

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF THE REASONS INVOLVED IN TEACHER  
TURNOVER USING A SAMPLE GROUP OF MARKETING  
EDUCATION GRADUATES FROM 1995 TO 1999

by

Richard W. Nelson

Plan B Research Proposal

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the  
Master of Science Degree  
With a Major in

Vocational and Technical Education

Approved: 2 Semester Credits

---

Investigation Advisor

The Graduate School  
University of Wisconsin-Stout  
July, 2001

The Graduate School  
University of Wisconsin-Stout  
Menomonie, WI 54751

ABSTRACT

Nelson	Richard	W.
(Writer)	(Last Name)	(First) (Initial)

A Follow-up Study of the Reasons Involved in Teacher Turnover Using a Sample Group  
of UW-Stout Marketing Education Graduates from 1995 to 1999  
(Title)

Vocational and Technical Education	Carol Mooney	07/01	61
(Graduate Major)	(Research Advisor)	(Month/Year)	(Pages)

Publication Manual of The American Psychological Association, Fourth Edition  
(Name of the Style Manual Used in this Study)

This study attempted to determine the reasons for teacher turnover utilizing a sample group of marketing education graduates from 1995 to 1999.

Research objectives to be answered by this study involved:

- (1) What were the reasons for marketing education teacher turnover?
- (2) What percentage of marketing education graduates between the years of 1995 and 1999 were currently teaching?
- (3) Of those currently teaching marketing education, how long had they been teaching?
- (4) Were any of the graduates working in a field unrelated to marketing education?
- (5) What were some of the recommendations for making a marketing education teaching career more engaging or appealing?

A survey questionnaire, cover letter, and return envelope were mailed to a total of 98 participants. The survey included 11 questions designed to extract feedback that

corresponded with the objectives of this study. The outcome was a total of 44 respondents, representing a 44.8 percent response rate.

It was concluded from the respondents that the top six reasons for marketing education teacher turnover were salary, burnout, lack of administrative support, better opportunities in the business world, student discipline problems, and politics.

The percentage of marketing education graduates that were currently teaching was 43.2 percent. Of those currently teaching, 13.6 percent had been teaching for five years; 9.1 percent each for three and four years; 6.8 for one year; and 2.3 percent for two years.

Occupations unrelated to teaching with the highest response rate were sales, marketing manager, advertising consultant, development director, and homemaker.

Recommendations for making a marketing education teaching career more appealing with the highest response rate were increase salary, combine marketing education with a business degree, more funding, create internships for business and industry, more administrative support, and financial rewards.

Overall, studies indicated the need for continued research on the topic of teacher turnover. It was implied that effective solutions need to be created to lessen the burden of teacher turnover. Past studies also indicated that the number one reason for teacher turnover, and the number one recommendation to make a marketing education teaching career more appealing, was to increase teacher salary.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Purpose of the Study.....	4
Research Objectives of the Study.....	5
Significance of the Study.....	5
Limitations of the Study.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	6
Chapter 2 Review of Literature.....	8
Teacher Turnover Trends and Characteristics.....	8
The Reasons for Teacher Turnover.....	10
The Reasons for Marketing Education Teacher Turnover.....	18
Summary.....	19
Chapter 3 Methodology.....	21
Introduction.....	21
Subjects.....	21
Instrumentation.....	22
Procedures.....	23
Chapter 4 Analysis of Results.....	25
Introduction.....	25
Survey Table Analysis.....	26
Chapter 5 Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations.....	38
Introduction.....	38
Summary.....	38
Statement of the Problem.....	38
Methodology.....	39
Findings.....	40
Demographic Findings.....	41
Reasons for Leaving Teaching.....	42
Conclusions.....	43
Recommendations.....	47
Recommendations for Further Study.....	48
References.....	50
Appendix A Marketing Education Survey.....	54
Appendix B Marketing Education Survey Cover Letter.....	56
Appendix C Marketing Education Survey Follow-up Cover Letter.....	58
Appendix D Greetings From UW-Stout Alumni Association.....	60

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Graduation Dates.....	26
Table 2: Respondents Currently Teaching.....	27
Table 3: Location of Teachers.....	28
Table 4: Teaching Subjects.....	29
Table 5: Longevity.....	29
Table 6: Other Occupations.....	30
Table 7: Obtaining a Teaching Position.....	31
Table 8: Number of Respondents Leaving Teaching.....	31
Table 9: Reasons for Leaving Teaching.....	32
Table 10: Career Plans.....	33
Table 11: Reasons for not Pursuing a Teaching Position.....	33
Table 12: Reasons for Leaving Teaching.....	34
Table 13: Reasons for Leaving Teaching.....	36
Table 14: Recommendations to Make Teaching More Appealing.....	37

## CHAPTER 1

### Introduction

Research has determined and identified many of the factors and reasons that lead to teacher turnover in the field of education. The eight disciplines of teaching, as cited in a recent edition of Educational Leadership are: general elementary education; mathematics; science education; social studies education; arts, physical, and health education; business and vocational education; and special education. The focus of this study was to determine the reasons for people leaving the educational arena (Boe, Bobbitt, Cooke, Barkani, & Maislin, 1998).

Some of the main reasons cited for leaving the educational field were salary and career change (Greene & Tahti, 1984). A select group involved in this study were more concerned with salaries and freedom, and less with personal rewards that teaching had to offer. Other reasons cited for leaving the field of education as discussed by McKnab (1983) were family relocation, maternity leave, moving, and marriage. McKnab's research also discussed reasons for teacher turnover, such as the lack of administrative support, and cumbersome paperwork burdens.

In addition to these findings, a study by Kremer and Hofman (1981) cited some different aspects for teacher turnover. These included: burnout and the need for renewal; lack of encouragement for initiative; low professional status of teachers; lack of autonomy; lack of promotional opportunity, and few challenges. Other areas of unrest included a sense of disparity between what is expected of teachers, what the teacher was able to achieve, and the lack of appreciation by parents and students (1981).

Seyfarth and Best (1986) identified the concerns of a safe environment and salary as valid reasons behind teacher turnover. School districts with better pay and more fringe benefits had lower levels of teacher turnover. Long distances to and from school, plus older, dreary, uncomfortable buildings, and ambiance were also related to high teacher turnover in the educational arena (1986).

This data was congruent with the findings of Ingersoll and Rossi (1995) in, “A Tally of Teacher Turnover.” Here, discussion indicated what type of school educator left the field most often. A four-stage process was examined by Grady and Figueria (1987) involving a model concept that suggested an individual scrutinize four stages before deciding to stay in or leave a career. The four stages include: (1) selection, (2) integration, (3) evaluation, and (4) decision (1987).

Some educators may consider these aspects carefully before leaving a career, while for others the transition could be extremely difficult (Whettingsteel & Minett, 1999). These job re-evaluation steps introduced by Whettingsteel and Minett included:

- (1) Start with an objective, detailed self-assessment.
- (2) Research your overall aims in a clear and focused manner.
- (3) Approach the job market with a strategic self-marketing plan (1999).

This information runs jointly with the significance of determining the reasons behind teacher turnover from teachers that have left the field and current teachers in the classroom. These approaches could also be utilized by anyone leaving a career.

While examining the many aspects of teacher turnover, the general public would probably agree the main reason for teacher turnover is salary (Chase, 2000). Chase asserted that, “The salaries of teachers in America should be raised in order to retain

them” (2000, p.5). Chase suggested that in a high powered, stellar economy teachers in America should look at teaching as charity, and to overlook pay scales was considered insulting. In addition to this, people had always gone into education for the “psychic rewards,” (2000, p.2) but low salaries are a valid reason why at least 30 percent of new teachers left the classroom within five years (2000).

Further studies have determined that as many as 25 percent of teachers left the the profession after only one year, and that 50 percent remained after five years of service (Norton, 1999). Evidence suggested that with these high turnover rates education was losing many of its most talented people (1999). The most valid part of turnover is identified as “the loss of intellectual capital” (Ettorre, 1997, p.2). Although there are no easy solutions to the complexity of teacher turnover, the most viable step is for educational directors, administrators, and instructors to provide support and positive leadership that underscores the problem of teacher turnover, and the result is a meaningful transition to a resolution (Norton, 1999).

This research will be a follow-up study of UW-Stout’s marketing education graduates between the years of 1995 and 1999. Marketing education graduates in previous studies cited “better opportunities in the business world” as the first reason, and “poor salary” as a close second, as reasons to pursue a career outside of education (Cooper, et al., 1985, p.96). This chosen time frame was utilized due to its recency.

The marketing education undergraduate degree offers a unique opportunity in that there are options that exist upon graduation. Graduates in this field are provided with career choices. They may decide to pursue a position in the business world, or a career as a marketing education instructor in a secondary or a post-secondary setting. UW-Stout’s

career services office has information that approximately 50 percent of the marketing education graduates opt to go either way (Placement and Co-op Services, 1999-2000).

### Statement of the Problem

There has been no recent follow-up research to identify the factors that lead to teacher turnover of UW-Stout's marketing education graduates. New research is needed that specifically determines and identifies the reasons behind turnover with current marketing education teachers.

