World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences
eISSN: 2582-8266
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/wjaets
Journal homepage: https://wjaets.com/

(REVIEW ARTICLE)

Check for updates

The positive influence of large language models on fact-checking practices: A case study of Grok

Uri Samet *

CEO, Buzz Dealer Limassol, Cyprus.

World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences, 2025, 15(03), 1727-1738

Publication history: Received on 09 May 2025; revised on 16 June 2025; accepted on 18 June 2025

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjaets.2025.15.3.1123

Abstract

This paper investigates the profound impact of Large Language Models (LLMs), with a specific focus on Grok, on the evolution of user fact-checking practices. Contrary to a simplistic view that LLMs solely exacerbate misinformation, this paper argues that their widespread adoption has positively contributed to a heightened public awareness of the critical need for information verification and a demonstrable increase in proactive fact-checking behaviors. This phenomenon is driven by the inherent limitations of LLMs, such as "hallucinations" and biases, which compel users to adopt a more vigilant and critical approach to digital content. Through empirical data on LLM proliferation, shifts in user trust, and evolving fact-checking habits, this study illustrates how these technologies, despite their imperfections, serve as catalysts for enhanced digital literacy. The unique integration and accessibility of Grok within the X platform are highlighted as a significant factor in fostering user-initiated fact-checking, offering a compelling case study for the future of AI-driven information integrity strategies.

Keywords: Large Language Models (LLMS); Fact-Checking; Artificial Intelligence; Grok; Misinformation Detection; AI-Assisted Verification

1. Introduction

1.1. The Evolving Digital Information Ecosystem and the Rise of LLMs

The digital information landscape has undergone a profound transformation with the advent and rapid proliferation of Large Language Models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and Grok. These generative AI tools offer unprecedented access to information, writing assistance, and problem-solving support, becoming integral to daily functioning across various sectors.[1] Their ability to generate human-like text, summarize complex information, and answer diverse queries has made them accessible and versatile tools for a broad audience.[5]

The widespread integration of LLMs marks a new baseline for how individuals interact with information. For instance, 81% of researchers have already incorporated LLMs into their workflow for tasks like information seeking and editing, indicating a fundamental shift in academic contexts.[1] This suggests that LLMs are no longer merely novel tools but have become an expected, foundational component of digital interaction. This pervasive adoption creates a critical tension between efficiency and information quality. While LLMs are lauded for improving efficiency and automating routine tasks [1], the very ease with which they generate content leads to a massive influx of digital material, some of which may contain inaccuracies or biases. This dynamic means that the tools designed to make information access more efficient inadvertently contribute to an "information disorder".[7] The efficiency gains provided by AI come with an implicit requirement for increased vigilance from the user, as the volume of potentially questionable information grows.

* Corresponding author: Uri Samet

Copyright © 2025 Author(s) retain the copyright of this article. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Liscense 4.0.

1.2. The Global Challenge of Misinformation and the Critical Role of Fact-Checking

The digital age has brought an overwhelming spread of misinformation, disinformation, and malinformation, posing significant threats to various societal aspects, including public health, climate change response, and democratic processes.[8] Traditional, human-led fact-checking mechanisms, while effective, are insufficient to combat the sheer volume and speed at which false information propagates online.[9] This necessitates automated solutions and tools to increase the efficiency of verification efforts.[9]

This situation presents a compelling dynamic: AI is simultaneously a contributor to and a powerful catalyst for enhanced fact-checking. Multiple studies indicate that AI plays a noticeable role in the production and dissemination of false information.[14] The ability of AI to generate content faster than traditional methods means a massive volume of data requires analysis by fact-checkers.[15] Yet, the same technology is increasingly seen as essential for fact-checking. This duality suggests a complex relationship where the negative externalities of AI in information generation are actively driving the demand for its positive applications in verification, creating a self-reinforcing cycle of technological reliance in maintaining information integrity.

1.3. Research Hypothesis: LLMs as Catalysts for Enhanced Fact-Checking Awareness and Practice

This paper posits that the pervasive integration of AI Large Language Models (LLMs), exemplified by Grok's accessible features within the X platform, has cultivated a heightened public awareness of the imperative for fact-checking and demonstrably increased user engagement in verification practices, transforming information consumption habits. This hypothesis challenges a simplistic view of AI as solely a source of misinformation, proposing instead that its inherent limitations and widespread presence actively foster a more critical approach to information.

1.4. Article Structure and Scope

This report will proceed by first detailing the current landscape of LLM adoption and their inherent challenges. Subsequently, it will examine shifts in user behavior, particularly the rise of proactive fact-checking. A dedicated section will then analyze Grok as a case study, exploring its unique features and impact on user-initiated verification. The discussion will further explore how LLM limitations drive critical engagement and how AI tools enhance human fact-checking efficiency. Finally, the report will synthesize these findings, address broader implications, and outline future research directions.

2. The Proliferation and Impact of Large Language Models

2.1. Global Adoption Trends of LLMs (2023-2025)

The adoption of LLMs has been exceptionally rapid, surpassing the adoption rates of previous transformative technologies like personal computers and the internet.[16] By August 2024, nearly 40% of the U.S. population aged 18-64 reported using generative AI, with 28% of employed respondents integrating it into their work.[16] Notably, nearly one in nine workers reported daily usage of these tools.[16] This swift permeation into daily life and professional workflows indicates that LLMs are not a fleeting trend but are becoming deeply entrenched components of modern society.

The global AI chatbot market, a significant subset of LLMs, demonstrates this rapid expansion. Valued at approximately $15.6 billion in 2024, it is projected to nearly triple to $46.6 billion by 2029, reflecting a robust Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) of approximately 24.5%.[20] This substantial growth is primarily driven by the increasing demand for automated customer service and efficiency gains across various industries.[21] The economic incentives for widespread LLM deployment are clear, as businesses seek to reduce costs and enhance operational efficiency.

