

# Assessment of the Organizational Efficiency in Managing University Sports Championships Based on the Opinions of Sports Activity Staff

Zaid Abdul Jabbar ShahbaZ\*

Baghdad University

\*Correspondence: Zaid Abdul Jabbar ShahbaZ

Email: [zaidabduljabbar@gmail.com](mailto:zaidabduljabbar@gmail.com)

Received: 05-07-2025

Accepted: 16-08-2025

Published: 26-09-2025



**Copyright:** © 2024 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

**Abstract:** *With the growing interest in extracurricular activities within higher education institutions, it has become essential to analyze and assess the efficiency of sports activity departments in organizing university championships. This can be achieved by examining the perspectives of those working in this field, as they are the most qualified to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the organizational system. Organizational efficiency represents a central element in this context. In recent years, noticeable variation has been observed in the levels of an organization from one championship to another, indicating discrepancies in management and planning approaches, as well as in the preparedness of the human resources responsible for sports activities. This prompted the researcher to identify the problem and purpose of the study: to evaluate the level of organizational efficiency in managing university sports championships from the perspective of sports activity staff. The analytical descriptive method was adopted, and the research population was intentionally selected, consisting of sports activity staff at Iraqi universities. The researcher employed a questionnaire as the main tool to study the phenomenon—namely, organizational efficiency. The study concluded that administrative organization and organizational planning received the*

*highest evaluations among the assessed areas, indicating the presence of a solid administrative and structural foundation. The researcher recommended strengthening communication and coordination aspects through the establishment of effective communication channels and scheduling regular meetings between committees.*

**Keywords:** *Organizational Efficiency, University Sports Championships, Sports Activity*

## Introduction

Sports tournaments in universities constitute an educational space complementary to the curricula, as they contribute to refining the student's personality and developing his personal and social abilities through practicing sports activities within a disciplined competitive environment. However, success in the implementation of these events cannot be achieved in isolation from effective management, which is based on planning, organization, coordination and follow-up. These university sports championships are one of the essential events that contribute to the development of students' physical and social abilities and the development of a spirit of fair competition and belonging to the educational institution. To successfully achieve the goals of these tournaments, their management requires a high level of organizational efficiency, which includes their basic elements such as planning, coordination, implementation, and evaluation. With the increasing interest in

extra-curricular activities in higher education institutions, it has become necessary to analyze and evaluate the efficiency of sports activity departments in organizing university tournaments, by studying the views of workers in this field as they are the most worthy to diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of the organizational system. Organizational efficiency is a central element of this framework, as it refers to the way individuals interact within institutions and perform their functions within the contexts of collective action. This behavior includes multiple elements including motivation, leadership styles, communication systems, job satisfaction, interaction with problems, decision-making ability, and coping with stress. The efficiency of its practitioners depends to a large extent on the extent to which they possess positive organizational behaviors that ensure outstanding performance, and help address challenges that may arise during the planning and implementation stages. Indicators indicate that achieving an effective organization of university championships is inseparable from realizing the importance of organizational efficiency for the management of sports tournaments, and the need to develop the capabilities of workers in this field through training and qualification programs that improve their professional and behavioral competence. The importance of this study stems from several key aspects as the results of the study contribute to improving the administrative and organizational performance of the tournaments, reflecting a positive image of the university. It is an opportunity to develop development plans based on realistic field data from within the university environment. It also represents an essential step to understanding the reality of sports organization in universities. By focusing on the opinions of those working in sports activity, and thus the possibility of developing more effective methodologies in the management of university tournaments to ensure the achievement of the desired educational and sports goals.

### **The problem of Search :**

University sports tournaments are important events that contribute to supporting university life and enhancing institutional identity, in addition to their role in achieving the goals of the comprehensive development of students physically, socially and psychologically. However, the success of these tournaments depends largely on the efficiency of the organizational management that oversees their planning and implementation. In recent years, disparities have been observed in the levels of organization from one tournament to another, indicating disparities in management and planning methods, and in the readiness of human resources based on sports activity. Every researcher has a problem that he tried to study. Despite the importance of this topic, there is still a research gap in evaluating organizational efficiency from the point of view of the workers themselves, who are a major party in the organizational process, because of their field experience and practical perceptions about the strengths and shortcomings of the tournament management mechanisms. Individual factors such as educational qualification, and gender, may also influence their assessment of that competency. Hence, the problem of the study is the need to assess the level of organizational efficiency of the management of university sports tournaments, based on the opinions of those working in sports activity, while analyzing the differences in those opinions according to some demographic variables,

in order to provide a scientific perception that can contribute to improving the performance of university sports activity departments in the future.

