



(REVIEW ARTICLE)



## The relationship between attitudes toward Artificial Intelligence and problem-solving among young adults

Muthusudar R.<sup>1,\*</sup> and Athira Das<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, Msc counselling psychology, Kristu Jayanti deemed to be university.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology, faculty, Kristu Jayanti deemed to be university.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 29(03), 2101-2109

Publication history: Received on 17 February 2026; revised on 23 March 2026; accepted on 26 March 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2026.29.3.0723>

### Abstract

The aim of this study was to explore how one's perception of Artificial Intelligence (AI), as reflected by self-reported attitudes, affects their problem-solving ability. The study sample included 203 individuals who completed a self-report instrument measuring both their attitudes towards AI (AI Attitude Scale), and their self-perceived ability to solve problems (Problem Solving Inventory). Results indicated that there was a statistically significant positive correlation between AAS and PSI scores; i.e., those who had positive attitudes toward AI had high levels of self-identified problem-solving ability than those with negative attitudes. Additionally, all three AAS categories were found to independently predict an individual's level of problem-solving ability. The findings from this research suggest that there is a complex and multi-faceted relationship between human attitudes towards AI, and confidence to engage in problem solving tasks by individuals. Due to these implications, additional research should continue in educational settings, employment-related training programs, and the formation of regulatory policies regarding the development and implementation of AI technologies.

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence; Attitude towards AI; Problem solving ability; Human Ai interaction; Young Adults

### 1. Introduction

After nearly two decades of astonishing growth in technology (this growth rate is unparalleled), coupled with its many implications for AI, we can now consider AI one of the principal forces of global transformation in the twenty-first century. As if pulled from a science fiction novel, Artificial Intelligence is a factor in virtually every aspect of life today including but not limited to healthcare, education, business and government (Shin, 2020; Zawacki-Richter, et al., 2019). For example, search engine algorithms/online search engines & social media use machine learning; digital assistants use natural language processing; medical image systems & autonomous vehicles use computer vision (Davenport & Ronanki, 2018; Esteva, 2019). The addition of many different types of Artificial Intelligence technology into our daily lives will change how we interact; how we perform work; how we learn; and how we make decisions. In addition, attitudes toward Artificial Intelligence (favourable and unfavourable) have emerged as key predictors of the anticipated success of new technology innovations, user acceptance of technology innovation and related adaptive behaviours towards those innovations (Glikson & Woolley, 2020).

In the last ten years, AI has driven advancements in medicine (Esteva et al., 2019), introduced transformative predictive analytics in many industries (Davenport & Ronanki, 2018), reconfigured educational settings with adaptive learning systems (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019), and restructured the operational components of everyday life by implementing intelligent agents such as voice assistants and personalized recommendation systems into our daily routines (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). These technologies are not only affecting the technology but also the way humans are affected, such

\* Corresponding author: Muthusudar R

as how people make decisions, what skills they possess, and how they see the world as they interact more with autonomous systems (Shin, 2020). As digital ecosystems become more integrated into society, understanding how humans psychologically and behaviorally interact with AI will be one of the most important areas of research (Glikson & Woolley, 2020).

When studying human interaction with artificial intelligence, understanding our own attitudes towards artificial intelligence is an important variable to consider. Attitudes towards AI include our cognitive appraisal, emotion, and behaviour towards it (Schepman & Rodway, 2020). People do not have a uniform or homogenous attitude towards artificial intelligence; rather, they have a wide range of beliefs that have been formed through a multitude of narrative contexts, whether through culture, direct or indirect exposure to AI, media representations of AI, ethical issues, and our personal values (Cave et al., 2019). While there are those who view AI as valuable resources that enhance our ability to make informed decisions and to solve issues, some have anxiety and distrust towards AI based on different concerns such as privacy, job loss, algorithmic bias, and moral accountability (Zhang & Dafoe, 2019). These attitudes are predicated on a range of factors including one's ability to practice, adopt and use AI-enhanced systems.

