

December 2018

## An Analysis of Black, Latinx, Multicultural and Asian/Pacific Islander Fraternity/Sorority Organizational Values

Ashley Tull

*Southern Methodist University, atull@smu.edu*

Andrew Shaw

*University of Texas Dallas, andrew.shaw3@utdallas.edu*

Brittany Barker

*Southern Methodist University, bbarker@smu.edu*

Taylor Sandoval

*Texas Woman's University, tsandoval1@twu.edu*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/jma>

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

[Tell us](#) how this article helped you.

---

### Recommended Citation

Tull, Ashley; Shaw, Andrew; Barker, Brittany; and Sandoval, Taylor (2018) "An Analysis of Black, Latinx, Multicultural and Asian/Pacific Islander Fraternity/Sorority Organizational Values," *Journal of Multicultural Affairs*: Vol. 3 : Iss. 2 , Article 2.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/jma/vol3/iss2/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by SFA ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Multicultural Affairs by an authorized editor of SFA ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [cdsscholarworks@sfasu.edu](mailto:cdsscholarworks@sfasu.edu).

## **An Analysis of Black, Latinx, Multicultural and Asian/Pacific Islander Fraternity/Sorority Organizational Values**

*Ashley Tull, Southern Methodist University  
Andrew Shaw, University of Texas, Dallas  
Brittany Barker, Southern Methodist University  
Taylor Sandoval, Texas Woman's University*

Fraternity/sorority organizations on campus hold a variety of values that shape their membership and organizational culture (McCreary, 2014). Previous research on historically White organizations, has found many shared values among fraternity/sorority organizations (Schutts, 2013). The present study examined fraternity/sorority values of groups not often studied in the literature. These included historically Black, Latinx, multicultural and Asian/Pacific Islander groups. With values, previously having been studied universally and cross-culturally (Bilsky, Janik & Schwartz, 2011; Schwartz, 2012), researchers approached their study with interest in examining the alignment (or misalignment) of fraternity/sorority organizations values with those that are found more broadly.

To conduct the study, researchers reviewed the historical development of major governing organizations for each type of fraternity/sorority included. A particular focus was on the rationale for their development and their identification of unique and commonly shared espoused values. These organizations included: the National Pan-Hellenic Association (NPHC), historically Black organizations; the National Association of Latin Fraternal Organizations (NALFO), historically Latinx organizations; the National Multicultural Greek Council (NMGC), historically Multicultural organizations; and the National Asian Pacific Islander Desi American Panhellenic Association (NAPA),

historically Asian/Pacific Islander organizations. The values classification results explicated later in this study were also compared to previous research (Tull & Shaw, 2018; Tull, Shaw & Barker, 2018) on historically White fraternity/sorority organizations including those that are members of the North-American Interfraternal Conference (NIC) and the National Panhellenic Council (NPC).

### **Review of the Literature**

Higher education institutions will continue to see increased enrollments of minoritized students. Between 2007 and 2018, White students will increase by 4%, 26% for Black students, 38% for Hispanic students, 29% for Asian or Pacific Islander students, 32% for American Indian or Alaskan Native students (Hussar & Bailey, 2009). Due to this growing demand to meet the diverse cultural needs of women and men and their pursuits of identity development on college campuses, the emergence of multicultural, ethnic, and heritage based Greek-lettered organizations emerged in the late decades of the twentieth century (Worley & Wells, 2007). Largely in part to the Civil Rights Movement cultivating a positive climate for minoritized populations, individuals “felt the need to belong to organizations that not only embraced and highlighted their own culture, but also valued the effervescent qualities and richness of other cultures shared by their friends and families” (NMGC, 2017, para. 2). Individuals from all walks of life experiencing exclusion, inhospitable environments or lack of support from existing social fraternity organizations on the local and national levels began creating new ways to promote multicultural awareness and unite college communities. Similar in rituals and activities to those in NPC, IFC and NALFO organizations

desired to create a sacred bond, an opportunity for acceptance in multicultural fraternities and sororities offered those of minoritized populations a chance to develop a sense of understanding or affinity with other individuals in underrepresented populations; especially in predominately White serving institutions (PWI) (Worley & Wells, 2007).

The added dimension of a shared desire among members to sponsor educational, economic, political, and social advancement...for other members of their gender, race, ethnicity, and culture fits the individual aspirations of many college-going members of these populations, too. (Worley & Wells, 2007, p. 513)

### **Historically Black Fraternity/Sorority Organizations**

The NPHC, is currently composed of nine international fraternities and sororities (NPHC, 2017). The purpose and mission of this organization is “Unanimity of thought and action as far as possible in the conduct of Greek letter collegiate fraternities and sororities, and to consider problems of mutual interest to its member organizations” (NPHC, 2017, para 3). The organizations that make up the NPHC were all created for similar reasons at a time when Black college students were entering postsecondary education in greater numbers. These organizations, historically for Black college students, were formed by those who wanted a support system to help them succeed on college campuses while also giving back to their communities. The founding dates of these organizations range from 1906 through 1963 (NPHC, 2017). These organizations are committed to community service, racial equality, and social justice (Morial, Parks, & Malveaux, 2008).

