

## **Opportunities and Headaches: Dichotomous Perspectives on the Current and Future Hiring Realities in the Sport Management Academy**

**W. James Weese**  
**University of Windsor**

I am moved by the privilege of delivering the 2001 Dr. Earle F. Zeigler Lecture. Joining the list of previous Zeigler recipients is like joining a “who’s who” of sport management academicians. I have great respect and admiration for every member of this group, and I am pleased and honored to be in their company.

Another tremendous source of pride for me is the fact that I am joining two of my University of Windsor colleagues as Earle F. Zeigler Award Recipients. Both Bob Boucher and Gordon Olafson have been mentors and friends whose contributions to my development as a sport management academician cannot be overstated. Gordon introduced me to the area of sport management over 20 years ago, and Bob fueled my enthusiasm for the field as my graduate supervisor, mentor, and advocate. I am delighted to join them as recipients of this prestigious award.

Finally, I am pleased to receive this award named in honor of Dr. Earle Zeigler. Earle has also inspired my work and served as a tremendous role model. His un-failing support and encouragement of young faculty members and students is particularly noteworthy. While one cannot match the scope or volume of Earle’s academic contributions to the field of sport management, or the broader field of Physical and Health Education, our area of sport management and, for that matter, all areas in higher education would be well served by adopting his approach of encouraging and supporting students and young faculty members. It is in honor of his *modus operandi* that the topic of this paper was selected. Current graduate students hoping to gain entry to the sport management academy and/or mobile faculty members remotely interested in pursuing other opportunities should draw inspiration from the contents of this paper. Conversely, sport management academicians assuming or planning to assume administrative roles will find the recruitment and retention of quality sport management faculty members to be their biggest challenge.

Many factors impact the quality of one’s educational experience, but nothing is more important than the quality of professors who make significant

---

The author is with the Faculty of Human Kinetics at the University of Windsor, Windsor, ON.

contributions to the areas of teaching, research, and service. Naturally, I'm talking about professors who are physically present to counsel, teach, and guide students through their words and actions. A scene in my favorite movie, *Mr. Holland's Opus*, drives this point home when the school principal (played by Olympia Dukakis) mentors a young, non-committed teacher (played by Richard Dreyfuss) and transforms his affection and commitment to the field. In one scene she tells him that teachers not only fill the minds of young students with valuable information, but they must also provide students with a compass to guide them in their careers and lives. Implied in this advice is the need to develop positive and trusting relationships with students, something that can only be done effectively on a face-to-face basis. Further testimony to the profound and lasting impact that professors can have on their students can be uncovered in *Tuesdays with Morrie*. Readers of this book will be moved by the immense influence that Sociology professor Morrie Schwartz had on his former student (Mitch Albom) who authors the book. In fact, this title should be required reading for all faculty members.

There have been futurists who predict that universities will change in immeasurable ways. Peter Drucker suggested that our current teaching centers will be replaced by virtual classrooms, and program delivery will be offered almost entirely through distance education and Web-based delivery vehicles (Beatty, 1998). While this would expose students to the very best professors in their respective fields, and we have dabbled in this mode of delivery in sport management (e.g., the University of Ottawa Sport Management Teleconferencing Lecture Series), it is my opinion this type of learning will increase to *complement* the educational experience, *not replace* the traditional university teaching experience for our future students. I recently attended a conference where the topic of distance education was raised, and a professor from a northwestern university spoke of a colleague who was approached by a busy student inquiring about taking his course through distance education. The professor replied, "sure, you can do this course through distance education, just sit in the back row of the classroom."

Universities are steeped in a tradition of exploring concepts, pushing back one another's ideas, as well as learning and growing from exposure to the curricular opportunities that exist on our respective campuses. We will always need professors "on the ground" to teach, conduct research, and provide service to our field of study, our universities, and our communities.

The area of sport management has undergone explosive growth over the past 35 years. That growth will be briefly chronicled in the next section of the paper followed by an analysis of the challenges that will emerge for our area due to its popularity. The concepts of "population push" and "participation pull" will be discussed, outlining the implications of these concepts on institutions of higher learning and programs like sport management. These factors will create tremendous opportunities for entering and mobile professors, and immense headaches for program administrators forced to deal with sport management faculty recruitment and retention issues. Some suggestions for meeting these challenges are presented at the end of the paper.

## ***Growth of Sport Management***

Many sport management academicians (Chelladurai, 2001; Parkhouse & Pitts, 2001; Stier, 2001) have chronicled the evolution and explosion of sport management programs since their formal introduction as an area of study in 1966. This explosive growth has been particularly evident over the past 15 years, coinciding with the development of the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM), a fact that should bring justifiable pride and satisfaction to our NASSM founders. At present, the NASSM Web page (<http://www.nassm.com>) boasts 178 sport management academic programs. Chelladurai (2001) noted that there are over 200 sport management programs in North America and correctly asserts that sport management is one of the fastest growing programs of study in American universities. Alsop and Fuller (2001) offered that students can choose from “some 200 programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels” (p. viii), while Stier (2001) estimated the number of programs to be in excess of 250 and that “this rapid growth speaks to the need that is perceived for professionally prepared and knowledgeable sport managers” (p. 44). Regardless of the exact number of programs in existence, there is support for the claim of Parkhouse and Pitts (2001) that sport management is “one of the fastest growing areas on many college campuses” (p. 3). We continue to grow as a respected academic area of study (Parks, in Parkhouse & Pitts, 2001), with more of our programs being taught by faculty members holding doctoral degrees in sport management. Professors are pursuing defined research agendas, and the quality of their work continues to improve.

