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Problem

The process of adjusting to college has been difficult for many Korean-Americans because of the tension that exists between traditional sex roles versus androgynous sex roles. While it has opened doors to new and exciting opportunities in personal growth, complex challenges of academic, emotional, and social adjustments must be made. The traditional views of the subculture have posed unique problems for young Korean Americans who have enrolled in higher education. This descriptive study examined the relationship between androgynous flexibility and the college adjustment of Korean American students.
Androgynous flexibility was investigated in terms of college adjustment.

Method

The sample population consisted of 153 Korean American college students from six universities from the East and West Coasts of the United States who voluntarily completed two surveys, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI), Short Version, measuring psychological androgyny, and the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ), measuring college adjustment. Each subject's Bem score was determined. The score from the Bem indicated if an individual was identified as androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, or feminine. Then, the adjustment scores for each individual was calculated from the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire. The four sex-role groups' adjustment scores were compared for significant differences at the .05 level by using t-tests.

Results

Results indicated that androgynous Korean American subjects adjusted to college significantly better than feminine or undifferentiated Korean American students. However, there were no significant differences in levels of adjustment to college between androgynous Korean American students and masculine Korean American students.
Conclusions

Bem's theory of behavioral flexibility was not fully supported by the findings of this research. There was no conclusive evidence of greater flexibility of behavior with androgynous individuals. Bem postulated that Psychological Androgyny allows people to be more flexible in their behaviors. Overall, androgynous individuals reported significantly higher adjustment levels than feminine or undifferentiated subjects, however their adjustment scores were not significantly higher than masculine individuals.

Another conclusion which can be made from this study is that masculine traits play a more active role than feminine traits in the adjustment process to college for Korean Americans. Findings suggest that masculine traits are more influential with the adjustment process to college for this population.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Rationale for the Study

Differences between men and women have existed and have been recognized long before psychologists coined terms such as masculinity or femininity. Sex-role development and its psychological and behavioral manifestations have been much investigated since the inception of psychology. Along with other societal trends, sex-role developments have progressed through the wheel of evolution.

Traditionally, both society in general and experts in psychology have readily accepted the supposition that a significant intercorrelation exists between biological gender, the psychological orientation of masculinity or femininity, and sex-role behaviors. As far as males and females were concerned, biological, psychological, and exhibited behavior patterns marked clear distinctions between the two genders. Both in reality and in theory, such sex-role differentiation was strictly adhered to and its boundaries were left uncompromised. Thus, it was necessary as well as imperative for an individual to exhibit sexually appropriate personality characteristics and appropriate sex-role behaviors to be accepted and to
be successful in society. American society has traditionally considered masculinity to be characteristic of a psychologically healthy, functional male, and femininity to be characteristic of a psychologically healthy, functional female (Bem, 1974).

As the Women's Liberation Movement and the counter emergence of the Men's Liberation Movement challenged the traditional views, the rigid system of sex-role differentiation seemed no longer appropriate for the contemporary lifestyle demanded by our ever-changing society (Lukman, 1983). In fact, it has been suggested that this sex-typing serves to prevent and restrict both men and women from reaching their full potential. Consequently, an alternative mode of sex role, exhibited by the androgynous personality, seemed more adaptive (Bem, 1975). While a masculine self-concept leads to the inhibition of feminine behaviors, and a feminine self-concept to the suppression of masculine behaviors, the androgynous individual integrates both feminine and masculine traits. This integration of masculinity and femininity allows an individual to exercise greater freedom and flexibility to adapt to the requirements of the situational context and demands (Bem & Lenney, 1976).

Highly advanced technology in transportation and in communication have brought our world closer together as a global neighborhood. No longer are different cultures and societies isolated, but many, if not most, depend on each
other for existence. Hence, knowledge of and sensitivity to different cultures is not only necessary but crucial in today's world, especially in a multicultural setting such as exists in the United States. When it comes to exemplifying multiculturalism, there is no better model than the United States. In the U.S., many different cultures coexist side by side, creating a mosaic of cultures.

Asian Americans have become an integral part of the multicultural fabric of American society. The Census Bureau in 1990 counted nearly 7.3 million Asian Americans, indicating an increase of 3.8 million or 108% from 1980. Within this Asian American population, Korean Americans constitute a significant subculture, totaling 800,000 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991). The Korean American subculture holds some traditional values and beliefs that are indigenous to their heritage.

One such traditional value concerns the issue of sex roles. There is no other culture in which the sex-role distinctions have been more apparent than among Koreans. This rigid sex differentiation in Korean culture has been rooted in Neo-Confucianist philosophy. Achieving balance between the human world and the cosmic order is demanded by this philosophy. The domination over woman by man was in the law of nature according to Confucius. In accordance with this law, women's "inner-domestic" sphere and men's "outer-public" sphere were strictly maintained.
(Chung, 1983). This traditional Korean sex-role differentiation seems to fit the prototype of nonandrogynous individuals, females displaying feminine behaviors, and males modeling masculine behaviors. Nevertheless, as increasing Westernization has been taking place in the Korean American population, liberation from traditional sex typing has become a reality. Hence, androgynous sex role typing has become an alternative choice for Korean Americans living in the United States.

Statement of the Problem

The process of adjusting to college has been difficult for many Korean-Americans because of the tension that exists between traditional sex roles versus androgynous sex roles. According to Chickering (1969), entering into college is a major transition in one's life, demanding many difficult adjustments. While it has opened doors to new and exciting opportunities in personal growth, complex challenges of academic, emotional, and social adjustments must be made. The traditional views of the subculture have posed unique problems for young Korean Americans who have enrolled in higher education (Axelson, 1993). This study, therefore, attempted to determine how psychological androgyyny affects college adjustment.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this descriptive study was to examine the relationship between androgynous flexibility
and the college adjustment of Korean American students. Androgynous flexibility was investigated in terms of college adjustment. There were six research questions addressed. Research questions 1 through 3 addressed the primary purpose, mentioned above, while research questions 4 to 6 addressed the secondary purpose of the study (which was to compare differences among androgynous individuals in terms of gender, geography, and type of educational institution). The research questions were:

1. Are androgynous individuals more likely to report a higher level of college adjustment than masculine individuals?

2. Are androgynous individuals more likely to report a higher level of college adjustment than feminine individuals?

3. Are androgynous individuals more likely to report a higher level of college adjustment than undifferentiated individuals?

4. Is there a difference in level of college adjustment between androgynous males and androgynous females?

5. Is there a difference in level of college adjustment between East Coast androgynous individuals and West Coast androgynous individuals?

6. Is there a difference in level of college adjustment between androgynous individuals from private
colleges and androgynous individuals from public universities?

**Definition of Terms**

**Gender:** The biological sex of the individual, either male or female.

**Sex typing:** The learning process by which children acquire the values, motives, and behaviors appropriate to their biological sex (McCandless, 1967).

**Androgynous sex-role identity:**

Androgyne is a term which denotes the integration of both masculinity and femininity within a single individual. The concept of psychological androgyne implies that it is possible for an individual to be both masculine and feminine, both instrumental and expressive, both agentic and communal, depending upon the situational appropriateness of these various modalities. (Bem, Martyna, & Watson, 1976, p. 1018)

**Masculine sex-role identity:** Refers to those rudimentary traits that are considered to be more appropriate for a man than for a woman. According to Bem (1981a, p. 360), "assertive, dominant, forceful, aggressive, independent, leadership abilities, strong personality, willingness to take a stand, defending own beliefs, and willingness to take risks" are among those masculine characteristics.

**Feminine sex-role identity:** Refers to those rudimentary traits that are considered to be more appropriate for a woman than for a man. According to Bem (1981a, p. 362), "gentle, tender, compassionate, warm,
sympathetic, understanding, affectionate, sensitive to the needs of others, eagerness to soothe hurt feelings, and loving children" are among those feminine characteristics.

**Undifferentiated sex-role identity:** Refers to an identity in which both traditional masculine and feminine characteristics are not well represented.

**Sex role:** Refers to those behaviors prescribed and identified with a person of a given biological sex within a society. For men, this term refers to identification with traditional masculine characteristics, and for women, it refers to identification with traditional feminine characteristics.