---

## 2. Review of Literature

### 2.1. Attitude Towards Ai

Research over the last decade shows that a combination of psychological, contextual, and demographic factors can influence individuals' attitudes toward artificial intelligence (AI). For example, studies indicate that while clinicians and males generally display higher levels of positive attitudes towards AI, administrative staff and females tend to be more concerned with job security and potential replacement. AI adoption in sectors such as healthcare and education is largely influenced by perceived usefulness, institutional supports, and hands-on experience; however, perceived data privacy, lack of data transparency, and lack of data compatibility are common barriers for AI adoption. Additionally, a range of things such as organizational culture/leadership readiness, ethical governance, will have a significant impact on the acceptance and implementation of AI technologies.

### 2.2 Problem-solving

Studies have shown that problem solving is related to cognition (how learners think), emotion (what learners are feeling), and the educational context that students experience. Further, problem solving is closely connected to computational thinking (CT), which is a framework for organizing everyday problems according to CT attributes such as decomposition, pattern recognition, abstraction, and algorithmic thinking.

Problem solving development is also positively correlated with achievement: academic success, self-confidence, resiliency, and engagement with the task at hand; while negative emotions (such as being anxious to take a test) are negatively correlated with performance.

Instructional strategies (how teachers teach) and the learning environment (the physical environment in which students learn) have been shown to be important for developing effective problem-solving skills. The use of structured guidance and collaborative (as in working with peers) approaches to teaching problem-solving skills, along with continued practice of those skills also help develop problem-solving strategies, improve a student's ability to reason, and improve how much they remember about what was just taught.

In addition, as demonstrated by a number of studies, environmental factors (such as the availability of educational materials or other resources, support from the institution or state/country level for delivering effective instruction in an inclusive manner), have a greater impact on developing a student's problem-solving skills than do demographic factors. Furthermore, provided they are combined with other instructional methods, the use of technology (including AI-based adaptive tools) in teacher training or as instructional methods will improve a student's critical thinking ability and an increase in collaborative skills among students.

Ultimately, to develop a student's problem-solving skills will require the interaction between the cognitive capabilities of student(s), their emotional regulation (stability), the type of instructional method(s) being used, and the integration of technology into their learning experiences.

#### 2.2.1 Hypotheses

- H1: There is a significant relationship between Attitude towards Ai and Problem Solving.

- H2: There is a significant impact of Attitude towards Ai on Problem Solving.
- H3: There is a significant difference between Male and Female in Problem Solving.

### 2.2.2 Research Question

What is the connection between attitudes toward artificial intelligence and problem-solving in adults?

### 2.2.3 Objectives

This study aims to examine the association between attitudes towards AI (artificial intelligence) with self-reported problem-solving skills of adults while controlling for relevant behavioral and demographic variables.

---

## 3. Theoretical Framework

Theoretical frameworks including the TAM (Technology Acceptance Model) and UTAUT (Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology) create a basis for analyzing what drives people to adopt AI technology; Venkatesh et al. (2012) These frameworks develop and describe several constructs including perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, perceived risk and trust that continue to be the focus of researchers investigating the attitudes toward AI technology today. Researchers utilizing these models have added an emotional component by identifying the role emotional responses (excitement, anxiety or excitement, etc.) have on Behavioural Intention & Actual Usage Pattern (Shin, 2021). For example, through trust in human-AI interaction, Glikson & Woolley (2020) describe how Users' acceptance of AI systems is significantly influenced by how reliable & transparent AI systems are perceived to be, especially for users who make professional & critical decisions using AI Systems.

---

## 4. Methodology

### 4.1. Research design

Quantitative research design was used to investigate the correlation among young adults between their attitude toward AI and their individual ability to solve problems. The data were collected through Google Forms from participants aged 18–25, living in all regions of India, who met pre-established inclusion/exclusion criteria. Standardized self-report inventories were developed for both AI attitude and individual problem-solving ability, and results were entered into an Excel spreadsheet prior to analysis using SPSS and Jamovi software.