While we can be proud of our progress, we must turn our attention to some pressing questions. For example, *how much can we grow?* There will be pressure and temptation to increase the size and number of programs. As professors retire, campus administrators will look to reallocate resources to areas of growth. Sport management is a growth area on most North American university campuses. There may be capacity in the employment sector to increase the size and number of our programs, if we broadly and effectively prepare our graduates. We would be negligent if we did not heed the warnings of people like Brassie (Parkhouse & Pitts, 2001) and Stier (2001), who cautioned us on the overgrowth of our programs, leading to a market saturation of graduates and un- or under-employment of our students. This overgrowth is inevitable if we narrowly define our programs and focus exclusively on elite sport applications. We must strategically design and deliver programs that align favorably with the demographic fit and the needs of our field. *How can we strategically focus our programs to sustain successful growth?* We must consider the advice of Michael Porter (1998) and ensure our competitiveness by keeping our programs both current and innovative. We must also heed the insights of Chelladurai (1999) and Zeigler (1987) and focus our programs broadly on the management of sport and physical activity programs targeted to women and men, able and disabled populations, mass participation programs, as well as the elite sport areas. We must also consider the realities of demographics (e.g., focus on the expanding seniors’ market). As Clement (1990) noted, “successful sport

managers will be sensitive to trends and events, will welcome change, will anticipate the needs of society, and will develop new programs when requested” (p. 264).

Arguably the most relevant question is *where will we find faculty in the future to teach our students?* While it appears that we will not have any trouble finding students for our programs or possibly resources to operate them, we will have tremendous difficulty finding and keeping faculty members to teach our students. In fact, we cannot satisfy the current demand for sport management professors.

Mondello, Mahony, Hums and Moorman’s (2001) 3-year review of sport management faculty searches (1997–2000) uncovered 74 sport management faculty positions advertised in 1998–99; 93 advertised opportunities in 1990–2000, and 82 positions advertised in 2000–01. Many of the 249 positions were repeat advertisements, signifying a failed search. The areas noted in the advertisements were very broad in most cases, casting the net wide to attract the interest of as many people as possible, an effective strategy in any market, and especially prudent in the attractive market in which young and mobile professors find themselves today. Their survey of search committee chairs uncovered that the primary reason for a failed search was “the lack of qualified candidates.” This finding would not surprise the Deans and Directors of Physical Education/Kinesiology in Canadian universities (CCUPEKA) who have identified sport management as a particularly difficult area for which to find qualified professors. Some have noted that “they can’t get *any* candidates.”

While some would attribute the faculty shortage to a thinning of the candidate pool due to an increase in number of programs currently offered in North American universities, others would argue that there is an insufficient supply of fresh PhDs to fill the current and anticipated vacancies within the sport management academy. The NASSM Web page lists 13 doctoral programs in North America, two in Canada, and 11 in the United States. Stier (2001) claimed that there were 18 U.S. doctoral programs and three Canadian programs; however, the Canadian number is inflated by one, and the United States number may be overstated as well. Most sport management academicians could identify six to eight of these programs but would be hard pressed to name the others. Many have shared the frustration that our Masters students experience in finding a sport management doctoral program to continue their studies in North America. This supports my contention that the number of doctoral programs is insufficient to meet the current demand, to say nothing of the future demand we will face given the demographic realities. As noted below, a pending demographic shift coupled with sustained societal interest in higher education will magnify the problem for a number of academic fields including sport management.

### ***The Realities of the Pending Demographic Shift***

Demographics refers to the study of human populations. Acclaimed management author Peter Drucker (1997) underscored the importance of understanding demographics as a planning and forecasting tool by stating that “the most dominant factor for business in the next two decades . . . is not going to be eco-

nomics or technology. It will be demographics—study of human populations” (p. 20). Keller (2001) offered that “higher education leaders and scholars would be prudent to understand the underlying demographic shifts shaping the future” (p. 234). According to noted economist and demographer David Foot (2000), the study of demographic profiles can be “the most powerful—and most underutilized—tool for understanding the past and to foretell the future” (p. 8). Foot’s work is predicated on three assumptions. First of all, every year, every person gets 1 year older. Secondly, he suggested that it is easy to accurately measure the demographic profiles and, based on the first assumption, anticipate future demographic profiles. The 30-year-old baby boomer in 1971 will be 40 years old in 1981, 50 years old in 1991, and 60 years old in 2001. Finally, Foot noted that there is a predictability of behavior and needs for each cohort group. Specific to the example of higher education, we know that the core university student market is the 18- to 24-year-old person. Given the predictability of aging, we know that the young people who are 13 years old today will be in the prime university-age bracket in 5 years while many of the 8-year-old children in 2001 will be entering our universities in 2011. We can measure the size of these groups and, given the predictability of aging, anticipate the demand for university education.

