2026-yil
9(2)-son

“FAN VA TA’LIM YANGILIKLARI”

ILMIY - METODIK

JURNALI

saen.uz

FAN VA TA'LIM YANGILIKLARI
JURNALI

2026-yil
9(2)-son

Bosh muharrir:
Shoumarov G‘ayrat Bahromovich, psixologiya fanlari doktori, akademik

Bosh muharrir o‘rinbosari:
Qodirov Umarali Do‘stqobilovich, psixologiya fanlari doktori (DSc), professor

Mas’ul kotib:
Muqimov Alisher

Texnik muharrir:
Qarshiyev Jamshid Murotaliyevich, pedagogika fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent v.b.

TAHRIR HAY’ATI:

01.00.00 – FIZIKA-MATEMATIKA FANLARI
Ayupov Shavkat Abdullayevich, fizika-matematika fanlari doktori, akademik
A’zamov Abdulla, fizika-matematika fanlari doktori, akademik
Zohidov Erkin A’zamovich, fizika-matematika fanlari doktori, professor

02.00.00 – KIMYO FANLARI
Normaxamatov Nodirali Soxobataliyevich, kimyo fanlar doktori, professor
Tojibayev Komiljon Sharobitdinovich, kimyo fanlar doktori, akademik

03.00.00 – BIOLOGIYA FANLARI
Abdurahmonov Ibrohim Yo‘lchiyevich, biologiya fanlari doktori, akademik
Sulaymonov Botirjon Abdushukurovich, biologiya fanlari doktori, akademik

04.00.00 – GEOLOGIYA-MINERALOGIYA FANLARI
Fayziyev Abdulhaq Radjabovich, geologiya-mineralogiya fanlari doktori, professor
Husanov Sultonboy To‘xtayevich, geologiya-mineralogiya fanlari doktori, professor

05.00.00 – TEXNIKA FANLARI
Allayev Qahramon Rahimovich, texnika fanlari doktori, akademik
Majidov Inom Urishevich, texnika fanlari doktori, professor
Turobjonov Sadritdin Maxamatdinovich, texnika fanlari doktori, akademik
Shaumarov Said Sanatovich, texnika fanlari doktori, professor

06.00.00 – QISHLOQ XO‘JALIGI FANLARI
Namozov Shodmon Ergashovich, qishloq xo‘jaligi fanlari doktori, akademik
Shoumarov Hikmat Bahromovich, qishloq xo‘jaligi fanlari nomzodi, professor

07.00.00 – TARIX FANLARI
Ziyo Azamat Hamid o‘g‘li, tarix fanlari doktori, akademik
Sagdullayev Anatoliy Sagdullayevich, tarix fanlari doktori, akademik
Yusupova Diloram Yunusovna, tarix fanlari doktori, akademik

08.00.00 – IQTISODIYOT FANLARI
Abdurahmonov Qalandar Xodjayevich, iqtisod fanlari doktori, akademik
Musayev Behzod Anvarovich, iqtisod fanlari nomzodi
To‘xliyev Nurislom, iqtisod fanlari doktori, akademik
G‘ulomov Saidahror Saidahmedovich, iqtisod fanlari doktori, akademik

FAN VA TA'LIM YANGILIKLARI
JURNALI
2026-yil
9(2)-son

09.00.00 – FALSAFA FANLARI
Nazarov Qiyom Normirzayevich, falsafa fanlari doktori, professor
Saifnazarov Ismoil Saifnazarovich, falsafa fanlari doktori, professor

10.00.00 – FILOLOGIYA FANLARI
Mengliyev Baxtiyor Rajabovich, filologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Sirojiddinov Shuhrat Samariddinovich, filologiya fanlari doktori, akademik
Xidirov Rajab Gulmatovich, filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent (Tojikiston)

11.00.00 – GEOGRAFIYA FANLARI
Nigmatov Asqar Nigmatullayevich, geografiya fanlari doktori, professor
Tojiyeva Zulxumor Nazarovna, geografiya fanlari doktori, professor

12.00.00 – YURIDIK FANLAR
Rustamboyev Mirzayusuf Hakimovich, yuridik fanlar doktori, professor
Saidov Akmal Xolmatovich, yuridik fanlar doktori, akademik
Xolmo'minov Jumanazar Toshtemirovich, yuridik fanlar doktori, professor
Qodirov Bobiromon Bekmurodovich, yuridik fanlar doktori, professor

