

Supplementary Materials

Institutional Readiness and the Boundaries of AI Adoption: Evidence from UAE Newsrooms

Journalism and Media - manuscript journalmedia-4524444 (accepted version)

All estimates were computed from the harmonized dataset (N = 336). Three collection streams are distinguished throughout: the main Arabic administration (n = 267; 185 respondents to the current instrument and 82 to its earlier version), the second Arabic administration (n = 45), and the English administration (n = 24). Valid n is reported for every estimate. Percentages use the valid n for the item; brackets are Wilson 95% confidence intervals unless stated otherwise. Supplementary Material S9 is supplied as a separate Excel workbook.

Contents

- S1. Exact and Monte Carlo tests, pooling decisions, and valid n by item
- S2. Results by questionnaire stream
- S3. Component loadings, communalities, and number of readiness indicators answered per respondent
- S4. Robustness check: main questionnaire stream only
- S5. Robustness check: alternative treatment of the undocumented “Good” category
- S6. Robustness check: listwise deletion
- S7. Robustness check: strict seven-of-seven composite inclusion rule
- S8. Questionnaire (Arabic and English versions)
- S9. Ordinal models of adoption maturity, Brant tests, and additional robustness results (separate Excel file)

S1. Exact and Monte Carlo Tests, Pooling Decisions, and Valid n by Item

Item	Valid n	Streams	χ^2	df	p	Cramér's V	% cells expected < 5	Monte Carlo p	Pooled
Occupational role	330	3	43.12	6	< .001	.256	25.0	< .001	No
Professional experience	328	3	30.54	4	< .001	.216	11.1	< .001	No
Organization type	249	3	35.93	4	< .001	.269	0.0	< .001	No
Training provision	240	3	43.10	8	< .001	.300	33.3	—	No
Adoption maturity	183	2	8.36	4	.079	.214	40.0	.092	Yes
Perceived return on AI investment	192	3	51.75	6	< .001	.367	41.7	< .001	No
Perceived Arabic-language output quality	246	3	10.53	10	.395	.146	50.0	.372	Yes
Personal performance impact	182	2	9.04	5	.107	.223	41.7	.107	Yes
Expected future role	181	2	10.48	4	.033	.241	40.0	—	No
Skills needed	222	2	1.79	3	.618	.090	25.0	—	Yes

Note. Chi-square tests of independence across the streams in which each item was asked. Monte Carlo p-values (5,000 permutations) were computed for the items entering the principal analyses; no pooling decision changed. Organization type is tested on the current instrument's three categories (valid n = 249). A non-significant test is absence of evidence of a difference, not evidence of equivalence (Section 3.4).

S2. Results by Questionnaire Stream

Pooled distributions with Wilson 95% confidence intervals, followed by counts by stream. Off-scale categories volunteered by respondents are shown separately.

