

Final Project 2

PMG 497

Project title

**Exploring the Impact of AI Adoption on Job
Insecurity: The Mediating Role of Leadership
Support in Saudi Organizations**

Student name

Hassan Mansour Bantan

Final Project - 2

Faculty of Management - Midocean University

Supervisor

Dr. Abdulrahim Nader

Faculty member- Faculty of management- Midocean University

28-08-2025 – 9

Research instruments and Questionnaires

Informed Consent Form

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this study. Before you proceed, please read the following information carefully:

1. Your participation in this research is completely voluntary.
2. You have the right to withdraw at any point without any negative consequences.
3. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential and used only for academic and research purposes.
4. No personal identifiers will be disclosed in any reports or publications resulting from this study.
5. The estimated time to complete the questionnaire is approximately 10–15 minutes.

By selecting “Yes” below, you confirm that:

- ☐ You have read and understood the above information.
 - ☐ You agree to voluntarily participate in this study.
- ☐ Yes, I consent to participate.
- ☐ No, I do not consent to participate.

Demographic Information Sheet

Please provide the following details:

1. **Name:** _____
2. **Age (Please select one):**
 - 18–25
 - 26–30
 - 31–35
 - 36–40
 - 41–45
 - 46–50
 - 51–55
 - 56–60
 - 61–65
 - 66–70

3. Gender:

- Male
- Female

4. Education Level:

- Bachelor's
- Master's
- PhD

5. Field of Work: _____

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

Instructions:

This questionnaire provides a description of your leadership style. Twenty-one descriptive statements are listed below. Judge how frequently each statement fits you. The word “others” may mean your followers, clients, or group members.

KEY:

- ☐0 = Not at all
- ☐1 = Once in a while
- ☐2 = Sometimes
- ☐3 = Fairly often
- ☐4 = Frequently, if not always

No.	Statement	0	1	2	3	4
1	I make others feel good to be around me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	I express with a few simple words what we could and should do.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	I enable others to think about old problems in new ways.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4	I help others develop themselves.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5	I tell others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6	I am satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7	I am content to let others continue working in the same way as always.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8	Others have complete faith in me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9	I provide appealing images about what we can do.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10	I provide others with new ways of looking at puzzling things.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11	I let others know how I think they are doing.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12	I provide recognition/rewards when others reach their goals.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13	As long as things are working, I do not try to change anything.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14	Whatever others want to do is O.K. with me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15	Others are proud to be associated with me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16	I help others find meaning in their work.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17	I get others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18	I give personal attention to others who seem rejected.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19	I call attention to what others can get for what they accomplish.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

- 20 I tell others the standards they have to know to carry out their work. ☐☐☐☐☐
- 21 I ask no more of others than what is absolutely essential. ☐☐☐☐☐

Job Insecurity Scale (JIS)

Instructions:

The following statements are about your job situation. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

KEY:

☐☐1 = Strongly Disagree

☐☐2 = Disagree

☐☐3 = Neutral

☐☐4 = Agree

☐☐5 = Strongly Agree

No.	Statement	1	2	3	4	5
1	Chances are, I will soon lose my job.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	I am sure I can keep my job. (<i>reverse scored</i>)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	I feel insecure about the future of my job.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4	I think I might lose my job in the near future.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Methodology

Research Design

A qualitative research design was used in this study because it allowed for a deeper understanding of people's real thoughts feelings and reactions. Since the study focused on personal emotions like fear anxiety and trust a phenomenological approach was used so that lived experiences could be explored in detail. This approach helped in understanding the full story behind what employees were going through instead of relying on numbers or ratings.

