
MAPPING PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: EXPECTATIONS, RISK-BENEFIT TRADEOFFS, AND VALUE AS DETERMINANTS FOR SOCIETAL ACCEPTANCE

A PREPRINT

Philipp Brauner
Communication Science
RWTH Aachen University
52056 Aachen, Germany
brauner@comm.rwth-aachen.de

Felix Glawe
Communication Science
RWTH Aachen University
52056 Aachen, Germany
brauner@comm.rwth-aachen.de

Gian Luca Liehner
Communication Science
RWTH Aachen University
52056 Aachen, Germany
brauner@comm.rwth-aachen.de

Luisa Vervier
Communication Science
RWTH Aachen University
52056 Aachen, Germany
brauner@comm.rwth-aachen.de

Martina Ziefle
Communication Science
RWTH Aachen University
52056 Aachen, Germany
ziefle@comm.rwth-aachen.de

December 2, 2024

ABSTRACT

Understanding public perception of artificial intelligence (AI) and the tradeoffs between potential risks and benefits is crucial, as these perceptions might shape policy decisions, influence innovation trajectories for successful market strategies, and determine individual and societal acceptance of AI technologies. Using a representative sample of 1100 participants from Germany, this study examines mental models of AI. Participants quantitatively evaluated 71 statements about AI's future capabilities (e.g., autonomous driving, medical care, art, politics, warfare, and societal divides), assessing the expected likelihood of occurrence, perceived risks, benefits, and overall value. We present rankings of these projections alongside visual mappings illustrating public risk-benefit tradeoffs. While many scenarios were deemed likely, participants often associated them with high risks, limited benefits, and low overall value. Across all scenarios, 96.4% ($r^2 = 96.4\%$) of the variance in value assessment can be explained by perceived risks ($\beta = -.504$) and perceived benefits ($\beta = +.710$), with no significant relation to expected likelihood. Demographics and personality traits influenced perceptions of risks, benefits, and overall evaluations, underscoring the importance of increasing AI literacy and tailoring public information to diverse user needs. These findings provide actionable insights for researchers, developers, and policymakers by highlighting critical public concerns and individual factors essential to align AI development with individual values.

Keywords AI Ethics, cognitive maps, technology acceptance, psychometric paradigm, technology assessment, mental models, artificial intelligence

1 Introduction

The rapid advancements in Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Deep Learning (DL) in general and large language models (LLMs) in particular, has ignited widespread interest and concern across multiple domains. These technologies become increasingly integrated into almost all sectors ranging from education (L. Chen, P. Chen, and Lin 2020) and healthcare (Amunts et al. 2024) to journalism (Diakopoulos 2019), forestry and farming (Holzinger et al. 2024), as well as production and manufacturing (Brauner, Dalibor, et al. 2022). They offer benefits in terms of efficiency, convenience,

and innovation (Bouschery, Blazevic, and Piller 2023), but also pose significant risks in terms of privacy infringement, job displacement (Acemoglu and Restrepo 2017), and ethical dilemmas for individuals, organizations, and society as a whole (Awad et al. 2018).

Although AI’s origins stretch back several decades (Hopfield 1982; Rumelhart, G. E. Hinton, and Williams 1986; McCarthy et al. 2006), its development has accelerated significantly in recent years, driven by advancements in computing power, greater availability of digital data (Deng et al. 2009), enhanced algorithms, and a considerable surge in funding (Lecun, Bengio, and G. Hinton 2015; Statista 2022). The expectations surrounding AI appear to be split: while some researchers and consumers regard AI as a transformative tool that will enhance our lives (Brynjolfsson and McAfee 2014; Makridakis 2017; Bouschery, Blazevic, and Piller 2023), others voice concerns about its ethical implications and associated risks (Bostrom 2003; Cath 2018; Crawford 2021).

For decades, it has been recognized that computers and algorithms are not value-neutral but inherently embody values and potential biases (Friedman and Helen Nissenbaum 1996; H. Nissenbaum 2001). Through the currently has a unique yet ambiguous position within the human cognitive and social landscape (Budish 2021; Garcia 2024), prompting a critical evaluation of how people perceive AI and the broader societal implications they associate with its adoption. This underscores the need for critical scrutiny in the design and deployment of technology, as the embedded values can influence decisions and outcomes in ways that may perpetuate inequality or reinforce existing biases. Further, the deployment and successful use of technologies, such as AI, can be accelerated by higher acceptance or hindered by perceived obstacles (Young et al. 2021).

There is a shared concern about the ethical and societal impacts of AI, with a need for careful design and forward-looking research policies to avoid setbacks (Gursoy and Kakadiaris 2023). Hence, understanding public perception of artificial intelligence, particularly how people balance its perceived benefits and risks, is essential as these views shape policy decisions, influence innovation trajectories, and determine the individual and societal acceptance of AI technologies (Sadek, Calvo, and Mougnot 2024). This article examines how the public evaluates AI’s potential impact and future capabilities, exploring the tradeoffs they consider between AI’s utilities and associated risks. The results are analysed both at the level of individual differences, meaning how personality factors influence the perception of AI, as well as at the technological level, meaning how the risk and benefit perception of the different projections shape the overall evaluation of AI. We further illustrate the risk and benefit tradeoff by placing the evaluations on visual maps. Overall, this article helps to identify topics where risk and benefit expectations are aligned, as well as topics with greater differences and potential for conflict in terms of public perception and acceptance.

The structure of the article is as follows: Section 2 gives an overview on the public perception of AI as well as an overview on technology and risk perception. Section 3 presents the concept of using micro scenarios as the basis for our empirical approach, the survey, and the sample. In Section 4 we present the results of the study starting with the overall perception of the various AI-related statements and their visual mapping, followed by an analysis of the influence of the individual differences. Section 5 discusses the findings and their implications, as well as the limitations of the study. Lastly, Section 6 suggests policy implications and future research.

2 Related Work

We first provide a brief overview on risk perception and the psychometric model for measuring subjective risk. Then we then give an overview on studies on the public opinion and perception of AI.

2.1 Risk Perception and the Psychometric Model

Across many domains, individual risk and benefit perceptions influence attitudes, usage intentions, or actual behaviors (Witte and Allen 2000; Hoffmann, Post, and Pennings 2015; Huang, Dai, and Xu 2020). Risk can be conceptualised from two perspectives (Fischhoff et al. 1978; Aven and Renn 2009): On one hand, risk can be modeled as the expected utilities of negative events, their potential consequences, and related to individual responses (Kahneman and Tversky 1984). However, a key challenge is to accurately model the probabilities and consequences, making it difficult to calculate expected utilities and link them to individual responses. On the other hand, risk can be viewed as events and their perceived consequences. According to this psychometric model of risk perception, an individual’s perceived threat from these consequences can be measured, for example, by means of rating scales (Fischhoff et al. 1978; Slovic, Fischhoff, and Lichtenstein 1979, 1986). For example, it was used to explore the role of risk perception in areas such as gene technology (Connor and Siegrist 2010), genetically modified food (Verdurme and Viaene 2003), nuclear energy (Slovic, Flynn, et al. 2000), general climate change (Pidgeon and Fischhoff 2011), and Carbon Capture and Utilization technologies (Arning et al. 2020). It represents a framework for understanding how individuals perceive and balance risks and benefits and link these weightings with related dispositions and properties of the technologies. Therefore, it is

particularly useful for studying perceptions of emerging technologies or technologies whose implications are not easily understood by laypeople. This is even more important in the early phases of technology development, to assess potential social and societal consequences through the lens of laypeople, even though they might have a limited and fragmented understanding of the impacts of AI and the resulting changes in society, the job market, or other areas. Independently from the specific context, a commonly observed pattern is an inverse relationship between perceived risks and perceived benefits (Alhakami and Slovic 1994): When a technology is perceived as risky, its benefits are often viewed as less significant, whereas technologies perceived as safer tend to be associated with higher perceived benefits, and vice versa.

2.2 Perception of Artificial Intelligence

Studies reveal a complex landscape of attitudes and perceptions towards AI that vary by time, context, and individual. But as AI spans numerous tasks and domains, it is challenging to provide a comprehensive overview of the research on public perceptions of AI, particularly in relation to the associated risk-benefit tradeoffs. Especially the rapid and unprecedented adoption of ChatGPT following its public release in 2022 (Hu 2023) spurred academic interest on perception of AI and much of this research remains to be consolidated. Henceforth, the following section offers a brief and necessarily incomplete overview of this rapidly evolving field.

2.2.1 General AI Perception

(Fast and Horvitz 2017) conducted a media analysis of AI coverage in the New York Times spanning three decades. They found a growing public interest in AI after 2009, marked by both optimism and concern, with AI generally receiving more positive than negative coverage. Yet, recent years have seen rising concerns about control loss and ethical dilemmas, contrasting with optimism, particularly regarding AI's potential for healthcare. People often hold inflated expectations about AI's potential, driven in part by optimistic portrayals in news and entertainment media (Fast and Horvitz 2017).

Recently, Sanguinetti and Palomo (2024) examined how news outlets convey "AI anxiety" by depicting AI as an autonomous, opaque entity independent of human control. They derived an AI anxiety index and analyzed headlines across major newspapers before and after ChatGPT's launch. Their findings indicate that ChatGPT's introduction not only increased AI-related coverage but also intensified negative sentiments, with regional media driving the heightened AI anxiety index.

Research indicates that public awareness of AI technologies is still generally limited, with many people struggling to differentiate between specific forms like machine learning, robotics, and automation. A survey by Ipsos found that the general population often lacks a nuanced understanding of AI's technical achievements and limitations (Ipsos 2022). Pew Research found that only a fraction of Americans could correctly identify AI in everyday scenarios, highlighting a general lack of clarity about AI's scope and capabilities (Pew Research Center 2023). This limited awareness contributes to misconceptions and oversimplified views of AI's impact and applications, potentially impeding informed public discourse on AI's ethical and societal implications. The Alan Turing Institute also highlighted that public understanding varies significantly depending on education level and context, with frequent concerns about automation and robotics in particular, such as in employment and security applications (The Alan Turing Institute and Ada Lovelace Institute 2023).

