National Research Journal of Information Technology & Information Science ISSN: 2350-1278
Volume No: 13, Issue No: 2, Year: 2026 (July-December) Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.9)
PP: 73-85 Journal Website www.nrjitis.in

DOES AGE CHANGE HOW PEOPLE ADOPT GENERATIVE AI?

A Cross-Generational Study Of Indian Users

Aarav Marjara

Sat Paul Mittal School

ABSTRACT

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is becoming an important part of everyday life, helping people learn, work and access information more easily. However, people of different age groups may use and experience this technology differently.

This study explores how age influences the adoption of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini and Claude among Indian users. An online survey was conducted with 106 respondents belonging to four age groups: 16–24, 25–44, 45–54 and 55 years and above. The study examined how frequently people use GenAI, their reasons for using it, and their opinions about its usefulness, ease of use and reliability. It also explored their concerns and habits of verifying AI-generated information.

The findings show that younger respondents use generative AI more frequently than older respondents. Among those aged 16–24, 69.6% reported using AI daily or more often, compared with 16.7% of respondents aged 55 and above. However, respondents across different age groups generally recognised the usefulness of AI and expressed an interest in continuing to use it. Over-dependence on AI (36.8%) and privacy and data security (25.5%) emerged as the most common concerns.

The study concludes that age appears to influence how frequently people use generative AI, but not necessarily how useful they consider it. It also highlights the importance of digital awareness, trust and responsible AI use across all age groups. As the study is based on a limited sample, its findings cannot be generalised to the entire Indian population.

Keywords: Generative Artificial Intelligence, Age Groups, AI Adoption, Technology Acceptance, Trust, India

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) has moved from research laboratories into everyday life within a few years. Since the chatbot ChatGPT was released in November 2022 (Pew Research Center, 2025), millions of ordinary people have started typing questions in plain language and receiving detailed written answers within seconds. ChatGPT, Claude and Gemini belong to a family of tools called generative AI, which can create text, images, code and other content in response to a user's instructions. People now use them to write emails, understand difficult topics, plan trips and solve problems at work.

India is one of the most important markets for these tools (OpenAI, 2026). But national totals can hide differences between groups. A college student, a homemaker, a shop owner and a retired person may all have heard of GenAI, yet they may use it very differently, or not at all.

Researchers have long asked whether age changes how people accept new technology. One popular idea says that people who grew up with digital technology, often called "digital natives", are more comfortable with it than "digital immigrants" who met it later in life

© Copyright @ Authors

(Prensky, 2001). If this is true for generative AI, then older and younger people should differ both in how often they use it and in what they believe about it. This study tests that idea with a cross-generational sample of 106 Indian respondents.

1.2 Generative AI and Its Growth

1.2.1 What is generative AI?

Generative AI refers to computer systems that produce new content, such as text, images, audio or program code, after learning patterns from very large amounts of data. Users interact with these tools by writing a *prompt*, which is simply a question or instruction. Because the tool answers in ordinary language, almost anyone can start using it without technical training, which is one reason it has spread so quickly.

However, these systems can also produce answers that sound confident but are wrong or made up, a problem often called *hallucination* (Ji et al., 2023). This means that a user's trust in the tool, and the habit of checking its answers, are important parts of any study of GenAI adoption.

1.2.2 Generative AI in India

India is now one of the largest markets for generative AI. In February 2026, OpenAI's chief executive said that ChatGPT had 100 million weekly active users in India, the second-largest user base after the United States, and that India had more student users than any other country ("India Has 100M Weekly Active ChatGPT Users," 2026). OpenAI's own report on Indian usage adds that ChatGPT use in India is younger than the global average, with users aged 18–24 sending the largest share of messages (OpenAI, 2026).

These figures come from the company itself, so they are best read as signs of scale rather than as independent research. They show that young Indians are early and heavy users. They say much less about older adults, homemakers or business owners, who make up a large part of the real population and of this study's sample.

1.2.3 Age and technology use

Age differences in technology use are well documented abroad. In a 2025 survey of 5,123 adults in the United States, 58% of those under 30 said they had used ChatGPT, compared with 41% of those aged 30 to 49, 25% of those aged 50 to 64 and only 10% of those aged 65 and above (Pew Research Center, 2025). A steady fall in use with age is therefore clear in that country. What is less clear is whether older people also *think* differently about GenAI, for example by finding it less useful, harder to use or less trustworthy, or whether they simply use it less often. This question is the focus of the present study.