Foot’s (2000, 2001) work has certainly informed my thinking in this area and has served as a foundation for this paper. Statistics Canada (<http://www.statcan.ca/>) and U.S. Census Bureau (<http://www.census.gov/>) reports have also been informative, as have reports prepared by the U.S. Department of Education and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. Based on a review of these sources, it is clear that university enrolments will escalate over the next decade. I anticipate a commensurate increase in sport management enrolments during the same time period.

North American society is experiencing a demographic shift that will have a profound impact on the study, teaching, and staffing within sport management programs in our institutions of higher learning. Enrolments are expected to increase in many regions of Canada and the United States due to a number of factors, including the large cohort of 18- to 24-year-old citizens who are currently creating enrolment challenges in many Canadian and United States secondary schools and the senior levels of elementary schools.

The impact of a demographic shift will be felt within our sport management programs. Have we considered the demographic realities and planned accordingly? An honest answer would undoubtedly lead to a negative response.

### ***Impact of Population Push***

The Statistics Canada Census Data lists Canada’s population at 30.7M while the U.S. Census Bureau lists the U.S. population at 284.9M. The United States population is approximately nine times larger than Canada’s total population. Of course, one’s analysis needs to run deeper than total population figures, and Foot (2000) has provided a thorough analysis with his *Boom, Bust and Echo* text. The title of this text refers to three demographic cohorts (the Baby Boom Cohort, the Baby Bust Cohort, and the Baby Boom Echo Cohort). According to Foot (2000),

and confirmed by reviewing Statistics Canada and US Census Bureau Data, these three demographic population patterns are evident and virtually identical in relative scope in both Canada and the United States.

The Baby Boom Cohort is a large group in both Canada and the United States. It is such a large group for a number of reasons. Following World War II, the servicemen returned home to a booming economy in the period between the mid-1940s through the mid-1960s, when a fewer percentage of females were pursuing higher education and employment outside the home, and fertility rates peaked (e.g., 4.0 children per family in Canada; 3.7 children per family in the U.S.). Canada and the United States also experienced high levels of immigration during this time frame, particularly by immigrants in their child-bearing years. In Canada, the Baby Boom Cohort refers to those citizens born between the years 1947–1966 who are aged 35 to 54 in the year 2001. This large cohort bubble represents 30% of Canada's total 30.7M population. In the United States, the Baby Boom Cohort started 1 year earlier (i.e., in 1946 due to better economic conditions) and ended 2 years sooner (i.e., in 1964 due to more expedient acceptance of the birth control pill). The United States Baby Boom Cohort is comprised of 79M people (28% of USA's 284.9M population) who are aged 37 to 55 in 2001.

The advancement of the birth control pill, coupled with societal changes in Canada and the United States where increased numbers of females pursued higher education and greater participation in the workforce, resulted in a decreased fertility rate (1.5 children per family in Canada; 2.0 children per family in the U.S.) as couples decided to postpone childbirth and/or have fewer children. These realities gave way to the Baby Bust Cohort, a group that is half the size of the Baby Boom group. These citizens were born in the mid- to late-1960s through to 1979. Many citizens from the tail end of this small group are in the final stages of their university programs in 2001.

Although women continued to enter institutions of higher learning and the workforce in greater numbers, and the fertility rates remained low, birth rates started to increase in the early 1980s due to the fact that the large Baby Boom Cohort were in the prime child-bearing years. This produced another large population group, known as the Baby Boom Echo Cohort, and the tip of this group has just started to significantly impact university enrolments. Citizens of this group were born between the years of 1980 and 1995 and are aged 6 through 21 in 2001. The relative size of this cohort is comparable to the significant Baby Boom Cohort group, and it represents 23% of Canada's 30.1M population and 76M or 27% of the United States' 284.9M population. It is anticipated that this cohort will drive up and sustain university enrolments for a 15-year period. Many of these students, like those who went before them, will be drawn to the area of sport management.

The next cohort group, the Millenium Busters (born 1996–2110), will have the exact opposite effect. It is anticipated that this will be a small group due to low birth rates (i.e., children of the small Baby Bust Group) and low fertility rates. This cohort will present different challenges for institutions of higher learning and new headaches for administrators in the years 2014 through 2028.

The impact of population push will be felt in both Canada and the United States, although most suggest the impact will be felt in specific regions. Universities in other less populated regions, if effectively positioned and marketed, will benefit from the spill-over effect. Robert Giroux (1999), the President of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), predicted that Canadian universities can expect a 20% increase in enrolment by 2010 based on demographic growth. However, he was quick to note that the increase due to population push would be felt primarily in the Provinces of Ontario, Alberta, and British Columbia. In Ontario, the increase has been estimated to be 40% (due to the Baby Boom Echo enrolment and high school reform that will place students in universities 1 year earlier and create a double cohort of students who will take 4 years to move through the system).

