
ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ADOPTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION- MAKING IN UNIVERSITY SPORTS MANAGEMENT IN RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA

¹Ochor, D.C.,

ORCID iD: 0009-0008-0429-054X

²Frank, Chijoke

ORCID iD: 009-0003-5350-1538

³Udeme., Bassey

ORCID iD: 0009-0004-6710-5066

Department of Sport and Exercise Science, Faculty of Education,
University of Port Harcourt, Choba, Port Harcourt, Rivers State.

daniel.ochor@uniport.edu.ng,

+2348161678408

Abstract

This study found that AI adoption significantly predicted administrative decision-making and sports management efficiency among university sports administrators in Rivers State, Nigeria. The study adopted a cross-sectional correlational research design. The study involved sports administrators from the University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State University, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, and Federal University of Environment and Technology. The estimated population was 160 sports administrators, from which a sample of 114 respondents was selected using the Taro Yamane formula. Eighty-nine completed questionnaires were retrieved, representing a 78% return rate. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire measuring AI adoption, administrative decision-making, and sports management efficiency. Descriptive statistics, including mean and standard deviation, were used to answer the research questions, while simple linear regression was employed to test the hypotheses at the 0.05 significance level. The findings showed that AI adoption had a strong perceived influence on administrative decision-making (grand mean = 3.03). Regression analysis further indicated that AI adoption significantly predicted administrative decision-making, $R = .614$, $R^2 = .377$, $\beta = .614$, $F(1, 87) = 52.61$, $p < .001$. AI adoption also demonstrated a strong perceived influence on sports management efficiency (grand mean = 3.06) and significantly predicted management efficiency, $R = .638$, $R^2 = .407$, $\beta = .638$, $F(1, 87) = 59.72$, $p < .001$. The study concludes that AI adoption represents a promising mechanism for improving decision quality and operational efficiency in university sports

management. The study recommended, among other things, that university sports management adopt AI-supported administrative systems for planning, scheduling, information management, resource allocation, and monitoring of sporting programs.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Sports Administration, Administrative Decision-Making, Sports Management, University Sports, Nigeria.

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is no longer just a technological innovation; it is increasingly a tool for organizational planning, analysis, and decision-making. AI-powered systems can filter vast amounts of information, detect patterns, and produce predictive insights to help managers make quicker, more informed decisions across sectors. Growing evidence in higher education shows that AI is used in strategic planning, resource allocation, quality assurance, risk management, and institutional coordination. Still, questions remain about transparency, accountability, trust, and algorithmic bias (Jiang & Abdullah, 2026). This development is especially significant for sport, where administrators make many decisions about selection, timing, the use of sports facilities, sports finance, talent identification, personnel management, and the organization of sports events. A recent study of AI in sport also found that other operational applications, such as competition management and performance analysis, are vital domains where AI is introducing new opportunities (Li et al., 2025).

As sport increasingly becomes AI-driven, sport organizations are therefore starting to transform how they develop and leverage information for management. The significance of technology-mediated environments (TME) has continued to grow, and emerging evidence on digital technology and its implications for the psychosocial functioning of young people in Nigeria has further shown this. Predict performance, financial, operational, and participation data using AI-based analytics and assist in planning and resource allocation. In a systematic review of sports analytics and AI, Pu et al. (2024) showed the growing importance of intelligent systems for decision-making in sport, especially for data-driven analysis and predictive techniques. Similarly, Elstak et al. (2024) reviewed 190 peer-reviewed studies on football codes. They found uses for athlete assessment, event detection, prediction, and decision-making in relation to injuries, among other areas. Still, they noted issues of data security, bias, use, and inappropriate decision-making. The improvements in both the quality, speed and evidence base of managerial decisions are what make AI valuable in sport administration, not just the ability to automate routine processes.

In sports administration and management, however, technological skills are not necessarily related to effective decision-making in the organization. Sport organizations exist within governance frameworks where accountability, transparency, stakeholder interests, and ethical responsibility are vital. According to Thompson et al. (2022), in their systematic review of 73 sources on sport

governance, transparency, accountability, and stakeholder engagement were the most salient governance principles, and governance approaches needed to be more grounded in evidence. More recent scholarship has expanded this concern to address AI, arguing that algorithmic systems raise novel questions about data ownership, bias, equity, autonomy, and institutional legitimacy. For instance, Sholiha Mia et al. (2026) found that digital determinism, underrepresentation, sensitive-data governance, and the need for explainable and auditable AI systems are risks of algorithmic governance in sport. Therefore, the usefulness of AI in administrative decision-making is intricately connected to the readiness of the organization, the skill of management, people's trust, ethical considerations, and proper human supervision.

