

Generative AI Practices, Literacy, and Divides: An Empirical Analysis in the Italian Context

Beatrice Savoldi^{1*}, Giuseppe Attanasio², Olga Gorodetskaya³,
Marta Marchiori Manerba⁴, Elisa Bassignana⁵, Silvia Casola⁶,
Matteo Negri¹, Tommaso Caselli⁷, Luisa Bentivogli¹,
Alan Ramponi¹, Arianna Muti⁸, Nicoletta Balbo⁸, Debora Nozza⁸

¹Fondazione Bruno Kessler, Italy.

²Instituto de Telecomunicações, Portugal.

³FBK-IRVAPP, Italy. ⁴University of Turin, Italy.

⁵IT University of Copenhagen and Pioneer Center for AI, Denmark.

⁶LMU Munich and Munich Center for Machine Learning, Germany.

⁷University of Groningen, The Netherlands. ⁸Bocconi University, Italy.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): bsavoldi@fbk.eu;

Abstract

The rise of Artificial Intelligence (AI) language technologies, particularly generative AI (GenAI) chatbots accessible via conversational interfaces, is transforming digital interactions. While these tools hold societal promise, they also risk widening digital divides due to uneven adoption and low awareness of their limitations. This study presents the first comprehensive empirical mapping of GenAI adoption, usage patterns, and literacy in Italy, based on newly collected survey data from 1,906 Italian-speaking adults. Our findings reveal widespread adoption for both work and personal use, including sensitive tasks like emotional support and medical advice. Crucially, GenAI is supplanting other technologies to become a primary information source: this trend persists despite low user digital literacy, posing a risk as users struggle to recognize errors or misinformation. Moreover, we identify a significant gender divide—particularly pronounced in older generations—where women are half as likely to adopt GenAI and use it less frequently than men. While we find literacy to be a key predictor of adoption, it only partially explains this disparity, suggesting that other barriers are at play. Overall, our data provide granular insights into the multipurpose usage of GenAI, highlighting the dual need for targeted educational initiatives and further investigation into the underlying barriers to equitable participation that competence alone cannot explain.

1 Introduction

The rapid advancement of AI language technologies (LTs)—computational models that process and generate human language—has entered a transformative phase with the rise of powerful “GenAI chatbots” such as ChatGPT (OpenAI 2023), which are reshaping how we work, access information, and interact with technology. Unlike prior LTs designed for a dedicated activity or modality, these new tools are general-purpose, capable of performing numerous tasks—from writing and translation to coding and tutoring—across languages without domain-specific training. This makes them uniquely accessible to diverse users and adaptable across contexts. As a result, GenAI chatbots have achieved unprecedented adoption: By 2025, the ChatGPT platform had become one of the five most visited websites in the world (Exploding Topics 2025), leaving researchers, policymakers, and developers to grapple with fundamental questions about adoption, usage, and global impact.

As a new commodity, access to GenAI chatbots offers promises for personalized learning (Abbes et al. 2024), personal convenience (Skjuve et al. 2024), and workforce productivity (Noy and Zhang 2023; Brynjolfsson et al. 2025). The impact of access—or lack thereof—can be substantial: a temporary ChatGPT ban in Italy produced a significant drop in coding productivity, with output levels recovering only after users developed strategies to circumvent the restrictions (Kreitmeir and Raschky 2023). However, alongside these benefits come significant risks. GenAI can propagate bias and stereotypes (Hofmann et al. 2024; Mitchell et al. 2025), spread misinformation (Chen and Shu 2024), and critically, also widen digital divides (UNESCO 2024). Recent research suggests that uneven adoption and varying levels of AI proficiency threaten to deepen existing inequalities (Bentley et al. 2024; Capraro et al. 2024; Wang et al. 2025; Suárez and García-Mariñoso 2025), with higher uptake concentrated among populations of higher socioeconomic status (Bassignana et al. 2025), urban residents (Daepf and Counts 2025), and more educated individuals (Hartley et al. 2024).

The escalating interest in understanding how individuals engage with these technologies has prompted surveys to grasp user attitudes towards AI more broadly (e.g., Scantamburlo et al. 2024), as well as analyses of user conversations to specifically document GenAI chatbots’ emerging applications (e.g., Ouyang et al. 2023; Trippas et al. 2024). The largest and recent analyses, however, rely on proprietary company data from single platforms—e.g., Microsoft Bing Copilot (Tomlinson et al. 2025), ChatGPT (Chatterji et al. 2025) or Claude (Handa et al. 2025)—and lack reported social, geographical, and demographic information on users. Also, such studies inherently focus on current users only, overlooking those who do not engage with these tools—a potentially distinct demographic group with different needs or technological constraints (Zhou et al. 2025). Another limitation of these studies is their predominant focus on English-speaking contexts, particularly the United States, despite evidence that socio-cultural norms and contexts shape users’ expectations and attitudes toward technology (Murayama et al. 2025). This gap is especially relevant given that GenAI performance varies across languages (Zhang et al. 2023; Holtermann et al. 2024), potentially reinforcing linguistic and cultural asymmetries in how these tools are experienced and adopted.

In this paper, we focus on the Italian-speaking context, where comprehensive research on GenAI chatbot adoption and usage is critically lacking. Italy presents a compelling case, also due to its challenges in digital competence, ranking 23rd of 27 EU Member States in the Digital Economy and Society Index (DESI) for basic digital skills.¹ Specifically to AI technologies, Ipsos’ 2025 AI Monitor (Ipsos 2025) reveals that while a substantial portion of the Italian population has heard of AI, only half feel they truly understand it—placing Italy 29th out of 30 ranked countries. These aggregate figures, however, may mask important disparities across social groups. For instance, Sublime and Renna (2024) identify a gender gap in GenAI chatbot usage among Italian students, yet their analysis is confined to educational settings, leaving the broader population unexplored.

We provide the **first comprehensive empirical mapping of GenAI chatbot adoption, usage patterns, and literacy in Italy**. Drawing on newly collected survey data ($n = 1,906$) that include both adopters and non-adopters and rich demographic information, we combine quantitative statistical analyses with qualitative examination of open-ended responses to pursue four research objectives. **(1)** First, we examine GenAI chatbot adoption by comparing it with other longstanding LTs to understand how GenAI fits into existing technological ecosystems and if and why it replaces existing LTs. **(2)** Second, we document GenAI chatbots usage patterns—including activities, intents, and contexts (i.e., work versus personal use). **(3)** Third, we assess awareness of the benefits and risks to identify literacy gaps. **(4)** Finally, we explore whether GenAI adoption and usage divides emerge across sociodemographics, and the role of literacy and experience with other LTs in predicting such gaps.

Our data represent a rich snapshot of 2025 for the Italian context. Aware that GenAI and its applications continue to evolve rapidly, we make all survey data publicly available to enable longitudinal monitoring.

2 Related Work

The field of LTs has undergone a paradigm shift with the rise of highly capable Large Language Models (LLMs), which form the backbone of modern GenAI chatbots.² Departing from traditional LT solutions based on task-specific models (e.g., dedicated to summarization or machine translation), LLMs are inherently a general-purpose LT, capable of capturing complex language patterns and addressing multiple tasks with minimal adaptation. This versatility—across modalities (e.g., voice, text) and languages—coupled with high accessibility of friendly conversational interfaces, has driven rapid public adoption of GenAI chatbots and a vast expansion of potential use cases. This, in response, has sparked intense institutional, media, and scholarly interest across disciplines. In this section, we summarize recent works across thematic areas aligned with our contribution.

GenAI chatbot Usage and Language Technology Replacement

Research on the real-world applications of GenAI chatbots has focused on analyzing large-scale user conversations. Early work by Ouyang et al. (2023) identifies novel user requests, such as design and planning, that were unaddressed by traditional LTs.

Recent studies confirm rapidly evolving patterns, with a focus on software development and writing using Claude (Handa et al. 2025), professional use cases supported by Microsoft Bing Copilot (Tomlinson et al. 2025), and everyday information-seeking via ChatGPT, where non-work usage is growing faster than professional use (Chatterji et al. 2025). However, these findings are constrained by a focus on English and proprietary, non-public datasets. Evidence on usage patterns for the Italian context is particularly scarce, limited to younger demographics in descriptive reports (Eurispes 2025). More fundamentally, the question of technological substitution—whether GenAI is augmenting or replacing existing tools—remains open. Our work addresses these gaps by analyzing usage patterns across the Italian adult population and investigating the potential replacement of existing technologies, thereby providing insights into GenAI’s consolidating impact in the current technological ecosystem.

Literacy and Risks

Understanding public awareness of GenAI’s risks and limitations, as well as literacy levels, is crucial for contextualizing its societal impact. Public concerns are significant; a global study found that 54% of Italians have experienced errors from GenAI, and 84% support laws against generated misinformation (Gillespie et al. 2025). Such worries are not unique to Italy—both the public and experts in the U.S. have expressed concerns about insufficient oversight (Pew Research Center 2025c). The relationship between literacy in GenAI and usage, however, presents a complex picture. On one hand, frequent use can increase trust, while a deeper understanding of the underlying mechanics can reduce it (Bouyzourn and Birch 2025). These findings contrast with those of Gillespie et al. (2025), which found that higher levels of training and literacy correlated with greater trust and acceptance. Furthermore, Tully et al. (2025) find that individuals with lower literacy were more receptive to GenAI, perceiving it as “magical”—a finding that challenges the assumption that education uniformly promotes adoption. Given these ambiguous findings, we investigate the state of literacy in GenAI and LTs in the Italian context, and examine its relation to engagement with GenAI chatbots across sociodemographic segments and usage scenarios.

Sociodemographic Divides

Existing research has identified age, education, and income as significant adoption predictors of GenAI. U.S. surveys find increasing use is most notable among younger, more educated individuals (Pew Research Center 2025a), a trend reinforced by workplace data (Hartley et al. 2024). The pattern is documented by Gillespie et al. (2025) in a global study across 47 countries, finding that younger, more educated, and higher-income individuals are more trusting and accepting of GenAI. Gender has also emerged as a relevant factor. A synthesis of 18 studies by Otis et al. (2024) reports persistent gender disparities across regions and occupations, even when access to technology is equalized. These differences manifest in both adoption rates and engagement patterns. Sublime and Renma (2024) find significant gender gaps among French and Italian students, with males reporting higher usage rates across academic fields. Similarly, Møgelvang et al. (2024) observe that male Norwegian students use GenAI chatbots more frequently, while female students express greater concern for critical thinking

and a stronger need to learn appropriate use. While gender is a key demographic lens, socioeconomic status also shapes interactions. Bassignana et al. (2025) uses qualitative methods to find that users with lower status tend to anthropomorphize GenAI, suggesting that background influences not just whether people use the technology, but also *how* they engage with it. Understanding these demographic patterns raises questions about what drives adoption in the first place. While surveys of early adopters identify key motivators like productivity and novelty (Skjuve et al. 2024), the reasons for non-adoption—and the characteristics or technological constraints of those that do not currently use GenAI—remain overlooked (Zhou et al. 2025). Our work addresses this gap by examining factors for both adoption and non-adoption. Through a dual approach, we analyze whether sociodemographic divides manifest differently at the stage of initial GenAI *adoption* versus the frequency and nature of *usage*.

3 Design and Methods

We provide here a brief outline of our study design, followed by detailed information about our sample, measures, and analytical methods.

3.1 Study Design

Our survey design reflects our four main research objectives and is organized as follows.