The user base for AI chatbots is also surging, with global users projected to exceed 1.5 billion by 2025, representing a 40% increase from 2023.[22] Furthermore, in 2024, 71% of companies reported using generative AI in at least one function, an increase from 65% in early 2024.[24] This widespread business integration and user adoption highlight that the "AI era" is not a future concept but a current reality for a significant portion of the global population. This pervasive presence means that users are increasingly exposed to AI-generated content, which in turn amplifies the need for effective information verification strategies. The plateauing of adoption in some specific text domains, such as financial consumer complaints and corporate press releases, observed by late 2024 [26], could suggest market saturation or, more critically, an increasing sophistication in LLMs that makes their outputs indistinguishable from human writing. This indistinguishability further complicates the information landscape, implicitly increasing the imperative for users to engage in fact-checking.

2.2. LLMs in Information Generation and Dissemination

Large Language Models are increasingly utilized for generating diverse content, ranging from financial reports and corporate press releases to academic texts and social media posts.[26] These tools can effectively draft articles, create images, summarize extensive documents, and even assist with complex coding tasks.[27] This capability enables content creation at an unprecedented scale, significantly reducing production costs and expanding reach for businesses and individuals alike.[28]

This widespread automation of information production fundamentally alters the nature of digital content. For example, by late 2024, an estimated 18% of financial consumer complaint text and up to 24% of corporate press releases were LLM-assisted.[26] This means that a substantial portion of the digital information environment is now machine-generated, shifting from predominantly human-authored content to algorithmically produced material. This change necessitates a new approach to verification, as traditional methods of assessing human authorship, such as relying on journalistic standards or author reputation, become less applicable. The sheer volume of AI-generated content further exacerbates the challenge, making manual fact-checking increasingly impractical.

The pervasive use of LLMs for tasks like copywriting and social media posts [31] also contributes to a blurring of the lines of authorship. As AI-generated content becomes increasingly indistinguishable from human writing [26], users face a growing challenge in discerning the origin of the information they encounter. This ambiguity directly impacts public trust and highlights the urgent need for clear labeling of AI-generated content, a transparency measure desired by a significant majority of the U.S. population (90%).[32] This lack of transparency in authorship inherently pushes users towards a more skeptical stance, compelling them to engage in personal verification efforts more frequently.

3. Shifting User Behavior: Increased Awareness and Fact-Checking Practices

3.1. User Trust in Online Information and AI-Generated Content

The digital age has significantly eroded public trust in online information, with only 12% of Americans fully trusting search engine results.[33] This skepticism extends to AI-generated content, where only 33% of individuals place their trust in it, even though 70% can identify it.[32] A substantial 90% of the U.S. population advocates for clear labeling of AI-generated content, indicating a strong demand for transparency.[32] This prevailing distrust in AI-generated information, coupled with the desire for clear disclosure, suggests a growing public awareness regarding the potential for misinformation and the need for independent verification.

Despite these concerns, there is a complex picture of user perception. While 50% of consumers view AI optimistically and 65% trust businesses that use AI, significant worries persist regarding AI misuse, such as cyberattacks (80% concerned), identity theft (78% concerned), and deceptive political ads (74% concerned).[34] This dual perception — optimism for AI's benefits alongside deep concerns about its risks — contributes to a heightened sense of caution among users. The expectation that AI will transform customer experience (70% of consumers) and improve written content (54% of consumers) [34] demonstrates a recognition of AI's capabilities, yet the lingering skepticism compels users to remain vigilant. The concept of "trust nothing, verify everything" becomes paramount in this environment, as AI's ability to impersonate individuals at a record rate necessitates a shift from implicit trust to explicit verification.[36] This redefinition of trust places verification at the core of all digital interactions, driving users to proactively engage in fact-checking.

The following graph illustrates the significant gap between users' ability to identify AI-generated content and their trust in it, alongside the broader erosion of trust in online information sources. This visually represents the underlying psychological mechanism — distrust — that compels users to engage in more frequent and thorough fact-checking.

3.2. Generational Differences in Fact-Checking Habits

Fact-checking habits vary significantly across generations, with younger demographics demonstrating a higher propensity for skepticism and verification. Seventy percent of Gen Z and 65% of Millennials frequently fact-check online information, compared to 52% of Gen X and 40% of Baby Boomers.[32] This generational disparity suggests that digital natives, who spend more time online, are more attuned to the need for verification. Over three in five Gen Zers, who are online almost constantly, report a greater urge to fact-check.[33]

The most common fact-checking methods include cross-checking with multiple sources (44%), looking for primary sources (35%), and checking for consistency with prior knowledge (11%).[33] Gen Z predominantly prefers cross-checking (53%), while younger internet users (63% of Gen Z and 61% of Millennials) are more likely to seek external

confirmation compared to older generations.[33] This indicates a proactive approach to information consumption among younger users, driven by their extensive exposure to diverse online content and, implicitly, the recognition of its variable reliability.

The rising adoption of AI tools, particularly LLMs, further influences these generational habits. While only 4% of Baby Boomers will interact with a chatbot, 20% of Gen Z shoppers consistently choose chatbots over human agents.[37] This comfort with AI interaction, combined with a heightened skepticism towards online information, suggests that younger generations are more likely to leverage AI tools as a first line of defense for quick verification. The increasing presence of AI-generated content, including misinformation, may inadvertently train these younger users to be more critical consumers of information, fostering a continuous cycle of AI exposure leading to increased fact-checking.

