

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

**This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.**

**The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.**

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.**
- 5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.**

**University Microfilms International**  
300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA  
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green  
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

77-25,216

BAILEY, Archie Hall, 1937-  
AN INVESTIGATION OF PARENTS' ATTITUDES AND  
OPINIONS REGARDING THE COLLECTION AND USE  
OF STUDENT INFORMATION IN THREE SELECTED  
MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1977  
Education, guidance and counseling

**Xerox University Microfilms,** Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

AN INVESTIGATION OF PARENTS' ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS REGARDING  
THE COLLECTION AND USE OF STUDENT INFORMATION IN THREE  
SELECTED MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

By

Archie Hall Bailey

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Counseling, Personnel Services  
and Educational Psychology

1977

## ABSTRACT

### AN INVESTIGATION OF PARENTS' ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS REGARDING THE COLLECTION AND USE OF STUDENT INFORMATION IN THREE SELECTED MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

By

Archie Hall Bailey

The purpose of this study was to conduct an investigation of parent attitudes and opinions regarding the collection and use of student information in elementary and secondary schools. The researcher was unable to locate any previous examination of how parents view this topic. The degree and intensity of parent interest was unknown.

The dimensions of the study required proposing four research questions:

Q. 1: How do parents believe the collection and use of student information has been handled in their school district?

Q. 2: What do parents believe should be contained in student records?

Q. 3: Who do parents believe should have access to student records?

Q. 4: How do parents view the storing/maintenance of student records?

The study was a descriptive study and represents an exploratory attempt to identify and examine parent attitudes relating to the

collection and use of student information. The two main objectives of this research were: (1) to study the attitudes of parents regarding student information in three selected Michigan school districts, and (2) if differences were found to exist, to attempt to identify the factors that appear to contribute to the observed differences.

Three K-12 Michigan public school districts participated in the study. The three school districts were selected on the basis of identified differences thought to be associated with variation in attitudes.

The population for the study consisted of 51,000 students enrolled in three school districts as of June, 1976. The sample size was determined by using a modification of a formula developed by the Research Division of the National Education Association. Eight hundred ten students were randomly selected from elementary school, junior high school, and senior high school enrollments of all districts. A stratified sample of 383 parents, representing children in all grades in all schools was then drawn from this group.

A questionnaire was used to gather data for assessing parent attitudes regarding the collection and use of student information. The questionnaire, containing 31 items in three sections, was developed specifically for this study and validated in a pilot program including a group of seventy-eight parents. Section I contains nine items dealing with demographic data. Section II contains

sixteen items dealing exclusively with respondents' attitudes regarding the collection and use of student information, and Section III contains items dealing with: (a) how parents have been informed by their school districts about the student record process, (b) the degree of significance the respondents place on material kept in student record files, and (c) who the responding parents see as the final authority in dealing with student records. Items in Section III were framed within the context of the Child Accounting Student Record File (CA-60) widely used in Michigan.

A questionnaire was mailed to the parent(s) of each randomly selected student. Two follow-up mailings to non-responding parents were conducted.

The procedure for analyzing the data in this study consisted primarily of a comparison of parents' attitudes in the three selected Michigan school districts. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize and describe the research data. The Z-test was used to estimate the range of scores representing the respondents' attitudes. One-way analysis of variance was used to test significant differences among the three school districts. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used. Data were run on the CDC 6500 computer at Michigan State University.

Major findings and implications include: (1) despite the fact that all three school districts applied the letter of the law in advising parents of student record procedures, the respondents

**This  
volume  
is  
dedicated  
to  
my  
parents  
Frederick and Katherine Bailey**

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful for the guidance of my doctoral committee members, Dr. James Costar, Dr. Archibald Shaw, Dr. Christopher Vanderpool and especially my chairman Dr. Raymond N. Hatch.

Dr. C. Robert Muth's assistance in securing the cooperation of the three school districts was exemplary.

Many thanks go also to Ms. Suwatana Sookpokakit for her assistance with the statistics of this study and to Ms. Deborah Dearing for typing the original manuscript.

Finally--and most importantly--my wife, Susan, who never waived in her total support of my effort...during what must have seemed like an endless period of time.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Introduction To The Problem . . . . .	1
Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act in Practice . . . . .	2
Parent Attitudes and The Issue of Student Record Information . . . . .	4
Parents' Role to Date . . . . .	8
Statement of The Problem . . . . .	9
Questions To Be Answered by This Study . . . . .	9
Purpose of The Study . . . . .	9
Identification and Definition of Terms . . . . .	10
Limitations of The Study . . . . .	14
Summary . . . . .	15
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	18
Introduction . . . . .	18
History of Student Information . . . . .	18
Student Record Literature . . . . .	29
Legal Aspects of Student Records . . . . .	29
Movement for Change . . . . .	30
Literature Since Passage of The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 . . . . .	33
Parent Attitudes . . . . .	34
Summary . . . . .	36
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY . . . . .	38
Introduction . . . . .	38
Data Collection . . . . .	38
Flint Community Schools . . . . .	40
The Community . . . . .	40
Facilities . . . . .	41
Students . . . . .	42
Staff . . . . .	43
Sources of Funds . . . . .	43

Chapter	Page
Bay City Public Schools . . . . .	44
The Community . . . . .	44
Facilities and Staff . . . . .	46
Sources of Funds . . . . .	46
Students . . . . .	47
Ann Arbor Public Schools . . . . .	47
The Community . . . . .	47
Staff . . . . .	49
Sources of Funds . . . . .	49
Students . . . . .	50
Facilities . . . . .	50
The Survey Population and Sample . . . . .	50
The Population . . . . .	50
The Sample . . . . .	51
Development of The Instrument . . . . .	54
Questionnaire Administration . . . . .	57
Data Processing . . . . .	58
Data Analysis . . . . .	58
Summary . . . . .	59
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	60
Introduction . . . . .	60
Parent Questionnaire . . . . .	60
Answer Categories . . . . .	60
Characteristics of Respondents . . . . .	61
Three School Districts Contrasted . . . . .	61
Questionnaire Response by School District . . . . .	62
Demographic Characteristics . . . . .	63
Level of Education of Respondents . . . . .	63
Age of Respondents . . . . .	63
Years of Residency in School District . . . . .	63
Occupation of Respondents . . . . .	64
Discussion of Student Records Among Parents . . . . .	67
Parent Attendance at School Sponsored Meetings . . . . .	67
Parent/School Official Discussion of Student Records . . . . .	67
Parent Attitudes and Opinions . . . . .	68
Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Level of Parents. . . . .	68
Student Record Location . . . . .	69
Parent Accessibility to Student Records . . . . .	69
Student Record Content . . . . .	72
School District Procedures Regarding the Handling of Student Records . . . . .	72

Chapter	Page
Parent Use of Student Records . . . . .	72
Legal Protection of Student Records . . . . .	76
Parents' Right to Challenge Accuracy of Their Child's School Record . . . . .	76
Student Record Use by Police or Social Agencies . . . . .	76
School's Authority to Control Student Records . . . . .	80
Special-Help Information in Student Records . . . . .	80
Storing/Maintenance of Student Records . . . . .	83
Use of Computers in Storing Student Records . . . . .	83
Use of Student Records for Research by Institutions of Higher Education . . . . .	86
School District Officials' Awareness of Parents' Attitudes and Opinions . . . . .	86
School District Policy for Handling Student Information . . . . .	86
School's Motives for Keeping Student Records . . . . .	90
Removing Negative Information From Student Records. . . . .	90
Parent Sources of Information Regarding Student Records . . . . .	93
Student Record Content . . . . .	93
Final Authority Over Use of Student Records . . . . .	96
Testing Data in Student Records . . . . .	96
Items Currently Included in Student Records . . . . .	96
Analysis by Age . . . . .	100
Analysis by Educational Status . . . . .	105
Analysis by Occupation . . . . .	109
Open-Ended Questionnaire Responses . . . . .	113
"Satisfied" Parents . . . . .	113
"Dissatisfied" Parents . . . . .	116
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	119
Summary of Findings: Implications and Observations . . . . .	119
Research Question 1 . . . . .	120
Summary of Related Findings . . . . .	120
Research Question 2 . . . . .	120
Summary of Related Findings . . . . .	121
Research Question 3 . . . . .	122
Summary of Related Findings . . . . .	122
Research Question 4 . . . . .	122
Summary of Related Findings . . . . .	123
Additional Findings . . . . .	123

Chapter	Page
Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	126
Recommendations for Implementation of The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act . . . . .	127
APPENDIX	
A. LETTERS TO PARENTS . . . . .	130
B. PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	134
C. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES . . . . .	137
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	154

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. The Number of Students in The Ann Arbor Public Schools Selected For The Sample . . . . .	52
2. The Number of Students in The Bay City Public Schools Selected For The Sample . . . . .	53
3. The Number of Students in The Flint Community Schools Selected For The Sample . . . . .	53
4. Selected School Districts Identified by Community, Population, Type . . . . .	62
5. Questionnaires Distributed to School Districts and Percentage of Returns . . . . .	62
6. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents By School District . . . . .	65
7. An Analysis of Respondents By Occupation . . . . .	66
8. Verbal Communication of Parents Regarding Discussions Between Parents Regarding the Information Kept in Student Records . . . . .	67
9. Parent Attendance At School Sponsored Meetings . . . . .	68
10. Verbal Communication Between Parents and School Officials Regarding School Records . . . . .	68
11. Parent Responses Regarding Satisfaction With How School District Personnel Have Informed Parents of Where Their Child's School Record is Located . . . . .	70
12. Parent Responses Regarding Satisfaction With How School Personnel Have Informed Parents of Accessibility to Student Records . . . . .	71
13. Parent Responses Regarding Satisfaction With How They Have Been Informed By School Officials Of The Content Of Student Records . . . . .	73

Table	Page
14. Parent Responses Regarding Satisfaction With School District Procedures Relating Generally To Student Record Information . . . . .	74
15. Parent Responses Regarding Parent Accessibility To Their Child's School Record . . . . .	75
16. Parent Responses Regarding Legal Protection of Information in Student Records . . . . .	77
17. Parent Responses Regarding Parents' Right To Challenge The Accuracy of Information In Their Child's School Records . . . . .	78
18. Parent Responses Regarding The Use of Student Records by Police or Other Social Agencies Without Prior Parental Consent . . . . .	79
19. Parent Responses Regarding The Authority of The School To Control Student Records . . . . .	81
20. Parent Responses Regarding The Inclusion of Special-Help Information in Student Records . . . . .	82
21. Parent Responses Regarding The Storing/Maintenance of Student Records . . . . .	84
22. Parent Responses Regarding The Use of Computers To Store Student Record Information . . . . .	85
23. Parent Responses Regarding Use of Student Records By Institutions of Higher Learning For Research Purposes . . . . .	87
24. Parent Responses Regarding School Official's Awareness of Parent Attitudes and Opinions . . . . .	88
25. Parent Responses Regarding School District Policy For The Handling of Student Information . . . . .	89
26. Parent Responses Regarding Parents' Perceptions of The School's Motives For Keeping Student Records . . . . .	91
27. Parent Responses Regarding An Annual Purge of Negative Information From Student Records . . . . .	92
28. Parents' Sources of Information Regarding Student Information . . . . .	94

Table	Page
29. Parent Ranking By "Degree of Importance" of Information To Be Contained in Student Records . . . . .	95
30. Parent Responses Regarding Who Should Have "Final Authority" Over The Use of Student Records . . . . .	97
31. Parent Responses Regarding "Degree of Importance" of Test Data To Be Contained in Student Records . . .	98
32. Parent Responses Regarding Ranking of Items Currently Included In Student Records (Re: Russell Sage Guidelines . . . . .	99
33. Parent Responses Ranked By Age Regarding Satisfaction With How School District Personnel Have Informed Parents of Where Their Child's School Record is Located . . . . .	101
34. Parent Responses Ranked By Age Regarding Satisfaction With How Effectively School Personnel Have Informed Parents of Accessibility To Student Records . . . . .	102
35. Parent Responses Ranked By Age Regarding Satisfaction With How They Have Been Informed By School Officials Of The Content Of Student Records . . . . .	103
36. Parent Responses Ranked By Age Regarding Satisfaction With School District Procedures Relating Generally To Student Record Information . . . . .	104
37. Parent Responses Ranked By Educational Status Regarding Satisfaction With How School District Personnel Have Informed Parents of Where Their Child's School Record Is Located . . . . .	106
38. Parent Responses Ranked By Educational Status Regarding Satisfaction With How Effectively School Personnel Have Informed Parents of Accessibility to Student Records . . . . .	107
39. Parent Responses Ranked By Educational Status Regarding Satisfaction With How They Have Been Informed By School Officials of The Content of Student Records. .	108
40. Parent Responses Ranked By Educational Status Regarding Satisfaction With School District Procedures Relating Generally To Student Record Information . . . . .	110

Table	Page
41.1. Parent Responses Ranked By Occupation Regarding Satisfaction With School District Procedures Relating Generally To Student Record Information (Part I) . . . . .	111
41.2. Parent Responses Ranked By Occupation Regarding Satisfaction With School District Procedures Relating Generally To Student Record Information (Part II) . . . . .	112
42. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #10 . . . . .	137
43. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #11 . . . . .	138
44. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #12 . . . . .	139
45. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #13 . . . . .	140
46. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #14 . . . . .	141
47. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #15 . . . . .	142
48. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #16 . . . . .	143
49. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #17 . . . . .	144
50. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #18 . . . . .	145
51. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #19 . . . . .	146
52. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #20 . . . . .	147
53. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #21 . . . . .	148



Table	Page
54. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #22 . . . . .	149
55. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #23 . . . . .	150
56. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #24 . . . . .	151
57. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #25 . . . . .	152
58. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #26 . . . . .	153

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Introduction To The Problem

One of the latest convulsions in the continuing crisis of public education deals with the collection and use of student record information and the general use of the cumulative record.

Student records involve privacy. Privacy has been both widely exalted and debated throughout our nation's history. Justice Louis Brandeis affirmed this in a famous minority opinion:

Every unjustified intrusion upon the privacy of the individual, by whatever means employed, must be deemed a violation of the Fourth Amendment.<sup>1</sup>

The Buckley Amendment, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, seemed to focus significant national attention on common educational practices which constituted alleged violations of the individual's right to privacy. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act was seen as the culminating step in a movement to protect information about the lives of students.<sup>2</sup> The Act was basic and specific. The Act said:

---

<sup>1</sup>Olmstead v. United States 277 U.S. 438 (1927).

<sup>2</sup>William Rioux, "While 25 Million Children Wait," Parent Alert (October, 1975), p. 1.

- (a) parents of students have the right to see their children's school records.
- (b) parents have the right to challenge and correct misleading, incorrect and irrelevant information.
- (c) controls on accessibility to student records must be established.

In August, 1976 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) implemented the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act by publishing guidelines reaffirming the necessity for educators to develop a sensitivity for the privacy of students in their care.<sup>3</sup>

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act in Practice

Currently the broad principle of the right of privacy regarding the collection and use of student information is being translated into procedures implemented by local school districts nationally. And, in some instances:

. . . school administrators are resisting efforts to spell out new policies or tell parents about their new rights (as required by law). . . <sup>4</sup>

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act is evidence of a growing national concern regarding the collection and use of student information.<sup>5</sup> Several studies of school districts completed since

---

<sup>3</sup>"Privacy Rights of Parents and Students," Federal Register, Volume 40, No. 3, Part III (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare), p. 24662.

<sup>4</sup>Rioux, op. cit., p. 1.

<sup>5</sup>Rioux, op. cit., p. 2.

passage of the Act were designed to examine how well school systems are responding to public and judicial pressure to reform the information-handling and releasing procedures. The results of those studies imply non-compliance.<sup>6</sup>

Following passage of the Act the Department of HEW worked for fifteen months preparing operational guidelines. The Department attempted to reconcile questions raised by more than three hundred publicly recorded comments on the proposal. From November 19, 1974 to August, 1976 national parent advocacy groups forcefully urged HEW to issue comprehensive guidelines.<sup>7</sup>

The Buckley Amendment, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, and the final HEW guidelines have contributed to a professional dilemma. In support of that position one observer had commented that:

The problem with the final regulations, which are described in pure administrativesese, is that they are nearly impossible to comprehend and they tend to create a climate among school people which clearly approximates fear.<sup>8</sup>

In effect, recent legislation has further complicated the issue of the collection and use of student information. Instead of

---

<sup>6</sup>Carl Ashbaugh and Martha Williams, "Changing Laws and Un-changing Practices in Student Record Keeping," Phi Delta Kappan, (May, 1975), p. 62.

<sup>7</sup>Rioux, op. cit., p. 2.

<sup>8</sup>Editor, "School Privacy Act," The Flushing Observer (Flushing, Michigan: August 11, 1976), p. 4.

acting in consultation with practitioners and after lengthy substantive study, the Buckley Amendment, for example, was passed without benefit of any public hearings. One United States Senator felt and expressed the frustration of the issue before voting. Senator Philip Hart (D), Michigan said:

I profess total bafflement on this issue. I don't know which side I am on. . . I wish we had a study or report on this. [the issue was then passed on an unrecorded voice vote].<sup>9</sup>

Others also saw the legislation as further complicating resolution of the issue.

The new laws sound so straightforward, you would think school people would have little trouble understanding them. Trouble is, a labyrinth of complexities lurk behind the words.<sup>10</sup>

#### Parent Attitudes and the Issue of Student Record Information

The Buckley Amendment, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, and the HEW guidelines have made the collection and use of information one of the most widely discussed topics in educational circles at this time.<sup>11</sup>

Parent attitudes and opinions can play an important role in the resolution of this issue.<sup>12</sup> Identifying, classifying, comparing,

<sup>9</sup>Congressional Record, Vol. 120 (1974), 1183.

<sup>10</sup>Editor, "School Record Dilemma," American School Board Journal (January, 1975), p. 47.

<sup>11</sup>As demonstrated by the inclusion of the topic "Student Records" in Research in Education, 1975-76.

<sup>12</sup>American Association of Secondary School Administrators, Public Relations for America's Schools, Twenty-Eighth Yearbook (Washington, D.C., 1960), p. 5.

and understanding parent attitudes and opinions regarding practices and procedures used for collecting and using student information can be important. An understanding of the issue is essential in order to determine a proper balance between limited access to student information and freedom of information to meet the needs of society and the welfare of the student.

There has been increasing acknowledgment that support for public education depends upon the goodwill and understanding of parents.<sup>13</sup> Parents confront school administrators daily with strong indications of approval and disapproval of what they are doing. Administrators are becoming more aware that keeping alert to the opinion of the people is important.<sup>14</sup> The public's past passive consumption of educational operations can no longer be taken for granted. Instead, there is a growing demand for greater direct parent participation in the planning and implementation of school programs.<sup>15</sup> Pollster George Gallup confirmed this recently writing that:

. . .if parents are to maintain their faith in the public schools as a basic service, citizens will have to share in policy decisions affecting their children's future.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>Raymond N. Hatch, "Summary of Overhead Presentation: Pupil Personnel Record," (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1975), p. 1.

<sup>14</sup>Michael Y. Nunnery and Ralph B. Kimbrough, Politics, Power, Polls, and School Elections, (Berkeley: McCutchan Press, 1971), pp. 2-3.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 122.

<sup>16</sup>George Gallup, "The Public Looks at the Public Schools," Today's Education (September, 1975), p. 17.

The formulation of policies and practices for the collection and use of student information within individual school districts now merits direct parent participation. An important prerequisite of that participation must be a systematic examination of parents' attitudes and opinions regarding the subject.<sup>17</sup>

A study of parent attitudes and opinions regarding the collection and use of student information, and of the content of the cumulative record, can be significant at this time as a result of growing interest among the general public and educators. Assessing parent attitudes and opinions of school activities is one way for educators to effectively relate to the school community and its existing concerns.

