

Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Daily Life: A Comprehensive Review of Applications, Benefits, Challenges, and Future Directions

Student, Ms. Avani Mishra

School of sciences, KK Modi University, Durg

HOD, Dr. Mohammed Bakhtawar Ahmed

School of sciences, KK Modi University, Durg

Abstract

Abstract—Artificial Intelligence (AI) has moved from a specialized research area to a technology embedded in everyday digital, domestic, educational, commercial, healthcare, and workplace activities. This review synthesizes evidence from nineteen uploaded research papers covering daily-life applications, social impacts, education, healthcare, transportation, finance, security, automation, and human–AI interaction. The reviewed literature consistently describes AI as a data-driven technology that can automate routine tasks, personalize services, support decisions, improve accessibility, and process information at a scale that is difficult to achieve manually. At the same time, the literature identifies recurring concerns involving privacy, algorithmic bias, cybersecurity, workforce disruption, dependence on automated systems, reduced human interaction, and the need for transparency and human oversight. The sources include narrative reviews, qualitative studies, quantitative survey research, a curriculum-oriented societal resource, a medical-education systematic review, and a public-health education review. The synthesis indicates that the practical impact of AI is domain-dependent: consumer applications such as recommendation systems and virtual assistants are widely integrated, while high-stakes applications such as healthcare and autonomous mobility require stronger validation and governance. The paper proposes a human-centered integration framework in which data quality, model capability, user literacy, domain safeguards, and continuous oversight operate together. The review also identifies research gaps, particularly the need for longitudinal user studies, cross-cultural evidence, measurable evaluation of human–AI collaboration, and stronger analysis of equity and accessibility.

Keywords—Artificial intelligence, machine learning, natural language processing, computer vision, daily life, automation, human–AI collaboration, ethics, privacy, digital society.

I. INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence is increasingly experienced not as a separate technological product but as an underlying capability inside familiar systems. Search engines, recommendation engines, voice assistants, navigation services, fraud detection, smart appliances, medical decision-support tools, educational platforms, and workplace software can use AI to interpret data, identify patterns, generate outputs, or recommend actions. Several reviewed papers emphasize that users may interact with AI without explicitly recognizing that an AI model is operating in the background [1], [2], [4], [7], [14].

The literature reviewed for this study presents AI as a broad family of computational techniques rather than a single application. Machine learning enables systems to learn patterns from data; deep learning uses multilayer neural networks for complex pattern recognition; natural language processing supports interaction with human language; computer vision processes images and video; robotics connects intelligent computation with physical action; and expert systems encode specialized knowledge for decision support [2], [4], [9], [11], [15].

The expansion of AI has been associated with improvements in efficiency, convenience, personalization, and decision support. In daily consumer environments, recommendation systems can tailor entertainment and shopping experiences, while virtual assistants can

support reminders, information retrieval, and smart-home control [1], [4], [12], [14], [15]. In healthcare, the reviewed literature describes applications in medical imaging, predictive analytics, patient monitoring, personalized treatment, and clinical support [14], [17], [18], [19]. In education, adaptive learning, intelligent tutoring, automated assessment, and interactive systems can respond to learner needs [6], [8], [17], [18].

However, technological capability does not automatically translate into social benefit. AI systems depend on data, and data can be incomplete, biased, sensitive, or difficult for users to interpret. The reviewed literature repeatedly raises privacy and security concerns because AI systems can collect, combine, and analyze large quantities of personal information [5], [7], [10], [13]. Other sources discuss employment disruption, overdependence, loss of human interaction, misinformation, and unequal access to technology [1], [5], [8], [10], [16].

This paper therefore examines AI in daily life through a balanced literature synthesis. Rather than treating AI adoption as uniformly beneficial or harmful, it organizes the evidence by application domain and by the mechanisms through which benefits and risks arise. The objectives are to identify major everyday applications, examine reported benefits, analyze recurring challenges, compare methodological approaches in the supplied literature, and identify future research directions.

II. BACKGROUND AND TECHNOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS

The historical development of AI described across the reviewed sources begins with the idea that aspects of intelligent behavior can be represented computationally. The literature frequently refers to Alan Turing's work on machine intelligence and to the 1956 Dartmouth conference as an important milestone in the formal development of AI [4], [7], [13], [15]. Early approaches relied heavily on symbolic reasoning, predefined rules, and expert systems. Later progress in machine learning shifted attention toward systems that learn patterns from data, while deep learning expanded the ability to process images, speech, and other unstructured information [4], [7], [15].

Machine learning is central to many everyday systems because it can identify statistical patterns in historical data and use those patterns to make predictions or recommendations. Recommendation systems in entertainment and e-commerce, fraud detection in financial services, and predictive maintenance are examples described in the supplied literature [7], [11], [15]. Deep learning has been especially influential in computer vision and speech-related tasks, where large datasets and improved computing resources support high-dimensional pattern recognition [4], [7], [14].

Natural language processing has made interaction with software more conversational. Virtual assistants, chatbots, translation tools, and language-based interfaces allow users to express requests in ordinary language rather than through rigid command structures [4], [9], [12], [16]. This development has accessibility implications because speech and natural-language interfaces may reduce some barriers for users who find conventional interfaces difficult to operate [16].

Computer vision extends AI into image and video interpretation. The reviewed sources discuss facial recognition, medical imaging, vehicle perception, number-plate recognition, and security

monitoring as examples [7], [11], [15], [22]. Robotics combines perception, planning, and physical action, allowing intelligent systems to operate in manufacturing, healthcare, domestic environments, and other settings [4], [7], [11].

The practical value of these technologies depends on the complete system around the model. Data collection, preprocessing, model selection, deployment infrastructure, user interface, cybersecurity, monitoring, and human oversight all influence outcomes. Anish Raj's review notes that AI systems can be difficult for users to understand because their operations may depend on large datasets and complex algorithms, while implementation can require substantial resources [11]. This supports a systems-level view of AI adoption rather than a model-only view.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

The nineteen supplied papers cover overlapping but complementary perspectives. Early and general reviews focus on the growing presence of AI in daily activities and identify healthcare, transportation, communication, entertainment, smart homes, and finance as major domains [14]. Other reviews expand the scope to education, agriculture, marketing, governance, environmental applications, cybersecurity, and workplace transformation [7], [8], [11], [13].

Several studies specifically examine daily-life experience. Du uses an empirical quantitative approach with an online Likert-scale survey of adults and reports positive effects in work, education, and everyday applications while also considering substitution threats and human-AI coexistence [1]. Islam, Ithmam, and Tanvirul Islam report a survey of 252 participants in the Chattogram region and apply reliability, scale-statistics, ANOVA-related testing, Hotelling T-squared, KMO, and Bartlett's test to examine AI's effects on daily life and workplaces [8]. These studies are useful because they move beyond conceptual descriptions toward measured user perceptions, although their populations and contexts are geographically specific.

The social-psychology study by Lyu and Wang examines participation, interaction, dependence, motivation, self-cognition, and social cognition in relation to AI [10]. Its contribution is to show that AI adoption is not purely technical. User behavior and psychological responses can influence how people interact with intelligent systems. The curriculum resource by Pasichnyk and Dujkovic-Blagojevic similarly emphasizes that people should understand both AI's possibilities and its challenges, including the role of data and algorithms in shaping suggestions and decisions [6].

Healthcare-focused sources provide evidence from high-stakes domains. Suresh and Hanamant review diagnostic systems, personalized medicine, patient monitoring, and virtual health assistants [14]. Faiyazuddin and colleagues synthesize recent healthcare evidence involving machine learning, deep learning, natural language processing, robotics, predictive analytics, and remote monitoring, while emphasizing data security and resource limitations [19]. Ren and colleagues review AI in medical education, including large language models, virtual reality, intelligent tutoring, and decision-support systems, and identify bias, inaccuracy, privacy, accountability, and human-oversight concerns [17]. Wang and Li focus on AI in public-health education and highlight personalized learning, data analysis, simulation, and policy support together with privacy and bias challenges [18].

The literature therefore converges on five broad themes: pervasive everyday integration; measurable gains in efficiency and personalization; domain-specific benefits in health, education, mobility, finance, and communication; risks involving data, fairness, security, employment, and dependence; and the need for human-centered governance. The present paper synthesizes these themes across domains rather than treating individual applications in isolation.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a structured narrative literature-synthesis approach based exclusively on the nineteen research papers supplied for the task. The source set includes review articles, empirical studies, a preprint, and a curriculum-oriented publication. The purpose is not to generate new survey data but to consolidate the evidence and concepts already reported in the supplied sources.

The analysis followed four stages. First, each source was examined for its research focus, population or evidence base, methodology, major applications, reported benefits, limitations, and ethical or social concerns. Second, recurring concepts were grouped into thematic categories: AI technologies, daily-life applications, sectoral impacts, human behavior, benefits, risks, governance, and future directions. Third, findings were compared across domains to identify areas of convergence and areas where the evidence is context-specific. Fourth, a conceptual framework was developed to connect technical inputs, AI processing, human interaction, domain outcomes, and safeguards.

The source set contains different methodological strengths. Du's survey uses a Likert-scale questionnaire and SPSS-based analysis [1]. Islam et al. report 252 primary responses and multiple statistical tests [8]. Lyu and Wang use questionnaire and empirical analysis to examine social-psychological factors [10]. Ren et al. employ a PRISMA-based systematic review of medical-education literature and identify nineteen eligible studies [17]. Faiyazuddin et al. use Web of Science data and literature synthesis for healthcare [19]. Wang and Li provide a conceptual and application-oriented analysis of AI in public-health education [18]. Other sources are narrative or descriptive reviews [4], [7], [9], [11], [12], [14], [15], [16].

Because the supplied sources vary in geography, publication type, and methodological design, their numerical results are not pooled into a single statistical estimate. Instead, the study uses qualitative thematic synthesis. This avoids presenting context-specific survey findings as if they represented all AI users. It also recognizes that AI applications change rapidly, meaning older sources can provide useful foundations but may not capture the newest systems.

The main limitation of this method is dependence on the quality and scope of the supplied literature. The review cannot establish causal relationships beyond what the sources themselves report. It also cannot independently validate claims made in the source papers. The findings should therefore be interpreted as a structured synthesis of the supplied evidence rather than as a new population-level empirical study.

V. AI IN COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION ACCESS

Communication is one of the most visible areas of everyday AI use. Natural language interfaces, search systems, predictive text, translation services, chatbots, and virtual assistants reduce the need for users to interact with software through rigid menus or technical commands [4], [9], [12], [15], [16]. These systems can interpret speech or text, generate responses, summarize information, and support routine communication tasks.

The literature describes virtual assistants as an important bridge between users and digital services. Talati's preprint discusses natural-language interfaces as a way to overcome some accessibility barriers and notes their use in everyday work support and other assistance contexts [16]. The same source also highlights concerns about bias, job effects, safety, and privacy. This illustrates a recurring pattern: the same interface that improves convenience can increase the amount of personal information exchanged with an automated service.

AI-based translation can also reduce language barriers. The supplied education-focused sources describe translation and language-processing capabilities as useful for more inclusive learning environments [9], [18]. In broader daily life, language tools can help users communicate across linguistic boundaries and access information that would otherwise be difficult to understand. However, translation quality depends on the model, language, context, and available data.

