

Open
AccessCheck for
updates

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Section: *Digital Humanities*

Trust in AI translation: Reception and adoption among Jordanian business professionals

Ahmad S. Haider^{1*}¹Department of English Language & Translation, Faculty of Arts & Humanities, Applied Science Private University, Jordan*Correspondence: a_haidar@asu.edu.jo

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) has become increasingly integrated into multilingual professional communication, particularly in translation. This study examines the perceptions, adoption patterns, and future intentions of 2,500 business professionals across various sectors in Jordan regarding AI-powered translation tools. Data were collected using a 28-item questionnaire covering seven dimensions: trust in human versus AI translators, perceived AI accuracy and reliability, adoption and frequency of use, perceived usefulness, organizational policy and support, ethical concerns, and future adoption intentions. The findings revealed a significant negative correlation between perceived AI accuracy and reliability and comparative trust in human translators ($r = -.339, p < .001$), alongside a positive correlation with future adoption intentions ($r = .453, p < .001$). Organizational policy and support were negatively associated with ethical concerns ($r = -.411, p < .001$). No significant differences in perceived AI accuracy and reliability were found based on formal AI training ($p = .057$). However, AI translation adoption varied significantly across sectors, with higher adoption in Technology and Marketing/Advertising than in Legal Services and Healthcare/Pharmaceuticals. Larger organizations also reported stronger institutional policy and support. Overall, the findings suggest that growing reliance on AI translation does not eliminate the need for human linguistic expertise, particularly in sensitive professional contexts. The study highlights the importance of organizational support and ethical governance in promoting the responsible integration of AI translation into professional practice.

KEYWORDS: Artificial Intelligence (AI), business decision-makers, ethical concerns, ai adoption and organizational policy, Jordan

Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

Volume 7, Issue 4, 2026

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: 29 July 2026

Accepted: 14 September 2026

Published: 14 October 2026

HOW TO CITE

Haider, A. S. (2026). Trust in AI translation: Reception and adoption among Jordanian business professionals. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 7(4). <https://doi.org/10.58256/sne7v004>



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.

1. Introduction

Advances in artificial intelligence (AI) have brought AI-based tools into professional communication and language services, including translation (Al-Jarf, 2025; Hammouri, 2025; Megdadi et al., 2026). DeepL, ChatGPT, and Gemini are now used in business tasks that involve more than one language, ranging from internal emails and international marketing to the translation of professional documents (Burgos, Branch, Tlili, Stracke, & de la Higuera, 2024; Liedtke, 2025). Their speed, capacity, and fairly low running costs account for much of this uptake, and they have prompted organizations to rethink how they handle multilingual work (Clark, 2020; Johnsen, 2025; Van der Meer, 2020). Questions of reliability and responsibility, however, are still open. Where a translation error could have legal or reputational consequences, professional trust, ethical accountability, human review, and the role of the translator become pressing issues (Bowker, 2020; Moniz & Escartín, 2023).

Recent research has highlighted the growing integration of artificial intelligence across legal, administrative, and educational contexts, emphasizing its potential benefits alongside concerns regarding trust, ethical accountability, and institutional governance (Al-Billeh, Khashashneh, Alhendi, Al-Shabatat, & Al-Billeh, 2026; Al Khaldi, Khawaldeh, Alhusban, Altarawneh, & Al-Wreikat, 2025; Almubasher et al., 2026; Rukba et al., 2025). Introducing AI translation into professional work involves decisions beyond the choice of a new tool. Its use is shaped by how much professionals trust the output, the value they see in it for their work, the rules and support available within their organizations, and the ethical concerns attached to AI-mediated communication. Professionals working with multilingual material may therefore shape not only whether AI is adopted, but also how far it is used and when human translation or review is still required (Owolabi et al., 2024; Rezaei, Pironti, & Quaglia, 2025; Rivas Ginel & Moorkens, 2025; Saba, Sahli, & Hadidi, 2020). Continued advances in natural language processing (NLP) make these questions more pressing, particularly those concerning context, culture, privacy, accountability, and responsible professional practice (Hariri, 2023; Khurana, Koli, Khatter, & Singh, 2023; Kumar & Nagar, 2024; Torfi, Shirvani, Keneshloo, Tavaf, & Fox, 2020; Zaki & Ahmed, 2024). Professional responses to AI translation are likely to depend on several considerations at once: perceived accuracy and reliability, usefulness, organizational policy, training, and institutional support. Ethical questions also arise when translated material contains confidential information or when responsibility for an AI-assisted decision is unclear (Leslie, 2019).

Although AI translation is being used more widely, the relationship between confidence in AI and confidence in human translators remains insufficiently understood. The same is true of the role played by organizational support, training, industry sector, and organization size. These questions have particular relevance in Jordan because multilingual communication is used across a broad range of professional sectors.

Professional communication across languages depends on more than lexical substitution. Tone, context, intended meaning, and expectations about how a message should be communicated can all affect the exchange. The present study focuses on what professionals report about AI translation and its adoption rather than testing the linguistic or cultural quality of the output itself. For this reason, translation is considered separately from cultural adaptation and localization, which extend beyond language transfer to wider contextual and cultural adjustments.

The study therefore looks at trust, perceived reliability, usefulness, adoption, organizational support, ethical concerns, and future intentions side by side, in order to see where AI translation currently stands in multilingual professional communication in Jordan.

Data came from 2,500 business professionals in Jordan. The analysis looks at how they view and use AI translation, how that use relates to human translation, what workplace conditions surround it, and what they expect about future adoption. Three research questions were addressed:

1. How do Jordanian business professionals judge the reliability, usefulness, risks, and future use of AI translation in comparison with human translation?
2. What is the relationship between perceived AI reliability and trust in human translators, organizational support, ethical concerns, training, and future intentions?
3. Are there differences in reported AI adoption across industry sectors and in organizational support across organizations of different sizes?

