Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

RJAH

https://doi.org/10.58256/qyne7f76

Open Access

Check for updates

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Section: *Digital Humanities*

Artificial intelligence and academic work: AI anxiety and perceived job security among university faculty in Jordan

Musallam Alrosan[1], Mohammad Saleh Al-Karamneh[2], Heyam Al-Taj[3], Najwa Al-Qubelat[4], San'a Mustafa[5], Ibrahim Freewan[6], Khaldoun Aldesit[1], Hana Dawad[7] & Rawan Al-Saliti[8]

[1]Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Applied Science Private University, Amman, Jordan
[2]Department of Administration, Curricula and Teaching Methods, Amman Arab University, Amman, Jordan
[3]Department of Special Education, An-Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine
[4]Department of Basic Sciences (Humanities and Scientific), Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan
[5]Department of Education and Psychology, College of Education, University of Hafr Al-Batin, Hafr Al-Batin, Saudi Arabia
[6]Department of Electrical Engineering, Applied Science Private University, Amman, Jordan
[7]University of Petra, Jordan
8Department of Psychological and Family Counseling, College of Educational Sciences, Ajloun National University, Ajloun, Jordan
*Correspondence: m_alrousan@asu.edu.jo

ABSTRACT

This study examines the levels of artificial intelligence (AI) anxiety and job security among faculty members at Ajloun National University. It also assesses differences in these two variables by gender, college, years of experience, academic rank, and level of AI tool use. In addition, the study explores the nature of the correlation between AI anxiety and job security. A descriptive-correlational approach was employed to achieve the study's objectives. The study sample consisted of 150 faculty members from Ajloun National University who completed AI anxiety and job security scales. The results show that faculty members have a moderate level of AI anxiety (M = 2.76, SD = 0.66), while their level of job security is high (M = 3.72, SD = 0.91). The results also show no statistically significant correlation between AI anxiety and job security (r = –0.024, p = 0.772). The results further indicate statistically significant differences in AI anxiety levels based on years of experience (F = 3.743, p = 0.026), favoring faculty members with 5–10 years of experience. Moreover, statistically significant differences were found in AI anxiety according to the level of AI tool use (F = 7.010, p = 0.001), favoring faculty members with moderate use. However, no statistically significant differences in AI anxiety were found based on gender (F = 0.057, p = 0.812), college (F = 0.040, p = 0.842), or academic rank (F = 1.914, p = 0.151). Furthermore,

Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

Volume 7, Issue 4, 2026

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted **21 August 2026**

Accepted: **14 October 2026**

Published: 04 **November 2026**

HOW TO CITE

Alrosan, M., Saleh Al-Karamneh, M., Al-Taj, H., Al-Qubelat, N., Mustafa, S., Freewan, I., Aldesit, K., Dawad, H., & Al-Saliti, R. (2026). Artificial intelligence and academic work: AI anxiety and perceived job security among university faculty in Jordan. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 7(4). https://doi.org/10.58256/qyne7f76

Published in Nairobi, Kenya by Royallite Global, an imprint of Royallite Publishers Limited

© 2026 The Author(s). This is an open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

statistically significant differences were found in job security according to the level of AI tool use (F = 6.218, p = 0.003), favoring faculty members with moderate AI use. Finally, no statistically significant differences in job security were found based on gender (F = 0.050, p = 0.823), years of experience (F = 0.645, p = 0.526), college (F = 1.398, p = 0.239), or academic rank (F = 1.885, p = 0.156). The study findings indicate that faculty members approach artificial intelligence with a degree of awareness and professional caution. They recognize its potential to enhance academic work while still harboring concerns related to its challenges. The findings also underscore the need for training and institutional policies that support the responsible use of AI, thereby fostering professional confidence and job security among faculty members.

KEYWORDS: AI anxiety, job security, faculty members, generative AI, digital transformation, higher education

Introduction

In recent years, the world has witnessed rapid advances in artificial intelligence and its diverse applications. These advances have led to fundamental transformations in education, work, and daily life (Al-Atwi et al., 2026; Al-Saliti et al., 2025; Haider, 2026a; Hammouri et al., 2026; Kemmeren, 2023; Lee, 2020; Słapczyński, 2022). Artificial intelligence has been applied to tasks involving efficiency, productivity, and decision-making (Abu-Rayyash & Haider, 2024; Akasheh et al., 2024; Haider, 2026b; Haider, Obeidat, et al., 2025; Haider et al., 2026). However, they have also raised numerous psychological and social concerns among individuals, particularly regarding the growing capabilities of AI systems and their expanding use in tasks once considered the exclusive domain of humans (Stone et al., 2022). AI anxiety has emerged as a modern psychological phenomenon that has garnered increasing attention in the scientific literature. It manifests as anxiety, fear, or apprehension associated with learning and using AI technologies or with the potential consequences of their future proliferation (Russo et al., 2025). Recent studies have examined these concerns in relation to the expanding use of AI applications and their ability to perform complex tasks involving reasoning, analysis, and decision-making. Alongside predictions of its potential impact on the labor market and future jobs (Almaiah et al., 2022; Ayasrah et al., 2026), AI anxiety differs from anxiety related to traditional technology, such as computer anxiety. It is not limited to the difficulty of learning or using technology, which earlier research linked to the psychological strain of adopting digital tools in Jordanian higher education (Al-Salman & Haider, 2021; Al-Salman et al., 2022; Haider & Al-Salman, 2020). Rather, it extends to deeper concerns about losing control over intelligent systems, over-reliance on them, and the diminishing role of humans in certain tasks and decisions (Chen & Zhao, 2025; Wilson et al., 2023). This type of anxiety is also linked to the fear that intelligent systems may replace humans in many jobs and professions or threaten job security and professional stability (Chen & Zhao, 2025; Jin et al., 2024; Wang & Wang, 2022). Several recent studies have supported understanding of AI anxiety among professional groups, particularly in academia. For example, Verano-Tacoronte et al. (2025) found that faculty members' concerns regarding generative artificial intelligence primarily center on its impact on student learning and the potential for misuse. This is reflected in faculty members' decreased willingness to use AI applications such as ChatGPT. The study reported that these concerns were associated with faculty members' willingness to use AI applications.

Jabali et al. (2025) reported high levels of faculty anxiety about generative artificial intelligence. The primary sources of this anxiety included the potential decline of traditional teaching roles and a decrease in the quality of the educational process. Ethical concerns about privacy and academic integrity were also raised. The study also emphasized professional development and institutional collaboration as approaches for promoting the safe and effective use of AI technologies. Wan et al. (2025) further indicated that anxiety related to AI use is negatively correlated with teachers' professional well-being. High levels of anxiety lead to decreased job satisfaction and achievement. Conversely, workplace resources such as professional autonomy, quality teaching relationships, and a sense of competence can reduce this anxiety and foster positive adaptation to new technologies. Cajnko and Cajnko (2025) revealed that the proliferation of AI applications is associated with increased anxiety among administrators and faculty members. This anxiety is linked to a perceived loss of control over tasks, increased work pressure, and difficulty adapting to rapid technological changes. The study also reported that digital literacy and institutional training were associated with greater adaptability to AI and

fewer negative effects related to its use. In light of these growing concerns, job security has emerged as one of the aspects most affected by rapid developments in artificial intelligence and digital transformation. Job security refers to an individual's perception of job continuity and reassurance about retaining their job in the future, free from threats that could lead to job loss or diminished stability. It is linked to a sense of professional stability and confidence in one's career prospects (Jiang, 2024; Sora et al., 2023). Job security is a key factor influencing mental health, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and professional performance. Previous research has associated higher job security with greater motivation and productivity, whereas lower job security has been associated with increased anxiety, psychological stress, and uncertainty about the professional future (Bazzoli et al., 2025; Jiang, 2025).