**Flexibility** is the ability of an individual to adapt to changing situations with a balance of masculine and feminine sex-role dimensions.

**Korean American** is an individual who has at least one parent who is of Korean ancestry.

**Significance of the Study**

As mentioned earlier, the increasing presence and participation of Korean Americans in the United States has created a need for better understanding of this specific subculture by professional psychologists. Not only did this study scrutinize the validity of Bem’s alternative theoretical model of sex roles as it relates to college adjustment within Korean Americans, it also offered
valuable insight for Korean Americans into understanding themselves.

**Limitation of the Study**

The sample population of this research was limited to Korean American college students. The subjects in the sample group were randomly picked from selected universities. Thus, it is important to generalize the findings of this study only to the above mentioned group.

**Organization of the Study**

This study is organized as follows: Chapter 1 include the background and rationale for the study, purpose of the study, definition of terms, significance of the study, and its limitations. Chapter 2 reviews the pertinent literature on this topic. Chapter 3 discusses research methodology, including the sample group, instrumentation, field procedures, the null hypotheses, and method of analysis. Chapter 4 presents the results of the study. Chapter 5 summarizes the research, and presents the findings, conclusions, ramifications of findings, and further recommendations.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this review is to provide relevant background information to the present research. The following text presents comprehensive and succinct summaries of appropriate studies. This chapter includes discussions of theoretical models on psychological sex-role identity, an alternative theoretical construct on sex-role, androgynous sex-role identity, college adjustment, and multicultural experience research.

Theoretical Models on Psychological Sex-Role Identity

One significant aspect of human experience is marked by the development of sex role identity. Traditionally, development of sex role identity has involved the internalization of behaviors and attributes which society considers sex appropriate, either masculine traits or feminine traits according to one's biological gender. Hence, appropriate sex role identification has served as a sign of mental health and social acceptance, with the healthy male being characterized as masculine, and the healthy female as feminine.
More specifically, sex role socialization can be defined as the acquisition of biologically appropriate values, motives, and behaviors by children. It is through this socialization process that masculinity or femininity is developed within an individual. Throughout the course of history, sex role identity development has been explained by a couple of psychological theorists. Three pivotal theories have contributed greatly to the field of psychology. These include psychoanalytic theory (Freud, 1933), cognitive development theory (Kohlberg, 1966), and social learning theory (Mischel, 1966).

Freud, the father of psychoanalysis, has developed a detailed account of sex role acquisition. He has outlined the process of sex role identification from birth to adulthood with specific and detailed stages. According to Freud (1933), the crucial distinction between men and women results from a consequence of different experiences in the Oedipal stage of development. During the critical time of adolescence, the resolution of the Oedipal conflict is completed, where in the end, the boy identifies with his father, and the girl with her mother. Therefore, Freud concludes that the sex role identification process is a function of Oedipal conflict resolution.

Psychoanalytic theory, however, has been subjected to frequent and persistent criticism. Malinowski (1927) suggested that the Oedipal complex is a product of the
middle-class family in Western society rather than a universal fact. Likewise, Mead (1953) challenged the lack of cultural influence on the Oedipal conflicts and resolution in Freud's assertions. She proposed that those conflicts might have been a product of a particular cultural or social impact rather than a universal human condition.

Based on Piaget's (1952) theory of cognitive development, Kolhberg (1966) contended that sex role development is a result of cognitive phenomenon. According to Kolhberg, children go through three major systematic stages in the process of acquiring sex appropriate behavior and identity. These three stages include: (1) gender identity, (2) gender stability, and (3) gender consistency. Throughout these cognitive stages, a child first recognizes that he or she is a male or female, consequently learning the labels "boy" and "girl." After referring to himself or herself with appropriate labels, he or she realizes that boys invariably become men and girls become women. Apparently, this realization motivates children to learn how to become a competent male or female. Finally, the consistency of male or female attributes, regardless of changing environment and situations, is the motivational force behind the acquisition of sex appropriate behaviors. Hence, an individual is motivated to be consistent with
his/her internalized sex role standards by displaying sex appropriate behaviors.

Social learning theorists such as Mischel (1966) offer an alternative explanation for the development of sex roles. Mischel proposes that children learn from observing the behavior of others, more specifically, their parents, their peers, and other various forms of media. He stated that imitation and observational learning, or modeling, are critical in the acquisition of sex role behaviors. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) further expanded this theory by discussing reinforcement, which increases the probability for the behavior to recur, and punishment, which decreases the probability of recurrence. Sex appropriate behavior patterns are then internalized through reinforcement.

In their review of these traditional theoretical perspectives on sex role socialization, Hefner, Rebecca, and Oleshansky (1975, p. 147) argued that these views "perpetuate a truncated, polarized view of human nature and female inferiority and are incapable of explaining the interactions of many variables or the impact of the historical-cultural milieu of development."

An Alternative Theoretical Construct on Sex-Role Identity

Close scrutiny of traditional masculinity/femininity measures by Constantinople (1973) resulted in conceptual and methodological changes in sex role development. This
study was a revolutionary step towards modern attitudes regarding sex role functioning, and a humble beginning of an alternative theoretical construct on sex role identity. To borrow the words of Kelly and Worell (1977, p. 1109) in their summary of Constantinople's evaluation, the construction of masculinity/femininity scales resulted in the definition of masculinity/femininity in terms of "the empirical sex-differentiated frequency of item endorsement without apparent reliance on any theory or concept of sex role." More significantly, they introduced the possibility of masculinity and femininity coexisting within the same person. This would occur in those individuals who score somewhere in between the two polar ends of the masculinity/femininity continuum. Constantinople's evaluation is further validated by the works of many other experts including Kohlberg (1966), Tyler (1968), Herzog and Sudia (1970), and Edwards and Abbot (1973). His theory also became a springboard for the classic study by Bem (1974).

Although historically speaking, the bipolar unidimensional approach to masculinity and femininity has been dominant in the psychological literature, there have been some dualistic conceptions of sex roles. Jung (1945) is one of the earliest pioneers who proposed that masculinity and femininity may coexist to some degree in every individual, male or female. In his analytical theory, he recognized masculine animus and feminine anima
to be a significant aspect of human psyche. Similarly, Bakan (1966) theorized that agency and communion are coexisting male and female spheres that characterize all living organisms. Hence, he urged that these rudimentary modes of existence need to be in balance for the insurance of societal and individual survival. Spence and Helmreich (1978) consequently emphasized the importance of achieving a balance between agency and communion for both males and females.

From the dualistic conceptions of sex role functioning, there has been a recent emergence of the concept of psychological androgyne. Rather than the polarized perspective of masculinity and femininity, the concept of androgyne implies that an individual can possess both masculine and feminine characteristics: "both assertive and yielding, both instrumental and expressive—depending on the situational appropriateness of these various behaviors" (Bem, 1974, p. 158). This topic of androgynous sex role in relation to adaptability and flexibility has been the focus of many studies, especially a series of research studies by Bem.

**Androgynous Sex-Role Identity**

Heilbrun (1974, p. 146) offered poignant insight into the concept of androgyne in his definition. According to his description, androgyne "suggests a spirit of reconciliation between the sexes . . . a spectrum upon
which human beings choose their places without regard to propriety or custom."

Breaking away from the traditional conceptualization of masculinity and femininity as bipolar ends of a single continuum, Bem has formulated an alternative sex role function, psychological androgyny, that allows coexistence of both masculinity and femininity within a single individual. With the development of a new type of sex role inventory and a series of research endeavors, Bem has legitimized the concept of androgyny. As the traditional system of sex role differentiation has become obsolete, the flexibility and adaptability associated with androgyny has become a relevant alternative in today's demanding society.

Bem (1974) proposed that socialization for androgyny was more functional because the behavior of androgynous individuals of both sexes seemed to vary cross-situationally, resulting in higher flexibility. She also described the development of a new sex role inventory that considers masculinity and femininity as two independent dimensions, measuring the difference between his or her endorsement of masculine and feminine characteristics. Bem (1975) found that androgynous subjects displayed higher levels of function by showing "masculine" independence when under pressure to conform, and also demonstrating "feminine" nurturance when given the opportunity to interact with a kitten. On the other hand,
the nonandrogynous subjects were found to lack "cross-sex" behaviors, leaving them less than competent in the situations demanding certain sex-type behaviors.

