E1b: Faculty respect for minority grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.3	41.8%	47.3%	8.8%	2.2%	91

E1b: Faculty respect for minority grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.5	48.6%	48.6%	2.9%		35
Female	3.1	35.2%	48.1%	13.0%	3.7%	54

E1b: Faculty respect for minority grad students	Mean	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.4	46.2%	44.6%	7.7%	1.5%	65
Students of Color	3.1	30.8%	53.8%	11.5%	3.8%	26

E1b: Faculty respect for minority grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.3	44.4%	40.7%	11.1%	3.7%	27
Middle class	3.3	37.2%	53.5%	9.3%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	56.3%	37.5%		6.3%	16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.3	45.1%	40.7%	8.8%	5.5%	91

E1c: Faculty respect for female students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.5	54.3%	40.0%	5.7%		35
Female	3.1	37.0%	42.6%	11.1%	9.3%	54

E1c: Faculty respect for female students		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.3	50.8%	36.9%	7.7%	4.6%	65
Students of Color	3.0	30.8%	50.0%	11.5%	7.7%	26

E1c: Faculty respect for female students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.2	48.1%	37.0%	3.7%	11.1%	27
Middle class	3.3	46.5%	41.9%	9.3%	2.3%	43
Upper middle/Upper class	3.3	50.0%	37.5%	6.3%	6.3%	16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

E1e: Graduate student respect for minority faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.3	41.8%	49.5%	7.7%	1.1%	91

E1e: Graduate student respect for minority faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.4	48.6%	45.7%	5.7%		35
Female	3.2	35.2%	53.7%	9.3%	1.9%	54

E1e: Graduate student respect for minority faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.4	44.6%	49.2%	6.2%		65
Students of Color	3.2	34.6%	50.0%	11.5%	3.8%	26

E1e: Graduate student respect for minority faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.3	37.0%	55.6%	3.7%	3.7%	27
Middle class	3.3	44.2%	46.5%	9.3%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	50.0%	37.5%	12.5%		16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 3

E1f: Graduate student respect for female faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.4	46.2%	46.2%	5.5%	2.2%	91

E1f: Graduate student respect for female faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.5	54.3%	45.7%			35
Female	3.2	38.9%	48.1%	9.3%	3.7%	54

E1f: Graduate student respect for female faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.4	50.8%	41.5%	6.2%	1.5%	65
Students of Color	3.2	34.6%	57.7%	3.8%	3.8%	26

E1f: Graduate student respect for female faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.2	40.7%	48.1%	3.7%	7.4%	27
Middle class	3.4	51.2%	41.9%	7.0%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	50.0%	43.8%	6.3%		16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

E1g: Undergrad respect for minority TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	2.9	22.2%	54.4%	16.7%	6.7%	90

E1g: Undergrad respect for minority TAs		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.0	32.4%	38.2%	23.5%	5.9%	34
Female	2.9	13.0%	66.7%	13.0%	7.4%	54

E1g: Undergrad respect for minority TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	2.9	21.9%	56.3%	15.6%	6.3%	64
Students of Color	2.9	23.1%	50.0%	19.2%	7.7%	26

E1g: Undergrad respect for minority TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	2.8	14.8%	59.3%	14.8%	11.1%	27
Middle class	3.0	25.6%	51.2%	20.9%	2.3%	43
Upper middle/Upper class	2.9	25.0%	56.3%	6.3%	12.5%	16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 5

E1h: Undergrad respect for female TAs	Mean	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.0	31 1%	48.9%	13 3%	6.7%	90

E1h: Undergrad respect for female TAs		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.1	38.2%	44.1%	11.8%	5.9%	34
Female	2.9	24.1%	53.7%	14.8%	7.4%	54

E1h: Undergrad respect for female TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.1	34.4%	46.9%	12.5%	6.3%	64
Students of Color	2.9	23.1%	53.8%	15.4%	7.7%	26

E1h: Undergrad respect for female TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	2.8	18.5%	55.6%	11.1%	14.8%	27
Middle class	3.2	39.5%	41.9%	18.6%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	3.1	31.3%	56.3%		12.5%	16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 6

E1i: Graduate student respect for grad students of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.3	40.0%	54.4%	4.4%	1.1%	90

E1i: Graduate student respect for grad students of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.5	47.1%	52.9%			34
Female	3.2	33.3%	57.4%	7.4%	1.9%	54

E1i: Graduate student respect for grad students of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.4	45.3%	53.1%	1.6%		64
Students of Color	3.1	26.9%	57.7%	11.5%	3.8%	26

E1i: Graduate student respect for grad students of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.2	29.6%	66.7%		3.7%	27
Middle class	3.4	47.6%	47.6%	4.8%		42
Upper middle/Upper class	3.3	43.8%	43.8%	12.5%		16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

E1j: Graduate student respect for grad students of different sexual orientation	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.3	37.8%	53.3%	6.7%	2.2%	90

E1j: Graduate student respect for grad students of different sexual orientation	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.4	44.1%	52.9%	2.9%		34
Female	3.1	31.5%	55.6%	9.3%	3.7%	54

E1j: Graduate student respect for grad students of different sexual orientation	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.3	42.2%	48.4%	6.3%	3.1%	64
Students of Color	3.2	26.9%	65.4%	7.7%		26

E1j: Graduate student respect for grad students of different sexual orientation	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.1	29.6%	59.3%	7.4%	3.7%	27
Middle class	3.4	40.5%	54.8%	4.8%		42
Upper middle/Upper class	3.3	43.8%	50.0%		6.3%	16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 8

E1k: Friendships between grad students of different racial/ethnic groups		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.2	30.8%	54.9%	13.2%	1.1%	91

E1k: Friendships between grad students of different racial/ethnic groups	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.2	37.1%	45.7%	17.1%		35
Female	3.1	24.1%	63.0%	11.1%	1.9%	54

E1k: Friendships between grad students of different racial/ethnic groups		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.2	32.3%	52.3%	13.8%	1.5%	65
Students of Color	3.2	26.9%	61.5%	11.5%		26

E1k: Friendships between grad students of different racial/ethnic groups	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.1	22.2%	66.7%	11.1%		27
Middle class	3.3	39.5%	48.8%	11.6%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	2.9	25.0%	50.0%	18.8%	6.3%	16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 9