1.3 How Technology Adoption Is Explained

Researchers use several models to explain why people accept or reject a technology. The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) proposes that two beliefs matter most: perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use (Davis, 1989). Later work added social influence, meaning the effect of other people's opinions and behaviour (Venkatesh & Davis, 2000). The Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) combined several earlier models and showed that age can change how strongly these beliefs matter (Venkatesh et al., 2003).

This study uses TAM and its extensions as its framework. Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, social influence and trust are expected to shape a person's intention to continue

© Copyright @ Authors

using GenAI, and that intention is expected to be linked to how often the person actually uses it. Age is then examined as a possible influence on every part of this chain.

1.4 Factors Influencing the Adoption of Generative AI

Earlier research and common sense point to several factors that may shape whether and how people adopt GenAI.

Perceived usefulness. This is the belief that GenAI helps a person do things faster or better. In TAM, it is usually the most important influence on acceptance (Davis, 1989).

Perceived ease of use. This is how easy it feels to learn and use the tool. GenAI is operated in ordinary language, so ease may be less of a barrier than for older technologies. Even so, many people find it hard to write prompts that give good answers.

Social influence. People are more likely to try a tool when family, friends and colleagues use it and approve of it (Venkatesh & Davis, 2000; Venkatesh et al., 2003).

Trust. Trust is the willingness to rely on GenAI's information. Too little trust leads people to avoid a tool, while too much trust leads them to rely on it when they should not (Lee & See, 2004; Hoff & Bashir, 2015).

The habit of checking information. Because GenAI can make mistakes (Ji et al., 2023), a careful user verifies important facts before relying on them. This habit shows how thoughtfully a person uses the tool.

Age and generation. Age may influence both how often people use GenAI and what they believe about it (Morris & Venkatesh, 2000; Prensky, 2001; Pew Research Center, 2025).

Occupation and education. Students may use GenAI mainly for studying, employed people for work and homemakers for personal tasks. Education may also affect confidence in using new tools.

Concerns and perceived risks. Worries about privacy and data security, becoming too dependent on AI, incorrect information, loss of jobs and environmental impact may slow adoption or change how people use the tools.

Intention and frequency of use. Intention to continue using a technology is a key link between beliefs and actual use (Venkatesh et al., 2003). In a study of 503 university students, Strzelecki (2024) found that behavioural intention had the strongest effect on actual ChatGPT use.

These are the factors that the questionnaire in this study asks about, so the results in Chapter IV can be read against this list.

1.5 Statement of the Problem

Generative AI is spreading quickly in India, but most reports describe the country as a whole or focus on students. It is unclear whether people of different age groups, such as young adults, middle-aged adults and older adults, differ in how often they use GenAI, in how useful, easy and trustworthy they find it, and in whether they plan to keep using it. The problem addressed here is whether age is associated with the adoption of generative AI among Indian users, and whether the same factors drive the intention to keep using it across age groups. The answer matters because GenAI is becoming part of study, work and daily life, and groups that fall behind may miss its benefits, while groups that use it without checking it may face its risks.

© Copyright @ Authors

1.6 Definitions of Key Terms

Generative AI (GenAI). Artificial intelligence tools that create new content, such as text, images or code, in response to a user's prompt. In this study, it refers to tools such as ChatGPT, Claude and Gemini.

Prompt. The question or instruction that a user types into a GenAI tool.

Hallucination. An answer from a GenAI tool that sounds convincing but is false or invented (Ji et al., 2023).

Technology adoption. The process by which a person starts using, and then continues to use, a new technology. In this study, it is measured through frequency of use and intention to continue using GenAI.

Age cohort. A group of people in the same age range. Age cohorts are used here as a practical stand-in for generations. The four cohorts are 16–24, 25–44, 45–54 and 55 and above.

Perceived usefulness. The degree to which a person believes that using GenAI improves their performance in daily life, studies or work (Davis, 1989).

Perceived ease of use. The degree to which a person believes that using GenAI is free of effort (Davis, 1989).

Social influence. The extent to which a person feels that people around them use GenAI and see it as useful (Venkatesh et al., 2003).

Trust. A person's willingness to rely on information from GenAI for everyday tasks.

Intention to continue use. A person's stated plan to keep using GenAI, and to use it more often, in the future.

Frequency of use. How often a person currently uses GenAI, from "never" to "several times a day".

Verification. The habit of checking important information from GenAI before relying on it.