### 4.2. Instruments

**The AI Attitude Scale (Schepman & Rodway, 2020)** is a 13-item measure assessing how individuals think, feel, and behave toward artificial intelligence. Respondents completed the scale using a 5-point Likert format (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Higher total scores reflect more positive attitudes toward AI. The scale demonstrates excellent reliability ( $\alpha = .92$ ) and comprises three subscales: positive AI attitudes, negative AI attitudes, and engagement with AI.

**The Problem-Solving Inventory (PSI; Heppner & Petersen, 1982)** was used to assess respondents' perceived confidence in their problem-solving ability. The PSI measures cognitive and affective dimensions of self-appraised problem-solving skill using a 6-point Likert format (1 = strongly agree, 6 = strongly disagree). Higher total scores indicate lower perceived problem-solving confidence; lower scores indicate greater confidence. The PSI demonstrates strong validity ( $\alpha = .90$ ).

### 4.3. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

- **Inclusion** Participants must be 18 years of age or older; have regular access to technology which will ensure an awareness to technology; have sufficient English proficiency to complete the measures.
- **Exclusion** Individuals 18 years of age or younger, individuals who do not provide informed consent, individuals who are not considered regular users of a digital technology Individuals who do not have sufficient English proficiency to understand and complete the survey instruments, individuals who with incomplete surveys or who demonstrated apparent random or careless answering responses.

### 4.3 Data Analysis

The data obtained will be coded and input into the SPSS program and Jamovi. Data cleaning will be conducted to identify any missing values, outliers, and normality. Any surveys that are either incomplete or indicated patterns of careless responding will be removed from the final analysis.

Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequencies, and percentages) will be calculated for all demographic variables (age, gender, education level, frequency of AI use), as well as for total scores and subscales on the AI Attitude Scale and the Problem Solving Inventory (PSI). This will provide a thorough summary of the sample characteristics along with the distribution of the main study variables.

The internal consistency reliability of both the AI Attitude Scale and Problem Solving Inventory (PSI) will be evaluated in the current sample through the use of Cronbach's alpha coefficient. This will establish the reliability of these two instruments for the current study population.

A Pearson's product-moment correlation will be conducted to assess the strength and direction of the linear relationship between total AI Attitude Scale scores and total PSI scores, and is a direct test of Hypothesis 1 (H1: There is a significant relationship between Attitude towards AI and Problem Solving).

A standard multiple regression analysis will be conducted to determine whether attitudes towards AI predict problem-solving ability while controlling for the influence of demographic variables. In this model, the total PSI score will be the dependent variable and the total AI Attitude Scale score will be entered as an independent variable along with several demographic variables (age, gender, education level, and frequency of AI use) as control variables. This will test Hypothesis 2 (H2: Attitude towards AI has a significant impact on Problem Solving).

An independent samples t-test will examine the difference in mean PSI scores between male and female participants. This analysis will directly test Hypothesis 3 (H3: There is a difference between Male and Female in Problem Solving).

All inferential statistical tests will be considered statistically significant at  $p < .05$ . For significant results, effect sizes will also be calculated and reported to provide additional information about the practical significance of the results.

### 4.4 Ethical consideration

Ethical research practice requires voluntary participation. Any student who declined to provide informed consent or withdrew consent at any point during the study was excluded from the final sample. This ensured compliance with ethical standards and protected participants' autonomy and rights. Data collection was conducted Participants were invited to complete an online questionnaire distributed via institutional email and classroom announcements.

The questionnaire included an informed consent form, demographic questions, and the two standardized scales. Participation was voluntary, and students were informed that they could withdraw at any time without penalty. The average time to complete the survey was approximately 15–20 minutes. Responses were automatically recorded and stored in a secure database accessible only to the researcher and supervisor. To ensure data quality, responses were screened for completeness and consistency. Incomplete or duplicate entries were excluded from the final analysis. The final dataset consisted of 203 valid responses.

## 5. Result

**Table 1** The descriptive of the Attitude towards Ai and Problem Solving

	N	Missing	Mean	Median	SD	Minimum	Maximum
<b>AI</b>	203	0	60.3	61	9.79	30	85
<b>PS</b>	203	0	134.6	129	17.26	101	186

Note. N is number of participants, AI is attitude towards ai and PS is Problem Solving.

