E1b: Faculty respect for minority grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.4	47.6%	43.8%	6.7%	1.9%	105

E1b: Faculty respect for minority grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.3	39.1%	52.2%	8.7%		23
Female	3.4	50.6%	40.7%	6.2%	2.5%	81

E1b: Faculty respect for minority grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.5	49.3%	46.5%	4.2%		71
Students of Color	3.2	44.1%	38.2%	11.8%	5.9%	34

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	47.4%	39.5%	7.9%	5.3%	38
Middle class	3.5	51.2%	43.9%	4.9%		41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	40.0%	55.0%	5.0%		20

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

E1c: Faculty respect for female students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.5	53.8%	39.6%	5.7%	0.9%	106

E1c: Faculty respect for female students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.6	60.9%	39.1%			23
Female	3.4	52.4%	39.0%	7.3%	1.2%	82

E1c: Faculty respect for female students		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.5	54.2%	38.9%	5.6%	1.4%	72
Students of Color	3.5	52.9%	41.2%	5.9%		34

E1c: Faculty respect for female students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.3	41.0%	46.2%	12.8%		39
Middle class	3.5	61.0%	34.1%	2.4%	2.4%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	65.0%	35.0%			20

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 2

E1e: Graduate student respect for minority faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.3	40.0%	50.5%	7.6%	1.9%	105

E1e: Graduate student respect for minority faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.3	39.1%	52.2%	4.3%	4.3%	23
Female	3.3	40.7%	49.4%	8.6%	1.2%	81

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	43.7%	47.9%	8.5%		71
Students of Color	3.1	32.4%	55.9%	5.9%	5.9%	34

E1e: Graduate student respect for minority faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.2	36.8%	50.0%	10.5%	2.6%	38
Middle class	3.3	39.0%	51.2%	7.3%	2.4%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	45.0%	50.0%	5.0%		20

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

E1f: Graduate student respect for female faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.4	48.1%	41.5%	9.4%	0.9%	106

E1f: Graduate student respect for female faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.4	47.8%	43.5%	8.7%		23
Female	3.4	48.8%	40.2%	9.8%	1.2%	82

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	48.6%	40.3%	9.7%	1.4%	72
Students of Color	3.4	47.1%	44.1%	8.8%		34

E1f: Graduate student respect for female faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.3	43.6%	46.2%	10.3%		39
Middle class	3.4	48.8%	41.5%	7.3%	2.4%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.5	60.0%	25.0%	15.0%		20

^{*} 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)	2.8	15.9%	53.4%	27.3%	3.4%	88

E1g: Undergrad respect for minority TAs		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.0	19.0%	66.7%	14.3%		21
Female	2.8	15.2%	50.0%	30.3%	4.5%	66

E1g: Undergrad respect for minority TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	2.9	19.7%	49.2%	29.5%	1.6%	61
Students of Color	2.7	7.4%	63.0%	22.2%	7.4%	27

E1g: Undergrad respect for minority TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	2.7	15.2%	48.5%	30.3%	6.1%	33
Middle class	2.8	13.9%	58.3%	25.0%	2.8%	36
Upper middle/Upper class	2.7	7.1%	57.1%	35.7%		14

E1h: Undergrad respect for female TAs	Mean	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	2.9	20.5%	54.5%	23 0%	1.1%	88

E1h: Undergrad respect for female TAs		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.1	19.0%	71.4%	9.5%		21
Female	2.9	21.2%	50.0%	27.3%	1.5%	66

E1h: Undergrad respect for female TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.0	23.0%	50.8%	24.6%	1.6%	61
Students of Color	2.9	14.8%	63.0%	22.2%		27

E1h: Undergrad respect for female TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	2.9	21.9%	50.0%	28.1%	32
Middle class	2.9	19.4%	55.6%	25.0%	36
Upper middle/Upper class	2.9	7.1%	71.4%	21.4%	14

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)	3.2	33.3%	53.5%	11.1%	2.0%	99

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	3.3	36.4%	54.5%	9.1%		22
Female	3.2	32.9%	53.9%	10.5%	2.6%	76

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	3.3	39.1%	52.2%	7.2%	1.4%	69
Students of Color	2.9	20.0%	56.7%	20.0%	3.3%	30

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	3.1	29.7%	56.8%	10.8%	2.7%	37
Middle class	3.1	26.3%	57.9%	15.8%		38
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	50.0%	44.4%	5.6%		18

^{*} 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)	3.1	31.3%	52.5%	15.2%	1.0%	99

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	3.3	40.9%	45.5%	13.6%		22
Female	3.1	28.9%	55.3%	14.5%	1.3%	76

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	39.1%	50.7%	10.1%		69
Students of Color	2.8	13.3%	56.7%	26.7%	3.3%	30

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	30.6%	50.0%	16.7%	2.8%	36
Middle class	3.0	18.4%	60.5%	21.1%		38
Upper middle/Upper class	3.5	52.6%	42.1%	5.3%		19

^{*} 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)	3.1	28.7%	57.4%	11.9%	2.0%	101

E1k: Friendships between grad students of different racial/ethnic groups	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.1	36.4%	40.9%	22.7%		22
Female	3.1	26.9%	61.5%	9.0%	2.6%	78

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	32.9%	55.7%	11.4%		70
Students of Color	2.9	19.4%	61.3%	12.9%	6.5%	31

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	32.4%	48.6%	13.5%	5.4%	37
Middle class	3.1	21.1%	71.1%	7.9%		38
Upper middle/Upper class	3.2	35.0%	50.0%	15.0%		20

^{*} 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	27.0%	57.0%	14.0%	2.0%	100

E1I: Friendships between heterosexual and GLBT grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.2	31.8%	59.1%	9.1%		22
Female	3.1	26.0%	55.8%	15.6%	2.6%	77

E1I: Friendships between heterosexual and GLBT grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.2	33.3%	53.6%	11.6%	1.4%	69
Students of Color	2.9	12.9%	64.5%	19.4%	3.2%	31