Keller's (2001) review of U.S. Census Bureau Data led him to conclude that universities and colleges in the United States would be significantly affected by the demographic shift. James Duderstat (2000), President Emeritus from the University of Michigan, predicts burgeoning university enrolments in the United States based on the demographic profile that shows a 13% growth in the traditional U.S. college-age population (18 to 24 years) through 2010. However, like Canada (where the population push is concentrated in Ontario and the Western Provinces), the impact from population push will be felt most in the southwestern United States, notably in Arizona, California, Texas, and Nevada, where the 18- to 24-year-old population is expected to rise by 40% over the 1995–2015 time frame. Schmidt (1999) reported that college enrolments in California will increase by 36% by the fall of 2010. Ironically, the majority of sport management programs are found in the eastern United States (Alsop & Fuller, 2001). Given the popularity of sport management coupled with its underrepresentation in the American southwest where immense population push exists, it seems reasonable to predict the emergence of more sport management programs. The question of course is, *where might these universities find faculty members to teach in these programs?* My prediction is from existing programs, which will create faculty recruitment and retention issues and contribute to the professorial shortage we are now experiencing.

Population push may not only be felt from the expanding 18- to 24-year-old cohort. One must remember that the expanding Baby Boom group will be entering their retirement years with greater frequency, seeking further challenge and enrichment and perhaps a desire to return to school. Many of these Baby Boomers may have already been to university, therefore increasing the likelihood that they may return if they are interested in furthering their education (Foot, 2001). MIT professor Lester Thurow sounded this alarm in a *New York Times Magazine* article (1996), when he talked of the “woopies,” the “well off older people” growing in larger numbers and embarking on enrichment experiences. Some institutions like Oberlin College in Ohio and the University of North Carolina at Asheville have established special units like the “Living and Learning Institute” and the “College for Seniors” in direct response to this demographic reality.

While the impact of demographics will significantly drive up university enrolments in both Canada and the United States, especially in regions where there is

a large Baby Boom Echo enrolment, growth on the basis of population push is only part of the equation. Another factor that will also drive up enrolments is “participation pull.”

### ***Impact of Participation Pull***

Participation pull refers to the attraction that a university education has on the citizens of a region and is measured in the percentage of citizens who enroll in our university programs. More Canadian and U.S. citizens are attending institutions of higher learning than in previous generations, and in the knowledge society, this trend will undoubtedly continue. David Smith (2000) noted that 23.1% of Canadians and 21.7% of Americans aged 18–21 years attend university programs. According to Galt (2000), the United States and Canada lead all of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OCED) countries in the percentage of people (aged 25–64) who complete University programs. Increased societal value for university education, coupled with the understanding that a university degree is often a requirement for entry positions in the knowledge society, has fostered higher levels of participation pull.

As testimony to the heightened levels of participation pull, Keller (2001) noted that 27.1% of Americans have 4 years of college or more in 1996, compared to only 4.6% in 1940. A higher percentage of females are being drawn to higher education as evidenced by Giroux (1999) when he noted that female student participation in Canadian universities has risen from 10% in 1980 to 21% in 1999, while male student participation rose from 10% to 14% during the same time frame.

Another factor impacting participation pull is the education level attained by one’s parents. The children of parents who attended universities are more likely to attend themselves (Foot, 2001), and more baby boomers have completed degrees than any other generation that preceded them. As noted above, the exploding Echo Generation (aged 6 to 21 today) are the children of this large, educated Baby Boom Cohort.

The picture is clear. The demographic realities (i.e., population push) coupled with an increased interest in pursuing higher education (i.e., participation pull) will drive up university enrolments in both Canada and the United States. The popularity of sport management as an academic area of study and as a career choice makes it a prime area for growth, particularly in regions where there is an emerging Baby Boom Echo Cohort. Ironically, many of these regions are underrepresented with respect to offering sport management programs. In addition to channeling new resources into the development of programs in this growing and attractive field, senior officials may divert existing resources to the initiation/expansion of sport management programs. A wave of professorial retirements are expected to take place on our campuses, and senior officials may be interested in diverting resources to programs of growth. Twenty thousand professors are expected to retire in Canada by 2008 (Giroux, 1999), yet Canada only produces half the number of required PhDs to fill these vacancies. The University of Alberta expects to hire 140–170 professors a year for each of the next 5 to 7 years. The University of



Toronto requires 500 to satisfy student demand by 2004. The University of British Columbia will introduce 900 professors by 2005. Some have labeled the pending faculty shortage in Canada a national crisis. Leatherman (2001) sounded the alarm of a pending faculty shortage by reporting a decline in the number of doctoral degrees awarded by American research institutions, supporting Rice, Socinelli, and Austin's (2000) concern of a faculty shortage in the United States. Evidence of a growing demand for professors can be taken from a review of the job postings advertised in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, which have increased 28% since 1998–99 and 34% for tenure track positions (Rice et al., 2000). The situation will get worse when the retirement waves emerge. Tabs' (2001) U.S. Department of Education report contains frightening information on the greying professorate in the United States university system. He notes that over 60% of faculty members are between the ages of 45 and 64 (62% are in this age cohort for Faculties of Business, and 71.8% are in this age range for the Faculties of Education).