Recommendation and information-ranking systems represent another form of AI-mediated communication. Search and social-media systems can prioritize content based on observed behavior, while entertainment and shopping platforms recommend items using patterns in viewing, listening, or purchasing activity [7], [15]. These systems can reduce information overload by filtering large collections, but the same filtering can affect what users see and may reinforce narrow preference patterns.

The societal implication is that AI increasingly participates in information selection, not merely information delivery. The curriculum source emphasizes that digital actions create data traces that can later be analyzed by algorithms to generate suggestions or evaluations [6]. Consequently, AI literacy should include awareness of how data is collected, how algorithms influence information exposure, and why automated outputs may not always represent neutral or complete information.

VI. SMART HOMES, PERSONAL ASSISTANTS, AND DAILY AUTOMATION

Domestic environments provide a clear example of AI becoming embedded in routine activities. The reviewed literature describes smart speakers, voice assistants, robotic vacuums, thermostats, sensors, and other connected devices that can learn preferences or automate repetitive tasks [4], [14], [15]. The objective is usually not to create a general-purpose intelligent machine but to improve a narrow function such as controlling a device, retrieving information, or completing a household task.

Automation can save time and reduce the effort required for repetitive activities. Smart systems may adjust settings based on observed preferences, while robotic devices can map an environment and perform routine cleaning. These applications show why narrow AI can have substantial everyday value even without human-level general intelligence [4], [15].

At the same time, domestic AI depends on continuous sensing and data processing. Devices may collect information about routines, locations, voices, preferences, and interactions. The literature therefore identifies privacy, cybersecurity, interoperability, and reliability as important concerns [7], [14], [16]. A failure in a low-stakes recommendation may be inconvenient, while a failure in a connected physical system can create safety issues.

Automation can also change human behavior. Talati discusses the possibility that replacing physical household work with automation may reduce activity in some contexts and that physical robots introduce safety considerations when interacting with people [16]. Lyu and Wang emphasize that repeated interaction with AI can produce patterns of participation and dependence that are relevant to social psychology [10]. These observations suggest that evaluation of domestic AI should consider not only technical accuracy but also behavioral effects.

A responsible smart-home design should therefore include user control, clear privacy settings, secure communication, failure handling, and understandable explanations of important actions. The literature supports a human-centered approach in which automation is used to support user goals while preserving the ability to intervene or disable the system when necessary [5], [7], [14].

VII. AI IN HEALTHCARE

Healthcare is repeatedly identified as a high-impact AI domain in the supplied literature. Applications include medical-image analysis, clinical decision support, predictive analytics, personalized medicine, patient monitoring, drug discovery, and virtual health assistance [14], [17], [18], [19]. The central value proposition is the ability to process large and complex datasets and identify patterns that can support clinicians or patients.

Suresh and Hanamanth describe convolutional neural networks for medical imaging, expert systems for clinical decision support, machine-learning approaches for personalized medicine, wearable monitoring, and natural-language health assistants [14]. Faiyazuddin and colleagues similarly report applications in diagnostics, treatment planning, patient interaction, predictive analytics, and remote monitoring, while their review emphasizes the importance of data security and resource availability [19].

The healthcare literature also illustrates why AI adoption in high-stakes environments can be more cautious than adoption of entertainment or consumer applications. Errors may have direct consequences for patients. Ren et al.'s systematic and narrative review of medical education reports benefits from AI-assisted learning and simulation but also identifies inaccuracy, bias, data security, accountability, and the need for human oversight [17].

Wang and Li likewise emphasize data bias and privacy in public-health education [18].

AI can support personalized treatment by combining patient information, medical history, imaging, and other data. However, personalization also increases the importance of data governance. Sensitive health information requires strong protection, and users need to understand how their data is used. The literature does not support treating AI output as a substitute for professional judgment in every context. Instead, several sources frame AI as a tool that can augment professional capability when appropriately validated and supervised [14], [17], [19].

The main research need is therefore not only higher model accuracy but reliable integration into clinical workflows. Future evaluation should measure safety, interpretability, fairness across patient groups, usability, and the effect of AI on clinician decision-making. This is consistent with the broader literature's emphasis on human-centered implementation and multidisciplinary oversight.

VIII. AI IN EDUCATION AND LEARNING

Education is another major area in which the supplied literature describes personalization and automation. Intelligent tutoring systems, adaptive learning platforms, automated assessment, language tools, virtual assistants, and simulation-based learning can adjust content or feedback according to learner performance [8], [9], [17], [18]. The underlying goal is to move beyond a uniform learning path toward more responsive educational experiences.

Wang and Li describe AI as capable of processing large-scale data and tailoring educational content to learner needs, while also supporting interactive training and public-health education [18]. Ren et al. report that medical-education studies involving large language models, virtual reality, tutoring systems, and decision-support tools found improvements in areas such as examination performance, procedural competence, self-directed learning, engagement, and motivation in the reviewed contexts [17].

The literature also identifies limitations. AI-generated content can be inaccurate, and excessive dependence on automated assistance may weaken independent reasoning or reduce opportunities for face-to-face interaction [1], [5], [8], [17]. The social and educational impact therefore depends on how AI is used. An AI tutor that provides hints and feedback can support learning, whereas a system that simply supplies answers may reduce the learner's active cognitive effort.

AI literacy is consequently part of the educational challenge. Students and teachers need to understand model limitations, verify outputs, protect personal information, and use AI in ways that support rather than replace learning objectives. The curriculum resource by Pasichnyk and Dujkovic-Blagojevic specifically stresses awareness of data, algorithms, suggestions, and the potential for users to be influenced by automated systems [6].

A useful educational model is human-led, AI-supported learning. Teachers remain responsible for pedagogy, context, motivation, and ethical guidance, while AI can provide scalable feedback, practice opportunities, accessibility tools, and administrative assistance. This division is consistent with the reviewed evidence that AI can augment human capabilities while requiring oversight and clear educational goals [7], [17], [18].

IX. TRANSPORTATION, MOBILITY, AND SAFETY

AI is used in transportation for route planning, traffic management, predictive maintenance, perception, and autonomous driving. The reviewed sources describe computer vision, sensor fusion, path planning, reinforcement learning, and intelligent control as technical components of transportation systems [4], [11], [15]. These technologies can process environmental information and adjust decisions in response to changing conditions.

Traffic-management systems can analyze congestion and modify signal timing, while predictive maintenance can identify patterns associated with possible equipment failures [11], [22]. Automated number-plate recognition and other computer-vision applications can support transportation monitoring and security [22]. Such systems demonstrate the broader principle that AI can connect real-time sensor data to operational decisions.

Autonomous vehicles represent a higher-stakes application because AI decisions can affect physical safety. The literature emphasizes the role of computer vision, sensor fusion, and decision-making algorithms in autonomous systems [14]. It also indicates that safety-related domains generally require more cautious deployment because validation and regulatory requirements are stronger than in low-risk consumer applications [14].

The benefits described in the literature include potential improvements in safety, efficiency, accessibility, and travel-time management. However, transportation AI remains dependent on infrastructure, sensor quality, edge-case handling, cybersecurity, and reliable fallback mechanisms. A system that performs well under normal conditions can still fail when road conditions, weather, sensor inputs, or human behavior differ from training assumptions.

Future research should therefore evaluate transportation AI using real-world safety metrics rather than only model accuracy. Important measures include detection reliability, response time, failure recovery, robustness to unusual situations, human intervention requirements, and fairness across operating environments. The literature's emphasis on human-AI collaboration is particularly relevant because mixed environments will continue to contain both automated and human-controlled systems [1], [4].

X. FINANCE, E-COMMERCE, AND CONSUMER SERVICES

Financial services and e-commerce use AI to process transactions, detect anomalies, personalize recommendations, automate communication, and support customer decisions. The reviewed papers identify fraud detection, credit-related analysis, recommendation systems, customer support, and financial automation as recurring applications [2], [7], [9], [11], [15].

Fraud detection is particularly suited to machine learning because financial systems generate large streams of transactional data. AI can identify unusual patterns and flag transactions for further review. The technical review in Research paper 22 also describes AI-based signature verification, intrusion detection, and other pattern-recognition applications that illustrate how AI can be used for security-related decision support [22].

E-commerce platforms can use user activity to recommend products. Entertainment and shopping recommendations rely on patterns in viewing, listening, purchasing, or browsing behavior [7], [15]. This personalization can reduce search effort and make large catalogs easier to navigate. At the same time, it means that user behavior becomes an input to automated profiling and ranking.

The literature therefore connects financial and commercial benefits with concerns about transparency, privacy, and trust. When an automated system influences a financial decision, users may need understandable information about the basis of the decision. Anish Raj also notes that complex AI systems can be difficult for users to comprehend and that implementation can require substantial resources [11].

For consumer services, a practical governance model includes data minimization, secure processing, monitoring for unfair outcomes, human escalation paths, and clear user communication. AI can automate routine customer-service interactions, but sensitive complaints and high-impact decisions may require human review. The literature's broader conclusion is that the strongest implementations often augment human capabilities rather than eliminating the human role completely [14].

XI. ENTERTAINMENT, SOCIAL MEDIA, AND PERSONALIZATION

Entertainment is among the everyday domains with high user exposure to AI. Recommendation systems can select films, music, products, or social content according to observed preferences [4], [7], [15]. These systems reduce the need for users to manually search through very large collections and can continuously adapt as user behavior changes.

The reviewed sources describe collaborative filtering, recommendation algorithms, and personalization as mechanisms for delivering content that is more likely to match individual interests [1], [7], [15]. In social media, ranking systems can determine which

posts or videos appear more prominently. This makes AI part of the user's information environment, not simply a behind-the-scenes computational tool.

Personalization has clear convenience benefits, but it can also create narrower exposure patterns. If a system repeatedly prioritizes content similar to previous behavior, users may receive less variety. The literature raises related concerns about privacy, misinformation, and filter effects [7], [14]. These concerns are not arguments against personalization by themselves; they indicate the need to evaluate how ranking systems affect user autonomy and information diversity.

Generative AI adds another layer to entertainment and content creation. The supplied sources discuss AI in content generation and creative applications, while also noting concerns about originality, authorship, and the changing role of human creators [5], [13]. The key issue is how AI-generated material is incorporated into human creative processes and how users distinguish generated content from verified or human-produced material.

Future studies should examine personalization outcomes over longer periods, including user satisfaction, diversity of exposure, privacy expectations, and the effects of recommendation feedback loops. Research should also distinguish between applications that merely recommend content and systems that generate new content, because their technical and social consequences can differ substantially.

XII. WORKPLACE, BUSINESS, AND AUTOMATION

AI can automate repetitive tasks, analyze business data, support recruitment, assist customer communication, and improve operational decision-making. The reviewed sources describe AI use in marketing, management, accounting, productivity, recruitment, logistics, manufacturing, and customer service [2], [7], [8], [11], [15].

