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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Education "... is a broader concept than schooling and may go forward without schools. At the same time schools were organized in our society to enhance education and we assume that schools can and do just that" (Campbell & Layton, 1969, p. 1). Silberman, as reported by Rosenberg (1976, p. 14), "... has described American schools as 'grim and joyless places,' which are 'intellectually sterile and aesthetically barren.'"

The majority of the Trust Territory students leave their islands to obtain education beyond the secondary educational level. For the purposes of this study, the Trust Territory, often referred to as Micronesia, is defined as those Pacific Islands acquired by the United States after the Second World War. These islands (see Appendix A) were under the Japanese mandate during the existence of the League of Nations and were later transferred to the United Nations, under the trusteeship system administered by the United States (Murray, 1957). Most of the Trust Territory students seeking higher educational opportunities attend American colleges and universities (Edvalson, 1976a). Therefore, Trust Territory students are those Micronesians who are attending institutions of higher learning in the United States and its territory, Guam. It may be speculated that students are also faced with coping with the educational system as described by Illich (1971) and Silberman (1976).

1
The culturally diversified Trust Territory students are faced with unique obstacles during their years in American higher education. Culturally, geographically, and environmentally the Trust Territory students personify a contrasting background. The major hypothesis is that these differences will affect the Trust Territory students' satisfaction with college life.

The Problem Statement

The study was an investigation of the Trust Territory students' perceptions of factors—cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities—affecting their satisfaction with college life at selected institutions of higher learning.

The terms used in the preceding problem statement are defined as follows:

1. Cultural difference is defined as the variability in attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, and familiarity with man-made objects and tools (Hoebel, 1966).

2. Financial assistance is defined as those federally funded programs in which the Trust Territory students may participate. These include: (a) the College Work Study Program, which is a part-time employment opportunity averaging 15 hours per week while school is in session, and a maximum of 40 hours during vacations; (b) the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program, which is a direct award made to applicants who demonstrate exceptional financial need; (c) the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program, which is a direct award made to students based on their financial need in order to
attend college; and (d) the Federal Insured Student Loan, which is a loan offered to university students by participating banks with the federal government providing insurance for the loan (Student Personnel Services, 1976).

3. Academic performance refers to the student's perception of his/her educational accomplishments, encompassing the dimensions of language, work, time, and performance, relating to collegiate course work.

4. Housing facilities are defined as the place of abode while in attendance at an institution of higher learning.

5. Satisfaction with college life is defined as an attitude toward (a) the institution, (b) himself/herself with regard to the campus community, and (c) life in the United States in general.

6. Institutions of higher learning refer to junior colleges, community colleges, and four-year colleges and universities in the United States and Guam.

Overview of Importance

This is a study of students with different cultures, languages, and ethnic backgrounds. The Trust Territory students have been educated by the American educational system from kindergarten through the twelfth grade. In order to obtain post-secondary educational opportunities, the majority are being sent to the United States and its territory, Guam.

Countless questions have been raised over the suitability, appropriateness, and continued utilization of the American educational
system for the training of Trust Territory students. There are no easy answers to such questions. The issues are complex and controversial. There is increasing evidence that the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands will have a long and lasting affiliation with the United States. The establishment of the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, in which Saipan (a Commonwealth member) was formerly the capital of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, is an example of the desire on the part of the Micronesian people to perpetuate this relationship. Equally important is the fact that the number of Trust Territory students attending institutions of higher learning within the United States as compared to other foreign countries is increasing (Edvalson, 1976b).

The United States government has recognized the need for educating Trust Territory youth beyond the secondary level. As a result, the United States Congress has authorized an $8,000,000 expenditure for the construction of a four-year college in Micronesia (Harlan, 1976). However, before the authorized amount is to be disbursed, the President of the United States must report the answers to two basic questions asked by Congress (Harlan, 1976). They are:

1. Is a college needed? If so,

2. What is the appropriate educational concept for it?

Rather than debate the issue whether or not a college is needed in Micronesia, this investigator's question was, What makes an American education satisfactory to Micronesians? Some of the facts enumerated in the "Tentative Outline of Alternative Recommendations for the President's Report to Congress on a College for Micronesia" by former
Special Assistant Harlan (1976), in the Office of Territorial Affairs, are as follows:

1. In 1976, 1,256 Trust Territory students graduated from high school. Based upon a population projection for the year 2,000, one can expect 2,500 Trust Territory students graduating from high school.

2. Currently, there are an estimated 2,000 Trust Territory students in post-secondary education. Six hundred of these students are attending Trust Territory institutions of higher learning, the Micronesian Occupational Center and the Community College of Micronesia. Neither of these institutions is accredited. Approximately 350 of the students are attending the University of Guam, while the majority of the remaining students are being educated in the United States mainland.

3. Of the 1,200 jobs in the Trust Territory requiring a college degree, only 360 are held by Trust Territory citizens.

4. There are 3,888 (approximately 89%) out of 4,368 Trust Territory elementary school teachers and 187 (approximately 60%) of the 311 secondary school teachers who do not have college training.

The above facts are indicative of several conditions. First, the potential population of post-secondary students is increasing. Second, a large number of graduating Trust Territory students are seeking and will continue to seek a college education. Third, by their selection of colleges, the majority of Micronesians are choosing to be educated in the United States. Fourth, most Micronesians lack the necessary college education for effective job placement. This is particularly true of the overwhelming majority of Trust
Territory school teachers who are inadequately prepared. Therefore, the quality of education received by the Trust Territory students is undoubtedly low by United States standards. This condition, in all probability, has implications for those students who elect to pursue a higher education.

An in depth study of the successes and failures of educating Trust Territory students in an American higher educational system is a logical starting point for investigating this issue. The problem necessitates the consideration of many facets. At the same time, the ability of any single study to successfully answer all the questions surrounding higher education is unrealistic. One must, therefore, begin with the first logical step toward accomplishing this objective. Consequently, an investigation of the present situation, as perceived by Trust Territory students with regard to their campus life, is a must. It is only upon learning the Micronesian perceptions of the American higher educational system, of which they are a consumer, that meaningful consideration and impact upon the identified problems can begin.

The Delimitations

The study was limited to those selected institutions of higher learning in the United States and Guam which had 30 or more Trust Territory students enrolled and to those Trust Territory students on the freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior levels.

The study was further limited to those institutions having programs specifically for Trust Territory students. The programs for
determining the population of institutions were the "Sponsorship Program," the "Micronesian Mission Understanding," and the "Trust Territory Student Summer Camp Program." The United States institutions that are involved in these three programs are Suomi College in Hancock, Michigan; the University of Guam in Agana, Guam; and the Grand Valley State College in Allendale, Michigan.

A Brief Rationale

Trust Territory students are considered foreign students for immigration purposes. Therefore, a financial statement is required of these students to insure that the students have adequate financial support while in the United States. This is an immigration safeguard in order to prevent a Trust Territory student from becoming a burden to the state of residence at a later date. Because of the financial situation of the Trust Territory economy, the Sponsorship Program was initiated at the University of Guam. The program requires that the sponsor of any Trust Territory student takes the responsibility of meeting the student's physical, emotional, social, and financial needs. The program has afforded some students an opportunity to attend the University of Guam (Olter, 1977). This program has enabled at least 10% of those Micronesian students at the University of Guam campus to minimize the obstacles of adjustment and basic need fulfillment essential to a successful transition to campus life (Sobral, 1977). In spite of its merits, the number of students participating in the Sponsorship Program has declined in recent years (Sobral, 1977). Evidence would indicate that one of the reasons for the
decline is the unwillingness of sponsors to assume the specific responsibilities required by the program.

The administration at Suomi College has instituted a program primarily for Micronesian students. Pacific Micronesian Cultural Aid Incorporated was established in 1966 as a privately registered organization in Michigan. This non-profit organization was formed by Michael Caldwell who is a former Dean of Students at Suomi College, Sue Caldwell, and Esther Pekkala, a secretary at Suomi College.

As an outgrowth of the Pacific Micronesian Cultural Aid Program, Suomi College's Micronesian Mission Understanding project came into being as part of the institution. The primary purpose of the Micronesian project was to create international and intercultural understanding in a community of caring. In so doing, Suomi has left itself open to misunderstanding, criticism, and even, hostility from the people in the surrounding communities. The hostility Suomi has felt in recent years has been specifically directed toward the institution's Micronesian students (Strang, 1974).

Parenthetically, Micronesian Mission Understanding began as a project in Suomi College to orient both the community and the Micronesian students to each other. Courses were designed specifically for the local community and the Trust Territory students to aid in their understanding of each other. The Trust Territory students attending Suomi College assisted in the orientation program for the college community. Representatives of the institutions were sent to Micronesia for the summer in order to become sensitized to the real and potential difficulties of the Micronesian students.
The Micronesian Mainland Education Project, under the auspices of the National Demonstration Project-Talent Search (1975-1976) and directed by David J. Strang, Dean of Students, Suomi College, led to the formation of a collegial consortium. Participation included Grand Valley State College, North Florida Junior College, and Concordia College in Nebraska during the second year of the program. The other cooperating institutions were Lake Superior State College in Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan; Northern Michigan University in Marquette, Michigan; Texas Lutheran College in Sequin, Texas; and Wagner College in Staten Island, New York. The consortium met to discuss "human concerns which confront and confound Micronesian students in the mainland ..." (Strang, 1976a, p. 2). The areas discussed were homesickness, alcoholism, dating mores, too much freedom, and poor English comprehension (Strang, 1976a). The consortium is concerned with all Trust Territory students throughout the United States and Guam, rather than with only those students who are on the campus of the Micronesian Mainland Education Project member institutions of higher learning.

Institutionally, Suomi College has been the forerunner in leadership for Micronesian student assistance. Similarly, the University of Guam has been the institution which has had the largest percentage of Trust Territory students enrolled of all other colleges and universities combined. This represents approximately 350 of the total Trust Territory student body attending institutions of higher learning both in the United States and other foreign countries (Edvalson, 1976a).
Grand Valley State College has initiated a Micronesian student summer and interim program which involves Micronesian students during vacation periods while the rest of the student body is off campus. The primary program activities are assigning Micronesians to work as summer camp counselors and arranging field trips for Micronesians to other areas of the continental United States. Both of these activities are intended to assist the students financially and facilitate reacculturation (Harding, 1976).