The first NPHC organization to be founded was Alpha Phi Alpha, Inc., which

was established December 4, 1906 at Cornell University, a predominantly White Ivy League institution (Morial, et al., 2008; Ross, 2000). At the time, Black students were still subject to strict rules by institutions and had to form separate student organizations. Since college life and student involvement opportunities were limited for these students, they had to band together to support one another and navigate a college campus (Brown, Parks & Phillips, 2005). This was particularly true as Alpha Phi Alpha, Inc. was born out of a study and support group structure created to help Cornell’s Black students be successful. It’s leaders (Henry Arthur Callis, Eugene Kinckle Jones, Robert Harold Ogle, Charles Henry Chapman, Nathaniel Allison Murray, George Biddle Kelly, and Vertner Woodson Tandy) would serve as founding fathers (known as the Seven Jewels) of the first college fraternity for African American students (Ross).

Not only did the founders of Alpha Phi Alpha, Inc. want to bolster the academic success of its brothers, they also wanted to create equal opportunities for co-curricular activities outside of their studies. Through that experience they decided they wanted a similar fraternal organization for themselves. Although the founders were already a part of a literary society that was formed for and by Black students, they wanted more. Black students were at risk of dropping out because of social isolation and fraternities were a way to fight that isolation (Morial et al.; Ross). The number of Black students enrolled at Cornell was low; the founders were seven out of the eleven total incoming Black students that year (1906). Some aspects of the White fraternity system were used as a model for newly formed Black organization this allowed for a unique organization that was different from the established White fraternities of that day resulted (Morial, et al.; Ross).

Alpha Phi Alpha, Inc. decided to expand to other college campuses starting in 1907 at Howard University. The year after they arrived at Howard the first sorority for Black women was founded, Alpha Kappa Alpha, Inc. This sorority celebrated scholarship and dedicated itself to the “service of all mankind” (Morial et al., p. 41). In the following years, another four NPHC organizations (Omega Psi Phi, Inc., Delta Sigma Theta, Inc., Phi Beta Sigma, Inc. and Zeta Phi Beta, Inc.) were founded at Howard, bringing the total to five organizations to be founded at this institution. While chapters continued to expand, their purpose remained the same and their commitment to brotherhood/sisterhood, community service, and social justice prevailed (Morial et al.). The full timeline (organizations and founding dates) for Divine Nine organizations follows: Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc. (1906); Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. (1908); Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc. (1911); Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc. (1911); Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. (1913); Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. (1914); Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Inc. (1920); Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority, Inc. (1922); and Iota Phi Theta Fraternity, Inc. (1963).

### **Historically Latinx Fraternity/sorority Organizations**

The NALFO was established in 1998 and is comprised of 16 national Latinx sororities/fraternities (NALFO, 2017). The origins of Latino fraternities began in the 1800s as secret societies for wealthy students from Latin American countries studying in the U.S. Many members of these secret societies also attended more prestigious American college and universities (Rodriquez, 1995). These secret societies evolved into alliances that were the

basis of Latino fraternities. This occurred during what Munoz and Guardia (2009) described as, “Phase I: Principio (1898-1980)” (p. 107).

There were many organizations and fraternities that joined forces to become Phi Iota Alpha Fraternity on December 26, 1931, making Phi Iota Alpha the oldest Latino fraternity in the U.S. Phi Iota Alpha, “formed an intellectual group to discuss the social, economic and political problems of their native countries and how these factors were affecting their educational experiences in the United States,” (Munoz & Guardia, p. 108). The largest time of growth for Latinx fraternities/sororities was between the 1980s and 1990s (Guardia & Evans, 2008). Latino students were joining historically White Greek organizations but felt like they did not fit that mold completely. In order to preserve their heritage but still be a part of the mainstream culture, they began to create their own fraternity/sorority organizations (Guardia & Evans, 2008).

### **Historically Multicultural Fraternity/sorority Organizations**

In November 1981, the first multicultural sorority, Mu Sigma Upsilon, Inc., was founded at Rutgers University and by 1998, the NMGC formed into the advocacy and support umbrella agency over unique chapters of multicultural fraternities/sororities we know today. Since the founding of the NMGC, member chapters, advisors, executive boards, student affairs administrators and other campus affiliates have worked to highlight the idea of multiculturalism, defined as “a state of mind – a philosophy that embraces any and all aspects of cultural identity with unconditional respect and equality” (NMGC, 2017, para. 11), an aspect many students felt was missing on a college campus. Kimbrough (2003) added that by

bringing together different races and backgrounds and majority and minoritized populations into fraternity/sorority groups, one is openly embracing the idea of multiculturalism. Organizations partaking in this notion would enact campus and community wide diversity and inclusion experiences by learning about new cultures and maintaining a “willingness to see race and culture as culturally constructed...[yet] authentic and valuable” (Hunter & Hughey, 2013, p. 534). Instilling this foundation, the NMGC shifted from collaboration among its chapters to a council “that would strengthen the presence of its member organizations on college campuses while fortifying ties with university professionals” (NMGC, 2017, para. 9). In doing so, the NMGC and its 11-member organizations solidified a unique set of values and ideals to better accomplish widespread visibility and comfort for students searching for community on campus. Through leadership, service, multicultural awareness, scholarship, unity, civic responsibility, and an active citizenship, just to name a few, members in multicultural fraternities/sororities will “recognize and value differences, teach and learn about differences, and bridge differences [through] personal friendships and organizational alliances” (McCabe, 2011, p. 521). In public or private institutions, minoritized or majority populations, students can begin forming their racial, ethnic, and cultural identity.

