



STIAEM

Slow Tech Innovation

AI, Ethics and
New Teaching Methods

METHODOLOGICAL DOCUMENT FOR COMPARATIVE RESEARCH



Università di Foggia
Studi Umanistici, Lettere, Beni Culturali,
Scienze della Formazione



İSTANBUL - ESENLER
İLÇE MİLLÎ EĞİTİM MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ



14 74



Co-funded by
the European Union

2025-1-IT02-KA220-SCH-000365213

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them. Project reference code: 2025-1-IT02-KA220-SCH-000365213



STIAEM
Slow Tech Innovation
AI, Ethics and
New Teaching Methods



Co-funded by
the European Union

2025-1-IT02-KA220-SCH-000365213

PROJECT STIAEM INFORMATION

Disclaimer

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them. Project reference code: 2025-1-IT02-KA220-SCH-000365213



CC BY-NC-SA 4.0

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International

CC BY-NC-SA 4.0

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International

This license requires that reusers give credit to the creator. It allows reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format, for noncommercial purposes only. If others modify or adapt the material, they must license the modified material under identical terms.



Università di Foggia
Studi Umanistici, Lettere, Beni Culturali,
Scienze della Formazione



İSTANBUL - ESENLER
İLÇE MİLLÎ EĞİTİM MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ



1474

METHODOLOGICAL DOCUMENT FOR COMPARATIVE RESEARCH

1. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF THE DOCUMENT

This document defines the methodological guidelines for the implementation of Activity 1 of Work Package 2 (Research and Methodological Development), which represents the operational core of our comparative research. The primary objective of this work is to map the State of the Art of Artificial Intelligence integration in schools within the partner countries: Italy, Spain, Turkey, Greece, and Lithuania.

However, this investigation has been designed to clearly move beyond a mere survey of technological equipment or a superficial reconnaissance. The intent is to obtain a real and in-depth snapshot by investigating the deep competencies of teachers, with particular attention to critical, ethical, and pedagogical dimensions. Indeed, we aim to go beyond the technical surface to understand if teachers are aware not only of *how* to use AI, but above all *why* to integrate it into their teaching.

From this perspective, the research will not limit itself to quantifying the technical level of AI Literacy, but will seek to bring out the intrinsic motivations and ethical attitudes of the participants. Specifically, we will investigate what we define as the "Slow Tech Attitude" (Patrignani & Whitehouse, 2014a; 2014b; 2019)—that is, the set of reflective postures that guide or, conversely, hinder the conscious adoption of Artificial Intelligence.

The data collected through this framework are not destined to remain unused; rather, they possess a crucial operational purpose: they will provide the solid empirical basis necessary for drafting the National Reports and the Final Comparative Report. Ultimately, this evidence will constitute the indispensable foundation upon which the STIAEM Pedagogical Model and future training pathways (MOOCs) will be built.

2. INTRODUCTION TO EDUCATIONAL DESIGN RESEARCH

The STIAEM project adopts the Educational Design Research (EDR) approach. According to Plomp and Nieveen (2013), EDR is not merely a procedure, but a "high-level research methodology" designed to bridge the gap between academic research and educational practice.

It is defined as the systematic study of the design, development, and evaluation of educational interventions as solutions to complex problems in real contexts, aiming to generate reusable theoretical knowledge (McKenney & Reeves, 2012; Plomp & Nieveen, 2013).

This methodology is not limited to observing educational reality but aims to develop evidence-based solutions for complex problems. EDR is distinguished by its dual goal: developing effective solutions for educational practice ("design") and generating reusable scientific knowledge ("research").

This specific strategic choice is dictated by the very nature of the Erasmus+ intervention, which does not intend to limit itself to a mere statistical or descriptive observation of phenomena related to Artificial Intelligence, but rather aims to develop and validate practical training solutions to address emerging educational challenges.

The EDR approach proves particularly suitable as it structures the investigation as a systematic process of analysis, design, and evaluation oriented towards solving real problems.