E1I: Friendships between heterosexual and GLBT grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.1	27.8%	56.7%	12.2%	3.3%	90

E1I: Friendships between heterosexual and GLBT grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.0	25.7%	51.4%	20.0%	2.9%	35
Female	3.1	26.4%	62.3%	7.5%	3.8%	53

E1I: Friendships between heterosexual and GLBT grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.1	29.2%	53.8%	12.3%	4.6%	65
Students of Color	3.1	24.0%	64.0%	12.0%		25

E1I: Friendships between heterosexual and GLBT grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	2.9	18.5%	63.0%	11.1%	7.4%	27
Middle class	3.2	35.7%	50.0%	14.3%		42
Upper middle/Upper class	3.1	25.0%	68.8%		6.3%	16

E1m: Graduate student respect for transgender students		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.0	23.3%	57.8%	17.8%	1.1%	90

E1m: Graduate student respect for transgender students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.1	22.9%	60.0%	17.1%		35
Female	3.0	20.8%	58.5%	18.9%	1.9%	53

E1m: Graduate student respect for transgender students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.0	24.6%	56.9%	16.9%	1.5%	65
Students of Color	3.0	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%		25

E1m: Graduate student respect for transgender students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	2.9	18.5%	59.3%	18.5%	3.7%	27
Middle class	3.1	26.2%	59.5%	14.3%		42
Upper middle/Upper class	3.1	31.3%	50.0%	18.8%		16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 11

North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Section E: Campus Climate

Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

E2a: NCSU Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	31.5%	47.2%	16.9%	3.4%	1.1%	89

E2a: NCSU Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	38.2%	47.1%	14.7%			34
Female	3.9	28.3%	47.2%	17.0%	5.7%	1.9%	53

E2a: NCSU Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	31.7%	44.4%	20.6%	3.2%		63
Students of Color	4.0	30.8%	53.8%	7.7%	3.8%	3.8%	26

E2a: NCSU Supportiveness: African American students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	29.6%	48.1%	18.5%		3.7%	27
Middle class	4.2	34.9%	51.2%	11.6%	2.3%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	31.3%	31.3%	25.0%	12.5%		16

E2b: NCSU Supportiveness: Asian students		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)

E2b: NCSU Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.2	35.3%	50.0%	14.7%		34
Female	3.9	28.8%	44.2%	17.3%	9.6%	52

E2b: NCSU Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	34.9%	46.0%	14.3%	4.8%	63
Students of Color	3.8	20.0%	48.0%	24.0%	8.0%	25

E2b: NCSU Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	29.6%	55.6%	11.1%	3.7%	27
Middle class	4.0	31.0%	47.6%	16.7%	4.8%	42
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	37.5%	25.0%	25.0%	12.5%	16

North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Section E: Campus Climate

Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

E2c: NCSU Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students	Mean	0,		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	22.5%	44.9%	27.0%	4.5%	1.1%	89

E2c: NCSU Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	29.4%	44.1%	23.5%	2.9%		34
Female	3.7	18.9%	45.3%	28.3%	5.7%	1.9%	53

E2c: NCSU Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	25.4%	41.3%	25.4%	6.3%	1.6%	63
Students of Color	3.8	15.4%	53.8%	30.8%			26

E2c: NCSU Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	18.5%	51.9%	25.9%		3.7%	27
Middle class	4.0	27.9%	44.2%	23.3%	4.7%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	3.5	18.8%	25.0%	43.8%	12.5%		16

E2d: NCSU Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students	Mean			3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	21.3%	39.3%	33.7%	5.6%	89

E2d: NCSU Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.9	29.4%	38.2%	29.4%	2.9%	34
Female	3.7	17.0%	39.6%	35.8%	7.5%	53

E2d: NCSU Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.8	23.8%	39.7%	28.6%	7.9%	63
Students of Color	3.7	15.4%	38.5%	46.2%		26

E2d: NCSU Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.9	18.5%	48.1%	33.3%		27
Middle class	3.9	25.6%	41.9%	25.6%	7.0%	43
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	18.8%	18.8%	50.0%	12.5%	16

E2e: NCSU Supportiveness: White students				3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	43.8%	40.4%	13.5%	2.2%	89

E2e: NCSU Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	35.3%	41.2%	17.6%	5.9%	34
Female	4.4	50.9%	39.6%	9.4%		53

E2e: NCSU Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	39.7%	41.3%	15.9%	3.2%	63
Students of Color	4.5	53.8%	38.5%	7.7%		26

E2e: NCSU Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	44.4%	37.0%	14.8%	3.7%	27
Middle class	4.3	39.5%	51.2%	7.0%	2.3%	43
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	50.0%	18.8%	31.3%		16

E2f: NCSU Supportiveness: International students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	27.3%	53.4%	17.0%	2.3%	88

E2f: NCSU Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.2	32.4%	52.9%	14.7%		34
Female	4.0	23.1%	55.8%	17.3%	3.8%	52

E2f: NCSU Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	30.6%	50.0%	16.1%	3.2%	62
Students of Color	4.0	19.2%	61.5%	19.2%		26

E2f: NCSU Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	29.6%	59.3%	11.1%		27
Middle class	4.1	28.6%	54.8%	14.3%	2.4%	42
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	25.0%	37.5%	31.3%	6.3%	16

E2g: NCSU Supportiveness: Female students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	28.4%	5/1 50/	14.8%	2.3%	88

E2g: NCSU Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.2	35.3%	52.9%	11.8%		34
Female	4.0	25.0%	55.8%	15.4%	3.8%	52

E2g: NCSU Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	29.0%	56.5%	11.3%	3.2%	62
Students of Color	4.0	26.9%	50.0%	23.1%		26

E2g: NCSU Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	29.6%	51.9%	14.8%	3.7%	27
Middle class	4.2	26.2%	64.3%	9.5%		42
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	37.5%	25.0%	31.3%	6.3%	16

North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Section E: Campus Climate

Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

E2h: NCSU Supportiveness: Male students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	37.5%	44.3%	14.8%	1.1%	2.3%	88

E2h: NCSU Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.9	32.4%	41.2%	20.6%		5.9%	34
Female	4.3	42.3%	46.2%	9.6%	1.9%		52

E2h: NCSU Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.1	37.1%	43.5%	16.1%		3.2%	62
Students of Color	4.2	38.5%	46.2%	11.5%	3.8%		26