These programs recognize there is a need for assistance to the Micronesian student. While the Micronesians are considered foreigners, they have no representative from their government to assist them. Micronesian students face problems related to daily living and their educational programs. This study was intended to investigate how the Trust Territory students perceive four major areas (cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities) in those selected institutions that have taken the initiative to single-out the Micronesian students and assist them through specific programs.

The study was an appropriate beginning for an investigation of the Micronesian problem. The three previously discussed institutions (Suomi College, Grand Valley State College, and the University of Guam) are the only ones participating in specific programs designed to facilitate the Micronesian students. All three institutions have encountered difficulties with Micronesian students. The existence of the programs discussed is evidence that Micronesian students have been formally recognized as needing additional attention.
Organization of the Study

The dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter I presents the introduction to the study, the statement of the problem, the overview of importance, the delimitations of the study, and the organization of the study. Chapter II contains the purpose and the rationale for the study in terms of cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing. These four areas are discussed as a rationale for the study with regard to the hypotheses which have been formulated around them and are presented in Chapter II. Chapter III includes the design of the study. It includes: (a) the review of the purposes of the study, (b) the population, (c) instrumentation, (d) procedures for data gathering, (e) procedures for data analysis, and (f) summary. Chapter IV contains the results of the study. It includes: (a) the description of the response rates, (b) perceptions by districts, (c) perceptions by grade level, (d) district/grade level interaction effect, and (e) perceptions of satisfaction with campus life. Chapter V presents the summary and conclusions. This chapter is made up of: (a) a review of the study, (b) a discussion of findings, (c) conclusions, and (d) implications of the study.
CHAPTER II

PURPOSE AND RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

A Historical Background

The Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, the Marshall Islands, Ponape, Truk, and Yap comprise the six administrative districts of the Trust Territory. While the islands of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are principally composed of the Micronesian Islands, and to a lesser extent of the Polynesian Islands, each district represents a distinct ethnic background (Puyo, 1964). With the exception of the Kapingamarangi, the Nukuoronians, and a smattering of other racial groups, the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands are classified, in a general sense, as Micronesians. A matrilineal society is found everywhere except in Nukuoro and Kapingamarangi; a cultural quality unlike that of the United States (Trust Territory Headquarters, 1975).

In order to place the study in its true perspective, a historical accounting of the Trust Territory and its development is necessary. This section deals with the primary events concerning the islands and their people. The following account, unless another source is cited, is obtained from the Briefing Materials (1975) prepared by the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands Headquarters in Saipan.

In 1521, Magellan discovered the southernmost island (Guam) of the Mariana Archipelago. In time, other Spanish explorers became
familiar with the islands and named them after the wife of Philip IV, Queen Maria Ana.

During 1526, the Portuguese discovered Yap and Ulithi. At a later period, the Spaniards sighted these islands (Yap and Ulithi) and many other islands and named the archipelago "Caroline," for Charles II of Spain. In 1529, a group of islands known as the Marshall Islands was discovered by the Spaniards, but was not named until 1778 when the English Captain Marshall made an exploratory voyage into the region.

In the latter part of the 19th century, Spain extended her administrative territory to include both the Caroline and the Marshall Islands. In 1885, Germany claimed formal possession of the Marshall Islands. This infuriated the Spanish Government. To avoid international confrontation, the issue was referred to Pope Leo XIII for mediation. The outcomes were (a) the confirmation of Spain's claim to sovereignty over the Carolines, (b) the maintenance by Spain of an orderly government of her sovereign right over the Carolines, and (c) the preservation of Germany's right to trade with the Caroline Islands.

The United States acquired Guam in 1898 as a result of the Spanish-American War. The following year, Spain decided to withdraw her interest from the Pacific and sold all her remaining Micronesian possessions to Germany. The German control of Micronesia ended with the outbreak of World War I.

By December 17, 1920, the League of Nations had entrusted to Japan the responsibility of administering the islands of Micronesia under the Mandate System. In 1935, Japan withdrew from the League of
Nations until 1938. During October, 1941, Japan took possession of the Marshall Islands, the Carolines, and the Northern Marianas.

With the outbreak of World War II, Micronesia became the bulwark for the Japanese, forming a natural barrier from which to operate against the Allied Forces. As each island was occupied by the American troops, it became subject to United States authority in accordance with the international law of belligerent occupation until July 1947, when the islands formally became a United Nations' Trust Territory. (Trust Territory, 1975, p. 6)

In 1947, the United States proposed the formation of a Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. This proposal was unanimously approved by the United Nations' membership. However, ratification of such a proposal was not obtained until September 8, 1951, when Japan signed a Treaty of Peace in San Francisco (Murray, 1957).

Recent political developments in Micronesia include the granting of United States citizenship to the people of Guam (Carano & Sanchez, 1965), the creation of the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas (Coleman, 1977, p. 1), and the current constitutional activity of the Trust Territory (Jacobs, 1977).

The Marianas withdrew from the Trust Territory and voted to become a separate commonwealth of the United States, which was granted to them in 1976 (Basilius, 1976). As a result of the establishment of the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, the administrative center (capital of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) has been transferred to Ponape.

Not only is the political future of the Trust Territory uncertain, but fundamentally the very existence of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is in question. The termination of the Trusteeship Agreement may be realized within 5 years (Basilius, 1976). The
United States' trusteeship of Micronesia will expire in 1981 (Jones, 1977). Political fragmentation of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands seems to be quite likely. Although there is a political division within Micronesia already, optimistically, there appears to be a desire among the islands' leaders to remain in close ties with the United States. An example of this is that the Palau Status Commission has begun to press for a "permanent association" with the United States; however, the Commission does not expect the district to assume a commonwealth association with the United States (Uludong, 1977, p. 1). Regardless of Palau's political fate, Micronesia should be of paramount interest to the United States. Speculation would indicate the United States, and in turn its educational system, will play a major role in Micronesia's future.

Significance of the Study

The Sixth Congress of Micronesia (1975-1976) recognized the importance of educating its youth (Tun, 1975). To gain further insight into the education of Micronesian students, the Student Assistance Office was established in 1976 at the Trust Territory Department of Education Headquarters in Saipan. It is apparent that the students from the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands have not been as successful as others in obtaining higher education degrees. An informal study made in the Registrar's Office at the University of Guam has suggested that Trust Territory students may require more than 4 years to accomplish a normal 4-year course of study. In comparing the Trust Territory students to American students, the Trust Territory
students seem to take 2 years longer on the average to complete a 4-year program (Cruz, 1975).

There are several problem areas confronting the Trust Territory students. Several communities in Michigan, which have Trust Territory students in residence, were visited by the author. Racial and ethnic stereotyping of the Trust Territory students was found to be a common occurrence. An example of the problem is found in the account given by the Dean of Students, David J. Strang, at Suomi College in Hancock, Michigan.

Our own students, faculty, and staff members have made the mistake of assuming that Micronesian students are black when their heritage is Asiatic and Melanesian. Townspeople have only "baited" our Micronesian students by calling them "Pineapples" and "Niggers." And when one of our students responded to such taunts, disputes have broken out. Invariably, our "White" police force arrest the "Micros," as they call them, while letting the "Townies" go free. Recently one of our students was accused of assault and battery after he had spent three days in the hospital while his assailants went unscathed. The police wanted the college to send the young man home; but we decided to go into court and contest the case. Our student was found guilty of being disorderly, and put on 90 days voluntary probation, but, because he was found not guilty of assault, all charges were dropped and no fine or jail sentence was imposed. (Strang, 1974, pp. 2-3)

Whether the Trust Territory students are called "Niggers," "Pineapples," "Micros," or "Indians," racial tensions are evident in the relationship between the Trust Territory students and the communities in which they reside.

The community in which Trust Territory students reside, typically the college dormitory, has presented a multitude of problems for Trust Territory students. The problems inherent in dormitory living transcend the individual student. Some of the problems faced
for the first time in dormitory living include the use of bathroom facilities, the degree of sexual freedom, the day versus night sleeping habits, and the use of communal property. These and other culturally imbedded behaviors lead to intercultural conflict that may result in violence. The University of Guam's dormitory director resigned in 1973 because of a knifing incident which left him scarred for life; and to further add to the problem, no one would accept the dormitory directorship from 1973-1975 (Chargualaf, 1975).

Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan, has physically separated Trust Territory students from each other by instituting a practice that controls the number of Micronesians living in the same dormitory complex. In practice, there are no more than two Trust Territory students living in the same dormitory (Jackson, 1976).

Grand Valley State College, located in Allendale, Michigan, has deemed it necessary to screen the male from the Trust Territory very carefully with regard to admittance at the college (Scott, 1976). It has gotten to the point where other students at Grand Valley State College "will not be" in the same room with a Micronesian (Harding, 1976).

The previously mentioned examples are from only two regions, Guam and the state of Michigan. These two regions were specifically chosen because more Trust Territory students are located in institutions of higher learning in these areas than in any other. While Guam is a part of Micronesia, it is not part of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Guam typifies most of the cultural characteristics of the United States as a result of its long association
through a military trusteeship, and presently as an unincorporated territory. This status gives the island's inhabitants all the privileges of United States citizenship, with the exception of the right to vote in presidential elections. It is therefore anticipated that Trust Territory students attending the University of Guam experience similar adjustment problems with regard to campus living as do their peers who are attending "stateside" institutions.

Additional investigation into the study area has indicated that research on Trust Territory education is extremely limited. Administrators of Micronesian education are concerned over the lack of records available for data gathering on Micronesian students. The available data is limited and grossly inadequate. School records, students' personnel files, and other related information sources are either incomplete or not to be found (Edvalson, 1976b). The lack of needed data sources compounds the difficulty of the task of adequately coping with Trust Territory students' adjustment problems.

The Hypotheses and Their Rationale

As a result of the previously described situation, the hypotheses investigated in this study are constructed to focus upon the perceived differences and difficulties associated with Trust Territory students who are attending United States institutions of higher learning.

The First Hypothesis

The first hypothesis is that Trust Territory students from each district will have different perceptions of cultural differences.
The sub-hypotheses. There are 15 sub-hypotheses which together involve all pairings of the six districts. Each sub-hypothesis predicts a difference in student perceptions of cultural differences between two districts, e.g., Students from the Marianas and the Marshall Districts will have different perceptions of cultural differences.

Rationale for the first hypothesis and its sub-hypotheses.