First, we measure adoption rates of GenAI chatbots alongside five longstanding task-specific LT applications: machine translation (e.g., Google Translate), voice assistants (e.g., Siri), assisted writing (e.g., Grammarly), speech transcription (e.g., Zoom captions), and text-to-speech generation (e.g., Adobe Read Out Loud). These applications were selected for their widespread commercial use and allow us to assess *i*) participants’ familiarity and experience with other task-specific LTs, *ii*) whether GenAI is complementary or also replacing existing tools. For each technology that participants reported using, we asked whether usage had changed since the introduction of GenAI chatbots and about the reasons for this shift. Additionally, we explicitly ask about potential behavioral shifts in the use of Web search queries.

Second, for participants who adopted GenAI chatbots (henceforth GenAI *users*), we asked questions mapping how, when, and for what purposes they use these tools. We provided a list of *activities* identified as significant in prior research (Ouyang et al. 2023) (e.g., email writing, coding, travel planning), asked participants to indicate whether they perform these activities for work or personal use, and inquired about interaction modalities (e.g., using spoken language or written text) and the language (e.g. Italian or English) used in such interactions. To move beyond specific activities, we also analyzed users’ interaction *intent*, as a single activity like “revising a text” can serve divergent goals—from polishing an email to practicing a language. We classified these underlying purposes using established taxonomies of usage intent (Bodonhelyi et al. 2024; Shah et al. 2025).

Third, to assess literacy in AI language technologies, we collected information on prior training, self-reported knowledge and competence, awareness of these technologies’ benefits and risks, and desiderata for future education.

User Intent	Description	Examples
Information Retrieval	Requesting factual information or instructions.	<i>What is the capital of Italy?</i>
Problem Solving	Support in managing tasks or decisions.	<i>My PC is slow, how can I fix it?</i>
Learning	Support in acquiring new skills or understanding concepts.	<i>Explain the difference between Hegel’s and Kant’s theories.</i>
Content Creation	Generating, editing, or revising materials.	<i>Make the following text shorter and more persuasive.</i>
Personal Leisure	Questions asked for fun or companionship.	<i>What is your name?</i>
Creativity	Seeking ideas, inspiration, or suggestions.	<i>Give me 5 Christmas gift ideas.</i>

Table 1 Intent categories and definitions for GenAI chatbot usage. The taxonomy of intents is drawn by the five categories outlined by [Shah et al. \(2025\)](#), with the addition of the “Creativity” intent validated by [Bodonhelyi et al. \(2024\)](#). For each of the six intents, we present the descriptions and examples provided in the survey.

Finally, we gathered sociodemographic information, including age, gender, geography, socioeconomic status, educational level, and professional area to investigate their relationships with adoption, usage of the technology, and divides.

To ensure accessibility for non-expert participants, we follow [Bassignana et al. \(2025\)](#) and provide a friendly definition of LT (i.e., computational models that process and generate human language), distinguishing between general-purpose GenAI chatbots and task-specific LTs, alongside examples and descriptions for each of our five specific LT applications. The survey—distributed in Italian and translated here for dissemination purposes—was extensively piloted and refined to enhance clarity, construct validity, and reliability. We provide the full list of definitions in the Supplementary materials (Supplementary 1.1, Table S1) and chatbot activities (Supplementary S1.2), whereas intent categories are shown in Table 1.

3.2 Participants and Distribution

The questionnaire was distributed between May 23rd and August 27th, 2025, using the Qualtrics platform ([Qualtrics 2025](#)). We use a non-probability sampling strategy ([Vehovar et al. 2016](#)), where respondents voluntarily self-select into the survey. To ensure broad coverage and approximate the Italian population more closely, the survey was disseminated through multiple online channels, including social media, mailing lists, and messaging apps such as WhatsApp and Telegram. Broader outreach was achieved via national and local media outlets, including *Corriere della Sera*,³ *TP24*,⁴ and *Il Fatto Quotidiano*.⁵ Participants were encouraged to share the survey within their networks, fostering a snowball sampling effect. They completed the survey anonymously on a device of their choice.

Variable	GenAI Users <i>n</i> = 1,533	Non-Users <i>n</i> = 373	Total <i>N</i> = 1,906
Gender (%)			
Men	810 (52.8)	126 (33.8)	936 (49.1)
Women	700 (45.7)	237 (63.5)	937 (49.2)
Non-binary/Other	23 (1.5)	10 (2.7)	33 (1.7)
Age (%)			
18–34	491 (32.0)	44 (11.8)	535 (28.1)
35–54	498 (32.5)	85 (22.8)	583 (30.6)
55–64	304 (19.8)	92 (24.7)	396 (20.8)
65+	240 (15.7)	152 (40.8)	392 (20.6)
Education (%)			
Graduates	1,120 (73.1)	202 (54.2)	1,322 (69.4)
Non-graduates	413 (26.9)	171 (45.8)	584 (30.6)
Geography (%)			
North	917 (59.8)	237 (63.5)	1,154 (60.6)
Centre	253 (16.5)	58 (15.6)	311 (16.3)
South and Islands	271 (17.7)	66 (17.7)	337 (17.7)
Abroad	92 (6.0)	12 (3.2)	104 (5.5)
Socioeconomic Status (%)			
Lower	281 (18.3)	79 (21.2)	361 (18.9)
Mid	802 (52.3)	220 (59.0)	1,020 (53.5)
Higher	450 (29.4)	74 (19.8)	525 (27.5)

Table 2 Description of the sample. We provide distributions for the full sample (*Total*; *N* = 1,906) as well as disaggregated across participants who reported using GenAI chatbots in the last twelve months (*GenAI Users*; *n* = 1,533) and those that did not (*Non-Users*; *n* = 373).

Eligibility required participants to be at least 18 years old and have native or C1 level proficiency in Italian (standard CEFR language proficiency scale). Responses failing this language filter, representing 4.55% of submissions (*n* = 100), were excluded. Additional filters were applied to enhance data quality. We removed responses completed in less than 2.78 minutes (*n* = 3)—below the lower interquartile range of the median survey duration of 8.7 minutes—as well as responses flagged by Qualtrics as potential duplicates (*n* = 66). Participants with missing responses on the GenAI chatbot adoption question (*n* = 10) were also excluded. After applying these criteria, the final analytical sample consisted of 1,906 respondents. Key sample characteristics are summarized in Table 2. We report age, gender, geography (including Italian people living abroad), education, and socioeconomic status. This was operationalized by asking respondents “In which socioeconomic bracket do you place yourself?” The responses were then recoded into three categories: Lower (“Low” and “Middle-low”), Mid (“Middle”), and Higher (combining “Mid-high” and “High”). “I prefer not to answer” responses (2.7%) were proportionally distributed across the three categories.

Our sample demonstrates a reasonable alignment with the key demographic characteristics of the Italian population (comparison with national statistics in Supplementary S1.3, Fig. S2 based on Italian National Statistics Institute data—i.e. ISTAT 2025⁶). Gender distribution is balanced and closely mirrors national statistics.

Age shows typical patterns of online surveys, with a slight underrepresentation (65+ years old; 20.06% in our sample vs. 28.7% in the general population). Educational attainment shows the largest deviation from a representative sample (30.6% of non-graduates, vs. 85% in the general population), likely due to a higher representation of younger individuals in our sample. Importantly, this over-representation of educated respondents makes our first exploratory findings more conservative, likely providing lower bound estimates: if significant digital divides and modest literacy levels are evident even in this highly educated sample, they are likely more pronounced in the broader population.⁷

Our sample shows a higher proportion of GenAI users (80.4%, $n = 1533$) compared to non-users. We acknowledge that, as an opt-in survey, individuals who are not interested in the technology may have been less inclined to participate. Nevertheless, the number of non-users ($n = 373$) remains sufficient for robust analysis of adoption barriers and usage patterns.

To test the robustness of our results, we performed sensitivity analyses using post-stratification weights based on nationally representative ISTAT data for gender, age, and geography; the main findings remain substantively unchanged (results in Supplementary S2.1). Therefore, we retain all data to maximize statistical power.

3.3 Measures

In this study, we operationalize key variables of interest.

GenAI chatbot adoption. GenAI chatbot adoption is treated as a binary variable based on participants' self-reported use of GenAI chatbots in the past 12 months. To facilitate understanding, we provided a multiple-choice list of specific chatbot models, such as ChatGPT, Claude, and Gemini (list available in Table S1 in the Supplementary materials). Participants were classified as *users* if they selected at least one of these models and as *non-users* if they did not select any.

LT adoption and experience. To compare GenAI chatbot adoption with the use of longstanding task-specific LTs, we collected data on the use of five well-established applications: machine translation (e.g., Google Translate), voice assistants (e.g., Siri), assisted writing (e.g., Grammarly), speech transcription (e.g., Zoom captions), and text-to-speech (e.g., Adobe Read Out Loud). Responses for each application were coded as binary variables (has/does not have experience). An index of prior LT experience was then constructed by summing participants' responses for each of the five applications, with the resulting score ranging from 0 (indicating no use of any application) to 5 (indicating use of all five applications).

Usage intent and frequency. For GenAI users, we collected self-reported data on the frequency of GenAI chatbot use across six specific intents: Information Retrieval, Problem Solving, Learning, Content Creation, Leisure, and Creativity (see Table 1). The response options were recoded to represent frequency on a scale of 0 (never), 1 (less than monthly), 2 (monthly), or 3 (weekly).

LT literacy. We assessed self-reported competence and knowledge of GenAI and AI language technologies more broadly using six items on a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree). The items included: (1) "I have a good

knowledge of language technologies,” (2) “I can recognize errors in language technologies,” (3) “I can distinguish automatically generated text from text written by humans,” (4) “I feel prepared to use language technologies,” (5) “I know the limitations of language technologies,” and (6) “I know the potential of language technologies.” Responses to these items were recoded into a mean unified score on a 0-1 linear scale, with higher values indicating greater self-assessed LT literacy.

3.4 Analysis and Methods

3.4.1 Statistical Analysis

Our analytical approach combines descriptive and inferential methods to address our research objectives. For research objectives 1–3 (GenAI and LT adoption, GenAI chatbot usage, and LT literacy and education), we employ descriptive statistics—e.g., frequencies, means, standard deviations, and cross-tabulations to characterize broad patterns across the sample. For research objective 4 (digital divides), we use inferential methods to examine whether adoption and usage differ systematically across sociodemographic groups, and if they can be explained by LT experience and literacy.

We use logistic regression to predict GenAI chatbot adoption (users vs. non-users) and estimate odds ratios, which provide a more intuitive measure of the likelihood of adopting GenAI based on the predictor variables. To identify intent-specific predictors of usage frequency, we run separate ordinary least squares (OLS) models for each of the six intents. While this is formally an ordered measure (0-3), it can be reasonably interpreted as approximating a continuous frequency of use. In fact, ordered logistic and OLS regressions yield virtually identical results in terms of sign, magnitude, and significance of the coefficients (see S6 and S7 in the Supplementary materials). For parsimony and ease of interpretation, we therefore report OLS estimates.

All models incorporate sociodemographic variables as controls, and include LT experience and literacy as additional interdependent variables to account for technology familiarity and digital competence.

We verified that the predictor variables do not exhibit problematic multicollinearity using Variance Inflation Factors (VIF; [O’Brien 2007](#)). All VIF values are below 1.2, well below conventional thresholds, indicating no significant multicollinearity among predictor variables (full results reported in Supplementary S2.2, Table S3).

3.4.2 Free-Form Response Analysis

Our survey included optional open-ended questions to capture qualitative insights into participants’ perceptions of the technology’s usability, experience with potential errors, and preferences for use (e.g., language of the interaction or modality). We include in our analyses three questions that received at least 300 responses (~20% of the users’ response pool).