The questions are concerned with AI translation as it is encountered in workplace practice, not only as a technical

development. Increased use of AI is not treated as evidence that the role of human translation has necessarily diminished. Attention is given instead to the way confidence in AI, reliance on human expertise, governance, ethical concerns, and future adoption plans occur together as professional translation practices change.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Theoretical Background

The application of AI in international business communication has revolutionized the way institutions communicate with one another. In terms of language, some institutions are leveraging AI's language models to make decisions and manage multilingual information for their operations, aiming to streamline processes. They are time- and cost-saving; they also offer firms multilingual solutions that would allow the companies to interact with more international markets and establish themselves in new markets (Boluwatife, 2025). According to Mihalache (2020), AI translation is not a secondary process anymore, but an essential assistant in the process of moving towards being competitive and agile on a global level.

This study approaches AI translation through the combined perspectives of technology acceptance and AI-mediated intercultural communication. From a technology-acceptance perspective, adoption is influenced by users' evaluations of a technology's usefulness, reliability, and suitability for professional tasks. In AI-mediated translation, however, acceptance extends beyond functional efficiency because the technology operates directly through language. Its use may consequently influence how multilingual messages are produced, interpreted, and communicated across linguistic and cultural boundaries. This study therefore conceptualizes adoption as both a technological decision and a communicative practice situated within multilingual professional environments. In this ever-evolving landscape, trust has emerged as a pivotal element in shaping the adoption or strategic integration of AI translation tools and services by businesses. Trust has become a key component in a business's decision on whether to adopt AI translation tools and services or to adopt them in a strategic manner in this ever-changing space. Other scholars (see AlAfnan, 2025; Mustapha & Malkan, 2025) argue that the effectiveness of AI in Arabic-English translation depends on the reliability of the system, the linguistic compatibility, and the user's awareness of the system's limitations. Consistency, specificity, and domain accuracy are some terms under which the optimization of trust is discussed in the context of business translation (Asrifan, Nursyam, & Aini, 2025; Moniz & Escartín, 2023; Mutashar, 2024). They state that enterprises should be given the confidence that AI translations will not undermine their brand as a business and will not affect cross-cultural care or legal requirements.

Within this framework, trust involves more than a willingness to use an AI tool. It encompasses confidence in the accuracy and dependability of AI-generated translation, perceptions of its usefulness, and judgments about whether automated output is appropriate when professional, ethical, reputational, or intercultural consequences are at stake. Human translation can act as a relevant point for comparison, as professional translation is associated with interpretations of communicative purpose and context that do not overly rely on literal meanings. These translations reflect the skills and expertise of professionals and could thus serve as a useful benchmark for AI translations. This can provide insights into how confidence in AI translation relates to confidence in this human expertise, which could reflect changes in the field of professional translation.

Hadla, Hailat, and Al-Kabi (2014) have noted that MT has specific structural and script issues which leave the judgments and legitimacy of MT quality not clear in various types of sentences. If business leaders can trust and believe that AI translation is reliable and more in line with business goals, it will help them gain faster access to the market, better communication between all stakeholders, and internal efficiency in multi-goal teams. To understand the dynamics in greater depth, Mutashar (2024) discussed AI translation systems in relation to the Arabic and English languages, and the cost-saving and quality-control of the systems. Within this line of thinking, leadership decisions would be affected by the factors of trust and risk assessment. Hadla et al. (2014) insisted that automated assessment procedures offer efficiency without taking into consideration the complexity of proper translation.

An intercultural perspective treats multilingual business communication as both linguistic and cultural. Meaning is shaped not only by wording but also by context, pragmatic conventions, culturally situated expectations, and the relationship between participants. AI translation may therefore affect how the quality and trustworthiness of international business communication are perceived, rather than merely helping users cross

a language barrier. This is particularly relevant in Jordanian professional settings, where communication may move between Arabic and other languages and between local and international organizations.

AI translation also serves as a valuable resource in the business realm (Enholm, Papagiannidis, Mikalef, & Krogstie, 2022; Kaggwa et al., 2024; Mohamed et al., 2024; Murire, 2024; Rajagopal et al., 2022). In this context, there are leaders who are required to consider cultural factors, not only within the organization. The theoretical framework has paved the way for fostering trust, cultural relevance, and decision-making as key pillars for integrating AI into the Arab business world successfully.

For conceptual clarity, this study distinguishes translation from cultural adaptation and localization. Translation here means moving meaning from one language to another, whereas cultural adaptation changes the content itself to suit the expectations and conventions of a particular culture. Localization represents a broader adjustment of content to a particular linguistic, cultural, or market context. The present study investigates professional perceptions and adoption of AI translation; it does not directly evaluate AI-generated cultural adaptation or localization. These distinctions are nevertheless important for locating AI translation within the broader field of AI-mediated intercultural communication.

2.2. Empirical Studies

There have been several researchers who have examined user trust, perceived risk, and the behaviors used. In the study by Nurminen and Koponen (2020), the role of high-stakes situations in relation to the use of output of machine translation by professionals who already have a high degree of expertise in the field was examined. Results indicated that the main application for translation was gisting, but that users' proficiency in the field was important for effectiveness, and that distributed perception of machine-generated translation (Nurminen & Koponen, 2020). The trustworthiness and the perception of risk are also important aspects of the decision-making process concerning AI tools.

According to Orbán and Stefkovics (2025), user trust in systems for algorithmic decision-making significantly increased when these systems were supplemented by human errors. This means that transparency and human accountability are vital to underpin confidence in AI-assisted processes. Their results reflect background factors, including the considerable importance of domain sensitivity and stakes in the decision, as two strong determinants of trust. Among these broader concerns is the potential impact of AI-generated document translation on organizational reputation, legal standing, and financial outcomes within business decision-making contexts (Afroogh, Akbari, Malone, Kargar, & Alambeigi, 2024).

