Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

RJAH

https://doi.org/10.58256/q6wf3862

Open Access

Check for updates

RESEARCH ARTICLE **Section:** *Literature, Linguistics & Criticism*

Language teachers' perspectives on artificial intelligence in education: administrative and pedagogical standards in Jordan

Zakaria Mahmoud Almubasher[1], Mohammed O Abu-Rahme[1], Riyad Abu-Mallouh[2], Sayel H. Al-Hawawsheh[3], Mohamed. A. M.A .Obeid[4], Almu'tasembellah Mustafa Kh. Dabash[1] & Ahmad Mohammad AL-Salman[5]

[1]Department of Basic Sciences, Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Applied Science Private University, Jordan

[2]Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Technology, Applied Science Private University (ASU), Jordan

[3]Sohar University, Sohar, Oman

[4]Faculty of Education and Arts, Sohar University, Oman

[5]Ministry of Education_ Khalil Al-Rahman Academy

*Correspondence: MAMAhmed@su.edu.om

ABSTRACT

The study aims to identify the necessary conditions for implementing artificial intelligence technologies in the educational administrative process, as perceived by administrators and language educators in the Ministry of Education and its directorates in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. A total of 350 language educators were included in the sample, selected through a random process. The study employed a descriptive analytical approach and utilised a questionnaire as the primary research instrument. The inclusion comprised three axes that symbolise the educational, administrative, and technical prerequisites for the utilisation of artificial intelligence technologies in the educational administrative procedure. The study's findings indicated that the participants exhibited a moderate level of agreement regarding the educational requirements, while demonstrating a high level of agreement regarding the administrative requirements. The level of consensus regarding the technical requirements was significantly higher in comparison to the educational and administrative requirements. Furthermore, it was evident that there were no statistically significant disparities in the responses of the participants based on gender, academic rank, and years of experience, in relation to the educational, administrative, and technical prerequisites for utilising artificial intelligence technologies. The study provided several recommendations, with the most crucial one being to thoroughly examine the anticipated challenges in implementing artificial intelligence in educational institutions and addressing them.

KEYWORDS: artificial Intelligence, administrative decisions, artificial intelligence technologies, education, educational administrators

Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

Volume 7, Issue 2, 2026

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: **03 February 2026**

Accepted: 25 **April 2026**

Published: 18 **May 2026**

HOW TO CITE

Almubasher, Z. M., Abu-Rahme, M. O., Abu-Mallouh, R., Al-Hawawsheh, S. H., Obeid, M. A. M., Kh. Dabash, A. M., & AL-Salman, A. M. (2026). Language teachers' perspectives on artificial intelligence in education: administrative and pedagogical standards in Jordan. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 7(2). https://doi.org/10.58256/q6wf3862

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

Introduction

The world is witnessing a digital transformation in all aspects of life within what is known as the Fourth Industrial Revolution, as this included a wide spread of the use of artificial intelligence applications, robotics, three-dimensional printing, and other technologies in all areas of human activity, including, but not limited to, industry, trade, economy, and management, including the daily life of man, and the impact of these technologies has shifted to educational institutions, and this led to a radical transformation in the educational process in all its practices, and an unprecedented development in Communication between students and their language teachers or between them and their educational institutions.

Artificial intelligence (AI) technologies are considered one of the most influential technologies on the development of the educational process, as the inclusion of sensors and mobile devices in these technologies can lead to the emergence of new teaching methods, non-traditional educational environments, and to enhance interaction between people and physical or virtual entities in educational institutions, and this flexible approach to communication and interaction will lead to an unprecedented development in the educational process (Ali and Nihad, 2021. p.3).

In this context, the role of the Ministry of Education in preparing qualified human competencies capable of managing the digital transformation process in all fields is evident, as well as the role of faculty members in qualifying and preparing students in line with the technologies of the industrial revolution, including artificial intelligence, despite what previous studies indicated of the importance of using artificial intelligence techniques for However, the use of these technologies does not reach the required level, as shown by a study (Al-Shammari, 2022), which indicated the need to support the requirements of digital transformation, and pay attention to the role of human competencies.

