

Report of the EGH subgroup on measuring artificial intelligence (AI) through household surveys

August 2026

Summary of recommendations

Building on the conceptual foundations agreed in 2025, the subgroup worked in 2026 to translate its priority themes into concrete question proposals. The following draft recommendations emerged from five virtual meetings, supported by cognitive and feasibility testing shared by members. They are intended to remain flexible and subject to further testing given the rapid evolution in the use of AI as well as the practical challenges of measuring its use through household surveys.

- Consistent steps have been taken towards a fundamental conceptual framework for measuring AI through household surveys. Household surveys measure the **conscious use of AI**. This refers to instances where respondents knowingly use AI tools or systems for a specific purpose.
- Concrete examples should be included in the question on **AI awareness** so users who recognise AI only through specific activities are included. This is particularly important if the question is used to exempt respondents who are unaware of AI from further AI-related questions in a survey. Questions should be framed as whether the respondent has “heard of” AI. Placement of an awareness question and its use as a filter within a household survey module on AI use will depend on country and survey context.
- Inclusion of a **general AI use** question should be decided through further testing. Evidence suggests that asking about specific activities may produce higher reported use than a single general question, but the explanation for this discrepancy is not yet clear.
- **AI activities** should be organised around five broad, internationally comparable categories: writing/editing/summarising text; seeking information or practical guidance; creating, editing or analysing media; data analysis or coding; social and personal interaction. An additional category for ‘Other’ should also be included in early rounds of surveys on AI use. Where survey space is available more specific questions on activities within each category could be included.
- **Purpose of AI use** questions should prioritise a work / education / personal split, with education specified as formal schooling, allowing for more detailed personal sub-purposes where space permits.
- Where **frequency or intensity of AI use** is measured, response options should be expressed as the approximate number of times a person has used AI over a given period (e.g., several times a day, about once a month, etc). The added value of measuring

frequency of use relative to other indicators should be weighed against the constraints of limited space in the survey questionnaire.

- Questions on purpose of AI use and frequency or intensity of AI use asked per activity are generally not feasible in standard household surveys, owing to respondent burden but may be appropriate in specialised studies.
- Countries and other stakeholders should continue cognitive and feasibility testing of AI-related questions, with particular attention to relevance across income levels and socio-economic groups and new developments in the adoption of AI.
- **Renew the subgroup on measuring AI in household surveys for 2027 to make recommendations on indicators for inclusion in the core list of ICT household indicators. Continue the conversation on methodology and conceptual framework and the revision of standard ICT household indicators that might need to be revised as the adoption of AI continues, such as activities, skills and cybersecurity.**

Introduction

AI technologies are spreading rapidly in everyday life, increasing the need for official statistics on how people use them. Although alternative methods exist to measure this diffusion, household surveys remain vital. They can provide nationally representative and internationally comparable data across socio-demographic groups where many alternatives cannot. However, such data remains scarce. The rapid demand of information that NSOs and data producers are confronted with put forward the need for a set of readily and evidence-based recommendations for members to start measuring AI use through household surveys. Some members states that have already done so, have generously share their experiences and lessons learned, others are currently for the first time measuring IA use through household surveys.

In 2024, the ITU Expert Group on ICT Household Indicators (EGH) established a subgroup to explore how AI use could be measured through household surveys. The subgroup was active in 2025 and recommended a conceptual definition of AI, a focus on conscious use, and a set of priority themes for measurement. Recognising that further work was needed to move from concepts to concrete questions, the EGH renewed the subgroup for 2026.

This report summarises the subgroup's deliberations and draft recommendations from its 2026 cycle of work. It builds directly on the 2025 report and draws on national experiences, cognitive testing, and feasibility testing shared by members. From February to June 2026, the subgroup worked through a series of virtual meetings, member presentations, and collaborative drafting.