Major concerns exist about issues relating to the accuracy of generative AI tools, copyright implications, and the possibility of displacing conventional indices of professional authorship. Hadla et al. (2014) argue that systems are nowhere near human professional translators in translation accuracy. The major factors impairing translation accuracy are the disordering of syntactic and lexical selection, which directly impinges on the output translation. The same applies to Jiménez-Crespo (2025), who examined the importance of Human-centred artificial intelligence in translation, namely, how to introduce human control into AI translation pipelines in complicated and sensitive situations. The researcher stated that to build trust and diminish perceived risks in professional translation workflows, there would be a need for human intervention to gain trust and minimize risk perception in professional translation.

Some researchers have argued that the combination of AI and machine translation influences the translation profession to pressure decision-makers into prioritizing cost reduction over maintaining consistency and meeting their quality expectations (Cronin, 2024; Drugan, 2013). Professionals have been enthusiastic about the higher yield, alongside concerns about the loss of interpretive nuances in AI output. With this in mind, Mutashar (2024) emphasized the importance of quality assurance and ethical oversight in AI-powered translation workflows to preserve user confidence in AI-generated translation output.

This issue is especially relevant in cross-cultural professional exchanges. A translation may be correct in grammar and vocabulary and still miss the intended message when pragmatic meaning, tone, context, or cultural conventions are ignored. These features can determine whether professional communication is understood as intended.

Other studies touched on translation and the development and implementation of AI in translation. The development of statistical machine translation set the foundation for machine-generated natural language

translation systems that are still in use today, as outlined by Koehn (2010).

Castilho et al. (2017) provided important insights into the adaptation of post-editing strategies in a professional setting, demonstrating how the translator's perceptions of quality and production volume influenced the use of machine translation. Jiménez-Crespo (2013) identified how the different translation production environments, with dissimilar institutional workflows and translation norms, affect the use of AI-powered systems. Tahmasbi, Rastegari, and Truong (2025) developed a typology of the translator's trust and distrust in generative AI-powered systems, demonstrating that trust is influenced by perceived authorial control, task complexity, and institutional norms. Their framework reaffirmed the necessity of empirical studies into how businesspeople make AI translation decisions.

Despite this growing body of research, comparatively little attention has been given to how business professionals in Arab contexts perceive AI translation as part of their everyday multilingual communication. Existing research has largely concentrated on translation quality, translator–technology interaction, post-editing, or the technical performance of machine translation. Less is known about how trust, perceived reliability, usefulness, organizational support, ethical concerns, training, and future intentions operate together in shaping AI translation adoption within a specific professional and sociocultural context. Evidence from Jordan is particularly limited, leaving an important gap in understanding how AI-mediated translation is being received within Arab business environments and increasingly intercultural professional workplaces.

The previous studies suggest that for successful integration, AI translation should be sector-specific, take into consideration cultural expectations, and be supported with institutional mechanisms. Trust, explainability, post-editing integration, and domain knowledge became pivotal in the decision-making process of professional and business leaders. The present state of scholarship around business communication has changed in that the implementation of the AI-based translation application in business organizations is not only about technology, but also about humans who should be trained to make use of the translation application. Accordingly, examining AI translation in the Jordanian business context provides an opportunity to understand technological adoption as part of a wider transformation in multilingual and intercultural professional communication.

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

Participants were 2,500 business professionals in Jordan representing a range of roles, sectors, and organization sizes. They also differed in their reported use of AI, experience of formal AI training, work with human translators, and level of decision-making authority. Recruitment was conducted through professional networks and industry associations. As a result, the sample should not be regarded as statistically representative of the entire population of business professionals in Jordan.

3.2. Survey Instrument

The survey contained two sections. Part I gathered demographic and professional information. Part II comprised 28 statements organized into seven constructs: Trust in Human vs. AI Translators (Items 1–4), Perceived Accuracy and Reliability of AI (Items 5–8), Adoption and Frequency of AI Use (Items 9–12), Perceived Usefulness (Items 13–16), Organizational Policy and Support (Items 17–20), Ethical Concerns (Items 21–24), and Future Intentions (Items 25–28). Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

3.3. Data Collection

Between March and June 2025, the online survey was circulated through professional networks and industry associations. Before full data collection, 40 professionals completed a pilot version to assess whether the items were clear and relevant. Minor changes followed the pilot, and those 40 respondents were not included in the final sample.

3.4. Reliability and Construct Validity

The internal consistency of the seven questionnaire constructs was assessed using Cronbach's alpha.

Table 1. Internal Consistency Reliability of the Questionnaire Constructs

Construct	Items	Cronbach's α
Trust in Human vs. AI Translators	1–4	0.74
Perceived Accuracy and Reliability of AI	5–8	0.76
Adoption and Frequency of AI Use	9–12	0.75
Perceived Usefulness	13–16	0.77
Organizational Policy and Support	17–20	0.72
Ethical Concerns	21–24	0.79
Future Intentions	25–28	0.78

Cronbach's α values ranged from .72 to .79, indicating acceptable internal consistency. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) showed good sampling adequacy (KMO = .851), and Bartlett's test was significant, $\chi^2(378) = 18,062.94, p < .001$.

3.5. Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize participant characteristics and questionnaire responses. Pearson correlations tested H1, H2, and H4; an independent-samples *t*-test tested H3; and one-way ANOVA tested H5 and H6, with post-hoc comparisons where appropriate. Statistical significance was set at $p < .05$, and effect sizes were considered where relevant. Because the study was cross-sectional, relationships were interpreted as associations rather than causal effects.

3.6. Hypotheses

H1: Higher perceived AI accuracy and reliability are negatively associated with comparative trust in human translators.