Public discourse often includes both, unfocused and generic fears on the one hand as well as high expectations about AI on the other, particularly around the concept of artificial general intelligence (AGI), which still remains largely fictional (Jungheer 2023). Cave, Coughlan, and Dihal (2019) investigated prevalent narratives about AI using a sample from the UK, identifying eight primary themes—four optimistic and four pessimistic. Their findings suggest that perceptions of AI's impact are often tinged with anxiety, with only two of the narratives viewing benefits as outweighing concerns (such as the idea that AI could make life easier). Additionally, participants expressed a sense of powerlessness over AI development, viewing it as largely driven by government and corporate interests. About half of the respondents were able to provide plausible definitions of AI, while 25% associated AI primarily with robots.

Further research indicates that public concern over AI's ethical use is on the rise, particularly as awareness of biased algorithms and discriminatory outcomes has grown (O'Neil 2016). Scholars argue that transparency, accountability, and fairness are key factors in building public trust in AI systems (Binns 2018; Floridi et al. 2018).

In an earlier study, we examined the expectations (is the AI projection likely or not likely to occur) and sentiment (is the use of AI negative or positive) of laypersons towards AI-related scenarios by utilizing a younger convenience sample (Brauner, Hick, et al. 2023). The findings suggest greater disparities in the perceptions of these subjects: Of particular concern was the expectation of cyber security threats, a factor deemed both highly likely and least favorable by the participants.

2.2.2 Context dependency of AI perception

Context-wise, studies on the (public) perception of domain-specific uses of AI are relatively common. Perceptions of AI risks and benefits vary across different domains such as healthcare, education, and creative arts, with healthcare often seen as more beneficial (Novozhilova et al. 2024). Alessandro et al. (2024) suggest that AI's perceived social risk and value are inversely related; higher perceived risks lead to lower attributed social value. In this study, medical AI applications were perceived as particularly risky. Gao et al. (2020) studied the perception of AI in medical care in China through content analysis of social media posts. Key concerns associated with a negative evaluation were the immaturity of the technology and distrust in the related companies. Further, in the majority of the posts replacing human doctors being replaced with AI was expected.

With an experimental approach Liehner et al. (2021) studied the willingness to delegate morally sensitive tasks to automated AI-agents and found that context and reliability (i.e., risk of an error) of the automation shapes the perception of and trust in AI. A meta-analysis on risk perception of narrow AI (AI for specific tasks) found that key influences that mitigate risk perception are familiarity, trust, whereas privacy concerns exacerbate the perceived risks of a technology (Krieger et al. 2024). Araujo et al. (2020) explored how individual differences related to the perceptions of automated decision-making by AI and how AI perception differs by context (media, (public) health, and judicial). People were concerned about risks and had mixed opinions about fairness and usefulness of automated decision-making at a societal level, although AI-based decisions were evaluated on par or even better than human experts for specific decisions. In the study, AI knowledge had a positive influence on perceived benefits and fairness of AI, whereas privacy concerns were linked to the perceived risks.

2.2.3 AI Perception and Individual Differences

Individual differences, such as demographics (gender, age) but also experience with and knowledge of AI influence the perception of AI (Yigitcanlar, Degirmenci, and Inkinen 2022). For instance, people with higher technological competence and AI familiarity tend to trust AI more (Crockett et al. 2020; Novozhilova et al. 2024). Kaya et al. (2022) investigated general attitudes towards artificial intelligence and the influence of personality traits with a Turkish sample. Again, computer use and knowledge about AI had a positive influence on attitude towards AI. Agreeableness, AI learning anxiety, and AI configuration anxiety had a negative influence on the attitudes towards AI.

Winter, Dodou, and Eisma (2024) studied the relationship between personality factors, performance expectations, and intention to use and actual use of ChatGPT. Perceived effectiveness and concerns correlated with ChatGPT use frequency. Further, intention to use was linked to the personality trait Machiavellianism (i.e., use of manipulation tactics).

Kelley et al. (2021) conducted a study on public opinion regarding AI, surveying over 10,000 participants from the eight countries Australia, Canada, the USA, South Korea, France, Brazil, India, and Nigeria. The study examined the anticipated societal impact of AI and participants' attitudes toward it, using four key descriptors: exciting, useful, worrying, and futuristic. In developed countries, such as the USA, Canada, and Australia, respondents predominantly expressed concerns about AI, coupled with futuristic expectations. In contrast, developing countries like India, Brazil, and Nigeria exhibited a greater sense of excitement about AI's potential. South Korea stood out for its focus on AI's usefulness and future applications, reflecting its advanced technological landscape. Across all regions, there was a broad consensus that AI would have a significant societal impact, though the exact implications were still uncertain.

Studying the perceptions of participants from China on a few selected AI-based technologies Cui and Wu (2019) found an overall positive attitude towards AI and that the perceived benefits of AI outweigh the perceived risks. Notably, media usage was solely correlated with positive perceptions of AI's advantages, potentially influenced by government-controlled media that presents AI in a favourable manner. Further, individuals with a high level of personal relevance exhibited reduced susceptibility to media influence, fostering a more critical stance towards AI.

A comparative media analysis explored the similarities and differences in coverage of the historic chess match between Lee Sedol and AlphaGo (Curran, Sun, and Hong 2019). The analysis examined 27 Chinese and 30 American newspaper articles. Chinese media more frequently portrayed AlphaGo as non-threatening compared to American media, highlighting cultural differences in attitudes toward AI (Curran, Sun, and Hong 2019).

“In summary, despite the growing body of literature on AI perception and use, significant gaps remain. One critical area of focus is the perceptions of the general public, as public acceptance and deliberate usage are essential for the successful development and deployment of human-centered AI. Given that AI is a relatively new technology for most individuals—many of whom lack substantial understanding and experience with its applications in daily life—their views on its perceived benefits and drawbacks are important. Understanding these perceptions can inform researchers, technical designers, policymakers, and educational strategists, providing insights into the areas that require targeted

educational initiatives, as well as effective information and communication strategies. Specifically, this research aims to address the following research questions:

1. In which areas and application fields is AI perceived as matching to ones values (positive–negative)?
2. Is the sentiment towards AI rather driven by the perceived benefits or by the perceived risks?
3. Is the tradeoff between risk and benefit universal or context dependent?
4. Do demographics and personality factors—such as age, gender, and attitudes toward technology—influence the perception of risk, benefit, and overall value of AI?

3 Method

The goal of this study was to explore public perceptions of AI, specifically regarding its risks, benefits, and overall evaluation. It also examined how individuals weigh the trade-off between risks and benefits, and whether personal characteristics influence these perceptions.

3.1 Risk-Benefit Tradeoff using Micro Scenarios

To achieve this, we built on Slovic’s psychometric model (Slovic, Fischhoff, and Lichtenstein 1986), meaning we assess perceived risks and benefits by quantifying people’s subjective judgments associated with the technology. A common approach to study technology perception is to let participants evaluate a specific or a few selected scenarios using a battery of scales. While this yields a detailed evaluation of a specific topic, it does not fit to AI with its many potential applications and implications for individuals, organisations, and society. Hence, we asked subjects to evaluate a large range of topics with potential capabilities and impacts that AI could have in the next decade using micro scenarios (Brauner 2024), that is, the subjects assessed brief statements such as “AI raises living standards” on a short set of single-item scales.

This approach offers two distinct but complementing perspectives: 1) For each participant, the average evaluations across many topics can be considered as a reflexive measurement of an underlying latent construct and thus be interpreted as user factors or individual differences. This facilitates the analysis of how participants differ in regard to the evaluations and what other personality states and traits shape the assessment. 2) For each topic, the average evaluations of the participants can be considered as a topic factor. The scores for each topic can be placed on visual maps and analysed for outliers, relationships, and patterns.

For creating the list of topics and statements, we drew on existing research and expert workshops. Through multiple rounds of refinement, we optimized the selection, eliminated redundancies, and improved the statements for clarity and conciseness. The list of topics encompassed a range of 71 statements, from more obvious ones to more speculative ones, such as AI creating jobs, fostering innovation, operating according to moral principles, and perceiving humans as a threat. We let each subject assess a randomized random subset of 15 out of the 71 topics. Table 5 in the Appendix lists all items from the study.

Each topic was evaluated on five dependent variables on a single 6-point semantic differential: expectation of occurrence in the next decade (*will not happen—will happen*), perceived personal risk (*low-risk—high-risk*), benefit (*useful—useless*), social risk (socially harmful—socially harmless) (excluded in the analysis, see below), and general valuation or sentiment (*positive—negative*)¹. The latter builds on the Value-based Adoption Model by Kim, Chan, and Gupta (2007) as the target variable to investigate how perceived risks and benefits shape overall evaluations of the technology. Using single item scales is admissible, given that one has assumptions regarding the relevance of the construct (Fuchs and Diamantopoulos 2009; Rammstedt and Beierlein 2014); which we had based on prior work on the psychometric risk-benefit model (Slovic, Fischhoff, and Lichtenstein 1979; Alhakami and Slovic 1994).

3.2 Demographics and Exploratory Personality Traits

In addition to the micro scenarios, we collected demographic data from the participants, including age (in years), gender (following Spiel, Haimson, and Lottridge (2019) as closed-choice male, female, diverse, no response), current job, and highest educational attainment.

¹In the “Werturteilsstreit”, Weber argued that science should remain objective and value-neutral, while acknowledging that values, norms, and ideals could themselves be valid subjects of research (Weber 1904).




Figure 1: Survey design: After obtaining informed consent, questions on demographics and explanatory user factors participants evaluated 15 out of 71 micro-scenarios related to potential AI capabilities.

We further queried several personality traits. While we did not have specific hypotheses about the exact magnitude or interrelationships of these effects, we hypothesize that these variables will influence both, the perception of and attitude towards AI.

Interpersonal trust: Given that people tend to perceive technology as social actors (Reeves and Nass 1996; Fogg and Tseng 1999), we assume this may carry over to AI, leading individuals to view AI as social actors. Since trust plays a critical role in mediating social relationships, we hypothesize that interpersonal trust may be related to the perception of AI and measured interpersonal trust using the 3 item KUSIV3 short scale (Nießen, Beierlein, et al. 2021).

