

Course Title	:	Capstone Project - Junior Research Project
Course Code	:	SCE4002
Recommended Study Year	:	Year 4
No. of Credits/Term	:	3
Mode of Tuition	:	Individual supervision
Class Contact Hours	:	Regular meeting (1-hour biweekly meeting)
Category in Major Prog.	:	Major Electives
Discipline	:	Sports
Prerequisite(s)	:	SCE3003 Research Method in Sports Management and Coaching
Co-requisite(s)	:	N/A
Exclusion(s)	:	N/A
Exemption Requirement(s)	:	N/A

Brief Course Description

This three-credit capstone project course enables students to integrate, articulate, advance, and present their learning in the programme. Students will take the course in Year 4. For the students to choose to conduct an independent junior research project, they will attend workshops and receive individual supervision from an advisor. They will decide their research topic and work towards the production of an individual project which incorporates fundamental elements of their research project. These elements include (but are not limited to) a literature review, development of a theoretical framework, and the formulation of appropriate research questions, methods of data analysis etc. Students will write up a research proposal and conduct a pilot study. IRB/ethics approval and compliance with the Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance are necessary. This work could be further developed to form part of a complete thesis.

Aims

This course aims to:

- Provide students opportunity to critically reflect on the key issues in the area of sports event management or sports coaching
- Provide students a platform to apply fundamental theories, concepts, knowledge and skills in sports event management or sports coaching aspects
- Give students opportunity to sharpen their communication skills

Learning Outcomes (LOs)

On successful completion of this course, students will be able to:

1. identify the requirements of an academic research project and master the skills of literature search, questionnaire and interview;
2. apply the theories, concepts and knowledge in sports event management or sports coaching;
3. formulate a topic for critically analysis in the area of sports event management or sports coaching; and
4. produce a report which incorporates (but is not limited to) key elements of a thesis, and complies with the basic requirements and format of academic research

Indicative Content

1. Workshops will introduce the requirements of the junior research project, the practical skills of literature search, questionnaire and interview.
2. Each student must conduct an individual research project on a topic relevant to sports event management or sports coaching.

Teaching Methods

Each student will be assigned an advisor. Students are expected to meet with their advisors regularly (1 hour meeting biweekly) to receive guidance on completing their chosen topic. Each student will receive supervision regularly during the course. All elements in the research project will be discussed, and the advisors' feedback has to be recorded in the progress reports as the supervision engagement and documented progress follow-up. Students are expected to spend a total of 9 hours per week working on the research project to achieve the course learning outcomes.

Measurement of Learning Outcomes

The assignment includes the composition of literature search and the design of a questionnaire & interview question set, which helps the student to brainstorm and formulate their own research project.

Progress reports include a number of progress reports, students should be provided in different project stage to report progress of their work including literature review, theoretical framework, research questions, method of data analysis and other related elements of their research project.

Final report shall be the final output from the course. The research proposal with pilot run result must be presented in a formal manner. Both questionnaire and interview research techniques are expected in the capstone project.

Learning Outcome	Assignment	Progress reports	Final report
1. Identify the requirements of an academic research project and master the skills of literature search, questionnaire and interview	✓	✓	✓
2. Apply the theories, concepts and knowledge in sports event management or sports coaching		✓	✓

3. Formulate a topic for critically analysis in the area of sports event management or sports coaching		✓	✓
4. Produce a report which incorporates (but is not limited to) key elements of a thesis, and complies with the basic requirements and format of academic research			✓

Assessment

Continuous Assessment

100%

1. 20% Assignment
2. 40% Progress reports
3. 40% Final report

Required/Essential Readings

Gratton, C., & Jones, I. (2014). Research methods for sports studies. Routledge.

Thomas, J.R., Nelson, J.K. & Silverman, S.J. (2011). Research methods in physical activity (6th ed.). Human Kinetics.

Recommended/Supplementary Readings

Bell, J. (2014). Doing your research project: A guide for first-time researchers (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education UK.

Bloyce, D., & Smith, A. (2018). Sport Policy and Development: An Introduction (2 ed.). Routledge.

David A. Whetten, & Cameron, K. S. (2020). Developing Management Skills (10 ed.). Pearson Rental.

DK Publishing. (Ed.). (2020). The Sports Book: The Sports, the Rules, the Tactics, the Techniques (5 ed.). DK Publishing, Inc.

Gill, A. J. (Ed.). (2021). Foundations of Sports Coaching: Applying Theory to Practice (3 ed.). Routledge.

Greenwell, T. C., Danzey-Bussell, L. A., & Shonk, D. J. (2020). Managing sport events (2 ed.). Human Kinetics.

Masterman, G. (2021). Strategic Sports Event Management, Routledge: UK

Nelson, L., Potrac, P. and Groom, R. (2014). Research methods in sports coaching. Routledge.

Tapps, T. N., & Wells, M. S. (Eds.). (2019). Introduction to recreation and leisure (3 ed.). Human Kinetics.