Following standard textual modeling practices (e.g., [Alipour et al. 2023](#); [Bhandarkar et al. 2025](#)), we search for and group similar answers into clusters, and then describe each cluster’s topic to infer trends and insights. In practice, given all open-text responses of a question, we use BERTopic ([Grootendorst 2022](#)), an established topic

modeling tool. The software uses embedding models to transform text into numerical representations, clustering and dimensionality reduction algorithms, and LLMs to generate textual descriptions of the discovered topics. We report in the Supplementary material (S.1.4) more details about BERTopic, as well as the complete information on the preprocessing applied to texts, our choices of model parameters, and steps taken to verify the extracted topics.

4 Results

4.1 GenAI and Language Technologies Adoption Results

We present results on GenAI chatbot adoption by comparing usage rates with other task-specific LTs (Figure 1). This comparative perspective reveals whether GenAI chatbots complement or replace existing LTs providing insights into their growth and impact. We also explore drivers of GenAI chatbot adoption to understand their appeal




Fig. 1 Language technology adoption and replacement. Panel.a (*left*) shows the ratio of participants ($n = 1,906$) who reported having used each language technology, including GenAI chatbots. Panel.b (*right*) shows, among users of each technology, the ratio of users reporting that GenAI chatbots have completely or partially replaced their use of that technology. For “Web search”, ratios are calculated among GenAI chatbot users ($n = 1,533$). Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

GenAI Chatbot Adoption Surpass most Longstanding Language Technology Applications

Figure 1.a presents adoption rates across six language technologies. GenAI chatbots have rapidly achieved widespread adoption (80.5%), surpassing established LTs such as voice assistants (72%) and approaching the near-universal usage (94%) of machine translation. This is particularly notable given that voice assistants like Siri and Alexa have been popular for years. Other speech-related applications (speech transcript at 27% and text-to-speech at 15%) remain considerably less prevalent, suggesting that

longevity alone does not guarantee widespread adoption. These figures attest to the explosive growth of GenAI chatbots. Our data further allow us to examine the specific composition of the GenAI chatbots adopted: ChatGPT emerges as the dominant platform, used by nearly three-quarters (74.5%) of respondents in our sample. Gemini is a distant second, used by 37.4%. This significant disparity points to limited platform diversification among users and suggests that ChatGPT’s first-mover advantage has cemented a strong incumbent position for this emerging technology.

GenAI Chatbots Drive Shift from existing Technologies

When GenAI users were asked whether the onset of GenAI chatbots had affected how and if they used other digital technologies, 34.6% reported a definitive shift, while an additional 18.3% were unsure. Specifically for LTs, we find technology-specific displacement patterns (Figure 1.b). Assisted writing tools face the most substantial replacement by GenAI chatbots (24.5% partial, 19.8% complete replacement) — an expected outcome given their text-generation capabilities, which also allow drafting text from scratch. Notably, web search experiences meaningful displacement (34% partial, 5% complete), suggesting that users bypass traditional query-based information retrieval in favor of conversational interfaces that provide targeted, synthesized responses.⁸

Usability as a Pathway to GenAI Chatbot Usage

To understand the mechanisms driving GenAI chatbot growth, we asked participants who reported replacing other technologies with GenAI ($n = 624$) to select reasons from six multiple-choice options (i.e., convenience, flexibility & personalization, accuracy, reliability, transparency, besides “other”). The results reveal that the shift stems primarily from practical advantages rather than higher performance or trustworthiness: convenience (38%) and flexibility/personalization (30%) dominate users’ motivations, while accuracy (19%), reliability (8%), and transparency (2%) play secondary roles. Accordingly, the displacement of existing specialized technologies seems driven more by usability improvements and novel interaction paradigms in user-friendly interfaces that reduce friction in user workflows across multiple functionalities rather than a sense of trust.

4.2 GenAI Chatbot Usage Results

Having established adoption rates, here we focus on GenAI users ($n = 1,533$) and examine how they engage with the technology in practice. We analyze which intents and activities dominate usage, whether interactions serve professional or personal needs, and the extent to which users employ GenAI chatbots as productive instruments, creative assistants, or emotional companions (Andersson 2025). Finally, for more pragmatic insights, we explore how the general-purpose, multilingual, and multi-modal nature of the tools is leveraged by examining in which languages and modalities users interact with them, and why, by analyzing participants’ open-text responses.

GenAI Chatbots Usage Patterns




Fig. 2 Usage patterns for GenAI chatbots. Panel.a displays frequency distributions across six usage intents with mean frequency scores (0 = never, 1 = less than monthly, 2 = monthly, 3 = weekly). Panel.b shows the total count of activities performed across all users, distinguishing the number of times each activity was indicated for work/study versus personal contexts. Panel.c shows the number of distinct activities each user engages in. The distribution is right-skewed (mean = 5.74 activities). Panel.d displays work/study usage percentage by professional area, with a 50% threshold line (red dashed) distinguishing work/study-dominant from personal-dominant usage. We only include professional area with at least $n = 35$. Dots show point estimates, error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals, and sample sizes (n) are annotated.

GenAI chatbots are a Multi-Purpose Tool

Figure 2.a shows GenAI chatbot usage frequency across six intents. *Learning* and *Information Retrieval* lead with the highest average frequencies (2.1 [CI 2.05-2.15] and 2.06 [CI 2.0-2.12] on a 0–3 scale), with around 50% of users engaging weekly. *Problem Solving* and *Content Creation* follow closely (mean = 2.01 [CI 1.95-2.06]




Fig. 3 GenAI Chatbot activity by age groups. Bars show the percentage of users in each age group performing the activities, with 95% confidence intervals. Sample sizes of each age group are in the legend.

and 1.95 [CI 1.89-2.01], respectively) but with lower weekly usage shares. *Leisure* shows the lowest frequency (mean = 0.74 [CI 0.68-0.79]) and the smallest user share. Yet, 20% of respondents engage with GenAI chatbots for leisure regularly (monthly or more), revealing a non-negligible segment using the technology for enjoyment—chatting, playing, or companionship—rather than purely for utility and instrumental tasks.

Engagement Spans Instrumental to Companionship Activities, with Diversity Declining by Age

Figure 2.b provides complementary, granular insight into specific activities performed with GenAI chatbots, corroborating our intent-level findings. *Explanations* emerge as the most common activity (selected by 53.1% of users at least once in either work/study or personal contexts), followed by *Image Generation* (47.1%) and *Email Writing* (46.9%). While instrumental activities dominate, the long tail reveals compelling patterns: activities such as *Emotional Support* (10.2%) and *Medical* (24.3%) or *Personal Advice* (23.5%), though less frequent, represent substantial and high-risk applications. In terms of diversity, we find that users concentrate their engagement around an average set of 5.73 different activities (Figure 2.c), a figure that decreases with age: younger users tend to perform more activities (18–34: 6.4; 35–54: 6.2) compared to older cohorts (55–64: 5.2; 65+: 4.0) (full results are in the Supplementary materials, Fig. S3). Activity types also vary across age groups (Figure 3). While variation is moderate for seeking explanations or personal advice, younger users predictably dominate technical tasks such as data analysis, text analysis, and programming help. Notably, older users (65+) stand out for seeking medical advice—likely driven by healthcare needs—and

fact-checking, despite these models’ established susceptibility to hallucinations and misinformation (e.g. Kreps et al. 2022; Zhang et al. 2025; Li et al. 2024).

Usage is Evenly Distributed across Work, Study and Personal Contexts

GenAI chatbots extend well beyond professional tools, with users deploying them across work, study, and personal contexts. Overall, activity mentions show relatively balanced distribution between work/study (52%, $n = 5,562$) and personal (48%, $n = 4,827$) context of usage, though this varies substantially by activity type (Figure 2.b). For instance, email writing occurs predominantly in work/study contexts, while travel planning is overwhelmingly personal. Figure 2.d explores work/study usage ratios by professional area and employment status. Research & Academia shows the highest work-orientation, followed by Education. In contrast, retired users show the lowest work/study usage (18%), in line with their status.⁹ Overall, most professional sectors cluster around or above 50% work/study usage, suggesting that to a certain extent GenAI chatbots have permeated professional workflows across diverse professions.

Dominance of Text Interactions and Context-Driven Language Choice

We asked users which language and modality (writing or speaking) they use when interacting with GenAI chatbots. Regarding languages, while almost all users report using Italian (95%), a substantial portion also relies on English (52%)—a notably high figure likely driven by the high representation of graduates and younger segments in our sample.¹⁰ Also, there is a strong preference for writing (85%) over speaking (2.2%) or alternating between voice and text modalities (13.2%) when interacting with GenAI chatbots.

Our clustering analysis of free-form responses exposes the main users’ attitudes. Among those who left an open comment about the **preferred language for interactions** ($n = 529$), we identified several driving factors. Most commonly ($n = 207$), it is a contextual choice. Frequently, users prefer English for work and Italian for personal use. Moreover, users associated queries in English with higher reliability in model outputs, especially for image generation. A second trend ($n = 95$) centers on a strong preference for Italian because it is the respondents’ native language. Such explicit preference co-occurs with mentions to “convenience,” “ease of use,” “practicality,” and “simplicity.” In smaller clusters, language choice is explicitly related to i) the desired output language ($n = 45$)—i.e., a pragmatic reason rather than a preference—ii) task-dependent conditions ($n = 32$), including the “topic discussed,” “target audience” or even their “mood;” iii) the superior availability of technical information in English ($n = 27$) (e.g., for programming), and iv) educational purposes for themselves ($n = 26$), e.g., to practice English. A final group ($n = 26$) uses GenAI chatbots almost exclusively in Italian due to a lack of competence in other languages, preventing them to interact as they would like to.

Among those who commented on the **preferred modality for interacting with GenAI chatbots** ($n = 464$), most explained why writing is superior. Many ($n = 106$) underline the perceived benefits of control, precision, and clarity that the written medium facilitates. They consistently highlight the ability to refine and revise prompts before submission as a key advantage, mentioning that writing allows for a “more

pondered” choice of words and greater clarity. Another group ($n = 97$) prefers written input due to established habits and a sense of comfort. In this cluster, two respondents identify as dyslexic, suggesting that writing may be a more accessible or preferred mode of interaction for individuals with reading or writing challenges. Two clusters explicitly highlight the shortcomings of voice inputs, driven by a combination of practical, social, and cognitive factors. Many report perceived limitations in accuracy, reliability, and overall user experience, citing “transcription errors” and a sense that the system does not fully understand them, leading to repetition. Voice is also deemed less suitable in various environments (e.g., a shared workspace or a crowded environment) than text, as it risks disturbing others or sharing unwanted information. Interestingly, some respondents display discomfort or self-consciousness when speaking to a device, even when alone (translated: “When I’m alone talking to the phone, I feel dumb”). A small portion of participants ($n = 14$) highlight privacy concerns. Upon manual inspection, we noticed a strong emphasis on the potential misuse of audio data. A key concern is the activation of microphones and the permissions required by chatbot platforms. This worry extends to uncertainty about *how* recorded audio is being used—specifically, whether it is “being used for training purposes” or other “undisclosed applications.” The few respondents ($n = 12$) who exhibited a clear preference for speaking to chatbots are primarily driven by perceived efficiency gains and convenience compared to typing. Despite acknowledging an initial awkwardness (“I feel awkward [...]”) when using voice, they explicitly state they can “talk faster” or that voice is “faster overall” compared to typing (“I’m slow with the qwerty”). The practical benefit of using vocal inputs on a smartphone is also mentioned.

These findings reveal a strong user preference for the control, precision, and privacy afforded by written text. Language selection, meanwhile, emerges as a deliberate, context-dependent choice, balancing the convenience of native Italian with the perceived reliability and technical utility of English.

4.3 Language Technology Literacy and Impact Results

We aim to assess participants’ familiarity with LTs and their awareness of potential risks, benefits and social impact. To do so, we examine prior education received, as well as self-reported competence with LTs across dimensions encompassing both knowledge and practical skills (i.e., measures of LT literacy, as defined in Sec. 3.3). Specifically, we compare responses across GenAI users and non-users, so to also inform barriers preventing the adoption of such technologies.