Intra- and inter-district customs differ among the six districts. This is due, in part, to the geographic location of the individual Micronesian Islands. Micronesia encompasses about 3,000,000 square miles of the Western Pacific Basin just north of the equator. Its location is approximately 1 degree north latitude and 170 degrees east longitude (see Appendix A). The Micronesian Islands vary in size from tiny coral islets, which are formed from a coral atoll, such as the Bikini Atoll, to substantial volcanic islands, such as Maug.

A reflection of the geographic diversity is mirrored in the variation of languages inculcated into Micronesia. Every language is a special way of looking at the world and interpreting experience (Kluckhohn, 1970). Language is a "complex medium of oral expression of a speech community." Culture has the profoundest effect upon vocabulary (Jacobs & Stern, 1955). Although the Micronesian languages have a common Austronesian source (Costenoble, 1974), nine major languages are spoken in the six administrative districts (Briefing Materials, 1975). In addition, some districts that were previously inhabited by large foreign populations--Spanish, German, or Japanese--had additional languages imposed upon the indigenous people. The
schools were the primary vehicle for language indoctrination (Ramarui, 1976). Consequently, many of the older people know, at least, the conversational aspects of these "foreign" languages.

In all districts, English is the official language. Chamorro, Spanish, and Japanese are spoken by the Saipanese. German and Marshallese are spoken in the Marshall Islands. Palauan, Sonsorolese—Tobian, and Japanese are spoken in Ponape. In Truk, Trukese is the native language. In Yap, Japanese, Yapese, and Ulithi-Woleai are spoken.

In general, each island within each district has its own dialect. Within each district, therefore, communication may be difficult, but not impossible. Between districts it is often impossible. Any differences in attitudes and beliefs that exist are unlikely to be reduced through interpersonal communications due to language barriers.

The control of the individual Micronesian islands by different foreign nations at various lengths of time has widened the gap of acculturation within and among the islands. Every district culture within Micronesia is an outcome of the events in its history. The rate of cultural change differs from region to region because of the strategic role each island and district played in the economic, political and recreational development of the region (Kluckhohn, 1970).

This phenomenon may be illustrated by a brief characterization of the six districts as they exist today. The Mariana Islands (Rota, Tinian, and Saipan) are the most highly developed economically. Palau is next in terms of economic development due to the Van Camp tuna fishing industry. The remaining four districts (Marshalls,
Ponape, Truk, and Yap) are almost completely undeveloped. It should be recognized that all of the islands would be considered undeveloped by United States standards.

Truk, because of its sunken World War II artifacts, is a recreational center for scuba divers. Tourists are also invited by Saipan (Marianas), while the remaining districts discourage tourism within their islands.

The task of reacculturation of the Micronesian people to a foreign land (the United States) is dependent upon the extent of the differences between the new culture to be entered and the old culture, which is a product of the area's cultural history. The discovery of the islands in the Trust Territory by different nations, at various times, and with different lengths of foreign control has resulted in reflecting a relatively unique cultural heritage in each district and its people (Ramarui, 1976).

It seems reasonable to hypothesize that the magnitude of cultural shock is amplified when the Trust Territory student enters western society. Some implications of this may be that persons placed in different cultures may experience role ambiguity and uncertainty. The conflict between old, learned responses and new, societal experiences can produce anxiety, fear, frustration, and the feeling of dissatisfaction and alienation (Toffler, 1971).

From this brief overview, it is evident that each district can be expected to differ substantially from the others in terms of its cultural attitudes.
The Second Hypothesis

The second hypothesis is that Trust Territory students from each district will have different perceptions of the adequacy and availability of financial assistance.

The sub-hypotheses. There are 15 sub-hypotheses which together involve all pairings of the six districts. Each sub-hypothesis predicts a difference in student perceptions of the adequacy and availability of financial assistance between two districts, e.g., Students from the Marianas and the Marshall Districts will have different perceptions of the adequacy and availability of financial assistance.

Rationale for the second hypothesis and its sub-hypotheses.
Languages and cultural differences are not the only sources of difficulty to Micronesians. The continually changing amount of financial assistance and its availability to Trust Territory students have compounded adjustment problems. In 1969, there were 13 common sources of financial aid compared to eight at the present time (Edvalson, 1976c). Two of the more substantial scholarships are presently non-existent or, when available, criteria for eligibility were drastically changed (Edvalson, 1976b).

Current financial assistance sources may be categorized into two major groupings. These categories, along with their sub-categories, represent the sources of financial assistance presently available to Trust Territory students. They are:

1. The Trust Territory Government
   a. Trust Territory (General) Scholarship
   b. Medical Scholarships
c. Congress of Micronesia Scholarships
d. Department of Transportation Scholarships
e. Department of Agricultural Scholarships
f. Library Services Scholarships
g. Educational Assistance Grants
h. Congress of Micronesian Student Loans

2. United States Government (Federal Programs)
   a. Basic Educational Opportunity Grants
   b. Supplementary Educational Grants
   c. College Work Study Program

In addition to a reduced number of sources of financial assistance, the bureaucratic red tape of stateside institutions compounds the difficulty of securing financial assistance for the Trust Territory students. Federal policy necessitates specific information, and documentation is next to impossible. The requirements of the 1040 Form, the lack of postal mail delivery and other services, the need for parental signatures, and other financial statements are major contributions to resulting financial problems.

Many different means are used to determine financial need. These include the American College Testing Program, the College Scholarship Service, Federal Income Tax forms, and individual institutional methods. Orwig (1970) found that in spite of the great diversity of sources for obtaining financial data, the College Scholarship Service is utilized by more institutions than all other methods combined.

A rather unique situation presently exists with regard to financial assistance. The eligibility of the Trust Territory students for
federal financial assistance, coupled with the economic situation of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, has made it appear relatively easy for Micronesian students to obtain financial benefits.

The Student Assistance Office at the Trust Territory Headquarters has been able to design a financial package for the individual students with the following criteria:

1. School of the student's choice.
2. Financial application forms, Trust Territory and Federal.
3. Student resources.
4. Family resources.
5. Potential Federal resources (limits establishment by the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Student Eligibility Report Index).
6. Potential school resources, based on (a) academic record, (b) recommendation, (c) minority/disadvantage status, and (d) established need.
7. Adequacy of funding.

"Ideally, if a gap still exists between the amount of aid available and the amount of aid offered, the remainder is provided from Micronesian sources" (Edvalson, 1976c, p. V). However, in practice, the difficulty of obtaining financial assistance is compounded not only by bureaucratic red tape, but also by the necessity of involving four different, geographically diversified agencies. They are:

1. Student Assistance Office
2. Student
3. Institution of higher learning
4. The District from which the student came
The problem is magnified by the fact that the financial aid recipient has to reapply on a yearly basis. Therefore, with all the compounding factors relating to the difficulty of obtaining financial aid, it is apparent that an investigation of the students' perception of the adequacy and availability of financial aid is a critical component of the study.

The Third Hypothesis

The third hypothesis is that Trust Territory students from different districts will have different perceptions of their academic performance.

The sub-hypotheses. There are 15 sub-hypotheses which together involve all pairings of the six districts. Each sub-hypothesis predicts a difference in student perceptions of their academic performance between two districts, e.g., Students from the Marianas and the Marshall Districts will have different perceptions of their academic performance.

Rationale for the third hypothesis and its sub-hypotheses. In addition to cultural and financial problems, maintaining an acceptable academic standing is a major task for many Trust Territory students (Perdew, 1974). Language barriers seem to be a significant contributor to poor academic performance (Perdew, 1974). Trust Territory students are required to take Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL), English Language Institute (ELI), or other related programs, before being admitted into regular college courses at the University of Guam and at Suomi College (Rogers, 1974; Strang, 1976b).
A discrepancy seems to exist between the difficulties encoun-
tered with language and the American educational system. Microne-
sians have accused "the system" of creating "Micro-Americans, white minds wrapped in brown skin" out of Micronesian students (Hazel, 1975).

Trust Territory Public Schools have been criticized for being oriented toward stateside standards instead of serving the Islands' need. The report of the 1973 United Nations Visiting Mission urged that Micronesia's educa-
tional system serve as a unifying agent to prepare the people for self-government and participation . . . (Howard, 1973, p. 30)

In addition, these stateside oriented systems would appear to be poorly operated and to do very little in preparing Micronesian youth for higher education in the United States.

Academic performance is critical for Micronesian students who are attending United States institutions of higher learning. In addi-
tion, scholarly achievement is related to satisfaction with campus life, and is therefore logically a part of this study.

The Fourth Hypothesis

The fourth hypothesis is that Trust Territory students from dif-
ferent districts will have different perceptions of the adequacy of housing facilities.

The sub-hypotheses. There are 15 sub-hypotheses which together involve all pairings of the six districts. Each sub-hypothesis pre-
dicts a difference in student perceptions of the adequacy of housing facilities between two districts, e.g., Students from the Marianas will differ in their perceptions of the adequacy of housing facilities.
Rationale for the fourth hypothesis and its sub-hypotheses.

Never has Toffler's "Cultural Shock" been more applicable than in the situation facing the Trust Territory students upon their arrival in the United States.

Take an individual out of his own culture, and set him down suddenly in an environment sharply different from his own, with a different set of cues to react to—different conceptions of time, space, work, love, religion, sex, and everything else—cut him off from any hope of retreat to a more familiar landscape, and the dislocation he suffers is doubly severe. (Toffler, 1971, pp. 11-12)

One of the many administrative problems that the institutions of higher learning is faced with in dealing with the Trust Territory students is housing (Castro, 1975). A recurring difficulty has been the selection of roommates. Roommates selectivity for the student should be based upon the particular student's values, personal habits, needs, and behavior. A study by Pierce (1970) concluded that selectivity of roommates should be based upon similar values. For optimum student growth and health, roommate selection should be based upon the needs of each individual. Cerny (1970) has shown that personal habits tend to be highly correlated with roommate compatibility. In 1955, Nudd found that roommate relationships failed because each person's behaviors were not consistent with the expectations held by their roommates. Cultural differences encompass differences in expectations.

The intra- and inter-district cultural uniqueness of the Trust Territory students has caused a considerable number of problems within the housing facilities in which they reside (Perdew, 1974). This is
illustrated by the previously mentioned practice of Western Michigan University which calls for placing no more than two Micronesian students in the same dormitory (Jackson, 1976). This limitation stems from frequent conflicts among Micronesians from different tribes when they reside together.

Compatibility of roommates transcends the Micronesian themselves. As previously mentioned (Harding, 1976), other students do not want to associate in the dormitory with Micronesians. This illustrates the severity of the housing problem with regard to Micronesian students.