In another insightful study, Bem and Lenney (1976) successfully demonstrated that highly sex typed individuals avoided cross sex activities, while androgynous individuals engaged in all activities equally. Nonandrogynous subjects indicated more discomfort when performing cross sex activity then androgynous or sex reversed subjects. They further suggested that this restriction of common and useful behaviors by conforming to traditional sex roles might even indicate some level of dysfunction.

Throughout her studies, Bem has hypothesized and confirmed that androgynous individuals exhibit higher levels of functioning than traditionally sex typed individuals. Her conclusions have been in agreement with previous findings by many experts (Block, Von Der Lippe, & Block, 1973; Harford, Willis, & Deabler, 1967) who have reported the high feminine scores of traditional females to be correlated with high anxiety, low self-esteem, and low social acceptance. Maccoby (1966) has contended that boys and girls who are highly sex typed have been found to have lower overall intelligence, lower spatial ability, and lower creativity, while greater intellectual development has been correlated with masculinity in girls and feminine characteristics in boys.
Several other research findings seem to suggest that androgyny has more positive characteristics and implications than the traditional sex type role. Nevill (1977) has presented evidence that links androgynous individuals with stronger self-actualization, more sensitivity to self-needs and feelings, and more potential for developing meaningful relationships with others. In addition, Nevill found that there were fewer signs of psychopathology in androgynous individuals than in sex typed individuals. All in all, the findings seem to suggest that androgynous individuals are psychologically healthier than sex typed individuals. Block et al. (1973) concluded, after two independent studies, that higher maturity of moral reasoning and ego functioning was accompanied by a more androgynous and a less sex typed self-concept. He also pointed out that the socialization of children in traditionally defined sex roles tends to deter introspection and self-evaluation, which are critical processes in psychological maturity. Leahy and Eiter's study (1980) predicted a positive relationship between moral and ego development with androgyny and a negative relationship with traditional sex typing. That is, as the individual achieves higher levels of moral and ego development, androgyny increases and stereotyping decreases. Their findings seem to be consistent with the results of Cristall and Dean's (1976) research that individuals who were highly self-actualized were also free
from strong sex stereotypes. Cristall and Dean concluded that while masculinity and femininity restrict an individual's flexibility in self-expression, androgyny might expand their range of behaviors, allowing people to respond more effectively in diverse situations. More recently, Lukman (1983) identified a significantly higher mean flexibility index of coping strategies among androgynous individuals than that among masculine individuals. Chung (1983) conducted a cross-cultural study in the U.S. and Korea using college students as subjects. She concluded that in the U.S. sample, masculine attributes were more critical in explaining self-esteem, while the androgynous attributes were more positively related to self-esteem in the Korean subjects.

In summary, it can be safely assumed that androgynous individuals have the advantage of better adjustment and flexibility due to the fact that "they demonstrate multidimensional behaviors and utilize positive characteristics of both masculine and feminine roles, as the situation demands." (Chung, 1983, p. 112)

Theoretical Models of Androgyny

There are two essential underlying assumptions in androgyny theory. Masculinity and femininity are independent dimensions, and individuals high on both are socially more effective, as indicated by measures such as self-concept. Exactly how masculinity and femininity are
related to global self-concept has been widely studied by several theorists.

In agreement with Bem’s (1974) original formulation, Spence (1984) described the additive androgyny model predicting that masculinity and femininity contribute positively to the self-conception. The masculinity model of androgyny theory, formulated by Cook (1985), predicted that at least in modern Western society masculinity, rather than femininity, determines the self-concept. However, Hall and Taylor (1985) suggested that androgyny is more than a mere sum of masculinity and femininity.

The empirical evidence, as well as meta-analyses, seems to provide the strongest support for the masculinity model. Antill and Cunningham (1979, p. 784) concluded, "In every case masculinity showed significant positive correlations with self-esteem in both sexes whereas the correlations with femininity were generally nil or negative." Meta-analyses by Hall and Taylor (1985) and by Whitley (1983) revealed that most of the variance in masculinity and femininity self-concept relations could be explained by masculinity while little contribution was made by femininity.

According to androgyny theory, self-concept should be positively correlated with both masculinity and femininity, but typically, previous research findings negate the contribution of femininity in total self-concept. In order to substantiate androgyny theory, it is
necessary to demonstrate the contribution of femininity to a variety of different variables in self-concept. Marsh and Byrne (1991) have been able to accomplish this task. Contrary to previous studies, their findings have noted the positive contribution of femininity to many areas of self-concept. In some instances, femininity has contributed more positively than masculinity. They also called attention to the bias of the influence of social desirability in measurement. In other words, the Bem Sex Role Inventory includes feminine characteristics that are, for the most part, less socially desirable than the masculine qualities included in the inventory. Hence, when the masculinity and femininity scales are balanced with respect to social desirability, the results are quite different. Marsh and Byrne's study provided stronger support for the androgyny theory than do previous studies of masculine and feminine self-concept relations. A cross-cultural research study by Ang Pei-Hui (1994) provided some more substantial empirical evidence of masculinity and femininity having a significant influence on personal and social self-concept.

Some challenges to the construct of androgyny have been measured by the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Kottke (1988) raised some question as to the bipolarity of Bem's 1977 classification method (masculine, feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated). She contended that Bem's measurement is not two-dimensional but rather
unidimensional and suggested using a single bipolar Masculinity/Femininity scale with Androgyny as a midpoint. Willemsen (1993) pointed out two errors in Kottke's assessment. According to Willemsen, Kottke made errors in the median splits by calculating for the sexes separately, and dismissing the undifferentiated classification from the analyses. In reply to Willemsen's comment, Miller and Kottke (1993) wrote that the original intention was to show that the concept of androgyny required some supplementary theoretical and empirical classification in its measurement.

**College Adjustment**

Entrance into college marks an exciting as well as demanding transition in one's life. As Chickering (1969) wrote, this transition involves complex challenges in emotional, social, and academic adjustment. As the educational demands in our society increase and more people pursue higher education, the issue of college adjustment becomes more relevant. Certainly, it can be assumed that efficient college adjustment will enhance the college experience and reduce attrition.

Surprisingly, prior to the 1980s, there were relatively few studies that attempted to systematically measure adjustment to college. Instead, several investigators developed very simple measures that included a single item or a few items to assess adjustment to
college (e.g., Baumgart & Johnstone, 1977; Kowalski, 1977; Wright, 1973). Still others such as Anastasi, Mead and Schneiders (1960), and Terenzini and Pascarella (1978) attempted to devise more comprehensive, multi-item measures. These measures addressed various aspects of adjustment, including social and academic adjustment, alienation, and personal-emotional adjustment (Anastasi et al., 1960; Kurash, 1979; Terenzini & Pascarella, 1978; and Timmons, 1978). Nonetheless, these inventories lacked satisfactory reliability and validity.

The College Inventory of Academic Adjustment (CIAA) (Burow, 1949) was one of the first instruments developed that had adequate reliability and validity. Several investigators used the CIAA to measure relationship between adjustment as measured by the CIAA and academic performance in college as reflected in grade point average and/or over- and underachievement. Henton, Lamke, Murphy, and Haynes (1980) measured the distance from home, the expected frequency of visits home, and the number of relatives living in the vicinity of the student’s college as the variables involved in college adjustment. Long (1977) related his alienation measures to other scales, assessing attitudes towards various aspects of campus governance. However, this posed the problem of considerable overlap between the independent and dependent variables in types of items.
Another problem with previous studies and measurements of college adjustment was the random nature of variable selection and expected findings, precluding their use as validity criteria. For example, Bryant and Trower (1974) correlated their measure to socioeconomic class, the number of siblings in a subject's family, and country of origin, without stating their rationale for the selection of such variables, and without making predictions as to how they relate to the adjustment measure. Likewise, Graff and Cooley (1970) compared commuter and residential students using the CIAA without rationale or explanation.