These questions are especially relevant in university sport, where administrators must balance competitive goals with educational ones, scarce resources, athlete well-being, and institutional responsibilities. However, although global discourse on the use of AI in sport has grown, there is still limited research on how AI is incorporated into administrative decision-making processes in sport at the University of Nigeria. Recent developments in sport management have highlighted the implications of AI for organizational design and stakeholder decision-making (Westerbeek & Van Schaik, 2025), and modern research in higher education has yet to fully explore AI governance and institutional decision-making (O'Connor et al., 2024; Jiang & Abdullah, 2026). In this light, it is opportune to look at Artificial Intelligence Adoption and Administrative Decision-Making in University Sports Management in Rivers State, Nigeria. The study aims to determine the relationship between AI adoption and administrative decision-making among university sport managers, providing context-specific evidence to enhance planning, resource allocation, athlete management, event administration, and strategic governance in Nigerian university sport.

While AI is increasingly affecting the field of sport management, from facilitating rapid data analysis to predicting outcomes, to automating administrative functions, to informing strategic decisions based on data, the extent to which these functions are being applied to effective sport administration practice is not well understood. Recent literature suggests that AI is becoming a more and more relevant tool for team composition, talent identification, resource optimization, operational planning, and strategic decision-making, in addition to raising concerns regarding data privacy, algorithmic bias, transparency, and the need for human oversight (Kim & Ford, 2025; Li et al., 2025). In this context, the overall growth of digital technologies has already demonstrated measurable impacts on behavioral and organizational contexts; for example, George and Ochor (2026) indicate that exposure to digital technologies via social media can significantly affect behavioral and psychological outcomes among Nigerian adolescents. While the daily decisions made by sport administrators in sports are complex, such as the allocation of facilities, finances, athlete selection, competition scheduling, personnel, communication, and resources, evidence specifically examining the use of AI in administrative decision-making in Nigerian university sport

management is limited. This gap is especially significant because the role of a university sporting official demands timely, transparent, and evidence-based decision-making.

In contrast, AI-driven decision-making without proper digital competence, organizational preparedness, ethical protections, and managerial oversight could lead to new forms of errors, biases, and overreliance on AI recommendations. Therefore, it is necessary to have empirical evidence to determine whether and how the use of AI is aiding in decision-making in university sport administration in Rivers State as a foundation to responsibly integrate AI technology into the administration of university sport in Rivers State. Hence, empirical evidence is needed to determine whether and how AI use aids decision-making in university sport administration in Rivers State as a basis for responsibly integrating technology into the administration of university sport in Rivers State.

1. To what extent does artificial intelligence adoption influence administrative decision-making among university sports administrators in Rivers State?
2. To what extent does artificial intelligence adoption influence the efficiency of sports management practices among university sports administrators in Rivers State?

The following null hypotheses will be tested at the 0.05 level of significance:

- 1 Artificial intelligence adoption has no significant influence on administrative decision-making among university sports administrators in Rivers State.
- 2 Artificial intelligence adoption has no significant influence on the efficiency of sports management practices among university sports administrators in Rivers State.

Methodology

The study adopted a descriptive correlational research design to determine the relationship among the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI), administrative decision-making, and the efficiency of sports administration among sports administrators in universities in Rivers State, Nigeria. The study population comprised Sports Directors, Sports Coordinators, Coaches with administrative responsibilities, Sports Officers, and other personnel directly involved in the management and administration of sports programmes at the University of Port Harcourt (UNIPORT), Rivers State University (RSU), Ignatius Ajuru University of Education (IAUE), and the Federal University of Environment and Technology (FUET). The accessible population was estimated at 160 sports administrators, comprising approximately 40 administrators from each institution. Using the Taro Yamane formula at a 5% level of precision, a sample size of 114 respondents was obtained. A multistage sampling procedure was used, with proportional allocation applied to ensure representation from the four universities. Data were collected using a structured researcher-

developed questionnaire titled Artificial Intelligence Use, Administrative Decision-Making and Sports Administration Efficiency Questionnaire (AIADM-SAEQ). The questionnaire was structured to measure AI adoption, including perceived usefulness, frequency of use, ease of use, digital competence, organisational readiness and trust in AI; administrative decision-making covering planning, resource allocation, scheduling, athlete management, event administration and strategic decision-making; and efficiency of sports administration practices.

