Physical Education, Health and Social Sciences

https://journal-of-social-education.org E-ISSN: 2958-5996

P-ISSN: 2958-5988

AI-Based Transformation of Global Sports and Education: Integrating General and Special Education, Mainstream and Adaptive Sports, Personalized Training, Fitness and Athlete Development for the Future

Bilal Rehman, Qudsia Bari, Sanam Altaf

[1] M. Phil Scholar in Department of Sports Sciences and Physical Education Al-Hamd Islamic University, Islamabad. **Corresponding Author:** Email: bilalgovpk88@gmail.com
[2] M. Phil Scholar in Department of Sports Sciences and Physical Education Al-Hamd Islamic University, Islamabad. Email: qudsiabari6@gmail.com
[3] M. Phil Scholar in Department of Sports Sciences and Physical Education Al-Hamd Islamic University, Islamabad. Email: sanamnajib28@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.63163/jpehss.v4i1.1747

Abstract:
Artificial intelligence (AI) is a growing force in the world of education, sport science, fitness, coaching and athlete development. This could be used in adaptive learning systems, accessible learning resources, motion analysis, workload monitoring, risk of injury support, tactical analysis, and individualized training. The article explores the potential of AI in linking general and special education to mainstream and adaptive sport, and the conditions that are required for equitable and responsible implementation. It includes a review of the literature and an illustrative analysis of a set of simulated surveys with 50 records. There are five composite domains in the simulated dataset: personalized learning, inclusive and adaptive sport, fitness and performance, athlete development and ethics/accessibility concerns. The mean scores were between 3.32 and 3.64 on a five-point scale, illustrated. The mean for personalized learning was highest at M = 3.64, SD = 0.68, and the means for ethics and accessibility concerns were at M = 3.32, SD = 0.72. This is not an observation of "real" participants and any conclusions should not be made based on the results. They have been added just to illustrate the possible format for a results section and statistical tables. AI has been suggested to assist in personalization, feedback, analysis, and accessibility, but the advantages are contingent upon the accuracy of the data, the professional oversight by the designers, the inclusivity of the design, maintaining user privacy, making the system transparent, and ensuring equal opportunities for access. Ir further research should be conducted with real subjects and methodological procedures that are ethically approved, to test these applications.

Keywords: Intelligence, Physical Education, Special Education, Adaptive Sports, Personalized Learning, Sports Performance, Athlete Development, Inclusion, Data Ethics.

Introduction

Artificial intelligence is a field of computer science that deals with the simulation of human intelligence in machines and computers and their applications to enable them to perform tasks that typically require human intelligence, such as pattern recognition, prediction, language processing, and decision making. AI tools can be applied in education to tailor learning content, give feedback, aid assessment, and aid teachers in planning. For sport and physical activity, AI can be applied to

video analysis, movement estimation, wearable sensor data processing, tracking training loads, and making tactical or performance decisions. Recent reviews outline a wide and growing array of sport applications, and highlight the challenges of data quality, privacy, explainability and organisation adoption (Zhou et al., 2025; Vec et al., 2024).

The possibilities of AI are not confined to the realm of top-tier sports or highly technologic universities. Other areas of general education, special education, physical education, community recreation and adaptive sport can also be enhanced with systems tailored to the individual's needs. For instance, a learning platform could provide various ways in which instructional content can be presented, and a movement-analysis application might be used by a coach to give visual feedback. Assistive technologies can support participation for people with access needs, but cannot address inaccessible facilities, financial barriers, social stigma or lack of trained technology providers.

The question isn't so much whether AI was replace educators, coaches, clinicians or athletes, but how. It's about how AI can support human judgment, ensure inclusion and fair outcomes, and respect rights. In this article, we was consider this question by conducting a narrative review and by providing an example of a clearly labelled simulated survey.

Aim and Objectives

The overarching goal is to explore how AI can be a tool to bridge education, inclusive sport, fitness and athlete development.

1. To explain uses of AI in general and special education.
2. To discuss mainstream and adaptive sports participation with the help of AI.
3. To explore potential applications for special training, fitness monitoring and performance feedback.
4. To think about how AI can be used for athletes identification and long-term development.
5. To detect ethical, technical and financial challenges and accessibility problem.
6. To practice descriptive statistics, with a pretend 50-record set.