Objectives

Following up on the previous year's work, the subgroup set out to:

- Focus on the priority AI use topics identified in the 2025 final report;
- Propose question sets for further study;
- Assess the feasibility of integrating AI indicators into the core set of ICT household indicators; and

- Prepare proposals and recommendations for EGH consideration.

Methods of work

The work was organised during the 2026 cycle as follows:

- Five virtual meetings were convened between February and June 2026.
- Members from national statistical offices (NSOs), international organisations, and other bodies presented national experiences, cognitive testing, and feasibility testing (see Annex).
- Feedback was gathered through the subgroup's MS Teams channel and a collaborative document on candidate AI activities and purposes of use, with multilingual input accepted.
- Members were encouraged to consult regulators, policymakers, and researchers to ensure that proposed indicators reflect user needs.
- The subgroup reviewed a synthesis of task and activity lists drawn from researcher interest, evidence on actual AI use, and existing approaches of NSOs and international organisations.

Discussion

Building on 2025 recommendations

In 2025, the subgroup agreed on a common conceptual definition of AI for use in household survey design¹, drawn from international and national sources:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to technologies that imitate logical reasoning, learning, planning and creativity. AI enables technical systems to perceive their environment, deal with the perceived information and solve problems to achieve a certain goal.

It also recommended focusing on conscious use of AI and prioritising the following measurement themes: use of AI, awareness of AI, frequency of use, domain of use, and use of AI by activity. The 2026 discussions reaffirmed the focus on conscious use and concentrated on turning these themes into concrete, testable questions.

There are known drawbacks of the conscious use approach. As AI is increasingly integrated into everyday applications, two individuals could perform that same task using the same application with only one of them aware that they were using AI. This is comparable to the

¹ The subgroup agreed that while the definition should be shared with questionnaire designers for context and enumerators for training (where possible), survey instruments themselves should avoid using this definition to avoid possibly confusing non-technical respondents.

limitation in the understanding of Internet use by survey respondent as some use applications without the awareness that they are using the Internet. Such challenges are inherent to household survey questions on technology.

More information on these topics can be found in the [2025 report of the subgroup](#) to EGH.

Awareness of AI

Understanding levels of awareness of AI is especially important in low Internet use and lower-income contexts, where familiarity with AI cannot be assumed. To avoid undercounting individuals, concrete examples tailored to the local context should be included in questions. Cognitive testing has shown that asking respondents if they have “heard of” AI is preferable to asking whether they “know” what AI is.

The placement of the question relates to two considerations on filtering. First, whether awareness itself should serve as a filter. The benefits include an avoidance of acquiescence bias², particularly among lower-income or lower-education populations. However, there is a considerable risk of excluding respondents who would recognise their AI use only when prompted with examples.

Statistics Canada conducted cognitive testing using a question which combined awareness and knowledge of AI tools, with only respondents that had heard of AI receiving subsequent questions. Ultimately, this question was removed as a filter due to the observation that reported knowledge and use did not seem to be consistently correlated (see Annex D: Cognitive feasibility testing for the Canadian Survey on Digital Life for more information). In comparison, Statistics Slovenia has used a separate question on awareness to only route aware respondents to a question on reasons for non-use.

Second, whether AI-use questions should be filtered on earlier Internet-use questions. Internet use is, in nearly all cases³, a precondition for AI use. Filtering on Internet use can serve a similar purpose to an awareness filter, reducing false positives later in the module. However, some respondents may not recognise this link as they may know they use AI without realising it relies on the Internet.

These issues ultimately raise the same underlying question: how well do respondents understand these concepts? More research is needed before generalised recommendations can be made on either of these design choices. Research should be weighed against the clear value of well-designed filters. Countries with high Internet use, such as Canada, are already filtering on Internet use ahead of AI questions. In other contexts, it might be better to keep the respondent base broad until further testing is done.

Recommendations:

² Refers to respondents' tendency to agree with or give a positive response to survey questions, regardless of their actual views or experiences. See [OECD Guidelines on Measuring Subjective Well-being](#), Table 2.1.