Automation can reduce time spent on repetitive work and allow employees to focus on tasks requiring judgment, creativity, communication, and domain knowledge. The daily-life literature repeatedly presents this as an opportunity for human-AI collaboration rather than a simple substitution model [1], [2], [14]. However, the distribution of benefits depends on how organizations redesign jobs and whether workers receive appropriate training.

Employment disruption is one of the most frequently repeated concerns in the supplied literature. Mahajan discusses job displacement and broader economic disruption, while other sources note that the effect of AI can vary by industry, time, location, and skill profile [5], [8]. The literature also recognizes that new roles and opportunities may emerge as technology changes production and service processes.

The important distinction is between task automation and complete job replacement. A job often contains multiple tasks, some of which may be highly automatable while others require contextual judgment or human interaction. Therefore, research that measures only whether a technology can perform a task may overstate the extent to which an entire occupation is replaced.

A responsible workplace transition requires reskilling, transparent implementation, employee participation, and monitoring of job-quality outcomes. The reviewed sources repeatedly point to education and skill development as mechanisms for helping workers adapt [2], [5], [8]. Future research should measure not only productivity gains but also changes in workload, autonomy, skill requirements, career mobility, and access to training.

XIII. AGRICULTURE, ENVIRONMENT, GOVERNANCE, AND SECURITY

Although the daily-life literature is often centered on consumer applications, several supplied papers show that AI also affects food systems, environmental monitoring, public administration, and cybersecurity. AI-based agricultural applications can support prediction, monitoring, logistics, and resource management [8], while environmental applications include air-pollution analysis and sustainability-related optimization [7], [13].

Environmental AI illustrates an important dual role. AI can be used to optimize systems, detect environmental patterns, and support

more efficient resource use, but AI systems themselves consume computing and energy resources. The reviewed literature therefore supports evaluating both the environmental benefit of an application and the resource cost of operating the AI system.

In governance and public services, AI can support automation, information processing, and service delivery. The daily-life review by Doot and colleagues describes AI applications in governance alongside healthcare, education, finance, and sustainability [13]. However, public-sector AI can involve high-impact decisions, making fairness, transparency, accountability, and privacy especially important.

Cybersecurity is another area where AI can both defend and create risks. Research paper 22 describes AI-based intrusion detection, cyber-awareness, software-defect analysis, and related security applications [22]. AI can identify suspicious patterns at scale, but complex automated systems may also introduce new attack surfaces and can be vulnerable to adversarial or manipulated inputs.

These applications reinforce the need for domain-specific governance. The same model capability can have different consequences depending on whether it is recommending a film, supporting a medical decision, controlling a vehicle, or detecting a cyberattack. AI governance should therefore consider impact level, data sensitivity, reversibility of decisions, human oversight, and the consequences of system failure.

XIV. ACCESSIBILITY, INCLUSION, AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR

AI can improve accessibility by enabling speech-based interaction, translation, personalization, and adaptive interfaces. Talati identifies natural-language interfaces as a way to address accessibility issues for some user groups [16]. Education-focused sources similarly describe translation and adaptive learning as mechanisms that can support learners with different needs [17], [18].

However, access to AI is not automatically equitable. Systems require devices, connectivity, data, digital skills, and often paid services or institutional infrastructure. The literature on society and workplaces notes the possibility of a digital divide in which people with better resources receive greater benefits while others are left behind [5], [8].

Human behavior is also affected by the design of AI systems. Lyu and Wang's social-psychology study emphasizes interaction, motivation, cognition, and dependence [10]. The curriculum source emphasizes that people should understand how their digital actions generate data and how algorithms can use those data to shape suggestions [6]. Together, these sources indicate that AI literacy should include behavioral and social dimensions, not only technical knowledge.

Overdependence is another concern. If users routinely delegate information search, writing, navigation, learning, or decision-making to automated systems, they may become less practiced at performing those tasks independently. The literature does not establish a universal level of harm, but it identifies dependence and loss of critical thinking as issues requiring attention [5], [16].

An inclusive approach therefore combines technical accessibility with user education and meaningful control. AI systems should communicate limitations, provide alternatives where practical, and avoid assuming that every user has the same digital resources or cognitive needs. Inclusion should be treated as an evaluation criterion alongside accuracy and efficiency.

XV. BENEFITS OF AI IN DAILY LIFE

Across the supplied sources, several benefits appear repeatedly. The first is efficiency. AI can process large datasets quickly, automate repetitive procedures, and provide recommendations or predictions without requiring manual analysis of every data point [2], [4], [7], [11], [15].

The second is personalization. Recommendation systems, adaptive learning platforms, personalized healthcare tools, and smart-home systems can use user or patient information to tailor outputs [7], [14], [17], [18]. Personalization can reduce search effort and make services more responsive, although it also increases the importance of privacy and transparency.

The third is decision support. AI can identify patterns that may be difficult to detect manually and can provide ranked options, alerts, predictions, or classifications. Examples include fraud detection, medical-image analysis, traffic management, predictive maintenance, and educational analytics [11], [14], [19], [22].

The fourth is accessibility. Natural-language interfaces, translation, adaptive learning, and virtual assistants can lower barriers to information and services [9], [16], [18]. This benefit is especially relevant when AI is designed around diverse user needs rather than a single standard interaction model.

The fifth is continuous availability. Software-based assistants and automated systems can operate outside conventional working hours and provide repeated support. This can be valuable for routine information, customer service, learning practice, and monitoring [4], [15], [17].

The benefits should nevertheless be interpreted conditionally. AI can improve performance when data are suitable, the model is appropriate, the deployment environment is reliable, and users understand the system's limitations. The reviewed literature repeatedly indicates that benefits are strongest when AI augments human capability and when safeguards are built into the surrounding system [1], [7], [14].

XVI. ETHICAL, SOCIAL, AND TECHNICAL CHALLENGES

Privacy is a central concern because many AI systems depend on large quantities of personal or behavioral data. Smart devices, recommendation systems, health applications, educational platforms, and financial services can all process sensitive information [5], [6], [7], [18]. Privacy protection therefore requires more than a general statement of consent; it also involves data minimization, security, access controls, retention practices, and understandable explanations.

Algorithmic bias is another recurring issue. If training data reflect historical or social inequalities, an AI model can reproduce or amplify those patterns. The reviewed literature identifies bias in areas such as healthcare, education, recruitment, and other decision-support contexts [5], [10], [17], [18]. Fairness should therefore be tested across relevant user groups and monitored after deployment.

Security and reliability are important because AI systems can fail, be manipulated, or operate incorrectly in unfamiliar conditions. Research paper 22 includes cybersecurity and intrusion-detection applications, while Mahajan discusses dependency, technical failures, cyber threats, and adversarial attacks [5], [22]. High-impact applications need fallback procedures rather than assuming that the automated system will always operate correctly.

Transparency and accountability are difficult when complex models produce outputs that are not easily interpretable. Users and professionals may need to know what information influenced a decision, what the system's limitations are, and who is responsible for final action. Explainable AI and human oversight are repeatedly proposed as mechanisms for addressing this challenge [7], [13], [17].

Finally, there are social concerns involving employment, human interaction, dependence, misinformation, and unequal access. These concerns do not affect every AI application equally. A useful risk assessment should therefore consider the domain, affected population, reversibility of errors, sensitivity of data, and degree of human control.

Domain	AI use and main benefit	Concern and human role
Communication	NLP, assistants, translation; Accessibility, convenience	Concern: Privacy, misinformation; Human role: Verify important outputs
Healthcare	Imaging, prediction, monitoring; Decision support, personalization	Concern: Safety, bias, data security; Human role: Clinical oversight
Education	Adaptive learning, tutoring; Personalized practice	Concern: Overdependence, accuracy; Human role: Teacher guidance

Domain	AI use and main benefit	Concern and human role
Mobility	Vision, routing, control; Efficiency, safety support	Concern: Edge cases, infrastructure; Human role: Intervention/fallback
Finance	Fraud detection, recommendations; Speed, anomaly detection	Concern: Trust, transparency; Human role: Review high-impact cases
Entertainment	Recommendation, generation; Discovery, personalization	Concern: Filter effects, authorship; Human role: User choice
Workplace	Automation, analytics; Productivity	Concern: Job/task disruption; Human role: Reskilling, supervision

Fig. 1. Conceptual framework linking AI inputs, models, human interaction, application domains, and safeguards.

XVII. COMPARATIVE SYNTHESIS OF APPLICATION DOMAINS

The reviewed literature suggests that AI adoption varies substantially across domains. Consumer-facing communication and entertainment applications have high visibility and frequent user interaction, while healthcare and autonomous mobility involve greater safety and validation requirements. Finance combines high-volume automation with trust and security requirements. Education combines personalization with concerns about learning autonomy and academic integrity.

XVIII. RESEARCH GAPS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Although the supplied literature is broad, several gaps remain. First, many papers are descriptive or narrative, while fewer provide longitudinal evidence about how AI changes behavior over time. Short surveys can capture perceptions at one moment but cannot fully explain whether convenience, dependence, trust, or productivity effects persist.

Second, evidence is geographically uneven. The supplied empirical studies include specific contexts such as Bangladesh and the United Kingdom, while several reviews are international in scope [1], [8]. Cross-cultural studies are needed because digital infrastructure, language, education, regulation, and social expectations can influence AI adoption.

Third, more research is needed on human-AI collaboration. The literature often proposes augmentation rather than replacement, but there are relatively few standardized measures of collaboration quality. Future studies could measure decision accuracy, time, workload, user confidence, error recovery, learning outcomes, and the distribution of responsibility between humans and AI.

Fourth, evaluation should move beyond model accuracy. In high-impact domains, researchers should measure fairness, explainability, robustness, privacy, usability, and safety. The medical-education and healthcare reviews particularly emphasize these dimensions [17], [19].

Fifth, AI literacy deserves greater attention. Users need to understand that AI outputs can be probabilistic and may contain errors. Education programs should teach verification, privacy protection, responsible prompting, source evaluation, and appropriate escalation to human experts [6], [17], [18].

Finally, future AI research should examine environmental and infrastructure costs, accessibility, cybersecurity, and interoperability. Responsible adoption depends on the complete socio-technical system rather than on model capability alone.

XIX. DETAILED SECTOR-WISE SYNTHESIS OF AI IN DAILY LIFE

The reviewed literature shows that artificial intelligence does not affect daily life through one universal mechanism. Its effects depend on the domain in which an AI capability is embedded, the quality and sensitivity of the available data, the degree of automation, and the extent to which a human remains involved in the decision process. The supplied

studies repeatedly describe AI as a supporting layer inside ordinary services rather than as a standalone product. This section develops that observation by examining the major application domains together and identifying the common design requirements that emerge from the literature [1], [3], [7], [14], [15].

A. Communication and Information Services

Communication systems illustrate how AI can become almost invisible to users. Search engines, predictive text, translation, conversational assistants, spam filtering, and recommendation systems process language or behavioral information before a user sees the final result. The practical benefit is reduced effort: a person can formulate a query in natural language, receive a ranked set of results, translate content, or interact with a digital service without learning a complex command structure. Talati and the general everyday-life reviews describe this movement toward natural-language interaction as an important reason AI feels integrated into routine digital activity [7], [14], [16].