A significant contributor to Micronesian student problems arises from the visibility of the Trust Territory students, not only in the dormitory and on the campus, but also in the community at large (Strang, 1974). This may be a result of the fact that Trust Territory students are generally older, in addition to having a dramatically different appearance, dress, habits, and behavior from the native population. These perceived differences make it easy to regard the Trust Territory students as "outsiders," and to treat them in discriminatory ways.

Apparently, from the time of arrival in the United States to the return to their islands, the Trust Territory students are faced with adjusting to the new society in which they reside. Therefore, the Micronesian students' perceptions of the adequacy of their housing facilities necessarily become a significant part of this study, in fact, housing is an integral part of society and its culture.
Rationale for the Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Hypotheses and Their Sub-Hypotheses

The previously discussed study conducted by the Registrar's Office at the University of Guam (Cruz, 1975), indicated that the Trust Territory students, on the average, complete their undergraduate program of study in 5 or 6 years. As a result of this extended residency in the United States, reacculturation of the Trust Territory students become more complete as students reside in the United States for longer periods of time. Consequently, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that students' length of stay on the mainland can be translated to academic grade levels. Parenthetically, freshmen students will have spent less time in the United States than sophomores. Similarly, sophomores will have resided on the mainland for a lesser period of time than juniors, the same would be true for juniors having a shorter period of United States living than seniors. No doubt there are exceptions to this assumption, but it is generally true that grade levels are reflective of the duration of mainland residency. Therefore, the consideration of the grade level variable may result in a significant difference in the perceptions of Trust Territory students. The grade level hypotheses are needed in a study of the perceptions of Trust Territory students and their satisfaction with campus life.

The Fifth Hypothesis

The fifth hypothesis is that Trust Territory students in different grade levels will differ in their perception of the cultural
differences.

The sub-hypotheses. There are six sub-hypotheses which together involve all pairings of the four grade levels. Each sub-hypothesis predicts a difference in student perceptions of cultural differences between two grade levels, e.g., Trust Territory students from the freshman level will differ in their perceptions of the cultural differences.

The Sixth Hypothesis

The sixth hypothesis is that Trust Territory students in the different grade levels will differ in their perceptions of the adequacy and availability of financial assistance.

The sub-hypotheses. There are six sub-hypotheses which together involve all pairings of the four grade levels. Each sub-hypothesis predicts a difference in student perceptions of the adequacy and availability of financial assistance between the two grade levels, e.g., Trust Territory students from the freshman level will differ in their perceptions of the adequacy and availability of financial assistance.

The Seventh Hypothesis

The seventh hypothesis is that Trust Territory students in different grade levels will differ in the perceptions of their academic performance.

The sub-hypotheses. There are six sub-hypotheses which together involve all pairings of the four grade levels. Each sub-hypothesis
predicts a difference in student perceptions of their academic performance between two grade levels, e.g., Trust Territory students from the freshman level will differ in their perceptions of their academic performance.

The Eighth Hypothesis

The eighth hypothesis is that Trust Territory students in the different grade levels will differ in their perceptions of the adequacy of their housing facilities.

The sub-hypotheses. There are six sub-hypotheses which together involve all pairings of the four grade levels. Each sub-hypothesis predicts a difference in student perceptions of the adequacy of their housing facilities between the two grade levels, e.g., Trust Territory students from the freshman level will differ in their perceptions of the adequacy of their housing facilities.

Rationale for the Interaction Effect

Though the interaction effect between districts and grade levels on the students' perceptions of (a) cultural differences, (b) the adequacy and availability of financial assistance, (c) their academic performance, and (d) adequacy of their housing facilities is hypothesized, there is no evidence to indicate that an interaction effect will be found. However, the data analysis procedures utilized will determine if and where an interaction effect occurs.
The Ninth Hypothesis

The ninth hypothesis is that there will be an interaction effect between district and grade level on the Trust Territory students' perceptions of cultural differences.

The Tenth Hypothesis

The tenth hypothesis is that there will be an interaction effect between district and grade level on the Trust Territory students' perceptions of the adequacy and availability of financial assistance.

The Eleventh Hypothesis

The eleventh hypothesis is that there will be an interaction effect between district and grade levels on the Trust Territory students' perceptions of academic performance.

The Twelfth Hypothesis

The twelfth hypothesis is that there will be an interaction effect between district and grade level on the Trust Territory students' perceptions of the adequacy of housing facilities.

Rationale for Satisfaction with Campus Life as a Dependent Variable

"... Perception cannot be observed directly in behavior, but must be inferred from performance and particularly from changes in performance or behavior" (Lindgren, 1965, p. 144). This research, "Comparative Study of the Trust Territory students' perceptions of
areas affecting satisfaction in college life at selected institutions of higher learning," was formulated from the viewpoint that the Trust Territory students' perceptions of each of the four major areas (cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities) will affect their satisfaction with campus life. While each area has been previously discussed, a brief rationale relating it to satisfaction is presented to articulate more fully the purposes of the study.

**Cultural differences.** Persons "... can tolerate a certain amount of change and instability, but too many rapid and violent changes in the perceptual field lead to anxiety, confusion and severe stress" (Lindgren, 1965, p. 153). Toffler's (1971) "Cultural Shock" with Trust Territory students may happen in varying degrees depending upon the individual students. The extent of reacculturation as reflected by the perceived cultural differences may very well affect the degree of satisfaction with campus life. The further one is removed from the culture in which he lives, the more likely one is to find the living experience less satisfying.

**Financial assistance.** Anxiety, confusion, and stress may be caused by the instability of the availability and adequacy of financial assistance. Therefore, this condition may affect the students' perceived level of satisfaction with campus life.

**Academic Performance.** Harlan (1976), in his tentative report to the President of the United States, has indicated that the quality of elementary and secondary education received by Trust Territory students is less than adequate. The low standard of education
undoubtedly has an adverse effect upon the individual students and their probability for success in higher education. Although Micronesian students can overcome this academic handicap, they may experience high levels of anxiety and frustration. Negative perceptions of academic performance may, therefore, be affecting their overall satisfaction with campus life.

Housing facilities. As was previously indicated, there are obvious differences between the Micronesian and the Western cultures. These differences may influence the perceived adequacy of housing facilities for Trust Territory students. Correspondingly, the extent of satisfaction with their housing experience may affect the perceived overall satisfaction with campus life.

The Thirteenth Hypothesis

The thirteenth hypothesis is that Trust Territory students with different perceptions of cultural differences will have different degrees of satisfaction with campus life.

The Fourteenth Hypothesis

The fourteenth hypothesis is that Trust Territory students with different perceptions of financial assistance will have different degrees of satisfaction with campus life.

The Fifteenth Hypothesis

The fifteenth hypothesis is that Trust Territory students with different perceptions of academic performance will have different
degrees of satisfaction with campus life.

The Sixteenth Hypothesis

The sixteenth hypothesis is that Trust Territory students with different perceptions of housing facilities will have different degrees of satisfaction with campus life.

Summary

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, encompassing 3,000,000 square miles, has been under foreign control from its discovery by these foreign powers, to the present. Spain, Germany, Japan, and the United States of America have all governed these islands at one time or another. The Micronesian islands have nine major languages with distinct cultural differences in each administrative district.

The economic and political developments of Micronesia have been painstakingly slow although in recent years an important change in their political status has been insured by the termination date (1981) for the Trusteeship of the Pacific Islands administered by the United States of America under the authority of the United Nations. Free association with the United States, federation of the Micronesian states, as well as commonwealth status have been sought by these Trust Territory administrative districts.

The Trust Territory students leaving home for their formal education can expect more than they anticipated. Cultural differences, financial availability, academic standards, and housing facilities
may greatly amplify Toffler's "Cultural Shock" on the Micronesian students. Therefore, the hypotheses investigated in this study focused upon the perceived differences and difficulties among the Trust Territory students who are attending United States institutions of higher learning.
CHAPTER III

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter includes the review of the purposes of the study, procedures for identifying the population to be studied, instrumentation, data gathering procedures, and data analysis conducted for the testing of the major hypotheses and their sub-hypotheses.

Review of the Purposes of the Study

The study investigates (a) Trust Territory students' perceptions by districts of cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities; (b) Trust Territory students' perceptions by grade level of cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities; (c) Trust Territory students' perceptions, by district and grade level, of cultural differences, financial assistance, and housing facilities; and (d) Trust Territory students' perceptions of cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities as they relate to satisfaction with campus life.

The Trust Territory students whose perceptions were the basis for this study are discussed under the procedures for identifying the population.
Population

The population was identified in accordance with the rationale presented in the "Delimitations" section of Chapter I. Briefly, this rationale dealt with the identification of those institutions of higher learning which (a) participated in one of the three programs discussed and (b) had at least 30 or more Micronesian students in attendance as freshmen, sophomores, juniors, or seniors.

The procedure utilized for identifying the specific institutions and the names of those students in attendance at each institution was as follows:

1. A visit to the Department of Education Headquarters of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in Saipan, Mariana Islands, was made in order to gain access to files containing information regarding institutions at which Micronesians were in attendance and programs in which the institution was participating.

   An interview of the Student Assistance Officer was held to determine the institutions of higher learning which complied with the criteria set under the Delimitations section.

2. Records, reports, files, and other related materials revealed that only three institutions met the established criteria. Again, these institutions were Grand Valley State College, Suomi College, and the University of Guam.

3. A listing of Trust Territory students and the institutions in which they were in attendance was prepared in Saipan. An analysis of the obtained information revealed two things. First, the list of students was outdated, being derived from records from the academic...
year 1975-1976. Second, Saipan officials indicated the listing of students was not complete.

4. In order to rectify the inaccurate and incomplete data, the researcher visited each of the three institutions in order to obtain an accurate listing of students. At Grand Valley State College and Suomi College, the Student Personnel Services Office provided a complete and accurate listing of those Micronesian students in attendance. The Trust Territory Student Coordinator's Office at the University of Guam provided a similar listing of those Micronesian students currently enrolled.

As a result of the aforementioned procedures, the study population consisted of all Micronesian freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior students in attendance at Grand Valley State College, Suomi College, and the University of Guam. This represented 46 students at Grand Valley State College, 38 students at Suomi College, and 384 students at the University of Guam for a population total of 468 students.

