WEP Warwick Evans Publishing

International Journal of Global Economics and Management

ISSN: 3005-9690 (Print), ISSN: 3005-8090 (Online) | Volume 9, Number 3, Year 2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62051/ijgem.v9n3.22
Journal homepage: https://ijgem.org

Dilemma Resolution and Mechanism Innovation of Collaborative Education between Sports and Economics & Management Disciplines from the Perspective of Industry-Education Integration

Jiawei Zhang [1], Yidi Dai [2], Dongjin He [2, *]

[1] School of Business Administration, Guangdong University of Finance, Guangzhou, China
[2] Department of Physical Education, Guangdong University of Finance, Guangzhou, China

ABSTRACT

Driven by the dual momentum of the "Healthy China" strategy and the high-quality development of the sports industry, there is an increasingly urgent demand for composite talents who possess both athletic skills and modern business management wisdom. However, the current collaborative education between sports disciplines and economics & management disciplines in universities still faces the dual dilemmas of severe "disciplinary barriers" and "disconnection between industry and education," leading to a structural misalignment between the supply side of talent training and the demand side of the industry. Based on the theoretical perspective of industry-education integration, this paper deeply analyzes the realistic obstructions in the current interdisciplinary collaborative education of sports and economics & management in terms of institutional supply, curriculum system, faculty structure, and evaluation mechanisms. The study suggests that the key to resolving this dilemma lies in breaking the closed loop of single disciplines and constructing a collaborative mechanism with coupled interests. The paper further proposes innovative paths covering a "dual-element driven" governance mechanism, a "competency-based" curriculum reconstruction mechanism, a "dual-qualification structure" teaching operation mechanism, and a "value-added oriented" evaluation feedback mechanism. It aims to provide theoretical compliance and practical solutions for the transformation of the composite sports talent training paradigm under the background of the New Liberal Arts.

KEYWORDS

Industry-Education Integration; Sports and Economics & Management; Collaborative Education; Mechanism Innovation; Composite Talents; New Liberal Arts Construction

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Research Background and Problem Statement

As China's economy and society enter a stage of high-quality development, the sports industry is no longer limited to traditional competitive performances and fitness services. Instead, it has deeply integrated with multiple business formats such as tourism, culture, health, and finance, demonstrating strong industrial relevance and economic driving effects. The "Opinions on Accelerating the Development of the Sports Industry and Promoting Sports Consumption" issued by the State Council explicitly proposes to build the sports industry into a pillar industry of national economic development. The implementation of this macro strategy poses new challenges to the knowledge structure and ability quality of sports talents. The market is no longer satisfied with "teaching and

research" talents who only master a single sports skill but urgently needs a batch of "Sports + Economics/Management" composite talents who understand both the laws of sports specialization and business logic such as marketing, event operations, and investment & financing management [1].

However, examining the current status of higher education in China, although many universities have established majors related to sports economics and management, in actual operation, there is still a thick "invisible wall" between sports disciplines and economics & management disciplines. Sports colleges and economics & management colleges often act independently, making it difficult to share teaching resources and resulting in fragmented curriculum systems. Sports courses focus on the standardization of technical movements and physiological training, while economics & management courses lean towards abstract management theories and mathematical model deductions, lacking organic penetration and integration between the two. This phenomenon of "two separate skins" (dichotomy) leads to an awkward situation where students, when facing complex sports business practice problems, often "understand sports but not business, or understand business but not sports." There is a significant gap between talent training and industrial demand.

How to break down disciplinary barriers, resolve the realistic dilemmas of collaborative education, and innovate interdisciplinary talent training mechanisms from the perspective of industry-education integration has become a core proposition that urgently needs to be solved in the reform of higher sports education under the current background of New Liberal Arts construction.

1.2. Research Significance

1.2.1. Theoretical Significance

Based on the theories of industry-education integration and collaboration, this study explores the coupling logic of talent training in the two highly heterogeneous disciplines of sports and economics & management. By deeply attributing the dilemmas of collaborative education and systematically constructing mechanism innovations, it enriches the theoretical system of interdisciplinary education and provides new academic support for explaining the "disciplinary intersection" and "industry-education interaction" relationships in applied talent training.

1.2.2. Practical Significance

The mechanism innovation plan proposed in this study directly points to the pain points of current university talent training. By constructing an actionable guide involving a "Case + Project" dual-driven teaching mode, a deep "dual mentor" system between schools and enterprises, and a whole-process evaluation system, it provides a roadmap for universities to break administrative and disciplinary barriers and achieve optimal resource allocation. This helps to improve the quality of talent training and effectively serve the development needs of the regional sports industry.