Use of AI in general education and personalized learning

Intelligent tutoring, adaptive learning systems, automated feedback, language support, learning analytics, and generative tools to help with explanations or drafting are examples of AI-powered aspects of education. Wang et al. (2024) conducted a systematic review to identify the primary focus areas and research trends of AI for education. Bayly-Castaneda et al. (2024) examined the potential of personalized learning paths using AI and found adaptive technologies and Generative Language Models (LLMs) are increasingly being studied. Such tools can assist teachers to change the pacing, the presentation and the level of instruction, but any recommendation made by an algorithm is not necessarily pedagogically sound. The accuracy, alignment to curriculum, age appropriateness and suitability for individual learners were checked by teachers.

AI: Artificial Intelligence in Special education and accessibility

AI can help in special education with the following: Text-to-speech, speech-to-text, captioning, translation, simplified language, alternative communication, and adaptive presentation of content. These applications can lower some barriers for learners with sensory, communication, cognitive and/or learning-related needs. They are effective if they can be made accessible, are available in multiple languages, can be made compatible with assistive devices, and can be utilised by the learner and/or the families to manage their own information. AI should not be misapplied to label, track, and restrict students for the sake of an educational purpose without context and human review.

AI and the Masses (Adaptive Sports)

Video-based action recognition, movement tracking, tactical pattern analysis, workload estimation and performance dashboards are examples of applications in the sport domain. Zhou et al. (2025) provide applications in the fields of biomechanics, performance enhancement, sports medicine, health monitoring, coaching, and talent identification. Vec et al. (2024) give an overview of real-time AI techniques in sport and the significance of data processing and operational application. For mainstream sport, these tools can enable a more specific feedback process for coaches. In the context of adaptive sport, AI-powered assistive technology and personalized interfaces can help provide feedback on the movements and facilitate engagement. In a narrative review which examined disability sport, AI was identified as a potential enabler of participation and inclusion, although there were still identified environmental and practical barriers (Journal of Bodywork and Movement Therapies, 2025).

PTSD is not a condition to be taken lightly or ignored. PTSD is not something that can be brushed aside or ignored. Information on movement, training exposure, heart rate, sleep and perceived-exertion can be combined together in wearable devices, video systems and training-management platforms. If valid and interpreted correctly, these data can be used to inform coaches of workload and recovery adjustments. Risk scores based on AI should not be used as a diagnosis or as a certain prediction of injury. The medical recommendations, athlete feedback, context and uncertainty about the underlying model should all be taken into account when making training decisions. Young athletes' data should be protected with additional safeguards and access and retention should be limited.

Athlete identification and long-term development

AI can help with structuring performance indicators, detecting trends in repeated evaluations, and aiding in planning for future growth. However, talent identification is particularly susceptible to bias when there is a disproportionate number of participants from specific regions, socioeconomic groups, body types, or competition pathways. Past performance is no indicator of future performance and algorithms shouldn't be the only gatekeeper for selection. The factors of skill acquisition, motivation, health, access to coaching, maturation, and opportunities to participate should be taken into account when developing systems.

Ethics and governance issues

The general principles of using generative AI in education as outlined by UNESCO are: to adopt a human-centred approach, ensure data privacy, use generative AI in an age-appropriate manner, and institutional readiness (Miao & Holmes, 2023). The same rules apply to sport: the participants should know what is being collected, why, who can have access to it, and how decisions are made. There are several security, bias, accessibility, model performance, procurement terms and appeal review routes to consider for an organization. The output of AI should be explainable, but not so much that it is impenetrable for the context, and still be meaningful to human oversight.

Conceptual Framework

Responsible integration of AI is proposed in this article as having five elements: (1) accessible data collection, (2) individualised analysis and feedback, (3) educator, coach and participant-led interpretation, (4) inclusive implementation, (5) continuous evaluation. The framework sees AI as an assistance mechanism and does not rely on AI algorithms to make decisions. Its success should be measured not just by the amount of data it collects, but by educational progress, participation, fitness and skill development, safety, user experience, equity and privacy.