E2h: NCSU Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	33.3%	51.9%	11.1%		3.7%	27
Middle class	4.1	35.7%	47.6%	11.9%	2.4%	2.4%	42
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	43.8%	25.0%	31.3%			16

E2i: NCSU Supportiveness: Transgender students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	16.1%	48.3%	26.4%	8.0%	1.1%	87

E2i: NCSU Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	27.3%	48.5%	21.2%	3.0%		33
Female	3.5	9.6%	48.1%	28.8%	11.5%	1.9%	52

E2i: NCSU Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.7	17.7%	48.4%	22.6%	9.7%	1.6%	62
Students of Color	3.7	12.0%	48.0%	36.0%	4.0%		25

E2i: NCSU Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	18.5%	55.6%	18.5%	3.7%	3.7%	27
Middle class	3.7	14.6%	51.2%	24.4%	9.8%		41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.6	18.8%	31.3%	37.5%	12.5%		16

E2j: NCSU Supportiveness: GLB students				3:	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very	Total (NI)
GLD Students	Nating	Supportive	Supportive	iveutiai	Nonsupportive	nonsupportive	Total (IV)
				19.5%		1.1%	87

E2j: NCSU Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	30.3%	48.5%	18.2%	3.0%		33
Female	3.8	13.5%	59.6%	19.2%	5.8%	1.9%	52

E2j: NCSU Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	24.2%	51.6%	16.1%	6.5%	1.6%	62
Students of Color	3.8	12.0%	60.0%	28.0%			25

E2j: NCSU Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	18.5%	63.0%	11.1%	3.7%	3.7%	27
Middle class	4.0	24.4%	53.7%	17.1%	4.9%		41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	18.8%	43.8%	31.3%	6.3%		16

E2k: NCSU Supportiveness: Christian students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	39.1%	37.9%	19.5%	1.1%	2.3%	87

E2k: NCSU Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.8	30.3%	39.4%	21.2%	3.0%	6.1%	33
Female	4.3	46.2%	36.5%	17.3%			52

E2k: NCSU Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.1	40.3%	37.1%	17.7%	1.6%	3.2%	62
Students of Color	4.1	36.0%	40.0%	24.0%			25

E2k: NCSU Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	33.3%	44.4%	18.5%		3.7%	27
Middle class	4.0	34.1%	41.5%	19.5%	2.4%	2.4%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	62.5%	18.8%	18.8%			16

E2I: NCSU Supportiveness: Jewish students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	18.6%	50.0%	27.9%	3.5%	86

E2I: NCSU Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.9	27.3%	42.4%	27.3%	3.0%	33
Female	3.8	13.7%	54.9%	27.5%	3.9%	51

E2I: NCSU Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.8	22.6%	43.5%	29.0%	4.8%	62
Students of Color	3.8	8.3%	66.7%	25.0%		24

E2I: NCSU Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.9	18.5%	51.9%	29.6%	-	27
Middle class	3.9	20.0%	50.0%	25.0%	5.0%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	18.8%	37.5%	37.5%	6.3%	16

E2m: NCSU Supportiveness: Muslim students			3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	22.1%	 23.3%	8.1%	86

E2m: NCSU Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	33.3%	39.4%	21.2%	6.1%	33
Female	3.7	13.7%	52.9%	23.5%	9.8%	51

E2m: NCSU Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.8	27.4%	40.3%	21.0%	11.3%	62
Students of Color	3.8	8.3%	62.5%	29.2%		24

E2m: NCSU Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.7	18.5%	44.4%	29.6%	7.4%	27
Middle class	3.9	25.0%	52.5%	12.5%	10.0%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	25.0%	31.3%	37.5%	6.3%	16

	E2n: NCSU upportiveness: Other Non-Christian students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
T	otal (N)	3.8	20.7%	46.0%	26.4%	6.9%	87

E2n: NCSU Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	30.3%	39.4%	30.3%		33
Female	3.7	15.4%	50.0%	23.1%	11.5%	52

E2n: NCSU Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.8	24.2%	40.3%	25.8%	9.7%	62
Students of Color	3.8	12.0%	60.0%	28.0%		25

E2n: NCSU Supportiveness:				3:	2:	
Other Non-Christian students	Rating	supportive	Supportive	Neutral	Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.7	18.5%	44.4%	29.6%	7.4%	27
Middle class	3.9	22.0%	48.8%	24.4%	4.9%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	25.0%	37.5%	25.0%	12.5%	16

	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	29.9%	46.0%	19.5%	3.4%	1.1%	87

E2o: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	42.4%	36.4%	18.2%	3.0%		33
Female	3.9	23.1%	51.9%	19.2%	3.8%	1.9%	52

E2o: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	30.6%	45.2%	21.0%	3.2%		62
Students of Color	3.9	28.0%	48.0%	16.0%	4.0%	4.0%	25

E2o: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	29.6%	51.9%	11.1%	3.7%	3.7%	27
Middle class	4.0	31.7%	46.3%	17.1%	4.9%		41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	25.0%	37.5%	37.5%			16

North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Section E: Campus Climate

Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

E2p: NCSU Supportiveness: Poor/working class students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	17.4%	41.9%	31.4%	8.1%	1.2%	86

E2p: NCSU Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.9	28.1%	37.5%	28.1%	6.3%		32
Female	3.6	11.5%	46.2%	32.7%	7.7%	1.9%	52

E2p: NCSU Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.6	18.0%	39.3%	29.5%	11.5%	1.6%	61
Students of Color	3.8	16.0%	48.0%	36.0%			25

E2p: NCSU Supportiveness: Poor/working class students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	19.2%	46.2%	23.1%	7.7%	3.8%	26
Middle class	3.7	17.1%	41.5%	36.6%	4.9%		41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.6	18.8%	37.5%	31.3%	12.5%		16

North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Section E: Campus Climate

Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

E2q: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle class students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	31.4%	39.5%	25.6%	2.3%	1.2%	86

E2q: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.9	27.3%	42.4%	24.2%	3.0%	3.0%	33
Female	4.1	35.3%	37.3%	25.5%	2.0%		51

E2q: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	37.1%	33.9%	25.8%	1.6%	1.6%	62
Students of Color	3.8	16.7%	54.2%	25.0%	4.2%		24