Technology readiness (or technology commitment): This refers to an individual’s propensity to embrace and effectively use new technologies. We hypothesize that this trait positively influences attitudes toward AI and measured it on a subset of the technology commitment scale (Neyer, Felber, and Gebhardt 2016).

Openness: Similarly, in the Big Five personality model, the dimension *openness* is characterized by imagination, curiosity, and a preference for novelty, creativity, and diverse experiences. This trait has been linked to greater curiosity about and more positive attitudes toward technology, including AI (Kaya et al. 2022).

General Self-efficacy: Self-efficacy is a person’s belief in their ability to successfully perform tasks and handle challenges across various situations. Self-efficacy beliefs may be relevant as individuals with higher self-efficacy may feel more capable of understanding and engaging with AI technologies, which can positively influence their attitudes toward AI. We measured general self-efficacy using the General Self-Efficacy Short Scale-3 (GSE3) (Doll et al. 2021).

Risk propensity: Risk propensity reflects individuals’ tendency to take or avoid risks, indicating their willingness to engage in behaviors with uncertain outcomes. We expect that risk propensity may shape attitudes toward AI and especially the perception of the risks associated with AI: individuals with higher risk tolerance may view AI technologies as opportunities for innovation and efficiency, while those with lower risk tolerance may see AI as a threat, focusing on risks such as job displacement, privacy concerns, or loss of control. We measured risk propensity on a single item scale (Nießen, Groskurth, et al. 2020).

AI-Readiness: Finally, we assessed individuals’ AI-readiness using a subset of the Medical Artificial Intelligence Readiness Scale for Medical Students (MAIRS-MS or just AIRS in the following; Karaca, Çalışkan, and Demir (2021)). Although originally designed for medical contexts, we assume this scale is versatile and applicable across different settings, potentially serving as a better predictor of positive views on AI than the general technology readiness scale. We included it with the assumption that a greater understanding of AI, coupled with higher self-efficacy in using it, would positively influence participants’ attitudes toward AI.

The survey began with participants being asked to provide informed consent and being informed that participation was voluntary, no personal data would be collected, and the collected data would be shared as open data. The questionnaire was administered in German. Figure 1 illustrates the design of the questionnaire.

3.3 Sample Acquisition, Data Cleaning, and Data Analysis

The sample was recruited via an independent online research participant pool. The study was approved by our university’s institutional review board (IRB) under ID [REDACTED].

We analysed the data using both parametric and non-parametric procedures, such as Bravais-Pearson correlation coefficient r and Spearman's ρ , Chi-square (χ^2) and Kendal's Tau (τ) tests, multiple linear regressions. We assessed the assumptions underlying each test and report any violations. Missing responses were deleted on a test-wise basis. In line with common practice in the social sciences, we set the Type I error rate at 5% ($\alpha = .05$) for statistical significance (Field 2009).

We filtered the data to exclude incomplete or low-quality responses using the following criteria: the participant must 1) have fully completed the survey, 2) have passed the attention item (i.e., "please select 'rather agree'"), and 3) not be classified as a speeder (i.e., completing the survey in less than one-third of the median survey duration). These thresholds are typically sufficient for identifying meaningless data in surveys (Leiner 2019). The median survey duration was 9.8 min. and the cutoff criterion therefore < 3.3 minutes. After filtering, the data contains 1100 of originally 1354 cases (dropout rate: 18.8%).

The scales demonstrated acceptable to high reliability: technology readiness ($\alpha = .883$), interpersonal trust ($\alpha = .850$), general self-efficacy ($\alpha = .830$), openness from the Big Five model ($\alpha = .730$), and the AI readiness scale AIRS ($\alpha = .920$). We excluded the assessment dimension "perceived harmfulness" and focus on the dimension of perceived risk, as both dimensions are too tightly correlated for meaningful inferences ($r = .928, p < .001$).

All materials, raw and unfiltered data, analyses, and this reproducible manuscript are publicly accessible in the open data repository on OSF (██████████).

3.4 Description of the sample

By using an online research participant pool, we ensured that the sample represents the population of Germany across key demographic variables such as age, gender, education, employment status, and geographical background. The final sample consists of 1100 participants (570 (51.8%) women; 524 (47.8%) men, 5 (0.5%) diverse or non-binary, 1 (0.1%) person did not disclose their gender identity). The age ranged from 18 to 85 years with a median age of 51 years. There is no association between age and gender in the sample ($\tau = -.031, p = .210 > .05$).

The participants in the sample report to have a diverse range of educational backgrounds. The majority of participants have completed their education at the university level, with 27.1% having an academic degree and 20.4% having a university entrance certificate ("Abitur" or "Fachabitur"). Another significant portion of participants completed a high school diploma ("Realschulabschluss") (23.5%) or have vocational training (18.4%). A smaller percentage of participants have completed a secondary school certificate ("Hauptschulabschluss", 10.5%), while only a few participants have no formal education (0.2%).

Participants reported a diverse range of current employment statuses. The largest proportion of participants are currently employed full-time (48.2%), followed by those who are retired (22.5%). 14.8% of participants are employed part-time, while a smaller percentage are currently unemployed (7.8%) or in other employment relations, such as vocational training (0.7%), study programs (2.5%), or parental leave (1.3%). A very small percentage of participants are engaged in voluntary military or social services (0.1%), have irregular or mini jobs (1.9%), or are currently in school (0.2%). Overall, the sample consists of individuals with a wide range of employment statuses, reflecting different stages in their professional lives and personal circumstances.

In the sample, higher age is associated with lower technical readiness ($r = -.224, p < .001$) and lower AI-readiness ($r = -.250, p < .001$), but not with interpersonal trust ($r = .067, p = .114$), general self-efficacy ($r = .061, p = .131$), or openness ($r = -.071, p = .114$). Gender is associated with lower technology readiness scores ($r = -.210, p < .001$), AI-readiness ($r = -.156, p < .001$ with women reporting lower experience with AI, and openness ($r = .093, p = .014$), with women, on average, reporting to be slightly more open than men. Gender is neither associated with interpersonal trust (KUSIV3) ($r = .008, p = .779$), and general self-efficacy ($r = -.048, p = .218$).

4 Results

First, we present the evaluations of the four assessment dimensions—*Expectancy*, *Perceived Risk*, *Perceived Benefit*, and overall *Valence*—averaged across each queried topic and each participant. These serve as an assessment of the general perception of AI in society. Second, we present the individual evaluations of selected topics in regard to the four assessment dimensions and analyse their interrelationships. Lastly, we analyse the individual risk-benefit tradeoffs and the role of user-diversity and individual differences in the evaluation of AI.




Figure 2: Average evaluation of the 71 micro scenarios on the four assessment dimensions *Expectancy*, *Perceived Risk*, *Perceived Benefit*, and overall *Valence*. N=1100 participants as box- and violin plot. The grey area illustrates the distribution of the topic evaluations regarding the respective dimension.

4.1 Overall Assessment of AI

On average, the expectancy that these AI topics will come true is above neutral (12.7%), meaning the participants believe that most of the projections will become reality within the next decade. The average perceived risk across all topics is rather high (34.7%) and, as illustrated by the gray distribution in Figure 2, only a few topics are below a neutral evaluation thus being evaluated as at least safer than others. Average benefit is about neutral (-5.2%), although the distribution shows that some of the projections are seen as more useful and others as more useless. Lastly, the overall valence or sentiment of the participants towards the queried topics is rather negative (-19.7%), although some of the queried topics are evaluated positively.

Figure 2 illustrates these attributions and the left side of Table 1 presents the average scores across all topics and across all participants.

4.2 Evaluations of the queried AI statements

Due to the large number of topics queried, we will not address each individual topic and its evaluations in detail. Interested readers find the average ratings of all topics in Table 5 in the Appendix. Instead, we report the three highest and lowest rated topics for each evaluation dimension in the following.

Regarding the expectancy of various statements related to artificial intelligence (AI), the top three most expected items were “AI will independently drives automobiles” with a score of +68.9%, followed by “is misused by criminals” (+67.7%), and “learns faster than humans” (+60.5%). Conversely, the least expected statements were “AI helps us to have better relationships” with a score of -46.3%, “is a family member” (-43.0%), and “has a sense of responsibility” (-40.7%).

For the assessment of the perceived risk of various concepts related to AI, the top three items rated as most risky were “AI is misused by criminals” with a score of +68.4%, followed by “supervises our private life” (+67.1%), and “determines warfare” (+66.4%). Conversely, the lowest ranked statements, perceived as safest, were “AI is humorous” with a score of -22.5%, “creates valuable works of art that are traded for money” (-11.2%), and “serves as a conversation partner in elderly care” (-5.9%).

Table 1: Correlation table showing that the perceived risk, benefit and the overall valence or sentiment of the N=71 topic evaluations are closely associated. However, there is no significant association to the evaluation if the depicted scenarios are likely to occur in the next decade [*** signify significant correlations at $p < .001$. Values in parentheses indicate insignificant correlations.].

	M	SD	Expectancy	Risk	Benefit	Valence
Expectancy	12.7 %	66.7 %	—	(+0.150)	(+0.277)	(+0.054)
Perceived Risk	34.7 %	56.4 %		—	-0.524***	-0.800***
Perceived Benefit	-5.2 %	59.0 %			—	+0.904***
Overall Valence	-19.7 %	57.8 %				—

Concerning the perceived benefit of the various concepts, the top three items rated as useful were “AI carries out medical diagnoses” with a score of +32.3%, followed by “promotes innovation” (+31.7%), and “improves our health” (+31.1%). Conversely, the lowest ranked statements, considered least useful, were “reduces our need for interpersonal relationships” with a score of -36.7%, “creates valuable works of art that are traded for money” (-37.6%), and “decides about our death” (-43.2%).