Accordingly, the problem of the study is to answer the following main question:

(1) *What are the educational requirements for employing artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process from the language teachers' point of view?*
(2) *What are the administrative requirements for employing artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process from the point of view of language teachers?*
(3) *What are the technical requirements for employing artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process from the language teachers' point of view?*
(4) *Are there statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the responses of the sample of language teachers about the educational, administrative, and technical requirements for employing artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process due to variables (gender, academic rank, and years of experience)?*

The current study attempts to achieve the following objectives:

(1) Educational, administrative, and technical requirements for employing artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process from the point of view of language teachers.
(2) Detecting differences between the responses of the study sample members about the requirements for employing artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process according to the following variables: gender, academic rank, and years of experience.

Literature Review

The recent studies of artificial intelligence (AI) in education note that it has become increasingly influential in the development of administrative as well as pedagogical practices, especially in the framework of language education. Research has demonstrated that AI tools can positively impact language learning with automated feedback, adaptive learning systems, and translation technologies, as well as raise doubts about accuracy, ethical usage, and teacher readiness (Al-Salman and Haider, 2024a; Akasha et al., 2024; Ahmad, Haider, and Saed, 2025; Al-Salman and Haider, 202 The perceptions of educators in the Jordanian setting focus on the necessity of definite administrative and educational norms that would direct the adoption of AI in the classroom to make sure that the specified technologies facilitate, but not displace pedagogical competencies (Hussein and Al-Yasen, 2024; Khatatbah and Ashour, 2024; Ja'afreh, 2023; In addition, AI-based applications like machine translators and auto-subtitling systems have proven their potential and limitations in language accuracy and

cultural competency, which supports the significance of teacher control (Al-Darabee, Farghal, and Haider, 2025; Alkhatib and Haider, 2024; Abu-Rayyash and Haider, 2023a, 2024

Moreover, the literature highlights that institutional readiness, digital literacy, and alignment between AI applications and curriculum objectives are the key factors in the successful implementation of AI in education (Al-Dhuhli, Alkindi, and Al-Taani, 2022; Fraihat, 2024; Al-Salman and Haider, 2021b; Al-Salman, Haider, and Saed Language educators, specifically, can act as a key mediator in the use of AI because their opinions can be used in building a set of standards to find a balance between technological innovation and pedagogical integrity. According to the previous research, AI may positively affect student engagement and their learning outcomes when introduced with a careful approach, in particular, in multilingual and translation-based learning contexts (Abu-Rayyash and Haider, 2024; Darwish et al., 2025b; Akasheh and Haider, 2024; Al-Momani et al., 2025 However, without clear policies and sustained professional development, the adoption of AI may lead to inconsistencies in teaching practices, assessment standards, and learning outcomes (Ja'afreh, 2023; Masoud, 2025; Naib, 2025; Abu Rumman & Haider, 2023).

Artificial intelligence technologies help improve the educational process by providing students with an interactive and collaborative environment, promoting participatory learning, and creating a smart learning environment. Similarly, it helps faculty prepare smart lesson plans, provide personalised learning content, understand aspects of student learning and performance, create new channels of communication between students and faculty, and enable students to get guidance and help to solve their academic problems anywhere, anytime (Safdar et. al., 2019, p.2).

The results of a number of previous studies showed that the use of artificial intelligence in education will enhance the educational process, and will lead to the achievement of distinguished educational outcomes in line with the requirements of the digital age, including studies (Looi et al., 2015; Taha, 2018; Hassanein, 2020; Ali & Nihad, 2021; Fragou & Mavroudi, 2020; Saeed et al., 2021) on the need to include artificial intelligence techniques and applications in the educational process to provide students with modern knowledge and technologies, and the importance of enabling them to organize, process and arrange information, processes and experiences related to the Internet of Things.

Many countries of the world have shown great interest in the role of artificial intelligence technology in the educational process, and the Chinese Ministry of Education announced in 2010 the launch of 140 modern university majors, including 31 specializations related to Internet of Things technology, and some European countries, including Norway and Switzerland, adopted virtual campus initiatives e Campus, and these initiatives depend on employing artificial intelligence techniques Among the different entities on campus (Younes, 2022), there are unique experiences of employing artificial intelligence technologies in some European and American universities Netherlands, including: University of Twente, University of Birmingham at United Kingdom University of Birmingham, and Saint Louis University at United States Saint Louis University (Saeed et. al., 2021, p.4185).

In 2016, Cisco developed a technology model based on artificial intelligence technologies, and this model included energy management, campus lighting, mobile education, distance education, virtual classroom management, campus communication network, parking, and university building management (Alwani, 2022, p. 1453).