The same systems also introduce a selection layer between people and information. A ranking model decides which results, messages, products, or posts receive attention first. This does not necessarily mean that the system is making a final decision for the user, but it can influence the information environment from which the user makes that decision. The literature therefore supports attention to transparency, user controls, and the ability to inspect or change recommendations. In communication systems, usefulness should be evaluated together with relevance, error rates, accessibility, and the possibility of misleading or incomplete output [5], [10], [25].

B. Healthcare and Personal Well-Being

Healthcare represents a different risk profile because errors can have consequences for diagnosis, treatment, monitoring, and patient communication. The supplied healthcare papers describe applications including medical-image analysis, clinical decision support, personalized medicine, predictive analytics, patient monitoring, and conversational systems [14], [17], [19], [23], [24]. More recent literature also surveys smart-healthcare systems and large language models in medicine, emphasizing both their application potential and the need for validation, privacy, interpretability, and clinical oversight [26], [30], [31].

A recurring point is that technical performance should not be treated as the only criterion for successful healthcare AI. A model may perform well on a benchmark but still be difficult to integrate into clinical workflows or unsuitable for a particular patient population. Human professionals remain important for contextual interpretation, communication, consent, and escalation when model outputs are uncertain. The literature consequently supports a human-in-the-loop approach for high-stakes medical applications, with monitoring continuing after deployment rather than ending when a model is installed [17], [19], [23], [31].

C. Education and Learning

Education applications include adaptive learning, intelligent tutoring, automated assessment support, content generation, language assistance, learner analytics, and medical education. The supplied education studies describe the possibility of tailoring educational content to learner needs and using AI to support interactive and scalable learning experiences [17], [18]. The benefit is particularly relevant where students need different levels of practice,

explanation, feedback, or repetition. AI can provide rapid assistance while teachers concentrate on pedagogy, motivation, classroom context, and social development.

However, education also demonstrates the importance of preserving learner agency. If automated systems provide answers without encouraging verification or reasoning, students may become dependent on outputs rather than developing independent problem-solving skills. AI-generated material can also contain factual or contextual errors. The literature therefore points toward AI literacy as a core educational requirement. Students should learn how to question outputs, compare information with trusted sources, protect personal data, and recognize when human expertise is necessary [6], [15], [18].

D. Transportation and Mobility

AI supports route planning, traffic prediction, vehicle perception, predictive maintenance, and autonomous driving. These applications combine data from sensors, maps, historical traffic patterns, and operational systems. In everyday mobility, the most immediate benefits are reduced search effort, improved routing, and more efficient management of transport resources. At a more advanced level, autonomous systems use computer vision and sensor fusion to interpret road environments and select actions [7], [11], [22].

Transportation also illustrates why context matters. A recommendation about an entertainment video and a braking decision by an autonomous vehicle are both AI outputs, but their consequences are very different. For mobility systems, reliability must be considered under unusual conditions, sensor failure, changing environments, and human interaction. The literature therefore supports evaluation through operational safety measures, response time, robustness, accessibility, and human override procedures rather than model accuracy alone [11], [16].

E. Finance, E-Commerce, and Consumer Services

Financial and commercial systems use AI for fraud detection, anomaly identification, customer support, product recommendation, demand prediction, and transaction analysis. Machine learning is particularly useful when large volumes of historical transactions contain patterns that are difficult to identify manually. In e-commerce and entertainment, recommendation systems can reduce the time required to find relevant products or content by learning from prior behavior [1], [3], [9], [12].

The same personalization creates a need for careful handling of user data. Transaction records, browsing history, purchase behavior, and inferred preferences may reveal sensitive information. A responsible system should therefore distinguish between data necessary for a service and data collected merely because it is technically available. Financial applications also require mechanisms for reviewing unusual or disputed decisions. The literature on algorithmic decision-making emphasizes that explainability and human review become more important as automated decisions affect access to services or financial resources [25], [28].

F. Smart Homes and Domestic Automation

Smart speakers, connected appliances, robotic cleaning devices, energy-management systems, and other domestic technologies demonstrate AI at the household level. These systems can interpret voice commands, recognize patterns of use, optimize settings, and automate repetitive tasks. The resulting convenience is one reason AI is increasingly

perceived as part of ordinary life rather than as a specialist technology [14], [16].

Domestic AI also raises a distinctive privacy issue because the system may observe routines inside a private environment. Voice recordings, device states, movement patterns, schedules, and preferences can reveal information about household behavior. The literature therefore supports local processing where feasible, clear retention policies, access controls, and visible user settings. Automation should also provide predictable failure behavior so that a user can regain manual control when the system produces an incorrect action [5], [16].

G. Entertainment, Social Media, and Personalization

Entertainment platforms use AI to rank, recommend, classify, and personalize large amounts of content. Recommendation algorithms can help users discover music, films, games, news, and social content that match previous interests. The benefit is scalability: a person cannot manually examine millions of available items, whereas an automated system can reduce the search space. The literature on everyday AI repeatedly identifies personalization as one of the most visible user-facing benefits [1], [7], [9].

At the same time, personalization changes what users encounter and can reinforce existing preferences. This makes recommendation quality a broader question than simple prediction accuracy. A useful system should allow users to modify preferences, understand why an item was recommended where practical, and retain access to diverse information. These requirements connect personalization with autonomy and information quality rather than treating engagement as the sole measure of success [5], [10], [25].

H. Workplace and Business Automation

AI in the workplace includes document processing, customer support, forecasting, scheduling, software assistance, quality inspection, and decision support. The reviewed literature describes AI as capable of augmenting human tasks by processing information quickly and identifying patterns across large datasets [2], [8], [13]. Routine activities can therefore be partially automated, allowing employees to spend more time on tasks requiring judgment, communication, creativity, or physical presence.

Workplace adoption also changes the distribution of skills. Employees may need to learn how to supervise AI outputs, formulate effective instructions, verify generated material, and recognize system failure. The social literature warns that automation can affect motivation, dependence, and perceptions of personal capability [10]. Consequently, organizations should treat AI implementation as a work-design issue rather than only a software procurement decision. Training, role redesign, feedback channels, and accountability should accompany technical deployment.

I. Accessibility and Inclusion

AI can improve accessibility by converting speech to text, translating languages, describing visual information, assisting navigation, and supporting alternative interaction methods. These capabilities can reduce barriers for users who face limitations in conventional interfaces. The everyday-life literature identifies language processing, conversational interfaces, and intelligent assistance as mechanisms through which digital services can become easier to access [7], [14], [15].

Inclusion is not automatic, however. A system may perform differently across languages, accents, demographic

groups, devices, or environmental conditions. Accessibility evaluation should therefore include diverse users and real-world contexts. The goal should be to provide additional choices rather than force all users into a single automated interaction style. Human assistance should remain available when an automated interface is uncertain or inaccessible.

XX. AI DATA LIFECYCLE AND THE EVERYDAY DECISION PROCESS

An important way to understand AI in daily life is to follow the lifecycle of information from collection to action. The first stage is data generation. Everyday activities produce text, images, audio, location signals, transaction records, device events, and interaction histories. Some information is intentionally provided by users, while other information is generated as a side effect of using a service. The literature emphasizes that the quality and sensitivity of this data strongly influence later AI behavior [5], [14], [25].

The second stage is preparation and representation. Raw information may be cleaned, transformed, labeled, aggregated, or converted into numerical features suitable for a model. Errors introduced at this stage can propagate through the system. The third stage is model processing, where machine learning, deep learning, natural language processing, computer vision, or another technique produces a prediction, classification, ranking, recommendation, or generated response [20]–[22].

The fourth stage is presentation. Users normally do not see the internal model; they see an interface containing a recommendation, warning, score, answer, route, or suggested action. Interface design therefore affects whether users interpret the output correctly. A technically accurate prediction can still be misunderstood if uncertainty is hidden or if the system makes an automated suggestion look like a confirmed fact. This is particularly relevant to conversational systems and decision-support applications [16], [24], [30].

The fifth stage is human response and feedback. A user may accept, reject, edit, ignore, or challenge an AI output. This response can influence future recommendations or become training data in some systems. A complete evaluation should therefore examine not only model performance but also what people do after receiving the output. Human behavior is part of the system, not an external factor [10].

The final stage is monitoring and correction. Models can degrade when user behavior, data distributions, regulations, or operating environments change. Continuous monitoring can identify abnormal error patterns, security incidents, unfair outcomes, and changes in user needs. The reviewed literature supports this lifecycle view because responsible AI depends on governance throughout deployment, not only during model development [25], [27], [29].

XXI. RISK, PRIVACY, SECURITY, AND TRUST MANAGEMENT

The benefits identified in the reviewed literature are accompanied by a set of recurring risks. Privacy is prominent because many everyday AI services depend on personal information. The risk is not limited to a single data breach. Persistent collection can create detailed behavioral profiles, while combining datasets can reveal information that users did not knowingly provide. Privacy protection therefore includes data minimization, purpose limitation, access control, retention management, and clear user choices [5], [14], [25].

Bias and uneven performance form another recurring concern. AI systems learn from data, and historical data may reflect unequal representation or measurement practices. A model can therefore perform differently across populations or contexts even when the underlying algorithm is identical. The literature on algorithmic ethics and the supplied social studies suggests that evaluation should examine who benefits, who experiences errors, and whether users have practical ways to challenge an outcome [5], [10], [25].

Cybersecurity is also closely connected with AI adoption. AI systems may become targets because they process valuable information or control connected devices. Smart-home systems, healthcare platforms, financial services, and workplace systems require different security controls, but common principles include authentication, least-privilege access, encryption, secure updates, logging, and incident response. Security should be considered during system design rather than added after deployment [14], [27], [29].

Trust should not be confused with unconditional confidence. Appropriate trust means that users understand the system well enough to decide when to rely on it and when to verify the output. Explainability can support this process, but explanations should be meaningful to the intended user. For a consumer recommendation, a short reason may be sufficient; for a medical or financial decision, users may require information about uncertainty, relevant evidence, and the possibility of human review [23], [25], [28].

A practical risk-management process can therefore be organized around four questions: What data does the system use? What decision or action does it produce? What is the consequence of an error? What mechanism exists for correction? This approach connects technical risk to everyday impact and helps determine how much automation is appropriate for a given application.

XXII. HUMAN-AI COLLABORATION AND DIGITAL AI LITERACY

The reviewed sources suggest that many everyday applications are best understood as forms of human-AI collaboration. AI can search, classify, summarize, predict, recommend, translate, or generate, while people contribute goals, context, values, judgment, and accountability. This division of roles is particularly important in domains where a correct answer depends on circumstances that are difficult to encode completely in a model [1], [2], [14].

Human-AI collaboration requires users to understand the strengths and limitations of the system. AI literacy includes recognizing that outputs are probabilistic, checking important claims, identifying sensitive information, understanding basic privacy controls, and knowing when human expertise is needed. In education, AI literacy should become part of digital competence rather than a separate technical subject. In workplaces, training should include verification and responsible use of generated content [15], [18].