13.00.00 – PEDAGOGIKA FANLARI
Djurayev Risboy Haydarovich, pedagogika fanlari doktori, akademik
Ibraimov Xolboy, pedagogika fanlari doktori, akademik
Musurmonova Oynisa, pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor
Umarov Bahrom Norboyevich, pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori, dotsent

14.00.00 – TIBBIYOT FANLARI
Akilov Xabibulla Ataullayevich, tibbiyot fanlari doktori, professor
Nazirov Feruz Gafurovich, tibbiyot fanlari doktori, akademik

15.00.00 – FARMATSEVTIKA FANLARI
Abdullabekova Viloyat Nurillabekovna, farmatsevtika fanlari doktori, professor
Tulaganov Abduqodir Abdurahmonovich, farmatsevtika fanlari doktori, professor

16.00.00 – VETERINARIYA FANLARI
Daminov Asadullo Suvonovich, veterinariya fanlari doktori, professor
Jabborov Shuhrat Abdumajidovich, veterinariya fanlari doktori, professor
G'afurov Aktam G'afurovich, veterinariya fanlari doktori, professor

17.00.00 – SAN'ATSHUNOSLIK FANLARI
Ahmedova Nigora Rahimovna, sanatshunoslik fanlari doktori, professor
Hakimov Akbar Abdullayevich, san'atshunoslik fanlari doktori, akademik

18.00.00 – ARXITEKTURA FANLARI
Nozilov Dodo Avazovich, arxitektura fanlari doktori, professor
Uralov Axtam Sindarovich, arxitektura fanlari doktori, professor

19.00.00 – PSIXOLOGIYA FANLARI
Abdusamatov Hasanboy Usmonjon o'g'li, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Barotov Sharif Ramazonovich, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Karimova Vasila Mamanosirovna, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Halimova Mashraboy Vohidovna, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Lazar Drajeta, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor (Belgrad, Serbiya)
Karpinskiy Konstantin Viktorovich, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor (Grodno, Belarussiya)
Boboyeva Sayyora Boboradjabovna, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor (Tojikiston)
Suletbayeva Ella Serikbayevna, psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent

Turaxonov Abdukarim Eshkuziyevich, psixologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori, dotsent

22.00.00 – SOTSIOLOGIYA FANLARI

Bekmurodov Mansur Bobomurodovich, sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor
Toshmuhamedova Dilorom Gafurdjanovna, sotsiologiya fanlari doktori

23.00.00 – SIYOSIY FANLAR

Avazov Komil Xolliyevich, siyosiy fanlar bo'yicha falsafa doktori, dotsent
Fayzullayev Alisher Omonullayevich, siyosiy fanlar doktori, professor
Hasanov Otabek Abdurashidovich, siyosiy fanlar doktori
Paxrutdinov Shukritdin Ilyasovich, siyosiy fanlar doktori, professor
Omonov Baxtiyor Axtamovich, siyosiy fanlar doktori, professor
Quronboyev Qahramon Qo'chqorovich, siyosiy fanlar doktori, professor

24.00.00 – ISLOMSHUNOSLIK FANLARI

Ibrohimov Ne'matulla, filologiya fanlari doktori, akademik
Islomov Zohidjon Mahmudovich, filologiya fanlari doktori, professor

FAN VA TA'LIM YANGILIKLARI
JURNALI
2026-yil
9(2)-son

UDC 378.4:004.8

Buriyeva Nilufar,
Master's Student, New Uzbekistan University

Abdujabborova Madina,
BA Student, Tashkent State University of Economics

Fayzullayev Miromon,
BA Student, University of World Economy and Diplomacy

STUDENTS' TRUST IN AI-GENERATED INFORMATION FOR ACADEMIC LEARNING

Annotation. Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has become increasingly visible in higher education, with university students using tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, DeepSeek, and Claude for information search, explanation of difficult concepts, idea generation, writing support, and other academic tasks. At the same time, the growing use of these technologies raises questions about the extent to which students trust AI-generated information and how they evaluate its reliability before using it for academic purposes. This study examines university students' trust in AI-generated information for academic learning, focusing on perceived accuracy, reliability, usefulness, and the factors that contribute to trust. A quantitative survey was conducted among 216 undergraduate students from universities in Uzbekistan during the Fall 2026 semester. Data were collected through Google Forms and included questions concerning students' demographic characteristics, previous experience with AI, frequency of AI use, level of trust, and factors influencing trust in AI-generated information. The findings indicate that students generally demonstrate a cautious approach to AI-generated information.