The importance of this study was to establish feasible and workable recommendations that can be utilized to aid in the process of resolving teacher turnover of marketing educators in the field. UW-Stout's marketing education professors, alumni, secondary and post-secondary educators may be able to examine this study and its findings to create new programs and develop proactive solutions in dealing with this problem. Cooper, et al. (1985), exclaims in a national study on marketing education teacher turnover that, "teacher educators and state supervisors should provide pre-service and in-service opportunities for marketing teacher coordinators to address the causes of teacher turnover" (p.101).

### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the reasons UW-Stout's marketing education graduates from 1995 to 1999 may be leaving the field of education. Compiled information through surveys and questionnaires will establish significant reasons for teacher turnover with marketing graduates from a sample time frame of 1995 to 1999.

This research study will become a valuable resource in the future for all educational professionals to utilize as a tool to address problems related to teacher turnover. These recommendations may change or encourage some students that planned to leave the

field of education to stay in the marketing classroom as a teacher.

### Research Objectives of the Study

This study will focus on the following research objectives:

- (1) What were the reasons for marketing education teacher turnover?
- (2) What percentage of marketing education graduates between the years of 1995 and 1999 were currently teaching?
- (3) Of those currently teaching marketing education, how long had they been teaching?
- (4) Were any of the graduates working in a field unrelated to marketing education?
- (5) What were some of the recommendations for making a marketing education teaching career more engaging or appealing?

### Significance of the Study

This research study may be justified when awareness of teacher turnover reduces the talent lost in education (Norton, 1999). Future knowledge of teacher turnover may be advanced by this study. An increase in merit could arise from this research study if it is utilized as a learning resource for marketing education students that decide to choose marketing education as a major field of study. In addition, this study will identify the factors involved in marketing education teacher turnover from current marketing teachers and those that have left the field. As a result of this information, it may be utilized as an effective anecdote for UW-Stout's marketing education faculty to create proactive solutions to lessen the problem of marketing teacher turnover.

### Limitations of the Study

The following is a list of some of the factors that may affect the outcome of the

research being conducted in this study:

- (1) The study was only limited to a specific sample time frame of UW-Stout's marketing education graduates from 1995 to 1999.
- (2) Limitations exist on surveys and questionnaires when candidates relocated to a different demographic area or married and had their names changed.
- (3) Time may be a limitation when it comes to the accountability of marketing education graduates from 1995 to 1999.
- (4) Because of different opinions and variables in teacher turnover, this research may have limitations with reliability.
- (5) There may be limitations on information gathered if students are not objective and honest with their responses.
- (6) Marketing education professionals may have contrasting opinions on the findings in this research.
- (7) Some of the marketing education graduates may opt to completely ignore the survey, resulting in a low response rate.

#### Definition of Terms

Attrition: A gradual reduction of personnel through resignation, retirement, or death (Tormont Webster's Dictionary, 1990).

Attrition: A constituent of teacher turnover (yearly status change). Turnover may include leaving the classroom and changing teaching disciplines (Boe, Bobbit, & Cook, 1993, as cited in Croasmun, Hampton, & Herrmann, 1997).

Cognate: Related in analogous nature, character or function (Webster's Dictionary, 1990).

Marketing Education: A cooperative education program in which students are instructed in marketing concepts through classroom instruction, cooperative or project oriented on-the-job training, and DECA (Tollefson, 1984, as cited in Glampe, 1999).

Self-Assessment: An evaluation or an appraisal of a particular individual's goals.

Teacher Turnover: Instructors who exit the field of education for reasons of salary, better opportunities in the business world, administration problems, marriage, etc.

Vocational Education: Organized educational programs that are directly related to the preparation of individuals for paid or unpaid employment, or additional preparation for a career requiring a baccalaureate or advanced degree (Tollefson, 1984, as cited in Glampe, 1999).

The review of literature will be discussed in chapter two.

## CHAPTER 2

### Review of Literature

The review of literature will be presented under the following headings:

1. Teacher Turnover Trends and Characteristics
2. The Reasons for Teacher Turnover
3. The Reasons for Marketing Education Teacher Turnover
4. Summary

#### Teacher Turnover Trends and Characteristics

The introduction of this paper presented eight discipline areas of teaching. These areas ranged from elementary education to business and vocational education. Information gathered from samples, surveys, and longitudinal studies implicated that turnover trends included: moving or switching to different schools; voluntarily leaving public schools; and, in many cases leaving for involuntary reasons (Boe, et al., 1998).

Boe, et al. (1998), discussed the trends for leaving the field of education as either voluntary or involuntary. Voluntary categories included: switching to new teaching positions; moving to different schools; and leaving the field of education. On the other hand, involuntary categories included: retirement; staffing problems; health problems; incompetence; and the inability to teach. The majority of teachers leaving the field of education had been for involuntary reasons. Retirement was one that left a large gap in the foundation of education, which created significant pressure for school administration to fill these with ready, willing, and qualified teachers (1998).

Whether voluntary or involuntary, elementary education seemed to have the lowest rate of turnover, while teachers in general education were much higher. In contrast to these findings, business/vocational education teachers were leaving at twice the rate of

other disciplines, because of dissatisfaction (Boe, et al., 1998). On the other hand, according to Boe's, et al. (1998), research, special education teachers seemed to be the most satisfied with their career choice. It was suggested that there should be a more concentrated effort in retaining instructors as a result of the many differences that exist in the various teaching disciplines (1998).

Boe, et al. (1998), found that most teachers who left for other opportunities, teaching discontent, and because of retirement, had no intent to return to the classroom. In this study, Boe found that 67 percent left for reasons of new opportunities; 71 percent for discontent; and 88 percent for retirement. Teachers who had intentions of returning to the classroom within five years left for personal or sabbatical reasons. Sabbatical accounted for 64 percent of the loss, while family and personal reasons accounted for 63 percent (1998).

Another characteristic of teacher turnover was attrition. Retaining qualified teachers in the classroom nationwide was an issue addressed by former President Clinton in a State of the Union address in 1997 (Croasmun, et al., 1997). This portion of the address was based on a goal of hiring effective, and qualified teachers for our schools, and the development of ways to keep them in the educational system (1997).

In Heyns' 1988 study (as cited in Croasmun, et al., 1997) teacher attrition had been a problem since the 1970's and early 1980's. Charters (1970), Mark and Anderson (1978), and Murnane (1981), as cited in Croasmun, et al. (1997), indicated that 25 percent of all teachers with certificates never became teachers. In 1972, Heyns (as cited in Croasmun, et al., 1997) noted in a National Longitudinal Study that 25.2 percent of teachers who finished elementary or secondary training programs never embarked on a teaching

career (Heyns, 1988). In 1990-1991, a Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), as cited in Croasmun, et al. (1997), indicated attrition accounted for 75.8 percent of teaching positions in general education. Teacher attrition was a significant factor associated with the process of hiring in schools (Boe, et al., 1995). Attrition rates for teachers over age 60 and under age 25 were among the highest in another Schools and Staffing Survey cited by Baker and Smith (1997). Boe's study indicated that retirement and the teaching environment were key elements of teacher turnover (1998).

Another trend was that available monies would be drastically influenced by labor in the teaching force shifting from mature veterans to a younger audience. Lawmakers would notice a reduced salary budget because of new teachers compared to older and more seasoned instructors that had gained higher salaries and more perks (Grissmer & Kirby, 1997).

A study by Ingersoll (1997) found that poor salaries, widespread discipline problems, and the lack of support from faculty and administration had all created high teacher turnover. It was suggested that improvement in these areas would equal a decrease in teacher turnover and result in lower teacher shortages. The teaching profession needs to be treated as a more valued profession and eventually it will attract qualified and effective teachers (1997).

#### The Reasons for Teacher Turnover

Studies conducted by Chase (2000) and Cooper, et al. (1985), discussed the most consistent and recurring factors for teacher turnover as, respectively, poor salaries and better opportunities in the business world. Chase debated that competitive salaries should be congruent with quality instruction. Chase asserts that it was insulting to offer teachers compensation that had barely kept up with inflation. It was difficult for him to

understand why states that had demonstrated record surpluses had not embarked on a mission to attract quality teachers through competitive wages (Chase, 2000).

Other issues discussed in Chase's study were that teachers, in some cases, became a student's second family, implanted integrity and values, instructed manners, and promoted tolerance. In addition to this, teachers were involved in coaching sporting events and chaperoning for school dances (Chase, 2000).

Another notation by Chase was that 42 percent of the National Education Association's (NEA) members were expected to retire within the next ten years. These vacancies needed to be filled with qualified teachers through attractive teacher salaries. Turnover had a long-term effect on the student's stability, and the teacher's presence was imperative for students to successfully progress through learning development stages. Chase indicated that the outcome of future retirements and new students would be the largest shortage of teachers in history. Teacher of the year only made \$36,000, and contributed 30 years of service (Chase, 2000).

The Educational Renaissance (Cetron and Gayle, 1991, as cited in Richards, O'Brien, & Akroyd, 1997), suggested that there are many problems related to teachers' salaries. In 1987, their research found the beginning average salary for teachers was \$17,500. This paled to the salary of computer specialists at \$26,700, and engineers who were making an average yearly income of \$28,500. Cetron and Gayle's study (as cited in Richards, et al., 1997) also pointed out that it was more than difficult to recruit students for teacher colleges when poor salaries were involved. Furthermore, Cetron and Gayle's 1991 study (as cited in Richards, et al., 1997) found that teachers had a 50 percent chance of leaving the profession within five years, and 75 percent if the teacher was

working in an urban area (1991).