Limited LT Education and Literacy Levels

Our findings reveal limited prior education in LT among respondents, a pattern partially explained by the recent and rapid emergence of GenAI chatbots. The majority of participants reported receiving no formal training or informal (i.e., including self-searched educational videos or information online) on LTs, nor any other AI technology. This knowledge gap is particularly pronounced among non-users, with 76.2% reporting no training at all compared to 51.2% of users (Full results are provided as Supplementary materials in Fig. S4). Self-assessed literacy levels mirror this training




Fig. 4 Mean responses on LT literacy, attitudes toward LT education, and bias awareness among GenAI users and non-users. Responses are measured on a five-point scale ranging from -2 (strongly disagree) to $+2$ (strongly agree), with 0 representing a neutral response. We show a restricted range (-1.5 — 1.5) for better visualization. Panel.a (left) shows six LT literacy items, with dots representing the group means. Panel.b and Panel.c on the right depict, respectively, the believed importance of establishing LT education in schools and higher education (top) and awareness that LT can reproduce biases (bottom). All differences between chatbot users and non-users are statistically significant according to independent samples t-tests ($p < 0.05$).

deficit. As shown in Figure 4.a, mean scores on a five-point scale— with 0 representing a neutral stance—reveal modest self-perceived competence, even among chatbot users, though scores are even lower for non-users. Participants reported greatest difficulty with theoretical knowledge (“good knowledge of LT”: $M = -0.99$, non-users; $M = 0.06$, users) compared to practical applications (“feel prepared to use LT”: $M = 0.23$, users; $M = -0.84$, non-users). Notably, both groups expressed high uncertainty in distinguishing AI-generated content from human text (users: $M = -0.03$; non-users: $M = -0.28$), suggesting a critical gap that can affect trust. Overall, our findings echo the descriptive results in the report by Ipsos (2025), where only 50% of the Italian population felt to have a good understanding of AI. What’s more, here we see that such levels do not raise substantially even when looking only at those who use chatbots. While results disaggregated by age (Table 4.3) show improved competence among younger cohorts, literacy levels deteriorate considerably among older age groups, highlighting a notable generational divide in LT literacy.

Social Bias and Hallucination Awareness

Despite limited overall literacy, participants demonstrate comparatively higher awareness that LTs can reproduce biases and stereotypes (Figure 4.c: users $M = 0.96$, non-users $M = 0.56$). This awareness also comes with smaller divides between users and non-users, suggesting broader public discourse on AI ethics and social impact has reached beyond the experts and adopters community. Overall bias awareness (All

LT Literacy (GenAI Users)	18-34	35-54	55-64	65+
Good knowledge of LT	0.18	0.14	0.08	-0.42
Feel prepared to use LT	0.34	0.33	0.26	-0.25
Know limitations of LT	0.47	0.39	0.25	-0.19
Know potential of LT	0.52	0.41	0.35	0.00
Can recognize errors in LT	0.54	0.56	0.39	-0.10
Can distinguish AI from human text	0.11	0.02	-0.06	-0.36
Average	0.36	0.31	0.21	-0.22

Table 3 LT literacy scores by Age Group for GenAI users.

Responses are measured on a five-point scale ranging from -2 (strongly disagree) to $+2$ (strongly agree), with 0 representing a neutral response.

Note. Sample sizes: 18-34 ($n=492$), 35-54 ($n=499$), 55-64 ($n=307$), 65+ ($n=245$).

$M = 0.89$) also scores higher than the ability to spot errors (All $M = 0.27$), potentially signaling a gap between awareness and actual ability to recognize such issues. This gap is further evidenced by GenAI users’ reported experiences: when asked if they had ever encountered errors or biased examples in the output of GenAI chatbots, 39.5% of GenAI users confirmed encountering them, whereas 24.3% were unsure.

In a free-form question, we asked participants to expand on their experienced errors and stereotyped outputs. Among those who commented ($n = 334$), the most commonly reported issues centered on factual inaccuracies and fabrications. The largest cluster ($n = 100$) describes experiences with hallucinations—instances in which GenAI chatbots “present false information as facts.” Issues frequently concern ontological knowledge about Italian culture, e.g., historical events or bibliographic details. Crucially, some ($n = 6$) report issues in high-stakes contexts, e.g., legal and fiscal requests about the Italian system, with GenAI generating “references to non-existent legal articles,” “fabricating supporting precedents,” or offering information that “contradicts established Italian law.” Several users ($n = 55$) documented pervasive gender and racial bias in AI outputs. In image generation, users reported managerial roles depicted as “handsome middle-aged men,” teachers as young, blond, “Barbie-like” women figures, and caregivers as inherently feminine. Requests for “images of poor people consistently generated people of color,” while successful people yielded white individuals. Linguistic biases were also prevalent ($n = 24$), with users reporting a systematic defaulting to masculine forms in Italian, even when gender-neutral options existed in the source language—e.g., “translating a doctor and a nurse” consistently produced “un medico e un’infermiera,” (masculine and feminine forms in Italian, respectively). Additionally, some users ($n = 11$) identified cultural homogenization, describing responses as “anglocentric” and noting the GenAI’s tendency toward excessively polite outputs that avoid genuine depth or critical perspectives.

Lack of Competence and Loss of Critical Thinking as Barriers to Adoption

Given the attested moderate levels of LT literacy and previous education reported, Figure 4.b presents scores on endorsing the integration of LT education into formal school and university curricula. GenAI users express particularly strong support ($M =$

1.17) compared to non-users ($M = 0.51$). This pattern suggests that while current users recognize gaps in their knowledge and desire structured learning opportunities, non-users have a lower interest in improving their LT literacy.

Non-users ($n = 373$) were asked about the reasons for not using GenAI chatbots and conditions that might facilitate future adoption. Regarding non-adoption reasons, we find that this subsample segments into distinct groups: those with knowledge barriers (40.7%, $n = 152$)—unaware of chatbot existence (19.3%) or feeling that they don’t know how to use them (21.4%)—and those who deliberately choose not to adopt them either by preference (35.1%) or perceived lack of utility (26.3%).¹¹ For future adoption, change lies on LT education and support infrastructure (option selected by 43.4% of non-users), followed by accuracy guarantees (27.3%), privacy assurances (24.1%), and, notably, social and work pressure (12.9%). However, 24.1% of non-users express complete disinterest in future use, representing a resistant segment that raises concerns about the potential of GenAI chatbots to undermine critical thinking and diminish self-sufficiency, which explains their lower support for LT education integration.

4.4 GenAI Chatbot Divides Results

To conclude our analysis, we employ regression modeling to explore GenAI chatbot divides at two stages: adoption (user vs non-users) and usage frequency across intents among users. This dual approach reveals whether factors predicting uptake also shape engagement patterns, distinguishing between barriers to entry versus differences in engagement. All models (see details in Sec. 3.4.1) include age, gender, geography, socioeconomic status, and education as independent variables, as well as LT prior experience and literacy to explore their role in predicting potential divides.




Fig. 5 Odds ratios for GenAI chatbot adoption. We show logistic regression results predicting the likelihood of using GenAI chatbots. Points represent odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals. Results are displayed on a logarithmic scale to facilitate comparison of effects across different magnitudes. The dashed line indicates no effect ($OR = 1$). Reference categories are shown on the right. Statistically significant results are shown as filled markers, while non-significant ones are empty. Results are also available in Table S5 in the Supplementary materials.

LT literacy is strongly predictive of GenAI Adoption

Figure 5 presents odds ratios from a logistic regression predicting GenAI chatbot adoption (logarithmic scale). Values above 1.0 indicate increased adoption likelihood, and vice versa. Consistent with earlier waves of digital technology diffusion (Francis et al. 2019, e.g.), adoption declines sharply with age. Compared to 18-34 year-olds, those aged 35-54 show 56% lower odds ($OR = 0.44$), while 55-64 and 65+ groups face odds ratios of 0.37 and 0.20 respectively. Gender also matters: women have half the odds of men ($OR = 0.50$). Socioeconomic gradients follow expected patterns—graduates show 48% higher odds ($OR = 1.48$) and higher-income individuals 73% higher odds ($OR = 1.73$)—while no differences are observed between low and mid income participants, suggesting income effects concentrate at the upper end. Geography shows no significant regional variation within Italy nor with participants living abroad. Most notably, prior LT experience and competence emerge as very strong positive predictors. Each point increase on the 0-5 LT experience scale raises odds by 72% ($OR = 1.72$), while LT literacy exhibits an exceptionally strong effect ($OR = 20.82$). However, causality likely runs in both directions: prior LT literacy and experience lower adoption barriers, while usage of GenAI chatbots might further increase competence and knowledge of such technology. This reinforcing dynamic might bring cumulative advantage, where early adopters pull further ahead.

Usage Frequency across Intents Unveil GenAI User Diversity

Having explored gaps in GenAI chatbot adoption, we now examine whether these disparities extend to usage frequency among actual adopters. Figure 6 presents coefficients from six OLS regressions predicting usage frequency for each intent among users (full results are reported in Table S6 in the Supplementary materials). The results reveal heterogeneous patterns with limited consistency across sociodemographic groups, likely reflecting GenAI chatbot’s general-purpose nature serving diverse functions for different users. Unlike the clear age decline in adoption, usage patterns among adopters vary substantially by intent. *Content Creation* follows the expected pattern, with older users predicting significantly lower engagement (55-64: $\beta = -0.19$; 65+: $\beta = -0.66$). *Information Retrieval*, however, exhibits the opposite trend: usage increases with age, peaking among those 65+ ($\beta = 0.33$). This intent also shows striking anomalies regarding digital factors—neither LT literacy nor prior experience significantly predict information-seeking frequency, whereas all five other intents are associated with higher LT literacy levels. This presents a double-edged sword: *Information Retrieval* emerges as the most accessible and universal use case, regardless of literacy or prior LT experience, but this ease of access may come with limited awareness of GenAI’s risks and limitations, particularly among older and less digitally literate users who engage primarily through simple queries.

Overall, our results suggest an important distinction between barriers of adoption and patterns of usage across those who have adopted GenAI chatbots, which are highly intent-dependent. However, as we explore in the following, gender is the exception, with a persistent divide that structures both who uses GenAI chatbots and how intensively they engage with it across all domains.




Fig. 6 Predictors of GenAI chatbot usage frequency by intent. OLS regression coefficients with 95% confidence intervals for six separate models predicting usage frequency across different intents among GenAI users. Filled circles indicate statistical significance at $p < 0.05$; empty circles indicate non-significant effects. All models control for sociodemographics, LT experience, and LT literacy. Baseline categories shown in gray text at the top.

Gender Divides in Chatbot Adoption and Usage

In Figure 7, we isolate the effect of gender in adoption and usage frequency to examine gender disparities, by showing predicted probability differences between women and men of our regression models using average marginal effect (AME). Concerning adoption rates, we find a clear age gradient in Figure 7.a: among 18-34 year-olds, women have 4.1 percentage points lower adoption probability than men (AME = -0.041), reaching 13.5 points for those 65+ (AME = -0.135). Thus, we identify that gender gaps compound with age, but also suggest that gender divides in adoption might be reducing in younger generations. Among GenAI users, gender gaps persist (Figure 7.b), with women consistently using chatbots less frequently than men across all intents. The most significant disparities appear in *Problem Solving* (AME = -0.38 on the 0-3 frequency scale), and the smallest ones in *Content Creation* (AME = -0.09). Notably, even for *Information Retrieval*—the most accessible intent—women engage less frequently.

