

## **Conference Report**

Fabienne Katharina Müller, Jennifer Quentin, Laura Daniela Ramirez Salinas, May-Britt Anna Jacobs, Neele Baumgart, Vanessa Kowalke & Tabea Mehić

# **Intercultural Perspectives on Information Literacy and Metaliteracy (IPILM)**

Online Conference on December 11, 2025

## **Conference Context**

As part of the transnational project-based course “*Intercultural Perspectives on Information Literacy and Metaliteracy*”, an online conference was held on December 11, 2025 with around 100 participants. The course was aimed at students from various countries and sought to bring together international perspectives within a shared learning and working environment, while actively fostering intercultural exchange.

The overarching objective of the conference was to present and collectively reflect on the outcomes of the group projects developed during the course. In this context, students were expected not only to present their academic findings but also to discuss differing viewpoints and learn from one another. The conference thus served as both the conclusion and the culmination of the course.

The organizational framework of the course was strongly project oriented. Throughout the semester, students worked in several groups, each focusing on a distinct topic. For each topic, multiple assignments were completed to enable in-depth engagement. The international composition of the participants significantly shaped the conference. Diverse cultural, academic, and methodological backgrounds contributed to a wide range of perspectives and highlighted the transnational character of the event.

## **AI and Mental Health**

*Baumgart, N.; Chettri, A.; Mishra, N.; Schaar, M.; Wartikar, O.*

The session on artificial intelligence (AI) and mental health examined the opportunities and challenges associated with AI-based applications in the field of mental health. The focus was on the use of AI for the early detection of psychological distress, for continuous support, and for improving access to mental health services. Research findings indicate that AI can identify indicators of stress, anxiety, or depression based on text, speech, and behavioral data, thereby enabling low-threshold support services in particular (Kjell et al., 2021; Li et al., 2023). Key scientific insights were drawn from the systematic review by Dehbozorgi et al. (2025), which reports a high level of acceptance of AI-based applications as well as positive effects on self-monitoring and emotional regulation. At the same time, it was emphasized that AI in the mental health context should not be understood as a replacement for human professionals, but rather as a complementary tool. In addition, ethical, cultural, and epistemic risks were addressed. Saeidnia et al. (2024) identify data protection issues, algorithmic bias, and a lack of transparency as central challenges. These concerns were further supported by an international online survey, which revealed a general openness toward AI but also highlighted limited trust and high expectations regarding responsibility, transparency, and information literacy.

## **AI and Access (Education and the Labor Market)**

*Gupta, B.; Khurshheed Parimoo, A.; Müller, F.; Ramirez Salinas, L.; Roy, L.*

The second group focused on the significance of artificial intelligence (AI) for access to education and its implications for the labor market. It was demonstrated that AI can make a substantial contribution to inclusive education through personalized learning opportunities and intelligent tutoring systems (Al-Zahrani & Alasmari, 2024; Holmes et al., 2019; UNESCO, 2024). At the same time, structural and ethical challenges were addressed, including algorithmic bias, a lack of transparency in AI systems, as well as risks related to data protection and privacy (Marín et al., 2025). Access to AI technologies varies considerably across the globe, with countries possessing advanced digital infrastructures being able to utilize these

technologies more effectively. In contrast, less developed regions face the risk of falling further behind (Cazzaniga et al., 2024).

The analysis of the topic was based on two studies. The study by Viberg et al. (2025) examined teachers' trust in AI-supported systems within educational processes, while the study by Cazzaniga et al. (2024) investigated the effects of generative AI on employment structures. Both studies highlighted that, although AI offers significant potential, its effective use is contingent upon clear ethical guidelines and responsible implementation. During a plenary discussion, it was collectively emphasized that while AI presents opportunities in education and the world of work, it is generally viewed critically, particularly due to risks such as bias, data protection concerns, and a lack of transparency.

### **AI as a Substitute for Human Relationships**

*Biga, A.; Jacobs, M.; Kahle, L.; Priyadarshini, P.; Rangwalla, M.; Sikarwar, L.*

The session addressed the growing significance of artificial intelligence in social and emotional contexts and examined the extent to which AI can complement or potentially replace human relationships. It was emphasized that AI systems are no longer used solely as tools for information retrieval but are increasingly perceived as conversational partners or sources of emotional support.

To further contextualize these developments, two scientific studies were drawn to examine existing research on human–AI relationships. Brandtzaeg et al. (2022) demonstrated that users can develop friendship-like bonds with social chatbots; however, these relationships are characterized by a lack of reciprocity and limited emotional depth. Complementing this perspective, Smith et al. (2025) showed that while generative AI can convincingly simulate emotional responses, it does not fulfill fundamental psychological characteristics of human relationships.

In addition, an exploratory online survey was presented to identify initial tendencies in interactions with AI. The results indicated that AI primarily provides emotional comfort and functional support but does not replace human relationships.