Operationally, the adoption of this framework transforms the administration of survey tools into an organic research process that accompanies the project's timeline through three interconnected logical stages:

1. **Diagnosis Phase:** This corresponds to the "Analysis Phase" of the EDR model. During this stage, the investigation focuses on the deep exploration of the context, educational needs, and entry skills of teachers and students, thus establishing an essential baseline.
2. **Process Phase:** This aligns with the "Design & Prototyping Phase," coinciding with the implementation of training interventions and ongoing data collection. This is necessary to monitor participant reactions and calibrate instructional actions in real-time.
3. **Impact Phase:** The cycle concludes with this phase, corresponding to the "Evaluation Phase," dedicated to the systematic evaluation of the intervention's effectiveness and retrospective reflection on the collected data.

This structure ensures that every piece of data collected is not an end in itself, but actively contributes to the validation of the proposed "Slow Tech" pedagogical model and ensures its future transferability to other European educational contexts.

In STIAEM, this approach guarantees that the Pedagogical Model is not only theoretical but rooted in the real school contexts of the partners. Specifically for this project, EDR combines the development of educational solutions (the STIAEM Pedagogical Model and MOOCs) with empirical research to generate new theoretical knowledge.

This approach is iterative, flexible, and design-oriented: the process moves from a rigorous analysis of the problem toward the development of solutions that are cyclically tested and refined in real contexts. Indeed, in the STIAEM project, the data collected in Phase 1 through research does not merely describe the state of the art, but provides the empirical basis for the design of training interventions, directly informing the creation of the STIAEM Pedagogical Model and future MOOCs.

In conclusion, STIAEM integrates the most recent perspectives of Design-Based Research (DBR), which emphasize the role of teacher "agency" and co-design in digital innovation processes (Anderson & Shattuck, 2012; Bakker, 2018).

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The construction of the STIAEM project's survey tools does not occur in a vacuum but is solidly anchored in the international scientific debate. The main theoretical frameworks on AI Literacy converge in defining artificial intelligence not only as a technological field but as a complex socio-technical phenomenon requiring the development of cognitive, critical, ethical, and civic competencies.

3.1 AI Literacy in the International Landscape: A Multidimensional Vision

Literature analysis, ranging from frameworks such as AI4K12, DigComp 2.2 and 3.0, to UNESCO documents and digital citizenship education models, reveals a shared and

multidimensional vision. According to this perspective, a full understanding of AI must necessarily integrate basic knowledge of how intelligent systems function with the capacity for conscious interaction, critical evaluation of limits and biases, and deep, value-oriented ethical reflection.

A pivotal reference is represented by the AI4K12 initiative, which structures AI teaching around five fundamental "Big Ideas." The first idea, Perception, explores how computers perceive the world through sensors, extracting meaning via algorithms, and invites a distinction between the limits of artificial sensors compared to human senses. The second idea, Representation and Reasoning, focuses on how intelligent systems build models to make decisions. The third, Learning, clarifies how computers learn from data, introducing key concepts like neural networks and the need to correct biases in datasets. The fourth idea concerns Natural Interaction, namely the ability of AI to interact with humans through language and emotions. Finally, the fifth and crucial idea is Societal Impact, which analyzes how AI can influence society positively or negatively.

In parallel, the UNESCO Frameworks for students and teachers explicitly highlight the relationship between AI Literacy, human rights, equity, and inclusion. The competency framework for students outlines twelve competencies distributed across dimensions ranging from a human-centered mindset to AI ethics, promoting the vision of students as responsible co-creators. Similarly, the framework for teachers defines the competencies necessary to master AI in an educational context, ranging from technical fundamentals to AI pedagogy, up to the use of AI for professional development, always maintaining a humanistic perspective.

At the European level, DigComp 3.0 updates the digital competence framework by integrating AI transversally. A fundamental distinction is posited between "Implicit AI," which concerns the unconscious use of integrated intelligent systems, and "Explicit AI," which instead requires a conscious understanding of concepts, algorithms, and ethical principles, enabling the user to have a critical gaze. Initiatives like "Digital Promise" and the "AILit Framework" (EU/OECD) also reinforce this vision, highlighting the need to develop "Citizen Ethics" and to overcome barriers due to a lack of shared knowledge, to prepare young people to live and work in the AI era with critical thinking and creative expression.