Keywords: generative artificial intelligence, AI-generated information, student trust, academic learning, higher education, AI literacy, information reliability.

TALABALARNING AKADEMIK TA'LIM UCHUN SUN'IY INTELLEKT TOMONIDAN YARATILGAN AXBOROTGA ISHONCHI

Annotatsiya. Generativ sun'iy intellekt (SI) oliy ta'limda tobora keng qo'llanilayotgan texnologiyalardan biriga aylanmoqda. Bugungi kunda universitet talabalari ChatGPT, Gemini, DeepSeek va Claude kabi vositalardan axborot izlash, murakkab mavzularni tushunish, g'oyalar ishlab chiqish, matn tayyorlash va boshqa akademik vazifalarni bajarishda foydalanmoqdalar. Shu bilan birga, ushbu texnologiyalardan foydalanish talabalar tomonidan sun'iy intellekt yaratgan

axborotning qanchalik ishonchli deb qabul qilinishi masalasini ham dolzarb qilmoqda. Mazkur tadqiqotda talabalarning akademik ta'lim jarayonida sun'iy intellekt tomonidan yaratilgan axborotga bo'lgan ishonchi, xususan, uning aniqligi, ishonchliligi va foydaliligi haqidagi qarashlari o'rganiladi. Tadqiqot miqdoriy yondashuv asosida 2026-yil kuzgi semestrida O'zbekistonning turli oliy ta'lim muassasalarida tahsil olayotgan 216 nafar bakalavriat talabasi ishtirokida amalga oshirildi. Ma'lumotlar Google Forms platformasi orqali to'plandi. So'rovnomada talabalarning demografik ko'rsatkichlari, sun'iy intellektdan foydalanish tajribasi, undan foydalanish chastotasi, AI tomonidan yaratilgan axborotga ishonch darajasi hamda ishonchni shakllantiruvchi omillar o'rganildi.

Kalit so'zlar: generativ sun'iy intellekt, AI tomonidan yaratilgan axborot, talabalarning ishonchi, akademik ta'lim, oliy ta'lim, AI savodxonligi, axborot ishonchliligi.

ДОВЕРИЕ СТУДЕНТОВ К ИНФОРМАЦИИ, СОЗДАННОЙ ИСКУССТВЕННЫМ ИНТЕЛЛЕКТОМ, В АКАДЕМИЧЕСКОМ ОБУЧЕНИИ

Аннотация. Генеративный искусственный интеллект (ИИ) становится все более распространенным инструментом в системе высшего образования. Студенты используют такие технологии, как ChatGPT, Gemini, DeepSeek и Claude, для поиска информации, объяснения сложных тем, генерации идей, подготовки письменных работ и выполнения других учебных задач. Вместе с тем широкое использование генеративного ИИ вызывает вопросы относительно степени доверия студентов к информации, создаваемой такими системами, а также их способности оценивать ее точность и надежность. В настоящем исследовании изучается доверие студентов к информации, созданной искусственным интеллектом, в процессе академического обучения с особым вниманием к ее точности, надежности и полезности. Исследование проведено с использованием количественного подхода среди 216 студентов бакалавриата различных высших учебных заведений Узбекистана в осеннем семестре 2026 года. Данные были собраны посредством онлайн-анкеты Google Forms. Опрос включал вопросы о демографических характеристиках студентов, предыдущем опыте использования ИИ, частоте его применения, уровне доверия к информации, созданной ИИ, а также факторах, повышающих доверие.

Ключевые слова: генеративный искусственный интеллект, информация, созданная ИИ, доверие студентов, академическое обучение, высшее образование, ИИ-грамотность, надежность информации.

Introduction. The rapid development of generative artificial intelligence has created new possibilities for teaching and learning in higher education. AI-based

systems can generate explanations, summarize information, provide examples, suggest ideas, assist with writing, and respond to questions in conversational formats. As a result, students increasingly encounter AI not only as a technological innovation but also as a practical learning resource that can be incorporated into everyday academic activities.