Lastly, we asked the participants to rate the overall valence (as a measure for sentiment or value (Kim, Chan, and Gupta 2007)) towards the statements, i.e., if they evaluate the projection as positive or negative for them. The top three positively rated items were “AI improves our health” with a score of +23.8%, followed by “serves as a conversation partner in elderly care” (+18.1%), and “supports me as a helper in my tasks” (+17.6%). In contrast, the three lowest ranked statements, indicating negative perceptions, were “AI is misused by criminals” with a score of -66.1%, “decides about our death” (-51.4%), and “supervises our private life” (-50.6%).

While this univariate analysis provides a foundational understanding of participants’ perceptions of AI, we now turn to a bivariate perspective to explore the relationships between these variables through correlation and later regression analysis.

4.2.1 Relationships among the topic evaluations

We analyzed if the evaluations of the topics in regard to the assessment dimension are associated. The right side of Table 1 shows the correlations between the assessment dimensions. The average expectancy if the statements will occur in the next decade is neither related to the evaluation of their perceived risk ($r = .150, p = .632 > .05$), benefit ($r = .277, p = .077 > .05$), and valence ($r = .054, p = .449 > .05$). Apparently, the felt distance of AI projections does not impact evaluations in term of risk or benefit. However, perceived risk is negatively associated with both perceived benefit ($r = -.524, p < .001$) and overall valence ($r = -.800, p < .001$). Hence, topics perceived as riskier are also perceived as less useful and as less positive. Further, perceived benefit is strongly associated with perceived valence ($r = +.904, p < .001$): Topics perceived as more useful are also perceived as more positive and vice versa.

Since both perceived risk (negatively) and perceived benefit (positively) impact the overall valence of the topics, and risk and benefit are themselves coupled, we calculated a multiple linear regression to separate and examine their individual contribution in explaining the overall valence (as dependent variable).

The significant model included both risk ($\beta = -.490, p < .001$) and benefit ($\beta = +.672, p < .001$) as strong and significant predictors. Neither the interaction term of both predictors ($\beta = +.138, p = .305$), nor the intercept term ($I = 0.014, p = .265$) were statistically significant. The overall model fit was strong ($r^2 = .965, F(3, 67) = 612.3, p < .001$), indicating that perceived risk and benefit significantly predicted the overall sentiment towards the queried topics. Variance inflation due to collinearity of the predictors was not an issue ($VIF < 1.5$). Table 2 shows the regression table of the model. Consequently, even after controlling for the correlation between risk and benefit, both perceived risk and benefit have a strong effect on the evaluation of the AI-related statements.

4.2.2 Expectancy and Valence of the Queried Topics

Figure 3 shows both the overall average sentiment of the participants towards each of the 71 queried projections (on the x -axis), as well as their assessment expectation if this projection will come true in the next decade (on the y -axis). The diagram can be read as follows: Points on the left are considered as rather negative implications that AI might have, whereas points on the right indicate potential developments that are evaluated as positive. Likewise, points on the lower side of the diagram are seen as developments that are perceived as less likely, whereas points on the upper side are considered as rather likely developments. Consequently, the diagram can further be split in four sectors with a) topics that are seen as positive and expected, b) positive and unexpected, c) negative and unexpected, d) negative and expected.

Table 2: Regression table for the average overall valence across all 71 topics based on the predictors perceived risk and perceived benefit. The significant model explains $r^2 = .965$ (96.5%) of the variance in valence towards the AI-related statements.

Variable	Std. $\beta = B$	SE	T	p
(Intercept)	0.012	0.011	1.125	.265
Perceived Risk	-0.490	0.033	-14.722	< .001
Perceived Benefit	0.672	0.046	14.564	< .001
Perc. Risk \times Benefit	0.138	0.134	1.035	.305

Lastly, points on or near the diagonal can be interpreted as less controversial (from the view of the participants!), as the projections are considered as either likely and positive or as unlikely and negative. In contrast, points far-off the diagonal signify a discrepancy between expectation and valuation, such as topics that are seen as likely but negative or unlikely but positive.

As the scattered distribution of the points suggests, expectancy and valuation are not coupled.

4.2.3 Risk-Benefit Tradeoff of the Queried Topics

Figure 4 shows both the overall average perceived benefit the participants attribute to each of the 71 queried topics (on the y -axis), as well as their assessment of the perceived risk (on the x -axis). As above, the diagram can be read as follows: Points on the left are AI-related statements that the participants, on average, perceive as rather safe, whereas points on the right side are perceived as rather risky. Likewise, statements shown on the lower side of the diagram are evaluated as rather useless and statements on the upper side are considered as rather useful. Again, the diagram can be split into the four sectors with a) topics that are seen as higher risk and also higher benefit, b) higher risk but lower benefit, c) lower risk and lower benefit, and d) lower risk and high benefit. Figure 4 illustrates the visual mapping of the AI-related statements in terms of risk and benefit and their strong relationship. As the figure illustrates, only few topics are perceived as low risk and are placed on the left side of the diagram. In particular, that AI will create valuable art is perceived as being of lower risk and also as useless. That AI might be funny is seen as rather safe and rather neutral in terms of benefits. AI being a conversation partner in elderly care is not seen as risky but as useful. Most other AI statements range from a neutral risk evaluation to being perceived as risky. In contrast to the previous figure, Figure 4 suggests the strong relationship between risk and benefit that is also illustrated by the black regression line.

4.3 Perception of AI as Individual Difference

Next, we analyse the perception of AI interpreted as individual differences to explore how demographics and personality factors influence the evaluations. For that, we interpret the average evaluations of the selected topics per participant as a reflexive measurement of the latent constructs perceived expectancy, risk, benefit, and overall valence (Brauner 2024).

As the lower part of Table ?? shows, some of the queried demographic and explanatory variables are associated with the evaluation of the AI statements. The expectancy if the AI projections will come true within the next decade is associated with the participants' openness from the Big Five personality model ($r = .136, p = < .001$) and their AIRS ($r = .094, p = .036$). Participants reporting being more open, rated the likelihood of the projections becoming true higher. Higher experience with AI is weakly linked to higher expectations on AI. The perceived risk of AI is associated to the age of the participants ($r = .197, p < .001$), their reported technology readiness ($r = -.152, . < 001$), as well as their AIRS ($r = -.175, . < 001$). Older participants perceive AI are riskier, whereas higher technology readiness and higher AIRS lowers the perceived risk of AI. Regarding the perceived benefit, age ($r = -.182, . < 001$), technology readiness ($r = .233, . < 001$), as well as AIRS ($r = .274, . < 001$) are associated. With higher age, the AI's perceived benefit decreases. In contrast, the perceived benefit increases with higher technology readiness and higher AIRS. Neither participants' gender nor their general self-efficacy is associated with the overall evaluations of AI.

The upper part of Table 3 shows that the four assessment dimensions are closely interwoven: Perceived expectancy is weakly associated with higher perceived risk ($r = .212, p < .001$) and benefit ($r = .143$), but not with the overall valence. The association between perceived risk and perceived benefits is negative, strong, and significant ($r = -.639, p < .001$). The overall valence of AI is linked to both perceived risk ($r = -.749, p < .001$) and perceived benefit ($r = +.869, p < .001$).

To understand how demographics and the user factors influence perceived AI risk, AI benefit and overall AI valence, we conducted hierarchical multiple regressions with two blocks of variables. In the first block, we included the demographic




Figure 3: Average evaluation of the 71 micro scenarios on the dimensions *Valence* (*x*-axis) and *Expectancy* (*y*-axis) of the N=1100 participants. While there is no significant correlation between both assessment dimensions across the topics ($r = .054, p > .999$) many topics fall in the area with expected but negative statements.

variables age and gender. In the second block, we added technology readiness and AI readiness. We left out the other insignificant predictors (see Table 3).

For the first block, results indicated that all three models were significant: AI risk ($F(2, 1091) = 23.46, p < .001, R^2 = 0.041$), AI benefit ($F(2, 1091) = 20.19, p < .001, R^2 = 0.036$), and AI valence ($F(2, 1091) = 14.65, p < .001, R^2 = 0.026$). In all three models, age had a significant effect on perceptions of AI, with older age associated with higher perceived risk ($\beta = 0.198$), lower perceived benefit ($\beta = -0.183$), and reduced overall valence toward AI ($\beta = 0.149$). Gender affected only the overall valence of AI ($\beta = 0.068$), with women reporting lower AI valence than men, though it did not significantly impact perceived AI risk or benefit.

Table 3: Significant correlations of demographic and attitudinal factors with the individual perceived expectancy, risk, benefit, and valence towards the AI projections (N=1100, “.” signifies insignificant correlations).

Variable	AI Expectancy	AI Risk	AI Benefit	AI Valence
AI Expectancy	—	+0.212	+0.143	.
AI Risk		—	-0.639	-0.711
AI Benefit			—	+0.869
Age in Years	.	+0.197	-0.182	-0.146
Gender (dummy coded m=1, w=2)
Openness (Big 5)	+0.136	.	.	.
General Self-Efficacy (GSE3)
Technology Readiness	.	-0.152	+0.233	+0.207
AI Readiness (AIRS/MAIRS-MS)	+0.094	-0.175	+0.274	+0.223

The second-level models (including technology readiness and AI readiness) were also significant and improved model fit for each dependent variable: AI risk ($F(4, 1089) = 16.92, p < .001, R^2 = 0.059$), AI benefit ($F(4, 1089) = 29.22, p < .001, R^2 = 0.097$), and AI valence ($F(4, 1089) = 19.85, p < .001, R^2 = 0.068$). Adding technology readiness and AI readiness in the second block significantly improved the fit of each regression model. AI readiness has a mitigating effect on perceived risk, increases perceived benefit, and overall valence. While technology readiness does not sig. influence perceived risks, it significantly increases the perceived benefits and overall valence. Additionally, for all three dependent variables, the effect of age decreased, and the formerly significant impact of gender on overall AI valence diminished. Table 4 details the three hierarchical regression analyses.

Table 4: Results of the Hierarchical Linear Regression Analysis for Individuals’ Perceived Risk, Benefit, and Valence of AI, by Demographics (Age, Gender) and Technology Attitudes. Including Technology Readiness and AI Readiness improved the model’s explanatory power and decreased the influence of age (and to a lesser extent, gender) on the three target variables (n=1094). “****” significant at $p < .001$, “**” significant at $p < .05$.