NMGC, NPHC and other multicultural fraternity/sorority umbrella organizations like NALFO or NAPA are at the advantage of being less institutionalized and have more autonomy over the focus of authenticating students lived cultural experience and values based programming on college campuses (National Multicultural Greek Council, 2017; National Pan-Hellenic Council, 2017; National Association of Latino Fraternity Organizations, 2017; National APIA

Panhellenic Association, 2017). Barnhardt (2014) asserted that sororities best add value to the community when its culture and environment is supported by personal and social responsibility of its members. Therefore, NMGC organizations look for leadership, action-oriented men and women eager to carry out the ideals of their founding organizations and “provide unity and a sense of belonging, particularly at predominately White institutions” (Atkinson, Dean, & Espino, 2010, p. 35). Recent accounts from student members of NMGC left them feeling less a part of the campus community before becoming a member and taking on an active role in their culturally adapted chapter (Atkinson, et al.). Additionally, the difference in Greek affiliated experiences or carried out values of White and Black students, for instance, are attributed to the “different historical and structural realities that have shaped [their] lives” (Berkowitz & Padavic, 1999, p. 532). This likely can be explained by the founding purposes of these organizations. While these groups were founded to help curb isolation and provide social opportunities, Black fraternities (such as Alpha Phi Alpha, Inc.) were initially founded to provide supportive structures for academic success (Ross, 2000). Historically White fraternities were formed for more social reasons, as opposed to the reasons for the founding of other types. This was as a response to their wanting more social outlets than the literary societies to which they belonged provided (Syrett, 2011).

### **Historically Asian/Pacific Islander Fraternity/Sorority Organizations**

Current members of national organizations affiliated under the NAPA have recalled the fraternity/sorority recruitment experience as “leisure for Caucasian Americans...[where] mainstream

[NPC and NIC] Greek fraternities and sororities could legally discriminate on the basis of race, preserving their upper-class, White, Christian character” (Chen, 2009, p. 83). Members of NAPA (as well as NMGC, NALFO, NPHC) and other multicultural Greek organizations place heavy emphasis on the opportunity to unite in racial uplift, build comradery and a home within their college or city community. Asian-American students along with Black, Latinx or Native Americans felt the need to form ethnic or race specific organizations for a retreat from the otherwise exclusionary world they were experiencing (National APIA Panhellenic Association, 2017). In doing so, specific populations, like Native Americans, fought “the tension between embracing a new culture and maintaining traditions... [an ambition] imperative for a place of power in the student world” (Kelly, 2009, p. 134).

In the past ten years, over sixty Asian-American fraternities and sororities have emerged, and men and women with ethnic minorities such as Chinese or Japanese can thrive through the ideals of community, heritage and advocacy on primarily White campuses (NAPA, 2017). In coalition with the NIC or NPC, primarily White serving embodiments; additions in the past 30 years of many widespread multicultural organizations have “developed a unique vibrant identity to the Greek world” (Kelly, 2009, p. 134). Ethnically focused student organizations for Asian/Pacific Islander students have been found to help in increasing awareness and commitment to community for Asian/Pacific Islanders (Inkelas, 2004). This has the added benefit of allowing these students to further develop cultural values that are aligned with their membership in a fraternity/sorority. Museus and Yi (2015) stated that opportunities to engage with other Asian/Pacific Islander students can aid in cultural commitment and help students thrive while in college.

Fraternity/sorority advisors and college administrators working with affiliated students should understand that students “form predispositions from prior interracial experiences” (Fischer, 2008, p. 646). These are brought with them to college. Students from minoritized populations, such as those that are a focus of the present study, have a need to further develop and preserve their culture while in college.

Fraternities/sororities provide such an outlet for this development and opportunities to interact with others from similar backgrounds and experiences. This not only furthers social and group development, but also provides a support system for student success for these students.

### Values Theory and Study Framework

Values have been the focus of research universally, although with little specifically on college and university students and even less regarding students belonging to fraternity/sorority organizations. Universally accepted values have been defined as:

- (1) Values are beliefs linked inextricably to affect.
- (2) Values refer to desirable goals that motivate action.
- (3) Values transcend specific actions and situations.
- (4) Values serve as standards or criteria.
- (5) Values are ordered by importance relative to one another.
- (6) The *relative* importance of multiple values guides action. (Schwartz, 2012, pp. 3-4)

Universal values have also been studied widely across cultures and various multicultural perspectives over time (Bilsky, Janik & Schwartz, 2011; Davidov, Schmidt & Schwartz 2008). With the abundance of research on universal values conducted by Schwartz (2012) and as the most widely-cited author on the subject, we chose to

explore the themes of self-enhancement, openness to change, self-transcendence and conservation. These have been developed over many years of research across 82 countries (Schwartz, 2012). The following are Schwartz's themes and specific values that are aligned under each:

Self-Enhancement (power and achievement/achievement and hedonism); Openness to Change (hedonism and stimulation/stimulation and self-direction/self-direction and universalism); Self-Transcendence (universalism and benevolence/benevolence and tradition/benevolence and conformity); and Conservation (conformity and tradition/tradition and security/conformity and security/security and power) (Schwartz, S. H., 2012, pp. 9-10).