The early retirement programs, implemented for austerity purposes in the 1990s, have amplified the situation. An additional 4,000 professors are required in Canadian universities to re-balance the student:faculty ratio. At the University of Ottawa a senior official noted that their student:faculty ratio has risen from 17:1 to 23:1, and they have an institutional plan to return it to a 19:1 ratio, a goal that will require an additional 115 professors per year for each of the next 5 years (Gilles, 2001). Given the popularity of sport management as a potential growth area, it may be a candidate for investment and/or reinvestment of institutional resources. The demographic realities (i.e., a large number of professors in the aging Baby Boom Group and the exploding student pool coming from the large Baby Boom Echo Cohort) highlight a pressing need for professors over the next 12 years. *Where will they come from?*

### ***Current and Anticipated Need for Faculty Members***

As Mondello and his colleagues (2001) have illustrated, we do not have a sufficient number of sport management professors to meet the existing demand. Our search committee chairs are claiming that they are not getting enough (or any) qualified candidates, and faculty searches are not successful. As illustrated above, the demographic realities will soon amplify the problem, especially if universities in high population areas that are currently underrepresented in sport management enter the mix by launching sport management programs to meet student demand. Administrators of programs with competent, young faculty members should be concerned, as their professors may be prime targets for Deans and Department Heads from other institutions looking to jump start a sport management program.

Competition for new and mobile faculty members in sport management is acute at present and likely to intensify. We can learn from the experience of administrators in academic programs like business, electrical engineering, and computer science. Like sport management, these areas are experiencing a tremendous shortage and competition for faculty. Bidding wars for fresh PhDs and mobile faculty have taken on a new significance. Existing faculty complements are being eroded.

In my own institution an entire department (i.e., the professors, their research grants, and their graduate students) was recruited by another institution. It is certainly one way to jump-start a program, and this scenario could be played out in the area of sport management, much to the chagrin of the raided institution.

As for entry level positions, we may learn from the situation experienced in some Faculties of Business, where competition for freshly minted PhDs (or soon to be PhDs) generates multiple offers to candidates, institutions offering six-figure salaries, subsidized housing, attractive research start-up funds, and two course teaching loads. In the area of Finance, entry professors are securing salaries of \$130K, often more than their colleagues with 10 years of experience (Mangan, 2001). Although on a smaller scale, we have started to see some of this in sport management, and we will undoubtedly see more of it in the future.

The limited sport management PhD graduate pool is further reduced when one considers the growth of sport management in the college system. Colleges are also mounting programs to capture an expanding prospective student pool (Halworth, 1999). Finally, we cannot count on all PhD graduates taking up the existing and future vacancies within the academy. Like other academic areas, some graduates will be drawn to colleges or to industry, specifically the area of athletic administration. Jisha (2001) noted that a survey of PhD candidates indicated that 20% would be seeking positions in athletic administration upon graduation.

### ***Possible Solutions***

It is clear that sport management PhD production does not meet the current or anticipated demand for professors given the demographic realities of the Echo Boom Cohort. Economists would suggest that the supply and demand ratio be balanced by either increasing the supply of candidates or decreasing the demand side of the equation. While we do need more quality PhD programs in North America, the fruits of this solution would not be realized for 5 years, perhaps longer, if there are stringent institutional and other regulatory procedures that need to be followed in starting a PhD program. By the time the first graduates emerge from these new programs, we will be well into servicing the expanding Echo Boom Cohort and starting to worry about the different enrolment challenges created by the Millenium Bust Cohort. The implementation of this solution should have been undertaken 7 years ago, not today. Addressing the other side of the equation would require a moratorium on the development and/or expansion of sport management programs. While this idea may have merit, holding the line on sport management growth is not a realistic option. Sport management is too popular as an area of study. Prospective students are interested in the area, and senior administrators will re-invest resources to support programs that have growth potential. Given the demographic realities, especially in the American southwest where sport management is underrepresented as an area of study, program expansion and development is a certainty. However, we need to make better use of the resources available in the academy. Students should be encouraged to take courses from universities currently offering programs (e.g., distance education, student exchange programs, spending a term on another campus, etc.).

We do need more PhD graduates, so increasing the size of current PhD programs might be the answer for some institutions, but this alternative must be explored with great caution. We must prepare future professors through quality educational and mentoring experiences. These students must be sufficiently prepared to make meaningful contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Increasing the size of programs without ensuring the appropriate student:faculty ratio is a plan doomed to fail and bring about long-term consequences. Novel programs that use the expertise of graduate faculty from two or three universities that do not have PhD programs might also be an attractive approach to increasing the PhD pool. Doctoral students could be mentored by these academics and, in the process, enrich their doctoral experience (as well as decrease the burden on the few universities currently offering PhD programs). In addition, these candidates might be able to teach a class or two to help the participating institutions cope with the undergraduate enrolment pressures brought on by the Echo Boom Cohort. Video-conferencing and Web-based learning with adjunct professors throughout the world, especially those from institutions that currently do not offer PhD programs might be another way of increasing the PhD capacity of existing programs and, consequently, the pool of candidates for future faculty positions.

The use of visiting scholars might also provide relief to this escalating problem. The demographic pressures are not consistent in all parts of North America (or throughout the world). Perhaps a professor from an area where student pressures are less intense would be interested and made available to serve as a time-bound visiting professor in a program experiencing tremendous growth at another institution.