Notably, all our results control for sociodemographic variables, LT literacy, and prior experience. Yet sequential decomposition reveals our models explain only 34% of the baseline gender gap in adoption (i.e., gender without controls) and on average 15% of usage frequency across all intents (Tables with compositional analyses




Fig. 7 Gender gaps in GenAI chatbot adoption and usage frequency. Average marginal effects (AME) of gender (Woman - Man) with 95% bootstrap confidence intervals. Panel.a displays predicted probability differences (Woman - Man) in adoption across age groups, as estimated by logistic regression. Panel.b displays predicted differences in usage frequency across six intents among GenAI users, estimated by one OLS regression model per intent. Filled circles indicate statistical significance at $p < 0.05$. Negative values indicate lower adoption/usage frequency by women.

in Supplementary Fig. S8 and Fig. S9). Thus, the majority of gender disparities remain unexplained by measured factors, suggesting the gap operates through mechanisms beyond technical competence, education, or socioeconomic status—potentially including differences in interest, perceived utility, privacy concerns, or gendered norms around technology adoption and use that require future investigation.

5 Discussion and Conclusion

This study provides the first comprehensive, quantitative, empirical analysis of how Italian-speaking adults (i) adopt GenAI chatbots, comparatively to other language technologies, as well as (ii) their usage patterns, and (iii) literacy. Using original 2025 survey data from nearly 2,000 individuals, we examine how GenAI chatbots are used, by whom, and for what purposes. Moreover, we investigate how sociodemographic characteristics are associated with different degrees of adoption and use, and their relationship with prior technological experience and literacy.

Our findings confirm the disruptive and fast-growing role of GenAI chatbots, hinting at renewed potential to *supplant* other technologies, as anecdotal evidence suggests (e.g. [Honan 2025](#)). Among Italian speakers, GenAI chatbots have gained a larger user base than established technologies such as voice assistants (Siri, Cortana), despite their longstanding and pervasive presence in everyday applications. In our data, web search and information seeking are the most compelling examples of this phenomenon. Indeed, 39% of GenAI users reported to have replaced traditional search engines to at least a partial extent—a trend likely to accelerate as AI-generated summaries gain prominence atop search results ([Pew Research Center 2025b](#)). Stark adoption, however, is not driven by the pursuit of more accurate and trustworthy results. Rather, versatility and convenience attract users who favor a general-purpose, multimodal, multilingual technology that lets them switch between tasks seamlessly.

Ease of use, while potentially democratizing access, can pose significant threats when matched with poor awareness of the technology’s limitations—especially in light of frequent accounts of hallucination and sycophancy.¹² In our sample, regarding literacy in AI language technologies, competence and knowledge gaps are pronounced even among GenAI users. This finding mirrors Italy’s nationwide low levels of overall digitalization skills (Kralj 2024) and broad understanding of AI technologies (Beccalli et al. 2024; Ipsos 2025). One in two users has never received any training whatsoever, whether formal or informal, on GenAI or other AI technologies. Self-reported literacy is low, with a mean score across several skill categories of 0.23 (on a scale from -1.5 to $+1.5$, with 0 indicating uncertainty about one’s competence). Crucially, users are mostly unsure whether they can spot potential errors in GenAI outputs (score: 0.41). Low literacy is a particularly urgent issue because GenAI’s impact on the workplace (Handa et al. 2025; Brynjolfsson et al. 2025) is rapidly extending to personal life (our sample shows a balanced distribution of GenAI chatbots use between work and personal time, echoing recent trends (Chatterji et al. 2025)). We observe activities such as seeking medical advice, verifying “facts,” and seeking information more broadly, which were not reported in the most recent accounts from Italian agencies (e.g., Eurispes 2025). These activities are prevalent among older users (65+) who have the lowest literacy levels and a higher risk of being particularly vulnerable to errors and misinformation. We also find emerging use cases in companionship and emotional support across all age groups, applications previously reported among US teens (Common Sense Media 2025). While GenAI may address shortages of accessible and affordable support, it also raises concerns about appropriate boundaries and dependencies.

Concerning GenAI’s potential to exacerbate existing divides, we are interested in the factors that contribute to adoption barriers *and* usage frequency among adopters, with particular attention to the role of prior language technology experience and self-perceived competence. This dual approach reveals whether the same factors that predict uptake also shape engagement patterns. Concerning adoption, our findings largely echo existing literature: men, more highly educated individuals, those with higher socioeconomic status, and progressively younger cohorts are more likely to adopt chatbots (Bassignana et al. 2025; Hartley et al. 2024; Chatterji et al. 2025). Notably, we find no regional differences. This null finding should be interpreted cautiously: our online survey sample equalizes internet access across regions, masking Italy’s documented north-south digital divide (Serrecchia 2024). Additionally, our analysis did not capture urban-rural distinctions, which concurrent research identifies as a meaningful predictor of GenAI adoption in the US (Zhou et al. 2025), thus suggesting an important avenue for future investigation. However, once users cross the adoption threshold, these patterns shift substantially. Age, educational, and socioeconomic factors lose consistent predictive power, and usage frequency becomes scattered and highly intent-dependent. For example, LT literacy—the strongest predictor of GenAI adoption—has no predictive power for how frequently a user would rely on GenAI to search for new information on the web. This divergence highlights how GenAI chatbots serve diverse needs. A lack of technical skill does not prevent engagement for many of these purposes. Consequently, studies that only measure overall

usage frequency without distinguishing between user intents risk overlooking this critical variation. Still, self-reported competence on AI and language technologies is low, and both current users and around half of non-users express desire for more education on the matter.

Gender is the striking exception: women lag in both adoption and usage frequency. Importantly, literacy only partially explain the disparities, suggesting competence alone cannot account for gender differences in GenAI chatbots engagement. This pattern points to trust issues and social and cultural factors beyond competence (Otis et al. 2024). In educational settings, female students exhibit lower trust in GenAI (Møgelvang et al. 2024) or fear being penalized and perceived as cheating when using it (Carvajal et al. 2024). By taking an intersectional approach, we find that gender differentials in adoption are lower among younger cohorts, suggesting that when the use of GenAI chatbots becomes normalized gender divide decreases. However, future work and interventions are needed to understand such divides and avoid entrenching inequalities. Moreover, the underrepresentation of women in user data may contribute to biased data used to train and improve future models.

Our study provides novel empirical evidence and data on GenAI chatbot adoption, use, and literacy that can inform interventions. As these technologies become embedded in daily life, these insights can guide policymakers, educators, and developers in ensuring equitable access while protecting vulnerable users from the risks of uninformed adoption.

Notes

1. <https://digital-decade-desi.digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/datasets/desi/charts>
2. We use the term GenAI chatbots to distinguish between the core technology (i.e., LLMs) and the tools available in conversational interfaces accessible to the broader population.
3. <https://www.corriere.it/>
4. <https://www.tp24.it/>
5. <https://www.ilfattoquotidiano.it/>
6. <https://demo.istat.it/app/?i=POS&l=it>
7. Our literacy results align with the 2025 IPSOS monitor, which uses a representative sample of the Italian adult population (online sample, age 18-75 : 40% of their participants disagreed with the statement “I have a good understanding of what artificial intelligence is” (Ipsos 2025). This is consistent with our survey, where 43.3% of respondents disagreed that they had a “good knowledge of (AI) language technologies.”
8. We are unable to conclusively distinguish whether users solely conduct searches within conversational interfaces or refer to using synthesized AI overview features (e.g., Google’s AI Overviews, launched in Italy in March 2024), which are already affecting webpage traffic (Giuffrida 2025).
9. Profession refers to respondents’ status at survey completion, while reported activities span more than one year since the onset of GenAI chatbots like ChatGPT. Consequently, retirees may report work-related usage from recent pre-retirement employment.
10. Language of choice is stratified: 56.5% of graduate users ($n = 624$) rely on English versus 38.2% of non-graduates ($n = 123$). In the 18-34 age range, 63.7% ($n = 311$) use English, dropping to 34.4% ($n = 79$) among those aged 65 and over.
11. The few optional selections of “other reasons” ($n = 20$) mainly reflected mistrust towards the technology.

12. E.g., <https://theconversation.com/eat-a-rock-a-day-put-glue-on-your-pizza-how-googles-ai-is-losing-touch-with-reality-230953>, <https://www.404media.co/google-serves-ai-generated-images-of-mushrooms-putting-foragers-at-risk/>, or <https://openai.com/index/sycophancy-in-gpt-4o/>.

Declarations

Data availability. Data with participants’ responses are available at <https://github.com/RiTA-nlp/Survey-GenAI-Italy>. The repository also contains the survey itself (original Italian and translated into English).

Code availability. All code used to prepare the data, analyze them, compute results and visualize them are in the same project repository <https://github.com/RiTA-nlp/Survey-GenAI-Italy>

Funding. The current work did not receive any supporting funding.

Acknowledgements. This work is the result of a joint effort of members of the “Risorse per la Lingua Italiana” community (<https://rita-nlp.org>): we thank every member who invested their time in the project. Beatrice Savoldi is supported by the PNRR project FAIR- Future AI Research (PE00000013), under the NRRP MUR program funded by the NextGenerationEU. Giuseppe Attanasio was supported by the Portuguese Recovery and Resilience Plan through project C645008882-00000055 (Center for Responsible AI) and by FCT/MECI through contract UIDB/50008 (Instituto de Telecomunicações). Elisa Bassignana is supported by a research grant (VIL59826) from VILLUM FONDEN. Matteo Negri and Luisa Bentivogli are supported by the Horizon Europe research and innovation programme, under grant agreement No 101135798, project Meetween (My Personal AI Mediator for Virtual MEETtings BetWEEN People). Arianna Muti and Debora Nozza are supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No. 101116095, PERSONAE). Nicoletta Balbo is supported by the European Union (ERC FRAILIFE—Child Disability and Family Life, G.A. 101077533) under the European Union’s Horizon 2021-2027 research and innovation program.

Author Contribution. B.S. and G.A. conceived the original idea and designed the methodology, with revisions from E.B., S.C., A.R., M.N., L.B., T.C., N.B, and D.N. The responsibility for validation, formal analysis, and investigation was of B.S. with O.G. and G.A. Data curation was performed by B.S., G.A., M.M.M., S.C., and O.G. The original draft was written by B.S. with M.M.M. and G.A. Visualization was handled by B.S. and M.M.M. All authors reviewed and edited the final manuscript.

Conflict of interest. The author(s) declare no competing interests.

Ethics Statement

Ethics approval. This research project received ethical approval from the Bocconi Research Ethics Committee (approval number EA000960) through the expedited review procedure. The project was approved on 12 May 2025—before distributing the survey—and was deemed compliant with the Research Ethics Policy of Bocconi

University. The approval covered the content of the survey (i.e., the questions administered to participants) and the data collection procedures, including the methods used to distribute the survey and recruit participants. All research procedures involving human participants were conducted in accordance with institutional and national ethical standards and the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki.

Consent to participate. Informed consent to participate was obtained electronically for each participant before starting the survey. On the first page of the Qualtrics survey, participants were linked to the detailed informed consent document describing the purpose of the study, its voluntary nature, the procedures involved, data protection measures, and participants’ rights under the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR 679/2016). To proceed, participants were required to confirm the following written statement: *I confirm that I am at least 18 years old and that I have received the provided information. I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary, anonymous, and unpaid, and that I may withdraw at any time. I acknowledge that my data will be processed in full compliance with applicable data protection regulations and I therefore consent to participate in this study, authorizing the use of my responses in aggregated form for research purposes.* Only participants who actively selected *Yes (I agree to participate in the study)* could access and complete the questionnaire. No personal identifiers were collected, and all responses were stored in anonymized form on secure servers accessible only to the research team. The consent covered participation in the study, the use of anonymized data for research and publication in aggregated form, and data storage in compliance with relevant privacy regulations. No vulnerable individuals or minors were involved, and no deception or foreseeable risks were associated with participation.

