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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to determine whether the stated institutional teacher education goals, the nomothetic dimension, differ from the personal needs dispositions, the idiographic dimension, of educators of American Samoa. The population which the study sought to generalize was the public school teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators of American Samoa.

The theoretical framework upon which this study was based was a general model described by Getzels and Guba called the Social Process Theory. Using this model, the study developed three testable hypotheses.

The background of the study reviewed the historical teacher education development in the following areas: (1) American Samoa, (2) Hawaii and (3) U.S.A. The review focused around the major developments of teacher education in Hawaii and American Samoa as consequences of their close relationship with the American education system.

The major problem investigated was whether differences existed in the perceptions between the four groups of public school educators (elementary teachers, secondary teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators). Further investigation included whether there were differences due to ethnicity, sex, age, experience, education, division, language, residency, matai and participation in the teacher education program.

To analyze the problem, a survey instrument was developed to measure the subjects' responses on three dependent variables: (1) the
appropriateness of the teacher education program goals, (2) whether the teacher education program goals have been addressed, and (3) the rank order of educational needs. The goals and need statements were extrapolated from documents of the American Samoa Community College Teacher Education program and the College of Education, University of Hawaii Teacher Education Program.

The instrument was developed through the following major steps: (1) goal statements were compiled into a list; (2) a panel of "judges" reviewed the list; (3) the instrument was field tested on volunteer teachers; and (4) an item analysis and cluster analysis was done to ascertain reliability level. The final instrument consisted of 20 goal statements and 8 need statements.

Subjects participated in the study based on their responsibility for implementing the education goals in the schools and being recipients of the teacher education activities provided for American Samoa. The instrument was administered to 528 subjects. Ninety percent response was received from the subjects.

A series of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to search for differences between the four groups, and the difference based on the independent variables. The Scheffé Range post hoc comparison test was conducted to discern where the differences were between the four groups.

The chi-square test was employed to ascertain the relationship between the groups of respondents and the eight educational needs of the territory. A Friedman two-way analysis was used to determine the relationship of the total group of educators and the total group of variables.
The study revealed that teachers, curriculum specialists and administrators generally perceived the teacher education goals for American Samoa as appropriate and that their perceptions were significantly different when asked whether or not the goals have been addressed. Whereas the elementary teachers' and administrators' perceptions were not significantly different, from each other, they were significantly different from the perceptions of the secondary teachers and curriculum specialists. The study also revealed that the educators showed a significant relationship to only four of the eight educational needs.

This study concluded that the educators of Samoa perceived the goals of teacher education as appropriate. This conclusion implies that there seems to be a congruency between the stated institutional goals, the nomothetic dimension, and the needs dispositions, the idiographic dimension, of the educators. In addition, this study concluded that there seems to be an incongruency between the nomothetic dimension and the idiographic dimension when educators were asked whether or not the goals have been addressed. The educators' perceptions of the educational needs seem to imply an incongruency between the nomothetic dimension, the territorial educational needs, and the idiographic dimension or the educators' needs dispositions.

It is recommended, based on the conclusions of the study that, it is imperative for the educators of American Samoa to examine carefully the goals of the teacher education program and the educational needs of the territory in order to implement necessary steps to achieve congruency between their needs dispositions and the institutional expectations.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>xv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Purpose of the Study</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Theoretical Framework of the Study</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hypotheses</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Definitions</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education in American Samoa</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education in Hawaii</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education in the United States</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of the Study</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Respondents</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample for the Attitudinal Survey</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Instrument, Validation and Administration</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Procedures</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive Data</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation of the Hypotheses</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings Relative to Hypothesis I</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings Relative to Hypothesis II</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Examination of Findings Relative to the Independent Variables</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings Relative to Hypothesis III</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of the Findings</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Findings</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER V</td>
<td>SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Letters of Solicitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>College of Education Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Graduate Program Goals, 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>American Samoa Teacher Education Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Samoa Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Original List of Goal Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepared for the Panel of Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Instrument Mailed to the 528 Subjects in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Tables Showing Item, Cluster and Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Scores of Selected Goal Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Rank Order Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Results of Open-Ended Survey Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participants of the Study by Division, Number and Percent of Teachers, Administrators and Curriculum Specialists of the American Samoa Department of Education: 1983</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coefficient of Correlation of Total Group and Goal Cluster by Cluster, Goal Statement Number, Mean and Standard Deviation</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coefficient of Correlation of Total Group and Goal Cluster by Cluster, Goal Statement Number, Mean and Standard Deviation</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coefficient of Correlation of the Appropriateness of Cluster Goals by Categories, Mean and Standard Deviation</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Coefficient of Correlation of the Addressed Cluster Goals by Categories, Mean and Standard Deviation</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Numbers and Percentages of Survey Instruments Mailed Out and Returned by Categories</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Ethnicity Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Age Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The Sex Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Education Division Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Years of Teaching Experience Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Education Level Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The Residency Outside of Samoa Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14  The Matai Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages .......................... 91
15  The Use of Samoan Language Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages ............... 92
16  The Enrollment in the Teacher Education Program Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages .................................................. 92
17  Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Appropriateness Goals Relative to Interpersonal Relations Cluster .................................................. 94
18  Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Appropriateness Goals Relative to Attitudes Cluster ................................................................. 95
19  Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Appropriateness Goals Relative to Skills Cluster ........................................................... 96
20  Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Appropriateness Goals Relative to Knowledge Cluster .......................................................... 97
21  Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Addressed Goals Relative to Interpersonal Relations Cluster .................................................. 98
22  Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Addressed Goals Relative to Attitudes Cluster ................................................................. 99
23  Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Addressed Goals Relative to Skills Cluster ........................................................... 99
24  Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Addressed Goals Relative to Knowledge Cluster .......................................................... 100
25  Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Group on Total Appropriate Scores ....................... 102
26  Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Total Group on Total Addressed Scores ................................................................. 103
27  Results of the Scheffé Multiple Range Test for the Mean of Addressed Goals for Four Groups of Educators ................................. 103
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriateness (TAPP) Goals Relative to Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goals Relative to Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriate (TAPP) Goal Scores Relative to Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriate (TAPP) Goal Scores Relative to Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriate (TAPP) Goal Scores Relative to Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriateness (TAPP) Goal Scores Relative to Years of Teaching Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Years of Teaching Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriate (TAPP) Goal Scores Relative to Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriateness (TAPP) Goal Scores Relative to Residency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Residency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriateness (TAPP) Goal Scores Relative to Matai

### Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Matai

### Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriateness (TAPP) Goal Scores Relative to Use of Samoan Language

### Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Use of Samoan Language

### Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriateness (TAPP) Goal Scores Relative to Enrollment in the Teacher Education Program

### Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Enrollment in the Teacher Education Program

### Results of Rank Ordering of the Unmet Educational Need Statements

### Appendix Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-1</td>
<td>Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate and Total Addressed Scores of Respondent Groups</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-2</td>
<td>Number of Responses and Means of Goal Clusters by Group and Dependent Variables</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-3</td>
<td>Number of Responses and Means of Goal Clusters by Group and Dependent Variables</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-4</td>
<td>Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate Goal Scores and Total Addressed Goal Scores of Respondents' Ethnicity</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-5</td>
<td>Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate Goal Scores and Total Addressed Goal Scores of Respondents' Age</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-6</td>
<td>Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate Goal Scores and Total Addressed Goal Scores of Respondents' Division</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-7</td>
<td>Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate Goal Scores and Total Addressed Goal Scores of Respondents' Experience</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-8</td>
<td>Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate Goal Scores and Total Addressed Goal Scores of Respondents' Education</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-9</td>
<td>Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate Goal Scores and Total Addressed Goal Scores of Respondents' Residency</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-10</td>
<td>Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate Goal Scores and Total Addressed Goal Scores of Respondents' Matai</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-11</td>
<td>Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate Goal Scores and Total Addressed Goal Scores of Respondents' Use of Samoan Language</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-12</td>
<td>Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate Goal Scores and Total Addressed Goal Scores of Respondents' Enrollment in Teacher Education Program</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-13</td>
<td>Results of Group Relationship to Need Statements</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Normative and Personal Dimension of Social Behavior.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Continuum of Behavior.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Certification Profile of Instructors</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins with a brief historical overview of the development of teacher education in the United States, Hawaii and American Samoa. A description of the purpose of the study follows the overview. Following the purpose of the study is a discussion of the theoretical framework of this study. The summary is the final section of this chapter.

Teacher education, the training of people in the professional art of teaching, has undergone public scrutiny in the United States and elsewhere in the world. In the United States, where teacher education was introduced from Europe in the form of normal schools between 1830 and 1840, graduates of these early teacher training schools had less than a high school education, but later, a high school education became a common requirement (Howsam et al., 1976:23). Questions have arisen as to the role of the teacher and the school. The prevailing dilemma in considering the role of the school in the United States at that time was whether the school should be a change agent or an agent to preserve traditional values. The role of the school has changed over the years. With the rapid growth of urban life and the widespread notion of opportunity for all and upward social mobility, the school has taken on the role as an agent of social change (Howsam et al., 1976:23).

One vital need of the educational system in the United States is the need to develop capacity for critical self-evaluation and change.
Change, however, is impeded by the fact that teacher education institutions seem to be partially insulated from their social context and often from the active experimentation that occurs in the schools. The challenge to update information, to question traditional assumptions, to consider new methods of working and to develop new structures and relationships is not being done, and in some cases may not even be generally recognized as a function of the teacher training institutions (Lynch & Plunkett, 1973:3).

In Hawaii, teacher training was conducted by the Territorial Normal School as an adjunct to the public school system. The Normal School functioned to prepare students to teach in the public schools. This was done to establish a close collaboration between the public schools and the teacher training institution. Public schools provided up to an eighth grade education prior to 1896. By 1896, the teaching department of the Honolulu High School was established as a separate institution from the Normal School. The Normal School became primarily responsible for the secondary education of students who completed their eighth grade education in the public school system (Minoque, 1971:27).

A federal survey in 1920 recommended that all students planning to enroll in post-secondary school complete high school as an admission requirement. The federal survey also recommended that the Normal School be merged, or be affiliated with the teachers' college, which at that time was independent of the University of Hawaii. Consequently, in 1931, the Hawaii Teachers' College combined with the University of Hawaii School of Education to form the University of Hawaii's Teacher's College. It is known today as the University of Hawaii College of Education (Minoque, 1971:28).
Teacher education in Hawaii and in American Samoa is discussed in depth in Chapter II. A brief description of the development of the teacher education program in Hawaii is followed by an introductory discussion of the development of teacher training in American Samoa.

The University of Hawaii College of Education has played a major role in American Samoa. It was in 1932, after the merger of the Hawaii Teacher's College with the School of Education of the University of Hawaii, that the personnel of the College of Education became involved with the education system and the training of teachers in American Samoa. American Samoa received services from the College of Education of the University of Hawaii through the affiliation of the College of Education personnel with the Barstow Foundation. These personnel were members of the Barstow Foundation Committee and as such, provided educational expertise to help determine how the Foundation was to spend money in a meaningful way to help educate the Samoans. The Foundation was set up in Honolulu by Dr. and Mrs. Barstow of New York, acting upon the request of their only son to use his inheritance to provide educational assistance for the Samoans.

Dean Benjamin G. Wist, former principal of the Territorial Normal and Training School of Hawaii, who became Dean of the College of Education of the University of Hawaii, wrote a 393-page report to the Barstow Foundation regarding his observations and study of the entire educational situation of American Samoa during his 1932-33 visit. Essentially, Dean Wist recommended to the Governor of American Samoa that a complete reorganization of the public school system in Samoa be done. In addition, he recommended that a teacher training school for American Samoan teachers be established (Sutherland, 1941:3).
A friend of Dr. Barstow suggested the following regarding the matter of an education program for the Samoans:

They [Samoans] were to be special students trained with one object in mind, further life in the Samoan village when they would act as mentors in building up the native culture and in protecting and preserving their race . . .

. . . Hawaii was to provide the embryonic chiefs with the object lesson in what can happen to a new race, by intermarriage, and by attempting to affect a culture wholesale and without adaptation first.

. . . education was to be quite general to provide a good background with always the one definite objective in view—to produce an individual that would be racially conscious to rule successfully as the head of a Samoan village. (FOB, 1980:5)

In addition to being members of the Barstow Committee, faculty members of the College of Education were sent to Samoa each summer as instructors for the annual teacher training institute funded by the Barstow Foundation and the Government of American Samoa. Reorganization of the school system and the format for the annual teacher training institutes for the American Samoa Department of Education were thus established based on the efforts of Dean Wist of the College of Education and the Barstow Foundation.

In the last decade (1970-1980), with the support of federal monies, the College of Education has not only sent faculty members to teach courses in American Samoa, but it now coordinates most of the federally-funded teacher training activities for the American Samoa Department of Education. The program enables the American Samoan teachers to transfer acceptable credits from the American Samoa Community College to the University of Hawaii for the last two years of course work towards a four-year degree.
In 1904, the first government school was established in American Samoa, principally for the purpose of teaching Samoans the English language (Sanchez, 1956:79). The government school was initially staffed by wives of navy officers. By 1922 there were 19 schools employing 24 Samoan teachers, 5 American teachers and a listing of 1,500 students (Huebner & Reid, 1985). In addition to the goal of English proficiency, government schools in Samoa were established to Americanize Samoan students. This became the primary responsibility of the teachers in American Samoa. Government school teachers, however, had only a fourth to eighth grade education, depending upon where in Samoa they went to school and the availability of schooling at that time.

Due to a severe lack of trained teachers for the public schools, the Barstow Foundation established the Feleti High School to provide secondary education and a year of training for prospective teachers. When the government of American Samoa was financially able to establish the first government high school, the Feleti High School was merged with the government high school. This merger gave birth to the establishment of the Feleti Teacher Training School in 1931, funded primarily by the Barstow Trust Foundation in collaboration with the American Samoa Department of Education (American Samoa DOE, Annual Report, 1975).

The Feleti Teacher Training School offered Home Economics and Industrial Arts for teachers, and a one-year teacher training course. Essentially, the goal of the teacher training school was to train teachers to teach in the elementary schools of Samoa:
... [help] all children become competent in reading and writing in their own language, in use of numbers and in understanding the application of science. (FDB, 1980:48)

The role of the teacher training school was to teach all the traditional chiefs and leaders of American Samoa to meet changing conditions so that the controls and the orderly ways of the Faa Samoa, or the Samoan Ways, might not be lost. The Foundation felt strongly that the Faa Samoa should be retained insofar as it was useful, and not be changed except for the addition of something that might prove itself to be better under new circumstances. The Foundation also believed that establishing a school to train young Samoan leaders would be a better way to preserve the Faa Samoa. Furthermore, the Foundation desired that Samoan students should excel both in English and Samoan, as "... it is a great asset and advantage for a young person to be bicultural" (FDB, 1980:62).

In spite of the advocacy of the Barstow Foundation to educate the Samoans to preserve their traditions, the government of American Samoa viewed education as the means to teach the Samoans the English language and bring about social and economic change. Consequently, Samoan public school teachers were expected to teach in English only and utilize instructional materials developed in the United States for the Philippines.

Many important decisions regarding teacher education were made by administrators without the involvement of the classroom teachers. School administrators determined the courses to be taught in the schools. They also decided what courses and topics would be included for teacher training. Teacher training was conducted in English only with the idea
that the more the Samoan teachers were trained in English, the more English they would learn and the better able they (teachers) would be to teach in English. The time, place and duration of the training were all decisions made by the administrators of the school system. Teacher training in Samoa was directed toward training Samoan teachers to be agents of the American culture, although the culture in which, and for which schools existed, was Samoan (Sanchez, 1956).

With the establishment of the American Samoa Community College (ASCC) in 1970, the Feleti Teacher Training School was phased out. The ASCC provided a two-year, post-secondary education in the arts and sciences. Teachers completing the two-year program from the ASCC received a two-year Associate of Arts degree which generally permitted further teacher education training at the University of Hawaii or other U.S. accredited college in the U.S. (ASCC Teacher Education Handbook, 1973).

Although the American Samoa Department of Education (ASDOE) requires a minimum of a four-year degree from an accredited college or university for all teachers in American Samoa, many teachers currently employed do not meet this requirement. Hence, the ASDOE has developed a teacher education program in collaboration with the University of Hawaii, College of Education (UHCOE) to assist teachers in obtaining the proper credential. The American Samoa Teacher Education Program (ASTEP) requires its teachers to complete a two-year Associate degree from the ASCC. Upon graduation from the ASCC, and upon meeting all admissions requirements of the University of Hawaii, applicable college credits of American Samoa teachers are transferred
to the College of Education at the University of Hawaii where the last two years of a four-year baccalaureate degree are completed.

The goals of the ASTEP, therefore, are a combination of the goals of both the teacher education program at the ASCC for the first two years and those of the UHCOE for the last two years. Some of the major teacher education program goals are:

American Samoa Community College:

1. The teacher will be able to develop the ability to identify the basic knowledge and understandings that are consistent with the major content areas.
2. The teacher will demonstrate general instructional competencies.
3. The teacher will plan and carry out community education programs.
4. The teacher will have experiences at a variety of grade levels and in the special education classrooms.
5. The teacher will be able to communicate effectively with other school staff and contribute to the total school program.
6. The teacher will work together with the cooperating teacher to plan curriculum and management for a common group of children.
7. The teacher will develop effective behavioral objectives and learning activities resulting in behavior change of children.
8. The teacher will be able to develop effective teaching strategies.
9. The teacher will have input in the direction of his/her learning by periodically meeting with his/her instructors (The Teacher Education Program Guide, ASCC, 1973).
The training program will develop teachers who:

1. are open, flexible and honest;
2. have a realistic perception of themselves and their personal relationships with others;
3. have developed a high level of critical thinking, problem-solving and evaluation skills;
4. have competent language skills and subject matter competence;
5. have an understanding of human behavior (ASCC Handbook, 1973).

University of Hawaii, College of Education goals are to:

1. Actualize Self
   1.1 The teacher is able to accept humanistic principles (i.e., dignity of man, worth of individual, value of creativity, etc.).
   1.2 The teacher is able to demonstrate self-confidence.
   1.3 The teacher is able to assume responsibility for own behavior.
   1.4 The teacher is able to accept praise and criticism objectively, avoid denying or distorting feelings, motives, and abilities in self.
   1.5 The teacher is able to develop a sensitive awareness of others.
   1.6 The teacher is able to work effectively and efficiently with others.
   1.7 The teacher is able to develop warm interpersonal relationships.
   1.8 The teacher is able to demonstrate openness to experience.
1.9 The teacher is able to solve problems by considering alternative courses of action.

2. Help Others Understand and Accept Themselves
   2.1 The teacher is able to use and model interpersonal communication skills.
   2.2 The teacher is able to use counseling skills.
   2.3 The teacher is able to involve others in decision making.
   2.4 The teacher is able to involve others in problem solving.

3. Facilitate Learning
   3.1 The teacher is able to articulate broad educational goals.
   3.2 The teacher is able to set instructional objectives.
   3.3 The teacher is able to develop relevant teaching-learning experiences.
   3.4 The teacher is able to evaluate teaching and learning experiences.
   3.5 The teacher is able to improve his/her professional competencies (College of Education Undergraduate & Graduate Program, 1973. See Appendix B).

It is evident from the historical overview of the development of teacher education in Hawaii and American Samoa that the developments have had strong western influence. It also appears from the historical overview, that changes implemented in the development of teacher training and education in general have been primarily prompted by the recommendations of western educators over the years.

This study acknowledges the strong western influence in Samoan education and the historical ties of education in Samoa to the University of Hawaii, and it proposes to examine the role which the U.S. and
Hawaii teacher education have played in the development of teacher training for American Samoa. More specifically, this study will examine the perceptions of Samoan educators regarding the goals of the teacher education program for American Samoa which have developed through strong American influence.

Purpose of the Study

The review of the development of teacher education in American Samoa shows that there are no data or information on the perceptions of classroom teachers, school administrators and curriculum specialists regarding the teacher education program. In addition, no information is available discussing the perceptions of educators regarding the educational needs of the territory. The purpose of this study, then, is to determine whether the stated institutional teacher education goals, the nomothetic dimension, differ from the personal orientation, the idiographic dimension, of the Samoan educators in American Samoa. This study will examine the perceptions of elementary and secondary classroom teachers, school administrators and curriculum specialists regarding: (1) the appropriateness of the goals of the teacher education program for American Samoa, (2) whether or not the goals of the teacher education program have been addressed, and (3) the educational needs of the territory.

The literature examined (see Chapter III, Perception of Attitudes section) indicates that behavior is a function of a person's perception (Combs et al., 1976:16). This means that perception is the thought of a behavior one expects to execute or has experienced. It is, therefore, significant to obtain the perceptions of educators regarding
educational goals because the information will provide insight to the attitude each educator has, or has had, with respect to each goal. An analysis of their perceptions of the goals will provide information by which the educators of American Samoa can base their decision to either continue pursuing goals, which may not have been met, or to discontinue pursuing those goals which they feel have not been met, or are not applicable, to their situation in American Samoa.

The Theoretical Framework for the Study

The theoretical framework on which this study is based has been taken from the work of Jacob W. Getzels and Egon G. Guba. According to Getzels (1963:309), there are "more contradictory demands and constraints upon education than upon other occupational groups."

The Getzels-Guba theoretical framework is known as the Social System Model (Getzels & Guba, 1957). The concept of a social system is theoretical and was invented to help conceptualize the conflicts and interdependent relationships of people within social organizations and the larger community. Although interrelated, each of these units may be viewed separately. A community, a school, and even a classroom, may be viewed as a social system. Getzels suggests that a social system may be viewed as having a hierarchy of subordinate and superordinate relationships. Further, he explains that this hierarchy of relationships is the locus for allocating and integrating roles and facilities in order to achieve the goals of the social system. In these relationships, the assignment of positions, the provision of facilities, the organization of procedures, the regulation of activity and the evaluation of performance take place (Campbell et al., 1977:18A).
The social system is conceived as involving two classes of phenomena which are independent, yet in actual social situations are interactive. The first of the two classes of phenomena is the institution. The institution functions to carry out in certain routinized ways, specific institutional functions such as governing, educating and policing. It is characterized by specific roles and expectations to achieve the goals of the system. The second phenomenon of a social system is the individual, characterized by a unique personality and needs disposition, interacting within the system. The institution, with its roles and expectations, constitutes what Getzels calls the nomothetic or normative dimension of activity in a social system, while the individual personality and needs dispositions constitute the idiographic or personal dimension of activity in a social system (Campbell, 1977:184). Figure 1 illustrates the two classes of phenomena which constitute the social system.