H2: Stronger organizational policy and support are associated with lower ethical concerns.

H3: Participants with formal AI training report higher perceived AI accuracy and reliability than those without training.

H4: Higher perceived AI accuracy and reliability are positively associated with stronger future intentions toward AI adoption.

H5: AI adoption differs across industry sectors, with higher adoption expected in technology and marketing/advertising than in legal services and healthcare/pharmaceuticals.

H6: Participants in larger organizations report greater organizational policy and support than those in smaller organizations.

4. Results and Discussion

The results are presented first in terms of participants' demographic and professional characteristics, followed by responses to the seven questionnaire constructs and the six hypothesis tests. These findings reflect participants' perceptions and self-reported practices and do not constitute a direct assessment of the linguistic or cultural quality of AI-generated translation.

4.1. Sample Characteristics

The sample comprised 2,500 professionals working in Jordan across different roles, sectors, and organization sizes. Participants also varied in their exposure to AI, formal training, organizational support, and institutional experience. Table 2 presents their demographic and professional characteristics.

Table 2. Demographic and Professional Characteristics of Participants (N = 2,500)

Variable	Category	Count	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	1,220	48.8
	Female	1,240	49.6
	Prefer not to say	40	1.6

Position/Role	Owner / CEO / Managing Director	85	3.4
	Department Head / Manager	192	7.68
	Marketing or Communications Specialist	341	13.64
	Translator or Language Services Coordinator	1,678	67.12
	Other	204	8.16
	Technology	462	18.48
	Marketing / Advertising	410	16.4
	Legal Services	215	8.6
	Healthcare / Pharmaceuticals	183	7.32
	Manufacturing / Engineering	150	6
Industry Sector	Education / Training	707	28.28
	Other	373	14.92
	Daily	532	21.28
	Weekly	791	31.64
	Occasionally	824	32.96
	Rarely	253	10.12
	Never	100	4
	Yes	1,030	41.2
	No	1,470	58.8
	Yes	1,220	48.8
AI Tool Usage Frequency	Occasionally / as needed	910	36.4
	No	370	14.8
	1–10 employees	327	13.08
	11–50 employees	652	26.08
	51–200 employees	803	32.12
	More than 200 employees	718	28.72
	Formal AI Training		
	Human Translator Collaboration		
	Organization Size		

Decision-Making Authority	Executive management	1,040	41.6
	Department heads/team leads	462	18.48
	Marketing/communications team	367	14.68
	Language services/localisation team	318	12.72
	IT / digital transformation unit	189	7.56
	Other	124	4.96

As Table 2 indicates, the gender distribution was nearly even: 49.60% were female, 48.80% male, and 1.60% preferred not to disclose gender. Translators and language-services coordinators formed 67.12% of the sample. Marketing/communications specialists represented 13.64%, other roles 8.16%, department heads/managers 7.68%, and owners/CEOs/managing directors 3.40%.

Participants represented education/training (28.28%), technology (18.48%), marketing/advertising (16.40%), other sectors (14.92%), legal services (8.60%), healthcare/pharmaceuticals (7.32%), and manufacturing/engineering (6.00%). Frequency of AI use varied: 21.28% reported daily use, 31.64% weekly use, 32.96% occasional use, 10.12% rare use, and 4.00% no use. Overall, 85.88% used AI at least occasionally. Formal AI training had been received by 41.20%, while 58.80% reported no such training.

Regular collaboration with human translators was reported by 48.80% of respondents, and another 36.40% worked with them occasionally or when needed; 14.80% reported no collaboration. This means that 85.20% had some experience of working with human translators. Organization sizes were 1–10 employees (13.08%), 11–50 (26.08%), 51–200 (32.12%), and more than 200 (28.72%). AI-related decision authority was held by executive management (41.60%), department heads/team leads (18.48%), marketing/communications (14.68%), language services/localization (12.72%), IT/digital transformation (7.56%), and other areas (4.96%). Overall, the sample combined substantial exposure to AI with continued contact with human translators and included respondents from varied sectors and organizational settings.

4.2. Analysis of the Questionnaire's Items

Responses to all 28 questionnaire statements are reported in Table 3 under the seven constructs. The original five Likert categories are presented in three groups—Agree, Neutral, and Disagree—to simplify the item-level presentation. Percentages are calculated from the full sample (N = 2,500). They reflect what participants reported and should not be interpreted as measures of AI-translation performance.

Table 3. Questionnaire Item Responses by Construct (N = 2,500)

Construct	Item No.	Questionnaire Item	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)
Comparative Trust in Human vs. AI	1	I trust human translators to make better judgment calls than AI.	68.2	21.5	10.3
	2	I have more confidence in a human translator's ability to catch subtle errors.	71.3	18.3	10.4
	3	AI is suitable for speed and cost, but not for high-stakes use.	64.5	24.1	11.4
	4	I'm more confident in the legal/reputational safety of human-produced translations.	70.1	20	9.9