The growing availability of tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, DeepSeek, and Claude has changed the way students search for and interact with information. Instead of relying exclusively on textbooks, academic databases, search engines, or instructors, students can now ask an AI system to explain a concept, compare different ideas, provide examples, or help structure an assignment. The accessibility and speed of these systems make them attractive for academic use. Research on student adoption of GenAI similarly indicates that perceived usefulness, ease of use, enjoyment, perceived value, AI literacy, and trust may all be associated with students' intentions to use such technologies [1].

However, the availability of AI-generated information does not automatically guarantee that students consider such information reliable. Generative AI systems can produce fluent and convincing responses even when some elements of the response are inaccurate, incomplete, insufficiently supported, or unsuitable for a particular academic context. Consequently, the central issue is not simply whether students use AI, but how they decide whether the information generated by AI deserves to be trusted.

Trust is particularly important in academic learning because students may use AI-generated information as a basis for assignments, presentations, examinations, research projects, or independent study. If students accept AI responses without verification, inaccurate information may become part of their academic work. On the other hand, if students distrust AI-generated information completely, they may overlook potentially useful learning support. Thus, the relevant educational issue is not simply high or low trust, but the development of appropriately calibrated trust based on the quality, transparency, and verifiability of information.

Recent research supports the view that trust in educational AI is a multidimensional phenomenon. Pitts and Motamedi distinguish between human-like and system-like forms of trust and show that different dimensions of trust are associated with students' intentions to use AI and their perceptions of its usefulness [2]. Similarly, Wang and Tian identify practicality, reliability, and accessibility as important attributes associated with students' trust and subsequent dependency on GenAI in academic settings [3]. These findings suggest that students' trust cannot be explained by a single characteristic of AI systems.

The present study focuses on undergraduate students in Uzbekistan and examines their perceptions of AI-generated information for academic learning. In particular, it considers the level of trust students place in AI-generated information, the factors that increase this trust, the frequency of AI use, and the relationship between trust and students' reported use of AI for academic learning. By focusing

on students in the Uzbek higher education context, the study contributes empirical information to an area that remains relatively underexplored.

Literature review. Trust in artificial intelligence has become an increasingly important issue in educational research because students are expected to make decisions about when and how to rely on AI-generated information. Trust in this context can be understood as a student's willingness to rely on information or assistance provided by an AI system despite uncertainty concerning whether every generated response is accurate.

Recent research suggests that trust is closely connected with students' perceptions of AI system characteristics. Wang and Tian examined the relationship between GenAI attributes, trust, and dependency among university students and reported that practicality, reliability, and accessibility were significant factors associated with trust [3]. Their findings are particularly relevant to the present study because the Uzbek students surveyed here were also asked to evaluate factors that contribute to confidence in AI-generated academic information.

Pitts and Motamedi provide a more differentiated understanding of trust in educational AI. Their study of undergraduate students distinguishes between human-like trust and system-like trust. The authors found that human-like trust was more strongly associated with trusting intention, whereas system-like trust was more closely associated with perceived usefulness and behavioral intention to use AI [2]. This distinction indicates that students may trust an AI system in different ways depending on whether they evaluate it as a conversational partner or as a technological system.

The relationship between trust and actual use is also not straightforward. Cabrera and Neville, studying 132 undergraduate and postgraduate students from six UK universities, found that generative AI was widely used even though fewer than one quarter of participants regarded its outputs as reliable [4]. Their findings demonstrate that students may continue to use AI because of its usefulness and accessibility even when they remain cautious about the reliability of its outputs. This observation is particularly relevant to the present study, where a considerable proportion of respondents reported that their level of trust had no effect on their use of AI.

The credibility of AI-generated content is another important dimension of the problem. Cui and Zhang examined students' ability to identify AI-generated content and emphasized the difficulty of distinguishing AI-generated and non-AI-generated material in educational contexts [5]. Their work suggests that credibility judgments cannot necessarily be based on the appearance or fluency of an AI-generated response. Students therefore need appropriate evaluation strategies rather than relying solely on how convincing an answer appears.

Trust may also change as students gain experience with AI. Song investigated undergraduate students' trust in generative AI chatbots over an academic semester and found that changes in trust were particularly noticeable among lower-

performing students, whereas trust among higher-performing students remained relatively stable [6]. The study also found no significant relationship between trust and several learning-related variables, including computational thinking, self-regulated learning, and learning performance. These findings support the idea that trust is dynamic and may develop through students' interaction with AI in particular learning contexts.