---

**NORMATIVE (Nomothetic) DIMENSION**

social system

institution \(\rightarrow\) role \(\rightarrow\) expectations

social behavior

individual \(\rightarrow\) personality \(\rightarrow\) needs dispositions

**PERSONAL (Idiographic) DIMENSION**

---

Figure 1. The Normative and Personal Dimension of Social Behavior

Essentially, the theory suggests that social behavior is a derivative of the inter-relation of both dimensions. The individual in the Getzels-Guba model is defined by personality, and personality is characterized by needs dispositions. On the other hand, the institution is defined by roles and expectations. Therefore, the clearer the individual perceives the role and expectations set by the institution, and the more cognizant the institution is of the needs of the individuals inhabiting the roles, the more congruent the dimensions are said to be.

People see what their own background permits them to see. When two role incumbents understand each other, it means that their perceptions and their own organization of prescribed complementary expectations are congruent. When two role incumbents misunderstand each other, it means their perceptions and their own organization of prescribed complementary expectations are incongruent. (Campbell, 1977:187)

If this be the case, then one can say that "an act is concerned as deriving from the interaction between the nomothetic and idiographic dimensions in the model" (Getzels, 1963:310).

The proportion or degree to which role and personality factors determining behavior can dominate varies with each specific act and the role and personality involved.

As illustrated in Figure 2, behavior for military personnel is largely dictated by the prescribed role, as opposed to the artist, whose behavior is established, for the most part, by personality. It is important to note that in Figure 2, at both extremes, behavior of military personnel and artist are not solely determined by their roles or personalities. Instead, behavior is determined by the interaction of both role and personality in varying degrees. School behavior, using Figure 2, is perceived as having equal interaction between role and
personality and also expectation and needs dispositions. This study will focus on the interaction of the institution expectation, the nomothetic dimension, with the need dispositions, the idiographic dimension. This means that teacher behavior is theoretically derived from a balanced interaction of institutional role and expectations with individual personality and needs disposition.

![Figure 2. Continuum of Behavior](image)


The Getzels-Guba model illustrates that when there is a balance in the interaction and interrelationship of the dimensions with one another in the system, theoretically speaking, the behavior is oriented towards achieving the expectations of the institution as well as meeting the needs of the individual. If any one dimension dominates the other in the social system, however, the resulting behavior reflects that imbalance and an incongruency between the institutional expectation and the individual needs dispositions secured. Thus, individual perceptions of role in the institution, and cultural values all influence behavior (Campbell, 1977).
Getzels explains that there are five major types of conflicts (Getzels, 1963:313):

1. conflict between culture values and institutional expectations (conflict between dimensions);
2. conflict between role expectations and personality disposition (conflict between dimensions);
3. conflict between roles and within roles (conflict within a dimension);
4. conflict deriving from personality disorder (conflict within a dimension);
5. conflict in the perceptions of role expectations (conflict within a dimension).

This study will focus only on the conflict between institutional role expectations (nomothetic dimension) and the individual needs dispositions (idiographic dimension).

It is important to understand the interrelationship of behavior and perception. Behavior is defined as one's reaction to the environment, motivated by interacting conditions within (personal) and those outside (external). One factor leading to a specific behavior is perception. Perceptions or assumptions, define roles and expectations. Consequently, one may say that behavior is motivated by how one perceives factors including needs, role and relation to others (Campbell, 1977: 290-297). This being the case, the educators who participated in this study responded to this study based upon two dimensions: (1) their perceptions of themselves (personality) and their needs (dispositions), in addition to (2) their perceptions of their roles as prescribed by the institution. Consequently, the responses of the educators, or their
perceptions as educators, may be said to be an evidence of the interactions and interrelationships of the personal and normative dimensions as discussed in this section.

Perceptions of teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators are important to ascertain the appropriateness and implementation of the teacher education program goals.

Statement of the Problem

The need to examine the goals of teacher training for Samoa is evidenced by the lack of data and information on what the perceptions of educators are regarding the goals of the teacher education program for American Samoa. This study will examine the perceptions of elementary and secondary classroom teachers, school administrators, and curriculum specialists regarding the appropriateness of the goals of the teacher education program for American Samoa, and whether or not the goals of the teacher education program have been addressed. In addition, this study will examine the respondents' perceptions regarding the educational needs of the territory.

The Hypotheses

The following hypotheses have been formulated:

H-I: There will be no significant difference between the perceptions of elementary teachers, secondary teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators regarding the appropriateness of the goals of the teacher education program for American Samoa.
H-II: There will be no significant difference between the respondents' perceptions as to whether or not the goals of the teacher education program have been addressed.

H-III: There will be no significant difference between the respondents' perceptions of the education needs of the territory.

The Definitions

The following terms are defined, as they are used in this study:

Perceptions--A personal point of view based on understanding of self and role.

Educational goal--A general statement of a desired education condition or behavior.

Teacher education or teacher training--Formal post-high school schooling for members of the teaching profession.

Educator--Respondents of this study: the classroom teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators who participated in this study.

Educational need--An assessed, unaccomplished want of the classroom or department of education.

Matai--Samoan men or women holding traditional chief titles.

Summary

The growth and development of teacher education in the United States have been subject to the stated goals and assessed needs of the school and the community. Particularly in Samoa, the development of education can be viewed as a result of outside influence: Christianity,
merchants, military and the political division of Samoa by colonial powers. Social and economic developments have shaped the characteristics of education and the training of teachers in American Samoa.

The purpose of this study is to determine whether the stated institutional teacher education goals, the nomothetic dimension, differ from the personal orientation, the idiographic dimension, of educators in American Samoa. More specifically, this study will examine the perceptions of elementary and secondary teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators regarding the appropriateness of the goals of the teacher education program for American Samoa and whether or not these goals have been addressed. Further, this study will examine the perceptions of the Samoan educators regarding the educational needs of the territory.

Chapter II of the study contains a review of related literature. It consists of a historical overview of the developments of teacher education in American Samoa, Hawaii and the United States. The focus of this discussion will be on how teacher education in Hawaii and the United States influenced the development of teacher training in Samoa. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of the relatedness of the theoretical framework and the topics discussed in the chapter.

Chapter III will report the design of the study, perception of respondents, sample for the attitudinal survey, survey instrument, validation and administration and the statistical procedures utilized.

Chapter IV will present the significant findings and discussion of the findings.

Chapter V will include a summary of the study, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter is a review of literature on the development of teacher education in American Samoa, Hawaii and the United States. Each section will begin with a brief historical overview of the development of education and teacher education, and will be followed by a discussion of the teacher education program currently operating in each entity. The relationship of the development of teacher education programs in each entity will be examined, specifically the influence of the United States teacher education movement on Hawaii and the influence of the Hawaii teacher education on Samoa. Each section will conclude with a summary.

Teacher Education in American Samoa

The development of teacher education in American Samoa has been closely intertwined with the development of the public school system there. This development will be discussed in four phases:

Phase I: The Navy Administration (1900-1952)
Phase II: The Barstow Foundation Efforts (1932-1960)
Phase IV: The Samoanization Movement (1972-present)

A striking characteristic during the first phase was the way in which teachers were almost always excluded from the planning and development of their training. It is possible that this omission may be the result
of the conflict discussed in the theoretical framework section of the preceding chapter.

Phase I: Navy Administration: 1900-1952. According to a study done by Mark Sutherland (1941:1-5), the development of the public school system in American Samoa not only enabled the native population to successfully meet the unavoidable forces of the expanding western civilization, but it also facilitated their need to preserve what they valued about their own civilization. He further explained that their success in meeting the influences of the west and simultaneously preserving cultural goods was attributable to the development of the teacher training program for the native Samoans.

The concept of teaching was not foreign to the Samoan people. Skilled craftsmen and craftswomen in the village taught their eager apprentices while making or building necessary utensils or structures used in village/family functions. When the missionaries arrived in 1830, teaching the natives was widespread, due largely to the missionaries who taught Christianity using: (1) Samoan preachers, (2) the vernacular, (3) concepts which were compatible to Samoan cultural values and traditions, and (4) activities which did not obstruct the traditional system of the family, matai and village life (Huebner & Reid, 1985).

When the islands of Tutuila and Manua were finally ceded to the U.S. government in 1900 and 1904 respectively, the U.S. Department of the Navy was assigned to govern the islands. The commanding officers of the Navy viewed the islands as lacking a central political figure and a central government. In addition, the officers felt the people
needed to be educated; they needed to learn to speak English. With this orientation, the first public school was established in 1904 in American Samoa with navy wives and officers as teachers (Sutherland, 1941:29). It was set up in Pago Pago for American and part-Samoan children (Allen, 1970:176).

The early development of teacher training began in 1921 when the emphasis was given to the inservicing of native teachers in the public school system to teach English. Nineteen government schools were opened in three districts. Seventeen schools offered grades 1 through 4, one school offered grades 1 through 5 and the other had grades 1 through 8. Schools were open five days a week with four hours of instruction daily.

By 1922, the Navy had enrolled 1,567 students in the 19 schools but had only 29 teachers (an average of 54 students per teacher). Twenty-four of the 29 teachers were Samoan, who had barely finished primary school, and whose English proficiency left much to be desired. The Navy chose the 24 "as those best prepared to teach." Very few had any special training for the work.

The lack of trained teachers was recognized from the first as the weakest part of the whole undertaking. The best prepared of the native teachers had only a poor 8th grade education . . . the very low degree of pre-service training the teachers had received seemed to be an almost insurmountable obstacle. (Sutherland, 1941:24-36).

To improve the quality of teachers in the public school system from 1921 to 1922, the Navy commander developed the vacation institutes for teachers which proved ineffective. Teachers were required to teach in English because of "the limited amount of printed educational
materials in the Samoan language, and the great difficulty of preparing sufficient quantities of it" (Sutherland, 1941:51). Thus, from 1922 to 1931, there were very few opportunities for professional growth among teachers.

According to Gray (1960),

The public school system . . . soon found itself unable to provide the necessary facilities due to lack of funds needed to employ trained supervisors and teachers . . . some Samoans contemplated the abolition of the public school in 1928.

It was apparent that although the Navy administrators opened as many as 19 schools with 29 teachers, the progress of education in American Samoa was slower than the Navy administrators had hoped. This however was in large part related to how these administrators perceived the Samoan situation.

First of all, the commanding officers of the Navy, charged with the responsibility of governing American Samoa, saw a place and a people with many deficiencies. Although the people were nearly 100% literate in their own language due to missionary efforts 30 years prior, the Navy administrators saw the inability of the people to speak English as a dire need for education. Secondly, the commanding officer of the Navy saw a seeming lack of a central figure of authority and the absence of any central political government over the group of islands. This they interpreted as the islands being disorganized and primitive. They failed to see that historically and culturally the traditional governing of Samoa was in the village. Village life in Samoa flourished with abundant traditional activities which nurtured genealogical bonds between villages and between islands.
In Samoa . . . close cultural and social affinities extended to the outer boundaries of the geographical region . . . . From Manu'a to the west end of Savai'i the people all acknowledged having a common identity as Samoans. They intermarried widely, recognized far-flung family and political relationships, and maintained these relationships by paying each other frequent visits and joining in a variety of inter-village activities. (Gilson, 1970:9)

Samoans were related to each other and kept this bond alive as they paid service to their kinsmen from island to island (Franco, 1985). The matai titles held by the chiefs in Tutuila signified specific status and rank in the village, intervillage and between the islands.

. . . political organization rested largely upon the ramified lineage and the local extended families joined in dealing with common local problems. The interaction and cross-cutting of principles of kinship and locality among others of lesser importance, produced with Samoa's relatively large-scale society a complex pattern of associations, obligations and alliances . . . . (Gilson, 1970:9)

These flourishing cultural activities of the Samoans went unnoticed and unappreciated by the Navy government. The Navy's mission was clear: the officers of the Navy in Samoa were to Americanize and educate the people. This being the case, no effort was made by the Navy to consider the native culture or the people over whom it now had stewardship.

The schools and the training of teachers as products of the Navy Administration reflected the mission of the Navy, a mission which brought the schools and the training of Samoan teachers in conflict with the culture in which the institution was embedded.

The students in the American modeled schools were taught in English and used English instructional materials and routines. The school structure and student expectations were in direct violation of the values and customs of Samoan culture.
Phase II: The Barstow Foundation Efforts: 1932-1960. It was clear that the Barstow Foundation mission was very different from the Navy's mission. The Barstow Foundation attempted to address the needs of the people, while simultaneously addressing the needs of the Foundation.

An objective which recognizes that much in Samoan ways and life is good in itself . . . but that American Samoa is undergoing change, especially through the influence of western civilization. In view of this changing condition . . . the objective of education should be to conserve the acquaintance with the great intellectual tools and social concepts and institutions of the west to the end that Samoans may maintain respect for their native heritage and skills in their traditional arts and crafts and at the same time may learn to meet on equal terms with other people the conditions of the modern world. (FOB Foundation, 1932)

The strong recommendation made by Barstow Committee members to the Governor of Samoa led to the usage of the native language for instruction in grades 1 to 3 and the teaching of Samoan history in the curriculum. The efforts of the Barstow Foundation brought a gradual congruency or agreement between the cultural dimension (Samoan culture) and the nomothetic dimension (education system).

Native teachers were tested in 1931 and 1932 to assess where the teachers in Samoa needed the most help. The test revealed that, based on United States norms, the Samoan teacher had "equivalent of the average school age standing of 5.7 and an educational age of 11 years." In addition, the test revealed that Samoan teachers rated fairly well in personal qualities, but indicated a lack of understanding of methods and theory of teaching. Further, the teacher institutes, sponsored by the Barstow Foundation in collaboration with the American Samoa
school system, were designed "to teach everything centered around the concept of raising the general level of intelligence of the Samoan people."

In 1936, all teachers and principals who held matai titles were honorably discharged from their positions in the public school system by the commanding officer.

After visiting Samoa and surveying the traditional leaders of selected villages, the Barstow Committee agreed with American Samoa in 1936 that for a two-year period educators from Hawaii would "fill the key position of Superintendent of Schools, teacher training director and other higher education institutions" (Sutherland, 1941:53).

Rather than training teachers to teach a United States curriculum in English, the second phase in the development of teacher education recognized the value of teaching primary children in their native language and postponing the use of English as the medium of instruction. It also advocated the need to train the teachers to teach the preservation of the Samoan way of life.

The Feleti School opened in September 1934 as a high school for sons of chiefs. After World War II, Feleti School was integrated with the newly built high school and the birth of the Feleti Teacher Training College, and the Feleti Memorial Demonstration School came to be in 1948 (Allen, 1962:167). Teachers in Samoa were now required to obtain a high school diploma and successfully complete the course of study at the Feleti Teacher Training College, and the Demonstration School before teaching.

On June 29, 1951, the administration of American Samoa was transferred from the Department of the Navy to the Secretary of the
Department of Interior by means of Executive Order 10262. The change of administration had far-reaching effects on the people of Samoa, beyond the schools and the teachers. The change of administration resulted in an economic recession. Native Samoans once employed by the Navy were jobless. In addition to the high level of unemployment, a severe drought brought crop failure and food shortages throughout the territory. Additionally, the world price of copra dropped drastically. Essentially, the change of government administration in American Samoa in 1951 was handicapped "by the lack of overlapping services between most of the stateside civil employees and their Navy counterparts" (Annual Report, 1956:6).

Though the Navy pullout occurred, the assistance of the Barstow Foundation in the training of teachers continued. Annual teacher institutes conducted by University of Hawaii instructors were held in Samoa.

From 1952 to 1962, the public school system and the training of teachers continued, as established by the Department of the Navy and the Barstow Foundation. At the same time, the American government did little to develop the territory of American Samoa and the education system. By 1960 however the election of President John F. Kennedy brought new and swift changes to Samoa. The educational television era began, with President Kennedy approving the appointment of Governor Rex Lee for the American Samoa territory.

Phase III: ETV Era: 1962-1972. With the Department of Interior under the Kennedy administration, Governor Rex Lee was appointed and directed to bring about change to Samoan education: "The television
system could help eliminate the present conflicts between school--where English is taught, and the home where Samoan is spoken" (Allen, 1962: 203). This led to another problem. The teaching personnel from the mainland on two-year contracts were "not necessarily devoted to making significant accomplishments" (Allen, 1962:213).

The importance of mainland contract teachers to teach via ETV left the ill-trained Samoan teachers as teaching aides or classroom monitors.

I have a feeling that the abilities of the classroom teachers are being sold short . . . the fact remains that the classroom teachers I have observed in operation, and those I talked with, have classroom skills far beyond what classroom teachers as a class are credited with having . . . classroom teachers . . . seem to be asking for a greater opportunity to exercise their own talents. (Brown, 1971)

The new government administration felt an urgency to change the life style of the Samoan people and to modernize the neglected territory of the United States without respect to culture and heritage.

In a place where culture nuance dominate any form of transaction, it is essential to be sensitive to the culture and the changes it is going through . . . the department must be sensitive to the specific attributes and educational background of the individual. (Chun, 1981)

To put it more succinctly, Topping commented:

What is education trying to do to cope with the problem of preparing American Samoans to live in their world? It would appear that they are doing exactly what they are doing in the rest of America, only worse, for what they have is basically an American system. (Topping, 1976)

What the Lee administration saw was an island with poor sanitation conditions, no roads to access the entire island, electrical and water plants that were limited and unsatisfactory and the people not any better educated than when the Navy had governed the islands. The school buildings were an embarrassment and the teachers were ill prepared.
After consultation with friends for the National Association of Educational Broadcasting (NAEB), Governor Lee felt educational television was the vehicle to mass educate the students, given the situation of the shortage of trained teachers. The decision to use educational television for the entire school system meant several things:

- Mainland teachers had to be hired;
- Housing was needed for the mainland teachers;
- New schools needed to be built;
- Roads had to be built in order to build the new schools throughout the island;
- Electricity had to be installed in every village.

The decision to use ETV for the education of Samoans boosted the economy and American Samoa was on its way to modernization, never to be the same again.

The Department of Interior increased federal funds to the territory from $2.1 million in 1961 to $9.5 million in 1962 (Pirie, 1970:498). Consequently a new jet runway was built, and a second tuna cannery opened in Pago Pago.

In the past, American Samoa was a classic example of retarded economic development compounded by remoteness and miniscule size. . . . A sudden massive infusion of outside capital and technical assistance has propelled the territory towards prosperity, sustained economic growth and eventual self-support at a high level. (Pirie, 1970:500, Franco, 1985)

The installation of ETV was not only aimed at educating the children in school, it was aimed at changing the lives of the people in their homes and in their villages. Neither the people in the community nor the Samoan educators involved in the implementation of ETV were surveyed regarding the changes which occurred.
The view of the American life style, the sounds of the English language, and the lessons of the model teachers aired through television were not limited to the central part of the business section in Samoa. They were conspicuously channelled out to every village, even to the remotest islands of Manua where the life style was as untouched as in the days of Margaret Mead.

With the mainland contract teacher planning and teaching lessons on TV, every school age child in American Samoa had a 20-minute lesson and worksheet for every subject offered in the curriculum, with the Samoan teacher in the classroom as an aide. In the elementary schools, students had core instruction via television for language arts, science, social studies, math, music, art and Samoan language arts. Samoan teachers in the classrooms reinforced and followed each lesson with pre-planned discussions, seat work and other activities. The studio (the hub-bub of ETV production) had native English speaking teachers for every subject, producing lesson plans and telelessons for daily dissemination. The studio was equipped with its own art and film production crew to support the television teachers. The air-conditioned, four-studio building had the latest equipment for quality taping. Clerical staff assisted with the preparation of volumes and volumes of lesson plans for distribution to the Samoan teachers in the classroom.

Phase IV: The Samoanization Era: 1972-Present. With the appointment of John M. Haydon as Governor in 1972, changes began to occur in American Samoa particularly in the public school system.

Its affect (American education) has been more to the detriment of the Samoan culture than its intended function. For too long it has always been expected
that the Samoan culture change for American education. It is high time that both (Samoan culture and American education) be considered variable to attain a mutually beneficial compromise. (Galeai, 1980:42)

According to Beauchamp, attempts to Americanize Samoa have lacked design and have been contradictory.

Of the territories annexed during the McKinley years some have experienced significant changes under American rules but American Samoa is not one such territory. Perhaps this is because there has never been a rational designed, consistent American policy toward American Samoa. Since 1900, American policies, particularly educational policies, have been noted for their contradictory nature and their singular lack of success. (1975:24)

The eagerness to expedite changing Samoa from an unknown and neglected American territory to a model United States territory in the Pacific within a decade included the grave omission of serious consideration of traditional culture and values of the Samoan community. This prompted the premature abortion of ETV in its seventh year. Many questions regarding the full impact of ETV on the Samoan children have risen to test the conscience of researchers and Samoans themselves:

- if more time could have been taken with the original decision;
- if hardware preparation had not been permitted to outrun the planning and preparation software;
- if there had been time to bring in the classroom teachers;
- if there had been time for a thorough meeting of minds with the community leaders on the goals of education;
- if the decision had been to introduce television one grade at a time, rather than in all subjects and all grades by the beginning of the second year;
- if there had been time to find out what changes were taking place in the classroom teachers in the first half-dozen years of the project, particularly in the first two or three years;
If there had been time to consider more carefully what might be the ultimate results of bringing in, with government money, a few American commercial network entertainment programs for evening broadcast. (Schramm et al., 1981:193-197)

The consistent reporting of the omission of involvement of Samoan classroom teachers was a major factor in the abrupt demise of the "model ETV system of the Pacific."