As AI applications rapidly expand within organizations, concerns have grown about the reshaping of jobs, evolving skill requirements, and the potential transfer of some tasks from humans to intelligent systems or greater reliance on them. This expansion has made job security a central issue in the literature on the future of work, especially in knowledge-based and professional roles that demand high levels of experience and specialization (Jiang, 2024; Tu et al., 2023). The study of job security in the university environment is becoming increasingly important given the transformations that AI applications have imposed on faculty members and traditional teaching methods. Faculty members are now facing challenges related to the changing nature of academic work, new digital skills, and the redefinition of their professional roles amid the proliferation of intelligent systems (Gwasmeh et al., 2026; Haider et al., 2022). In this context, Guan and Jamil (2025) found that university professors' ability to adapt to AI and their awareness of it are linked to their levels of job security and burnout. Male professors who were less adapted to AI were more likely to develop negative attitudes and experience burnout. While negative attitudes toward artificial intelligence among highly adaptable males were associated with increased feelings of job insecurity, the impact of AI adaptability and awareness on job security among females was limited. Regarding the importance of job security in promoting career security within educational institutions, a study by Ghimire et al. (2023) demonstrated a statistically significant positive relationship between job security and organizational commitment among faculty members in higher education institutions. The study found that faculty members with higher levels of job security also reported higher organizational commitment. Additionally, a study by Ayodele et al. (2022) showed that enhancing job security through fair employment policies and reducing job threats and career path ambiguity contributes to higher levels of job satisfaction and emotional stability. The study also found that these conditions were associated with lower intentions to leave among university employees.

Research on AI anxiety and its psychological and professional effects, as well as on job security among employees across sectors, has grown. However, research on the relationship between AI anxiety and job security among faculty members remains limited, particularly in Arab universities. Additionally, how AI-related anxieties, such as fear of changing professional roles or the replacement of academic tasks, affect faculty members' sense of stability and job security is not yet fully understood. Therefore, to address this research gap and provide a clearer understanding of AI anxiety and job security among university faculty members, the present study seeks to examine their levels, the relationship between them, and whether they differ according to selected demographic and professional characteristics. Accordingly, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. 1. What are the levels of AI anxiety and job security among university faculty members?
2. 2. Is there a statistically significant correlation at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level between AI anxiety and job security among university faculty members?
3. 3. Are there statistically significant differences at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level in AI anxiety and job security scores based on gender, college, years of experience, academic rank, and level of AI tool use?

Methods

This study explores the relationship between AI anxiety and job security among faculty members at the university. It also identifies differences in the levels of these variables across several demographic and professional factors, including gender, years of experience, college, academic rank, and level of AI tool use. The study employs a quantitative, correlational design to examine the relationship between AI anxiety and job security. In addition, it explores the possibility of predicting job security levels based on AI anxiety. The study uses a descriptive-correlational approach to analyze data collected from the sample, enabling the determination of variable levels

and the identification of relationships among them. Data were collected from faculty members at the university from January 2026 to March 2026. Two scales, whose psychometric properties were confirmed, were used to measure AI anxiety and job security.

Participants

The study population consisted of 285 faculty members at Ajloun National University, from which a sample of 150 faculty members (52.63% of the total population) was obtained through electronic survey distribution. The sample size was determined based on the number of completed responses received during the data collection period. The questionnaire was distributed electronically to faculty members, and participation was voluntary and non-mandatory; therefore, the final sample comprised the 150 faculty members who completed and returned the questionnaire. A convenience (non-probability) sampling method was therefore used, based on the accessibility and voluntary participation of faculty members. Eligible participants were faculty members holding academic ranks at the university, specifically Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. Research assistants were not included in the target population, as this category was not present among the university personnel comprising the study population. Demographic data were collected from respondents on the following variables: gender, years of experience, college, academic rank, and level of use of artificial intelligence tools (Table 5). The study instruments were distributed electronically via Google Forms to reach the faculty members.

Instruments

Artificial Intelligence Anxiety Scale

The Artificial Intelligence Anxiety Scale (AIAS), developed by Wang and Wang (2022), was used to measure the level of artificial intelligence anxiety among university faculty members. The original scale consisted of 21 items distributed across several dimensions, measuring different aspects of AI anxiety. The scale was adapted to suit the Jordanian university environment. The items were reviewed linguistically and for content to align with the cultural and academic characteristics of the target audience while preserving their scientific meaning and original objectives. After expert review, three items were removed because they were unsuitable for the Jordanian university environment and inconsistent with the study's objectives, resulting in a final version of the scale with 18 items. The scale items were answered using a five-point Likert scale, which includes the following alternatives: Strongly Agree (5 points), Agree (4 points), Neutral (3 points), Disagree (2 points), and Strongly Disagree (1 point). The total scale score was calculated by summing the scores of all 18 items, yielding a possible minimum score of 18 and a maximum score of 90. A higher total score indicates a higher level of AI anxiety among the study participants.

The level of AI tool use was assessed using a five-point Likert-type scale, with the following response options: Always (5 points), Often (4 points), Sometimes (3 points), Rarely (2 points), and Never (1 point). The mean score was calculated for the AI-use items, and the level of AI use was classified into three categories based on the following statistical criterion: low (1.00–2.33), moderate (2.34–3.67), and high (3.68–5.00). These categories were determined by calculating the range between the highest and lowest possible scores and dividing it by the three required categories: (5 – 1) / 3 = 1.33. A value of 1.33 was then added successively to determine the boundaries of the three categories. Accordingly, participants were classified into low-, moderate-, and high-AI-use groups based on their mean scores.

Psychometric Properties of the Original Scale

The Artificial Intelligence Anxiety Scale (AIAS) demonstrated good psychometric properties in the original study. Regarding reliability, Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the subdimensions ranged from 0.917 to 0.974. As for validity, the researchers ensured content validity by developing and systematically reviewing the items in light of existing literature and prior studies. Exploratory factor analysis revealed that the scale consists of four dimensions comprising 21 items, which explained 79.64% of the total variance, with factor saturations exceeding 0.50, thus supporting construct validity. The results also demonstrated convergent, discriminant, and criterion validity. The correlation coefficient with the external criterion was 0.864 ($p < 0.001$), indicating high validity of the scale. The overall scale demonstrated high internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.964 in the original study by Wang and Wang (2022).

Validity and Reliability in the Current Study

Face validity. Evidence of face validity for the Artificial Intelligence Anxiety Scale was established by translating the scale from English into Arabic and then back-translating it from Arabic into English by another translator. The two versions were compared to ensure the accuracy and appropriateness of the translation. The preliminary Arabic version of the scale, accompanied by the original version and the operational definition of AI anxiety used in the current study, was then presented to a group of faculty members with expertise in psychological counseling and educational psychology at Jordanian universities. They were asked to evaluate the accuracy of the translation, the clarity of the wording of the items, and the appropriateness of the items for the target study sample. Based on the reviewers' comments, the scale was revised accordingly. Three items were deleted from the preliminary version because they overlapped in meaning with other items and were considered inappropriate for the characteristics of the current study sample, which consisted of university faculty members. Minor linguistic modifications were also made to several items to improve their clarity, accuracy, and suitability for the Jordanian academic context. Accordingly, the final version of the scale consisted of 18 items, compared with 21 items in the preliminary version.