Baker and Siryk (1985) took a significant step in revolutionizing the research process by developing an instrument that reliably and validly measures college adjustment. The Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (Baker & Siryk, 1985) could be used as a source of dependent variables in investigations of the role of personality and environmental determinants of adjustment to college. Not only does it serve as a diagnostic tool for the identification of students experiencing difficulty in adjusting to college, it also provides a reliable and valid instrument that can be utilized in other research endeavors.

Predictors of College Adjustment

With the advent in recent years of instruments that are reliable and valid, there has been an increase in the
research on college adjustment. An attrition rate as high as 20% during the freshman year alone (Mallinckrodt & Sedlacek, 1987) demands close investigation and perhaps possible intervention related to college adjustment. Several theorists have addressed the area of predictors of college adjustment.

Researchers (Nachtwey, 1978; Ogden & Trice, 1986) have found that personality variables are often closely related to college adjustment. Personal control (Anderson & Fleming, 1986) and self-esteem (Coopersmith, 1967; Rosenberg, 1965) are suggested as significant parts of the multidimensional phenomenon of college adjustment. Recent evidence seems to identify a relationship between academic locus of control and college adjustment. Academic locus of control refers to a belief in personal control over academic outcomes (Ogden & Trice, 1986). Coopersmith (1967) and Rosenberg (1965) proposed that individuals with low self-esteem experience higher interpersonal awkwardness and increased interpersonal isolation than their high self-esteem counterparts. Similarly, Geist and Borecki (1982) reported that those students who had lower self-esteem and greater external academic locus of control also responded high in social avoidance and distress.

Another possible variable in college adjustment is "homesickness." On this matter, Fisher, Murray, and Frazer (1985) noted that those who labeled themselves as being homesick and finding college adjustment more
difficult had significantly greater distance from home. In a more recent study, Mooney, Sherman and Lo Presto (1991) investigated academic locus of control, self-esteem, and perceived distance from home as predictors of college adjustment. They concluded that both academic locus of control and self-esteem were positively correlated with total college adjustment, whereas subjects indicating a "just right" distance from home reported more successful adjustment than subjects indicating a "too far" distance.

Pantages and Creedon (1978) focused on academic ability as a predictor of retention in higher education, and concluded that academic performance explained no more than half of the dropout decisions. In later studies by Baker and Siryk (1984, 1989), academic adjustment took on a broader concept including the motivation to learn, actions initiated to meet academic demands, a clear sense of purpose, and general satisfaction with the academic environment. This broader concept of academic adjustment seemed to accommodate the multidimensional aspects of college adjustment.

Social adjustment of students is yet another suggested dimension of college adjustment (Mallinckrodt, 1988; Pantages & Creedon, 1978). Becoming integrated into the social life of college, forming a support network, and managing new social freedoms are all critical elements in successful social adjustment. Hays and Oxley (1986)
proposed that social support networks are essential ingredients in achieving successful adjustment to college.

Young adults entering college embark on a major journey that is filled with confusion, excitement, dreams, responsibilities, unfamiliarity of new territory, and fear, all at the same time. Chickering (1969) viewed this tumultuous transition as one that is teeming with questions of relationships, directions in life, and self-worth. Hence, the personal crisis that is reported from this tremendous inner turmoil is really no surprise (Henton et al., 1980). According to Pappas and Loring (1985) and Sherer (1985), while anxiety predisposed students to drop out, depression was the primary psychiatric disorder among college students. In a recent longitudinal study of college retention, Gerdes and Mallinckrodt (1994) concluded that emotional and social adjustment predicted attrition as well or better than academic adjustment. In summary, emotional maturity and fitness seem to be a significant element in adapting to college life.

**Theoretical Models of College Adjustment**

Psychological separation/individuation from parents is a critical developmental task facing late adolescents that impacts personal, social, and academic adjustment (Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994). This separation/individuation process may be particularly
pertinent in understanding the adjustment of college students because, for many, it is the first time that they will have been away from parents and have had to master adaptational challenges. This relationship between students and their parents and their level of adjustment during the college years has been recognized (Hoffman & Weiss, 1987; Lapsley, Rice, & Shadid, 1989; Rice, Cole, & Lapsley, 1990). The separation/individuation transition has been described as an intrapsychic process that resolves in the consolidation of one's sense of self as a distinct and unique person (Blos, 1979). Cooper, Grotevant, and Condon (1983) viewed this process as achieving a fine balance between enmeshment with parental identifications and complete disengagement and isolation, in the context of interpersonal process. Along the same line, Josselson (1988) suggested that individuation occurs in the context of relationships, and further argued that an adolescent who is securely attached to his or her parents is better equipped to individuate from parents and to adapt to new situations. According to Josselson (1988), this process of individuation required a reworking of family relationships in order to preserve the close family ties.

The difficult task of striking that fine balance was also noted by Allison and Sabatelli (1988) as they viewed the individuation process as one that demands simultaneous
separation as well as some continued support from family members.

Hoffman (1984) developed a measure of psychological separation, the Psychological Separation Inventory, which has been used in many research studies. According to Hoffman (1984), psychological separation was a multidimensional construct that can be divided into functional independence, attitudinal independence, conflictual independence, and emotional independence. Hoffman (1984) later found that greater conflictual independence was related to better personal adjustment in college subjects. He also found emotional independence to be related to academic adjustment.

In a more recent study (Lapsley et al. 1989), college freshmen and upperclassmen were compared in terms of psychological separation and adjustment to college. As expected, freshmen showed considerably higher psychological dependencies on mother and father than the upperclassmen and poorer social and personal/emotional adjustment to college than the upperclassmen. Lapsley et al. (1989) also suggested that women showed more dependent characteristics than men. Rice et al. (1990) concluded that students who reported positive feelings about separation also reported being well adjusted to university life. Apparently, according to Rice et al. (1990), the successful management of emotional responses to separation is more critical than independence when it comes to
mastery of the adaptational challenges of the college environment.

Closely related to separation/individuation are the issues of attachment and autonomy in the home-living process. Sullivan and Sullivan (1980) reported higher family-functioning indicators such as communication, affection, independence, and satisfaction in the freshmen who moved away from home when compared to those who commuted to college. Moore (1987) conceptualized the home-leaving process as the way in which late adolescents construe the meaning and character of separation that will influence the experience of separation. These notions of late adolescents concerning separation are ultimately assimilated into their self-concept and their relationships with their parents. Based on this perspective, Moore developed an instrument that would measure the cognitive constructs of the home-leaving process. Moore expected certain cognitions such as self-goverance to be more adaptive than others, such as emotional detachment. The ability to adapt to life changes that accompany the home-leaving process was closely related to how well the individual adjusted to the stresses of college (Holmbeck & Hill, 1991).

A recent study that involved a college-age sample correlated adjustment to two personality types: masculinity and femininity (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). Similarly, in an earlier study by Spence and Helmreich
(1978), these same traits but referred to as "intrumentality" and "expressiveness" were noted to be associated with adjustment outcomes. Findings have suggested that separation/individuation, family relations, and personality variables were better predictors of college adjustment than were the cognitive indicators or home-leaving status (Holmbeck & Wandrei, 1993).

For many adolescents, entering the college scene is one of the first and most demanding life transitions. Challenges of living apart from a familiar social network (e.g., parents and friends), meeting academic demands, assuming new and unfamiliar responsibilities, and establishing a new social network (e.g., peers and faculty) await the college freshmen. Hence, effective and successful adjustment to college life becomes a real issue, especially with the growing number of college students who become victims of attrition and the increasing severity of psychological problems reported in college counseling centers (Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994; Hoffman & Weiss, 1987). In order to confront the monumental task of assisting students to successfully adapt to the college environment, it is both necessary as well as imperative to investigate the possible related predictors of college adjustment. From the reviewed literature, it is apparent that the concept of college adjustment involves multidimensional variables.
Multicultural Issues

The United States has become the crossroads of different ethnic and racial groups from around the world. This pluralistic society demands sensitivity toward multicultural issues from its members, especially among professionals in psychology. According to Axelson (1993), the study of diverse lifestyles and life experiences and the important issues that people face within different cultural contexts is a major objective.

Multicultural counseling courses ranked 1st out of 34 new courses added in 1990, 6th out of 20 in 1983, and 10th out of 20 in 1980 (Axelson, 1993). Thus, it is clear that the counseling field is attempting to address the issues of cross-cultural counseling.