Several writers have emphasized the need for more accurate perceptions of parent attitudes and opinions. Griffiths has said that:

One must know the group he is working with. This means that the school administrator should know the facts about the community as well as the feelings and opinions of the community.<sup>18</sup>

Doll agrees and suggests a means for measuring community attitudes but expresses the following concerns:

What a community expects and will tolerate from its schools can be indicated roughly by surveys of community opinion. Responses to questionnaires have limited value

---

<sup>17</sup>Donald Ross, Administration for Adaptability (Metropolitan School Study Council: New York, 1971), pp. 85-86.

<sup>18</sup>Daniel E. Griffiths, Human Relations in School Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956), p. 29.

unless the meanings which the respondents intend to express are explored. Determining meaning can be accomplished which confirms support for certain projects and provides warnings against launching others.<sup>19</sup>

Similarly, Donald T. Campbell, past-President of the American Psychological Association, said recently that: ". . .we should inform the public as best we can, and be willing to be informed by them." The issue of the collection and use of student information can be dealt with in those terms. A first step is a study dealing with the collection of basic data regarding the subject from both parents and professionals. Administrators need accurate information about parents' attitudes and opinions regarding the collection and use of student information.

Attitudes are based to a considerable degree upon understanding.<sup>20</sup> Considerable evidence exists which indicates that parent attitudes and opinions regarding the collection and use of student information can be significant.<sup>21</sup> However, a literature search fails to reveal evidence of a research base directly related to this subject. The researcher was unable to locate studies that deal with what parents are thinking about this topic, what they know about current law, and how they want the issue dealt with in their own local school district.

---

<sup>19</sup>Ronald C. Doll, Curriculum Input: Decision-Making Process (Boston: Allyn-Bacon, 1964), p. 62.

<sup>20</sup>Robert McNelis, "An Investigation of Parents' Attitudes, Opinions and Knowledge of Selected Aspects of the Public Schools of St. Mary's County, Maryland," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1968), p. 3.

<sup>21</sup>See Chapter II for a review of the role of parents to date in the student record controversy.



### Parents' Role to Date

The National Committee for Citizens in Education (NCCE) reports that as of June, 1976 their organization had received over 6,000 negative parent contacts focusing on alleged abuses in the collection and use of student information by schools. No comprehensive evaluation or classification of the parent contacts was made. The 6,000 parent contacts may not be statistically significant, but they do indicate a degree of parental concern. NCCE states that their organization has not received a similar volume of mail on any other single issue.

Obtaining and analyzing more information about how parents feel will be a major goal of this study. McClosky agrees that often school-community communications are unrealistic because educators fail to obtain an accurate measure of parents' attitudes and opinions on issues that can provide direction. McClosky states that one of the key steps in the effective communication process is to:

obtain facts from parents about educational values and needs as they see them.<sup>22</sup>

To date, parents have been in the shadows on this important issue.<sup>23</sup> Individual parents have originated challenges in the courts, prodded legislators to action, formed parent advocacy groups, and generally attempted to stimulate interest in the issue of student information, but these were primarily individual efforts.

---

<sup>22</sup>Gordon L. McClosky, "Planning the Public Relations Program," National Education Journal, XLIX (February, 1960), p. 15.

<sup>23</sup>See Chapter II.

### Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to conduct an investigation of parent attitudes and opinions regarding the collection and use of student information. The researcher has been unable to locate a systematic examination of how parents view this topic. The degree and intensity of parent interest appears to be unknown.

The dimensions of this study require proposing four research questions.

### Questions to be Answered by This Study

This study was designed to find answers to four general research questions:

Question 1: How do parents believe the collection and use of student information has been handled in their own school district?

Question 2: What do parents believe should be contained in student records?

Question 3: Who do parents believe should have access to student records?

Question 4: How do parents view the storing/maintenance of student records?

### Purpose of the Study

This study is a descriptive study and represents an exploratory attempt to identify and examine parent attitudes related to the collection and use of student information.

The objectives of this research are: (1) to study the attitudes of parents regarding student information in three selected Michigan school districts, and, (2) if differences are found to exist, to attempt to identify the factors that appear to contribute to the observed differences.

It would appear that a thorough examination of this issue can provide a new source of information for administrators in this vital area. Concomitantly, the study can assist in developing effective school district-community relations and an improved educational atmosphere.

Accordingly, the study can provide administrators in the participating school district with direct access to parent attitudes and opinions in their school districts. The differences in parent attitudes will be explored and their extent and importance assessed.

Finally, this study can also provide information in formulating legislation to further deal with this issue.

#### Identification and Definition of Terms

Attitude: social scientists consider attitude to be an important variable of behavior. Consequently, many of them have attempted to define it. For the purpose of this study, attitude will be used as defined by G. W. Allport: "A mental and neural state of readiness, organized through

experience, asserting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related.<sup>24</sup>

**Privileged Communication:** right of the clients of professional persons to protect these persons from revealing in legal proceedings any information given in confidence as a result of the professional relationship.<sup>25</sup>

**Right to Privacy:** legally protected right of an individual to be free from unwarranted publicity and to be protected from any wrongful intrusion into their private life which would outrage or cause mental suffering, shame, or humiliation to a person of ordinary sensitivities.<sup>26</sup>

**Student:** any person at any time enrolled as a student in a public school regardless of the dates of attendance.<sup>27</sup>

**Minor Student:** any student under the age of 18 years.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup>Gordon W. Allport, Handbook of Social Psychology (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954), p. 16.

<sup>25</sup>John Bancroft, "Ethical and Legal Aspects of Pupil Personnel Work," The Organization of Pupil Personnel Programs--Issues and Practices (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1977), p. 77.

<sup>26</sup>Black, Black's Law Dictionary 1038 (4th ed., 1968).

<sup>27</sup>Michigan Child Accounting and Attendance Association, Information Guide for the Collection-Maintenance-Dissemination of Student Records (Pontiac, Mich.: Oakland Schools, 1974), p. 2.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

**Student Record:** a record kept by the schools in accordance with a state law or regulation and kept on file in a school or in a school district office.<sup>29</sup>

**Confidential Records:** all information concerning students (except that recorded in the Cumulative Record), including psychological evaluations, external agency reports, school reports, school social worker reports, and behavioral records.<sup>30</sup>

**Permanent Records:** those records that are stored during the student's tenure in the school district which includes only the cumulative record.<sup>31</sup>

**Temporary Records:** records which are used during the school year and include only evidence of academic progress and some examples of a child's work such as language skills sample, a social studies skill sample, a handwriting example, and an art work sample. Once the child's placement for the next school year is determined, these temporary records should be destroyed.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup>Michigan Child Accounting and Attendance Association, op. cit., p. 2.

<sup>30</sup>Michigan Child Accounting and Attendance Association, op. cit., p. 2.

<sup>31</sup>Michigan Child Accounting and Attendance Association, op. cit., p. 3.

<sup>32</sup>Michigan Child Accounting and Attendance Association, op. cit., p. 3.

**Cumulative Record:** contains that information recorded on school forms which include the following:

- (a) identifying data: name, parents' name, country of birth of parents, home language, race, sex, residence and phone number.
- (b) academic record: elementary and secondary grades and attendance.
- (c) record of transfers: schools attended and where credits have been sent.
- (d) personal qualifications: subjective senior high school rating.
- (e) standardized testing information: percentile and I.Q. scores.
- (f) health information: immunization record and other health test results.<sup>33</sup>

**CA-60 (Michigan) File:** technical reference name used by professionals to describe a student's cumulative record.

**Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974:** an act dealing with the collection, use, and dissemination of student record information. (see Appendix)

**Buckley-Pell Amendment:** amendment to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974. Clarified the meaning of the words

---

<sup>33</sup>Flint Public Schools, "Right of Access, Cumulative and Confidential Records," (Revised, November, 1974), p. 1.

"Records" and "Hearings". The only sanctions for enforcement of the law(s) calls for the withholding of Federal funds from such institutions as failed to follow its (the Act's and Amendment's) provisions. The Act and Amendment placed the burden of informing the parents of their rights in this area on the educational institutions.<sup>34</sup>

National Committee for Citizens in Education: a parent-advocacy group headquartered in Columbia, Maryland. Headed by Carl L. Marburger. Assisted in the development of appropriate procedures for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to monitor compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

"Satisfied Parents": ratings in response to the four questionnaire items dealing with parent satisfaction. (Q: 10, 11, 12, 13).

Satisfaction: the degree to which an individual's expectations are realized. In this study satisfaction is assessed by the degree to which the respondents perceive student record procedures in their school district as they believe they should be, as compared to what they believe they are.

#### Limitations of the Study

This study is exploratory in nature. The study's main purpose is to investigate parent attitudes and, if differences are found to exist, to identify the factors needing further research that appear to contribute to the observed differences.

---

<sup>34</sup>Roger E. Craig, "Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974: A Tentative Look," Michigan Personnel and Guidance Newsletter, IX, No. 1, September, 1975, p. 1.

The study was planned and conducted under the following limitations:

(1) This study is limited to an investigation of 383 randomly selected parents of children in three selected K-12 Michigan school districts. The children were enrolled in the three school districts as of June, 1976. The 383 randomly selected parents represent .0074% of the total student population in the three school districts.

(2) The collection of data was limited to parents' written responses on a questionnaire.

(3) It is recognized that attitudes and opinions are volatile and are subject to change. This should be considered within the time frame in which the questionnaire was administered.

(4) Twenty-six parents did not complete the questionnaire. Whether the responses of those twenty-six non-respondents could have changed the results of this study is unknown.

### Summary

The privacy of the individual has been the central issue in the controversy regarding the collection and use of student record information. Legislators have written legislation intending to guarantee the right of privacy as it applies to student record information. At the same time educators attempted to maintain a viable student record file. The cumulative record folder of student information is much more than an academic record, it is a human document. Both legislators and educators have aimed for balance between the privacy of the individual and the public's need to know.



Individual parents have played an active role in highlighting individual cases of alleged student record abuse. Parents have started court cases, aggressively lobbied for state and federal legislation, and sponsored parent advocacy groups searching for solutions to the issue. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and the Buckley Amendment are the products of this activity.

Throughout the conflict, parents' attitudes and opinions regarding the issue have not been studied. The depth and degree of parent interest and concern appears to remain unknown. Parents, however, appear to have been at the center of the controversy.

Opinions of writers in the field support the contention that the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act is not being consistently or uniformly enforced. They also contend that the issue of student information is a widening gap separating parents and school officials.

This study is an attempt to provide data from parents regarding their perceptions of student information and the importance they place on---the content of student records, access to student record information, the maintenance/storing of student records, and how parents want student information handled in their own school district.

The problem of this study has been presented and the limitations outlined. This study presents research questions focusing on four areas: the content of student records, access to student record information, the maintenance/storing of student records, and how the respondents want student information to be handled in their own local school district.

The literature related to the study and the historical aspects of the issue will be reviewed in Chapter II. Chapter III is a discussion of the procedures and methods used in the study. Chapter IV, part I, will contain results of parent responses on the questionnaire by school district. Chapter IV, part II, will contain the results of parents' attitudes and opinions regarding student information in relation to certain theoretical constructs and demographic data. Chapter V presents a general summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Introduction

A review of the literature for this study requires a review of previous research in parent attitudes and student information. This review of the literature will provide a background for information to be collected and analyzed in this study.

The most important articles of literature which consider parents' attitudes and opinions and the collection and use of student information have been surveyed.

A thorough search of the literature failed to locate similar studies. The researcher was unable to locate studies of the exact nature of the present study; however, research studies dealing with certain relevant aspects of this study were located and will be referred to in this chapter.

The format used for the review of literature on student information and parent attitudes is the topical approach.

#### History of Student Information

The privacy of school records has developed as a crucial issue in the 20th century. Louis Brandeis called the right to privacy "the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized man."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Brandeis, op. cit.

Student record-keeping began innocently enough in New England in the 1820's.<sup>2</sup> School officials began keeping records of enrollments and attendance records. As the size of the population increased, record-keeping procedures also increased.

The natural centralization of schooling, and the increasing mobility of society, added to the causes of the expansive growth of the student record. The need of educators to know, and encouragement from agencies and organizations outside the school setting contributed to the growth of the school record-keeping process.

In 1925 the National Education Association recommended that extensive health, guidance, and psychological data also be maintained for each pupil.<sup>3</sup> In 1941 the American Council of Education introduced a student record form that directed more attention to behavioral descriptions and evaluation and less to other data like grades and subjects.<sup>4</sup>

In the 1950's and early 1960's a variety of other special interest organizations--i.e. counselors, principals, school psychologists, school social workers--all made substantial additions to the content of the student record. As late as 1960 the U.S. Office of Education listed eight major classifications of information to be included in student records.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Diane Divoky, "Cumulative Records: Assault on Privacy," Learning, September, 1973, p. 18.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>4</sup>Divoky, op. cit., p. 19.

<sup>5</sup>Divoky, op. cit., p. 19.

By 1964 the standard, widely-used Michigan Student Record File, for example, was extensive. The file included:<sup>6</sup>

**Necessary Enclosures:**

- (1) Elementary Insert (CA-60A)
- (2) Secondary Insert (CA-60B)
- (3) Health Insert (CA-60C)

**Optional Enclosures:**

- (1) Reading Insert (CA-60D)
- (2) Special Help - such as Guidance Clinics, Remedial work, Special Education, Social Adjustment, Parent-Teacher Conferences.
- (3) Test Tabulation Sheets
- (4) Records:
  - (a) anecdotal
  - (b) inheritable tendencies
  - (c) neighborhood environment
  - (d) where reared: farm/city
  - (e) parents' preference of occupation for student
  - (f) associates
  - (g) sociograms
  - (h) sex curiosity and development
  - (i) character and moral traits
  - (j) truancy history

---

<sup>6</sup>Michigan Student Record File: GA-60; copyright Rieggle Press, Flint, Michigan, 1960.

- (k) vocational placement and guidance
- (l) statement for part-time employers
- (m) offenses and disciplinary action
- (n) temper tantrums
- (o) participation in school activities

Nationwide, school record-keeping continued to increase. Throughout the 1930's, '40's, '50's, and '60's there appears to have been no development of policies and practices by which the right to privacy and society's need to know were balanced.<sup>7</sup>

Public protest over abuses increased. The nation's courts served as the first battleground. The judiciary was willing to examine the procedures, regulations, and attitudes of the nation's schools regarding pupil personnel records. The courts were willing to hear and resolve, where possible, those cases where rights to privacy were infringed. The courts, in effect, temporarily maintained an uneasy truce between individuals and their school districts on the issue of student information.<sup>8</sup>

A case decided in 1961 was an important decision in a closely associated series of New York cases establishing important rules for the confidentiality of student information. In Van Allen v. McCleary, 211 N.Y.S. 2nd. 501 (1961), a father asked for permission to see all his

---

<sup>7</sup>Henry E. Butler, et al., Legal Aspects of Student Records (Topeka: National Organization of Legal Problems, 1972), p. 4.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 28.

son's school records. The school denied his request. The court granted the father's request saying:

The Court needs no further citation of authority to recognize the obvious 'interest' which a parent has in the school records of his child. We are, therefore, constrained to hold as a matter of law that the parent is entitled to inspect the records.<sup>9</sup>

A similar case decided in New York laid guidelines for outsiders' use of school records. In Marmo v. New York City Board of Education, 289 N.Y.S. 2nd. 51 (1968), a defendant needed school records to build a defense for himself when charged with a crime. He wanted to compel the Board of Education to allow him to inspect school records. The Board of Education refused, based on the principle of confidentiality. The court ruled that sufficient interest was shown, and that the defendant should be allowed to inspect the records. The court said:

Where the defense of a person accused of a crime requires access to public records or even to records sealed from public examination the right to inspection has a greater sanction and must be enforced.<sup>10</sup>

In the area of student use of student records, three significant decisions were rendered between 1962-69. Einhorn et al. v. Maul et al., 300 F. Supp. (1969) sustained the right of high school officials to make public to institutions of higher learning student records relating to nonacademic matters. The court said:

---

<sup>9</sup>Van Allen v. McCleary, 211 N.Y.S. 2nd 501 (1961).

<sup>10</sup>Marmo v. The New York City Board of Education, 289 N.Y.S. 2nd 51 (1968).

School officials have the right and, we think, a duty to record and communicate true factual information about their students to institutions of higher learning, for the purpose of giving to the latter an accurate and complete picture of applicants for admission.<sup>11</sup>

It is important to note here, by way of contrast, a California decision in Elder v. Anderson 23 Cal. Rptr. 48 (1962) in which the court ruled that a student could recover damages if a school improperly, and in violation of statutory direction, released information about him.<sup>12</sup>

In People v. Russell, 29 Cal. Rptr. 562 (1963) regarding students and student records, the court said that:

There is a reasonable basis for college authorities to restrict public circulation of school records. A person who attends a public school might be injured by the promiscuous circulation of this information. There remains a category of records in which the public as a whole has no interest.<sup>13</sup>

In these decisions and a wide variety of other state and national decisions, the courts appeared to be attempting to minimize the risks involved in the collection and use of student information. Similarly, the American Bar Association's Section on Individual Rights and Responsibilities stated that:

---

<sup>11</sup>Einhorn et al. v. Maul et al., 300 F. Supp. (1969).

<sup>12</sup>Elder v. Anderson, 23 Cal. Rptr. 48 (1962).

<sup>13</sup>People v. Russell, 29 Cal. Rptr. 562 (1963).



An institution might presently be enjoined from giving 'unreasonable' publicity to the private lives of its students, or otherwise held to account for an invasion of privacy.<sup>14</sup>

In the same section the American Bar Association suggested a series of proposals, designed to minimize the risk of improper disclosures.

In 1968 a series of personal case histories of alleged abuse of the student record-keeping process motivated two sociologists, David A. Goslin and Nancy Bordier of the Russell Sage Foundation, to survey record-keeping practices in fifty-four representative school districts.

The Goslin-Bordier study attracted wide national attention and the push for reform of the record-keeping practices began.<sup>15</sup> The Goslin-Bordier study was followed in 1969 by the Russell Sage Foundation study. The prestigious Russell Sage Foundation gathered a group of educators, lawyers, and social scientists to review the legal and ethical aspects of student record-keeping and to develop guidelines for the collection, maintenance, and release of student information.

The Russell Sage Foundation report began:

---

<sup>14</sup>American Bar Association, Individual Rights and Responsibilities (Washington, D.C.: 1968), p. 82.

<sup>15</sup>David A. Goslin and Nancy Bordier, The Goslin-Bordier Study (The Russell Sage Foundation: New York), 1969, p. 14.

There are clear indications that current practices of schools and school personnel relating to the collection, maintenance, and use of information about students threatens a desirable balance between the individual's right to privacy and the school's stated need to know.<sup>16</sup>

The Russell Sage Foundation committee's final report contained a wide variety of student record-keeping abuses. The report concluded that:

These deficiencies in record-keeping policies constitute a serious threat to individual privacy in the United States.<sup>17</sup>

The Goslin-Bordier study and the Russell Sage Foundation report and guidelines, accompanied by court decisions, added to the growing concern about threats to privacy posed by an increasingly technological and bureaucratic society.<sup>18</sup>

By 1970 the school record-keeping system was extensive. Government agents had almost total access to students' records in public school settings.<sup>19</sup>

A mother could be coolly informed that she had no right to see the records that resulted in her child being transferred to a class for the mentally retarded. A father attending a routine parent-teacher conference about his outgoing son could discover in the boy's anecdotal record comments that

---

<sup>16</sup>Russell Sage Foundation, Guidelines for the Collection, Maintenance and Dissemination of Pupil Records, Sterling Forest, New York (May 25-28), 1969, pp. 7-8.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 87.