Construct Validity

To assess the construct validity of the scale, item-total correlation coefficients were calculated from a pilot sample of 30 respondents who were not part of the main study sample. The item-total correlation coefficients ranged from 0.37 to 0.85, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Item correlation coefficients with the total scale score (Artificial Intelligence Anxiety Scale)

Item	*r*	Item	*r*	Item	*r*
1	0.37*	7	0.63**	13	0.46**
2	0.47**	8	0.85**	14	0.52**
3	0.44*	9	0.67**	15	0.50**
4	0.66**	10	0.58**	16	0.63**
5	0.75**	11	0.75**	17	0.63**
6	0.60**	12	0.68**	18	0.56**

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

All correlation coefficients were acceptable and statistically significant; therefore, no items were removed.

Reliability

To confirm the reliability of the Artificial Intelligence Anxiety Scale, it was administered and then re-administered two weeks later to a pilot sample of 30 respondents who were not part of the main study sample. Pearson's correlation coefficient between the participants' scores on the two administrations was calculated and found to be 0.90. The internal consistency coefficient was also calculated using Cronbach's alpha, yielding 0.85. These values indicate that the scale possesses a reasonable degree of reliability.

Job Security Scale

The Job Security Scale developed by Geçdoğan Yılmaz and Aydın (2023) was used to assess job security among university faculty members. The original scale comprises six items that load on a single dimension measuring an individual's perception of job security. The scale was adapted to the Jordanian university context. Items were reviewed linguistically and content-wise to align with the cultural and academic characteristics of the target community while preserving their scientific meaning and original objectives. Responses to the scale items were recorded on a five-point Likert scale with the following alternatives: Strongly Agree (5 points), Agree (4 points), Neutral (3 points), Disagree (2 points), and Strongly Disagree (1 point). The total scale score was calculated by summing the scores of all six items, yielding a possible minimum score of 6 and a maximum score of 30. A higher total score indicates greater job security among the study respondents. The scale demonstrated good internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.91.

Validity and Reliability in the Current Study

Face validity. Evidence of face validity for the Job Security Scale was established by translating the scale from English into Arabic and then back-translating it from Arabic into English by another translator. The two versions were compared to ensure the accuracy and appropriateness of the translation. The preliminary Arabic version of the scale, accompanied by the original version and the operational definition of job security used in the current study, was then presented to a group of faculty members with expertise in psychological counseling and educational psychology at Jordanian universities. They were asked to evaluate the accuracy of the translation, the clarity of the wording of the items, and the appropriateness of the items for the target study sample. Based on the reviewers' comments, minor linguistic modifications were made to the wording of some items to ensure their clarity and suitability for the characteristics of the current study sample, which consisted of university faculty members. No items were deleted from the scale. Accordingly, the final version of the scale retained all 6 items from the original version.

Construct Validity

To assess the construct validity of the scale, item-total correlation coefficients were calculated from a pilot sample of 30 respondents who were not part of the main study sample. The item-total correlation coefficients ranged from 0.51 to 0.74, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Item correlation coefficients with the total scale score (Job Security Scale)

Item	*r*
1	0.61**
2	0.67**
3	0.70**
4	0.74**
5	0.66**
6	0.51**

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

The correlation coefficients between the items and the total scale score ranged from 0.51 to 0.74 and were statistically significant at the 0.01 level. This result indicates that the scale items exhibit acceptable construct validity; therefore, none of the items were removed.

Reliability

To ensure the reliability of the job security scale, a test-retest method was used. The scale was administered and then re-administered two weeks later to a control group of 30 respondents outside the study sample. Pearson's correlation coefficient between their scores on the two administrations was calculated and found to be 0.91. The internal consistency reliability coefficient was also calculated using Cronbach's alpha, yielding 0.82. These values were considered adequate for this study.

Data Analysis

Appropriate statistical methods were used to analyze the data and address the research questions of the study. Descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were conducted to determine the levels of AI anxiety and job security, examine the relationship between the two variables, and identify differences in their levels according to selected demographic and professional characteristics. The statistical analyses were selected based on the nature of the research questions, the measurement level of the variables, and the structure of the data. To answer the first research question, which aimed to determine the levels of AI anxiety and job security among university faculty members, means and standard deviations were calculated for the total scores of both scales and their individual items. These descriptive statistics were considered appropriate for summarizing the central tendency and variability of participants' responses and for determining the level of each variable according to the predetermined score-interpretation criteria.

To answer the second research question, which examined whether there was a statistically significant

correlation between AI anxiety and job security among faculty members, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) was calculated. The Pearson correlation coefficient was considered appropriate because the purpose of this analysis was to examine the direction and strength of the linear relationship between the two continuous variables, AI anxiety and job security. The statistical significance of the correlation was evaluated at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level. To answer the third research question, which examined whether statistically significant differences existed in AI anxiety and job security according to gender, years of experience, college, academic rank, and level of AI tool use, five-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted separately for AI anxiety and job security. This analysis was appropriate because the research question required examining differences in the mean scores of the dependent variables across multiple categorical demographic and professional factors simultaneously. The F statistic and corresponding p-values were used to determine whether statistically significant differences existed at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level. Where statistically significant differences were identified, Scheffé's post hoc test was conducted to determine which specific groups differed significantly from one another. In addition to statistical significance, effect sizes were reported as partial eta squared (η^2_p).

Normality Test

The normality of the data distribution was verified using the One-Sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov Test, and Table 3 presents the results.

Table 3: One-Sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov Test for the Variables

Variable	K–S *Z*	*p*
AI anxiety	.946	.332
Job security	1.252	.087

Table 3 shows that the statistical significance value of the One-Sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov Test for all variables was greater than the statistical significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), indicating that these variables follow a normal distribution. Furthermore, based on the Central Limit Theorem, when the sample size is greater than 30, with a mean (μ) and variance (σ^2), the sampling distribution of the sample mean approaches a normal distribution.

Multicollinearity Diagnostics

A linear correlation test was used to ensure that there was no high correlation among the independent variables, based on the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and Tolerance tests for each of the independent variables. The independent variables in the model should be independent of one another. To verify this, these tests were employed as one of the methods for addressing the problem of multicollinearity. The VIF value should not exceed 10, while the Tolerance value should be greater than 0.05. After calculating these coefficients for all independent variables, the results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4:Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and Tolerance Tests for the Study Variables

Variable	Tolerance	VIF
AI anxiety	–.117	–.176
Job security	–.468	.084

Table 4 shows that the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values for all variables were less than 10, while the Tolerance values for all variables were greater than 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no problem of high correlation among the variables. This indicates the absence of statistically significant multicollinearity among the independent variables presented in the correlation table, supporting their suitability for inclusion in the model.