Studies done by O'Brien, Akroyd, and Richards (1993), as cited in Richards, et al. (1997), proposed the need for work-related rewards to circumvent not only poor teacher compensation, but overall teacher commitment, stress, and burnout in education. As a whole, salaries, personnel, and other resources had an influence on teachers' attitudes toward the institutions where they were employed (1993).

Overall, poor teacher salaries created a negative effect in schools nationwide. It literally became impossible to recruit and retain high caliber professionals when salaries were far from the normal cost of living. As stated by Dwight Jundt, Principal of a Crook County school in Wyoming (1997), "When I started in this profession, salaries in the state of Wyoming were near the top in the nation—now we are nearer the bottom. As this progression proceeds downward it is my perception that quality of instruction will follow. In order to attract quality teachers, we must pay them well" ( p.1).

Research has implicated that poor salaries were much too often a recurring theme. In some cases, salaries were so minimal that teachers could not afford housing in their selected school radius. In some situations, the basic pay had been cut, housing provisions had been rolled into salaries, and compensation for moving was stripped from the teacher (Colbourne, 1998). Pat Thomas, from Northern News Service (NNS, 1998), as cited in Colbourne (1998), exclaims, "That's why I wanted money, and I want more funding put into education to improve those learning conditions as well. We have to improve the teacher compensation package" (1998, p.1).

In an editorial, Alan J. Borsuk (2000), editor of the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel (2000), discussed teacher salary and compensation. In his article, Borsuk cited a

statement made by an instructor at Pulaski High School, named Koren Jackson. When asked, “How can a teaching position be made more appealing?” She exclaims, “I would increase the pay” (Borsuk, 2000, p.1).

In this article, Borsuk (2000) explores the fact that it was common knowledge that teacher compensation ran cold, and because of this, teachers were very unhappy. Borsuk suggested that it was easy for teachers to follow a career path other than teaching, because of the money factor. Many graduates from colleges statewide also ranked teaching as an undesirable career path because of the poor salaries that were offered. In addition to this, matters were increasingly complicated when teacher representatives had to deal with the negatives of state laws that put a limit on pay hikes. Borsuk’s article also suggested that it was difficult for most people to understand what a teacher deals with today. Teaching is considered tedious, exhausting, and laden with disrespect from others, and the outcome is the offering of a weak salary (2000).

Studies have shown that better opportunities in the business world was one of the main reasons for leaving a teaching position. Past research conducted by Cooper, et al. (1985), cited teacher coordinators had left the teaching profession because, “better opportunities were available in business,” and secondly, teaching provided a “poor salary” (Cooper, et al., 1985, p.101). Evidence also indicated that 43 percent of the teachers surveyed held part-time jobs to supplement their income, and 68 percent of their total income came from teaching. These findings were based on school size, gender, years of experience and whether the respondent was single or married (Cooper, et al., 1985).

Some implications for the surge into the business world were that many teachers did

not look upon their work as a career (Cory, 1970, as cited in Greene & Tahti, 1984). It was suggested that the curriculum possibly prepares them more for business careers than for teaching. Cory suggested that there was no substantial evidence for research to be conducted to find out why teachers were not making a career out of their profession. In addition to this, the “holding power” (p. 2) of the teaching profession needed to be improved through guidance and selection in teacher education programs (1970).

Research done by Williams (1992) demonstrated that many teachers held a second job. Implications were directed toward the fact that the lack of competitive salary was the main reason for instructors moonlighting. There seemed to be a correlation between poor teacher salaries and better opportunities in the business world. It was also suggested that some of the teachers opted to leave the field of education and secure employment with the second job full-time, or seek other capital ventures (Williams, 1992). Cooper, et al. (1985), indicated in a study that better opportunities in the business world, poor salaries, and lack of administration support were the most substantial reasons for leaving the educational arena.

Many companies have recently adopted a new philosophy on turnover. “Companies have swung around” (Ettorre, 1997, p.3), says Peter Veruki, placement director at the Owen School of Management at Vanderbilt University. He exclaims, “Ten years ago, companies wanted a rich pool of star athletes, regardless of which position they played.” Now, he says, “Employers have specific requirements because they don’t want to lose people, especially to the competition” (1997, p.3).

The National Education Association (NEA, 2000) cited that nationwide some 2.4

million teachers will be needed in the next 11 years because of teacher attrition, retirement, and increased student enrollment. This projection jumps as high as 2.7 million when researchers factor in declining student/teacher ratios based on nationwide class size reduction efforts. This issue was discussed earlier by Chase (2000) on the importance of raising salaries in order to recruit and retain teachers of today. Prior studies also implied that there were many reasons besides salary and better business opportunities involved in teacher turnover that needed to be investigated (Williams, 1992).

Kremer and Hofman (1981) cited teacher burnout and the need for renewal as other teacher turnover factors. Burnout, experienced by many teachers, was a direct result of rigidity in the school system, and spending an overwhelming amount of time dealing with administrative problems, lateness, absences, and school attire. In Kremer and Hofman's study, beginning applicants were excited at first with their new teaching venture—then came boredom and apathy. Teachers felt there was a lack of time to develop new teaching methods and self knowledge, and were turned off by teaching the same old curriculum year after year. Burnout seemed to be a direct result of the lack of encouragement and cooperation from the administration (1981).

As a result of these factors, teachers experienced a lack of initiative to be innovative in the development of curricula and new programs. The outcome seemed to have a negative relay effect, which also prompted a lack of self-respect, and a low feeling of status and self-efficacy. It was suggested through research that each turnover factor was in some fashion responsible for a corresponding factor (Kremer & Hofman, 1981).

According to Webster's Dictionary (1990), burnout is defined as: "To become

exhausted, especially as a result of long-term stress, overwork, or dissipation” (p.241). Wayne McGuire, former President of the NEA, in 1979 cited that, “Literally thousands of teachers are leaving the profession as victims of teacher burnout” (McNergney & Carrier, 1981, p.30, as cited in Greene & Tahti, 1984). Cory’s (1970) study (as cited in Greene & Tahti, 1984) stated, “No occupational group can hope to attain recognition as a profession if a relatively large numbers of its practitioners are transients who do not look upon their work as a career” (p.1).

Kremer and Hofman’s (1981) study embraced the turnover factors of autonomy, lack of encouragement, teacher status, and promotion. Teachers felt a need for some form of independence in the decision-making process, and desired some liberties and replenishment. Turnover may become less of a problem if the administration offered more personal autonomy. Lack of independence seemed to run parallel with teacher status and promotion, and created indifference (1981).

Deficiencies in the administrative support were evident in studies cited by Kremer and Hofman (1981), McKnab (1983), and Cooper, et al. (1985). All three studies discussed a need for sustaining a relationship of effective communication between administration and the instructor. A study done by Vandehey (1981), as cited in Greene and Tahti (1984), found that, “One-third of the men identified administration and/or supervision as the factor most influencing their decision to leave” (1984, p.4).

Studies conducted by Williams (1992) and Cooper, et al. (1985), found that administrative support was listed as a recommendation for improvement, and Cooper, et al., discovered that the lack of administrative support was ranked third as a reason for leaving the field of education (1985). A report done by the Catalyst (1999) cited that

60 percent of the teachers surveyed were disgruntled by the lack of support from the principal. In contrast to these findings, it was noted that teachers who received support from principals and the administration were less likely to leave their positions. Overall, newly hired teachers said they received more support from their colleagues than from the administration (1999).

According to a study completed by Norton (1999) student behavior and support from parents is important for the lifelong success of programs and teacher satisfaction. Some teachers decided to exit the field of education when they found there was a lack of encouragement from the administration and the parents during the rough times. Teachers were also concerned with the overall atmosphere and climate that was set by the administration. Norton's research placed an emphasis on the importance of teacher and parent support for each other when dealing with problems in the classroom (1999).

A study done by Seyfarth and Best (1986) noted that teachers had also been subjected to working in old, uncomfortable buildings, and were encompassed by laboring in unsafe environments. They felt that well-planned recruitment efforts, by placing teachers in their field of expertise, was an area to be addressed. Seyfarth and Best found that, at times, teachers were placed in awkward positions by heading up classes and teaching curricula with which they were unfamiliar. This had a tendency of evolving into teacher workload, while negating the expectations of new and current teachers (1986).

The Catalyst (1999) demonstrated some of the reasons why teachers had left some of the Chicago area schools. Ranked by discontent, some of the reasons were: lack of support from the principal; poorly run schools; discipline problems; parent apathy; short

on school supplies; student apathy; and instructor overload. This information was based on how new teachers rated their first year in the classroom (1999).

#### The Reasons for Marketing Education Teacher Turnover

Studies done by Cooper, et al. (1985), and Williams (1992) focus primarily on the reasons for marketing education teacher turnover. Recommendations made by Searle (as cited in Cooper, et al., 1985), related to the theme of marketing education teachers included: “Teacher educators and state supervisors should provide pre-service and in-service opportunities for marketing teacher coordinators to address the causes of teacher turnover” (p. 96). Searle also suggested the need for additional research to be conducted to determine ways of eliminating the reasons behind turnover (1985).