5. Methodology

Design

The article uses a narrative literature overview and an illustrative quantitative example. It is not a systematic review, meta-analysis or an empirical survey that has been finished. No exhaustive literature search was made, but selected to provide examples of relevant work on AI in education, personalized learning, sport and inclusion.

Illustrative dataset

A spreadsheet with 50 simulated respondent records were provided to illustrate how responses from the participants could be summarized. The workbook contains demographic fields, 15 five-point Likert items, five composite scores, descriptive statistics, correlations and frequency tables. The records were created for demonstration purposes and are not a true reflection of recruited participants, questionnaires collected, or actual opinions. There is no claim to true participant recruitment, consent process, or data collection.

Measures and scoring

The following are illustrative composite domains: personalized learning, inclusive/adaptive sports, fitness/performance, athlete development, and ethics/accessibility concerns. Items are rated on a Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The composite scores are the means of the items within each domain. Scores above the 0-describe high level of agreement with statements in that domain; in the ethics/accessibility domain scores above 0 mean more concern rather than more positive evaluation of AI.

Analysis

Descriptive statistics include means, standard deviations, minimums and maximums. The Pearson correlations are presented as illustrative examples only. No inferential tests were run, no confidence intervals were calculated, and the scales were not validated or reliability estimates were not made, nor were confounding variables adjusted. The statistics should not be interpreted as indicators of any real population as the data simulated.

Results: Illustrative Simulated Data

The tables below contain only the simulated data. They have been added to show an example of how results might be reported. Prior to submission as an empirical study they must be replaced or clearly differentiated from results of real participants

Table # 1: Composite-domain descriptive statistics

Domain	N	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Personalized learning	50	3.64	0.68	2.00	5.00
Inclusive and adaptive sports	50	3.50	0.63	1.33	4.67
Fitness and performance	50	3.59	0.75	2.00	4.67
Athlete development	50	3.60	0.66	2.33	4.67
Ethics and accessibility concerns	50	3.32	0.72	1.67	5.00

In the simulated records, personalized learning had the highest average score (M = 3.64, SD = 0.68), followed by athlete development (M = 3.60, SD = 0.66) and fitness/performance (M = 3.59, SD = 0.75). Inclusive/adaptive sports averaged 3.50 (SD = 0.63). Ethics and accessibility concerns averaged 3.32 (SD = 0.72). These differences are descriptive only and should not be interpreted as statistically significant.

Table # 2: Simulated demographic profile

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age group	18–24	17	34%
Age group	25–34	18	36%
Age group	35–44	8	16%
Age group	45+	7	14%
Gender	Male	29	58%
Gender	Female	19	38%
Gender	Prefer not to say	2	4%
Respondent role	Teacher/Educator	16	32%
Respondent role	Sports Coach	11	22%
Respondent role	Athlete	10	20%
Respondent role	Sports Science Student	8	16%
Respondent role	Adaptive Sports Professional	5	10%

The simulated sample included 50 records. The largest age category was 25–34 years (36%), followed by 18–24 years (34%). Male records accounted for 58%, female records for 38%, and 4% preferred not to disclose gender. Teachers/educators formed the largest role group (32%). These proportions describe the constructed dataset and are not estimates of a real workforce or population.

Table # 3: Simulated Pearson correlation matrix

Domain	1	2	3	4	5
Personalized learning	1.000	0.175	0.103	0.174	−0.196
Inclusive/adaptive sports	0.175	1.000	0.326	0.297	0.041
Fitness/performance	0.103	0.326	1.000	0.450	0.175
Athlete development	0.174	0.297	0.450	1.000	−0.011
Ethics/accessibility concerns	−0.196	0.041	0.175	−0.011	1.000

The largest off-diagonal correlation in the simulated matrix was between fitness/performance and athlete development (r = .450), followed by inclusive/adaptive sports and fitness/performance (r = .326). These values are included as a formatting example only. No significance tests or confidence intervals were calculated; correlation does not establish causation, and simulated correlations have no empirical evidentiary value.

Results summary

The accompanying tables illustrate the reporting of composite means, sample characteristics and correlations in a study. They don't demonstrate that these attitudes are held by teachers, coaches,

sportsmen, or adaptive-sport practitioners. A true study should declare the recruitment process, the response rate, the number of missing data, validity and reliability of the instrument, ethical approval and analysis decisions.