2. LOGICAL RATIONALE OF COLLABORATIVE EDUCATION BETWEEN SPORTS AND ECONOMICS & MANAGEMENT DISCIPLINES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF INDUSTRY-EDUCATION INTEGRATION

2.1. The Inherent Necessity of Interdisciplinary Collaboration

2.1.1. Objective Requirements of Composite Industrial Forms

The modern sports industry is essentially a combination of "sports ontology" and "business operations." A large-scale marathon event requires not only precise control of track design, medical support, and competition rules (sports discipline knowledge) but also professional operations in event investment promotion, brand marketing, risk control, and cost accounting (economics & management discipline knowledge). The composite nature of industrial forms determines the composite nature of the talent knowledge structure; the knowledge graph of a single discipline can no longer cover the

value creation process of the entire industry chain. Therefore, the collaboration between sports and economics & management disciplines is not an artificial "forced marriage," but an inevitable choice forced by industrial logic.

2.1.2. Inherent Meaning of New Liberal Arts Construction

The "New Liberal Arts" construction vigorously promoted by the Ministry of Education lies in breaking through the confinement of traditional liberal arts and advocating interdisciplinary integration. As a field with strong interdisciplinary attributes, the integration of sports science with management and economics is the only way for its connotative development. Through disciplinary collaboration, modern management science research paradigms can be introduced to transform traditional sports disciplines, while also providing fresh sports industry application scenarios for management science, achieving a "win-win" in disciplinary construction [2].

2.2. Industry-Education Integration as the Core Engine of Collaborative Education

2.2.1. Transformation of Knowledge Production Mode

Traditional knowledge production, or "Mode 1," is mainly carried out within the academic community based on disciplinary logic; while knowledge production under the background of industry-education integration, or "Mode 2," emphasizes joint participation by universities and the industry in application contexts. In "Sports + Economics/Management" talent training, real corporate cases, market data, and operational difficulties are the sources of knowledge innovation. Industry-education integration provides a common "context" and "field" for the collaboration of the two disciplines, enabling both parties to engage in dialogue and cooperation around solving real industrial problems.

2.2.2. Supply-Side Structural Reform of Educational Resources

For a long time, the allocation of educational resources in universities has mainly relied on financial investment, with problems such as lagging resource updates and low simulation fidelity. Industry-education integration introduces capital, technology, venues, and expert resources from enterprises, greatly enriching the supply of educational resources. For economics & management disciplines, the sports industry provides a vast practice base; for sports disciplines, enterprises introduce market-oriented competition mechanisms and management tools. This convergence of resources from multiple subjects is the material basis for achieving high-quality collaborative education.

3. SCRUTINY OF REALISTIC DILEMMAS IN COLLABORATIVE EDUCATION BETWEEN SPORTS AND ECONOMICS & MANAGEMENT DISCIPLINES

Although the concept of collaborative education has reached a consensus, in specific educational practices, constrained by the inertia of traditional institutional mechanisms, it still faces multiple dilemmas, presenting a state of "separation in spirit despite unity in appearance."

3.1. "Island Effect" at the Governance Level: Institutional Barriers of Mechanisms

3.1.1. Segmentation of Administrative Organizations

Universities in China generally implement a three-level management system of university, college, and department. As entity operating units, colleges possess relatively independent personnel rights, financial rights, and teaching management rights. The Sports Department (or Sports College) and the Economics & Management College belong to different administrative structures and have their own performance assessment indicator systems. Under the current assessment baton, cross-college cooperation is often seen as "extra work." The lack of a top-level designed cross-departmental

coordination mechanism leads to difficulties in reaching a consensus on key links such as the formulation of talent training plans, curriculum arrangements, and mutual recognition of credits, leaving collaborative education without institutional guarantees.

3.1.2. Differentiation of Interest Demands

The essence of industry-education integration is the cooperation of stakeholders. However, in current practice, the interest demands of the four parties—universities, enterprises, teachers, and students—are often difficult to align. Enterprises pursue profit maximization and immediate human resource acquisition, often lacking patience for long-cycle talent training; universities pursue academic rankings and employment rates; teachers pursue research outputs and teaching hours. Due to the lack of effective interest distribution and incentive mechanisms, the motivation for enterprises to participate in collaborative education is insufficient, often staying at the superficial level of "hanging plaques" and "signing agreements," making it difficult to penetrate the core of curriculum development and teaching implementation [3].