Williams (1992) also attempted through research to identify and analyze the reasons why marketing education teachers leave the educational arena. Williams found that the most common reasons for leaving the marketing education teaching field were: the program was discontinued; they wanted a change of job assignment; higher pay; better location; they needed one year; and they desired to work at their part-time job as full-time status (1992).

In correlation to studies done with an emphasis on marketing education teacher turnover, Cooper, et al. (1985), found that the main reasons for leaving education were: better opportunities in the business world; poor salaries and compensation; lack of administrative support; low level of student motivation; and the need for more time in managing a successful marketing education program. Although these five factors were considered to be the most common answers as a result of these surveys, there were also other reasons that were ranked lower, but were considered important enough to mention as feedback (1985).

The following list of other reasons that were cited for marketing education teacher turnover in Cooper, et al. (1985), were too many administrative duties, few opportunities for advancement, teaching lacks challenges and rewards, the lack of recognition, discipline problems, lack of marketing education student support, lack of job security, worry about program longevity, teaching is boring, lack of personal safety, enrollments declining, and the lack of federal, state and local funding (1985).

The review of literature shows that some of the reasons for teacher turnover have been poor salaries, and better opportunities in the business world. Studies have also shown the other factors involved in teacher turnover were an accumulation of, burnout, lack of administrative support, low level of student motivation, discipline problems, and autonomy. Therefore, the research hypothesis for this study is that the factors involved in teacher turnover of UW-Stout's marketing education graduates from 1995 to 1999 may also be poor salaries, better business opportunities, and a combination of the other reasons.

Both studies by Cooper, et al. (1985), and Williams (1992), pinpointed some of the main factors involved in marketing education teacher turnover. While reviewing the literature of the general reasons as a whole for turnover in the educational system, past studies demonstrated the need for continued research in the area of teacher turnover (1985).

### Summary

The objective of this study was to determine the turnover factors of marketing education graduates of UW-Stout from 1995 to 1999. The purpose was to attain feedback from marketing education teachers that have left the field of education and from

those that have remained in the classroom.

The review of literature discussed some of the current trends and characteristics such as attrition and retention. It was indicated that retirement and the teaching environment were the key elements of teacher turnover (Baker & Smith, 1999). The literature review also discussed the reasons for teacher turnover, such as salary, lack of support from the administration, better opportunities in the business world, burnout and autonomy.

Research indicated that the reasons behind marketing education teacher turnover in studies conducted by Williams (1992), and Cooper, et al. (1985), were salary, lack of administrative support, better opportunities in the business world, low student motivation, and not enough time to run a successful marketing program.

Every study that was examined for this specific research has paved the way for continued efforts to aggressively attack the topic of teacher turnover, and has created a search for recommendations and solutions. Historically, it has been implied that teacher turnover has been a problem, and part of the mainstream for many decades. Some of the main reasons that were evident thirty years ago still exist today. Past studies have implied that there need to be programs introduced that will satisfy the needs of the teacher, and there should be an emphasis on continuing efforts for more research on teacher turnover (Cooper, et al. 1985). The methodology will be discussed in chapter three.

## CHAPTER 3

### Methodology

#### Introduction

The objective of this descriptive study was to gather feedback on the reasons behind marketing education teacher turnover with a sample group of UW-Stout's marketing education graduates from 1995 to 1999. A questionnaire was developed to collect feedback on marketing education teacher turnover and to establish recommendations for creating a more appealing marketing education program.

This descriptive study attempted to find answers for the following objectives:

- (1) What were the reasons for marketing education teacher turnover?
- (2) What percentages of marketing education graduates between the years of 1995 and 1999 were currently teaching?
- (3) Of those currently teaching marketing education, how long had they been teaching?
- (4) Were any of the graduates working in a field unrelated to marketing education?
- (5) What were some of the recommendations for making a marketing education teaching career more engaging or appealing?

#### Subjects

The sample group for this study consisted of UW-Stout's marketing education graduates from 1995 to 1999. The sample group included graduates from spring, summer, and winter commencements, from spring, 1995, through winter, 1999. This graduation pool encompassed fifteen graduation dates. All of the participants were of undergraduate status and attained a Bachelor of Science Degree in Marketing Education.

### Instrumentation

The instrumentation process involved a survey questionnaire of 11 questions. The format was similar to previous surveys that had successfully accomplished the goal of attaining information on marketing education teacher turnover (Cooper, et al., 1985; Williams, 1992). The questionnaire was designed to determine the reasons for marketing education teacher turnover from respondents that had left the field of education and those that were currently teaching.

The survey questionnaire was also designed to extract feedback regarding teachers that left the field of education for a position in business, and whether the respondent would secure a future position in education. The main purpose of the survey was to attain answers to the objectives previously discussed in the methodology introduction.

The UW-Stout Alumni Association supplied current addresses based on 98 UW-Stout marketing education graduates from 1995 to 1999 to be utilized for this study. On February 5, 2001, the 11 question survey was sent to all 98 marketing education graduates. The survey was accompanied with an alumni greeting, a cover letter, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope. The cover letter included: purpose of the survey statement, introduction of the researcher, an emphasis on returning the survey on a timely basis, and a protection of human subjects regulations agreement. The envelope utilized for sending the survey was identified with the UW-Stout Alumni Association's address and a stamped message that stated, "Greetings from your Alumni Association." The purpose of this was to establish a rapport between the marketing education graduate and the researcher. Respondents were given three weeks to read the information and return the survey.

The survey instrument was also designed to extract information on what year the marketing education student graduated, how many years they had been teaching, and what subjects were taught, other than marketing-related courses. The survey requested the respondent to check marketing, business, or other, for subjects taught.

In addition to this, the questionnaire attempted to find information on whether the respondent attained a position upon graduation from UW-Stout; whether they have left a teaching position for an occupation in the business world; and if they were working in an occupation other than teaching, would they ever come back to the educational environment.

### Procedures

On January 29, 2001, the UW-Stout Alumni office was contacted by the researcher to locate the current addresses and the total number of marketing education graduates from spring, 1995, through winter, 1999. The Alumni staff identified 98 marketing education graduates that were utilized for the survey which was designed to find reasons for teacher turnover.

On February 5, 2001, the mailing process was put together with greetings from the UW-Stout Alumni Association. Each envelope was inserted with a cover letter, the marketing education graduate survey, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope for ease in return. Upon completion of this process, the Alumni office staff placed mailing labels on the front of each envelope. Each marketing education graduate was given approximately three weeks to respond to the survey and mail it back to the researcher for analysis.

During this three-week period, there were approximately 18 participants who responded to the survey. On March 1, 2001, a follow-up letter was sent requesting the

marketing education graduate to try to answer the survey questions and return it by March 12, 2001. The second mailing resulted in 44 total respondents. One more week was given for any last surveys that might arrive for analysis. During this period, two duplicate surveys arrived. The overall count remained at 44, which resulted in a 44.8 percent response rate. The analysis of results will be discussed in chapter four.

## CHAPTER 4

### Analysis of Results

#### Introduction

The analysis for this marketing education study was descriptive in nature. The purpose of this study was to collect feedback from marketing education teachers that had left the field of education, and from current marketing education teachers that had maintained teacher status. The majority of the analysis was conducted through frequencies and percents, what year they graduated, and how many years they had been teaching. Reasons for leaving marketing teaching positions were also analyzed, in tables, through frequencies and percents.

A total of 98 surveys were mailed to marketing education graduates that encompassed the spring of 1995, through winter of 1999. There were 44 respondents, equaling a 44.9 percent response rate. The following results were based on 44 responses. Each survey question was analyzed, in sequential order as it appeared in the marketing education questionnaire.

The following was a breakdown of the analysis of results for this study:

- (1) Each survey question was presented in table form, represented by frequencies and percents, in sequential order.
- (2) Each table was precluded with a summary analysis stating the results.
- (3) The following research objectives were answered within the analysis of results.
  - A. What were the reasons behind marketing education teacher turnover?
  - B. What percent of marketing education graduates between the years of 1995 and 1999 were currently teaching?
  - C. How long had they been teaching marketing education?

- D. Were any of the graduates working in a field unrelated to marketing education?
- E. What were some recommendations for making a marketing education teaching career more appealing?

### Survey Table Analysis

Survey Question 1:

When did you graduate from UW-Stout's Marketing Education Program?

The majority of marketing education graduates completed their undergraduate degree in May, 1996. Between the years of 1995 and 1999, 70.5 percent of the graduates completed their degree requirement in the month of May. December was second, with a combined total of 18.2 percent, and August demonstrated 11.4 percent (see Table 1).

Table 1: Graduation Dates

<u>Graduation Dates</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
May 1995	7	15.9
Aug 1995	3	6.8
Dec 1995	1	2.3
May 1996	11	25.0
Aug 1996	2	4.5
Dec 1996	2	4.5
May 1997	4	9.1
Dec 1997	4	9.1
May 1998	5	11.4
Dec 1998	4	9.1
May 1999	4	9.1

## Survey Question 2A:

Are you currently teaching?