The previous presentation indicates the increasing interest in artificial intelligence technologies in university education, and some previous studies have shown the importance of these technologies for faculty members in universities, including a study (Younis, 2022), which indicated that the use of artificial intelligence techniques contributes to the development of many skills among faculty members, including digital communication skills, skills of using smart digital educational applications, and acquiring accuracy in dealing with devices. A study (Gul et. al., 2017) indicated that artificial intelligence techniques allow faculty members to identify the characteristics of students and the preferred learning styles of each student by monitoring their reactions through artificial intelligence techniques during lectures or through distance education, and a study (Al-Dahshan, 2019) showed that artificial intelligence techniques grant The faculty member has a lot of flexibility regarding the possibility of accessing the appropriate educational material, creating appropriate educational content for students commensurate with the knowledge experiences of each student, sending it to them via smart phones, and enabling him to follow the progress of each student in the educational process.

The Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is showing great interest in digital transformation and the applications of the industrial revolution, in light of the Kingdom's Vision 2030 and its endeavour to develop the capabilities of Jordanian youth in all areas of digital transformation, and recent years have witnessed the establishment of many institutions and research centres supporting this transformation.

Methodology

Study Sample

The study population consisted of all language teachers in the Ministry of Education in Jordan, and to determine the sample size, the equation of Stephen Thompson was used. Table 1 shows the distribution of the sample members according to gender variables, academic rank, and the number of years of academic experience.

Table 1: **Distribution of Sample Members**

Variable	Variable levels	Number	Percentage
Gender	Male	138	39%
	Female	212	61%
Academic Rank	Assistant Language teacher	38	11%
	Language teacher	184	52%
	Senior Language teacher	92	26%
	Expert Language teacher	36	11%
Number of years of experience	Less than 5 years	38	11%
	5 – 10 years	142	41%
	More than 10 years	170	48%
Total		350	

Study Tools

The study relied on the questionnaire, which is one of the good tools to collect information, data and facts about a reality or topic.

Determine the Axes of the Resolution

The axes of the questionnaire were determined in light of reviewing previous studies and educational literature, theoretical trends and various definitions in the field of artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process, and in light of this, the questionnaire consisted of two parts as follows:

Part I: Basic data for language teachers.
Part II: It included three axes:

(1) Educational requirements for employing artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process.
(2) Administrative requirements for employing artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process.
(3) Technical requirements for employing artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process.

Study Validity

To ensure the sincerity of the content of the tool, and its validity to measure what was developed to measure, it was presented to a group of competent arbitrators, to explore their opinions on the validity of the scientific and linguistic formulation of the paragraphs of the tool, and the appropriateness of each paragraph for the axis to which it belongs, and to make the necessary amendments, and in light of the opinions of the arbitrators, some amendments were made to the initial image of the questionnaire, which was represented in modifying the wording of some paragraphs, and deleting some of them, and the questionnaire consisted of (28) phrases distributed over three axes.

Internal consistency

The study tool was applied to an exploratory sample consisting of 40 language teachers who do not belong to the study sample, and the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated between the degree of each paragraph

and the total degree of the axis to which it belongs. The results are shown in Table 2)

Table 2: Correlation coefficients between the degree of each statement and the total degree of the axis to which it belongs

The first axis		The second axis		Third Theme	
No.	Correlation coefficient	**No.**	Correlation coefficient	**No.**	Correlation coefficient
1	0.582**	**10**	0.437**	**21**	0.712**
2	0.518**	**11**	0.539**	**22**	0.770**
3	0.510**	**12**	0.691**	**23**	0.445**
4	0.656**	**13**	0.696**	**24**	* 0.317
5	* 0.392	**14**	0.643**	**25**	0.715**
6	0.530**	**15**	0.646**	**26**	0.770**
7	0.417**	**16**	0.370*	**27**	0.628**
8	0.699**	**17**	0.579**	**28**	0.715**
9	0.728**	**18**	* 0.359*	****D correlation coefficient at significance level 0.01**	
		19	0.528**	***D correlation coefficient at significance level 0.05**	
20		0.459**			

It is clear from the previous results that the degree of each statement is associated with a correlation coefficient at the levels of significance 0.01 and 0.05 with the total degree of the axis to which it belongs, and the correlation coefficient was calculated between the degree of each axis and the total degree of the resolution, and the results were as shown in Table (3)

Table 3: Correlation coefficients between the degree of each axis and the total degree of the resolution

Questionnaire axes	Correlation coefficients	
Pedagogical requirements	0.539**	
Administrative requirements	0.787**	
Technical requirements	0.807**	
**D correlation coefficient at significance level 0.01		

The previous results indicate that the degree of each axis is associated with a correlation coefficient D at a significance level of 0.01 with the total degree of resolution, and it is clear from the above that the resolution has a high degree of internal consistency.