Variable	Category	n	Valid n	%	95% CI	Main Arabic	Second Arabic	English
Occupational role	Reporter, editor, correspondent, or photographer	136	330	41.2	[36.0, 46.6]	118	6	12
Occupational role	Video producer or digital content creator	32	330	9.7	[7.0, 13.4]	15	14	3
Occupational role	Section head or platform/project manager (leadership)	60	330	18.2	[14.4, 22.7]	53	4	3
Occupational role	Other	102	330	30.9	[26.2, 36.1]	75	21	6
Professional experience	< 3 years	43	328	13.1	[9.9, 17.2]	25	13	5
Professional experience	3–10 years	69	328	21.0	[17.0, 25.8]	45	17	7
Professional experience	> 10 years	216	328	65.9	[60.6, 70.8]	189	15	12
Organization type (all versions)	Print or broadcast	161	330	48.8	[43.4, 54.2]	137	15	9
Organization type (all versions)	Digital-only platform or news agency	91	330	27.6	[23.0, 32.6]	55	25	11
Organization type (all versions)	Government media office	66	330	20.0	[16.0, 24.6]	57	5	4
Organization type (all versions)	Other	12	330	3.6	[2.1, 6.2]	12	0	0
Training provision	Adequate training received	61	240	25.4	[20.3, 31.3]	43	13	5
Training provision	Training received but insufficient	76	240	31.7	[26.1, 37.8]	57	12	7
Training provision	Not received: organization does not provide it	72	240	30.0	[24.6, 36.1]	56	16	0
Training provision	Not received although available	22	240	9.2	[6.1, 13.5]	20	2	0
Training provision	Not received (other wording; off-scale)	9	240	3.8	[2.0, 7.0]	4	0	5
Adoption maturity	Stage 1: limited or experimental use	31	183	16.9	[12.2, 23.0]	23	8	0
Adoption maturity	Stage 2: partial use in simple tasks	85	183	46.4	[39.4, 53.7]	69	16	0
Adoption maturity	Stage 3: regular use in some processes	44	183	24.0	[18.4, 30.7]	42	2	0
Adoption maturity	Stage 4: essential element of the workflow	20	183	10.9	[7.2, 16.3]	18	2	0
Adoption maturity	Stage 5: near-total reliance	3	183	1.6	[0.6, 4.7]	3	0	0
Perceived return on AI investment	Clear return	24	192	12.5	[8.5, 17.9]	17	5	2
Perceived return on AI investment	Limited return so far	43	192	22.4	[17.1, 28.8]	20	19	4
Perceived return on AI investment	No tangible return	37	192	19.3	[14.3, 25.4]	36	1	0
Perceived return on AI investment	Cannot be assessed at present	88	192	45.8	[38.9, 52.9]	82	3	3
Perceived Arabic-language output quality	Very poor	6	246	2.4	[1.1, 5.2]	4	1	1
Perceived Arabic-language output quality	Poor	19	246	7.7	[5.0, 11.7]	14	1	4
Perceived Arabic-language output quality	Average	145	246	58.9	[52.7, 64.9]	102	30	13
Perceived Arabic-language output quality	Good (off-scale)	8	246	3.3	[1.7, 6.3]	8	0	0
Perceived Arabic-language output quality	Excellent	57	246	23.2	[18.3, 28.8]	43	11	3
Perceived Arabic-language output quality	Very excellent	11	246	4.5	[2.5, 7.8]	9	1	1

Personal performance impact	Clearly improved efficiency and quality	79	182	43.4	[36.4, 50.7]	61	18	0
Personal performance impact	Noticeable improvement (off-scale)	8	182	4.4	[2.2, 8.4]	8	0	0
Personal performance impact	Limited improvement	64	182	35.2	[28.6, 42.3]	56	8	0
Personal performance impact	No noticeable difference	8	182	4.4	[2.2, 8.4]	8	0	0
Personal performance impact	Increased workload or complexity	3	182	1.6	[0.6, 4.7]	2	1	0
Personal performance impact	Does not use AI enough to assess	20	182	11.0	[7.2, 16.4]	19	1	0
Expected future role	Will strengthen and develop my role	86	181	47.5	[40.4, 54.8]	65	21	0
Expected future role	Will change the nature of my role	41	181	22.7	[17.2, 29.3]	37	4	0
Expected future role	May threaten some of my tasks	17	181	9.4	[5.9, 14.5]	16	1	0
Expected future role	Trajectory still unclear	32	181	17.7	[12.8, 23.9]	30	2	0
Expected future role	Will enhance my capabilities (off-scale)	5	181	2.8	[1.2, 6.3]	5	0	0
Skills needed	Prompt engineering	74	222	33.3	[27.5, 39.8]	60	14	0
Skills needed	Data analysis and visualization	79	222	35.6	[29.6, 42.1]	64	15	0
Skills needed	Ethics of machine-generated content	63	222	28.4	[22.9, 34.6]	49	14	0
Skills needed	Critical analysis of AI content (off-scale)	6	222	2.7	[1.2, 5.8]	6	0	0

Note. Organization type is shown across both instrument versions (Table 1; earlier-version options mapped as described in Section 3.3). Training excludes six unmapped English-stream values. Items not asked in a stream show zero counts for that stream.