³ While these may remain edge cases in most contexts, some businesses are already implementing AI into their Interactive Voice Response (IVR) systems.

- Include a question framed around whether the respondent has “heard of” AI.
- This question on awareness of AI should include concrete examples so that users who recognise AI only through specific activities are properly counted. This is particularly important if the question is used for screening.
- NSOs and other survey practitioners should consider testing respondent understanding of (i) AI awareness and (ii) the relationship between AI use and Internet use, before applying either an Internet-use filter or filtering on an awareness question ahead of AI-use questions.

Overall use of AI

A general question on an individual’s use of AI offers a single, comparable headline indicator and is already used by many countries and organizations. Keeping this indicator broad and consistent allows for a time series tracking the rate of adoption of AI in the general population. This is an important data point to help understand AI’s impact. But as the nature of AI use changes, the relevance of such an indicator should continue to be evaluated. AI is increasingly integrated into common applications and existing online activities such as Internet search. With this integration, there is a risk that AI use will converge to Internet use making the indicators less useful for policymaking.

Like the question on awareness of AI, a general use question also has the benefit of routing confirmed non-users away from the full activity list. However, evidence from CETIC.br (Brazil) demonstrates how sensitive responses can be to question wording (see Annex E: Measuring AI use in Brazil). In 2025, CETIC.br surveyed 10-17-year-olds on AI use in two separate surveys. One asked a general yes/no question on AI use, while the other skipped this question and asked directly about specific AI activities. When positive responses to the specific-activity questions were combined into a comparable “overall AI use” indicator, reported use was substantially higher than the result from the general yes/no question.

Two explanations are possible for this discrepancy. Respondents who answer “no” to a general question may later recall their use once prompted with specific activities – becoming aware of use, particularly in cases where longer reference periods make it harder for respondents to recall accurately. Alternatively, respondents asked about activities without a general filter may feel pressured to respond affirmatively, again introducing acquiescence bias. More data and cognitive testing are needed to understand these dynamics and the outcome may vary by country context.

Recommendations:

- The inclusion of a general AI use screener remains an open question to be resolved through further testing, weighing comparability with existing surveys against the risk of distorting reported use.

- NSOs and other survey practitioners should continue to assess the usefulness of a single question on AI use as individual behaviour and technologies evolve, in consultation with policymakers and researchers.

Tasks and activities

The subgroup reviewed and refined a proposed list of AI-related tasks and activities. As new applications of AI continue to emerge such a list must be sufficiently forward-looking to maintain relevance. To address this the subgroup considered different sources where AI activities are categorized.

A 2025 [National Bureau of Economic Research white paper](#) modified a classifier used by research teams at OpenAI which identified what users are requesting from ChatGPT. These categories can be seen as representative of how AI (ChatGPT specifically) is being used today. The interest of researchers and policymakers is another important signal on how to classify AI activities. Representative of this perspective was a [March 2026 poll](#) conducted by Epoch AI, a research firm specializing in analysis of AI progress and impact as well as discussion from a workshop held by the OECD in May 2026. Lastly, the perspective of NSOs was also considered through existing questions on AI activities from Statistics Slovenia among others (see Annex B: Cognitive testing of AI questions in Slovenia for more information). These sources converge on the five broad categories shown in Table 1 which are comprised of sub-activities that could be used in more detailed surveys.

Table 1. Recommended classification of AI activities for use in household surveys⁴

Activity	Sub-activities
Writing, editing or summarising text	Draft or edit text Summarise or analyse text Translate text
Seeking information or practical guidance	Answer questions or explain topics Compare products/services; get recommendations Get practical guidance to solve a problem Generate ideas or outlines of projects
Creating, editing or analysing media	Create, edit or analyse images Create, edit or analyse video Create, edit or analyse music / audio
Data analysis or coding	Write, debug or explain code Analyse data, create charts or forecasts
Social and personal interaction	Greetings and informal conversation Companionship and emotional support

⁴ The specific analytical delimitation and list of activities within these five broad categories is an ongoing theme of discussion as new ways of using AI and the population's comprehension and even verbal delimitation is changing rapidly as this technology continues to develop and there are unforeseeable modes of adoption.