The Theoretical Model of Relations Among Ten Motivational Types of Values (Schwartz, 2012) was used as a framework for our study. The model was selected as it has been widely used in values research in over 80 countries, thus providing validity across many cultures. This model provided us a system for organizing the ten universal values previously identified under the four areas that are a part of Schwartz's values continuum. These four areas and the associated values that fall under each were described in the last paragraph. Schwartz's values continuum helped to inform the development of our classification system for all organizations that will be further described below.

### **Methodology**

We designed our research questions for the study at the conclusion of our review of literature on the development of historically Black, Latinx, Multicultural and Asian/Pacific Islander fraternity/sorority organizations and values theory:

- (1) What are the values of fraternities/sororities that are members of the NPHC, the NALFO, the NMGC, and the NAPA, and how are they classified according to universally accepted values?
- (2) How do the universally accepted values of the above fraternities/sororities compare to those of historically White Greek fraternities of the IFC and sororities of the NPC?

In response to the first question outlined above, content analysis methodology was implemented for the review and classification of all values related to those organizations identified. This was done through a review of 54 organizational websites (9 NPHC, 16 NALFO, 11 NMGC and 18 NAPA). The national coordinating organizations were used for the identification and study of their member groups as they serve as national trade associations for like fraternity/sorority organizations.

A total of 252 espoused values were identified through the review of the 54 organizational websites for the study. These were identified though values that were identified and outlined on websites maintained by the individual organizations. Not all values were unique, some were duplicative in both similarity and still some were the exact same words (i.e. brotherhood and sisterhood). The total of 252 espoused values above represented the unduplicated total of espoused values of those organizations examined. The average number of values for each organization was 4.86 with one organization having the highest number reported at ten and two organizations having the lowest number reported at two. The mode for espoused values reported for those organizations examined was five.

A classification system was used that was previously implemented (Tull & Shaw, 2018; Tull, Shaw & Barker, 2018) for similar studies conducted with predominately White fraternities/sororities. The classification system was developed for the study by including all organizations alphabetically (through the use of the Greek alphabet) by national governing council. This included the 54 organizations and 252 espoused values identified above. These were classified under four values themes identified through the literature (Schwartz, 2012) that included: self-enhancement, openness to change, self-transcendence, and conservation.

Both internal validity and reliability were examined for the previous related studies (Tull & Shaw, 2018; Tull, Shaw & Barker, 2018). Internal validity was examined by selecting every seventh (fraternities) and fifth (sororities) group in the values classification system and coding values on two separate and independent occasions. This occurred with a time period of one-month in-between coding processes. Values were re-coded on the second occasion at 94% (fraternities) and 96% (sororities). The re-classification process was conducted by researchers to “test the re-productivity and stability of the values classification system,” (Tull, Shaw & Barker, 2018). To test for interrater reliability of the values classification system, we conducted three independent reviews and coded a systematic sample of 29 values drawn from the total of 134 for sororities and 33 values drawn from the total of 351 for fraternities. The systematic samples were developed by selecting every seventh (fraternities) and fifth (sororities) from the values database created for the previous studies. Next we ran a Cohen’s Kappa through the use of SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) for each of the databases and obtained coefficients of

.94 for fraternities and .93 for sororities. We found that, “the reliability coefficient we obtained for our study signified reasonable confidence in the sorority values system that we created,” (Tull & Shaw, 2018, p. 10).

## Results

In response to the first research question developed for this study, frequencies and percentages for the 252 espoused values that were classified showed the greatest number under conservation (85 values; 33.73%), followed by self-transcendence (72 values; 28.57%), followed by openness to change (50 values; 19.84%) and self-enhancement (45 values; 17.85%). Each percentage provided above represents the percentage of the cumulative total values classified under this theme. Espoused value means by type included: 0.83 for self-enhancement, .92 for openness to change, 1.33 self-transcendence, and 1.57 for conservation. Means and percentages for each national organization are provided below in Table 1.

**Table 1**

*Means and Percentages by National Governing Organization*

	Self-Enhancement	Openness to Change	Self-Transcendence	Conservation
NPHC	1.11 (20.40%)	1.11 (20.40%)	1.55 (28.57%)	1.66 (30.61%)
NMGC	0.63 (13.72%)	1.0 (21.56%)	1.63 (35.29%)	1.36 (29.41%)
NALFO	.81 (19.69%)	.93 (22.72%)	.93 (22.72%)	1.43 (34.84%)
NAPA	.83 (17.44%)	.77 (16.27%)	1.38 (29.06%)	1.77 (37.20%)
All Organizations	.83 (17.85%)	.92 (19.84%)	1.33 (28.57%)	1.57 (33.73%)

Frequency data are provided for each organization with regard to the how we classified them along the continuum of universal values. This can be found in Table 2 below. Of the 54 organizations examined for this study 47 (87.03%) had values that were classified under self-transcendence; 46 (85.18%) had values that were classified under conservation; 42 (77.77%) had values that were classified under openness to change; and 35 (64.81%) had values that were classified under self-enhancement. Nineteen (35.18%) had no values classified

under self-enhancement; eight (14.81%) had no values classified under conservation; 12 (22.22%) had no values classified under openness to change; and seven (12.96%) had no values classified under self-transcendence. Each percentage provided above represents the percentage of the cumulative total of fraternities/sororities with values classified under this theme.