Less than one-half of the respondents (43.2 percent) were currently teaching. More than one-half of the respondents surveyed (56.8 percent) were not teaching (see Table 2).

Table 2: Respondents Currently Teaching

<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	19	43.2
No	25	56.8
Total	44	100.0

## Survey Question 2B:

What is the name of the school and location where you are currently teaching?

Nine marketing education graduates were teaching in eight Wisconsin schools (two taught at Kimberly High School). Seven marketing education graduates were teaching in a Minnesota school. There was also one marketing education teacher in Boston, Massachusetts, and one located in Aurora, Colorado. The table demonstrated that the majority of graduates were teaching in Wisconsin and Minnesota. One respondent that was currently teaching did not indicate the location of the school (see Table 3).

Table 3: Location of Teachers

<u>School Name</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Appleton North High School	Appleton, Wisconsin	1
Beaver Dam High School	Beaver Dam, Wisconsin	1
Boston Public Schools	Boston, Massachusetts	1
Chippewa Valley Technical College	Eau Claire, Wisconsin	1
Duluth East High School	Duluth, Minnesota	1
Eastview High School	Apple Valley, Minnesota	1
Elk Mound High School	Elk Mound, Wisconsin	1
Folwell Middle School	Minneapolis, Minnesota	1
Kenosha Bradford High School	Kenosha, Wisconsin	1
Kimberly High School	Appleton, Wisconsin	2
Lakeville High School	Lakeville, Minnesota	1
Mounds View High School	Arden Hills, Minnesota	1
North High School	Eau Claire, Wisconsin	1
Waunakee High School	Waunakee, Wisconsin	1
Wayzata High School	Plymouth, Minnesota	1
White Bear Lake High School	White Bear Lake, Minnesota	1
Total		18

Survey Question 2C:

What subjects are you teaching?

Table 4 demonstrated that the majority of respondents, 22.7 percent, were teaching marketing-related courses, and 2.3 percent were teaching business courses. It also demonstrated that 6.8 percent were teaching a combination of marketing and business-related courses (see Table 4).

Table 4: Teaching Subjects

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1. Marketing	10	22.7
2. Business	1	2.3
3. Other	3	6.8
1 & 2 Comb.	3	6.8
1 & 3 Comb.	1	2.3
1-2-3 Comb.	1	2.3
Total	19	43.2

## Survey Question 3:

How many years have you been teaching marketing education?

Six, or 13.6 percent, of the respondents have been teaching for five years. Three of the respondents had taught for one year, and one respondent for two years. It was also indicated that four respondents taught for three years, and four respondents had taught for four years (see table 5).

Table 5: Longevity

<u>Years Taught</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 Year	3	6.8
2 Years	1	2.3
3 Years	4	9.1
4 Years	4	9.1
5 Years	6	13.6
Total	18	40.9

## Survey Question 4:

If you are not teaching, what is your occupation?

Table 6 demonstrated that five respondents pursued an occupation related to sales, and three opted to secure employment as a marketing manager. Advertising consultant, development director, and homemaker all revealed a frequency of two. Totally unrelated to marketing, one graduate became a police officer. All of the other occupations that were unrelated to teaching marketing had a frequency of one (see Table 6).

Table 6: Other Occupations

<u>Occupations</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Occupation 1: Sales	2	11.4
Occupation 2: Marketing Manager	3	6.8
Occupation 3: Advertising Consultant	2	4.5
Occupation 4: Development Director	2	4.5
Occupation 5: Homemaker	2	4.5
Occupation 6: Assistant Principal	1	2.3
Occupation 7: Claims Adjuster	1	2.3
Occupation 8: Field Supervisor	1	2.3
Occupation 9: Human Resources	1	2.3
Occupation 10: Lender	1	2.3
Occupation 11: Project Coordinator	1	2.3
Occupation 12: Real Estate	1	2.3
Occupation 13: Self-employed	1	2.3
Occupation 14: Police officer	1	2.3
Total	23	52.3
Missing	21	47.7
Total	44	100.0

## Survey Question 5:

Did you attain a teaching position upon graduation from UW-Stout?

Table 7 revealed that 47.7 percent attained a marketing teaching position upon graduation, whereas, 52.3 percent did not (see Table 7).

Table 7: Obtaining a Teaching Position

<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	21	47.7
No	23	52.3
Total	44	100.0

## Survey Question 6:

Did you leave a teaching position for a position in business?

Table 8 revealed that 13.6 percent of the respondents that were teaching decided to leave for an occupation in the business world (see Table 8).

Table 8: Number of Respondents Leaving Teaching

<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	6	13.6
No	34	77.3
Total	40	90.9
Missing	4	9.1
Total	44	100.0

Survey Question 7:

If you answered yes to survey question 6, what were the reason(s) why you left?

The most popular reason for leaving the position of a marketing education teacher was salary. Maturity and location revealed a frequency of two. Other reasons were stress, politics, lack of parental involvement, and to attend graduate school (see Table 9).

Table 9: Reasons for Leaving Teaching

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Reason 1: Salary	3
Reason 2: Maturity	2
Reason 3: Location	2
Reason 4: Attend graduate school	1
Reason 5: More travel	1
Reason 6: Business experience	1
Reason 7: Lack of parental involvement	1
Reason 8: Too much stress	1
Reason 9: Too much Politics	1
Reason 10: School district problems	1
Total	14

Survey Question 8A:

If you are working in an occupation unrelated to teaching marketing, do you think you will ever go into the teaching profession?

Table 10 indicated that 31.8 percent would not go into the teaching profession from an occupation that was unrelated to education. It also indicated that 22.7 percent would opt to secure a marketing teaching position from the transition of a career unrelated to teaching (see Table 10).

Table 10: Career Plans

<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	10	22.7
No	14	31.8
Total	24	54.5
Missing	20	45.5
Total	44	100.0

Survey Question 8B:

If you said no to question 8, what was the reason(s)?

Salary was the most popular reason mentioned for not pursuing a teaching career if presently employed in an unrelated field, with a frequency of four. Other reasons that were revealed with a frequency of one were politics, certification, and discipline problems. In addition to this, “Teaching is not for me, lack of support from parents, and too difficult to locate a teaching position,” were stated reasons for not going into the educational field (see Table 11).

Table 11: Reasons for not Pursuing a Teaching Position

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Reason 1: Salary	4
Reason 2: Too much politics	1
Reason 3: Did not want to go through certification	1
Reason 4: Will use experience for other fields	1
Reason 5: Student discipline problems	1
Reason 6: Lack of support from parents	1
Reason 7: Enjoy current non-teaching position	1
Reason 8: Teaching is not for me	1
Reason 9: Too difficult to find teaching position	1
Total	12

## Survey Question 9:

If you have left the field of teaching marketing education, what do you feel is the main reason for marketing teacher turnover?

Lack of support from the administration, burnout, and politics were repeated twice in Table 12. Reasons for leaving a marketing teaching position with a frequency of one were salary, better opportunities in the business world, time, impossible class size, budget cuts, violence, program cancellations, and teaching is too grueling. Teacher retirement was discussed in the review of literature as an involuntary reason for leaving the field of education.

Table 12: Reasons for Leaving Teaching

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Reason 1: Lack of support from the administration	2
Reason 2: Burnout	2
Reason 3: Too much politics	2
Reason 4: Salary	1
Reason 5: Better opportunities in the business world	1
Reason 6: Impossible class size	1
Reason 7: Time commitment	1
Reason 8: Budget cuts	1
Reason 9: Violence	1
Reason 10: Not enough marketing education positions	1
Reason 11: Program cancellations	1
Reason 12: Teacher retirement	1
Reason 13: Teaching is too grueling	1
Total	16

Survey Question 10:

What do you feel are some of the other reasons for marketing teacher turnover?

Sixteen respondents indicated salary was a reason for turnover. Burnout and lack of administrative support had a frequency of five. Better opportunities in the business world followed with a rating of four, while student discipline problems had three. Need more acknowledgement, too many extra responsibilities, violence in schools, student apathy, job security, and too many extra hours without pay maintained a frequency rating of two. According to Table 13, insanity of the career, to a lack of marketing education positions revealed a frequency of one. Salary, burnout, lack of administrative support, better opportunities in the business world, and student discipline problems ranked as the top five reasons respectively (see Table 13).

Table 13: Reasons for Leaving Teaching

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Reason 1: Salary	16
Reason 2: Burnout	5
Reason 3: Lack of administrative support	5
Reason 4: Better opportunities in the business world	4
Reason 5: Student discipline problems	3
Reason 6: Need more acknowledgement	2
Reason 7: Too many extra responsibilities	2
Reason 8: Violence in schools	2
Reason 9: Student apathy	2
Reason 10: Job security	2
Reason 11: Too many extra hours without pay	2
Reason 12: Insanity; running a business within a school	1
Reason 13: Struggling to keep program intact	1
Reason 14: Lack of accountability	1
Reason 15: Society does not place enough value on teachers	1
Reason 16: Schools lack structure	1
Reason 17: Too much politics	1
Reason 18: Not enough time	1
Reason 19: Not enough teaching careers available	1
Reason 20: Students do not need coordinators for jobs anymore	1
Reason 21: Lack of enrollments	1
Reason 22: Lack of promotions	1
Reason 23: Not enough funding for program	1
Reason 24: Other teachers	1
Reason 25: Moving to area with no marketing education programs	1
Reason 26: Overwhelming; trying to run DECA and classroom	1
Reason 27: Tough competition in the field	1
Reason 28: Inaccurate training on expectations of a marketing teacher	1
Reason 29: Over-sized classes	1
Reason 30: Budget cuts	1
Reason 31: Lack of marketing education positions	1

Survey Question 11:

What are some recommendations for making a marketing education teaching position more appealing?