The literature also raises the issue of over-reliance. When an AI system is consistently convenient, users may gradually reduce independent checking. This can be particularly problematic when the system is wrong in an unusual situation. Interfaces can reduce this risk by communicating uncertainty, requesting confirmation before consequential actions, and making correction easy. Human oversight should be designed into the interaction instead of relying only on users to remember that an AI system can fail.

At the organizational level, collaboration also requires clear responsibility. If an AI-assisted decision produces an

undesirable outcome, users should know who is accountable for reviewing the process and correcting the system. The responsibility should not disappear behind the statement that an algorithm produced the result. This principle is consistent with the ethical concerns mapped in the broader literature [25], [27].

XXIII. EVALUATION METRICS FOR EVERYDAY AI SYSTEMS

The literature indicates that model accuracy alone is insufficient for evaluating AI in daily life. A recommendation system may have high predictive accuracy but still provide little value if recommendations are repetitive or difficult to control. A healthcare model may have strong benchmark performance but require additional evaluation for calibration, workflow compatibility, and safety. Evaluation should therefore combine technical, human, and social measures [23], [26], [29].

Technical metrics can include accuracy, precision, recall, F1 score, calibration, latency, robustness, and resource consumption, depending on the task. Human-centered measures can include task completion time, user satisfaction, comprehension, error recovery, accessibility, and the rate at which users correctly interpret system outputs. Governance measures can include privacy incidents, auditability, complaint resolution, and the frequency of human escalation.

For high-impact applications, evaluation should be scenario-based. Testing should include normal conditions, edge cases, incomplete information, adversarial inputs, and representative user groups. Longitudinal evaluation is also valuable because the behavior of a deployed AI system can change as data and user behavior change. The future directions identified in the supplied literature therefore support evaluation frameworks that continue after initial deployment rather than treating launch as the end of assessment [8], [10], [19].

XXIV. IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES FOR RESPONSIBLE EVERYDAY AI

The literature can be translated into a practical implementation sequence. First, define the user problem before selecting an AI technique. AI should be introduced when it provides a meaningful improvement in a task rather than simply because it is technologically available. Second, identify the minimum data needed to perform the task and establish rules for collection, storage, access, and deletion. Third, select a model appropriate to the risk and complexity of the application [20], [27].

Fourth, design the human interaction before finalizing automation. Users should know what the system is doing, what information it uses where appropriate, and how to correct an error. Fifth, test the system with representative users and realistic scenarios. Sixth, define escalation paths for uncertain or high-impact cases. Seventh, monitor performance after deployment and update the model or workflow when evidence shows degradation or new risks [25], [29].

This sequence is applicable across domains but should be adapted to context. A smart-home recommendation may require simple user controls, whereas a healthcare system may require formal validation, audit trails, clinical review, and stronger data protections. The common principle is proportionality: the amount of oversight, explanation, testing, and security should reflect the consequences of failure.

Organizations should also document model purpose, data sources, known limitations, intended users, prohibited uses, monitoring metrics, and responsible personnel. Documentation improves continuity when models are updated or when responsibility moves between teams. It can also help users understand why a system behaves differently after a software or model change.

XXV. CROSS-CULTURAL, ECONOMIC, AND INFRASTRUCTURE CONSIDERATIONS

AI adoption does not occur under identical conditions everywhere. The supplied literature includes studies from different countries and publication contexts, which demonstrates that user experience and adoption can vary with digital infrastructure, education, economic conditions, language, and cultural expectations [1], [8], [10], [15]. A system developed for one population may not automatically generalize to another population.

Language is particularly important for everyday AI. Natural-language systems may have different levels of performance across languages, accents, dialects, and mixed-language communication. If evaluation focuses mainly on high-resource languages, users of other languages may receive weaker service. Inclusive design therefore requires multilingual testing and, where feasible, locally relevant datasets and interfaces [7], [14].

Economic factors also affect who can benefit from AI. Advanced devices, reliable internet access, paid digital services, and modern computing infrastructure may not be equally available to all users. AI can reduce barriers in some areas, but it can also create new barriers if essential services become dependent on technologies that require expensive hardware or high-speed connectivity. Accessibility should consequently include affordability and infrastructure requirements as well as interface design.

The literature also suggests that social acceptance depends on perceived usefulness and trust. Users are more likely to adopt an AI-supported service when its purpose is understandable and the benefit is visible. Adoption should therefore be accompanied by communication and training rather than assumed to follow automatically from technical deployment [2], [10].

XXVI. SYNTHESIS OF PRACTICAL DESIGN PRINCIPLES

Across the reviewed sources, several design principles repeatedly appear. The first is usefulness: AI should solve a clearly defined problem for a real user. The second is proportional automation: the system should automate only as much as is appropriate for the consequences of error. The third is transparency: users should receive enough information to understand the role of AI in the service. The fourth is controllability: people should be able to correct, reject, or override important outputs where feasible [5], [25].

The fifth principle is privacy by design. Data collection should be connected to a defined purpose, and sensitive information should receive stronger protection. The sixth is security throughout the lifecycle. The seventh is inclusive evaluation across relevant user groups, languages, devices, and environments. The eighth is continuous monitoring, because model behavior and real-world conditions can change after deployment [14], [27], [29].

These principles connect the technical and social dimensions of AI. A high-performing model can still produce poor outcomes if the interface is confusing, the data are

inappropriate, or users cannot challenge errors. Conversely, a modest model can provide useful assistance when it is carefully scoped, transparent, secure, and integrated into a workflow that preserves human judgment. This is consistent with the socio-technical interpretation developed throughout this review.

XXVII. CASE-BASED APPLICATION ANALYSIS

A useful way to interpret the reviewed literature is to examine how the same AI capability behaves differently when embedded in different everyday situations. Consider recommendation, prediction, conversation, and classification as four broad capabilities. Recommendation appears in shopping, entertainment, news, and education; prediction appears in traffic, finance, healthcare, and maintenance; conversation appears in assistants and chatbots; classification appears in spam filtering, image interpretation, fraud detection, and content moderation. The literature shows that the capability itself does not determine its social effect. The surrounding task, data, user expectations, and consequence of error are equally important [1], [7], [14].

A. Recommendation as a Low-Friction Decision Aid

Recommendation systems reduce the number of choices presented to users. In entertainment, this can make large libraries easier to navigate. In shopping, recommendations can shorten product search. In education, a recommendation can suggest learning material based on observed performance. The common mechanism is a model that estimates relevance from historical interactions or other available information [3], [9], [12].

The key design question is whether recommendation should merely optimize predicted interest or also support broader user goals. A system that always predicts the most familiar content may reduce exploration. A learning platform that recommends only material similar to what a student already understands may reduce opportunities to encounter more challenging topics. Therefore, recommendation quality can include relevance, diversity, controllability, and transparency. Users should have ways to change preferences or reset personalization when the system no longer represents their needs [5], [10].

B. Prediction in High-Impact Domains

Prediction is useful when historical patterns contain information about future events. Traffic systems can estimate congestion, financial systems can flag unusual transactions, and healthcare systems can estimate clinical risks. These applications demonstrate why predictive performance must be interpreted in relation to consequences. A false positive in spam filtering may be inconvenient, while a false positive in a medical or financial context can require human investigation [19], [23], [28].

The reviewed literature therefore supports calibrated and context-aware use of predictions. Users should know when an output is an estimate rather than a fact. Systems should provide thresholds appropriate to the task and define what happens when the model is uncertain. Human review is especially important when a prediction can materially affect a person or when an incorrect result is difficult to reverse.

C. Conversation as an Interface Layer

Conversational AI changes the way users access services. Instead of navigating menus, users can describe an objective in natural language. This can reduce interface complexity and improve accessibility, especially for users who are less comfortable with conventional digital interfaces [14], [16],

[24]. However, conversational fluency can create a misleading impression of reliability because a system can produce a coherent response without guaranteeing that every statement is correct.

For this reason, conversational interfaces should distinguish between fluent communication and verified information. In high-stakes settings, the interface should encourage source checking, disclose uncertainty where meaningful, and provide a path to human assistance. The literature on conversational healthcare agents particularly illustrates why natural interaction must be combined with clinical and safety requirements [24], [30].

D. Classification and Automated Filtering

Classification is often hidden from users. Spam filters decide which messages appear suspicious, security systems classify activity as normal or anomalous, and computer-vision systems classify objects or patterns in images. These systems can operate at a scale that would be difficult for humans to manage manually. Their everyday value comes from reducing routine screening effort [14], [22].

Yet classification systems can make mistakes that are not immediately visible. A message may be incorrectly filtered, an unusual transaction may be blocked, or an image may be interpreted incorrectly. The appropriate response is not to eliminate automation but to provide recovery mechanisms. Users should be able to review important filtered decisions, correct errors, and report failures. Feedback can then inform system improvement and reveal where automated assumptions do not match real-world behavior.

XXVIII. MODEL LIMITATIONS AND FAILURE MODES

The reviewed sources repeatedly point toward limitations that should be considered before interpreting AI outputs. One limitation is dependence on training data. Machine-learning systems identify patterns from examples, so missing, noisy, outdated, or unrepresentative data can affect performance [20], [21]. Another limitation is distribution change. A model developed using one environment may encounter different conditions after deployment, reducing reliability even when the original evaluation was strong.

A second limitation is ambiguity. Human language, images, social behavior, and real-world events often contain multiple plausible interpretations. A model may select one interpretation based on statistical patterns without understanding the broader context in the same way a human does. This is especially relevant to conversational systems and automated content generation. Users should therefore treat generated or predicted outputs as system-produced information that may require verification, not as automatically authoritative statements [16], [30].

A third limitation is correlation without sufficient causal understanding. An AI model can identify that two variables are associated without establishing that one causes the other. In everyday recommendations, this may be acceptable because the task is prediction. In healthcare, public policy, or other high-impact settings, confusing association with causation can lead to inappropriate conclusions. The literature consequently supports domain expertise and careful interpretation alongside statistical modeling [19], [23], [28].

A fourth limitation is feedback loops. If an AI system recommends certain content and users respond to those recommendations, the resulting behavior becomes part of the data that may later influence the model. Similar loops can

occur in finance, employment, education, and social platforms. A system can therefore reinforce patterns created partly by its own previous outputs. Monitoring should consider these dynamics instead of evaluating each prediction independently [5], [10], [25].

A fifth limitation is operational failure. Even a well-designed model can be affected by unavailable data, software errors, network problems, sensor failures, integration mistakes, or adversarial behavior. Everyday AI should therefore include fallback modes. A service that cannot safely operate without AI should provide an alternative path when the model is unavailable or uncertain. This is particularly important in healthcare, mobility, security, and connected-home systems.

XXIX. COMPARISON OF HUMAN-LED, AI-ASSISTED, AND HIGH-AUTOMATION WORKFLOWS

The literature suggests that automation can be represented as a continuum rather than a binary choice. At one end, the human performs the task and AI provides optional information. At the middle, AI performs routine analysis and the human reviews the result. At the higher end, AI performs a sequence of actions with limited human intervention. Different daily-life applications require different positions on this continuum [1], [2], [14].

A. Human-Led Workflow

In a human-led workflow, the person remains the primary decision maker and AI acts as a supporting tool. Examples include a teacher using AI to generate practice questions, a clinician reviewing an AI-supported image analysis, or a consumer using a recommendation system while making the final purchase decision. This structure preserves human judgment and is appropriate when context is important or when the cost of error is significant.