The AIADM-SAEQ was subjected to face and content validation by three experts drawn from relevant academic departments: one expert from the Department of Sport and Exercise Science, Faculty of Education; two experts from the Department of Educational Psychology, Guidance and Counselling, Faculty of Education, University of Port Harcourt. The experts examined the instrument for relevance, clarity, adequacy and appropriateness of the items in relation to the study objectives and research variables. Their observations and recommendations were incorporated before the final administration of the questionnaire. A pilot test was subsequently conducted among sports administrators in a comparable institution outside the study area. The internal consistency of the instrument was determined using Cronbach's alpha, with coefficients of 0.70 or above considered acceptable for the respective scales. The completed questionnaires were coded and analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions, while simple linear regression was employed to determine the relationship between AI use and administrative decision-making and between AI use and the efficiency of sports administration practices. The hypotheses were tested at the 0.05 level of significance. For the four-point Likert scale, a criterion mean of 2.50 was adopted; therefore, mean scores of 2.50 and above were regarded as high/agree, whereas mean scores below 2.50 were regarded as low/disagree. For the inferential tests, a hypothesis was rejected when $p < .05$ and not rejected when $p \geq .05$. Ethical principles, including informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, anonymity and participants' right to withdraw from the study, were maintained throughout the research process.

RESULTS

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviation Analysis of AI Adoption and Administrative Decision-Making

S/N	Statement	(M)	(SD)	Remark
1	AI tools are increasingly used in my institution to support administrative decisions in sports management.	3.02	0.78	High Extent
2	AI provides timely and useful information that improves the quality of sports-management decisions.	3.15	0.71	High Extent
3	AI enables sports administrators to analyse large amounts of information and identify useful patterns for decision-making.	3.11	0.74	High Extent
4	AI-assisted information improves planning and scheduling of university sporting activities.	2.94	0.82	High Extent
5	AI supports better decisions concerning the allocation of sports facilities, equipment and financial resources.	2.87	0.86	High Extent
6	AI-generated insights assist administrators in making informed decisions about athlete selection, management and development.	2.91	0.83	High Extent
7	AI helps sports administrators compare alternative solutions before making important management decisions.	3.00	0.79	High Extent
8	AI enables sports administrators to make evidence-based strategic decisions concerning the development of university sports.	3.06	0.76	High Extent
9	AI reduces the time required to obtain and evaluate information for sports-management decisions.	3.18	0.69	High Extent
10	Overall, AI adoption has strengthened the quality and effectiveness of administrative decision-making in my institution's sports management.	3.09	0.73	High Extent
Grand Mean		3.03		High Extent

The grand mean (3.03) for artificial intelligence adoption in university sports management (3.03 > 2.50) indicated that AI was highly influential in administrative decision-making in the university

sports management system. Participants rated AI as most effective in terms of time to obtain the right information and assess it for sports-management decisions ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 0.69$), and for delivering timely and useful information to enhance decision quality ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 0.71$). Additionally, AI helped administrators gain insights from vast amounts of data and identify useful patterns ($M = 3.11$, $SD = 0.74$) and improved the overall quality and effectiveness of administrative decisions ($M = 3.09$, $SD = 0.73$). The lowest mean was for the allocation of sports facilities, equipment, and funding based on AI ($M = 2.87$, $SD = 0.86$), but it was still higher than 2.50. The relatively small standard deviations suggest that the respondents' perceptions of the situation were fairly consistent. Overall, the results indicated that AI was considered a helpful administrative tool for enhancing decision-making in university sports management, in terms of its speed, quality, analytical basis, and effectiveness.

Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation Analysis of AI Adoption and Efficiency of Sports Management Practices (N = 89)

S/N	Statement	M	(SD)	Remark
1	AI helps reduce the time required to complete routine sports-management tasks.	3.16	0.70	High Extent
2	AI improves the efficiency of managing sports-related information and records.	3.21	0.67	High Extent
3	AI assists in coordinating sporting events more efficiently.	3.08	0.74	High Extent
4	AI improves communication between sports administrators, athletes, coaches and other stakeholders.	3.02	0.79	High Extent
5	AI helps sports administrators use available financial and material resources more efficiently.	2.89	0.84	High Extent
6	AI reduces duplication of administrative tasks within sports management.	2.94	0.81	High Extent
7	AI improves the monitoring and evaluation of sports programmes.	3.06	0.76	High Extent
8	AI enables sports administrators to identify administrative problems earlier.	3.12	0.72	High Extent

S/N	Statement	M)	(SD)	Remark
9	AI-supported systems improve the coordination of facilities, equipment and sporting activities.	3.00	0.80	High Extent
10	Overall, AI adoption has improved the efficiency of sports management in my institution.	3.10	0.75	High Extent
Grand Mean		3.06		High Extent

The table results suggest that AI use had a significant effect on sports management practices, as shown by a grand mean score of 3.06, which exceeds the criterion mean score of 2.50. The statement "AI is helping to make managing sports-related information and records more efficient" scored the highest mean with SD 0.67. In contrast, the statement "AI is making the routine administrative tasks of sports management more efficient" had the highest mean (SD = 0.70). Respondents also indicated that AI allowed administrators to identify administrative issues earlier (M = 3.12, SD = 0.72) and that overall sports administration was more efficient with the help of AI (M = 3.10, SD = 0.75). The lowest MDS was obtained for the efficient use of financial and material resources (M = 2.89, SD = 0.84), but this was still above the criterion mean. Overall, the results indicated that AI was perceived as being especially helpful in information management, task efficiency, event coordination, monitoring, and early detection of administrative issues.

Hypothesis One

H₀₁: Artificial intelligence adoption has no significant influence on administrative decision-making among university sports administrators in Rivers State.

Table 3: Regression Analysis of AI Adoption and Administrative Decision-Making

Variable	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F(1, 87)	β	t	p	Decision
AI adoption → Administrative decision-making	.614	.377	.370	52.61	.614	7.25	.001	Rejected

The regression result shows a moderately strong positive relationship between AI adoption and administrative decision-making among university sports administrators (R = .614). The model produced an R² of .377, indicating that AI adoption explained 37.7% of the variance in administrative decision-making. In contrast, the adjusted R² of .370 showed that the model retained substantial explanatory power after adjustment. The regression model was statistically significant,

$F(1, 87) = 52.61$, $p = .001$, and AI adoption made a significant positive contribution to administrative decision-making ($\beta = .614$, $t = 7.25$, $p = .001$). Since the p-value was less than the 0.05 significance level, the null hypothesis that AI adoption has no significant influence on administrative decision-making was rejected. Thus, the finding indicates that greater AI adoption was significantly associated with improved administrative decision-making among university sports administrators in Rivers State.

Hypothesis Two

Artificial intelligence adoption has no significant influence on the efficiency of sports management practices among university sports administrators in Rivers State.

Table 4: Regression Analysis of AI Adoption and Sports Management Efficiency (N = 89)

Variable	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F(1, 87)	β	t	p	Decision
H ₀₂ : AI adoption → Sports management efficiency	.638	.407	.400	59.72	.638	7.73	.001	Rejected

The regression analysis indicates a strong positive relationship between AI adoption and sports management efficiency among university sports administrators ($R = .638$). The model yielded an R^2 of .407, showing that AI adoption accounted for 40.7% of the variance in sports management efficiency, while the adjusted R^2 of .400 indicated that the model maintained substantial explanatory power after adjustment. The regression model was statistically significant, $F(1, 87) = 59.72$, $p = .001$, and AI adoption significantly predicted sports management efficiency ($\beta = .638$, $t = 7.73$, $p = .001$). Since the p-value was below the 0.05 significance level, the null hypothesis (H₀₂) was rejected. The finding therefore indicates that greater AI adoption was significantly associated with improved efficiency of sports management practices among university sports administrators in Rivers State.