The study utilized the entire population for data gathering purposes and investigation. Consequently, no sampling procedures were necessary.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire items were developed to measure each variable of the study (see Appendix B). Each variable was sub-divided into a number of components (see Appendix C). The distribution of the instrument items focused upon the variable components being discussed.
Cultural Differences

Cultural differences were sub-divided into three divisions: (a) commitment, (b) communication, and (c) orientation. Commitment was operationalized to include punctuality with regard to appointments and work and keeping previously made appointments. Communication was concerned with the reciprocation of understanding between the Micronesian and other students and the surrounding difficulty of getting one's idea accepted. Orientation addressed itself to the desired initial institution of higher learning to be attended, cultural shock, and the institutional administration's understanding of Micronesian students.

Financial Assistance

Financial assistance was also sub-divided into three divisions: (a) adequacy, (b) application, and (c) administration. The operationalized sub-division of adequacy, included educational and living expenses, personal expenses, fund depletion, and supplemental budget. The sub-division application included the difficulties encountered in the completion of financial assistance application and difficulties encountered with required financial documentation from home. The third sub-division, administration of financial assistance, dealt with student perceptions of difficulties in receiving the awarded funds, and the insecurity of receiving funds in time for meeting educational expenses.
Academic Performance

Included under the academic performance sub-divisions were (a) language, (b) work, (c) time, and (d) performance. Language was operationalized to include understanding of class instruction and encountered difficulty with the English language. Work included difficulty with studies or college courses. Time entailed punctuality in class attendance, satisfactory completion of class assignments and course requirements. Performance included knowledge of course content, completion of the prescribed course of study, and earned grades in courses.

Housing Facilities

The housing facilities variable was sub-divided into three main divisions: (a) personal habits, (b) group-related, and (c) individual. Personal habits included perceptions of community living in a dormitory setting and American eating habits. Group-related items included roommate preference, access to Micronesian friends' rooms, and the noise level of the housing facilities. The items under the sub-division, individual, were adequacy of housing needs, previous roommate assignments, and the suitableness of present housing facilities.

Satisfaction

The dependent variable, satisfaction, was sub-divided into three divisions: (a) school, (b) students, and (c) general. School was operationalized to include the Micronesian's interest in the
institution of higher learning being attended, recommendation of the institution to other Micronesian students, and transference to a different institution. The sub-division, students, included participation in student activities, acceptance and feeling a part of the institution, and attendance and enjoyment of student sports events. The third sub-division, general, included the student's desire to stay in the United States after completion of the degree program, adaptability to the weather, and general satisfaction.

Data Gathering Procedures

A Brief Rationale

Due to the professional experience of the investigator with the Micronesian students, 9 years as an administrator at the University of Guam, working with federal aid program, the Sponsorship Program, and other programs which involved Micronesian students, it was apparent that it would be necessary to incorporate the assistance of a facilitator in the distribution and gathering of the questionnaires at each institution. The utilization of a facilitator was intended to insure that the dissemination and gathering of the instrument was thoroughly and accurately completed. The ultimate success of the study was dependent upon, to a great extent, the utilization of the facilitator.

The steps incorporated to gather data were as follows:

1. During an on-site visit to the institution, responsible and appropriate facilitators were identified and recruited to assist in the distribution and gathering of the questionnaires. The
facilitators were personally approached by the investigator for their assistance.

2. Two requests were made of the facilitators: (a) that a listing of Trust Territory students be prepared and (b) that they distribute the questionnaires to each Trust Territory student and gather the completed questionnaires.

3. Each facilitator was provided a checklist of Trust Territory students and the appropriate number of questionnaires. The facilitators were requested to utilize the following procedures for data gathering: (a) distribute the questionnaires without any verbal instructions on how to complete the questionnaires (the directions for completing the questionnaires were self-explanatory) and (b) the completed questionnaires were to be returned to the facilitator by the students. Due to institution uniqueness, each facilitator was requested to select the most appropriate time and place for administering the questionnaire. Specific instructions were a part of the questionnaire (see Appendix B). It should be noted that the investigator assumed many of the functions of the facilitator at the University of Guam. This was particularly true of the follow-up necessary to obtain the completed questionnaires.

4. After collection by the facilitator, the questionnaires were mailed to the investigator. The completed questionnaires at the University of Guam were personally delivered to the investigator by the students.
Procedures for Data Analysis

Scoring

The items in the questionnaire were derived from sub-categories developed within each dependent variable. Each item was scored on a 5-point scale: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neither agree nor disagree; 4 = agree; and 5 = strongly agree. Items which have a negative connotation were reversed in the scoring to insure consistency in the direction of the positive response. The mean of the responses of the set of items corresponding to a variable was computed for each respondent. The high end of the scale corresponds to the student perceiving no problems with the area under consideration while the low end corresponds to the student perceiving such problems. The data analysis conducted utilized the mean response for each person by variable.

Missing Data

For those variables which had missing data, the unanswered questionnaire items were deleted from the treatment. The remaining items pertaining to the specific variable were then utilized in calculating the mean. This procedure was utilized in all cases rather than eliminating all items for that individual which focused upon a certain variable. In this way, maximum utilization of the questionnaire items was obtained.
Data Analysis for the Major Hypotheses and Their Sub-Hypotheses

The first group of hypotheses. The first group of major hypotheses pertained to Trust Territory students from each district having different perceptions of cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities. Initially, the data analysis for the first group of major hypotheses was a description of response rates. The remaining data analysis for the first set of major hypotheses utilized the two-way fixed effects analysis of variance (Glass & Stanley, 1970, p. 400).

In those cases in which the major hypotheses were supported, a post-hoc analysis was conducted using the Scheffe test (Glass & Stanley, 1970; Kerlinger, 1973). This was done to test each of the sub-hypotheses pertaining to specific districts in order to determine significant differences in perceptions.

The second group of hypotheses. The second group of major hypotheses pertained to Trust Territory students in different grade levels having different perceptions of cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities. A description of response rates was also compiled for the second group of hypotheses. The data analysis for the second set of major hypotheses also utilized a two-way fixed effects analysis of variance.

Again, in those cases in which the major hypotheses were supported, a post-hoc analysis was conducted using the Scheffe test. This was done to test each of the sub-hypotheses pertaining to specific grade levels in order to determine significant differences in perceptions.
The third group of hypotheses. The third group of major hypotheses pertained to the interaction effect between districts and grade levels and Trust Territory students' perceptions of cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities. A two-way fixed effects analysis of variance was also utilized for the third group of hypotheses.

The fourth group of hypotheses. The fourth group of major hypotheses pertained to Trust Territory students with different perceptions of cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities having different degrees of satisfaction with campus life. A Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient (Glass & Stanley, 1970, pp. 109-113) was computed for the purpose of testing those hypotheses.

Summary

The Design of the Study presented a brief review of the purposes of the research. The population and the methods of identification were described. It was indicated that the entire population was to be studied; hence, no sampling procedures were discussed.

The instrumentation was developed to test Trust Territory students' perceptions of cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities by district and grade level. Differences in satisfaction with campus life were also hypothesized and included in the instrumentation.

The specific procedures for data gathering were discussed. This was followed by a description of the data analysis to be conducted.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

In this chapter, the results of the study are organized into the following areas: (a) description of response rates and respondents, (b) perceptions by districts, (c) perceptions by grade level, and (d) analysis of results with respect to each hypothesis.

Description of Response Rates and Respondents

This section describes the response rate and respondents in the study. In order to place the results in proper perspective, a brief review of the study population is presented.

Respondents

The total population as it was defined (468 students from the Trust Territory) was utilized in the study. Micronesian students at Suomi College, Grand Valley State College, and the University of Guam were used in this study. Responses from the students attending these selected institutions had a total response rate of 72%. The difference in the rate of return from the institutions with the best response rate to that with the worst was 8.5% (see Table 1). More of the students attended and most of the respondents were from the University of Guam. Eighty-two percent of the population attended the University of Guam. Grand Valley State College encompassed 9.8% of the respondents, while Suomi College made up 8.1% of the total respondents.
Table 1

Return Rate by Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suomi College</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Valley State College</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Guam</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further analysis of the population revealed that a breakdown of respondents by districts (see Table 2) indicated that the highest concentration of Micronesian students came from the districts of Ponape and the Marianas.

The distribution of respondents by grade level is depicted in Table 2. The mean class level was approximately 2.0, or the beginning of the sophomore year.

A cross tabulation of respondents by district and grade level (see Table 2) indicated that the highest number of respondents within a cell was at the freshman level from the Mariana District. The cells were relatively proportional both horizontally and vertically. The exceptions to this were three cells which contained fewer than three respondents or less than 1% of the total number of respondents.

The smallness of the aforementioned cells made it necessary to collapse the grade levels of Freshmen, Sophomores, Juniors, and Seniors into a lower division (Freshmen and Sophomores) and an upper
### Table 2

Distribution of Respondents by District and Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Mariana</th>
<th>Marshall</th>
<th>Palau</th>
<th>Ponape</th>
<th>Truk</th>
<th>Yap</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.95%</td>
<td>6.33%</td>
<td>5.72%</td>
<td>8.43%</td>
<td>8.43%</td>
<td>4.52%</td>
<td>46.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.71%</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td>5.72%</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td>4.52%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>21.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.01%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>4.22%</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td>18.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>4.22%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>332^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.59%</td>
<td>9.64%</td>
<td>19.88%</td>
<td>22.59%</td>
<td>17.17%</td>
<td>8.13%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a**Difference between Tables 1 and 2 are due to incomplete grade level indication.**
division (Juniors and Seniors). For the data analysis techniques to be meaningful or in some cases possible, the presence of the extremely small cells had to be calculated. Similarly, the Marshall District had to be eliminated from the responses because the collapsed grade levels left the upper division (Juniors and Seniors) cell for the Marshall District with only three individuals (less than 1% of the total population). Table 3 presents the collapsed grade levels by district with the Marshall District eliminated. In the three colleges studied, there were only 32 students from the Marshall Islands. Because the numbers in each cell of Table 3 for the Marshall District were too small for valid analysis, they were not included. The reporting of results by district and grade level is presented utilizing the collapsed grade levels and the Marshall District eliminated.

Table 3
Collapsed Distribution of Respondents\textsuperscript{a} by District and Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Mariana</th>
<th>Palau</th>
<th>Ponape</th>
<th>Truk</th>
<th>Yap</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>9.44%</td>
<td>16.08%</td>
<td>15.03%</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
<td>64.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.04%</td>
<td>9.79%</td>
<td>9.44%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>35.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>286\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.22%</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
<td>25.52%</td>
<td>19.44%</td>
<td>9.44%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Number of respondents from Marshall District was too small for valid analysis.