B. AI-Assisted Workflow

In an AI-assisted workflow, the system completes a substantial part of information processing but a person reviews the output before a consequential action. This can improve efficiency while maintaining an opportunity for correction. The effectiveness of this model depends on whether the human reviewer has enough time, information, and expertise to detect errors. Simply placing a human at the end of a process does not guarantee meaningful oversight if the interface encourages automatic acceptance.

C. High-Automation Workflow

High automation is appropriate when tasks are repetitive, well-defined, and relatively tolerant of error, or when rapid response is necessary and the system has been validated for the operating environment. Spam filtering, routine content sorting, and some household automation can operate with limited intervention. For higher-impact uses, the system should provide monitoring, escalation, and manual override mechanisms [11], [14], [25].

The continuum perspective helps avoid the assumption that every AI application should either replace humans or remain entirely optional. A more useful question is which tasks should be automated, which should be assisted, and which should remain primarily human. The answer depends on reversibility, consequence, uncertainty, user expertise, and the availability of reliable fallback procedures.

XXX. RESEARCH AGENDA FOR FUTURE STUDIES

The supplied literature identifies several areas where additional research can strengthen understanding of AI in daily life. First, more longitudinal studies are needed. Many studies describe current attitudes or applications, but long-term use can change behavior, dependence, expectations, and skill levels. Repeated measurement could show whether initial convenience remains beneficial or whether new risks emerge over time [1], [8], [10].

Second, future work should compare user experiences across languages, cultures, age groups, and levels of digital literacy. Everyday AI is often evaluated using relatively narrow populations, while actual users have diverse backgrounds and constraints. Cross-cultural research can identify which findings are general and which depend on local infrastructure or social norms [7], [15].

Third, researchers should develop standardized measures for human-AI collaboration. Traditional model metrics do not fully capture whether an AI system helps people complete tasks accurately and safely. Future studies could combine model performance with human decision quality, time saved, error recovery, confidence calibration, accessibility, and user control. Such measures would make it easier to compare systems across domains.

Fourth, high-impact applications require stronger real-world evaluation. Healthcare, finance, transportation, and education should be studied under realistic operational conditions, including edge cases and system failures. Research should report not only successful outcomes but also uncertainty, errors, correction mechanisms, and the conditions under which the system should not be used [19], [23], [28], [31].

Fifth, future research should examine the environmental and infrastructure cost of AI-enabled services. Model training and deployment can require computing resources, storage, network capacity, and device energy. Everyday usefulness should therefore be evaluated together with efficiency and sustainability where relevant. Lightweight models, local processing, and efficient system design may become increasingly important for broad deployment.

Finally, more work is needed on governance that is understandable to ordinary users. Privacy notices and AI disclosures are useful only when people can understand their practical meaning. Research should investigate how to communicate data practices, uncertainty, automated decision involvement, and appeal procedures in concise forms that users can actually act upon. This connects technical transparency with usable transparency [25], [27].

XXXI. INTEGRATED DISCUSSION OF THE LITERATURE

Taken together, the nineteen supplied papers and the additional foundational and recent references used in this review show a consistent transition from isolated AI applications toward AI as an infrastructure layer in everyday systems. The most visible applications are often simple from the user perspective: a recommendation appears, a route is calculated, a question is answered, a transaction is flagged, or a device responds to speech. Behind these interactions are combinations of data processing, machine learning, natural language processing, computer vision, and decision-support techniques [20]–[31].

The literature also indicates that the value of AI is strongly dependent on context. Convenience and efficiency are repeatedly reported in consumer, educational, workplace, and

household applications [1], [2], [7], [14], [15]. In healthcare and other high-impact domains, the literature gives greater attention to validation, privacy, interpretability, workflow integration, and human oversight [17], [19], [23], [26], [30], [31]. This difference is not a contradiction. It reflects the fact that the acceptable level of automation depends on the consequences of error.

Another important synthesis is that AI changes not only tasks but also decision environments. Recommendation systems decide what receives attention, predictive systems estimate what may happen, and conversational systems shape how users access information. These effects can be beneficial when they reduce cognitive and administrative burden, but they also mean that users interact with AI-mediated environments even when they do not explicitly choose an AI tool. Understanding AI in daily life therefore requires attention to system design, not only to user adoption.

The reviewed literature supports a human-centered interpretation in which AI is evaluated by the quality of the complete socio-technical system. Data quality, model performance, interface design, user literacy, institutional processes, privacy protection, cybersecurity, and monitoring all contribute to the final outcome. This perspective explains why a technically advanced model can fail to produce practical value and why a carefully scoped AI system can be useful even when it performs a relatively narrow task.

For future everyday systems, the most important research challenge is therefore integration. Researchers and developers must determine where AI adds measurable value, where human judgment is essential, how uncertainty should be communicated, and how users can retain meaningful control. The supplied literature provides a foundation for this approach by documenting both the expanding applications of AI and the practical limitations that accompany them [5], [10], [25], [27], [29].

XXXII. DOMAIN-SPECIFIC EVALUATION AND GOVERNANCE MATRIX

The literature review indicates that the same governance principle cannot be applied with identical intensity to every AI application. A practical evaluation framework should connect the characteristics of a task with the level of oversight required. Five dimensions are particularly useful: consequence of error, sensitivity of data, degree of automation, reversibility of the decision, and diversity of the operating environment. These dimensions provide a structured way to interpret the findings of the supplied studies without reducing AI performance to a single numerical score [5], [19], [25], [27].

A. Consequence of Error

The first dimension is the potential consequence when an AI system is wrong. Errors in entertainment recommendations are generally recoverable because the user can choose another item. Errors in healthcare, transportation, financial services, or access to essential services can have more serious consequences. This distinction explains why the reviewed healthcare literature emphasizes validation and human oversight more strongly than general consumer literature [17], [19], [23], [26].

A consequence-based approach does not imply that low-risk systems require no safeguards. Even consumer systems can affect privacy, information exposure, or user behavior. Instead, consequence helps determine the depth of testing, monitoring, documentation, and human intervention that is

appropriate. A useful implementation should make this relationship explicit before deployment.

B. Data Sensitivity

The second dimension concerns the sensitivity of the information processed by the system. Smart-home devices may process voice and routine information; healthcare systems process medical records; financial systems process transaction information; educational systems may process learner performance. The more sensitive the data, the stronger the requirements for access control, retention management, security, and user transparency should be [14], [25].

Data sensitivity also affects architecture. Where practical, systems can reduce exposure by collecting less information, processing information locally, separating identifying data from analytical data, or limiting retention. The objective is not to eliminate data use but to establish a clear relationship between the data collected and the service provided. This principle is consistent with the privacy concerns identified throughout the reviewed literature.

C. Degree of Automation

The third dimension is how much control the AI system has over the final action. A system that only displays a recommendation is different from one that automatically executes a transaction or changes a physical device setting. Higher automation can provide greater efficiency but reduces the number of opportunities for human correction. The literature therefore supports matching automation to task reliability and consequence [1], [11], [14].

For high-automation systems, safeguards should include confirmation for consequential actions, monitoring for abnormal behavior, manual override, and safe fallback states. For lower-automation systems, the primary concern may instead be whether the user can correctly interpret and verify the recommendation. The appropriate interface should follow from the automation level rather than treating all AI outputs in the same way.

D. Reversibility and Appeal

A fourth dimension is whether an AI-assisted decision can easily be reversed. If a user receives an irrelevant entertainment recommendation, the consequence is easily corrected. If an automated system denies a service, changes a financial state, or contributes to a high-impact decision, correction may be more difficult. Systems should therefore provide clear mechanisms for review, correction, and appeal whenever decisions have meaningful consequences [25], [28].

Appeal mechanisms also produce useful information for system improvement. Patterns in complaints can reveal systematic errors that aggregate accuracy measures may hide. A mature AI lifecycle should treat user feedback and correction requests as operational evidence rather than as exceptional events.

E. Diversity of the Operating Environment

The fifth dimension is the diversity of the environment in which the model is used. A model may encounter different languages, accents, devices, lighting conditions, network quality, cultural practices, or user skill levels. The supplied literature includes studies from different contexts, supporting the observation that everyday AI should not be evaluated only under ideal conditions [7], [8], [10], [15].

Evaluation should therefore include representative users and realistic operating conditions. For language systems, this can include multiple languages and speech patterns. For

computer vision, it can include different environments and device characteristics. For educational systems, it can include learners with different levels of prior knowledge. For healthcare, it can include relevant patient populations and clinical workflows. This approach reduces the gap between laboratory performance and real-world performance.

F. Governance Across the AI Lifecycle

The five dimensions above can be converted into lifecycle checkpoints. During planning, the organization should define purpose, users, data, expected benefits, and unacceptable uses. During development, it should evaluate data quality, model performance, security, and relevant user groups. During testing, it should examine edge cases and failure recovery. During deployment, it should monitor performance and incidents. During maintenance, it should reassess the system when the model, data, environment, or intended use changes [25], [27], [29].

This lifecycle view is important because an AI system can change without its core model being replaced. A new data source, interface update, user population, or integration with another service can alter outcomes. Governance should therefore follow the deployed system rather than being treated as a one-time approval step.

G. Practical Evaluation Questions

For everyday deployment, a concise evaluation checklist can ask: Is the AI task clearly defined? Is the data necessary and appropriately protected? What happens when the model is uncertain? Who can review an important decision? Can the user correct an error? Is there a non-AI fallback? Has the system been tested with relevant users and environments? Are performance and incidents monitored after launch? These questions convert the broad ethical and technical themes identified in the literature into operational checks.

The resulting framework supports proportional governance. Systems that process sensitive information, make consequential decisions, or control physical actions require stronger safeguards than systems that provide optional low-risk recommendations. At the same time, every AI system should preserve basic principles of privacy, security, transparency, accessibility, and user control. This provides a practical bridge between the research literature and real-world implementation.

These additional considerations reinforce the central conclusion of the review: responsible everyday AI is a lifecycle activity. Data decisions, model development, interface design, deployment, user education, monitoring, and correction are interconnected. Treating these activities as separate stages can leave gaps between technical performance and practical outcomes. An integrated evaluation process is more consistent with the socio-technical character of the applications documented across the supplied literature.

Finally, evaluation should consider whether an AI system continues to serve the original user need. A system can maintain technical performance while becoming less useful because user behavior, business processes, or external conditions have changed. Periodic review can therefore examine relevance, accessibility, privacy, security, user feedback, and measurable task outcomes. This keeps AI deployment connected to the purpose for which it was introduced rather than allowing the technology itself to become the objective.

For organizations, accountability can be strengthened by assigning responsibility at several levels. Technical teams can

be responsible for model monitoring and security; domain specialists can review task-specific validity; managers can oversee appropriate use; and users can report failures or unexpected behavior. Clear roles reduce the possibility that responsibility becomes unclear when a system is integrated into an existing workflow. This organizational perspective complements the technical safeguards discussed in the reviewed sources [19], [27], [29].