Activity	Sub-activities
	Games and role play
Other	Defined by respondents

Note: The “other” category should be added in early survey rounds to capture uses not yet listed.

This structure allows countries to use broad categories for comparability while retaining the option of more detailed analysis through sub-categories. It also provides further insight that may be missed in a general question on AI where it is increasingly difficult to distinguish information found through chatbots from information found through search engines.

Depending on policy needs, countries may also embed domain-specific elements within a category (for example, seeking information on health and wellness), and an “other” category could be used in initial data collections to capture missing uses. When the “other” category is included, it should be followed by an open-ended question asking respondents to specify the activity they performed. This provides valuable information on whether the question should be supplemented with additional response categories or activities.

Recommendations:

- Organise AI activities around the five broad categories above to support international comparability and include an “other” category in early survey rounds to capture any missing areas;
- Ask more detailed questions on activities within these categories where survey space is available.

Purpose of use

The subgroup weighed a simple work / education / personal split against a more detailed breakdown of personal uses. More detailed categories can help respondents recall specific uses but increase survey length. Work and education were seen as the most essential categories, with a need to specify that “education” refers to formal schooling.

Participants noted that a flexible approach may be warranted, as some purposes such as health and travel can overlap personal and work use. Spillover effects on economic activity, such as personalised travel bookings that benefit small businesses, further underline the value of capturing purpose with some nuance.

Recommendations:

- Prioritise a work / education / personal split, specifying that education refers to formal schooling;
- Allow more detailed personal sub-purposes where survey space permits, recognising that some purposes span personal and work use.

Frequency and intensity of use

The subgroup also examined the value of measuring frequency and intensity. Participants observed that frequency questions for Internet use no longer provide much meaningful variation, as most users report daily use, and questioned whether the same would soon hold for AI. Others noted that respondent recall could be limited on the exact number of uses of AI. Contrary to this view, cognitive testing by Gallup⁵ indicated meaningful behavioural differences between “multiple times a day” and “once a day”. In addition, in cognitive testing in Slovenia, some respondents felt that a frequency question was missing and should be added.

Where frequency is measured, participants generally agreed that response options expressed as the approximate number of times a respondent has used AI over a given period (several times a day, about once a month, etc) are preferable to vague terms such as “a lot” or “a little”, as they are more direct. Some participants suggested that measures of reliance on AI, or the range of activities performed, may be more informative than frequency alone.

Recommendations:

- Where frequency is measured, use numeric response options and consider distinguishing “multiple times a day” from “about once a day”;
- Weigh the added value of frequency against alternative indicators of reliance or breadth of use, and against limited survey space.

Other topics

The subgroup also discussed the trade-off between granular insight and respondent burden. Asking about purpose of use and frequency or intensity of use for each activity could provide valuable detail but would substantially increase response burden. This combination of activities multiplied by purpose and frequency questions is not currently used by any country. While such detailed, per-activity questions are generally not feasible in standard household surveys, they may be appropriate in specialised studies.

Cross-cutting challenges were also noted. For new technology such as AI, countries and researchers should be aware that results may differ depending on whether questions are administered in an ICT-specific survey or as a module within a general-purpose survey.

Recommendation:

- While per-activity purpose of use and frequency of use questions are likely to be infeasible in standard household surveys, such detail could be collected for specialised studies.

⁵ <https://news.gallup.com/opinion/methodology/711806/gallup-developed-global-survey-questions.aspx>

Future work

Current recommendations are flexible and subject to further testing, given the rapid evolution of AI and the challenges of measuring its use through household surveys. If renewed, next year's subgroup should focus on refining indicators on the use of AI for inclusion in the core list of ICT household indicators.