\textsuperscript{b}Differences in totals between Tables 2 and 3 are due to incomplete questionnaires.
Perceptions by District

The perceptions of the Trust Territory students by districts are presented in the ensuing section as they are related to cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities (see Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7).

Cultural Differences

Perceptions of the cultural differences variable revealed that the means of the responses by district ranged from 2.84 to 3.10 (see Table 4). The mean response for all districts combined was 3.0. Utilizing the instrument rating scale, the mean response of 3.0 was directly upon "neither agree nor disagree" with statements expressing the view that there are small cultural differences.

Financial Assistance

Following district perceptions of cultural differences, the financial assistance variable was matched with the responses by district. Table 5 presents the mean responses to those items pertaining to the variable by district. The means ranged from 2.24 to 2.42. The total group had a combined mean of 2.34. This value was between "disagree" (2.0) and "neither agree nor disagree" (3.0) with statements extolling the adequacy, application, and administration of financial assistance. Therefore, the respondents perceived to some degree problems with financial assistance.
Table 4
Cultural Differences: Mean Responses by District and Grade Level

|                | Mariana | Palau | Ponape | Truk | Yap | Division
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean(^a)</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean(^a)</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Means</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)A rating scale value of 5 means that the respondents felt there were no cultural differences while a rating scale value of 1 means there were great cultural differences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mariana</th>
<th>Palau</th>
<th>Ponape</th>
<th>Truk</th>
<th>Yap</th>
<th>Division Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Means</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*A rating scale value of 5 means that the respondents felt their financial assistance was adequate while a rating scale value of 1 means their financial assistance was inadequate.
Academic Performance

The third dependent variable, academic performance, was also measured by district. Table 6 reports the mean responses for each district. The district means presented in the table had a range from a low of 2.89 to a high of 3.35. The combined mean for all districts was 3.14. This value was placed between "neither agree nor disagree" (3.0) and "agree" (4.0) with statements expressing no difficulty with language, studies, use of time, and academic performance outcomes. Therefore, the respondents' perceptions tended towards no problems with academic performance.

Housing Facilities

The fourth variable to be matched with the respondents by district was housing facilities. Table 7 presents the mean responses for each of the five districts. The means of the district were between 2.95 and 3.44. The combined mean for all districts was 3.15. This value was between "neither agree nor disagree" (3.0) and "agree" (4.0) with statements describing mainland U.S.A. personal habits, group relationships, and individual feelings of housing adequacy. Therefore, the respondents tended to perceive the housing facilities towards the adequate end of the scale.

Perceptions by Grade Level

The perceptions of Trust Territory students of cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing
Table 6

Academic Performance: Mean Responses by District and Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division Means</th>
<th>Mariana</th>
<th>Palau</th>
<th>Ponape</th>
<th>Truk</th>
<th>Yap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Means</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>A rating scale value of 5 means that the respondents felt their academic performance was adequate while a rating scale value of 1 means their academic performance was inadequate.
## Table 7

**Housing Facilities: Mean Responses by District and Grade Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Mariana</th>
<th>Palau</th>
<th>Ponape</th>
<th>Truk</th>
<th>Yap</th>
<th>District Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.30 2.82 3.13 3.18 3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.57 3.08 2.95 3.10 3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>A rating scale value of 5 means that the respondents felt their housing facilities were adequate while a rating scale value of 1 means their housing facilities were inadequate.
facilities were also presented by grade levels. Again, because of small numbers, the Marshall District was eliminated from the grade levels when they were collapsed into a lower division (Freshmen and Sophomores) and an upper division (Juniors and Seniors).

Cultural Differences

For the cultural differences variable, the lower division had a range of means from 2.85 to 3.08 (see Table 4). The mean for the entire lower division was 2.96.

The upper division respondents had means ranging from a low of 2.83 to a high of 3.15. Their combined mean was 3.03. Consequently, the upperclassmen perceived the presence of cultural differences to a slightly lesser degree than the underclassmen.

Financial Assistance

The responses to the financial assistance variable yielded lower division means ranging from 2.02 to 2.49, while the upper division means ranged from a low of 2.02 to a high of 2.46 (see Table 5). Therefore, the lower division students as well as the upper division students as groups have fairly neutral feelings about the financial assistance they receive.

Academic Performance

In the variable academic performance, the lower division had means ranging between 2.92 and 3.28 (see Table 6). This placed the lower division on the rating scale between "disagree" (2.0) and
"agree" (4.0) points with statements expressing no difficulty with language, studies, use of time, and academic performance outcomes. The upper division means ranged from 2.85 to 3.42. These values also placed the upper division between "disagree" and "agree" as previously mentioned with the lower division. It appears that both the lower division students and the upper division students tend to have neutral feelings towards aspects of their lives related to academic performance.

**Housing Facilities**

The fourth variable of housing facilities, matched with grade level, yielded lower division means ranging from 2.82 to 3.30 (see Table 7). The upper division means ranged from a low of 2.95 to a high of 3.57. The combined mean of the lower division (3.10) was close to the "neither agree nor disagree" with statements describing mainland U.S.A. personal habits, group relationships, and individual feelings of housing adequacy. The mean of the upper division was 3.20. It was essentially in the same place as the lower division. This suggests that the students did not have strong feelings either in the positive or negative direction about housing facilities.

**Analysis of Results**

A two-way fixed effects analysis of variance was utilized on the three major groups of hypotheses: (a) Trust Territory students from each district having different perceptions of cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities;
(b) Trust Territory students in different grade levels having different perceptions of cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities; and (c) the interaction effect between districts and grade levels and Trust Territory students' perceptions of cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities.

In those cases in which the major hypotheses were supported in the first two groups of hypotheses, a post-hoc analysis was conducted using the Scheffe method. This was done to test each of the sub-hypotheses pertaining to specific districts in order to determine specific differences in perceptions which are significant.

For the fourth group of major hypotheses—Trust Territory students with different perceptions of cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities having different satisfaction ratings—a Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient was calculated. To test the significance of these correlations, the exact probability of getting a Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient greater than the value of the sample was calculated under the assumption that the population correlation is zero.

**Cultural Differences**

Table 8 presents the results of a two-way fixed effects analysis of variance. The two main effects and the interaction effect in this analysis produced F-ratios too low to reject the null hypothesis using a probability of .05 for making a Type I error. Therefore, the research hypotheses relating perceptions of cultural differences with
districts, perceptions of cultural differences with grade levels, and interaction between district and grade level upon perceptions of cultural differences cannot be accepted.

Table 8
Cultural Differences: Two-way Fixed Effects Analysis of Variance by District/Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level/District</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Assistance

The two-way fixed effects analysis of variance results in Table 9 imply that the research hypotheses relating the grade level to the perceptions of financial assistance and the district to the perceptions of financial assistance cannot be accepted using a probability of .05 for making a Type I error.

However, the interaction effect utilized in this two-way fixed effects analysis of variance (Table 9) produced an F-ratio high enough to reject the null hypothesis using a probability of .05 for making a Type I error. Therefore, the research hypotheses relating to the interaction between district and grade level upon perceptions of financial assistance can be accepted. In Figure 1, one can see that in
the lower divisions Palau and Yap Districts were less satisfied than the upper division counterparts; however, the reverse was true for Mariana, Ponape, and Truk Districts.

Table 9

Financial Assistance: Two-way Fixed Effects Analysis of Variance by District/Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level/District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Academic Performance

Table 10 presents the results of a two-way fixed effects analysis of variance. The two main effects produced F-ratios high enough so that the null hypothesis can be rejected using a probability of .05 for making a Type I error. Therefore, the two research hypotheses relating perceptions of academic performance with districts and perceptions of academic performance with grade levels can be accepted.

The interaction effect in this analysis (see Table 10) produced an F-ratio too low to reject the null hypothesis using a probability of .05 for making a Type I error. Therefore, the research hypotheses relating to the interaction between district and grade level upon perceptions of academic performance cannot be accepted.
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Table 10
Academic Performance: Two-way Fixed Effects Analysis of Variance by District/Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.034*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level/District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

In order to further test the significance of the main effect of district on the academic performance variable, a post-hoc analysis was conducted on the pairing of districts and perceptions related to academic performance utilizing the Scheffe method (Glass & Stanley, 1970). It should be noted that those ratios in excess of the test statistics are significant and therefore would reject the null hypotheses. Table 11 presents the pertinent statistics utilized in the Scheffe method.

Differences were found between the comparison of Mariana with Truk and Truk with Yap. The null hypotheses for each of these relationships were rejected. In fact, looking at Table 6, it is obvious that Truk is less satisfied than the other four districts with their academic performance, although significantly so for only Yap and the Marianas.
Table 11
Scheffe's Method for Academic Performance by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Pairing</th>
<th>Estimate of Contrast</th>
<th>Standard Error of Contrast</th>
<th>Ratio of Contrast to Error</th>
<th>Test Statistic&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mariana/Palau</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariana/Ponape</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariana/Truk</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>3.22*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariana/Yap</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau/Ponape</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau/Truk</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau/Yap</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponape/Truk</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponape/Yap</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truk/Yap</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>3.85*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The test statistic is equal to \( \sqrt{(I-1)_{1-\alpha}} \frac{F_{I-1, N-IJ}}{ \text{Standard Error}} \) (Glass & Stanley, 1970, p. 445).

*<sup>p</sup> < 0.05
Housing Facilities

The two-way fixed effects analysis is presented in Table 12. One of the main effects, grade level, in this analysis produced an F-ratio too low to reject the null hypothesis using a probability of .05 for making a Type I error. Therefore, the research hypothesis relating perceptions of housing facilities with grade level cannot be accepted.

The other main effect, district, and the interaction in this analysis produced F-ratios beyond the probability of .05. Consequently, the null hypothesis can be rejected. Therefore, the research hypotheses relating the perception of housing facilities with district and interaction between districts and grade levels upon perception of housing facilities can be accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level/District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.030*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
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Table 13 contains the results of the Scheffe method as it was conducted for further testing the relationship between district and housing facilities. The results indicated that the contrasts between the Mariana District and the Palau, Ponape, and Truk Districts were significant. In these pairings, the null hypothesis for district and housing facilities could be rejected. Table 7 shows that Marianas District response is most favorable to housing, whereas Truk, Ponape, and Palau, in that order, show the least favorable response to housing. The question now is to explain why the Marianas District has such a favorable response.