Non-user. In this study, a respondent who reported using GenAI "never" at the time of the survey.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews earlier research that helps explain how age may be linked to the adoption of generative AI. The review is organised into four themes: theories of technology acceptance, age and technology adoption, acceptance of ChatGPT and generative AI, and trust, accuracy and verification. It ends with the gap that this study addresses.

2.2 Theories of Technology Acceptance

Davis (1989) developed the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to explain why people use or reject computer systems. He found that perceived usefulness was strongly linked to how much people used a system, while perceived ease of use was linked more weakly. Venkatesh and Davis (2000) extended TAM by adding social influence and other factors, and tested the extended model in four field studies.

© Copyright @ Authors

Venkatesh et al. (2003) compared eight earlier models and combined their strengths into the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT). It has four main influences: performance expectancy (similar to usefulness), effort expectancy (similar to ease of use), social influence and facilitating conditions. The model also includes age, gender, experience and voluntariness as moderators, which are factors that change the strength of the other influences. The model explained about 70% of the variation in people's intention to use a technology. Venkatesh et al. (2012) later adapted the model for consumers by adding hedonic motivation, price value and habit.

Rogers (2003) took a broader view in his theory of the diffusion of innovations. New ideas spread through a society over time, and people adopt them at different stages. He described groups ranging from innovators and early adopters to the late majority and laggards. This helps explain why a technology such as GenAI can be widely used by one group and barely touched by another at the same moment.

2.3 Age and Technology Adoption

Age has been treated as an important factor since the early days of technology acceptance research. Morris and Venkatesh (2000) studied workers' decisions about a new software system. They found that younger workers were influenced more strongly by their own attitude toward using the technology, while older workers were influenced more by other people's opinions and by whether they felt in control of using it. In UTAUT, age was likewise found to change the strength of the main influences (Venkatesh et al., 2003).

Prensky (2001) described young people who grew up with digital technology as "digital natives" and older people as "digital immigrants". The idea is simple and widely used, though real people vary a great deal. Current survey data show a clear age gradient for ChatGPT in the United States: use was highest among adults under 30 (58%) and lowest among those aged 65 and above (10%) (Pew Research Center, 2025). Together, these studies suggest that age may change both how often people use new technology and what drives their decisions. The present study tests the first point for GenAI and also checks whether the beliefs themselves differ across age groups.

2.4 Acceptance of ChatGPT and Generative AI

Many studies of ChatGPT acceptance have used university students as respondents. For example, Strzelecki (2024) applied an extended version of UTAUT to 503 students at Polish universities. Behavioural intention had the strongest effect on actual use, followed by habit and facilitating conditions. The model explained about 73% of the variation in intention and 55% of the variation in use. These results support the idea that intention is a key link between beliefs and behaviour, which is also assumed in this study.

In India, evidence on usage comes mostly from company reports and news sources. They show very large numbers of users, a strong student presence, and a user base that is younger than in most other countries (OpenAI, 2026; "India Has 100M Weekly Active ChatGPT Users," 2026). They do not compare how people of different ages in India think about GenAI, and they are not independent academic studies.

2.5 Trust, Accuracy and Verification

Trust is central to the use of automated systems. Lee and See (2004) argued that trust guides how much people rely on automation, and that trust should be well calibrated: too much trust leads to misuse, while too little leads to disuse. Hoff and Bashir (2015) reviewed the research

© Copyright @ Authors

on trust in automation and grouped the influences into those that come from the person, the situation and the experience of using the system.

Trust is particularly important for GenAI because of the problem of hallucination. Ji et al. (2023) surveyed research on this problem and described how language-generation systems can produce text that is unfaithful to the source or simply made up. For a user, this makes checking important information a sensible habit. It also means that a person who both trusts GenAI heavily and rarely checks it is at greater risk of being misled.

2.6 Research Gap

The studies reviewed show that usefulness, ease of use, social influence and trust are important in technology acceptance, that age can change how technology is used, and that young people are the heaviest users of ChatGPT. However, most research on ChatGPT acceptance focuses on students, much of it outside India, and Indian evidence on age differences comes largely from company reports. Few studies place respondents from several age groups and occupations in the same survey and ask them the same questions about frequency of use, usefulness, ease, social influence, trust, intention and checking of information. Even fewer ask whether the *reasons* people intend to keep using GenAI are the same for younger and older users. The present study addresses this gap with a cross-generational sample of 106 Indian respondents.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

Research methodology refers to the process followed to collect, organise and analyse information for a study.