Members of EGH are encouraged to:

- Continue cognitive and feasibility testing of AI-related questions and share results, with attention to comprehension, survey mode, and relevance across socio-economic groups. Future testing could also investigate questions on reasons for not using AI and/or barriers to AI use;
- Continue coordination with other international organisations (e.g. OECD, Eurostat, UNSD) to ensure alignment and avoid duplication;
- Promote engagement with policymakers and regulators to ensure that AI indicators align with emerging data needs;
- Renew the subgroup in 2027 with the objective of recommending indicators on AI use for adoption into the core set of ICT household indicators.

Annex A: Presentations given to the subgroup

The following presentations were important inputs to the subgroup's discussions and recommendations. Short summaries provided by presenters are appended where available.

Meeting	Presenter	Topic
10 Mar 2026	Fabio Storino, CETIC.br (Brazil)	AI questions in Brazil's ICT Households (aged 10+) and ICT Kids Online (aged 9-17) surveys, including differences in reported AI use between the two instruments. See Annex E: Measuring AI use in Brazil for more detail
10 Mar 2026	Charles Lau, Gallup	Cognitive testing of AI questions in Colombia, India, South Africa and the UK, covering operational definitions, translation, examples, frequency, trust and perceived future impacts. See Gallup website for more detail
10 Mar 2026	DANE (Colombia)	Shared presentation on Colombia's experience with AI questions in its most recent survey. See Annex C: Colombia experience for more detail.
14 Apr 2026	Howard Bilodeau, Statistics Canada	Feasibility testing with 30 respondents ahead of the Canadian Survey on Digital Life (planned November 2026), including questionnaire-design

Meeting	Presenter	Topic
14 Apr 2026	Tilen Mlakar, Statistics Slovenia	and category-definition challenges and findings on attitudinal questions. See Annex D: Cognitive feasibility testing for the Canadian Survey on Digital Life for more detail Cognitive testing with 11 participants on AI questions in the upcoming ICT household survey (following the Eurostat model questionnaire), covering four generative AI activities, an awareness filter, and a requested frequency question. See Annex B: Cognitive testing of AI questions in Slovenia for more detail.
12 May 2026	Nathan Menton, ITU	Synthesis of candidate AI topics for recommendations – awareness, overall use, tasks/activities, purpose, and frequency/intensity – based on prior meetings and presentations.

Annex B: Cognitive testing of AI questions in Slovenia

The Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia (SURS) included questions on the use of artificial intelligence in its yearly survey on the Usage of Information-communication technologies in households and by individuals in 2026. The data collection began in April, and the sample included 5,000 individuals aged 16–89.

As part of the preparation, cognitive testing of the questionnaire was carried out in February 2026 with 11 participants (30- to 70-year-old). This is a standard procedure when new questions are introduced. Eight external participants and three new SURS employees participated in the testing over Microsoft Teams or Zoom Meetings.

Respondents first completed the questionnaire independently using a *think-aloud* approach, after which interviewers and respondents reviewed the questions together to identify potential misunderstandings or ambiguities. The cognitive testing was carried out by the methodologist for cognitive testing and the methodologist in charge of the survey.

The questionnaire for the survey itself is based on Eurostat’s 2026 model questionnaire, ensuring full comparability of data across EU Member States. The Eurostat model questionnaire for 2026 includes a question whether individuals have used **generative AI tools**—such as ChatGPT, Copilot, Gemini, LLaMA, Midjourney, Claude, or DeepSeek—to create content (text, images, code, videos) in the last three months.

Expansion of the Generative AI Question

SURS decided to expand the Eurostat question to better capture the data on the extent of usage. Therefore, SURS included questions about the activities individuals performed with generative AI tools. This approach mirrors the long-standing methodology used for measuring Internet usage where the emphasis is not only whether individuals use the Internet, but for what purposes are they using it - what are they doing online. Given the rapid development of AI technologies and the diversity of user needs, a similar multi-activity approach was deemed necessary.