S3. Component Loadings, Communalities, and Number of Readiness Indicators Answered

Indicator	Type	n	M	SD	Corrected item-total r	α if deleted	Loading (7)	Communality (7)	Loading (6)	Communality (6)
Actual adoption of AI in daily work	Implementation outcome	224	56.4	22.8	.605	.920	.700	.490	—	—
Staff media and digital qualification	Resource	222	53.7	22.9	.781	.904	.844	.712	.824	.679
Speed of converting ideas into applications	Process	276	56.5	26.4	.809	.900	.869	.754	.864	.747
Editorial-technical collaboration	Process	221	60.9	25.7	.762	.905	.834	.696	.848	.719
Use of audience engagement in development	Process	272	59.2	25.5	.803	.901	.863	.746	.878	.770
Availability of AI and misinformation guidance	Resource	270	54.7	29.0	.791	.902	.852	.726	.862	.743
Accessibility across audience groups	Normative commitment	223	55.9	28.1	.703	.912	.782	.611	.805	.648

Note. Indicators rated 0–100. Loadings are first-principal-component loadings on the listwise-complete cases (n = 218). Six-indicator columns omit actual adoption.

Component	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Observed eigenvalue (7 indicators)	4.74	0.71	0.49	0.36	0.29	0.25	0.17
Parallel analysis, 95th percentile	1.35	1.22	1.11	1.05	0.97	0.90	0.83
Observed eigenvalue (6 indicators)	4.31	0.49	0.42	0.33	0.29	0.17	—

Note. Parallel analysis: 500 random normal datasets of the same size (n = 218, 7 variables), seed 2026. One component is retained: the first observed eigenvalue (4.74) exceeds its simulated threshold (1.35), and the second (0.71) is below both the Kaiser criterion and its simulated threshold (1.22). The simulated thresholds varied by at most 0.01 across alternative seeds.

Statistic	Seven indicators	Six indicators
Cronbach's α [95% CI, Feldt]	.919 [.901, .934]	.920 [.902, .935]
Listwise n	218	218
First component, % variance	67.7%	71.8%
Inter-item correlations: range (mean)	.39–.77 (.62)	—
Raw vs standardized α	$\Delta = .0007$	—
Composite rule	≥ 5 of 7 indicators (71.4% of the item pool)	≥ 4 of 6 indicators
Respondents scored (indicators answered)	221 (7: 218; 6: 3)	221
Composite M (SD)	56.6 (20.4)	—

S4. Robustness Check: Main Questionnaire Stream Only

Estimate	Pooled %	Pooled 95% CI	Pooled n	Main stream %	Main stream 95% CI	Main stream n	Shift (points)	CIs overlap
Adoption at stage 4 or 5	12.6	[8.5, 18.2]	183	13.5	[9.0, 19.8]	155	1.0	Yes
Adoption at stage 2 (partial use)	46.4	[39.4, 53.7]	183	44.5	[36.9, 52.4]	155	-1.9	Yes
Training absent or insufficient	65.4	[59.2, 71.1]	240	65.0	[57.8, 71.6]	180	-0.4	Yes
Arabic output rated excellent or very excellent	27.6	[22.4, 33.5]	246	28.9	[22.8, 35.9]	180	1.2	Yes
Return absent or not yet assessable	65.1	[58.1, 71.5]	192	76.1	[68.8, 82.2]	155	11.0	Yes

Note. Main questionnaire stream = the main Arabic administration; valid n = 155–180 per estimate. Four of five estimates move by 2 points or less. The share reporting returns as absent or not yet assessable is 11.0 points higher in the main stream than pooled, with only marginally overlapping intervals, so that proportion depends more than the others on which streams are pooled.

S5. Robustness Check: Alternative Treatment of the Undocumented

“Good” Category

Four items contain a category that is not a documented response option and was volunteered by respondents. For perceived Arabic-language output quality, all eight “good” ratings come from the main stream and were among 20 responses entered on a single day, consistent with transcription of face-to-face answers (Table 8 note).

Treatment of “Good” (perceived Arabic-language output quality)	Share rated excellent or better	95% CI	n
Retained as a distinct category (primary)	27.6% (68/246)	[22.4, 33.5]	246
Excluded	28.6% (68/238)	[23.2, 34.6]	238
Collapsed into “excellent”	30.9% (76/246)	[25.5, 36.9]	246

Variable	Target category	Off-scale excluded: %	n	Off-scale collapsed into target: %	n	Difference (points)
Perceived Arabic-language output quality	Excellent	23.9	238	26.4	246	2.5
Personal performance impact	Clearly improved efficiency and quality	45.4	174	47.8	182	2.4
Expected future role	Will strengthen and develop my role	48.9	176	50.3	181	1.4

Note. Off-scale categories: perceived Arabic-language output quality “good” (n = 8); personal performance “noticeable improvement” (n = 8); expected future role “will enhance my capabilities” (n = 5); skills needed “critical analysis of AI content” (n = 6). In correlational analyses the off-scale responses are treated as missing (Section 3.2.2). The primary-task category “drafting news reports and articles” (n = 6) was also volunteered and is shown separately in Table 2.