List of Figures

- 1 **Language technology adoption and replacement.** Panel.a (*left*) shows the ratio of participants ($n = 1,906$) who reported having used each language technology, including GenAI chatbots. Panel.b (*right*) shows, among users of each technology, the ratio of users reporting that GenAI chatbots have completely or partially replaced their use of that technology. For “Web search”, ratios are calculated among GenAI chatbot users ($n = 1,533$). Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. 10

2	Usage patterns for GenAI chatbots. Panel.a displays frequency distributions across six usage intents with mean frequency scores (0 = never, 1 = less than monthly, 2 = monthly, 3 = weekly). Panel.b shows the total count of activities performed across all users, distinguishing the number of times each activity was indicated for work/study versus personal contexts. Panel.c shows the number of distinct activities each user engages in. The distribution is right-skewed (mean = 5.74 activities). Panel.d displays work/study usage percentage by professional area, with a 50% threshold line (red dashed) distinguishing work/study-dominant from personal-dominant usage. We only include professional area with at least $n = 35$. Dots show point estimates, error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals, and sample sizes (n) are annotated.	12
3	GenAI Chatbot activity by age groups. Bars show the percentage of users in each age group performing the activities, with 95% confidence intervals. Sample sizes of each age group are in the legend.	13
4	Mean responses on LT literacy, attitudes toward LT education, and bias awareness among GenAI users and non-users. Responses are measured on a five-point scale ranging from -2 (strongly disagree) to $+2$ (strongly agree), with 0 representing a neutral response. We show a restricted range (-1.5 — 1.5) for better visualization. Panel.a (left) shows six LT literacy items, with dots representing the group means. Panel.b and Panel.c on the right depict, respectively, the believed importance of establishing LT education in schools and higher education (top) and awareness that LT can reproduce biases (bottom). All differences between chatbot users and non-users are statistically significant according to independent samples t-tests ($p < 0.05$).	16
5	Odds ratios for GenAI chatbot adoption. We show logistic regression results predicting the likelihood of using GenAI chatbots. Points represent odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals. Results are displayed on a logarithmic scale to facilitate comparison of effects across different magnitudes. The dashed line indicates no effect ($OR = 1$). Reference categories are shown on the right. Statistically significant results are shown as filled markers, while non-significant ones are empty. Results are also available in Table S5 in the Supplementary materials.	18
6	Predictors of GenAI chatbot usage frequency by intent. OLS regression coefficients with 95% confidence intervals for six separate models predicting usage frequency across different intents among GenAI users. Filled circles indicate statistical significance at $p < 0.05$; empty circles indicate non-significant effects. All models control for sociodemographics, LT experience, and LT literacy. Baseline categories shown in gray text at the top.	20

7	Gender gaps in GenAI chatbot adoption and usage frequency. Average marginal effects (AME) of gender (Woman - Man) with 95% bootstrap confidence intervals. Panel.a displays predicted probability differences (Woman - Man) in adoption across age groups, as estimated by logistic regression. Panel.b displays predicted differences in usage frequency across six intents among GenAI users, estimated by one OLS regression model per intent. Filled circles indicate statistical significance at $p < 0.05$. Negative values indicate lower adoption/usage frequency by women.	21
---	--	----

References

- Abbes F, Bennani S, Maalel A (2024) Generative AI and gamification for personalized learning: Literature review and future challenges. *SN Computer Science* 5(8):1154
- Alipour S, Galeazzi A, Sangiorgio E, et al (2023) Cross-platform social dynamics: an analysis of chatgpt and covid-19 vaccine conversations. *Scientific Reports* 14. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:264172259>
- Andersson M (2025) Companionship in code: AI's role in the future of human connection. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 12(1):1–7
- Bassignana E, Curry AC, Hovy D (2025) The AI gap: How socioeconomic status affects language technology interactions. In: Che W, Nabende J, Shutova E, et al (eds) *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Vienna, Austria, pp 18647–18664, <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2025.acl-long.914>, URL <https://aclanthology.org/2025.acl-long.914/>
- Beccalli E, Pais I, Rosina A, et al (eds) (2024) *Intelligenza artificiale: rischi e opportunità*. No. 11 in *Quaderni Istituto Toniolo - Rapporto Giovani, Vita e Pensiero / Istituto Toniolo*, Milan
- Bentley SV, Naughtin CK, McGrath MJ, et al (2024) The digital divide in action: How experiences of digital technology shape future relationships with Artificial Intelligence. *AI and Ethics* 4(4):901–915
- Bhandarkar A, Mishra G, Juchani K, et al (2025) Investigating thematic patterns and user preferences in llm interactions using bertopic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:251007557*
- Bodonyi A, Bozkir E, Yang S, et al (2024) User intent recognition and satisfaction with large language models: A user study with chatgpt. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.02136>, *arXiv:2402.02136*
- Bouyzourn K, Birch A (2025) What shapes user trust in chatgpt? A mixed-methods study of user attributes, trust dimensions, task context, and societal perceptions

- among university students. CoRR abs/2507.05046
- Brynjolfsson E, Li D, Raymond L (2025) Generative AI at work. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 140(2):889–942
- Capraro V, Lentsch A, Acemoglu D, et al (2024) The impact of generative artificial intelligence on socioeconomic inequalities and policy making. *PNAS nexus* 3(6):pgae191
- Carvajal D, Franco C, Isaksson S (2024) Will Artificial Intelligence get in the way of achieving gender equality? NHH Dept of Economics Discussion Paper
- Chatterji A, Cunningham T, Deming DJ, et al (2025) How people use ChatGPT. Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research
- Chen C, Shu K (2024) Combating misinformation in the age of LLMs: Opportunities and challenges. *AI Magazine* 45(3):354–368
- Common Sense Media (2025) Talk, trust, and trade-offs: How and why teens use ai companion. URL https://www.common sense media.org/sites/default/files/research/report/talk-trust-and-trade-offs_2025-web.pdf
- Daepf MIG, Counts S (2025) The emerging generative artificial intelligence divide in the united states. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.11988>, arXiv:2404.11988
- Eurispes (2025) 37° rapporto italia. URL https://www.primaonline.it/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/eurispes_-sintesi-37-rapporto-italia_compressed.pdf
- Exploding Topics (2025) Most Visited Websites In The World (August 2025). <https://explodingtopics.com/blog/most-visited-websites>, accessed: October 15, 2025
- Francis J, Ball C, Kadylak T, et al (2019) Aging in the digital age: Conceptualizing technology adoption and digital inequalities. In: *Ageing and digital technology: Designing and evaluating emerging technologies for older adults*. Springer, p 35–49
- Gillespie N, Lockey S, Ward T, et al (2025) Trust, attitudes and use of artificial intelligence. University of Melbourne, KPMG
- Giuffrida A (2025) Google ai overviews: Italian news publishers demand investigation. URL <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2025/oct/16/google-ai-overviews-italian-news-publishers-demand-investigation>, accessed: 2025-10-19
- Grootendorst M (2022) Bertopic: Neural topic modeling with a class-based tf-idf procedure. arXiv preprint arXiv:220305794
- Handa K, Tamkin A, McCain M, et al (2025) Which economic tasks are performed with AI? Evidence from millions of Claude conversations. arXiv preprint arXiv:250304761

- Hartley J, Jolevski F, Melo V, et al (2024) The labor market effects of generative artificial intelligence. Available at SSRN
- Hofmann V, Kalluri PR, Jurafsky D, et al (2024) Ai generates covertly racist decisions about people based on their dialect. *Nature* 633(8028):147–154
- Holtermann C, Röttger P, Dill T, et al (2024) Evaluating the elementary multilingual capabilities of large language models with MultiQ. In: Ku LW, Martins A, Srikumar V (eds) Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, pp 4476–4494, <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.265>, URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-acl.265/>
- Honan M (2025) AI means the end of internet search as we’ve known it. URL <https://www.technologyreview.com/2025/01/06/1108679/ai-generative-search-internet-breakthroughs/>
- Ipsos (2025) The ipsos ai monitor 2025: A 30-country ipsos global advisor survey. URL <https://resources.ipsos.com/rs/297-CXJ-795/images/Ipsos-AI-Monitor-2025.pdf>
- Kralj L (2024) Italy: A snapshot of digital skills. Digital Skills and Jobs Platform, URL <https://digital-skills-jobs.europa.eu/en/latest/briefs/italy-snapshot-digital-skills>, accessed: 2025-10-24
- Kreitmair DH, Raschky PA (2023) The unintended consequences of censoring digital technology—evidence from italy’s chatgpt ban. arXiv preprint arXiv:230409339
- Kreps S, McCain RM, Brundage M (2022) All the news that’s fit to fabricate: AI-generated text as a tool of media misinformation. *Journal of experimental political science* 9(1):104–117
- Li J, Chen J, Ren R, et al (2024) The Dawn After the Dark: An Empirical Study on Factuality Hallucination in Large Language Models. In: Ku LW, Martins A, Srikumar V (eds) Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers). Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, pp 10879–10899, <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.586>, URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.586/>
- Mitchell M, Attanasio G, Baldini I, et al (2025) SHADES: Towards a multilingual assessment of stereotypes in large language models. In: Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers), pp 11995–12041
- Møgelvang A, Bjelland C, Grassini S, et al (2024) Gender differences in the use of generative artificial intelligence chatbots in higher education: Characteristics and consequences. *Education Sciences* 14(12):1363

- Murayama T, Miyazaki K, Matsubara Y, et al (2025) Linguistic Landscape of Generative AI Perception: A Global Twitter Analysis Across 14 Languages. In: Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media, pp 1262–1294
- Noy S, Zhang W (2023) Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. *Science* 381(6654):187–192
- OpenAI (2023) ChatGPT: Large language model. <https://chat.openai.com>, accessed: October 15, 2025
- Otis NG, Delecourt S, Cranney K, et al (2024) Global evidence on gender gaps and generative AI. Harvard Business School Boston, MA, USA
- Ouyang S, Wang S, Liu Y, et al (2023) The shifted and the overlooked: A task-oriented investigation of user-GPT interactions. In: Bouamor H, Pino J, Bali K (eds) Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, pp 2375–2393, <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.146>, URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.146/>
- O’Brien RM (2007) A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. *Quality & quantity* 41(5):673–690
- Pew Research Center (2025a) 34% of u.s. adults have used chatgpt, about double the share in 2023. URL <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2025/06/25/34-of-us-adults-have-used-chatgpt-about-double-the-share-in-2023/>
- Pew Research Center (2025b) Do people click on links in google ai summaries? URL <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2025/07/22/google-users-are-less-likely-to-click-on-links-when-an-ai-summary-appears-in-the-results/>
- Pew Research Center (2025c) How the u.s. public and ai experts view artificial intelligence. URL <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2025/04/03/how-the-us-public-and-ai-experts-view-artificial-intelligence/>
- Qualtrics (2025) Qualtrics xm. URL <https://www.qualtrics.com>, software
- Scantamburlo T, Cortés A, Foffano F, et al (2024) Artificial intelligence across europe: A study on awareness, attitude and trust. *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence*
- Serrecchia M (2024) Analysis of internet development and internal digital divide by using the “.it” domain names as an indicator: Evidence from italy. *Telecommunications Policy* 48(10):102870. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2024.102870>, URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308596124001678>