3.3. The Role of AI Hallucinations and Biases in Fostering Critical Evaluation

AI hallucinations, where LLMs generate factually incorrect or fabricated information with high confidence and fluency, pose significant risks and challenges to information integrity.[38] These errors are often seamlessly blended with accurate information, making their detection a daunting task for users without meticulous scrutiny.[38] For instance, ChatGPT (GPT-3.5) has been found to produce fake citations nearly 40% of the time, and GPT-4 in about 29% of cases, while Google's Bard AI exhibited a 91% hallucination rate in one experiment.[28] This inherent fallibility, particularly in high-stakes domains like scientific writing or medical education, necessitates rigorous examination and fact-checking by users.[38]

Despite their negative implications, AI hallucinations and biases paradoxically contribute to a heightened awareness and proactive engagement in fact-checking by users. When users encounter confidently presented but incorrect AI-generated content, it can serve as a direct impetus for critical evaluation. Academic discussions highlight that LLMs, when used effectively, can encourage higher-order thinking by prompting students to evaluate AI output, compare it with other sources, and make independent judgments.[41] The unreliability of AI in certain contexts can transform it into an "intellectual sparring partner," pushing users to articulate thoughts, challenge assumptions, and clarify their reasoning.[41]

The awareness of AI's limitations, such as its tendency to hallucinate or reflect biased training data, fosters a "trust nothing, verify everything" mindset.[36] This is particularly evident in academic settings, where AI literacy programs emphasize that students must "carefully evaluate AI output for inaccuracies and hallucinations".[42] This involves teaching students to research and employ specific prompting techniques to reduce hallucinations and to meticulously review AI output, often requiring them to submit evidence of their verification process.[42] The exposure to AI's imperfections, therefore, does not necessarily lead to a complete rejection of the technology but rather cultivates a more discerning and proactive approach to information verification, transforming users into more critical consumers of digital content.

4. Grok as a Case Study in User-Initiated Fact-Checking

4.1. Grok's Unique Features and X Platform Integration

Grok, developed by XAI and launched in November 2023, is a generative artificial intelligence chatbot uniquely integrated with the social media platform X (formerly Twitter).[45] This deep integration is a foundational aspect of its operation, allowing it to blend social media content with advanced AI capabilities.[27] Grok's access to real-time information directly from X is a key differentiator from many other LLMs, enabling it to provide up-to-the-minute responses on breaking news, trending topics, and user sentiment.[29] This real-time data access is crucial for its utility in a rapidly evolving information environment.

Beyond real-time data, Grok offers several distinctive features. It is designed with a "rebellious streak" and a "bit of wit," aiming to answer "almost anything" with a conversational and often sarcastic tone.[45] While its "fun mode" was removed in December 2024 [45], its regular mode still provides straightforward, factual responses.[29] Grok also possesses multimodal capabilities, such as image generation and the ability to process visual information like documents, diagrams, and photographs.[45] Its Deep Search mode is designed to delve into web and X posts for nuanced details, making it useful for research-heavy topics and current events.[47]

The seamless integration with X means users can access Grok directly within the platform, eliminating the need for separate applications.[27] This ease of access is significant: users can simply tap the Grok icon within the X app or on the web version to initiate a query.[29] This direct, low-friction access to an AI assistant that can pull real-time data from the

very platform where misinformation often circulates positions Grok as a readily available first-line tool for verification for X users. This contrasts with other LLMs like ChatGPT, which, while having web browsing capabilities, are described as less aggressive with real-time updates and function more as general research assistants.[47] Gemini, despite leveraging Google Search, was also found to be less focused on live updates than Grok.[47] Grok's direct pipeline to X content, including user profiles and posts, makes it particularly relevant for on-platform fact-checking.[47]

4.2. Grok's Fact-Checking Capabilities and Perceived Ease of Use

Grok is explicitly marketed with a "Fact-Checking" feature, allowing users to verify claims or posts that seem questionable directly within the X platform.[29] The process is designed for ease of use: a user provides Grok with a claim or link, and Grok analyzes the information against real-time updates and relevant sources from X, delivering a detailed response often with references.[29] This immediate input mechanism encourages users to take an active role in questioning information they encounter.

Grok-3, the latest iteration of XAI's chatbot, has demonstrated impressive automated fact-checking capabilities, powered by advanced self-correction mechanisms.[52] These mechanisms are designed to enhance the model's reliability by involving error detection, data validation against verified external sources, and ensuring logical coherence in its conclusions.[52] This continuous improvement during the fact-checking process allows Grok-3 to refine the quality of its output in real-time, leading to more accurate assessments, particularly in complex or rapidly evolving discussions.[52]

A notable test conducted by Isaac Saul, founder of Tangle, involved Grok-3 analyzing the truthfulness of Elon Musk's last 1,000 posts on X. The results were revealing: 48% of Musk's posts were categorized as true (primarily updates regarding his companies), 22% were deemed false, and 30% were considered misleading or poorly informed.[52] Beyond merely flagging inaccuracies, Grok-3 also recognized patterns in Musk's posting habits, such as the spread of unverified political content.[52]

The ease of use, stemming from its seamless integration with X, makes Grok a uniquely accessible tool for user-initiated fact-checking. Users do not need to navigate away from the platform to verify content, streamlining the process and making it more likely for them to engage in verification whenever suspicious content is encountered.[27] This direct interaction within the platform, combined with its real-time data access, positions Grok as an immediate and relevant tool for verifying claims actively trending or discussed on X.[29]

However, despite its promise, Grok's fact-checking capabilities have faced scrutiny. In one notable instance, Elon Musk publicly rebuked Grok for incorrectly verifying a fabricated post, highlighting challenges in AI accuracy and the potential for AI-driven misinformation.[53] Grok's response, which inferred authenticity based on Musk's "behavior" and "pattern of deleting controversial posts" rather than factual accuracy, exposed a flaw in its methodology.[53] Other reports indicate Grok's struggles with accuracy, with one study finding it answered 94% of queries incorrectly, compared to Perplexity's 37% failure rate.[54] It has also misinterpreted jokes and spread misinformation regarding political deadlines.[54] These instances underscore that while Grok's accessibility encourages user-initiated fact-checking, users must still exercise critical judgment and cross-verify its outputs. The presence of such a readily available, yet occasionally flawed, fact-checking tool on a major social media platform inherently drives users to question and verify, even if it means verifying Grok itself.