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	22.2%	55.6%	16.7%	5.6%	36
Middle class	3.0	15.8%	71.1%	13.2%		38
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	50.0%	40.0%	10.0%		20

E1m: Graduate student respect for transgender students		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	2.9	19.8%	52.1%	22.9%	5.2%	96

E1m: Graduate student respect for transgender students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.0	22.7%	59.1%	18.2%		22
Female	2.8	19.2%	50.7%	23.3%	6.8%	73

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	25.8%	48.5%	21.2%	4.5%	66
Students of Color	2.7	6.7%	60.0%	26.7%	6.7%	30

E1m: Graduate student respect for transgender students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	2.8	22.9%	45.7%	20.0%	11.4%	35
Middle class	2.8	10.5%	63.2%	26.3%		38
Upper middle/Upper class	2.9	23.5%	47.1%	23.5%	5.9%	17

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

E2a: NCSU Supportivenes African American students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive	3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
	_				

E2a: NCSU Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.8	18.2%	59.1%	4.5%	18.2%	22
Female	3.8	20.0%	51.3%	21.3%	7.5%	80

E2a: NCSU Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.0	24.6%	56.5%	11.6%	7.2%	69
Students of Color	3.4	8.8%	44.1%	29.4%	17.6%	34

E2a: NCSU Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	23.7%	47.4%	18.4%	10.5%	38
Middle class	3.7	14.6%	53.7%	17.1%	14.6%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	20.0%	55.0%	20.0%	5.0%	20

E2b: NCSU Supportiveness: Asian students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.6	12.6%	50.5%	22.3%	12.6%	1.9%	103

E2b: NCSU Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.6	9.1%	63.6%	13.6%	9.1%	4.5%	22
Female	3.6	13.8%	47.5%	25.0%	12.5%	1.3%	80

E2b: NCSU Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.7	17.4%	53.6%	15.9%	11.6%	1.4%	69
Students of Color	3.3	2.9%	44.1%	35.3%	14.7%	2.9%	34

E2b: NCSU Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	18.4%	50.0%	21.1%	10.5%		38
Middle class	3.5	7.3%	51.2%	24.4%	14.6%	2.4%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	5.0%	50.0%	25.0%	15.0%	5.0%	20

E2c: NCSU Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.6	15.5%	46.6%	24.3%	11.7%	1.9%	103

E2c: NCSU Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.7	18.2%	50.0%	18.2%	9.1%	4.5%	22
Female	3.6	15.0%	46.3%	26.3%	11.3%	1.3%	80

E2c: NCSU Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.9	21.7%	50.7%	20.3%	5.8%	1.4%	69
Students of Color	3.1	2.9%	38.2%	32.4%	23.5%	2.9%	34

E2c: NCSU Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	21.1%	42.1%	26.3%	10.5%		38
Middle class	3.4	9.8%	46.3%	22.0%	17.1%	4.9%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	15.0%	50.0%	30.0%	5.0%		20

E2d: NCSU Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.5	11.7%	45.6%	28.2%	11.7%	2.9%	103

E2d: NCSU Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.4	9.1%	50.0%	22.7%	9.1%	9.1%	22
Female	3.6	12.5%	45.0%	30.0%	11.3%	1.3%	80

E2d: NCSU Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.7	15.9%	49.3%	26.1%	7.2%	1.4%	69
Students of Color	3.1	2.9%	38.2%	32.4%	20.6%	5.9%	34

E2d: NCSU Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	18.4%	44.7%	28.9%	5.3%	2.6%	38
Middle class	3.3	4.9%	46.3%	26.8%	17.1%	4.9%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.5	10.0%	40.0%	35.0%	15.0%		20

E2e: NCSU Supportiveness: White students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.5	55.8%	37.5%	5.8%	1.0%	104

E2e: NCSU Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.3	45.5%	40.9%	13.6%		22
Female	4.5	59.3%	35.8%	3.7%	1.2%	81

E2e: NCSU Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.5	55.7%	41.4%	2.9%		70
Students of Color	4.4	55.9%	29.4%	11.8%	2.9%	34

E2e: NCSU Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.4	55.3%	36.8%	5.3%	2.6%	38
Middle class	4.5	53.7%	41.5%	4.9%		41
Upper middle/Upper class	4.5	55.0%	35.0%	10.0%		20

E2f: NCSU Supportiveness: International students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	26.2%	54.4%	14.6%	4.9%	103

E2f: NCSU Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.9	22.7%	54.5%	13.6%	9.1%	22
Female	4.1	27.5%	53.8%	15.0%	3.8%	80

E2f: NCSU Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	28.2%	56.3%	9.9%	5.6%	71
Students of Color	3.9	21.9%	50.0%	25.0%	3.1%	32

E2f: NCSU Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	34.2%	50.0%	10.5%	5.3%	38
Middle class	4.0	20.0%	60.0%	17.5%	2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	20.0%	55.0%	15.0%	10.0%	20

E2g: NCSU Supportiveness: Female students		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)

E2g: NCSU Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	22.7%	59.1%	13.6%	4.5%	22
Female	3.9	20.0%	58.8%	15.0%	6.3%	80

E2g: NCSU Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	19.7%	66.2%	9.9%	4.2%	71
Students of Color	3.8	21.9%	43.8%	25.0%	9.4%	32

E2g: NCSU Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	26.3%	50.0%	21.1%	2.6%	38
Middle class	3.9	15.0%	65.0%	10.0%	10.0%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	15.0%	65.0%	15.0%	5.0%	20

E2h: NCSU Supportiveness: Male students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.3	44.7%	44.7%	9.7%	1.0%	103

E2h: NCSU Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	36.4%	45.5%	13.6%	4.5%	22
Female	4.4	47.5%	43.8%	8.8%		80

E2h: NCSU Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.4	46.5%	46.5%	5.6%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	4.2	40.6%	40.6%	18.8%		32

E2h: NCSU Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.3	47.4%	42.1%	7.9%	2.6%	38
Middle class	4.3	40.0%	50.0%	10.0%		40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	50.0%	35.0%	15.0%		20