S6. Robustness Check: Listwise Deletion

Spearman ρ (listwise $n = 76$)	Readiness	Adoption maturity	Training provision	Perceived Arabic-language output quality	Perceived return on investment	Personal performance
Readiness	—					
Adoption maturity	.378	—				
Training provision	.512	.268	—			
Perceived Arabic-language output quality	.100	.010	.021	—		
Perceived return on investment	.385	.084	.347	-.030	—	
Personal performance	.262	.148	.243	.126	.042	—

Association	Pairwise ρ	Pairwise n	Listwise ρ ($n = 76$)	Difference
Readiness $\times$ adoption maturity	0.415	179	0.378	-0.036
Readiness $\times$ training provision	0.429	193	0.512	+0.084
Readiness $\times$ perceived Arabic-language output quality	0.097	212	0.100	+0.003
Readiness $\times$ perceived return on investment	0.431	97	0.385	-0.046
Readiness $\times$ personal performance	0.226	150	0.262	+0.035

Completers versus non-completers of the adoption item (current Arabic instrument, $n = 230$: 183 answered, 47 skipped).

Comparison variable	Test	Result
Questionnaire stream	$\chi^2(1)$	9.07, $p = .003$ (skipping more common in the second Arabic administration)
Organization type	$\chi^2(2)$	1.95, $p = .377$
Professional experience	$\chi^2(2)$	8.24, $p = .016$ (skipping more common with < 3 years)
Readiness	Mann–Whitney	$M = 57.2$ vs. 54.2 , $p = .469$
Perceived Arabic-language output quality	Mann–Whitney	$p = .252$
Readiness $\times$ adoption, inverse-probability weighted	Weighted ρ	$\rho = .408$ (unweighted .415); response model: stream, organization type, experience

Note. Neither deletion rule removes selection on later modules; the checks indicate its likely direction and size (Sections 3.6.2 and 4.9; Table 10).

S7. Robustness Check: Strict Seven-of-Seven Composite Inclusion Rule

Association	ρ (≥ 5 of 7, primary)	n	ρ (7 of 7)	n	Difference
Readiness $\times$ adoption maturity	0.415	179	0.417	177	+0.002
Readiness $\times$ training provision	0.429	193	0.443	191	+0.014
Readiness $\times$ perceived Arabic-language output quality	0.097	212	0.090	209	-0.007
Readiness $\times$ perceived return on investment	0.431	97	0.431	97	+0.000
Readiness $\times$ personal performance	0.226	150	0.224	148	-0.003

Rule	Respondents scored	M	SD
At least five of seven indicators (71.4% of the item pool; primary)	221	56.62	20.44
All seven indicators	218	56.51	20.56

Note. The two composites correlate $r = 1.000$ (three respondents differ). Ordinal model of adoption maturity: OR per SD 2.587 (primary) vs. 2.585 (strict rule).

S8. Questionnaire (Arabic and English Versions)

The questionnaire was developed in Arabic and administered online through SurveyMonkey (and, for some respondents, in face-to-face sessions). Part A reproduces the current Arabic instrument from its Word master (April 2026), checked against a screenshot of the fielded online form; the wording is identical. Part B was transcribed from a full-page screenshot of the fielded SurveyMonkey English form, because no source file of the English version is available. In both parts, grids, sliders and required-answer marks are rendered as text, and question numbers and bracketed annotations are editorial additions. Question order follows each version. An earlier Arabic version, answered by 82 main-stream respondents between October 2025 and February 2026, shared the demographic items and three readiness indicators (Section 3.1); it is not reproduced here.

Part A. Arabic instrument (current version)

استبيان حول تبني الذكاء الاصطناعي في المؤسسات الإعلامية الإماراتية

يهدف هذا الاستبيان إلى قياس مستوى تبني الذكاء الاصطناعي في المؤسسات الإعلامية الإماراتية، ورصد جاهزيتها الرقمية وقدرتها على الابتكار للحصول على رؤى معمقة حول مستقبل التقنيات الإعلامية. يرجى الإجابة بناءً على تقييمك العام لأداء مؤسستكم. جميع الإجابات سرية وتستخدم لأغراض بحثية وتطويرية.