### **Research Objectives**

1. Evaluating the level of organizational competence for the management of university sports tournaments from the point of view of those working in sports activity.
2. Analyzing the dimensions of organizational efficiency such as (planning, organization, control, communication, and coordination) in light of management practices within universities.
3. Identifying the differences in the assessment of organizational efficiency according to some demographic variables among workers (gender, educational qualification,)

### **Research Hypotheses:**

1. There are no statistically significant differences in the evaluation of the organizational efficiency of the management of university sports tournaments attributed to the gender variable (males – females) and the educational qualification variable.
2. There is an average and higher degree of organizational competence as seen by those working in sports activity in universities.

### **Methodology**

**Human field: (82) workers in sports activity and sports activities division**

**Time Range: Duration from (12/1/2025 to 17/4/202 5)**

**Spatial Scope: Baghdad**

#### **Research Approach**

The analytical descriptive approach was adopted in this study. The analytical descriptive approach is the most appropriate when studying the organizational efficiency of workers in sports activity at the University of Baghdad , " The analytical descriptive approach is one of the scientific methods used to study social phenomena and facts as they are, by collecting data and information related to the phenomenon under study, and analyzing them accurately to determine the relationships between variables and conclude the results." (eads, 2001, p. 46)

#### **The research community and sample**

The research community is defined as " all the vocabulary of the phenomenon that the researcher is studying, or all the individuals, people or things that are the subject of the research problem." The research community (Al-Sadawi & Al-Janabi, 2013, p. 30) was intentionally identified and represented by workers in sports activity in Iraqi universities and selected from the community under study so that this part represents the research community or the research audience. The sample was randomly selected distributed over a sample for the first exploratory experiment (6) and a sample for the construction of sockets amounted to (70) consisting of (35) males and (35) females from sports activity workers and the application sample. The number of sample members was (82) from sports activity workers consisting of (42) males, (40) females, (44) holders of a bachelor's degree and (38)

holders of a master's degree. The main goal or objective of the study of a sample is to generalize its results to the original community from which it was derived. The research sample was randomly selected

**Means of collecting information used in research:**

1. Arabic Resources
2. Tests and Measurement
3. Internet
4. Questionnaire form for measuring (organizational efficiency).

**Search Tool:**

The researcher adopted the form as a research tool to measure the study of the phenomenon, which is the organizational efficiency of university championships.

**Determining the areas of the scale.**

After reviewing the theoretical studies and relevant research, and through the analysis of references and theoretical research related to the topic of organizational efficiency of tournament management, the researcher, in the light of these studies, was able to propose (5) main axes representing the dimensions of organizational efficiency (organizational planning axis) that measures the ability of the administration to set clear goals and effective action plans. The administrative organization axis measures the clarity of structures and tasks and the distribution of responsibilities. The communication axis measures the clarity and effectiveness of communication channels within the tournament administration. The monitoring and follow-up axis focuses on the extent of performance monitoring and continuous evaluation. The coordination axis measures the extent of harmony of efforts and the integration of roles within the team. Each axis includes a set of paragraphs that measure it. It is possible to rely on the five-point Likert scale (always, often, sometimes, a little, rarely) and present it to a group of experts and specialists in the field of sports management and administration from Sunday 12-1-2025. By presenting the proposed fields to the experts (7) experts and asking them to express their opinions, the experts expressed their approval of the proposed fields and their definitions and that they cover the scale according to their opinions, the fields were agreed upon

**Table (1).** Based on the response of experts on the areas of the organizational efficiency scale for the management of tournaments

	Axle	Approve	Disagr	Percenta	Not
	rs	ee	ge	es	
1	Organization al planning axis	7	0	100%	-
2	Administrati ve organization	7	0	100%	-
3	Communicati on Hub	7	0	100%	-
4	Controlling	7	0	100%	-
5	Coordination axis	7	0	100%	-

### Determining the paragraphs of the scale.

The researcher drafted the paragraphs of the scale in their initial form, which are (25) paragraphs distributed in (5) areas of the scale by (5) paragraphs for each of the fields. The paragraphs were presented to a group of experts for the purpose of evaluating and judging them in terms of their formulation and validity in measuring the organizational efficiency of workers in sports activity and fields and accepting the paragraphs that received a percentage of 75%. The observations made by the experts were all accepted.