E2i: NCSU Supportiveness: Transgender students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.3	9.8%	33.3%	35.3%	16.7%	4.9%	102

E2i: NCSU Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.3	9.1%	36.4%	31.8%	18.2%	4.5%	22
Female	3.3	10.1%	32.9%	36.7%	15.2%	5.1%	79

E2i: NCSU Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.4	11.4%	40.0%	28.6%	17.1%	2.9%	70
Students of Color	3.0	6.3%	18.8%	50.0%	15.6%	9.4%	32

E2i: NCSU Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.5	13.5%	35.1%	37.8%	10.8%	2.7%	37
Middle class	3.2	5.0%	37.5%	32.5%	17.5%	7.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	3.1	10.0%	25.0%	35.0%	25.0%	5.0%	20

E2j: NCSU Supportiveness: GLB students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.6	10.7%	47.6%	33.0%	6.8%	1.9%	103

E2j: NCSU Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.7	9.1%	63.6%	18.2%	9.1%		22
Female	3.6	11.3%	43.8%	37.5%	5.0%	2.5%	80

E2j: NCSU Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.7	12.7%	52.1%	28.2%	5.6%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	3.3	6.3%	37.5%	43.8%	9.4%	3.1%	32

E2j: NCSU Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	13.2%	55.3%	28.9%	2.6%		38
Middle class	3.4	7.5%	47.5%	27.5%	12.5%	5.0%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	3.6	10.0%	40.0%	45.0%	5.0%		20

E2k: NCSU Supportiveness: Christian students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	42.2%	41.2%	14.7%	1.0%	1.0%	102

E2k: NCSU Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	36.4%	54.5%	4.5%		4.5%	22
Female	4.2	43.0%	38.0%	17.7%	1.3%		79

E2k: NCSU Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.4	48.6%	42.9%	7.1%		1.4%	70
Students of Color	3.9	28.1%	37.5%	31.3%	3.1%		32

E2k: NCSU Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.2	39.5%	42.1%	15.8%		2.6%	38
Middle class	4.3	48.7%	35.9%	12.8%	2.6%		39
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	35.0%	55.0%	10.0%			20

E2I: NCSU Supportiveness: Jewish students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	13.9%	40 50/	32.7%	6.9%	101

E2I: NCSU Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.8	13.6%	54.5%	27.3%	4.5%	22
Female	3.7	14.1%	44.9%	34.6%	6.4%	78

E2I: NCSU Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.8	18.6%	50.0%	25.7%	5.7%	70
Students of Color	3.4	3.2%	38.7%	48.4%	9.7%	31

E2I: NCSU Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	15.8%	50.0%	34.2%		38
Middle class	3.5	5.0%	50.0%	32.5%	12.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	20.0%	40.0%	30.0%	10.0%	20

E2m: NCSU Supportiveness: Muslim students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.5	12.9%	41.6%	31.7%	11.9%	2.0%	101

E2m: NCSU Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.6	13.6%	45.5%	27.3%	13.6%		22
Female	3.5	12.8%	41.0%	33.3%	10.3%	2.6%	78

E2m: NCSU Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.6	17.1%	42.9%	27.1%	10.0%	2.9%	70
Students of Color	3.3	3.2%	38.7%	41.9%	16.1%		31

E2m: NCSU Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	18.4%	42.1%	28.9%	10.5%		38
Middle class	3.3	5.0%	47.5%	27.5%	15.0%	5.0%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	3.5	10.0%	35.0%	45.0%	10.0%		20

E2n: NCSU Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.5	12.9%	38.6%	38.6%	9.9%	101

E2n: NCSU Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.3	9.1%	31.8%	40.9%	18.2%	22
Female	3.6	14.1%	41.0%	38.5%	6.4%	78

E2n: NCSU Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.6	17.1%	40.0%	31.4%	11.4%	70
Students of Color	3.4	3.2%	35.5%	54.8%	6.5%	31

E2n: NCSU Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.7	18.4%	39.5%	36.8%	5.3%	38
Middle class	3.3	2.5%	42.5%	40.0%	15.0%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	3.6	15.0%	35.0%	40.0%	10.0%	20

Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile	

E2o: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with disabilities	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	19.8%	45.5%	20.8%	10.9%	3.0%	101

E2o: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.8	22.7%	50.0%	13.6%	9.1%	4.5%	22
Female	3.7	19.2%	44.9%	23.1%	10.3%	2.6%	78

E2o: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.7	21.4%	48.6%	15.7%	11.4%	2.9%	70
Students of Color	3.5	16.1%	38.7%	32.3%	9.7%	3.2%	31

E2o: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	34.2%	34.2%	23.7%	5.3%	2.6%	38
Middle class	3.6	10.0%	57.5%	15.0%	15.0%	2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	10.0%	40.0%	30.0%	15.0%	5.0%	20

E2p: NCSU Supportiveness: Poor/working class students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.6	13.0%	47.0%	23.0%	16.0%	1.0%	100

E2p: NCSU Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.8	18.2%	59.1%	9.1%	9.1%	4.5%	22
Female	3.5	11.7%	44.2%	27.3%	16.9%		77

E2p: NCSU Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.7	15.7%	55.7%	15.7%	12.9%		70
Students of Color	3.1	6.7%	26.7%	40.0%	23.3%	3.3%	30

E2p: NCSU Supportiveness: Poor/working class students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.5	16.2%	37.8%	29.7%	16.2%		37
Middle class	3.4	5.0%	55.0%	20.0%	17.5%	2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	15.0%	55.0%	15.0%	15.0%		20

E2q: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle class students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	25.5%	53.9%	17.6%	2.9%	102

E2q: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	22.7%	59.1%	9.1%	9.1%	22
Female	4.0	25.3%	53.2%	20.3%	1.3%	79

E2q: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.1	25.7%	64.3%	7.1%	2.9%	70
Students of Color	3.8	25.0%	31.3%	40.6%	3.1%	32