Tiell, B., & Cebula, K. (Eds.). (2021). Governance in Sport: Analysis and Application. Human Kinetics.

Weinberg, R. S., & Gould, D. (2019). Foundations of Sport and Exercise Psychology (7 ed.). Human Kinetics.

**Additional readings may also be suggested on a topic by topic basis*

Important Notes:

1. IRB/ethics approval and compliance with the Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance are necessary.
2. Students are expected to spend a total of 9 hours per week to work at the research project to achieve the course learning outcomes.
3. Students shall be aware of the University regulations about dishonest practice in coursework, tests and examinations, and the possible consequences as stipulated in the Regulations Governing University Examinations and Course Work. In particular, plagiarism, being a kind of dishonest practice, is “the presentation of another person’s work without proper acknowledgement of the source, including exact phrases, or summarised ideas, or even footnotes/citations, whether protected by copyright or not, as the student’s own work”. Students are required to strictly follow university regulations governing academic integrity and honesty.
4. Students are required to submit writing assignment(s) using Turnitin.
5. To enhance students’ understanding of plagiarism, a mini-course “Online Tutorial on Plagiarism Awareness” is available on <https://pla.ln.edu.hk/>
6. Students must adhere to the University’s guidelines and practices when using Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools. The official documents “Guidelines for Using GAI Tools at Lingnan University” and “Best Practices for Ethical and Responsible Use of GAI Tools in Course Assessments” can be found here: <https://www.ln.edu.hk/cital/generative-artificial-intelligence/gai-guidelines-best-practices>

Rubrics

Assignment (20%)

Assessment Criteria	Excellent (80–100)	Good (65–79)	Fair (50–64)	Pass (40–49)	Fail (0–39)
Literature Search (40%)	Comprehensive search using multiple databases; identifies 5+ relevant, peer-reviewed articles; effectively synthesizes key findings and gaps.	Effective search using 3-4 databases; identifies 3-4 relevant articles; synthesizes key findings with minor gaps.	Basic search using 1-2 databases; identifies 2-3 articles; synthesizes findings with some gaps or inaccuracies.	Limited search; identifies 1-2 articles; synthesis is vague or incomplete.	Minimal effort; identifies fewer than 2 articles; no synthesis or critical analysis.
Questionnaire Design (30%)	Questions are clear, unbiased, and aligned with research objectives; includes a mix of question types; peer feedback is incorporated effectively.	Questions are mostly clear and aligned; minor issues with bias or structure; peer feedback is partially incorporated.	Questions are somewhat aligned but may include bias or poor structure; peer feedback is minimally incorporated.	Questions lack clarity or alignment; significant issues with bias or structure; no peer feedback incorporated.	Questions are unclear or irrelevant; no attempt to address bias or structure.
Interview Techniques (30%)	Questions are open-ended, probing, and aligned with research objectives; demonstrates active listening and note-taking in mock interview; incorporates peer feedback.	Questions are mostly open-ended and aligned; minor issues with probing or structure; peer feedback is partially incorporated.	Questions are somewhat aligned but may lack depth or probing; peer feedback is minimally incorporated.	Questions are closed-ended or irrelevant; no probing or active listening demonstrated.	Questions are unclear or inappropriate; no attempt to incorporate feedback.

Progress reports (40%)

Assessment Criteria	Excellent (80–100)	Good (65–79)	Fair (50–64)	Pass (40–49)	Fail (0–39)
Topic formulation, scope and critical focus & significance (20%)	Topic is clearly defined, researchable, and appropriately scoped; strong critical focus and justification; key constructs are defined and boundaries are explicit; significance to sport event management or	Topic clear and researchable; scope mostly appropriate; critical focus evident; minor gaps in justification, definition, or significance.	Topic generally relevant but scope may be broad/narrow; critical focus is partial; definitions/justification/ significance limited.	Topic stated but poorly scoped or weakly justified; critical angle unclear.	Topic missing, not researchable, or incoherent.