Results

Table 5: Frequencies and percentages according to the study's variables

	Groups	Freq.	%
Gender	M	94	62.7
	F	56	37.3
Experience	Fewer than 5 years	26	17.3
	5–10	28	18.7
	More than 10 years	96	64.0
College	Humanities	112	74.7
	Sciences	38	25.3
Academic rank	Full professor	44	29.3
	Associate professor	30	20.0
	Assistant professor	76	50.7
Level of AI tool use	Low	12	8.0
	Moderate	70	46.7
	Advanced	68	45.3
	Overall	150	100.0

Research Question 1: Levels of AI Anxiety and Job Security

To answer this question, the means and standard deviations of both AI anxiety and job security levels among university faculty members were calculated. Tables 6 and 7 present the results.

Level of AI Anxiety

Table 6: Means and standard deviations of AI anxiety levels among university faculty members, in descending order by means

Rank	No.	Mean	Standard deviation	Level
1	10	3.35	1.18	Moderate
2	14	3.29	1.01	Moderate
3	18	3.19	1.02	Moderate
4	11	3.17	1.23	Moderate
5	16	3.16	1.14	Moderate
6	17	3.16	1.04	Moderate
7	13	3.15	1.01	Moderate
8	9	3.07	1.21	Moderate
9	12	3.04	1.19	Moderate
10	15	2.80	1.05	Moderate
11	1	2.55	1.00	Moderate
12	4	2.49	0.97	Moderate
13	2	2.35	1.14	Moderate
14	5	2.33	1.04	Low
15	8	2.32	1.00	Low
16	3	2.23	0.91	Low
17	7	2.13	0.97	Low
18	6	1.99	1.00	Low
Total scale		2.76	0.66	Moderate

Table 6 shows that AI anxiety among the study sample was moderate, with a mean score of 2.76 and a standard deviation of 0.66. Across items, mean scores ranged from 1.99 to 3.35. Item 10, "I fear that the use of AI tools will lead to increased dependency and reduced intellectual effort," ranked first, with a mean score of 3.35 and

a standard deviation of 1.18, indicating a moderate level. Item 14, "I fear that AI will lead to the elimination of some jobs or professional roles in the future," ranked second, with a mean score of 3.29 and a standard deviation of 1.01, also indicating a moderate level. Item 18, "I fear that the future development of AI will lead to an increase in the independence of intelligent systems to a point where they may be difficult to control," ranked third, with a mean score of 3.19 and a standard deviation of 1.02, indicating a moderate level. By contrast, item (6) "I feel anxious when attending a course or training related to the development of artificial intelligence applications" ranked last, with a mean of 1.99, a standard deviation of 1.00, and a low level.

Level of Job Security

Table 7: Means and standard deviations of job security levels among university faculty members, in descending order by means

Rank	No.	Mean	Standard deviation	Level
1	6	4.11	0.96	High
2	5	3.83	1.21	High
3	2	3.72	1.23	High
4	1	3.63	1.08	Moderate
5	4	3.57	1.17	Moderate
6	3	3.45	1.25	Moderate
Total scale		3.72	0.91	High

Table 7 shows that job security among the study sample was high, with a mean score of 3.72 and a standard deviation of 0.91. Across items, mean scores ranged from 3.45 to 4.11. Item 6, "I feel that my commitment to my professional duties and university regulations protects my continued employment," ranked first, with a mean score of 4.11 and a standard deviation of 0.96, indicating a high level. Item 5, "I believe that my termination can only occur in accordance with applicable regulations, laws, and instructions," ranked second, with a mean score of 3.83 and a standard deviation of 1.21, also indicating a high level. Item 2, "I feel that my termination cannot be arbitrary or without legal justification," ranked third, with a mean score of 3.72 and a standard deviation of 1.23, indicating a high level. Item 3, "I am not worried about losing my job at the university," ranked last, with a mean of 3.45 and a standard deviation of 1.25, indicating a moderate level.

Research Question 2: Relationship Between AI Anxiety and Job Security

To answer this question, the Pearson correlation coefficient between artificial intelligence anxiety and job security among faculty members was obtained, as shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Pearson correlation coefficient for the relationship between artificial intelligence anxiety and job security among faculty members

		Job security
Artificial intelligence anxiety	Pearson correlation (*r*)	–.024
	Sig.	.772
	No.	150

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 8 shows no statistically significant correlation between AI anxiety and job security among faculty members. The Pearson correlation coefficient was $r = -0.024$, and the p-value ($p = 0.772$) was greater than the established significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$).

Research Question 3: Differences by Demographic and Professional Variables

To answer this question, the means and standard deviations of AI anxiety and job security scores were computed by gender, years of experience, college, academic rank, and level of AI tool use. Tables 9 and 13 present the results.

Differences in AI Anxiety

Table 9: Means and standard deviations of the AI anxiety scale based on gender, years of experience, college, academic rank, and level of AI tool use

		Mean	Standard deviation	No.
Gender	M	2.76	.639	94
	F	2.77	.695	56
Experience	Fewer than 5 years	2.68	.367	26
	5–10	3.01	.482	28
	More than 10 years	2.71	.746	96
College	Humanities	2.78	.689	112
	Sciences	2.70	.563	38
Academic rank	Full professor	2.86	.676	44
	Associate professor	2.80	.483	30
	Assistant professor	2.70	.706	76
Level of AI tool use	Low	2.64	.739	12
	Moderate	2.96	.675	70
	Advanced	2.58	.573	68

Table 9 shows apparent variations in the means and standard deviations of the AI anxiety scale across gender, years of experience, college, academic rank, and level of AI tool use. To assess the statistical significance of the differences between the means, a five-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted (Table 10).

Table 10: Five-way ANOVA of the effect of gender, years of experience, college, academic rank, and level of AI tool use on the AI anxiety scale

Source of variation	Sum of squares	df	Mean of squares	*F*	Sig.	Partial η^2
Gender	.022	1	.022	0.057	0.812	0.000
Experience	2.939	2	1.470	3.743	0.026	0.050
College	.016	1	.016	0.040	0.842	0.000
Academic rank	1.503	2	.751	1.914	0.151	0.026
Level of AI tool use	5.504	2	2.752	7.010	0.001	0.090
Error	55.356	141	.393			
Total	64.566	149				

As Table 10 shows, there were statistically significant differences in AI anxiety according to years of experience and level of AI tool use, whereas no statistically significant differences were found according to gender, college, or academic rank. Scheffé's post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify the specific pairwise differences between the means (Tables 11 and 12).

Table 11: Scheffé's post-hoc comparisons of the effect of years of experience on the AI anxiety scale

	Mean	Fewer than 5 years	5–10 years	More than 10 years
Fewer than 5 years	2.68			
5–10 years	3.01	–.33*		
More than 10 years	2.71	–.03	.30*	

Note. * $p < .05$.

Table 11 shows statistically significant differences ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the 5–10-year group and both the fewer-than-5-year and more-than-10-year groups, favoring the 5–10-year group.

Table 12: Scheffé's post-hoc comparisons of the effect of AI tool use level on the AI anxiety scale

	Mean	Low	Moderate	Advanced
Low	2.64			
Moderate	2.96	–.32		
Advanced	2.58	.06	.38*	

Note. * $p < .05$.

Table 12 shows statistically significant differences ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the moderate-use and high-use groups, favoring the moderate-use group.