1. ما هو طبيعة عملك داخل المؤسسة؟ (إجابة مطلوبة)

مندوب أو محرر صحفي / مراسل / مصور؛ منتج فيديو / صانع محتوى رقمي؛ رئيس قسم / مدير منصات / مشاريع رقمية؛ أخرى (يرجى التحديد)

2. سنوات الخبرة في المجال الإعلامي؟

أقل من 3 سنوات؛ من 3 – 10 سنوات؛ أكثر من 10 سنوات

3. ما طبيعة المؤسسة التي تعمل بها؟ (إجابة مطلوبة)

مطبوعة / بث (تلفزيون/إذاعة)؛ منصة رقمية فقط / وكالة أنباء؛ مكتب إعلامي حكومي

4. إلى أي مدى توافق أو لا توافق على العبارات التالية

مقياس الإجابة: غير موافق تماماً؛ غير موافق؛ محايد/ لا رأي لي؛ موافق؛ موافق تماماً

4.1 أستخدم أدوات الذكاء الاصطناعي في عملي الإعلامي بشكل منتظم ضمن مهام اليومية.

4.2 تتوفر أدوات رقمية وتقنية تساعدني على تحليل المحتوى الإعلامي وفهم تفاعل الجمهور معه.

4.3 تساعدني التقنيات الرقمية والذكاء على تحسين جودة المحتوى الذي أقدمه.

4.4 يُسمح لنا بتجربة أفكار أو أساليب عمل جديدة دون تعقيدات إدارية مفرطة.

4.5 يتم تشجيع المبادرات والأفكار الابتكارية من قبل الإدارة داخل المؤسسة.

4.6 يراعي المحتوى الإعلامي المدعوم بالذكاء الاصطناعي القيم الثقافية والاجتماعية المحلية.

4.7 توجد توجيهات واضحة داخل المؤسسة لتنظيم استخدام أدوات الذكاء الاصطناعي.

4.8 أشعر بالثقة تجاه التزام مؤسستي بحماية بيانات الجمهور وخصوصيته.

4.9 أطلع بشكل منتظم على بيانات التفاعل مع الجمهور (مثل المشاهدات، التعليقات، المشاركات).

4.10 يُراعى تنوع الجمهور واحتياجاته المختلفة عند إنتاج المحتوى الإعلامي.

4.11 أدى التحول الرقمي واستخدام التقنيات الذكية إلى تغيير إيجابي في أدوري المهنية.

4.12 يتم التعامل بوضوح وشفافية مع المخاوف المهنية المرتبطة باستخدام الذكاء الاصطناعي.

5. إلى أي مدى تستخدم أدوات الذكاء الاصطناعي في المهام التالية؟

جمع وتوليد المعلومات مثل ChatGPT؛ تحرير وتلخيص النصوص؛ الترجمة الآلية؛ التحقق من الأخبار وكشف التزييف العميق؛ تحليل بيانات الجمهور وتفاعله

6. بشكل عام، كيف أثر استخدام الذكاء الاصطناعي على أدائك المهني الشخصي؟

حسن الكفاءة وجودة العمل بشكل واضح؛ أحدث تحسناً محدوداً؛ لم يحدث فرقاً ملحوظاً؛ زاد من عبء العمل أو التعقيد؛ لا أستخدامه بما يكفي لتقييم الأثر

7. كيف تصنف مستوى تبني مؤسستك لتقنيات الذكاء الاصطناعي في العمل الإعلامي؟

تجارب محدودة أو استخدام تجريبي؛ استخدام جزئي في مهام بسيطة؛ استخدام منتظم في بعض العمليات التحريرية أو الرقمية؛ عنصر أساسي في سير العمل الإعلامي؛ اعتماد شبه كامل ولا يمكن إنجاز العمل دونها

8. هل تلقيت تدريباً متخصصاً على استخدام الذكاء الاصطناعي في مؤسستك؟

نعم، تلقيت تدريباً كافياً؛ تلقيت تدريباً لكنه غير كاف؛ لم أتلق تدريباً لأن المؤسسة لا توفره؛ لم أتلق تدريباً رغم توفره

