reform*, edited by Nathaniel Persily and Joshua A. Tucker, 10-32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanckel, B., and Chandra, S. 2021. Social media insights from sexuality and gender diverse young people during COVID-19. Sydney, Australia: Western Sydney University, Young and Resilient Research Centre.
- Handa, N., and Power, C. 2005. Land and Discover! A Case Study Investigating the Cultural Context of Plagiarism. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice* 2(3): 74-95. doi.org/10.53761/1.2.3.8.
- Harsin, J. 2015. Regimes of post-truth, postpolitics, and attention economies. *Communication, Culture, and Critique*, 8(2): 327-33. doi.org/10.1111/cccr.12097.
- Harsin, J. 2018. Post-truth and critical communication studies. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*. doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.757.
- Hassoun, A.; Beacock, I.; Consolvo, S.; Goldberg, B.; Kelley, P. G.; and Russell, D.M. 2023. In *Practicing Information Sensibility: How Young People Engage with Online Information*. In Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3581328.
- Holton, J.A. 2007. The coding process and its challenges in *The Sage handbook of grounded theory 3*, edited by Antony Bryant and Kathy Charmaz, 265-89. New York: Sage Publications.
- Jenkins, E.L.; Ilicic, J.; Barklamb, A.M.; and McCaffrey, T.A. 2020. Assessing the credibility and authenticity of social media content for applications in health communication: scoping review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 22(7): e17296. doi.org/10.2196/17296.
- Kahneman, D. 2011. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York: Macmillan.
- Karizat, N.; Delmonaco, D.; Eslami, M.; and Andalibi, N. 2021. Algorithmic folk theories and identity: How TikTok users co-produce Knowledge of identity and engage in algorithmic resistance. In *Proceeds of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 5(CSCW2): 1-44. doi.org/10.1145/3476046.
- Katz, R.; Olgivie, S.; Shaw, J.; and Woodhead, L. 2021. *Young People, Explained: The Art of Living in a Digital Age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Koetsier, J. 2023. Generative AI Generation Gap: 70% Of young people Use It While Gen X, Boomers Don't Get It. <https://GenAI.forbes.com/sites/johnkoetsier/2023/09/09/generativ-e-ai-generation-gap-70-of-gen-z-use-it-while-gen-x-boomers-dont-get-it/?sh=1d850bf623b6>. Accessed 2024-05-03.
- Krishnaram, K., Lakkaraju, GENAI., and Rajani, N. 2023. Generative AI meets Responsible AI: Practical Challenges and Opportunities. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD '23)*. New York: Association for Computing Machinery. doi.org/10.1145/3580305.3599557.
- Lee, A.GENAI.; Mieczkowski, GENAI.; Ellison, N.B.; and Hancock, J.T. 2022. The algorithmic crystal: Conceptualizing the self through algorithmic personalization on TikTok. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 6(CSCW2): 1-22. New York: Association for Computing Machinery. doi.org/10.1145/3555601.
- Lenat, D., and Marcus, G. 2023. Getting from Generative AI to Trustworthy AI: What LLMs might learn from Cyc. arXiv:2308.04445.
- Li, B.; Qi, P.; Liu, B.; Di, S.; Liu, J.; Pei, J.; Yi, J.; and Zhou, B. 2023. Trustworthy AI: From Principles to Practices. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(9), 1-46: doi.org/10.1145/3555803.
- Lindtner, S. 2014. Hackerspaces and the Internet of Things in China: how makers are reinventing industrial production, innovation, and the self. *China Information* 28(2): 145-167. doi.org/10.1177/0920203X14529.
- Lim, M.S.C.; Molenaar, A.; Brennan, L.; Reid, M.; McCaffrey, T. 2022. Young adults' use of different social media platforms for health information: Insights from web-based conversations. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 24(1):e23656. doi.org/10.2196/23656.
- Lohr, S. 2023. IBM Tries to Ease Customers' Qualms About Using Generative A.I. <https://GenAI.nytimes.com/2023/09/28/business/ibm-ai-data.html>. Accessed: 2024-05-03.
- Melumad, S., Inman, J.J., Pham, M.T. 2019. Selectively emotional: How smartphone use changes user-generated content. *Journal of Marketing Research* 56(2): 259-75. doi.org/10.1177/0022243718815.
- Metzger, M.J., and Flanagin, A.J. 2013. Credibility and trust of information in online environments: The use of cognitive heuristics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 59: 210-220. doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.07.012.
- Metz, C. 2023. 'The Godfather of A.I.' Leaves Google and Warns of Danger Ahead. <https://GenAI.nytimes.com/2023/05/01/technology/ai-google-chatbot-engineer-quits-hinton.html>. Accessed: 2024-05-03.
- Milan, S., and Treré, E. 2019. Big data from the South(s): beyond data universalism. *Television & New Media* 20(4): 319-35. doi.org/10.1177/15274764198377
- Mills, J., Bonner, A., and Francis, K. 2006. The development of constructivist grounded theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 5(1): 25-35. doi.org/10.1177/160940690600500.
- Mohan, S. 2017. The Photoshop State: Image Manipulation, Visual Culture and Electoral Politics in India. [https://sites.lsa.umich.edu/umich-upr/wp-content/uploads/sites/421/2017/02/The-Photoshop-State\\_Slides\\_1.pdf](https://sites.lsa.umich.edu/umich-upr/wp-content/uploads/sites/421/2017/02/The-Photoshop-State_Slides_1.pdf). Accessed: 2024-05-03.
- Morris, M.R. 2023. "Scientists' Perspectives on the Potential for Generative AI in their Fields." arXiv:2304.01420.
- Morris, M.R.; Sohl-dickstein, J.; Fiedel, N.; Warkentin, T. et. al. 2023. Levels of AGI: Operationalizing Progress on the Path to AGI. arXiv:2311.02462.
- Nithya, S.; Arnesen, E.; Hutchinson, B.; Doshi, T.; and Prabhakaran, V. 2021. Re-imagining Algorithmic Fairness in India and Beyond. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT '21)*. New York: Association for Computing Machinery. doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445896.