These theoretical frameworks agree that AI literacy is not reducible to a technical skill, such as coding, but is a socio-ethical competence that enables students and teachers to understand limits, equity challenges, and the imperative need for constant human supervision.

3.2 The Project's Response: The "Slow Tech" Paradigm

Based on these theoretical premises, the STIAEM project introduces its specific interpretative framework grounded in the "Slow Tech Attitude." This perspective does not reject innovation; rather, it counters the logic of uncritical digital accelerationism to promote a reflective and sustainable approach that places the human being back at the center of the technological process through the human-in-the-loop paradigm.

This conceptual framework is articulated across three interconnected dimensions, beginning with "Good IT," which identifies ethically acceptable technology capable of respecting natural learning rhythms and individual well-being, thereby preventing risks

associated with technostress. This is complemented by "Clean IT," oriented toward environmental sustainability and awareness of the ecological footprint left by artificial intelligence systems, fostering environmentally sustainable digital practices. The framework is completed by "Fair IT," dedicated to evaluating the social desirability of technology through the critical analysis of algorithmic biases, the countering of access inequalities, and the promotion of genuine inclusion.

In this context, the primary objective consists not in the mere application of the "Slow Tech" model, but rather in its dynamic evolution. Through a critical and conscious integration of artificial intelligence within educational contexts, the project aims to consolidate that delicate balance between technological advancement and pedagogical ethics that constitutes the core identity and primary strength of the approved proposal.

4. RESEARCH DESIGN

To translate the theoretical framework into an effective empirical investigation, the project adopts an Explanatory Sequential Mixed Methods Design (QUAN - qual). This methodological choice is dictated by the need not only to quantify the level of competence (*AI Literacy*), but to understand the deep motivations and ethical attitudes (*Slow Tech Attitude*) that drive or hinder AI adoption.

The design is articulated in two distinct and connected phases:

- **Quantitative Phase (QUAN):** An extensive survey (involving the administration of a questionnaire to teachers and students featuring validated scales and Situational Judgment Test scenarios—dilemmas designed to measure ethics "in action") to map competencies, practices, and attitudes across of the sample in the five partner countries.
- **Qualitative Phase (qual):** Focus groups and semi-structured interviews aimed at "explaining" the trends emerging from the survey. This phase will involve all target groups (Teachers, Students, and Stakeholders) to guarantee a complete triangulation of perspectives. Semi-structured interview guides will be used for Stakeholders and School Principals to bring systemic barriers to light, along with Participatory Workshops (co-design sessions) to deeply explore "implicit didactics" and participant fears (e.g., "fear of replacement").

4.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Currently, the integration of Artificial Intelligence in schools appears often fragmented, focused almost exclusively on technological infrastructure, while neglecting the critical, ethical, and pedagogical competencies required of teachers to effectively govern these tools. This approach has engendered a form of "digital accelerationism": a race toward innovation that disregards human well-being, sustainability, and the natural rhythms of learning. Indeed, there is a distinct lack of genuine understanding regarding how AI impacts the profound dimensions of teaching.

Teachers often possess the technical skills to utilize new tools, yet they do not always master the underlying pedagogical and ethical rationale. The result is an instructional practice that is at times uncritical. Consequently, many training interventions fail because they treat AI as a mere tool, rather than as a complex socio-technical phenomenon. The true challenge, therefore, lies not in teaching "how to use" AI, but in cultivating teachers capable of deep ethical reflection regarding its role in the classroom (Wang et al., 2025).

To address this need, the STIAEM project adopts the Slow Tech framework (based on the principles of good, clean, and fair technology) as its foundational design theory. However, the project's ambition extends beyond a mere mechanical or static application of this model.