**Table 2**  
Frequencies for Fraternity/sorority Organizations Examined in Study Fraternity Values Classification System

	Self-Enhancement	Openness to Change	Self-Transcendence	Conservation	Total
<b>NPHC Organizations (n = 9)</b>					
Alpha Kappa Alpha	1	2	2	--	5
Alpha Phi Alpha	1	2	3	2	7
Delta Sigma Theta	--	1	3	2	6
Iota Phi Theta	2	1	1	3	7
Kappa Alpha Psi	1	--	1	2	4
Omega Psi Phi	1	1	1	--	4
Phi Beta Sigma	2	1	2	1	5
Sigma Gamma Rho	1	--	--	4	5
Zeta Phi Beta	1	2	1	1	5
<b>NPHC Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>NMGC Organizations (n = 11)</b>					
Delta Xi Nu	1	--	--	2	3
Delta Xi Phi	--	1	1	1	3
Delta Sigma Chi	1	1	1	4	7
Gamma Eta	--	1	2	1	4
Lambda Sigma Gamma	--	1	2	1	4
Lambda Tau Omega	--	1	3	--	4
Mu Sigma Upsilon	1	1	2	1	5
Omega Phi Chi	--	1	1	--	2
Phi Sigma Chi	2	1	4	2	9
Psi Sigma Phi	1	2	1	1	5
Theta Nu Xi	1	1	1	2	5
<b>NMGC Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>NALFO Organizations (n = 16)</b>					
Alpha Pi Sigma	1	1	1	2	5
Alpha Psi Lambda	1	1	1	2	5
Chi Upsilon Sigma	--	1	1	--	2
Gamma Zeta Alpha	2	2	1	2	7
Gamma Phi Omega	1	--	1	2	4
Kappa Delta Chi	3	1	1	3	8
Lambda Alpha Upsilon	--	1	1	1	3
Lambda Pi Chi	--	--	1	2	3
Lambda Pi Upsilon	1	2	2	--	5
Lambda Sigma Upsilon	--	1	--	2	3
Lambda Theta Nu	1	1	--	2	4
Lambda Upsilon	1	--	1	1	3
Omega Phi Beta	--	1	1	--	2
Phi Iota Alpha	1	1	1	1	4
Sigma Iota Alpha	1	1	2	1	5
Sigma Lambda Upsilon	--	1	--	2	3
<b>NALFO Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>NAPA Organizations (n = 18)</b>					
Alpha Kappa Delta Phi	1	1	2	2	6
Alpha Phi Gamma	--	1	2	3	6
Beta Chi Theta	--	1	1	1	3
Chi Sigma Tau	2	--	1	1	4
Delta Epsilon Psi	1	--	1	1	3
Delta Kappa Delta	--	1	2	2	5
Delta Phi Lambda	2	--	1	--	3
Delta Phi Omega	--	2	2	1	4
Delta Sigma Iota	1	--	1	1	3
Iota Nu Delta	2	--	1	1	4
Kappa Phi Gamma	--	1	1	1	3
Kappa Phi Lambda	--	1	1	1	3
Lambda Phi Epsilon	1	1	2	1	5
Pi Alpha Phi	--	1	--	3	4
Pi Delta Psi	2	1	--	1	4
Sigma Beta Rho	1	--	1	4	6
Sigma Sigma Rho	1	1	3	5	10
Sigma Psi Zeta	1	2	3	3	9
<b>NAPA Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>All Organizations Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>252</b>

In response to the second research question, valuable comparisons can be made between previous similar studies conducted by the researchers. These can have implications for further practice and research, as will be addressed later. After a review of values classifications, it was found that organizations in the present study as well as in two others (Tull & Shaw, 2018; Tull, Shaw & Barker, 2018) had both similar and divergent findings. When examining values classifications for self-transcendence all organizations (historically White fraternities/sororities and multicultural fraternities/sororities) were high in the percentages of values they had classified for this theme at 81%, 100% and 87% respectively. When examining values classifications for conservation, some organizations were high in their percentages (historically White fraternities/sororities), but were low for multicultural fraternities/sororities. These were at 79%, 85%, and 46% respectively.

When examining values classifications for openness to change, two groups (historically White fraternities and multicultural fraternities/sororities) were low in their classification of this value, while historically White sororities were high. These were at 44%, 42% and 79% respectively. When examining the values classifications for self-enhancement, two groups (historically White fraternities and multicultural fraternities/sororities) were low in their classification of this value, while historically White sororities were high. These were at 48%, 35% and 72% respectively.

## Discussion

### Self-Transcendence

Eight-Seven percent of all fraternities/sororities that were a part of the

present study had values that were classified under the theme of self-transcendence. This represented the largest number of values under any theme that was examined. A representative sample of those espoused values for this theme included: service, philanthropy, cultural awareness, uplift, community advocacy, and social impact. Similar results have also been found in previous studies. One found one-hundred percent of historically White sororities had values related to self-transcendence (Tull, Shaw & Barker, 2018) and another found eighty-one percent of historically White fraternities to have values related to self-transcendence (Tull & Shaw, 2018).

Self-transcendence, as a values theme, has been described as, “more heavily emphasized as they are related to enhancing others vs. selfish interests; commitment to one’s group; and normative actions that promote more insular relationships and bonds between members,” (Tull, Shaw & Barker, 2018, p. 16). Previous research on college fraternities/sororities has found that they can be insulating in nature (DeSantis, 2007; Dugan, 2006; Matney, Biddix, et al., 2016; Wolf-Wendel, Ward & Kinzie, 2009) and that membership in these organizations can be counter to the value or self-transcendence with its’ focus on universalism and the greater community (Schwartz, 2012).