For consumer applications, governance should remain understandable and proportionate. Users generally do not need to understand the internal architecture of a recommendation model, but they may need to know why a service is collecting particular information, whether personalization can be disabled, and how to correct inaccurate information. Practical controls can therefore be more valuable than lengthy technical explanations. This supports the broader distinction between technical transparency and usable transparency identified in the literature [5], [25].

Change management is another practical requirement. When an organization replaces a model, changes a data source, or introduces a new AI feature, previous performance should not automatically be assumed to continue. A controlled transition can compare old and new behavior, document changes, and identify unexpected effects. This is particularly important when users have developed routines around the previous system. Clear communication can reduce confusion and support continued trust.

Governance should also distinguish between system error and user error. If an interface makes an AI recommendation look like a confirmed answer, a user may reasonably misunderstand the system. Conversely, users may sometimes ignore clear warnings. Evaluation should therefore examine the complete interaction and not attribute every failure to the model alone. Human factors, interface design, training, and organizational procedures all contribute to the final result.

Another consideration is uncertainty communication. Different AI systems have different meanings for confidence, probability, or ranking. A numerical confidence value may be misunderstood if users do not know what it represents. For ordinary users, simple language, clear status indicators, and explicit instructions for verification may be more useful than technical probability values. In professional environments, more detailed information can be provided because trained users may need to interpret uncertainty as part of their workflow [23], [25].

An additional consideration is data provenance. The reliability of an AI output depends not only on the volume of data but also on how the data were collected, labeled, updated, and combined. In daily-life applications, information can come from multiple devices and services with different levels of quality. Documentation of data sources can help developers identify unexpected gaps and can make later auditing more practical. Where users contribute information directly, interfaces should make important data practices understandable without requiring specialist knowledge.

The final evaluation principle is proportionality. AI should not be judged only by whether it is possible to automate a task. The more important question is whether automation provides sufficient value to justify the data, complexity, monitoring, and risks involved. A narrow model that solves a well-defined problem may be preferable to a more complex system that introduces unnecessary dependencies. This principle is consistent with the literature's broader emphasis on practical usefulness, human oversight, and responsible integration [1], [5], [27].

Energy and infrastructure efficiency may become increasingly relevant as AI becomes embedded in more devices. Everyday services operate across phones, cloud platforms, data centers, networks, and connected devices. Efficient models and appropriate deployment strategies can reduce unnecessary computation while maintaining useful performance. Research can compare local processing, cloud processing, model size, response latency, and energy requirements to understand trade-offs between capability, cost, privacy, and sustainability.

Accessibility should similarly be evaluated as an outcome rather than an assumption. A conversational interface may help a user who has difficulty navigating menus, but it may create barriers for someone whose language or speech pattern is poorly supported. Visual descriptions can assist some users while remaining inaccurate in unusual environments. Testing with the intended user groups is therefore necessary to establish whether an AI feature actually improves access. Inclusion should be measured through task success, independence, comprehension, and user satisfaction.

For educational and workplace settings, AI evaluation should include changes in skills over time. If AI performs a task repeatedly, users may become faster but may also practice the underlying skill less frequently. Research should therefore examine both productivity and learning. In some settings, automation may free time for higher-level work; in others, excessive automation may reduce opportunities to develop expertise. The literature on education, workplace change, and individual behavior provides a basis for studying this balance [2], [10], [17], [18].

Another research opportunity is the study of failure recovery. Many evaluations focus on whether an AI system produces a correct output, but real users encounter incorrect outputs and unexpected situations. A resilient system should help the user recognize the problem, recover from it, and continue the task. Measures such as time to correction, success after an error, and user understanding of recovery options can complement traditional accuracy metrics.

Future studies can also benefit from mixed-method approaches. Quantitative surveys can measure frequency of use, satisfaction, or perceived usefulness, while interviews and observational studies can reveal why users behave in particular ways. System logs and performance measurements can add technical evidence. Combining these forms of evidence can provide a more complete picture of everyday AI because user experience and system performance are related but not identical.

From a research perspective, reproducibility is important for evaluating claims about AI in daily life. Studies should report enough information about participants, data, tasks, evaluation criteria, and limitations to allow other researchers to understand how results were obtained. Differences in study design can otherwise make it difficult to determine whether apparently conflicting findings actually reflect different populations or different definitions of success. The heterogeneous methodology in the supplied literature makes this issue particularly relevant.

The reviewed literature also suggests that AI adoption should be accompanied by realistic expectations. Public descriptions of AI can sometimes emphasize capability without explaining uncertainty or limitations. In practice, systems work within defined data and operational boundaries. Clear communication about intended use can prevent users from applying a tool outside the context in which it was

evaluated. This is especially important for general-purpose conversational and generative systems [16], [30].

AI systems can also create hidden dependencies. When a service becomes faster or easier because AI handles a task, users may gradually stop maintaining an alternative manual method. If the AI service becomes unavailable, the user may then face difficulty completing the task. Resilience planning should therefore consider whether a critical activity has a manual fallback or an alternative service. This is particularly relevant to transport, communication, healthcare support, and connected environments.

Interoperability is another consideration for AI-enabled daily services. A user may interact with several systems that process related information, such as a phone, wearable device, health application, financial platform, or smart-home service. When systems are connected, the benefits of integrated information can increase, but so can privacy and security risks. Clear boundaries between systems, controlled data sharing, and explicit authorization can reduce unnecessary exposure while preserving useful interoperability.

User control can be implemented at several levels. At the basic level, users should be able to correct information or reject an output. At a higher level, they may need to change personalization settings, pause automated processing, or request human assistance. In high-impact systems, users may also require a formal review or appeal process. The appropriate control depends on the consequences of the AI-supported activity, but the general objective is to preserve meaningful human agency.

The evaluation of everyday AI should also distinguish between immediate and cumulative effects. An individual recommendation may have little significance, but repeated recommendations can shape habits, attention, purchasing behavior, or learning patterns. Similarly, a single automated workplace suggestion may be minor, while repeated monitoring can change how employees organize their work. Long-term evaluation is therefore important when AI interacts continuously with users [10], [25].

XXXIII. PROPOSED HUMAN-CENTERED AI INTEGRATION FRAMEWORK

The synthesis of the nineteen sources supports a five-layer framework for everyday AI integration. Layer 1 is data and sensing. AI systems depend on information collected from users, devices, transactions, environments, or professional records. Data quality, consent, security, and representativeness are therefore foundational.

Layer 2 is model and computation. Machine learning, deep learning, NLP, computer vision, expert systems, reinforcement learning, and related techniques transform data into predictions, classifications, recommendations, or generated content [2], [4], [9], [11]. Model selection should reflect the task and the consequences of errors.

Layer 3 is human interaction. Users interpret outputs, provide feedback, accept or reject recommendations, and sometimes intervene in system operation. Interface design should communicate uncertainty and limitations where these matter. Natural-language interaction can improve accessibility, but it can also make complex systems appear more certain than they are [16].

Layer 4 is domain deployment. The same technical capability can have different consequences in healthcare, education, finance, mobility, entertainment, or domestic environments. High-impact applications require stronger validation, human oversight, and failure handling than low-stakes applications.

Layer 5 is governance and continuous monitoring. Privacy controls, bias testing, cybersecurity, auditability, user education, and

human escalation should continue after deployment. AI systems can change as data, users, and operating environments change.

The framework can be summarized as: Data quality → AI processing → Human interaction → Domain outcome → Safeguards → Monitoring and feedback. This cycle is consistent with the reviewed literature's emphasis on responsible, human-centered, and context-sensitive AI adoption [1], [5], [7], [14], [17].

XXXIV. DISCUSSION

The literature shows that AI's impact on daily life is best understood as a combination of automation, personalization, decision support, and interaction. The technology is already integrated into many ordinary activities, but its visibility differs by application. Users may consciously interact with a chatbot or voice assistant, while recommendation and fraud-detection algorithms operate largely in the background [2], [4], [7].

One important pattern is that successful everyday applications tend to offer a clear and immediate value proposition. Recommendations reduce search effort; assistants reduce interaction friction; fraud detection identifies unusual activity; adaptive learning can provide targeted practice; and medical systems can help process complex data [7], [14], [17].

A second pattern is that risk increases when decisions are high-impact, difficult to reverse, or based on sensitive information. Healthcare, financial decisions, employment-related screening, and autonomous mobility therefore require stronger safeguards than entertainment recommendations. This is consistent with the comparative analysis in the supplied literature, which describes more cautious development in safety-critical domains [14].

A third pattern concerns the human role. Several sources argue that AI can augment rather than simply replace people [1], [2], [14]. This does not remove employment or skill concerns. Instead, it shifts the research question from whether AI replaces a job to how tasks, skills, responsibilities, and training requirements change.

A fourth pattern is the importance of literacy. When users understand what AI can and cannot do, they are better positioned to verify outputs, protect data, and make informed decisions. The educational and social sources strongly support awareness of algorithms, data, bias, and responsible use [6], [10], [17], [18].

Overall, the supplied literature supports a socio-technical interpretation of AI. Technical capability is necessary but not sufficient. Outcomes depend on data, system design, human behavior, institutional processes, governance, and the context in which AI is deployed. Additional foundational and recent literature also supports this systems-level view [20]–[31].

XXXV. CONCLUSION AND LIMITATIONS

This review synthesized nineteen supplied papers on artificial intelligence and related applications to examine how AI affects daily life. Across the literature, AI appears in communication, smart homes, healthcare, education, transportation, finance, entertainment, workplaces, agriculture, environmental applications, governance, and cybersecurity. The technologies most frequently discussed include machine learning, deep learning, natural language processing, computer vision, robotics, expert systems, and intelligent control [2], [4], [7], [11], [14].

The reviewed evidence consistently identifies efficiency, convenience, personalization, accessibility, and decision support as major benefits. At the same time, privacy, bias, cybersecurity, job and task disruption, dependence, reduced human interaction, misinformation, and technical reliability recur as significant concerns [5], [7], [10], [16], [17], [19].

High-stakes domains require more than technical accuracy. Healthcare and education sources emphasize validation, human oversight, ethical training, privacy, and institutional readiness [17], [18], [19]. Workplace research highlights the importance of reskilling and adaptation [5], [8]. Social-psychology research shows that AI also changes patterns of interaction and dependence [10].

The paper proposes that responsible everyday AI should follow a human-centered cycle connecting data quality, model capability, human interaction, domain-specific safeguards, and continuous monitoring. This approach does not assume that all AI applications

have identical consequences. Instead, it recognizes that risk and benefit depend on context.

The main limitation is that the study is a secondary synthesis of the supplied literature and does not introduce new primary data. The sources also differ in methodology, geography, publication type, and scope. Some are review articles, one is explicitly identified as a non-peer-reviewed preprint, and one is a curriculum-oriented resource [6], [16]. Therefore, the paper should be read as an organized synthesis rather than a new empirical measurement of AI adoption.

Future work should include longitudinal and cross-cultural studies, standardized measures of human–AI collaboration, domain-specific safety evaluation, accessibility research, and stronger empirical assessment of privacy, fairness, employment transitions, and AI literacy.