E2q: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	33.3%	37.0%	22.2%	3.7%	3.7%	27
Middle class	4.0	32.5%	37.5%	27.5%	2.5%		40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	31.3%	37.5%	31.3%			16

E2r: NCSU Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	31.4%	40.7%	25.6%	2.3%	86

E2r: NCSU Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	33.3%	42.4%	18.2%	6.1%	33
Female	4.0	31.4%	39.2%	29.4%		51

E2r: NCSU Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	33.9%	41.9%	22.6%	1.6%	62
Students of Color	3.8	25.0%	37.5%	33.3%	4.2%	24

E2r: NCSU Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	44.4%	33.3%	18.5%	3.7%	27
Middle class	4.0	25.0%	45.0%	30.0%		40
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	25.0%	37.5%	31.3%	6.3%	16

E2s: NCSU Supportiveness: Nontraditional students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	17.2%	41.4%	32.2%	9.2%	87

E2s: NCSU Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.9	24.2%	45.5%	30.3%		33
Female	3.5	13.5%	40.4%	32.7%	13.5%	52

E2s: NCSU Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.6	17.7%	40.3%	30.6%	11.3%	62
Students of Color	3.7	16.0%	44.0%	36.0%	4.0%	25

E2s: NCSU Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.7	14.8%	48.1%	29.6%	7.4%	27
Middle class	3.7	19.5%	39.0%	34.1%	7.3%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.6	18.8%	37.5%	25.0%	18.8%	16

E2t: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with children	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.6	16.1%	36.8%	34.5%	11.5%	1.1%	87

E2t: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.7	24.2%	36.4%	30.3%	6.1%	3.0%	33
Female	3.4	11.5%	36.5%	36.5%	15.4%		52

E2t: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.6	16.1%	38.7%	32.3%	11.3%	1.6%	62
Students of Color	3.5	16.0%	32.0%	40.0%	12.0%		25

E2t: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.6	14.8%	40.7%	33.3%	11.1%		27
Middle class	3.7	22.0%	39.0%	29.3%	9.8%		41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.1	6.3%	25.0%	50.0%	12.5%	6.3%	16

E2u: NCSU Supportiveness: Students who are veterans	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	24.4%	45.3%	27.9%	2.3%	86

E2u: NCSU Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	33.3%	36.4%	30.3%		33
Female	3.9	19.6%	52.9%	23.5%	3.9%	51

E2u: NCSU Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	25.8%	48.4%	22.6%	3.2%	62
Students of Color	3.8	20.8%	37.5%	41.7%		24

E2u: NCSU Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	22.2%	44.4%	25.9%	7.4%	27
Middle class	3.9	22.5%	47.5%	30.0%		40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	37.5%	37.5%	25.0%		16

E2v: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	27.0%	41.6%	23.6%	6.7%	1.1%	89

E2v: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	35.3%	44.1%	17.6%	2.9%		34
Female	3.7	22.6%	39.6%	26.4%	9.4%	1.9%	53

E2v: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	30.2%	36.5%	23.8%	7.9%	1.6%	63
Students of Color	3.9	19.2%	53.8%	23.1%	3.8%		26

E2v: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	22.2%	51.9%	22.2%	3.7%		27
Middle class	3.9	30.2%	41.9%	16.3%	9.3%	2.3%	43
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	31.3%	18.8%	43.8%	6.3%		16

North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Section E: Campus Climate

E3a: Grad Prog Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	28.1%	41.6%	24.7%	3.4%	2.2%	89

E3a: Grad Prog Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.9	29.4%	41.2%	26.5%		2.9%	34
Female	3.9	28.3%	41.5%	22.6%	5.7%	1.9%	53

E3a: Grad Prog Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	31.7%	41.3%	20.6%	4.8%	1.6%	63
Students of Color	3.7	19.2%	42.3%	34.6%		3.8%	26

E3a: Grad Prog Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	22.2%	40.7%	25.9%	3.7%	7.4%	27
Middle class	4.1	32.6%	44.2%	20.9%	2.3%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	31.3%	31.3%	31.3%	6.3%		16

E3b: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Asian students		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	32.6%	18.0%	3.4%	89

E3b: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.2	35.3%	52.9%	11.8%		34
Female	4.0	32.1%	41.5%	20.8%	5.7%	53

E3b: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.2	38.1%	46.0%	12.7%	3.2%	63
Students of Color	3.8	19.2%	46.2%	30.8%	3.8%	26

E3b: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	25.9%	48.1%	22.2%	3.7%	27
Middle class	4.2	32.6%	53.5%	11.6%	2.3%	43
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	50.0%	12.5%	31.3%	6.3%	16

E3c: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	28.1%	46.1%	22.5%	3.4%	89

E3c: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	35.3%	41.2%	20.6%	2.9%	34
Female	3.9	24.5%	49.1%	22.6%	3.8%	53

E3c: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	31.7%	46.0%	17.5%	4.8%	63
Students of Color	3.8	19.2%	46.2%	34.6%		26

E3c: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	18.5%	44.4%	37.0%		27
Middle class	4.1	32.6%	51.2%	14.0%	2.3%	43
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	37.5%	31.3%	25.0%	6.3%	16

E3d: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students	Mean			3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	25.3%	43.7%	27.6%	3.4%	87

E3d: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	28.1%	43.8%	25.0%	3.1%	32
Female	3.9	24.5%	43.4%	28.3%	3.8%	53

E3d: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	29.0%	41.9%	24.2%	4.8%	62
Students of Color	3.8	16.0%	48.0%	36.0%		25

E3d: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	19.2%	42.3%	38.5%		26
Middle class	4.0	28.6%	47.6%	21.4%	2.4%	42
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	31.3%	31.3%	31.3%	6.3%	16

E3e: Grad Prog Supportiveness: White students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.4	47.1%	43.7%	8.0%	1.1%	87

E3e: Grad Prog Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.3	40.6%	50.0%	9.4%		32
Female	4.4	52.8%	39.6%	5.7%	1.9%	53

E3e: Grad Prog Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.4	46.8%	50.0%	3.2%		62
Students of Color	4.2	48.0%	28.0%	20.0%	4.0%	25

E3e: Grad Prog Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	38.5%	46.2%	15.4%		26
Middle class	4.4	45.2%	47.6%	4.8%	2.4%	42
Upper middle/Upper class	4.6	68.8%	25.0%	6.3%		16