## **AI and Value Propositions for Stakeholder Groups**

*Draboo, M.; Quentin, J.; Thakkar, R.; Vukić, T.*

The fourth group examined core value propositions for different stakeholder groups. Three overarching stakeholders were identified: 1. individuals who directly interact with AI, 2. companies involved in AI technologies, and 3. national and international organizations responsible for the development of guidelines and regulatory frameworks. Due to the increasing demand for AI, the influence of companies has expanded, leading to an imbalance among stakeholder groups (Deshpande & Sharp, 2022).

In addition, three central value propositions were identified that may generate positive effects across stakeholders. First, the use of LLMs enables increased productivity, as large volumes of data can be processed within short timeframes. Second, the mental workload of individuals can be reduced, for instance through the automation of repetitive tasks. Third, AI improves access to knowledge production and may thereby foster more inclusive, skill-transcending forms of work (UNHDR, 2025).

Within the scope of the project, a survey was conducted in India, Croatia, Austria, and Germany. The results were largely consistent with those of the *UN Human Development Report* (2025) and showed that value assessments and usage priorities varied depending on individuals' life stages.

The plenary discussion revealed varied opinions about the benefits of AI tools. While some participants assessed the personal benefits as relatively low, others saw a high personal added value. However, overall, a generally positive assessment of AI tools emerged.

## **AI and Political Disinformation and Misinformation**

*Bagchi, A.; Dige, A.; Mehić, T.; Simmons, A.*

The session demonstrated that generative AI is profoundly transforming political communication and democratic processes by not merely accelerating disinformation but qualitatively reshaping it—for example through increased scalability, personalization, and

plausibility of political content (Gaborit, 2024; Romanishyn et al., 2025). Comparative case studies from the United States, India, and Germany illustrate that AI-supported political misinformation and disinformation manifest differently depending on context. During the 2024 U.S. presidential election campaign, public perceptions and media discourses surrounding a potential “supercharging” of disinformation through AI were particularly relevant to the electoral process (Yan et al., 2025). In contrast, analyses of the Indian context document the active use of generative AI—such as deepfakes and manipulated audiovisual content—with direct effects on political polarization and voter confusion (Dhanuraj et al., 2024). In the German case, AI-based voting assistance tools revealed that even systems designed to be neutral can unintentionally produce biased or misleading political content, raising fundamental questions of transparency and accountability (Dormuth et al., 2025). Complementary findings from exploratory surveys indicate generally low levels of trust in political information on social media across countries, as well as uncertainty in recognizing AI-generated content, further exacerbating democratic risks (Romanishyn et al., 2025).

## **AI and the Ethics of Producing Digital Media**

*J. M. Legenstein; C. Haddad; B. Patrick, V. Kowalke and R. Nongthangsana*

The session “*AI and the Ethics of Producing Digital Media*” addressed the growing influence of artificial intelligence on the production of digital media and the associated ethical challenges. Central topics included authorship, copyright, bias, trust, and the future role of human creativity.

Drawing on interdisciplinary research, the session illustrated how generative AI challenges traditional notions of originality and authorship (Das & Kundu, 2024), reproduces existing social biases embedded in training data, and poses significant data protection risks (Al-kfairy et al., 2024). In addition, the discussion highlighted how AI-based systems enable the large-scale production of synthetic media, such as deepfakes, thereby potentially undermining trust in media content (Karnouskos, 2020).

A key case study was *Théâtre d’Opéra Spatial*, an AI-generated artwork that won an art competition but was subsequently denied copyright protection. This example illustrates the

tensions between technological innovation and existing legal frameworks, which remain strongly oriented toward human authorship (U.S. Copyright Office, 2025). Furthermore, qualitative interviews with artists from different disciplines and regions were presented, revealing divergent perspectives on AI, from concerns about the loss of artistic authenticity to views of AI as a supportive creative tool. The session concluded with a discussion on transparency, responsibility, and the development of new standards to ensure the provenance and authenticity of digital content.

## **Conclusion**

Overall, the conference demonstrated that the use of AI across different societal domains is associated with significant transformative potential while simultaneously generating new epistemic, ethical, and social challenges. The sessions consistently emphasized that AI systems cannot be considered independently of their respective cultural, political, and institutional contexts, as they may both reproduce and reconfigure existing inequalities, relations of trust, and power structures. The intercultural orientation of the conference highlighted that perceptions, normative evaluations, and expectations of AI vary internationally, while the need for transparency, accountability, and critical judgment is widely shared. Against this backdrop, the systematic promotion of information literacy and metaliteracy emerges as a key prerequisite for a reflective and responsible engagement with AI technologies in transnational contexts.