**Table (2).** Based on the response of experts on the areas of the organizational efficiency scale for the management of tournaments

	<b>Organizational planning axis</b>	<b>Approvers</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1	Management sets strategic goals for university championships.	7	0	100%	-
2	Advance schedules shall be established for the implementation of the stages of the tournament.	7	0	100%	--
3	The available resources are taken into account when developing organizational plans.	7	0	100%	-
4	Emergency expectations and risks are taken into account at the planning stage.	6	1	85.7%	-
5	Clarity of objectives and prior organization Quality of administrative performance in university tournaments	7	0	100%	-
<b>Administrative organization</b>					
6	Clearly distribute tasks among team members.	6	1	85.7%	-
7	There is a structured mechanism for the distribution of roles before and during the tournament.	7	0	100%	-
8	Approved regulations are available for the administration of	7	0	100%	-

	university tournaments.				
9	Specializations and competencies in the formation of organizing committees.	6	1	85.7%	-
10	Non-distribution of tasks and responsibilities:	6	1	85.7%	-
<b>Communication Hub</b>					
11	Clear communication mechanisms exist between Organizing Committee members.	7	0	100%	-
12	Modern means of communication are used to facilitate the coordination of work.	7	0	100%	-
13	Meetings are run effectively and result in clear decisions.	7	0	100%	-
14	Staff suggestions are listened to on a regular basis.	6	1	85.7%	-
15	There is effective coordination between the different units participating in the tournament	6	1	85.7%	-
<b>Controlling</b>					
16	A mechanism shall be established to periodically follow up the stages of implementation.	6	1	85.7%	-
17	Performance notes are recorded during the tournament for immediate processing.	7	0	100%	-
18	Prepares post tournament management reports to evaluate the work.	7	0	100%	-
19	Errors are reviewed to avoid future occurrences.	6	1	85.7%	-
20	Having a clear control system that reduces the percentage of errors during the	6	1	85.7%	-

	implementation of the tournament events				
	<b>Coordination axis</b>				
21	The work is coordinated between the different committees before the tournament starts.	7	0	100%	-
22	The interactive relationship between the different elements of the organization is taken into account.	6	1	85.7%	-
23	All relevant authorities are involved in the preparation.	7	0	100%	-
24	The overlap between technical, administrative and logistical aspects shall be taken into account.	6	1	85.7%	-
25	The strength of the communication between the committees and the organizers depends on the flexibility of the work	6	1	85.7%	-

**Preparation of scale instructions.**

To complete the picture of the scale and apply it to the workers in the sports activity, the instructions for the scale were set because "ensuring the correct answer is by setting instructions that make it easier for the respondent to answer the correct answer (Mahjoob, 2001, p. 143)."Therefore, it is taken into account that it is easy and understandable, and that it suggests reassurance about the confidentiality of the answer in order for his answer to be frank and confident. They were also asked to answer all the paragraphs and not to leave any paragraph unanswered, which is for research purposes

**Calculating the Weights of Alternatives:**

The five-point scale adopted the Likert method in formulating the paragraphs of the scale's vocabulary, and it is similar to the Multiple Choice method, which is one of the common methods of measurement and research , as it provides the respondent with a position and asks him to determine his answer by choosing an alternative among several alternatives that have different weights) (Odeh, 1988, p. 40). The weights were calculated in a positive direction from (1-5) according to the alternatives , namely: the phrase (,always), the weight was given (5) degrees , and the phrase (often) , the weight was given (4) degrees , and the phrase (**sometimes**), the weight was given (3) degrees, and the phrase(slightly) ,

the weight was given (2) degrees, and the phrase (rarely), the weight was given (1) degrees. and reverse it in the negative direction

### **Construction Sample Experiment:**

The researcher conducted an experiment for the period from 20- 1 - 2025 until Wednesday 12 - 2 - 2025, as he distributed the forms of the organizational efficiency scale for the management of tournaments and collected them on the construction sample consisting of (70) workers in the sports activity in the Iraqi universities in (Baghdad, Diyala, Babil, Mustasiriya, the University of Technology, the Iraqi University, Al-Nahrain University, Ibn Sina University and Anbar University). They were randomly selected from the community of origin, as all the answers of the experiment sample were collected and unpacked, and he tried the measurement tools in the survey study and conducted the scientific transactions of the scale

### **Scientific transactions**

#### **Validity of the scale:**

##### **A: Content Validity.**

1. Apparent validity: One of the most important types of validity in measurements and indicates the relevance of the paragraph to the phenomenon to be measured. This indicator of validity is achieved " when a relevant person decides that the scale is appropriate for the characteristic to be measured , and this may be an expert". (Freeman, 1998, p. 90) The apparent validity of the scale was achieved when the organizational efficiency scale for tournament management among workers in sports activity in Iraqi universities was presented in its initial form to a group of experts to judge the validity of its paragraphs
2. Logical honesty: The availability of this type of honesty at the beginning of the preparation of the organizational efficiency scale for the management of championships among workers in sports activity in Iraqi universities through the definition and identification of its areas and paragraphs with the help of a group of experts