<sup>18</sup>Dvoky, op. cit., p. 18.

<sup>19</sup>Dvoky, op. cit., p. 21.

he was 'strangely introspective' in the third grade, 'unnaturally interested in girls' in the fifth, and had 'developed peculiar political ideas' by the time he was twelve--judgments that the father could neither retroactively challenge nor explain.<sup>20</sup>

Findings of the Goslin-Bordier study found similar weaknesses in the system. The study reported that:

- permanent files contained varied information on students.
- almost all files contained high security data.
- three-fourths of all records contained: personality ratings, student work samples, diaries, and autobiographical sketches.
- anyone from school psychologist to a school secretary could add information to the student file.
- records were consistently little used by the school staff (the official rational being that school files were necessary in order to guide teachers).
- CIA and FBI agents, juvenile court workers, and others had ready access to student files in more than one-half of all school districts surveyed.<sup>21</sup>

Hyman Gross has said that:

Not the law, nor policies, but the aroused conscience of the community should protect privacy in the first instance.<sup>22</sup>

And in the early 1970's that "aroused conscience" began to surface publicly. The Goslin-Bordier report and the Russell Sage Foundation study received wide publicity.

---

<sup>20</sup>Divoky, op. cit., p. 21.

<sup>21</sup>Goslin-Bordier, op. cit., p. 27.

<sup>22</sup>Hyman Gross, Privacy - Its Legal Protection (New York: 1964) p. 84.

In 1971 the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) issued a legal memorandum on the subject entitled "Concerning the Confidentiality of Pupil School Records."<sup>23</sup> The memorandum stressed that:

. . . this emerging area of the law is far from settled, but certain judicial trends consistent with the general challenge to the concept of 'in loco parentis' are beginning to emerge. Although the right of the school to collect and maintain pupil personnel records remains unassailable, the right of a 'party in interest,' i.e. pupils and parents, to access is being more clearly established.<sup>24</sup>

Subsequently, several other educational groups formulated public position papers demanding that the confidentiality of student information be safeguarded. For example, in 1971 the National Education Association, which 46 years earlier urged more comprehensive record-keeping, published a Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities which stated:

The interest of the student must supercede all other purposes to which records might be put.<sup>25</sup>

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 seemed to be the culmination of national concern regarding student record-keeping. Significantly, throughout all these developments parents took

---

<sup>23</sup>National Association of Secondary School Principals, "Concerning the Confidentiality of Pupil School Records," (September, 1971).

<sup>24</sup>National Association of Secondary School Principals, op. cit., p. 1.

<sup>25</sup>National Education Association, Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities (Washington, D.C., 1971), p. 7.

on an adversary role. Parents, with the greatest legal and moral responsibility for the child, were clearly denied access to, and explanation of, their child's student record.<sup>26</sup> The Goslin-Bordier report stated that:

School officials have strong reservations about giving parents very much information about the content of evaluations that are continually being made about their children.<sup>27</sup>

The evidence suggests that school personnel viewed parents as adversaries on this issue. As a result, parents were denied a meaningful role in determining appropriate methods for handling student information. There appeared to be a national division of support between what parents believed about student information and what school administrations believed. As parents resorted to legal redress in both state and federal courts, as seen in the preceding series of cases, school administrators were incapable of dealing with the problem. Tort liability proved to be a strong motivator in calling forth action for the wrong reasons. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 appeared to be the result of the stand-off between parents and school administrators. The Act was one of the few major pieces of legislation passed by Congress in 1974 without public hearings.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup>Goslin-Bordier, op. cit., p. 22 (the authors found that parents had access to the entire student file in fewer than 10% of the districts studied).

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 73.

<sup>28</sup>Congressional Record, op. cit., p. 1183.

### Student Record Literature

Existing sources in the literature provide a foundation for this study. Until the 1960's literature dealing with the collection and use of student information was limited. Huckins,<sup>29</sup> Wagner,<sup>30</sup> Killian,<sup>31</sup> and Pardue, Whichard and Johnson<sup>32</sup> (in a joint study) generally provide the most thorough historical data on the subject.

### Legal Aspects

Butler, Moran, and Vanderpool<sup>33</sup> extensively discussed the legal and administrative aspects of the collection and use of student information, but have not dealt with any other area. The purpose of their study was to focus primarily on the institutionalized collection and use of student information by public elementary and secondary schools nationwide. In particular, the study concerns the circumstances under which information contained in student records can be

---

<sup>29</sup>Wesley Huckins, Ethical and Legal Considerations in Guidance (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1968).

<sup>30</sup>Elmer E. Wagner, "Legal Implications of Duties Performed by Pupil Personnel Workers in California Public Schools," (Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools Report, 1966).

<sup>31</sup>John C. Killian, "The Law, the Counselor, and Student Records," The Personnel and Guidance Journal (February, 1960).

<sup>32</sup>Jerry Pardue, Willis Whichard, and Elizabeth Johnson, "Limiting Confidential Information in Counseling," The Personnel and Guidance Journal (September, 1970).

<sup>33</sup>Butler, op. cit., p. 7.

released, and the legal principles that apply. The authors surveyed state departments of education. They concluded that relatively little serious research had been conducted on the legal aspects of student records.

The Butler, Moran, and Vanderpool study was significant in that it highlighted three truths identified by the authors. First, that man appears to be an extensive record-keeper. Secondly, man seems to be overly curious. And third, that man seeks to protect himself from others by jealously regarding his individual privacy. The authors provided evidence that all three characteristics collide in the area of public school records.

#### Movement for Change

Prior to the enactment of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 several writers called for a re-examination of procedures for dealing with student information.

Hatch warned:

It may be necessary to re-evaluate the entire record-keeping system to see if the information collected, the way it is used, and how it is retained can be justified in terms of professional ethics and legal limitations.<sup>34</sup>

Likewise, Bailey stressed that:

The issue of the collection and use of student information is a critical mandate challenging administrators to show their deep concern about students' fundamental right to

---

<sup>34</sup>Raymond N. Hatch, The Organization of Pupil Personnel Programs, Issues and Practices (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1974), p. 40.

privacy. The confidentiality of student information presents administrators with an opportunity to respond positively and constructively in an increasingly significant area.<sup>35</sup>

The literature of a decade of professional frustration with the student information dilemma was summarized by Ware. She wrote in 1971:

The emerging right to privacy is a legal concept stating that a person should have the right to sue for damages if their individual privacy has been invaded. The courts have been dealing with the right to privacy only in this century and, to say the least, the law is in flux.<sup>36</sup>

The push for reform was evident in the literature. Goslin-Bordier reported:

What is particularly significant is the impression that school officials have strong reservations about giving parents very much information (other than routine grade reports and sometimes achievement test scores) about the content of evaluations that are continually being made of their children.<sup>37</sup>

The Russell Sage Foundation Report found that:

There are clear indications that current practices of schools and school personnel relating to the collection, maintenance, and use of information about students threatens a desirable balance between the individual's right to privacy and the school's stated need to know.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Archie H. Bailey, "A Strategy for Handling Confidential Student Information," The Clearing House, Spring, 1973, p. 35.

<sup>36</sup> Martha Ware, "The Law and Counselor Ethics," The Personnel and Guidance Journal (December, 1971), p. 305.

<sup>37</sup> David A. Goslin and Nancy Bordier, The Goslin-Bordier Study (The Russell Sage Foundation: New York, 1969), p. 14.

<sup>38</sup> Russell Sage Foundation, Guidelines for the Collection, Maintenance, and Dissemination of Pupil Records (Sterling Forest, New York, May, 1969), p. 74.



In 1972 Pratt's study reported the:

Negligence of a majority of secondary school administrators in reviewing the Russell Sage Foundation guidelines. That the guidelines have been available for almost three years indicates that meaningful modification of current practices will be slow indeed.<sup>39</sup>

The purposes of Pratt's study were: (1) to determine the extent to which practices in the public high schools in the State of Michigan conformed with the Russell Sage Foundation guidelines which were designed to ensure the confidentiality of student information, and (2) to determine the extent to which educational organizations' policy statements conformed to the same Russell Sage Foundation guidelines in accomodating the confidentiality of student information.

Pratt's approach included collection of data from questionnaires and document examinations. His significant conclusions included: (1) current public high school practices for handling student information in the State of Michigan did not conform in a substantial number of instances to the Russell Sage Foundation guidelines that were designed to protect the privacy of students; (2) the negligence of a majority of secondary school administrators in reviewing the Russell Sage Foundation guidelines that had been available for almost three years indicated that meaningful modification of then current practices could be slow indeed.

---

<sup>39</sup>Philip D. Pratt, "Practices Employed by Public High Schools and Policy Statements of Educational Organizations in the Collection, Maintenance, and Dissemination of Student Information," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Michigan (1972), p. 303.

Literature Since Passage of the  
Family Educational Rights and  
Privacy Act of 1974

Literature since passage of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act is in three divisions dealing with the problem: (1) popular literature written by spokesmen for parent advocacy groups detailing abuses of student record practices (these writings are not found in the professional literature); (2) effusive literature attempting to explain and clarify the Act itself (generally found in professional journals); and, (3) literature concentrating on the Act's ambiguities and calling for even greater reform.

Typical of literature in professional journals is Craig's statement:

I have delayed this presentation in the hope that the Courts, the Congress, or a group of prominent legal scholars would step forward and explain some of the Act's ambiguities. Since no such clarification has been forthcoming, I submit the following analysis. . .<sup>40</sup>

The purpose of Ashbury and Williams' study<sup>41</sup> was to examine how well certain selected school districts were responding to public, legislative, and judicial pressures to reform student information procedures following distribution of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act guidelines by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

---

<sup>40</sup>Craig, op. cit., p. 1.

<sup>41</sup>Carl R. Ashbaugh and Martha Williams, "Changing Laws and Unchanging Practices in Student Record-Keeping," Phi Delta Kappan (May, 1976), p. 43.

The authors surveyed 440 potential respondents with a 14 item questionnaire. A majority of their respondents (284, or 65%), were school administrators who reported that written policies still did not exist for the collection, use, and release of student information. The authors concluded that unwritten policy tends to be the rule rather than the exception in handling of student information despite passage of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

The authors concluded further that:

Answers to other questionnaire items indicate that neither written nor unwritten policies have been modified of late; the general opinion of the respondents was that existing policies--whether formal or informal--should not change.<sup>42</sup>

### Parent Attitudes

Several studies exist revealing that parent attitudes and opinions continue to be important to all facets of public education. Studies by Parker and McNelis provide evidence for this study that parent attitudes are not something outside or apart from the school community.

The purpose of Parker's study<sup>43</sup> was to identify attitudes toward school quality as expressed by the lay public in selected districts. The author determined the frequency of occurrences of

---

<sup>42</sup>Ashbaugh and Williams, op. cit., p. 45.

<sup>43</sup>Charles Parker, "An Analysis of Public Attitudes Toward Education in Selected School Districts of Associated Public School Districts," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1964

expressed attitudes and the author established polling and analysis procedures for further research that are significant to this study. The author used a questionnaire mailed to 140 school districts.

In his study Parker concluded that:

Local opinion is a force with which educators must cope in decision-making and program planning. The relationship between high quality educational programs and favorable public opinion is well established. High quality school programs cannot exist in an environment of doubt and ignorance.<sup>44</sup>

The purpose of McNelis' study<sup>45</sup> was to investigate parents' opinions and attitudes in a selected school district. McNelis used a parent questionnaire to gather data. He concluded that:

The successful school system depends upon the attitude and understanding of its public. Much school-public communications is misdirected because educators neglect to obtain an accurate picture of parent awareness and opinion which, in turn, enables them to provide facts which they need to know.<sup>46</sup>

Opinion makers have emphasized the importance of parent attitudes. R. M. Travers said:

In a democracy, the task of educational administrators is to serve, not to rule, and consequently it is his duty to know the opinions of those he serves with respect to various policies.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 48.

<sup>45</sup>Robert McNelis, "An Investigation of Parent Attitudes of Selected Aspects of Public Schools of St. Mary's County, Maryland," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The George Washington University, 1964.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>47</sup>R. M. Travers, "A Study in Judging the Opinions of Groups," Archives of Psychology, XLIX, (1960), p. 4.

Similarly, Ross states:

The progress of the schools is too dependent upon the climate of opinion in which they operate. It seems imperative that educational administrators should study to improve it. Little can be done to raise the level of understanding of a community if the administrators have no understanding as to the level existent in the community.<sup>48</sup>

The general relevancy of attitudes to education today is confirmed by current inclusion of the topic attitudes in the various current editions of the Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Research has also revealed that how one feels about something is as important as what one knows about it.<sup>49</sup>

### Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to summarize the literature that relates to the present study.

It should be noted that: First, controversy regarding the past and current procedures for the collection and use of student information has been bitter, lengthy, and complex. Secondly, despite recent major legislation the literature demonstrates that the issue remains unresolved.

The popular literature reveals that parents have had an active indirect role outside the school community in making the issue of the collection and use of student information a national issue.

---

<sup>48</sup>Ross, op. cit., p. 74.

<sup>49</sup>John A. Williamson and Lloyd P. Campbell, "Attitudes Toward Individualizing Instruction," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin (November, 1970), p. 110.

Parents have accomplished this by forming parent advocacy groups, championing the issue as a cause célèbre, and by taking the issue to the courts and legislators.

The professional literature seems to reveal, in a variety of studies, that school administrators have not actively given the same significance to the issue that parents have.

Prior to this study, however, parent attitudes toward the issue have not been assessed.

Clearly, the background of the issue itself and the accompanying literature demonstrate a natural division of support between parents and school administrators. The literature suggests this division continues despite passage and enactment of legislation designed to eliminate the antagonism.

Finally, the literature provides evidence of the importance of parent support in general. The first step in gaining that support is a major assessment of parent attitudes and opinions regarding the subject.

This then would appear to be what we know and which leads to a systematic examination of parent attitudes and opinions in this study regarding student information.

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN OF THE STUDY

#### Introduction

This is a descriptive study which is defined as a "process for learning pertinent information about an existing situation."<sup>1</sup>

John W. Best describes this type of research the following way:

In solving a problem or charting a course of action several sorts of information are needed. These data may be gathered through the processes of the descriptive method.

This type of information is based on present conditions. Where are we now? From what point do we start? These data may be gathered by a systematic description and analysis of all aspects of the present situation.<sup>2</sup>

This chapter contains a discussion of the methodology used to collect, process, and analyze the data. It consists of six sections. They are: (1) data collection, (2) development of the questionnaire, (3) administration of the instrument, (4) data processing, (5) data analysis, and (6) summary.

#### Data Collection

Three K-12 Michigan public school districts participated in this study. The school districts were: the Ann Arbor Public Schools,

---

<sup>1</sup>Fred P. Barnes, Research for the Practicum in Education (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1964), p. 67.

<sup>2</sup>John W. Best, Research in Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 104.

the Bay City Public Schools, and the Flint Community Schools. All school districts are members of the Middle Cities Education Association (MCEA). MCEA is an organization of school districts formed to confront common problems.

The researcher visited the superintendents of each school district to review the proposed research and secure cooperation and to arrange for the collection of the sample. In two districts the sample was drawn by a computer (Ann Arbor, Bay City); in the third school district (Flint) the sample was drawn by an objective third party.

The three school districts are distinctly different. These three school districts were selected because of identified differences that include:

- (a) racial and ethnic composition of the districts,
- (b) geographic location around the state,
- (c) population/area differences,
- (d) influence of higher ed institutions in the area, and
- (e) amount of local, state, and federal financial support.

Selection of these three participating districts was done with the consultation and cooperation of Dr. C. Robert Muth, Executive Director, Middle Cities Education Association.

A brief scenario of each district is included here.



## The Flint Community Schools<sup>3</sup>

### The Community

The center of Genesee County, Flint also is strategically located in the heart of one of the nation's greatest industrial corridors, stretching westward from New York state to Chicago. Its southeastern Michigan location, 70 miles northwest of Detroit, is one of the fastest growing and most populous regions in the state. In terms of economic importance, Flint and Genesee County serve as a major world industrial complex, with many residents employed as professional, skilled and semi-skilled workers in the numerous industrial plants in the area.

The public schools serve a city population of 193,000 residents residing in an area covering more than 30 square miles. Nearly 500,000 people reside in the Flint metropolitan area comprising most of Genesee County, and the city's retail trade area extends to a population of more than a million persons. A racially mixed community, Flint is made up of approximately 70 percent Caucasian and 30 percent Negro residents.

Primarily a mixture of white and blue collar workers, Flint residents enjoy a higher than average standard of living. More than 70 percent of Flint dwellings are single-family houses, with a majority of Flint households being homeowners. Institutions of higher learning

---

<sup>3</sup>The Flint Community Schools (Flint, Michigan: Office of the Superintendent, 1976).

include Charles Stewart Mott Community College, the Flint College of the University of Michigan, General Motors Institute and Baker Business University. The city is also the home of the Michigan School for the Deaf, and a unique cultural center composed of seven distinctly different facilities that enrich the city's educational and cultural life. A full complement of city and county parks and facilities, in addition to opportunities provided by the schools, offers extensive recreational advantages. The Industrial Mutual Association, established as a benevolent association of factories, also provides a wealth of facilities and services--education, recreational, social and civic--for the enjoyment and well-being of the city's populace. Social and health services and facilities--including six hospitals--also are outstanding.

#### Facilities

The Flint Community Schools serve a kindergarten through twelfth grade student enrollment of more than 39,000 in an educational plant that includes more than 60 permanent buildings--as well as 170 primary and mobile units--all valued in excess of \$155 million. In the past 25 years, 30 new schools have been constructed, 19 existing schools have received additions, and most of the other facilities have been modernized. The Flint Board of Education also operates a public library system, Flint's College and Cultural Development, and a public radio station.

Two major building projects are underway, including a \$3.5 million modernization project and addition to Central High

School and a \$1.5 million elementary school replacing the 64-year-old Dort building. From 1953 until 1974, construction of new facilities was funded on a "pay-as-you-go" basis, saving Flint taxpayers millions of dollars in interest payments. However, the recent spiralling inflation has made it more economical to change to a bonding plan and borrow funds for immediate construction. The Central and Dort projects are part of a bonding proposal of \$7 million to be repaid in five years ending in 1980.

### Students

Of the 39,000 students enrolled in kindergarten through twelfth grade classes, 22,000 are elementary school youngsters, 9,000 are junior high school age and 8,000 attend senior high school. Additionally, 600 youngsters are enrolled in preschool programs on a regular basis, and 5,500 adults are enrolled in adult high school classes. Racially, Caucasian and Black students are nearly equal in numbers, each making up approximately 49 percent of the student population. Students of Spanish-American, Indian and Oriental heritage, together, account for most other ethnic groups served by the schools. Class sizes average about 28 pupils per class at the elementary level, 29 pupils per class at the junior high level, and 30 students at the senior high level (based on the Fourth Friday Count, September, 1974). The ratio of adult staff having a direct effect on instruction--including special teachers, staff specialists, other professional personnel and teacher aides--averages about one adult for every 19 students.

### Staff

Governed by a nine-member Board of Education elected at large, the Flint school system is Genesee County's next to largest employer, second only to the facilities of the General Motors Corporation. Totally, 3,750 individuals are employed by the schools on a regular full and part-time basis, exclusive of substitute help. Of this number 1,950 are classroom teachers and other professional instructional personnel, and 200 are administrators and central supportive staff. Also, the district employs 437 paraprofessional classroom aides, 678 maintenance, operational and clerical employees, and 137 food service workers. The professional staff composition is 70 percent Caucasian, 29 percent Negro and less than one percent of other ethnic groups.