3.2. "Platter Phenomenon" at the Curriculum Level: Mechanical Superposition of Knowledge Systems

3.2.1. Simple Stacking of Course Content

Looking at the talent training plans of "Sports Economics and Management" directions in many universities, they are often a physical platter of "Sports Courses + Management Courses." The first two years focus on basic sports skills and theories, and the last two years on basic management and economic theories. There is a lack of logical coherence and permeability between courses. For example, when teaching "Marketing," the cases cited by teachers are mostly from the FMCG or home appliance industries, rarely involving the particularity of sports event marketing; when teaching "Tennis" technical courses, teachers only teach how to play, not how to operate a tennis club. This "two separate skins" curriculum setting makes it difficult for students to build an integrated knowledge system.

3.2.2. Lag in Textbooks and Resources

The sports industry is a rapidly changing sunrise industry with emerging formats and models (such as e-sports, sports live streaming commerce). However, the existing textbook system is slow to update, and many cases remain stuck in a decade ago. High-quality interdisciplinary textbooks are severely scarce, and the construction of comprehensive teaching case libraries that understand both sports and economics/management is lagging. The knowledge students learn in the classroom is often outdated the moment they step out of the campus gate, unable to meet the actual needs of the industry.

3.3. "Structural Shortage" at the Faculty Level: Lack of Dual-Qualified Teams

3.3.1. Singularity of Teachers' Knowledge Structure

This is the core bottleneck restricting collaborative education. Teachers of sports disciplines mostly graduate from sports universities, possessing solid athletic skills and sports theory foundations, but lacking systematic economic management knowledge and corporate practical experience; teachers of economics & management disciplines mostly graduate from business schools of comprehensive universities, with profound theoretical literacy, but lack perceptual knowledge and in-depth understanding of the special attributes of the sports industry (such as intangible asset operation, competition organization laws). Teachers from both sides have different discourse systems, making it difficult to carry out in-depth teaching discussions and cooperation.

3.3.2. Absence and Virtualization of Enterprise Mentors

Although many universities hire corporate executives as adjunct professors or off-campus mentors, restricted by time, energy, and teaching ability limits, the role of enterprise mentors often becomes a

formality. They may only give a lecture once a semester or hang their name during graduation defense, without truly participating in curriculum design, daily teaching, and procedural evaluation. The lack of a stable "industry professor" team deeply involved in teaching makes it difficult for industry-education integration to take root.

3.4. "Score-Only Theory" at the Evaluation Level: One-Dimensionality of Evaluation Systems

3.4.1. Inertia of Result-Oriented Assessment

Although the OBE (Outcome-Based Education) philosophy has been promoted for many years, in actual teaching evaluation, a final exam paper is still the main basis for determining student grades. This evaluation method focuses on the assessment of knowledge memory while ignoring the assessment of students' interdisciplinary ability to solve complex problems, innovative thinking, and teamwork ability. For composite talents, their core competitiveness lies in "application" and "integration," and a single test score cannot truly reflect their comprehensive literacy.

3.4.2. Singularity of Evaluation Subjects

Current teaching evaluations are mainly completed by on-campus instructors, lacking the participation of enterprise mentors, industry associations, and third parties. Since on-campus teachers lack an industrial vision, their evaluation standards are often disjointed from corporate employment standards. For example, when evaluating a "Sports Event Proposal," on-campus teachers may focus more on formatting norms and the accuracy of theoretical citations, while enterprise mentors focus more on the feasibility of the plan, the rationality of the budget, and the potential for commercial realization. The misalignment of evaluation standards misleads students' learning direction [4].

4. ATTRIBUTION ANALYSIS OF COLLABORATIVE EDUCATION DILEMMAS

4.1. Path Dependence: Inertial Constraints of Traditional Academic Paradigms

For a long time, China's higher education has formed a discipline-centered academic paradigm. This paradigm emphasizes the clarity of disciplinary boundaries and the purity of knowledge, often holding a conservative attitude towards interdisciplinary "hybridization." Sports disciplines have long had a tendency to "emphasize technical subjects and despise academic subjects," while economics & management disciplines have a tradition of "emphasizing theory and despising practice." This path dependence makes both parties often habitually retreat to their respective comfort zones when facing the new thing of collaborative education, lacking the internal courage and motivation to break conventions and carry out a paradigm revolution.