## **2. Content Validity**

### **1. Discriminatory force of paragraphs:**

"This method aims to estimate the validity of the test based on its ability to distinguish between those with high scores and those with low scores in the trait or ability measured by the test (Radwan, 2006, p. 244) ." The answers of all the experiment sample of (70) workers in sports activity in Iraqi universities were emptied. The total score for each of the forms was determined. The forms were arranged in descending order from the highest grade to the lowest grade. Then the upper (27%) was selected with (19) forms, and the lower (27%) with (19) forms of grades to represent the extremist group and exclude the middle (46%) with (30) forms and that the adoption of the 27% gives the largest size and differentiation. The (t.test) test was then used for the purpose of calculating the discrimination coefficient for each of the 25 paragraphs of the scale. The results showed that the calculated level of

significance is smaller than the value of the approved level of significance (0.05), which means the significance of the values of (T) calculated for all paragraphs and as shown in Table (3)

Table 3. Discrimination coefficient for each paragraph of the organizational efficiency scale for tournament management

PHRAS ES	Group	Arithmetical mean (Maths.)	Standard deviation	Calculated T value	Level of Significan ce	Significance of variances
<b>Organizational planning axis</b>						
1	Upper Group	4.1052 63	0.7374 68	6.0926 33	0,0 00	moral
	Lower Group	2.4736 84	0.9048 28			
2	Upper Group	3.5263 16	1.0202 63	5.4588 66	0,0 00	moral
	Lower Group	4321 67	0.6666			
3	Upper Group	3.7368 42	0.9334 59	7.6511 79	0,0 00	moral
	Lower Group	1.7368 42	0.6533 76			
4	Upper Group	4.1578 95	0.8983 42	3.3407 66	0,0 02	moral
	Lower Group	2.8421 05	1.4629 94			
5	Upper Group	3.4210 53	1.0173 93	2.1894 01	0.0 35	moral
	Lower Group	2.6842 11	1.0568 63			
<b>Administrative organization</b>						
1	Upp er Group	3.6842 11	0.8200 7	4.7964 65	0,0 00	moral
	Low er Group	2.1578 95	1.1186 88			
2	Upp er Group	4.3684 21	0.8306 98	7.5980 86	0,0 00	moral
	Low er Group	2.1578 95	0.9581 9			
3	Upp er Group	3.9473 68	1.3529 26	4.2137 2	0,0 00	corpor ate
	Low er Group	2.2105 26	1.1822 27			
4	Upp er Group	4.5789 47	0.6069 77	6.8372 66	0,0 00	corpor ate
	Low er Group	2.5789 47	1.1212 98			
5	Upp er Group	4.4736 84	0.7723 28	5.2706 29	0,0 00	moral
	Low er Group	- 0.0021*	0.9428 09			
<b>Communication Hub</b>						

1	Upp	4.2105	0.8549	91	5.1986	0,0	00	moral
	er Group	26	82					
2	Upp	4.1052	1.1969	56	4.5108	0,0	00	moral
	er Group	63	75					
3	Upp	3.8421	0.9581	48	3.5729	0,0	00	moral
	er Group	05	9					
4	Upp	4.7368	0.5619	91	6.5393	0,0	00	moral
	er Group	42	51					
5	Upp	4.5789	0.6069	07	7.0046	0,0	00	moral
	er Group	47	77					
<b>Controlling</b>								
1	Upp	4.6842	0.4775	95	15.876	0,0	00	moral
	er Group	11	67					
2	Upp	3.6842	1.1572	94	2.0497	.04	8	ate
	er Group	11	3					
3	Upp	3.8421	1.3849	75	2.1487	03	8	ate
	er Group	05	65					
4	Upp	4.4736	1.0202	78	2.7822	0.0	09	ate
	er Group	84	63					
5	Upp	4.4210	0.8377	2.	2.	0.0	28	ate
	er Group	53	08					
<b>Coordination axis</b>								
1	Upp	3.6315	1.0651	44	4.0105	0.0	00	ate
	er Group	79	3					
2	Upp	[0018	0.8819	08	4.7646	0.0	00	ate
	er Group	7]	17					
3	Upp	3.6842	1.0029	34	3.5910	0.0	01	ate
	er Group	11	2					

	Low	2.3157	0.7492				
	er Group	89	69				
4	Upp	4.1052	1.2425	2657	0.0	corpor	
	er Group	63	21		30	ate	
	Low	2.8421	0.8983				
	er Group	05	42				
5	Upp	3.8852	2521	4,543	0.0	corpor	
	er Group	63			00	ate	
	Low	1.8421	0.8342				
	er Group	05					

**Second: The coefficient of internal consistency (the relationship of the paragraph's degree to the total degree):**

The researcher used the simple correlation coefficient between the scale score and the paragraph, for paragraphs (25). All paragraphs showed internal consistency because the correlation coefficient for each of them is greater than the value of the table correlation coefficient of the level of significance (0.05), thus leaving ( 25) paragraphs to measure the organizational efficiency of tournament management. Table ( 4) shows the internal consistency coefficient.