In terms of teachers' salaries, the Flint schools compare favorably with Bay City and Ann Arbor. Based on both education and number of years of experience, Flint teachers are well qualified, with 915 holding a master's degree or more advanced educational training. The average Flint teacher has been in the profession more than 11 years, and staff turnover is less than five percent annually.

### Sources of Funds

For operation of the schools and the public library system, more than \$33 million, or 60 percent, of the \$60 million required in 1974-75 came from local taxes. More than \$32 million of the local tax support was for operation of the schools and about \$1.4 million

for operation of the Flint Public Library. About 30 percent--\$17.8 million--of the funding came from state aid and grants; and federal money--\$5 million--represented approximately nine percent. Within a total budget of some \$68.7 million, about \$2.8 million was for modernization and repair, and \$2.1 million for operation of auxiliary services, including operation of the Genesee Area Skill Center and Flint's cultural center. It should be noted that all 21 school districts in Genesee County provide tax funds for operation of the skill center and that private funds are used for operation of the cultural center. Additionally, \$4.7 million in grants from the Mott Foundation fund Community Education programs in the school system, including a number of enrichment opportunities and experimental projects.

#### The Bay City Public Schools<sup>4</sup>

##### The Community

The Bay City Public Schools include two incorporated cities and two unincorporated villages. Bay City proper is split by the Saginaw River, making a natural rivalry within the city. The religious affiliations are predominantly Roman Catholic (55%), primarily Polish, Irish, and French. There is also a large Lutheran population, generally of German extraction. The Black and Hispanic communities are both widely dispersed. There is a substantial Jewish population.

---

<sup>4</sup>The Bay City Public Schools (Bay City, Michigan: Office of the Superintendent, 1976).

The geographic area is largely rural and suburban. The cities and villages make up less than 10 percent of the total area. Farming is still a factor in the area, with emphasis on cash crops--sugar, beets, corn, potatoes, and beans. Bay City is a center for wholesaling--hardware, auto parts, electrical supplies--with auto parts manufacturing, shipbuilding, machinery manufacturing, and sugar processing as major industrial enterprises.

There is a growing four-year degree-granting State supported college, and a two-year community college in the area.

The population is labor union-oriented, Democratic party dominated, and provincial in outlook.

There are many in the work force who travel to Midland (Dow Chemical), Saginaw (auto plants), and Flint (auto plants).

The community supports a little theater group, a local art gallery, a county museum, a community center and swimming pool, two separate libraries, three separate hospitals, movie houses, and several churches. The Downtown Bay City, Inc. has actively worked to preserve the commercial downtown center.

The Bay City Public School District has a \$20 million budget. The school district contains over 250 square miles. It extends as far east as Tuscola County and as far south as the Saginaw County line. There are a few parcels of land within Saginaw County itself. The district extends as far west as the Midland County line and includes most of the lower half of Bay County.

### Facilities and Staff

The School District operates and maintains over 30 separate buildings with a total capital investment estimated to be in excess of \$50 million. The District operates a fleet of 57 buses with a capital investment close to \$500,000. This fleet transports 6,000 children daily. Not only are the public schools served by this facility, but also 27 parochial schools.

The district is governed by a Board of Education. The Board is popularly elected and is an extension of the educational arm of the state. Its members are elected on a rotating basis, without pay, for a period of four years.

The Bay City Public School District has grown to the point where it now employs approximately 1,100 individuals. This makes the district one of the key employers in the area. These employees return in excess of \$15 million in wages/salaries back into the local economy. The majority of them are homeowners, taxpaying residents of the community.

### Sources of Funds

Sources of funds for the school district are as follows:

Local taxes = \$9,608,274

State/Federal funds = \$9,294,383

The 1976 tax rate: 25.0 mills (general school fund)

4.85 mills (debt service)

## Students

There are 85,000 people living in the school district. The 1976 school census shows approximately 30,000 persons under age 20 years. Approximately 17,500 of these young people attend public schools and another 5,500 attend parochial schools within the district.

The student population is over 91 percent white. The remainder includes approximately 4.5 percent Spanish surnamed, 2 percent American Indian, and 2 percent Black. These percentages approximate the population in general.

### The Ann Arbor Public Schools<sup>5</sup>

## The Community

Ann Arbor, approximately 35 miles from the center of Detroit, is part of a large and varied geographic region which is one of the most rapidly urbanizing areas in the nation. The city is surrounded by a network of highways connecting it with other centers and contributing to its growth. It is the county seat of Washtenaw County and the business center of a long-established, prosperous farming community.

The University of Michigan moved to Ann Arbor in 1837. It has grown to be one of the largest universities in the nation, and its student body accounts for approximately one-third of Ann Arbor's

---

<sup>5</sup>The Ann Arbor Public Schools (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Office of the Superintendent, 1976).



population. Since 1945 government and private research laboratories and light industry have located in the area, leading to the designation of Ann Arbor as the "Research Center of the Midwest."

The profile of the community served by the Ann Arbor Public Schools reflects a population whose character has been shaped by its largest industry, education. The population is young, well educated, cosmopolitan, relatively affluent--and growing.

The population of the Ann Arbor area increased substantially during the sixties. Washtenaw County, west of Detroit, grew from 172,440 persons in 1960 to 234,103 in 1970, a gain of 35 percent. The city of Ann Arbor grew even more rapidly, from 67,340 in 1960 to 99,797 in 1970, a gain of 47 percent. The Ann Arbor school district encompasses a 114-square-mile area, five times the size of the corporate limits of Ann Arbor. The school district population in 1970 was 115,216.

Between 1960 and 1970 the number of students in the Ann Arbor Public Schools increased by 67 percent, from 12,118 to 20,152. Some of the growth was due to changes in the district's boundaries, but most was the result of expansion of the population within the general area. Between 1971 and 1974 there was a slight decrease in the number of students. In 1973-74 students numbered 19,201, a decline of 951, or 4.7 percent, from the peak year of 1970-71.

The more than 30,000 students at the U-M constitute over one-fourth of the school district's population. The relatively young

age of the population is evident from 1970 statistics which show the median ages of residents of Ann Arbor to be 20-24; of Washtenaw County, 25-34; and of Michigan, 25-44.

Ann Arbor citizens attain a higher level of education than those in the state as a whole. In 1970 the median number of school years completed by Ann Arbor residents over the age of 25 was 15.4; the comparable figure for the state of Michigan was 12.1. While 82.9 percent of Ann Arbor residents over 25 were high school graduates, only 52.8 percent of those over 25 in the state had completed high school.

At the time of the 1970 census, nearly one-third of the 47,699 employed residents of the school district worked in educational services. The second largest group was employed in manufacturing, but numbered fewer than half as many as those in education.

### Staff

There are approximately 880 classroom teachers in the district, 91 percent with tenure. The average percentage of teachers leaving the district is 8.5 percent. Approximately 35 percent are men, 65 percent women; 88 percent white, 12 percent non-white; 69 percent have MA or MA+ (17 teachers have Ph.D. degrees).

### Sources of Funds

Local property tax:	90.6 % (or)	\$23,994,783
State funds	: 5.29% (or)	\$ 1,395,311
County funds	: 1.24% (or)	\$ 328,315
Federal funds	: .38% (or)	\$ 100,000
Other	: 2.13% (or)	\$ 560,311

### Students

There are 121,216 people living in the school district. Approximately 19,201 young people attend the public schools.

The student population is approximately 85.2 percent white. The remainder includes approximately 1.18 percent Spanish surnamed, 1.63 percent oriental, 11.78 percent black. These percentages approximate the population in general.

Class size approximates 26.46 students.

### Facilities

Facilities include more than 41 permanent buildings valued in excess of \$205 million. In the past 25 years, 26 new schools have been constructed.

The Ann Arbor Board of Education is also the governing body of the Ann Arbor Public Library, the Instructional Materials Center, and a cable television station.

### The Survey Population and Sample

#### The Population

The Ann Arbor, Bay City, and Flint school districts provided the respondents for this study. The population consists of 51,000 students enrolled in the three school districts as of June, 1976.

### The Sample

The sample size was determined by utilizing a modified formula developed by the Research Division of the National Educational Association.<sup>6</sup> The formula is:

$$s = \chi^2 NP (1-P) \div d^2 [(N-1) + \chi^2 p (1-P)]$$

where:

s = required sample size based upon the number in the population

$\chi^2$  = the table value of chi-square from one degree of freedom at the desired confidence level (3.841)

N = the population size

p = the population proportion (assumed to be .50 since this would provide the maximum sample size)

d = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (.05).

This formula was applied to the population of 51,000 students in the three districts. The small sample size was computed to be 410 students.<sup>7</sup>

The parents of 810 students were randomly selected from school enrollment lists as of June, 1976. A random selection procedure was employed to obtain the sample. A table of random numbers was

---

<sup>6</sup>National Education Association, "Small Sample Techniques," The NEA Research Bulletin, Vol. 38, (December, 1960), p. 99.

<sup>7</sup>With assistance of the Office of Research, Erickson Hall, Michigan State University.

utilized for this purpose.<sup>8</sup> At the suggestion of the doctoral guidance committee chairperson, a greater number of students were selected (810) than that required by the sample (410).

From the total population (51,000) 810 random respondents were randomly selected from Elementary, Junior High, and Senior High School enrollments, as shown in tables 1, 2, and 3.

Table 1. The Number of Students in the Ann Arbor Public Schools Selected for the Sample.

Building Level	Total No. of Schools	No. of Students Selected	No. of Buildings Drawn <sup>a</sup>		No. of Students From Each Building	Totals
Senior High School	5	90	5	x	18	90
Junior High School	5	90	2	x	45	90
Elementary School	26	90	5	x	18	90
						<span style="border: 1px solid black;">270</span>

<sup>a</sup>Buildings randomly selected.

---

<sup>8</sup>Malcolm J. Slakter, Statistical Inference for Educational Researchers (Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1972), p. 466.

**Table 2. The Number of Students in the Bay City Public Schools Selected for the Sample.**

<b>Building Level</b>	<b>Total No. of Schools</b>	<b>No. of Students Selected</b>	<b>No. of Buildings Drawn</b>		<b>No. of Students From Each Building</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Senior High School	3	90	3	x	30	90
Junior High School	5	90	2	x	45	90
Elementary School	26	90	5	x	18	90
						<b>270</b>

**Table 3. The Number of Students in the Flint Community Schools Selected for the Sample.**

<b>Building Level</b>	<b>Total No. of Schools</b>	<b>No. of Students Selected</b>	<b>No. of Buildings Drawn</b>		<b>No. of Students From Each Building</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Senior High School	4	92	4	x	23	92
Junior High School	8	90	4	x	22	88
Elementary School	41	90	5	x	18	90
						<b>270</b>

It was determined at the beginning of the sampling procedure that the final selected sample would be a random, stratified sample across all grades from K-12. It was desired that the sample be representative of the enrollments in each district and in all grades.<sup>9</sup>

In summary, a sample size of approximately 410 was calculated using a formula developed by the National Education Association Research Division. Twenty-seven questionnaires were not returned; therefore, 383 respondents make up the sample for this study.

#### Development of the Instrument

A questionnaire was selected as the vehicle to be used to gather data for assessing parent attitudes regarding the collection and use of student information. The questionnaire for this study meets the following criteria:

- (1) the questions are easily understood and easily answerable
- (2) the questions are appropriate for parents
- (3) the data can be obtained in a usable form that can be efficiently evaluated and tabulated
- (4) the questionnaire provides the data necessary for the investigation.

The questionnaire was developed specifically for this study. The questionnaire was developed by: considering the purpose of the

---

<sup>9</sup>Leslie Kish, Survey Sampling (New York: J. Wiley, 1965), p. 218.

study; by deciding what information would provide the data required for accurate analysis of parent attitudes toward the collection and use of student information; by a series of meetings with the Executive Board of the Genesee Area Personnel and Guidance Association (Flint); and by discussions with Dr. Raymond Hatch, chairman of the doctoral guidance committee; by a pilot study; and by reviewing Chapter Two of Marvin E. Shaw<sup>10</sup> and Jack M. Wright's Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes "Methods of Scale Construction." Also, questions successfully used in other studies were examined.

There were four major issues considered in the questionnaire's construction. They are previously stated as research questions that focus on how parents view: (a) the handling of confidential information in their own local school districts, (2) accessibility of student records, (c) content of student records, (d) storing/maintenance of student records.

Upon completion of the initial questionnaire the instrument was piloted with a group of seventy-eight (78) parents for purposes of validation. The pilot study was conducted in May, 1976, sixty days before the final research packet was mailed to the randomly selected parents. Conditions of the pilot study approximated the final study. The pilot study's purpose was to assist in determining whether the instrument would produce the necessary data. Adequate space was allotted on the pilot questionnaire for comments, criticisms, and general reactions.

---

<sup>10</sup>Marvin E. Shaw and Jack M. Wright, Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 72.



Sixteen revisions were made in the instrument, and three in the content of the cover letter based on the reactions of the pilot group. The questionnaire, as administered to the parents, and in its final form, is included in Appendix B.

The questionnaire contains thirty-one (31) items. There are three sections to the instrument. Section I contains nine (9) items dealing with demographic data.

Section II has sixteen (16) items dealing exclusively with the respondents' attitude(s) regarding the collection and use of student information. In Section II respondents were directed to place an "X" in one of five categories provided: (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) undecided; (4) disagree; (5) strongly disagree. Items in Section II concentrated on the collection and use of student information.

Section III contains five (5) items dealing with: (a) how they, as parents, have been informed of the student record-keeping procedures in their school district; (b) the degree of significance they place on material kept in student record files; (c) the respondents' determination of who should be the final authority in dealing with student records. Items in Section III are framed within the context of the currently widely used and accepted CA-60 student record file.

Thurstone's judgmental procedure of scale construction was used in selecting items for Section II. Procedures employed included:

- (1) a large number of items dealing with the object of the attitude were formulated

- (2) the items were sorted in eleven (11) different categories which appeared to be equally spaced in terms of the degree to which agreement with the items reflected the underlying attitude
- (3) the categories were numbered 1 to 11, and a scale was computed for each item, taken as the median of the position given the item
- (4) the interquartile range, or Q value, was computed as a measure of judgmental variability, items for which there was disagreement were rejected
- (5) a small number of items for the final scale were selected as they spread evenly along the attitude continuum.

### Questionnaire Administration

A questionnaire was sent to the parents (respondents) of 816 randomly selected students. Each participating school district was asked to provide a list of ten (10) additional randomly drawn names to be used in case of duplication. Parents' names were used once, regardless of the number of children in school.

A cover letter accompanied the questionnaire (see Appendix B) briefly outlining the purpose of the study and guaranteeing the respondents' anonymity. Parents were asked to complete and return an enclosed, stamped postcard indicating that they would complete the questionnaire (Appendix B). This procedure facilitated the follow-up activities.

Two follow-ups of non-respondents were conducted. A personal message, handwritten and signed by the researcher, accompanied the first follow-up packet.

### Data Processing

Data from the questionnaires were transferred to machine scored answer sheets. The answer sheets were processed and the data transferred to data cards for analysis by computer.

### Data Analysis

The means of data analysis in this study was a comparison of parents' attitudes in three selected Michigan school districts--Ann Arbor, Bay City, and Flint.

The respondent is used as the unit of analysis and the primary unit of interest. The respondents were randomly selected from a stratified population.

The descriptive statistics (mean, percentage, standard deviation, variance, ranking) were used in this study to summarize and describe the research data.

The Z-test was used to estimate the ranges of scores which represent the respondents' attitudes.

One way analysis of variance was used to test significant differences in the three school districts. Tables reporting the analysis of variance are included in the appendices. Post hoc pair-wise comparison was used to specify the differences between any two districts.

To summarize, transform and analyze the data, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used. Data were run on the CDC 6500 computer at the Michigan State University Computer Center.

### Summary

This chapter contains the methodology used in this study. The chapter discussed: data collection, development of the collection instrument, administration of the questionnaire, data processing, and data analysis. Each was discussed in terms of what was needed as a set of procedures for analyzing and synthesizing the observations into a number of relationships that can serve as a basis for further study and observation.

Data were collected by administering questionnaires to parents of students enrolled as of June, 1976 in three selected K-12 Michigan school districts.

The population was composed of approximately 51,000 students. A sample, calculated by using a formula developed by the Research Division of the National Education Association, was randomly selected from the population. Three hundred and eighty three (383) respondents made up the final sample for this study.

Data from the questionnaires were transferred to machine scored answer sheets. The Michigan State University Computer Center Services assisted in the data analysis.

The data were analyzed to determine present attitudes in relation to the collection and use of student information.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

#### Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze information regarding parent attitudes toward the collection and use of student information as revealed in the form of questionnaire responses.

Discussion will begin with the presentation and analysis of data obtained through the questionnaire mailed to parents.

#### Parent Questionnaire

The total number of responses received from parents in the three selected school districts was 383. This was considered to be an adequate return based on the original number mailed out in September, 1976. The return represented 47.2 percent.

The questionnaires provided information regarding demographic data and four research questions on student information. The method of analysis was the use of frequency of responses contained in the 383 returned questionnaires. Each questionnaire had thirty-one responses with a final open-ended question. A zero was recorded when no response was given.

#### Answer Categories

There were three types of answer responses. Demographic data was answered in items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 by selecting the appropriate response that applied to the respondent.

Items 10-26 asked for the respondent's attitude. Respondents' answers were limited to a single Likert scale-type response: (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree. Respondents were asked in this section of the questionnaire to respond to a statement.

Items 27-31 asked respondents to rank their response from 1 (most important) to 5 (least important).

The percent figures contained in the tables represent a combination of carry outs to the third place to the right of the decimal. The percent figures were rounded off to the second place to the right of the decimal. Percentage totals do not always equal 100 percent because of the rounding-off procedure.

### Characteristics of the Respondents

The selection of three school districts composed of varying geographic, economic, racial, and educational characteristics formed a group quite contrasting in its composition. It is the purpose of this chapter to explore the attitudes within the participating school districts collectively and individually and contrasting, where applicable, certain attitudes and characteristics.

### Three School Districts Contrasted

Table 4 contrasts the three participating school districts selected for analysis. They are identified by community, population, and type.

Table 4. Selected School Districts Identified by Community, Population, Type.

Community	Population**	Type*
Ann Arbor	115,216	Composite
Bay City	85,000	Composite
Flint	193,000	Industrial Urban

\*As recorded by the United States Census Bureau, 1970 Census.

\*\*As reported by the school district's superintendent.

Questionnaire Response  
by School District

Table 5 is an analysis of the responses to the questionnaire by parents according to school district. An analysis of the table reveals that of the 810 questionnaires mailed, 383 (47.2%) were returned. Further analysis of the table reveals that for the Ann Arbor School District, of the 270 mailed to parents in the district, 124 (45.9%) were returned. Of the 270 mailed to the Bay City Public Schools, 154 (57.0%) were returned, while 105 (38.9%) of the 270 mailed to the Flint Community Schools were returned.

Table 5. Questionnaires Distributed to Communities and Percentage of Returns.

Community	Questionnaires Distributed	Questionnaires Returned	Percent Returned
Ann Arbor	270	124	45.9
Bay City	270	154	57.0
Flint	<u>270</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>38.9</u>
Totals:	810	383	47.2

### Demographic Characteristics

Table 6 is an analysis of the demographic characteristics of respondents. An analysis of the table reveals that in the category of Parental Status of Respondents, 282 (74%) were MOTHERS, 91 (24%) were FATHERS, and 10 (2%) were GUARDIANS. The researcher requested in the cover letter that "the parent who deals most directly with the school district" should complete the questionnaire.