Perceived Accuracy and Reliability of AI	5	AI accurately reflects the intended meaning.	56.7	28.6	14.7
	6	AI is dependable for routine business communication.	61.8	26.4	11.8
	7	Output quality is stable across content types.	58.4	29.3	12.3
	8	AI translations typically require minimal corrections.	53.6	31.7	14.7
Adoption and Frequency of AI Use	9	I've adopted AI tools as part of my regular workflow.	59.9	25.2	14.9
	10	My organization encourages AI tool usage.	55.2	30.3	14.5
	11	AI is used where humans were previously preferred.	50.7	32.5	16.8
	12	AI is used for specific tasks, such as email marketing.	60.1	22.8	17.1
Perceived Usefulness of AI	13	AI saves time producing multilingual content.	66.4	23.5	10.1
	14	AI improves communication with international clients.	68.7	21	10.3
	15	AI reduces the need for external language services.	63.5	26.2	10.3
	16	AI helps me complete tasks without deep language knowledge.	62.1	27.4	10.5
Organizational Policy and Support	17	My organization has AI usage guidelines.	54.8	30.1	15.1
	18	AI decisions are made at the management level.	57.3	29.5	13.2
	19	Training/resources are provided for AI tools.	52.2	31.6	16.2
	20	There's a review process for AI-generated translations.	49.9	32.2	17.9
Ethical Concerns and Risk Perception	21	I worry AI may compromise confidentiality.	63.2	24.6	12.2
	22	Without human oversight, AI can cause communication risks.	66.1	22.1	11.8
	23	Overusing AI could reduce accountability.	60.5	26.4	13.1
	24	AI should be used in accordance with ethical guidelines.	69.8	21	9.2
Future Intentions Toward AI	25	I plan to increase the use of AI in future communication.	65.7	23.3	11
	26	AI will become standard in professional workflows.	67.9	22.7	9.4
	27	I want to invest in more advanced AI translation tools.	61.5	25.6	12.9
	28	AI will support the international growth strategy.	66.3	24.2	9.5

The overall descriptive results demonstrate that there is a clear difference between the recognition of the usefulness of AI translation and the continued confidence in human expertise.

Items 1-4 assessed the comparative trust in human and AI translators, with agreement to the items suggesting higher trust in human translations than in those of AI. Agreement rates for these items ranged from 64.5% to 71.3%. Item 2, which related to the ability to deal with subtlety, had the highest agreement rate of 71.3%, indicating that nuance is amongst the biggest concerns when it comes to the use of or reliance on AI translation. Item 4 had the second-highest agreement at 70.1%. Agreement with this item indicated higher trust in human translation when it came to legal and reputational safety. This item also reflects the limited reliability of AI translations. 68.2% agreement to item 1 continues these implications by indicating higher trust in human judgment, again suggesting limitations in the capabilities of AI. Item 3, which received 64.5% agreement, similarly pointed to limited trust in AI yet also shows one of AI's desirable features, which draws

in users. The responses therefore suggest that there were practical benefits associated with the use of AI that coexisted with a preference for human involvement when there is a need for professional judgment or more significant consequences.

The reliability of AI in relation to accuracy was addressed more directly in items 5-8. Responses to these items were more moderate as they fell on the 53.6% to 61.8% range. Item 6 showed the highest agreement in this construct at 61.8%. That item concerned whether AI could be relied on for routine business communication, which shows that respondents were prepared to depend on it for some tasks. The other three items, however, show the limits of this trust. Only 58.4% agreed that AI output was of consistent quality across content types (item 7), and agreement that AI renders meaning accurately was lower still at 56.7% (item 5). Item 8, which stated that AI translations usually need few or no corrections, had the lowest agreement in the construct at 53.6%. Respondents therefore accepted AI translation to a degree, but their trust in its output was limited and depended on the field and purpose of the translation. These percentages reflect perceived accuracy and reliability, not the actual quality of AI translations.

Items 9-12, which relate to adoption and frequency of use, also showed moderate ranges of agreement between 50.7% and 60.1%. In item 12, 60.1% of respondents indicated that AI is used for specific tasks. In item 9, 59.9% admitted that AI is integrated into their day-to-day work. Furthermore, in item 10, 55.2% of the respondents indicated that the use of AI was encouraged by their organizations. The lowest agreement at 50.7% was for item 11, which suggested that AI translation was replacing human translation by being used where human input was traditionally preferred. Additionally, the highest neutral response was for the same area (32.5%). This indicates that AI was not being used in place of human translators, but rather integrated as part of their work, as 85.2% of respondents said they still work with human translators at least sometimes.

Perceived usefulness was relatively high for Items 13- 16, as agreement was over 60% for all four items. Item 13 showed that 66.4% of the participants believed that the use of AI was beneficial from a time-saving aspect when it came to the production of multilingual content. Additionally, in item 14, 68.7% agreed that it was beneficial in international communication with clients. Additionally, through item 15, 63.5% of the respondents indicated that AI helped reduce the need to resort to external language services. In item 16, 62.1% of the respondents stated that AI helped them complete tasks without needing to be fluent in the language. The responses showed that workplace efficiency and multilingual communication are central features of perceived usefulness.

Items 17–20 addressed organizational policy and support and had the lowest levels of agreement, ranging between 49.9% and 57.3%. Item 18, which discussed management involvement in AI-related decision-making, received the highest agreement at 57.3%. Item 17, which related to organizational guidelines, and Item 19, which related to training or resources, followed at 54.8% and 52.2%, respectively. The lowest agreement was found for the formal review of translations produced by AI (49.9%, Item 20). The percentage of neutral responses in all of these items ranged from 29.5% to 32.2%. Formalized organizational arrangements for AI translation seemed to differ between the organizations represented in the sample, with less than 60% of respondents agreeing on each item.

While the perceived advantages and implementation of AI translation were noted in previous items, items 21-24 address perceptions of issues of ethics and involved risks. These items all received moderately high agreement, which exceeded 60%. Item 24 had the highest agreement rate in this construct at 69.8%, which is among the highest agreement rates across the study. This item discussed the need to follow ethical guidelines when AI is employed. These responses suggest that even when AI use is supported, it still comes with conditions that aim to ensure that the implementation is ethical. In item 22, 66.1% of the respondents expressed concerns about miscommunication if AI is implemented without human supervision. The responses suggest limited trust in the outputs of AI. Item 21 showed another common area of concern was confidentiality, as AI does not guarantee the privacy of what is input into its databases. Finally, in item 23, 60.5% of respondents agreed that excessive dependence on AI could lead to decreased accountability. The relatively high consensus around human oversight (66.1%) and ethical guidelines (69.8%) suggests that while the positive sentiment around the usefulness and increasing use of AI has not diminished, there remains a sense of concern over conditions of professional use of AI.