This research aims to understand how people belonging to different age groups use Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini and Claude. It focuses on their frequency of use, reasons for using AI, perceptions of its usefulness and ease of use, level of trust and concerns regarding the technology.

An online survey was conducted to gather responses from individuals of different ages, occupations and educational backgrounds. The collected information was then examined to identify similarities and differences in how people adopt generative AI in their everyday lives.

3.2 Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of this research are:

1. To study how frequently people of different age groups use generative AI and the purposes for which they use it.
2. To understand how people across different age groups perceive the usefulness and ease of using generative AI tools.
3. To examine the role of trust, social influence and personal experiences in the adoption and continued use of generative AI.
4. To identify the major concerns related to generative AI and understand whether users verify the information provided by these tools.

© Copyright @ Authors

3.3 Research Design

The study follows a **descriptive, survey-based research approach**.

A structured questionnaire was used to collect information about people's experiences and opinions regarding generative AI. The questionnaire included multiple-choice questions and statements that respondents rated according to their level of agreement.

This approach was chosen because it allows information to be collected from people belonging to different age groups and makes it possible to compare their responses.

The study focuses on understanding existing patterns of AI usage rather than conducting experiments or testing the performance of AI tools.

3.4 Sample Size and Selection

The study was conducted with **106 respondents aged 16 years and above**.

Participants belonged to different age groups and included students, homemakers, business owners, working professionals and retired individuals.

For the purpose of comparison, the respondents were divided into four age groups:

Age Group	**Number of Respondents**
16–24 years	23
25–44 years	37
45–54 years	28
55 years and above	18
Total	**106**

The participants were selected through **convenience sampling**, which means that the survey was shared with people who were accessible and willing to participate.

Although the sample includes people from different backgrounds, it does not represent the entire Indian population.

3.5 Data Collection

The research is based mainly on **primary data**, collected directly from respondents through an online questionnaire.

Some questions required respondents to select an answer from the available options. Others used a **five-point rating scale**, ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

This helped collect information about both the usage habits and opinions of the participants.

3.6 Method of Data Analysis

After collecting the survey responses, the information was organised and examined to understand how people of different age groups use and perceive generative AI.

The responses were grouped according to age, occupation and educational background. The number of respondents selecting each answer was counted, and percentages were calculated to make comparisons easier.

The responses to rating-based questions were also examined to understand people's opinions about the usefulness, ease of use, trust and continued use of generative AI.

The findings were presented through tables, graphs and simple interpretations to highlight similarities and differences between age groups.

© Copyright @ Authors

This approach helped identify general patterns in AI adoption and understand how people's experiences and attitudes may vary with age.

3.7 Significance of the Study

Generative AI is increasingly becoming part of education, business, professional work and everyday life. However, people belonging to different age groups may have different levels of familiarity, confidence and experience with this technology.

This study helps understand how AI adoption varies across age groups and what encourages or discourages people from using these tools.

The findings may be useful in understanding the importance of digital awareness and responsible AI use. They may also help educators, families and technology developers recognise the different needs of younger and older users.

The study highlights the importance of making AI tools accessible, useful and trustworthy for people of all ages.

3.8 Scope and Limitations of the Study

The study focuses on generative AI tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini and Claude and examines their adoption among 106 respondents aged 16 years and above.

It covers frequency of use, purposes of use, usefulness, ease of use, trust, social influence, future usage intentions and concerns related to AI.

However, the research has certain limitations:

1. **Limited sample size:** The study includes 106 respondents, so the findings cannot be considered representative of the entire Indian population.
2. **Selection of participants:** Respondents were selected through convenience sampling rather than random selection.
3. **Self-reported information:** The findings are based on participants' own responses, which may not always reflect their actual usage habits.
4. **Other influencing factors:** Differences in occupation, education, digital awareness and access to technology may also affect AI adoption. Therefore, differences observed between age groups cannot be attributed to age alone.

Despite these limitations, the study provides useful insights into how individuals of different age groups use and perceive generative AI.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter presents the responses of 106 participants and compares how different age groups use and view generative AI. The findings describe patterns within this survey.

4.1 Profile of Respondents

Age Cohort	Frequency	Percentage
16–24 years	23	21.7%
25–44 years	37	34.9%
45–54 years	28	26.4%
55 years and above	18	17.0%
Total	106	100%

© Copyright @ Authors

Respondents included students, homemakers, business owners, working professionals and retired individuals. Differences in occupation and education may also influence AI use.