On the contrary, the research decisively advocates for an evolution of the Slow Tech model in favor of the full integration of AI. This evolution materializes in the definition of a new multidimensional construct: a theoretical structure capable of simultaneously analyzing not only technical competencies but also ethical postures, emotional dynamics, and the pedagogical implications of digital transformation.

To translate this theoretical construct into tangible measurement tools, the Consortium developed the Methodological Coherence Matrix (*Table 1*). This matrix serves as the epistemological backbone of the data collection phase, demonstrating how the abstract "Slow Tech Attitude" has been distilled into measurable variables through a rigorous process of operationalization.

The survey architecture is built upon a triangulation strategy that intersects four fundamental dimensions:

- **The Well-being Dimension (Good IT):** This investigates the psychological impact of AI. Going beyond simple acceptance, the selected instruments (GAAIS and TPS) aim to correlate levels of anxiety and *technostress* with perceived usefulness. The hypothesis posits that a "Slow" approach mitigates emotional discomfort, fostering harmonious integration.
- **The Ethical and Social Dimension (Fair IT):** This represents the axiological core of the project. The investigation is not limited to measuring theoretical knowledge (AIEAS and AIERS scales) but evaluates practical moral judgment via **Situational Dilemmas (SJT)**. This allows for the observation of how declared ethics translate into actual instructional behavior.
- **The Ecological Dimension (Clean IT):** Often overlooked, this dimension is explicitly mapped using DigComp 3.0 indicators (Area 4.4) to detect awareness of the digital carbon footprint, an indispensable element for sustainable citizenship.
- **The Technical Competence Dimension (AI Literacy):** Finally, the competence pillar (MAILS, AILQ) acts as a control variable, essential to understand whether higher technical literacy corresponds to greater ethical sensitivity.

The exclusive use of validated psychometric scales guarantees the statistical robustness of the data and international comparability, ensuring that the STIAEM model is grounded in solid empirical evidence.

Theoretical Pillar	Investigated Construct(What we measure)	Target Group	Instrument (Scale)
Good IT (Well-being and Human-Centricity)	Technostress & Anxiety	Students	GAAIS General Attitudes towards Artificial Intelligence Scale (Negative Attitude)
	Measures fear and emotional discomfort towards AI.	Teachers	TPS Teachers' Perception Scale (Factor 2: Anxiety)
	Digital Well-being	Students	DigComp 3.0 (Area 4.3)
	Work/life balance and psychophysical health.	Teachers	
	Perceived Usefulness	Students	SATAI Students' Attitudes Toward Artificial Intelligence Scale (Affective)
	Does AI truly improve human life or teaching?	Teachers	TPS Teachers' Perception Scale (Factor 3: Usefulness)
Clean IT (Sustainability)	Environmental Awareness	Students	DigComp 3.0 (Area 4.4)
	Ecological impact of technologies (e.g., server consumption).	Teachers	
Fair IT (Ethics and Justice)	Ethical Awareness	Students	AIEAS Artificial Intelligence Awareness Scale (Awareness)
	Recognition of Bias, Discrimination, and Privacy.	Teachers	AIERS AI Ethical Reflection Scale (Reflection)

	Ethical Reasoning (Practical) How does one act when facing a moral dilemma?	Teachers	Dilemma Scenarios (SJT)
	Human Agency Human control over the machine (Human-in-the-loop).	Students	AIEAS Artificial Intelligence Awareness Scale (Autonomy)
AI Literacy (Technical Competence)	Self-Efficacy Perception of "knowing how to do."	Teachers	MAILS Multidimensional Artificial Intelligence Literacy Scale (Self-Efficacy)
	Pedagogical Competence Knowing how to integrate AI into teaching.	Teachers	TPS Teachers' Perception Scale (Factor 1: Competence)
	Technical & Cognitive Skills Understanding how AI works (Knowledge).	Students	AILQ Artificial Intelligence Literacy Questionnaire (Cognitive) DigComp (Areas 1-3)
Control Variables	Context and Style Factors influencing responses.	All	Demographics HowYouTeach

Table 1. Methodological Coherence Matrix (Slow Tech Alignment Matrix). The table illustrates the systematic alignment between the theoretical pillars of the "Slow Tech" framework (Good, Clean, and Fair IT) and the adopted quantitative data collection tools. For each dimension, the investigated constructs and the corresponding validated psychometric scales are detailed, highlighting the methodological triangulation strategy used to map the competencies of teachers and students.