### Level of Education of Respondents

Under the category of Level of Education data was compiled as follows (Table 6). Of the 383 respondents, four (1%) attended elementary school, 13 (3%) completed elementary school, 27 (7%) attended high school, 137 (36%) graduated from high school, 70 (18%) attended college, 58 (15%) were college graduates, and 74 (19%) had attended graduate school.

### Age of Respondents

An analysis of the category of Age provides the following data (Table 6). Of the 383 respondents none were under the age of 20. One (.8%) was between 20-24 years of age, 114 (30%) were between 25-34 years of age, 173 (45%) were between 35-44 years of age, 80 (21%) were between 45-54 years of age, 15 (4%) were 55 years of age or older.

### Years of Residency in the School District

Years of Residency in the school district were as follows (Table 6). Of the 383 respondents 13 (3%) had lived in the district



for less than one year, 85 (22%) had lived in the school district from 1-5 years, 81 (21%) had lived in the school district from 6-10 years, and 204 (53%) had lived in the school district for 11 years or more.

### Occupation of Respondents

Respondents were asked to answer the question: "What is your occupation?" For the purpose of this study, thirteen occupational categories were determined for use. The categories were developed from The Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1976-77 Edition (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor). The thirteen defined categories are:

Industrial production and related occupations

Office occupations

Service occupations

Educational and related occupations

Sales occupations

Construction occupations

Transportation occupations

Scientific and technical occupations

Mechanics and repairers

Health occupations

Social scientists

Social Service occupations

Art, design, and communication occupations

Table 6. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents by School District.

Characteristic	<u>Ann Arbor</u>		<u>Bay City</u>		<u>Flint</u>		<u>N and Percent of Total Sample</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Parental Status:</u>								
Mother	95	77	99	64	88	84	282	74
Father	24	19	50	32	17	16	91	24
Guardian	5	4	5	4	0	0	10	3
<u>Level of Education:</u>								
Attended elementary school	0	0	4	3	4	4	4	1
Completed elementary school	9	7	6	4	0	0	13	3
Attended high school	12	10	37	24	9	9	27	7
High school graduate	61	49	22	14	39	37	137	36
Attended college	18	15	39	25	30	29	70	18
College graduate	9	7	46	30	10	10	58	15
Attended graduate school	15	12	0	0	13	12	74	19
<u>Age:</u>								
Under 20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-24	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
25-34	31	25	43	28	40	38	114	30
35-44	57	46	80	52	36	34	173	45
45-54	30	24	30	19	20	19	80	21
55+	5	4	1	1	9	9	15	4
<u>Years of Residency in School District:</u>								
Less than 1 year	4	3	5	3	4	4	13	3
1-5 years	29	23	38	25	18	17	85	22
6-10 years	17	14	43	28	21	20	81	21
11 years or more	74	60	68	44	62	59	204	53

An analysis of Table 7 reveals that of the 383 respondents 27 (7%) were in industrial and related occupations, 29 (8%) office occupations, 22 (6%) service occupations, 41 (11%) education and related occupations, 26 (7%) sales, 2 (1%) construction, 2 (1%) transportation, 8 (2%) scientific and technical, 1 (0%) mechanics and repairers, 38 (10%) health occupations, 5 (1%) social scientists, 11 (3%) social service occupations, 4 (1%) art, design, and communications occupations. One hundred sixty-seven respondents wrote in the word HOUSEWIFE as their occupation.

Table 7. An Analysis of Respondents' by Occupation.

Occupation	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Total
Housewife	167	43.6
Industrial + Related	27	7.0
Office	29	7.6
Service	22	5.7
Education + Related	41	10.7
Sales	26	6.8
Construction	2	5.0
Transportation	2	5.0
Scientific + Technical	8	2.1
Mechanics + Repairers	1	.3
Health	38	9.9
Social Scientists	5	1.3
Social Service	11	2.9
Art, Design, Communication	4	1.0

### Discussion of Student Records Among Parents

Table 8 presents the number and percentage of responses for question six which dealt with determining if parents had talked with other parents in their district about information kept in student records. Answer possibilities were divided into "yes" or "no" responses.

Table 8. Verbal Communication of Parents Concerning Discussions Between Them and Other Parents Regarding the Information Kept in Student Records.

Category	Ann Arbor		Bay City		Flint		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
"yes"	49	38	47	31	32	30	127	33
"no"	75	61	108	69	72	70	253	66
Total:	124	99	155	100	104	100	380	99

### Parent Attendance at School Sponsored Meetings

A reporting of parent responses to the question (#7): "Do you attend school-sponsored meetings?" is reported in Table 9. Answer possibilities were: "Yes, regularly," "occasionally," "no."

### Parent/School Official Discussion of Student Records

Table 10 reveals that 199 respondents (52% in the total sample) had not met with a school official regarding information in their child's school record. Item 9 asked: "In the past, have you met with a school official (principal, counselor, teacher) regarding information in your child's school record?" Answer possibilities were: "yes" or "no" responses.

Table 9. Parent Attendance at School Sponsored Meetings.

Category	Ann Arbor		Bay City		Flint		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes, regularly	49	40	49	32	31	30	129	34
Occasionally	61	49	81	53	62	59	204	53
No	12	10	23	15	10	10	45	12
Total:	122	99	153	100	103	99	378	99

Table 10. Verbal Communication Between Parents and School Official(s) Regarding School Records.

Category	Ann Arbor		Bay City		Flint		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	69	56	65	42	47	45	181	47
No	55	44	86	56	58	55	199	52
Total:	124	100	151	98	105	100	380	99

### Parent Attitudes and Opinions

#### Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Level of Parents

Likert scale item responses are reported in Tables 11-33. Tables 11, 12, 13, and 14 report the frequency and percentage of parent "satisfaction"/"dissatisfaction" with their school district's handling of student record procedures. Specifically, how have school district officials performed in advising parents where their child's school record is located (Table 11), who has access to the record (Table 12),

what is contained in the record (Table 13), and how well prepared are they (parents) with the information provided by school officials to locate, examine, and consult with school personnel regarding their child's records (Table 14). Answer alternatives included: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree.

#### Student Record Location

Table 11 reports parents' responses regarding their satisfaction/dissatisfaction with how good a job school district personnel had done of informing parents of the location of their child's school record. Numbers and percentages are recorded by school district and totalled.

Summarizing, 213 respondents (56%) were dissatisfied with the job their school district had done of informing them of where their child's school record was located. Forty respondents (10%) were undecided. One hundred thirty respondents (34%) were satisfied with the job their school district had done.

#### Parent Accessibility to Student Records

Table 12 reports parent responses regarding parent satisfaction/dissatisfaction with school district procedures relating to parents' accessibility to student records.

Summarizing, 235 respondents (61%) were dissatisfied with the job their school district had done in informing them about who could see (had accessibility to) their child's school records. Forty-two respondents (11%) were undecided. One hundred six respondents (27%) were satisfied with the job their school district had done in this area.

Table 11. Parent Responses Regarding Satisfaction With How School District Personnel Have Informed Parents of Where Their Child's School Record is Located.

Statement: Your school district has done a satisfactory job of informing parents of where their child's school record is kept.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	9	7%	31	25%	10	8%	37	30%	37	30%	2.500	1.340
BAY CITY	15	10%	54	35%	21	14%	38	25%	26	17%	2.818	1.205
FLINT	0	20%	21	9%	9	0%	39	37%	36	34%	2.143	1.104
TOTAL:	24	6%	106	28%	40	10%	114	30%	99	26%	2.587	1.301

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
 A = Agree  
 U = Undecided  
 D = Disagree  
 SD = Strongly Disagree

Table 12. Parent Responses Regarding Satisfaction With How School Personnel Have Informed Parents of Accessibility to Student Records.

Statement: Your school district has done a satisfactory job of informing parents of who can see your child's school records.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	8	6%	18	25%	15	12%	40	32%	43	35%	2.258	1.255
BAY CITY	6	4%	57	37%	19	12%	47	31%	25	16%	2.818	1.207
FLINT	3	3%	14	13%	8	8%	41	39%	39	37%	2.057	1.117
TOTAL:	17	4%	89	23%	42	11%	128	33%	107	28%	2.428	1.240

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
 A = Agree  
 U = Undecided  
 D = Disagree  
 SD = Strongly Disagree



### Student Record Content

Table 13 reports parent responses regarding satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the job done by school officials in advising them of the content of student records. Two Hundred Sixty-Six respondents (69%) were dissatisfied. Forty-three respondents (11%) were undecided. Seventy-three respondents (19%) were satisfied with school personnel action on this issue.

### School District Procedures Regarding Student Records

Table 14 reports parent responses regarding their satisfaction/dissatisfaction with school district procedures relating to student record information.

Two hundred thirty-five respondents (61%) were dissatisfied with their school district's handling of student record procedures. Thirty-nine respondents (10%) were undecided. One Hundred Nine respondents (28%) were satisfied with the way their school district was handling student information.

### Parent Use of Student Records

Table 15 reports parent responses regarding parent use/review of their child's school records. Three Hundred Sixty-eight respondents (96%) favored the right of parents to review their child's school records. Five respondents (1%) were undecided. Ten respondents (3%) opposed parent review of their child's school record.

Table 13. Parent Responses Regarding Their Satisfaction With How They Have Been Informed by School Officials of the Content of Student Records.

Statement: Your school district has done a satisfactory job of informing you about what is in your child's school records.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	8	6%	19	15%	9	7%	45	36%	42	34%	2.218	1.265
BAY CITY	9	6%	20	13%	22	14%	73	47%	30	19%	2.383	1.116
FLINT	3	3%	14	13%	12	11%	37	35%	39	37%	2.095	1.131
TOTAL:	20	5%	53	14%	43	11%	155	40%	111	29%	2.251	1.173

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
A = Agree  
U = Undecided  
D = Disagree  
SD = Strongly Disagree

Table 14. Parent Responses Regarding Satisfaction With School District Procedures Related to Student Record Information.

Statement: With the information you have received from your school district you are now able to go to your child's school knowing where, how, and who to see to look at your child's school records.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	10	8%	23	19%	10	8%	53	4%	28	23%	2.468	1.252
BAY CITY	12	8%	44	29%	21	14%	50	32%	27	18%	2.766	1.257
FLINT	5	5%	15	14%	8	8%	46	44%	31	30%	2.210	1.158
TOTAL:	27	7%	82	21%	39	10%	149	39%	86	22%	2.517	1.247

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
A = Agree  
U = Undecided  
D = Disagree  
SD = Strongly Disagree

Table 15. Parent Responses Regarding Parent Accessibility to Their Own Child's School Record.

Statement: Parents should be allowed to see all information in their child's school records.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	101	81%	23	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.895	.390
BAY CITY	104	68%	40	26%	5	3%	4	3%	1	1%	4.571	.740
FLINT	84	80%	16	15%	0	0%	3	3%	2	2%	4.686	.788
TOTAL:	289	75%	79	21%	5	1%	7	2%	3	1%	4.021	1.213

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
 A = Agree  
 U = Undecided  
 D = Disagree  
 SD = Strongly Disagree

### Legal Protection of Student Records

Table 16 reports parent responses regarding legal protection of information in student records.

Summarizing, 283 respondents (74%) favored legal protection of information through an Act of Congress, if necessary. Forty-five respondents (12%) were undecided. Fifty-one respondents (13%) were opposed on this issue.

### Parents' Right to Challenge Accuracy of Their Child's School Record

Table 17 reports parent responses regarding parents' right to challenge the accuracy of the information in their child's school record.

Summarizing, 355 respondents (93%) favored the right of parents to challenge the accuracy of information contained in their child's school record. Twelve respondents (3%) were undecided. Fifteen respondents (4%) opposed parents' right to challenge the accuracy of their child's school record.

### Student Record Use by Police or Social Agencies

Table 18 reports parent responses regarding the use of student records by police or social agencies without prior parental consent.

Table 16. Parent Responses Regarding Legal Protection of Information in Student Records.

Statement: The information in your child's school record is worth "legal protection" through an Act of Congress, if necessary.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	67	54%	26	21%	16	13%	8	6%	5	4%	4.097	1.246
BAY CITY	58	38%	53	34%	17	11%	24	16%	1	1%	3.090	1.128
FLINT	59	56%	20	19%	12	11%	6	6%	7	7%	4.095	1.290
TOTAL	184	48%	99	26%	45	12%	38	10%	13	3%	4.021	1.213

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
A = Agree  
U = Undecided  
D = Disagree  
SD = Strongly Disagree

**Table 17. Parent Responses Regarding Parents' Right to Challenge The Accuracy of Information in Their Child's School Records.**

**Statement:** Parents should have the right to challenge the accuracy of information in their child's school records.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	79	64%	41	33%	2	2%	2	2%	0	0%	4.589	.612
BAY CITY	83	54%	52	34%	7	5%	9	6%	2	1%	4.351	.918
FLINT	71	68%	29	28%	3	3%	2	2%	0	0%	4.610	.643
TOTAL:	233	61%	122	32%	12	3%	13	3%	2	1%	4.499	.765

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
 A = Agree  
 U = Undecided  
 D = Disagree  
 SD = Strongly Disagree

**Table 18. Parent Responses Regarding The Use of Student Records by Police or Social Agencies Without Prior Parental Consent.**

**Statement:** As part of an investigation, police or other social agencies should be allowed to see any student's school record without permission of student/parent.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	16	13%	11	9%	3	2%	37	30%	57	46%	2.129	1.414
BAY CITY	12	8%	14	9%	7	5%	44	29%	77	50%	1.961	1.273
FLINT	3	3%	21	20%	9	9%	21	20%	51	49%	2.086	1.279
TOTAL:	31	8%	46	12%	19	5%	102	27%	185	48%	2.050	1.320

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
 A = Agree  
 U = Undecided  
 D = Disagree  
 SD = Strongly Disagree



### School's Authority to Control Student Records

Table 19 reports parent responses regarding the school's authority to completely control student records. Two Hundred Ninety respondents (76%) opposed the concept that school records should be the school's business and that the school should have complete control of student records. Twenty-nine respondents (8%) were undecided. Sixty-four respondents (17%) approved of the school's control of student records.

### Special-Help Information in Student Records

Table 20 reports parent responses regarding the inclusion of special help information in student records. Two Hundred Ninety-Seven respondents (77%) approved including special-help information i.e. special reading instruction, math instruction in their child's school record. Thirty-one respondents were undecided. Fifty-One respondents (14%) opposed placing special-help information in the child's school record.

Table 19. Parent Responses Regarding The Authority of The School to Control Student Records.

Statement: School records should be the school's business. The school should have complete control of student records.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	8	6%	11	9%	10	8%	46	37%	49	40%	2.056	1.191
BAY CITY	6	4%	17	11%	13	8%	52	34%	66	43%	1.994	1.146
FLINT	9	9%	13	12%	6	6%	28	27%	49	47%	2.095	1.341
TOTAL:	23	6%	41	11%	29	8%	126	33%	164	43%	2.042	1.214

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
A = Agree  
U = Undecided  
D = Disagree  
SD = Strongly Disagree

Table 20. Parent Responses Regarding The Inclusion of Special-Help Information in Student Records.

Statement: If your child received special help in reading, math, or some other area it should be noted in their school record.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	21	21%	68	55%	10	8%	16	13%	4	3%	3.774	1.027
BAY CITY	25	16%	105	68%	11	7%	5	3%	8	5%	3.870	.905
FLINT	12	11%	61	58%	10	10%	12	11%	9	9%	3.495	1.161
TOTAL:	63	16%	234	61%	31	8%	33	9%	21	5%	3.736	1.029

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
 A = Agree  
 U = Undecided  
 D = Disagree  
 SD = Strongly Disagree

### Storing/Maintenance of Student Records

Table 21 reports parent responses regarding the storing/maintenance of student records when a child transfers from one school district to another. One Hundred Ninety-Six respondents (52%) favor the practice of having school districts keep a permanent record of a child in each school district in which the child attended school. Fifty-Seven respondents (15%) were undecided. One Hundred Twenty-Nine respondents (34%) opposed storing/maintaining a student record in each school district.

### Use of Computers in Storing Student Records

Table 22 reports parent responses regarding the use of computers to store student record information. One Hundred Twenty-Six respondents (33%) approved of using computers to store student record information. One Hundred Seventeen respondents (31%) were undecided. One Hundred Forty respondents (36%) were opposed to using computers to store student record information.

Table 21. Parent Responses Regarding The Storing/Maintenance of Student Records.

Statement: When a child transfers from one school district to another, the school district the child is leaving should keep a permanent copy of the child's complete school record.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	23	19%	42	34%	20	16%	24	19%	15	12%	3.274	1.303
BAY CITY	26	17%	54	35%	26	17%	39	25%	8	5%	3.351	1.197
FLINT	11	10%	40	38%	11	10%	32	30%	11	10%	3.076	1.238
TOTAL:	60	16%	136	36%	57	15%	95	25%	34	9%	3.251	1.245

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
A = Agree  
U = Undecided  
D = Disagree  
SD = Strongly Disagree

Table 22. Parent Responses Regarding The Use of Computers to Store Student Record Information.

Statement: Computers should be used to store student record information.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	14	11%	27	22%	46	37%	27	22%	10	8%	3.065	1.102
BAY CITY	17	11%	32	24%	43	28%	45	29%	12	8%	3.013	1.138
FLINT	12	11%	19	18%	28	27%	29	28%	17	16%	2.810	1.241
TOTAL:	43	11%	83	22%	117	31%	101	26%	39	10%	2.974	1.157

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
A = Agree  
U = Undecided  
D = Disagree  
SD = Strongly Disagree

### Use of Student Records for Research Purposes by Higher Ed Institutions

Table 23 reports parent responses regarding the study of the contents of student records by colleges and universities. Two Hundred Seventeen respondents (56%) believed that the use of student records by colleges and universities is necessary to obtain an understanding of past, current, and future school programs. Sixty-eight respondents (18%) were undecided. Ninety-seven respondents (25%) opposed the practice of colleges and universities using student records to evaluate past, current, and future school programs.

### School District Officials' Awareness of Parents' Attitudes and Opinions

Table 24 reports parent responses regarding school officials' awareness of parents' attitudes and opinions.

Summarizing, Three Hundred Five respondents (79%) believed that, generally speaking, school officials should pay more attention to parents' attitudes and opinions than they currently do. Forty-one respondents (11%) were undecided. Thirty-five respondents (9%) believed that school officials are adequately aware of parents' attitudes and opinions.

### School District Policy for Handling Student Information

Table 25 reports parent responses regarding written school district policies for the handling of student information.

Table 23. Parent Responses Regarding Use of Student Records by Institutions of Higher Learning for Research Purposes.

Statement: Study of the contents of student records by colleges and universities is necessary to obtain an understanding of past, current, and future school programs.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	23	19%	55	44%	15	12%	15	12%	16	13%	3.435	1.283
BAY CITY	22	14%	60	39%	31	20%	28	18%	12	8%	3.318	1.192
FLINT	22	21%	35	33%	22	21%	16	15%	10	10%	3.410	1.246
TOTAL:	67	17%	150	39%	68	18%	59	15%	38	10%	3.381	1.235

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
A = Agree  
U = Undecided  
D = Disagree  
SD = Strongly Disagree



Table 24. Parent Responses Regarding School Officials' Awareness of Parents' Attitudes and Opinions.

Statement: Generally speaking, school officials should pay more attention to parents' attitudes and opinions than they do.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	45	36%	55	44%	18	15%	5	4%	1	1%	4.105	.891
BAY CITY	53	34%	65	42%	18	12%	16	10%	1	1%	3.974	1.022
FLINT	41	39%	46	44%	5	5%	10	10%	3	3%	4.067	1.040
TOTAL:	139	36%	166	43%	41	11%	31	8%	4	1%	4.042	.986

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
 A = Agree  
 U = Undecided  
 D = Disagree  
 SD = Strongly Disagree

Table 25. Parent Responses Regarding School District Policy For The Handling of Student Information.