XXXVI. EXTENDED LITERATURE SYNTHESIS AND COMPARATIVE TABLES

To strengthen the literature synthesis, the reviewed studies are compared below by research design, application area, technology, reported contribution, and major limitation. The tables are derived from the supplied papers and are intended to make the evidence base transparent rather than to assign rankings.

Study	Approach and area	Contribution and scope
Du [1]	Quantitative survey; Daily life, work, education	Measures user perceptions of AI benefits and substitution concerns; Limitation: Context-specific survey population
Islam et al. [8]	Survey + statistical tests; Daily life and workplace	252 responses; examines AI effects with reliability and multivariate tests; Limitation: Geographic and sample-specific evidence
Lyu & Wang [10]	Empirical psychology social-study; Human behavior	Examines interaction, motivation, cognition and dependence; Limitation: Behavioral context limits generalization
Suresh & Hanamant [14]	Narrative review; Healthcare and daily life	Maps AI across healthcare, transport, communication, entertainment, smart homes and finance; Limitation: Primarily review-based evidence
Ren et al. [17]	Systematic + narrative review; Medical education	Synthesizes AI, LLMs, VR and tutoring applications with ethical concerns; Limitation: Focused on medical education
Wang & Li [18]	Review / conceptual analysis; Public-health education	Explores personalization, data analysis, simulation and policy support; Limitation: Conceptual rather than primary empirical study
Faiyazuddin et al. [19]	Literature review; Healthcare delivery	Covers diagnostics, treatment, prediction, automation and robotics; Limitation: Depends on published evidence and implementation context
Azenkhouk et al. [15]	Review; Daily life	Covers assistants, recommendations, healthcare, transport, finance and smart homes; Limitation: Broad review with heterogeneous evidence

Table I. Comparison of major application domains and human safeguards.

Domain	Technique and application	Benefit and risk/control
Communication	NLP, speech recognition; Assistants, chatbots, translation	Benefit: Faster information access; Risk/control: Privacy, misinformation; verify important outputs

Domain	Technique application and	Benefit and risk/control
Healthcare	ML, DL, computer vision, NLP; Diagnosis support, monitoring, personalization	Benefit: Decision support and efficiency; Risk/control: Bias, safety, data security; human oversight
Education	Adaptive ML, NLP, LLMs; Tutoring, assessment, personalized learning	Benefit: Targeted feedback and practice; Risk/control: Overdependence, inaccurate output; teacher guidance
Transportation	Computer vision, sensor fusion, RL; Navigation, traffic control, autonomy	Benefit: Route and traffic efficiency; Risk/control: Edge cases and safety; fallback mechanisms
Finance	ML, anomaly detection; Fraud detection, recommendations	Benefit: Fast pattern detection; Risk/control: Transparency and privacy; review high-impact cases
Entertainment	Recommendation models, generative AI; Content ranking and creation	Benefit: Personalization and discovery; Risk/control: Filter effects, authorship; user control
Smart home	Sensors, ML, robotics; Automation, voice control	Benefit: Convenience and time saving; Risk/control: Data exposure, reliability; secure controls
Workplace	ML, NLP, analytics; Automation, recruitment, customer support	Benefit: Productivity and task assistance; Risk/control: Task displacement; reskilling and oversight

Table II. Comparison of selected supplied studies and their scope.

Benefit	How it appears in the literature	Associated concern
Efficiency	Automation of repetitive tasks; rapid data processing	Automation can change job/task structures
Personalization	Recommendations, adaptive learning, personalized care	Profiling and privacy risks
Decision support	Fraud detection, diagnosis support, predictive analytics	Bias, overreliance, opacity
Accessibility	Voice translation, interfaces, adaptive systems	Digital divide and unequal access
Continuous support	Assistants, monitoring, chatbots	Dependence and reduced human interaction
Safety support	Traffic optimization, anomaly detection, monitoring	Failures can have physical or financial consequences

Table III. AI technologies, everyday applications, benefits, and safeguards.

Research gap	Why it matters	Suggested future method
Longitudinal evidence	Short surveys cannot show lasting behavioral effects	Repeated-measures studies over 6–24 months
Cross-cultural evidence	AI adoption differs by infrastructure, language and norms	Multi-country comparative surveys
Human–AI collaboration	Productivity alone does not measure collaboration quality	Controlled experiments measuring time, accuracy, workload and error recovery
High-stakes validation	Healthcare, finance and mobility require stronger evidence	Domain-specific safety and fairness evaluation
AI literacy	Users need to understand limitations and verification	Pre/post education intervention studies
Accessibility and equity	Benefits may not reach users equally	User-centered accessibility and inclusion testing

Table IV. Recurring benefits and corresponding challenges identified across the reviewed literature.

The comparative tables show that the literature is methodologically heterogeneous. Survey studies provide direct evidence about user perceptions, while reviews provide broader domain coverage. The strongest future research direction is therefore methodological triangulation: combine surveys, experiments, longitudinal observation, and domain-specific evaluation rather than relying on one evidence type. Recent external reviews also report broad AI deployment across healthcare, education, finance, transportation and other sectors, while emphasizing privacy, bias, interpretability and governance concerns.

XXXVII. REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Du, "The impact of artificial intelligence on people's daily life," The Frontiers of Society, Science and Technology, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 12–18, 2024, doi: 10.25236/FSST.2024.060603.
- [2] S. V., "A study on impact of artificial intelligence on everyday life," International Journal for Research Trends and Innovation, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 992–994, 2023.
- [3] M. Abbas and G. Rasool, "Artificial intelligence in our daily life," International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology, vol. 7, no. 1, 2021, doi: 10.48175/568.
- [4] O. Kofi and O. Allen, "The rise of AI in everyday life: How artificial intelligence is transforming daily tasks," International Journal of Progressive Research in Engineering Management and Science, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 2368–2372, 2024.
- [5] S. Mahajan, "Artificial intelligence and its impacts on the society," Contemporary Social Sciences, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 136–149, 2023.
- [6] O. Pasichnyk and B. Dujkovic-Blagojevic, "Impact of the artificial intelligence on society: Curriculum for primary school children," European Wergeland Centre and IRIM, AI in STEM Education project.
- [7] A. Yadav, P. Rai, Satyender, and S. Sofia, "Artificial intelligence in everyday life: A comprehensive review of recent developments and future prospects," Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, vol. CI, no. 10, pp. 143–153, 2024.
- [8] M. A. Islam, S. R. Ithmam, and M. T. Islam, "The impact of artificial intelligence on daily life and the workplace: A qualitative statistical survey in Bangladesh," International Journal of Science and Business, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 140–151, 2023, doi: 10.58970/IJSB.2239.
- [9] T. Solanki and S. Doifode, "Usefulness of AI in day-to-day life," Electronic International Interdisciplinary Research Journal, vol. XII, issue IV, 2023.
- [10] Z. Lyu and X. Wang, "The impact of artificial intelligence technology on individual behavior from the perspective of social psychology," International Journal of Frontiers in Sociology, vol. 5, issue 15, pp. 13–18, 2023, doi: 10.25236/IJFS.2023.051503.
- [11] A. Raj, "Artificial intelligence," International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology, vol. 12, issue XI, 2024, doi: 10.22214/ijraset.2024.64695.
- [12] Y. M. Ombale and N. Jajoo, "Usefulness of AI in day-to-day life," International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology, vol. 4, issue 1, 2024, doi: 10.48175/IJARSCT-19583.
- [13] A. Doot, V. Shrivastava, and A. Pandey, "Role of artificial intelligence in daily life," International Journal Research Publication Analysis, vol. 1, issue 7, pp. 1–11, 2025.
- [14] S. B. and H. B., "An overview of artificial intelligence applications in everyday life," World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 344–353, 2021, doi: 10.30574/wjarr.2021.9.1.0024.
- [15] A. Azenkouk, F. Z. Mouchtachi, and H. Aghbal, "How artificial intelligence can improve our daily life," International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, vol. IX, issue VIII, 2025, doi: 10.47772/IJRISS.2025.908000483.
- [16] D. Talati, "AI (Artificial Intelligence) in daily life," TechRxiv preprint, posted Feb. 9, 2024, doi: 10.36227/techrxiv.170751714.46556037/v1.
- [17] Y. Ren, Y. Wang, S. Dong, W. Su, Y. Wu, S. Liang, and X. Yang, "Application of artificial intelligence in medical education: A systematic and narrative review of pedagogical potential and ethical implications," Advances in Medical Education and Practice, vol. 17, 2026, doi: 10.2147/AMEP.S567190.
- [18] J. Wang and J. Li, "Artificial intelligence empowering public health education: Prospects and challenges," Frontiers in Public Health, vol. 12, 2024, doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2024.1389026.
- [19] M. Faiyazuddin et al., "The impact of artificial intelligence on healthcare: A comprehensive review of advancements in diagnostics, treatment, and operational efficiency," Health Science Reports, vol. 8, 2025, e70312, doi: 10.1002/hsr2.70312.
- [20] S. Russell and P. Norvig, Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach, 4th ed. Pearson, 2020.
- [21] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville, Deep Learning. MIT Press, 2016.
- [22] Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton, "Deep learning," Nature, vol. 521, no. 7553, pp. 436–444, 2015, doi: 10.1038/nature14539.
- [23] F. Jiang et al., "Artificial intelligence in healthcare: past, present and future," Stroke and Vascular Neurology, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 230–243, 2017, doi: 10.1136/svn-2017-000101.

- [24] L. Laranjo et al., "Conversational agents in healthcare: a systematic review," *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, vol. 25, no. 9, pp. 1248–1258, 2018.
- [25] B. D. Mittelstadt, P. Allo, M. Taddeo, S. Wachter, and L. Floridi, "The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate," *Big Data & Society*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2016.
- [26] X. Gao, P. He, Y. Zhou, and X. Qin, "Artificial Intelligence Applications in Smart Healthcare: A Survey," *Future Internet*, vol. 16, no. 9, 308, 2024, doi: 10.3390/fi16090308.
- [27] A. Bin Rashid and M. A. K. Kausik, "AI revolutionizing industries worldwide: A comprehensive overview of its diverse applications," *Hybrid Advances*, vol. 7, 100277, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.hybadv.2024.100277.
- [28] S. A. et al., "AI and the decision-making process: a literature review in healthcare, financial, and technology sectors," *International Journal of Technology, Policy and Management*, 2024, doi: 10.1080/12460125.2024.2349425.
- [29] K. Kotyal et al., "Advancements and Challenges in Artificial Intelligence Applications: A Comprehensive Review," *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, vol. 30, no. 10, pp. 375–385, 2024, doi: 10.9734/jsrr/2024/v30i102465.
- [30] D. Wang and S. Zhang, "Large language models in medical and healthcare fields: applications, advances, and challenges," *Artificial Intelligence Review*, vol. 57, 299, 2024, doi: 10.1007/s10462-024-10921-0.
- [31] G. Joseph, N. Bhatti, R. Mittal, and A. Bhatti, "Current Application and Future Prospects of Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare and Medical Education: A Review of Literature," *Cureus*, 2025, doi: 10.7759/cureus.77313.

Source note: The references above are based on the research papers supplied in this conversation. Citation numbering in the manuscript refers to this reference list.