Discussion

The first major finding revealed a significant positive relationship between AI use and the administrative decision-making of University Sports Administrators in Rivers State. AI adoption had a significant positive influence on the administrative decision-making of University Sports Administrators in Rivers State. The grand mean of the descriptive analysis was 3.03, indicating a high perceived level of influence from AI, and the regression analysis was statistically significant ($R = .614$, $R^2 = .377$, $\beta = .614$, $p < .001$). This finding suggests that, in the study model, AI adoption accounted for about 37.7% of the variation in administrative decision-making. This indicates that AI has become more and more important than information technology as an administrative

decision support that enhances the speed, quality, and analytical basis of managerial judgments. This perspective aligns with Kim and Ford (2025), who suggest that AI's role in sport management is evolving, with machine learning, natural language processing, computer vision, and intelligent agents all making significant contributions, with implications for sport management decision-making and practice. Likewise, Tyrell (2025), in a systematic review of the use of AI in sport management, found AI to be a new organizational and methodological development that has the potential to impact decision-making, stakeholder engagement, and organization design.

This discovery aligns with recent studies showing AI's growing potential to analyze complex sports data and deliver actionable insights. AI tools are used in sports analytics to support data-driven decision-making and have also expanded to other aspects of sport, such as competition management, performance analysis, and talent identification, as demonstrated by Pu et al. (2024). In sport, for instance, AI has increasingly been leveraged to aid real-time decision-making, personalized analysis, and organizational applications, as highlighted by Zhou et al. (2025), who pointed to the need for data governance and organizational readiness for effective implementation. Therefore, this study indicates that using AI in university sports administration in Rivers State can be helpful because decision-making relies on large volumes of information that change frequently. This finding suggests that using AI in sports administration in universities in Rivers State can be advantageous because decisions in such administration rely on large volumes of information that change quickly, involving athletes, competitions, facilities, finances, scheduling, and program development. The substantial size of the beta coefficient ($\beta = .614$) also suggests that adopting AI was not only a correlate of administrative decision-making; it also positively and meaningfully contributed to the statistical model. However, AI should not be seen as the sole metric for decision quality, given the 62.3% unexplained variance. Additionally, administrative decisions are likely to be influenced by human expertise, organizational culture, leadership, financial capacity, institutional policies, digital competence, and the reliability of available data. The need for this qualification is significant, given recent scholarship that warns of the importance of “transparency, ethical governance, and appropriate human oversight and responsible data management” in implementing AI in sport (Zhou et al., 2025; Kim & Ford, 2025).

The second finding revealed that AI significantly affected the efficiency of sports administration practices among University sports office administrators in Rivers State. The descriptive analysis yielded a grand mean of 3.06, indicating a high extent of perceived influence, while the regression analysis produced $R = .638$, $R^2 = .407$, adjusted $R^2 = .400$, $\beta = .638$, $F(1, 87) = 59.72$, $p < .001$. This relationship therefore captured about 40.7% of the variance in sports management efficiency, compared with the relationship between sports management efficiency and administrative decision-making, which captured only about 40.1% of the variance. The immediate impact of AI in university sports may be clearer in operational tasks such as information management,

scheduling, communication, event organization, monitoring, and minimizing repetitive administrative work. This interpretation aligns with Li et al. (2025), who showed AI applications in competition management and other operational functions of sport, as well as with Li (2025), who claimed that AI can revolutionize sports-event management by providing data-driven processes, real-time responses, and more efficient sports management.

The high proportion of AI in management efficiency also aligns with the current shift in traditional sports management to data-driven management systems. AI has proven effective in recent studies for automating information processing, detecting patterns, and providing speedy solutions to operational issues. In sports club management, for instance, Ghorbani Asiabar et al. (2025) focused on AI tools that enhance the quality and efficiency of managerial decision-making. Similarly, Thamer (2025) introduced a digital sports-management model, highlighting the role of AI-driven data analysis and fast decision-making in enhancing administrative efficiency, as well as the need for digital infrastructure and personnel training. The current findings, therefore, support the notion that AI could support the operational efficiency of university sport management. Of particular interest, the most descriptive responses in the study related to information and records management, reducing time spent on routine tasks, and identifying administrative issues earlier. The functions listed are ones where AI can support, but never replace, administrators: systems can organize and analyze information quickly, and administrators should interpret it, make judgments, and implement it. But the 59.3% variance that could not be explained also demonstrates that management efficiency is not solely due to AI. Efficiency can be significantly affected by institutional funding, staff competence, infrastructure, leadership, administrative procedures, and the availability of reliable sporting data. This aligns with Zhou et al. (2025), who found organizational adoption, as well as data privacy and governance, to be challenges related to integrating AI in sport.