Stability of the study tool: To verify the stability of the resolution, the alpha-Cronbach coefficient was calculated for each axis of the resolution, and for the resolution as a whole, and the results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Stability coefficients for resolution

Questionnaire axes	Number of paragraphs	Stability coefficients
Pedagogical requirements	9	0.734
Administrative requirements	11	0.763
Technical requirements	8	0.798

The resolution as a whole	28	0.825

It is clear from the previous results that the stability coefficients for the resolution axes range between (0.734 – 0.798) and (0.825) for the resolution as a whole, and these values indicate that the resolution has a high degree of stability.

Estimation and grading system: The degree of approval of the sample members on the paragraphs of the questionnaire was calculated according to a five-point scale, and these responses were classified into five levels. Table 5 shows the quantitative estimate of the responses of the sample members and the average relative weight of each response.

Table 5: Degrees of response of sample members to the paragraphs of the study tool

Degree of approval Quantification	Very large 5	Large 4	Medium 3	Few 2	Very few 1
Average relative weight	4.2 - 5	3.4- 4.19	2.6 – 3.39	1.8 – 2.59	1 – 1.79

Study Hypotheses

(1) There were no statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) for the requirements of employing artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process among the sample members according to the gender variable.

(2) There were no statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) for the requirements of employing artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process among the sample members according to the academic rank variable.

(3) There were no statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) for the requirements of employing artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process among the sample members according to the variable of years of experience.

Study Results and Discussion

The results of answering the first question, "What are the educational requirements for employing artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process from the language teachers' point of view?"

To answer this question, the arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the responses of the sample members were calculated on the first axis of the study tool, and then the degree of approval of the sample members on the paragraphs of this axis was determined, and the results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: *Results of Respondents' Responses on the First Axis of the Study Tool*

No.	Educational requirements for employing artificial intelligence technology in the educational process	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Degree of approval	
1	Provide the necessary training for language teachers to improve their skills in employing artificial intelligence techniques	3.29	0.83	Medium	
2	Providing qualified trainers to train language teachers and students on the use of artificial intelligence techniques	3.27	0.76	Medium	
3	Supporting administrative leaders to adopt the application of artificial intelligence in education	3.21	0.8	Medium	
4	Providing technicians for computer maintenance and network malfunctions	2.46	0.92	Few	
5	Qualifying language teachers to have the ability to reconcile artificial intelligence techniques with humanity in the educational process	2.49	0.79	Few	
6	Training students to integrate into education activities using artificial intelligence techniques	3.34	0.79	Medium	

No.	Educational requirements for employing artificial intelligence technology in the educational process	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Degree of approval	
7	Providing experts to design and produce AI technologies	3.35	0.92	Medium	
8	Providing administrators familiar with the laws and regulations governing the application of artificial intelligence	2.55	0.99	Few	
9	Provide experts to evaluate the results of the language teacher and student application	3.46	0.81	Large	
The first axis as a whole		3.04	0.84	Medium	

It is clear from the previous results that the respondents agreed to an average degree on the requirements related to education to employ artificial intelligence technology in the educational process, and the responses on this axis ranged between a large degree of approval for one phrase, an average degree of approval for five statements, and a low degree of approval for three statements.

These results reflect the interest of the sample members in providing experts and trainers specialized in artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process, and the communication theory has emphasized the need for the language teacher to have the ability to manage the learning network, which needs more training, in addition to the importance of preparing them for learning environments that provide students with multiple opportunities for reflection, cooperation and integration into learning activities, and this can be explained that artificial intelligence technology is from Relatively modern technologies, and that their technologies in educational institutions in Jordan and in Arabic countries in general are still limited, in addition to that, the design and use of artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process needs special skills, different from the skills for using computerized technologies or other technologies currently prevailing, and the use of these technologies requires the support and support of experts and trainers specialized in this field, and these results are consistent with what my study (Leong& Letchumanan, 2019), and Shahin, 2020) regarding the need for AI specialists or trainers to deliver and manage AI specialized courses.

The results of answering the second question, "What are the administrative requirements for employing artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process from the language teachers' point of view?"