4.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The investigation is guided by the following research questions, formulated to intercept both technical (*DigComp*) and ethical (*Slow Tech*) dimensions:

- **RQ1 (Mapping Competences):** What is the current level of AI Literacy (technical and ethical) of teachers in the partner countries, distinguishing between technical skills (tool usage) and critical skills (understanding mechanisms and risks)?
- **RQ2 (Slow Tech Attitude):** What is the ethical perception of AI in partner schools? Is there widespread awareness regarding sustainability (Clean IT), equity (Fair IT), and well-being (Good IT)?
- **RQ3 (Correlation):** Is there a significant correlation between the level of general digital competence and the "Slow Tech" attitude? (*Hypothesis: greater technical skills favor a more critical and less deterministic vision*).
- **RQ4 (Educational Needs):** What specific training needs emerge to support an AI adoption that is pedagogically effective and not merely instrumental?

4.3 RESEARCH DOMAINS AND OPERATIONAL PHASES

The research operates across three main domains: Socio-Technical, representing the domains of AI Literacy (based on frameworks such as UNESCO and DigComp 3.0); Ethical (*Slow Tech*); and Practical Knowledge (poly-referential approach).

Inspired by the methodological models of McKenney and Reeves (2012) and the evolutions proposed by Plomp and Nieveen (2013), the STIAEM research is articulated in several macro-cyclic phases:

Phase 1 (Analysis and Exploration): Quantitative mapping via desk research and surveys of the state of the art and needs analysis.

Phase 2 (Development): Qualitative deepening and co-design via focus groups and workshops to better understand and explain the emerging trends.

Phase 3 (Triangulation): Triangulation of the emerged qualitative-quantitative results.

Phase 4 (Design): Development of the STIAEM model based on collected data (iterative phase of model creation through prototyping cycles).

Phase 5 (Evaluation/Implementation): Testing of training pathways (MOOCs) and refinement of pedagogical theory.

Phase 6 (Reflection/Theorization): Production of final recommendations.

4.4 SAMPLING STRATEGY

To ensure accessibility to the field and optimize the timeline, the project employs a **non-probabilistic convenience sampling strategy**. This methodological choice allows the consortium to capitalize on the partners' existing school networks, ensuring a high response rate from the identified target groups.

4.4.1 Target Groups

Primary Target: Secondary school teachers (ISCED 2 and 3), stratified to ensure a balanced representation between STEM and Humanities subjects, as well as varying levels of teaching experience.

Secondary Target: Students aged 14 to 19.

Stakeholders: Key educational actors, including School Principals, Digital Coordinators, and local Policy Makers.

4.4.2 Minimum Quotas per Country

To guarantee statistical comparability while respecting the diverse operational structures of the consortium, the sampling plan is organized into a differentiated cluster system. This approach assigns specific quotas based on the partner type:

- **Cluster A (Academic Institutions):** Tasked with broader engagement, aiming for a target of over 150 students and 80–100 teachers.
- **Cluster B (Schools and Administrative Bodies):** Focused on granular data collection, with a minimum threshold of 80–100 students and 40–50 teachers. Additionally, Cluster B partners retain the strategic flexibility to extend the survey scope to the 11–14 age group to broaden the study's knowledge base.

Target Group		Instrument	Cluster A	Cluster B
Teachers (Secondary School)		Online Survey	N = 80-100	N = 40-50
Students (14-19 years old)		Online Survey	N = 100-150	N = 80-100
Stakeholders (Principals)		Interviews	N = 3-5	N = 3-5
Teachers/Students		Participatory Workshop Logbook	N = Previously involved sample	N = Previously involved sample

5. SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The research integrates a poly-referential theoretical approach based on the analysis of educational practices (Altet, 2003; Wittorski, 2004; Perla & Vinci, 2021). This

framework allows for going beyond the measurement of declared competencies to explore “teacher practical knowledge” and “implicit didactics.” The objective is to bring to light non-codified ethical and pedagogical decisions—that “instructional doing” which often escapes standard surveys but determines the real integration of AI in the classroom.