- Shah C, White R, Andersen R, et al (2025) Using large language models to generate, validate, and apply user intent taxonomies. *ACM Trans Web* 19(3). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3732294>, URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3732294>
- Skjuve M, Brandtzaeg PB, Følstad A (2024) Why do people use ChatGPT? Exploring user motivations for generative conversational AI. *First Monday* 29(1)
- Sublime J, Renna I (2024) Is chatgpt massively used by students nowadays? a survey on the use of large language models such as chatgpt in educational settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:241217486*
- Suárez D, García-Mariñoso B (2025) On the verge of a digital divide in the use of generative AI? *Telecommunications Policy* 49(7):102997. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2025.102997>, URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308596125000941>
- Tomlinson K, Jaffe S, Wang W, et al (2025) Working with AI: Measuring the Applicability of Generative AI to Occupations. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.07935>, *arXiv:2507.07935*
- Trippas JR, Al Lawati SFD, Mackenzie J, et al (2024) What do users really ask large language models? An initial log analysis of Google Bard interactions in the wild. In: *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pp 2703–2707
- Tully SM, Longoni C, Appel G (2025) Lower artificial intelligence literacy predicts greater ai receptivity. *Journal of Marketing* p 00222429251314491
- UNESCO (2024) AI literacy and the new digital divide: A global call for action. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-literacy-and-new-digital-divide-global-call-action>, accessed: October 15, 2025
- Vehovar V, Toepoel V, Steinmetz S (2016) *Non-probability sampling*, vol 1. The Sage handbook of survey methods
- Wang C, Boerman SC, Kroon AC, et al (2025) The artificial intelligence divide: Who is the most vulnerable? *New Media & Society* 27(7):3867–3889
- Zhang X, Li S, Hauer B, et al (2023) Don’t trust ChatGPT when your question is not in English: A study of multilingual abilities and types of LLMs. In: Bouamor H, Pino J, Bali K (eds) *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, pp 7915–7927, <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.491>, URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.491/>
- Zhang Y, Li Y, Cui L, et al (2025) Siren’s song in the ai ocean: A survey on hallucination in large language models. *Computational Linguistics* pp 1–46

Zhou K, Gligorić K, Cheng M, et al (2025) Attention to Non-Adopters. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.15951>, arXiv:2510.15951

Supplementary Materials

S1 Experimental Details

S1.1 LT and GenAI Chatbot Definitions

The definitions and examples of each language technology in our survey are provided in Table [S1](#).

S1.2 List of GenAI Activities

In the following, we provide a full list of the 26 GenAI activities (translated to English) included in the survey.

- **Conversations and Support**
 - Medical advice
 - Personal advice
 - Emotional or psychological support
 - Other advice and suggestions
 - Friendly conversations
 - Philosophical or political conversations
 - Romantic or erotic conversations
 - Other conversations
- **Generation and Content Creation**
 - Quiz creation
 - Audio or music generation
 - Image generation
- **Writing and Analysis**
 - Analysis (general)
 - Data analysis and comprehension
 - Programming language assistance
 - Summaries
 - Academic writing
 - Creative writing
 - Email writing
 - Other writing
- **Others**
 - Travel and itinerary planning
 - Idea collection and draft creation
 - Explanations
 - Text comprehension and formatting

Item	Definition	Examples
<i>General Definition</i>		
Language Technologies	Tools based on artificial intelligence (AI) used to analyze and produce human language, both written and spoken.	Voice assistants, machine translators, voice generation, assisted writing, speech transcript, chatbots
<i>Task-Specific LT Applications</i>		
Machine Translation	Applications that automate the translation of text or speech from one language to another.	Google Translate, DeepL, Microsoft Bing, Amazon Translator
Voice Assistants	Applications designed to perform tasks, provide information, and control devices through voice commands.	Siri, Google Assistant, Alexa, Cortana, Bixby, Celia
Assisted Writing	Applications for text correction and revision (grammar, paraphrasing, and summarizing), or support for creative writing. It does not include generating text from scratch, only revision of already drafted text.	Grammarly, Writefull, QuillBot, Smart Compose (Google), Jasper AI
Speech Transcription	Applications for transcribing audio content into text, such as dictation systems, subtitling tools, or applications for the hearing impaired.	Apple Note, Automatic transcription on Zoom / Google Meet / Teams, Otter.AI, Speechmatics, Rev
Text-to-Speech	Applications for generating artificial voice and reading text aloud.	Google Cloud Text-to-speech, IBM Watson, ElevenLabs, Adobe Acrobat Read Aloud, Apple VoiceOver, NVDA, JAWS
<i>General-Purpose GenAI Systems</i>		
Chatbots	General-purpose systems for creating text, images, audio, or other content from simple verbal prompts. Allow natural interaction via chat to obtain answers, support, or complete various tasks.	ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude, Copilot, Perplexity

Table S1 Definitions and examples of language technologies.

Method	Parameter	Language Choice	Modality Type
UMAP	n_neighbors	10	5
	n_components	20	20
HDBSCAN	min_cluster_size	10	6
	min_samples	5	5

Table S2 BERTopic parameters. Final choice for UMAP and HDBSCAN parameters for the open-text questions about users’ expressed preference about the language chosen to prompt the model and the modality, i.e., typing or speaking.

- Fact checking (verification of information accuracy)

S1.3 Demographic Sample

To compare our demographic sample, in Figure S2 we plot the population of our survey (teal bars) compared to the national one (red dashed reference lines). For representative values and distribution, we refer to the Italian National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT) 2025 data (<https://demo.istat.it/app/?i=POS&l=it>). Values are reported as percentages across four key demographic categories, i.e., gender, age, geographic area, and education.

S1.4 BERTopic Details and Configuration

BERTopic is Python software¹ commonly used for topic modeling. Off-the-shelf, it offers an integrated interface to a wide range of natural language processing tools, along with high customizability.

Our BERTopic processing pipeline includes several steps. First, it converts each text individually into a numerical representation. For this step, we used a state-of-the-art *sentence embedder* model, namely Qwen3-Embedding-8B (Zhang et al. 2025). Sentence embedders capture semantic meaning in a format suitable for computational analyses by computing an N-dimensional vector representation for the text, also known as *embedding*. The geometrical properties of embeddings are commonly used for semantic search and information retrieval (e.g., the cosine similarity between embeddings is often used to retrieve documents relevant to a user query). Second, BERTopic applies dimensionality reduction using UMAP (McInnes et al. 2018) to minimize noise by reducing the embedding dimensionality. Third, it uses the HDBSCAN clustering algorithm (McInnes et al. 2017) to group semantically similar responses. In all cases, this step produced no more than 25 distinct clusters. Finally, for each cluster, the algorithm selects the N most relevant texts and compiles a prompt for a large language model. For this step, we prompted Gemma 3 Instruct (Team et al. 2025), a leading generative language model, to provide a detailed but concise summary of the cluster’s topics. Listing S1 reports the prompt we used. Since some textual nuances introduce noise, we manually verified all extracted clusters and merged similar ones.

Before running the BERTopic pipeline, we exclude all responses shorter than three characters and remove a set of Italian stopwords as found at <https://github.com/>

```

I wrote and published a survey to understand how Italians use generative AI.
→ The survey and the participant responses are in Italian.
Now, I am analyzing the following open-form question:

# Question
[question]

After clustering my answers, I have identified a topic described by the
→ following keywords.

# Keywords
[keywords]

The following responses are a representative sample of the cluster
→ representing the topic

# Documents
[documents]

# Guidelines
Based on this information, your task is to generate a topic description in
→ the context of this question. Here are the guidelines:
1. The description must be detailed and exhaustive, but it CANNOT exceed 300
→ words.
2. Describe what brought you to the description by mentioning the sample
→ answers.
3. Do not mention the question, it's known to the reader. Moreover, do not
→ make any assumption of the number of responses in the cluster.
4. Begin the description with a short title that summarizes it, e.g.,
→ "Enhanced perceived precision. <description>", or "Chosen due to
→ convenience. <description>"
5. If the answers are simply "no" or "nessuna", this is a cluster with
→ negative answers. In this case, just avoid spending many words and say
→ "Negative answers".

Begin the answer right after this prompt.

```

Fig. S1 Cluster summarization prompt. [question], [keywords], and [documents] are replaced with one of the questions of the survey, the 10 most relevant keywords and documents describing the cluster, respectively.

[stopwords-iso/stopwords-it/blob/master/stopwords-it.txt](https://stopwords-iso.github.io/stopwords-it/blob/master/stopwords-it.txt) from the remaining ones. We manually tuned two UMAP and HDBSCAN parameter sets to adjust cluster granularity and diversity based on the question. Table S2 reports all the final parameters.




Fig. S2 Distribution of demographic characteristics in our sample (teal bars) relative to national statistics (red dashed reference lines), broken down by (a) gender, (b) age, (c) geographic area, and (d) education.

S2 Additional Results

S2.1 Sample Robustness Checks

To assess the robustness of our findings, we applied post-stratification weights based on Italian population benchmarks from ISTAT 2025 data for gender, age, and geography. We computed frequency tables comparing unweighted and weighted percentages across all key variables, calculating the delta (Δ ; difference in percentage points) for each categorical response. We classified variables using three thresholds based on the maximum delta across categories: *pass* ($\Delta \leq 3$ pp), *review* ($3 < \Delta \leq 5$ pp), and *critical* ($\Delta > 5$ pp). We also verified whether the top-2 responses remained consistent between weighted and unweighted distributions.

Most key variables showed minimal weighting effects. Educational level and socioeconomic status all passed the robustness check with deltas under 2 pp. GenAI chatbot adoption (80.4% vs. 80.1% weighted), language technology usage and replacement behaviors were similarly robust. Usage modalities, strategies, and prior experiences with errors also showed stable patterns. Intent frequencies for using GenAI passed checks with deltas under 2.5 pp, with the sole exception of the “Learning” intent, where weighted estimates showed slightly higher weekly use ($\Delta = 3.02$ pp).

Variable	VIF	Df	VIF (Norm)
Age Group	1.178	1	1.086
Education Group	1.077	1	1.038
Gender Group	1.033	1	1.016
Geography Group	1.013	2	1.003
Income Group	1.074	1	1.036
LT Experience	1.130	1	1.063
LT Literacy	1.167	1	1.080

Table S3 Variance Inflation Factors (VIF).

Values for each predictor variable in our study, degree of freedom (Df), and normalized VIF (Norm) obtained as $VIF^{1/2 \cdot Df}$.

All substantive directions remained consistent, and only two sets of responses exhibited larger weighting effects. English language use showed a 5.06 pp delta, with weighted samples showing higher adoption (53.4% vs. 48.4%), potentially reflecting over-representation of younger respondents. Work versus personal use patterns varied by occupation, with Healthcare ($\Delta = 15.25$ pp) and Services and Hospitality ($\Delta = 5.61$ pp) flagged as *critical*, likely due to small subcategory sample sizes ($n = 74$ and $n = 35$ respectively), but while keeping the overall trends unchanged.

Overall, our main findings regarding demographic disparities, adoption patterns, and replacement behaviors remain robust to post-stratification weighting, supporting our decision to report unweighted results and retain all participant responses.

S2.2 Multi-collinearity Verification

Multi-collinearity between predictor variables may hinder the reliability of regression analyses. Across our experiments, we use seven variables divided into numerical, ordinal, and categorical: Education Group (categorical), Geography Group (categorical), Gender Group (categorical), Socioeconomic Group (ordinal), Age Group (ordinal), LT Experience (numerical), and LT Literacy (numerical).

To verify multi-collinearity, we follow a standard approach based on Variance Inflation Factors (VIF; O’Brien 2007). Specifically, we use linear regression and R^2 to estimate numerical variables and logistic-type models and McFadden’s pseudo- R^2 for categorical and ordinal ones. Table S3 reports the VIF value for each variable. The highest score is 1.178, indicating a non-problematic multicollinearity.