### **Conservation**

Forty-six percent of those fraternities/sororities that were a part of the present study were found to have values classified under the conservation theme. Some representative espoused values that were found included: brotherhood/sisterhood, friendship, manhood/womanhood, heritage and tradition. Similar results have also been found in previous studies. One found eighty-

five percent of historically White sororities had values related to conservation (Tull, Shaw & Barker, 2018) and another found seventy-nine percent of historically White fraternities to have values related to conservation (Tull & Shaw, 2018).

Fraternity/sorority organizations, for the present study and others, have been found to values related to social norming, in-group likeness and a focus on social favorability (McCollum, 2005; Schwartz, 2012). While these are positive attributes of these organizations, they can be socially isolating and hinder holistic student development, if all efforts are put towards enacting conservation related values. Values are best developed along a more stratified and comprehensive system that includes values of all universal themes, as examined here (Schwartz, 2012).

### **Openness to Change**

Forty-two percent of those fraternities/sororities that were a part of the present study were found to have values classified under the openness to change theme. Some representative espoused values that were found included: scholarship, academic excellence, knowledge, advancement, wisdom and intellectual development. Both similar and divergent results have also been found in previous studies. One found seventy-seven percent of historically White sororities had values related to openness to change (Tull, Shaw & Barker, 2018) and another found forty-four percent of historically White fraternities to have values related to openness to change (Tull & Shaw, 2018).

Findings of the present study, related to openness to change, are also in line with research conducted on fraternity populations (Matney, Biddix, Arsenoff, Keller, Dusendang, & Martin, 2016). Like values related to conservation above,

fraternity/sorority organizations who enact values related to openness to change, at the detriment of exhibiting all universal values can find more narrow experiences and development opportunities as a result. Protecting and promoting one's culture, as with the conservation related values described below must be balanced with a willingness and openness to change. This is a hallmark outcome of a college experience for all, particularly fraternity/sorority members.

### **Self-Enhancement**

Thirty-five percent of those fraternities/sororities that were a part of the present study were found to have values classified under the self-enhancement theme. Some representative espoused values that were found included: leadership development, professional development, discipline, empowerment, personal growth, and character development. Both similar and divergent results have also been found in previous studies. One found seventy-two percent of historically White sororities had values related to self-enhancement (Tull, Shaw & Barker, 2018) and another found eight-percent of historically White fraternities to have values related to openness to change (Tull & Shaw, 2018).

“While the literal definition of these values (according to Schwartz, 2012) might appear self-centered and hedonistic, values under self-enhancement appear to be in line with the general goals of participation in postsecondary education,” (Tull & Shaw, 2018, p. 16). The previous statement well defines how values related to self-enhancement may be viewed externally; however, the overall experience of a postsecondary education (and its various co-curricular components) are well aligned with self-enhancement initiatives.

### **Limitations**

As with much social science research, limitations are present that should be addressed. These provide greater context for our work and its acceptance among readers. Each of the authors belong to fraternity/sorority organizations. These memberships are to historically White organizations including fraternities Lambda Chi Alpha and Pi Kappa Phi, as well as sororities Delta Delta Delta and Kappa Kappa Gamma.

Through our use of qualitative research techniques, our analysis of data is our own and could be interpreted differently by others. Sampling in content analysis methodology is often a problem; however, to address this we included all organizations as part of our study. Achieving generalizability through the use of sampling techniques is also common. While we used all organizations, and did not employ sampling techniques, we do realize that others may code our data differently. This may not lead to wide generalizability. Knowing this, and to minimize subjectivity in the data analysis process, we developed and tested our classification system to examine its reliability and validity.

### **Recommendations for Future Research and Practice**

The results of the study should have benefit for those who study college student development, fraternity/sorority values systems and multicultural affairs/education. It also has great utility for those who serve as campus based fraternity/sorority professionals or volunteers working with organizations on the local or national levels. As with previous studies, recommendations can be made to inform future research and practice on the topic.

We would recommend further study (both quantitative and qualitative) about how espoused values of fraternity/sorority groups are enacted. This would provide evidence to gain meaning from, and the results could benefit both members and those who work with them.

Continued research to examine the alignment of espoused values of fraternities/sororities with universally accepted values can help them remain relevant in changing environments, both within and outside of higher education. Firm commitments to shared values can assist members in their student development and preparation for life after college.

Scholars of higher education, fraternity/sorority life, and multicultural student affairs can benefit from this new information in their current and future scholarship on espoused and enacted values of these organizations.

Student affairs administrators (particularly those in multicultural affairs), as practitioners who work directly with students, should have knowledge of the espoused values that they work with to support their enactment by members.

### Conclusion

The values of historically Black, Latinx, Multicultural and Asian/Pacific Islander fraternity/sorority organizations have received little attention in the research literature to date. Our purpose in conducting the present study was to examine espoused values held by these organizations and to establish how these were aligned with universally accepted values (from previous research). A values classification system, informed by previous scholarship, was implemented to execute this research process. Additionally, researchers sought to examine how the espoused values of groups examined in this study aligned with those of

historically White fraternity/sorority organizations.

Both similar and divergent findings were discovered for organizational values examined in the present study. These provide both new information about the shared universal values between groups examined, as well as how they align (or don't align) with those that have been examined overtime and across cultures. This has important implications for both scholars and practitioners working with fraternity and sorority groups both on campus and beyond.