To ensure maximum methodological rigor and international comparability of results, the research plan adopts a Mixed-Method approach (quantitative and qualitative). The survey instruments are currently being defined: the process of construction and operationalization of variables involves the selection and adaptation of items drawn from validated scales found in the most recent scientific literature.

The objective is to investigate the "Slow Tech Attitude" construct through a double lens:

- **Quantitative Dimension:** Statistical measurement of competencies and attitudes through structured surveys (Likert scales).
- **Qualitative Dimension:** Deep exploration of motivations, fears, and ethical reasoning through dilemma scenarios and open-ended items, necessary to understand the "why" behind the numerical data.

5.1. Data Standardization (Pre-processing)

To ensure the transnational comparability of the raw data collected by the Partners:

Unique Codebook: A “Master Codebook” in English will be created, associating a unique code with each variable (question), identical for all national versions.

Data Cleaning: The responsible partner will centralize the datasets, eliminate incomplete or invalid responses (e.g., “speedsters”), and verify internal consistency.

5.2. Quantitative Analysis

The analytical workflow commences with an exploratory and descriptive phase, designed to provide a granular overview of the dataset. This preliminary step involves calculating frequencies, means, and standard deviations for each investigated dimension—such as AI Literacy and Ethical Awareness—stratified by country to immediately highlight specific national trends.

Once this statistical baseline is consolidated, the investigation evolves into a comparative analysis supported by rigorous tests. The application of these instruments is crucial for uncovering significant divergences, not only among the various partnership countries but also within key subgroups: for instance, the dichotomy between STEM and Humanities teachers, or the existing perceptual gaps between the teaching staff and the student body.

To transcend the merely comparative level and investigate causal links, the study will subsequently implement correlational and linear analyses. Through the use of Pearson coefficients and linear models, the research team will verify the central hypotheses, specifically assessing the robustness of the relationship between technical competence and ethical awareness.

Finally, the analytical pathway culminates in a synthesis of a psychometric and predictive nature. By utilizing advanced techniques such as Factor Analysis (EFA/CFA) and Item Response Theory (IRT), the structural integrity of the data will be thoroughly investigated. This in-depth analysis will enable the construction of a comprehensive model capable of explaining the complexity of the variables at play and predicting outcomes across different educational and cultural contexts.

5.3. Qualitative Analysis

Thematic Analysis: Analysis of open-ended questions to identify recurring themes (e.g., "Fear of replacement," "Need for clear guidelines").

Triangulation: Qualitative results will be used to interpret and enrich the trends emerging from the quantitative analysis.

5.4 Centralized Translation and Expert Review Protocol

To ensure maximum semantic uniformity and mitigate the risk of interpretive discrepancies among the five consortium countries, the project departs from traditional autonomous translation procedures, adopting a centralized translation approach with local validation. In this configuration, the Lead Partner (University of Foggia) assumes responsibility for producing the initial translation drafts for all target languages, delegating the crucial role of review and cultural validation to the national partners.

Operationally, the procedure is based on the use of a "Translation Kit," a working file rigorously structured on a four-column matrix that guarantees the traceability of every modification. The file structure includes:

1. An immutable unique code for each item (Column A);
2. The original English text acting as the binding master version (Column B);
3. The preliminary translation proposal developed by the Lead Partner (Column C);
4. A workspace reserved for partner notes and corrections (Column D).

The local partner's task is to compare the translation draft with the English original. If the proposed version is correct and adequate, the validator will confirm the item by leaving the verification field unchanged. Conversely, in the presence of syntactic errors, "false friends," or expressions culturally unsuitable for the school target group (students aged 14–19), the partner must insert the amended version directly into the column dedicated to validation.