E2q: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	28.9%	44.7%	26.3%		38
Middle class	4.0	22.5%	60.0%	10.0%	7.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%		20

E2r: NCSU Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.3	41.2%	47.1%	10.8%	1.0%	102

E2r: NCSU Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.3	40.9%	54.5%		4.5%	22
Female	4.3	40.5%	45.6%	13.9%		79

E2r: NCSU Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.4	41.4%	54.3%	2.9%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	4.1	40.6%	31.3%	28.1%		32

E2r: NCSU Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.3	47.4%	36.8%	15.8%		38
Middle class	4.2	30.0%	62.5%	5.0%	2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	45.0%	40.0%	15.0%		20

E2s: NCSU Supportiveness: Nontraditional students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.3	10.7%	36.9%	29.1%	19.4%	3.9%	103

E2s: NCSU Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.4	13.6%	36.4%	27.3%	22.7%		22
Female	3.3	10.0%	36.3%	30.0%	18.8%	5.0%	80

E2s: NCSU Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.4	12.7%	36.6%	28.2%	18.3%	4.2%	71
Students of Color	3.2	6.3%	37.5%	31.3%	21.9%	3.1%	32

E2s: NCSU Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.4	15.8%	34.2%	31.6%	13.2%	5.3%	38
Middle class	3.2	5.0%	42.5%	25.0%	22.5%	5.0%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	3.3	10.0%	35.0%	30.0%	25.0%		20

E2t: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with children	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.2	8.7%	31.1%	35.9%	22.3%	1.9%	103

E2t: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.2	9.1%	31.8%	31.8%	27.3%		22
Female	3.2	8.8%	30.0%	37.5%	21.3%	2.5%	80

E2t: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.2	9.9%	31.0%	32.4%	25.4%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	3.2	6.3%	31.3%	43.8%	15.6%	3.1%	32

E2t: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.3	15.8%	23.7%	39.5%	18.4%	2.6%	38
Middle class	3.2	2.5%	42.5%	30.0%	22.5%	2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	3.1	5.0%	25.0%	40.0%	30.0%		20

E2u: NCSU Supportiveness: Students who are veterans	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.6	16.8%	39.6%	34.7%	8.9%	101

E2u: NCSU Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.5	13.6%	40.9%	31.8%	13.6%	22
Female	3.7	17.9%	39.7%	35.9%	6.4%	78

E2u: NCSU Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.7	17.4%	43.5%	30.4%	8.7%	69
Students of Color	3.5	15.6%	31.3%	43.8%	9.4%	32

E2u: NCSU Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.9	29.7%	35.1%	29.7%	5.4%	37
Middle class	3.4	5.0%	42.5%	40.0%	12.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	3.6	10.0%	45.0%	35.0%	10.0%	20

E2v: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.6	12.6%	47.6%	27.2%	11.7%	1.0%	103

E2v: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.6	13.6%	45.5%	27.3%	13.6%		22
Female	3.6	12.5%	48.8%	27.5%	10.0%	1.3%	80

E2v: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.7	15.9%	52.2%	17.4%	13.0%	1.4%	69
Students of Color	3.4	5.9%	38.2%	47.1%	8.8%		34

E2v: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	18.4%	47.4%	23.7%	10.5%		38
Middle class	3.5	7.3%	48.8%	29.3%	12.2%	2.4%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	5.0%	45.0%	35.0%	15.0%		20

E3a: Grad Prog Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.3	43.7%	44.7%	10.7%	1.0%	103

E3a: Grad Prog Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.4	50.0%	36.4%	13.6%		22
Female	4.3	42.5%	46.3%	10.0%	1.3%	80

E3a: Grad Prog Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.5	54.3%	40.0%	5.7%		70
Students of Color	3.9	21.2%	54.5%	21.2%	3.0%	33

E3a: Grad Prog Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	30.8%	51.3%	15.4%	2.6%	39
Middle class	4.4	46.3%	43.9%	9.8%		41
Upper middle/Upper class	4.6	60.0%	35.0%	5.0%		20

E3b: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Asian students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	33.0%	45.6%	16.5%	3.9%	1.0%	103

E3b: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	31.8%	40.9%	22.7%	4.5%		22
Female	4.1	33.8%	46.3%	15.0%	3.8%	1.3%	80

E3b: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.3	44.3%	42.9%	10.0%	1.4%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	3.6	9.1%	51.5%	30.3%	9.1%		33

E3b: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	28.2%	43.6%	25.6%	2.6%		39
Middle class	3.9	29.3%	46.3%	14.6%	7.3%	2.4%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	45.0%	50.0%	5.0%			20

E3c: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	33.7%	46.2%	15.4%	3.8%	1.0%	104

E3c: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	40.9%	36.4%	18.2%	4.5%		22
Female	4.1	32.1%	48.1%	14.8%	3.7%	1.2%	81

E3c: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.2	42.3%	43.7%	9.9%	2.8%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	3.8	15.2%	51.5%	27.3%	6.1%		33

E3c: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	23.1%	51.3%	23.1%	2.6%		39
Middle class	4.0	34.1%	46.3%	12.2%	4.9%	2.4%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	50.0%	40.0%	10.0%			20

North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Education Section E: Campus Climate

Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

E3d: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		0,		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	28.2%	47.6%	19.4%	3.9%	1.0%	103

E3d: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	31.8%	40.9%	22.7%	4.5%		22
Female	4.0	27.5%	48.8%	18.8%	3.8%	1.3%	80

E3d: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.2	37.1%	45.7%	14.3%	1.4%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	3.6	9.1%	51.5%	30.3%	9.1%		33

E3d: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	23.1%	48.7%	25.6%	2.6%		39
Middle class	3.9	24.4%	48.8%	17.1%	7.3%	2.4%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	40.0%	45.0%	15.0%			20

E3e: Grad Prog Supportiveness: White students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.5	53.9%	41.2%	3.9%	1.0%	102

E3e: Grad Prog Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.4	45.5%	50.0%		4.5%	22
Female	4.5	57.0%	38.0%	5.1%		79