Table 1 displays the central tendency and dispersion of the main study variables. Attitude towards AI (AI) The mean score of 60.3, on an 85-point scale, with a standard deviation of 9.79, suggests a generally positive attitude towards AI in the sample, with a moderate range in responses.

Problem Solving (PS) The mean problem-solving score of 134.6, on a scale with a maximum of 186, and a larger standard deviation of 17.26, shows participants generally reported moderate-high confidence about their ability to solve problems, although responses did vary across individuals. The wide range in scores (101 to 186) also suggests a healthy variability in the data which is conducive to correlation analysis.

**Table 2** The correlation between Attitude towards Ai and Problem Solving

Variables	Attitude towards Ai	Problem solving
Attitude towards Ai	1	-.187**
Problem solving	-.187**	1

Note. \* p < .05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001

Table 2 demonstrates the correlation analysis conducted to test H1 (There is a significant relationship between Attitude towards AI and Problem Solving).

The Pearson's correlation coefficient is -0.187 and is significant at the p < .01 level.

This supports H1, supporting the claim that a significant relationship is present. The negative direction is unexpected; it implies that with a positive attitude about AI, your self-reported ability to solve the problem may slightly decrease. The effect size is small as interpreted by common conventions ( $\pm 0.1$  is small,  $\pm 0.3$  is medium,  $\pm 0.5$  is large). This suggests, while statistically significant, the relationship is not strong.

**Table 3** A multiple regression Analysis predicting problem solving ability from three subscales of Attitude towards AI

Variable	B	SE	$\beta$	t	p
(Constant)	148.45	7.33		20.25	< .001
POS AI+	1.14	0.50	.17	2.28	.023
NEG AI-	-1.20	0.33	-.25	-3.61	< .001
ENGAGEMENT	-0.79	0.27	-.21	-2.90	.004

Note. N = 203.  $R^2 = .118$ ,  $F(3, 199) = 8.87$ ,  $p < .001$ . POS AI+ = positive artificial intelligence; NEG AI- = negative artificial intelligence.

Table 3 Results from running a multiple regression analysis show that the statistical significance (p-value < .0001) of the model, as well as its large-R squared value (.118), indicates that the attitude towards AI can explain about 11.8% of the variance in someone's ability to solve problems (a small to moderate effect). Therefore, although there are some meaningful predictors associated with attitude toward AI and their use as predictors of problem-solving ability, other predictors play a more significant role in determining an individual's overall performance in terms of their ability to solve problems.

When looking at the various predictor variables, the positive attitude towards AI can predict higher confidence ( $\beta = .17$ ,  $p = .023$ ) in an individual's ability to solve problems, whereas the negative attitudes related to fear, anxiety, or skepticism will predict lower ability and will be the strongest predictor for everyone who has one or more of those negative attitudes ( $\beta = -.25$ ,  $p < .0001$ ). Also, it appears that those individuals who engaged in greater numbers of AI-related behaviors may have been less confident in their ability to solve problems independently ( $\beta = -.21$ ,  $p = .004$ ) suggesting that there may be some sort of dependency effect where relying on AI causes people to feel less confident in their ability to solve problems without assistance from AI.

**Table 4** Independent Sample t-Test for Problem-Solving Scores by Gender.

	n	M	SD	Levene's F	Levene's p	t	p
Problem Solving				2.414	0.122	-1.254	0.211
Male	92	132.89	15.75				
Female	111	135.94	18.37				

Note.  $H_a \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$ ,  $df = 201$

Table 4 presents the results of an independent samples t-test for H3. The t-test result is not statistically significant ( $t = -1.25, p = 0.211$ ).

**Interpretation:** This leads to a failure to reject the null hypothesis. There is no statistically significant evidence to suggest that problem-solving ability differs between male and female participants in this sample. These findings challenge simplistic assumptions of gender-based cognitive differences in problem-solving ability.