Looking at Figure 2, we note that for the Marianas, Palau, and Yap Districts, the lower division students are less satisfied with housing when compared to the upper division students. However, in the Ponape and Truk Districts, it is the upper division students who are less satisfied.

Perceptions of Satisfaction with Campus Life

In addition to the previous analyses, the relationship between each of the four variables (cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities) and campus life satisfaction was tested utilizing Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficients (Glass & Stanley, 1970). The correlation coefficients are reported in Table 14.
Table 13
Scheffe's Method for Housing Facilities by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Pairing</th>
<th>Estimate of Contrast</th>
<th>Standard Error of Contrast</th>
<th>Ratio of Contrast to Error</th>
<th>Test Statistic&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mariana/Palau</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>6.03*</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariana/Ponape</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>5.08*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariana/Truk</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>3.53*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariana/Yap</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau/Ponape</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau/Truk</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau/Yap</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponape/Truk</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponape/Yap</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truk/Yap</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The test statistic is equal to $\sqrt{(I-1)_{1-\alpha} F_{I-1, N-IJ}}$ (Glass & Stanley, 1970, p. 445).

*<sup>p</sup> < .05
Figure 2

Interaction Effects Between Districts and Grade Level Upon Housing Facilities
Table 14
Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Between Satisfaction and Each of the Four Major Perceptual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Differences</th>
<th>Financial Assistance</th>
<th>Academic Performance</th>
<th>Housing Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlations</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob. (r ≤</td>
<td>r'</td>
<td>*)</td>
<td>.0228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*|r'| = the absolute value of the sample correlation coefficient.

To test the significance of these correlations, the exact probabilities of getting an r greater than the value of the sample r was calculated under the assumption that the population correlation equals zero. These probabilities did not exceed .05 in any of the four cases. The null hypothesis of p = 0 was therefore repeatedly rejected.

In addition to the simple correlations, a multiple R was calculated testing the relationship between satisfaction and the four variables taken together. This procedure yielded a multiple R of .47. Thereby, one can reject the null hypothesis that the multiple R is zero using a probability of .01 of committing Type I error.

The variance that is noted in the level of satisfaction can be accounted for by the four variables to the extent of 22%. One might infer that the four variables are impacting the level of satisfaction considerably.

If one is interested in making changes in the level of satisfaction, it is reasonable to assume that manipulation of the four variables will achieve the desired results to some extent.
Summary

This chapter indicated that in the three universities surveyed, response rate ranged from 65.2% to 73.7% for an overall rate of 72.0%. An additional breakdown was made by districts and grade levels of the respondents. The perceptions by districts and grade levels were next presented.

None of the hypothesized relationships involving Trust Territory students' perceptions of cultural differences were supported. While the hypotheses relating districts to perceptions of financial assistance and grade levels to perceptions of financial assistance were also not supported, there was evidence that an interaction effect between districts and grade level upon perceptions of financial assistance does exist.

The hypotheses relating districts and grade levels with Trust Territory students' perceptions of academic performance can both be accepted. The associated interaction effect, however, was not supported. A further test of academic performance by districts found significant difference between Mariana and Truk and between Truk and Yap, Truk lying below the other four districts in the perception of academic performance.

The hypothesized relationships between grade levels and perceptions of housing facilities was not supported; however, a significant relationship was found between districts and perceptions of housing facilities as well as the interaction of district and grade level on perceptions of housing facilities. Further analysis identified significant contrasts between the Marianas and Palau, Ponape, and
Truk with the Marianas having the most favorable response to the perceptions of housing facilities. In addition, it was found that for the Mariana, Palau, and Yap, the lower division students were less satisfied than the upper division students with housing while for Ponape and Truk the reverse was true.

The correlation between perceptions of financial assistance and perceptions of satisfaction with campus life was negative. The correlation between the other three factors and satisfaction with campus life was positive. Twenty-two percent of the variability in satisfaction with campus life was possible to account by the perceptions of cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter of the study deals with a brief review of the study, a discussion of the results, subsequent conclusions, implications, and recommendations of the study. The latter portions of the study pertain to the overall highlights of the results and provide some possible reasons for the results that were obtained.

Review of the Study

The study was designed to investigate the perceptions of Trust Territory students in four areas affecting their satisfaction with campus life at selected institutions. It was hypothesized that the perceptions of the Micronesian students were different when compared among the six districts of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Similarly student perceptions, by grade levels, of the four factors, cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities, were hypothesized to be different. These four dependent variables were then correlated with the overall satisfaction with campus life variable in order to determine the extent of the relationship between the four variables and overall satisfaction with campus life. The following is the discussion of the results.
Discussion of the Results

The discussion of the study was organized to correspond to the areas utilized to report the findings in Chapter IV. The areas dealt with were the description of response rates, perceptions by districts, perceptions by grade level, interaction effect, and perceptions of overall satisfaction with campus life.

Description of Population and Response Rates

Population. An overwhelming majority of the Trust Territory student population utilized for this study was enrolled at the University of Guam. While the University of Guam is an American institution of higher learning, the cultural background of the local population (Guamanian) has historical origins similar to those of the Trust Territory students involved in the research. Geographically, a high percentage of the study population may not have experienced the severity of cultural shock normally associated with mainland university attendance. In turn, it should be considered that the results of the study may have been altered if the University of Guam students would not have been included in the study.

The response rate averaged 72% on the returns from the three institutions of higher learning utilized in this study. As was indicated in Chapter IV, Suomi College, having the smallest number of Trust Territory students, had the highest percentage (73.7%) of returns.

District. Conversely with the exception of Yap, responses by district were fairly evenly distributed throughout the other districts.
utilized in the study. Therefore, the results should be reflective of the differences in perceptions among the districts.

**Grade level.** Contrastingly, the distribution of respondents by grade level revealed that the majority of the students were in the lower division. Again, the results of the study have been potentially altered. This is due to the high probability that the lower division students may not have fully developed an ability to cope with the factors being investigated with regard to their adjustment to campus living. With the majority of the respondents being freshmen, there is no doubt that the differences would result in a more select group of students in the upper grade levels, presumably more suited to college life. In turn, the intellectual ability of the successful freshmen respondents would afford them a better perceptual ability. Consequently, the large number of freshmen may have yielded a less insightful set of responses.

**Perceptions by District**

The study of the Trust Territory students' perceptions by district involved the Mariana, Palau, Ponape, Truk, and Yap Districts. The sixth district, Marshall, was deleted from the study due to the small number in the cells during the two-way fixed effects analysis. The respondents from each district were asked for their perceptions of items which pertained to the four dependent variables being investigated.

The mean responses to each of the four variables ranged from 2.34 in the financial assistance to 3.15 in the housing facilities.
variable. The responses to all four variables were not strongly directional in either the agree or disagree direction. Due to this outcome, it would be difficult to deduce any definitive perception held by the Trust Territory students in the relationship of the four variables to satisfaction with life on American campuses.

Statistical significance was obtained in the two-way fixed effects analysis of variance treatment of the academic performance and housing facilities variables. A post-hoc analysis of variance was conducted utilizing the Scheffe method. The Scheffe method of the differences between district on the academic performance variable had indicated that the significant differences were between (a) Mariana District and the Truk District, and (b) Truk District and Yap District, with Mariana and Yap Districts having the more positive perceptions. Significance (using the Scheffe method) of differences in perceptions of housing facilities between districts was found among the (a) Mariana and Palau Districts, (b) Mariana and Ponape Districts, and (c) Mariana District and Truk District, with Mariana District having the most positive perceptions amongst the districts.

One should note that the Truk District students had the most negative perceptions on the academic performance variable. These findings were corroborated with other information available to this investigator. As was previously mentioned, Micronesian students from Truk were especially screened before admittance into the institution of higher learning. In summary, these related findings corroborated our statistics that there is something different about students from the Truk District. Our statistics show they have a significantly
negative perception of their academic performance and the items mentioned show they are more likely to be involved in disciplinary or social problems.

Consistently significant in the perceptions of housing facilities was that Mariana District was the most positive when matched with other districts. The significant differences between the Mariana District and Palau, Ponape, and Truk Districts may be due to the economic advantages that Mariana District students enjoy when compared to other districts. Developmentally, this island group is the most economically and technologically advanced within the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. As a consequence, progress within the Mariana Islands had surpassed other Micronesian Islands. One of the main difficulties which faced the Trust Territory students in their transition into the Western culture was the taboo on the utilization of community bathroom facilities. The majority of Micronesians attending the selected institutions of higher learning were living in dormitories with community facilities.

The remaining variables may not be significant between the districts due to the subtle nature of the cultural differences variable; the subsidy of the Trust Territory students for attendance in institutions of higher learning by the Trust Territory Government and the eligibility of the Micronesian students for Federal aid may have reduced the significance of financial assistance as an impact on college life.

Though there may be cultural differences between districts, the isolation of the Trust Territory islands from foreign countries and
their Twentieth Century progress had left Micronesia culture substantially intact. As a consequence, progress into the Twentieth Century has been left to the individual island districts.

The Federal Government has given the Micronesian students favorable considerations on Federal grants and aids. The low-income family benefits further enhanced the eligibility of the Micronesian students.

Those Trust Territory students who were in attendance at institutions of higher learning were most likely benefiting from one form of Trust Territory Government subsidy or another. The liberal assistance of the Trust Territory Government was possible by granting the awards to fewer recipients. Other students who were able to receive liberal grants were assisted in getting Federal aid packages by the Trust Territory Student Assistance Offices from the institutions of higher learning in which they were to attend. Note that the University of Guam is the exception to this rule.

Perceptions by Grade Level

The data treatment necessitated collapsing the four grade levels into two divisions: lower division (freshman and sophomore grade levels) and upper division (junior and senior grade levels). The mean of the four variables, cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities, for the two divisions centered around "neither agree nor disagree" or 3.0 on a scale of 5 points. There was no strong indication of direction of the responses; therefore, no clear trend was established.
A significant difference was established on the academic performance variable with the two-way fixed effects analysis of variance. The lack of statistical significant differences among the remaining variables was possibly due to (a) the subtlety of the differences between Micronesian cultures, (b) the influence of the Trust Territory and Federal governments on the financial assistance variable, and (c) the attrition of the students in housing facilities.

Interaction Effects Between District and Grade Level Upon the Perceptions

Statistically significant differences in the interaction between district and grade level were obtained by the perceptions of financial assistance and housing facilities variables of the students. The interaction shows that the Marianas, Palau, and Yap are different from Ponape and Truk with respect to the way the upper and lower divisions perceive housing and financial assistance.