9. في تصورك، ما هي المهارات الأكثر إلحاحاً التي تحتاجها حالياً؟

هندسة الأوامر Prompt Engineering؛ تحليل البيانات وعرضها مرئياً؛ أخلاقيات التعامل مع المحتوى المولد آلياً

10. كيف تقيم جودة مخرجات الذكاء الاصطناعي باللغة العربية (الفصحى واللهجات المحلية) في عملك؟

ضعيفة جداً؛ ضعيفة؛ متوسطة؛ ممتازة؛ ممتازة جداً

11. كيف تتوقع أن يؤثر الذكاء الاصطناعي على دورك المهني خلال السنوات الثلاث إلى الخمس القادمة؟

سيعزز دوري ويطوره؛ سيعتبر طبيعة دوري ومسؤولياتي؛ قد يهدد بعض مهام المهنة؛ لا يزال المسار غير واضح

12. من فضلك قم بتحريك المؤشر أسفله لتحديد نسبة تحقق الجوانب التالية في مؤسستك الإعلامية (إجابة مطلوبة؛ مؤشر من 0 إلى 100 لكل بند)

12.1 مستوى التبني الفعلي لتقنيات الذكاء الاصطناعي في العمل اليومي.

12.2 درجة تأهيل الكوادر إعلامياً ورقمياً

12.3 سرعة تحويل الأفكار الابتكارية إلى تطبيقات عملية

12.4 درجة التعاون بين الفرق القائمة على العمل التحريري والفرق التقنية

12.5 مدى توظيف تفاعل الجمهور وثقته في تطوير المحتوى والخدمات الإعلامية

12.6 توافر أدلة وإرشادات حول كيفية توظيف الذكاء الاصطناعي والأخبار المضللة في مؤسستك

12.7 الوصول الي جميع الفئات (ذوو الإعاقة & كبار السن & لغات مختلفة)

13. برأيك، هل تحقق مؤسستك عائداً واضحاً من الاستثمار في تقنيات الذكاء الاصطناعي؟

نعم، عائد واضح ومؤثر؛ عائد محدود حتى الآن؛ لا يوجد عائد ملموس؛ لا يمكن التقييم في الوقت الحالي

14. يرجى ذكر مثال أو أكثر لمشروعات أو مبادرات الذكاء الاصطناعي التي تعمل عليها المؤسسة حالياً، مع توضيح مجالها والغرض منها (إن أمكن). (إجابة مفتوحة)

15. يرجى ذكر أمثلة محددة على كيفية توظيف الذكاء الاصطناعي داخل سير العمل الإعلامي (مثل التحرير، التحليل، الأتمتة، معالجة المحتوى). (إجابة مفتوحة)

16. ما أبرز التحديات التقنية أو التشغيلية التي تواجهها المؤسسة في توسيع استخدام تقنيات الذكاء الاصطناعي؟ (إجابة مفتوحة)

17. ما اقتراحاتك لتطوير أو تحسين استخدام الذكاء الاصطناعي داخل المؤسسة خلال المرحلة القادمة؟ (إجابة مفتوحة)

18. اسم مؤسستك (إجابة مفتوحة)

Question numbers and bracketed annotations are editorial additions; they do not appear on the form.

Part B. English version (as fielded)

AI Adoption in UAE Media Institutions Survey (Journalists)

This survey aims to measure the level of artificial intelligence adoption in UAE media institutions, assess digital readiness, and evaluate innovation capacity. Please respond based on your overall assessment of your organization's performance. All responses are confidential and used only for research and development purposes.

1. What is your role within your organization?

Reporter / Journalist / Correspondent / Photographer; Section Head / Platforms Manager / Digital Projects Manager; Video Producer / Digital Content Creator; Other (please specify)

2. Years of experience in the media field:

Less than 3 years; 3–10 years; More than 10 years

3. Name of your organization: (open)

4. What type of organization do you work in?

Print / Broadcast (TV or Radio); Digital-only Platform / News Agency; Government Media Office

5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Scale: Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Neutral / No Opinion; Agree; Strongly Agree