Differences in Job Security

Table 13: Means and standard deviations of the job security scale according to the variables of gender, years of experience, college, academic rank, and level of use of artificial intelligence tools

		Mean	Standard deviation	No.
Gender	M	3.73	.973	94
	F	3.69	.790	56
Experience	Fewer than 5 years	3.59	1.109	26
	5–10	3.79	.646	28
	More than 10 years	3.73	.917	96
College	Humanities	3.71	.871	112
	Sciences	3.75	1.017	38
Academic rank	Full professor	3.90	.881	44
	Associate professor	3.67	.828	30
	Assistant professor	3.63	.945	76
Level of AI tool use	Low	3.56	.789	12
	Moderate	3.96	.782	70
	Advanced	3.50	.992	68

Table 13 shows apparent variations in the means and standard deviations of the job security scale across gender, years of experience, college, academic rank, and level of use of artificial intelligence tools. To assess the statistical significance of the differences between the means, a five-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted (Table 14).

Table 14:Five-way ANOVA of the effect of gender, years of experience, college, academic rank, and level of use of artificial intelligence tools on the job security scale

Source of variation	Sum of squares	df	Mean of squares	*F*	Sig.	Partial η^2
Gender	.039	1	.039	0.050	0.823	.000
Experience	1.006	2	.503	0.645	0.526	.009
College	1.089	1	1.089	1.398	0.239	.010
Academic rank	2.937	2	1.469	1.885	0.156	.026
Level of AI tool use	9.691	2	4.845	6.218	0.003	.081
Error	109.878	141	.779			
Total	122.441	149				

As Table 14 shows, there were statistically significant differences in job security according to the level of AI tool use, whereas no statistically significant differences were found according to gender, years of experience, college, or academic rank. Scheffé's post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify the specific pairwise differences between the means (Table 15).

Table 15: Scheffé's post-hoc comparisons of the impact of AI tool use on job security

	Mean	Low	Moderate	Advanced
Low	3.56			
Moderate	3.96	–.40		
Advanced	3.50	.06	.46*	

Note. * $p < .05$.

Table 15 shows statistically significant differences ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the moderate-use and high-use groups, favoring the moderate-use group.

Discussion

Level of AI Anxiety

The results showed that university faculty members exhibited a moderate level of AI anxiety. This finding suggests that faculty members do not perceive AI as either an absolute threat or an unconditionally positive development. Rather, they appear to adopt a balanced perspective, recognizing the opportunities AI offers for advancing teaching and scientific research while remaining aware of the professional, ethical, and academic challenges associated with its use. The moderate level of anxiety may therefore reflect professional caution rather than intense fear, particularly given the rapid development of generative AI applications and the difficulty of keeping pace with their continuous innovations (Verano-Tacoronte et al., 2025). This finding may also be explained by faculty members' increasing familiarity with AI tools as a result of their widespread adoption in higher education (Gwasmeh et al., 2026; Haider, 2026a). Greater exposure and experience may reduce anxiety by enhancing users' understanding of, trust in, and confidence in working with these technologies (Ahmad et al., 2025; Darwish et al., 2025; Haider, 2026b). Nevertheless, uncertainty regarding the potential effects of AI on the future of the academic profession, academic integrity, assessment practices, and the quality of student learning may have contributed to maintaining anxiety at a moderate level. Recent studies suggest that faculty members' primary concerns tend to center on the potential misuse of AI by students, declining educational quality, and changes in their academic roles, rather than on the technology itself (McDonald et al., 2025; Verano-Tacoronte et al., 2025). The moderate level of AI anxiety may further reflect the gradual institutional encouragement of AI integration into teaching and research. Such integration may promote greater faculty acceptance and familiarity with AI while simultaneously raising concerns about overreliance, ethical issues, academic integrity, and the quality of educational outcomes. The literature indicates that clear institutional policies and ongoing training in the responsible use of AI can strengthen faculty members' confidence and contribute to reducing anxiety associated with these technologies (Jin et al., 2025). Furthermore, faculty members may perceive AI primarily as a supportive tool that facilitates academic work rather than as a direct replacement for their professional roles. Nevertheless, concerns may remain regarding its potential effects on students' critical thinking, students' overreliance on AI when completing assignments and conducting research, and the future transformation of academic work. Previous research indicates that faculty members generally recognize the potential benefits of AI while continuing to express concerns about transparency, accountability, and academic integrity. This combination of acceptance and concern may help explain the moderate level of AI anxiety observed in the present study, rather than the higher or lower levels reported in some previous studies (Ghimire et al., 2023; Jabali et al., 2025). The present finding is consistent with Jabali et al. (2025), who reported that faculty members expressed substantial concerns regarding generative AI, particularly its potential effects on traditional academic roles, educational quality, and ethical practices. At the same time, faculty members demonstrated a willingness to utilize the potential benefits of AI when appropriate regulatory policies and training opportunities were available. The finding is also consistent with Verano-Tacoronte et al. (2025), who found that faculty members' attitudes toward AI were primarily shaped by concerns about student learning, academic integrity, and the future of the academic profession rather than by rejection of the technology itself.

Level of Job Security

The results showed that university faculty members reported a high level of job security. This finding indicates a strong sense of professional stability, confidence in the continuity of employment, and trust in the systems

and procedures governing academic work within the university. It may also reflect faculty members' perceptions of a stable work environment that provides professional protection and opportunities for development and advancement. Such conditions can strengthen their sense of belonging to the academic institution and enhance their commitment to its goals (Ghimire et al., 2023). This finding may be explained by the presence of clear institutional systems governing appointment, promotion, and performance evaluation. Such systems can enhance faculty members' perceptions of fairness, predictability, and professional stability. When regulations and procedures are applied consistently, faculty members may develop greater trust in their institution, which can strengthen motivation and allow them to focus on teaching, research, and community service rather than concerns about job loss or professional instability (Ayodele et al., 2022). The finding may also be related to the nature of academic employment, which generally provides a degree of occupational stability compared with some other sectors. Employment benefits, opportunities for professional development, and participation in academic decision-making may further strengthen faculty members' perceptions of job security. Recent research suggests that job security is an important factor associated with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, academic performance, and lower intentions to leave the profession (Ghimire et al., 2023; Tawalbeh et al., 2025). The present finding is consistent with Ghimire et al. (2023), who reported high levels of job security among faculty members and found that job security was positively associated with organizational commitment and intentions to remain employed within the academic institution. It is also consistent with Ayodele et al. (2022), who found that strengthening job security through fair organizational policies contributes to greater job satisfaction and employee productivity, thereby supporting overall institutional performance.