It is fundamental that such modifications be made exclusively to correct substantial inaccuracies or to ensure comprehensibility, avoiding stylistic alterations that could deviate from the original meaning.

The process concludes with the return of the validated file to the Lead Partner, who will proceed to integrate the approved corrections and upload the definitive versions to the survey platform, subject to a final technical display check. This method ensures that every variation from the original text is documented, justified, and traceable.

Unique Code	English item	Spanish item	Expert Check Item
AIEAS_AUT_05	The development of AI should promote the autonomy of all human beings and control the autonomy of AI systems.	El desarrollo de la IA debería promover la autonomía de todos los seres humanos y controlar la autonomía de los sistemas de IA.	
MAILS_KU_10	In everyday life, I can interact with AI in a way that makes my tasks easier.	En mi vida cotidiana, puedo interactuar con la IA de forma que me facilite las tareas.	
AILQ_SE03	I believe I can master AI knowledge and skills.	Creo que puedo dominar los conocimientos y las habilidades relacionados con la IA.	

Unique Code	English item	Turkish item	Expert Check Item
AIEAS_AUT_05	The development of AI should promote the autonomy of all human beings and control the autonomy of AI systems.	Yapay zekanın gelişimi, tüm insanların özerkliğini teşvik etmeli ve YZ sistemlerinin özerkliğini kontrol altında tutmalıdır.	
MAILS_KU_10	In everyday life, I can interact with AI in a way that makes my tasks easier.	Günlük yaşamda, yapay zeka ile işlerimi kolaylaştıracak şekilde etkileşim kurabilirim.	
AILQ_SE03	I believe I can master AI knowledge and skills.	Yapay zeka bilgi ve becerilerine hakim olabileceğime inanıyorum.	

Unique Code	English item	Greek item	Expert Check Item
AIEAS_AUT_05	The development of AI should promote the autonomy of all human beings and control the autonomy of AI systems.	Η ανάπτυξη της ΤΝ θα πρέπει να προάγει την αυτονομία όλων των ανθρώπων και να ελέγχει την αυτονομία των συστημάτων ΤΝ.	
MAILS_KU_10	In everyday life, I can interact with AI in a way that makes my tasks easier.	Στην καθημερινότητά μου, μπορώ να αλληλεπιδρώ με την ΤΝ με τρόπο που διευκολύνει τις εργασίες μου.	
AILQ_SE03	I believe I can master AI knowledge and skills.	Πιστεύω ότι μπορώ να κατακτήσω τις γνώσεις και τις δεξιότητες που σχετίζονται με την ΤΝ.	

Unique Code	English item	Lithuanian item	Expert Check Item
AIEAS_AUT_05	The development of AI should promote the autonomy of all human beings and control the autonomy of AI systems.	DI plėtra turėtų skatinti visų žmonių autonomiją ir kontroliuoti DI sistemų autonomiją.	
MAILS_KU_10	In everyday life, I can interact with AI in a way that makes my tasks easier.	Kasdienybėje galiu sąveikauti su DI taip, kad tai palengvintų mano atliekamas užduotis.	
AILQ_SE03	I believe I can master AI knowledge and skills.	Tikiu, kad galiu įvaldyti su DI susijusias žinias ir įgūdžius.	

Unique Code	English item	Italian item	Expert Item	Check
AIEAS_AUT_05	The development of AI should promote the autonomy of all human beings and control the autonomy of AI systems.	Lo sviluppo dell'IA dovrebbe promuovere l'autonomia di tutti gli esseri umani e controllare l'autonomia dei sistemi di IA.		
MAILS_KU_10	In everyday life, I can interact with AI in a way that makes my tasks easier.	Nella vita quotidiana, riesco a interagire con l'IA in modo da facilitare le mie attività.		
AILQ_SE03	I believe I can master AI knowledge and skills.	Credo di poter padroneggiare le conoscenze e le abilità relative all'IA.		

REFERENCES

Bakker, A. (2018). *Design Research in Education: A Practical Guide for Early Career Researchers*. Routledge.