4.2. Interest Gaming: Insufficiency of Endogenous Motivation for Cooperation

Collaborative education is not only an educational issue but also an economic one. According to stakeholder theory, the premise of cooperation is that all parties can obtain incremental benefits from cooperation. However, under the existing system, the positive externalities of collaborative education between sports and economics/management (such as improved talent quality and enhanced social reputation) are often difficult to internalize into direct benefits for participating subjects in the short term. For colleges, interdisciplinary cooperation increases management costs; for teachers, interdisciplinary lesson preparation increases workload; for enterprises, deep participation in teaching not only consumes labor costs but also faces risks such as leakage of commercial secrets. The lack of explicit benefit compensation and incentive mechanisms leads to insufficient endogenous motivation for cooperation.

4.3. Lack of Platforms: Barriers in Physical and Information Spaces

Collaborative education needs carriers. Currently, although universities are building experimental training centers, most are built by discipline classification. Sports venues and economics & management laboratories are often far apart in physical space, lacking a comprehensive training platform that integrates sports activities, business operations, and data analysis. At the same time, there is a lack of normalized information communication mechanisms and data sharing platforms between schools and enterprises, and between departments, leading to information asymmetry and low collaborative efficiency.

5. INNOVATIVE CONSTRUCTION OF COLLABORATIVE EDUCATION MECHANISMS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF INDUSTRY-EDUCATION INTEGRATION

Aiming at the above dilemmas and causes, we must adhere to problem orientation and use mechanism innovation as a breakthrough to reconstruct the ecosystem of collaborative education between sports and economics & management.

5.1. Innovation of Governance Mechanism: Building a "Dual-Element Driven" Organizational Architecture

5.1.1. Establish an Interdisciplinary Collaborative Education Steering Committee

Break administrative barriers. Led by the university level, unite the Sports Department, Economics & Management College, Academic Affairs Office, and core cooperative enterprises to establish the "Sports Economics and Management Collaborative Education Steering Committee." As the highest decision-making body, this committee is responsible for coordinating the formulation of talent training plans, coordinating the allocation of teaching resources, and formulating incentive policies. Under the committee, a professional construction working group is set up, composed of leaders from sports and economics & management disciplines and corporate technical backbones, specifically responsible for the reconstruction of the curriculum system and the monitoring of teaching implementation [5].

5.1.2. Substantive Operation of Industry Colleges

Drawing on the construction experience of modern industry colleges, explore the establishment of a mixed-ownership "Sports Industry College." Through co-construction, co-management, and sharing between schools and enterprises, introduce corporate capital, technology, and standards into the campus. The Industry College implements a dean responsibility system under the leadership of the council, enjoying relatively independent personnel appointment rights and financial disposal rights. Through substantive operation, enterprises and universities are bundled into a "community of shared destiny," fundamentally solving the problem of insufficient cooperation motivation.

5.2. Innovation of Curriculum Mechanism: Implementing "Competency-Based" Reconstruction Strategies

5.2.1. Reverse Design of Curriculum System Based on OBE Philosophy

Abandon the traditional logic of "discipline orientation" and establish a "demand-oriented" curriculum design idea. Through extensive industry research (questionnaires, interviews), precisely depict the competency models of key positions in the sports industry (such as event directors, sports agents, venue managers). Based on this, decompose talent training objectives into several core competency indicators, and then reverse map these indicators to specific course modules, constructing

a curriculum system of "bottom-layer sharing, middle-layer integration, and top-layer mutual selection."

5.2.2. Develop "Sports+" Interdisciplinary Integration Course Clusters

Focus on building a batch of deeply integrated bridge courses.

(1) Sports Event Operation Module: Integrate "Competition Organization" and "Project Management," introduce WBS (Work Breakdown Structure) tools, and let students use management tools to operate sports events.

(2) Sports Marketing and Media Module: Integrate "Sports Journalism" and "New Media Marketing," combine short video live streaming trends, and cultivate students' sports content production and monetization capabilities.

(3) Sports Finance and Risk Management Module: Integrate "Introduction to Sports Industry" and "Investment and Financing Analysis," focusing on discussing sports intangible asset valuation and club financial health diagnosis.

Through these modular courses, achieve a chemical reaction of knowledge rather than physical stacking.