In the area of college adjustment, few studies (Abe & Zane, 1990; Cheatham, Slaney, & Coleman, 1990) have addressed adjustment issues with minority populations. Although Asian Americans have been included in these studies, there has yet to be an in-depth study of any one Asian American group, including the Korean American population. To my knowledge, there are no studies in the literature about the college adjustment of Korean Americans in terms of psychological androgyny.

Korean Americans

Prior to concluding this review of pertinent literature to the current study, it is necessary to acquaint the reader with a brief description of the Korean
American population and mention some general characteristics that have been associated with this subculture.

Korean Americans have been virtually unknown in the United States for most of this century; however, after 1965 (when the immigration quota system was abolished) immigrants from South Korea began settling throughout the country, clustering in and near major cities on either coast. Before 1960, there were about 10,000 Korean Americans in the United States (Patterson, 1977). Today there are between 800,000 and 1 million Korean Americans in this country. Although Korean Americans live throughout the United States, about half live in the states of California (29%), New York (9%), Illinois (7%), and Hawaii (5%). Regionally, 43% of Korean-Americans live in the West, while 20% live in the South, 19% live in the Northeast, and 18% of Korean-Americans live in the Midwest (Lehrer, 1996).

Mayberry (1991) presented a typical profile of Korean Americans. Korean Americans are among the higher-educated ethnic groups in America. Over 90% of men and approximately 70% of women are high-school graduates. At least 40% of all Korean Americans between the ages of 20 and 24 are enrolled in universities, compared with "One-fourth of white Americans in the same age group are enrolled in college" (Mayberry, 1991, p. 39).
Lehrer (1996) further indicated that Korean Americans born in the United States work in the same occupations and professions as other Americans. Many Korean Americans prefer to go into businesses for themselves. Neighborhoods all over major cities feature Korean produce stores, liquor stores, restaurants, stationery shops, wig stores, and dry cleaners. Often Korean businesses are located in poor, high-crime areas of large cities. These merchants risk robbery, assault, and murder to operate their businesses.

Axelson (1993) also described a composite profile of a typical Korean American family. The average family has one or two children, and they usually attend a Protestant church on a regular basis. English is the second language in the typical Korean American family, and Korean Americans usually live in cities and have managerial positions, own businesses, or are professionals.

As Korean Americans adjust to being in the United States, Korean families are at times torn between Eastern and Western points of view. According to Lehrer (1996), women, in particular, have difficulty reconciling the traditional Confucian role of wife with that of an American working woman. For centuries in Korea, women could not go out in public in the daytime. Women had no outside jobs, rather they were housewives with hired household help. Women lived with their in-laws and were expected to keep house, raise their children, and defer to
their husbands in all things. Now in the United States, over 80% of Korean American women take paying jobs. Nevertheless, most Korean American women are caught between the demands of two conflicting cultures. Most Korean American women still perform traditional duties like cooking meals for the day, before going off to work for 12 to 16 hours; even though they have become much more independent than they were at home in Korea, and no longer are so deferential to their husbands.

Korean American children and teenagers (second generation) typically feel closer to mainstream American society than their parents do. Cultural exposure is reinforced by movies, videos, music, and television.

Overall, Ho (1985) stated that Asians, including Korean Americans, still value and stress: interdependence, compliance, conformity, harmony, family ties, and maturity (old age). They underplay: independence, expression of feelings, competition, freedom, assertiveness, and youth. More specifically, Koreans differ from Americans in their definition of proper behavior. Influenced by Confucian beliefs, Korean Americans see morality as the fulfillment of a prescribed role in which parents and children, brothers and sisters, husbands and wives, all know what is expected of them and how they should act. Respect for elders is of such paramount importance that a child is taught to think nothing of sacrificing personal satisfaction in order to uphold filial duty.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the methodology of this research project. The following sections are included in this chapter: (1) Purpose of the Study, (2) Research Questions, (3) Design, (4) Sample Group, (5) Instrumentation, (6) Testing Procedures, (7) Null Hypotheses, (8) Treatment and Analysis of Data.

Purpose of Study

The primary purpose of this descriptive study was to examine the relationship between androgynous flexibility and the college adjustment of Korean American students. Androgynous flexibility was investigated in terms of college adjustment. The secondary purpose of the study was to report any differences among androgynous individuals in terms of gender, East Coast and West Coast school differences, and between private versus public types of college institutions. The rationale for comparing West Coast students (California) with East Coast students (Maryland) was to determine if geographic location would influence the level of college adjustment.
It was expected that West Coast students would report higher levels of college adjustment than would East Coast students due to the fact that there are larger Asian American and Korean American communities in California than in Maryland. It was believed that the existence of these communities would make the transition process to college less difficult.

The rationale for comparing private universities with public universities was to determine if type of institution would influence the level of college adjustment. It was expected that students attending private institutions would report higher levels of college adjustment than would students attending public institutions. It was believed that the students attending the private universities would have two advantages that could positively affect college adjustment. First, students who attended private institutions were likely to have more financial resources and fewer financial concerns than students who attended public institutions. Second, students who attended private institutions were more likely to have met more stringent admissions standards than students who attended public institutions. These students would have experienced fewer academic difficulties.

Research Questions

The research questions for this project were:
1. Are androgynous individuals more likely to report a higher level of college adjustment than masculine individuals?

2. Are androgynous individuals more likely to report a higher level of college adjustment than feminine individuals?

3. Are androgynous individuals more likely to report a higher level of college adjustment than undifferentiated individuals?

4. Is there a difference in level of college adjustment between androgynous males and androgynous females?

5. Is there a difference in level of college adjustment between East Coast androgynous individuals and West Coast androgynous individuals?

6. Is there a difference in level of college adjustment between androgynous individuals from private colleges and androgynous individuals from public universities?

**Design**

The design of this study was in the form of a mail survey. The Bem Inventory and the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire were sent out.

**Sample Group**

The subjects for this study consisted of 153 Korean American students from selected universities within the
United States. Each participant was chosen randomly from the directories of each school's Korean American Association list. The students attended the following universities: University of California Los Angeles (UCLA), University of California Riverside (UCR), University of Southern California (USC), University of Maryland College Park (UMCP), University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC), and Johns Hopkins University (JHU). These schools were selected for their large population of Korean American students and for their locality (these institutions are on the two coastal regions of the states, where the Korean American populations are concentrated).

The Korean American Student Association list from each school was considered to be the total population of Korean Americans in each program. Then, 50% of the total population was randomly selected to receive surveys (each name on the list was assigned a number and drawn out of a box). Table 1 summarizes the above-mentioned information along with the return rate of the surveys.

**Instrumentation**

This study used two objective instruments, the Bem Inventory and the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ). Both of these instruments have qualities desirable for research. Both inventories are fairly brief in form and clear in directions. The administration and scoring of the Bem and SACQ were simple
and did not consume excessive time for the participants or the scorer.

**TABLE 1**

**SUMMARY OF SELECTION PROCESS AND RETURN RATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Surveys Sent/Returned</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public West</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>153/52</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(UCLA &amp; UCR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private West</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>58/25</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(USC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public East</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>147/46</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(UMCP &amp; UMBC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private East</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>54/30</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JHU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>416/153</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bem Inventory, developed by Sandra Bem (1974), is one of the most widely used inventories used to measure the construct of androgyny. This inventory provides independent assessments of masculinity and femininity by measuring the reported possession of socially desirable, stereotypically masculine, and feminine personality characteristics. The Bem Inventory, Short Version, is a self-administering 30-item questionnaire measuring the following constructs: masculinity, femininity, androgyny, and undifferentiated.

When taking the BSRI, Short Version (see Appendix), the subject is asked to indicate on a 7-point Likert-type scale how well each of the 30 masculine, feminine, and neutral personality characteristics describes himself or
herself. The scale ranges from 1 ("Never or almost never") to 7 ("Always or almost always true").