E3f: Grad Prog Supportiveness: International students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	37.5%	47.7%	12.5%	2.3%	88

E3f: Grad Prog Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.3	36.4%	57.6%	6.1%		33
Female	4.2	37.7%	43.4%	15.1%	3.8%	53

E3f: Grad Prog Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.3	43.5%	48.4%	6.5%	1.6%	62
Students of Color	3.9	23.1%	46.2%	26.9%	3.8%	26

E3f: Grad Prog Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	26.9%	61.5%	11.5%		26
Middle class	4.3	41.9%	46.5%	9.3%	2.3%	43
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	50.0%	18.8%	25.0%	6.3%	16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 39

E3g: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Female students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	31.4%	54.7%	9.3%	3.5%	1.2%	86

E3g: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.3	32.3%	61.3%	6.5%			31
Female	4.1	32.1%	50.9%	9.4%	5.7%	1.9%	53

E3g: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.2	37.7%	54.1%	3.3%	3.3%	1.6%	61
Students of Color	3.8	16.0%	56.0%	24.0%	4.0%		25

E3g: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	23.1%	53.8%	11.5%	7.7%	3.8%	26
Middle class	4.3	35.7%	54.8%	9.5%			42
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	40.0%	46.7%	6.7%	6.7%		15

E3h: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Male students			4: Supportive	3: Neutral	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.3	42.5%	48.3%	9.2%	87

E3h: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive	4: Supportive	3: Neutral	Total (N)
Gender					
Male	4.3	37.5%	53.1%	9.4%	32
Female	4.4	47.2%	45.3%	7.5%	53

E3h: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive	4: Supportive	3: Neutral	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*					
White/Caucasian	4.4	46.8%	50.0%	3.2%	62
Students of Color	4.1	32.0%	44.0%	24.0%	25

E3h: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive	4: Supportive	3: Neutral	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	4.3	38.5%	50.0%	11.5%	26
Middle class	4.4	42.9%	50.0%	7.1%	42
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	50.0%	37.5%	12.5%	16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

E3i: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Transgender students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	24.4%	37.2%	32.6%	4.7%	1.2%	86

E3i: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	28.1%	43.8%	28.1%			32
Female	3.7	23.1%	32.7%	34.6%	7.7%	1.9%	52

E3i: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	29.0%	38.7%	24.2%	6.5%	1.6%	62
Students of Color	3.6	12.5%	33.3%	54.2%			24

E3i: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	15.4%	46.2%	30.8%	3.8%	3.8%	26
Middle class	4.0	29.3%	41.5%	24.4%	4.9%		41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	31.3%	12.5%	50.0%	6.3%		16

North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Section E: Campus Climate

Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

E3j: Grad Prog Supportiveness: GLB students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	29.1%	41.9%	23.3%	4.7%	1.2%	86

E3j: Grad Prog Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	31.3%	53.1%	15.6%			32
Female	3.8	26.9%	36.5%	26.9%	7.7%	1.9%	52

E3j: Grad Prog Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.0	35.5%	41.9%	14.5%	6.5%	1.6%	62
Students of Color	3.7	12.5%	41.7%	45.8%			24

E3j: Grad Prog Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	19.2%	50.0%	23.1%	3.8%	3.8%	26
Middle class	4.0	31.7%	43.9%	19.5%	4.9%		41
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	43.8%	18.8%	31.3%	6.3%		16

E3k: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Christian students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	37.9%	40.2%	18.4%	3.4%	87

E3k: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.2	40.6%	40.6%	18.8%		32
Female	4.1	37.7%	39.6%	17.0%	5.7%	53

E3k: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.2	41.9%	38.7%	14.5%	4.8%	62
Students of Color	4.0	28.0%	44.0%	28.0%		25

E3k: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	26.9%	50.0%	19.2%	3.8%	26
Middle class	4.1	35.7%	42.9%	16.7%	4.8%	42
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	62.5%	18.8%	18.8%		16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

E3I: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Jewish students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	25.9%	41.2%	29.4%	3.5%	85

E3I: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	28.1%	40.6%	31.3%		32
Female	3.9	25.5%	41.2%	27.5%	5.9%	51

E3I: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	30.6%	41.9%	22.6%	4.8%	62
Students of Color	3.7	13.0%	39.1%	47.8%		23

E3I: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	19.2%	50.0%	26.9%	3.8%	26
Middle class	3.9	25.0%	40.0%	30.0%	5.0%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	43.8%	25.0%	31.3%		16

E3m: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Muslim students	Mean			3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	27.1%	12 1%	28.2%	2.4%	85

E3m: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	31.3%	40.6%	28.1%		32
Female	3.9	23.5%	45.1%	27.5%	3.9%	51

E3m: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	33.9%	40.3%	22.6%	3.2%	62
Students of Color	3.7	8.7%	47.8%	43.5%		23

E3m: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.9	19.2%	50.0%	30.8%		26
Middle class	3.9	25.0%	45.0%	27.5%	2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	50.0%	18.8%	25.0%	6.3%	16

E3n: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	26.7%	43.0%	25.6%	4.7%	86

E3n: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	28.1%	43.8%	28.1%		32
Female	3.9	26.9%	42.3%	23.1%	7.7%	52

E3n: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	32.3%	41.9%	19.4%	6.5%	62
Students of Color	3.7	12.5%	45.8%	41.7%		24

E3n: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	19.2%	50.0%	26.9%	3.8%	26
Middle class	3.9	26.8%	43.9%	24.4%	4.9%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	43.8%	25.0%	25.0%	6.3%	16

North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Section E: Campus Climate

Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

E3o: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with disabilities	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	28.4%	40.9%	25.0%	4.5%	1.1%	88

E3o: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	30.3%	45.5%	24.2%			33
Female	3.8	28.3%	37.7%	24.5%	7.5%	1.9%	53

E3o: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	32.3%	43.5%	19.4%	4.8%		62
Students of Color	3.6	19.2%	34.6%	38.5%	3.8%	3.8%	26

E3o: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	19.2%	42.3%	26.9%	7.7%	3.8%	26
Middle class	4.0	32.6%	44.2%	18.6%	4.7%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	37.5%	25.0%	37.5%			16

E3p: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Poor/working class students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	28.7%	41.4%	21.8%	8.0%	87