E3e: Grad Prog Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.6	58.6%	40.0%		1.4%	70
Students of Color	4.3	43.8%	43.8%	12.5%		32

E3e: Grad Prog Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.5	52.6%	42.1%	5.3%		38
Middle class	4.4	48.8%	46.3%	2.4%	2.4%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	4.6	65.0%	30.0%	5.0%		20

E3f: Grad Prog Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive	4: Supportive	3: Neutral	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	37.6%	41.6%	20.8%	101

E3f: Grad Prog Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive	4: Supportive	3: Neutral	Total (N)
Gender					
Male	4.1	40.9%	31.8%	27.3%	22
Female	4.2	37.2%	43.6%	19.2%	78

E3f: Grad Prog Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive	4: Supportive	3: Neutral	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	4.3	44.3%	40.0%	15.7%	70
Students of Color	3.9	22.6%	45.2%	32.3%	31

E3f: Grad Prog Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive	4: Supportive	3: Neutral	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	4.1	39.5%	31.6%	28.9%	38
Middle class	4.2	35.0%	47.5%	17.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	35.0%	50.0%	15.0%	20

^{*} 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	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.4	49.5%	42.6%	6.9%	1.0%	101

E3g: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.5	59.1%	36.4%	4.5%		22
Female	4.4	47.4%	43.6%	7.7%	1.3%	78

E3g: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.5	58.6%	35.7%	4.3%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	4.2	29.0%	58.1%	12.9%		31

E3g: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.3	44.7%	42.1%	13.2%		38
Middle class	4.4	47.5%	47.5%	2.5%	2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.6	60.0%	35.0%	5.0%		20

North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) **College of Education Section E: Campus Climate**

Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

E3h: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Male students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.3	45.1%	46.1%	6.9%	1.0%	1.0%	102

E3h: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	31.8%	63.6%		4.5%		22
Female	4.4	49.4%	40.5%	8.9%		1.3%	79

E3h: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.4	53.5%	40.8%	2.8%	1.4%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	4.1	25.8%	58.1%	16.1%			31

E3h: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.3	42.1%	44.7%	13.2%		38
Middle class	4.4	42.5%	52.5%	2.5%	2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.5	55.0%	40.0%	5.0%		20

E3i: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	29.0%	39.0%	31.0%	1.0%	100

E3i: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	31.8%	40.9%	27.3%		22
Female	3.9	28.6%	37.7%	32.5%	1.3%	77

E3i: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	34.8%	40.6%	23.2%	1.4%	69
Students of Color	3.7	16.1%	35.5%	48.4%		31

E3i: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.9	27.0%	40.5%	32.4%		37
Middle class	3.9	22.5%	40.0%	37.5%		40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	40.0%	35.0%	20.0%	5.0%	20

North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Education 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)	4.1	34.7%	47.5%	15.8%	1.0%	1.0%	101

E3j: Grad Prog Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.3	40.9%	50.0%	9.1%			22
Female	4.1	33.3%	46.2%	17.9%	1.3%	1.3%	78

E3j: Grad Prog Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.3	44.3%	44.3%	8.6%	1.4%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	3.8	12.9%	54.8%	32.3%			31

E3j: Grad Prog Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	32.4%	48.6%	18.9%		37
Middle class	4.1	27.5%	52.5%	20.0%		40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	50.0%	40.0%	5.0%	5.0%	20

North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Education Section E: Campus Climate

Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

E3k: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Christian students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	35.6%	45.5%	16.8%	1.0%	1.0%	101

E3k: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	36.4%	50.0%	9.1%		4.5%	22
Female	4.1	35.9%	43.6%	19.2%	1.3%		78

E3k: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.3	44.3%	44.3%	8.6%	1.4%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	3.8	16.1%	48.4%	35.5%			31

E3k: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	28.9%	50.0%	18.4%		2.6%	38
Middle class	4.1	35.0%	40.0%	22.5%	2.5%		40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	45.0%	50.0%	5.0%			20

E3I: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Jewish students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	29.7%	45 5%	22.8%	2.0%	101

E3I: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.9	27.3%	45.5%	18.2%	9.1%	22
Female	4.1	30.8%	44.9%	24.4%		78

E3I: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.2	37.1%	45.7%	15.7%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	3.7	12.9%	45.2%	38.7%	3.2%	31

E3I: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	26.3%	44.7%	28.9%		38
Middle class	3.9	25.0%	42.5%	27.5%	5.0%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	40.0%	55.0%	5.0%		20

North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Education Section E: Campus Climate

Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

E3m: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Muslim students	Mean			3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	30.4%	43.1%	23.5%	1.0%	2.0%	102

E3m: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.9	31.8%	40.9%	18.2%	4.5%	4.5%	22
Female	4.0	30.4%	43.0%	25.3%		1.3%	79

E3m: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.1	38.0%	42.3%	16.9%		2.8%	71
Students of Color	3.7	12.9%	45.2%	38.7%	3.2%		31

E3m: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	26.3%	44.7%	26.3%		2.6%	38
Middle class	3.9	27.5%	37.5%	30.0%	2.5%	2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	40.0%	50.0%	10.0%			20

North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Education Section E: Campus Climate

Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

E3n: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian	Mean	5: Strongly		3:	2:	1: Very	
students	Rating	supportive	Supportive	Neutral	Nonsupportive	nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	31.7%	12 60/	21.8%	2.0%	1.0%	101

E3n: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.8	31.8%	36.4%	18.2%	9.1%	4.5%	22
Female	4.1	32.1%	44.9%	23.1%			78

E3n: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.2	40.0%	42.9%	14.3%	1.4%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	3.7	12.9%	45.2%	38.7%	3.2%		31

E3n: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	26.3%	42.1%	28.9%		2.6%	38
Middle class	3.9	27.5%	42.5%	25.0%	5.0%		40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	45.0%	50.0%	5.0%			20

E3o: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with disabilities	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	29.7%	47.5%	18.8%	4.0%	101

E3o: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.9	22.7%	54.5%	13.6%	9.1%	22
Female	4.1	32.1%	44.9%	20.5%	2.6%	78