Many universities have established domestic and international student and faculty exchange programs that allow students to take courses from another institution that count in the student's program of study. These should be expanded and encouraged as a way of coping with increased demand. The faculty exchanges may help institutions cope with enrolment pressures in specific areas of study. These 1-year to 2-year exchanges may need to be arranged at the senior levels of administration (i.e., Vice President-Academic) so campus-wide priorities can be considered. For example, a faculty exchange between two universities might exchange a chemistry professor in one institution for a sport management program in another institution, to the advantage of all parties involved.

The use of part-time faculty members may also be a viable solution (Sommer, 1994). Some part-time faculty may secure full-time opportunities that exist throughout North America. Others may decide to stay in a part-time capacity. United States-based institutions tend to rely more extensively on part-time faculty, and some (Benjamin, 2001; Duderstat, 2000) suggest that this approach may be used to meet the challenges of population push and participation pull, much to the chagrin of scholars like Harper, Baldwin, Gansneder, and Chronister (2001) and Schuster (1998) who have written on the perils of this approach (e.g., lack of a research climate/focus, decreased levels of institutional commitment and accountability, decrease in the number of faculty eligible for important committee work and student counseling).

Keeping members from taking early retirement programs should be helpful as would extending the age of retirement (assuming government legislation/institutional policy compliance). A graduated retirement program (e.g., 70% load for 70% salary from age 58 to 60; 50% load for 50% salary from age 60 to 63; 30% load for 30% salary from age 63 to a determined retirement date thereafter) might stem the flow of early retirements and result in numerous spin-off benefits to the involved parties. Senior faculty would remain involved at a lower level of responsibility, and the salary saving could be used to bring in a fresh PhD or nearly completed PhD student. The program would enjoy the synergy of more people in the area at no additional cost to the institution. The PhD candidate could be mentored by the senior faculty member, the host institution might assist them financially as they complete their doctoral studies, and their tenure clock would not start until they had completed their studies. This plan would make financial sense to the institution and provide it with a plan for overcoming the undergraduate enrolment challenges brought on by the Echo Boom Cohort.

We may also learn from Columbia University who established the Society of Senior Scholars, a group of approximately 30 professors emeriti who teach two courses a year, maintain their research programs, and publish and present their research. While respecting legislation and any Collective Bargaining Agreements that may exist on our campuses, we may need to look at ideas like this to help us overcome the demands placed on programs given the demographic shift. The deployment of 100% retired faculty is a viable option that we should consider, but it will take more than sending them a notice of the opportunity. Retired faculty need to be encouraged to exchange their freedom for the opportunity to stay involved in the academy. They may require office space, attractive sessional stipends, and most of all, a feeling that they are genuinely welcome to contribute. Many of these faculty members were employed at times when there were few opportunities for young faculty, not the times we are now experiencing. They need to know that they are needed, wanted, and not taking an opportunity away from a young faculty member.

Having experienced faculty members on the ground can provide many benefits. In addition to helping the unit cope with the human resource issues of few available faculty to mount courses and programs, the use of retired faculty has the potential to benefit all involved. The program needs faculty, and retired faculty have the skills and expertise to provide valuable assistance. They often stay in the area and therefore are available to provide help. They can enrich their retirement years by staying involved and continuing to learn. In addition, they can provide valuable insights to young faculty members through a mentoring relationship. They might also mentor the PhD candidate who contributes to a program through the shared PhD program idea forwarded earlier in this paper. University programs might be in a better position to attract young faculty and PhD candidates if they will be given the opportunity to be involved with respected retired faculty members who can provide mentoring enrichments. The senior/retired faculty know the formal and informal methods of getting things done in a university and have a wealth of experience and wisdom honed and tempered by a career of experience.

As Benjamin Franklin once noted, “Life’s tragedy is that we get old too soon—and wise too late.”

The recruitment and retention of sport management professors has been challenging in recent times, and as outlined above, it will become a greater challenge in the next few years. The times will call for creative, aggressive action in compliance with any existing Collective Agreements/University Faculty Hiring/Retention policies as well as any pertinent State/Provincial and/or Federal laws. Administrators will need to utilize a full array of strategic plans and bargaining chips to attract, secure, and retain faculty. Traditional advertising will not be effective, as the marketplace is too thin. Candidates have too many options. “Post it and they will come” will not work in this marketplace. Administrators need to develop relationships with prospective candidates prior to their graduation, and they must be kept abreast of possible opportunities long before they become available. Some institutions are considering the development of a career award for a sport management position, a program that would provide someone without a doctoral degree the necessary funding to complete a PhD in exchange for a minimum commitment of 3 to 5 years of service as a faculty member upon graduation. Identifying current graduate students who may be potential faculty members (e.g., through their publications/scholarly presentations and interaction with PhD professors) is a good starting point. Maintaining contact with these candidates can be an effective method of positioning future employment opportunities within the competitive marketplace. Hosting a sport management conference is also highly recommended to showcase one’s program, faculty, campus, and city to prospective faculty members (e.g., graduate students long before they enter the marketplace, current professors who will entertain other opportunities). The international marketplace may also be a place to look for quality faculty in a highly competitive marketplace. Although sport management is growing internationally, there are some international regions where the demographic cohorts are small and programs are not moving forward, creating another market for potential faculty members.

