

Book of Abstracts

Book of abstracts of the Research Summit 2025
July 16-18, 2025

University of Aveiro, Portugal





Precision or illusion? navigating the algorithmic mirage of confidently inconsistent ai in the validation of a data collection instrument

João Ferreira-Santos^{†,*,1}, Lúcia Pombo¹

- 1. University of Aveiro Campus Universitário de Santiago, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal
- * Corresponding author; joaomrsantos@ua.pt; † Presenting author; [CIDTFF] Education.

Abstract. The development and validation of instruments for the collection of educational data, including psychometric assessments, require a high degree of methodological precision and replicable findings. Given the increasing prevalence of artificial intelligence-based tools, researchers have examined their applicability in various analytical methodologies, such as factor analysis, reliability evaluation, and construct validation. This work critically reflects on the integration of generative AI into the validation process of the GreenComp-Based Questionnaire (GCQuest), which is an instrument designed to assess sustainability competences. It focuses on the inconsistencies that were identified when using tools such as Julius and PowerDrill.ai for statistical validation. Despite working with an identical dataset, results varied across sessions due to subtle changes in prompt phrasing and model interpretation. These inconsistencies highlight the stochastic and opaque nature of large language models, which poses risks to reproducibility and research integrity (Megahed et al., 2023). Systematic logging of multiple interactions revealed that, although the outputs appeared robust, they diverged unpredictably. This raises concerns about the reliability of AI-generated results in high-stakes educational research. According to the literature, these findings emphasize the importance of human oversight, ethical safeguards, and robust methodological controls when incorporating AI into research workflows (Bulut et al., 2024; Riordan et al., 2024). As Burleigh and Wilson (2024) argue, replacing human reasoning with unverified AI outputs can undermine both the epistemic and ethical foundations of research. This paper therefore advocates for a human-centred and cautious approach to the development of AI-supported instruments, including training in prompt engineering, triangulation with traditional methods, and the application of ethical frameworks, to ensure the trustworthy and replicable use of AI in education.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Educational Research, Instrument development, GCQuest, Psychometric validation, Prompt engineering

References.

Bulut, O., Beiting-Parrish, M., Casabianca, J. M., Slater, S. C., Jiao, H., Song, D., Ormerod, C., Fabiyi, D. G., Ivan, R., Walsh, C., Rios, O., Wilson, J., Yildirim-Erbasli, S. N., Wongvorachan, T., Liu, J. X., Tan, B., ; Morilova, P. (2024). The rise of artificial intelligence in educational measurement: Opportunities and ethical challenges. Chinese/English Journal of Educational Measurement and Evaluation, 5(3), 119. https://doi.org/10.59863/MIQL7785

Burleigh, C., ; Wilson, A. M. (2024). Generative AI: Is authentic qualitative research data collection possible? Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 53(2), 89115. https://doi.org/10.1177/00472395241270278

Megahed, F. M., Chen, Y.-J., Ferris, J. A., Knoth, S., ; Jones-Farmer, L. A. (2023). How generative AI models such as ChatGPT can be (mis)used in SPC practice, education, and research? arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10916. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.10916

Riordan, A., Echeverria, V., Jin, Y., Yan, L., Swiecki, Z., Gaevic, D., ; Martinez-Maldonado, R. (2024). Human-centred learning analytics and AI in education: A systematic literature review. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6, 100215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100215

Acknowledgements. This work was supported by FCT - Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia, I.P. by grant reference 2023.00257.BD with DOI https://doi.org/10.54499/2023.00257.BD.