The adoption of GenAI is additionally influenced by factors that extend beyond trust itself. Ittefaq et al. found that perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, enjoyment, subjective norms, novelty, trust in technology, perceived value, and AI literacy were positively associated with intention to use GenAI among international students [1]. This suggests that trust should be considered as one component within a broader set of technological, psychological, and contextual factors.

Jiang and Meng further demonstrate that trust does not necessarily have a direct and consistent role in every AI integration context. Their three-wave study of open education teachers in China found that digital mindset and AI sensemaking significantly predicted AI integration, while trust in AI and digital teaching competence did not demonstrate direct or consistent mediating effects [7]. Although their study focused on teachers rather than students, it provides a useful reminder that technology adoption is influenced by multiple factors.

Overall, the literature indicates that students' trust in AI-generated information is shaped by reliability, usefulness, accessibility, experience, perceived value, information quality, and the broader learning context. Existing research also indicates that use and trust do not always develop together. Students may use AI frequently while remaining cautious about the reliability of its outputs. This distinction provides an important conceptual basis for examining the Uzbek higher education context.

Research gap. Although previous studies have examined student adoption of generative AI, perceptions of reliability, credibility assessment, and trust in educational AI, comparatively less attention has been given to students in Uzbekistan. Existing international research provides useful evidence concerning the relationship between trust and AI use, but differences in educational environments, digital practices, institutional policies, and students' previous experience with AI may influence how these relationships appear in different countries.

A further gap concerns the distinction between using AI and trusting the information generated by AI. Students may use AI because it is convenient and accessible while simultaneously questioning the reliability of its answers. Therefore, measuring only frequency of AI use may not provide sufficient information about students' attitudes toward AI-generated academic information.

The present study addresses this gap by examining undergraduate students' trust in AI-generated information in the Uzbek higher education context. It specifically investigates three related dimensions: students' overall level of trust,

factors that increase trust, and the relationship between trust and reported AI use for academic learning.

Research objective and research questions

The main objective of the study is to examine university students' trust in AI-generated information and to identify factors associated with their willingness to use such information for academic learning.

The study addresses the following research questions:

RQ1. What level of trust do university students place in AI-generated information for academic purposes?

RQ2. What factors contribute to students' trust in AI-generated academic information?

RQ3. How does students' level of trust relate to their reported use of AI for academic learning?

RQ4. How frequently do university students report using AI-generated information for academic learning?

Methodology

Research Design

The study employed a quantitative research design based on an online questionnaire. The survey was conducted during the Fall 2026 semester among undergraduate students enrolled at different universities in Uzbekistan. The questionnaire was administered through Google Forms.

A total of 216 undergraduate students participated in the study. Participation was voluntary, and respondents first reviewed an informed consent statement before completing the questionnaire. The sample consisted of 114 female students and 102 male students**.**

The questionnaire collected demographic and academic background information, including age, gender, grade-point average (GPA), academic major, year of study, and previous experience with AI tools. The questionnaire also included items measuring students' frequency of AI use, trust in AI-generated information, factors influencing trust, and the perceived relationship between trust and AI use.

Data Analysis

The present article uses descriptive analysis to summarize the responses to selected survey questions. Frequencies and percentages were used to describe students' responses. Four questions were selected for detailed analysis: Q6 concerning the relationship between trust and AI use, Q8 concerning factors that increase trust, Q12 concerning the overall level of trust in AI-generated information, and Q14 concerning the frequency of AI use for academic learning.

Because the study is based on self-reported survey responses, the findings describe students' perceptions and reported behavior rather than objectively measured AI use or verified information accuracy.

Results

Relationship Between Trust and AI Use

Question 6 (Q6) asked respondents: "How does your level of trust in AI-generated information affect your use of AI for academic learning?" Participants selected one of five response options: Strongly decreases, Decreases, No effect, Increases, *and* Strongly increases.

The responses demonstrate that the relationship between trust and AI use differs among students. The largest proportion of respondents, **39.6%**, selected No effect. This indicates that for a substantial group of students, their level of trust in AI-generated information does not appear to determine whether they use AI for academic learning.