E3p: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	28.1%	46.9%	18.8%	6.3%	32
Female	3.9	30.2%	39.6%	22.6%	7.5%	53

E3p: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	33.9%	38.7%	17.7%	9.7%	62
Students of Color	3.8	16.0%	48.0%	32.0%	4.0%	25

E3p: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	19.2%	50.0%	19.2%	11.5%	26
Middle class	4.0	31.0%	40.5%	23.8%	4.8%	42
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	43.8%	25.0%	18.8%	12.5%	16

E3q: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle class students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	33.3%	46.0%	18.4%	2.3%	87

E3q: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	34.4%	46.9%	15.6%	3.1%	32
Female	4.1	34.0%	45.3%	18.9%	1.9%	53

E3q: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.3	40.3%	46.8%	11.3%	1.6%	62
Students of Color	3.7	16.0%	44.0%	36.0%	4.0%	25

E3q: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	26.9%	50.0%	19.2%	3.8%	26
Middle class	4.1	31.0%	47.6%	19.0%	2.4%	42
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	56.3%	25.0%	18.8%		16

E3r: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive	4: Supportive	3: Neutral	Total (N)
Total (N)	42	36.0%	45.3%	18.6%	86

E3r: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive	4: Supportive	3: Neutral	Total (N)
Gender					
Male	4.2	34.4%	53.1%	12.5%	32
Female	4.2	38.5%	40.4%	21.2%	52

E3r: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive	4: Supportive	3: Neutral	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*					
White/Caucasian	4.3	41.0%	47.5%	11.5%	61
Students of Color	3.9	24.0%	40.0%	36.0%	25

E3r: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive	4: Supportive	3: Neutral	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	4.1	30.8%	50.0%	19.2%	26
Middle class	4.1	34.1%	46.3%	19.5%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	50.0%	31.3%	18.8%	16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 51

E3s: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Nontraditional students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	25.3%	54.0%	12.6%	6.9%	1.1%	87

E3s: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	28.1%	53.1%	15.6%	3.1%		32
Female	3.9	24.5%	56.6%	9.4%	7.5%	1.9%	53

E3s: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	29.0%	53.2%	9.7%	8.1%		62
Students of Color	3.8	16.0%	56.0%	20.0%	4.0%	4.0%	25

E3s: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	19.2%	50.0%	23.1%	3.8%	3.8%	26
Middle class	4.1	26.2%	64.3%	4.8%	4.8%		42
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	37.5%	37.5%	12.5%	12.5%		16

E3t: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with children	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	29.9%	46.0%	17.2%	6.9%	87

E3t: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	31.3%	50.0%	15.6%	3.1%	32
Female	3.9	30.2%	43.4%	17.0%	9.4%	53

E3t: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.1	35.5%	48.4%	9.7%	6.5%	62
Students of Color	3.6	16.0%	40.0%	36.0%	8.0%	25

E3t: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	19.2%	50.0%	19.2%	11.5%	26
Middle class	4.1	33.3%	50.0%	11.9%	4.8%	42
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	37.5%	31.3%	25.0%	6.3%	16

E3u: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students who are veterans	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	28.7%	48.3%	20.7%	2.3%	87

E3u: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	31.3%	50.0%	18.8%		32
Female	4.0	28.3%	49.1%	18.9%	3.8%	53

E3u: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	33.9%	48.4%	16.1%	1.6%	62
Students of Color	3.8	16.0%	48.0%	32.0%	4.0%	25

E3u: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	19.2%	50.0%	26.9%	3.8%	26
Middle class	4.0	26.2%	52.4%	19.0%	2.4%	42
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	56.3%	31.3%	12.5%		16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 54

E3v: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	29.9%	46.0%	21.8%	2.3%	87

E3v: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.2	34.4%	46.9%	18.8%		32
Female	4.0	28.3%	45.3%	22.6%	3.8%	53

E3v: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.1	33.9%	50.0%	12.9%	3.2%	62
Students of Color	3.8	20.0%	36.0%	44.0%		25

E3v: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.9	19.2%	53.8%	26.9%		26
Middle class	4.1	33.3%	45.2%	19.0%	2.4%	42
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	43.8%	25.0%	25.0%	6.3%	16

E4a: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	88.5%	5.7%	3.4%	2.3%	87

E4a: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.1	97.0%		3.0%		33
Female	1.3	82.7%	9.6%	3.8%	3.8%	52

E4a: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	1.1	91.8%	4.9%		3.3%	61
Students of Color	1.3	80.8%	7.7%	11.5%		26

E4a: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.1	96.2%			3.8%	26
Middle class	1.2	88.1%	4.8%	7.1%		42
Upper middle/Upper class	1.4	75.0%	18.8%		6.3%	16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 56

E4b: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.3	79.5%	15.9%	2.3%	2.3%	88

E4b: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.2	84.8%	15.2%			33
Female	1.4	75.5%	17.0%	3.8%	3.8%	53

E4b: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.2	80.6%	16.1%	1.6%	1.6%	62
Students of Color	1.3	76.9%	15.4%	3.8%	3.8%	26

E4b: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.2	84.6%	11.5%	3.8%		26
Middle class	1.3	81.4%	14.0%	2.3%	2.3%	43
Upper middle/Upper class	1.5	62.5%	31.3%		6.3%	16

E4c: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.3	74.7%	18.4%	4.6%	2.3%	87

E4c: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.3	78.8%	15.2%	6.1%		33
Female	1.4	71.2%	21.2%	3.8%	3.8%	52

E4c: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.3	78.7%	18.0%	1.6%	1.6%	61
Students of Color	1.5	65.4%	19.2%	11.5%	3.8%	26

E4c: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd			2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.3	76.9%	19.2%	3.8%		26
Middle class	1.3	78.6%	16.7%	4.8%		42
Upper middle/Upper class	1.8	56.3%	25.0%	6.3%	12.5%	16

E4d: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.4	68.2%	23.9%	6.8%	1.1%	88

E4d: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.3	78.8%	15.2%	6.1%		33
Female	1.5	60.4%	30.2%	7.5%	1.9%	53

E4d: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.4	72.6%	21.0%	4.8%	1.6%	62
Students of Color	1.5	57.7%	30.8%	11.5%		26