The inadequate involvement of Samoan teachers, in particular, must have signaled possible dangers. There is no record that classroom teachers were brought into the initial planning. Just as had been the case before television, policy making and administration were kept tightly in the hands of U.S. stateside personnel. (Schramm et al., 1981:65)

The Samoanization era can generally be said to be a time of the dismantling of educational television as the principal vehicle for dissemination of instruction in the American Samoa Department of Education, and the rise of focusing on the role of the Samoan classroom teachers.

Governor Lee resigned in 1967 and was succeeded by Governor Owen Aspinall. Aspinall's target, once in office, was to cut back hours of TV instruction and discontinue other practices in the Department of Education. In addition, he negotiated with the University of Southern California (USC) for a consulting contract after NAEB's contract expired. These activities resulted in NAEB's decision to terminate service on completion of the contract with Government of American Samoa as of February 17, 1969 (Schramm, 1981:79).

Instead of contracting USC as Governor Aspinall had hoped, the Department of Interior contracted the University of Hawaii through 1971. It was during the administration of Governor John M. Haydon (1969-74) that public criticism of the system led to various measures to change the system.
Governor Haydon's criticism of the system had been given impetus by the findings of Wolf Management Services, an organization commissioned by the U.S. Department of Commerce to recommend an economic development program for American Samoa. The Wolf Report of 1969 not only criticized the educational system for its failure to relate its program to Samoa's current and potential manpower needs, but specifically questioned the effectiveness of television as a teaching tool. (Schramm et al., 1981:81)

Director of Education Roy Cobb, and other advocates of ETV during Lee's administration, resigned and were replaced by University of Hawaii Vice President Richard Balch. He was dismissed four months later by Governor Haydon. By 1970, Milton deMello, Deputy Superintendent of the Windward District of the Hawaii State Department of Education, was named to the post of Director of Education by Governor Haydon.

He (deMello) found a system in complete chaos and set about trying to restore some semblance of harmony and order. . . . It was under deMello that most of the cutbacks in the television system took place. (Schramm et al., 1981:81)

deMello called for a reduction of hours for television instruction and hired new contract teachers from the mainland to replace television in the classroom. In addition, a team of five persons from the University of Hawaii, under ASDOE contract, visited the territory and documented inadequacies of the program measured against its (ASDOE) stated goals. They reported that the major opposition to television came from teachers and students from the high schools. By 1970, the process to dismantle ETV was implemented. The following year, deMello appointed a task force to review the status of television and to make recommendations concerning its future. The task force was made up of a cross section of ETV personnel, teachers and administrators. The task force conducted a survey of 243 teachers and administrators at
all levels: 1,915 students in upper elementary levels and 1,624 high school students (Schramm, 1981:83). The task force report given to deMello in 1972 essentially recommended that classroom teachers be given control and choice of television for classroom use.

We no longer view teaching done by means of TV as the core of all instruction in the system and no longer consider that the sole purpose of classroom activities is to reinforce TV instructions. . . . TV should continue to be used as one of several instructional tools. (Schramm, 1981:86)

deMello completed his contract by 1973 at which time Chief Nikolao Pula became director and inherited the dismantled system. His untimely death a year later turned the department to his associate director, Mere Betham, who further reduced the use of television in 1974. By 1975, the Department of Education had little or no ETV production going on (Schramm, 1981:89). Betham continued to head the Department of Education from 1974 until 1985.

Momentum to upgrade the Department of Education staff, teachers and administrators alike, was the prime focus of the Betham administration. Through federal funds and outside contracts with Brigham Young University, both Hawaii and Provo campuses, and the University of Hawaii, Betham was successful in providing financial assistance, in terms of tuition and room and board, for hundreds of the American Samoa Department of Education staff. Educators in Samoa were able to work towards undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate studies in Hawaii and on the mainland. In order to receive a "free" education one needed to be a Department of Education employee and agree to return to Samoa to work upon completion of studies.
The initial step to the Samoanization process of the Department was to put Samoan leaders in command. Chief Pula, for a short time, and then Betham, who filled the slot as she was groomed to do. The establishment of the American Samoa Community College (ASCC) provided another means to support the local leaders in their effort to upgrade the skills of department personnel to handle teaching positions and meet educational objectives. The ASCC provided the two-year post secondary general education for students before they went on to complete work at a four-year college.

The Department of Education was successful in securing, qualifying and competing for federal grants for the training of personnel. Millions of dollars poured into the American Samoa Department of Education for the training of personnel. This was the avenue by which the Department of Education sought to further train personnel after completing two years at ASCC.

In 1978, the American Samoa Department of Education, in collaboration with the ASCC, received a two-year grant under the Teacher Corps Program. ASCC searched for a university that would accept the selected teachers for training and would offer a four-year degree within two years. Proposals from universities from the west coast and Hawaii were reviewed as part of this search. In 1979, the University of Hawaii was granted the first teacher training contract for a degree program with the American Samoa Department of Education and ASCC. The contract pioneered a teacher training program model designed by the College of Education, University of Hawaii (COE-UH). The model provided courses during the regular semesters by having the COE-UH professors travel to Samoa to teach designated courses for the teachers. This
was to allow the Samoan teachers to continue working in the schools and take courses after work. In the summers, the teachers were required to travel to the University of Hawaii, Manoa campus, to take courses over the 12-week summer period. By the end of the contract period, nearly all of the selected undergraduates graduated, and all the graduate teachers completed their theses and degree requirements. The Samoa Department of Education found this teacher training program model highly appropriate for their teachers' needs and work schedule. That is, teachers taught during the school year and concentrated on teacher training courses leading to a degree during the summer.

Betham reported that,

The teacher, together with the school, represents to the community the most visible symbols of the Department of Education. It is recognized that the success of any educational program, no matter how well intentioned or researched, ultimately depends on how well that program is received and utilized by the classroom teacher. It is primarily for this reason that the Department, three years ago, embarked on its most ambitious and extensive staff development program to date.

With the assistance of the American Samoa Community College, the University of Hawaii, and Brigham-Young University-Provo, the teachers, and administrators of American Samoa are afforded the opportunity to obtain quality higher education training, enabling them to address with more confidence the specific educational needs and concerns of our public school children.

The program is proving to be highly successful, with many teachers earning undergraduate or post-graduate degrees. (Annual Report, 1983:7)

In the same report (1983:44), the following teacher training grants were reported to have been awarded to the American Samoa Department of Education:
- Chapter II of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA) $2,928,320
- Title VII Basic Grant through the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (OBEMLA) - 3 years 199,558
- Title VII Technical Assistance Grant through OBEMLA - 2 years 10,000
- Title VII Multifunction Support Center - 3 years 1,200,000
- Territorial Teacher Training Grant - 4 years 150,000

The Samoanization period, which is still ongoing, has been and will continue to provide the opportunity for Samoan educators to upgrade their professional training in order for them to teach and/or administer the affairs of the Department of Education with as much competence as did their American counterparts before them. The Samoanization era signifies the period when the Samoans themselves have taken leadership positions, have made and will continue to make decisions that will ultimately affect them and the youth of Samoa.

The Department of Education realized the need to upgrade the capability of its personnel. It applied for grants and contracts to fund the training. When the funds were received, the cycle of teacher training began. Figure 3 illustrates the certification profile of the instructional personnel. Note the decline of the non-certified personnel and the rise of the number of certified personnel. One crucial element was missing in the American Samoa Department of Education's effort to upgrade its staff: the involvement of the teachers, the curriculum specialists and the school administrators in the process of assessing needs and participating in the design of the program for their training. The identification of the needs for teacher training,
Figure 3. Certification Profile of Instructors

the development, design and implementation of the program of Samoa for
some 300 teachers, have been decisions made primarily by those educators
in the central office of the Department of Education in the interest
of time and available funds. No records nor reports indicate any effort
by the ASDOE to elicit teacher perceptions and ideas regarding training
since the first teacher training school was established in Samoa. Like
the rush to install the ETV system during the governorship of Rex Lee,
there has been a rush to train the teachers in American Samoa before
federal funds terminate.

... the classroom teachers must be partners in
planning what is to be taught. They must be partners
in the enterprise of planning what should go on ... 
and so far as possible how it should be taught.
(Schramm et al., 1981:190)

In addition, a study by George Bronson (1981) showed that "teacher needs
and problems should be accentuated in the planning of inservice educa-
tion programs."

Summary. To summarize the review of literature regarding the
development of teacher education in American Samoa, the following
developments have been discussed.

First, throughout the history of teacher education in Samoa, a
comprehensive assessment of the needs and strengths of the Samoan
teachers has never been made. Year after year, program after program,
the exclusion of the participation of teachers in the process of
assessing their needs in relation to their roles in the school has been
consistent. From the Navy administration to the current Samoanization
movement, a comprehensive needs assessment of the capabilities and needs
of the teaching staff has been consistently omitted in the planning
and implementation process of developing teacher education programs. Consequently, the second issue in the development of teacher education in Samoa is directly related to the first and has never been resolved, namely the issue of what language the Samoan teachers use for the instruction of Samoan students. While teachers receive their professional training in English, the majority of the students who they teach speak Samoan as their native language. In other words, the professional training of Samoan teachers historically has not dealt with the issue of the language and culture of the students whom they (teachers) will ultimately teach. Merely being able to speak the same language the students speak is not an assurance that the teachers will be able to help their students effectively. This leads to the third issue. With the exception of the Barstow Era, the development of teacher education in American Samoa has been primarily directed towards training the Samoan teachers to become change agents in the Americanization process of students. The culture of the school advocates values which are in direct conflict with the traditional values of the teachers themselves and the students.

Having discussed the development of teacher education in American Samoa from the Navy administration to the current ongoing Samoanization movement, discussions of the developments of teacher education in Hawaii and the United States follow. Each discussion will be followed by a summary at the end of each section as well as the chapter. The writer has reviewed the literature to provide a brief historical overview of how teacher training developed in these areas, the current teacher education program in operation and whether teacher perceptions were incorporated in the planning of these programs.
Teacher Education in Hawaii

The development of teacher education in the state of Hawaii cannot be appreciated without examining the development of public education during the former years. For background information, a brief historical review of public education in Hawaii will be examined. The discussion will proceed as follows:

Phase I: Mission Schools (1820-1830)
Phase II: Public Schools (1840-1893)
Phase III: Normal Schools (1897-1921)

Phase I: The Mission Schools (1828-1830). From 1778, when Captain James Cook discovered Hawaii until the arrival of Christian missionaries in 1820, ancient Hawaii changed to modern Hawaii. Traders, whalers, and merchants sought the wealth and romance of these mid-Pacific islands, described by Captain Cook in his writings. Fur trade between China and America and the abundance of sandalwood in Hawaii made Hawaii not only commercially important, but also resulted in rapid spread of disease and the rapid breakdown of the indigenous cultural practices (Wist, 1940:1).

As was the common practice of missionaries who labored among Pacific Islanders, the New England Calvinist missionaries of 1820 who arrived in Hawaii taught about God through the Holy Scripture. This warranted the need to teach the natives of the islands reading and writing and the need to print reading materials in the vernacular. The missionaries trained native teachers to help spread the Word.

The early missionary efforts were . . . confined almost exclusively to schooling of adults. Children were growing up under influences subversive to the good of the social order, lacking the controls of the
indigenous culture and needing likewise parental regulation in a quasi-communal setting. It was obvious that the future welfare of the Hawaiians was contingent upon the education of youth. This led to a new emphasis in missionary work, the training of native teachers together with universal schooling for children. (Wist, 1940:2)

By 1831, Lahainaluna School was established by the missionaries to provide schooling for children and native teachers.

**Phase II: Public Schools (1840-1893).** Public education was inaugurated in Hawaii in 1840 when King Kamehameha III passed the first school laws under the Hawaiian constitution. However, political, economic and religious instability did not allow for further development of public education in Hawaii until the passage of the organic acts of 1845-1846. The acts provided for a minister of public educators in the king's cabinet (Wist, 1940:3).

From 1847 until 1876 when the Reciprocity Treaty was passed, great strides were made in the early Hawaii public school system through the efforts of Richard Armstrong. Armstrong set the foundation for the American type school system, organized hundreds of small schools, removed sectarianism from the system and pushed to have the school system supported by taxes. The Reciprocity Treaty of 1876 led to tremendous industrial developments in Hawaii—the sugar industry and the importation of immigrants to work on the plantation. American businessman and philanthropist Charles R. Bishop served as a president of the board of education, and under his guidance the board fostered the American democratic principles of education.

By 1893, Queen Liliuokalani was dethroned, and a five-year Republic was established in preparation for United States annexation. During
this five-year period, Americanization process included several key features: (a) public control over secondary education and teacher training, (b) the English language was made compulsory, (c) education was free, and (d) private schools were no longer subsidized by government (Wist, 1940:4).

Public education in Hawaii, as defined in American theory and practice, did not spring suddenly into well developed form. Rather, it was the outcome of a process of slow building upon foundations already laid by the American Protestant missionaries—a process influenced by the social, political and economic history of the Islands. (Wist, 1940:6)

The Inspector General of Schools was authorized to visit the United States for the purpose of familiarizing himself with modern educational practices. Additionally, American textbooks used were charged to the students. Teachers were certified by the board of education committee through examinations administered after successful completion of classes for inservice training at the Fort Street School. In addition, teachers' conventions were held during the summer meetings—these meetings were the forerunners of the University of Hawaii summer session for teachers.

Phase III: Normal Schools (1897-1921). Closely associated with the inauguration of public secondary education was the establishment of a normal school. The problem of teacher training was a major concern when English became the required medium of instruction. In addition, importing American teachers was not satisfactory because these teachers were transient, their salaries were higher than local teachers and they generally lacked an understanding of local children and their culture and learning style. Moreover, the increase in enrollment made
it difficult to procure the number of these teachers required. The feasible route was to train local teachers.

... there was the very natural disposition to feel that local young men and women were entitled to school positions, provided their training was comparable to that of teachers, imported from the United States. These various considerations contributed to the decision to organize a normal school in Hawaii. (Wist, 1940:132).

By 1895 a new teacher training department was organized in the new Honolulu High School which was originally the Fort Street School. The following year, this department was separated from the Honolulu High School and named the Honolulu Normal and Training School. In the summer of 1896 the first summer course was offered for teachers in the field. This course was so successful that it became the forerunner of summer inservice training for teachers in Hawaii. From 1897-1921, the Honolulu Normal and Training School underwent its growing years. It developed a three-year program for teachers providing Special Diploma and/or teacher certification.

The Federal Survey of Education of 1920 made drastic changes to the Normal School in Hawaii and around the entire country.

Fully recognizing the difficulties the Normal School had faced in its pioneering days, the commission nevertheless concluded that the school was not offering the kind of teacher training which the territory needed. To correct this situation, the following recommendations were made: (1) raising admissions standards to require high school graduation; (2) establishing a two-year collegiate program of preparation; (3) securing a new plant in the vicinity of the University of Hawaii; (4) merging its program with that of the proposed University School of Education, placing all teacher education under University control... (Wist, 1940: 207)
Phase IV: College of Education, University of Hawaii (1931-Present). By 1931, the Normal School complied with the recommendation of the 1920 Federal Survey and merged with the University School of Education. The School of Education became known as the Teacher's College, and in 1959 it became the College of Education (COE, 1981:1).

A brief review of the purpose and role of the University of Hawaii College of Education is appropriate at this point, before examining in detail the teacher education program it has developed.

The College of Education of the University of Hawaii fulfills a combination of roles, primarily because it is the only major state institution providing higher education in the field of professional education.

As part of the state university, the College is charged with the responsibility of producing 'new knowledge' relative to education, . . . assist the State Department of Education in the continuing inservice development of its staff and the evaluation of its personnel and programs . . . the preservice preparation of teachers for the public and private schools.

These three major charges--research, service and instruction--are the broad mandates which give rise to the multiple and interrelated functions of education professorate . . . (COE, 1981:1)

In addition, the College has been the major teacher preparation institution and resource for improving the quality of education in the Pacific and Asia. The College has served the teacher training needs of American Samoa, Guam, Micronesia, Burma, Thailand and Laos (COE, 1981:4).

... the purposes of preservice teacher education will continue to be:

a) to provide educational development programs of high quality;
b) to prepare as many teachers and other educators as are needed for educational positions in the state of Hawaii;

c) to prepare Hawaii students for educational positions on the mainland and other parts of the world;

d) to provide services for training teachers for the Pacific Island communities and the developing nations of Asia on a contract basis. (COE, 1981: 12)

With regard to its relationship with American Samoa, the College of Education has committed resources to undertake a major effort in providing teacher development programs for 200 to 300 American Samoan pre-service and inservice teachers from 1980-1984. This training effort will be funded by federal grants received by the Government of American Samoa.

The College of Education of the University of Hawaii currently provides the following programs:

1) B.Ed. degrees in:
   a) early childhood/elementary education;
   b) secondary education:

   This entails a liberal arts core of 55 to 58 credits in Arts and Sciences courses, a professional core, and an academic or distributive major. Field work of one semester of student teaching is required of all students.

2) Professional Diplomas provide a fifth year of education for B.Ed. candidates leading to professional teacher certification.

To make revisions and improve the basic undergraduate teacher education program it offered, the College of Education established a task force—the Faculty for Undergraduate Teacher Education Program (FUTEP), to review and make recommendations needed. However, much of the reorganization of the College of Education was the result of the "Stiles Report"
of 1965. The report was in response to a Legislature request of the University of Hawaii to conduct "a review of teacher education in the University of Hawaii...and to develop recommendations for improving the education of Hawaii's future teachers at the University of Hawaii."

Dr. Lindley J. Stiles, Dean of the School of Education of the University of Wisconsin was the leader of the team who conducted the review.

Basically, the Stiles Report recommended that:

1) the College of Education be reorganized to become an upper division and graduate school. It would serve as an indispensable link between the University of Hawaii, State Department of Education, the elementary and secondary schools of the state, and other education-oriented agencies such as the Congress of Parents and Teachers, and members of the teaching profession in general.

2) inservice education of teachers be a shared responsibility between the State Department of Education and the University of Hawaii.

3) a university-wide council for teacher education, appointed by the President (of the University) and various department and school representatives become the highest policy making body for the College of Education. (COE, 1981)

Although the College has provided basically preservice preparation for teachers throughout its history, undergraduate enrollment has gradually declined from the early 70s. In 1979-80, undergraduate enrollment had dropped to 630 while graduate enrollment had risen to 718 (COE, 1981: 109). This reflects the glut of teachers without jobs, due to declining enrollment in the schools.

The College of Education at the University of Hawaii provides programs for both Asian and Pacific students without drastic modification to the core requirements specified for all its education students.
Specifically for American Samoa, the College of Education has accommodated the particular needs of this territory, by contractually agreeing to provide (a) on-island courses so that American Samoa teachers need not vacate their jobs during the school year, (b) acceptance and transferability of selected American Samoa Community College courses and credits towards partial fulfillment of a University of Hawaii degree in education, (c) summer session courses on the Manoa campus to complete required courses not available in Samoa, and (d) individual monitoring of teachers during the degree earning process so that a much higher percentage of teachers accepted into the University of Hawaii degree program complete the program. Because of the now unionized employment system in the state of Hawaii, and because the Department of Education of the state of Hawaii has made it a practice to involve its employees in the planning of their training, and because the College of Education has made it a point to study the effectiveness of its programs by soliciting student and teacher input regarding its teacher education program, educators in Hawaii are an integral part of the teacher education program of the College of Education, University of Hawaii.

Summary. Teacher education in Hawaii developed as a consequence of the need to train local Hawaii teachers to teach in the public school system. The first teacher training school established was Lahainaluna School. It was established by the missionaries in 1831. Then between 1893 and 1898, when Queen Liliuokalani was dethroned, almost complete Americanization of the public schools and teacher training occurred. Between 1897 and 1921, teacher training developed from a training
department of the Honolulu High School to the Honolulu Normal and Training School offering a three-year program for teachers providing Special Diploma and/or teacher certification.

The Normal School merged with the University School of Education in 1931 and has developed to what is now the University of Hawaii College of Education (UHCOE).

The UHCOE has had a long history of working with the American Samoa Department of Education but it wasn't until 1980 that a formal agreement was made between the two institutions regarding a teacher education program of American Samoa. The current teacher education program for American Samoa is therefore a combination of two years of arts and sciences training at the American Samoa Community College and two years training in education theory and practice with the University of Hawaii College of Education. This program was agreed upon by administrators of the UHCOE and administrators of the American Samoa Department of Education.

Teacher Education in the United States

It is essential to briefly review the historical developments of teacher education in the United States and then focus on its development within the last decade (1970-1980) for several reasons:

1. The United States is the colonizing country which has shaped and molded the political, economic and educational developments of Hawaii. Hawaii in turn has been the "big sister" to American Samoa particularly in the developments in education.
2. The importation of American modeled institutions, particularly the schools, have caused questions to emerge relative to their effectiveness for non-American populations and in an island setting. The goals set for a particular teacher training program in the United States cannot be imported as they are to another society, and be expected to be appropriate without some modifications.

3. The United States continues to set a precedence for progress and development in education for the Pacific. Although the implementation of innovative ideas or the results of research findings are received much later in the Pacific, it appears that Pacific islands regard the developments in the United States important for them to understand and emulate.

This section of Chapter II will review the history of teacher education in the United States and then discuss the various studies done in the United States about teacher education in the last decade. The discussion will focus on the importance of teacher involvement in their professional training. In addition, the discussion will include the relation of the literature reviewed and the theoretical framework upon which this study is based. Finally, a summary of the discussion of the teacher education development in the United States will conclude this section of Chapter II. The literature examined in this section will be discussed as follows:

Phase I: Normal Schools (1823-1960)

Phase II: Teacher Training Institutions (1960-Present)
Phase I: Normal Schools (1823-1960). Teacher education in America began from Samuel R. Halls in Concord, Vermont normal school in 1823 (Krug, 1966:67). A normal school functioned to train teachers to teach primary schools. By 1835, there were five academies in New York State training teachers in the principles of teaching. Teachers took what the academy offered. When they completed their requirements, they (teachers) were presented to the school committees for certificates.