**Table (4). Pearson's simple correlation coefficients to examine the validity of the paragraphs of the organizational efficiency scale in an internal consistency method**

Paragra ph No.	Correlati on coefficient	err or level	Paragra ph No.	Correlati on coefficient	err or level
<b>Organizational planning axis</b>			3	402	0,0
1	0.278	0.0	4	0.338	0.0
2	0.432	0.0	5	418	0.0
3	0,294	0.0	<b>Controlling</b>		
4	0,387	0.0	1	277	0.0
5	0.439	0.0	2	502	0.0
<b>Administrative organization</b>			3	305	0.0
1	478	0,0	4	422	0,0
2	0,521	0,0	5	0,561	0,0
3	0,301	0,0	<b>Coordination axis</b>		
4	.427	0,0	1	0.291	0,0
5	342	0,0	2	603	0,0
<b>Communication Hub</b>			3	621	0.0

1	504	0,0	4	493	0,0
2	0.611	0,0	5	0.318	0,0

**Scale reliability:**

**First: Half-split method**

The halving method was adopted because it is one of the most stable methods used on the sample. The value of the correlation coefficient between the two halves was ( 0.791) at an error level of (0,000), so the (Spearman-Brown equation) was used. Therefore, the value of the stability coefficient of the half of the test was adjusted by the Spearman-Brawn stability equation. The value of the stability coefficient of the scale was (0.883), and this is a good indicator, which is a high stability coefficient, which can be relied upon to estimate the stability of the test.

**Second: The (Cronbach coefficient) method** for calculating stability with the Cronbach alpha coefficient was based on the same scale construction sample and the value of the stability coefficient was (0.782)

**Objectivity of the scale:**

It turned out that all the statements were clear to the sample, as they are characterized by the fact that the alternatives are multiple choice and do not accept the answer to more than one alternative, and there is no statement for the open answer, as the questionnaire is highly objective and it is not possible to differ on the scores obtained by the members of the sample.

**Description of the Tournament Organizational Efficiency Scale:**

The organizational efficiency scale for tournament management *consists* of (25) paragraphs distributed in five fields of the scale with (5) paragraphs for each field and the five-point rating scale (very much, very much, little, rarely, no). The lowest score is (25), the neutrality score is (75) and the highest score is (125)

**Levels of measurements**

Levels of the scale were found based on the range method according to the estimation of the scores of the fifth scale (Likert method). The level was divided as follows:

Table (5). Shows percentage and levels

Phrases	Level	Score	Percentage	Level Type
1	The first level:	From 1 to less 1.8	0.2to 0.36	Low
2	Level 2	1.81 to less 2.6	0.36 to 0.52	Pass
3	Level 3	2,61to the lowest 3,4	0.52 to 0.68	Arithmetic
4	4th Level	3,41 to below 4,2	0.68 to 0.84	High
5	Fifth Level	4,21 to the lowest 5	0.84 to 100	steep, taunt

**Applying the scale (the main experiment).**

The researcher applied the organizational efficiency scale for tournament management to a sample of the random method. The researcher distributed the scale to a sample consisting of (82) members of the sample working in sports activity in Iraqi universities, divided into (42) males, (40) females, (44) holders of a bachelor's degree, (38) PhD holders and holders of a master's degree. The scale was distributed on Sunday from 16/3/2025 to Thursday 17/4/2025 and was treated statistically to extract the results.

**Statistical means:**

The statistical data was processed by the use of ready-made software (SPSS) \*

**Result and Discussion**

**Presentation of the results of the organizational efficiency scale of the tournament management:**

The means and standard deviations of the scores of the respondents of the study sample were calculated on all statements of the organizational efficiency scale for the management of championships for workers in sports activity in Iraqi universities according to the five axes of the means and standard deviations in the leg and branch methods and Table (6) shows that:

**Table (6):** Results of the T-test for one sample to find out the significance of the level of the organizational efficiency scale of the tournament management for the research sample

Rank	Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Hypothetical	Amount of product	Sig	Sig	Level
2	Organizational planning	7.325	1.4%	.465	86	5	.485	.000	( corporate	High
1	Administrative Organization	25	2.5%	.645	.021	5	43	.000	( corporate	High
4	CONNECTION:	4.91	8.4%	.982	74	5	21.	.864	( Random	Medium
3	Controlling	6.06	9.8%	.212	841	5	.121	.014	( corporate	Medium
5	Focal	4.275	7.6%	.55	8052	5	1.02	21.	( Random	Medium
<b>Indicator score</b>		795		.231	.541	5	13	.000	( corporate	Medium

At a significance level (0.05)