Independent Variable	Perceived Risk	Perceived Benefit	Perceived Valence
Step 1: Demographics			
(Intercept)	+0.074	+0.214****	+0.059
Age in Years (β)	+0.198****	-0.183****	-0.149****
Gender (β , dummy coded m=1, w=2)	+0.051	-0.055	-0.068****
R^2	0.041	0.036	0.026
$F(2, 1091)$	23.46 ***	20.19 ***	14.65 ***
Step 2: Explanatory Variables			
(Intercept)	+0.332****	+0.286****	+0.390****
Age in Years (β)	+0.159****	-0.109****	-0.088*
Gender (β , dummy coded m=1, w=2)	+0.022	+0.000	+0.021
Technology Readiness (β)	+0.058	+0.109*	+0.108*
AI Readiness (AIRS) (β)	-0.100**	+0.189****	+0.141****
ΔR^2	+0.018	+0.061	+0.042
R^2	0.059	0.097	0.067
$F(4, 1089)$	16.92 ***	29.22 ***	19.85 ***

4.4 Desired Foci of AI governance

Lastly, we asked for the primary foci for effective AI governance (as single choice). From the participants perspective, the predominant requirement, with 45.3% of respondents, was Human Control and Supervision of AI usage and development. Other significant demands included Transparency at 13.0%, Data Protection and Data Management at 11.7%, and Social and Ecological Well-being at 9.3%. Lesser but still notable concerns were Diversity, Non-discrimination, and Fairness at 4.8%, Robustness and Security at 4.7%, and Accountability at 4.5%. 6.7% of the participants did not respond to this question at all.

5 Discussion

Artificial Intelligence (AI) could become one of the defining technologies of the 21st century. Understanding how people perceive and weigh the risks and benefits of this technology is essential for ensuring that AI research and implementation align with human values and for developing effective AI governance. Drawing on the psychometric paradigm (Slovic, Fischhoff, and Lichtenstein 1986), we examined the trade-offs between perceived risks and benefits of various AI-related micro-scenarios from both individual and technological perspectives, using a sample of 1100 participants from Germany.

Across the various topics surveyed, we observed an overall negative sentiment across most of the topics: The majority of the topics are perceived as rather risky for the individuals and of little use. This may, of course, be a bias due to the selection of topics that included a large range of statements that are apparently negative or challenging, ranging from “AI will be misused by criminals” and “AI determines warfare”. On the other hand, this is also formed by statements such as “AI creates many jobs” or “AI will independently drive automobiles” that participants neither liked nor disliked, but attributed higher risks to them. Overall, less than 20% of the statements received a positive evaluation and many of these were nonetheless perceived as risky.

Beyond the absolute evaluation, we also analysed how the overall sentiment is formed. First, we observed an inverse relationship between perceived risks and perceived benefits. This corroborates prior findings, from both studies on AI perception in particular (Alessandro et al. 2024), as well as from risk perception studies in different contexts (Alhakami and Slovic 1994). While this may sound trivial at first sight, this is meaningful as it highlights a cognitive bias where individuals tend to downplay the benefits of a technology if they perceive it as risky, and vice versa, which can influence public attitudes and policy decisions regarding the adoption of new technologies. Further, we found that the overall sentiment (negative to positive) is formed by both the perceived risk and the perceived benefits, with the benefits having a stronger influence on the overall valence than the perceived risks. On the one hand, perception of risk negatively affects emotional responses to AI, making people feel more negatively about it. On the other hand, perception of benefit has a strong positive effect, more than offsetting the negative impact of risk in shaping positive valence. This, again, corroborates many findings from risk research (Alhakami and Slovic 1994) that found that technology perception is mostly driven by the perceived benefits rather than the perceived risks. This is interesting insofar, as AI and its implications are frequently seen as negative or worrying (Cave, Coughlan, and Dihal 2019), at least in many western countries (Curran, Sun, and Hong 2019; Kelley et al. 2021).

Overall, these results suggest that improving and demonstrating the benefit of AI is key to fostering positive attitudes, but risk management is also crucial, as high risk can erode the positive impact of benefit on emotional perceptions.

From the perspective of individual differences, our results indicate that perceptions of AI’s risks, benefits, and overall evaluation are shaped by both demographic factors and individual attitudes. Younger respondents tended to view AI-related topics as less risky, more beneficial, and rated them with a higher overall valence. Gender also played a role, though to a lesser extent, with women generally giving lower evaluations of AI than men. These findings align with current research on AI perception, which shows that age and gender can influence AI attitudes (e.g., Crockett et al. (2020) and Yigitcanlar, Degirmenci, and Inkinen (2022)), and that individuals with higher levels of technology or AI literacy are often less apprehensive about AI (Novozhilova et al. 2024).

However, these effects get smaller, if people have higher technology or AI readiness. Consequently, increasing technology and AI literacy may be suitable to address the perceived risks, lower benefits, and overall lower acceptance of AI in the society. If people have a better understanding about the basic functioning of AI, the many ethical challenges involved in building sophisticated AI models and the implications AI for individuals and the society, we can have a broad and substantial democratic debate about AI’s potential, its limits, and potential caveats on different levels of social and societal consequences. This can be a foundation to decide where we want AI to take over control, where it should support us, and which areas should be free of AI. Offering free online courses for adults, such as “Elements of AI” and updated school curricula that incorporate digitalisation and AI literacy are a necessity (Olari and Romeike 2021; Marx et al. 2022).

However, even after controlling for the influence of technology and AI readiness, a significant age bias remained. As the development of AI algorithms and the applications of AI in various contexts is predominantly driven by younger developers (that are further predominantly male), that raises the concern if the current and future developments are well-aligned with the norms and values of the later actual users of the technology. Here, it is essential to educate the developers in methods for human-centered and participatory development methods and to integrate an ethical perspective in the development of AI applications.

The visual maps can provide a common ground to identify critical topics, discuss research needs, and societal implications of AI. These cartographies of AI perceptions can help to identify areas that are considered as more critical than others and can and should be extended by future work.

In addition to enhancing our understanding of public perceptions of AI, this article also offers methodological contributions. By building on micro scenarios (Brauner 2024), we could analyze two different perspectives on the public perception of AI: first, with responses interpreted as individual differences, and second, as technology evaluation. This dual approach is important because it allows for a more nuanced understanding of how people view AI, revealing not only general attitudes but also the factors that vary across individuals. This relevance extends to policymakers and technology developers, as it shows that public opinion on AI is complex, balancing both risks and benefits, with benefits often outweighing concerns about risk. Understanding these dynamics helps in crafting more targeted public communication that are in line with different usage contexts and target groups and regulatory strategies that resonate with diverse public concerns and highlight AI's practical value. This methodological approach, therefore, not only deepens theoretical insights but also provides practical guidance for aligning AI development and regulation with public sentiment.

5.1 Limitations

This study is not without limitations. Firstly, although the sample of participants is large and diverse in terms of age, gender, education, and employment, we only surveyed participants from Germany. Based on studies that suggest cultural differences in AI perception (Curran, Sun, and Hong 2019; Kelley et al. 2021), future work may therefore extend our work and analyse how cultural dimensions, such as country of origin or an individual's cultural heritage, influence the perception of AI and the involved risk-benefit tradeoffs.

Secondly, although the sample of queried topics builds on existing research, the selection may be biased, yielding spurious findings due to Berkson's paradox (Berkson 1946). Future work may therefore specifically compile topics based on a systematic underlying design space or focus on areas currently under-explored. Nevertheless, the identified patterns between the topic evaluations (perspective 2) and the individual's sentiment towards AI (perspective 1) are similar. Biases in the topic selection would not carry over to biases in the individual differences due to the representative sample used. This suggests that the selection was sufficiently well-chosen and the findings are generalizable.

Thirdly and most importantly, the study examined many and broad statements on AI's future implications across a few dependent variables. This approach captures heuristic evaluations of the participants instead of cognitively demanding thorough assessments. However, recent studies suggest that the results of conventional surveys are not only formed by the judgements of the participants as intended, but also to a significant extent by linguistic properties of the items, such as word co-occurrences (Gefen and Larsen 2017). Our approach addresses this concern by employing reflexive measurements across a diverse range of topics, rather than relying on psychometric scales of similarly phrased items (Brauner 2024). Nevertheless, the results display strong and systematic evaluation patterns, indicating the effectiveness of the approach and reliable measurements. This suggests that it offers a novel perspective for triangulating cognitive phenomena in technology perception. While this provides insight into the broader perception of AI and how it is influenced by individual differences, we know little about the specific motives behind the evaluations of individual topics. As AI reshapes individual lives and the society as a whole, each topic deserves in-depth qualitative and quantitative studies to deepen the understanding of these evaluations. This could inform practitioners, researchers, and policymakers to better align AI with human needs.

6 Conclusion and Outlook

Shneiderman raised concerns about the trajectories of recent AI developments (Shneiderman 2021) and he emphasizes the importance of rethinking AI development to prioritize human-centered AI and human well-being. He argues that rather than focusing on technical innovation, AI should be designed to enhance human values, ethical considerations, and the social good through human-centered AI guidelines. Similarly, Crawford argues that artificial intelligence is neither artificial nor intelligent (Crawford 2021). It's not artificial, as it depends on vast energy consumption, extensive computer hardware for cloud servers, and massive invisible human labor to label data for training. Nor is it intelligent, as it is a product of human design, inherently shaped by human biases, limitations, and goals. While it may mimic intelligent behavior, it lacks independent thought, genuine understanding, and true self-awareness.

We believe that integrating both individual and societal values into AI development is essential to aligning future advancements with personal norms and broader social principles. Of course, this human-centered approach requires collaboration across disciplines and participatory value-oriented approaches (Hoven, Vermaas, and Poel 2015). Our focus on the individual perceived value of AI across various domains and contexts contributes to this alignment process

and is essential for responsible development of AI and policy-making. We hope that the rating of the topics, the identified relationships, and the actionable visual maps can support other researchers to better align their work, ensuring that AI is beneficial and aligned with individual and societal needs, equity, safety, and inclusivity.