E3o: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	35.7%	45.7%	15.7%	2.9%	70
Students of Color	3.8	16.1%	51.6%	25.8%	6.5%	31

E3o: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	31.6%	42.1%	21.1%	5.3%	38
Middle class	4.0	25.0%	50.0%	22.5%	2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	30.0%	55.0%	10.0%	5.0%	20

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 48

E3p: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Poor/working class students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	33.7%	39.6%	18.8%	7.9%	101

E3p: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	36.4%	50.0%	4.5%	9.1%	22
Female	3.9	33.3%	35.9%	23.1%	7.7%	78

E3p: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.1	42.9%	35.7%	14.3%	7.1%	70
Students of Color	3.6	12.9%	48.4%	29.0%	9.7%	31

E3p: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.9	26.3%	47.4%	21.1%	5.3%	38
Middle class	3.9	30.0%	37.5%	20.0%	12.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	50.0%	30.0%	15.0%	5.0%	20

E3q: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	37.6%	47.5%	12.9%	2.0%	101

E3q: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	36.4%	50.0%	4.5%	9.1%	22
Female	4.2	38.5%	46.2%	15.4%		78

E3q: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.4	47.1%	44.3%	7.1%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	3.8	16.1%	54.8%	25.8%	3.2%	31

E3q: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	31.6%	52.6%	15.8%		38
Middle class	4.1	35.0%	47.5%	12.5%	5.0%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	50.0%	40.0%	10.0%		20

E3r: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	38.6%	46.5%	13.9%	1.0%	101

E3r: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	27.3%	54.5%	13.6%	4.5%	22
Female	4.3	42.3%	43.6%	14.1%		78

E3r: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.3	45.7%	45.7%	7.1%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	3.9	22.6%	48.4%	29.0%		31

E3r: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	31.6%	52.6%	15.8%		38
Middle class	4.2	42.5%	42.5%	12.5%	2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	40.0%	45.0%	15.0%		20

North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Education Section E: Campus Climate

Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

E3s: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Nontraditional students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	32.4%	46.1%	14.7%	4.9%	2.0%	102

E3s: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	40.9%	36.4%	13.6%	9.1%		22
Female	4.0	30.4%	48.1%	15.2%	3.8%	2.5%	79

E3s: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.1	39.4%	42.3%	12.7%	2.8%	2.8%	71
Students of Color	3.8	16.1%	54.8%	19.4%	9.7%		31

E3s: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	31.6%	52.6%	10.5%	2.6%	2.6%	38
Middle class	4.0	32.5%	42.5%	15.0%	7.5%	2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	30.0%	40.0%	25.0%	5.0%		20

	E3t: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with children	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
1	Γotal (N)	4.0	31.7%	42.6%	16.8%	7.9%	1.0%	101

E3t: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.8	22.7%	45.5%	18.2%	13.6%		22
Female	4.0	34.6%	41.0%	16.7%	6.4%	1.3%	78

E3t: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	37.1%	40.0%	12.9%	8.6%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	3.8	19.4%	48.4%	25.8%	6.5%		31

E3t: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	34.2%	39.5%	15.8%	7.9%	2.6%	38
Middle class	3.9	22.5%	52.5%	17.5%	7.5%		40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	42.1%	31.6%	21.1%	5.3%		19

E3u: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	30.7%	42.6%	24.8%	2.0%	101

E3u: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	27.3%	45.5%	22.7%	4.5%	22
Female	4.0	32.1%	41.0%	25.6%	1.3%	78

E3u: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.2	37.1%	42.9%	18.6%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	3.7	16.1%	41.9%	38.7%	3.2%	31

E3u: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	34.2%	52.6%	13.2%		38
Middle class	3.8	22.5%	35.0%	37.5%	5.0%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	36.8%	42.1%	21.1%		19

North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Education Section E: Campus Climate

Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

E3v: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	28.4%	46.1%	17.6%	6.9%	1.0%	102

E3v: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	27.3%	50.0%	13.6%	9.1%		22
Female	3.9	29.1%	44.3%	19.0%	6.3%	1.3%	79

E3v: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.1	35.7%	45.7%	12.9%	4.3%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	3.6	12.5%	46.9%	28.1%	12.5%		32

E3v: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	23.7%	52.6%	18.4%	5.3%		38
Middle class	3.8	26.8%	41.5%	19.5%	9.8%	2.4%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	35.0%	45.0%	15.0%	5.0%		20

E4a: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.1	89.1%	9.9%	1.0%	101

E4a: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender*					
Male	1.1	90.9%	9.1%		22
Female	1.1	89.7%	9.0%	1.3%	78

E4a: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.1	90.0%	8.6%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	1.1	87.1%	12.9%		31

E4a: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.1	92.1%	5.3%	2.6%	38
Middle class	1.1	87.5%	12.5%		40
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	85.0%	15.0%		20

^{*} 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	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	83.7%	11.5%	4.8%	104

E4b: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender*					
Male	1.2	81.8%	18.2%		22
Female	1.2	85.2%	8.6%	6.2%	81

E4b: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.2	84.5%	9.9%	5.6%	71
Students of Color	1.2	81.8%	15.2%	3.0%	33

E4b: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.2	84.6%	10.3%	5.1%	39
Middle class	1.2	82.9%	14.6%	2.4%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	85.0%	10.0%	5.0%	20

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 57

E4c: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	85.1%	7.9%	6.9%	101

E4c: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender*					
Male	1.1	90.9%	9.1%		22
Female	1.2	84.6%	6.4%	9.0%	78

E4c: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.2	88.6%	5.7%	5.7%	70
Students of Color	1.3	77.4%	12.9%	9.7%	31

E4c: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd		1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.3	84.2%	5.3%	10.5%	38
Middle class	1.2	85.0%	10.0%	5.0%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	90.0%	5.0%	5.0%	20

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 58

E4d: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.3	81.7%	11.5%	5.8%	1.0%	104