The significant differences between the Mariana District and Palau District and the remaining Trust Territory districts may be due to the aggressiveness of the students from the two mentioned districts. Mariana and Palau Districts have been thrust into the Twentieth Century by the utilization of the Marianas as the administrative center for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and Palau vying for the same position.

Perceptions of Satisfaction with Campus Life

In addition to district and grade level, the four dependent variables were correlated with satisfaction with campus life. Results
indicated that satisfaction with campus life was directly related to perceptions of cultural differences, academic performance, and housing facilities while inversely related to perceptions of financial assistance. Further test indicated that 22% of the manipulated variables may achieve the desired results to some extent.

Conclusions

The results show a number of theoretical hypotheses which could be accepted. For the purpose of this study, there was no clear trend of Trust Territory students' perceptions. Generally, their perceptions neither agree nor disagree with the four dependent variables affecting campus life.

The statistically significant differences between districts were in academic performance and housing facilities. The significant results between grade levels and the academic variable can easily be explained by attrition. Only those who perceive themselves as good students continue on to the upper divisions. As such, this finding is of no great importance, other than increasing confidence in the other results.

However, the Trukese perceive their performance academically different from the other regions in a more negative fashion. This fact might be related to the disciplinary problem encountered with these students.

In addition, it is obvious that there is a factor in Ponape and Truk which causes their lower division and upper division students to perceive housing and financial assistance in a manner different from
those of Palau and Yap.

Finally, our study shows that the Mariana District students are most favorably inclined with respect to housing.

Though there were no relationships between the Trust Territory students' perceptions of cultural differences, financial assistance, academic performance, and housing facilities and satisfactions with campus life, there were positive correlations between cultural differences, academic performance, and housing facilities variables as compared to a negative direction for the financial assistance variable. From the preceding summary of conclusions, there were several implications which became apparent.

Implications of the Study

It was originally stated that this research was an initial step toward the understanding of the Micronesian students. The factors investigated have produced a new understanding. An implication of the study was that the future research will have to be more cognizant of the composition of the Micronesian population, perhaps involving a controlled sampling of all Micronesian students in future studies.

Due to these implications, it would be advisable to conduct future studies longitudinally. The heavy attrition of Micronesian students would be a less important factor in studies such as the one just completed. The skewness of the study on the lower division's perceptions may be lessened as an influencing factor.

Lastly, and most important, the study poignantly revealed the lack of known, empirically validated, facts pertaining to the
Micronesian people. Little substantial research was located in preparing to conduct this study. The need for indepth, intensive investigation became obvious. If this study has done this alone, then it will be considered a contribution to the field.

Recommendations

As indicated under the Implications of the Study, (a) future studies should be conducted longitudinally; (b) a controlled sampling procedure should be established; and (c) a better understanding of the composition of the Micronesian population should be emphasized.

Other recommendations are as follows:

1. The research should be intradistrict as well as inter-district.

2. A similar study of Micronesian students attending other institutions of higher learning both in the United States and other foreign countries should be conducted.

3. A comparative study of the Micronesian students according to the geographical regions should be undertaken. Especially, our study indicates that a comparison of the Ponape and Truk Districts with the Palau and Yap Districts would be fruitful.

4. Of great importance would be a program designed to affect Trukese perceptions of academic performance, with the intended outcome of lessening disciplinary problems. We cannot imply that one is the cause of the other, but our study shows that this perhaps is a good starting point.
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Questionnaire
Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS: Please check the appropriate blanks provided to complete the following statements.

I am a _____Freshman, _____Sophomore, _____Junior, _____Senior.
I am from the district of _____Mariana, _____Marshalls, _____Palau, _____Ponape, _____Truk, _____Yap.

INSTRUCTIONS: To what extent do you agree with the following statements? Please indicate the extent of your agreement by circling the appropriate response as follows:

STRONGLY AGREE = SA
AGREE = A
NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE = N
DISAGREE = D
STRONGLY DISAGREE = SD

For Example: I enjoy chewing betel nuts.
SA A N D SD

If you strongly agree, circle SA; if you agree, circle the A; if you are neutral, circle the N; if you disagree, circle the D; and if you strongly disagree, circle SD.

1. My housing facilities are adequate for my needs.
SA A N D SD

2. I have difficulty getting my ideas accepted.
SA A N D SD

3. I have free access to my Micronesian friends' rooms.
SA A N D SD

4. I rarely miss my appointments.
SA A N D SD

5. I am having difficulties with my studies.
SA A N D SD

6. The noise level in my housing is pleasant.
SA A N D SD
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7. I frequently feel that I am not understood.  
SA   A N D   SD

8. Micronesian students should first be sent to Guam for part of their education.  
SA   A N D   SD

9. I rarely get less than a "C" in class.  
SA   A N D   SD

10. I would prefer my roommate to be from my district rather than from another district.  
SA   A N D   SD

11. I am rarely late for appointments.  
SA   A N D   SD

12. I want to stay in the United States after I have completed my education.  
SA   A N D   SD

13. I feel accepted and part of this institution.  
SA   A N D   SD

14. I wish I were in a different institution.  
SA   A N D   SD

15. I would recommend this school to other Micronesians.  
SA   A N D   SD

16. I do not mind community bathroom facilities.  
SA   A N D   SD

17. It is difficult for me to understand classroom instructions.  
SA   A N D   SD

18. The college courses are too difficult for me.  
SA   A N D   SD

19. My financial resources are adequate for my educational expenses.  
SA   A N D   SD

20. I feel uncomfortable with the roommate(s) that have been assigned to live with me.  
SA   A N D   SD

21. I have no difficulty with the American way of eating.  
SA   A N D   SD

22. I have enough money to treat my friends when I want to.  
SA   A N D   SD
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. I have difficulty understanding Americans.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I am confident that I will graduate on time.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The weather here is too uncomfortable to put up with.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I attend and enjoy student sports events.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I frequently run out of money.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I can get additional money if I needed it.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I really do not have anything to complain about.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I am able to satisfactorily complete and turn in my homework on time.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. It is difficult for me to complete my financial applications on time.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I feel uncomfortable with the American culture.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I have no difficulties in receiving the awarded funds from my financial assistance.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I am having difficulty with the English language.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I am usually on time for work.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I rarely get an &quot;Incomplete&quot; in class.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I feel insecure about receiving my funds on time from my financial program.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I am actively participating in student activities.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
39. The American school administration does not understand the Micronesian student.
   SA A N D SD

40. I have a hard time getting necessary documentation from home.
   SA A N D SD

41. I usually find myself bored with school.
   SA A N D SD

42. I rarely am on time for class.
   SA A N D SD

43. I do not feel that I know enough to ask questions in class.
   SA A N D SD

44. I like where I am living.
   SA A N D SD

45. My financial resources are adequate for my living expenses.
   SA A N D SD

1This is a copy of the original in order to comply with Dissertation Regulations.
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The Variables and Their Sub-Divisions
The Variables and Their Sub-Divisions

Cultural Differences

1. Commitment
   a. I am usually on time for work. (Item No. 35)
   b. I rarely miss my appointments. (Item No. 4)
   c. I am rarely late for appointments. (Item No. 11)

2. Communication
   *a. I have difficulty understanding Americans. (Item No. 23)
   *b. I have difficulty getting my ideas accepted. (Item No. 2)
   *c. I frequently feel that I am not understood. (Item No. 7)

3. Orientation
   *a. Micronesian students should first be sent to Guam for their education. (Item No. 8)
   *b. I feel uncomfortable with the American culture. (Item No. 32)
   *c. The American school administration does not understand the Micronesian students. (Item No. 39)

Financial Assistance

1. Adequacy
   a. My financial resources are adequate for my educational expenses. (Item No. 19)
   b. I have enough money to treat my friends when I want to. (Item No. 22)
   *c. I frequently run out of money. (Item No. 27)
   d. I can get additional money if I needed it. (Item No. 28)
   e. My financial resources are adequate for my living expenses. (Item No. 45)

2. Application
   *a. It is difficult for me to complete my financial applications on time. (Item No. 31)
   *b. I have a hard time getting necessary documentation from home. (Item No. 40)

3. Administration
   a. I have no difficulties in receiving the awarded funds from my financial program. (Item No. 33)
*b. I feel insecure about receiving my funds on time from my financial program. (Item No. 37)

Academic Performance

1. Language

*a. It is difficult for me to understand the class instructions.  (Item No. 17)
*b. I am having difficulty with the English language.  (Item No. 34)

2. Work

*a. I am having difficulty with my studies.  (Item No. 5)
*b. The college courses are too difficult for me.  (Item No. 18)

3. Time

*a. I rarely am on time to class.  (Item No. 42)
b. I rarely get an "Incomplete" in class.  (Item No. 36)
c. I am able to satisfactorily complete and turn in my homework on time.  (Item No. 30)

4. Performance

*a. I do not feel that I know enough to ask questions in class.  (Item No. 43)
b. I am confident that I will graduate on time.  (Item No. 24)
c. I rarely get less than a "C" in class.  (Item No. 9)

Housing Facilities

1. Personal Habits

a. I do not mind community bathroom facilities.  (Item No. 16)
*b. I have difficulty with the American way of eating.  (Item No. 21)

2. Group-related

*a. I would prefer my roommate to be from my own district rather than from another district.  (Item No. 10)
b. I have free access to Micronesian friends' rooms.  (Item No. 3)
c. The noise level of my housing is pleasant.  (Item No. 6)
3. Individual
   a. My housing facilities are adequate for my needs. (Item No. 1)
   *b. I feel uncomfortable with the roommate(s) who have been assigned to live with me. (Item No. 20)
   c. I like where I am living. (Item No. 44)

Satisfaction

1. School
   *a. I usually find myself bored with school. (Item No. 4)
   b. I would recommend this school to other Micronesian students. (Item No. 15)
   *c. I wish I were in a different institution. (Item No. 14)

2. Students
   a. I am actively participating in student activities. (Item No. 38)
   b. I feel accepted and part of the institution. (Item No. 13)
   c. I attend and enjoy student sports events. (Item No. 26)

3. General
   *a. I want to stay in the United States after I have completed my education. (Item No. 12)
   *b. The weather here is too uncomfortable to put up with. (Item No. 25)
   c. I really do not have anything to complain about. (Item No. 29)

*These items are considered as negative items; therefore, in the scoring the scales for these items were reversed.
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