Cluster hiring is another popular way of attracting key faculty members to a program. The excitement and benefits of being part of a group are appealing to faculty who seek collaboration and synergy in their workplace. Bradford (2001) noted that collegiality and team building are key factors in a decision to join and/or stay in a faculty. While this plan might have more appeal and practicality to universities starting a program, it has been used effectively in some universities with existing programs, and it certainly aligns with the hiring/retention literature.

Getting prospective candidates interested in the position is only the first step in the process. Getting an employment commitment is another matter entirely, and one that will be even more challenging in the years ahead, given that a small employment pool will have a multitude of opportunities available to them. Candidates will compare their experience in the interview with the interviews experienced at other institutions. Every effort must be made to treat all candidates with respect and dignity. Boucher, Chant, and Morse’s (2001) article on the public relations of the hiring process contains a number of helpful suggestions that an Appointments Committee should consider in staging employment interviews (e.g.,

treatment of all candidates in the process, importance of including a brief visit with the University President if at all possible).

Naturally, the offer of employment will need to be competitive with the marketplace (e.g., a competitive salary that is also sensitive to equity theory and how significant imbalances can negatively impact morale, a considerable dowry of benefits such as research start-up funds, conference travel, research assistance, and, due to housing prices in some North American cities, housing supplements). Fortunately, professors in our area of study do not require extensive and expensive research equipment like our colleagues in the bio-physical sciences where \$100K start-ups are becoming the norm, and in some North American universities, \$250K and more is required. A reduced teaching load may also be required, although administrators must be cognizant of the fact that students need classes taught by professors. Spousal hiring is becoming more of an issue in the competitive marketplace and, in response, some universities are developing spousal hiring programs. At the University of Alberta, the Vice President-Academic provides 1/3 of the funding for a spousal hiring, and 1/3 of the funding comes from the faculty hiring the professor (Owran, 2001). The unit receiving the spousal hire only needs to contribute 1/3 of the funding for the person, an incentive to increase their participation in the program and facilitate a faculty hire.

While the successful recruitment of sport management faculty continues to evolve as one of the most important and difficult challenges facing program administrators, it is only one piece of the puzzle. The growth of sport management has given way to a job market whereby young and mobile faculty have a wealth of opportunities available to them. Faculty retention is a significant issue facing program administrators. While administrators might take comfort in the quality of their faculty members who are desired by other universities, the shallow supply pool makes the replacement of these faculty a challenging feat. Projections call for an increase in mobility within the sport management academy. Professors who are lured away from one Canadian university to another institution are given a letter indicating that they have been granted a "leave," therefore keeping a link to the institution and keeping the option open for them to return. Salary "top-ups" to retain faculty members are commonplace in Canadian universities in response to keeping faculty, and we are in the preliminary stages of servicing the large Echo Generation and coping with the large faculty retirement bulge. Most of these salary top-ups are in the \$2K to \$3K range, although some top-ups are now in the \$10K to \$20K range at the University of Alberta. The need to respond to increasing demands for salary top-ups is evident at the University of Alberta where the dedicated fund has grown from \$600K in 1998–99 to \$2.3M in 2001–02. Their current Vice President-Academic has noted that the University will "go to the edge of bankruptcy to keep their faculty" (Owran, 2001).

Zinghein and Schuster (2001), in their article entitled "Retaining Top Talent," noted that administrators can take pro-active steps to retain their best staff members. They suggest that a competitive salary, positive workplace, team approach to decision making, and culture that values people and celebrates accomplishments

of members are generally the units that retain top talent. Bradford (2001) concurred on the importance of a positive, supportive culture in the retention of superstars.

### ***Concluding Thoughts***

As illustrated in this paper, there are dichotomous perspectives at play within the sport management academy, brought on by the popularity of our field of study coupled with the realities of demographics. We will have no trouble finding students, but we will have tremendous challenges finding and keeping faculty to teach them. We'll have relative ease attracting students into our programs. Programs will expand and new programs will crop up throughout North America. However, students will face un- or under-employment upon graduation if we do not ensure a broad perspective/quality education taught by quality faculty members who have taught these graduates to critically analyze situations, make sound decisions, communicate effectively, work in teams employing a multitude of acquired skills, and most importantly, be prepared to apply these skills in a multitude of sport areas including recreational sport for women and men, able and disabled populations, and especially the expanding senior sector. Central to these issues is the quantity and quality of the professorate which is already in limited supply.

Doctoral students coming out of our PhD programs today and in the next few years should feel positive about the opportunities that await them in their academic careers. Those interested or willing to move should also be comforted by the contents of this paper. Current and future administrators should have another perspective. While we should feel good about the growth of our field of study, we will spend increasingly more time strategically recruiting faculty to our programs, and ensuring existing faculty are supported and satisfied given the opportunities they will have elsewhere.

We will have some challenging times ahead of us. How we lead our programs and area through the next 10 years will be interesting as well as challenging. It will also be a test of our resolve and commitment, things best measured in times of challenge and change. That being said, and being an eternal optimist, I have great faith in the current sport management academy and those who will join us in effectively leading us through these challenging times.