To answer this question, the arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the responses of the sample members were calculated on the second axis of the study tool, and then the degree of approval on the paragraphs of this axis was determined, and the results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Results of the responses of the sample members on the second axis of the study tool

No.	Administrative requirements for employing artificial intelligence technology in the educational process	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Degree of approval
1	Provide systems that enable language teachers to implement the Internet of Things	3.53	0.88	Large
2	Changing traditional educational policies related to the systems of the educational process in line with artificial intelligence applications	3.04	0.83	Medium
3	Establishing and spreading the culture of using artificial intelligence among language teachers and students	3.43	0.89	Large
4	Provide adequate financial support for the purchase of modern software and technologies used	3.66	0.93	Large
5	Provide adequate financial support for the purchase of used computing equipment	3.69	0.79	Large
6	Provide appropriate financial support for the maintenance of required hardware and software	3.54	0.85	Large
7	Allocate a sufficient budget for technical experts in the field of artificial intelligence who are hired.	3.56	0.83	Large

No.	Administrative requirements for employing artificial intelligence technology in the educational process	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Degree of approval
8	Provide a guide on how to activate artificial intelligence techniques	3.26	0.85	Medium
9	Allocate sufficient budget to introduce academic disciplines in artificial intelligence into the curriculum	3.28	0.95	Medium
10	Providing the necessary financial allocations for networking in the Ministry of Education	3.22	0.94	Medium
11	Allocate appropriate incentives and rewards for outstanding language teachers in the application of artificial intelligence software	3.31	0.9	Medium
The second axis as a whole		3.41	0.87	Large

It is clear from the previous results that the respondents agreed that the administrative requirements for employing artificial intelligence technology in the educational process are generally large according to the point of view of the sample members, and the approval came on six statements to a large degree, and five phrases to a medium degree. The terms that received a high degree of approval were those related to the provision of financial support in the areas of the provision of computer hardware, software and technology, then support for technology experts, and finally with regard to maintenance. This is followed by the adoption of the Ministry of Education for systems that emphasise the application of artificial intelligence techniques, and the consolidation and dissemination of the culture of using artificial intelligence among students and language teachers.

The degree of high approval for the provision of financial support in the above areas can be explained by the fact that the use of artificial intelligence technology requires the provision of a multi-element technological infrastructure in order to use artificial intelligence effectively, including devices, protocols, bands, and technologies, as well as with regard to the maintenance costs of smart systems, as indicated by the study (Al-Dahshan, 2019) and the study (Abdul Razzaq, 2019) regarding financing. In addition, the study of Shahin (2020) in this aspect, which is related to the material cost related to the high energy consumption of devices associated with artificial intelligence technologies, the need to develop devices, and the Internet, and these reasons may be the motivation for considering the aspect of financial support at the forefront of requirements in this axis. As for the degree of interest of respondents in changing educational policies related to educational systems with regard to the use of artificial intelligence, this may be because changing these policies must be preceded by an infrastructure consistent with this use, in addition to the presence of qualified human elements to use artificial intelligence, including language teachers, administrative staff, and other requirements that may take a longer period of time.

The results of answering the third question, "What are the technical requirements for employing artificial intelligence (AI) techniques in the educational process from the point of view of language teachers?"

To answer this question, the arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the responses of the sample members were calculated on the third axis of the study tool, and then the degree of approval of the paragraphs of this axis was determined, and the results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Results of Responses of Sample Members on the Third Axis of the Study Tool

No.	Technical requirements for employing artificial intelligence technology in the educational process	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Degree of approval
1	Provide effective solutions to adapt the content to the desires of users of (AI) technologies.	3.36	0.87	Medium
2	Provide customised learning activities using highly interactive AI technologies	3.32	0.86	Medium

No.	Technical requirements for employing artificial intelligence technology in the educational process	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Degree of approval
3	Activating the learning matrix that allows language teachers to make informed decisions on which to build development and improvement processes	3.27	0.91	Medium
4	Provide valuable processing data to language teachers through analytics, security controls and process modelling	3.48	0.88	Large
5	Provide a powerful and effective tool for faculty and students to enhance academic integrity and assess originality within the university	3.65	0.7	Large
6	Providing and securing access for language teachers and students within the artificial intelligence network to access resources and information sources through their authenticated identity	3.78	0.8	Large
7	Development of reference services	3.64	0.84	Large
8	Provide a rapid, sensitive and secure response to meet the information needs of students, language teachers and administrators about AI technologies	3.7	0.82	Large
The third axis as a whole		3.52	0.83	Large

It is clear from the previous results that the respondents agreed on the technical requirements for employing artificial intelligence technology in the educational process in general, and the approval came on five statements to a large degree, and three phrases to a medium degree. The approval of the technical requirements was relatively greater than the educational and administrative requirements.