The remaining items, items 25-28, gauged how the respondents viewed the future of AI. Across these

items, agreement ranged from 61.5% to 67.9%. 67% and 66.3% saw AI as being ubiquitous in the professional workflow and as helping international growth in items 26 and 28, respectively. Furthermore, 65.7% expressed intentions to use AI for their future communications, and 61.5% expressed intentions to invest in more advanced AI translation tools in items 25 and 27, respectively. These perceptions of future use were not without their doubts, however, regarding the ethical use of these tools, their accountability, and their oversight.

The responses to the seven constructs reveal that attitudes towards AI combine perceptions of benefits with some skepticism. The responses show that many respondents are open to using AI in certain areas and under certain circumstances; they still acknowledge some limitations in areas of accuracy, ethics, and confidentiality. Therefore, it is suggested that respondents may appreciate that AI aids in cross-linguistic operations at high speed without the need for external assistance; they still prefer human involvement in higher-stakes areas. The results showed that there has been an increased awareness of AI usage, and confidence in the practicality of using AI tools in the future, while there was still a sense of doubt regarding confidentiality, accountability, ethical governance, and human oversight. The descriptive findings thus reflect both the co-occurrence of adoption and caution in the sample and serve as the foundation for the inferential analyses to come.

4.3. Testing the Hypotheses

Inferential analysis was used to test the six hypotheses. H1, H2, and H4 were examined with Pearson correlations, H3 with an independent-samples t-test, and H5 and H6 with one-way ANOVA. Statistical significance was evaluated at $p < .05$, with effect sizes and post-hoc comparisons considered when relevant.

Table 4. Pearson Correlation Results for H1, H2, and H4

Hypothesis	Variables Compared	r	p-value	Result
H1	Perceived Accuracy and Reliability of AI vs. Comparative Trust in Human Translators	-.339	< .001	Supported
H2	Organizational Policy and Support vs. Ethical Concerns	-.411	< .001	Supported
H4	Perceived Accuracy and Reliability of AI vs. Future Intentions	0.453	< .001	Supported

H1 was supported. Perceived AI accuracy/reliability had a significant negative association with comparative trust in human translators, $r = -.339$, $p < .001$. Respondents who expressed greater confidence in AI tended to show a lower comparative preference for human translators. The correlation was moderate, however, and does not indicate that human translation was viewed as dispensable; confidence in human judgment remained evident for high-stakes work.

H2 was also supported. Organizational policy and support was negatively associated with ethical concerns, $r = -.411$, $p < .001$, indicating that stronger organizational support was associated with lower ethical concern. As the study is cross-sectional, this relationship should not be interpreted causally.

H4 showed the strongest of the three correlations. Perceived AI accuracy/reliability was positively associated with future intentions, $r = .453$, $p < .001$, indicating that greater confidence in AI was associated with stronger intentions to increase, invest in, and incorporate AI translation in future professional activities.

H3: Formal AI Training and Perceived Accuracy and Reliability

H3 proposed that formally trained participants would report higher perceived AI accuracy and reliability.

Table 5. Independent-Samples T-Test: Formal AI Training and Perceived Accuracy and Reliability

Formal AI Training	n	Mean	SD
Yes	1,030	3.61	0.753
No	1,470	3.551	0.785

$t(2498) = 1.903$, $p = .057$, Cohen's $d = .077$

Participants with formal AI training reported a slightly higher score ($M = 3.610$, $SD = 0.753$) than those without

training ($M = 3.551$, $SD = 0.785$). However, the difference was not statistically significant, $t(2498) = 1.903$, $p = .057$, and the effect size was negligible (Cohen's $d = .077$). H3 was therefore not supported. Despite 58.8% of participants reporting no formal AI training, training did not meaningfully distinguish perceived AI accuracy/reliability in this sample.

H5 and H6: Group Differences

H5 and H6 were tested using one-way ANOVA, followed by Tukey HSD post-hoc comparisons for significant results.

Table 6. One-Way ANOVA Results for H5 and H6

Hypothesis	Grouping Variable	Dependent Variable	F-value	p-value	η^2	Result
H5	Industry Sector	Adoption and Frequency of AI Use	405.78	< .001	0.494	Supported
H6	Organization Size	Organizational Policy and Support	278.54	< .001	0.251	Supported

H5: Industry Sector and AI Adoption

AI adoption differed significantly across industry sectors, $F(6, 2493) = 405.777$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .494$, with sector accounting for approximately 49.4% of the variance in adoption scores.

Industry Sector	Mean Adoption Score
Technology	4.242
Marketing / Advertising	3.932
Education / Training	3.635
Other	3.235
Manufacturing / Engineering	3.078
Healthcare / Pharmaceuticals	2.798
Legal Services	2.32

Technology recorded the highest adoption ($M = 4.242$), followed by Marketing/Advertising ($M = 3.932$), while Healthcare/Pharmaceuticals ($M = 2.798$) and Legal Services ($M = 2.320$) recorded the lowest scores. Tukey HSD showed that Technology and Marketing/Advertising each had significantly higher adoption than Healthcare/Pharmaceuticals and Legal Services (all $p < .001$). Technology was also significantly higher than Marketing/Advertising ($p < .001$). H5 was therefore supported. These findings establish sectoral differences but do not explain their causes.

H6: Organization Size and Organizational Policy and Support

Organizational policy and support differed significantly by organization size, $F(3, 2496) = 278.544$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .251$, with organization size accounting for approximately 25.1% of the variance.