	sport coaching explained.				
Understanding of academic research requirements and planning (20%)	Demonstrates strong grasp of research project requirements (problem statement, literature, framework, RQs, methods, pilot); timeline and deliverables are realistic and aligned to requirements.	Good understanding of most requirements; plan/timeline largely realistic with minor misalignment.	Acceptable understanding but some key requirements are missing/unclear; planning is incomplete.	Partial understanding; plan is weak or unrealistic; key requirements often overlooked.	Misunderstands requirements; no workable plan.
Literature engagement and theoretical framing (early-stage acceptable) (20%)	Uses relevant academic sources; synthesises (not lists) key ideas; proposes a coherent theoretical lens/framework that matches the topic and supports RQs/hypotheses.	Relevant sources and mostly coherent framing; some synthesis; minor gaps in fit or depth.	Some relevant sources but limited synthesis; framing is generic or only partially linked to RQs.	Minimal/weak sources; mostly descriptive summaries; theoretical framing unclear.	Little/no credible literature or major conceptual errors.
Research questions and methods readiness (including pilot plan with questionnaire design and interview protocol) (30%)	RQs are clear and aligned to framework; proposed design (questionnaire design and interview protocol) is justified and feasible; key measures/sampling/analysis steps are specified; pilot plan is ethical and practicable.	RQs and design (questionnaire design and interview protocol) mostly aligned; feasibility generally sound; minor gaps in operational detail or justification.	RQs/design (questionnaire design and interview protocol) present but alignment/feasibility is uneven; operational details thin.	RQs vague; method poorly matched or under-specified; pilot plan (questionnaire design and interview protocol) unclear.	RQs/method absent or not workable; pilot plan unsafe or missing.
Supervision engagement and documented progress follow-up (10%)	Consistently prepared for meetings (agenda/questions, draft artefacts shared in advance); accurately records decisions/action items; follows up on feedback with clear evidence of	Generally prepared; records key feedback; completes most follow-ups; minor gaps in documentation or timeliness.	Preparation/follow-up is inconsistent; documentation is basic; progress sometimes unclear between meetings.	Minimal preparation; limited follow-up evidence; relies heavily on supervisor direction; weak documentation.	Missed meetings without justification or no evidence of supervision engagement and follow-up.

	changes; escalates issues early with options.				
--	---	--	--	--	--

Final report (40%)

Assessment Criteria	Excellent (80–100)	Good (65–79)	Fair (50–64)	Pass (40–49)	Fail (0–39)
Thesis-like structure, coherence and academic genre compliance (20%)	Report is very clear and well structured; includes key thesis elements (intro/problem, literature, framework, RQs, method, pilot results, discussion, limitations, references, appendices as needed); fully complies with basic academic format.	Clear structure with key elements present; mostly compliant; minor organisation/format issues.	Acceptably structured; some key elements underdeveloped or missing; compliance is partial.	Unclear/poor structure; key elements missing; weak compliance with academic genre.	No workable structure; difficult to read; does not comply with basic academic requirements.
Literature review and theoretical framework (critical synthesis) (20%)	Critically synthesises relevant literature; identifies gaps/controversies; builds a coherent framework that logically supports RQs/hypotheses and key constructs; uses accurate citations. Smartly add new references to support the findings with accurate interpretation.	Good coverage and mostly coherent framework; some synthesis; minor gaps in criticality or linkage. Adequately add new references to support the findings with enough interpretation.	Basic coverage; limited synthesis; framework is generic or weakly linked to RQs. Able to add new references to support the findings with fair interpretation.	Superficial review; mostly descriptive; framework unclear or poorly justified. Able to add new references to support the findings with inaccurate interpretation.	Little/no credible literature or major conceptual misunderstandings. Fail to add new references to support the findings.
Research design, methods and justification (including questionnaire design, interview protocol and ethics where applicable) (20%)	Methods are clearly described and justified; sampling/participants, instruments/measures, procedures and analysis plan are appropriate and feasible; limitations and assumptions acknowledged; ethics considerations	Methods appropriate and mostly clear; justification adequate; minor gaps in detail/feasibility/ethics discussion.	Methods described but under-specified or weakly justified; feasibility/ethics issues not fully addressed.	Methods unclear or poorly matched to RQs; limited justification; feasibility concerns.	Methods absent/incoherent or unsafe/unethical approach.

	addressed appropriately.				
Pilot study execution and presentation of pilot findings (20%)	Pilot is conducted and reported clearly; data/observations are presented appropriately; analysis steps are transparent; pilot findings are used to refine instruments/procedures and justify next-step improvements.	Pilot reported with generally clear presentation; some refinement/learning shown; minor gaps in transparency or linkage to improvements.	Pilot included but limited detail; analysis/presentation is basic; improvements are suggested but weakly justified.	Pilot execution/reporting incomplete; findings unclear; limited learning used to refine the project.	No pilot evidence or reporting is not credible/usable.
Argumentation, discussion and conclusion grounded in theory and evidence (15%)	Arguments and conclusions are well grounded in sport event/coaching concepts/theory and pilot evidence; interpretation is logical; limitations and alternative interpretations are considered.	Discussion is generally well grounded; interpretation mostly sound; minor gaps in criticality/limitations.	Some grounding but reasoning is uneven; limited critical evaluation or weak linkage to evidence.	Poorly grounded discussion; claims mostly asserted; weak linkage to theory/evidence.	Arguments/conclusions do not ground on relevant knowledge/theory/evidence or contain major errors.
Academic writing quality, referencing and integrity (5%)	Writing is clear and academic; figures/tables (if any) labelled; consistent citation style; accurate paraphrasing; no integrity concerns; confidentiality handled appropriately.	Generally clear; minor language/referencing issues; integrity expectations met.	Readable but with recurring writing/referencing problems; citation practice inconsistent.	Hard to follow; weak referencing; academic style limited.	Incoherent writing; plagiarism, fabrication, policy-breaching GAI use, or serious ethics/confidentiality breach; or serious mis-citation.