The oldest system of formal teacher training in the United States is associated with the preparation of rural teachers. In 1834, five years prior to the establishment of the first publicly supported normal school at Lexington, Maine, New York instituted a "normal training" in various academies throughout the state (Carney, 1931:161). It wasn't until 1839 that teachers were all required "special qualifications for teaching career." This requirement led to the establishment of training schools for teachers (El-Bouhy, 1980:21). The first State Normal School was established in 1839 in Massachusetts. It offered one year training for teachers as inservice or preservice training program.

Other states in the country began to establish state normal schools for training of teachers thereafter. Illinois established its State Normal University in 1857 to develop a teacher training program at the college level. Massachusetts increased its one-year program to a two-year program at the Normal School in Lexington in 1860. The year 1887 is a landmark year in that Columbia Teacher College was established in New York for providing training for teachers and persons managing committees of schools (Chaube, 1969:160). When high schools were established in the latter part of the nineteenth century, teacher
training classes began to be organized publicly at the subcollegiate level. Among the states developing public programs at the subcollegiate level were New York (1894), Maine (1901), Michigan (1903), Minnesota and Nebraska (1904). By 1911 13 states were involved. Program for teacher training was a one-year course for rural school teachers to earn a short term certificate. There was no familiarization with rural life. Traditional subjects were required (Cubberly, 1914:290-293).

By 1894, means for improving the preparation of rural teachers was emphasized by a committee of the National Education Association. They recommended reforms in normal schools teacher training courses offered in the high schools and the use of rural practice schools. By the 1930s, 84 percent of the nation's teacher training institutions offered some form of preparation for prospective rural teachers (Robinson, 1954:30).

The Depression and World War II forced specialized program integration into general programs. The postwar years brought a need for more teachers due to the postwar baby boom (Charles, 1969:32-34).

It was reported that by 1960, there were 1,133 institutions for teacher education in the United States. They included both general and liberal arts colleges (Chaube, 1969). Many of the normal schools closed or expanded to four-year teachers colleges between 1920-1960 (El Bouhy, 1983:23). Today, almost everywhere, state universities have become major training agencies, setting standards for the public schools (Miller, 1979:3). According to the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Education Directory in 1977, there were 440 public teacher training institutions and 153 private teacher training institutions in the United States.
Teacher colleges throughout the country have made attempts to respond to the needs of both the teachers in the field and to the pressures launched by the community via political officers and/or institutional administrators. The Alaska Rural Teacher Training Corps (ARTIC) is a field based teacher training program consisting of a collaboration of several institutions (two universities, the state school system and the Alaska Federation of Natives). Likewise, Brigham-Young University, University of Tennessee, Idaho State University and Indiana University are among the many institutions of higher education which have developed a differentiated program for teachers for rural schools (Murphy, 1972).

Phase II: Teacher Training Institutions (1960-Present). The development of teacher education institutions in the United States, in many ways, reflect the development of the country. The number of institutions increasing over the years indicate the increase in number of school districts as well as the need for more teachers. It is also an indication of the complexity of the country. Whereas the normal schools were once sufficient, now teacher colleges offering programs for both primary and secondary teachers are common. In the last two decades, specialized elementary and secondary programs for teachers have been offered to meet the demands of public schools. Teachers can specialize in special education in elementary education or specialize in the area of bilingual or ESL in secondary education. The variety of specializations is numerous. The point here is, teacher education programs today, offer a variety of training opportunities for teachers in response to the complex needs of society. In spite of all the
variety of teacher education programs available in the United States, teachers have expressed both their satisfaction and dissatisfaction with their training.

The following discussion will describe studies and/or reports on teacher education and the comments teachers have made relative to their training.

A study by Hegtvedt showed that of the teachers she surveyed, over 60% of first through third year teachers in small rural schools felt their training was adequate particularly in practical methods (1972:44). This is in contrast to Borg's (1965:10) study which reported that teachers perceived a need for training in more subjects and better methods courses. Charles (1969:77) cited similar inadequacy of teacher training in his study. Why is there an incongruency in the training of teachers and their actual roles in the schools?

El-Bouhy (1980:2) offers this explanation:

Teacher training programs attempt to prepare teachers to meet social demands. . . . Programs vary from country to country and even from teaching institution to teaching institution in order to meet various purposes and requirements.

He goes on to explain that in spite of the variety of purposes for the variation, the inclusion of teacher feedback can offer guidelines for improvement.

. . . teachers can offer feedback, relative to their perception of their . . . training, which can be used to provide guidelines for improvements in the training, which in turn will lead to improvements in the quality of general education. (1980:2)

Margurite Michaels feels strongly that if teachers are having problems in the school, then the answer to those problems must also come from the teachers (1985).
In a recent educational survey sponsored by Parade and subcon-tracted to Mark Clements, Inc. and reported in the Honolulu Star Bulletin, teachers were asked to describe what they felt were the most pressing problems in education in the United States. Michaels felt that a large part of the problem with education is that teachers have often been left out of the solution.

In all the talk about the crisis in education in America in the last few years, one group has been far more talked about than talked to: teachers. Educa-tion experts say that intellectual and motivational problems of teachers are the cause of the crisis in education. Even if that is true—if teachers are a large part of the problem, then they must also be a large part of the solution. It seems only logical that what's wrong with our public school system cannot be fixed without their (teachers) involvement. (Michaels, 1985)

The survey tapped 1,941 elementary and secondary classroom teachers throughout the country. One thousand one hundred seventy-two teachers responded at a rate of 77.7%. Michaels reported that the survey findings showed that:

- teachers perceive that schools have been scapegoats for a lot of the social problems in the country.

- 87% of the teachers perceived parents of their students being too permissive.

- Teachers felt that if students came to school with better attitude and if parents were more involved with their children's education at home, their (teachers) jobs would be more effective.

- Only 40% of the teachers were satisfied with their jobs.

- 40% are more negative about teaching than they were when they first started teaching.

- One-third of the teachers would leave the teaching profession if other jobs with better salaries were offered them. (Michaels, 1985)
Interestingly enough, one teacher out of every five surveyed, mentioned conflicts with school bureaucracy. Moreover, there has been an 83% increase in the number of principals and supervisors compared to the 64% increase in the number of classroom teachers in the last 20 years. In 1960, 40,000 school districts throughout the country decreased to 16,000 due mostly to centralization changes and bureaucracy (Michaels, 1985).

Carnegie's survey of undergraduate students in teacher education indicated that they (students) weren't completely satisfied with their training. Almost 50% of the students agreed strongly, with reservations, that what was taught at many colleges, was irrelevant to what was happening in the outside world. On the other hand, practicing teachers felt they needed more field work, and an education that gives one some confidence to teach (1976:40).

A study by Swick (1975) revealed a large number of inservice teachers perceived three areas in need of improvement: (1) more quality setting for application of teaching methods in real classroom; (2) better method of selecting supervising teachers in the public schools; (3) more opportunity to work and apply teaching methods on disadvantaged and culturally different students.

El-Bouhy elected to survey teachers because teachers directly experience the adequacies or inadequacies of their college curriculum and "teacher perception can provide insight for improving teacher education program" (1980:7). Essentially El-Bouhy implied that teacher education cannot be improved without teacher feedback because it is they who apply what they supposedly learned from their training.
Philip Combs (1968:168) felt that in order to modernize and improve an education system, the whole system of teacher training needed to be overhauled. Sharing the same view, Arthur Combs had this to say:

Many efforts to reform teacher education have resulted in little more than reshuffling of the same old courses, a heavier load of content for teacher education students. . . . This is not enough. Teacher education needs much more than a tinkering job. (1974:ix)

Hefferline (1969:xi) said this about demands on modern institutions:

Faculty and students in colleges and universities are demanding that their institutions provide them with increased opportunities to participate meaningfully in the establishment of institutional policies and practices.

American philosophy of what higher education should be and the clientele it should serve has evolved from early colonial days to the present. From a strict aristocratic philosophy, the country has gradually shifted to a philosophy of meritocracy to a philosophy of equalitarianism in more recent years (Henderson & Henderson, 1975:44). More specifically, teachers have been seeking representation in decision making in all levels (1975:209). The inclusion of teachers is valuable because it enables them to provide information about their needs, and to state opinions about what features in the educational process they consider desirable or undesirable (Sikun, 1978:10).

The importance of involvement of teachers in their training cannot be emphasized enough. Combs and associates feel that improvement in education will come only as teachers change. In addition, major efforts must be directed to the source of supply—the teacher education program—if improvement in education is desired (1974:ix). Combs and associates advocate a student centered teacher preparation program.
That is, instead of emphasizing the traditional content areas in teacher education, emphasis should be directed toward the development of the teacher as a person and as a professional.

Jersild (1955) focused on the need for teachers to develop acceptance of themselves—to deal with their own emotions and feelings.

The teacher's understanding and acceptance of himself is the most important requirement in any effort he makes to help students to know themselves and to gain healthy attitudes of self-acceptance. (1955:3)

B. F. Skinner's posture is that teachers need to understand education methods and that too many teachers fail because of their inabilitys to use "arrangements of contingencies of reinforcement under which behavior change" (1969:169-170).

The number of teacher education agencies brought a concern among educators and the public alike regarding standards of certification. In addition, public complaints about students graduating from high school unable to read or obtain a job, launched a massive attack on the schools and the teachers. The public was demanding accountability. In response, the early 70s introduced the idea of competency based teacher education.

Rarely, if ever, has any movement swept through teacher education so rapidly . . . as has the competency based movement . . . the approach holds promise of renovating and regenerating teacher education.

Some see it as the vehicle through which . . . to make student and instructor accountability a realizable goal. (Houston & Howsam, 1972:viii).

Teachers who taught before the normal schools were established had no formal training. They taught based on the advice given by important men in the community about how to maintain order and administer corporal punishment. Matters regarding how to teach reading, writing and
arithmetic had to be learned in other ways. Typically in the 1850s, 60s, and 70s, teachers depended upon institutes of two to three days' duration and short evening courses to enable them to bridge the gap between what they were expected to do and what in fact their teaching competencies were (Tyler, 1971:6).

What has been the emphasis in teacher education in the United States in the last decade? How has that focus influenced the Pacific Islands, particularly American Samoa?

Education--both that of children and teachers--responds to developments within the society. Among the most recent changes in education include

1. a high level awareness of subcultures within the society and their needs and a program commitment to provide equal educational opportunity;

2. a realization that the revolution of transportation and communication has strained and breached the traditional bounds of time and place and has weakened the school's capacity to perform some of their traditional functions;

3. developments in the social and behavioral sciences and in educational research which provide new insights into instructional methodology;

4. the application to education of new technologies and management systems;

5. an increasing concern about the impact of change on the physical and social ecology, with special emphasis on the dehumanizing tendencies of a technological society. (Howsam & Houston, 1972:1-2)

These recent changes have been met more capably in other fields--business, medicine and military. However, in the field of education, responses to change have been more complex and difficult. The immediate consequences of educational action or inaction are less apparent than in other fields. However, the accelerating pace of change since World
War I have caused unchanging schools to become anomalous. In addition, schools which were inadaptable became non-functional or dysfunctional within the social system (Howsam & Houston, 1972:2). Concerns over the adequacy of schools and teacher education have steadily become widespread and the demand for relevance has come from all sides (Howsam & Houston, 1972:2).

How have teacher education programs responded to these demands? The most recent emphasis in teacher education in response to accountability, relevance and the movement to emphasize basic skills in teaching is the competency-based teacher education concept.

Competency-based teacher education programs place emphasis on exit or the mastery skills rather than the traditional emphasis on the entrance requirements. The traditional emphasis on entrance requirement screens out supposedly unqualified candidates for teaching without giving the candidate a chance to be in the program. With the competency-based teacher education program, emphasis is on exiting the program. Entrance is open to any and all interested persons from all levels of a society. The resulting change of emphasis from entrance to exit welcomes teachers with diverse backgrounds and the emphasis is on the mastery of teaching skills as admission into the teaching profession (Howsam & Houston, 1972:9). Many teacher education institutions in the United States have adopted this kind of teacher education program.

In August 1972, a statement of goals for a performance based undergraduate teacher education program was submitted by an appointed Committee on Undergraduate Teacher Education to the faculty of the University of Hawaii College of Education. It was endorsed by the
faculty members and was adopted by the Faculty Senate for transmission to the Dean of the College of Education (In, 1973:iii). The emphasis on competency-based teacher education in the United States influenced the University of Hawaii College of Education almost immediately. For American Samoa, the idea was not introduced until 1978 with the first degree oriented teacher training contract with the University of Hawaii College of Education (UHCOE). In 1973, the American Samoa Community College (ASCC) began a teacher education program leading towards an Associate degree. Teachers of the Samoa education department either graduated with four-year credentials from mainland universities or were attending ASCC to obtain their associate degrees. It was also at this time that the Samoa Department of Education contracted the University of Hawaii College of Education, to review the effectiveness of their educational television program, as plans were underway to cut back on the use of this medium for instruction. Essentially, the educational institutions of American Samoa were not developing nor implementing competency based teacher training program until a much later date, specifically around 1978.

Competency based teacher education made its way to American Samoa as part of a "package." When the American Samoa Department of Education (ASDOE) and the ASCC contracted the University of Hawaii College of Education to provide a treacher training program so that teachers of Samoa could earn their four-year degrees, the program offered in the contract for Samoa by the University of Hawaii College of Education was the undergraduate and graduate competency based teacher education program. Samoa accepted the program without reservation.
Another emphasis in teacher education, and in general education in the United States in the last decade, is programmed instruction, i.e., textbooks, cassette-taped lectures and videos. The role of the teacher as predicted in the late 60s would be changed with the latest research and developments in technology in communication media:

Research assists in revision of the teacher's role by deriving and evaluating the ways in which teacher behavior is changed. The new roles of teachers can be based on the size of the instructional group: a) the individual student working alone, b) the small group of students engaged in a discussion, c) the conventional classroom group of 25-35 students, (d) the large-group audience of the lectures, television presentation, or motion picture. (Gage, 1972:24)

The computer age entered the schools in the early 70s through the developments of high technology in relation to aerospace advancement. It brought changes to all academic fields including education. As computer training and education moved from government and the business community into the schools and universities, educators were compelled to be trained in computer science. Parents wanted their children to be computer literate. The market was flooded with home, office and school computers by big computer companies. It offered entertainment, instruction and business capabilities. The entire information system of the country was being converted into computer systems for storage, retrieval and manipulation.

The widespread concern for computer literacy moved from the United States mainland to Hawaii with elementary schools and secondary schools buying computers for the classroom in response to parental pressure. However, many teachers were not trained to deal with computers, let alone teach computer literacy to their students.
With the continued movement toward equal educational opportunity in the early 1980s, education and teacher education emphasized humanistic education, ethnic studies, bilingual education, multicultural education and English as a Second Language (ESL) during the early and mid-seventies. Fantini suggested an educational reform:

... In view of a mounting minority antagonism to white teachers, the problems of teacher training are obvious. We are called upon to prepare teachers to enter classrooms where the students are antisocial, antiestablishment, and antiwhite. To initiate new objectives it will be necessary to establish a different yardstick on which to measure teacher performance and the accomplishments of the school.

The corrective strategy is sequential: we must expand the humanistic aspects of education and corresponding new behavior objectives... And only after such a transformation has taken shape can we hope to train teachers we need. We cannot provide for the authentic professional growth of the teacher until we devise a school system that fits the sociology of our time. (1971:200-204)

Humanistic education and the emphasis on education of the minority students impacted Hawaii's community. By 1974, the first Title VII federally funded bilingual education project was implemented in the Hawaii State Department of Education. Consequently, the hiring and training of bilingual teachers have been ongoing with the Hawaii Department of Education and assisted by the University of Hawaii College of Education. The College of Education has developed and has offered multicultural/bilingual education courses for the undergraduate and graduate level students in response to this national and local emphasis. The bilingual movement reached its height in American Samoa in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Federal funds gave impetus to this education reform effort both in Hawaii and Samoa. Teachers in Samoa have
gradually become aware of the emphasis in teacher education throughout
the last decade by way of the teacher education developments in the
United States and Hawaii.

The point here is that efforts to improve, change and reform
teacher education have filtered from the mainland to Hawaii and from
Hawaii to American Samoa. This has been the avenue by which develop­
ments in education and teacher education have been historically paved.
Samoa's education system and the training of its teachers have been
strongly, although historically slow, influenced and tied to the Hawaii
education system and the University of Hawaii.

Summary

It is important to understand that the developments in education
and the training of teachers in Hawaii and in American Samoa are con­
sequences of American influence and colonization. However, the develop­
ments of teacher education in the United States have not been without
problems.

The normal schools developed early in 1835 were established first
in the eastern states spreading to the west. They offered one-year
training to inservice and preservice teachers. By 1887, Columbia
University Teacher College in New York provided a teacher training
program and a program for school managing personnel as well. From 1900
to the 1930s, teacher training institutions began offering two-year
courses and the preparation of rural teachers from city teachers were
differentiated. The Depression and World War II made demands on teacher
training schools to accommodate for the postwar baby boom.
In many ways the development of teacher education in the United States reflected the changes and demands of the American society. Yet in spite of the efforts of the teacher education programs to respond to demands of the American society, teachers and parents have continued to express their dissatisfaction with the quality of teachers and the quality of education overall.

Teacher education programs, trends and reforms in the United States have set a precedence for the Pacific Islands--mainly Hawaii and American Samoa. Specifically, Hawaii's education system and the teacher education program developed at the University of Hawaii are both products of the efforts to perpetuate American philosophy and ideals. This effort was extended to American Samoa through certain University of Hawaii College of Education personnel and Barstow Foundation. The efforts had tremendous impact on the development of education and teacher education in Samoa as discussed earlier in this chapter. Consequently the goals of teacher education and the kinds of programs developed in the United States and in Hawaii have been imported to Samoa with all good intentions to help the Samoans. However, the importation of any foreign commodity to a people and culture without the consideration of their needs can result in conflicts in their lives.

With this in mind, what differences or similarities are there between the different teacher education programs examined in the chapter? First, the literature indicated striking similarities in the developments of the teacher education programs in Hawaii and American Samoa. They were similar due to the strong influence of the United States and both, therefore, assumed United States program goals. Consequently, the teacher education programs in Hawaii and American Samoa
have developed without much input from local teachers of the communities. Secondly, the education systems in the Pacific Islands required the teaching of the English language. In Hawaii, English became compulsory. It replaced the vernacular. In American Samoa, English has become the official language of instruction, but the native language has been continually used in formal and informal instruction.

The literature examined also indicated that in American Samoa, the teacher education program began with teachers sent overseas. The current teacher education program of American Samoa now has a local training program segment and an overseas training program segment. This is due to the establishment of a local community college and the availability of federal funds for overseas university training. Extensive federal assistance has been provided for local teacher training. Lastly, the teacher education program in Hawaii and the current teacher education program in American Samoa have not made it a practice to involve the local teachers in assessing training needs and in the planning of teacher training goals. The literature examined indicated that these decisions have been made primarily by federal funding agencies and/or the administrators of the island education systems. Taking these facts into consideration, this study attempts to examine the perceptions of educators regarding the goals of the current teacher education program for American Samoa.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains five major sections: (1) the design of the study; (2) the perception of respondents; (3) the sample for the attitudinal survey; (4) survey instrument, validation, and administration; and (5) the statistical procedure utilized in determining the outcome of this study.

Design of the Study

The design used in this study is a survey research design. It is a one-time survey study of the perceptions of the public school educators of American Samoa. This study analyzed the perceptions of public school teachers, school administrators and curriculum specialists in American Samoa regarding the goals of the teacher education program and the educational needs of the territory. The survey was administered to the American Samoan educators to determine whether they perceived the teacher education program goals for Samoa as appropriate, and whether or not the teacher education goals have been addressed. In addition, this study analyzed the educators' perceptions regarding the unmet educational needs of the territory.

The findings of this study are not evaluative but rather focus on the current perceptions of public school educators in terms of the teacher education program and the educational needs of the territory of American Samoa.
Perception of Respondents

The literature examined indicated that behavior is a function of a person's perception or personal meanings and that each perception is meshed in a complex interrelated organization of all other perceptions called the perceptual field. It further indicated that perception is any differentiation a person is capable of making in his perceptual field whether or not an objectively observable stimulus is present. The differentiation of an idea or a concept is not basically different from the differentiation of a scent, sound or printed word. Each involves some measure of personal meaning on the part of the person or perceiver (Combs et al., 1976:16). Because perceptions are based upon long series of previous discriminations, extending back to a person's beginning, when a person is faced with incongruous events, he will tend to perceive them in a way that is most familiar or meaningful to him at that moment (Combs, 1976:102).

Essentially, the perceptual field as it exists at any moment has a controlling and determining effect upon other perceptions a person can experience. Past opportunities for perceiving have a vital bearing upon further perceptions. The meanings learned, moreover, are often highly stable and difficult to change. Studies of attempts to change attitudes and values of children and adults demonstrate that though new information may temporarily change a person's attitudes and values, when the pressure to change has passed, perceptions gradually revert to earlier forms (Combs et al., 1976:102). The basic process of perception is the same for all mankind; only the contents differ, and these only because they reflect different perceptual inference habits (Segall et al., 1966:214).
The literature examined regarding the measurement of attitudes, opinions or perceptions can be summarized as follows:

1. No one method of measuring attitude is universally the best method. Instead, the best method is the one which is most appropriate to the problem at hand (Oppenheim, 1956).

2. Each method of measuring attitude measures one aspect of attitude well, however, each method is also open to criticism (Oppenheim, 1956).

Basically, the measure of attitudes is done using a scale of opinion landmarks (Thurston, 1928). Some attitudinal scales measure attitudes in clusters (Hollander, 1967:140-141); others use "equal appearing intervals" (Thurston & Sherif, 1929, 1965), where subjects judge the statement on a scale of favorability or unfavorability toward the object attitude. Osgood, Suci and Tannebaum (1957) developed a multi-dimensional scale to ascertain different aspects of the subjects' attitude on an attitude object.

For the purpose of this study, a Likert-type scale was used to measure the perceptions of the sample. The Likert summated scale (Likert, 1932; Dunn-Rankin, 1983) uses statements representing positive and negative views of the attitude object. The scale may have a range or value of 1 to 5 or 1 to 7. Subjects indicate the degree of agreement or disagreement with the item. A score is obtained by summing the value of each separate response.