4.2 Frequency of Generative AI Use

Overall, 98 respondents (92.5%) reported having used generative AI. In the frequency question, 45 respondents (42.5%) reported using it daily or more often.

Age cohort	n	Daily or more	A few times a week	Monthly or less	Never
16–24	23	16 (69.6%)	3 (13.0%)	3 (13.0%)	1 (4.3%)
25–44	37	19 (51.4%)	8 (21.6%)	8 (21.6%)	2 (5.4%)
45–54	28	7 (25.0%)	12 (42.9%)	9 (32.1%)	0 (0.0%)
55 and above	18	3 (16.7%)	7 (38.9%)	4 (22.2%)	4 (22.2%)
All respondents	106	45 (42.5%)	30 (28.3%)	24 (22.6%)	7 (6.6%)

Daily use was highest among those aged 16–24 (69.6%) and lowest among those aged 55+ (16.7%). Younger respondents therefore used AI more frequently in this sample.

4.3 Purposes of AI Use

Finding information was the most common main purpose (33.0%). Among respondents aged 16–24, studying and learning was the leading purpose (47.8%). Work was more common among those aged 25–44 (27.0%), while finding information was most common among those aged 45–54 (46.4%).

4.4 Views About Generative AI

Participants rated statements from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

Belief (scale 1–5)	Mean
Perceived usefulness (PU)	3.93
Perceived ease of use (EOU)	3.71
Social influence (SN)	3.77
Trust (TR)	3.56
Intention to continue (INT)	3.84

Usefulness received the highest average rating (3.93). Trust was lower (3.56). Most respondents viewed AI positively: 84.0% agreed that it makes difficult tasks easier, while 77.4% intended to continue using it.

4.5 Comparison Across Age Groups

Measure	16–24 (n = 23)	25–44 (n = 37)	45–54 (n = 28)	55+ (n = 18)
Perceived usefulness	3.81	4.00	4.07	3.70
Perceived ease of use	3.83	3.77	3.57	3.65
Social influence	3.61	3.88	3.77	3.78
Trust	3.33	3.73	3.39	3.75
Intention to continue	3.67	3.99	3.82	3.78
Verification	3.35	3.76	3.75	3.22
Frequency of use (0–5)	3.74	3.19	2.93	2.33

Although younger respondents used AI more frequently, the age groups gave fairly similar ratings for usefulness, ease of use and future use. Less frequent use does not necessarily mean a negative opinion of AI.

© Copyright @ Authors

4.6 Trust and Verification

Overall, 62.3% said they usually check important information generated by AI. Verification differed across age groups: 47.8% of respondents aged 16–24, 67.6% aged 25–44, 78.6% aged 45–54 and 44.4% aged 55+ agreed that they check important information. These figures highlight the need for careful use of AI-generated content.

4.7 Concerns About AI

Biggest Concern	Frequency	Percentage
Becoming too dependent on AI	39	36.8%
Privacy / data security*	27	25.5%
No major concern	21	19.8%
Difficulty in using the technology†	6	5.7%
Incorrect information	5	4.7%
Impact on jobs	5	4.7%
Environmental impact	2	1.9%
More than one concern‡	1	0.9%
Total	106	100%

Over-dependence was the most common concern (36.8%), followed by privacy and data security (25.5%). At the same time, 19.8% reported no major concern.

4.8 Overall Findings

The survey suggests that age is associated with how frequently people use generative AI, but positive views about its usefulness extend across age groups. People use AI for different purposes depending on their needs, and concerns about dependence, privacy and reliability remain important. As this study uses a small convenience sample, these observations cannot be generalised to all Indian users or attributed to age alone.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary of Findings

The study examined how 106 respondents from different age groups use and perceive generative AI. The major findings are summarised below.

1. Frequency and Purpose of AI Use

The survey showed that younger respondents used generative AI more frequently than older respondents. Among those aged 16–24, 69.6% used AI daily or more often, compared with 16.7% of respondents aged 55 and above.

The purpose of using AI also varied. Younger respondents mainly used it for studying, while working-age respondents used it for professional tasks and finding information.

2. Usefulness and Ease of Use

Respondents across different age groups generally considered generative AI useful and relatively easy to use. Although younger respondents used AI more frequently, older respondents also recognised its benefits.

© Copyright @ Authors

This suggests that people may appreciate the usefulness of AI even if they do not use it regularly.