Statement: School districts should have a clearly written policy for the collection and use of information kept in student records.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	63	51%	47	38%	9	7%	3	2%	2	2%	4.323	.915
BAY CITY	74	48%	71	46%	1	1%	7	5%	1	1%	4.435	.625
FLINT	52	50%	47	45%	3	3%	2	2%	1	1%	4.390	.778
TOTAL:	189	49%	165	43%	19	5%	6	2%	3	1%	4.386	.771

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
 A = Agree  
 U = Undecided  
 D = Disagree  
 SD = Strongly Disagree

Three Hundred Fifty-Four respondents (92%) favored a clearly written school district policy for the collection and use of information kept in student records. Nineteen respondents (5%) were undecided. Nine respondents (3%) opposed a written policy for the collection and use of information kept in student records.

#### School's Motives for Keeping Student Records

Table 26 reports parent responses regarding parents' suspicion of the school's motives for collecting and maintaining student records at all. Three Hundred Three respondents (79%) were not suspicious of the school's motives for keeping student records. Forty-eight respondents (13%) were undecided. Thirty-two respondents (9%) were suspicious of the school's motives for keeping student records.

#### Removing Negative Information From Student Records

Table 27 reports parent responses regarding an annual purge of negative information from students' records. Two Hundred Sixty-One respondents (68%) opposed removing negative information about a child from a child's file at the end of the school year. Fifty respondents (13%) were undecided. Seventy-one respondents (19%) opposed the concept that "What's done, is done!" and that negative information about a student should be removed from each child's files at the end of every school year.

Table 26. Parent Responses Regarding Their Perceptions of The School's Motives for Keeping Student Records.

Statement: I am suspicious of the school's motives for keeping student records at all.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	1	1%	13	10%	24	19%	63	51%	23	19%	2.242	.905
BAY CITY	2	1%	9	6%	11	7%	80	52%	52	34%	1.890	.867
FLINT	3	3%	4	4%	13	12%	63	60%	22	21%	2.076	.863
TOTAL:	6	2%	26	7%	48	13%	206	54%	97	25%	2.055	.889

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
A = Agree  
U = Undecided  
D = Disagree  
SD = Strongly Disagree

Table 27. Parent Responses Regarding Annual Purge of Negative Information From Student Files.

Statement: "What's done, is done!" and negative information about a student should be removed from the files at the end of each school year.

CITY	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
ANN ARBOR	16	13%	10	8%	23	19%	46	37%	29	23%	2.500	1.291
BAY CITY	6	4%	18	12%	13	8%	83	54%	34	22%	2.214	1.041
FLINT	11	10%	10	10%	14	13%	46	44%	23	22%	2.400	1.253
TOTAL:	33	9%	38	10%	50	13%	175	46%	86	22%	2.358	1.189

Response Code: SA = Strongly Agree  
A = Agree  
U = Undecided  
D = Disagree  
SD = Strongly Disagree

### Parent Sources of Information Regarding Student Records

Table 28 reports parent ratings of their sources of information regarding student record information. According to the respondents, newspapers and magazines were their primary source of information regarding student records. Parent meetings, letters from school officials, and school newsletters followed.

### Student Record Content

Table 29 reports that parent rankings by "degree of importance" of data to be included in student records. Items ranked are collectable per the current Michigan CA-60. Items were ranked 1 (most important) through 10 (least important).

Summarizing, "participation in school activities" was ranked number 1 by 109 respondents. "Character and moral traits," followed with 105 respondents. "Characteristics inherited from parents" and "sex curiosity and development" received the greatest number of "no response" rankings.

Table 28. Parents' Sources of Information Regarding Student Information.

ITEM	Frequency of Rankings				Average of Ranking	Numerical Ranking	No Response
	1	2	3	4			
Newspaper/Magazine articles	169	42	31	47	1.394	1	94
Parent meeting(s)	25	82	64	53	1.548	2	159
Letter from school official	74	53	73	50	1.564	3	133
School newsletter	60	62	49	7	1.595	4	142

Table 29. Parent Ranking by "Degree of Importance" of Information for Student Record File.

ITEM	Frequency of Ranking									Average of Ranking	Numerical Ranking	No Response
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			
Participation in school activities	109	76	38	24	43	17	16	15	11	2.922	1	34
Character and moral traits	105	43	49	46	41	26	24	11	5	3.091	2	33
Truancy history	41	47	45	66	30	35	35	23	6	3.559	3	57
Disciplinary history	31	77	84	41	29	10	27	19	30	3.700	4	35
Characteristics inherited from parents	22	9	28	27	32	32	18	35	48	3.713	5	132
Temper tantrums	11	21	18	38	48	43	27	72	22	4.491	6	83
Neighborhood environment	17	34	38	22	38	51	47	45	39	4.760	7	52
Sex Curiosity and development	4	7	6	15	14	26	63	33	89	4.773	8	126
Where reared: city/farm/town	14	23	23	37	28	36	58	39	56	4.843	9	69
Child's friends	13	17	24	36	47	71	35	55	43	5.211	10	42



### Final Authority Over Use of Student Records

Table 30 reports parent ranking of who parents believe should be the "final authority" over the use of student records.

Summarizing, 313 respondents ranked "parents, and one of the below" as their first choice. One Hundred Thirty-Seven respondents ranked "principal" as their second choice. The "school counselor" was ranked third.

### Testing Data in Student Records

Table 31 reports parent ranking of test data to be included in student records.

Summarizing, 156 respondents ranked intelligence tests (I.Q.) as their first choice. One Hundred Twenty-Five respondents ranked vocational/career tests as their first choice. Reading and math testing followed.

### Items Currently Included in Student Records

Table 32 reports parent ranking of items generally included in student records.

Summarizing, 193 respondents ranked "grades earned each year" as the most important item on a scale from 1 to 5. In numerical ranking "reading level," "citizenship," "absence/tardiness record," and "classes/grades failed" followed in order.

Table 30. Parent Responses Regarding Who Should Have "Final Authority" Over Use of Student Records.

ITEM	Frequency of Rankings						Average of Ranking	Numerical Ranking	No Response
	1	2	3	4	5	6			
Parents with one or more of the following	313	17	8	9	10	16	1.444	1	10
Principal	20	137	63	64	54	24	3.010	2	21
Counselor	12	75	140	100	24	13	3.081	3	19
School Psychologist	9	84	55	68	110	37	3.619	4	20
Teachers	24	44	85	92	80	45	3.668	5	13
School Nurse	3	9	12	29	80	227	5.052	6	23

Table 31. Parent Responses Regarding "Rank of Importance" of Test Data to be Contained in Student Records.

ITEM	Frequency of Rankings				Average of Ranking	Numerical Ranking	No Response
	1	2	3	4			
Reading tests	91	132	137	16	2.167	1	7
Intelligence tests (I.Q.)	156	58	46	118	2.303	2	5
Vocational/Career tests	125	62	65	124	2.454	3	7
Math tests	6	123	127	117	2.888	4	9

**Table 32. Parent Responses Regarding Ranking of Items Currently Included in Student Records  
(Re: Russell Sage Guidelines).**

ITEM	Frequency of Rankings					Average of Ranking	Numerical Ranking	No Response
	1	2	3	4	5			
Grades earned each year	193	77	45	34	26	1.953	1	8
Reading level	80	102	87	79	27	2.601	2	8
Citizenship	57	83	118	78	39	2.846	3	7
Absence/Tardiness record	21	51	55	119	121	3.642	4	9
Classes/Grades failed	26	50	69	58	152	3.757	5	9

### Analysis by Age

In relation to Research Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 further analysis and comparison by age, educational status, and occupation can be reported here.

Table 33 reports that parents' attitudes on Research Question 1 (location of student records), ranked according to age from the most dissatisfied (1) to the least dissatisfied (4) are: (1) 25-34 year olds, (2) 45-54 year olds, (3) 35-44 year olds, and (4) 55+ year olds. There was no response from those under 25.

Table 34 reports parents' attitudes on Research Question 2 (accessibility of student records). Ranked by age from the most dissatisfied (1) to the least dissatisfied (4) are: (1) 25-34 year olds, (2) 35-44 year olds, (3) 45-54 year olds, and (4) 55+ year olds. There was no response from those under 25.

Table 35 reports parents' attitudes on Research Question 3 (content of student records). Ranked by age from the most dissatisfied (1) to the least dissatisfied (4) are: (1) 25-34 year olds, (2) 35-44 year olds, (3) 45-54 year olds, and (4) 55+ year olds. There was no response from those under 25.

Table 36 reports parents' attitudes on Research Question 4 (the school districts' procedures for handling student information). Ranked by age from the most dissatisfied (1) to the least dissatisfied (4) are: (1) 25-34 year olds, (2) 45-54 year olds, (3) 35-44 year olds, and (4) 55+ year olds.

Table 33. Parent Responses Ranked by Age Regarding Satisfaction With How School District Personnel Have Informed Parents of Where Their Child's School Record is Located.

AGE	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.	Rank
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%			
Under 20		%		%		%		%		%			
20-24		%		%		%		%		%			
25-34		%	24	21.1%	18	15.8%	41	36.0%	31	27.2%	2.307	1.090	1
35-44	11	6.4%	60	34.7%	13	7.5%	41	23.7%	48	27.7%	2.682	1.363	3
45-54	8	10.0%	17	21.2%	7	8.8%	28	35.0%	20	25.0%	2.563	1.339	2
55+	5	33.3%	4	26.7%	2	13.3%	4	26.7%		%	3.667	1.234	4

101

(No Response areas are blank)

Ranking: 1 = Most dissatisfied  
4 = Least dissatisfied

Table 34. Parent Responses Ranked by Age Regarding Satisfaction With How Effectively School Personnel Have Informed Parents of Accessibility to Student Records.

AGE	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.	Rank
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%			
Under 20		%		%		%		%		%			
20-24		%		%		%		%		%			
25-34	3	2.6%	23	20.2%	14	12.3%	39	34.2%	35	30.7%	2.298	1.182	1
35-44	1	.6%	43	24.9%	22	12.7%	59	34.1%	48	27.7%	2.364	1.151	2
45-54		%		%	6	7.5%	23	28.8%	24	30.0%	2.550	1.395	3
55+	4	26.7%	4	26.7%		%	7	46.7%		%	3.333	1.345	4

(No Response areas are blank)

Ranking: 1 = Most dissatisfied  
4 = Least dissatisfied

Table 35. Parent Responses Ranked by Age Regarding Satisfaction With How They Have Been Informed by School Officials of the Content of Student Records.

AGE	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.	Rank
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%			
Under 20													
20-24													
25-34	3	2.6%	6	5.3%	16	14.0%	47	41.2%	42	36.8%	1.956	.981	1
35-44	5	2.9%	39	22.5%	12	6.9%	68	39.3%	49	28.3%	2.324	1.191	2
45-54	7	8.8%	8	10.0%	10	12.5%	35	43.8%	20	25.0%	2.337	1.211	3
55+	5	33.3%			5	33.3%	5	33.3%			3.333	1.295	4

(No Response areas are blank)

Ranking: 1 = Most dissatisfied  
2 = Least dissatisfied



**Table 36. Parent Responses Ranked by Age Regarding Satisfaction with School District Procedures Relating Generally to Student Record Information.**

AGE	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.	Rank
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%			
Under 20		%		%		%		%		%			
20-24		%		%		%		%		%			
25-34	5	4.4%	19	16.7%	16	14.0%	49	43.0%	25	21.9%	2.386	1.133	1
35-44	10	5.8%	47	27.2%	10	5.8%	64	37.0%	42	24.3%	2.532	1.278	3
45-54	7	8.8%	11	13.7%	13	16.2%	30	37.5%	19	23.8%	2.462	1.242	2
55+	4	26.7%	5	33.3%		%	6	40.0%		%	3.467	1.302	4

104

(No Response areas are blank)

Ranking: 1 = Most dissatisfied  
2 = Least dissatisfied

### Analysis by Educational Status

Table 37 reports parents' attitudes on Research Question 1 (location of student records). Ranked by educational status from most dissatisfied (1) to least dissatisfied are:

- |                                 |                          |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (1) completed elementary school | (5) high school graduate |
| (2) attended elementary school  | (6) college graduate     |
| (3) attended college            | (7) graduate school      |
| (4) attended high school        |                          |

Table 38 reports parents' attitudes on Research Question 2 (accessibility of student records). Ranked by educational status from most dissatisfied (1) to least dissatisfied (7) are:

- |                                 |                          |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (1) completed elementary school | (5) high school graduate |
| (2) attended elementary school  | (6) attended college     |
| (3) attended high school        | (7) graduate school      |
| (4) college graduate            |                          |

Table 39 reports parents' attitudes on Research Question 3 (content of student records). Ranked by educational status from the most dissatisfied (1) to the least dissatisfied (7) are:

- |                                 |                          |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (1) completed elementary school | (5) college graduate     |
| (2) attended college            | (6) high school graduate |
| (3) attended elementary school  | (7) graduate school      |
| (4) attended high school        |                          |

**Table 37. Parent Responses Ranked by Educational Status Regarding Satisfaction With How School District Personnel Have Informed Parents of Where Their Child's School Record is Located.**

LEVEL OF EDUCATION	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.	Rank
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%			
Attended Elementary School							4	100%			2.000	0	2
Completed Elementary School					2	15.4%	6	46.2%	5	38.5%	1.769	.725	1
Attended High School			6	22.2%	4	14.8%	5	18.5%	10	37.0%	2.444	1.396	4
High School Graduate	2	1.5%	48	35.0%	8	5.8%	39	28.5%	40	29.2%	2.511	1.278	5
Attended College	2	2.9%	11	15.7%	8	11.4%	34	48.6%	15	21.4%	2.300	1.068	3
College Graduate	6	10.3%	16	27.6%	7	12.1%	12	20.7%	17	29.3%	2.690	1.417	6
Graduate Work	12	16.2%	25	33.8%	11	14.9%	14	18.9%	12	16.2%	3.149	1.352	7

(No Response areas are blank)

Ranking: 1 = Most dissatisfied

7 = Least dissatisfied

Table 38. Parent Responses Ranked by Educational Status Regarding Satisfaction With How Effectively School Personnel Have Informed Parents of Accessibility to Student Records.

LEVEL OF EDUCATION	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.	Rank
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%			
Attended Elementary School		%		%		%	4	100%		%	2.000	0	2
Completed Elementary School		%		%	2	15.4%	2	15.4%	9	69.2%	1.462	.776	1
Attended High School		%	7	25.9%	2	7.4%	7	25.9%	11	40.7%	2.185	1.241	3
High School Graduate	5	3.6%	26	19.0%	13	9.5%	53	38.7%	40	29.2%	2.292	1.183	5
Attended College		%	17	24.3%	9	12.9%	25	35.7%	19	27.1%	2.343	1.128	6
College Graduate		%		%	9	15.5%	23	39.7%	15	25.9%	2.276	1.056	4
Graduate Work	12	16.2%	28	37.8%	7	9.5%	14	18.9%	13	17.6%	3.162	1.385	7

(No Response areas are blank)

Ranking: 1 = Most dissatisfied  
7 = Least dissatisfied

Table 39. Parent Responses Ranked by Educational Status Regarding Satisfaction With How They Have Been Informed by School Officials of the Content of Student Records.

LEVEL OF EDUCATION	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.	Rank
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%			
Attended Elementary School							4						
		%		%		%		100%		%	2.000	0	3
Completed Elementary School					2		6		5				
		%		%		15.4%		46.2%		38.5%	1.769	.725	1
Attended High School			8		1		5		13				
		%		29.6%		3.7%		18.5%		48.1%	2.148	1.322	4
High School Graduate	10		16		10		58		42				
		7.3%		11.7%		7.3%		42.3%		30.7%	2.204	1.226	6
Attended College			5		11		32		22				
		%		7.1%		15.7%		45.7%		31.4%	1.986	.876	2
College Graduate			10		9		21		18				
		%		17.2%		15.5%		36.2%		31.0%	2.190	1.067	5
Graduate Work	10		14		10		29		11				
		13.5%		18.9%		13.5%		39.2%		14.9%	2.770	1.299	7

(No Response areas are blank)

Ranking: 1 = Most dissatisfied  
7 = Least dissatisfied

Table 40 reports parents' attitudes on Research Question 4 (the school districts' procedures for handling student information). Ranked by educational status from the most dissatisfied (1) to the least dissatisfied (7) are:

- |                                 |                          |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (1) attended elementary school  | (5) college graduate     |
| (2) completed elementary school | (6) high school graduate |
| (3) attended high school        | (7) graduate school      |
| (4) attended college            |                          |

#### Analysis by Occupation

Table 41.1 and Table 41.2 report parents' attitudes on Research Question 4 (the school districts' procedures for handling confidential information). Ranked by occupation from the most dissatisfied (1) to the least dissatisfied (14) are:

- (1) Art/Design/Communication
- (2) Sales
- (3) Health/Social Sciences
- (4) Industrial Related
- (5) Housewife
- (6) Scientific/Technical
- (7) Transportation
- (8) Mechanics/Repairers
- (9) Social Services
- (10) Service
- (11) Office

Table 40. Parent Responses Ranked by Educational Status Regarding Satisfaction With School District Procedures Relating Generally to Student Record Information.

LEVEL OF EDUCATION	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.	Rank
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%			
Attended Elementary School		%		%		%	4	100%		%	2.000	0	1
Completed Elementary School		%		%	2	15.4%	10	76.9%	1	7.7%	2.077	.494	2
Attended High School	1	3.7%	4	14.8%	2	7.4%	11	40.7%	9	33.3%	2.148	1.167	3
High School Graduate	10	7.3%	33	24.1%	13	9.5%	52	38.0%	29	21.2%	2.584	1.264	6
Attended College	2	2.9%	12	17.1%	6	8.6%	32	45.7%		%	2.257	1.112	4
College Graduate	2	3.4%	11	19.0%	12	20.7%	20	34.5%	13	22.4%	2.466	1.143	5
Graduate Work	12	16.2%	22	29.7%	4	5.4%	20	27.0%	16	21.6%	2.919	1.450	7

(No Response areas are blank)

Ranking: 1 = Most dissatisfied  
7 = Least dissatisfied

Table 41.1. Parent Responses Ranked by Occupation Regarding Satisfaction With School District Procedures Relating Generally to Student Record Information (Part I).

OCCUPATION	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.	Rank
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%			
Housewife	6	15.8%	8	21.6%	3	7.9%	7	18.4%	14	36.8%	2.600	1.552	6
Industrial Related		%		%	1	20.0%	3	60.0%	1	20.0%	2.200	1.095	4
Office	4	36.4%	5	45.5%		%	2	18.2%		%	4.000	1.095	12
Service		%	2	50.0%	2	50.0%		%		%	3.500	.577	11
Education Related	5	3.0%	38	22.8%	16	9.6%	69	41.3%	39	23.4%	2.407	1.162	6
Sales		%	2	7.4%	1	3.7%	10	37.0%	14	51.9%	1.667	.887	2
Construction	2	6.9%	4	13.8%	4	13.8%	11	37.9%	8	27.6%	2.345	1.233	5

Ranking: 1 = Most dissatisfied  
12 = Least dissatisfied

(No Response areas are blank)



Table 41.2. Parent Responses Ranked by Occupation Regarding Satisfaction With School District Procedures Relating Generally to Student Record Information (Part II).