5.2.3. Construct a Dynamic Industry-Education Integration Case Library

Schools and enterprises form a joint textbook writing team to collect real corporate cases. Implement a "Case Freshness" project, transforming the latest sports business hotspots (such as Winter Olympics operations, "Village Super League" model) into teaching cases immediately. Each case should contain a complete chain of "background description - problem conflict - theoretical analysis - decision suggestion," and be equipped with relevant data packages and video materials for students to conduct inquiry-based learning [6].

5.3. Innovation of Operation Mechanism: Promoting "Dual-Qualification Structure" and "Project Drive"

5.3.1. Build a "Dual-Qualified" Team with Mutual Employment and Recognition

Implement a "Mutual Assignment" plan. On the one hand, select outstanding young sports teachers to study in the Economics & Management College or take temporary posts in sports enterprises to make up for the shortcomings in business thinking; on the other hand, hire corporate executives as "Industry Professors" to form "Teaching Pairs" with on-campus teachers. Promote the "Dual-Teacher Co-Teaching" model in core courses: on-campus teachers are responsible for teaching theoretical frameworks, while industry professors are responsible for analyzing practical cases, complementing each other and achieving immediate verification of theory and practice.

5.3.2. Implement "Case + Project" Dual-Driven Teaching Mode

Reform traditional indoctrination teaching and fully promote PBL (Project-Based Learning).

Phase 1: Case Import. Through courses like "Appreciation of Sports Business Cases," use selected corporate cases to guide students in role-playing and simulated decision-making, cultivating their business intuition and critical thinking.

Phase 2: Project Actual Combat. Transform real corporate businesses (such as a marketing plan for idle time slots in a venue, or the production of an investment manual for an event) into teaching projects. Students form interdisciplinary teams (sports students + economics/management students) and, under the guidance of dual mentors, complete project tasks in a real-world setting. Classrooms are moved to the competition field and to the enterprise, achieving "learning by doing" [7].

5.4. Innovation of Evaluation Mechanism: Establishing a "Value-Added Oriented" Whole-Process Feedback System

5.4.1. Diversification and Capability-Orientation of Evaluation Dimensions

Shift from single knowledge evaluation to comprehensive evaluation of ability and literacy. Significantly reduce the weight of final exam paper scores (suggested to reduce to below 40%) and significantly increase the weight of procedural assessment. Focus on examining students' research ability, plan planning ability, roadshow expression ability, and teamwork spirit in project practice. Introduce "Ability Radar Charts" to quantitatively measure and visually display students' core capabilities.

5.4.2. Introduce Third-Party Evaluation and Social Evaluation

Break the closed nature of on-campus evaluation. In links such as project roadshows and graduation designs, invite industry experts and industry association representatives to participate in scoring. Establish a graduate tracking feedback mechanism, regularly survey employers' satisfaction with graduates, and use the feedback results as an important basis for revising talent training plans and evaluating teachers' teaching quality. Implement "Value-Added Evaluation," focusing on the growth magnitude of students from enrollment to graduation rather than just the final result, verifying the actual effectiveness of collaborative education through data comparison analysis [8].

6. PRACTICAL PATHS AND GUARANTEE STRATEGIES FOR COLLABORATIVE EDUCATION BETWEEN SPORTS AND ECONOMICS & MANAGEMENT

6.1. Practical Path: Iterative Optimization from the Perspective of Action Research

The implementation of the collaborative education mechanism is not achieved overnight but is a spiraling upward process. It is recommended to use the paradigm of Action Research to promote it.

Plan Phase: Conduct industry research, establish a steering committee, and formulate talent training plans and curriculum standards for pilot majors.

Action Phase: Implement the new curriculum system and teaching mode in pilot classes, and promote the "Dual Mentor" system and PBL teaching.

Observe Phase: Collect data during the teaching process through classroom recordings, student interviews, and questionnaires to observe changes in student behavior and teaching effects.

Reflect Phase: Regularly hold teaching salons and joint meetings, analyze existing problems (such as low student participation, declining corporate cooperation), review causes, adjust strategies, and enter the next cycle.

Through the continuous cycle of "Plan-Action-Observe-Reflect," continuously optimize the collaborative education model.

6.2. Resource Guarantee: Constructing a Virtual-Real Combined Training Platform

6.2.1. Build On-Campus Interdisciplinary Simulation Laboratories

Utilize modern information technology to build a "Sports Event Operation Virtual Simulation Center" or "Sports Big Data Analysis Laboratory." Purchase professional sports data services (such as Wyscout, Catapult), introduce enterprise-level ERP systems and event management software, allowing students to simulate real business environments for confrontation drills within the campus.