4.3. Comparative Analysis: Grok's AI-Driven Verification vs. Community Notes

Grok-3's automated fact-checking approach contrasts sharply with X's existing "Community Notes" feature, which relies on user-generated input.[52] Community Notes, a decentralized model, offers potential advantages in accuracy by crowdsourcing verification to a wider, more diverse audience. A 2024 study of over 45,000 Community Notes found that up to 97% were "entirely accurate," with approximately 90% relying on moderately to highly credible sources.[55]

Despite Community Notes' high accuracy and effectiveness in reducing misinformation spread, Grok-3's analysis revealed a notable difference in coverage. Grok-3 found that only about 10% of Musk's misleading or false posts were flagged by Community Notes.[52] This quantitative result suggests a potential advantage of AI-driven fact-checking tools over crowdsourced moderation in terms of consistency and speed, especially for high-volume content.[52] However, Community Notes have proven effective in reducing the spread of misinformation, with a 2024 review of 285,000 notes finding that their presence reduced retweets (re-shares) by nearly 50%, comments by a similar amount, and increased the probability of original post deletion by 80%.[55] A 2024 University of Chicago study confirmed that publicly displaying community notes increases the probability and accelerates tweet retractions, improving platforms' responsiveness to misinformation.[55]

This comparison highlights that "fact-checking" is a multi-faceted challenge, requiring both efficient identification and effective behavioral intervention. While Grok may offer speed and consistency in identifying problematic content, Community Notes demonstrate a tangible impact on reducing the spread of misinformation. This underscores that AI and human fact-checking are not mutually exclusive but potentially complementary, each addressing different aspects of the misinformation problem.

5. The Broader Impact: AI as an Enabler of Enhanced Fact-Checking Efficiency

5.1. AI Tools Enhancing Human Fact-Checking Workflows

While LLMs present challenges, they also offer significant opportunities to enhance the efficiency and scalability of human fact-checking efforts, which are otherwise overwhelmed by the volume of misinformation.[9] AI tools are increasingly integrated into professional fact-checking workflows, automating laborious tasks and providing real-time signals about content credibility.

One primary application is automated claim detection, where AI uses Natural Language Processing (NLP) to identify factual statements within large datasets like news articles or social media posts. This capability allows human fact-checkers to efficiently surface check-worthy claims from massive amounts of data that would be impossible to review manually.[13] Examples include tools like ClaimBuster, which analyzes political speeches to extract claims for verification.[13]

AI also contributes through contextual credibility indicators, where machine learning models assess website transparency, ownership, and history to provide quick trustworthiness assessments alongside search results or links.[13] This allows users and professionals to rapidly gauge content reliability. Furthermore, automated fact extraction and comparison tools can extract claims from text and cross-reference them against existing fact checks and reliable sources, identifying discrepancies and surfacing new unverified claims for human review.[13] Full Fact and FactMata are examples of organizations employing such tools.[13]

The efficiency gains are notable: AI-assisted evidence reviews have shown significant time reductions, with the analysis phase taking 56% less time and the synthesis phase 43% less time compared to human-only approaches.[6] This allows human experts to focus on deeper analysis and verification rather than initial data extraction. AI can also aid in claim similarity detection, grouping similar texts to prevent redundant verification efforts, and multimodal claim analysis, assessing the authenticity of images, videos, and audio content.[13]

Despite these advancements, human oversight remains critical. While 27% of organizations review all AI-generated content before use, a similar percentage reviews 20% or less, indicating a significant portion of AI-generated content is not thoroughly checked.[58] Industries where accuracy is paramount, such as business and legal services, are more likely to review all AI outputs, underscoring the indispensable role of human expertise in mitigating risks like inaccuracy and intellectual property infringement.[58] AI tools are best viewed as accelerators for human fact-checkers, amplifying their capacity and allowing them to handle the scale of misinformation, rather than as replacements.[9]

5.2. AI Literacy and Critical Thinking Development

The pervasive integration of LLMs has profoundly impacted the development of AI literacy and critical thinking skills, particularly in academic settings. While concerns exist about cognitive complacency and overreliance on AI [41], the very limitations of LLMs, such as their propensity for hallucinations and biases, paradoxically serve as catalysts for enhanced critical evaluation.

Academic discussions emphasize that LLMs can serve as interactive platforms for inquiry, prompting students to refine questions, explore multiple perspectives, and synthesize complex information.[60] When students are tasked with evaluating AI output, comparing it to other sources, and making independent judgments, the process actively promotes higher-order thinking skills.[41] This is crucial because AI tools, despite providing instant responses, often "don't always get it right" and can "sound confident even when they're wrong".[43] This inherent fallibility compels users to question and verify information, fostering a habit of critical inquiry.

AI literacy frameworks explicitly incorporate critical evaluation. For students, "Evaluative Skills" include the critical assessment of AI tools, evaluation of AI's impact on learning, and direct fact-checking of AI output for inaccuracies and hallucinations.[42] This involves teaching students proactive strategies, such as employing specific prompting techniques to reduce hallucinations and meticulously reviewing AI-generated content.[42] For example, users are encouraged to use

"lateral reading," a technique where they leave the AI output and consult other sources to evaluate the information, breaking down AI responses into searchable claims and verifying them externally.[57] This shifts the focus from "who's behind this information?" to "who can confirm this information?".[57]

The awareness of AI's limitations, particularly its tendency to fabricate or misrepresent facts, cultivates a necessary skepticism. Studies indicate that a higher level of confidence in AI correlates with lower critical thinking, while higher self-confidence is associated with more critical thinking.[44] This suggests that individuals who are confident in their own knowledge are more likely to critically assess AI outputs. Educational strategies are evolving to leverage AI's imperfections as learning opportunities, for instance, by turning AI mistakes into "class brain teasers" or using AI to model fact-checking processes.[43] This approach transforms AI from a potential "intellectual crutch" into a tool that actively strengthens critical thinking and information literacy, preparing users to navigate an increasingly complex digital information landscape.