## 6. Discussion

203 adults between the ages of 18 to 65 ( $M = 35.98; SD = 11.83$ ), were included in this study, along with 3 proportionately equal males from each sex for a total of 82 males and 121 females. The data suggests that approximately 35% of the participants resided in urban locations and 38% were students currently enrolled in school (66% = middle-class homes). Participants were more likely to be associated with a higher level of overall positive attitudes toward AI ( $M = 60.3; SD=9.79$ ) than moderately high (self-reported) level of problem-solving skills ( $M=134.6; SD=17.26$ ). Within overall AI attitude, individual attitudes varied widely, suggesting considerable variance among individuals.

The first hypothesis was tested using a Pearson correlation coefficient assessing the relationship between overall AI attitude with self-reported problem-solving abilities. The results indicated that an overall negative relationship exists between overall AI attitude and self-reported problem-solving abilities ( $r = -0.187; p < 0.01$ ). These results support H1; however, the overall negative correlation between these two variables appears to be intuitive, indicating that individuals with a higher overall attitude toward AI tend to be less confident when completing self-reported problem-solving tasks, as compared to those with lower overall AI attitudes or lower levels of self-confidence when solving problems relative to using AI. These findings become more interpretable when the attitude measure is broken down into subscale levels through an examination of overall AI attitude and self-reports of one's ability to complete specific types of problem-solving tasks using AI through multiple regression analyses.

A statistical model was developed using multiple regression analysis ( $F(3,199) = 8.87, p < .001$ ) which showed significance when evaluating measure of attitudes toward artificial intelligence (AI) as a collective accounting for 11.8% of variability in scores for problem solving ( $R^2 = .118$ ). All three subscales of attitudes toward AI were significant individual predictors of problem-solving ability. More specifically, having positive attitudes toward AI ( $\beta = .17; p = .023$ ) is significantly predictive of increased problem-solving abilities through greater cognitive confidence via the aforementioned positive beliefs and optimism of AI, supporting theoretical assumptions. Conversely, negative attitudes toward AI, or attitudes characterized by fear, anxiety, and/or distrust ( $\beta = -0.25; p < .001$ ), emerged as the strongest individual predictor of decreased problem-solving abilities; therefore, negative attitudes toward AI serve as an existing psychological barrier from solving problems successfully. Additionally, the engagement subscale ( $\beta = -0.21; p = .004$ ) was negatively predictive of problem-solving ability leading to the conclusion that through increased behavioral interaction with AI, there is a simultaneous decrease in one's perception of own self-efficacy as it relates to problem solving. Such findings support new insights from the literature on "cognitive offloading" or "dependency effect" illustrating that habitual use of AI for task completion may undermine individuals' confidence in doing independent thinking as a result. Collectively, these three subscales affect provide an explanation for the initial negative correlation; the empowering effects of having positive cognitions regarding AI, are being eclipsed by the collective negating impacts of anxiety and over-engagement.

Regarding H3, an independent samples t-test indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between genders with respect to problem-solving capability ( $t = -1.25, *p = .211$ ); therefore, H3 is rejected. The robustness of this finding contradicts simplistic gender-related explanations for cognitive differences and moves to an examination of psychological and behavioral characteristics specifically the effects of attitudes and AI utilization patterns as potential culprits of problem-solving confidence when working in an AI-enhanced environment.

The findings of this study indicate a complex relationship between artificial intelligence (AI) and its use in society: it can empower people but can also have a negative impact on people's confidence in their ability to solve problems. The results of this study suggest important implications for educators, organizations and designers developing AI technologies. In education, a balance between the use of AI tools and opportunities to practice independent problem-solving skills is essential in the implementation of AI literacy programs. In the workplace, training employees on the basis that AI augments their ability to think independently rather than replaces them with an "AI-free" zone for developing critical thinking skills should be a goal. From a design perspective, AI systems should be designed to support the user's thought process instead of just providing the answer. The limitations of this study were its cross-sectional design, reliance on self-reported measures, and the lack of a broader national sample by being limited to younger, urban students, and therefore it is not possible to draw a general conclusion or causal relation about the findings. Future

research using longitudinal, experimental, qualitative and cross-cultural methodologies would help to further understand how the use of AI will change over time and the influence of AI on cognitive capability.