We recommend further study of both espoused and enacted values exhibited by members of all fraternity/sorority organizations. Values held by these organizations have important qualities related to student development and professional preparation. Continued investment in furthering these values serve both their members and their organizations well in current context and beyond.

### References

- Atkinson, E., Dean, L., & Espino, M. (2010). Leadership outcomes based on membership in multicultural Greek council (MGC) organizations. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, 5(2), 34-48.
- Barnhardt, C. L. (2014).<sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub> Fraternities and sororities shaping the campus climate of personal and social responsibility. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 51(2), 128-142.<sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>
- Berkowitz, A., & Padavic, I. (1999). Getting a man or getting ahead: A comparison of Black and White sororities. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 27(4), 530-557.
- Bilsky, W., Janik, M., & Schwartz, S. H. (2011). The structural organization of human values – Evidence from three

- rounds of the European Social Survey (ESS). *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 42, 759-776.
- Brown, T. L., Parks, G. S., & Phillips, C. M. (2005). *Black Fraternities and Sororities: The Legacy and the Vision*. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Chen, E. (2009). Asian Americans in sororities and fraternities: In search of a home and place. In C.L. Torbenson & G.S. Parks (Eds.) *Brothers and Sisters: Diversity in College Fraternities and Sororities*, (pp. 83-103). Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses.
- Davidov, E., Schmidt, P., & Schwartz, S. H. (2008). Bringing values back in: The adequacy of the European Social Survey to measure values in 20 countries. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72, 420-445.
- DeSantis, A. (2007). *Inside Greek U: Fraternities, Sororities, and the Pursuit of Pleasure, Power, and Prestige*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.
- Dugan, J. P. (2006). Explorations using the social change model: Leadership development among college men and women. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(2), 217-225.
- Fischer, M. (2008). Does campus diversity promote friendship diversity? A look at interracial friendships in college. *Social Science Quarterly*, 89(3), 631-655.
- Guardia, J. R., & Evans, N. J. (2008). Factors influencing the ethnic identity development of Latino fraternity members at a Hispanic serving institution. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(3), 163-181.
- Hunter, J., & Hughey, M. (2013). 'It's not written on their skin like it is ours': Greek letter organizations in the age of the multicultural imperative. *Ethnicities*, 13(5), 519-543.
- Hussar, W. J., & Bailey, T. M. (2009). *Projections of education statistics to 2018*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/2009062.pdf>.
- Inkelas, K. K. (2004). Does participation in ethnic cocurricular activities facilitate a sense of ethnic awareness and understanding? A study of Asian Pacific American undergraduates. *Journal of Student Development*, 45(3), 285-302.
- Kelly, L. (2009). Preserving and creating traditions: A Native American emergence in Greek organizations. In In C.L. Torbenson & G.S. Parks (Eds.) *Brothers and Sisters: Diversity in College Fraternities and Sororities*, (pp. 133-56). Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses.
- Kimbrough, W. M. (2003). *Black Greek 101: The Culture, Customs, and Challenges of Black Fraternities and Sororities*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses.
- Mair, M. A. (2017). Content analysis: Advantages and disadvantages. In M. Allen (Ed.). *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Methods* (pp. 240-242). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Matney, M. M., Biddix, J. P., Arsenoff, S., Keller, T., Dusendang, J., & Martin, D. (2016). Fraternity member reflections about civic values. *Journal of College and Character*, 17(4), 223-240.
- McCabe, J. (2011). Doing multiculturalism: An interactionist analysis of the practices of a multicultural sorority. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 40(5), 521- 549.
- McCollum, D. L. (2005). What are the social values of college students? A social goals approach. *Journal of College and Character*, 6(6), 1-21.

- McCreary, G. (2014, February). The challenge of values congruence. *AFA Essentials*, 1-4.
- Morial, M., Parks, G. S., & Malveaux, J. (2008). *Black Greek letter Organizations in the Twenty-First Century: Our fight has just begun*. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Munoz, S. M., & Guardia, J. R. (2009). Nuestra historia y futuro (our history and future): Latino/a fraternities and sororities. In C. L. Torbens and G. S. Parks (Eds.). *Brothers and sisters: Diversity in college fraternities and sororities* (pp. 104-132). Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses.
- Museus, S. D., & Yi, V. (2015). Asian American college students. In P. A. Sasso & J. L. Devitis (Eds.). *Today's College Students: A Reader* (pp. 45-56). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- National APIA Panhellenic Association. (2017, January 20). *About*. Retrieved from: <http://www.napahq.org/about/#apia-greek-history>.
- National Association of Latin Fraternal Organizations (2017, August 30). *History*. Retrieved from <http://nalfo.org/nalfo-history/>.
- National Multicultural Greek Council. (2017, January 15). *About*. Retrieved from: <https://www.npcwomen.org/about.aspx>.
- National Pan-Hellenic Council (2017, August 30). *Our history*. Retrieved from <http://www.nphchq.org/quantum/our-history/>.
- Rodriquez, R. (1995, December 14). Hermandades on campus: Elite Latino secret societies and fraternities of the past give way to today's 'brotherhoods' and sisterhoods'. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 12, 26-29.
- Ross, L. C. (2000). *The divine nine: The history of African American fraternities and sororities*. New York, NY: Kensington.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An overview of the Schwartz Theory of Basic Values. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 1-20.
- Schutts, J. (2013, Fall). Perhaps it's time we stop talking about shared values. *Perspectives: The Magazine of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, 14-16.
- Syrett, N. (2009). *The company he keeps: A history of white college fraternities*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Tull, A., Shaw, A., & Barker, B. (2018). The values of undergraduate panhellenic women: Universal or unintentional? *College Student Affairs Journal*, 36(2).
- Tull, A., & Shaw, A. (2018). Universally espoused fraternal values on college and university campuses: Commonplace or coincidence? *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, 12(2), 1-11.
- Wolf-Wendel, L., Ward, K., & Kinzie, J. (2009). A tangled web of terms: The overlap and unique contribution of involvement, engagement, and integration to understanding college student success. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(4), 407-428.
- Worley, D., & Wells, A. (2007). Sororities. In B. Bank (Ed.), *Gender and Education: An Encyclopedia*. Westport, CT: Praeger. Retrieved from: <http://proxy.libraries.smu.edu/login?url=http://literati.credoreference.com/content/entry/abcge/sororities/0>