Parker, K. 2023. How Pew Research Center will report on generations moving forward. <https://GenAI.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2023/05/22/how-pew-research-center-will-report-on-generations-moving-forward/>. Accessed: 2024-24-04.

Peng, GENAI., Lu, GENAI., and Shen, C. 2023. An Agenda for Studying Credibility Perceptions of Visual Misinformation. *Political Communications* 40(2): 225-37. doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2023.2175398.

Petty, R.E., and Cacioppo, J.T. 1986. The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion. New York: Springer.

Pfeuffer, A., and Phua, J. 2022. Stranger danger? Cue-based trust in online consumer product review videos. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 46(3): 964-983. doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12740.

Saldana, Johnny. 2021. The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers. New York: Sage.

Sen, S. 2020. Mental health is a collective responsibility: The person is not the problem. <https://indianexpress.com/article/parenting/blog/imagine-mental-health-is-a-collective-responsibility-6467708/>. Accessed: 2024-05-03.

Sharma, D. 2023. AI has many dangers and could be a threat for the entire human race, says historian Yuval Noah Harari. <https://GenAI.indiatoday.in/technology/news/story/ai-has-many-dangers-and-could-be-a-threat-for-the-entire-human-race-says-historian-yuval-noah-harari-2461309-2023-11-10>. Accessed: 2024-05-03.

Swart, J. 2023. Tactics of news literacy: How young people access, evaluate, and engage with news on social media. *New Media & Society* 25(3): 505-21. doi.org/10.1177/1461444821101144.

Turner, R.GENAI., and Killian, L.M. 1957. Collective behavior (Vol. 3). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Weinstein, E. 2018. The social media see-saw: Positive and negative influences on adolescents' affective well-being. *New Media & Society* 20(10): 3597-623. doi.org/10.1177/1461444818755634.

Williams, M., and Tami, M. 2019. The art of coding and thematic exploration in qualitative research. *International Management Review* 15(1): 45-55. doi.org/10.56397/RAE.2022.12.07.

Xu, D.; Fan, S.; and Kankanhalli, M. 2023. Combating Misinformation in the Era of Generative AI Models. In Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia (MM '23). New York: Association of Computing Machinery. doi.org/10.1145/3581783.3612704.

Xu, R.; Le, N.; Park, R.; Murray, L. 2024. Like-minded, like-bodied: How users (18-26) trust online eating and health information. arXiv:2402.18753.

Zhou, F., and Zhou, X. 2022. 'Across Time and Space, I Am Together with Many, Many Others': Digital Writing and Temporality on Chinese Social Media. *Social Media and Society* 8(3). doi.org/10.1177/205630512211175.