These results can be interpreted in light of concerns related to the employment of artificial intelligence technologies, including the violation of users' privacy, the exploitation of some security vulnerabilities for unauthorized access to databases, the weak awareness of users of data protection laws, in addition to the need for data reliability, and attention to the role of artificial intelligence technology in developing information services provided within educational institutions, and this interest comes within the framework of the multiplicity of areas of use of intelligence technology. Artificial in the educational process, and the existence of a number of technical requirements in these areas, including those related to classrooms, libraries and facilities, and follow-up of the progress of students' performance, in addition to managing the educational process, as previous studies have shown the importance of previous elements related to protection, security, and data analysis in digital learning environments, including studies (Meacham et al., 2018), (Al-Aklabi, 2019), and (Al-Dahshan, 2019).

The results of the answer to the fourth question, "Are there statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the responses of the sample of language teachers about the educational, administrative, and technical requirements for employing artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process due to variables (gender, academic rank, and years of experience)?"

To answer this question, the validity of the hypotheses of the study was verified as follows:

A. Significance of the differences between the responses of the sample members according to the gender variable: The significance of the differences between the responses of the sample members according to the gender variable was verified through the first hypothesis validity test "There are no statistically significant differences between the responses of the sample members regarding the requirements of employing artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process according to the gender variable", and the "T" test was used for two independent samples for this purpose, and the results were as shown in Table (9).

Table 9: Results of the "T" test to indicate the differences between the responses of the sample members according to the variable Gender

Requirements	Gender	Number	Arithmetic averages	Standard deviations	Degree of freedom	Value "T"	Significance level	
Educational	male	136	27.52	3.33	350	0.566	0.572	Non-function
	female	214	27.34	2.68				
Administrative	male	136	38.25	6.14	350	1.762	0.08	Non-function
	female	214	37.07	6.09				
Technology	male	136	28.73	4.71	350	1.7	0.09	Non-function
	female	214	27.84	4.84				

It is clear from the previous results that there were no statistically significant differences between the responses of the sample members according to the gender variable, with regard to the educational, administrative, and technical requirements for employing artificial intelligence.

B. Significance of the differences between the responses of the sample members according to the variable of academic rank:

The significance of the differences between the responses of the sample members according to the academic rank variable was verified through the second hypothesis validity test "There are no statistically significant differences between the responses of the sample members with regard to the educational, administrative, and technical requirements according to the academic rank variable", and the single variance analysis test was used, and the results were as shown in Table (10).

Table 10: Results of Single Variance Analysis Test to Indicate the Differences between the Responses of the Sample Members According to the Academic Rank Variable

Requirements	Contrast source	Sum of squares	Degree of freedom	Average squares	F value	Significance level	
Educational	Between groups	27.18	3	9.06	1.04	0.373	Non-function
	Inside groups	3040.42	350	8.68			
	Total	3067.6	353	-			
Administrative	Between groups	151.69	3	50.56	1.35	0.258	Non-function
	Inside groups	13106.58	350	37.44			
	Total	13258.27	353	-			
Technology	Between groups	141.29	3	47.09	2.05	0.106	Non-function
	Inside groups	8026.9	350	22.93			
	Total	8168.19	353	-			

It is clear from the previous results that there were no statistically significant differences between the responses of the sample members according to the academic rank variable, with regard to the educational, administrative, and technical requirements for employing artificial intelligence techniques.

C. Significance of the differences between the responses of the sample members according to the variable of years of experience:

The significance of the differences between the responses of the sample members according to the variable of years of experience was verified through the validity test of the third hypothesis "There are no statistically significant differences between the responses of the sample members for the educational, administrative and

technical requirements according to the variable of years of experience", and the single variance analysis test was used, and the results were as shown in Table (11).