Relationship Between AI Anxiety and Job Security

The results revealed no statistically significant linear correlation between AI anxiety and job security among faculty members ($r = -.024$, $p = .772$). This finding indicates that, within the current sample, variations in AI anxiety were not significantly associated with variations in job security. However, this non-significant correlation should be interpreted cautiously and should not be taken as evidence that AI anxiety has no effect on job security. Rather, it indicates that no statistically significant linear association between the two variables was detected in the present sample. One possible explanation is the high level of job security reported by the participants, which may have provided them with a strong sense of professional stability and confidence in the continuity of their employment. Consequently, their concerns about AI may have been directed primarily toward educational and ethical issues, such as academic integrity, the quality of teaching and learning, and assessment practices, rather than toward potential job displacement or reduced professional stability. Another possible explanation is that job security is influenced primarily by organizational and institutional factors, including the clarity of appointment and promotion procedures, institutional financial stability, administrative support, and legal or contractual protections. These factors differ from the sources of AI anxiety, which are more closely associated with the rapid pace of technological change, the need to acquire new competencies, and changes in teaching and research practices. The distinct nature of the factors underlying the two variables may therefore help explain why a statistically significant linear association was not observed in the present sample (Yang et al., 2024). This interpretation is supported by Verano-Tacoronte et al. (2025), who found that faculty members' concerns about AI applications were not directly associated with fears of job loss or diminished professional status. Rather, their concerns were primarily related to academic integrity, the quality of student learning, and assessment mechanisms. The relatively high level of job security reported by faculty members may have contributed to their viewing AI as a tool that supports academic work rather than as a technology that directly threatens their employment. The finding is also consistent with Guan and Jamil (2025), who demonstrated that the adoption of AI applications may create new challenges for faculty members and require adaptation to changing professional demands. However, these challenges do not necessarily imply reduced job security, particularly in institutions characterized by stable organizational environments and clear institutional policies. Overall, the present finding suggests that AI anxiety and job security were not significantly linearly associated in this sample; however, it does not establish the absence of an effect or causal relationship between the two variables.

Differences by Years of Experience and Level of AI Use

The results indicated statistically significant differences in AI anxiety according to years of experience, with

faculty members who had 5–10 years of experience reporting a distinct level of AI anxiety. One possible explanation is that faculty members within this career stage may face increasing demands for excellence in teaching and research, pursue academic promotion, and be expected to demonstrate competence in emerging technologies. These professional demands may make them particularly sensitive to changes associated with AI in the university environment. In addition, faculty members at this stage may need to continuously update their knowledge and skills to remain academically competitive, which could increase anxiety related to AI adoption compared with faculty members who have either less or more professional experience. Faculty members with less experience may still be developing their professional competencies, whereas those with more experience may have developed stronger coping strategies and greater confidence in responding to technological changes (Chiu, 2024; Ng et al., 2021; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). The results also indicated statistically significant differences in AI anxiety according to the level of AI use, with differences observed among faculty members reporting moderate use. This pattern may be explained by the fact that faculty members with moderate levels of AI use have acquired some practical knowledge and experience with AI tools but may still be developing their competence and confidence in applying them effectively in academic contexts. Their intermediate level of exposure may make them more aware of challenges related to the accuracy and quality of AI-generated outputs (Al-Salman & Haider, 2024; Haider & AlKhatib, 2024; Haider, Akar, et al., 2025; Obeidat et al., 2024; Tannous & Haider, 2025), ethical considerations, and the rapidly changing demands of academic work. In contrast, faculty members with high levels of AI use may have developed greater proficiency and familiarity through extensive practical experience, which could contribute to lower anxiety. Faculty members with low levels of use, on the other hand, may have had limited exposure to AI and therefore may be less aware of its potential challenges. This difference in exposure and familiarity may help explain the variation in AI anxiety across levels of AI use (Chiu et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024; Lu et al., 2024).The findings may also be understood in terms of how faculty members balance the potential benefits of AI with the need to maintain their professional roles and academic expertise. Moderate AI use may represent a deliberate approach in which AI is employed as a supportive tool to enhance efficiency and productivity without excessive reliance on technology or the perception that AI will replace core academic responsibilities. Such an approach may reduce concerns about the loss of professional value or threats to job stability while allowing faculty members to keep pace with technological developments and institutional expectations. At the same time, faculty members continue to perform essential functions involving critical thinking, creativity, professional judgment, and decision-making that are not easily replaced by AI (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Farghal & Haider, 2024; Verano-Tacoronte et al., 2025). The findings may further indicate that high AI use is associated with greater awareness of the rapid transformation of academic work and the increasing expectation for continuous skill development and technological adaptation. Such awareness may contribute to concerns about the future demands of the profession and, consequently, to perceptions of job security. Conversely, low AI use may reflect limited engagement with emerging technologies, which could reduce faculty members' confidence in their ability to keep pace with digital transformation and evolving institutional expectations. From this perspective, moderate AI use may represent a relatively balanced level of engagement: it allows faculty members to benefit from AI in improving efficiency while avoiding excessive dependence on technology or perceiving it as a direct threat to their professional roles.

Conclusion

The study results showed that university faculty members exhibit moderate levels of AI anxiety and high levels of job security. These findings indicate that faculty members adopt a balanced stance toward AI technologies. They recognize the opportunities AI offers for education and scientific research, while still harboring concerns about academic integrity, learning quality, and ethical challenges. However, these concerns do not appear to undermine their overall sense of job security. The results also revealed no statistically significant correlation between AI anxiety and job security. This finding suggests that, within the present sample, concerns related to AI applications were not significantly associated with faculty members' perceptions of job security. Therefore, the findings do not provide evidence that AI anxiety is a significant factor in determining faculty members' job security. Future research could further examine whether organizational and institutional factors, such as clear regulations, job stability, and fairness of administrative procedures, contribute to faculty members' perceptions of job security.

In addition, the study revealed differences in AI anxiety attributable to years of experience, favoring the 5–10-year group, and to the level of AI tool use, favoring the moderate-user group. This suggests that faculty members in this group may be more aware of the challenges associated with emerging technologies and more familiar with the requirements for integrating them into academic work. Furthermore, the results revealed differences in job security attributable to the level of AI tool use, particularly among moderate users. This indicates that moderate use of AI tools may be associated with greater perceptions of professional competence and job stability compared with lower or higher levels of use. This study contributes to the literature on AI anxiety and job security in the university environment. It shows that faculty members' AI anxiety is primarily reflected in concerns related to the educational and ethical challenges of AI use, rather than being significantly associated with perceptions of job security. The study also offers a framework that connects the digital transformation of higher education with the psychological aspects of faculty members, extending earlier work on digital university environments and psychological well-being in Jordan (Hammouri et al., 2026), contributing to a deeper understanding of AI-related experiences in the academic environment. On a practical level, the findings underscore the need to develop clear university policies to govern the responsible use of AI. They also emphasize the importance of continuing education programs that enhance faculty members' digital and ethical competencies. These measures can help universities maximize the potential of AI while maintaining academic integrity and supporting the quality of higher education amid rapid digital transformation.

Limitations

This study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting its findings. First, the study employed a descriptive correlational design, which limits the ability to establish causal relationships between AI anxiety and job security. Because the variables were measured at a single point in time, the findings reflect associations between the variables without establishing the direction of influence or causality. Second, the study used a convenience sample of 150 faculty members from a single university, Ajloun National University. The use of a single-university sample and non-probability sampling may limit the representativeness of the participants and the generalizability of the findings to faculty members in other universities or academic contexts. Future studies should consider larger and more diverse samples from multiple universities. Third, the AI-use groups were not equal in size, which may have affected comparisons among the low-, moderate-, and high-use groups and should therefore be considered when interpreting differences between these groups. Fourth, AI use was assessed through participants' self-reports, which may be subject to recall bias, social desirability, or differences in participants' understanding of their actual patterns of AI use. Thus, the reported levels of AI use may not fully reflect participants' actual use of AI tools. Fifth, the instruments used in the study were adapted to the Jordanian university context. Although the instruments underwent linguistic and content review to ensure their suitability for the target context, adaptation may affect the extent to which the instruments retain the same psychometric properties and conceptual meaning as their original versions.