Better salary was repeatedly mentioned, 13 times. Combine marketing with business, and more funding, had a frequency of three (see Table 14).

Table 14: Recommendations to Make Teaching More Appealing

<u>Recommendations</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Recommendation 1: Better salary	13
Recommendation 2: Combine marketing education with business degree	3
Recommendation 3: More funding for the program	3
Recommendation 4: Intern positions in business and industry	2
Recommendation 5: More administrative support	2
Recommendation 6: Financial rewards	2
Recommendation 7: More time for subject matter and less for discipline	1
Recommendation 8: More emphasis on recruitment	1
Recommendation 9: Ability to work in a multiple program environment	1
Recommendation 10: No more mandatory certification of teachers	1
Recommendation 11: More local control of who is hired	1
Recommendation 12: More responsibility	1
Recommendation 13: Need additional resources for teachers	1
Recommendation 14: Select students for quality versus numbers	1
Recommendation 15: Less politics in the school system	1
Recommendation 16: Combine marketing with computer education	1
Recommendation 17: Create more marketable teachers	1
Recommendation 18: Promote value statewide and Minnesota	1
Recommendation 19: Lessen burnout	1
Recommendation 20: Teachers need more respect	1
Recommendation 21: Bring more notoriety to UW-Stout's program	1
Recommendation 22: More training in discipline	1
Recommendation 23: More experience in the classroom	1
Recommendation 24: More hands-on with kids	1
Recommendation 25: More rewards for attaining Master's Degree	1
Recommendation 26: Be realistic with students concerning job market	1
Recommendation 27: Double certify in business/marketing	1
Recommendation 28: Do not have program as an elective	1
Recommendation 29: Inform students of open door options in marketing	1

## CHAPTER 5

### Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

#### Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the complete study. The summary will reiterate the statement of the problem, the research objectives, and the methodology. In addition, the conclusions will be discussed based on these findings, and recommendations will be offered for continued research.

#### Summary

##### Statement of the Problem

There had been no recent follow-up research to identify the factors that lead to teacher turnover of UW-Stout's marketing education graduates. Research was needed to determine and identify the reasons why marketing education teachers had left the field of education.

The importance of this study was to establish feasible and workable recommendations that could be utilized to aid in the process of resolving teacher turnover of marketing educators in the field. UW-Stout's marketing education professors, alumni, secondary and post-secondary educators may be able to examine this study and its findings to develop new programs and teacher in-service, to open the lines of communication, and become proactive in dealing with this problem. Cooper, et al. (1985), exclaims in a national study on marketing education teacher turnover that, "Teacher educators and state supervisors should provide pre-service and in-service opportunities for marketing teacher coordinators to address the causes of teacher turnover" (p.101).

The following is a list of the research objectives that were answered by this study:

- (1) What were the reasons for marketing teacher turnover?
- (2) What percentage of marketing education graduates between the years of 1995 and 1999 were currently teaching?
- (3) Of those currently teaching marketing education, how long had they been teaching?
- (4) Were any of the graduates working in a field unrelated to marketing education?
- (5) What were some of the recommendations for making a marketing education teaching career more engaging or appealing?

### Methodology

The sample group for this study consisted of UW-Stout's marketing education graduates from 1995 to 1999. These graduates included May, August, and December commencement dates. All of the participants were of undergraduate status and attained a Bachelor of Science Degree in Marketing Education.

The instrumentation process involved a survey questionnaire of 11 questions. The questionnaire was designed to determine the reasons for marketing education teacher turnover from respondents that had left the field of education and those that were currently teaching. The questionnaire was also designed to obtain recommendations to make a marketing education teaching career more appealing.

On January 29, 2001, the UW-Stout Alumni office was contacted by the researcher to locate the current addresses, and the total number of marketing education graduates from spring, 1995, to winter, 1999. The Alumni staff identified 98 marketing education graduates that were considered the sample population of this study.

On February 5, 2001, the survey was sent to all 98 graduates, requesting a response

rate within three weeks. The initial response rate was 18 completed surveys. A follow-up letter was sent and the overall count increased to 44, which resulted in a 44.8 percent response rate.

### Findings

The following is a re-statement of the objectives of this study and their analysis:

(1) What were the reasons for marketing education teacher turnover?

The top reasons for marketing education teacher turnover were salary, burnout, lack of administration support, better opportunities in the business world, student discipline problems, politics, time commitment, violence in the schools, lack of acknowledgement, too many responsibilities, student apathy, job security, and too many extra hours without pay (see Tables 12, & 13).

(2) What percentage of marketing education graduates between the years of 1995 and 1999 are presently teaching?

The percentage of marketing education graduates that were currently teaching was 43.2 percent (see Table 2).

(3) Of those currently teaching marketing education, how long had they been teaching?

Of those currently teaching marketing education, 13.6 percent have been teaching for six years, 9.1 percent have been teaching for three years, 9.1 percent have been teaching four years, 6.8 percent have been teaching for one year, 2.3 percent have been teaching for two years and 13.6 percent have been teaching for five years (see Table 5).

(4) Are any of the graduates working in a field unrelated to marketing education?

Some of the unrelated occupations were homemaker, police officer, and self employed. The majority of unrelated careers were associated with marketing, such

as advertising consultant, lender, marketing manager, real estate, and sales. The two most popular careers were sales and marketing manager, with 11.4 percent and 6.8 percent respectively (see Table 6).

(5) What are some of the recommendations for making a marketing education teaching career more engaging or appealing?

The most recurring recommendations for making a marketing education teaching career more appealing were better salary, combine marketing education with business degree, more funding for the program, intern positions in business and industry, more administrative support, and financial rewards.

Other recommendations were more time for subject matter and less for discipline, more emphasis on recruitment, ability to work in multiple program environment, no more mandatory certification of teachers, more local control of who is hired, more responsibility, need additional resources for teachers, select students for quality versus numbers, less politics, combine marketing with computer education, create more marketable teachers, promote value of program statewide and in Minnesota, and lessen burnout (refer to Table 14 for additional recommendations). The summary, conclusions, and recommendations will be discussed in chapter five.

Demographic Findings

The majority of marketing education graduates completed their undergraduate degree during the May of 1996 semester. From the sample group of marketing education graduates from 1995 to 1999, May had the highest response rate of 70.5 percent. Less than one-half the respondents surveyed were currently teaching (43.2 percent), while more than one-half were employed in a non-teaching position (56.8 percent).

There were eight Wisconsin high schools with current marketing education teachers, and Minnesota was represented with seven. The majority of marketing education teachers were located in Wisconsin and Minnesota secondary schools.

The majority of respondents were teaching only marketing-related courses, which was demonstrated by a 22.7 percent rate. Of the respondents surveyed, only 6.8 percent were teaching a combination of marketing and business courses.

Five years had the most frequent responses for longevity in teaching at 13.6 percent. Three and four years of service each indicated a 9.1 percent rate, and one year at 6.8 percent. The lowest length of service with marketing education teachers was two years, with a rate of 2.3 percent.

The majority of non-teaching occupations were related to the marketing business world. The only careers with no relation to marketing were police officer, homemaker, and self-employment. Sales positions had the most frequent responses, with an 11.4 percent rate.

All of the respondents that opted to teach marketing education attained a teaching position upon graduation from UW-Stout from 1995 to 1999.

#### Reasons for Leaving Teaching

The respondent rate for marketing education teachers that left the educational arena for the business world was 13.6 percent. The top three reasons for leaving the educational arena for the business world were salary, maturity, and school location.

Of the respondents surveyed, 31.8 percent revealed they would not attain a teaching position, while 22.7 percent demonstrated they would opt to teach marketing from the transition of a career unrelated to education.

The reason with the most frequency responses for not pursuing a teaching career was salary. Some of the other reasons were too much politics, student discipline problems, lack of support from parents, and they did not want to go through certification.

The top three reasons for marketing teacher turnover from respondents that left the position of marketing coordinator were lack of support from the administration, burnout, and too much politics. The top six reasons for leaving a marketing teaching career from all of the respondents were salary, burnout, lack of administrative support, better opportunities in the business world, student discipline problems, and politics.

The top five recommendations for making a marketing education teaching career more appealing were better salary, combine marketing education with business degree, more funding for the program, intern positions in business and industry, and more administrative support.

### Conclusions

This study attempted to discuss conclusions based on the following research objectives:

(1) What were the reasons for marketing teacher turnover?

The questionnaire that was sent to marketing education graduates from 1995 to 1999 indicated that the main reasons for marketing education teacher turnover were salary, burnout, lack of administrative support, better opportunities in the business world, student discipline problems, and too much politics. This study has established the reasons for teacher turnover with marketing education graduates from 1995 to 1999.