### ***References***

- Albom, M. (1997). *Tuesdays with Morrie: An old man, a young man, and life's greatest lesson*. New York: Doubleday.
- Alsop, W.L., & Fuller, G.F. (2001). *Directory of academic programs in sport management*. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Beatty, J. (1998). *The world according to Peter Drucker*. New York: Free Press.
- Benjamin, E. (2001, January). *Doing more with less: "The America Way"*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations, Toronto, Ontario.
- Boucher, R.L., Morse, K., & Chant, P.L. (2001). Employee-selection practices and public relations. *NIRSA Journal*, **25**(1), 57-65.

- Bradford, R. (2001). Attract and retain your best people. *Executive Excellence*, **18**(4), p. 13.
- Chelladurai, P. (1999, September). *Sport management and the next Millenium*. Keynote address presented at the 7<sup>th</sup> Congress of the European Association for sport management, Thessaloniki, Greece.
- Chelladurai, P. (2001). *Managing organizations for sport and physical activity*. Scottsdale, AZ: Holcomb Hathaway Publishers.
- Clement, A. (1990). The future of sport and fitness. In J.B. Parks and B.R.K. Zanger (Eds.), *Sport and fitness management: Career strategies and professional content* (pp. 257-265). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics
- Drucker, P. (1997). The future has already happened. *Harvard Business Review*, **75**(5), 20-24.
- Duderstadt, J.J. (2000, October). *Preparing, recruiting, retaining and retiring the faculty of the future. A view from south of the boarder*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. Calgary, Alberta.
- Foot, D.K. (2000). *Boom, bust and echo: Profiting from the demographic shift in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Toronto, ON: Stoddart Publishing Co.
- Foot, D.K. (2001, February). *Demographics and higher education*. Presentation at the University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario.
- Frank, T. (2000, January), Competition for faculty heats up. *University Affairs*, **41**(1), 8, 10-12.
- Galt, V. (2000, February 22). Canadians pursuing higher education in record numbers. *The Globe and Mail*, A10.
- Gilles, G.P. (2001, March). *Faculty recruitment and retention*. Panel presentation at the Strategies on Faculty Recruitment and Retention seminar, Ottawa, Ontario.
- Giroux, R.J. (1999, October). *Faculty renewal: The numbers, the direction*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. Brandon, Manitoba.
- Halworth, K. (1999). More community colleges push to hire Ph.D.'s as professors. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, **45**(8), A12-A13.
- Harper, E.P., Baldwin, R.G., Gansneder, B.G., & Chronister, J.L. (2001). Full-time women faculty of the tenure track: Profile and practice. *The Review of Higher Education*, **24**(3), 237-257.
- Jisha, J. (2001). Factors in selecting a doctoral program in sport management. In B.G. Pitts (Chair), *Contribution to the so you want to be a sport management professor: From program selection to tenure and promotion*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the North American Society for Sport Management, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Keller, G. (2001). The new demographics of higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, **24**(3), 219-235.
- Leatherman, C. (2001). The number of Ph.D.'s drops for the first time since 1985. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, **47**(22), A10
- Mangan, K.S. (2001). The shortage of business professors leads to 6-figure salaries for new Ph.D.'s. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, **48**(35), A12-A13.
- Mondello, M.J., Mahony, D., Hums, M., & Moorman, A. (2001). *A survey of search committee chairpersons: Candidate qualifications preferred for entry-level tenure track sport management faculty positions*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Owran, D. (2001, March). *Faculty recruitment and retention*. Panel presentation at the Strategies on Faculty Recruitment and Retention Seminar, Ottawa, Ontario.



- Parkhouse, B.L., & Pitts, B.G. (2001). Definition, evolution, and curriculum. In B.L. Parkhouse (Ed.), *The management of sport* (pp. 2-14). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Porter, M.E. (1998). *On competition*. Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Rice, R.E., Sorcinelli, M.D., & Austin, A.E. (2000). *Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation*. (Rep. No. FRO7WP). Washington: American Association for Higher Education.
- Schmidt, P. (1999). Applications to California's public schools predicted to rise 36% by 2010. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, **46**(6), A50
- Schuster, J.H. (1998). Reconfiguring the professorate: An overview. *Academe*, **84**(1). 48-53.
- Smith, D.C. (2000). *Will there be enough excellent profs?: Report on prospective demand and supply conditions for university faculty in Ontario*. (COU No. 673). Toronto, ON: Council of Ontario Universities Report.
- Sommer, B. (1994). Recognizing academe's other faculty. *Planning for Higher Education*, **22**, 7-10.
- Stier, W.F. (2001). Sport management: The development of sport management. Perspectives. In D. Kluka, and G. Schilling (Eds.), *The business of sport* (pp. 39-56). Oxford, UK: Meyer & Meyer Sport.
- Tabb, E.D. (April, 2001). *Background characteristics, work activities, and compensation of faculty and instructional staff in post secondary institutions: Fall, 1998*. (NCES 2001 - 152). Jessup, MD: U.S. Department of Education Report.
- Thurow, L. (1996, May, 19). The birth of a revolutionary class. *New York Times Magazine*, 46-47.
- Zeigler, E.F. (1987). Sport management: Past, present, future. *Journal of Sport Management*, **1**(1), 4-24.
- Zingheim, P.K., & Schuster, J.R., (2001). Retaining top talent. *Executive Excellence*, **18**(13), 20.