Appendix

Table 5: Question items from the survey and average responses to each item from the participants (N=1100) ordered by valence.

In 10 years, AI...	Expectancy	Risk	Benefit	Valence
is misused by criminals.	67.7%	68.4%	-27.0%	-66.1%
decides about our death.	-33.3%	50.5%	-43.2%	-51.4%
supervises our private life.	55.6%	67.1%	-27.6%	-50.6%
determines warfare.	23.8%	66.4%	-23.0%	-50.6%
makes political decisions.	-17.0%	62.8%	-31.3%	-50.2%
reduces our need for interpersonal relationships.	-0.1%	44.5%	-36.7%	-48.6%
knows everything about me.	43.8%	60.8%	-22.0%	-47.0%
can no longer be controlled by humans.	18.1%	57.2%	-23.8%	-45.8%
knows my secrets.	18.2%	46.0%	-35.4%	-45.7%
decides on hiring, promotions, and terminations.	24.5%	58.0%	-29.7%	-45.5%
leads to personal loneliness.	25.9%	39.8%	-29.8%	-43.5%
destroys humanity.	-19.8%	42.3%	-29.4%	-43.4%
administers justice in legal matters.	-28.7%	64.6%	-26.0%	-43.3%
considers humans as a threat.	-11.6%	39.3%	-30.1%	-42.8%
controls what messages we receive.	51.9%	56.4%	-18.2%	-40.7%
divides society.	42.4%	46.7%	-22.6%	-40.1%
is influenced by an elite.	27.8%	45.1%	-21.1%	-39.7%
has its own consciousness.	-10.7%	51.0%	-15.1%	-37.1%
makes society lazy.	26.8%	38.2%	-22.4%	-35.7%
runs companies.	-7.1%	48.6%	-17.3%	-34.2%
can recreate itself.	21.2%	51.8%	-12.7%	-33.9%
destroys many jobs.	45.7%	48.7%	-13.6%	-33.5%
decides who gets an important financial loan.	35.7%	42.1%	-13.4%	-32.9%
conducts international diplomacy.	-25.7%	49.5%	-20.4%	-32.6%
prefers certain groups of people.	13.0%	38.2%	-21.2%	-32.5%
is a family member.	-43.0%	28.7%	-24.4%	-32.3%
helps us to have better relationships.	-46.3%	32.5%	-33.8%	-31.6%
occupies leadership positions in working life.	-3.1%	40.8%	-6.1%	-30.1%
makes independent decisions that affect our lives.	33.6%	52.8%	-10.4%	-28.7%
threatens my professional future.	-17.8%	15.1%	-20.0%	-27.7%
threatens my private future.	-15.8%	14.2%	-15.6%	-26.2%
controls hybrids of humans and technology.	-0.4%	40.9%	-7.4%	-24.1%
independently writes news.	55.5%	50.3%	-4.3%	-23.2%
is more intelligent than humans.	17.6%	49.0%	4.8%	-22.3%
supervises our behavior in public.	55.2%	45.8%	4.1%	-21.9%
becomes part of the human body.	-13.5%	48.8%	0.9%	-21.2%
determines our leisure time activities.	17.4%	18.4%	-9.6%	-17.1%
controls what and how we learn.	33.2%	37.6%	3.7%	-16.7%
controls our search for partners.	24.0%	21.2%	-14.3%	-16.3%
creates valuable works of art that are traded for money.	14.8%	-11.2%	-37.6%	-16.0%
has a sense of responsibility.	-40.7%	39.0%	-7.0%	-15.4%
decides on medical treatments.	29.7%	45.9%	5.8%	-15.1%
has the ability to recognize, understand and empathize with emotions.	-3.7%	29.1%	-6.3%	-14.8%
is ahead of humans in its abilities.	29.5%	43.3%	10.2%	-14.6%
acts according to moral concepts.	-32.1%	34.0%	-8.1%	-13.6%
teaches students.	24.0%	26.9%	9.2%	-12.4%
is omniscient.	-14.6%	38.1%	13.7%	-11.0%

Table 5: Question items from the survey and average responses to each item from the participants (N=1100) ordered by valence. (*continued*)

In 10 years, AI...	Expectancy	Risk	Benefit	Valence
independently writes scientific articles.	44.0%	33.6%	8.5%	-10.2%
can optimize itself.	45.0%	43.0%	11.6%	-9.5%
increases the wealth of many people.	-18.4%	25.0%	4.3%	-9.5%
increases social justice.	-38.8%	28.3%	-6.2%	-8.6%
autonomously takes off, flies, and lands airplanes.	25.2%	37.0%	14.2%	-7.2%
creates many jobs.	-30.5%	29.0%	2.0%	-4.9%
learns faster than humans.	60.5%	34.6%	21.6%	-3.6%
controls food production.	25.6%	19.9%	10.0%	-0.4%
contributes to solving complex social problems.	6.4%	28.3%	12.2%	2.0%
advises me in uncertain times.	16.4%	19.6%	13.4%	3.1%
raises our standard of living.	11.5%	18.1%	16.7%	3.4%
independently drives automobiles.	68.9%	36.1%	22.3%	3.6%
explains its decisions.	-0.1%	11.3%	15.9%	5.6%
is always subordinate to us in working life.	-4.7%	13.4%	15.9%	6.6%
determines the construction and infrastructure of our cities.	21.5%	14.3%	19.9%	7.7%
makes our society more sustainable.	-3.2%	7.2%	15.1%	8.3%
is humorous.	-18.0%	-22.5%	-6.9%	9.6%
prevents crimes.	-5.6%	15.3%	25.1%	11.5%
improves the security of people.	18.1%	13.4%	25.2%	12.4%
carries out medical diagnoses.	47.0%	20.9%	32.3%	16.0%
promotes innovation.	45.7%	11.8%	31.7%	16.3%
supports me as a helper in my tasks.	39.4%	2.3%	29.4%	17.6%
serves as a conversation partner in elderly care.	34.0%	-5.9%	25.9%	18.1%
improves our health.	19.7%	5.2%	31.1%	23.8%
AVERAGE	12.7%	34.7%	-5.2%	-19.7%

Note:
Measured on 6 point semantic differentials and rescaled to -100% to +100%. Negative values indicate a negative evaluation of the respective dimension (i.g., low valence, low perceived risk, low perceived benefit, or low expectancy) and positive values indicate a high evaluation. Permission to translate, use, and adapt the items is—of course—granted.

Acknowledgments

This approach builds on a the foundation laid by a prior study from Ralf Philipsen and the first author (Brauner, Hick, et al. 2023). The first author is deeply thankful for the creative idea we came up with. The methodology used in this study evolved over multiple studies and extensive discussions with colleagues. To name just a few, we express our gratitude to Julia Offermann, Julian Hildebrandt and Ralf Philipsen for inspiring discussions on the approach, analysis and aftermath. We own gratitude to Jana Uher and Jan Ketil Arnulf for inspiring impulses on the underlying method. Of course, we also thank Tim Schmeckel for dedicated research support.

Declarations

Funding

Funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy – EXC- 2023 Internet of Production – 390621612.

Conflicts of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Ethics approval

Our universities IRB approved this study under ID XXXXXXXXXX

Consent to participate

Participant were informed about the goal and approach of the study and that data will be stored on a public repository. They gave informed consent.

Consent for publication

All authors provided their consent for publication.

Availability of data and materials

All materials, data, and analysis are available on OSF (██████████).

Code availability

All materials, data, and analysis are available on OSF (██████████).

References

- Weber, Max (1904). “Die Objektivität sozialwissenschaftlicher und sozialpolitischer Erkenntnis [The Objectivity of Social Scientific and Social Policy Knowledge]”. In: *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 19.1, pp. 22–87. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-476-05142-4_65](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-476-05142-4_65).
- Berkson, Joseph (1946). “Limitations of the Application of Fourfold Table Analysis to Hospital Data”. In: 2 (3), pp. 47–53. DOI: [10.2307/3002000](https://doi.org/10.2307/3002000).
- Fischhoff, Baruch et al. (1978). “How safe is safe enough? A psychometric study of attitudes towards technological risks and benefits”. In: *Policy Sciences* 9.2, pp. 127–152. ISSN: 1573-0891. DOI: [10.1007/bf00143739](https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00143739).
- Slovic, Paul, Baruch Fischhoff, and Sarah Lichtenstein (1979). “Rating the Risks”. In: *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development* 21.3, pp. 14–39. ISSN: 1939-9154. DOI: [10.1080/00139157.1979.9933091](https://doi.org/10.1080/00139157.1979.9933091).
- Hopfield, John J. (1982). “Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities.” In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 79.8, pp. 2554–2558. ISSN: 1091-6490. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.79.8.2554](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.79.8.2554).
- Kahneman, Daniel and Amos Tversky (1984). “Choices, Values, and Frames”. In: *American Psychologist* 39.4, pp. 341–350. ISSN: 0003-066X. DOI: [10.1037/0003-066x.39.4.341](https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.39.4.341).
- Rumelhart, David E., Geoffrey E. Hinton, and Ronald J. Williams (1986). “Learning representations by back-propagating errors”. In: *Nature* 323.6088, pp. 533–536. ISSN: 1476-4687. DOI: [10.1038/323533a0](https://doi.org/10.1038/323533a0).
- Slovic, Paul, Baruch Fischhoff, and Sarah Lichtenstein (1986). “The Psychometric Study of Risk Perception”. In: *Risk Evaluation and Management*. Springer US, pp. 3–24. ISBN: 9781461321033. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4613-2103-3_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-2103-3_1).
- Alhakami, Ali Siddiq and Paul Slovic (1994). “A Psychological Study of the Inverse Relationship Between Perceived Risk and Perceived Benefit”. In: *Risk Analysis* 14.6, pp. 1085–1096. ISSN: 1539-6924. DOI: [10.1111/j.1539-6924.1994.tb00080.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.1994.tb00080.x).
- Friedman, Batya and Helen Nissenbaum (1996). “Bias in computer systems”. In: *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 14.3, pp. 330–347. ISSN: 1046-8188. DOI: [10.1145/230538.230561](https://doi.org/10.1145/230538.230561).
- Reeves, Byron and Clifford Nass (1996). *The Media Equation – How People Treat Computers, Television, and New Media Like Real People and Places*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fogg, B J and Hsiang Tseng (1999). “The Elements of Computer Credibility”. In: *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. CHI '99. New York, NY, USA: ACM, pp. 80–87. DOI: [10.1145/302979.303001](https://doi.org/10.1145/302979.303001).
- Slovic, Paul, James Flynn, et al. (2000). “Nuclear Power and the Public: A Comparative Study of Risk Perception in France and the United States”. In: *Cross-Cultural Risk Perception*. Springer US, pp. 55–102. ISBN: 9781475748918. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4757-4891-8_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-4891-8_2).
- Witte, Kim and Mike Allen (2000). “A Meta-Analysis of Fear Appeals: Implications for Effective Public Health Campaigns”. In: *Health Education & Behavior* 27.5, pp. 591–615. ISSN: 1552-6127. DOI: [10.1177/109019810002700506](https://doi.org/10.1177/109019810002700506).
- Nissenbaum, H. (2001). “How computer systems embody values”. In: *Computer* 34.3, pp. 120–119. ISSN: 0018-9162. DOI: [10.1109/2.910905](https://doi.org/10.1109/2.910905).
- Bostrom, Nick, ed. (2003). *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies*. Oxford University Press.