E4d: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.4	73.1%	15.4%	11.5%		26
Middle class	1.4	65.1%	30.2%	4.7%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	1.6	62.5%	25.0%	6.3%	6.3%	16

E4e: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.4	70.1%	19.5%	9.2%	1.1%	87

E4e: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.4	75.8%	12.1%	12.1%		33
Female	1.4	67.3%	23.1%	7.7%	1.9%	52

E4e: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.4	72.1%	19.7%	6.6%	1.6%	61
Students of Color	1.5	65.4%	19.2%	15.4%		26

E4e: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.2	84.6%	7.7%	7.7%		26
Middle class	1.5	66.7%	21.4%	11.9%		42
Upper middle/Upper class	1.7	50.0%	37.5%	6.3%	6.3%	16

E4f: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.3	75.0%	19.3%	3.4%	2.3%	88

E4f: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.2	81.8%	18.2%			33
Female	1.4	69.8%	20.8%	5.7%	3.8%	53

E4f: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.3	77.4%	17.7%	1.6%	3.2%	62
Students of Color	1.4	69.2%	23.1%	7.7%		26

E4f: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.3	84.6%	7.7%	3.8%	3.8%	26
Middle class	1.3	74.4%	20.9%	4.7%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	1.6	56.3%	37.5%		6.3%	16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 61

E4g: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.3	78.2%	12.6%	6.9%	2.3%	87

E4g: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.3	84.8%	6.1%	6.1%	3.0%	33
Female	1.4	73.1%	17.3%	7.7%	1.9%	52

E4g: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.3	82.0%	11.5%	3.3%	3.3%	61
Students of Color	1.5	69.2%	15.4%	15.4%		26

E4g: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*						
Poor/Working class	1.3	80.8%	11.5%	7.7%		26
Middle class	1.2	85.7%	7.1%	7.1%		42
Upper middle/Upper class	1.8	56.3%	25.0%	6.3%	12.5%	16

E4h: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.6	59.1%	25.0%	11.4%	4.5%	88

E4h: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.4	66.7%	27.3%	6.1%		33
Female	1.8	52.8%	24.5%	15.1%	7.5%	53

E4h: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)			2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.6	59.7%	22.6%	11.3%	6.5%	62
Students of Color	1.5	57.7%	30.8%	11.5%		26

E4h: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.7	65.4%	11.5%	15.4%	7.7%	26
Middle class	1.5	60.5%	25.6%	14.0%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	1.8	43.8%	43.8%		12.5%	16

E5a: Grad students make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.4	73.6%	16.1%	4.6%	3.4%	2.3%	87

E5a: Grad students make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.2	90.9%	3.0%	3.0%		3.0%	33
Female	1.6	61.5%	25.0%	5.8%	5.8%	1.9%	52

E5a: Grad students make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.4	77.0%	14.8%	1.6%	3.3%	3.3%	61
Students of Color	1.5	65.4%	19.2%	11.5%	3.8%		26

E5a: Grad students make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating			3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.5	76.9%	15.4%			7.7%	26
Middle class	1.5	69.8%	18.6%	7.0%	4.7%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	1.5	73.3%	13.3%	6.7%	6.7%		15

E5b: Grad students make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity		1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.6	65.1%	16.3%	14.0%	3.5%	1.2%	86

E5b: Grad students make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.4	78.8%	12.1%	6.1%		3.0%	33
Female	1.8	54.9%	19.6%	19.6%	5.9%		51

E5b: Grad students make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.5	68.9%	14.8%	11.5%	3.3%	1.6%	61
Students of Color	1.7	56.0%	20.0%	20.0%	4.0%		25

E5b: Grad students make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity				3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.7	57.7%	23.1%	11.5%	3.8%	3.8%	26
Middle class	1.5	69.0%	11.9%	16.7%	2.4%		42
Upper middle/Upper class	1.7	60.0%	20.0%	13.3%	6.7%		15

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 65

E5c: Grad students make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.7	58.6%	19.5%	17.2%	3.4%	1.1%	87

E5c: Grad students make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd		1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally		5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.6	63.6%	21.2%	12.1%		3.0%	33
Female	1.8	53.8%	19.2%	21.2%	5.8%		52

E5c: Grad students make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.6	62.3%	19.7%	13.1%	3.3%	1.6%	61
Students of Color	1.8	50.0%	19.2%	26.9%	3.8%		26

E5c: Grad students make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating			3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.8	50.0%	30.8%	15.4%		3.8%	26
Middle class	1.6	62.8%	16.3%	16.3%	4.7%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	1.9	53.3%	13.3%	26.7%	6.7%		15

E5d: Grad students make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	2.0	42.5%	28.7%	20.7%	4.6%	3.4%	87

E5d: Grad students make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.7	57.6%	21.2%	18.2%		3.0%	33
Female	2.2	30.8%	34.6%	23.1%	7.7%	3.8%	52

E5d: Grad students make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.9	45.9%	27.9%	18.0%	4.9%	3.3%	61
Students of Color	2.1	34.6%	30.8%	26.9%	3.8%	3.8%	26

E5d: Grad students make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating			3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.9	53.8%	19.2%	15.4%	3.8%	7.7%	26
Middle class	2.1	32.6%	34.9%	27.9%	2.3%	2.3%	43
Upper middle/Upper class	2.0	40.0%	33.3%	13.3%	13.3%		15

E5e: Grad students make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.7	58.6%	23.0%	10.3%	6.9%	1.1%	87

E5e: Grad students make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.6	63.6%	21.2%	9.1%	3.0%	3.0%	33
Female	1.7	55.8%	25.0%	11.5%	7.7%		52

E5e: Grad students make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.6	62.3%	23.0%	6.6%	6.6%	1.6%	61
Students of Color	1.8	50.0%	23.1%	19.2%	7.7%		26

E5e: Grad students make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating			3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.7	57.7%	26.9%	7.7%	3.8%	3.8%	26
Middle class	1.7	55.8%	23.3%	11.6%	9.3%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	1.6	66.7%	13.3%	13.3%	6.7%		15

E5f: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.7	58.6%	20.7%	16.1%	2.3%	2.3%	87

E5f: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.5	69.7%	15.2%	12.1%		3.0%	33
Female	1.8	50.0%	25.0%	19.2%	3.8%	1.9%	52

