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**AI Is Not Just a Technology—It's About Confidence**

When people evaluate AI, the conversation often centers around its technical performance or capabilities. But in my view, the more critical question is: “Can I handle this?”That is, AI evaluation often begins not with the technology itself, but with the user's sense of self-efficacy.

Studies show that social status factors like income and education influence people’s AI self-efficacy, which in turn positively affects their perceived usefulnessand ease of use—core predictors of AI adoption. Interestingly, variables like age or gender weren’t significant predictors. What this suggests is that people don’t just judge the AI—they assess their own relationship to it.

To me, AI self-efficacy isn’t simply about “tech-savviness.” It’s more about whether someone feels in control of the technologyand whether they believe it will serve rather than threaten them. In this sense, people’s evaluations of AI rely less on its features than on their own confidence and emotional safetyin using it.

**Psychological Distance and Emotional Alignment Shape AI Judgments**

One study that broke down AI self-efficacy into more detailed factors revealed that it goes beyond just technical skills—it also includes emotional and interactional dimensions. For example: Do I feel comfortable with AI? Do I find anthropomorphized AI interactions awkward or natural? Can I navigate AI assistance confidently?

These questions aren’t about function—they’re about whether the AI feels like an ally.AI evaluation, then, isn’t just about functional metrics; it’s deeply tied to psychological distanceand emotional alignmentbetween user and system.

Personally, I believe the most important determinant of AI acceptance is whether users can experience the technology not as a cold tool, but as a collaborative presence.And collaboration isn’t just about performance—it’s about trust, clarity, and emotional resonance. As the research confirms, users who feel emotionally comfortable with AI are more likely to engage in motivated learning behaviors.

Ultimately, people don’t judge AI based only on what it can do. They judge it based on how it makes them feel—like a controllable tool, a trustworthy partner, or a looming threat.That emotional distance is not peripheral; it’s central to how AI is evaluated.

**Sometimes Distrust in Humans Makes AI Seem More Trustworthy**

We often assume that humans are more trustworthy than AI, but in some cases, the opposite is true. People who have low trust in human systemsmay actually perceive AI decisions as more objective, fair, or acceptable—not because they fully trust AI, but because they distrust humans more.

A study in the healthcare domain highlighted this point. Individuals with high distrust in human judgment tended to rate AI and human decisions similarly—or even favored AIin certain cases. This doesn’t necessarily reflect strong confidence in AI, but rather a relative preference, based on their skepticism toward human bias or inconsistency.

Even then, it’s not that these individuals blindly trust AI. Interviews revealed that they still had concerns about algorithmic bias and lack of transparency.However, they believed that AI might at least be less intentionally discriminatory, or more easily auditable through data-based accountability.

This leads to an important realization: AI evaluation is not only about the technology—it also reflects people’s broader social experiences.Trust in AI is often shaped by distrust in institutions, systems, or past human interactions.It’s not just technical evaluation—it’s a sociocultural judgment.

**Evaluating AI Is About the Relationship Between Self, Society, and Technology**

In the end, evaluating AI is not simply about performance or accuracy. It’s about the relationship people form with technology—and what that technology means for their identity, autonomy, and role in society. High-performing features matter, but they’re not enough. What really shapes how AI is judged is how people interpret its presence in their lives.

I now see AI evaluation not as a technical review, but as a social and emotional negotiation.People don’t just ask: “Does this work?” They ask:

“What does this technology say about my place in the world?”

“Is this AI trying to help me—or replace me?”

“Will this system treat me fairly, or reinforce existing inequalities?”

The answers to these questions determine how people perceive AI—and whether they ultimately choose to adopt or reject it. And these answers are rarely just about the technology itself. They are shaped by broader social, psychological, and emotional experiences.

When we think about the future of AI, it’s not enough to build better systems. We also need to understand how people come to trust, resist, or reshape those systems.Because in the end, we don’t just evaluate AI—we decide how (and whether) we want to live with it.