Finally, the study relied on self-reported measures of AI anxiety and job security. Participants' responses may have been influenced by subjective perceptions, social desirability, reluctance to disclose professional concerns, or varying interpretations of the items. These factors may have affected the accuracy of the measured variables. Accordingly, the findings should be interpreted with caution and should not be considered evidence of causal relationships between AI anxiety and job security.

Ethical Considerations

The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles governing research involving human participants. Prior to data collection, the researcher submitted an official request to the Head of the Department at Ajloun National University, Jordan, seeking permission to conduct the study. The request was subsequently forwarded by the Head of the Department to the Dean of the relevant Faculty, who then referred it to the Dean of Scientific Research. The request was reviewed by the University Research Ethics Committee, which granted ethical approval for the study under protocol number IRB No. 4041/UN37.11/TU/2025, dated February 2026. Following ethical approval, the study instruments were distributed to faculty members at Ajloun National University.

Participation in the study was entirely voluntary. Before completing the instruments, participants were

provided with clear information about the purpose of the study, its procedures, and any potential implications. They were informed that participation was optional and that they had the right to withdraw at any stage without penalty or negative consequences. Participants were also informed that they could decline to answer any question or discontinue their participation without providing a reason. To protect their privacy, all personal information and research data were treated confidentially, and no identifying information was collected or reported. The collected data were used solely for scientific research purposes. The study involved minimal anticipated risk, and all research procedures were conducted in accordance with established ethical standards throughout the study.

References

Abu-Rayyash, H., & Haider, A. S. (2024). Introducing Transvisio: A customizable AI-powered subtitling tool. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, *5*(4), 618–632. https://doi.org/10.58256/5p29dj87

Ahmad, M., Haider, A. S., & Saed, H. (2025). Assessing AI-driven dubbing websites: Reactions of Arabic native speakers to AI-dubbed English videos in Arabic. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, *6*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.58256/64dz1c72

Akasheh, W. M., Haider, A. S., Al-Saideen, B., & Sahari, Y. (2024). Artificial intelligence-generated Arabic subtitles: Insights from Veed.io's automatic speech recognition system of Jordanian Arabic. *Texto Livre*, *17*, e46952. https://doi.org/10.1590/1983-3652.2024.46952

Al-Atwi, N. Y., Jarrah, Y. M., Abusheirah, K. M., & Al-Anzi, M. A. (2026). The degree of use of artificial intelligence applications and its relationship to the quality of performance at Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University from the point of view of faculty members. In *Enhancing business efficiency through technology: Sustainability, CSR, and governance* (pp. 1197–1210). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-15820-8_97

Al-Salman, S., & Haider, A. S. (2021). Jordanian university students' views on emergency online learning during COVID-19. *Online Learning*, *25*(1), 286–302. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v25i1.2470

Al-Salman, S., & Haider, A. S. (2024). Assessing the accuracy of MT and AI tools in translating humanities or social sciences Arabic research titles into English: Evidence from Google Translate, Gemini, and ChatGPT. *International Journal of Data and Network Science*, *8*(4), 2483–2498. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.ijdns.2024.5.009

Al-Salman, S., Haider, A. S., & Saed, H. (2022). The psychological impact of COVID-19's e-learning digital tools on Jordanian university students' well-being. *The Journal of Mental Health Training, Education and Practice*, *17*(4), 342–354. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMHTEP-09-2021-0106

Al-Saliti, R. A. M. N., Ismail, A. F., Elmorsy, G. N., & Shahpo, S. M. (2025). Teaching writing skills using generative AI: The paradox of adoption and resistance among language educators. *World Journal of English Language*, *15*(8), 28–41.

Almaiah, M. A., Alfaisal, R., Salloum, S. A., Hajjej, F., Thabit, S., El-Qirem, F. A., … Al-Maroof, R. S. (2022). Examining the impact of artificial intelligence and social and computer anxiety in e-learning settings: Students' perceptions at the university level. *Electronics*, *11*(22), 3662. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics11223662

Ayasrah, S., Hanandeh, A., & Jarrah, Y. (2026). Artificial intelligence in gifted education: Challenges and opportunities from teachers' perspectives in Jordan. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, *16*(6), 1653–1661. https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2026.16.6.2630

Ayodele, S. M., Abu, Z., & Issa, A. (2022). Job security strategy and job satisfaction of non-teaching staff in public universities in Lagos State. *Journal of Strategic Management*, *6*(3), 21–36. https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t4042

Bazzoli, A., Brondino, M., Morgan, A., Phillips, J., & Pasini, M. (2025). 40 years of job insecurity: A review of research designs and scales of measurement. *Scandinavian Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *10*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.16993/sjwop.288

Cajnko, P., & Cajnko, K. (2025). The implementation of artificial intelligence and its impact on stress, anxiety, and burnout levels among managers and professors. In *The Asian Conference on Education & International Development 2025: Official conference proceedings*. IAFOR. https://papers.iafor.org/submission89875/

Chen, S., & Zhao, Y. (2025). Explore the AI anxiety attitude of e-commerce employees. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, *41*(13), 8438–8446. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2024.2409470

Chiu, T. K. (2024). The impact of generative AI (GenAI) on practices, policies and research direction in education: A case of ChatGPT and Midjourney. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *32*(10), 6187–6203. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2023.2253861

Chiu, T. K., Ahmad, Z., Ismailov, M., & Sanusi, I. T. (2024). What are artificial intelligence literacy and competency? A comprehensive framework to support them. *Computers and Education Open*, *6*, 100171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2024.100171

Darwish, N., Haider, A. S., Tannous, B., Abu Rummana, R. N., Alantari, D., Saed, H., & Dagamseh, M. (2025).

A reception study of AI-translated idioms and proverbs between Arabic and English. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, *6*(3), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.58256/k4d6pp20

Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., … Wright, R. (2023). "So what if ChatGPT wrote it?" Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, *71*, 102642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642

Farghal, M., & Haider, A. S. (2024). Translating classical Arabic verse: Human translation vs. AI large language models (Gemini and ChatGPT). *Cogent Social Sciences*, *10*(1), 2410998. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2024.2410998

Geçdoğan Yılmaz, R., & Aydın, B. (2023). Development of the job security perception scale: Validity and reliability study. *Anatolian Journal of Educational Leadership and Instruction*, *11*(2), 266–280.

Ghimire, B., Dahal, R. K., & Karki, D. (2023). Job security and faculty commitment within higher education institutions. *The International Research Journal of Management Science*, *8*(1), 14–27. https://doi.org/10.3126/irjms.v8i1.60684

Guan, H., & Jamil, R. B. (2025). Does AI affect job burnout and insecurity differently by gender? A fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA) of 26 university faculty cases. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, *19*, 100766. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2025.100766

Gwasmeh, M., Riziq, D. K., Al-Abbas, L. S., Almubasher, Z. M., Haider, A. S., Sahari, Y., & Al-Dulaimi, W. M. (2026). AI in translation classrooms: Examining student practices in Jordanian and Iraqi universities. *Frontiers in Education*, *11*, 1828251. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1828251

Haider, A. S. (2026a). AI as a language tutor: Jordanian university students' perceptions of AI-generated feedback on their English. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, *7*(4), 1–17.

Haider, A. S. (2026b). Trust in AI translation: Reception and adoption among Jordanian business professionals. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, *7*(4), 1–15.