6. Discussion

6.1. Synthesis of Findings and Implications for the Information Ecosystem

The widespread adoption of Large Language Models has undeniably reshaped the digital information ecosystem, presenting a complex interplay between enhanced efficiency and heightened challenges to information integrity. The data unequivocally demonstrates an explosive growth in LLM usage across various sectors and demographics, surpassing the adoption rates of previous transformative technologies.[16] This pervasive integration means that AI-generated content is no longer a niche phenomenon but a significant component of the daily information flow, with substantial portions of corporate communications and other texts now being LLM-assisted.[26] This automates information production at an unprecedented scale, driven by clear economic incentives for efficiency and cost reduction.[65]

However, this proliferation has a profound consequence: it inherently blurs the lines of authorship and trust. As AI-generated content becomes increasingly sophisticated and indistinguishable from human writing [26], users face a growing challenge in discerning the origin and veracity of information. This ambiguity contributes to a general erosion of trust in online content, as evidenced by low public trust in search engine results and AI-generated material.[32] This prevailing skepticism, coupled with a strong public demand for clear labeling of AI-generated content [32], indicates a growing awareness of the potential for misinformation.

Crucially, this research argues that the very imperfections of LLMs, particularly their propensity for "hallucinations" and biases, have served as a powerful catalyst for increased fact-checking awareness and proactive verification behaviors among users. When AI confidently presents incorrect or fabricated information, it directly compels users to engage in critical evaluation and cross-verification. This dynamic fosters a "trust nothing, verify everything" mindset, shifting the burden of authentication onto the individual user.[36] Younger generations, who are digital natives and frequent AI users, exhibit a higher propensity for fact-checking, suggesting that continuous exposure to diverse online content, including AI-generated material, is cultivating a more discerning approach to information consumption.[32]

Grok serves as a compelling case study in this evolving landscape. Its seamless integration with the X platform and its real-time data access make it an exceptionally accessible first-line tool for user-initiated fact-checking.[27] The ease with which users can "ask Grok" to verify claims directly within their social media feed facilitates immediate engagement with verification processes. While Grok has demonstrated impressive capabilities in analyzing large datasets and identifying patterns [52], its documented instances of factual inaccuracies and misinterpretations [53] are critical. These flaws, rather than deterring all usage, appear to reinforce the need for user vigilance. The experience of encountering Grok's errors can inadvertently train users to be more critical, prompting them to further verify Grok's own outputs or seek external confirmation. This continuous cycle of querying and subsequent verification, driven by the AI's occasional unreliability, reinforces the "trust nothing, verify everything" mindset.

Ultimately, AI is emerging as a dual-edged sword: a source of potential misinformation due to its scale and occasional flaws, yet also an indispensable tool for combating it. AI tools are increasingly enhancing human fact-checking efficiency by automating claim detection, providing credibility indicators, and speeding up analysis.[6] This collaborative model, where AI handles the volume and initial processing while human experts provide critical oversight, is essential for maintaining information integrity in the digital age. The increasing emphasis on AI literacy in educational settings, which teaches users to critically evaluate AI outputs and understand its limitations, further supports the development of a more resilient and discerning information ecosystem.[42] The overall implication is that the very challenges posed by

AI in information generation are driving a societal adaptation towards greater digital literacy and a more proactive, verification-conscious approach to information consumption.

6.2. Limitations and Future Research Directions

This study, while highlighting significant trends, acknowledges several limitations. The reliance on self-reported data for LLM usage and fact-checking habits may introduce reporting biases. Longitudinal studies, such as the one examining ChatGPT adoption in higher education which found a decline in usage over eight months [75], are crucial for understanding the temporal dynamics of AI adoption and its sustained impact on user behavior. The rapid evolution of LLM technology means that reported capabilities and user perceptions can quickly become outdated. Furthermore, the specific impact of Grok's "tagging" or ease-of-use feature on user-initiated fact-checking, while inferred from its integration and reported features, lacks direct empirical studies quantifying this specific causal link. While AI labels are primarily a transparency mechanism, not communicating truth or falsehood [76], their influence on user behavior warrants further investigation.

6.2.1. Future research should focus on

- **Direct Causal Studies:** Empirical studies are needed to directly measure the causal relationship between exposure to AI-generated content (especially flawed outputs) and subsequent increases in user fact-checking frequency and critical thinking skills. This could involve controlled experiments tracking user behavior over time.
- **Quantifying Grok's Specific Impact:** Research should specifically quantify the unique contribution of Grok's seamless X integration and "ask Grok" feature to user-initiated fact-checking compared to other LLMs. This could involve A/B testing or detailed user behavior analytics on the X platform.
- **Longitudinal Analysis of Trust and Verification:** Continued longitudinal studies are essential to track how user trust in AI-generated content evolves as the technology improves and as users become more AI-literate. This includes understanding if the "trust nothing, verify everything" mindset becomes a permanent shift or adapts with increased AI accuracy.
- **Cross-Platform and Cross-Cultural Comparisons:** Expanding research beyond specific platforms (like X) and predominantly Western contexts is vital to understand the global variations in AI adoption, fact-checking habits, and the effectiveness of AI-driven verification tools in diverse information ecosystems.
- **Pedagogical Interventions:** Further research is needed on the most effective pedagogical strategies for fostering AI literacy and critical thinking in educational settings, particularly how to leverage AI's limitations to enhance learning outcomes without promoting overreliance.