The expanded activity list (Question A8) included:

- Searching for general information (e.g., via ChatGPT or Copilot)
- Creating, summarizing, or translating text
- Creating images or videos
- Programming or assistance with writing code
- Other activities (open question)
- None of the above

There were no major issues detected during testing. Respondents mentioned several examples for “other activities” carried out during cognitive testing, such as health-related tasks (training and nutrition), creating or editing documents, brainstorming, and help with cooking recipes.

Respondents also noted that AI-generated text appearing automatically in search engines (e.g., Google, Bing) was considered part of their AI usage.

Purpose of Using Generative AI (A9)

SURS also included a question on purpose of generative AI usage. Respondents could select multiple purposes:

- Private use
- Work-related use
- Formal education (secondary school, post-secondary, college, university)

One of the test respondents was a teacher who used AI to prepare materials for students. The question was raised whether this should be classified as *work* or *formal education*, or both. This may be an indication that some respondents may perceive some questions as overlapping, e.g. between professional (work-related) and educational contexts.

Reasons for Not Using Generative AI (A10-A11)

Respondents who had heard of generative AI but had not used it in the last three months were asked reasons for not using it. They could choose among:

- Not knowing how to use the tools

- Concerns about data security, privacy, or safety
- No need to use AI
- Ethical concerns (e.g., stereotypes, liability, content theft, inequality)
- Other reasons

Cognitive testing revealed no major issues with this section.

Overall awareness about General AI Technologies (A12)

For respondents who had neither used generative AI nor heard of it, the questionnaire included a broader question on awareness of general AI technologies, with examples such as:

- AI tools (ChatGPT, Copilot)
- Image or object recognition (e.g., manufacturing, healthcare, phone unlocking)
- Automatic search result summaries (Google, Bing)
- Virtual assistants (Alexa, Siri, Cortana)
- Customer-service chatbots
- Text translators (Google Translate)
- Self-driving vehicles (Tesla)
- Smart energy management systems

Again, no issues were detected during cognitive testing.

Additional Observations from Cognitive Testing

Respondents were mostly familiar with ChatGPT, which dominated their examples of AI usage. Higher exposure to generative AI in everyday life appeared to correlate with fewer comprehension issues. Overall, no major problems were identified in understanding the questions across the questionnaire.

In general, SURS concluded that there were no major issues with understanding the questions and they remained largely unchanged.

Annex C: Colombia experience

In 2024, Colombia's National Administrative Department of Statistics (DANE) conducted a specialized survey on ICT access and use by households and individuals called ENTIC Hogares. Among the topics covered in ENTIC Hogares were questions about AI use among individuals aged 5 and older who had previously reported using the Internet, in order to ensure the consistency of the responses received.

The questions about AI measured several aspects: a) whether a person uses AI tools, b) what types of activities the person performs with AI, c) the main reason the person was motivated to use AI, and d) for those who did not use AI, the main reason for not using it.

Among the main results obtained, it was found that, in 2024, 14.3% of the total target population of the survey (individuals aged 5 and older in Colombia) used AI tools. Of those who used AI tools, 90.4% did so to communicate and ask questions, 80.7% to perform basic academic, professional, or work-related tasks, 43.9% to generate images, audio, or video, and 14.9% to develop software or applications. Similarly, the main reason people used AI tools was to save time (49.5%), followed by reducing errors (23.8%) and supporting decision-making (17.5%). In contrast, for those who reported not using AI tools, the main reason given was not knowing what AI is (46.5%), followed by not considering it necessary for their professional, academic, or work activities (32.0%), and not knowing how to use AI tools (16.2%).