Organization Size	Mean Policy and Support Score
1–10 employees	2.722
11–50 employees	3.267
51–200 employees	3.598
More than 200 employees	3.932

Scores increased consistently with organization size, from $M = 2.722$ for organizations with 1–10 employees to $M = 3.932$ for those with more than 200 employees. Tukey HSD showed that all six pairwise comparisons were significant (all $p < .001$). H6 was therefore supported. Although larger organizations reported stronger policy and support, the analysis does not establish the organizational mechanisms responsible for this pattern.

Five hypotheses were supported, and H3 was not. Higher perceived AI accuracy/reliability was associated with lower comparative trust in human translators (H1), stronger organizational policy/support was associated with lower ethical concerns (H2), and perceived AI reliability was associated with stronger future intentions (H4). Sector was also associated with clear differences in adoption (H5), while policy and support scores increased as organization size increased (H6). In contrast, perceived AI accuracy and reliability did not differ significantly according to formal AI training.

Taken together, these tests show that perceptions of AI translation were related to perceived reliability and organizational context, while adoption also differed across sectors. Formal training alone was not significantly associated with perceived reliability in this sample. Since the study is cross-sectional, these results show associations and group differences, not causal effects.

5. Conclusion

This paper examined how business professionals in Jordan view and use AI-powered translation in workplace communication. AI translation is now part of professional practice, but how much it is used depends on the type of work. Respondents relied on it mainly for routine translation, for communicating across languages and with international clients, and for saving time. Most also expect to use it more in the future.

Their trust, however, was not the same across all situations. When a text involved linguistic nuance, legal information, reputational risk, or professional judgment, respondents still preferred human translators. AI has therefore not reduced the importance of linguistic skills. Professionals appear to use it selectively, weighing its convenience against what is at stake in a given text. The move toward AI translation is best seen as a gradual process in which the technology works alongside human translators rather than replacing them.

Whether this works well depends largely on organizations. Providing the tools is not enough on its own. Organizations need clear policies, defined responsibilities, confidentiality safeguards, and procedures for managing risk, especially where translation errors can have legal, ethical, or reputational consequences. They should also specify which tasks require closer linguistic checking and human responsibility. Training should cover data protection, ethics, and the critical evaluation of AI output, not only how to operate the tools, so that staff can judge when AI translation is appropriate.

The study has some limitations. The data were self-reported and may not reflect actual workplace practice. The cross-sectional design does not allow causal conclusions or show how attitudes change over time. Because non-probability sampling was used and translators and language professionals made up a large part of the sample, the findings cannot be generalized to the wider Jordanian business community. Finally, the study measured perceptions rather than translation performance, so it cannot show whether AI translations are accurate, culturally appropriate, properly localized, or free of bias.

Future studies could compare human and AI translations to test whether professionals' perceptions match the actual quality of AI output. Research covering other languages, professions, and levels of communicative risk could add evidence on accuracy, cultural and pragmatic appropriateness, localization, and bias, while longitudinal studies could track how trust, organizational policy, and workplace practice change as AI translation becomes more common.

References

- Afroogh, S., Akbari, A., Malone, E., Kargar, M., & Alambeigi, H. (2024). Trust in AI: progress, challenges, and future directions. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1), 1568.
- Al-Billeh, T., Khashashneh, T., Alhendi, N. I., Al-Shabatat, M., & Al-Billeh, G. (2026). The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Constitutional Adjudication: Comparative Insights from General Judicial Practice. *Access to Justice in Eastern Europe*, 9(3), 377–421.
- Al-Jarf, R. (2025). Translation of English and Arabic “sleep” terms and formulaic expressions by Artificial Intelligence: A comparison of Copilot and DeepSeek. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 8(11), 95-108.
- Al Khaldi, I., Khawaldeh, A. M., Alhusban, F. M., Altarawneh, S. M. D., & Al-Wreikat, E. I. (2025). Arbitration in cyber security disputes: Sci-fi or future reality? *Brazilian Journal of Law & International Relations/Relações Internacionais no Mundo*, 4(50), 1-17.
- AlAfnan, M. A. (2025). Artificial intelligence and language: Bridging Arabic and English with technology. *Journal of Ecohumanism*, 4(1), 240-256.
- Almubasher, Z. M., Abu-Rahme, M. O., Abu-Mallouh, R., Al-Hawawsheh, S. H., Obeid, M. A., Dabash, A. t. M. K., & 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), 1-15.
- Asrifan, A., Nursyam, N., & Aini, N. (2025). Lifelong Learning as a Lever for Translator Career Longevity: Strategies and Applications. In *Cutting-Edge Approaches in Translator Education and Pedagogy* (pp. 93-120): IGI Global Scientific Publishing.
- Boluwatife, O. S. (2025). The Impact of AI on the Translation Industry.
- Bowker, L. (2020). Translation technology and ethics. In *The Routledge handbook of translation and ethics* (pp. 262-278): Routledge.
- Burgos, D., Branch, J. W., Tlili, A., Stracke, C. M., & de la Higuera, C. (2024). Artificial Intelligence, Digital Transformation, and Education, as a Combined Contribution to Society. In *Radical Solutions for Artificial Intelligence and Digital Transformation in Education: Utilising Disruptive Technology for a Better Society* (pp. 3-13): Springer.
- Castilho, S., Moorkens, J., Gaspari, F., Calixto, I., Tinsley, J., & Way, A. (2017). Is neural machine translation the new state of the art?
- Clark, D. (2020). *Artificial intelligence for learning: How to use AI to support employee development*: Kogan Page Publishers.
- Cronin, I. (2024). Understanding generative AI business applications. *Apress eBooks*.
- Drugan, J. (2013). *Quality in professional translation: Assessment and improvement* (Vol. 9): A&C Black.
- Enholm, I. M., Papagiannidis, E., Mikalef, P., & Krogtstie, J. (2022). Artificial intelligence and business value: A literature review. *Information systems frontiers*, 24(5), 1709-1734.
- Hadla, L. S., Hailat, T. M., & Al-Kabi, M. N. (2014). Evaluating Arabic to English machine translation. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 5(11).
- Hammouri, D. M. (2025). The role of artificial intelligence in generating Arabic neologisms: A study of gaming localization. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 6(4), 1-15.
- Hariri, W. (2023). Unlocking the potential of ChatGPT: A comprehensive exploration of its applications, advantages, limitations, and future directions in natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02017*.
- Jiménez-Crespo, M. A. (2013). *Translation and web localization*: Routledge.
- Jiménez-Crespo, M. A. (2025). Human-centered AI and the future of translation technologies: What professionals think about control and autonomy in the AI era. *Information*, 16(5), 387.
- Johnsen, M. (2025). *Developing AI Applications With Large Language Models*: Maria Johnsen.
- Kaggwa, S., Eleogu, T. F., Okonkwo, F., Farayola, O. A., Uwaoma, P. U., & Akinoso, A. (2024). AI in decision making: transforming business strategies. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*, 10(12), 423-444.
- Khurana, D., Koli, A., Khatter, K., & Singh, S. (2023). Natural language processing: state of the art, current