- Verdurme, Annelies and Jacques Viaene (2003). “Consumer beliefs and attitude towards genetically modified food: Basis for segmentation and implications for communication”. In: *Agribusiness* 19.1, pp. 91–113. ISSN: 1520-6297. DOI: [10.1002/agr.10045](https://doi.org/10.1002/agr.10045).
- McCarthy, John et al. (2006). “A proposal for the Dartmouth summer research project on artificial intelligence”. In: *AI Magazine* 27.4, pp. 12–14. ISSN: 07384602.
- Kim, Hee-Woong, Hock Chuan Chan, and Sumeet Gupta (2007). “Value-based Adoption of Mobile Internet: An empirical investigation”. In: *Decision Support Systems* 43.1, pp. 111–126. ISSN: 0167-9236. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2005.05.009>.
- Aven, Terje and Ortwin Renn (2009). “On risk defined as an event where the outcome is uncertain”. In: *Journal of Risk Research* 12.1, pp. 1–11. ISSN: 1466-4461. DOI: [10.1080/13669870802488883](https://doi.org/10.1080/13669870802488883).
- Deng, Jia et al. (2009). “ImageNet: A large-scale hierarchical image database”. In: *2009 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 248–255. DOI: [10.1109/CVPR.2009.5206848](https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2009.5206848).
- Field, Andy (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*. 3. Sage Publications. ISBN: 1847879071.
- Fuchs, Christoph and Adamantios Diamantopoulos (2009). “Using single-item measures for construct measurement in management research – Conceptual issues and application guidelines”. In: *Die Betriebswirtschaft* 9 (2).
- Connor, Melanie and Michael Siegrist (2010). “Factors Influencing People’s Acceptance of Gene Technology: The Role of Knowledge, Health Expectations, Naturalness, and Social Trust”. In: *Science Communication* 32.4, pp. 514–538. ISSN: 1552-8545. DOI: [10.1177/1075547009358919](https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547009358919).
- Pidgeon, Nick and Baruch Fischhoff (2011). “The role of social and decision sciences in communicating uncertain climate risks”. In: *Nature Climate Change* 1.1, pp. 35–41. ISSN: 1758-6798. DOI: [10.1038/nclimate1080](https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1080).
- Brynjolfsson, Erik and Andrew McAfee (2014). *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies*. New York.
- Rammstedt, Beatrice and Constanze Beierlein (2014). “Can’t We Make It Any Shorter? The Limits of Personality Assessment and Ways to Overcome Them”. In: *Journal of Individual Differences* 35.4, pp. 212–220. ISSN: 2151-2299. DOI: [10.1027/1614-0001/a000141](https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001/a000141).
- Hoffmann, Arvid O. I., Thomas Post, and Joost M. E. Pennings (2015). “How Investor Perceptions Drive Actual Trading and Risk-Taking Behavior”. In: *Journal of Behavioral Finance* 16.1, pp. 94–103. ISSN: 1542-7579. DOI: [10.1080/15427560.2015.1000332](https://doi.org/10.1080/15427560.2015.1000332).
- Hoven, Jeroen van den, Pieter E. Vermaas, and Ibo van de Poel (2015). “Design for Values: An Introduction”. In: *Handbook of Ethics, Values, and Technological Design*. Springer Netherlands, pp. 1–7. ISBN: 9789400769700. DOI: [10.1007/978-94-007-6970-0_40](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6970-0_40).
- Lecun, Yann, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton (2015). “Deep Learning”. In: *Nature* 521.7553, pp. 436–444. ISSN: 14764687. DOI: [10.1038/nature14539](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14539).
- Neyer, Franz J., Juliane Felber, and Claudia Gebhardt (2016). “Kurzskaala Technikbereitschaft (TB, technology commitment)”. In: *Zusammenstellung sozialwissenschaftlicher Items und Skalen (ZIS)*. DOI: [10.6102/ZIS244](https://doi.org/10.6102/ZIS244).
- O’Neil, Cathy (2016). *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy*. USA: Crown Publishing Group. ISBN: 0553418815.
- Acemoglu, Daron and Pascual Restrepo (2017). “The Race Between Machine and Man”. In: *American Economic Review* 108.6, pp. 1488–1542. DOI: [10.3386/w22252](https://doi.org/10.3386/w22252).
- Fast, Ethan and Eric Horvitz (2017). “Long-term trends in the public perception of artificial intelligence”. In: *AAAI’17: Proceedings of the Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 963–969.
- Gefen, David and Kai Larsen (2017). “Controlling for Lexical Closeness in Survey Research: A Demonstration on the Technology Acceptance Model”. In: *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* 18.10, pp. 727–757. ISSN: 1536-9323. DOI: [10.17705/1jais.00469](https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00469).
- Makridakis, Spyros (2017). “The forthcoming Artificial Intelligence (AI) revolution: Its impact on society and firms”. In: *Futures* 90, pp. 46–60. ISSN: 0016-3287. DOI: [10.1016/j.futures.2017.03.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2017.03.006).
- Awad, Edmond et al. (2018). “The Moral Machine Experiment”. In: *Nature*, p. 1. ISSN: 0028-0836. DOI: [10.1038/s41586-018-0637-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0637-6).
- Binns, Reuben (2018). “Fairness in Machine Learning: Lessons from Political Philosophy”. In: *Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*. Ed. by Sorelle A. Friedler and Christo Wilson. Vol. 81. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, pp. 149–159.
- Cath, Corinne (2018). “Governing artificial intelligence: ethical, legal and technical opportunities and challenges”. In: *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 376.2133, p. 20180080. ISSN: 1471-2962. DOI: [10.1098/rsta.2018.0080](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2018.0080).
- Floridi, Luciano et al. (2018). “AI4People—An Ethical Framework for a Good AI Society: Opportunities, Risks, Principles, and Recommendations”. In: *Minds and Machines* 28.4, pp. 689–707. ISSN: 1572-8641. DOI: [10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5).