Sample for the Attitudinal Survey

The sample for the study included nearly all the public school personnel of the American Samoa Department of Education on the islands
of Tutuila, Ofu, Olesega and Tau. The sample did not incorporate non-instructional personnel of the American Samoa Department of Education such as custodians, television studio technicians, cafeteria workers or the top level administrators in the central office or private school classroom teachers. This sample was selected because the study was primarily focused on the public school certificated and non-certificated personnel who were recipients of teacher training activities.

Participants were selected for the study on the basis of the following criteria: (a) they have instructional responsibility for implementing the goals of education in the schools, and (b) they have been recipients of the teacher education activities offered by the American Samoa Department of Education and the University of Hawaii College of Education. Table 1 describes the participants to whom questionnaires were sent by division and number.

Of the total sample receiving the survey instruments, 8% were school administrators, 86% were classroom teachers and 6% were curriculum specialists. The findings of this study will be generalized to the American Samoa Department of Education.

Subjects participated in this study on a voluntary basis. They were encouraged to participate in the study by letters endorsed by the Deputy Director of Education, the Director of Elementary Education and the Director of Secondary Education and the encouragement of the various school and office department administrators. No rewards or incentives were offered for their participation. A network of school volunteers helped to solicit support from the subjects at the school and office levels.
Table 1

Participants of the Study by Division, Number and Percent of Teachers, Administrators and Curriculum Specialists of the American Samoa Department of Education: 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of Total Teachers in ASDOE</th>
<th>% of Total Administrators in ASDOE</th>
<th>% of Curriculum Specialists in ASDOE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Totals by Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Instructional Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals in ASDOE</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings of this study are generalizable only to the population of this study namely the public school system of American Samoa.

Survey Instrument, Validation and Administration

Survey Instrument. A survey instrument was used to collect the required data. The instrument was developed after various instruments were reviewed.

The survey instrument has the following parts:

Part I: Demographic Information--12 items
Part II: Teacher Education Program Goals--20 items
Part III: Unmet Educational Need Statements--8 items
Part IV: Open-ended Questions--2 items

There were a total of 42 items on the questionnaire (see Appendix E for instrument).

The demographic data requested of all respondents were: (1) ethnicity; (2) age; (3) sex; (4) residence outside Samoa two years or more; (5) matai; (6) Samoan language use to facilitate student learning; (7) division level; (8) years of experience in the education profession; (9) formal education completed; (10) enrollment in the teacher education program; (11) role; (12) teacher education status.

Following the demographic data were the 20 goal statements in Part II. The statements were used to assess the perceptions of all the respondents regarding the teacher education program. Each goal statement reflected one of the four clusters of the teacher education program goals: interpersonal relations, attitudes, skills and knowledge.

An item clustering process was conducted. This clustering of the goal statements provided a reliability level in terms of measuring the
perceptions of the respondents. In other words, soliciting the per­
ceptions of a respondent on five items which belong to a cluster 
provided a more reliable indication of the respondent's perceptions 
than it would be to solicit his perception of a single isolated item.

Based on the clustering, the final list of goal statements used 
for the questionnaire included five goal statements in each cluster:

A. Interpersonal Relations: 5 goal statements
   1. Works well with others.
   2. Includes others in decision making.
   3. Designs learning experiences cooperatively with others.
   4. Assists others evaluate their actions.
   5. Communicates effectively with others.

B. Attitudes: 5 goal statements
   7. Is responsible for own behavior.
   8. Accepts praise objectively.
  10. Accepts criticism objectively.

C. Skills: 5 goal statements
   11. Plans an effective community education program.
   12. Is competent in English language skills for use in the 
       classroom.
   13. Solves problems by creatively considering several courses 
       of action.
   14. Is competent in Samoan language skills for use in the 
       classroom.
15. Uses a variety of resources, e.g., community resource person, instructional TV, films, etc.

D. Knowledge: 5 goal statements

17. Is competent in subject matter area.
18. Plans instructional objectives in relation to broad education goals.
19. Evaluates the learner's status in relation to the education goals using a variety of measures.
20. Identifies basic areas of knowledge in the content fields.

(See Appendix D for complete list of goal statements.)

The subjects were asked to respond to each goal statement using the following Likert-type scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal statement: is appropriate</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal statement: has been addressed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subjects were asked to rate each goal statement in two different ways: whether the statement is an appropriate goal for Samoa, and whether the goal has been addressed.

The survey also measured respondent perceptions regarding the eight unmet educational needs of American Samoa in Part III. These need statements were extrapolated from the needs assessment report conducted by the American Samoa Department of Education in 1973. The need statements were examined by the panel of judges. They were randomly displayed in Part III of the survey instrument.
The respondents were asked to rank order each statement from one (1) to eight (8), "1" meaning the most critical need and "8" meaning the least critical educational need. The need statements were as follows: (1) Become proficient in mathematical skills; (2) Be provided varied opportunities to study business education and office practice; (4) Be provided opportunities to learn basic industrial skills and improved agricultural and fishing practices; (5) Read, speak and write English and understand oral English with greater proficiency; (6) Develop greater fluency in the Samoan language and understand the elements of Samoan culture and history; (7) Be provided opportunities to learn in specified subject matter field not formally a part of the curriculum; (8) Have a command of science methods and content.

Part IV of the survey included two open-ended questions. The questions included: (1) List the teacher education goals that you feel are important but were not listed in Part II of this questionnaire; (2) List the educational needs that you feel are important but were not listed in Part III of this questionnaire.

Survey Validation. The survey instrument was developed by the writer in the following manner to ensure a degree of validity and reliability:

1. Goal statements for the survey were extrapolated from the teacher education program documents of both the American Samoa Community College and the College of Education of the University of Hawaii. The goals from the University of Hawaii College of Education were categorized in three theoretical clusters: Actualize Self, Help Others Understand and Accept
Themselves and Facilitate Learning. The goal statements were examined by the judges to discard goal statements which were repetitive and redundant and were categorized into four related clusters. Clarity and content of each goal were examined. The judges included the following people and their position at the time of their task:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Area of Specialty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Winona Chang</td>
<td>Curriculum Specialist, Hawaii State Department of Education</td>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Thomas Huebner</td>
<td>Coordinator, Cross-Cultural Resource Center--Hawaii</td>
<td>Linguistics &amp; English as a Second Language (ESL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Belen Ongteco</td>
<td>Director, Hawaii Bilingual/Multicultural Education Project--Hawaii State Department of Education</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Hyacinth Gardart</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate, College of Education University of Hawaii</td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Faauuma Seui</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate, College of Education University of Hawaii</td>
<td>Education, Pacific Island Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The education need statements for the survey were extrapolated from the 1973 Community Survey Report of the American Samoa Department of Education Needs Assessment Survey. There were eight most critical needs reported.

3. Demographic information requested were selected according to the writer's intuition and experience as an educator in Samoa. In addition to age, sex, education and experience,
the writer felt that information such as ethnicity, matai status, role, division, use of Samoan language and residency would be interesting to gather as they would probably influence the respondents' perceptions of the institutional goals. Twelve class variables were requested of all respondents.

4. The draft instrument was then reviewed by the writer's committee members and consultants from the Educational Psychology Department of the University of Hawaii College of Education. Suggestions were incorporated into the draft survey instrument.

5. The draft survey instrument was then field tested once on two small groups of voluntary educators in Honolulu and American Samoa. Suggestions from the field test were made as appropriate.

The Veldman's TESTAT program was used to do the summary item statistics to determine the reliability and correlation of the items and the clusters. The correlation and reliability level of each individual goal statement in relation to the other 19 statements, and the reliability and correlation level of the cluster of items, were sufficiently high for use in the survey instrument. A coefficient of 1 means a perfect relationship of the items. Based on the summary item statistics, no goal statement was discarded. All 20 goal statements were used in the survey.

Table 2 presents the results of the TESTAT item and cluster summary statistics on total group reliability and correlation of the goal statements used to determine the appropriateness of the teacher education goals.
Table 2

Coefficient of Correlation of Total Group and Goal Cluster by Cluster, Goal Statement Number, Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Total Group Mean</th>
<th>Total Group Correlation</th>
<th>Goal Cluster Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.6057</td>
<td>0.7235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.5958</td>
<td>0.7477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.6319</td>
<td>0.7409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.6185</td>
<td>0.7260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.6705</td>
<td>0.7335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.6615</td>
<td>0.7100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.5817</td>
<td>0.7011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.5326</td>
<td>0.7069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.4744</td>
<td>0.6110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.7028</td>
<td>0.7746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.6146</td>
<td>0.6921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>0.6394</td>
<td>0.6966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.6915</td>
<td>0.7455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.4666</td>
<td>0.6351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.5904</td>
<td>0.6896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>0.6701</td>
<td>0.7652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.6051</td>
<td>0.7454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.6280</td>
<td>0.7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.6451</td>
<td>0.7609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.6815</td>
<td>0.7948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The summary item statistics shown in Table 2 indicated the high reliability and correlation level of each individual item to the other items and between the cluster of items. The summary statistics indicated that goal statements used to assess the appropriateness of the teacher education program were related and reliable.

Table 3 presents the results of the total group correlation and cluster correlation of the items used in the survey to determine whether or not the goals were addressed.

The summary item statistics shown in Table 3 indicated the high reliability and correlation level of each item to others and between clusters. Based on this analysis, all the goal statements were used in the survey to assess whether or not the goals of the teacher education program have been addressed.

Table 4 presents the summary of the cluster correlation/reliability statistics of goal statement clusters to assess the appropriateness of the teacher education goals.

The summary cluster statistics of the goal statements used to assess the respondents' perceptions of the appropriateness of the teacher education program indicated a high reliability/correlation level. Based on this summary, all the clusters of items were used in the analysis of the findings of this study.

Table 5 presents the summary of the cluster reliability/correlation statistics of the goal statement clusters to assess whether or not the teacher education goals have been addressed.

The correlation coefficient reported in Table 5 showed high reliability/correlation level between goal statement clusters used in the survey instrument to assess whether or not the teacher education
Table 3
Coefficient of Correlation of Total Group and Goal Cluster by Cluster, Goal Statement Number, Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Goal Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Total Group Correlation</th>
<th>Goal Cluster Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>0.6897</td>
<td>0.8039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Relations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td>0.7358</td>
<td>0.8306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.7385</td>
<td>0.8427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>0.6789</td>
<td>0.7714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>0.7120</td>
<td>0.7602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.7006</td>
<td>0.7579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.6633</td>
<td>0.7394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>0.6319</td>
<td>0.7579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.4813</td>
<td>0.6649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>0.7042</td>
<td>0.7752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>0.6924</td>
<td>0.7637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>0.6799</td>
<td>0.7314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.7368</td>
<td>0.7789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.5747</td>
<td>0.6603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>0.6781</td>
<td>0.7621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.7055</td>
<td>0.7933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.6815</td>
<td>0.8006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>0.7481</td>
<td>0.8479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>0.7601</td>
<td>0.8283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.7426</td>
<td>0.8258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Coefficient of Correlation of the Appropriateness
of Cluster Goals by Categories,
Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
<th>Cluster 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.8796</td>
<td>2.9511</td>
<td>2.9166</td>
<td>2.8441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>0.7835</td>
<td>0.7412</td>
<td>0.7185</td>
<td>0.8254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Coefficient of Correlation of the Addressed
Cluster Goals by Categories,
Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
<th>Cluster 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>18.4643</td>
<td>18.3613</td>
<td>18.3760</td>
<td>18.5588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>4.0020</td>
<td>3.6316</td>
<td>3.8989</td>
<td>4.1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>0.8610</td>
<td>0.7917</td>
<td>0.7902</td>
<td>0.8775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
goals have been addressed. Based on this summary, all the above clusters were used in the analysis of the findings of this study.

Survey Administration. The survey was delivered and distributed to the appropriate American Samoa Department of Education personnel on April 20, 1983. Prior arrangements were made through correspondence with the Director of Education and the Deputy Director of Education of the American Samoa Department of Education. Survey instruments were distributed to administrators of 24 out of the 29 schools. They were also distributed to the Directors of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction (DCI) and the Special Education Division. Explanation on how the survey was to be answered and returned were given to all administrators at a special meeting. The subjects were given two weeks from distribution time to the deadline of May 6 to complete and return the survey.

Within a week's time, 57% of the questionnaires were returned. After follow-up efforts for two weeks, a total of 477 questionnaires were returned out of the 528 distributed or a 90.3% return. Table 6 illustrates the surveys distributed and returned.

Table 6 indicates that 84% of the survey returned were from elementary and secondary teachers. Sixteen percent of the surveys returned were from curriculum specialists and school administrators who work in the schools with the teachers in American Samoa.

It is important to note here that although the total number of questionnaires returned was 477 of the 528 mailed out, incomplete surveys were not used in the analysis of the study. Therefore, the number used to calculate the mean scores and other statistical analysis
Table 6
Numbers and Percentages of Survey Instruments
Mailed Out and Returned by Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Mailed Out</th>
<th>Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teacher</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Specialist</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrator</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>528</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of this study varied. The percent of completed surveys used in the final analysis of the data was consistently above 80% of the total number of responses returned.

One elementary school did not respond to the first distribution of questionnaires or the follow up. Neighboring schools on the same island where this elementary school is located responded nearly 100%. No explanation was received as to why this school did not participate in the survey except that the administrator of this school did not attend the initial meeting where the writer disseminated the survey, and it was possible that the school administrator did not get the follow-up mailing at all.

All questionnaires were personally addressed to each respondent. A cover letter, signed by the writer and endorsed by respective division directors, was enclosed with the questionnaire. A network of people in each school, consisting of at least two or three classroom teachers
and the school administrators, assisted in the collection of the survey by following strict adherence to procedures for returning the questionnaires. Questionnaires were returned enclosed in self-addressed covers which had only the respondent's code number, assuring anonymity.

Statistical Procedures

All collected data were processed at the University of Hawaii Computer System. The statistical program selected to analyze the data was the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). The program relies on general linear models (GLM) approach to compute the analysis of variance. The GLM model is able to process studies with unequal groups. The independent variables used in the analysis were: (1) ethnicity; (2) age; (3) sex; (4) residency outside of Samoa; (5) Samoan language use; (6) matai; (7) division; (8) years of experience; (9) education; (10) enrollment in teacher education program. The dependent variables of the study were: (1) perceptions toward the appropriateness of the teacher education goals; (2) perceptions toward whether or not the teacher education goals have been addressed; and (3) perceptions toward the unmet educational needs of the territory.

Hypotheses I and II of this study were tested using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The hypotheses are as follows: (H_I) There will be no significant difference between the perceptions of elementary and secondary teachers, school administrators and curriculum specialists regarding the appropriateness of the goals of the teacher education program for American Samoa. (H_{II}) There will be no significant difference between the respondents' perceptions regarding whether
or not the goals of the teacher education program have been addressed. A probability level of $p = < .05$ was established as the level of significance.

A one-way analysis of variance was also used to investigate the significant differences between the group perceptions when examined relative to the independent variables.

The Scheffé test, a post-hoc multiple comparison test, was used to determine where the significant differences lie between the four groups of educators.

Hypothesis III was reported using number and percent consistent with the American Samoa Needs Assessment Report of 1973. Because the data collected for Hypothesis III are nominal, the chi-square test was used to test this hypothesis. The chi-square analysis was used to determine significant relationship between the respondents' perceptions and each of the eight educational needs of the territory. Hypothesis III is: There will be no significant difference in the perceptions of the respondents regarding the unmet educational needs of the territory of American Samoa. In addition, the Friedman two-way analysis of variance for rank order test was used to determine significant bias of the group of respondents with the total rank order variables.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

This chapter consists of three sections: the first section contains the general description of the data on the sample for this study; the second section contains the investigation of the hypotheses; and the third section is a discussion of the findings.

Descriptive Data

The sample for this study consisted of educators from American Samoa, divided into four groups: elementary teachers (ET), 57% of the total sample; secondary teachers (ST), 25% of the total sample; curriculum specialists (CS), 6% of the total sample; and the school administrators (SA), 8% of the total sample. There were a total of 477 respondents, all of whom were instructional personnel of the American Samoa Department of Education.

Table 7 presents the ethnic distribution of the sample. Of the 457 respondents, 87% were Samoan or part-Samoan and 13% were non-Samoan.

Table 8 presents the age distribution of the population.

The sample of this study consisted of 34% respondents under 30 years old, 35% were between 30-39 years old, 21% were between 40-49 years and 10% were 50 years old and over. Essentially, 69% of the respondents were between under 30-39 years old.

Table 9 presents the sex distribution of the sample. Of the total sample, 54% were females and 46% were males.
### Table 7
The Ethnicity Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages (N=457)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Samoan/Part-Samoan</th>
<th>Non-Samoan</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teacher</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Specialist</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrator</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8
The Age Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages (N=463)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Under 30</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50 &amp; over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teacher</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Specialist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrator</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9
The Sex Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages (N=465)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teacher</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Specialist</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrator</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 presents the division distribution of the sample.

Table 10
The Education Division Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages (N=463)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th></th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Specialist</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrator</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the two divisions, the sample for this study consisted of 69% elementary as compared to 31% of the secondary division.
Table 11 presents the experience distribution of the sample for the study.

### Table 11

The Years of Teaching Experience Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages (N=463)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>1-10 N</th>
<th>1-10 %</th>
<th>11-19 N</th>
<th>11-19 %</th>
<th>20 yrs. &amp; over N</th>
<th>20 yrs. &amp; over %</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teacher</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Specialist</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrator</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of years of teaching experience of the sample for this study, 57% of the educators have taught up to ten years, 23% have taught up to 19 years and only 20% have taught 20 years or more. Essentially about 80 percent of the sample for this study have worked as educators between one to 19 years.

Table 12 presents the education level distribution of the sample. The education level of the sample for this study showed that of the total sample, approximately 6% have only high school diplomas, 49% have completed associate degrees, 33% have four-year degrees and 12% have completed or attended graduate school. This means that slightly over half (56%) of the sample for this study have not completed their
Table 12
The Education Level Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages (N=460)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>High School N</th>
<th>Associate N</th>
<th>Bachelor N</th>
<th>Graduate N</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>20 5</td>
<td>194 42</td>
<td>48 11</td>
<td>6 1</td>
<td>268 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teacher</td>
<td>5 1</td>
<td>29 6</td>
<td>71 16</td>
<td>14 3</td>
<td>119 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Specialist</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>14 3</td>
<td>15 3</td>
<td>31 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrator</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>6 1</td>
<td>12 3</td>
<td>23 5</td>
<td>42 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

undergraduate work and most of these individuals were elementary personnel (see Table 10).

Table 13 presents the residency distribution of the sample. Of the total respondents, 55% have lived outside of Samoa two or more years, while 45% have never lived outside of Samoa.

Table 14 presents the matai distribution of the sample. Eighty-one percent of the total sample of this study are not matais, the traditional Samoan chief-leaders. Nineteen percent of the respondents are matais.

Table 15 presents language characteristic of the sample. Of the total sample, 80% of the respondents speak Samoan in the classroom, while 20% indicated that they do not.
Table 13
The Residency Outside of Samoa Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages (N=465)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Resided Outside Samoa for 2 yrs. or more</th>
<th>Resided in Samoa only</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teacher</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Specialist</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrator</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14
The Matai Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages (N=460)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Matai N</th>
<th>Matai %</th>
<th>Non-Matai N</th>
<th>Non-Matai %</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teacher</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Specialist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrator</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15
The Use of Samoan Language Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages (N=445)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Yes N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teacher</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Specialist</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrator</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 presents the number and percent of those enrolled in the education program.

Table 16
The Enrollment in the Teacher Education Program Distribution of the Respondents in Numbers and Percentages (N=459)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Yes N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teacher</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Specialist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fifty-two percent of the total sample was enrolled in the teacher education program while 48% were not.

The descriptive data on the sample for this study points out some striking characteristics about the respondents. The respondents were mostly Samoan (87%), female (54%), and below 40 years old. Basically, the respondents in this study were elementary school personnel (69%) who have taught up to 10 years (58%) and have completed up to an Associate degree (56%). Surprising to the writer, 55% of the respondents have lived outside of Samoa two or more years and 81% were not matais. In addition, 80% of the respondents speak Samoan and use the Samoan language in the schools.

Investigation of the Hypotheses

The major problem examined in this study was whether the idiographic dimension, the needs disposition of educators of American Samoa, would differ from the stated institutional teacher education goals, the nomothetic dimension. The goal statements were used to assess the perceptions of educators regarding the appropriateness of the teacher education program goals and whether or not these goals have been addressed. The goals were first examined by cluster as categorized by a panel of judges from the Teacher Education Program Goals of the University of Hawaii College of Education. The goal clusters are:

1. Interpersonal Relations
2. Attitudes
3. Skills
Findings Relative to Hypothesis I

The first hypothesis submitted that there will be no significant difference in the perceptions of elementary and secondary teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators regarding the appropriateness of the goals of the teacher education program of American Samoa.

In order to investigate the above hypothesis, mean scores of the goal clusters were obtained and a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to test for significant differences between the means of the groups with regards to the four clusters. The data are presented in Tables 17, 18, 19 and 20.

Table 17 presents the results of the ANOVA employed to examine the significant differences in the groups' perceptions of the Interpersonal Relations cluster.

Table 17
Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Appropriateness Goals Relative to Interpersonal Relations Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2.61 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>42.91</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>145.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05**
The ANOVA procedure comparing the perception of the elementary teachers, secondary teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators regarding the appropriateness of the interpersonal relations cluster produced no significant difference between the mean of the groups ($F = 2.61$, n.s.).

Table 18 presents the data for the ANOVA for respondents' perceptions of the appropriateness of the attitudes cluster.

Table 18

Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Appropriateness Goals Relative to Attitudes Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.10  n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>152.25</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>159.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05

The ANOVA procedure comparing the perceptions of the elementary teachers, secondary teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators regarding the appropriateness of the attitudes cluster produced no significant difference between the means of the groups ($F = .10$ n.s.).