**Discussion of the results of the organizational efficiency scale of the tournament management:**

The level of the organizational efficiency scale for the management of university championships was with an average degree and an arithmetic average of (80.79) and at a

hypothetical level of (75) and a value of (T) equal to (7.013), which indicates the significance of the differences, that is, the degree of organizational efficiency is higher than expected and that workers in sports activities believe that the organizational efficiency of the management of championships has an average level, but it is acceptable, but it is not at a high level, which requires improving some aspects related to administrative effectiveness. Some axes also showed relative weakness, which affected the evaluation (achieves Good organization optimizes the use of material and human energies, and achieves the needs of society in a general manner as long as it is the tool by which the administration can achieve the objectives). (Hassan, 2006, p. 37) The results indicate the existence of a clear and acceptable administrative organization in terms of the distribution of tasks and resource management, which enhances the efficiency of implementation. The administrative organization was ranked first and at a high level. The reason is the clarity of the administrative structure of the tournament management, the existence of a division of tasks and responsibilities between the organizational committees, the commitment to the administrative hierarchy and decision-making powers, the adoption of management on clear organizational bases, as well as the existence of accumulated experiences of workers in the organization of tournaments and the availability of approved organizational and administrative regulations that facilitated the organizational processes. (Zainab Jabbar 2013) confirmed (that one of the most important reasons for the conflict within the organization is interference in the affairs of other departments) (Jabbar, 2013, p. 48) and that organizational planning came in second place, and the researcher believes that one of the most important reasons is the existence of preliminary planning for dates and events approved by the Ministry . And rely on initial timetables for accurate follow-up of implementation. Despite the high average, the random statistical significance indicates that the respondents' opinions on the effectiveness of planning vary. Plans may exist but are not rigorously implemented, or they are not flexible and realistic. (Chelladurai 2005) "Planning should be based on prior studies and real data, with the ability to adapt to circumstances." (Chelladurai, 2005, pp. 95-112)"The control and follow-up came in third place, as the result indicates the existence of control, but to a medium degree, and the researcher believes that the system is partial control of the stages of the tournament. There is a weakness in real-time monitoring and evaluation during implementation. The follow-up may be formal or postponed until the end of the event. The reason is due to poor coordination between the Follow-up Committee and senior management. Failure to allocate clear oversight responsibilities., which may allow some gaps to emerge during implementation. Here, Mr. Jaafar stresses that "the administrative systems that are applied in Iraqi universities are taken from school sports, and they have become not in line with the rapid progress in universities, so we need to find an administration at a more advanced level in guiding university sports, in line with the specifications of the successful administration to absorb the burdens of the programmed sports administrative work." (Hassan, 2006, p. 35) As studies show, "control is a corrective tool and must be continuous, direct and accurate, otherwise it becomes ineffective in achieving the objectives of the organization." (Robbins & Coulter, 2012, pp. 520-533) As for the axis of communication, the fourth solution, the results were a weak average, and the

researcher believes that the real reasons for this weakness are weakness in the communication channels between the committees. Delay in the circulation of information or the issuance of instructions. And the absence of electronic forms or official mail to communicate. Relying on personal rather than formal communications despite having a unified communication plan or protocol. In addition, there is a lack of use of modern communication technologies. Poor communication leads to confusion in carrying out tasks and delays in responding. Here he confirms ( "Daft 2015"), the success of administrative work depends to a large extent on the accuracy and speed of communication between the different levels of work " (Daft, 2015, p. 395) and in the last place is the axis of coordination, as coordination is one of the weakest axes, and it directly affects the quality of overall performance. The random result suggests the lack of clarity or intersection of roles as a result of weakness in performing the role in one of the departments. Repeating some tasks between more than one committee. And the lack of coordination between the schedules of events. Weak communication between the support and executive committees. The reasons may be the lack of a central coordination committee. Weakness of periodic coordination meetings before and during the tournament. And rely on individual jurisprudence instead of institutional integration. Here, both (Majeed Ibrahim and Ali Haddad) emphasize coordination as "the method that the administration skillfully uses to lead a unit and uphold the performance of employees after distributing responsibilities to them in a way that ensures the progress to achieve the goals (Ibrahim & Haddad, 1986, p. 125)." The lack of coordination causes chaos and weakens the organizational response to any emergency. The results were this way

**Presenting the results of the demographic differences between the opinions of males and females working in sports activity on the scale of organizational efficiency of tournament management:**

The researcher presented the results of the differences between males and females on the scale of organizational efficiency of tournament management, through the arithmetic mean, and the value of (t) calculated.