E5f: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.6	63.9%	19.7%	11.5%	1.6%	3.3%	61
Students of Color	1.9	46.2%	23.1%	26.9%	3.8%		26

E5f: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating	1: Never		3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.9	50.0%	26.9%	15.4%		7.7%	26
Middle class	1.7	60.5%	16.3%	20.9%	2.3%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	1.6	60.0%	26.7%	6.7%	6.7%		15

E5g: Grad students make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.5	69.0%	13.8%	12.6%	3.4%	1.1%	87

E5g: Grad students make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.4	81.8%	3.0%	12.1%		3.0%	33
Female	1.6	61.5%	19.2%	13.5%	5.8%		52

E5g: Grad students make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.5	72.1%	11.5%	11.5%	3.3%	1.6%	61
Students of Color	1.6	61.5%	19.2%	15.4%	3.8%		26

E5g: Grad students make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating			3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.7	65.4%	11.5%	15.4%	3.8%	3.8%	26
Middle class	1.4	72.1%	14.0%	11.6%	2.3%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	1.7	60.0%	20.0%	13.3%	6.7%		15

E4h: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.9	47.1%	23.0%	24.1%	3.4%	2.3%	87

E4h: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.5	66.7%	18.2%	12.1%		3.0%	33
Female	2.1	34.6%	26.9%	30.8%	5.8%	1.9%	52

E4h: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)		1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.9	45.9%	23.0%	24.6%	4.9%	1.6%	61
Students of Color	1.8	50.0%	23.1%	23.1%		3.8%	26

E4h: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	2.0	53.8%	19.2%	11.5%	7.7%	7.7%	26
Middle class	1.9	44.2%	20.9%	34.9%			43
Upper middle/Upper class	1.9	40.0%	33.3%	20.0%	6.7%		15

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

E6a: Staff make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.1	91.9%	4.7%	2.3%	1.2%	86

E6a: Staff make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.1	96.9%		3.1%		32
Female	1.2	88.5%	7.7%	1.9%	1.9%	52

E6a: Staff make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.1	95.1%	3.3%		1.6%	61
Students of Color	1.2	84.0%	8.0%	8.0%		25

E6a: Staff make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.1	92.3%	7.7%			26
Middle class	1.1	90.5%	4.8%	4.8%		42
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	93.8%			6.3%	16

E6b: Staff make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity			2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.1	92.0%	3.4%	3.4%	1.1%	87

E6b: Staff make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.1	97.0%		3.0%		33
Female	1.2	88.5%	5.8%	3.8%	1.9%	52

E6b: Staff make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.1	95.1%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	61
Students of Color	1.2	84.6%	7.7%	7.7%		26

E6b: Staff make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.1	92.3%	3.8%	3.8%		26
Middle class	1.1	90.5%	4.8%	4.8%		42
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	93.8%			6.3%	16

E6c: Staff make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	87.4%	5.7%	4.6%	2.3%	87

E6c: Staff make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.1	90.9%	6.1%	3.0%		33
Female	1.3	84.6%	5.8%	5.8%	3.8%	52

E6c: Staff make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	1.1	91.8%	4.9%		3.3%	61
Students of Color	1.4	76.9%	7.7%	15.4%		26

E6c: Staff make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.2	92.3%	3.8%		3.8%	26
Middle class	1.2	85.7%	7.1%	7.1%		42
Upper middle/Upper class	1.4	81.3%	6.3%	6.3%	6.3%	16

E6d: Staff make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	84.1%	9.1%	5.7%	1.1%	88

E6d: Staff make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.2	87.9%	6.1%	6.1%		33
Female	1.3	81.1%	11.3%	5.7%	1.9%	53

E6d: Staff make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.2	87.1%	8.1%	3.2%	1.6%	62
Students of Color	1.3	76.9%	11.5%	11.5%		26

E6d: Staff make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.1	92.3%	3.8%	3.8%		26
Middle class	1.3	79.1%	11.6%	9.3%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	81.3%	12.5%		6.3%	16

E6e: Staff make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	87.4%	4.6%	5.7%	2.3%	87

E6e: Staff make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.2	90.9%	3.0%	6.1%		33
Female	1.3	84.6%	5.8%	5.8%	3.8%	52

E6e: Staff make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	1.2	91.8%	3.3%	1.6%	3.3%	61
Students of Color	1.4	76.9%	7.7%	15.4%		26

E6e: Staff make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.1	96.2%			3.8%	26
Middle class	1.3	83.3%	7.1%	9.5%		42
Upper middle/Upper class	1.4	81.3%	6.3%	6.3%	6.3%	16

E6f: Staff make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	87.4%	6.9%	4.6%	1.1%	87

E6f: Staff make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.1	93.9%		6.1%		33
Female	1.3	82.7%	11.5%	3.8%	1.9%	52

E6f: Staff make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.2	88.5%	6.6%	3.3%	1.6%	61
Students of Color	1.2	84.6%	7.7%	7.7%		26

E6f: Staff make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.2	88.5%	7.7%	3.8%		26
Middle class	1.2	83.3%	9.5%	7.1%		42
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	93.8%			6.3%	16

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 77

E6g: Staff make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status			2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.1	92.0%	4.6%	1.1%	2.3%	87

E6g: Staff make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.1	97.0%		3.0%		33
Female	1.2	88.5%	7.7%		3.8%	52

E6g: Staff make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.1	96.7%	1.6%		1.6%	61
Students of Color	1.3	80.8%	11.5%	3.8%	3.8%	26

E6g: Staff make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.0	96.2%	3.8%			26
Middle class	1.2	90.5%	4.8%	2.4%	2.4%	42
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	87.5%	6.3%		6.3%	16

E6h: Staff make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	87.5%	5.7%	5.7%	1.1%	88

E6h: Staff make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.2	87.9%	6.1%	6.1%		33
Female	1.2	86.8%	5.7%	5.7%	1.9%	53

E6h: Staff make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)		1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.2	90.3%	4.8%	3.2%	1.6%	62
Students of Color	1.3	80.8%	7.7%	11.5%		26

E6h: Staff make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.1	92.3%	3.8%	3.8%		26
Middle class	1.3	83.7%	7.0%	9.3%		43
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	87.5%	6.3%		6.3%	16