Carolus, A., Koch, M. J., Straka, S., Latoschik, M. E., & Wienrich, C. (2023). MAILS—Meta AI literacy scale: Development and testing of an AI literacy questionnaire based on well-founded competency models and psychological change- and meta-competencies. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans*, 1(2), Article 100014. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbah.2023.100014>

Cosgrove, J., & Cachia, R. (2025). *DigComp 3.0: European Digital Competence Framework—Fifth edition* (JRC144121). Publications Office of the European Union. <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2760/0001149>

Işık, S., Çakır, R., & Korkmaz, Ö. (2024). Teachers' perception scale towards the use of artificial intelligence tools in education. *Participatory Educational Research*, 11(Prof. Dr. H. Ferhan Odabaşı Gift Issue), 80–94. <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.24.95.11.6>

Koch, M. J., Carolus, A., Wienrich, C., & Latoschik, M. E. (2024). Meta AI literacy scale: Further validation and development of a short version. *Heliyon*, 10(21), Article e39686. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e39686>

Kong, S. C., et al. (2025). Evaluating the AI Ethical Awareness Scale (AIEAS) in secondary education. *Computers and Education*.

Lintner, T. (2024). A systematic review of AI literacy scales. *npj Science of Learning*, 9(1), Article 50. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41539-024-00264-4>

Miao, F., & Cukurova, M. (2024). *AI competency framework for teachers*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/ZJTE2084>

Miao, F., Shiohira, K., & Lao, N. (2024). *AI competency framework for students*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/JKJB9835>

Ng, D. T. K., Wu, W., Leung, J. K. L., Chiu, T. K. F., & Chu, S. K. W. (2024). Design and validation of the AI literacy questionnaire: The affective, behavioural, cognitive and ethical approach. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 55(3), 1082–1104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13411>

Patrignani, N., & Whitehouse, D. (2014a). Slow tech: A quest for good, clean and fair ICT. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, 12(2), 78–92. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JICES-11-2013-0051>

Patrignani, N., & Whitehouse, D. (2014b). Slow tech: The bridge between computer ethics and business ethics. In *11th IFIP International Conference on Human Choice and Computers (HCC)* (pp. 92–106). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-44208-1_9

Patrignani, N., & Whitehouse, D. (2019). Slow tech: Towards an ICT for the Anthropocene age. *Visions for Sustainability*, 12, 35–39. <https://doi.org/10.13135/2384-8677/4039>

Perla, L., & Vinci, V. (2021). La formazione dell'insegnante attraverso la ricerca. Un modello interpretativo a partire dalla didattica dell'implicito. *Formazione & Insegnamento*, 13(21). <https://doi.org/10.15160/2038-1034/2325>

Plomp, T., & Nieveen, N. (Eds.). (2013). *Educational design research: Part A. An introduction*. SLO – Netherlands Institute for Curriculum Development.

Schepman, A., & Rodway, P. (2023). The General Attitudes towards Artificial Intelligence Scale (GAAIS): Confirmatory validation and associations with personality, corporate distrust, and general trust. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 39(13), 2724–2741. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2022.2085400>

Suh, W., & Ahn, S. (2022). Development and validation of a scale measuring student attitudes toward artificial intelligence. *Sage Open*, 12(2), Article 21582440221100463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221100463>

Wang, Z., Chai, C.-S., Li, J., & Lee, V. W. Y. (2025). Assessment of AI ethical reflection: The development and validation of the AI Ethical Reflection Scale (AIERS) for university students. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 22, Article 19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00519-z>



STIAEM
Slow Tech Innovation
AI, Ethics and
New Teaching Methods



Co-funded by
the European Union

2025-1-IT02-KA220-SCH-000365213

PROJECT PARTNERSHIP



Università di Foggia
Studi Umanistici, Lettere, Beni Culturali,
Scienze della Formazione



İSTANBUL - ESENLER
İLÇE MİLLÎ EĞİTİM MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ



ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ
Διεύθυνση Δευτεροβάθμιας
Εκπαίδευσης Δωδεκανήσου



Universidad
Zaragoza



Universitat d'Alacar
Universidad de Alica