---

## 7. Conclusion

The findings of this study illustrate the complicated relationship we have with AI in nature. While many people have an overall positive opinion of AI, their feelings about their own ability to solve problems improve by using AI as a facilitator of problem-solving. Conversely, as people increasingly rely upon and use AI when working on problems, their belief in their own ability to solve problems decreases because they will become dependent on AI to assist them with their thinking tasks.

The use of AI presents challenges and opportunities in creating a balance between taking advantage of the benefits of AI while still being able to privately solve problems on a stand-alone basis. Additionally, both the challenges and opportunities created by AI are consistent among all gender types; therefore, they will be experienced by all users of AI.

### *Limitations*

This study has several limitations. The cross-sectional design precludes causal inference; it remains possible that individuals with lower problem-solving confidence are drawn to AI use, rather than AI use causing reduced confidence. The sample consisted predominantly of young, urban students from middle-class backgrounds, limiting generalizability to older professionals, rural populations, and non-student adults. All measures relied on self-report, introducing potential social desirability bias. Additionally, the convenience sampling approach may not fully represent the diversity of AI attitudes and problem-solving patterns across broader populations.

### *Significance of the Study*

The research links the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to cognitive psychology by demonstrating that while AI attitudes predict tech use, they also influence cognitive outcome, i.e. the ability to solve problems.

The results have practical implications for:

- **Educators:** develop programs in AI literacy that promote positive attitudes toward using AI tools and improve students' engagement with those tools.
- **Organizations:** identify attitudinal barriers to using AI in the workplace and develop training to improve human-AI collaboration.

---

## Compliance with ethical standards

### *Disclosure of conflict of interest*

No conflict of interest to be disclosed.

---

## References

- [1] Abbass, H. A., Scholz, J., & Reid, D. J. (2021). Foundations of trusted autonomy. Springer.
- [2] Cave, S., Craig, C., Dihal, K., Dillon, S., Montgomery, J., Singler, B., & Taylor, L. (2019). Hopes and fears for intelligent machines in fiction and reality. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1, 74–78.
- [3] Davenport, T., & Ronanki, R. (2018). Artificial intelligence for the real world. *Harvard Business Review*, 96(1), 108–116.
- [4] Esteva, A., Robicquet, A., Ramsundar, B., Kuleshov, V., DePristo, M., Chou, K., Cui, C., Corrado, G., Thrun, S., & Dean, J. (2019). A guide to deep learning in healthcare. *Nature Medicine*, 25, 24–29. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0316-z>
- [5] Funke, J. (2017). Complex problem solving: What it is and what it is not. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1153. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01153>
- [6] Glikson, E., & Woolley, A. W. (2020). Human trust in artificial intelligence: Review of empirical research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(2), 627–660.

- [7] Heppner, P. P., & Petersen, C. H. (1982). The development and implications of a personal problem-solving inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 29(1), 66–75.
- [8] Jenkins, A., Bhatt, U., & Riedl, M. (2022). AI attitudes and cognitive performance: Emerging connections. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 135, 107368. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107368>
- [9] Köthemann, M., Messingschlager, T., Stein, J.-P., & Appel, M. (2023). Developing and evaluating the ATTARI-12. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 145, 107752.
- [10] KPMG International. (2025). Trust in artificial intelligence: Global insights 2025. KPMG.
- [11] Manninen, L., Vartiainen, H., & Ruokamo, H. (2023). Basic psychological needs and attitudes toward AI across European countries. *Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 5, 100168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100168>
- [12] Schepman, A., & Rodway, P. (2020). Initial validation of the General Attitudes towards Artificial Intelligence Scale. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 1, 100014. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2020.100014>
- [13] Shin, D. (2020). How do users interact with algorithm recommender systems? The interaction of users, algorithms, and performance. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 109, 106344.
- [14] Shin, D. (2021). The effects of explainability and causability on perception, trust, and acceptance: Implications for explainable AI. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 146, 102551.
- [15] Venkatesh, V., Thong, J. Y. L., & Xu, X. (2012). Consumer acceptance and use of information technology: Extending the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 36(1), 157–178.
- [16] Zhang, B., & Dafoe, A. (2019). Artificial intelligence: American attitudes and trends. Center for the Governance of AI, Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford.
- [17] Zhang, W., & Luximon, Y. (2021). Security design for mobile payment: Role of context and social presence. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 147, 102559.
- [18] Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(1), 39.