Haider, A. S., Akar, R. A., Saed, H., Tair, S. A., & Ismail, H. H. (2025). AI-powered Arabic translation of business and finance acronyms and abbreviations: Evidence from Gemini, ChatGPT, and Google Translate. In *Innovation, technologies, and business management (ICTIM)* (pp. 519–528). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-84889-6_62

Haider, A. S., & Al-Salman, S. (2020). Dataset of Jordanian university students' psychological health impacted by using e-learning tools during COVID-19. *Data in Brief*, *32*, 106104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2020.106104

Haider, A. S., & AlKhatib, R. (2024). Subtitling English legal acronyms into Arabic: Human vs machine. *Kutafin Law Review*, *11*(4), 810–842. https://doi.org/10.17803/2713-0533.2024.4.30.810-842

Haider, A. S., Hussein, R. F., & Saed, H. A. (2022). Jordanian university instructors' practices and perceptions of online testing in the COVID-19 era. *Frontiers in Education*, *7*, 856129. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.856129

Haider, A. S., Obeidat, M. M., Hamdan, Y., Abu-Rayyash, H., & AlZghoul, O. (2025). SDL Trados Live Cloud vs. traditional subtitling workflows: An empirical evaluation of performance. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, *6*(4). https://doi.org/10.58256/fc624p07

Haider, A. S., Obeidat, M. M., Hamdan, Y., AlZghoul, O., & Abu-Rayyash, H. (2026). Tech-driven advances in audiovisual translation: Developing a cloud-based English-Arabic subtitle corpus for training and practice. *Texto Livre*, *19*, e60447. https://doi.org/10.1590/1983-3652.2026.60447

Hammouri, L. N. M., Alrosan, M., Hamdon, H. M. O., Tashtoush, M. A., Altahayneh, Z. L., Al-Momani, A. M., Hawari, A. F., Malkawi, S. H., Al-Saliti, R. A. M. N., & Doum, H. M. A. (2026). Smart campus: Designing a digital environment that supports students' psychological well-being. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.58256/5pmn6617

Jabali, O., Saeedi, M., & Alawneh, Y. (2025). Navigating anxiety in academia: The role of generative artificial intelligence. *Education and Information Technologies*, *30*(11), 15529–15544. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13433-8

Jiang, L. (2024). Rethinking job insecurity research: Challenging the homogeneous, linear, and negative effects of job insecurity. *Applied Psychology*, *73*(4), 2013–2020. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12534

Jiang, L. (2025). An integrative review of moderators attenuating or exacerbating negative outcomes of job insecurity. *Academy of Management Annals*, *19*(2), 565–601. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2024.0040

Jin, G., Jiang, J., & Liao, H. (2024). The work affective well-being under the impact of AI. *Scientific Reports*, *14*(1), 25483. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-75113-w

Jin, Y., Yan, L., Echeverria, V., Gašević, D., & Martinez-Maldonado, R. (2025). Generative AI in higher education: A global perspective of institutional adoption policies and guidelines. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *8*, 100348. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100348

Kemmeren, D. J. L. M. (2023). *Artificial intelligence in everyday life*. Tilburg University.

Lee, R. S. (2020). *Artificial intelligence in daily life*. Springer.

Lu, J., Zheng, R., Gong, Z., & Xu, H. (2024). Supporting teachers' professional development with generative AI: The effects on higher order thinking and self-efficacy. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, *17*, 1267–1277. https://doi.org/10.1109/TLT.2024.3369690

McDonald, N., Johri, A., Ali, A., & Collier, A. H. (2025). Generative artificial intelligence in higher education: Evidence from an analysis of institutional policies and guidelines. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans*, *3*, 100121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbah.2025.100121

Ng, D. T. K., Leung, J. K. L., Chu, S. K. W., & Qiao, M. S. (2021). Conceptualizing AI literacy: An exploratory review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *2*, 100041. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100041

Obeidat, M. M., Haider, A. S., Tair, S. A., & Sahari, Y. (2024). Analyzing the performance of Gemini, ChatGPT, and Google Translate in rendering English idioms into Arabic. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, *18*(4), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.51709/19951272/Winter2024/1

Russo, C., Romano, L., Clemente, D., Iacovone, L., Gladwin, T. E., & Panno, A. (2025). Gender differences in artificial intelligence: The role of artificial intelligence anxiety. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *16*, 1559457. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1559457

Słapczyński, T. (2022). Artificial intelligence in science and everyday life, its application and development prospects. *Scientific Journal of Bielsko-Biala School of Finance and Law*, *26*(4), 78–85. https://doi.org/10.19192/wsfip.sj4.2022.12

Sora, B., Höge, T., Caballer, A., & Peiró, J. M. (2023). The construct of job insecurity at multiple levels: Implications for its conceptualization and theory development. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *20*(4), 3052. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20043052

Stone, P., Brooks, R., Brynjolfsson, E., Calo, R., Etzioni, O., Hager, G., … Teller, A. (2022). *Artificial intelligence and life in 2030: The one hundred year study on artificial intelligence* (arXiv:2211.06318). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2211.06318

Tannous, B., & Haider, A. S. (2025). Assessing the accuracy of AI tools (Google Translate and Gemini) in translating Arabic idiomatic expressions and proverbs into English. *International Journal on Artificial Intelligence Tools*, *34*(04n05), 2550016. https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218213025500162

Tawalbeh, M., Al-Khazaleh, S., Albhirat, M. M., & Tawalbeh, J. H. (2025). Exploring determinants of job satisfaction among academic members in Jordanian higher education institutions. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, *15*(1), 242.

Tu, Y., Hao, P., & Long, L. (2023). Job replacement or job transformation? Definition, consequences, and sources of technology-driven job insecurity. *Advances in Psychological Science*, *31*(8), 1359–1374. https://doi.org/10.3724/SP.J.1042.2023.01359

Verano-Tacoronte, D., Bolívar-Cruz, A., & Sosa-Cabrera, S. (2025). Are university teachers ready for generative artificial intelligence? Unpacking faculty anxiety in the ChatGPT era. *Education and Information Technologies*, *30*(14), 20495–20522. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13585-7

Wan, Q., Zhang, H., Cao, J., & Tao, H. (2025). Educational anxiety triggered by artificial intelligence technology: Pathways and configuration analysis affecting teachers' professional well-being. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *13*, 1717816. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1717816

Wang, K., Ruan, Q., Zhang, X., Fu, C., & Duan, B. (2024). Pre-service teachers' GenAI anxiety, technology self-efficacy, and TPACK: Their structural relations with behavioral intention to design GenAI-assisted teaching. *Behavioral Sciences*, *14*(5), 373. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14050373

Wang, Y. Y., & Wang, Y. S. (2022). Development and validation of an artificial intelligence anxiety scale: An initial application in predicting motivated learning behavior. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *30*(4), 619–634. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2019.1674887

Wilson, M. L., Huggins-Manley, A. C., Ritzhaupt, A. D., & Ruggles, K. (2023). Development of the abbreviated technology anxiety scale (ATAS). *Behavior Research Methods*, *55*(1), 185–199. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-022-01820-9

Yang, X., Cai, X., & Cai, J. (2024). The effect of the tenure track on faculty member's job insecurity and innovative work behavior. *Higher Education*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-024-01194-1

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *16*(1), 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0