Based on the Colombian experience in measuring AI use, it is important to establish a clear and simple definition of AI to facilitate understanding of the topic, especially in developing countries where people do not have a high level of ICT knowledge. Similarly, it is recommended to use filter questions to define the target population for AI-related questions and avoid the risk of data inconsistencies (e.g., people who report using AI without having reported using the internet). Finally, it is also recommended to ask specific questions about AI not only for people who have used it, but also to those who have not (i.e, measure why not use), so that the results can be as input for defining future public policies for improving the use of ICTs.

Annex D: Cognitive feasibility testing for the Canadian Survey on Digital Life

Overview

The Canadian Survey on Digital Life (CSDL) is a new Statistics Canada questionnaire that will collect information on the use of digital technologies by Canadians aged 15 and over. The content of the CSDL builds upon the discontinued Canadian Internet Use Survey, but with a greater focus on the use and impacts of AI. The survey also includes other topics related to technology use such as: Internet use, e-commerce activities, digital skills and well-being, and online incidents. The first iteration of the CSDL will be collected starting in November 2026 with an anticipated release of data in September 2027.

Two rounds of cognitive feasibility testing were conducted during the CSDL's development. Statistics Canada employs a team of specialists in questionnaire design that are responsible for conducting this testing for any new or significantly modified questionnaire. This process ensures that the questionnaire is easy for respondents to comprehend, that they understand concepts and that they can respond appropriately to each question.

The first set of 30 interviews in February 2026 used a Word document version of the questionnaire, while the second smaller set (14 interviews in June 2026) tested updated questions using Statistics Canada's online questionnaire tool. Interviews were conducted in English and French, and participants were asked to share their thoughts regarding their interpretation of each question aloud as they read the questionnaire.

AI indicators

The CSDL has two AI-related modules:

1. *Generative AI (GenAI)*⁶: knowledge and trust, use and frequency of use, types of activities and information requested, benefits, costs, and reasons for not using.
2. *AI in general*: concerns, trust by sector, AI use at work, and learning activities.

Combined results from both rounds of feasibility testing

In the subsections that follow, areas for improvement of the questionnaire identified during feasibility testing are described. Indicators that are not mentioned tested well and will be included in the final questionnaire.

GenAI

- Originally, the question about knowledge of GenAI asked about people's understanding of "how GenAI tools work" and those who reported never having heard of GenAI would skip other GenAI questions. Many participants were unsure whether the question was asking about how GenAI functions on a technical level or just how to use it. Even those who reported understanding GenAI well did not always report using it for many purposes later in the survey, calling into question whether this question was measuring the correct concept or was an appropriate filter. Given these results, two changes were made:
 1. The question order and filtering were flipped, with GenAI use now being asked before knowledge, and only those who use GenAI being asked about knowledge.

⁶ GenAI is defined as tools that answer questions, provide information or advice and create new content (including text, images, programming code, videos or other data) based on user prompting such as asking questions or providing instructions. This definition was designed to align with definitions used by Eurostat and the OECD.

2. The knowledge question was refocused on understanding of “how GenAI generates responses or content” and the category for being unaware of GenAI was removed.
- A few participants mentioned that they used GenAI to ask questions about pictures but were unsure if they should report this as part of the category on using GenAI to “create, modify or edit media.” It was concluded that this activity should be included as an example in the category of “asking GenAI for other information or advice.”
 - Using GenAI for “companionship or romantic partnership” was too strong of a description for some people, so an additional category “for conversation or casual interaction” was added to the question on how GenAI is used.

AI in general

- Most participants were unfamiliar with types of AI other than GenAI (e.g., agentic AI, machine learning), even when examples were provided. This lack of knowledge could result in false positives regarding use of other types of AI. Therefore, it is recommended to limit or exclude questions about other types of AI at this time.
- Initially, the question on concerns about AI allowed multiple selections. Many participants indicated some level of concern about most categories (e.g., job impacts, environmental impacts). To ensure relevant data, a follow-up question was added asking what their main concern was among the responses they previously selected.
- In the question on trust in AI use by particular sectors, participants found it difficult to separate their trust in those sectors in general from their trust in AI use by those sectors. They also noted that their level of trust would depend on how AI tools were specifically being used (e.g., scheduling vs diagnosis in health care). Finally, participants noted that it was difficult to evaluate trust without also considering risk, since the risks of AI use could differ significantly by sector. Given that these concerns would make it difficult to interpret results from this question as it was currently constructed, it was decided to remove the question for the 2026 iteration.