---

## Appendices

- Problem Solving Inventory Scale 1

Read each statement and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement, using the scale provided. Mark your responses by writing the number to the right of each statement.

- Strongly Agree
- Moderately Agree
- Slightly Agree
- Slightly Disagree
- Moderately Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- When a solution to a problem has failed, I do not examine why it didn't work.
- When I am confronted with a complex problem, I don't take the time to develop a strategy for collecting information that will help define the nature of the problem.
- When my first efforts to solve a problem fail, I become uneasy about my ability to handle the situation.
- After I solve a problem, I do not analyze what went right and what went wrong.
- I am usually able to think of creative and effective alternatives to my problems.
- After following a course of action to solve a problem, I compare the actual outcome with the one I had anticipated.
- When I have a problem, I think of as many possible ways to handle it as I can until I can't come up with any more ideas.
- When confronted with a problem, I consistently examine my feelings to find out what is going on in a problem situation.
- When confused about a problem, I don't clarify vague ideas or feeling by thinking of them in concrete terms.

- I have the ability to solve most problems even though initially no solution is immediately apparent.
- Many of the problems I face are too complex for me to solve
- When solving a problem, I make decisions that I am happy with later.
- When confronted with a problem, I tend to do the first thing that I can think of to solve it.
- Sometimes I do not stop and take time to deal with my problems, but just kind of muddle ahead.
- When considering solutions to a problem, I do not take the time to assess the potential success of each alternative.
- When confronted with a problem, I stop and think about it before deciding on a next step.
- I generally act on the first ideal that comes to mind in solving a problem.
- When making a decision, I compare alternatives and weigh the consequences of one against the other.
- When I make plans to solve a problem, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
- I try to predict the result of a particular course of action.
- When I try to think of possible solutions to a problem, I do not come up with very many alternatives.
- When trying to solve a problem, one strategy I often use is to think of past problems that have been similar.
- Given enough time and effort, I believe I can solve most problems that confront me.
- When faced with a novel situation, I have confidence that I can handle problems that may arise.
- Even though I work on a problem, sometimes I feel like I'm groping or wandering and not getting down to the real issue.
- I make snap judgements and later regret them.
- I trust my ability to solve new and difficult problems.
- I use a systematic method to compare alternatives and make decisions.
- When thinking of ways to handle a problem, I seldom combine ideas from various alternatives to arrive at a workable solution.
- When faced with a problem, I seldom assess the external forces that may be contributing to the problem.
- When confronted with a problem, I usually first survey the situation to determine the relevant information.
- There are times when I become so emotionally charged that I can no longer see the alternatives for solving a particular problem.
- After making a decision, the actual outcome is usually similar to what I had anticipated.
- When confronted with a problem, I am unsure of whether I can handle the situation.
- When I become aware of a problem, one of the first things I do is try to find out exactly what the problem is.

### *Attitude towards Ai*

#### **Scale 2:**

Read each statement and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement, using the scale provided. Mark your responses by writing the number to the right of each statement.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
- I think artificial intelligence is an important advancement.
- I believe artificial intelligence makes life easier for people.
- I believe artificial intelligence will provide significant contributions to humanity.
- I see artificial intelligence as a threat.
- I think artificial intelligence reduces human-to-human communication.
- I am concerned that artificial intelligence will replace human labor.
- I believe artificial intelligence destroys creativity.
- I enjoy using artificial intelligence to produce textual content.
- I like keeping up with developments in artificial intelligence.
- I enjoy talking about topics related to artificial intelligence.
- I would like to chat with artificial intelligence.
- I enjoy creating visual products using artificial intelligence.
- I would like to use artificial intelligence tools for entertainment purposes.