The raw scores of the BSRI, Short Version, are determined by adding up the items that constitute the Masculinity and Femininity scales. Each scale consists of 10 items. These 10 items for each scale are added up and divided by 10. The other 10 items on the inventory are filler items and therefore are not included in the scoring. In this current study, to determine sex-role category, the raw scores of the Femininity and Masculinity scales were compared to Bem’s normative tables (as recommended by Bem for studies with a small sample of subjects) of median scores. If the raw scores of both the Masculinity and Femininity scales of a subject were above the median value of Bem’s original study, then the subject was categorized as androgynous. If both of the raw scores were below the median value of Bem’s original study, the individual was categorized as undifferentiated. If the Masculinity scale raw score was above Bem’s median value and the Femininity raw score was below Bem’s median value, then the subject was categorized as masculine. Individuals who were categorized as feminine were subjects who had raw score values in the Femininity scale that were above Bem’s median value, and raw scores in the Masculinity scale that fell below Bem’s median value. Bem (1981b) recommended the use of this Median-Split method because of its simplicity.
The Coefficient Alpha for the short Bem was .84 and .89. The Test-Retest reliability figures ranged from .76 to .91 (Bem, 1977). These psychometric values are satisfactory for use in research (Chung, 1983).

The Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ; Baker & Siryk, 1984, 1989) is a self-report measure of adjustment to college. The SACQ consists of 67 items to which students respond using a 9-point Likert scale. Each SACQ item is a statement that the subject responds to on a 9-point scale ranging from "applies very closely to me" on the left to "doesn't apply to me at all" on the right. The inventory yields a full scale measure of general adjustment, with scores ranging from 0 to 603 (the higher the score, the greater the perceived adjustment). In addition to the full scale, the SACQ assesses four features of college adjustment: academic (24 items), social (20 items), personal/emotional (20 items), and goal commitment-institutional attachment (8 items).

The Academic Adjustment scale is a subscale that measures a subject’s success in coping with the various educational demands of college. These items cover four domains including items that measure attitudes toward academic goals, items that focus on how well motivation is being translated into effort, items which measure the efficacy or success of academic effort as reflected in various academic methods of evaluation, and items that
measure the satisfaction of the subject with the academic environment.

The Social Adjustment subscale measures a student’s success in coping with interpersonal and societal demands inherent in the college experience. Items on this subscale address extent and success of societal activities in general, involvement with relationships on campus, dealing with relocation and being away from home, and satisfaction with the social aspects of the college environment.

The Personal-Emotional Adjustment subscale concentrates on a subject’s intrapsychic state during his or her adjustment to college, and the level to which he/she is experiencing psychological distress and any concomitant somatic symptoms.

The Attachment subscale is designed to measure the subject’s degree of commitment to educational and institutional goals and degree of attachment to the particular institution the student is attending.

Scoring the SACQ by hand is relatively simple and takes about 10 minutes. As students complete the questionnaire, their item responses are transferred via carbon paper to a scoring sheet underneath. Once the questionnaire is returned, the examiner detaches the perforated margin strip along the edge and opens the booklet to the scoring sheet. One begins scoring by transferring the circled value for each item to the
corresponding box(es) in the connected columns (please refer to Appendix B for further clarification). When all the boxes are filled, then the values are added in each column, and the sums are recorded at the bottom of the page (these are the raw scores). If desired, raw scores can easily be converted to t-scores and percentile rank equivalents on the profile forms provided for each questionnaire. For this study, the raw scores were used for the t-tests. Raw scores for the Full Scale range from 67 to 603. The range of raw scores for the subscale are (1) Academic Adjustment, 24-216, (2) Social Adjustment, 20-180, (3) Personal-Emotional Adjustment, 15-135, and (4) Attachment, 15-135. It should be noted that subscale scores do not sum up to the Full Scale score since two items appear on the Full Scale only and nine items appear on more than one subscale.

The Cronbach alpha has been reported as ranging from .89 to .95 for the SACQ full scale and from .73 to .91 for the subscales (Baker & Siryk, 1989). Several administrations of the SACQ have yielded correlations between the full scale and subscales between .68 to .90. Validity studies have shown significant correlations between the academic subscale and GPA. Low scores on the social and personal subscales along with low scores on the social activities checklist have predicted psychological counseling.
Testing Procedures

Each participant was sent a cover letter describing the research project along with the Bem and SACQ. It should be noted that basic demographic information was obtained from the SACQ form. In addition, a self-addressed envelope with a stamp was also included. The cover letter discussed:

1. The purpose of the study
2. The assurance of confidentiality, and for individuals who had questions, concerns, or had interest in the results, contact information was provided.

Postcards were sent out as reminders after 2 weeks to each participant.

Null Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no difference in college adjustment between androgynous individuals and masculine individuals.
2. There is no difference in college adjustment between androgynous individuals and feminine individuals.
3. There is no difference in college adjustment between androgynous individuals and undifferentiated individuals.
4. There is no difference in college adjustment between androgynous males and androgynous females.
5. There is no difference in college adjustment between androgynous individuals on the East Coast and androgynous individuals on the West Coast.
6. There is no difference in college adjustment between androgynous individuals from private colleges and androgynous individuals from public universities.

Treatment and Analysis of Data

Each subject's Bem score was determined. The score from the Bem identified individuals as androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, or feminine. Also, the adjustment scores for each individual were calculated from the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire. Then t-tests were performed to address the research hypotheses. Each sex role category's (i.e., androgynous, masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated) adjustment to college score means was compared for significant differences at the .05 level.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from the analyses of the data collected. This chapter is organized into two main sections. The first section presents a summary of the sample group, and the second section deals with each null hypothesis constructed in the preceding chapter. Finally, the results are summarized by addressing the research questions.

Sample Group

The sample group consisted of 153 individuals. There were 67 males (44%) and 86 females (56%). Their mean age was 20. This group had 28 freshmen, 40 sophomores, 43 juniors, and 42 seniors. Ninety-eight students were from public institutions, whereas 55 were from private universities. Seventy-six students were attending a university on the East Coast of the United States, whereas 77 students were from the West Coast of the United States. Forty-nine students were categorized as undifferentiated; 29 students were categorized masculine; 32 students were categorized feminine; and 42 were categorized androgynous. Table 2 summarizes the above-mentioned information.
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### TABLE 2
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year in College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public West (UCLA &amp; UCR)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private West (USC)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public East (UMCP &amp; UMBC)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private East (JHU)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex-Role Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Testing of the Hypotheses**

**Null Hypothesis 1**

The null hypothesis stated that there is no difference in the level of college adjustment between androgynous and masculine individuals. The null hypothesis was retained in the areas of Total College Adjustment, Social Adjustment, Personal-Emotional (PEREM) Adjustment, and Institutional Attachment (INSATT) Adjustment. The null hypothesis was rejected within the
Academic Adjustment domain. Table 3 summarizes these findings.

**TABLE 3**

**TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN THE MEANS OF COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT FOR ANDROGYNOUS AND MASCULINE GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment Variable &amp; Sex-Role Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>411.03</td>
<td>65.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>445.21</td>
<td>80.15</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACADEMIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>139.24</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>154.14</td>
<td>34.30</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>125.76</td>
<td>21.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>136.14</td>
<td>24.82</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEREM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>89.79</td>
<td>21.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>94.12</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSATT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>98.26</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>106.45</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level (Reject H0).

**Null Hypothesis 2**

The null hypothesis stated that there is no difference in the level of college adjustment between androgy nous and feminine individuals. The null hypothesis was rejected in the five areas of college adjustment. Table 4 summarizes these findings.
TABLE 4
TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN THE MEANS OF COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT FOR ANDROGYNOUS AND FEMININE GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment Variable &amp; Sex-Role Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>391.50</td>
<td>51.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>445.21</td>
<td>80.15</td>
<td>-3.31</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>134.53</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>154.14</td>
<td>34.30</td>
<td>-2.83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>118.78</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>136.14</td>
<td>24.82</td>
<td>-3.19</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEREM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>83.00</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>94.12</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.031*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSATT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>96.28</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>106.45</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.034*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level (Reject H0).

Null Hypothesis 3

The null hypothesis stated that there is no difference in the level of college adjustment between androgynous and undifferentiated individuals. The null hypothesis was rejected in the areas of Total College Adjustment, Academic Adjustment, Social Adjustment, and Institutional Attachment (INSATT) Adjustment. The null hypothesis was retained within the Personal-Emotional
(PEREM) Adjustment domain. Table 5 summarizes these findings.