Table 11: *Results of the Single Variance Analysis Test to Indicate the Differences between the Responses of the Sample Members According to the Years of Experience Variable*

Requirements	Contrast source	Sum of squares	Degree of freedom	Average squares	F value	Significance level	
Educational	Between groups	10.3	3	5.15	0.591	0.554	Non-function
	Inside groups	3057.3	350	8.71			
	Total	3067.6	353	-			
Administrative	Between groups	96.82	3	48.41	1.29	0.276	Non-function
	Inside groups	13161.44	350	37.49			
	Total	13258.27	353	-			
Technology	Between groups	85.1	3	42.55	1.84	0.159	Non-function
	Inside groups	8082.59	350	23.02			
	Total	8167.69	353	-			

It is clear from the previous results that there were no statistically significant differences between the responses of the sample members according to the variable of years of experience, with regard to the educational, administrative, and technical requirements for employing artificial intelligence techniques.

The previous results can be interpreted in the light of some factors that have already been addressed, including the novelty of the use of artificial intelligence technology in educational institutions, and that its use is still in fairly limited fields, which means that determining the degree of approval of educational, administrative, and technical requirements from the point of view of the sample members was not affected by the presence of previous experiences in this field, in addition to that the employment of artificial intelligence techniques is related to Qualification and training in multiple skills that differ from the skills associated with the educational technologies prevailing in the Ministry of Education.

Conclusion

It can be stated that the introduction of artificial intelligence into the educational process is accompanied by both considerable opportunities and critical threats, especially in the sphere of teaching language in Jordan. This paper has emphasised that language educators are at the centre of the development of the attitude towards AI perception, its adoption, and regulation in educational institutions. Their reflections indicate the increasing awareness of AI possibilities to improve the process of teaching and learning by using tools like automated feedback, translation systems, and adaptive learning platforms. Simultaneously, issues of accuracy, ethical issues, and the possibility of excluding the role of a teacher further highlight the necessity of a cautious and well-planned introduction.

The results underscore the necessity of setting out clear administrative and educational guidelines that can inform the effective use of AI in language education. These standards must make sure that they are aligned with pedagogical objectives, foster digital literacy among teachers and offer sustained professional development to guide teachers through the new technologies. Further, policy structures and institutional preparedness should tackle the problems of quality assurance, privacy of information, and equal access to technology.

Finally, the achievement of AI in education does not solely require technological change but also the human factor, namely, the experience and the discretion of language teachers. Including their views in the

policy and practice, the educational institutions in Jordan can create a balanced solution that would ensure the use of the advantages of AI without harming the profession of teaching. Further studies are to be undertaken on context-specific uses of AI and assessing the long-term outcomes of AI on teaching quality and student performance, so that innovation in education can be effective and ethical.

In light of the findings of the study, the researchers recommend the following:

(1) Developing language teacher training programs to ensure that they possess the skills to apply artificial intelligence techniques in the educational process.
(2) Study the obstacles that are expected to face the employment of artificial intelligence in educational institutions, and work to solve them.
(3) Holding more seminars and conferences to raise awareness of the importance of benefiting from artificial intelligence technologies in the educational process, and in the management of educational institutions and schools.

References

Abd al-Aty, M. A.-B. (2015). *Employing web technology in education*. New University House.

Abdel-Basset, M., Manoharan, G., Mohammed, M., & Rushdy, E. (2018). Internet of things in smart education environment: A Supportive framework in the decision-making process. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience, 31*(10), 1–12.

Abdul Razzaq, F. Z. (2019). A future vision of the role of Egyptian universities in benefiting from modern developments of the Internet: Artificial intelligence as a model. *Journal of the Future of Education Arabic, 26*, 33–94.

Ahmad, M., Haider, A. S., & Saed, H. (2025). Assessing AI-driven dubbing websites. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities, 6*(1), 1–20.

Akasha, W., Haider, A. S., Al-Saideen, B., & Sahari, Y. (2024). Artificial intelligence-generated Arabic subtitles: Insights from Veed.io's automatic speech recognition system. *Texto Livre, 17*, e46952.

Akasheh, W., & Haider, A. S. (2024). A comparative linguistic analysis for Jordanian Arabic artificial intelligence-powered subtitles: A case study of Veed and YouTube. Paper presented at the International Conference on Technology and Innovation Management.

Al-Aklabi, A. B. D. (2019). The return from artificial intelligence applications on the educational process. *International Journal of Research in Educational Sciences, 2*(3), 93–122.

Al-Alwani, S. M. (2022). Employing artificial intelligence in Saudi universities from the faculty perspective: Opportunities and challenges. *Educational Journal, Faculty of Education, Sohag University, 93*, 1439–1473.