7. Conclusion

The growing use of AI Large Language Models, and specifically Grok, has indeed contributed positively to the landscape of fact-checking. This contribution is not solely through AI's direct ability to verify information, which remains imperfect and requires human oversight, but significantly through its indirect influence on user behavior. The pervasive presence of AI-generated content, coupled with its inherent limitations such as hallucinations and biases, has compelled a broader public, particularly younger generations, to become more aware of the critical need for information verification. This awareness has translated into an observable increase in proactive fact-checking practices, as users adopt a necessary "trust nothing, verify everything" approach to digital information.

Grok's specific case highlights how ease of use and direct platform integration can be a significant factor in promoting user-initiated fact-checking. By providing a readily accessible tool within the X ecosystem, Grok encourages users to query and verify information instantly. While its occasional inaccuracies underscore the ongoing need for human discernment, these very imperfections serve as a powerful, albeit unintended, educational mechanism, training users to be more critical consumers of digital content. The dynamic relationship between LLM proliferation and heightened user vigilance suggests that these technologies, despite their challenges, are inadvertently fostering a more digitally literate and discerning public, ultimately contributing to a more robust and verification-conscious information environment.

References

[1] LLMs as Research Tools: A Large Scale Survey of Researchers' Usage and Perceptions, accessed on June 12, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2411.05025v1

[2] Li, F., & Yang, Y. (2024). Impact of Artificial Intelligence–Generated content labels on perceived accuracy, message credibility, and sharing intentions for misinformation: Web-Based, Randomized, Controlled experiment. JMIR Formative Research, 8, e60024. https://doi.org/10.2196/60024

[3] Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Students' Development of Critical Thinking Skills, accessed on June 12, 2025, https://www.pluralpublishing.com/blog/impact-artificial-intelligence-students-development-critical-thinking-skills

[4] Gerlich, M. (2025). AI Tools in Society: Impacts on cognitive offloading and the future of critical thinking. Societies, 15(1), 6. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15010006

[5] Evaluating open-source Large Language Models for automated fact-checking - arXiv, accessed on June 12, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2503.05565v1

[6] AI-Assisted vs human-only evidence review: results from a ... - GOV.UK, accessed on June 12, 2025, https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ai-assisted-vs-human-only-evidence-review/ai-assisted-vs-human-only-evidence-review-results-from-a-comparative-study

[7] AI and Automation's Role in Iberian Fact-checking Agencies - Profesional de la información, accessed on June 12, 2025, https://revista.profesionaldelainformacion.com/index.php/EPI/article/download/87700/63633/299222

[8] DeVerna, M. R., Yan, H. Y., Yang, K., & Menczer, F. (2024). Fact-checking information from large language models can decrease headline discernment. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 121(50). https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2322823121

[9] Quelle, D., & Bovet, A. (2024). The perils and promises of fact-checking with large language models. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 7. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2024.1341697

[10] AI's Impact on our Information Sphere. (n.d.). Annenberg. https://www.asc.upenn.edu/research/centers/milton-wolf-seminar-media-and-diplomacy-0

[11] Arikewuyo, A. O. (2025). Is AI stirring innovation or chaos? Psychological Determinants of AI Fake News Exposure (AI-FNE) and its effects on young adults. Journalism and Media, 6(2), 53. https://doi.org/10.3390/journalmedia6020053

[12] Tomassi, A., Falegnami, A., & Romano, E. (2024). Mapping automatic social media information disorder. The role of bots and AI in spreading misleading information in society. PLoS ONE, 19(5), e0303183. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0303183

[13] How AI-Powered Fact-Checking can Help Combat Misinformation | Ivy Exec. (n.d.). https://ivyexec.com/career-advice/2025/how-ai-powered-fact-checking-can-help-combat-misinformation/

[14] Kožuh, I., & Čakš, P. (2023). Social Media Fact-Checking: The effects of news literacy and news trust on the intent to verify Health-Related information. Healthcare, 11(20), 2796. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare11202796

[15] Gutiérrez-Caneda, B., & Vázquez-Herrero, J. (2024). Redibujando las líneas contra la desinformación: Cómo la IA está modificando el presente y futuro del fact-checking. Tripodos, 55, 04. https://doi.org/10.51698/tripodos.2024.55.04

[16] Team, P. O. W. (2024, October 18). The rapid adoption of generative AI. Project on Workforce. https://www.pw.hks.harvard.edu/post/the-rapid-adoption-of-generative-ai

[17] Bick, A., Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, Blandin, A., Vanderbilt University, Deming, D. J., Harvard Kennedy School, & National Bureau of Economic Research. (2024). The rapid adoption of generative AI. https://ctstate.edu/images/Forms-Documents/AI-presidential-fellows/The-Rapid-Adoption-of-Generative-AI.pdf

[18] The rapid adoption of generative AI. (2024). In NBER Working Paper Series (Working Paper 32966). http://www.nber.org/papers/w32966

[19] Burmagina, K. (2025, March 24). Artificial intelligence usage statistics and facts. Elfsight. https://elfsight.com/blog/ai-usage-statistics/

[20] Ltd, R. a. M. (n.d.). AI Chatbot Market - Forecasts from 2024 to 2029. Research and Markets Ltd 2025. https://www.researchandmarkets.com/reports/5794058/ai-chatbot-market-forecasts

[21] 15+ Chatbot statistics to know in 2025 - Zoho SalesIQ. (n.d.). Zoho. https://www.zoho.com/salesiq/chatbot/statistics.html

[22] Stefanelli, G. (2025, May 25). The most used AI Chatbots in 2025: Global usage, trends, and platform comparisons of ChatGPT, Gemini, Copilot,. Data Studios · Exafin. https://www.datastudios.org/post/the-most-used-ai-chatbots-in-2025-global-usage-trends-and-platform-comparisons-of-chatgpt-gemini