Table 19 presents the data for the ANOVA for respondents' perceptions of the appropriateness skills cluster.
The ANOVA procedure comparing the perceptions of elementary teachers, secondary teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators regarding the appropriateness of skills cluster produced a significant mean difference between the means of the groups ($F = 4.45$, $p < .01$).

The data results of the one-way analysis of variance completed on the appropriateness of the knowledge cluster is presented in Table 20.

The ANOVA procedure comparing the perceptions of elementary teachers, secondary teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators regarding the appropriateness of the knowledge cluster produced a significant difference between the means of the groups ($F = 2.90$, $p < .05$).

Based on the findings presented in Tables 17 and 18, there were no significant differences between the perceptions of the groups regarding the appropriateness of the interpersonal relations and
Table 20
Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Appropriateness Goals Relative to Knowledge Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>142.10</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>145.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01     *p < .05

attitude cluster. However, Tables 19 and 20 presented results of the ANOVA which produced significant differences between the means of the groups relative to the appropriateness of the skills and knowledge clusters. A decision will be made after further examination of the data in terms of rejecting the null hypothesis or not.

The respondents of this study were also asked to respond to the same goal clusters to determine whether or not the goals have been addressed. The following section presents the findings relative to Hypothesis II.

Findings Relative to Hypothesis II

Hypothesis II submitted that there will be no significant differences in the perceptions of elementary and secondary teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators as to whether or not the teacher education goals have been addressed.

In order to investigate the above hypothesis, mean scores of the goal clusters were obtained for the four educator groups. A one-way
analysis of variance was employed to test for significant differences between the mean of the groups. Where there were significant differences in the respondents' perceptions, a discussion will be made later in this section relative to where the differences were. Table 21 presents the data relative to the respondents' perceptions on whether or not the interpersonal relations cluster has been addressed.

Table 21
Results of a One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)
for Addressed Goals Relative to
Interpersonal Relations Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>142.10</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>145.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01    *p < .05

The ANOVA procedure comparing the perceptions of elementary teachers, secondary teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators as to whether or not the interpersonal relations cluster has been addressed produced a significant difference between the means of groups (F = 2.90, p < .05).

Table 22 presents the data on whether or not the attitudes cluster has been addressed.

The ANOVA procedure employed in comparing the perceptions of elementary teachers, secondary teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators as to whether or not the attitudes cluster has
Table 22
Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Addressed Goals Relative to Attitudes Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>9.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>200.30</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>235.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05

been addressed produced a significant difference between the mean of the groups (F = 9.20, p < .01).

Data relative to the respondents' perceptions on whether or not the skills cluster has been addressed are presented in Table 23.

Table 23
Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Addressed Goals Relative to Skills Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31.52</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>17.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>235.40</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>266.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05

The ANOVA procedure utilized in comparing the perceptions of the elementary teachers, secondary teachers, curriculum specialists and
school administrators as to whether or not the skills cluster has been addressed produced a significant difference between the means of the groups ($F = 17.68, p < .01$).

Table 24 presents the data on the one-way analysis of variance of the respondents' perceptions on whether or not the knowledge cluster has been addressed.

Table 24
Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Addressed Goals Relative to Knowledge Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.61</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>12.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>276.55</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>302.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01    *p < .05

The ANOVA procedure examining perceptions of the educators as to whether or not the knowledge cluster has been addressed produced a significant difference between the means of the groups ($F = 12.26, p < .01$).

Based on the findings presented in Tables 21, 22, 23 and 24, significant differences were produced between the means of the groups relative as to whether or not the goal clusters have been addressed.

Based on the one-way analysis of variance conducted to examine significant differences relative to the appropriateness and addressing the goal clusters the following findings were revealed:
a) Perceptions of Appropriateness of Interpersonal Relations Cluster--no significant difference between the mean of the groups ($F = 2.61$, n.s.).

b) Perception of Appropriateness of Attitude Cluster--no significant differences between the means of the groups ($F = .10$, n.s.).

c) Perceptions of Appropriateness of Skills Cluster--significant differences between the means of the groups ($F = 4.45$, $p < .01$).

d) Perceptions of Appropriateness of Knowledge Cluster--significant differences between the means of the groups ($F = 2.90$, $p < .05$).

e) Perceptions as to whether or not the interpersonal relations cluster has been addressed--significant differences between the means of the groups ($F = 2.90$, $p < .05$).

f) Perceptions as to whether or not the attitudes cluster has been addressed--significant differences between the means of the groups ($F = 9.20$, $p < .01$).

g) Perceptions as to whether or not the skills cluster has been addressed--significant differences between the means of the groups ($F = 17.68$, $p < .01$).

h) Perceptions as to whether or not the knowledge cluster has been addressed--significant differences between the means of the groups ($F = 12.26$, $p < .01$).
In order to decide whether to reject or not reject the null hypotheses, the total group mean scores of appropriate goals and the total group mean scores of whether or not the goals have been addressed were utilized to calculate the one-way ANOVA procedures presented in the following tables.

Table 25 presents the results of the ANOVA procedure employed on the group perceptions of the appropriateness of the total goals.

**Table 25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>560.78</td>
<td>186.92</td>
<td>1.94  n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>37581.64</td>
<td>96.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>38142.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01 *p < .05**

Table 25 indicates that the perceptions of the group of respondents did not differ with regards to the appropriateness of all the goals \(F = 1.94, \text{n.s.}\). Based on this analysis, the data failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 26 presents the results of the ANOVA procedure used to ascertain significant differences in the group perceptions as to whether or not the total goals have been addressed.

The results presented in Table 26 revealed that the perceptions of the respondents differed significantly \(F = 14.45, p < .01\). Based on this analysis, Hypothesis II was rejected.
Table 26
Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Group on Total Addressed Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8554.48</td>
<td>2851.49</td>
<td>14.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>67292.65</td>
<td>197.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>75847.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01    *p < .05

To discern where the differences lie between the groups with regards to rejecting Hypothesis II, a post hoc comparison was conducted relative to the perceptions of the respondents as to whether or not the goals have been addressed. The Scheffé Multiple Range test was conducted and the results are presented in Table 27.

Table 27
Results of the Scheffé Multiple Range Test for the Mean of Addressed Goals for Four Groups of Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Elementary Teachers</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4: School Administrators</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Secondary Teachers</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3: Curriculum Specialists</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the Scheffé test indicated the following regarding the significant differences in the perceptions of the four groups of educators as to whether or not the teacher education goals have been addressed:

a) Elementary teachers' perceptions differed significantly from the secondary teachers' perceptions.

b) Elementary teachers' perceptions differed significantly from the curriculum specialists' perceptions. Elementary teachers were less critical of the goals than the curriculum specialists and the secondary teachers.

c) Administrators' perceptions differed significantly from the perceptions of the secondary teachers' perceptions.

d) Administrators' perceptions differed significantly from the curriculum specialists' perceptions. Administrators were less critical of the goals than the curriculum specialists and the secondary teachers.

e) Secondary teachers' perceptions differed significantly from the administrators' perceptions. Secondary teachers were more critical of the goals than the administrators.

f) Curriculum specialists' perceptions differed significantly from the elementary teachers' perceptions. Curriculum specialists were more critical of the goals than elementary teachers.

The differences in perceptions of elementary teachers and administrators from secondary teachers and curriculum specialists seem to be
attributed to a belief that they (elementary teachers and administrators) represent educators who were once teachers and administrators at the onset and up to the demise of the Education Television System. As such, their views seem to be more conservative and are thus more favorable toward the current teacher education program. On the other hand, the secondary teachers and the curriculum specialists seem to represent educators who were once students of the former group when the American Samoa Department of Education utilized the ETV system at its greatest height. The secondary teachers and the curriculum specialists seem to represent the new generation of educators who have a wider comparison base and are thus more critical of the goals. They seem to be more Americanized.

In other words, this latter group may have been students of the former group and may therefore be products of the Samoa ETV era. They may have been educated primarily in the United States mainland for their undergraduate degrees as recipients of government scholarships before the consumation of the current teacher education program between the ASCC and University of Hawaii College of Education. Essentially, the two groups appear to differ from each other in that each group represents a different social, economic and educational development period of American Samoa. Consequently, it appears that the former group suggests needs dispositions, the idiographic dimensions, which are congruent with the institutional goals or nomothetic dimension, while the latter group suggests that their needs dispositions, the idiographic dimension, may be incongruent with the institutional goals or the nomothetic dimension.
Further Examination of Findings Relative to the Independent Variables

The following section examines the data in terms of the characteristics of the sample of this study. The findings of this section were not used to determine whether to reject or not reject Hypotheses I and II. Instead, the findings provided further understanding of the perceptions of the groups relative to the independent variables of this study. These variables include ethnicity, age, sex, division, years of teaching experience, education level, residency outside Samoa, matai, use of Samoan language in the classroom and enrollment in the teacher education program.

A one-way analysis of variance was employed to ascertain significant differences in the respondents' perceptions, the dependent variables, relative to the independent variables. The total mean scores of all the goal statements to assess appropriate (TAPP) and a total mean score for all the goal statements to assess whether or not the goals were addressed (TADD) were used in this analysis in view of ten independent variables. A discussion, at the end of this section, will describe the variables in context of their impact on the respondents' perceptions.

Tables 28 to 46 present the results of the one-way analysis of variance of the dependent variables relative to the independent variables.

The results of the ANOVA procedure conducted to determine differences in perceptions relative to ethnicity are presented in Tables 28 and 29.
The results of the one-way analysis of variance presented in Table 28 showed that ethnicity (Samoan versus non-Samoan) produced no significant difference in the perceptions of respondents relative to the appropriateness of the goals of the teacher education program ($F = 1.66$, n.s.).

Table 29

Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goals Relative to Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9057.39</td>
<td>9057.39</td>
<td>46.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>66635.26</td>
<td>194.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>75692.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05
The results of the one-way analysis of variance presented in Table 29 showed that ethnicity (Samoan versus non-Samoan) produced a significant difference between the means of the group ($F = 46.62, p < .01$). The non-Samoans were much more critical of the goals than the Samoan respondents.

The results of the ANOVA procedure conducted to determine differences in the respondents' perceptions relative to age are presented in Tables 30 and 31.

Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>563.52</td>
<td>187.84</td>
<td>1.94  n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>38229.48</td>
<td>96.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>38793.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01    *p < .05

Table 30 reveals that age groups did not make any significant difference in the perceptions of the respondents relative to the appropriateness of the goals ($F = 1.94$, n.s.).

Table 31 results indicate that age groups made a significant difference relative to the respondents' perceptions on whether or not the goals have been addressed ($F = 3.00, p < .01$). The younger
Table 31
Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1953.13</td>
<td>651.04</td>
<td>3.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>74558.80</td>
<td>216.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>76512.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01     *p < .05

respondents (under 30) seem to be more critical of the goals than the older respondents (40-50 and over).

Tables 32 and 33 present the results of the ANOVA procedure used to test for difference in perceptions relative to the respondents' sex.

Table 32
Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriate (TAPP) Goal Scores Relative to Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>.22 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>38852.51</td>
<td>97.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>38873.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01     *p < .05
The results presented in Table 32 showed that the respondents' perceptions of the appropriateness of the goals were not significantly different in terms of sex (F = .22, n.s.).

Table 33
Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>186.33</td>
<td>186.33</td>
<td>.85 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>76380.60</td>
<td>219.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>76566.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05

The analysis presented in Table 33 indicated that the respondents' perceptions regarding whether or not goals have been addressed did not differ significantly relative to sex (F = .85, n.s.).

Tables 34 and 35 present the results of the ANOVA procedure employed to analyze respondents' perceptions relative to division.

According to Table 34, respondents' perceptions regarding the appropriateness of the goals relative to their division (elementary-secondary) did not differ significantly (F = .20, n.s.).

Table 35 analysis revealed that respondents' perceptions differed significantly relative to division when asked whether or not the goals have been addressed (F = 35.00, p < .01). The respondents of the secondary division were more critical of the goals than the respondents of the elementary division.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>.20 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>38597.60</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>38614.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6965.05</td>
<td>6965.05</td>
<td>35.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>68289.20</td>
<td>199.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>75254.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05

Tables 36 and 37 present results of ANOVA procedure employed to analyze respondents' perceptions relative to teaching experiences.
Table 36

Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriateness (TAPP) Goal Scores Relative to Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>415.20</td>
<td>207.60</td>
<td>2.15  n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>38035.07</td>
<td>96.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>38450.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05

Table 36 indicates that respondents' perceptions of the appropriateness of the goals did not differ significantly with regards to their teaching experience (F = 2.15, n.s.).

Table 37

Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1764.90</td>
<td>882.45</td>
<td>4.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>74451.36</td>
<td>217.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>76216.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05
Analysis shown of Table 37 shows that the respondents' perceptions of whether or not the goals have been addressed differed significantly with regards to the years of teaching experience ($F = 4.07, p < .05$). Respondents with less experience (1-10 years) were more critical of the goals than respondents who had more experience (20 years and over).

Tables 38 and 39 present the results of the ANOVA procedure completed relative to the respondents' education.

### Table 38

**Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriate (TAPP) Goal Scores Relative to Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>723.76</td>
<td>180.94</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>37661.22</td>
<td>95.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>38385.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01    *p < .05**

The respondents' perceptions of the appropriateness of the goals relative to their education did not differ significantly ($F = 1.89$, n.s.).

Table 39 indicates that respondents' perceptions on whether or not the goals have been addressed relative to education differed significantly ($F = 10.53, p < .01$). The respondents with more education (Bachelor degree) were more critical of the goals than those with less education (High School and Associate degrees).
Table 39

Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8310.90</td>
<td>2077.72</td>
<td>10.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>67699.80</td>
<td>197.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>76010.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05

Tables 40 and 41 show the results of the ANOVA procedure employed to analyze respondents' perceptions relative to whether or not they have lived outside Samoa two or more years.

Table 40

Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriateness (TAPP) Goal Scores Relative to Residency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>.19 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>38855.64</td>
<td>97.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>38873.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05
Table 40 shows that the respondents' perceptions regarding the appropriateness of the goals relative to residency did not differ significantly (F = .19, n.s.).

Table 41
Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Residency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6502.74</td>
<td>6502.74</td>
<td>32.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>70064.18</td>
<td>201.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>76566.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05

The respondents' perceptions of whether or not the goals have been addressed relative to residency were significantly different (F = 32.30, p < .01). Respondents who have resided outside of Samoa for two or more years were more critical of the goals than those who did not.

Tables 42 and 43 indicate the results of the ANOVA procedure used to analyze respondents' perceptions relative to matai.

Table 42 shows that the respondents' perceptions of the appropriateness of the goals relative to matai did not differ significantly (F = .04, n.s.).

Respondents' perceptions on whether or not the teacher education goals have been addressed relative to matai differed significantly
Table 42  
Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriateness (TAPP) Goal Scores Relative to Matai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>38088.64</td>
<td>96.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>38092.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05

Table 43  
Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Matai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1061.82</td>
<td>1061.82</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>74862.24</td>
<td>217.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>75924.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05

(F = 4.88, p < .05). Respondents who were not matais, were more critical of the goals than those who were matais.
Tables 44 and 45 show the results of the ANOVA procedure used to analyze the respondents' perceptions relative to use of Samoan language.

Table 44

Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriateness (TAPP) Goal Scores Relative to Use of Samoan Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.91</td>
<td>44.91</td>
<td>.46 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>37573.65</td>
<td>98.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>37618.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01   *p < .05

Table 44 reveals that the respondents' perceptions of the appropriateness of the goals relative to use of the Samoan language did not differ significantly (F = .46, n.s.).

Table 45

Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance For Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Use of Samoan Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5750.54</td>
<td>5750.54</td>
<td>28.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>68364.88</td>
<td>203.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>74115.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01   *p < .05
Based on Table 45, respondents' perceptions on whether or not the teacher education goals have been addressed relative to the use of Samoan language in the classroom differed significantly ($F = 28.26$, $p < .01$). Respondents who do not use the Samoan language were more critical of the goals than those who do.

Tables 46 and 47 reveal the results of the ANOVA procedure employed to analyze the respondents' perceptions relative to enrollment in the teacher education program.

Table 46

Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Appropriateness (TAPP) Goal Scores Relative to Enrollment in the Teacher Education Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>.10 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>38384.72</td>
<td>97.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>38394.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**$p < .01$  *$p < .05$

Respondents' perceptions regarding the appropriateness of the goals relative to enrollment in the teacher education program did not differ significantly ($F = .10$, n.s.) according to Table 46.

Table 47 shows that the respondents' perceptions of whether or not the goals have been addressed relative to their enrollment in the teacher education program differed significantly ($F = 10.90$, $p < .01$).
Table 47
Results of a One-Way Analysis of Variance for Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores Relative to Enrollment in the Teacher Education Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2338.60</td>
<td>2338.60</td>
<td>10.90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>74224.38</td>
<td>214.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>76562.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01  *p < .05

Respondents who were not enrolled in the teacher education program were more critical of the goals than those who were enrolled.

Tables 28 to 47 revealed the following about the perceptions of the respondents relative to the independent variables:

a) Ethnicity made a significant difference in the respondents' perceptions of only the addressed goals. The non-Samoan respondents were more critical of the implementation of the goals than the Samoan respondents.

b) Age group made a significant difference in the respondents' perceptions of only the addressed goals. The younger respondents (under 30) seem to be more critical of the goals than the older (40-50 and over) respondents.

c) Sex made no significant difference in the respondents' perception of the goals.
d) Division made significant difference in the respondents' perception of only the addressed goals. The respondents of the secondary division were more critical of the goals than the respondents in the elementary division.

e) Experience made a significant difference in the respondents' perceptions of only the addressed goals. The less experienced (1-10 years) respondents were more critical of the goals than the more experienced (20 years and more) respondents.

f) Education made a significant difference in the respondents' perceptions of only the addressed goals. The respondents with more education (Bachelor's degree) were more critical of the goals than the respondents with less education (High School and Associate degree)

g) Residency made a significant difference in the respondents' perceptions of only the addressed goals. Respondents who resided outside Samoa for two or more years were more critical of the goals than those who did not.

h) Matai made significant difference in the respondents' perceptions of only the addressed goals. The non-matais were more critical of the goals than those who were matais.

i) Use of Samoan language in the classroom made a significant difference in the respondents' perceptions of only the addressed goals. Respondents who do not use the Samoan language were more critical of the goals than those who do use it.
j) Enrollment in the teacher education program made a significant difference in the respondents' perceptions of only the addressed goals. Respondents who were not enrolled in the teacher education program were more critical of the goals than those who were enrolled.

There were significant differences in the respondents' perceptions regarding whether or not the goals have been addressed based on their personal, social and educational characteristics. Respondents who were more critical of the goals relative to the question in discussion were likely to be Samoan, from under 30 years old, in the secondary division, worked from 1-10 years, obtained at least a bachelor's degree, resided outside of Samoa at least two or more years, not matais, do not use the Samoan language in school, and were not enrolled in the teacher education program. These particular respondents have indicated through this study that their perceptions of the institutional goals, nomothetic dimension, were not congruent with their needs dispositions (idiographic dimension). Moreover, the findings relative to the examination of the independent variables clearly suggest that the behavior and perceptions of respondents regarding institutional expectations are strongly influenced by their needs dispositions or the idiographic dimension.

**Findings Relative to Hypothesis III**

Hypothesis III submitted that there will be no significant differences in the respondents' perceptions regarding the unmet educational needs of the Territory of American Samoa.
The data relative to Hypothesis III are discussed first in terms of frequency and percentage, then followed by a discussion relative to the chi-square analysis completed to determine significant relationships of the respondents' perception to the unmet educational needs. In addition, a discussion will be made relative to the findings of the Friedman two-way ANOVA used.

Table 48 presents the total number and percent of respondents' perceptions of each unmet educational need of the territory of American Samoa.

The summary of the rank order frequencies of the unmet educational need statements showed that need statements 1, 5 and 6 were ranked by the respondents of this study as the most critical needs. Ninety-three percent of the total sample ranked need statement number 5 as the most critical. Fifty-six point seven percent of the total sample ranked need statement number 1 as second most critical need. Fifty-three percent of the total sample ranked need statement number 6 as the third most critical need.

The rank order summary also revealed that need statement numbers 2, 7 and 8 were considered the three least critical education needs of the territory. Seventy-two percent of the total sample ranked number 2 need as the least critical need. Forty-nine percent of the total sample ranked need statement number 8 as the second least critical need. Forty-four percent of the total sample ranked need statement number 7 as the third least critical need.

Essentially, the rank order summary indicated the following perceptions of the respondents:
Table 48
Results of Rank Ordering of the Unmet Educational Need Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Ordering</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Become proficient in Math</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Be provided opportunity in physical education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Be provided the opportunity to study Business Education and Office practice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Be provided the opportunity to learn basic industrial skills, agriculture, fishing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Read, speak and write English and understand oral English</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Develop greater fluency in the Samoan language</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Be provided the opportunity to learn subject matter not formally in the curriculum</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Have a command of science methods and content</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The three unmet education needs perceived to be the most critical were, in rank order:

(92%)  #5 "Read, speak and write English and understand oral English"

(55.7%)  #1 "Become proficient in math"

(53%)  #6 "Develop greater fluency in the Samoan language"

The three unmet education needs perceived to be the least critical were, in rank order:

(72%)  #2 "Be provided opportunity in physical education"

(49%)  #8 "Have a command in science methods and content"

(44%)  #7 "Be provided the opportunity to learn subject matter not formally in the curriculum"

The following discussion will focus on the results of the chi-square analysis employed to ascertain significant relationship between the perceptions of the group and each unmet education need of the Territory of American Samoa. The chi-square test examined significant relationship of the respondents' perceptions with each need statement as nominal variables.

The chi-square test was used to determine relationship frequency of the respondents' perceptions of need statement number 1 produced $X^2 = 22.38$, df = 21. This analysis showed no significant relationship between the groups' perceptions and need statement number 1.

The chi-square test used to determine relationship frequency of the respondents' perceptions of need statement number 2 produced $X^2 = 12.22$, df = 21. This analysis showed that there was no significant relationship between the groups' perceptions and this need statement.
The chi-square test used to determine the relationship of the respondents' perceptions to need statement number 3 indicated an $X^2 = 36.00$, df = 21 which was a significant relationship.

