










Demographics of Respondents







Scale Correlations

Correlations

		social	ethics	multi	flex
social	Pearson Correlation	1	.619(**)	.668(**)	.528(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	65	65	65	65
ethics	Pearson Correlation	.619(**)	1	.536(**)	.213
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.089
	N	65	65	65	65
multi	Pearson Correlation	.668(**)	.536(**)	1	.331(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.007
	N	65	65	65	65
flex	Pearson Correlation	.528(**)	.213	.331(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.089	.007	
	N	65	65	65	65

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Scale reliability




Social responsibility = Cronbach's Alpha = .771


Ethics = Cronbach's Alpha = .790

Multicultural sensitivity = Cronbach's Alpha = .889


Communication Flexibility = Cronbach's Alpha = .770




Scales by class level





Scales by Program of Study





Difference

No differences according to race, enrollment status, or major

Only gender difference was on the ethical scale


$t = -2.068$ $df = 63$ $sig = .043$



Two significant differences for respondents identifying themselves as minors.

1. Multicultural scale

$t = -2.466$ $df = 63$ $sig = .016$



2. Social responsibility scale

t= -2.396 df =63 sig = .020

