

# Designing a Skill-Based Education Model in Schools Based on the Real Needs of Society Using Grounded Theory

Atefeh. Khosravirad<sup>1</sup>, Ahmad. Akbari<sup>2\*</sup>, Mohammad. Karimi<sup>3</sup>, Moslem. Cherabin<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ph.D Student of Educational Management Department, Neyshabur branch, Islamic Azad University, Neyshabur, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Department of Education Science, Mashhad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mashhad, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Department of Management, Neyshabur Branch, Islamic Azad University, Neyshabur, Iran



<sup>4</sup> Department of Education Management, Neyshabur Branch, Islamic Azad University, Neyshabur, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: akbari.180@gmail.com

## Editor

Seyed Ali Darbani<sup>1</sup>  
Assistant Professor, Department of  
Psychology and Counseling, South  
Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad  
University, Tehran, Iran  
Ali.darbani@iau.ac.ir

## Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Parvaneh Mohammadkhani<sup>1</sup>  
Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rehabilitation Sciences  
and Social Health, Tehran, Iran. Email: Pa.mohammadkhani@uswr.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Mehdi Rostami<sup>1</sup>  
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond  
Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: dr.mrostami@kmanresce.ca

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The paper is well-structured with clear sections delineating the study's objectives, methodology, findings, and conclusions. However, transitions between sections could be smoother to enhance readability. Consider linking sections more explicitly to show the progression from objectives through findings to conclusions.

While the paper references relevant studies, the literature review could benefit from a broader scope. Expanding the review to include more recent studies and international perspectives on skill-based education would strengthen the argument for the proposed model's necessity and innovation.

The grounded theory approach is appropriate for the study's aims. However, the paper could provide more detail on the data analysis process, specifically how the open, axial, and selective coding was conducted. Clarifying these methods would enhance the replicability of the study and the credibility of the findings.

The findings are comprehensive, but the presentation of codes, categories, and themes could be more concise. Consider using tables or figures to summarize the main themes and their relationships, which would aid in visualizing the model's components and how they interrelate.

The discussion section effectively ties the findings back to the literature review but could delve deeper into the implications of the study for policy and practice. Discussing specific, actionable recommendations for educators, policymakers, and stakeholders on implementing skill-based education models would provide practical value.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The research questions are relevant but could be more precisely defined. Clarifying the specific aspects of AI implementation in higher education being investigated would help focus the study and guide the methodology.

The review covers essential ground but misses critical analyses of recent AI advancements in education and their practical implications. Including studies on the impact of AI on learning outcomes and student engagement would enrich the context.

The qualitative approach is suitable, yet the selection criteria for participants and the data collection methods (interviews, focus groups) need further elaboration. Detailing how participants were chosen and how data was analyzed for bias and reliability will strengthen the study's validity.

The findings are insightful but somewhat disjointed. Organizing them around key themes related to both opportunities and challenges of AI in education, and using visual aids like charts or graphs, could make the arguments more compelling and easier to follow.

While the paper suggests strategies for integrating AI, these recommendations are somewhat generic. Tailoring these strategies to specific educational contexts (e.g., community colleges vs. research universities) and discussing potential barriers to implementation would make this section more actionable.

This section is crucial but underdeveloped. Expanding on ethical frameworks and specific privacy safeguards, including case studies or examples of best practices, would provide valuable guidance for institutions navigating these issues.

The manuscript briefly mentions future research avenues but could provide a more detailed roadmap. Identifying specific gaps in the current understanding of AI's role in education and proposing targeted research questions would be beneficial.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.