Together, these findings show the broader organizational value of AI in university sports management beyond automating technical tasks. Both administrative decision-making ($\beta = .614$) and management efficiency ($\beta = .638$) were significantly improved by AI, with the slightly greater effect on management efficiency indicating that AI's primary role may be in enhancing operational processes and information flow. This discovery echoes the growing paradigm shift in sport management, which recognizes AI as an organizational capability rather than just a technological solution. Additionally, Kim and Ford (2025) state that AI is emerging as a more relevant tool for organizational design and management practice, not only in relation to athlete performance, whereas Tyrell (2025) highlights the need to explore AI adoption across various sporting industry sectors. The present study continues the discussion with context-specific empirical evidence on AI in university sports administration in Rivers State, where AI appears to contribute to administrators' decision-making and the efficient implementation of sports management activities.

The results should not, however, be seen as an indication that AI will replace sports administrators in the future. Instead, they enable a human-AI decision support model in which AI can quickly analyze, recognize patterns, and process information, while administrators provide context, ethical judgment, and institutional accountability. This distinction has taken on greater significance in the era of AI, digital platforms, and algorithmic systems impacting sport governance, as it raises new questions of transparency, autonomy, accountability, and responsible governance (Westerbeek & van Schaik, 2025). Recent studies also highlight the need for digital competence and preparedness in sport managers to embrace AI, with Destici et al. (2025) identifying perceptions, competence, and educational preparedness as key factors in sport managers' preparedness to adopt AI. Thus, the implications of the present study should be seen in a wider institutional context: AI has the greatest potential to enhance sports management in universities if the administrators have the skills to question the AI results, institutions enable the right digital infrastructure, and governance mechanisms safeguard the integrity, transparency and accountability of data. The findings thus reinforce the call for strategic rather than indiscriminate use of AI in Nigerian university sport management, highlighting the need to invest in staff training, digital infrastructure, data governance, and human oversight during AI implementation.

Overall, the results align with burgeoning international research that has positioned AI as an emerging force for transformation in sport management. AI's impact on sports management efficiency ($\beta = .638$) is more pronounced than in administrative decision-making ($\beta = .614$), indicating that its benefits will first become apparent in enhancing information processing, coordination, scheduling, monitoring, and routine administrative tasks, with a subsequent impact on strategic decision-making. This aligns with recent reviews of AI applications in sport management, competition management, analytics, and organizational processes (Kim & Ford, 2025; Li et al., 2025; Zhou et al., 2025). Importantly, however, the results are based on perceptions of AI adoption and perceived management outcomes among university sports administrators and therefore provide only statistical associations and predictions of management outcomes, not necessarily causal evidence. Future studies should use survey evidence alongside longitudinal, experimental, or mixed-methods designs and objective measures such as administrative processing time, event-management costs, resource utilization, scheduling accuracy, and decision outcomes. This would provide clearer indications of the value of using AI in Nigerian University sport and the organizational contexts in which these values would be maintained.

Conclusion

The study found that artificial intelligence significantly affected the decision-making of university sports administrators in Rivers State and the efficiency of sports management practices. AI proved especially useful in improving information handling, decision-making, planning, coordination, and resource management, highlighting its role as a strategic tool for modernizing sports administration

at universities. But for effective adoption, sufficient digital infrastructure, administrator skills and competence, ethical safeguards, and appropriate human oversight should be put in place to ensure that AI is not a substitute for professional judgment.

Recommendations

1. University sports management should adopt AI-supported administrative systems for planning, scheduling, information management, resource allocation, and monitoring of sporting programs. Such adoption should be guided by institutional policies that clearly define appropriate uses of AI in sports administration.
2. Universities should strengthen the digital competence of sports administrators through regular training and professional development in AI applications, data analysis, and digital decision-support systems. This will enable administrators to interpret AI-generated information critically and apply it appropriately to sports-management decisions.
3. Adequate digital infrastructure and reliable sports databases should be developed to support effective AI implementation. Universities should invest in secure data-management systems, appropriate software, internet connectivity, and digitized records covering athletes, facilities, competitions, finances, and sporting programs.
4. AI adoption should remain subject to human oversight, ethical standards, and data-governance safeguards. Sports administrators should retain final responsibility for important decisions. At the same time, institutions should establish measures to address data privacy, accuracy, transparency, algorithmic bias, and accountability to ensure that AI improves rather than compromises the quality of university sports management.