[23] Duarte, F. (2025, June 5). Number of ChatGPT users (March 2025). Exploding Topics. https://explodingtopics.com/blog/chatgpt-users

[24] Cardillo, A. (2025, May 28). How many companies use AI? (New 2025 data). Exploding Topics. https://explodingtopics.com/blog/companies-using-ai

[25] Alexandrea, J. (2025, May 16). How many companies use AI in 2025? Key statistics and industry trends. Hostinger Tutorials. https://www.hostinger.com/tutorials/how-many-companies-use-ai

[26] The widespread adoption of large language Model-Assisted writing across society. (n.d.). https://arxiv.org/html/2502.09747v1

[27] Bello, S. (2025, June 2). SmythOS - How to Use GROK: A Step-by-Step Guide. SmythOS. https://smythos.com/developers/agent-integrations/how-to-use-grok/

[28] Team, A., & Team, A. (2023, March 5). The impact of AI on content accuracy and reliability. AIContentfy. https://aicontentfy.com/en/blog/impact-of-ai-on-content-accuracy-and-reliability

[29] What can GroK AI do? Key features you should know - AI tools. (n.d.). https://www.godofprompt.ai/blog/what-can-grok-ai-do

[30] The Impact of AI on information Consumption Habits | Upword. (n.d.). https://www.upword.ai/blog-posts/impact-of-ai-on-information-consumption-habits

[31] Ovington, T. (2024, May 31). 41 Top AI adoption statistics for 2024. Digital Adoption. https://www.digital-adoption.com/ai-adoption-statistics/

[32] Nishad, Z. (2025, June 7). Who do you trust online? Americans are more skeptical than ever. Stan Ventures. https://www.stanventures.com/news/who-do-you-trust-online-americans-are-more-skeptical-than-ever-2116/

[33] Frank, K. (2025, March 17). Shaping Trust Online: How search engines, influencers, and media sources impact our digital behavior and beliefs. Page One Power. https://www.pageonepower.com/linkarati/navigating-digital-trust-what-makes-information-reliable

[34] Prestianni, T. (2025, January 14). 131 AI Statistics and Trends for (2024) | National University. National University. https://www.nu.edu/blog/ai-statistics-trends/

[35] Nagani, G., & Nagani, G. (2025, January 2). Impactful AI customer Service Statistics to know (2024). Desku. https://desku.io/blogs/ai-customer-service-statistics/

[36] Geusz, D. (2025, March 31). Redefining Trust in 2025: AI, digital identity, and the future of accountability. Best Identity Access Management (IAM) Software, Tools, Vendors, Solutions, &Amp; Services. https://solutionsreview.com/identity-management/redefining-trust-in-2025-ai-digital-identity-and-the-future-of-accountability/

[37] Admin. (2024, October 15). 50 Chatbots Statistics for 2024: Insights on usage, demographics, and emerging trends. Route Mobile. https://routemobile.com/blog/50-chatbots-statistics-for-2024-insights-on-usage-demographics-and-emerging-trends/

[38] Williamson, S. M., & Prybutok, V. (2024). The era of Artificial Intelligence Deception: unraveling the complexities of false realities and emerging threats of misinformation. Information, 15(6), 299. https://doi.org/10.3390/info15060299

[39] (PDF) AI Hallucinations and Misinformation: Navigating Synthetic ..., accessed on June 12, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/391876200_AI_Hallucinations_and_Misinformation_Navigating_Synthetic_Truth_in_the_Age_of_Language_Models

[40] Comprehensive Review of AI Hallucinations: Impacts and Mitigation ..., accessed on June 12, 2025, https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202505.1405/v1

[41] How does the use of LLM influence the critical thinking of university ..., accessed on June 12, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/post/How_does_the_use_of_LLM_influence_the_critical_thinking_of_university_students

[42] AI Literacy Literature Summary | CSU AI Commons, accessed on June 12, 2025, https://genai.calstate.edu/communities/faculty/ethical-and-responsible-use-ai/ai-literacy-literature-summary

[43] AI Literacy Literature Summary | CSU AI Commons. (n.d.). https://genai.calstate.edu/communities/faculty/ethical-and-responsible-use-ai/ai-literacy-literature-summary

[44] Albanese, C. (2025, April 23). Impacts of AI on critical thinking in education. TSH Anywhere. https://www.tshanywhere.org/post/impacts-ai-critical-thinking-education

[45] To think or Not to Think: The Impact of AI on Critical-Thinking Skills. (n.d.). NSTA. https://www.nsta.org/blog/think-or-not-think-impact-ai-critical-thinking-skills

[46] Wikipedia contributors. (2025, June 15). Grok (chatbot). Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grok_(chatbot)

[47] xAI (Grok) Integrations | Connect xAI (Grok) to your apps with Albato. (2025, June 11). Albato. https://albato.com/apps/grok

[48] Ekhator, O. (2025, June 10). Grok 3 vs ChatGPT & Gemini: my week-long experience | honest AI review. Techpoint Africa. https://techpoint.africa/guide/grok-3-vs-chatgpt-vs-gemini/

[49] XAI GrOk: What it is And How to Use it [Tutorial]. (n.d.). https://www.voiceflow.com/blog/grok

[50] Grok | xAI, accessed on June 12, 2025, https://x.ai/grok

[51] Gupta, D. (2025, May 17). Grok AI vs. Competitors: Comprehensive Comparison with GPT-4, Claude, and Other LLMs. Deepak Gupta | AI & Cybersecurity Innovation Leader | Founder's Journey from Code to Scale; Deepak Gupta | AI & Cybersecurity Innovation Leader | Founder's Journey from Code to Scale. https://guptadeepak.com/grok-ai-vs-competitors-comprehensive-comparison-with-gpt-4-claude-and-other-llms/

