

Identifying and Ranking Psychological Determinants of Teacher Readiness for AI Integration

Ali. Aghaziarati^{1*}, Kamdin. Parsakia^{2,3}

¹ Department of Psychology and Counselling, Farhangian University, Tehran, Iran

² Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling, Faculty of Psychology and education, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

³ Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada

* Corresponding author email address: a.aghaziarati@cfu.ac.ir

Editor

Ahmad Amani
Associate Professor, Counseling
Department, University of
Kurdistan, Sanandaj, Iran
a.amani@uok.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mohammad Salehi
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Management, Sari Branch, Islamic
Azad University, Sari, Iran. Email: drsalehi@iausari.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Seyed Ali Darbani
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, South Tehran
Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.
Email: Ali.darbani@iau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In paragraph 2, the authors write: “Teachers are expected to shift from traditional instructional delivery to facilitative, data-driven, and personalized pedagogies supported by AI tools.” This is conceptually strong but would benefit from adding a brief reference to the challenges of this transition in low-resource settings, to improve the global applicability of the argument.

The sentence “Readiness must be examined as a socially situated construct” (paragraph 8) introduces a sociocultural view but is not expanded later. A short elaboration on how institutional culture interacts with individual readiness would improve theoretical depth.

While discussing emotional readiness, the statement “Teachers’ emotional responses to AI often fluctuate between curiosity and apprehension” could be strengthened by linking it to emotional regulation theories or the affective domain literature to deepen the psychological analysis.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The introduction mentions multiple theoretical perspectives (Technology Acceptance Model, social cognitive theory, self-determination theory), but they are briefly discussed near the end. Consider integrating these frameworks earlier and explicitly showing how each contributes to the conceptualization of “psychological readiness.”

Table 1 provides rich qualitative data but lacks a description of how frequency or significance of open codes was determined. Clarify whether thematic prominence was based on citation count, co-occurrence, or researcher interpretation.

In Table 2, mean values are reported with two decimal points. For greater precision and transparency, include 95% confidence intervals or standard error values alongside the means.

The paragraph following Table 2 interprets ranking differences but does not report the effect size of the Friedman test (e.g., Kendall’s W). Including this would quantify the degree of consensus among respondents.

The Discussion section successfully connects findings to previous studies, but it occasionally repeats citations (e.g., Ofem et al., 2025; Ajlouni et al., 2025) without differentiating the contexts of those studies. The authors should synthesize how their Tehran-based findings contrast or align with these international results.

The sentence “Readiness appears to progress hierarchically: psychological empowerment and cognitive adaptation precede emotional equilibrium and social alignment” presents an important theoretical implication. However, this hierarchy should be visually represented as a conceptual model to improve clarity.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.