S2.3 Modeling

Table S5 reports the Odds Ratios and Standard Errors for GenAI chatbot usage across demographic, socioeconomic, geographic, and language technology factors, while Table S6 presents the OLS Regression coefficients of the frequency of use by GenAI chatbot users for each use intent.

Language	%	Modality	%
Italian	95.3	Mainly writing	84.6
English	51.5	Both writing and speaking	13.2
Other	5.2	Mainly speaking	2.2

Table S4 Results for language usage and interaction modality. Percentage and count of responses to the multiple-choice question “*In which language do you interact with chatbots?*” and the single-choice answers to “*Which interaction modality do you use?*”.




Fig. S3 Distribution of the number of different activities performed with GenAI chatbots across gender and age groups. Age groups on the *left*, gender groups on the *right*.

References

- McInnes L, Healy J, Astels S, et al (2017) hdbscan: Hierarchical density based clustering. J Open Source Softw 2(11):205
- McInnes L, Healy J, Melville J (2018) Umap: Uniform manifold approximation and projection for dimension reduction. arXiv preprint arXiv:180203426
- O’Brien RM (2007) A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. Quality & quantity 41(5):673–690
- Team G, Kamath A, Ferret J, et al (2025) Gemma 3 technical report. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.19786>, arXiv:2503.19786
- Zhang Y, Li M, Long D, et al (2025) Qwen3 Embedding: Advancing Text Embedding and Reranking Through Foundation Models. arXiv preprint arXiv:250605176




Fig. S4 Prior training in LT by chatbot usage status. Respondents were asked whether they had received prior training in AI-based LT technology via both formal or informal channels. Among chatbot users ($n = 1,542$), 51.2% reported no prior training, while 76.2% of non-users ($n = 373$) had no training background at all. Users showed higher rates of formal training through work/school (16.8% vs. 0%), as well as combined formal and self-training (17.6% vs. 5.2%). A small proportion in both groups reported other AI-related coursework (User: 10.1%, Non-user: 13.6%).

Variable	Odds Ratio	Standard Error	
Gender: Woman (Man)	0.501	0.071	**
Age: 35-54 (18-34)	0.437	0.098	**
Age: 55-64 (18-34)	0.370	0.085	**
Age: 65+ (18-34)	0.196	0.044	**
Geography: Centre (North)	1.077	0.205	
Geography: South&Islands (North)	0.817	0.150	
Geography: Abroad (North)	0.817	0.284	
Income: Mid (Lower)	1.322	0.239	
Income: Higher (Lower)	1.726	0.375	**
Education: Graduates (Non-graduates)	1.482	0.219	**
LT experience	1.715	0.130	**
LT literacy	20.819	7.001	**

Table S5 Odds Ratios and Standard Errors for GenAI chatbot usage across demographic, socioeconomic, geographic, and language technology factors. Reference categories are shown in parentheses, and statistically significant results are indicated with **.

	Information	Problem	Learning	Content	Leisure	Creativity
Age						
35-54	0.151** (0.074)	-0.016 (0.071)	-0.085 (0.069)	0.085 (0.070)	-0.022 (0.068)	-0.051 (0.070)
55-64	0.206** (0.086)	-0.054 (0.082)	-0.184** (0.081)	-0.190** (0.082)	-0.001 (0.080)	-0.183** (0.082)
65+	0.328*** (0.098)	-0.002 (0.095)	-0.074 (0.092)	-0.657*** (0.094)	-0.047 (0.092)	-0.270*** (0.094)
Education						
Graduates	0.070 (0.069)	-0.030 (0.066)	-0.086 (0.064)	0.248*** (0.066)	-0.112* (0.064)	-0.080 (0.065)
Gender						
Woman	-0.220*** (0.061)	-0.376*** (0.058)	-0.312*** (0.057)	-0.097* (0.058)	-0.286*** (0.056)	-0.140** (0.058)
Geography						
Abroad	-0.004 (0.126)	0.190 (0.120)	0.064 (0.118)	0.267** (0.120)	-0.095 (0.116)	0.022 (0.119)
Centre	0.101 (0.082)	0.116 (0.079)	0.036 (0.077)	0.051 (0.078)	0.127* (0.076)	0.111 (0.078)
South& Islands	-0.023 (0.082)	0.037 (0.078)	0.114 (0.077)	0.147* (0.077)	0.133* (0.076)	-0.022 (0.077)
Income						
Higher	0.221** (0.091)	0.087 (0.088)	0.273*** (0.086)	0.214** (0.087)	-0.069 (0.084)	0.197** (0.087)
Mid	0.044 (0.082)	0.032 (0.078)	0.083 (0.077)	0.034 (0.078)	-0.180** (0.075)	0.023 (0.078)
LT experience						
	0.032 (0.029)	0.073*** (0.028)	0.035 (0.027)	0.149*** (0.028)	0.045* (0.027)	0.146*** (0.028)
LT literacy						
	0.008 (0.148)	0.449*** (0.141)	0.357*** (0.138)	0.944*** (0.140)	0.340** (0.137)	0.413*** (0.140)
Intercept	1.794*** (0.146)	1.695*** (0.140)	1.940*** (0.137)	0.853*** (0.139)	0.718*** (0.134)	0.923*** (0.138)
Observations	1407	1385	1401	1388	1350	1385
R^2	0.034	0.057	0.048	0.164	0.045	0.059
Adjusted R^2	0.026	0.049	0.040	0.157	0.036	0.051

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table S6 OLS Regression coefficients of the frequency of use of GenAI chatbots. We run six OLS models, one per intent (columns). Standard Errors are reported between parentheses.

	Information	Problem	Learning	Content	Leisure	Creativity
Age						
35-54	1.327** (.17)	1.024 (.129)	.901 (.115)	1.211 (.158)	.911 (.119)	.953 (.114)
55-64	1.461** (.216)	.946 (.135)	.76* (.113)	.738** (.108)	.906 (.147)	.738** (.107)
65+	1.716*** (.281)	1.035 (.176)	.908 (.154)	.345*** (.058)	.866 (.164)	.633*** (.106)
Education						
Graduates	1.103 (.131)	.946 (.11)	.846 (.102)	1.501*** (.185)	.849 (.109)	.872 (.102)
Gender						
Woman	.679*** (.072)	.507*** (.053)	.583*** (.061)	.883 (.094)	.541*** (.062)	.809*** (.081)
Geography						
Abroad	.991 (.207)	1.45* (.322)	1.046 (.194)	1.665*** (.43)	.825 (.184)	1.017 (.217)
Centre	1.216 (.174)	1.253 (.185)	1.077 (.157)	1.096 (.157)	1.329** (.191)	1.2 (.173)
South& Islands	.992 (.149)	1.084 (.151)	1.311* (.197)	1.229 (.172)	1.281 (.196)	.96 (.125)
Income						
Higher	1.453** (.232)	1.184 (.184)	1.619*** (.265)	1.457** (.231)	.837 (.138)	1.402** (.22)
Mid	1.056 (.149)	1.062 (.145)	1.12 (.161)	1.023 (.147)	.718** (.104)	1.043 (.144)
LT experience	1.094* (.054)	1.184*** (.058)	1.104** (.054)	1.348*** (.068)	1.174*** (.06)	1.33*** (.066)
LT literacy	1.083 (.293)	2.145*** (.592)	1.826** (.487)	5.435*** (1.396)	1.797** (.486)	1.986*** (.527)
Observations	1407	1385	1401	1388	1350	1385
Pseudo R^2	.015	.026	.02	.068	.024	.024

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table S7 Odds Ratio for the frequency of use of GenAI chatbots. Results from 6 different ordinal regression models, one per intent (columns). Standard Errors are reported between parentheses.

	Dependent Variable: Chatbot User (Binary)				
	(1) Baseline	(2) +SocioDemo	(3) +Edu	(4) +LT Exp	(5) +LT Lit
Woman	-0.771*** (0.122)	-0.835*** (0.133)	-0.863*** (0.133)	-0.790*** (0.137)	-0.690*** (0.142)
Marginal Effect	-0.117	-0.114	-0.117	-0.101	-0.083
Pseudo R^2	0.023	0.116	0.124	0.169	0.218
N	1,883	1,833	1,833	1,833	1,833

Table S8 Sequential Decomposition: Gender Gap in GenAI Chatbot Adoption. Logistic regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Reference category: Man. Controls progressively added: (2) Sociodemographics: Age, Geography, Socioeconomic Status; (3) Education level (graduate vs non-graduate); (4) Language technology experience; (5) Language Technology literacy. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

	(1) Baseline	(2) +Demo	(3) +Edu	(4) +LT Exp	(5) +LT Lit
<i>Information Retrieval</i>					
Female	-0.271*** (0.059)	-0.223*** (0.060)	-0.226*** (0.060)	-0.220*** (0.060)	-0.220*** (0.061)
AME	-0.271*** (0.059)	-0.223*** (0.060)	-0.226*** (0.060)	-0.220*** (0.060)	-0.220*** (0.061)
R^2	0.015	0.033	0.033	0.034	0.034
N	1,446	1,407	1,407	1,407	1,407
<i>Problem Solving</i>					
Female	-0.419*** (0.056)	-0.415*** (0.058)	-0.414*** (0.058)	-0.397*** (0.058)	-0.376*** (0.058)
AME	-0.419*** (0.056)	-0.415*** (0.058)	-0.414*** (0.058)	-0.397*** (0.058)	-0.376*** (0.058)
R^2	0.037	0.042	0.042	0.050	0.057
N	1,424	1,385	1,385	1,385	1,385
<i>Learning</i>					
Female	-0.328*** (0.055)	-0.342*** (0.056)	-0.338*** (0.056)	-0.329*** (0.057)	-0.312*** (0.057)
AME	-0.328*** (0.055)	-0.342*** (0.056)	-0.338*** (0.056)	-0.329*** (0.057)	-0.312*** (0.057)
R^2	0.024	0.040	0.041	0.044	0.048
N	1,440	1,401	1,401	1,401	1,401
<i>Content Creation</i>					
Female	-0.136** (0.060)	-0.164*** (0.059)	-0.179*** (0.059)	-0.144** (0.058)	-0.097* (0.058)
AME	-0.136** (0.060)	-0.164*** (0.059)	-0.179*** (0.059)	-0.144** (0.058)	-0.097* (0.058)
R^2	0.004	0.097	0.108	0.137	0.164
N	1,426	1,388	1,388	1,388	1,388
<i>Leisure</i>					
Female	-0.333*** (0.054)	-0.319*** (0.056)	-0.314*** (0.056)	-0.303*** (0.056)	-0.286*** (0.056)
AME	-0.333*** (0.054)	-0.319*** (0.056)	-0.314*** (0.056)	-0.303*** (0.056)	-0.286*** (0.056)
R^2	0.026	0.035	0.037	0.040	0.045
N	1,388	1,350	1,350	1,350	1,350
<i>Creativity</i>					
Female	-0.194*** (0.057)	-0.194*** (0.058)	-0.191*** (0.058)	-0.161*** (0.057)	-0.140** (0.058)
AME	-0.194*** (0.057)	-0.194*** (0.058)	-0.191*** (0.058)	-0.161*** (0.057)	-0.140** (0.058)
R^2	0.008	0.028	0.029	0.053	0.059
N	1,423	1,385	1,385	1,385	1,385

Table S9 Sequential Decomposition by Intent Type: Gender Gap in GenAI Chatbot Frequency of Usage. OLS regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. AME: Average Marginal Effect of being a Woman on usage frequency. Each panel shows the sequential decomposition for one intent type. Reference category: Man. Controls progressively added across columns. (2) Demo = Demographics (Age, Geography, Socioeconomic); (3) Edu = Education level (graduate vs non-graduate); (4) Language technology experience; (5) Language Technology literacy. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$