## Sources

- Al-kfairy, M., Mustafa, D., Kshetri, N., Insiew, M., & Alfandi, O. (2024). Ethical challenges and solutions of generative AI: An interdisciplinary perspective. *Informatics, 11(3)*, 58. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-024-03432-4>
- Al-Zahrani, A.M. & Alasmari, T.M. (2024). Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on higher education: The dynamics of ethical, social, and educational implications. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun 11*, 912. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03432-4>
- Brandtzaeg, P. B., Skjuve, M., & Følstad, A. (2022). My AI friend: How users of a social chatbot understand their human–AI friendship. *Human Communication Research, 48(3)*, 404–429. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hcr/hqac008>
- Cazzaniga et al. (2024). Gen-AI: Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Work. *IMF Staff Discussion Note SDN2024/001*, International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC. <https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400262548.006>
- Das, S., & Kundu, R. (2024). The ethics of artificial intelligence in creative arts: A comprehensive review. *Interdisciplinary International Journal of Advances in Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities, 1(1)*, 26–33.
- Dehbozorgi, R., Zangeneh, S., Khooshab, E. et al. (2025). The application of artificial intelligence in the field of mental health: a systematic review. *BMC Psychiatry 25*, 132. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-025-06483-2>
- Deshpande, A. & Sharp, H. (2022). Responsible AI systems: Who are the stakeholders? *AIES '22: Proceedings of the 2022 AAI/ACM Conference On AI, Ethics, And Society*, 227 - 236. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3514094.3534187>
- Dhanuraj, D., Harilal, S., & Solomon, N. (2024). Generative AI and its influence on India's 2024 elections: Prospects and challenges in the democratic process. *Friedrich Naumann Foundation for Freedom*.
- Dormuth, I., Franke, S., Hafer, M., Katzke, T., Marx, A., Müller, E. & Rutinowski, J. (2025). A cautionary tale about “neutrally” informative AI tools ahead of the

- 2025 federal elections in Germany. In *Proceedings of the World Conference on Explainable Artificial Intelligence*, 64–85. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Gaborit, P. (2024). A sociopolitical approach to disinformation and AI: Concerns, responses and challenges. *Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 7(4), 75–88. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.jpsir.20240704.11>
- Holmes, W., Bialik, M. & Fadel, C. (2019). Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning. *Center for Curriculum Redesign*. <https://curriculumredesign.org/wp-content/uploads/AIED-Book-Excerpt-CCR.pdf>
- Karnouskos, S. (2020). Artificial intelligence in digital media: The era of deepfakes. *IEEE Transactions on Technology and Society*, 1(3), 138–147.
- Kjell, O. N. E., Sikström, S., Kjell, K. & Schwartz, H. A. (2022). Natural language analyzed with AI-based transformers predict traditional subjective well-being measures approaching the theoretical upper limits in accuracy. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1), 3918. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-07520-w>
- Li, H., Zhang, R., Lee, Y. C., Kraut, R. E. & Mohr, D. C. (2023). Systematic review and meta-analysis of AI-based conversational agents for promoting mental health and well-being. *NPJ digital medicine*, 6(1), 236. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-023-00979-5>
- Marín, Y. R., Caro, O. C., Rituay, A. M. C., Llanos, K. A. G., Perez, D. T., Bardales, E. S., Tuesta, J. N. A. & Santos, R. C. (2025). Ethical Challenges Associated with the Use of Artificial Intelligence in University Education. *Journal Of Academic Ethics*, 23(4), 2443–2467. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09660-w>
- Romanishyn, A., Malytska, O. & Goncharuk, V. (2025). AI-driven misinformation: Policy recommendations for democratic resilience. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 8, 1569115. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2025.1569115>
- Saeidnia, H. R., Hashemi Fotami, S. G., Lund, B. & Ghiasi, N. (2024). Ethical Considerations in Artificial Intelligence Interventions for Mental Health and Well-Being: Ensuring

- Responsible Implementation and Impact. *Social Sciences*, 13(7), 381.  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13070381>
- Smith, M. G., Bradbury, T. N. & Karney, B. R. (2025). Can generative AI chatbots emulate human connection? A relationship science perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 20(6), 1081–1099.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916251351306>
- UNESCO. (2024). AI and inclusive education: Policy guidance for promoting equity. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.  
<https://doi.org/10.54675/PCSP7350>
- United Nations (2025). Global Survey on AI and Human Development: Main Findings. In *Human Development Reports*.  
<https://hdr.undp.org/2025-global-survey-ai-and-human-development-main-findings>
- U.S. Copyright Office. (2025). Copyright and artificial intelligence, part 2: Copyrightability.
- Viberg, O., Cukurova, M., Feldman-Maggor, Y., Alexandron, G., Shirai, S., Kanemune, S., Wasson, B., Tømte, C., Spikol, D., Milrad, M., Coelho, R. & Kizilcec, R. F. (2025). What Explains Teachers' Trust in AI in Education Across Six Countries? *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 35, 1288–1316.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-024-00433-x>
- Yan, H. Y., Morrow, G., Yang, K. C. & Wihbey, J. (2025). The origin of public concerns over AI supercharging misinformation in the 2024 US presidential election. *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review*.