At the same time, **27.9%** of respondents indicated that lower trust decreases their use of AI. Within this group, **11.0%** selected Strongly decreases and **16.9%** selected Decreases. In contrast, **32.5%** reported that greater trust increases their use of AI, including **29.2%** who selected Increases and **3.3%** who selected Strongly increases.

These findings demonstrate that trust and AI use are related for some students but not for all respondents. For approximately two-fifths of the sample, trust was reported to have no effect on AI use, while the remaining respondents were divided between those reporting decreased and increased use. The result is consistent with previous research suggesting that trust is only one of several factors involved in students' adoption and use of GenAI [1][4].

Factors Increasing Trust in AI-Generated Information

Question 8 (Q8) examined the factors that increase students' trust in AI-generated academic information. The most frequently selected factor was clear explanation, reported by 54.3% of respondents. This indicates that students place considerable value on the way AI presents and explains information.

The second most frequently selected factor was supporting sources, selected by 46.3% of respondents. The availability of sources may allow students to check the information independently and therefore provide a stronger basis for evaluating an AI-generated response.

Accuracy was selected by 22.8% of respondents, while previous positive experience accounted for 16.0%**.** Only 8.6% selected recommendations from teachers or peers**.**

The percentages in this question should not be interpreted as mutually exclusive categories if respondents were permitted to select more than one factor. Instead, they indicate the proportion of participants identifying each factor as relevant to their trust.

Overall, the results indicate that students particularly value understandable explanations and the possibility of checking supporting sources. These findings correspond with research emphasizing information quality, reliability, and explainability as important dimensions of trust in educational AI [2][3][5].

Overall Trust in AI-Generated Information

Question 12 (Q12) asked: "How much do you trust information generated by AI tools such as ChatGPT and Gemini for academic purposes?"

The responses demonstrate a generally cautious pattern of trust. The largest group, 42.5%**,** reported a moderate level of trust**.** A further 34.0% indicated that they trusted AI-generated information only slightly, while 10.5% reported that they did not trust it at all.

Higher levels of trust were less common. 10.5% of respondents reported trusting AI-generated information very much, while approximately 2.5% reported complete trust.

Taken together, these responses indicate that most students did not report complete confidence in AI-generated academic information. Instead, moderate or limited trust was more common. This pattern is consistent with findings reported by Cabrera and Neville, whose study found substantial use of GenAI alongside relatively low perceptions of output reliability among surveyed higher education students [4].

The distribution also suggests that students may differentiate between finding AI useful and considering its output fully reliable. Such a distinction is important because usefulness may encourage continued use even when students recognize the possibility of errors.

Frequency of AI Use for Academic Learning

Question 14 (Q14) examined how frequently students use AI-generated information for academic learning.

The results show that AI use is common among the respondents. 68.6% reported using AI sometimes, making this the most common response. A further 27.3% reported that they always use AI for academic learning. Together, these two categories account for approximately 95.9% of respondents.

Only a small proportion reported limited or no use. Approximately 1% indicated that they rarely use AI, while approximately 3% reported that they never use AI for learning. Because the percentages are rounded, their total may differ slightly from 100%.

The findings indicate that AI has become a familiar component of academic learning for the surveyed students. At the same time, the results from Q12 demonstrate that frequent use does not necessarily correspond to very high trust. This distinction represents one of the central findings of the study: students may use AI regularly while maintaining a moderate or cautious level of confidence in its information.

Discussion. The findings provide evidence that students' trust in AI-generated information is neither uniformly high nor uniformly low. Instead, students demonstrate different patterns of trust and use. The largest group reported that trust has no effect on their AI use, while other students indicated that increased or decreased trust affects their use. This pattern suggests that students' decisions to use AI are likely shaped by several factors rather than by trust alone.

This interpretation is consistent with previous research. Ittefaq et al. [1] identified a number of factors associated with students' intention to use GenAI, including perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, enjoyment, subjective norms, novelty, trust, perceived value, and AI literacy. Similarly, Cabrera and Neville [4] reported that students may use GenAI despite relatively low confidence in the reliability of its outputs. The present findings reflect a similar distinction between technological use and confidence in information quality.

The results of Q8 provide additional insight into the basis of students' trust. Clear explanations were selected by more than half of the participants, while supporting sources were selected by nearly half. These results suggest that students do not evaluate AI-generated information solely on the basis of whether an answer is produced quickly. The way information is explained and the possibility of checking its supporting evidence appear to be important components of students' confidence.