6.2.2. Expand Off-Campus Industry-Education Integration Practice Bases

Screen a batch of industry-leading, well-managed sports enterprises to establish close internship bases. Unlike traditional observation-type internships, these bases should have "teaching" functions. Schools and enterprises jointly formulate internship outlines, and enterprises set up special guidance posts to ensure that students can rotate through posts during the internship and deeply participate in the core business processes of the enterprise [9].

6.3. Institutional Guarantee: Improving Incentive and Constraint Mechanisms

6.3.1. Reform of Teacher Evaluation System

In professional title reviews and performance assessments, list "Industry-Education Integration" as a separate indicator. For teachers who guide students to win high-level discipline competition awards, develop high-quality corporate cases, or achieve significant results in corporate temporary posts, give them academic recognition equivalent to publishing research papers. Break the "Paper-Only" tendency and guide teachers to devote themselves to interdisciplinary teaching reform.

6.3.2. Student Credit Replacement and Incentive System

Establish a flexible credit management system. Achievements obtained by students participating in corporate entity projects, entrepreneurial practices, and discipline competitions can be exchanged for professional elective course credits or graduation design credits after certification. Set up special scholarships to reward student teams with outstanding performance in interdisciplinary integration innovation [10].

7. CONCLUSION

Collaborative education between sports and economics & management disciplines is a strategic choice to conform to the trend of high-quality development of the sports industry and deepen the construction of New Liberal Arts. Facing current dilemmas such as institutional barriers, curriculum fragmentation, and single evaluation, we must adhere to the core concept of industry-education integration. Through comprehensive mechanism innovations in governance, curriculum, operation, and evaluation, we can build a collaborative education community with shared interests, shared responsibilities, and shared resources.

This transformation is not just a technical teaching repair but a profound educational paradigm revolution. It requires university administrators to have the courage to break the old and establish the new, teachers to have the ability of cross-boundary integration, and enterprises to have a long-term vision for talent investment. Only through multi-party cooperation can we truly cultivate composite outstanding talents who adapt to the needs of the new era and possess both a "sports heart" and a "business mind," providing solid intellectual support for building a leading sports power. In the future, with the further penetration of technologies such as artificial intelligence and big data in the sports industry, the connotation of collaborative education will also evolve to a higher dimension of "Sports + Economics/Management + Technology," which requires our continuous exploration and practice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Guangdong University of Finance Teaching-Academic + Practice Project

“Innovation and Practice of a ‘Sports + Management’ Interdisciplinary Talent-Cultivation Model under the OBE Framework”

REFERENCES

[1] Jiang, X. (2019). New China Sports 70 Years: Development Course, Major Achievements and Future Prospects. Management World, 35(10): 1-14.

[2] Zhong, B. (2020). Connotation and Development Path of New Liberal Arts Construction. China Higher Education, (18): 4-7.

[3] Huang, H. (2019). Theoretical Logic and Practical Path of High-Quality Development of Sports Industry. China Sport Science, 39(04): 12-21.

[4] Gu, P., Hu, W., Lin, P., et al. (2014). Engineering Education Model Based on "Learning Outcomes" (OBE) - Practice and Exploration of Shantou University. Research in Higher Engineering Education, (01): 27-37.

[5] Liu, R. (2022). Research on Collaborative Educational Mechanism of Applied Universities from the Perspective of Industry-Education Integration. Research in Educational Development, 42(05): 52-59.

[6] Wang, J., & Dong, J. (2020). Realistic Dilemmas and Path Selection of Talent Training in China's Sports Industry in the New Era. China Sport Science, 40(03): 3-12.

[7] Zhang, R., & Li, Y. (2021). Innovation Research on Talent Training Mode of Sports Economics and Management Major under the Background of "New Liberal Arts" Construction. Journal of Shenyang Sport University, 40(06): 15-22.

[8] Chen, X. (2024). On the Application Value and Practice Strategy of Action Research in University Teaching Reform. Higher Education Research, 45(01): 88-95.

[9] Yang, H. (2021). Opportunities, Challenges and Countermeasures for the Development of China's Sports Industry in the Process of Building a Leading Sports Power. Journal of Physical Education, 28(01): 1-8.

[10] Zhang, W. (2023). Business Model Innovation and Talent Demand Change of Sports Industry in the Digital Economy Era. Journal of Shanghai University of Sport, 47(02): 34-45.