OCCUPATION	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean	S.D.	Rank
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%			
Transportation	4 18.2%		2 9.1%		3 13.6%		13 59.1%			%	2.864	1.207	8
Scientific/ Technical	3 7.3%		14 34.1%		4 9.8%		11 26.8%		9 22.0%		2.780	1.333	7
Mechanics/ Repairers	4 15.4%		6 23.1%		6 23.1%		6 23.1%		4 15.4%		3.000	1.327	9
Health		%	2 100.0%			%		%		%	2.000	.000	3
Social Scientists		%		%		%	2 100.0%			%	2.000	.000	3
Social Service		%	3 50.0%		2 33.3%			%	1 16.7%		3.167	1.169	10
Art/Design Communication		%		%		%		%		100.0%	1.000	.000	1

(No Response areas are blank)

Ranking: 1 = Most dissatisfied  
9 = Least dissatisfied

### Open-Ended Questionnaire Responses

In a final open-ended item on the questionnaire respondents were advised: "THIS SPACE HAS BEEN SAVED FOR YOUR COMMENTS. Are there any questions on this subject that I have not asked? Please comment freely here on any aspect of student records."

One hundred eighty three respondents (48%) used this section of the questionnaire to comment on some aspect of student records.

The 183 respondents were identified as either SATISFIED/ DISSATISFIED parents on the basis of their response to questionnaire items 10, 11, 12, 13 on the questionnaire. If a respondent answered DISAGREE, STRONGLY DISAGREE they were classified as a DISSATISFIED respondent. If the respondent answered AGREE or STRONGLY AGREE they were classified as a SATISFIED respondent.

Representative comments of both groups are presented here. The respondents are identified by occupation.

#### "SATISFIED" Parents

Occupation: Hairdresser

"Most schools allow parents access to all school records. We have not had any need for obtaining these records, but I am sure that no principal would refuse.

Occupation: Homemaker

"It is unfortunate to deprive teachers of past records (as was done in our system some years ago), since it can be of great help

to a professionally oriented teacher whose concern should be to understand his students as well as to educate them. Though such records are sometimes misused to prejudice a teacher toward a child, this is probably the exception rather than the rule."

Occupation: Secretary

"As a secretary to an educator--I am aware of the Student Privacy Act.

I believe in openness and honesty. If a person has nothing to hide, then why hide his records? If a student needs to be protected then I believe in confidentiality."

Occupation: Homemaker

"The schools should approach student record-keeping with great discretion. Students' rights to privacy must be protected. The only records to be kept should be ones that will help teachers to provide a better education. All other unnecessary data should never be sought."

Occupation: Engineer

"In general, I feel that all persons, teachers, parents, etc. should work together from student records which are relevant to the future. I see no reason why all of the above items may not be included in a child's record as long as the child is not therefore automatically assumed to have unchangeable scores, habits, etc. for the future."

Occupation: Homemaker and School Volunteer

"Upon completing this, I realize that I know less concerning the subject than I thought I did. It is now my intention to find out more about my child's school records and their content. Thank you for bringing all of this to my attention."

Occupation: Receptionist

"What is contained in school records is really never brought to the parents' attention or even mentioned. I've become interested because of my child's problems in adjusting to school. I also plan to see my child's records because I feel if it contained his struggles in such early years they shouldn't hinder his future in adult life. We go through many stage [sic] growing up and most of us face adulthood when need be. I feel that grades are all that need be recorded."

Occupation: Waitress

"Last school year my husband and I were separated that led to a divorce in the middle of the school year. I told all the teachers of this problem that did not reflex [sic] on the children greatly. Only one teacher out of seven, said that, that had nothing to do with school. Well, sir it does, my environment does reflex [sic] on my children. Their grades were kept at C, before they were both about A and B. All about my divorce is in my childrens records!"

Occupation: Housewife

"Students records, is a subject I have never even heard discussed at a school meeting, with teachers, principals, counselors, or any one at no time I or my husband ever been told we could or had any right to review our childrens' records."

Occupation: Secretary

"I have never discussed or heard discussed any phase of school records mentioned in above questionnaire."

Occupation: Housekeeping Aide

"Other than my sons grades, the city schools have never mentioned his record--though I know he has one--When my second husband legally adopted my son at age four the final decree didn't come through until after the start of school. The schools weren't [sic] going to let us enroll our son in our last name until they could have copies of all his adoption proceedings. So I know they must have that, plus, more in his personal file. We have transferred him to a private school this year. I'm glad you reminded me. I am going to his old school and request his records. Lets [sic] see what happens."

#### "DISSATISFIED" Parents

Occupation: Housewife

"I think the schools in my district have played down the parents' rights to see their child's records. I suspect this is to eliminate time and trouble for them.

"I am quite concerned about the way in which one mistake on a child's part follows him along after it should have been forgotten."

Occupation: Real Estate Salesman

"To be honest I can never remember hearing, reading, or seeing anything in regard to student records. I talked with my child's principal about a behavior problem. Only then did he mention my child's school record and only stated that the discipline taken with my child would not be on the student's record. I've always wanted to see my child's school records, but thought they were personal records for school officials only. (Something like doctors' records on patients).

Occupation: Practical Nurse

"I know nothing that has been put in my childrens' records. I have found that each of my children have gone through a phase in which they were slack or should I say lacks in their schooling, but once they were in college their grades picked up. I certainly would not have wanted their high school grades held against them."

Occupation: Skilled Trades Worker

"Since we have very young children (K, 2nd grade) we were not aware that records were open at the schools. This district has had no public discussion of school records that we know of."

Occupation: Homemaker

"I do not feel that records kept are used to their fullest extent. As I have a 13 year old with reading problems and each year it takes the teacher at least 1/2 of the school year to get a program going for him. When I question the delay the answer is always the same: 'I have not had a chance to look at his records.' Why are they kept if teachers are not going to use them to possibly help the child function better?"

Occupation: Nurse

"I did not see my child's folder. When I asked I was told to come back another day, they were locked up or something. Later I was told they could not leave the room or be copied to study over at home or go over with my husband."

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Included in this chapter is a summary of the results of the investigation, suggestions for further research, and recommendations related to current parent attitudes regarding the collection and use of student record information at the elementary and secondary levels. The recommendations pertain primarily to implementing the Family Rights and Privacy Act of 1974.

The purpose of this study was to investigate parents' attitudes and opinions regarding the collection and use of student information in three selected Michigan school districts. The dimensions of the study required proposing four research questions. Four areas were previously identified and information relating to those areas was obtained from the questionnaire.

The findings for various aspects of this study were presented in the preceding chapter. Tables detailing relationships between the three school districts are included in Appendix C.

#### Summary of Findings: Implications and Observations

In order to bring the findings into focus, the following general summary of findings is presented.



### Research Question 1

Q. 1: How do parents believe the collection and use of student information has been handled in their school district?

### Summary of Related Findings

1. Of the 383 total respondents, 61 percent indicated that they either "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" with the statement that they were aware of where and how and who to see to examine their child's school record.

2. Fifty-six percent of the respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the procedure their school district used to advise parents of where their child's school record was actually located.

3. Sixty-one percent of the respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the procedures their school district has used in informing parents about accessibility to their child's school records.

4. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents were dissatisfied with their school district's procedures for advising them of the content of their child's school records.

In a situation such as this, perhaps a more delineated evaluation of the data will indicate that this is not a significant development.

### Research Question 2

Q. 2: What do parents believe should be contained in student records?

### Summary of Related Findings

1. Seventy-four percent of the respondents believed that, regardless of the content of the student file, student information was worth an "Act of Congress" to protect, if necessary.

2. Ninety-three percent of the respondents approved of the parents' right to challenge the accuracy of the content of information contained in their child's student record.

3. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents favored inclusion of special-help information (tutoring, etc.) in student records.

4. Using the current, widely used Michigan Child Accounting Student Folder (CA-60) as a guide, parents rank-ordered the following items for inclusion in the student record: (1) information relating to a student's participation in school activities; (2) student's character and moral traits, (3) student's truancy history, and (4) student's disciplinary history.

5. (a) Respondents ranked the following test data for inclusion in student records: (1) reading test data, (2) intelligence test data (I.Q.), (3) vocational/career test data, and (4) math test data.

5. (b) Respondents ranked the following general items for inclusion in the student record: (1) grades earned each year, (2) a student's reading level, (3) citizenship, (4) absence/tardiness record, and (5) classes/grades failed.

### Research Question 3

Q. 3: Who do parents believe should have access to student records?

#### Summary of Related Findings

1. Ninety-six percent of the respondents favored parents' rights to review all of their child's school records.

2. Seventy-six percent of the respondents disagreed with the concept that school records should be solely the school's business and that the school should have complete control of student records including the right of accessibility to them.

3. Seventy-five percent of the respondents disagreed with allowing police or other social agencies to review student records without permission of parents or student.

4. Fifty-six percent of the respondents favored allowing colleges and universities to study the content of school records to gain an understanding of the effectiveness of past, current, and future school programs.

5. Eighty percent of the respondents indicated that parents should be the "final authority" over the right to use school records. In rank-order they expressed a willingness to share that authority with: (1) principal, (2) counselor, (3) school psychologist, and (4) school nurse.

### Research Question 4

Q. 4: How do parents view the storing/maintenance of student records?

### Summary of Related Findings

1. Sixty-eight percent of the respondents did not favor removing negative information about students from their student records at the end of each school year. They disagreed with the statement that: "What's done, is done."

2. Fifty-two percent of the respondents favored the practice of having each school district in which a student resides keeping and maintaining a child's permanent school record.

3. Thirty-six percent of the respondents opposed using computers to store student record information. Thirty-three percent approved the practice. Thirty-one percent were undecided.

### Additional Findings

1. Ninety-two percent of the respondents favored a clearly written school district policy regarding the collection and use of student information.

2. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents expressed a belief that school officials should pay more attention to parents' attitudes and opinions than they currently do.

3. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents were not suspicious of the school's motives for collecting and using student information.

4. Sixty-six percent of the respondents indicated that they had not discussed the issue of student information with other parents.

5. Eighty-seven percent of the respondents indicated that they attended school-sponsored meetings; 33% attended regularly and 53% attended occasionally.

6. Forty-seven percent of the respondents indicated that they had discussed school records with school officials.

7. Forty-four percent of the respondents indicated that newspapers and magazine articles about student information were their primary sources of information regarding this issue. Other sources of information, in rank order, were: (2) school-parent meetings, (3) letter, or notice, from a school official, and (4) school newsletter.

8. Analysis of the four research questions by age, educational status, and occupation reveals that, with age, the level of dissatisfaction is greatest among young parents (ages 25-34) and decreases with age.

With educational status there is a pattern revealing that the lower the respondent's educational status the greater the dissatisfaction. In relation to all four research questions, parents with an elementary school education were the most dissatisfied; parents who were high school graduates, college graduates, or had attended graduate school were least dissatisfied.

Ranking by occupational status revealed that the highest level of dissatisfaction existed among highly professional occupational areas, i.e. Art/Design/Communication, Sales, Health. The middle range included: Industrial-related, Construction,

Education-related, and Housewives. Least dissatisfaction was found in: Scientific-Technical, Transportation, Mechanic-Repairers, Social Science, Service, and Office occupations.

A profile of parents who completed and returned the questionnaire is revealing:

A majority of the responding parents were mothers. Eighty-seven percent of the responding parents attend school meetings. The majority of parents received their information about student records from newspaper and magazine articles.

The responding parents believe school officials should pay more attention to parents' attitudes and opinions than they do.

The responding parents represent a wide spectrum of occupations. Most have earned high school diplomas; half have attended college, graduated from college, and/or attended graduate school. Seventy-five percent are between 25-44 years of age. Sixty-four percent have lived in the district for from 6 to 11 years or more.

The responding parents are interested in the issue of the collection and use of student information. Most of the responding parents have met with school administrators to discuss their child's student records, but they have not talked with other parents about school records.

The responding parents are serious about the privacy rights of their children. They are dissatisfied with how their school district has handled the student record issue. They do not

question the school's motives for collecting and using student information, but they question the school district's methods for advising parents about the collection, use, and content of student records.

The responding parents believe that the content of their child's school record merits protection by an "Act of Congress," if necessary. They also believe in a parent's right to challenge the accuracy of the contents of the child's student record. They want both "positive" and "negative" information included in the student record, but they emphasize the need for both privacy and fairness. Slightly more than half of the responding parents favor the use of the contents of student records by college and university personnel in order to study the effectiveness of school programs.

It seems that these are active, interested, and concerned parents who could be direct participants in the planning and direction of student record procedures.

### Recommendations for Further Research

An assessment of current parent attitudes and opinions regarding the collection and use of student information derived from the data contained in the 383 parent questionnaires supports the following recommendations related to further research. These findings raise important questions for further research. Suggested areas include:

1. The effect of geographic location on parent attitudes toward the collection and use of student information at the elementary and secondary levels.

2. Methods for distributing information to parents regarding the collection and use of student information would seem to merit further serious study. Questions of content and procedure need further objective study.

3. How schools can facilitate parent review of school records. Additional research is needed to determine how to best remove the inhibiting factors.

4. Alternative methods for making information more understandable to students and their parents through the use of a format developed for that purpose.

5. The relationship of parental responses to a variety of items and the attitudes they hold toward the collection and use of student information in such areas as: parent occupations, age, educational status, race, and lone-child v. multiple-child families.

6. Further research may be productive in exploring how parental concern in one area matched parental concern expressed in another.

Recommendations for Implementation  
of The Family Educational Rights  
and Privacy Act

These recommendations are suggested:



1. The law requires schools to notify parents of their rights; therefore, all aspects of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 should be actively enforced by all school districts with the right to privacy of both parents and students guaranteed. Parents should provide in-put in planning and directing the informational process. Parents should be advised that school records are protected by an Act of Congress. School districts should establish a Parent Advisory Committee to chart and implement the enforcement of all aspects of the Act throughout the system.

(a) Comprehensive educational programs for staff, students, and parents should be developed by the Parent Advisory Committee to provide for effective implementation of the Act.

(b) Guidelines established by the Act should be published and widely distributed by the school district via a wide variety of media.

2. Special notification forms for parents should be developed in every school system which:

(a) Identify individuals and/or organizations who have asked for permission to see their child's student record.

(b) Explain procedures to be used by parents who want to challenge the accuracy of the content of their child's student record.

3. Student records should be made available for parent review at at least one parent-teacher-principal meeting during the

school year. Provide the parent with the complete file plus a thorough, systematic explanation of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 and their rights as parents.

4. Parents should be advised that they have a major role, in partnership with the school principal, regarding the use of their child's school record. The vehicle for informing parents should be decided on the basis of the results of an in-district survey regarding the desirability of certain information dissemination techniques.

5. Professional organizations should attempt to sponsor legislation that goes beyond the established national guidelines for collection and dissemination of information in an attempt to provide greater protection for student as well as parent rights and privileges.

## **APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX A**  
**LETTERS TO PARENTS**

Archie H. Bailey  
423 Somerset Drive  
Flushing, Michigan 48433

July, 1976

Dear Parent:

I am interested in getting your opinion regarding the collection and use of information kept in students' school records.

You are among several hundred parents whose names have been randomly selected and who are being asked to complete the enclosed questionnaire. You are not required to disclose your identity. Your anonymity is guaranteed!

I hope you will make every effort to complete and return the questionnaire in the enclosed, stamped, addressed envelope (hopefully today).

This is your chance to make your opinions count!

Finally, I am requesting that the questionnaire be completed by the mother/father or guardian who deals most with your child's school.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Archie H. Bailey  
Doctoral Candidate  
Michigan State University

(The total cost of this mailing is at personal expense.)

**Mr. Bailey:**

**I will return the attached questionnaire, separately,  
in the enclosed return envelope as soon as possible.**

**Name** \_\_\_\_\_

**Address** \_\_\_\_\_

**City** \_\_\_\_\_

Archie H. Bailey  
423 Somerset Drive  
Flushing, Michigan 48433

Dear Parent:

Your opinion counts! ...that's why I am asking you to complete the enclosed questionnaire and mail it in the enclosed, stamped, addressed envelope.

Parents' attitudes are having a greater impact on American education today more than ever before.

I would like and appreciate your opinion regarding the collection and use of student information.

I am looking forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Archie H. Bailey  
Doctoral Candidate  
Michigan State University

Archie E. Bailey  
423 Somerset Drive  
Flushing, Michigan 48433

Dear Parent:

According to my records I have not yet received your questionnaire regarding the collection and use of student information. I hope this does not indicate a decision not to participate in the study. Your opinion counts!

In order to help the processing of questionnaires... and to include your opinion in the study...please return the enclosed questionnaire in the enclosed, stamped, addressed envelope.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Archie H. Bailey  
Doctoral Candidate  
Michigan State University



**APPENDIX B**  
**PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE**

## PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire deals with the collection and use of information kept in students' school records.

**DIRECTIONS:** For this first set of items place an "X" next to the space that applies to you.

- (1) This questionnaire is being completed by:  
       \_\_\_\_\_mother       \_\_\_\_\_father       \_\_\_\_\_guardian       other: \_\_\_\_\_
- (2) How much education have you had:  
       \_\_\_\_\_attended elementary school       \_\_\_\_\_completed high school  
       \_\_\_\_\_completed elementary school       \_\_\_\_\_attended college  
       \_\_\_\_\_attended high school       \_\_\_\_\_graduated from college  
   \_\_\_\_\_graduate work
- (3) How old are you:  
       \_\_\_\_\_under 20       \_\_\_\_\_25-34       \_\_\_\_\_45-54  
       \_\_\_\_\_20-24       \_\_\_\_\_35-44       \_\_\_\_\_55+
- (4) How many children do you have in the following grades:  
       K \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 6 \_\_\_\_\_ 9 \_\_\_\_\_ 12 \_\_\_\_\_  
       1 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ 7 \_\_\_\_\_ 10 \_\_\_\_\_ graduated \_\_\_\_\_  
       2 \_\_\_\_\_ 5 \_\_\_\_\_ 8 \_\_\_\_\_ 11 \_\_\_\_\_
- (5) How many years have you lived in this school district:  
       \_\_\_\_\_less than a year       \_\_\_\_\_1-5 years       \_\_\_\_\_6-10 years       \_\_\_\_\_11 or more
- (6) Have you talked with other parents in the district about the collection and use of information kept in student records:  
       \_\_\_\_\_yes       \_\_\_\_\_no
- (7) Do you attend school sponsored meetings:  
       \_\_\_\_\_yes, regularly       \_\_\_\_\_occasionally       \_\_\_\_\_no
- (8) What is your occupation: \_\_\_\_\_
- (9) In the past, have you met with a school official (principal, counselor, teacher) regarding information in your child's school records:  
       \_\_\_\_\_yes       \_\_\_\_\_no

**THESE STATEMENTS ASK FOR YOUR OPINION.** Indicate your opinion by placing an "X" for each statement whether you strongly agree (SA); agree (A); disagree (D); or strongly disagree (SD) with the statement. If you cannot make up your mind, or feel you don't know, mark the undecided (U) space.

- (10) \_\_\_\_\_SA \_\_\_\_\_A \_\_\_\_\_UN \_\_\_\_\_D \_\_\_\_\_SD Your school district has done a satisfactory job of informing parents of where their child's school record is kept.
- (11) \_\_\_\_\_SA \_\_\_\_\_A \_\_\_\_\_UN \_\_\_\_\_D \_\_\_\_\_SD Generally speaking, your school district has done a satisfactory job of letting parents know who can see your child's records.
- (12) \_\_\_\_\_SA \_\_\_\_\_A \_\_\_\_\_UN \_\_\_\_\_D \_\_\_\_\_SD Your school district has done a satisfactory job of informing you about what is in your child's school records.