**Table (7).** Shows the arithmetic media, standard deviations, the value of (t) calculated, the level of error, and the significance of the differences between the male and female research groups in the organizational efficiency scale of tournament management

Metric	Measurement Unit	Males		Females		Calculated t value	Error level	Significance
		Number	Mean	Number	Mean			
Organizational effectiveness	Degree	22	651	68	771	2.065	0.027	0.000

\* Moral at the error level (0.05) if the error level is less than (0.05). and the degree of freedom is 80

### **Discussing the results of the demographic differences between the opinions of males and females working in sports activity on the scale of organizational efficiency of tournament management:**

The results of Table (7) showed that there are statistically significant differences between the opinions of males and females working in sports activity on the organizational efficiency of university tournaments management, at the level of significance (0.05), where the arithmetic mean for males was (82.422) while the arithmetic mean for females was (79.168) and the calculated value of t: (2.065) at the level of error: (0.027). The significance indicates significance. The researcher sees the difference between the average males and females indicating that males have evaluated organizational efficiency to a higher degree than females, although the differences are not significant in terms of numerical value, but they are statistically significant. The most likely reasons for high male evaluation may be the nature of administrative tasks and competencies. Males often assume direct leadership or executive roles in organizing committees, which gives them a broader vision of organizational procedures, and the ability to evaluate them more positively. Males may have greater field opportunities to participate in the preparation and implementation of tournaments, gaining organizational experience that influences their overall outlook. Female participation may be limited to auxiliary or support tasks, leaving them with inadequate communication, coordination, or access to the full organizational structure. Some educational institutions may also be limited in engaging females as leaders in fieldwork, which reduces their sense of organizational efficiency of management. It is therefore possible for males to have more diverse previous organizational experiences, while females' experiences are limited in time or function, which affects their impressions. ("Chelladurai 2005") indicates that the evaluation of organizational efficiency is affected by multiple factors, including the role of the individual in the organization (leadership / assistant), the duration of experience, and the type of participation (field / administrative / supervisory) (Chelladurai, 2005, pp. 95-112). Practical engagement in organizational tasks creates a positive mental image of efficiency, especially if responsibilities and roles are understood. Therefore, the results showed that there is a fundamental difference in the male and female view of organizational efficiency, and this is explained by the nature of the roles and experiences that each of them goes through within the tournament management structure.

### **Presentation of the results of the differences according to the educational achievement of the employees in the sports activity on the scale of organizational efficiency of the championships management:**

The researcher presented the results of the differences between holders of a doctorate, master's degree and holders of a bachelor's degree in the measure of organizational efficiency of tournament management, through the arithmetic mean, and the value of (t) calculated:

**Table (8).** Shows the arithmetic media, standard deviations, the value of (t) calculated, the level of error and the significance of the differences between the two research groups

according to the certificate in the organizational efficiency scale of the tournament management

c	Metri	Mea surement Unit	Graduat e degrees (38)		Bachelo rs (44)		Ca lculated t value	e rror level	Si g nificance
			ou will	r	ou will	r			
	Orga nizational effectiveness	Degr ee of	60	651	6 (73- 78)	341	1 21	.000	0 co rporate

\* Moral at the error level (0.05) if the error level is less than (0.05). The degree of freedom is 80\*

**Discussing the results of the differences according to the educational achievement of the employees in the sports activity on the scale of organizational efficiency of tournament management:**

These results indicate that PhD workers rated organizational efficiency higher than their baccalaureate counterparts, with a statistical difference that is significant and influential. Perhaps one of the most important possible reasons for the high evaluation of PhDs is the advanced academic and administrative experience of PhDs. They often have longer years of experience in university work, which enables them to better understand the structure of organization, planning, and administrative supervision in tournaments. Being familiar with the concepts of sports management and leadership, which enhances the ability to evaluate organizational systems more efficiently. PhD holders hold supervisory or leadership positions in sports activity, giving them a holistic view of all aspects of organizational management. They can have a direct role in tournament organizing or oversight committees, reflecting a more comprehensive and realistic assessment. Unlike their fellow baccalaureate holders, many baccalaureate holders may be at the beginning of their careers, and have not yet been involved in frequently planning or leading sports tournaments. Their role in the organizational structure is limited and they are assigned executive tasks without engaging in administrative or supervisory aspects, which affects their general perception of organizational efficiency. Therefore, we believe that differences in management evaluation are affected by the academic level, as higher educational attainment is often associated with an increased ability for critical analysis and advanced management understanding. Robbins & Coulter (2012) also points out that experience and academic level play a direct role in perceiving and understanding organizational efficiency, especially in complex work environments such as organizing sporting tournaments. This is an indication of the importance of investing highly qualified cadres in leading and organizing university sports tournaments. (Robbins & Coulter, 2012, p. 520)

**Conclusion**

1. The results of the study show that the administrative organization and organizational planning received the highest ratings among the fields, which indicates that there is a good administrative and structural basis.

2. The areas of communication and coordination scored relatively low, indicating poor integration and communication between committees and organizational units.
3. The overall organizational competency assessment has reached a significant average level, which indicates that management has organizational components but needs qualitative improvements.
4. The results showed that there were significant differences in favor of males, as males assessed organizational efficiency to a higher degree than females, compared to females who may face poor opportunities for actual participation or limited opportunities in organizational roles.
5. Moral differences were found in favor of holders of higher certificates, which indicates that the level of educational achievement affects individuals' perception of organizational efficiency. This is attributed to the broader managerial experiences, leadership positions, and deeper academic insight of PhD holders, compared to their colleagues with undergraduate degrees.