Population and Sampling of the Study

The participants in this study were employees from many corporate sectors in Saudi Arabia, encompassing finance, information technology, health, and education. These industries were chosen to guarantee a variety of responses and to obtain a thorough comprehension of the interplay between AI adoption, leadership support, and job insecurity in various organisational settings. The target demographic comprised both male and female employees at various organisational levels, from entry-level positions to managing roles, to capture diverse viewpoints. The study utilised a non-probability convenience sampling method. This strategy was deemed suitable due to its efficacy in reaching respondents within the constrained

period and resources available. Convenience sampling facilitates data collection from people who are easily available and eager to participate, rendering it appropriate for exploratory research of this type. The theoretical rationale for this selection is its effectiveness in producing preliminary insights into phenomena when representativeness is subordinate to comprehending overarching patterns and linkages (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016). Probability-based approaches offer enhanced generalisability; yet, non-probability sampling is frequently utilised in social science research when logistical limitations hinder random selection. We built the sample frame by getting in touch with employees through professional networks, organisational contacts, and internet channels. We found people who would be interested in doing the survey and sent them an invitation to do so. We sent the survey out electronically so that more people could see it. The strategy did not ensure equitable opportunities for involvement among all population members; nonetheless, it allowed the researcher to engage a varied group of respondents from different sectors, therefore advancing the study's objectives.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Participants were included in the study if they had at least one year of work experience in a company where AI or intelligent digital systems were part of the workflow. They had to be full-time employees with regular job responsibilities and should have had a supervisor or leader to whom they reported. Only those who had experienced some

sort of shift or adjustment due to AI were selected so that their responses could provide relevant insights.

Participants were excluded if they were freelancers interns or consultants as their employment status was not stable enough for long-term AI exposure. Those who were in senior leadership roles or were part of the teams that designed or implemented AI were also excluded because the study focused on the employee side not the decision-maker side.

The Job Insecurity Scale (JIS)

The Job Insecurity Scale (JIS) created by De Witte (2000) is one of the most used tools for measuring how insecure people feel about their jobs. It was made to find out how someone feels about the danger of losing their job and the sentiments of helplessness that come with it. There are four items on the measure, and each one is assessed on a 5-point Likert scale that goes from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." The questions are structured to encompass both the cognitive aspect (the probability of job loss) and the emotive aspect (the anxiety or stress associated with job loss). Because it is simple and clear, it may be used in many different cultural and organisational settings. It has been widely used in both cross-sectional and longitudinal investigations of employee attitudes and well-being.

The JIS has shown strong reliability and validity when it comes to psychometric qualities. De Witte's (2000) initial validation showed a Cronbach's alpha over 0.80,

which means that the test was very consistent within itself. Subsequent studies across other nations and sectors have validated this dependability, demonstrating that the measure reliably reflects the notion of job insecurity. Construct validity has been substantiated by connections with pertinent outcomes, including stress, work satisfaction, and organisational commitment. Research indicates that elevated job insecurity scores correlate with diminished well-being and decreased organisational attachment. Factor studies have also shown that the items load strongly on one factor, which proves that it is unidimensional. In general, the JIS has shown to be a trustworthy, accurate, and free tool for measuring job insecurity in both research and real-world organisational settings.

Data collection

This study's data were gathered via a defined quantitative methodology. The work Insecurity Scale (JIS), created by De Witte in 2000, was used to quantify work insecurity. This scale is commonly utilised in organisational research to evaluate employees' attitudes on the potential of job loss and associated anxieties and concerns. The questionnaire was given together with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and questions on AI exposure to make sure that all the factors being studied were included. Data were collected from personnel in several areas, including banking, information technology, healthcare, and education, in Saudi Arabia. A non-probability sampling technique was employed owing to practical constraints and participant

accessibility. The survey was sent out electronically using email and online survey platforms. This made it simpler to get a wide range of responses while keeping things private and convenient. Before taking part, each responder gave their informed agreement, with the promise that their information would only be used for academic reasons and kept private.

Respondents filled out the questionnaire on their own, and steps were taken to eliminate response bias by making it clear that there were no right or incorrect answers and that honest answers were necessary for the study to be legitimate. This method made it easier to get accurate and trustworthy data, making sure that the answers were based on real feelings about AI exposure, leadership position, and job insecurity in the workplace.