- (13) SA A UN D SD With the information you have received from your school district you are able to go to your child's school knowing where and how and who to see to look at your child's school record.
- (14) SA A UN D SD Parents should be allowed to see all information in their child's school records.
- (15) SA A UN D SD The information in your child's school record is worth "legal protection" through an Act of Congress, if necessary.
- (16) SA A UN D SD Parents should have the right to challenge the accuracy of the information in their child's school records.
- (17) SA A UN D SD As part of an investigation, police or other social agencies should be allowed to see any student's school record without permission of student or parent.
- (18) SA A UN D SD School records should be the school's business. The school should have complete control of student records.
- (19) SA A UN D SD If your child received special help in reading, math, or some other area it should be noted in his/her school record.
- (20) SA A UN D SD When a child transfers from one school district to another, the school district the child is leaving should keep a permanent copy of the child's complete school record.
- (21) SA A UN D SD Computers should be used to store student record information.
- (22) SA A UN D SD Study of the contents of student records by colleges and universities is necessary to obtain an understanding of past, current, and future school programs.
- (23) SA A UN D SD Generally speaking, school officials should pay more attention to parents' attitudes and opinions than they do.
- (24) SA A UN D SD School districts should have a clearly written policy for the collection and use of information kept in students' records.
- (25) SA A UN D SD I am suspicious of the school's motives for keeping student records at all.
- (26) SA A UN D SD "What's done, is done!" and negative information about a student should be removed from the files at the end of each school year.

PLEASE ANSWER THESE BRIEF QUESTIONS ACCORDING TO THE INSTRUCTIONS FOR EACH.

- (27) Specifically, what kind of information have you read, heard, or seen in the past year or two about the collection and use of information kept in students' school records. Please mark each item from 1 (most remembered) to 4 (least remembered).  
☐ I read an article in a school newsletter.  
☐ I received a letter from a school official.  
☐ School personnel discussed the issue at a PTA meeting.  
☐ Newspaper and magazine articles.
- (28) Many of the items below about students could be placed in student records. Please mark each item according to how important you think it is to the student. Please mark each item from 1 (most important) through 10 (least important).  
☐ characteristics inherited from parents  
☐ character and moral traits ☐ neighborhood environment  
☐ where reared: city/farm/town ☐ disciplinary action  
☐ child's friends ☐ temper tantrums  
☐ sex curiosity and development ☐ participation in school activities  
☐ truancy history
- (29) Who should be the "final authority" over the use of the information in your child's school record. Rank each of the following from 1 (most authority) through 6 (least authority).  
☐ teachers ☐ school psychologist  
☐ school counselors ☐ school nurse  
☐ principal ☐ parents, with one or more of the above
- (30) In your opinion, which of the following do you consider most important to be included in a students' school record. Rank each of the following from 1 (most important) through 4 (least important).  
☐ intelligence test scores (I.Q.) ☐ reading test scores  
☐ math test scores ☐ vocational/career interest tests
- (31) These items listed here are recorded in student records in many school districts. Rank each according to importance from 1 (most important) through 6 (least important).  
☐ grades earned each year ☐ citizenship (how a child "behaves")  
☐ how well your child reads ☐ absence/tardiness record  
☐ all classes, or grades, failed

THIS SPACE HAS BEEN SAVED FOR YOUR COMMENTS. Are there any questions on this subject that I have not asked? Please comment freely here on any aspect of student records.

(When you have completed this page place the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope and mail. THANK YOU!)

## **APPENDIX C**

### **ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES**

Table 42. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #10.

"Your school district has done a satisfactory job of informing parents of where their child's school record is kept.

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	57.2057	18.434	.000
WITHIN GROUPS	380	589.6142		
TOTAL	382	646.8198		

POST HOC COMPARISON

	Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1 $D_1 - D_3$	.3247	.1576	2.060	380.0	.040
CONTRAST 2 $D_1 - D_2$	-.6454	.1503	-4.294	380.0	.000
CONTRAST 3 $D_2 - D_3$	.9700	.1652	5.872	380.0	.000

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.

Table 43. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #11.

"Generally speaking, your school district has done a satisfactory job of letting parents know who can see your child's records."

#### ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	54.1966	19.299	.000
WITHIN GROUPS	380	533.5789		
TOTAL	382	587.7755		

#### POST HOC COMPARISON

	Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1 $D_1 - D_3$	.1961	.1500	1.308	380.0	.192
CONTRAST 2 $D_1 - D_2$	-.7064	.1430	-4.941	380.0	.000
CONTRAST 3 $D_2 - D_3$	.9025	.1572	5.743	380.0	.000

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.

Table 44. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #12.

"Your school district has done a satisfactory job of informing you about what is in your child's school records."

#### ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	9.6961	3.569	.029
WITHIN GROUPS	380	516.2413		
TOTAL	382	525.9373		

#### POST HOC COMPARISON

		Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1	$D_1 - D_3$	.0801	.1475	.543	380.0	.588
CONTRAST 2	$D_1 - D_2$	-.3005	.1406	-2.137	380.0	.033
CONTRAST 3	$D_2 - D_3$	.3806	.1546	2.462	380.0	.014

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.



Table 45. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #13.

"With the information you have received from your school district you are able to go to your child's school knowing where and how and who to see to look at your child's school records."

#### ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	27.2131	9.128	.000
WITHIN GROUPS	380	566.4266		
TOTAL	382	593.6397		

#### POST HOC COMPARISON

		Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1	$D_1 - D_3$	.2255	.1545	1.460	380.0	.145
CONTRAST 2	$D_1 - D_2$	-.4440	.1473	-3.014	380.0	.003
CONTRAST 3	$D_2 - D_3$	.6695	.1619	4.135	380.0	.000

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.

Table 46. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #14.

"Parents should be allowed to see all information in their child's school records."

#### ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	5.4265	6.222	.002
WITHIN GROUPS	380	165.7118		
TOTAL	382	171.1384		

#### POST HOC COMPARISON

		Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1	$D_1 - D_3$	.1195	.0836	1.430	380.0	.154
CONTRAST 2	$D_1 - D_2$	.2810	.0797	3.527	380.0	.000
CONTRAST 3	$D_2 - D_3$	-.1615	.0876	-1.844	380.0	.066

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.

Table 47. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #15.

"The information in your child's school record is worth 'legal protection' through an Act of Congress, if necessary."

<u>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</u>				
Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	1.5352	.521	.595
WITHIN GROUPS	380	560.2977		
TOTAL	382	561.8329		

<u>POST HOC COMPARISON</u>						
		Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1	$D_1 - D_3$	-.0563	.1537	-.366	380.0	.714
CONTRAST 2	$D_1 - D_2$	.1035	.1465	.706	380.0	.480
CONTRAST 3	$D_2 - D_3$	-.1598	.1610	-.992	380.0	.322

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.

Table 48. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #16.

"Parents should have the right to challenge the accuracy of the information in their child's school records."

<u>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</u>				
Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	5.8114	5.066	.007
WITHIN GROUPS	380	217.9397		
TOTAL	382	223.7493		

<u>POST HOC COMPARISON</u>						
		Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1	$D_1 - D_3$	-.0446	.0958	-.465	380.0	.642
CONTRAST 2	$D_1 - D_2$	.2424	.0914	2.652	380.0	.008
CONTRAST 3	$D_2 - D_3$	-.2869	.1004	-2.857	380.0	.005

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.

Table 49. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #17.

"As part of an investigation, police or other social agencies should be allowed to see any student's school record without permission of the student or parent."

<u>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</u>				
Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	4.1330	1.186	.306
WITHIN GROUPS	380	661.9244		
TOTAL	382	666.0574		

<u>POST HOC COMPARISON</u>						
		Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1	$D_1 - D_3$	.0571	.1670	.342	380.0	.732
CONTRAST 2	$D_1 - D_2$	.2396	.1592	1.505	380.0	.133
CONTRAST 3	$D_2 - D_3$	-.1825	.1750	-1.043	380.0	.298

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.

Table 50. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #18.

"School records should be the school's business. The school should have complete control of student records."

<u>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</u>				
Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	2.0728	.702	.496
WITHIN GROUPS	380	561.2588		
TOTAL	382	563.3316		

<u>POST HOC COMPARISON</u>						
		Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1	$D_1 - D_3$	-.0043	.1538	-.028	380.0	.978
CONTRAST 2	$D_1 - D_2$	.1554	.1466	1.060	380.0	.290
CONTRAST 3	$D_2 - D_3$	-.1598	.1612	-.991	380.0	.322

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.

Table 51. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #19.

"If your child received special help in reading, math, or some other area it should be noted in his/her school record."

### ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	8.4346	4.048	.018
WITHIN GROUPS	380	395.9309		
TOTAL	382	404.3655		

### POST HOC COMPARISON

		Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1	$D_1 - D_3$	.3229	.1292	2.500	380.0	.013
CONTRAST 2	$D_1 - D_2$	-.0205	.1232	-.167	380.0	.868
CONTRAST 3	$D_2 - D_3$	.3435	.1354	2.537	380.0	.012

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.

Table 52. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #20.

"When a child transfers from one school district to another, the school district the child is leaving should keep a permanent copy of the child's complete school record."

<u>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</u>				
Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	4.4768	1.448	.236
WITHIN GROUPS	380	587.4605		
TOTAL	382	591.9373		

<u>POST HOC COMPARISON</u>						
		Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1	$D_1 - D_3$	.2550	.1574	1.620	380.0	.106
CONTRAST 2	$D_1 - D_2$	.0328	.1500	.219	380.0	.827
CONTRAST 3	$D_2 - D_3$	.2222	.1649	1.347	380.0	.179

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.



Table 53. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #21.

"Computers should be used to store student record information."

<u>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</u>				
Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	7.8526	2.961	.053
WITHIN GROUPS	380	503.8863		
TOTAL	382	511.7389		

<u>POST HOC COMPARISON</u>						
		Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1	$D_1 - D_3$	.3333	.1457	2.287	380.0	.023
CONTRAST 2	$D_1 - D_2$	.2396	.1389	1.725	380.0	.085
CONTRAST 3	$D_2 - D_3$	.0937	.1527	.614	380.0	.540

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.

Table 54. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #22.

"Study of the contents of student records by colleges and universities is necessary to obtain an understanding of past, current, and future school programs."

---



---

<u>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</u>				
Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	2.5546	.837	.434
WITHIN GROUPS	380	579.7900		
TOTAL	382	582.3446		

---

<u>POST HOC COMPARISON</u>						
		Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1	$D_1 - D_3$	.0450	.1563	.288	380.0	.774
CONTRAST 2	$D_1 - D_2$	.1884	.1490	1.264	380.0	.207
CONTRAST 3	$D_2 - D_3$	-.1434	.1638	-.875	380.0	.382

---

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.

Table 55. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #23.

"Generally speaking, school officials should pay more attention to parents' attitudes and opinions than they do."

<u>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</u>				
Source of Variance	Degree of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	1.8558	.954	.386
WITHIN GROUPS	380	369.4758		
TOTAL	382	371.3316		

<u>POST HOC COMPARISON</u>						
		Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1	$D_1 - D_3$	.0372	.1248	.298	380.0	.766
CONTRAST 2	$D_1 - D_2$	.1603	.1190	1.348	380.0	.179
CONTRAST 3	$D_2 - D_3$	-.1231	.1308	-.941	380.0	.347

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.

Table 56. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #24.

"School districts should have a clearly written policy for the collection and use of information kept in students' records."

---



---

<u>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</u>				
Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	1.2543	1.057	.349
WITHIN GROUPS	380	225.5551		
TOTAL	382	226.8094		

---

<u>POST HOC COMPARISON</u>						
		Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1	$D_1 - D_3$	-.0658	.0975	-.675	380.0	.500
CONTRAST 2	$D_1 - D_2$	-.1350	.0930	-1.452	380.0	.147
CONTRAST 3	$D_2 - D_3$	.0692	.1022	.677	380.0	.499

---

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.

Table 57. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #25.

"I am suspicious of the school's motives for keeping student records at all."

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	8.3113	5.380	.005
WITHIN GROUPS	380	293.5373		
TOTAL	382	301.8486		

POST HOC COMPARISON

	Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1 $D_1 - D_3$	.1251	.1112	1.125	380.0	.261
CONTRAST 2 $D_1 - D_2$	.3465	.1060	3.267	380.0	.001
CONTRAST 3 $D_2 - D_3$	-.2214	.1166	-1.899	380.0	.058

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.

Table 58. Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison of Questionnaire Item #26.

"'What's done, is done!' and negative information about a student should be removed from the files at the end of each school year."

#### ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	Degree of Freedom	Sum Squares	F-Ratio	F. Prob.
BETWEEN GROUPS	2	7.5466	2.693	.069
WITHIN GROUPS	380	532.4482		
TOTAL	382	539.9948		

#### POST HOC COMPARISON

		Magnitude of Difference	Standard Error	T-Value	Degree of Freedom	T-Prob.
CONTRAST 1	$D_1 - D_3$	.0870	.1498	.581	380.0	.562
CONTRAST 2	$D_1 - D_2$	.3257	.1428	2.281	380.0	.023
CONTRAST 3	$D_2 - D_3$	-.2387	.1570	-1.521	380.0	.129

Level of Significance = .05.

$D_1$  = Ann Arbor,  $D_2$  = Bay City,  $D_3$  = Flint.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Public Documents

Congressional Record, Vol. 120 (1974).

Einhorn v. Maul, et al., 300 F. Supp. (1969)

Elder v. Anderson, 23 Cal. Rptr. 48 (1962).

Marmo v. The New York City Board of Education, 289 N.Y.S. 2nd. 51 (1968).

Olmstead v. U.S., 66 A.L.R. 376 (1928).

People v. Russell, 29 Cal. Rptr. 562 (1963).

"Privacy Rights of Parents and Students," Federal Register (Washington, D.C., 1976), 24662.

Van Allen v. McCleary, 211 N.Y.S. 2nd. 501 (1961).

### Periodicals

Ashbaugh, Carl R., Williams, Martha. "Changing laws and Unchanging Practices in Student Record-Keeping," Phi Delta Kappan (1976).

Bailey, Archie H. "A Strategy for Handling Confidential Student Information," The Clearing House, 47, (February, 1973), pp. 351-2.

Beavan, Keith. "Parents Should be Able to Challenge School Files," New York Times: Educational Supplement, No. 2862 (March 27, 1970).

Craig, Roger E. "Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974: A Tentative Look," Quest, Michigan Personnel and Guidance Association, January, 1975.

Divoky, Diane. "Cumulative Records: Assault on Privacy," Learning, (1973).

Gallup, George. "Sixth Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitude Toward Education," Phi Delta Kappan, 56, (September, 1974).



- George, Thomas W. "The Law and Pupil School Records: Issues and Views," National Association of Secondary School Principals Journal, 56, (September, 1972), pp. 132-41.
- Goslin, David A. "New School Record-Keeping Guidelines Protect Student/Parent Privacy," Nation's Schools, 86, No. 1 (July, 1970).
- Goslin, David A., Teitelbaum, Vivien. "The Russell Sage Foundation Guidelines: Reactions from the Field," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Volume 50, No. 4 (December, 1971).
- Kerlinger, Fred. "Progressivism and Traditionalism: Basic Factors of Educational Attitudes," Journal of Social Psychology, XLVIII, (1958).
- Killian, John C. "The Law, the Counselor, and Student Records," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 48 (February, 1970).
- McCloskey, Gordon. "Planning the Public Relations Program," National Education Association Journal, XLIX, (1960).
- Michigan Child Accounting and Attendance Association, Information Guide for the Collection-Maintenance-Dissemination of Student Records. Pontiac, Michigan: October, 1974.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals, Concerning the Confidentiality of Pupil School Records. New York: NASSP Press, 1971.
- National Education Association, Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities. Washington, D.C.: 1971.
- Pardue, Jerry, et al. "Limiting Confidential Information in Counseling," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 49 (September, 1970).
- Rioux, William. "While 45 Million Children Wait," Parent Alert, 1, October, 1975.
- Russell Sage Foundation. Guidelines for the Collection, Maintenance, and Dissemination of Pupil Records. Sterling Forest, New York (May 25-28), 1969.
- Travers, R. M. "A Study in Judging the Opinions of Groups," Archives of Psychology, XLIX, (1960).
- Ware, Martha. "The Law and Counselor Ethics," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 50 (December, 1971).

Books

Allport, Gordon. Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

American Association of School Administrators, Public Relations for America's Schools, Twenty-Eighth Yearbook. Washington, D. C., 1960.

American Bar Association, Individual Rights and Responsibilities, Washington, D. C., 1968.

Bancroft, John. "Ethical and Legal Aspects of Pupil Personnel Work," The Organization of Pupil Personnel Programs--Issues and Practices. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1974.

Barnes, Fred P. Research for the Practicum in Education. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1964.

Best, John. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

Black. Black's Law Dictionary 1038 (4th ed., 1968).

Borg, Walter and Gall, Meredith. Educational Research. New York: McKay & Co., 1971.

Bullock, Robert P. School-Community Attitudes Analysis for Education. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1959.

Butler, Henry E., Moran, K.D., and Vanderpool, Floyd. Legal Aspects of Student Records. Topeka, Kansas: National Organization of Legal Problems of Education, 1972.

Carver, F. D. and Sergiovanni, T. J. Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1969.

Doll, Ronald C. Curriculum Improvement: Decision-Making Process. Boston: Allyn-Bacon, 1964.

Goslin, David A., Bordier, Nancy. The Goslin-Bordier Study. New York: The Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

Griffiths, Daniel E. Human Relations in School Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.

Gross, Hyman. Privacy--It's Legal Protection. New York: MacMillan Co., 1964.

- Hatch, Raymond N. (ed.). The Organization of Pupil Personnel Programs--Issues and Practices. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1974.
- Harris, Chester (ed.). Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York: MacMillan Co., 1960.
- Huckins, Wesley L. Ethical and Legal Questions in Guidance. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1968.
- Kish, Leslie. Survey Sampling. New York: J. Wiley, 1965.
- Lane, William R., Corwin, Ronald C., and Monahan, William G. Foundations of Educational Administration: A Behavioral Analysis. New York: MacMillan Co., 1970.
- Miller, Arthur R. The Assault on Privacy: Computers, Data Banks, and Dossiers. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1971.
- Ross, Donald (ed.). Administration for Adaptability. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.
- Slakter, Malcolm T. Statistical Inference for Educational Research. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1972.
- Wagner, Elmer. Legal Implications of Duties Performed by Pupil Personnel Workers in California Public Schools. Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, 1966.
- Westin, Alan F. Privacy and Freedom. New York: Atheneum Press, 1967.
- Wright, Jack and Shaw, Marvin. Scales for the Measurement of Attitude. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

### Dissertations

- Bladt, Dorothy L. "A Comparison of the Attitudes of Parents of Elementary Teachers Toward Elementary School Problems." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1968.
- Davis, William P. "An Analysis of Adults' Knowledge of Public School Matters." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The George Washington University, 1968.
- Groshong, Roderick B. "An Exploratory Study of Factors Contributing to Parent Attitude on a Graded and Ungraded Elementary School." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1968.

- Gunnings, Thomas S. "The Effects of Computers on the Legal Status of Confidential Information as Related to Public School Counselors." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1969.
- McNelis, Robert E. "An Investigation of Parents' Opinions, Attitudes, and Knowledge of Selected Aspects of the Public Schools of St. Mary's County, Maryland." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The George Washington University, 1968.
- Parker, Charles A. "An Analysis of Public Attitudes Toward Education in Selected Districts Associated With Public School Systems." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The George Washington University, 1968.
- Pratt, Philip D. "Practices Employed by Public High Schools and Policy Statements of Educational Organizations in the Collection, Maintenance, and Dissemination of Student Information." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1972.
- Schiff, Herbert J. "The Effects of Personal Contractual Relationships on Parent Attitudes Toward and Participation in Local School Affairs." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1963.