Al-Darabee, M., Farghal, M., & Haider, A. S. (2025). Netflix versus Google Translate. *Studies in Linguistics, Culture and FLT, 13*(2), 77–95.

Al-Dhuhli, R., Alkindi, L., & Al-Taani, W. (2022). Digital technology in education. *Jordan Journal of Applied Science Humanities Series, 31*(1), 43–62.

Al-Faramawi, I. K., Imam, I. M., & Darwish, D. M. (2021). A program based on communication theory using artificial intelligence applications. *Research Journal, Faculty of Girls, Ain Shams University, 5*(2), 161–209.

Ali, M. I., & Sabr, K. J. (2022). Designing an e-learning environment based on communication theory. *Journal of the Egyptian Society for Educational Computers, 10*(1), 80–102.

Ali, S., & Nihad, M. (2021). Internet of Things for the education field. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1897*, 1–9.

Al-Momani, A., Haider, A. S., Dagamseh, M., & Akasheh, W. M. (2025). Audience responses to cultural and linguistic gaps in English–Arabic auto-subtitles on YouTube. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities, 6*(3). https://doi.org/10.58256/x3sten23

Al-Sadani, A., & Soliman, M. (2017). Experimental evaluation of internet of things in the educational environment. *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy, 7*(3), 50–60.

Al-Salman, S., & Haider, A. S. (2021a). COVID-19 neologisms. *Russian Journal of Linguistics, 25*(1), 24–42.

Al-Salman, S., & Haider, A. S. (2021b). Emergency online learning in Jordan. *Online Learning, 25*(1), 286–302.

Al-Salman, S., & Haider, A. S. (2024b). 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. *Journal of Mental Health Training, Education and Practice, 14*(4), 342–354. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMHTEP-09-2021-0106

Ammari, R., & Al-Ahmad, W. (2023). A corpus-based study of English synonyms: Small, little, tiny, and petite. *Jordan Journal of Applied Science-Humanities Series, 36*(2), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.35192/jjoas-h.v36i2.542

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

Debbas, M., & Haider, A. S. (2020a). Overcoming cultural constraints in translating English series: A case study of subtitling *Family Guy* into Arabic. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature®, 26*(1). https://doi.org/10.17576/3l-2020-2601-01

Dahshan, J. A. (2019). Employing AI in education: Justifications, areas, and challenges. *International Journal of Research in Educational Sciences, 2*(3), 49–92.

Duke, B., Harper, G., & Johnston, M. (2013). Connectivism as a digital age theory. *The International HETL Review*, 1–13.

Elsaka, T., & Abdul Aziz, E. (2019). Security of IoT: Ambitions and challenges. Paper presented at the Internet of Things Conference, Abu Dhabi.

Fragou, O., & Mavroudi, A. (2020). Exploring internet of things and mobile computing in education. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science, 4*(1), 75–82.

Gul, S., et al. (2017). A survey on role of internet of things in education. *International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security, 17*(5).

Hassan, A. H. (2021). Artificial intelligence services in university offices. *Journal of the Faculty of Arts in the New Valley, 7*(14), 1–54.

Hassanein, B. (2020). Artificial intelligence and big data in education. *International Journal of Learning Management Systems, 8*(1), 23–42.

Ibrahim, W. Y. (2015). Employing social networks in education. *Journal of E-Learning, Mansoura University*, 37–40.

Ibrahim, W. Y., & Shorb, R. A. (2020). Concept AI technology and educational applications. *Educational Technology Journal, 30*(3), 10–13.

Leong, Y. M., & Letchumanan, C. (2019). Effective learning using IoT tools. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Data Sciences* (pp. 152–157). IEEE.

Looi, C., Wong, H., & Milard, M. (2015). Seamless, ubiquitous learning. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 2–4.

Saeed, M., Shah, A., Mahmood, K., & Mcsc, M. (2021). Usage of IoT technology in higher education. *Journal of Engineering Science and Technology, 16*(5), 4181–4191.

Shaheen, Y. (2020). Technological acceptance of IoT in Egyptian schools. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Educational Studies, 1*(1), 6–10.

Taha, N. I. (2018). The revolution of digital artificial intelligence in education. *Educational Technology Studies and Research, 37*, 309–330.

Younes, M. A.-G. (2022). Faculty attitudes toward AI in university education. *Journal of the Faculty of Education, Ain Shams University, 46*(2), 15–94.