TABLE 5

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN THE MEANS OF COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT FOR ANDROGYNOUS AND UNDIFFERENTIATED GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment Variable &amp; Sex-Role Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiff.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>392.68</td>
<td>55.26</td>
<td>-3.68</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>445.21</td>
<td>80.15</td>
<td>-3.15</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiff.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>133.43</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>-3.37</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>154.14</td>
<td>34.30</td>
<td>-3.37</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiff.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>117.98</td>
<td>18.88</td>
<td>-3.96</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>136.14</td>
<td>24.82</td>
<td>-3.96</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEREM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiff.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>86.14</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>94.12</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSATT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undiff.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>94.92</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>-2.92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>106.45</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>-2.92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level (Reject HO).

Null Hypothesis 4

The null hypothesis stated that there is no difference in the level of college adjustment between androgynous males and androgynous females. The null hypothesis was retained in all five areas of college adjustment. Table 6 summarizes these findings.
TABLE 6
TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN THE MEANS OF COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT FOR ANDROGYNOUS MALES AND FEMALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment Variable &amp; Gender Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>424.37</td>
<td>84.69</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>462.43</td>
<td>73.60</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>143.79</td>
<td>31.82</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>162.70</td>
<td>34.58</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>132.00</td>
<td>24.66</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>139.57</td>
<td>24.97</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEREM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>89.68</td>
<td>25.47</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>97.78</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSATT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>101.42</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>110.61</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level (Reject HO).

**Null Hypothesis 5**

The null hypothesis stated that there is no difference in the level of college adjustment between androgynous individuals on the East Coast and androgynous individuals on the West Coast. The null hypothesis was retained in the areas of Total College Adjustment, Social Adjustment, Institutional Attachment (INSATT), and Personal-Emotional (PEREM) Adjustment. In the area of
Academic Adjustment, the null hypothesis was rejected. Table 7 summarizes these findings.

TABLE 7
TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN THE MEANS OF COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT FOR EAST COAST ANDROGYNOUS INDIVIDUALS AND WEST COAST ANDROGYNOUS INDIVIDUALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment Variable &amp; Coast</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>462.75</td>
<td>87.73</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>421.83</td>
<td>63.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>167.33</td>
<td>35.14</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>136.56</td>
<td>24.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>134.50</td>
<td>28.34</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>138.33</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEREM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>98.58</td>
<td>24.49</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88.17</td>
<td>20.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSATT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>107.17</td>
<td>20.07</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>105.50</td>
<td>23.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level (Reject HO).

Null Hypothesis 6

The null hypothesis stated that there is no difference in the level of college adjustment between androgynous individuals from private colleges and androgynous individuals from public universities. The
null hypothesis was retained in all the areas of college adjustment. Table 8 summarizes these findings.

**TABLE 8**

**TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN THE MEANS OF COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT FOR ANDROGYNOUS INDIVIDUALS FROM PRIVATE COLLEGES AND ANDROGYNOUS INDIVIDUALS FROM PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment Variable &amp; Type of School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>441.15</td>
<td>83.44</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>447.03</td>
<td>80.07</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACADEMIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>157.15</td>
<td>36.39</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>152.79</td>
<td>33.91</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>136.92</td>
<td>25.79</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>135.79</td>
<td>24.83</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEREM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87.62</td>
<td>22.47</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>97.03</td>
<td>23.31</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSATT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>99.77</td>
<td>22.74</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>109.45</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Questions**

1. Are androgynous individuals more likely to report a higher level of college adjustment than masculine individuals?
Only in terms of Academic Adjustment did androgynous individuals report a statistically significant higher level of adjustment than masculine individuals. In the four other areas of adjustment, which include the Total Adjustment, Social Adjustment, Personal-Emotional Adjustment, and Institutional Attachment Adjustment scores, androgynous individuals did have higher means, but the differences were not statistically significant.

2. Are androgynous individuals more likely to report a higher level of college adjustment than feminine individuals?

Androgynous individuals reported statistically significant higher levels of adjustment in all five scales (Total, Academic, Social, Personal-Emotional, and Institutional Attachment) of college adjustment compared to feminine individuals.

3. Are androgynous individuals more likely to report a higher level of college adjustment than undifferentiated individuals?

Androgynous individuals reported statistically significant higher levels of adjustment in four areas (Total, Academic, Social, and Institutional Attachment) of college adjustment when compared to undifferentiated individuals. Androgynous students had a higher mean than the undifferentiated students on the Personal-Emotional Adjustment scale, but the difference was not statistically significant.
4. Is there a difference in level of college adjustment between androgynous males and androgynous females?

There was no statistically significant difference in level of college adjustment between androgynous males and androgynous females. Androgynous females reported higher means on all five scales (Total, Academic, Social, Personal-Emotional, and Institutional Attachment) of college adjustment compared to their male counterparts; however, the difference between the means was not statistically significant.

5. Is there a difference in level of college adjustment between East Coast androgynous individuals and West Coast androgynous individuals?

Only in terms of Academic Adjustment did androgynous individuals on the East Coast report a statistically significant higher level of adjustment than androgynous individuals on the West Coast. In the four other areas of adjustment, which include the Total Adjustment, Social Adjustment, Personal-Emotional Adjustment, and Institutional Attachment Adjustment scores, differences were not statistically significant.

6. Is there a difference in level of college adjustment between androgynous individuals from private colleges and androgynous individuals from public universities?
There was no statistically significant difference in level of college adjustment between androgynous individuals from private colleges and androgynous individuals from public universities.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the research, discussion of the results, conclusion and implications of the findings, and recommendations for further research.

Summary

The summary of this research is divided into four sections: (1) Purpose of the Study, (2) Overview of Related Literature, (3) Sampling and Instrumentation, and (4) Null Hypotheses.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this descriptive study was to examine the relationship between androgynous flexibility and the college adjustment of Korean American students. Androgynous flexibility was investigated in terms of college adjustment.

Overview of Related Literature

The review of literature for this research consisted of several major divisions. The first section summarized the major theoretical perspectives of sex-role
development. Freud's (1933) psychoanalytic theory, Kohlberg's (1966) cognitive development theory, and Mischel's (1966) social learning theory were presented. In addition to these classical theorists, many researchers have contributed to the study of gender roles (Constantinople, 1973; Edwards & Abbot, 1973; Herzog & Sudia, 1970; Kelly & Worell, 1977; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Tyler, 1968). In Heilbrun's (1974) research, the concept of androgyny became prominent within gender-role studies. That same year, Bem (1974) formulated an alternative sex-role function, psychological androgyny, which allowed for coexistence of both masculinity and femininity within a single individual contrary to the traditional polarized perspective of masculinity and femininity. Furthermore, Bem and Lenney (1976), along with other researchers (Block et al., 1973; Chung, 1983; Cristall & Dean, 1976; Leahy & Eiter, 1980; Lukman, 1983; Nevill, 1977) concluded that androgynous individuals are socially more effective due to their psychological flexibility.

the research in college adjustment by developing the
Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire. All these
researchers have agreed that college adjustment involved
multidimensional factors, including personality variables
(Holmbeck & Wandrei, 1993).

The final section of the literature review discussed
multicultural issues. Axelsson (1993) pointed out that the
study of diverse lifestyles and life experiences along
with important issues that people face within different
cultural contexts are imperative in society today. Ho
(1985) stated that Asian Americans, including Korean
Americans, value and emphasize: interdependence,
compliance, harmony, family ties, and old age.

Sampling and Instrumentation

The random sample of 153 subjects (67 males and 86
females) was made up of undergraduate Korean American
students from selected universities along the western and
eastern coasts of the United States. Data were collected
by mail survey between January 1, 1996, and January 31,
1996.

This research study employed two objective
instruments: the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) and the
Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ). The
BSRI and SACQ have solid psychometric properties that make
these instruments suitable for research. The practical
advantages of these instruments lie in their clarity,
brief form, simplicity of administration and scoring, and the fact that typical respondents can complete them in a reasonable amount of time.