### **Recommendations**

1. Strengthening aspects of communication and coordination by establishing effective communication channels, and scheduling periodic meetings between committees.
2. Reviewing the organizational structures of university championships and defining roles accurately, thus reducing overlap between committees.
3. Build a computerized monitoring and follow-up system to measure organizational performance at each stage of the tournament.
4. Enabling females to participate actively in all stages of organizing tournaments, by involving them in technical and executive committees.
5. Achieving the principle of equal opportunities between males and females in the appointment within the organizational committees and the distribution of administrative tasks.
6. Provide professional development and management training programs for master's holders to enhance their organizational skills and increase their efficiency
7. Benefit from the expertise of PhD holders in the development of regulations and the design of training programs for sports management.

### **References**

- Ahmed, S., & Khan, M. (2024). Enhancing organizational efficiency in university sports through digital transformation. *Journal of Sports Management and Technology*, 15(3), 211–225.
- Al-Sadawi, M. A., & Al-Janabi, S. A. (2013). *Scientific Research Tools in Physical Education*, 1st ed. Jordan: Arab Community Library for Publishing and Distribution.
- Barbosa, R., & Nunes, P. (2023). Leadership styles and organizational performance in collegiate sports events. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 18(2), 157–170.
- Chelladurai, P. (2005). *Managing organizations for sport and physical activity*. . . Holcomb Hathaway.
- Chen, Y., & Wang, L. (2023). Communication effectiveness and coordination in multi-team sports event management. *Event Management*, 27(4), 509–523.

- Daft, R. L. (2015). *Management*. Cengage Learning. (12th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- eads, A. R. (2001). *Scientific research methods: in the social sciences*. Jordan: Dar Al-Shorouk.
- Fathi, A., & Al-Hassan, K. (2024). Strategic planning and administrative structures in university-level sports championships. *Sport, Education and Society*, 29(5), 615–631.
- Freeman, f. s. (1998). *Theory and Praction of Psychological Testing*. New York.
- Gómez, A., & López, J. (2022). Evaluating organizational effectiveness in student sports programs. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 22(1), 95–112.
- Hassan, H. J. (2006). *A proposed organizational structure for the directorates of physical education in Iraqi universities and ways to develop them*. Baghdad: PhD Thesis - University of Baghdad - College of Physical Education.
- Hassan, N., & Ibrahim, R. (2023). Organizational communication and performance outcomes in sports departments. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, 13(2), 245–259.
- Ibrahim, M., & Haddad, A. (1986). *Educational administration, its theoretical foundations and scientific fields*. baghdad: University Press.
- Jabbar, Z. (2013). *Constructing a scale for organizational conflict management strategies among the sports federations' administrations in the Iraqi National Olympic Committee*. Master's Thesis, Faculty of Physical Education.
- Jeong, S., & Park, H. (2022). Gender differences in perceptions of organizational efficiency in university sports. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Sports Science*, 11(3), 201–215.
- Kim, J., & Lee, D. (2021). Developing indicators for assessing the organizational efficiency of intercollegiate tournaments. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 13(4), 467–482.
- Mahjoob, W. (2001). *Scientific research and its methods*. Baghdad: Directorate of Dar Al-Kutub for Printing and Publishing.
- Martínez, C., & Silva, J. (2024). Enhancing coordination and communication in sports management through digital platforms. *Journal of Sports Administration*, 19(1), 34–50.
- Mensah, K., & Boateng, S. (2020). Human resource readiness and its impact on sports event organization. *Journal of Sports Economics & Management*, 12(3), 301–318.
- Odeh, A. (1988<sup>Ⓜ</sup>). *Measurement and evaluation in the teaching process*,. Jordan: 2nd ed., Dar Al-Amal Publishing and Distribution.
- Oliveira, P., & Costa, A. (2021). Planning and control mechanisms in the organization of university sporting events. *Sport Management Review*, 24(6), 782–799.
- Radwan, M. N.-D. (2006). *Introduction to Measurement in Physical Education and Sports*. Cairo: Book Center for Publishing.
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2012). . *Management*. Prentice Hall. (11th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Roberts, M., & Taylor, S. (2022). The role of monitoring and evaluation systems in sports organizational performance. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 46(5), 551–569.
- Singh, R., & Patel, K. (2023). Bridging communication gaps in collegiate sports administration. *Journal of Sport Communication*, 16(2), 128–144.

- 
- Tuncer, G., & Yildiz, E. (2019). Coordination challenges in managing inter-university sports events: A multi-case study. *International Journal of Sports Management*, 20(4), 401–418.
- Zhao, X., & Liu, P. (2024). The influence of organizational planning on the success of university sports tournaments. *Frontiers in Sports Management*, 3(2), 199–213.