- trends and challenges. *Multimedia tools and applications*, 82(3), 3713-3744.
- Koehn, P. (2010). *Statistical machine translation* (Vol. 11): Cambridge University Press Cambridge.
- Kumar, A., & Nagar, D. K. (2024). AI-based language translation and interpretation services: Improving accessibility for visually impaired students. In *As the editors of Transforming Learning: The Power of Educational* (pp. 178).
- Leslie, D. (2019). Understanding artificial intelligence ethics and safety. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.05684*.
- Liedtke, C. A. (2025). Artificial Intelligence for Strategic Improvement.
- Megdadi, S., Almahasees, Z., Al-Harashsheh, A., Al Rousan, R., Al-Taher, M. A., & Husienat, I. (2026). Translating food idioms across the English-Arabic language divide: A comparative study of human translators, ChatGPT, and Gemini. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 7(2), 1-15.
- Mihalache, I. (2020). Human and non-human crossover: Translators partnering with digital tools. In *When translation goes digital: Case studies and critical reflections* (pp. 19-43): Springer.
- Mohamed, Y. A., Khanan, A., Bashir, M., Mohamed, A. H. H., Adiel, M. A., & Elsadig, M. A. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence on language translation: a review. *IEEE access*, 12, 25553-25579.
- Moniz, H., & Escartín, C. P. (2023). Towards Responsible Machine Translation. *Ethical and Legal Considerations in Machine Translation*. Cham: Springer.
- Murire, O. T. (2024). Artificial intelligence and its role in shaping organizational work practices and culture. *Administrative Sciences*, 14(12), 316.
- Mustapha, R., & Malkan, S. N. A. (2025). Maqasid al-shariah in the AI era: Balancing innovation and Islamic ethical principles. *International Journal of Islamic Theology & Civilization (E-ISSN-3009-1551)*, 3(3), 1-21.
- Mutashar, M. K. (2024). Navigating Ethics in AI-Driven Translation for a Human-Centric Future: Menavigasi Etika dalam Penerjemahan Berbasis AI untuk Masa Depan yang Berpusat pada Manusia. *Academia Open*, 9(2), 10.21070/acopen. 21079.22024. 29407-21010.21070/acopen. 21079.22024. 29407.
- Nurminen, M., & Koponen, M. (2020). Machine translation and fair access to information. *Translation Spaces*, 9(1), 150-169.
- Orbán, F., & Stefkovics, Á. (2025). Trust in artificial intelligence: a survey experiment to assess trust in algorithmic decision-making. *AI & SOCIETY*, 40(6), 4955-4969.
- Owolabi, O. S., Uche, P. C., Adeniken, N. T., Ihejirika, C., Islam, R. B., Chhetri, B. J. T., & Jung, B. (2024). Ethical implication of artificial intelligence (AI) adoption in financial decision making. *Computer and Information Science*, 17(1), 1-49.
- Rajagopal, N. K., Qureshi, N. I., Durga, S., Ramirez Asis, E. H., Huerta Soto, R. M., Gupta, S. K., & Deepak, S. (2022). Future of business culture: An artificial intelligence-driven digital framework for organization decision-making process. *Complexity*, 2022(1), 7796507.
- Rezaei, M., Pironti, M., & Quaglia, R. (2025). AI in knowledge sharing, which ethical challenges are raised in decision-making processes for organisations? *Management Decision*, 63(10), 3369-3388.
- Rivas Ginel, M. I., & Moorkens, J. (2025). Translators' trust and distrust in the times of GenAI. *Translation Studies*, 18(2), 283-299.
- Rukba, R. A., Awaisheh, S., Al-Hobabseh, W., Al-Khalaileh, L., Hmaidan, R., Althunibat, A., . . . Abdelrahman, A. (2025). Balancing efficiency and ethics in public administration: The role of artificial intelligence in administrative law of the Middle East. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 6(4), 1-15.
- Saba, D., Sahli, Y., & Hadidi, A. (2020). The role of artificial intelligence in company's decision making. In *Enabling AI Applications in Data Science* (pp. 287-314): Springer.
- Tahmasbi, N., Rastegari, E., & Truong, M. (2025). A conceptual model of trust in generative AI systems.
- Torfi, A., Shirvani, R. A., Keneshloo, Y., Tavaf, N., & Fox, E. A. (2020). Natural language processing advancements by deep learning: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.01200*.
- Van der Meer, J. (2020). Translation technology—past, present and future. *The Bloomsbury companion to language industry studies*, 1, 285-310.
- Zaki, M. Z., & Ahmed, U. (2024). Bridging linguistic divides: The impact of AI-powered translation systems on communication equity and inclusion. *Journal of translation and language studies*, 5(2), 20–30