The chi-square analysis used to test the relationship of respondents' perceptions of need statement number 4 showed $X^2 = 17.92$, df = 21. There was no significant relationship between the respondents' perceptions and need statement number 4.

The results of the chi-square analysis used to determine the relationship of the respondents' perceptions of need statement number 5 indicated a $X^2 = 17.80$, df = 21. There was no significant relationship between the respondents' perceptions and need statement number 5.

The chi-square analysis of the respondents' perceptions of need statement number 6 indicated a significant relationship with an $X^2 = 56.61$, df = 21.

The chi-square test used to determine relationship between the respondents' perceptions of need statement number 7 revealed an $X^2 = 39.90$, df = 21, a significant relationship.

The results of the chi-square test used to analyze a significant relationship between the respondents' perceptions of need statement number 8 produced an $X^2 = 39.80$, df = 21. The respondents' perceptions related significantly to this need statement.

Based on the chi-square tests, the following can be summarized:
- Respondents' perceptions produced a significant relationship to the following need statements:

Need Statement #3 "Be provided the opportunity to study business education and office practice"
Need Statement #6  "Develop greater fluency in the Samoan language . . . "

Need Statement #7  "Be provided the opportunity to learn subject matter not formally in the curriculum"

Need Statement #8  "Have a command of science methods and content"

- Respondents' perceptions did not show any significant relationship to the following:

Need Statement #1  "Become proficient in Math"

Need Statement #2  "Be provided the opportunity in physical education"

Need Statement #4  "Be provided the opportunity to learn basic industrial skills, agriculture and fishing"

Need Statement #5  "Read, speak and writing English"

To examine significant bias each group of educators may have relative to the total group of need statements, a Friedman two-way analysis of variance was employed. With this test, the need statements are examined as ordinal variables. The findings of this treatment aimed at examining respondents' rank order bias of all the need statements. The findings of this analysis showed that the elementary teachers had a significant bias towards need statement number 5, thus producing an $X^2 = 409.17$, df = 7, $p < .01$.

With regards to the secondary teachers, the Friedman two-way analysis of variance produced an $X^2 = 257.45$, df = 7, $p < .01$, a significant bias towards need statement number 5, the need for proficiency in English. The analysis done relative to the curriculum specialists produced an $X^2 = 224.37$, df = 7, $p < .01$, another significant bias toward need statement number 5. In the same manner,
the school administrators were significantly biased towards need statement number 5 as the most critical educational need. The analysis revealed an $X^2 = 105.34$, df = 7, $p < .01$.

It is interesting to note that in employing the chi-square test, the respondents' perceptions of need statement 5 (English proficiency), was borderline to being significantly related. The results of the Friedman two-way analysis was clearly directional. Each group of educators showed significant bias to need statement 5. The reader must remember that whereas the chi-square aimed at examining significant relationship of each need statement as a nominal variable, the Friedman two-way analysis examined the need statements in a total group as ordinal variables to ascertain significant bias. Each test used is different and the results are therefore different.

Based on these analyses, the findings rejected null Hypothesis III.

Discussion of the Findings

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the personal needs dispositions of the Samoan educators differed from the stated institutional goals. More specifically, this study examined the perceptions of Samoan educators regarding (1) the appropriateness of the goals of the teacher education program, (2) whether or not the goals have been addressed, and (3) the unmet educational needs of the territory.

The findings of this study support the notion that the respondents felt that the institutional teacher education goals are appropriate for American Samoa. The one-way analysis of variance conducted on each of the four goal clusters showed that the educators' perceptions
differed significantly regarding the appropriateness of the skills and knowledge clusters only. This difference in perceptions could be attributed to the fact that many of the elementary educators have not had training or education from other institutions and therefore have no comparison base. Whereas the secondary teachers and curriculum specialists, the more educated of the group, may have had training from other institutions and are therefore much more critical in their judgment. The total group perception of all the goals relative to their appropriateness produced no significant differences and therefore suggests that the educators felt that the goals of the institution teacher education program are appropriate.

There are several factors which may explain why the respondents rated the total goals appropriate and why the generally agreed as a group. One factor is that it is socially and culturally expected for respondents to respond favorably. The respondents may have felt that they were doing the writer a favor by rating the goals as appropriate. The writer is personally acquainted with many of the respondents as an educator from American Samoa. Another factor which may explain the respondents' perceptions is that a large percentage of the respondents were educated in Samoa, and as such, these respondents have no comparison bases to argue that the goals for American Samoa are inappropriate. Another factor is that some educators may fear that if they rate the goals low, this may lead to a gradual termination of the teacher education program. Termination of the program would mean a financial burden for many to complete their undergraduate and graduate degrees or worse, the possibility of never completing their degrees. Last of
all, the goals are statements which convey the ideal for all teachers, therefore the respondents may have found it difficult to rate the goals inappropriate.

The findings suggest that the educators perceived the institutional goals congruent with their personal needs disposition. If this is so, then the individual personalities of educators are congruent with the institutional role and the individual needs disposition are also congruent with institutional expectations. Basically the respondents felt the goals are appropriate and the data therefore failed to reject null hypothesis I.

The findings of the study relative to Hypothesis II pointed out that there were significant differences in the respondents' perceptions. The total group means regarding whether or not the goals have been addressed were consistently lower on a scale of 1 to 5 than the total group mean of the appropriateness of the goals. It was interesting to note that 29% of the sample chose not to answer this question.

There are several factors which may explain why the respondents perceived the goals significantly different. First, respondents' decision not to respond supports the discussion relative to Hypothesis I. Just as it is socially and culturally expected for the educators to respond favorably it is also socially and culturally acceptable for the educators of Samoa not to respond to avoid a negative or potentially conflicting situation. Secondly, the differences in perceptions may be attributed to the fact that historically, the subjects of this study as a group, have never participated in the planning and implementation of the teacher education program as discussed in Chapter II. Consequently, the respondents may have felt this was an opportunity for them
to say how they felt and thus became much more critical. Thirdly, it is obvious that the educators' social and personal characteristics contributed to the different perceptions.

The finding rejected null hypothesis II. The findings suggest that the educators' perceptions of the institutional goals relative to this question are incongruent with their needs dispositions. This suggests a discrepancy between the nomothetic dimension, the goals, and the idiographic dimension, the needs dispositions. The discrepancy suggests that there may be a conflict between what the educators perceive as their institutional expectations and what the institution's teacher education program has done or not done in implementing the goals it has established for the teachers in American Samoa.

The findings relative to the independent variables showed that ethnicity, age, division, experience, education, residency, matai, language use and enrollment in the teacher education program have a significant effect on the perceptions of the educators regarding whether or not the goals have been addressed. Whereas the respondents, regardless of their personal and social characteristics, generally agreed that the goals were appropriate, when queried regarding whether or not the same goals were addressed, the respondents differed significantly in their perceptions by every social and personal characteristic except sex.

The findings relative to Hypothesis II pointed out that:

1) There is a significant difference in the perceptions of the educators of Samoa regarding whether or not the goals have been addressed; (2) There appears to be a conflict between what the individuals perceive as the institutional expectations and what the
institution's teacher education program expects; (3) It is culturally acceptable in Samoa not to respond to avoid conflicts.

The findings of this study relative to Hypothesis III showed that there were significant relationships in the respondents' perceptions relative to only four of the eight educational needs. There was no significant relationship between the respondents' perceptions and need statement on business education, Samoan language, science and the need to have other subject matter not in the curriculum. The findings indicated an interesting phenomenon. Whereas the community members viewed the English language as the most critical and the Samoan language as the second most critical educational need in 1973, the educators of this study perceived the same needs as the most critical and third most critical need respectively.

Several interesting factors seem to have contributed to this bias. One factor is that the educators may have come to realize how critical English has become in light of the emphasis for admission and completion of their degree program from institutions of higher education. Another factor which may have contributed to this bias is in relation to the institutional expectations of the educators in American Samoa. Because there is a growing population of Samoan students whose native language is English, parents of these children insist that their children be taught by native English speaking teachers or Samoan teachers who are competent and proficient in English.

Still another factor for the bias may be due to the English emphasis accentuated by the social and economic life style in American Samoa today. Business transactions are now done primarily in English in Samoa. Small businesses which have American, Chinese, Korean or
Tongan partnership have sprung up all over Tutuila, requiring proficiency in English. In addition, Samoans commute frequently to Honolulu and the west coast of the United States. The influence from and ties beyond American Samoa require fluency in the English language. In short, the Samoan community members and educators alike may have become more Americanized than Samoans a decade ago.

Summary of Findings

In accordance with the purpose of this study, the analysis of data disclosed these findings concerning the perceptions of teachers, administrators and curriculum specialists, administrators and curriculum specialists of the Department of Education of American Samoa regarding the teacher education program goals and the educational needs of the territory.

Findings relative to the appropriateness of the goals of the teacher education program.

1. There was no significant difference between the respondents' perceptions regarding the appropriateness of the interpersonal relations goal cluster.

2. There was no significant difference between the respondents' perceptions of the appropriateness of the attitude goal cluster.

3. There was a significant difference between the respondents' perceptions regarding the appropriateness of the skills goal cluster.

4. There was a significant difference between the respondents' perceptions regarding the appropriateness of the knowledge goal cluster.
5. There was no significant difference between the perceptions of the respondents regarding the appropriateness of the total group of goals.

The analysis of these findings failed to reject Hypothesis I.

Findings relative to whether or not the teacher education goals have been addressed:

1. There was a significant difference between the respondents' perceptions regarding whether or not the goals relative to interpersonal relations have been addressed.

2. There was a significant difference between the respondents' perceptions regarding whether or not the goals relative to attitudes have been addressed.

3. There was a significant difference between the respondents' perceptions of whether or not the goals relative to skills have been addressed.

4. There was a significant difference between the respondents' perceptions of whether or not the goals relative to knowledge have been addressed.

5. There was a significant difference between the respondents' perceptions regarding whether or not the total group of goals have been addressed.

The findings rejected Hypothesis II.

Based on the post hoc comparison, the Scheffé Range test, the educator groups differed in the following manner relative to whether or not the goals have been addressed:
1. Elementary teacher perceptions differed significantly from the perceptions of the secondary teachers and the curriculum specialists.

2. School administrator perceptions differed significantly from the perceptions of the secondary teachers and the curriculum specialists.

3. Secondary teacher perceptions differed significantly from the school administrators' perceptions.

4. Curriculum specialist perceptions differed significantly from the elementary teachers' perceptions.

Findings relative to the respondents' perceptions in terms of the independent variables.

1. There were no significant differences in the respondents' perceptions regarding the appropriateness of the goals relative to all ten independent variables.

2. There were significant differences in the respondents' perceptions of whether or not the goals have been addressed relative to ethnicity, age, division, experience, education, residency, matai, language use and enrollment in the teacher education program.

3. The Scheffé test conducted on every independent variable showed that (a) non-Samoan perceptions differed significantly from Samoans, (b) age groups showed no significant difference (Scheffé is the conservative approach), (c) secondary differed significantly from elementary division, (d) the less experienced differed significantly from the more experienced,
(e) the more educated differed significantly from the less educated, (f) those who resided outside Samoa differed significantly from those who did not, (g) non-matais differed significantly from those who are, (h) those who speak Samoan differed significantly from those who do not, (i) those in the teacher education program differed significantly from those who are not.

The findings regarding the independent variables further confirmed the decision that the findings failed to reject Hypothesis I and rejected Hypothesis II.

Findings relative to the respondents' perceptions regarding the educational needs of the territory.

1. A frequency summary of the rank order indicated that statement numbers 5, 1 and 6 were perceived by the respondents as the three most critical educational needs. The summary indicated that the respondents perceived need statements 2, 7 and 8 as the three least critical educational needs of the territory.

2. Findings from the chi-square tests showed that:
   a. There was a significant relationship in the respondents' perceptions of need statements 3, 6, 7 and 8;
   b. There was no significant relationship in the respondents' perceptions of need statements 1, 2, 4 and 5.

3. Findings from the Friedman two-way analysis showed that every group of educators had a significant bias to need statement 5, English proficiency.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine whether the perceptions of educators in American Samoa, the idiographic dimension, would differ from the stated institutional goals, the nomothetic dimension. The population to which the study sought to generalize was the public school teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators of American Samoa.

Theoretical Framework. The theoretical framework upon which this study was based was the model described by Getzels and Guba called the Social Process Theory. The general model basically stated that educational organizations were social systems comprised of both nomothetic and idiographic dimensions.

According to the model, the nomothetic dimension includes the institution, which prescribes roles and expectations for the role incumbents. The nomothetic dimension interacts with the idiographic dimension which consists of individuals, personality and needs dispositions. Social behavior results as the individual copes with the pattern of institution demands and expectations in ways that are consistent with his own independent needs disposition. This study examined whether the stated institution goals differed from the needs dispositions of Samoan educators.
Background. The historical development of teacher education in American Samoa, Hawaii and the United States were examined to establish that conflicts can result from incongruencies between stated institutional expectations and the individuals' needs dispositions. The background discussion indicated that changes implemented in the development of teacher education program in Samoa were primarily implemented by western institutional administrators without due consideration for the cultural values and needs dispositions of Samoans in general and Samoan educators in particular. The review of literature of the development of teacher education in American Samoa acknowledged the strong influence of United States education on American Samoa and the historical ties Samoa education has had with the University of Hawaii.

The Problem Investigated. This study examined whether the educators' perceptions the stated institutional goals differed from their needs dispositions. The problems investigated were: (1) What were the perceptions of the Samoan educators regarding the appropriateness of the teacher education goals? (2) What were the perceptions of the educators regarding whether or not the teacher education goals have been addressed? (3) What were the perceptions of the educators regarding the education needs of the territory?

An instrument was developed to generate the data for the analysis of the differences in group perceptions.

Hypotheses. Based on the problem statement, three hypotheses were generated that predicted no significant differences between the perceptions of the four groups of public school educators of American Samoa included in the study, namely elementary teachers, secondary teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators.
Review of Literature. Relevant literature was reviewed to study the effects of institutional goals developed by colonizing countries for Pacific island people. The literature review focused on an examination of the importance of teacher involvement, input and participation in the development and implementation of teacher education programs.

Sutherland, Allen, Gray and Gilson reported the effects of the early introductions of western-style education and teacher education for the Samoans by the Navy. Barstow and Wist recorded the need to incorporate cultural values and Samoan needs dispositions in the school structure and program.

Topping, Beauchamp and Schramm examined the problems faced by Samoan educators as they (Samoans) attempted to cope with institutional goals which were not congruent with their cultural values and personal needs disposition.

The writings of Wist, Stiles and reports of the College of Education of the University of Hawaii discussed how rapidly the educators of Hawaii were trained according to the western institutional goals and Hawaii's assimilation of American values.

Finally, Krug, El-Bouhy, Cubberly, Robinson, Chaube and others reported on the development of teacher education in the United States. They described how teacher education programs developed from traditional programs to programs which offered special training for rural teachers, as opposed to urban school teachers. Hegtvedt, Michaels, Swick, Combs, Hefferline, Jersild and others discussed the importance of incorporating the teachers' personal orientation as well as the cultural values into the training program and program goals in order for the program to be relevant and effective.
Methodology. The population from which the study sought to extract generalization was the educators of the American Samoa Department of Education. The sample was categorized into four groups: elementary teachers, secondary teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators. The sample consisted of educators from the American Samoa Department of Education who were (1) responsible for implementing the education goals in the classroom, and (2) recipients of the teacher education training offered for American Samoa. Every public school classroom teacher, curriculum specialist and school administrator was given the opportunity to participate in the study so that generalizations could be drawn about the population.

The development of the survey instrument used for the study included the following procedures:

1. Defining the three concepts to be measured;
2. Compiling the list of goal statements;
3. Validating the goal statements and categorizing them, using five judges;
4. Field testing the instrument with educators of public schools in American Samoa and Hawaii;
5. Compiling summary item statistics and summary cluster statistics to examine the correlation and reliability level of the items.

The final instrument consisted of 20 goal statements and 8 need statements.

The study employed a one-time survey research design to four groups of educators in American Samoa.
A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to statistically test for significant differences among the groups. The Scheffé Multiple Range test ascertained where the differences lie. The chi-square test was used to determine the relationship in respondents' perceptions and the needs statements. The Friedman two-way analysis of variance determined significant rank order bias. The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) was used to process all analyses for the study.

**Findings.** In accordance with the purpose of this study, the analysis of data disclosed the findings below concerning the perceptions of teachers, administrators and curriculum specialists of the Department of Education of American Samoa regarding the teacher education program goals and the educational needs of the territory.

**Findings relative to the appropriateness of the goals of the teacher education program.**

1. There was no significant difference between the respondents' perceptions regarding the appropriateness of the interpersonal relations cluster.
2. There was no significant difference between the respondents' perceptions of the appropriateness of the attitude cluster.
3. There was a significant difference between the respondents' perceptions regarding the appropriateness of the skills cluster. The difference between the mean of the group was below the .05 level with an $F = 4.45$.
4. There was a significant difference between the respondents' perceptions regarding the appropriateness of the knowledge
cluster. The difference between the means of the groups was below the .05 level with an $F = 2.90$.

5. There was no significant difference between the respondents' perceptions regarding the appropriateness of the total group of goals.

Based on the analysis of these findings, the data failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Findings relative to whether or not the teacher education goals have been addressed.

1. There was a significant difference between the respondents' perceptions relative to the interpersonal relations cluster. The difference between the mean of the groups was below the .05 level with an $F = 2.90$.

2. There was a significant difference between the respondents' perceptions relative to the attitudes cluster. The difference between the means of the group was below the .05 and below the .01 levels with an $F = 2.90$.

3. There was a significant difference between the respondents' perceptions relative to the skills cluster. The difference between the means of the groups was below the .05 and below the .01 levels with an $F = 17.68$.

4. There was a significant difference between the respondents' perceptions relative to the knowledge cluster. The difference between the means of the groups was below the .05 and below the .01 levels with an $F = 8.05$. 
5. There was a significant difference between the respondents' perceptions of all the goals of the teacher education program. The difference between the means of the groups was below the .05 and below the .01 levels with an $F = 14.45$.

Based on these findings, null hypothesis II was rejected. Based on the Scheffé test, the educator groups differed in the following manner:

1. Elementary teacher perceptions differed significantly from the perceptions of the secondary teachers and the curriculum specialists.

2. School administrator perceptions differed significantly from the perceptions of the secondary teachers and the curriculum specialists.

3. Secondary teacher perceptions differed significantly from administrators' perceptions.

4. Curriculum specialists' perceptions differed significantly from the elementary teacher perceptions.

Findings relative to the respondents' perceptions in terms of the independent variables.

1. The independent variables made no significant difference in the respondents' perceptions regarding the appropriateness of the teacher education goals.

2. Every independent variable, except sex, made a significant difference in the respondents' perceptions regarding whether or not the goals have been addressed.
The Scheffé test, the most conservative post hoc test, was conducted on every independent variable showed the following:

**Ethnicity** - Non-Samoans differed significantly from the Samoans and were more critical of the goals than the Samoans.

**Age** - The respondents who were under 30 years old did not differ significantly from the 40 years and older although the means suggest that the younger respondents were more critical of the goals than the 40 year old and over.

**Division** - The secondary division respondents differed significantly from the elementary respondents and were more critical of the goals than the elementary division respondents.

**Experience** - The respondents with 1-10 years experience differed significantly from the more experienced and were more critical of the goals than the respondents with 20 years and more.

**Education** - The respondents with bachelor degrees differed significantly from the less educated and were more critical of the goals than the respondents with a high school diploma or Associate degree.

**Residency** - Respondents who resided outside Samoa two or more years differed significantly from the others and were more critical of the goals than those who did not.

**Matai** - Respondents who were not matais differed significantly from the others and were more critical of the goals than those who were.

**Language** - Respondents who did not use the Samoan language in the class differed significantly from those who did not and were more critical of the goals than those who did.

**Teacher Education Program** - Respondents who were not enrolled in the teacher education program differed significantly from those who were not and were more critical of the goals than those who were.
Findings relative to the respondents' perceptions regarding the educational needs of the territory.

1. A summary of the rank order frequencies indicated that statement numbers 5, 1 and 6 were perceived by the respondents as the three most critical educational needs. The summary also indicated that the respondents perceived need statements 2, 7 and 8 as the three least critical educational needs of the territory.

2. Based on a chi-square test, there was a significant relationship in the respondents' perceptions and need statements 3, 6, 7 and 8. There was no significant relationship in the respondents' perceptions and need statements 1, 2, 4 and 5. The Friedman two-way analysis showed that every group had a significant bias to need statement 5, English proficiency.

Conclusions

Based upon the findings of this study, the following conclusions are warranted regarding the perceptions of the educators of American Samoa relative to the teacher education program goals and the educational needs of the territory:

1. The perceptions of the elementary teachers, secondary teachers, curriculum specialists and the school administrators did not differ significantly regarding the appropriateness of the teacher education goals for American Samoa.

   This conclusion was supported as the findings failed to reject null hypothesis I.
2. The perceptions of elementary teachers, secondary teachers, curriculum specialists and administrators were significantly different regarding whether or not the teacher education goals have been addressed.

It is concluded from the findings relative to this query, that the findings rejected null hypothesis II.

3. There were significant differences in the educators' perceptions relative to every independent variable except sex regarding whether or not the goals have been addressed.

4. There was a significant relationship in the educators' perceptions and need statements:
   - Be provided opportunity to study business education and office practice.
   - Develop greater fluency in the Samoan language . . .
   - Be provided the opportunity to learn subject matter not formally in the curriculum.
   - Have a command of science methods and content.

5. There was no significant relationship in between the educators' perceptions and need statements:
   - Become proficient in math.
   - Be provided the opportunity in physical education.
   - Be provided the opportunity to learn industrial skills, agriculture and fishing.
   - Read, speak and writing English . . .

6. There was a significant bias in the educators' perceptions to need statement 5, proficiency in English.
The conclusions which have been discussed have been based upon the results of this study, providing only an explanation of what appears to be the perceptions of the respondents of this study. Perception is influenced by many factors and as such is difficult to measure. This study did not attempt to examine the cause of the educators' perceptions regarding the teacher education goals and the needs of the territory or evaluate the teacher education program for American Samoa. Instead, the focus of this study was to examine what the current perceptions of educators are regarding the appropriateness of the teacher education goals and whether or not they were addressed. Theoretically, the study examined if the educators' perceptions of the stated institution teacher education program goals, the nomothetic dimension, differed from their needs dispositions, the idiographic dimension.