- Cave, Stephen, Kate Coughlan, and Kanta Dihal (2019). ““Scary Robots”: Examining Public Responses to AI”. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*. AIES '19. New York: ACM. DOI: [10.1145/3306618.3314232](https://doi.org/10.1145/3306618.3314232).
- Cui, Di and Fang Wu (2019). “The influence of media use on public perceptions of artificial intelligence in China: Evidence from an online survey”. In: *Information Development* 37.1, pp. 45–57. ISSN: 1741-6469. DOI: [10.1177/0266666919893411](https://doi.org/10.1177/0266666919893411).
- Curran, Nathaniel Ming, Jingyi Sun, and Joo-Wha Hong (2019). “Anthropomorphizing AlphaGo: a content analysis of the framing of Google DeepMind’s AlphaGo in the Chinese and American press”. In: *AI & SOCIETY* 35.3, pp. 727–735. ISSN: 1435-5655. DOI: [10.1007/s00146-019-00908-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-019-00908-9).
- Diakopoulos, Nicholas (2019). *Automating the News: How Algorithms Are Rewriting the Media*. Harvard University Press. ISBN: 9780674976986.
- Leiner, Dominik Johannes (2019). “Too Fast, too Straight, too Weird: Non-Reactive Indicators for Meaningless Data in Internet Surveys”. In: *Survey Research Methods* 13.3, pp. 229–248. DOI: [10.18148/srm/2019.v13i3.7403](https://doi.org/10.18148/srm/2019.v13i3.7403).
- Spiel, Katta, Oliver L. Haimson, and Danielle Lottridge (2019). “How to do better with gender on surveys: a guide for HCI researchers”. In: *Interactions* 26.4, pp. 62–65. ISSN: 1558-3449. DOI: [10.1145/3338283](https://doi.org/10.1145/3338283).
- Araujo, Theo et al. (2020). “In AI we trust? Perceptions about automated decision-making by artificial intelligence”. In: *AI & SOCIETY* 35.3, pp. 611–623. ISSN: 1435-5655. DOI: [10.1007/s00146-019-00931-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-019-00931-w).
- Arning, Katrin et al. (2020). “Risk-benefit perceptions and public acceptance of Carbon Capture and Utilization”. In: *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions* 35, pp. 292–308. ISSN: 2210-4224. DOI: [10.1016/j.eist.2019.05.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2019.05.003).
- Chen, Lijia, Pingping Chen, and Zhijian Lin (2020). “Artificial Intelligence in Education: A Review”. In: *IEEE Access* 8, pp. 75264–75278. DOI: [10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510](https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510).
- Crockett, Keeley et al. (2020). “Risk and Trust Perceptions of the Public of Artificial Intelligence Applications”. In: *2020 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, pp. 1–8. DOI: [10.1109/ijcnn48605.2020.9207654](https://doi.org/10.1109/ijcnn48605.2020.9207654).
- Gao, Shuqing et al. (2020). “Public Perception of Artificial Intelligence in Medical Care: Content Analysis of Social Media”. In: *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 22.7, e16649. ISSN: 1438-8871. DOI: [10.2196/16649](https://doi.org/10.2196/16649).
- Huang, Xingyu, Shanshan Dai, and Honggang Xu (2020). “Predicting tourists’ health risk preventative behaviour and travelling satisfaction in Tibet: Combining the theory of planned behaviour and health belief model”. In: *Tourism Management Perspectives* 33, p. 100589. ISSN: 2211-9736. DOI: [10.1016/j.tmp.2019.100589](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2019.100589).
- Nießen, Désirée, Katharina Groskurth, et al. (2020). “Risk Proneness Short Scale (R-1)”. In: *ZIS – The Collection of Items and Scales for the Social Sciences*. DOI: [10.6102/ZIS286](https://doi.org/10.6102/ZIS286).
- Budish, Ryan (2021). “AI’s Risky Business: Embracing Ambiguity in Managing the Risks of AI”. In: *Journal of Business & Technology Law* 16, p. 259.
- Crawford, Kate (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*. Yale University Press.
- Doll, E. S. et al. (2021). “General Self-Efficacy Short Scale-3 (GSE-3)”. In: *ZIS - The Collection of Items and Scales for the Social Sciences*. DOI: [10.6102/ZIS294](https://doi.org/10.6102/ZIS294). URL: <https://zis.gesis.org/DoiId/zis294>.
- Karaca, Ozan, S. Ayhan Çalışkan, and Kadir Demir (2021). “Medical artificial intelligence readiness scale for medical students (MAIRS-MS) – development, validity and reliability study”. In: *BMC Medical Education* 21.1. ISSN: 1472-6920. DOI: [10.1186/s12909-021-02546-6](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-021-02546-6).
- Kelley, Patrick Gage et al. (2021). “Exciting, Useful, Worrying, Futuristic: Public Perception of Artificial Intelligence in 8 Countries”. In: *Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*. AIES '21. ACM. DOI: [10.1145/3461702.3462605](https://doi.org/10.1145/3461702.3462605).
- Liehner, Gian Luca et al. (2021). “Delegation of moral tasks to automated agents The impact of risk and context on trusting a machine to perform a task”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Technology and Society* 3.1, pp. 46–57. ISSN: 2637-6415. DOI: [10.1109/TTS.2021.3118355](https://doi.org/10.1109/TTS.2021.3118355).
- Nießen, Désirée, Constanze Beierlein, et al. (2021). “Interpersonal Trust Short Scale (KUSIV3)”. In: *ZIS – The Collection of Items and Scales for the Social Sciences*. DOI: [10.6102/ZIS292_EXZ](https://doi.org/10.6102/ZIS292_EXZ).
- Olari, Viktoriya and Ralf Romeike (2021). “Addressing AI and Data Literacy in Teacher Education: A Review of Existing Educational Frameworks”. In: *The 16th Workshop in Primary and Secondary Computing Education*. WiPSCÉ '21. ACM. DOI: [10.1145/3481312.3481351](https://doi.org/10.1145/3481312.3481351). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3481312.3481351>.
- Shneiderman, Ben (2021). “Human-Centered AI”. In: *Issues in Science and Technology* 37.2, pp. 56–61.
- Young, Albert T. et al. (2021). “Patient and General Public Attitudes Towards Clinical Artificial Intelligence: A Mixed Methods Systematic Review”. In: *The Lancet Digital Health* 3.9, e599–e611.
- Brauner, Philipp, Manuela Dalibor, et al. (2022). “A Computer Science Perspective on Digital Transformation in Production”. In: *ACM Transactions on Internet of Things* 3.2, pp. 1–32. ISSN: 2691-1914. DOI: [10.1145/3502265](https://doi.org/10.1145/3502265).
- Ipsos (2022). *Global Attitudes Towards Artificial Intelligence*. Ipsos Report.

- Kaya, Feridun et al. (2022). “The Roles of Personality Traits, AI Anxiety, and Demographic Factors in Attitudes toward Artificial Intelligence”. In: *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction* 40.2, pp. 497–514. ISSN: 1532-7590. DOI: [10.1080/10447318.2022.2151730](https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2022.2151730).
- Marx, Erik et al. (2022). “Using Matchboxes to Teach the Basics of Machine Learning: an Analysis of (Possible) Misconceptions”. In: *Proceedings of the Second Teaching Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence Workshop*. Ed. by Katherine M. Kinnaird, Peter Steinbach, and Oliver Guhr. Vol. 170. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, pp. 25–29. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v170/marx22a.html>.
- Statista (2022). *Artificial Intelligence (AI) worldwide – Statistics & Facts*. <https://www.statista.com/topics/3104/artificial-intelligence-ai-worldwide/dossier-chapter1> last accessed 28 Nov. 2022.
- Yigitcanlar, Tan, Kenan Degirmenci, and Tommi Inkinen (2022). “Drivers behind the public perception of artificial intelligence: insights from major Australian cities”. In: *AI & SOCIETY* 39.3, pp. 833–853. ISSN: 1435-5655. DOI: [10.1007/s00146-022-01566-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01566-0).
- Bouschery, Sebastian G., Vera Blazevic, and Frank T. Piller (2023). “Augmenting human innovation teams with artificial intelligence: Exploring transformer-based language models”. In: *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 40.2, pp. 139–153. ISSN: 1540-5885. DOI: [10.1111/jpim.12656](https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12656).
- Brauner, Philipp, Alexander Hick, et al. (2023). “What does the public think about artificial intelligence?—A criticality map to understand bias in the public perception of AI”. In: *Frontiers in Computer Science* 5. ISSN: 2624-9898. DOI: [10.3389/fcomp.2023.1113903](https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2023.1113903).
- Gursoy, Furkan and Ioannis A. Kakadiaris (2023). “Artificial intelligence research strategy of the United States: critical assessment and policy recommendations”. In: *Frontiers in Big Data* 6. ISSN: 2624-909X. DOI: [10.3389/fdata.2023.1206139](https://doi.org/10.3389/fdata.2023.1206139).
- Hu, Krystal (2023). *ChatGPT sets record for fastest-growing user base*. <https://www.reuters.com/technology/chatgpt-sets-record-fastest-growing-user-base-analyst-note-2023-02-01> last accessed 2024-10-01.
- Jungherr, Andreas (2023). “Artificial Intelligence and Democracy: A Conceptual Framework”. In: *Social Media + Society* 9.3. ISSN: 2056-3051. DOI: [10.1177/20563051231186353](https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051231186353).
- Pew Research Center (2023). *What Americans Know About Everyday Uses of Artificial Intelligence*. Accessed: 2024-11-06. Pew Research Center. URL: <https://www.pewresearch.org/>.
- The Alan Turing Institute and Ada Lovelace Institute (2023). *Understanding Public Attitudes to AI*. Accessed: 2024-11-06. The Alan Turing Institute. URL: <https://www.turing.ac.uk/>.
- Alessandro, Gabbiadini et al. (2024). “Artificial Intelligence in the Eyes of Society: Assessing Social Risk and Social Value Perception in a Novel Classification”. In: *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies* 2024. Ed. by Pinaki Chakraborty, pp. 1–11. ISSN: 2578-1863. DOI: [10.1155/2024/7008056](https://doi.org/10.1155/2024/7008056).
- Amunts, Katrin et al. (2024). “The coming decade of digital brain research: A vision for neuroscience at the intersection of technology and computing”. In: *Imaging Neuroscience* 2.October 2023, pp. 1–35. ISSN: 2837-6056. DOI: [10.1162/imag_a_00137](https://doi.org/10.1162/imag_a_00137).
- Brauner, Philipp (2024). “Mapping Acceptance: Micro Scenarios as a Dual-Perspective Approach for Assessing Public Opinion and Individual Differences in Technology Perception”. In: *Frontiers in Psychology* 15. ISSN: 1664-1078. DOI: [10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1419564](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1419564).
- Garcia, Max (2024). “Keeping the Box Black: AI Regulation and Corporate Ambiguity”. PhD thesis. University of Oregon.
- Holzinger, Andreas et al. (2024). “Human-Centered AI in Smart Farming: Toward Agriculture 5.0”. In: *IEEE Access* 12, pp. 62199–62214. ISSN: 2169-3536. DOI: [10.1109/access.2024.3395532](https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2024.3395532).
- Krieger, Jonas Benjamin et al. (2024). “A systematic literature review on risk perception of Artificial Narrow Intelligence”. In: *Journal of Risk Research*, pp. 1–19. ISSN: 1466-4461. DOI: [10.1080/13669877.2024.2350725](https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2024.2350725).
- Novozhilova, Ekaterina et al. (2024). “More Capable, Less Benevolent: Trust Perceptions of AI Systems across Societal Contexts”. In: *Machine Learning and Knowledge Extraction* 6.1, pp. 342–366. ISSN: 2504-4990. DOI: [10.3390/make6010017](https://doi.org/10.3390/make6010017).
- Sadek, Malak, Rafael A. Calvo, and Céline Mougnot (2024). “Closing the Socio–Technical Gap in AI: The Need for Measuring Practitioners’ Attitudes and Perceptions”. In: *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine* 43.2, pp. 88–91. ISSN: 1937-416X. DOI: [10.1109/mts.2024.3392280](https://doi.org/10.1109/mts.2024.3392280).
- Sanguinetti, Pablo and Bella Palomo (2024). “An Alien in the Newsroom: AI Anxiety in European and American Newspapers”. In: *Social Sciences* 13.11, p. 608. ISSN: 2076-0760. DOI: [10.3390/socsci13110608](https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13110608).
- Winter, Joost de, Dimitra Dodou, and Yke Bauke Eisma (2024). “Personality and acceptance as predictors of ChatGPT use”. In: *Discover Psychology* 4.1. ISSN: 2731-4537. DOI: [10.1007/s44202-024-00161-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s44202-024-00161-2).