## Appendix A

**Table 1**

*Means and Percentages by National Governing Organization*

	Self- Enhancement	Openness to Change	Self- Transcendence	Conservation
NPHC	1.11 (20.40%)	1.11 (20.40%)	1.55 (28.57%)	1.66 (30.61%)
NMGC	0.63 (13.72%)	1.0 (21.56%)	1.63 (35.29%)	1.36 (29.41%)
NALFO	.81 (19.69%)	.93 (22.72%)	.93 (22.72%)	1.43 (34.84%)
NAPA	.83 (17.44%)	.77 (16.27%)	1.38 (29.06%)	1.77 (37.20%)
All Organizations	.83 (17.85%)	.92 (19.84%)	1.33 (28.57%)	1.57 (33.73%)

## Appendix B

**Table 2**

*Frequencies for Fraternity/sorority Organizations Examined in Study Fraternity Values Classification System*

	Self- Enhancement	Openness to Change	Self- Transcendence	Conservation	Total
<b>NPHC Organizations (n = 9)</b>					
Alpha Kappa Alpha	1	2	2	--	5
Alpha Phi Alpha	1	2	3	2	7
Delta Sigma Theta	--	1	3	2	6
Iota Phi Theta	2	1	1	3	7
Kappa Alpha Psi	1	--	1	2	4
Omega Psi Phi	1	1	1	1	4
Phi Beta Sigma	2	1	2	--	5
Sigma Gamma Rho	1	--	--	4	5
Zeta Phi Beta	1	2	1	1	5
<b>NPHC Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>NMGC Organizations (n = 11)</b>					
Delta Xi Nu	1	--	--	2	3
Delta Xi Phi	--	1	1	1	3
Delta Sigma Chi	1	1	1	4	7
Gamma Eta	--	1	2	1	4
Lambda Sigma Gamma	--	1	2	1	4
Lambda Tau Omega	--	1	3	--	4
Mu Sigma Upsilon	1	1	2	1	5
Omega Phi Chi	--	1	1	--	2
Phi Sigma Chi	2	1	4	2	9
Psi Sigma Phi	1	2	1	1	5
Theta Nu Xi	1	1	1	2	5
<b>NMGC Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>NALFO Organizations (n = 16)</b>					
Alpha Pi Sigma	1	1	1	2	5
Alpha Psi Lambda	1	1	1	2	5
Chi Upsilon Sigma	--	1	1	--	2
Gamma Zeta Alpha	2	2	1	2	7
Gamma Phi Omega	1	--	1	2	4

Kappa Delta Chi	3	1	1	3	8
Lambda Alpha	--	1	1	1	3
Upsilon					
Lambda Pi Chi	--	--	1	2	3
Lambda Pi Upsilon	1	2	2	--	5
Lambda Sigma	--	1	--	2	3
Upsilon					
Lambda Theta Nu	1	1	--	2	4
Lambda Upsilon	1	--	1	1	3
Lambda					
Omega Phi Beta	--	1	1	--	2
Phi Iota Alpha	1	1	1	1	4
Sigma Iota Alpha	1	1	2	1	5
Sigma Lambda	--	1	--	2	3
Upsilon					
NALFO Total	13	15	15	23	66

NAPA Organizations (n = 18)

Alpha Kappa Delta	1	1	2	2	6
Phi					
Alpha Phi Gamma	--	1	2	3	6
Beta Chi Theta	--	1	1	1	3
Chi Sigma Tau	2	--	1	1	4
Delta Epsilon Psi	1	--	1	1	3
Delta Kappa Delta	--	1	2	2	5
Delta Phi Lambda	2	--	1	--	3
Delta Phi Omega	--	2	2	1	4
Delta Sigma Iota	1	--	1	1	3
Iota Nu Delta	2	--	1	1	4
Kappa Phi Gamma	--	1	1	1	3
Kappa Phi Lambda	--	1	1	1	3
Lambda Phi Epsilon	1	1	2	1	5
Pi Alpha Phi	--	1	--	3	4
Pi Delta Psi	2	1	--	1	4
Sigma Beta Rho	1	--	1	4	6
Sigma Sigma Rho	1	1	3	5	10
Sigma Psi Zeta	1	2	3	3	9
NAPA Total	15	14	25	32	86

All Organizations	45	50	72	85	252
Total					