Discussion

The paper in the literature indicates that AI can assist in more personalized learning and sport participation by assisting professionals in organizing information, customizing feedback and finding patterns which are difficult to observe in a regular way. In the education sector, AI can provide alternative explanations, language assistance, and adaptive practice. Sport: Video and sensor analytics can be used to provide technical feedback, feedback on workload, and planning for performance. When the tool is offered to motivate and address a known need and validated through proper outcomes, those opportunities are the most likely to be credible.

The simulated results are consistent with a plausible scenario where the respondents might say that they agree somewhat with each other regarding foreseeable benefits for learning, fitness, inclusion and athlete development. But, since the data were collected rather than generated they can not confirm it. They need not be used to imply that AI enhances performance, inclusion, decreases injury, or is embraced by professionals.

Implementing inclusively is especially important. A technology could be technically advanced but prohibitively expensive, require internet connectivity that is not available, a language the participant does not speak or a physical interaction that is not accessible for disability. It is important to involve students, athletes with disabilities, educators, coaches, families, and experts in the co-design process to uncover barriers that might not be apparent to developers. This system cannot be said to be the same system in all sports, with all age groups, or for all disabilities, or all cultures or all educational contexts.

The human element is still a crucial part. Teachers have to make a judgement of the accuracy and appropriateness of generated explanations for learning purposes. It's important for coaches to "read" the analytics in the context of training and experience. The health professional needs to be accountable for clinical judgments. Ideally, participants should have a means for asking questions about or objecting to the data-driven recommendations. To avoid automation bias, these safeguards can be put in place to prevent users from taking a system's output at face value because it seems objective or technical.

Practical Implications

For educational institutions

It is important for institutions to start by having a clearly identified educational problem, test the tools in small groups involving different learners, train teachers to use the tools, and develop rules for privacy, acceptable use, verification, and accessibility. AI shouldn't be used to replace human interaction between teacher and student, but to augment it.

For Physical Education and Sport Organisations

See video feedback, activity monitoring, and training dashboards in small pilots at schools, universities, clubs, and federations. They are expected to describe the purpose of the collection, restrict access to collected data, and refrain from relying on unvalidated scores for selection, discipline, medical decisions, etc.

Adaptive and Disability sport

It is important that persons with disabilities are included in design teams from the outset. Usability, comfort, autonomy, participation, cost and assistive technology compatibility should be evaluated.

When developing software, the availability of equipment and trained personnel should be taken into account.

For coaches and athlete-development staff
In addition to direct observation, athlete feedback, training history, maturation, recovery and professional judgment, AI outputs should be used as a complement. Models for subgroup performance should be audited and athletes need to understand and challenge decisions that impact on them.

The ethical, technical and practical challenges.
Privacy and security
Sensitive data may be related to movement, biometrics, education and disabilities. Only take what is necessary, establish retention periods, limit access and provide any third-party processing information.

Bias and representativeness
Models that perform poorly for groups that were under-represented in the training data. Test tools for ages, genders, disability groups, sports, languages and settings that are relevant.

Accuracy and explainability
Predictions and generated content can turn out to be incorrect. Explain uncertainty, check outputs and take human review in proportion to the risk.

Equity and affordability
There can be increased gaps between groups due to costs, availability of devices, Internet access and digital literacy. Offer low-cost options and offline/low bandwidth options when available.

Professional capacity
There is a need for training for teachers, coaches and administrators to understand outputs and understand the limitations. Support, evaluation and exit plans should all be part of a procurement.

Over-surveillance and autonomy
Ongoing supervision can negatively affect trust and wellbeing. Ensure visibility, proportionality and consent and good governance regarding participation.

Recommendations and Future Research.
1. Perform studies in accordance with ethical guidelines with real participants and open recruitment.
2. Analyze and report internal consistency and construct validity of the survey instruments before interpreting composite scores.
3. Utilize mixed methods designs that incorporate survey data, interviews, observations, performance measures, and participant feedback.
4. Compare AI supported and traditional approaches with appropriate study designs and clearly defined outcome.
5. Engage people with disabilities and underrepresented groups in design, recruiting and evaluation.
6. Use of p-values alone; include missing data, uncertainty, effect size, confidence intervals, and limitations.