Discussion of Null Hypotheses and Findings

Hypotheses 1 to 3 examined the relationship between androgynous flexibility and the college adjustment of Korean American students, while hypotheses 4 to 6 addressed the effects of gender, geographic location, and type of institution on androgynous individuals. For each research question, the null hypothesis was stated, followed by a statement of retention or rejection, and a discussion of the finding.

The following null hypotheses were formulated for statistical testing:

1. The mean college adjustment score among androgynous Korean American students is not significantly higher than that among masculine Korean American students.

The null hypothesis was retained in the areas of Total College Adjustment, Social Adjustment, Personal-Emotional Adjustment, and Institutional Attachment Adjustment. However, the null hypothesis was rejected in the area of Academic Adjustment.

Masculine individuals are high on masculine traits (i.e., assertiveness, independence) and low on feminine traits (i.e., warmth, compassion). Androgynous individuals are high on masculine and feminine traits.
Masculine traits may be a more important influence on college adjustment. Because both Masculine individuals and Androgynous individuals are high on masculine traits there is no significant difference between them and level of college adjustment.

In the area of Academic Adjustment there were significant differences between Masculine individuals and Androgynous individuals. Androgynous individuals were better adjusted than Masculine individuals in the area of Academic Adjustment. These conflicting results are difficult to explain. It could be that the content of items on the SACQ that determine the Academic Adjustment score may have influenced masculine respondents. Many of the items on the SACQ that determine the Academic Adjustment score refer to feeling states. Masculine individuals may find it difficult to identify their feelings and respond to these items. This would result in lower college adjustment scores in the Academic Adjustment area.

2. The mean college adjustment score among androgynous Korean American students is not significantly higher than that among feminine Korean American students. This null hypothesis was rejected in all five areas of college adjustment.

This finding appeared to be consistent with Bem’s theory of androgynous flexibility. Bem postulated that one consequence of psychological androgyny was sex-role
adaptability, which advanced the hypothesis that psychological androgynous individuals might be more likely than masculine or feminine individuals to display sex role adaptability across situations (i.e., for this study the "situation" was college). Korean American students who were categorized as androgynous individuals reported higher levels of adaptability to college than Korean American students who were categorized as feminine individuals. This finding suggests that feminine traits may be a less of an influence on college adjustment.

3. The mean college adjustment score among androgynous Korean American students is not significantly higher than that among undifferentiated Korean American students.

This null hypothesis was rejected in the areas of Total College Adjustment, Academic Adjustment, Social Adjustment, and Institutional Adjustment. However, the null hypothesis was retained in the area of Personal-Emotional Adjustment.

Androgynous individuals scored significantly higher in 4 out of 5 college adjustment scores than undifferentiated Korean American students. Again, this finding supported Bem’s position since androgynous individuals displayed behavioral adaptability whereas non-androgynous individuals displayed behavioral restrictiveness.
In the area of Personal-Emotional Adjustment even though this finding did not support Bem's theory of easier adaptability for androgynous individuals at the .05 level of statistical significance, there were some evidence that androgynous subjects would have reported statistically higher level of Personal-Emotional Adjustment within less stringent analysis parameters and/or if the sample population was larger.

4. There is no significant difference in the mean college adjustment score between androgynous Korean American males and androgynous Korean American females.

This null hypothesis was retained in all five areas of college adjustment.

According to this result, androgynous males and androgynous females adjusted equally well to college. It appears that the trait of androgyny supercedes gender differences. Behavioral flexibility, one consequence of androgyny, benefits men and women equally. No significant differences of adjustment were reported between the aforementioned groups.

5. There is no difference in college adjustment between androgynous Korean American students on the East Coast and androgynous Korean-American students on the West Coast.

This null hypothesis was retained in the areas of Total College Adjustment, Social Adjustment, Personal-Emotional Adjustment, and Institutional Attachment.
Adjustment. However, the null hypothesis was rejected in the area of Academic Adjustment.

Contrary to expectations, at least in terms of this study, there were no East/West Coast differences found in 4 out of 5 college adjustment domains. This lack of difference in levels of adjustment for androgynous Korean American students may be attributed to the fact that each of their university campuses may be highly tolerant of ethnic diversity. The six schools (where this current study sample was collected) all actively promoted cultural diversity, therefore, whether one attended an East Coast school or West Coast school did not seem to matter, because the policies on these campuses created an environment conducive to adjustment of androgynous Korean American students.

However, on one subscale (Academic) of college adjustment, East Coast androgynous individuals reported significantly higher adjustment scores. This finding may be explained by the differences in general academic standards of the institutions surveyed. For example, the East Coast private institution was considered to be more selective academically than the West Coast private institution, and this may have had an effect on the higher academic adjustment score that was reported.

6. There is no difference in college adjustment between androgynous Korean American students from private
colleges and androgynous Korean American individuals from public universities.

This null hypothesis was retained in all five areas of college adjustment.

Again, this result is probably obtained because both the private universities and public universities represented in this study had comparable standards, programs, and policies for minorities. Therefore, each campus was (for all practical purposes) equally tolerant of a minority population.

Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

Bem's theory of behavioral flexibility was not fully supported by the findings of this research. There was no conclusive evidence of greater flexibility of behavior with androgynous individuals. Bem postulated that Psychological Androgyny allows people to be more flexible in their behaviors. Overall, androgynous individuals reported significantly higher adjustment levels than feminine or undifferentiated subjects, however their adjustment scores were not significantly higher than masculine individuals.

Another conclusion which can be made from this study is that masculine traits play a more active role than feminine traits in the adjustment process to college for Korean Americans. Findings suggest that masculine traits
are more influential with the adjustment process to college for this population.

This study and its findings have several implications. First, the findings of this study can provide more data of the Korean American college student to student affair specialists. For example, university counseling psychologists can use this data to understand his/her client more appropriately and implement treatment plans which may be culture specific.

Also, this study has value because it adds to the literature of psychology data about a minority group which still is relatively unknown to mainstream America.

Based on this study, there are several recommendations for future research:

1. A different set of instruments could be used for adjustment (i.e., College Adjustment Scale, College Adjustment Inventory, Student Adjustment Inventory), and androgyny (California Psychological Inventory, and Personal Attributes Questionnaire) to determine if different instruments would yield comparable results.

2. In order to investigate the relationship between androgyny and adjustment more comprehensively, it is suggested that other domains of adjustment (i.e., job, church, blended-family situation, remarriages) be examined.

3. In terms of further research with Korean American subjects, another group of individuals other than college
student populations could be examined in order to increase
generalizability of the study.

4. Replication of this study could be implemented
with other ethnic groups.
APPENDIX A

BEM SEX-ROLE INVENTORY
Please Note

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author’s university library.

70-72

UMI
APPENDIX B

STUDENT ADAPTATION TO COLLEGE QUESTIONNAIRE
Please Note

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

74-75

UMI
Winter 1995-1996

Dear Fellow Korean American Students:

I am a doctoral student enrolled in the Department of Counseling Psychology at Andrews University. I am currently in the final stages of my program, and I need YOUR help. One of my research interests has been in the field of multicultural issues, specifically with Korean Americans. Therefore, for my dissertation project I have chosen to measure college adjustment in Korean American students and how the psychological trait of androgyny (which is easily defined as the integration of femininity and masculinity within a single individual) affects the adjustment process.

There are several significant implications of this current research. Results of this research will aid universities in their understanding of Korean-American students. The findings of the research may be used for academic and personal counseling for Korean-American students. Furthermore, this study may generate more interest for future studies which are similar in content.

So this is where YOU come in. If you would be kind enough to fill out the two surveys which are enclosed in this package, I would greatly appreciate it. It will take you a total of 15 minutes at the most. Please follow the directions on each inventory. I would like to assure you that your responses will be guarded with confidentiality and you will not be identified either directly or indirectly.

Returning these inventories in the return envelope, I will consider you as an informed participant of this study.

If you have any questions or would like results of the study, please feel free to contact me or my principal advisor at these locations:

Danny Kim
903 Southern Drive
Bel Air, MD. 21014
(410) 879-8096

OR

Frederick Kosinski, Ph.D.
Andrews University
Bell Hall, Room 160
Berrien Springs, MI. 49104
(616) 471-3466

Thank you,

Daniel D. Kim
Doctorate Candidate in Counseling Psychology
Andrews University
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