This study concludes that the educators perceived the teacher education program goals appropriate for American Samoa. Further, this study concludes that the educators differed significantly in their perceptions regarding whether or not the teacher education goals have been addressed. This indicates that the educators' needs dispositions, the idiographic dimension, were congruent with the stated institutional goals, the nomothetic dimension relative to the appropriateness of the goals but that the dimensions were incongruent relative to the implementation of the stated goals.

It is concluded from this study that it is imperative for educators of American Samoa to carefully examine the goals of the teacher education program and the educational needs of the territory, to achieve congruency with the educators' needs dispositions.
Recommendations

In view of the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. The University of Hawaii College of Education, the American Samoa Community College and the American Samoa Department of Education work closely together to develop a plan to implement the teacher education program goals for American Samoa and direct attention toward program effectiveness.

2. Teachers, curriculum specialists and school administrators of the American Samoa Department of Education, who are recipients of the teacher education program training, be given a more active role in planning, designing and evaluating the implementation of the teacher education program goals for American Samoa.

3. The American Samoa Department of Education examine the educational needs of the territory in reference to stated institutional roles and expectations in addition to the educators' needs dispositions.

Recommendations for Further Study. Based on data and findings of this investigation, the following questions seem to be profitable areas for further study:

1. What teacher education goals would teachers perceive important for American Samoa as compared to the perceptions of administrators?
What would parents perceive as the most important teacher education goals for American Samoa teachers as compared to the educators' perceptions?

2. If American Samoa had its own University with a four-year teacher education program, how different would the program goals be implemented as opposed to the implementation of the current teacher education goals?

3. What role do educators perceive themselves performing in designing and evaluating the teacher education program?

4. Do educators in American Samoa perceive themselves moving towards more Americanized education today? What traditional Samoan values would educators in Samoa want incorporated in the training of new teachers for American Samoa?

5. Is the current teacher education program for American Samoa addressing the educational/professional needs of the teachers?

6. How are the educational needs of the territory being taught and perceived by teachers in the schools of American Samoa?

7. How do teachers trained in the current teacher education program perform in comparison to those trained elsewhere?

8. Would a replication of this study reproduce different results since 1983 after inservice training by HASBEMSC-ASDOE efforts.
APPENDIX A
LETTERS OF SOLICITATION

Dear Respondent,

Thank you for taking the time to fill out the attached questionnaire.

This study is conducted to find out what teachers and administrators think are the crucial needs of the teacher education program and the education system in American Samoa.

As clientele of the teacher education program and as educators directly responsible for implementing educational goals, your participation and your honest opinions are very important in an effort to address these needs and to make education as meaningful as possible in Samoa.

A copy of the results of this study will be available at the DOE office for your perusal.

Faafetai tele,

Salu H. Reid
Doctorate student
University of Hawaii

Your cooperation in this study will not only help Salu with her dissertation but more important, your cooperation will provide data for decision making for the future of education in Samoa.

You are encouraged to participate in this research by completing the attached questionnaire.

Malo ma Faafetai,

Director
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This study is conducted to find out what teachers and administrators think are the crucial needs of the teacher education program and the education system in American Samoa.

As clientele of the teacher education program and as educators directly responsible for implementing educational goals, your participation and your honest opinions are very important in an effort to address these needs and to make education as meaningful as possible in Samoa.

A copy of the results of this study will be available at the DOE office for your perusal.

Faafetai tele,

Salu H. Reid
Doctorate student
University of Hawaii

Your cooperation in this study will not only help Salu with her dissertation but more important, your cooperation will provide data for decision making for the future of education in Samoa.

You are encouraged to participate in this research by completing the attached questionnaire.

Malo ma Faafetai,
APPENDIX B

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION UNDERGRADUATE
AND GRADUATE PROGRAM GOALS, 1973

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII TEACHER EDUCATION GOALS

1. ACTUALIZE SELF

1.1 The teacher is able to accept humanistic principles (i.e. dignity of man; worth of individual; value of creativity, etc.)

1.2 The teacher is able to demonstrate self-confidence; rely on internalized values and standards.

1.3 The teacher is able to assume responsibility for own behavior.

1.4 The teacher is able to accept praise and criticism objectively, avoid denying or distorting feelings, motives, and abilities in self.

1.5 The teacher is able to develop a sensitive awareness of others.

1.6 The teacher is able to work effectively and efficiently with others.

1.7 The teacher is able to develop warm interpersonal relationships.

1.8 The teacher is able to demonstrate openness to experience.

1.9 The teacher is able to solve problems by creatively considering alternative courses of action.

2. HELP OTHERS UNDERSTAND AND ACCEPT THEMSELVES

2.1 The teacher is able to use and model interpersonal communication skills.

2.11 is able to express self verbally and nonverbally.

2.12 is able to respond to the expressions of others in ways that have a freeing effect.
2.13 is able to describe behaviors of others in non-judgemental terms.

2.14 is able to respond to the expressions of others in ways that do not have a binding or clueing effect.

2.15 is able to create a climate that enhances communication.

2.16 is able to improve communication skills.

2.2 The teacher is able to use counseling skills.

2.21 is able to develop a supportive climate based on cooperation, mutual trust, and respect.

2.22 is able to encourage others to express concerns.

2.23 is able to listen empathetically.

2.24 is able to demonstrate concern for others.

2.25 is able to paraphrase the others' feelings.

2.26 is able to allow others to make own decisions.

2.27 is able to make appropriate referral.

2.28 is able to relate information derived from testing to the needs of the others.

2.29 is able to provide vocational and guidance materials applicable to the others' needs.

2.3 The teacher is able to involve other in decision-making.

2.31 is able to involve others in setting goals that are expected to attain and or be evaluated against.

2.32 is able to design learning experiences cooperatively.

2.33 is able to participate in group decision-making concerning the overall direction of the school or group.

2.34 is able to delegate authority to facilitate decisions and their implementation.

2.35 is able to work in a variety of social settings and demonstrate group membership skills.

2.4 The teacher is able to involve others in problem solving.

2.41 is able to provide opportunities for others to solve problem.
2.42 is able to identify needs and problems of others.

2.43 is able to develop and examine alternatives and evaluative criteria.

2.44 is able to encourage others to put decisions into action.

2.45 is able to help others evaluate their actions.

2.46 is able to support others in the acceptance of consequences of their actions.

3. FACILITATE LEARNING

3.1 The teacher is able to articulate broad educational goals.

3.11 is able to set educational goals through involvement with students, other teachers and administrators.

3.12 is able to diagnose the learners' status in relation to the educational goals.

3.2 The teacher is able to set instructional objectives.

3.21 is able to translate program and educational goals into instructional activities at all levels of domain.

3.22 is able to develop objectives for the learner in terms of behavioral outcomes in relation to both long and short-term goals.

3.23 is able to develop ways in which to involve the learner in both the setting of the individual objectives and the learning of the task itself.

3.24 is able to develop specific objectives for the learner to based upon observational, behavioral and diagnostic data.

3.25 is able to break down the components of the learning task into a sequential and hierarchical order.

3.26 is able to create the teaching component based upon a task analysis of what it is to be learned.

3.3 The teacher is able to develop relevant teaching-learning experience.

3.31 is able to assess and employ educational constraints and options operating within the teaching-learning situations.
3.32 is able to utilize exemplary predesigned instructional development systems emphasizing need assessment, determination of goals and objectives, proposed solutions, multimedia learning experiences, evaluation and recycling.

3.33 is able to plan, create, supervise, and evaluate a learning environment which will permit learner to interact, carry on planning and response demonstrations, respond to instructions by employing a variety of communication techniques.

3.34 is able to individualize and personalize instruction.

3.35 is able to use a wide variety of resources, e.g. community persons, instructional television, films, games, etc.

3.4 The teacher is able to evaluate teaching and learning experience.

3.41 is able to evaluate change in terms of instructional objectives and educational goals, formatively and summatively.

3.42 is able to assist learner in self-evaluation.

3.43 is able to evaluate interaction between teacher and learner.

3.44 is able to restructure teaching-learning experiences on the basis of evaluation.

3.5 The teacher is able to improve professional competencies.

3.51 is able to design and implement a program for professional self-evaluation and self-development.
APPENDIX C

AMERICAN SAMOA TEACHER EDUCATION GOALS
AMERICAN SAMOA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Teacher Training Program, American Samoa Community College, 1973

General Objectives for Interns

1. The teacher will be able to develop the ability to identify the basic knowledges and understandings that are consistent content fields.

2. The teacher will be able to demonstrate general instructional competencies.

3. The teacher will be able to plan and carry out community education programs.

4. The teacher will be able to experience a variety of grade levels and special education classrooms.

5. The teacher will be able to communicate effectively with other school staff and contribute to the total school programs.

6. The teacher will be able to work together with CT to plan curriculum and management for a common group of children.

7. The teacher will be able to develop effective teaching behaviors and learning activities resulting in behavior change of children.

8. The teacher will be able to develop effective teaching strategies.

9. The teacher will be able to have input in the direction of his learning by periodically meeting with the instructors.

Goals of ASCC Training Program

The training program will develop teachers who:

1. are open, flexible and honest

2. have a realistic perception of themselves and their personal relationships with others

3. have developed a high level of critical thinking, problem solving and evaluation skills

4. have competent language skills and subject matter competence

5. have an understanding of human behavior
APPENDIX D

ORIGINAL LIST OF GOAL STATEMENTS PREPARED
FOR THE PANEL OF JUDGES

1. The teacher can identify the basic knowledges that are consistent with the content fields.

2. The teacher can identify the basic understandings that are consistent with the content fields.

3. The teacher can plan community education programs.

4. The teacher can carry out community education programs.

5. The teacher can use teaching experiences from a variety of grade levels.

6. The teacher is competent in language skills.

7. The teacher is competent in subject matter areas.

8. The teacher is knowledgeable in human behavior.

9. The teacher can use teaching experiences from special education.

10. The teacher can demonstrate self-confidence.

11. The teacher can take responsibility for own behavior.

12. The teacher can accept praise objectively.

13. The teacher can work well with others.

14. The teacher can develop friendly relationships with others.

15. The teacher can accept criticism objectively.

16. The teacher can solve problems by creatively, considering several courses of action.

17. The teacher can avoid hiding feelings and abilities in self.

18. The teacher can use communication skills with others.

19. The teacher can model communication skills with others.

20. The teacher can create a climate that helps strengthen communication.
21. The teacher can use counseling skills.

22. The teacher can use information received from test scores to help others.

23. The teacher can include others in decision-making.

24. The teacher can design learning experiences cooperatively.

25. The teacher can include others in problem solving.

26. The teacher can help others evaluate their actions.

27. The teacher can express broad educational goals.

28. The teacher can set instructional objectives.

29. The teacher can evaluate the learner's status in relation to the educational goals.

30. The teacher can develop relevant teaching-learning experiences.

31. The teacher can develop specific objectives for the learner based upon a variety of information.

32. The teacher can evaluate teaching and learning experiences.

33. The teacher can improve professional competencies.

34. The teacher can reset teaching-learning experiences on the basis of evaluation.

35. The teacher can use a variety of resources e.g. community persons, instructional television, films, etc.

36. The teacher can design a program for professional self-development.

**Need/Skill Statements**

**Skill in mathematics**

Students at all levels of the school system need to become more proficient in mathematical skills.

**Skill and knowledge in physical education**

Students need more varied opportunities in physical education, particularly at the community college.
Skill and knowledge in business education

Students need more opportunities to study business education and office practice.

Skills and knowledge in industrial agriculture and marine occupation

Students need more opportunities to learn basic industrial skills and improved agricultural and fishing practices.

Command of English

Students need to read, speak, and write English and understand oral English at a higher level of proficiency than is currently the case.

Skill with the Samoan language and a sound knowledge of Samoan culture

Students need to develop greater fluency in the Samoan language, both the language used in daily discourse and the language of formal ceremonies.

Students need to understand the elements of Samoan culture—faa Samoa and to know Samoan history. They should gain some skill in traditional arts (carving, weaving, singing and dancing).

Individual students' needs for particular subject-matter areas

Individual pupils need better opportunities to learn in specified subject-matter fields, such as in the social sciences, the arts, social behavior, foreign languages and the like.

Improved knowledge of Science

At least some students need a better command of science methods and content than they have had.
APPENDIX E
INSTRUMENT MAILED TO THE 528 SUBJECTS
IN AMERICAN SAMOA

PART I: General Information

Introduction: The questionnaire provides for the anonymity of each respondent. Please DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME on the questionnaire. Complete the questionnaire by following the instructions very carefully. As soon as you're finished, please return it sealed with the attached self addressed cover sheet (see last page). Return your questionnaire no later than May 6, 1983 to your administrator.

Directions: Please provide the information below by circling the appropriate letter. Circle only one (1) letter per question.

2. Age: a. Under 30 b. 30-39 c. 40-49 d. 50 and over
3. Sex: a. female b. male
4. Division Level: a. elementary b. secondary
5. Years of experience in the education profession: a. 1-10 years b. 11-19 years c. 20 and over
6. Formal education completed: a. high school b. AA degree c. Bachelor's degree d. Master's degree e. Doctorate degree
7. Your present role: a. teacher b. curriculum specialist c. administrator
8. Have you lived outside Samoa 2 years or more? a. yes b. no
9. Are you a matai? a. yes b. no
10. Do you teach in Samoan to facilitate student learning? a. yes b. no
11. Are you currently enrolled in the teacher ed program? a. yes b. no
12. If you answered YES to #11, which are you enrolled in? a. graduate b. undergraduate
PART II: This part of the questionnaire consists of 20 goal statements of the teacher education program. Respond to each goal statement in terms of the following parts:

a) Do you feel it IS AN APPROPRIATE (proper) goal for teacher education in American Samoa?

b) Do you feel the goal HAS BEEN ADDRESSED in your teacher education program?

Answer each part by circling the number you feel is the best response. The numbers relate to the following degrees:

1 - Very Low
2 - Low
3 - Medium
4 - High
5 - Very High

EXAMPLE: Statement

a) The teacher can climb a coconut tree in 10 minutes. IS APPROPRIATE 1 2 3 4 5

b) The teacher can swim across the bay without getting tired. IS APPROPRIATE 1 2 3 4 5

HAS BEEN ADDRESSED 1 2 3 4 5

Discussion of example:

In example a, The teacher can climb a coconut tree in 10 minutes, number 5 was circled for the appropriateness of the statement. This means that this goal is high in its appropriateness for teacher education in Samoa. Number 3 was circled in terms of how the goal has been addressed. Number 3 indicates a medium rating on how the goal has been addressed in the respondent's teacher education program.

In example b, The teacher can swim across the bay without getting tired, number 5 has been circled for both the appropriateness of the goal for the teacher education program and also for how this goal has been addressed in the respondent's teacher education program.
Please circle only one (1) number after IS APPROPRIATE and one (1) after HAS BEEN ADDRESSED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Works well with others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS APPROPRIATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAS BEEN ADDRESSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Includes other in decision making</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS APPROPRIATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAS BEEN ADDRESSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Designs learning experience cooperatively with others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS APPROPRIATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAS BEEN ADDRESSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assists other evaluate their actions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS APPROPRIATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAS BEEN ADDRESSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Communicates effectively with others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS APPROPRIATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAS BEEN ADDRESSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Demonstrates self-confidence.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS APPROPRIATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAS BEEN ADDRESSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Is responsible for own behavior.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS APPROPRIATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAS BEEN ADDRESSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Accepts praise objectively.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS APPROPRIATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAS BEEN ADDRESSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Demonstrates pride in cultural heritage.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS APPROPRIATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAS BEEN ADDRESSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Accepts criticism objectively.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS APPROPRIATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAS BEEN ADDRESSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Plans an effective community education program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS APPROPRIATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAS BEEN ADDRESSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Is competent in English language skills for use in the classroom.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS APPROPRIATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAS BEEN ADDRESSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Solves problem by creatively considering several courses of action.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS APPROPRIATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAS BEEN ADDRESSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Is competent in Samoan language skills for use in the classroom.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS APPROPRIATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAS BEEN ADDRESSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Uses a variety of resources, e.g., community resource person, instructional TV, films, etc.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS APPROPRIATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAS BEEN ADDRESSED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please circle only one (1) number after IS APPROPRIATE and HAS BEEN ADDRESSED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Is knowledgeable about human development.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Is competent in subject matters areas.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Plans instructional objectives in relation to broad education goals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Evaluates the learner's status in relation to the education goals using a variety of measures.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Identifies basic areas of knowledge in content fields.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART III: This part of the questionnaire lists eight (8) educational needs of students in public schools in American Samoa as expressed by educators, parents and students themselves. You are to rank each need statement in the order of what you feel is currently most crucial for the education in American Samoa. Use number 1 to rank the need statement you feel is most crucial, use number 2 to rank the second most crucial, number 3 the third most crucial, and so on until you have ranked the last need statement number 8.

Use only one (1) number to rank each need statement.

Rank Order

Become proficient in mathematical skills. 

Be provided varied opportunities in physical education.

Be provided opportunities to study business education and office practice.

Be provided opportunities to learn basic industrial skills and improved agricultural and fishing practices.
Use only one (1) number to rank each need statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Statement</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read, speak and write English and understand oral English with greater proficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop greater fluency in the Samoan language and understand the elements of Samoan culture and history.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be provided opportunities to learn in specified subject matter fields not formally a part of the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have command of science methods and content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART IV: This part of the questionnaire consists of two questions. You are to write your answers in the space provided below each question.

1. List the teacher education goals that you feel are important but which were not listed in Part II of this questionnaire.

2. List the educational needs that you feel are important but which were not listed in PART II of this questionnaire.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION. THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE READ THE BACK OF THE NEXT PAGE FOR RETURNING INSTRUCTIONS.
INSTRUCTIONS

After you have completed the questionnaire, DO THE FOLLOWING THINGS:

1. Go back to the questionnaire to see that you have responded to all the questions in all the parts of the questionnaire.

2. Make sure you have not signed your name anywhere in the questionnaire.

3. Fold the questionnaire in three parts:

(Fold on line)

4. Cover the folded questionnaire with this cover sheet so that forward address is facing up, then seal by taping or stapling together.

5. Drop sealed questionnaire in the questionnaire box provided for you school in the office.

6. Check off ( ) your code on the list attached to questionnaire box.

(Fold on line)

CODE NUMBER

DUE MAY 6, 1983

Forward to: SALU H. REID
6581 HAWAII KAI DRIVE
HONOLULU, HAWAII
96825

(This side facing front)
### Table F-1

Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate (TAPP) and Total Addressed (TADD) Scores of Respondent Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teachers - TAPP</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers - TAPP</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Specialists - TAPP</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrators - TAPP</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teachers - TADD</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers - TADD</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Specialists - TADD</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrators - TADD</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F-2
Number of Responses and Means of Goal Clusters by Group and Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F-3
Number of Responses and Means of Goal Clusters by Group and Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>Addressed</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Addressed</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Addressed</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Addressed</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F-4
Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate (TAPP) Goal Scores and Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores of Respondents' Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samoan - TAPP</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Samoan - TAPP</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan - TADD</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Samoan - TADD</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F-5
Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate (TAPP) Goal Scores and Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores of Respondents' Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30 years - TAPP</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39 years - TAPP</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49 years - TAPP</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and over - TAPP</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30 years - TADD</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39 years - TADD</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49 years - TADD</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and over - TADD</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F-6
Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate (TAPP) Goal Scores and Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores of Respondents' Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary - TAPP</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary - TAPP</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary - TADD</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary - TADD</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F-7
Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate (TAPP) Goal Scores and Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores of Respondents' Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 10 years - TAPP</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 years - TAPP</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 and over - TAPP</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 10 years - TADD</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 years - TADD</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 and over - TADD</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F-8
Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate (TAPP) Goal Scores and Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores of Respondents' Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School - TAPP</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree - TAPP</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree - TAPP</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School - TADD</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree - TADD</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree - TADD</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F-9
Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate (TAPP) Goal Scores and Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores of Respondents' Residency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residency - TAPP</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residency - TAPP</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency - TADD</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residency - TADD</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F-10
Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate (TAPP) Goal Scores and Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores of Respondents' Matai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matai - TAPP</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Matai - TAPP</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matai - TADD</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Matai - TADD</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F-11
Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate (TAPP) Goal Scores and Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores of Respondents' Use of Samoan Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use Samoan - TAPP</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Samoan - TAPP</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Samoan - TADD</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Samoan - TADD</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F-12
Means and Standard Deviations of Total Appropriate (TAPP) Goal Scores and Total Addressed (TADD) Goal Scores of Respondents' Enrollment in Teacher Education Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled - TAPP</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Enrolled - TAPP</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled - TADD</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Enrolled - TADD</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F-13
Results of Group Relationship to Need Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R3</th>
<th>R4</th>
<th>R5</th>
<th>R6</th>
<th>R7</th>
<th>R8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teachers</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>1042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Teachers</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Specialists</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrators</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>2167</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

RESULTS OF OPEN-ENDED SURVEY QUESTIONS

Two hundred sixty-one educators answered the questions or 55 percent of the total sample.

The three most frequent responses relative to question one were:

1. **Samoa DOE related matters**
   - e.g. better hiring procedures, teacher salary, classroom facilities and better teacher-administrator communication
   - N: 81, %: 30

2. **Teacher Competency**
   - e.g. more workshops: methods and strategies, child development and lesson planning
   - N: 74, %: 28

3. **Self-Improvement**
   - e.g. punctuality, follow through with duties, and develop professional standards
   - N: 39, %: 15

The three most frequent responses relative to question two were:

1. **Provide adequate instructional materials for students**
   - N: 30, %: 11

2. **Provide continued inservice training for teachers**
   - N: 27, %: 10

3. **Develop closer school-community involvement**
   - N: 12, %: 5
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