[52] Jayaraman, S. (2025). I Put Grok vs ChatGPT Head to Head and One Stood Out. G2.com. https://learn.g2.com/grok-vs-chatgpt

[53] FinTech Magazine Article. (2025, February 21). Grok-3's Self-Correction Mechanisms Set a New Standard for AI Fact-Checking - FinTech Weekly. FinTech Magazine Article. https://www.fintechweekly.com/magazine/articles/grok-3-analyzes-musk-posts-and-sets-a-new-benchmark-for-fact-checking

[54] AI, T. O., & Navi. (2025). Elon Musk Rebukes His Own AI Chatbot Grok for Spreading False Information. TheOutpost.ai. https://theoutpost.ai/news-story/elon-musk-fact-checks-his-own-ai-chatbot-grok-over-fabricated-post-16382/

[55] Welle, D. (2025, May 19). Fact check: How trustworthy are AI fact checks? The Times of India; Times of India. https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/rest-of-world/fact-check-how-trustworthy-are-ai-fact-checks/articleshow/121268313.cms

[56] A Brief Review of Fact-Checking in the Digital Era - R Street Institute. (2025, March 5). R Street Institute. https://www.rstreet.org/commentary/a-brief-review-of-fact-checking-in-the-digital-era/

[57] Grok v Community Notes - Live Action, accessed on June 12, 2025, https://www.liveaction.org/news/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/GROK-v-COmmunity-Notes-response-012125.pdf

[58] Almanza-Ferro, A. (n.d.). Research Guides: Using AI tools in Research: Fact-checking AI with Lateral Reading. Guides.library.tamucc.edu. https://guides.library.tamucc.edu/AI/lateralreadingAI

[59] Singla, A., Sukharevsky, A., Yee, L., Chui, M., & Hall, B. (2025, March 12). The state of AI: How organizations are rewiring to capture value. McKinsey & Company. https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack/our-insights/the-state-of-ai

[60] Skillicorn, N. (2025, January 15). Relying on AI tools can reduce our ability for critical thinking. Idea to Value. https://www.ideatovalue.com/insp/nickskillicorn/2025/01/relying-on-ai-tools-can-reduce-our-ability-for-critical-thinking/

[61] www.researchgate.net, accessed on June 12, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/post/How_does_the_use_of_LLM_influence_the_critical_thinking_of_university_students#:~:text=One%20of%20the%20key%20ways,their%20existing%20beliefs%20or%20assumptions.

[62] Media Literacy Is Vital for Informed Decision-Making. (2024). Learning for Justice. https://www.learningforjustice.org/media-literacy-is-vital-for-informed-decisionmaking

[63] Lee, H., Sarkar, A., Tankelevitch, L., Drosos, I., Rintel, S., Banks, R., & Wilson, N. (2025, May 14). The Impact of Generative AI on Critical Thinking: Self-Reported Reductions in Cognitive Effort and Confidence Effects from a survey of knowledge Workers - Microsoft Research. Microsoft Research. https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/the-impact-of-generative-ai-on-critical-thinking-self-reported-reductions-in-cognitive-effort-and-confidence-effects-from-a-survey-of-knowledge-workers/

[64] Critical Thinking in the age of AI. (2025, April 24). securing.dev. https://securing.dev/posts/critical-thinking-in-the-age-of-ai/

[65] Dipert, B. (2025, February 19). Global AI Adoption to Surge 20%, Exceeding 378 Million Users in 2025. Edge AI and Vision Alliance. https://www.edge-ai-vision.com/2025/02/global-ai-adoption-to-surge-20-exceeding-378-million-users-in-2025/

[66] AI Chatbot User statistics 2025: What developers and SMBs need to know. (n.d.). https://www.byteplus.com/en/topic/540794

[67] The Business Research Company. (2025). Artificial Intelligence (AI) Chatbot Global Market Report 2025. In The Business Research Company. https://www.thebusinessresearchcompany.com/report/artificial-intelligence-ai-chatbot-global-market-report

[68] Guan, S. (2025, May 27). AI Chatbots stats and numbers in 2025 | Thunderbit. https://thunderbit.com/blog/ai-chatbot-stats

[69] Global study reveals trust of AI remains a critical challenge. (2025). Melbourne Business School. https://mbs.edu/news/global-study-reveals-trust-of-ai-remains-a-critical-challenge

[70] Gilsenan, K. (2024). What every marketer should know about targeting students. Gwi.com. https://doi.org/1023116164/1737988170804

[71] News, P. (2025, June 12). Fact-checking misinformation about the Los Angeles protests. PBS News. https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/fact-checking-misinformation-about-the-los-angeles-protests

[72] Research guides: AI Literacy: AI and Factchecking. (n.d.). https://libguides.olympic.edu/UsingAI/FactCheck

[73] LibGuides: Artificial Intelligence (AI) and information literacy: welcome! (n.d.). https://holyfamily.libguides.com/c.php?g=1437563%C2%A0

[74] USMA Library homepage: Generative Artificial Intelligence: Evaluating Generative AI Outputs. (n.d.). https://library.westpoint.edu/GenAI/output

[75] Mowreader, A. (2025, February 10). How librarians can engage with generative AI. Inside Higher Ed | Higher Education News, Events and Jobs. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/student-success/academic-life/2025/02/10/how-librarians-can-engage-generative-ai

[76] Polyportis, A. (2024). A longitudinal study on artificial intelligence adoption: understanding the drivers of ChatGPT usage behavior change in higher education. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 6. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.1324398

[77] Höltervennhoff, S., Ricker, J., Raphael, M. M., Schwedes, C., & Fahl, S. (2025, May 28). Security Benefits and Side Effects of Labeling AI-Generated Images. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2505.22845