5.1 I regularly use AI tools in my daily media work.

5.2 Digital and technical tools are available that help me analyze media content and understand audience engagement.

5.3 Smart and digital technologies help improve the quality of the content I produce.

5.4 We are allowed to experiment with new ideas or workflows without excessive administrative restrictions.

5.5 Innovation and creative initiatives are encouraged by management within the organization.

5.6 AI-supported media content respects local cultural and social values.

5.7 There are clear guidelines within the organization to avoid bias or misinformation when using AI tools.

5.8 I trust my organization's commitment to protecting audience data and privacy.

5.9 I regularly review audience engagement metrics (views, comments, shares).

5.10 Audience diversity and different needs are considered in producing media content.

5.11 The digital transformation and use of smart technologies have positively changed my professional role.

5.12 Concerns about AI use are addressed with clarity and transparency.

6. How often do you use AI tools in the following media tasks

Scale: Never; Rarely; Sometimes; Often; Always

Gathering and generating information using tools like ChatGPT; Editing or summarizing texts; Converting audio into written text; Translation; Producing/editing images and videos; Fact-checking and combating misinformation; Collecting and analyzing audience data; Managing and distributing content on platforms

7. Overall, how has the use of AI affected your personal professional performance?

Significantly improved efficiency and work quality; Slight improvement; No noticeable impact; Increased workload or complexity; I do not use AI enough to evaluate its impact

8. Have you received specialized training on AI in your organization?

Yes, I received sufficient training; Training was insufficient; I have not received training and would like to (with text box)

9. In your view, what are the most urgent skills needed today? (check boxes)

Prompt engineering; Data analysis and visualization; Ethics of handling AI-generated content

10. How do you evaluate the quality of AI-generated Arabic output (Modern Standard Arabic and dialects) in your work?

Very Poor; Poor; Average; Excellent; Outstanding

11. How would you best describe your organization's level of artificial intelligence (AI) adoption in media work?

Limited experimentation or pilot use; Partial use for basic tasks; Regular use in some editorial or digital workflows; AI is a core component of daily media operations; Near-complete reliance on AI to perform media work

12. How do you expect AI to affect your professional role over the next 3–5 years?

It will enhance and strengthen my role; It will significantly change my role and responsibilities; It may threaten some aspects of my role; The impact is still unclear

13. Rating Sliders (0–100%): Please use the slider to indicate the percentage that reflects your organization's performance in the following areas:

13.1 Actual adoption level of AI technologies in daily operations

13.2 Media and digital skills readiness of staff

13.3 Speed of transforming innovative ideas into practical applications

13.4 Level of collaboration between editorial and technical teams

13.5 Degree of leveraging audience engagement and trust in developing content and services

13.6 Availability of guidelines on using AI and addressing misinformation

13.7 Accessibility to all audience groups (people of determination, seniors, different languages)

14. In your view, is your organization achieving a clear return on investment (ROI) from its use of AI technologies?

Yes, a clear and measurable return; A limited return so far; No tangible return at this stage; It is too early or difficult to assess

15. Please provide one or more examples of AI projects or initiatives currently being developed in your organization, including their purpose (if possible). (open)

16. Please provide specific examples of how AI is integrated within your media workflow (e.g., editing, analysis, automation, content processing). (open)

17. What are the main technical or operational challenges your organization faces in expanding the use of AI technologies? (open)

18. What suggestions do you have for improving or enhancing AI use in your organization in the coming period? (open)

Note. The English version was translated from the Arabic by the author; no independent back-translation was carried out (Section 3.2). It differs from the Arabic instrument in four respects that affect comparability: the task item asks how often each of eight tasks is performed (so the English stream is not included in Table 2); the training item offers three options; the adoption-maturity, personal-performance and expected-role items were not included in the English stream's analyses; and the highest Arabic-language output quality option is labelled "Outstanding". Transcription limitations: Part B was transcribed manually from a screenshot; two typographical slips on the form were corrected ("The impact is still unclear" to "unclear"; a missing

closing parenthesis in the accessibility indicator). Minor differences in punctuation or line breaks from the online form cannot be excluded.

S9. Ordinal Models of Adoption Maturity, Brant Tests, and Additional Robustness Results (separate Excel file)

Supplied as the Excel workbook `journalmedia-4524444-Supplementary-S9.xlsx`, with the following sheets:

- S9a — Full output of the four ordinal logistic models of adoption maturity (odds ratios, 95% CIs, coefficients, standard errors, p-values, thresholds, fit statistics)
- S9b — Brant tests of the proportional-odds assumption, global and for each predictor, for all four models