This finding is particularly relevant to the concept of calibrated trust. Appropriate use of AI in academic learning does not necessarily require students to trust every generated answer. Instead, students need to understand when AI-generated information can be used as preliminary assistance and when independent verification is necessary. Pitts and Motamedi [2] emphasize that trust in educational AI involves different dimensions and that the quality of the interaction and perceived usefulness of AI may contribute differently to students' intentions and perceptions.

The importance of source verification is also supported by research on the credibility of AI-generated content. Cui and Zhang [5] examined students' ability to identify AI-generated content and highlighted the challenges involved in assessing the credibility of such material. The findings of the present study, particularly the high proportion of students selecting supporting sources as a factor that increases trust, indicate that students may recognize the need for external verification.

The frequency-of-use results are also notable. Nearly all respondents reported using AI at least sometimes for academic learning. However, the Q12 findings show that moderate trust was substantially more common than complete trust. This suggests that regular use and strong trust should not be treated as equivalent concepts. Students may use AI because it is accessible, convenient, and useful while simultaneously recognizing that its responses require checking.

Song's longitudinal research provides another useful perspective. His study found that students' trust in generative AI did not have a simple relationship with learning performance and that changes in trust over time differed according to students' performance levels [6]. Although the present study did not measure changes in trust over time, the findings support the broader view that trust is a contextual and potentially changing construct rather than a fixed characteristic.

The findings can also be considered in relation to Wang and Tian's research [3], which connects GenAI attributes such as practicality, reliability, and accessibility with trust and dependency. In the present study, students' emphasis on

clear explanations and supporting sources similarly suggests that perceptions of the quality and usability of AI-generated information are important when students decide how much confidence to place in it.

Overall, the results indicate that students' trust in AI-generated academic information should be understood as a process of evaluation rather than simple acceptance or rejection. Students appear to recognize both the usefulness and the limitations of GenAI. This creates an important role for higher education institutions in developing students' ability to assess AI-generated information critically.

Educational implications. The findings have several implications for higher education. First, AI literacy should be incorporated into academic learning. Students need practical knowledge of how generative AI systems work, why AI-generated responses can contain inaccuracies, and how to identify situations in which verification is necessary.

Second, academic instruction can place greater emphasis on source evaluation. Since supporting sources were among the most frequently selected factors increasing trust, students should be encouraged to compare AI-generated information with textbooks, peer-reviewed articles, official documents, academic databases, and other reliable sources.

Third, students can be encouraged to treat AI as a supplementary learning resource rather than an unquestioned authority. AI can be useful for generating explanations, examples, questions, outlines, or alternative perspectives, while responsibility for evaluating and appropriately using the resulting information remains with the student.

Finally, teachers and universities may benefit from developing clear guidance concerning responsible AI use. Such guidance can distinguish between appropriate educational applications and practices that may compromise academic integrity or reduce students' independent engagement with course material.

Limitations. Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings. First, the study involved 216 undergraduate students, and therefore the results should not automatically be generalized to all university students in Uzbekistan or to students at other educational levels.

Second, the research used an online Google Forms questionnaire and relied on self-reported responses. Participants' reported frequency of AI use and trust may not correspond exactly to their actual behavior when interacting with AI systems.

Third, the study focused on general perceptions of AI-generated information rather than systematically comparing individual AI tools. Different systems may produce different levels of accuracy, explanation quality, source support, or user experience.

Fourth, the study did not analyze differences across academic disciplines in detail. Students in fields such as economics, medicine, engineering, humanities, or social sciences may have different requirements for information verification and may therefore develop different patterns of trust.

Finally, the study used descriptive analysis of selected questionnaire items. The available data do not permit conclusions about causal relationships between trust and AI use. In particular, the finding that trust has "no effect" for 39.6% of respondents should be interpreted as a self-reported perception rather than evidence that trust has no statistical relationship with AI use.

Conclusion. This study examined university students' trust in AI-generated information for academic learning and explored how trust relates to students' reported use of AI. The survey involved 216 undergraduate students from universities in Uzbekistan during the Fall 2026 semester.

The findings demonstrate that students generally use AI for academic learning while maintaining varying degrees of confidence in AI-generated information. Moderate trust was the most common response, while complete trust was reported by only a small proportion of participants. At the same time, trust did not influence AI use in the same way for all students. For 39.6% of respondents, trust was reported to have no effect on their use of AI, whereas others indicated that greater or lower trust influenced their use.