E4d: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.2	81.8%	18.2%			22
Female	1.3	82.7%	8.6%	7.4%	1.2%	81

E4d: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.2	83.1%	11.3%	4.2%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	1.3	78.8%	12.1%	9.1%		33

E4d: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.3	82.1%	10.3%	7.7%	39
Middle class	1.2	80.5%	14.6%	4.9%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	90.0%	5.0%	5.0%	20

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 59

E4e: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	81.2%	15.8%	3.0%	101

E4e: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender					
Male	1.2	81.8%	18.2%		22
Female	1.2	82.1%	14.1%	3.8%	78

E4e: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.2	78.6%	18.6%	2.9%	70
Students of Color	1.2	87.1%	9.7%	3.2%	31

E4e: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.2	86.8%	10.5%	2.6%	38
Middle class	1.3	75.0%	22.5%	2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	80.0%	15.0%	5.0%	20

E4f: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	87.4%	7.8%	4.9%	103

E4f: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender*					
Male	1.2	86.4%	9.1%	4.5%	22
Female	1.2	88.8%	6.3%	5.0%	80

E4f: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.2	88.6%	7.1%	4.3%	70
Students of Color	1.2	84.8%	9.1%	6.1%	33

E4f: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.2	89.7%	5.1%	5.1%	39
Middle class	1.2	85.4%	12.2%	2.4%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	85.0%	5.0%	10.0%	20

^{*} 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	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	82.4%	12.7%	3.9%	1.0%	102

E4g: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.1	90.9%	9.1%			22
Female	1.3	81.0%	12.7%	5.1%	1.3%	79

E4g: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.3	81.7%	12.7%	4.2%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	1.2	83.9%	12.9%	3.2%		31

E4g: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.2	86.8%	10.5%	2.6%	38
Middle class	1.3	77.5%	17.5%	5.0%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	85.0%	10.0%	5.0%	20

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 62

E4h: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.5	67.3%	22.1%	8.7%	1.9%	104

E4h: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.3	77.3%	18.2%	4.5%		22
Female	1.5	65.4%	22.2%	9.9%	2.5%	81

E4h: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)		1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.5	67.6%	21.1%	8.5%	2.8%	71
Students of Color	1.4	66.7%	24.2%	9.1%		33

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	1.4	71.8%	15.4%	10.3%	2.6%	39
Middle class	1.5	58.5%	34.1%	4.9%	2.4%	41
Upper middle/Upper class	1.4	75.0%	15.0%	10.0%		20

E5a: Grad students make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.4	73.5%	20.4%	4.1%	1.0%	1.0%	98

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	81.8%	13.6%	4.5%			22
Female	1.4	71.1%	22.4%	3.9%	1.3%	1.3%	76

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	75.0%	19.1%	2.9%	1.5%	1.5%	68
Students of Color	1.4	70.0%	23.3%	6.7%			30

E5a: Grad students make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.4	73.0%	18.9%	5.4%	2.7%		37
Middle class	1.3	79.5%	15.4%	2.6%		2.6%	39
Upper middle/Upper class	1.5	57.9%	36.8%	5.3%			19

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 64

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	60.6%	22.2%	13.1%	3.0%	1.0%	99

E5b: Grad students make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity		1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.5	63.6%	27.3%	9.1%			22
Female	1.7	59.7%	20.8%	14.3%	3.9%	1.3%	77

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	1.6	61.2%	22.4%	10.4%	4.5%	1.5%	67
Students of Color	1.6	59.4%	21.9%	18.8%			32

E5b: Grad students make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating			3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.6	59.5%	21.6%	13.5%	5.4%		37
Middle class	1.6	65.0%	20.0%	10.0%	2.5%	2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	1.7	47.4%	31.6%	21.1%			19

^{*} 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	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.6	64.3%	19.4%	13.3%	2.0%	1.0%	98

E5c: Grad students make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.3	77.3%	18.2%	4.5%			22
Female	1.6	60.5%	19.7%	15.8%	2.6%	1.3%	76

E5c: Grad students make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.5	69.1%	19.1%	7.4%	2.9%	1.5%	68
Students of Color	1.7	53.3%	20.0%	26.7%			30

E5c: Grad students make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.7	59.5%	13.5%	21.6%	5.4%		37
Middle class	1.5	66.7%	20.5%	10.3%		2.6%	39
Upper middle/Upper class	1.4	63.2%	31.6%	5.3%			19

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 66

E5d: Grad students make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.8	50.0%	28.0%	18.0%	3.0%	1.0%	100

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	1.6	59.1%	22.7%	18.2%			22
Female	1 Ω	17 10/	29.5%	17.9%	2 00/	1.3%	78

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	1.6	55.9%	29.4%	10.3%	2.9%	1.5%	68
Students of Color	2.0	37.5%	25.0%	34.4%	3.1%		32

E5d: Grad students make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.8	52.6%	18.4%	23.7%	5.3%		38
Middle class	1.9	40.0%	37.5%	17.5%	2.5%	2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	1.5	57.9%	31.6%	10.5%			19

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)	1.6	56.1%	29.6%	10.2%	2.0%	2.0%	98

E5e: Grad students make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.5	54.5%	40.9%	4.5%			22
Female	1.7	56.6%	26.3%	11.8%	2.6%	2.6%	76

E5e: Grad students make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.7	54.4%	30.9%	8.8%	2.9%	2.9%	68
Students of Color	1.5	60.0%	26.7%	13.3%			30

E5e: Grad students make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.6	59.5%	24.3%	13.5%	2.7%		37
Middle class	1.6	53.8%	38.5%	5.1%	2.6%		39
Upper middle/Upper class	2.0	47.4%	26.3%	15.8%		10.5%	19

E5f: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.6	59.6%	26.3%	12.1%	1.0%	1.0%	99

E5f: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.4	68.2%	22.7%	9.1%			22
Female			27.3%	13.0%	4 00/	1.3%	77