3. Trust and Continued Use

Most respondents expressed an interest in continuing to use generative AI. Usefulness and trust appeared to be important considerations in their willingness to use these tools.

However, only 62.3% of respondents said they usually verified important AI-generated information. This highlights the need for greater awareness about checking the accuracy of AI responses.

4. Concerns About AI

Over-dependence was the most common concern (36.8%), followed by privacy and data security (25.5%). Around 19.8% of respondents reported having no major concern.

All respondents aged 16–24 selected at least one concern, while difficulty in using AI was reported more frequently by respondents aged 55 and above (16.7%).

These findings show that different age groups may experience different challenges while using generative AI.

5.2 Conclusion

Generative AI is becoming an important part of everyday life, but its adoption varies across age groups.

The study found that younger respondents used generative AI more frequently, particularly for education and everyday tasks. Older respondents used it less often but generally recognised its usefulness and benefits.

The findings suggest that **age may influence how frequently people use AI, but it does not necessarily determine how useful they consider the technology**. Factors such as occupation, personal needs, familiarity with technology and confidence may also influence usage.

The research also highlights the importance of responsible AI use. While many respondents found generative AI helpful, concerns about over-dependence, privacy and inaccurate information remained important.

Overall, the study suggests that making AI accessible is only one part of encouraging its adoption. Helping people understand how to use it effectively, safely and responsibly is equally important.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are suggested:

1. Encourage Responsible AI Use

Users should treat generative AI as a tool for assistance rather than a replacement for independent thinking. Important information should be verified through reliable sources, especially in areas such as education, health and finance.

2. Improve Digital Awareness Among Older Adults

Simple demonstrations, workshops and guidance from family members may help older adults become more comfortable with AI tools. Introducing AI through everyday activities can make learning easier.

© Copyright @ Authors

3. Promote AI Literacy in Schools and Colleges

Educational institutions should teach students how to use AI responsibly, verify information and protect personal data. Students should be encouraged to use AI to support learning rather than depend on it for every task.

4. Make AI Tools More User-Friendly

AI developers should focus on simple instructions, easy-to-understand features, support for Indian languages and clear privacy settings. This may help make generative AI more accessible to people from different age groups and backgrounds.

5.4 Limitations of the Study

The study has certain limitations:

1. The survey included 106 respondents, which is a relatively small sample and may not represent the entire Indian population.
2. Participants were selected through convenience sampling, so the sample may not reflect the experiences of all age groups equally.
3. The findings were based on respondents' personal opinions and reported usage rather than direct observation.
4. Factors such as occupation, education, digital awareness and access to technology may also influence AI adoption. Therefore, differences in usage cannot be attributed to age alone.
5. The survey was conducted over a short period and reflects respondents' experiences at that particular time.

Despite these limitations, the study provides useful insights into how people of different ages interact with generative AI.

5.5 Scope for Further Research

Future research could include a larger number of respondents from different cities, rural areas and educational backgrounds.

It could also explore how factors such as occupation, digital literacy, language and access to technology influence AI adoption.

Interviews with users from different age groups may provide a deeper understanding of their experiences, difficulties and expectations.

As generative AI continues to develop, future studies could also examine how people's usage habits and attitudes change over time.

REFERENCES

1. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340.
2. Hoff, K. A., & Bashir, M. (2015). Trust in automation: Integrating empirical evidence on factors that influence trust. Human Factors, 57(3), 407–434. Ji, Z., Lee, N., Frieske, R., Yu, T., Su, D., Xu, Y., Ishii, E., Bang, Y. J., Madotto, A., & Fung, P. (2023).
3. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. ACM Computing Surveys, 55(12), Article 248.

© Copyright @ Authors

4. Lee, J. D., & See, K. A. (2004). Trust in automation: Designing for appropriate reliance. Human Factors, 46(1), 50–80 Morris, M. G., & Venkatesh, V. (2000). Age differences in technology adoption decisions: Implications for a changing work force.
5. Personnel Psychology, 53(2), 375–403. OpenAI. (2026, February). How India uses ChatGPT [Report]. Pew Research Center. (2025, June 25). 34% of U.S. adults have used ChatGPT, about double the share in 2023. Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of innovations (5th ed.). Free Press.
6. Strzelecki, A. (2024). To use or not to use ChatGPT in higher education? A study of students' acceptance and use of technology. Interactive Learning Environments, 32(9), 5142–5155.
7. Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. Management Science, 46(2), 186–204.

© Copyright @ Authors