The results also show that clear explanations and supporting sources are particularly important for students when developing confidence in AI-generated academic information. These findings emphasize that students' trust is closely connected with their ability to understand, evaluate, and verify AI-generated responses.

The study therefore points to the importance of developing AI literacy in higher education. Students should be encouraged to verify AI-generated information, consult reliable academic sources, recognize possible inaccuracies, and distinguish between the usefulness of an AI response and its factual reliability. Such skills can help students use generative AI more thoughtfully while maintaining independent academic judgment.

For higher education institutions, the findings suggest that responsible AI integration should include not only access to AI tools but also instruction on information evaluation, source verification, academic integrity, and appropriate use of AI-generated content. Teachers can support students by incorporating activities that require them to compare AI-generated answers with scholarly sources, identify inaccuracies, and explain why particular information can or cannot be accepted.

Further research could extend the present study by including larger and more diverse samples, comparing academic disciplines, examining differences between specific AI tools, and conducting longitudinal research to investigate how students' trust changes with continued experience. Such research would contribute to a more detailed understanding of the relationship between trust, AI literacy, and academic learning in Uzbekistan.

References:

1. Ittefaq, M., Zain, A., Arif, R., Ahmad, T., Khan, L., & Seo, H. (2025). Factors influencing international students' adoption of generative artificial intelligence: The mediating role of perceived values and attitudes. Journal of International Students, *15*(7), 127–156. https://doi.org/10.32674/fnwdpn48.

2. Pitts, G., & Motamedi, S. (2025). Understanding human-AI trust in education. Telematics and Informatics Reports, 20, 100270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teler.2025.100270.

3. Wang, H., & Tian, J. (2026). From trust to dependency: How generative AI attributes and organisational support shape student use of generative AI. Education and Information Technologies, *31*, 4303–4326. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-026-13983-5.

4. Cabrera, C., & Neville, R. (2025). Widely used but barely trusted: Understanding student perceptions on the use of generative AI in higher education. Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2025.2595453.

5. Cui, Y., & Zhang, H. (2025). Can student accurately identify artificial intelligence generated content? An exploration of AIGC credibility from user perspective in education. Education and Information Technologies, *30*(12), 16321–16346. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13448-1.

6. Song, D. (2025). How learners' trust changes in generative AI over a semester of undergraduate courses. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 35(3), 1445–1464. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-024-00446-6.

7. Jiang, N., & Meng, N. (2025). Digital mindset and sensemaking in AI integration: A study of open education teachers, competence and trust in AI. SAGE Open. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251396497.

FAN VA TA'LIM YANGILIKLARI
JURNALI

2026-yil
9(2)-son

Muassis - "FAN VA INNOVATSIYA YANGILIKLARI" MCHJ
Jurnal hamkori - «PROFI UNIVERSITY»

Jurnal O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti Administratsiyasi huzuridagi axborot va ommaviy kommunikatsiyalar agentligi tomonidan 2024-yil 24-may kuni № 454068-sonli guvohnoma bilan ro'yxatga olingan.

Jurnal 2024-yilda tashkil etilgan, 1 oyda bir marta o'zbek, tojik, qozoq, qirg'iz, qoraqalpoq, rus va ingliz tillarida nashr etiladi.

Tahririyat manzili: 190110, Toshkent shahri Uchtepa tumani, Bog'iston MFY, 14-mavze, 8-uy.

Telefonlar: +998 90 749 00 00
+998 90 749 77 77
+998 91 902 05 01
E-mail: saen_2024@mail.ru
Jurnal sayti: www.saen.uz
Telegram kanali: **https://t.me/saen_2024**

Maqolada keltirilgan fakt va ma'lumotlarning to'g'riligi uchun mualliflar mas'uldirlar.

"Fan va ta'lim yangiliklari" ilmiy-amaliy jurnali Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasi Rayosatining qarori (25.08.2025 y., №374/5) bilan pedagogika va psixologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD) va fan doktori (DSc) ilmiy darajasiga talabgorlarning dissertatsiyalari asosiy ilmiy natijalarini chop etish tavsiya etilgan milliy ilmiy nashrlar ro'yxatiga kiritilgan.

ISSN: 3093-8694