Research suggested that the lack of competitive salary has been one of the main

reasons for teacher turnover. It was implied that salaries need to be congruent with quality instruction and utilized to attract top notch instructors. Research implied that conventional wisdom needs to be scrutinized very carefully on salary increases to retain some of the most sincere and dedicated teachers in the field of education.

It was indicted in the review of literature that poor salary and better opportunities in the business world were somewhat correlated to each other (Cooper, et al., 1985). Many undergraduates who had made a concerted effort to major in education became side tracked by the higher compensation packages that were offered in the business avenue. This trend demonstrated the challenges that existed in securing teachers who were energetic, and qualified candidates that no longer viewed teaching as a rewarding career.

Past research implied that burnout has been in the educational arena for a long period of time. Studies by the NEA indicated that thousands of skilled educators had left the position of classroom facilitator because of stress, overwork and dispersion. It was also indicated that burnout was a result of the lack of support from the administration, heading up classes with which they were unfamiliar, an overwhelming amount of workload, student discipline problems, and the lack of recognition.

It was implicated in past studies that a positive and congenial attitude reflected by the administration toward teachers is paramount for the smooth transition into the school environment. Teamwork was the key to foster practical and workable solutions among the faculty and administration. However, it was evident that many school systems had a long way to go before positive results were attained. Past studies suggested that many of the problems could have been lessened if there was more of a combined effort to work toward common goals with the end result of satisfying the teacher.

Research indicated better opportunities in the business world was a reason for teacher turnover. Many companies were highly impressed with the classroom training that educational candidates possess. Corporations and businesses were always looking for individuals that could effectively train and teach employees operational skills that would ultimately affect the bottom line.

Big business was also aware of the strength in communication and organizational skills, which most educators possessed as a result of their academic training. Many businesses felt that if an applicant was skilled to handle the problems in the classroom, they could deal with those that exist in the framework of major companies. Therefore, many businesses and industries recruited college graduates with educational degrees.

Nationwide schools had been riddled with an increasing amount of discipline problems and disrespect. This study determined that discipline was a major problem related to teacher turnover. This created a considerable amount of doubt and drudgery about their career as an instructor, and in many cases lead to teacher turnover.

Politics was mentioned as one of the main reasons for marketing teachers leaving the educational arena. Research indicated that some educators tolerated much political unfairness. It was also implied that too much politics was directly linked to the lack of support from the administration and parents.

Overall, acknowledgement, respect, and self-determination were very significant issues with today's teachers. They deserved a sense of recognition and an open gate policy to express their ideas through needed programs, effective curriculum development, and organizational structure.

When teachers were trodden with a lack of encouragement to grow and develop

new and creative ideas in the classroom, or contribute to the mission and vision of the school, their initiative and self-worth were lost in the shuffle. The outcome was that student potential and capabilities struggled to survive. Research suggested that job satisfaction was a direct result of teachers that were able to express their ideas, be a viable part of a team, and have the opportunity to develop their personal worth.

(2) What percentage of marketing education graduates between the years of 1995 and 1999 were currently teaching?

The questionnaire indicated that 43.2 percent of marketing education graduates were presently teaching. Caution should be considered while interpreting this information because of the 44.8 percent response rate. In other words, less than one-half of the 44 respondents were teaching marketing education at this time.

(3) Of those currently teaching marketing education, how long had they been teaching?

The largest segment of the population representing marketing instructors had been teaching for five years (13.6 percent). Three and four year educators each represented 9.1 percent. One year of service was representative of a 6.8 percent rating. Two years in the classroom had the lowest response rate, at 2.3 percent. Five years of classroom instruction was representative of the longest span for marketing education teachers.

(4) Were any of the graduates working in a field unrelated to marketing education?

Occupations that were totally unrelated to marketing education were homemaker, police officer, and self-employed. Careers that were unrelated to teaching, but would fall under the marketing framework were claims adjuster, development director, field

supervisor, human resources, lender, project coordinator, and real estate. Positions that were unrelated to teaching, but were more than correlated to the marketing business world were sales, marketing manager, and advertising consultant.

(5) What were some of the recommendations for making a marketing education teaching career more engaging or appealing?

The number one recommendation by all respondents was salary. Marketing education graduates offered 29 recommendations for making a teaching career more appealing and engaging. Other recommendations were to combine marketing education with a business degree, more funding for the program, intern positions in business and industry, more administrative support, and offer financial rewards. The implications drawn from the surveys for this study were that internships for business and industry may produce a more knowledgeable and experienced instructor in the classroom. More administrative support and salary also correlated with the top six reasons for teacher turnover. In addition, financial rewards may create an incentive for teachers to become more dedicated.

Overall, the marketing education graduates offered many recommendations for improving an educational position. Hopefully, these recommendations will be scrutinized and discussed in creating realistic and proactive solutions to improve a marketing teaching career and the marketing program as a whole.

Recommendations

Past studies have emphasized the importance of creating effective programs that may be able to intercept a teacher in a positive way and eliminate the possibility of unneeded teacher turnover. Workshops and seminars are needed that network and strengthen the foundation of the teacher's attitude toward their fundamental position. The end result

may be the progressive development of an individual who realizes they can cope and survive with the problems that exist in education.

Many educational organizations were progressively trying to recommend and develop much needed programs to aid and retain current teachers in the field of education. Research implied that there had been many attempts to incorporate these positive steps into the system, but at times they had been unsuccessful because of budget cuts, the lack of support through the administration and political red tape.

Nevertheless, it was imperative that a continued effort was created to reveal the reasons encompassing teacher turnover. It was also important to understand the state of affairs, whether personal or scholastic, and the trends that created the difference between a teacher candidate who maintained career status and those that exited the field of education. These factors needed to be known and assessed in order to establish an environment conducive to attracting new and qualified instructors. This contrived information may be indispensable for the creation of programs involving guidance, mentoring, and the selection of future teacher coordinators (Greene & Tahti, 1984).

#### Recommendations For Further Study

- (1) Cooper, et al. (1985), suggested the need for pre-service and in-service programs designed to develop skills in coping with the many problems that confront teachers on a daily basis, and also address the causes of teacher turnover.
- (2) Further explore the reasons for marketing education teacher turnover, thus making an attempt to lessen this problem.
- (3) Prioritize the recommendations offered by marketing education graduates and realistically attempt to create solutions to resolve these issues.

- (4) Explore the possibility of creating UW-Stout workshop committees that are designed to discuss and evaluate viable issues confronting marketing education teachers.
- (5) Encourage potential marketing education students to attend workshops and seminars involving topics discussing new trends in marketing and the business world.
- (6) Stress the positives of a marketing education career, and the differences that teachers can make with today's youth.
- (7) More research should be conducted to assess and evaluate the value of business and other certifications to enhance the employability of marketing education graduates.
- (8) Explore the idea of conducting a similar study in the future, except with more time allocated for participants to respond to original and follow-up letters. In other words, work toward creating a higher response rate.
- (9) Carefully scrutinize the recommendations extracted from marketing education graduates who have been in the educational trenches and, thus, have actively participated in the program.
- (10) More emphasis placed on recruitment efforts throughout Wisconsin's and Minnesota's high schools, with the purpose of bringing more acclaim to UW-Stout's marketing education program.
- (11) Examine and assess the potential marketing educator's ability to perform all aspects of a program.
- (12) Examine realistic strategies that can be utilized to lessen the problem of burnout with marketing education coordinators.

## References

Baker, David P. & Smith, Thomas (1997). Teacher turnover and teacher quality: Refocusing the issue. Teacher's College Record, 99(1), pp. 29-35, 7p (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 557 683).

Boe, Erling E.; Bobbit, Sharon A.; Cooke, Lynn H.; Barkani, Gema; & Maislan, Greg (1998). Teacher turnover in eight cognate areas. National Trends and Predictors. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 426 991).

Borsuk, Alan J. (2000, March 6). For teachers, pay isn't the only thing. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel* [Online]. pp. A1.,A2.

Available: <http://www.jsonline.com/news/metro/mar00/pay07030600a.asp>

Catalyst: Finding and Keeping Teachers. (1999, September). First-year teacher plans issue on new teachers rating their first year.

Available: <http://www.catalyst-chicago.org/09-99/099survey.htm>

Chase, Bob (2000, April). Show us the money. *NEA Today* [Online]. 18(7), p.5, 1/2 p EBSCOhost Academic Search Elite FULLtext. Item Number 2953156.

Colbourne, Jeff (1998, Spring). Teacher turnover: As many as twenty-two percent of teachers will leave the North this year. Northern News Service (NNS).

Available: [http://www.nnscom/frames/newspapers/archive98-1/jun98/jun8\\_98teach.html](http://www.nnscom/frames/newspapers/archive98-1/jun98/jun8_98teach.html)

Cooper, William D., et al. (1985). Marketing and Distributive Education National Education Conference Report. A National Study on Marketing Education Teacher Turnover. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 329 666).

Croasmun, Janice; Hampton, Donald; & Herrmann, Suzannah (1997). Teacher attrition: Is time running out? Educational Leadership Program: School of Education.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: Horizon Site Sponsor.