REFERENCES

- Destici, S. N., Balaban, Ş., & Yıldız, K. (2025). Readiness of prospective sports managers for artificial intelligence: A qualitative study into perceptions and educational preparedness. *Journal of Sport for All and Recreation*, 7(4), 588–604. <https://doi.org/10.56639/jsar.1760455>
- Elstak, I., Salmon, P., & McLean, S. (2024). Artificial intelligence applications in the football codes: A systematic review. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 42(13), 1184–1199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2024.2383065>
- George, I., & Ochor, D. C. (2026). Social media-mediated normalization of psychoactive substance use: Longitudinal impact on adolescent psychological distress across Akwa Ibom

- State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Science Exceptional Research*, 5(2), 210–218. <https://doi.org/10.54660/IJSSER.2026.5.2.210-218>
- Jiang, X., & Abdullah, Z. (2026, July). AI-enabled governance in higher education: A systematic review of applications, outcomes, and emerging implications. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 11, p. 1856440). Frontiers Media SA.
- Kim, J. W., & Ford, V. (2025). An introduction to the AI special issue and a modern framework for AI in sport management. *Journal of Applied Sport Management*, 17(4). <https://doi.org/10.7290/jasml7LDQV>
- Kusan, M., & Arin, A. (2025). Ethical and security issues: The impact of artificial intelligence in sports management. *Acta Scientiae et Intellectus*, 10(2), 78–88.
- Li, W. (2025). A review of artificial intelligence for sports: Technologies and applications. *Intelligent Sports and Health*, 1(3), 113–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ish.2025.05.001>
- Li, Z. (2025). Innovation and transformation of sports event management driven by artificial intelligence. *Journal of Social Science Humanities and Literature*, 8(3), 16–20. [https://doi.org/10.53469/jsshl.2025.08\(03\).03](https://doi.org/10.53469/jsshl.2025.08(03).03)
- Milojević, S., Gligorijević, N., Savičević, D., & Milašinović, M. (2025). Integration of artificial intelligence into the research process of sports management: Potentials and challenges. *Scientific Journal Management in Sports*, 16(2), 156–210. <https://doi.org/10.46793/ManagSport16-2.156M>
- O'Connor, R., Bolton, M., Saeri, A. K., Chan, T., & Pearson, R. (2024). Artificial intelligence and complex sustainability policy problems: translating promise into practice. *Policy Design and Practice*, 7(3), 308-323.
- Pu, Z., Pan, Y., Wang, S., Liu, B., Chen, M., Ma, H., & Cui, Y. (2024). Orientation and decision-making for soccer based on sports analytics and AI: A systematic review. *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, 11(1), 37–57. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JAS.2023.123807>
- Sholiha Mia, A., Okilanda, A., & Desman, M. A. (2026). Artificial intelligence, algorithmic governance, and social inequality in sport: A systematic literature review. *Lentera Negeri*, 7(1), 665–680. <https://doi.org/10.29210/992680>
- Thamer, A. A. (2025). Digital sports management towards a theoretical model for the application of artificial intelligence in the development of the administrative performance of clubs. *University of Thi-Qar Journal for Sciences of Physical Education*.

-
- Thompson, A., Lachance, E. L., Parent, M. M., & Hoye, R. (2023). A systematic review of governance principles in sport. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 23(6), 1863–1888. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2022.2077795>
- Tyrell, K. (2025). *Artificial intelligence in sport management: A systematic review, scale development and validation, and implications* [Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina]. University of South Carolina Scholar Commons. <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/8560>
- Westerbeek, H., & van Schaik, T. (2025). Platform power, athlete branding, generative AI, and the future of sport governance—A systematic review. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living*, 7, Article 1642180. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2025.1642180>
- Westerbeek, H., & Van Schaik, T. (2025). Platform power, athlete branding, generative AI, and the future of sport governance—a systematic review. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living*, 7, 1642180.
- Zhou, D., Keogh, J. W. L., Ma, Y., Tong, R. K. Y., Khan, A. R., & Jennings, N. R. (2025). Artificial intelligence in sport: A narrative review of applications, challenges and future trends. *Journal of Sports Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2025.2518694>