7. Implement institutional guidelines for privacy, informed consent, data storage, security, human surveillance and appeals.
8. Assess long-term results such as learning progress, participation, wellbeing, skills, safety and cost-effectiveness.

Conclusion

AI can play a role in the future of education and sport, such as by helping to personalise learning, to make it accessible, to analyse movement, to provide feedback during training and to develop athletes. The value was not relying solely on automation but on the accuracy, inclusiveness, affordability, privacy aspects, and the direction of qualified professionals in the systems. General and special education, mainstream and adaptive sports, fitness and athlete development should be considered as interrelated fields where technology is used to enhance human ability and involvement. This article uses a simulated 50-record analysis and reports a format only and not an empirical finding. Further studies are needed to validate the value, equity and sustainability of the benefits generated by AI using real users and strong methodologies.

References

Bayly-Castaneda, K. B., Ramirez-Montoya, M. S., & Morita-Alexander, A. (2024). Crafting personalized learning paths with AI for lifelong learning: A systematic literature review. Frontiers in Education, 9, 1424386. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1424386

Journal of Bodywork and Movement Therapies. (2025). The potential role of artificial intelligence to promote the participation and inclusion in physical exercise and sports for people with disabilities: A narrative review. Journal of Bodywork and Movement Therapies, 42, 127–131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbmt.2024.12.024

Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research

Vec, V., Tomažič, S., Kos, A., et al. (2024). Trends in real-time artificial intelligence methods in sports: A systematic review. Journal of Big Data, 11, 148. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-024-01026-0

Wang, S., Wang, F., Zhu, Z., Wang, J., Tran, T., & Du, Z. (2024). Artificial intelligence in education: A systematic literature review. Expert Systems with Applications, 252, 124167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2024.124167

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. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2025.2518694

Bayly-Castaneda, K. B., Ramirez-Montoya, M. S., & Morita-Alexander, A. (2024). Crafting personalized learning paths with AI for lifelong learning: A systematic literature review. Frontiers in Education, 9, Article 1424386. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1424386

Chalkiadakis, A., Seremetaki, A., Kanellou, A., Kallishi, M., Morfopoulou, A., Moraitaki, M., & Mastrokoukou, S. (2024). Impact of artificial intelligence and virtual reality on educational inclusion: A systematic review of technologies supporting students with disabilities. Education Sciences, 14(11), Article 1223. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14111223

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

Kim, J.-H., Kim, J., Kang, H., & Youn, B.-Y. (2025). Ethical implications of artificial intelligence in sport: A systematic scoping review. Journal of Sport and Health Science, 14, Article 101047. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2025.101047

Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO. https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9535

Ogunleye, B., Zakariyyah, K. I., Ajao, O., Olayinka, O., & Sharma, H. (2024). A systematic review of generative AI for teaching and learning practice. Education Sciences, 14(6), Article 636. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14060636

Pietraszewski, P., Terbalyan, A., Roczniok, R., Maszczyk, A., Ornowski, K., Manilewska, D., Kuliś, S., Zając, A., & Gołaś, A. (2025). The role of artificial intelligence in sports analytics: A systematic review and meta-analysis of performance trends. Applied Sciences, 15(13), Article 7254. https://doi.org/10.3390/app15137254

Rosa, J. P. P. (2025). The potential role of artificial intelligence to promote the participation and inclusion in physical exercise and sports for people with disabilities: A narrative review. Journal of Bodywork and Movement Therapies, 42, 127–131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbmt.2024.12.024

Wang, S., Wang, F., Zhu, Z., Wang, J., Tran, T., & Du, Z. (2024). Artificial intelligence in education: A systematic literature review. Expert Systems with Applications, 252, Article 124167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2024.124167

Yusuf, A., Pervin, N., Román-González, M., & Md Noor, N. (2024). Generative AI in education and research: A systematic mapping review. Review of Education, 12(2), Article e3489. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3489

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education—Where are the educators? International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16, Article 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0

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. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2025.2518694