Annex E: Measuring AI use in Brazil

Brazil has two standalone ICT surveys, **ICT Households** and **ICT Kids Online Brazil**, both conducted by the Regional Center for Studies on the Development of the Information Society of the Brazilian Network Information Center (Cetic.br|NIC.br). ICT Households’ target population are individuals 10+ years old, while ICT Kids Online Brazil’s are children 9 to 17 years old. In 2025, both surveys started collecting data on the use of AI, with different approaches.

Indicators on AI use

In the **ICT Households** survey, there was a filter question:

"In the last 3 months, have you used artificial intelligence tools such as ChatGPT, Copilot, Gemini, or WhatsApp's Meta AI?" (Yes/No)

The following question (purpose of use of AI) was contingent on responding "yes" to this filter question; those responding "no" branched to another question (reasons for not using AI).

In the **ICT Kids Online Brazil** survey, respondents were asked whether they used AI for each of four specific activities:

"In the last 3 months, have you used artificial intelligence platforms or tools such as ChatGPT, Copilot, Gemini, or WhatsApp's Meta AI to..."

Search for information (Yes/No)

Carry out school research or study (Yes/No)

Talk about personal problems or emotions (Yes/No)

Create content such as text, images, videos, or programming code (Yes/No)

Someone was considered an AI user if they responded "yes" to having used AI for at least one activity.

Results

Considering only the population common to both surveys (residents 10–17 years old), there was a significant gap in the AI use indicator: in the **ICT Households** survey, the average for this age group was 43.4%, while in the **ICT Kids Online Brazil** the average was 64.2%, a ~21-percentage-point gap, with non-overlapping confidence intervals (39.0–48.2 and 60.5–68.0, respectively).

Since in the **ICT Households** survey this question was a filter for a subsequent question on the purpose of AI use, the gap persisted in the indicator about AI use for schoolwork: ~38.9% in **ICT Households** vs. ~58.3% in **ICT Kids Online Brazil**, a ~19-percentage-point gap.

As both surveys share the same sample design, reference period, collection period, and fieldwork, differences in results are thought to be heavily influenced by their distinct measurement approaches.

Analysis of the differences

There might be two concurrent effects at play—the underreporting of AI use in **ICT Households** and the overreporting in **ICT Kids Online Brazil**. At this time there is no direct way of estimating the size of either.

Behavioral prompts jog more recall. Listing concrete activities reminds respondents of activities they might not label as "using AI" when asked in the abstract, so the decomposed approach tends to capture more users.

Lower cognitive burden. Asking about specific tasks might be easier to answer accurately than a single self-classification question. Occasional AI users might have to go through different activities in their head to see if they match the definition.

Use vs. conscious use. The filter question used in the **ICT Households** survey captures *conscious, self-aware* AI use, while the aggregate used in the **ICT Kids Online Brazil** survey captures *any* qualifying activity, whether or not the respondent frames it as “AI use.”

Notes on the aggregate indicator approach

The “aggregate indicator” approach from the **ICT Kids Online Brazil** survey requires the activities to be broad enough to encompass all possible uses of AI, that the list be periodically revisited and updated if needed, and/or that a “other” option be added to capture new, relevant uses of AI.

This also means that, in order to avoid overreporting, the items are framed in a way not to include similar activities that did not involve AI (e.g., “searching for information” may or may not involve AI). One way is to include examples of AI tools or platforms (e.g., ChatGPT, Copilot, Meta AI) in the question. But as AI becomes embedded in general tools, platforms, and even in the OS itself, those examples might become increasingly less relevant to measure conscious AI use.