Available: <http://horizon.unc.edu/projects/issues/papers/ampton.asp>

Etorre, Barbara (1997, May). How are companies keeping the employees they want? *Management Review* [Online}. 86(5), p.49, 5p, 2c. EBSCOhost Academic Search Elite FULLtext. Item Number 9706096402.

Glampe, Linda M. (1999). A feasibility study on implementing a marketing education program in Elmwood, Wisconsin: UW-Stout Educational Thesis. (Thesis Collection Database No. LD 5171 S72h 1999 G456).

Grady, Thomas L. & Figueria, Edwardo A. (1987). Vocational teacher turnover/retention behavior: A four-stage process. Journal of Vocational and Technical Education, 4, pp. 25-38. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 364 505).

Greene, Myrna & Tahti, Mel (1984). A study of teachers who leave the teaching profession. Abstract of teaching survey. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 268 867).

Grissmer, David & Kirby, Sheila Nataraj (1997). Teacher turnover and teacher quality. Teacher's College Record, 99(1) p. 45, 12p. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 557 686).

Ingersoll, Richard M. & Rossi, Robert (1995, December). A tally of teacher turnover. *Education Digest* [Online]. 61(4), p.39,2p. EBSCOhost Academic Search Elite FULLtext. Item Number 9512113154.

Ingersoll, Richard M. (1997). Teacher turnover and teacher quality: The recurring myth of teacher shortages. Teacher's College Record, 99(1), pp. 41-44, 4p. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 557 685).

Jundt, Dwight J. (1997). Personal recommendations from Dwight J. Jundt, principal of the Little Snake River Valley Schools in Baggs, Wyoming. Select Committee on School Finance Memorandum.

Available: <http://legisweb.state.wy.us/1997inte/financemeetings/comments.htm>

Kremer, Lya & Hofman, John E. (1981). Teacher's professional identity and job leaving inclination. Abstract study on intrinsic motives that account for teachers leaving their profession. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 202 851).

McKnab, Paul (1983). A summary of attrition rates and an analysis of reasons for quitting. Abstract on reasons for teacher turnover. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 238 231).

National Education Association (NEA, 2000). Ready or not: A national education shortage looms. National Education Association Communications Fact Sheet.

Available: <http://www.nea.org/teaching/shortage/html>.

Norton, M. Scott (1999, Spring). Teacher retention: Reducing costly teacher turnover. *Contemporary Education* [Online]. 70(3), p.52, 4p. EBSCOhost Academic Search Elite Fulltext. Item Number 2442635.

Placement and Co-op Services (1999-2000). Annual Employment Report.  
103 Administration Building, University of Wisconsin-Stout: Menomonie, Wisconsin.

Available: [placementcoop@uwstout.edu](mailto:placementcoop@uwstout.edu) or [www.uwstout.edu/place](http://www.uwstout.edu/place)

Richards, Beverly; O'Brien, Terrance; & Akroyd, Duane (1993). Predicting the organizational commitment of marketing education and health occupations education teachers by work related rewards. Digital Library and Archives.

Available: <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JITE/v32nl/Richards.html>

Seyfarth, John T. & Best, William A. (1986). Teacher turnover and the quality of work life in schools: An empirical study. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 20, p.6. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 342 010).

The Tormont Webster's Illustrated Encyclopedic Dictionary. (1990). pp.119 & 241. Montreal, Canada: Tormont Publishers.

Whettingsteel, Heidi & Minett, Joanna (1999, May). Writing your future. *Director* [Online]. 52(10), p.20, 3/4p. EBSCOhost Academic Search Elite Fulltext. Item Number 1892143.

Williams, Harold (1992). Marketing education teacher turnover: Appapachicola, Florida, AP 3-5. Marketing Education National Research Conference Report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 380 700).

## APPENDIX A

### Marketing Education Survey

# Marketing Education Survey

February 5, 2001

- 1) When did you graduate from UW-Stout's Marketing Education program?  
Check appropriate month and year  
 Spring \_\_\_\_\_ Summer \_\_\_\_\_ Winter \_\_\_\_\_. 95 \_\_\_\_ 96 \_\_\_\_ 97 \_\_\_\_ 98 \_\_\_\_ 99 \_\_\_\_  
 May \_\_\_\_\_ August \_\_\_\_\_ December \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) Are you currently teaching? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_  
If Yes, please give the name of the school, location, and subjects taught:  
 School Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Location: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Subjects Taught: Marketing \_\_\_\_\_ Business \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_
- 3) How many years have you been teaching marketing education?  
 0 \_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_ 5 \_\_\_\_
- 4) If you are not teaching, what is your occupation? \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Did you attain a teaching position upon graduation from UW-Stout?  
 Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_
- 6) Did you leave a teaching position for a position in business? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_
- 7) If you answered yes to question 6, what were the reasons why you left?  
 A. \_\_\_\_\_  
 B. \_\_\_\_\_  
 C. \_\_\_\_\_
- 8) If you are working in an occupation unrelated to teaching marketing, do you think you will ever go into the teaching profession? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_  
 If no, why? \_\_\_\_\_
- 9) If you have left the field of teaching marketing education, what do you feel is the main reason for marketing teacher turnover?  
 A. \_\_\_\_\_
- 10) What do you feel are some of the other reasons for marketing teacher turnover?  
 A. \_\_\_\_\_  
 B. \_\_\_\_\_  
 C. \_\_\_\_\_
- 11) What are some recommendations for making a marketing education teaching position more appealing?  
 A. \_\_\_\_\_  
 B. \_\_\_\_\_  
 C. \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX B

Marketing Education Survey Cover Letter  
with  
Human Subjects Consent Form

February 5, 2001

Dear Marketing Education Graduate:

As a fellow alumni of UW-Stout's Marketing Education program, greetings from our alma mater! I am a graduate student in Vocational and Technical Education, with a concentration in marketing education at Stout.

You are all a valuable link in the improvement and updating process of higher education. Your point of view, ideas, and feedback as a former marketing student are crucial for the success of UW-Stout's Marketing Education program.

Working with Carol Mooney as my graduate advisor, I am in the process of gathering valid information to complete my thesis for graduation in May, 2001. Would you please take a few moments to respond to a brief survey. Your candor and honesty will be greatly appreciated. You will have complete anonymity with your survey responses.

Thank you very much for your time. You pass the learning torch to individuals like myself. So that I can accomplish my research goals, please return the survey in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope by February 28, 2001.

Sincerely,

Richard Nelson

Enclosure:  
marketing education student survey  
survey return stamped envelope

I understand that by returning the/this questionnaire, I am giving my informed consent as a participating volunteer in this study. I understand the basic nature of this study and agree that any potential risks are exceedingly small. I also understand the potential benefits that might be realized from the successful completion of this study. I am aware that the information is being sought in a specific manner so that no identifiers are needed so that confidentiality is guaranteed. I realize that I have the right to refuse to participate and that my right to withdraw from participation at any time during the study will be respected with no coercion or prejudice.

NOTE: Questions or concerns about participation in the research or subsequent complaints should be addressed first to the researcher or research advisor and second to Dr. Ted Knous, chair, UW-Stout Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, 11 HH, UW-Stout Menomonie, WI, 54751, phone (715) 232-1126.

## APPENDIX C

Marketing Education Follow-up Cover Letter  
with  
Human Subjects Consent Form

March 1, 2001

Dear Marketing Education Graduate:

This is just a brief follow-up letter on the marketing education graduate survey I sent to you on February 5, 2001. If you have already mailed me your survey results, thank you, and please disregard this letter. If not, please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed survey.

You are all a valuable link in the improvement and updating process of higher education. Your point of view, ideas and feedback as a former marketing student are crucial for the continued improvement of UW-Stout's marketing education program.

Thank you very much for your quick response to this request. I hope to begin analyzing data after March 12, 2001. All survey responses are guaranteed anonymity.

Sincerely,

Richard Nelson

Enclosure:  
marketing education student survey  
survey return stamped envelope

I understand that by returning the/this questionnaire, I am giving my informed consent as a participating volunteer in this study. I understand the basic nature of this study and agree that any potential risks are exceedingly small. I also understand the potential benefits that might be realized from the successful completion of this study. I am aware that the information is being sought in a specific manner so that no identifiers are needed and so that confidentiality is guaranteed. I realize that I have the right to refuse to participate and my right to withdraw from participation at any time during the study will be respected with no coercion or prejudice.

NOTE: Questions or concerns about participation in the research or subsequent complaints should be addressed first to the researcher or research advisor and second to Dr. Ted Knous, chair, UW-Stout Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, 11 HH, UW-Stout, Menomonie, WI, 54751, phone (715) 232-1126.

## APPENDIX D

Greetings from UW-Stout  
Alumni Association

**Alumni Office****Memorandum**

---

to: Marketing Education Graduates

from: Sue Pittman, Alumni Director

subject: Master Thesis Survey

---

The Alumni office is assisting a current student who is completing his Master's Thesis. As part of the process he must complete a survey to gather data to complete his thesis. As it is our policy not to provide names and addresses of our alumni, we are forwarding his survey to you on his behalf.

Thank you for keeping us informed of your address and current and information. And, if you find yourselves in Menomonie, please stop by the alumni office. I would welcome the opportunity to meet and visit with each of you.