E5f: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.6	59.7%	26.9%	10.4%	1.5%	1.5%	67
Students of Color	1.6	59.4%	25.0%	15.6%			32

E5f: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.6	60.5%	23.7%	13.2%	2.6%		38
Middle class	1.6	62.5%	25.0%	10.0%		2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	1.7	44.4%	38.9%	16.7%			18

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 69

E5g: Grad students make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.6	62.2%	21.4%	15.3%	1.0%	98

E5g: Grad students make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status			2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.5	68.2%	18.2%	13.6%		22
Female	4.0	CO E0/	22.4%	15.8%	1.3%	76

E5g: Grad students make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.4	67.6%	22.1%	8.8%	1.5%	68
Students of Color	1.8	50.0%	20.0%	30.0%		30

E5g: Grad students make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.7	59.5%	16.2%	21.6%	2.7%	37
Middle class	1.5	66.7%	20.5%	12.8%		39
Upper middle/Upper class	1.6	52.6%	36.8%	10.5%		19

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)	1.7	52.0%	28.0%	18.0%	1.0%	1.0%	100

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)
Gender							
Male	1.5	59.1%	27.3%	13.6%			22
Female	1.8	50.0%	28.2%	19.2%	1.3%	1.3%	78

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	1.7	51.5%	30.9%	14.7%	1.5%	1.5%	68
Students of Color	1.7	53.1%	21.9%	25.0%			32

E4h: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating			3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.7	57.9%	18.4%	21.1%	2.6%		38
Middle class	1.8	45.0%	32.5%	20.0%		2.5%	40
Upper middle/Upper class	1.6	52.6%	36.8%	10.5%			19

^{*} 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	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	81.6%	17.3%	1.0%	98

E6a: Staff make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender					
Male	1.0	95.5%	4.5%		22
Female	1.2	77.6%	21.1%	1.3%	76

E6a: Staff make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.2	82.1%	17.9%		67
Students of Color	1.2	80.6%	16.1%	3.2%	31

E6a: Staff make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.2	81.6%	15.8%	2.6%	38
Middle class	1.2	83.8%	16.2%		37
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	75.0%	25.0%		20

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 72

E6b: Staff make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity			2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	81.2%	14.9%	3.0%	1.0%	101

E6b: Staff make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity		1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.2	81.8%	13.6%	4.5%		22
Female	1.2	81.0%	15.2%	2.5%	1.3%	79

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	1.2	82.4%	14.7%	1.5%	1.5%	68
Students of Color	1.3	78.8%	15.2%	6.1%		33

E6b: Staff make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.2	84.6%	12.8%	2.6%		39
Middle class	1.3	79.5%	15.4%	2.6%	2.6%	39
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	75.0%	20.0%	5.0%		20

E6c: Staff make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	81.8%	15.2%	2.0%	1.0%	99

E6c: Staff make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.1	86.4%	13.6%			22
			15.6%	2.6%	1.3%	77

E6c: Staff make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.2	82.4%	14.7%	2.9%		68
Students of Color	1.3	80.6%	16.1%		3.2%	31

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	84.2%	13.2%		2.6%	38
Middle class	1.2	81.6%	15.8%	2.6%		38
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	75.0%	20.0%	5.0%		20

E6d: Staff make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.3	77.2%	17.8%	4.0%	1.0%	101

E6d: Staff make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.3	72.7%	22.7%	4.5%		22
Female	1.3	78.5%	16.5%	3.8%	1.3%	79

E6d: Staff make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.3	77.9%	17.6%	4.4%		68
Students of Color	1.3	75.8%	18.2%	3.0%	3.0%	33

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	1.2	82.1%	15.4%		2.6%	39
Middle class	1.3	74.4%	17.9%	7.7%		39
Upper middle/Upper class	1.4	70.0%	25.0%	5.0%		20

E6e: Staff make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	82.8%	13.1%	2.0%	2.0%	99

E6e: Staff make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.1	86.4%	13.6%			22
Female	1.3	81.8%	13.0%	2.6%	2.6%	77

E6e: Staff make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.2	85.3%	10.3%	1.5%	2.9%	68
Students of Color	1.3	77.4%	19.4%	3.2%		31

E6e: Staff make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.2	81.6%	15.8%	2.6%		38
Middle class	1.2	81.6%	15.8%		2.6%	38
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	85.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	20

E6f: Staff make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.3	80.2%	13.9%	5.0%	1.0%	101

E6f: Staff make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.4	72.7%	18.2%	9.1%		22
Female	1.2	82.3%	12.7%	3.8%	1.3%	79

E6f: Staff make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.3	82.4%	11.8%	4.4%	1.5%	68
Students of Color	1.3	75.8%	18.2%	6.1%		33

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	82.1%	15.4%	2.6%		39
Middle class	1.3	79.5%	15.4%	2.6%	2.6%	39
Upper middle/Upper class	1.4	75.0%	10.0%	15.0%		20

E6g: Staff make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.3	78.8%	17.2%	3.0%	1.0%	99

E6g: Staff make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status			2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.2	81.8%	13.6%	4.5%		22

E6g: Staff make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.2	82.4%	14.7%	1.5%	1.5%	68
Students of Color	1.4	71.0%	22.6%	6.5%		31

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	1.2	81.6%	15.8%	2.6%		38
Middle class	1.3	73.7%	21.1%	2.6%	2.6%	38
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	80.0%	15.0%	5.0%		20

E6h: Staff make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.3	78.2%	14.9%	5.9%	1.0%	101

E6h: Staff make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.3	77.3%	13.6%	9.1%		22
Female	1.3	78.5%	15.2%	5.1%	1.3%	79

E6h: Staff make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)		1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.3	77.9%	14.7%	5.9%	1.5%	68
Students of Color	1.3	78.8%	15.2%	6.1%		33

E6h: Staff make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.3	79.5%	15.4%	5.1%		39
Middle class	1.3	79.5%	12.8%	5.1%	2.6%	39
Upper middle/Upper class	1.4	70.0%	20.0%	10.0%		20

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 79