E1b: Faculty respect for minority grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.2	38.4%	43.4%	15.2%	3.0%	99

E1b: Faculty respect for minority grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.3	43.8%	40.6%	12.5%	3.1%	32
Female	3.1	35.5%	45.2%	16.1%	3.2%	62

E1b: Faculty respect for minority grad students	Mean	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.2	41.3%	42.7%	13.3%	2.7%	75
Students of Color	3.0	29.2%	45.8%	20.8%	4.2%	24

E1b: Faculty respect for minority grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.1	41.2%	35.3%	14.7%	8.8%	34
Middle class	3.3	42.9%	40.0%	17.1%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.2	29.2%	58.3%	12.5%		24

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star}$  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)	3.2	39.0%	41.0%	19.0%	1.0%	100

E1c: Faculty respect for female students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.3	50.0%	34.4%	15.6%		32
Female	3.1	33.3%	44.4%	20.6%	1.6%	63

E1c: Faculty respect for female students		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.2	42.1%	38.2%	19.7%		76
Students of Color	3.0	29.2%	50.0%	16.7%	4.2%	24

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	52.9%	29.4%	14.7%	2.9%	34
Middle class	3.1	34.3%	40.0%	25.7%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.2	28.0%	60.0%	12.0%		25

<sup>\*</sup> 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)	3.2	40.4%	43.4%	14.1%	2.0%	99

E1e: Graduate student respect for minority faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.4	50.0%	43.8%	6.3%		32
Female	3.1	33.9%	45.2%	17.7%	3.2%	62

E1e: Graduate student respect for minority faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.3	44.0%	42.7%	12.0%	1.3%	75
Students of Color	3.0	29.2%	45.8%	20.8%	4.2%	24

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	38.2%	47.1%	11.8%	2.9%	34
Middle class	3.2	45.7%	34.3%	17.1%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.3	37.5%	54.2%	8.3%		24

<sup>\*</sup> 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)	3.3	48.0%	35.0%	16.0%	1.0%	100

E1f: Graduate student respect for female faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.4	59.4%	25.0%	15.6%		32
Female	3.2	41.3%	39.7%	17.5%	1.6%	63

E1f: Graduate student respect for female faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.3	50.0%	31.6%	17.1%	1.3%	76
Students of Color	3.3	41.7%	45.8%	12.5%		24

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	52.9%	23.5%	23.5%		34
Middle class	3.2	42.9%	40.0%	14.3%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.5	52.0%	44.0%	4.0%		25

<sup>\*</sup> 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)	2.6	9.3%	52.3%	30.2%	8.1%	86

E1g: Undergrad respect for minority TAs		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	2.8	10.3%	58.6%	27.6%	3.4%	29
Female	2.5	7.5%	50.9%	30.2%	11.3%	53

E1g: Undergrad respect for minority TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	2.7	9.0%	56.7%	28.4%	6.0%	67
Students of Color	2.4	10.5%	36.8%	36.8%	15.8%	19

E1g: Undergrad respect for minority TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	2.5	14.3%	35.7%	35.7%	14.3%	28
Middle class	2.7	5.9%	64.7%	20.6%	8.8%	34
Upper middle/Upper class	2.8	10.0%	55.0%	35.0%		20

<sup>\*</sup> 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)	2.5	11.4%	42.0%	31.8%	14.8%	88

E1h: Undergrad respect for female TAs		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	2.6	10.3%	48.3%	31.0%	10.3%	29
Female	2.4	10.9%	40.0%	30.9%	18.2%	55

E1h: Undergrad respect for female TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	2.5	13.0%	40.6%	33.3%	13.0%	69
Students of Color	2.4	5.3%	47.4%	26.3%	21.1%	19

E1h: Undergrad respect for female TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	2.5	17.9%	35.7%	21.4%	25.0%	28
Middle class	2.3	5.9%	35.3%	41.2%	17.6%	34
Upper middle/Upper class	2.9	14.3%	57.1%	28.6%		21

<sup>\*</sup> 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	39.8%	49.0%	8.2%	3.1%	98

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	51.6%	35.5%	6.5%	6.5%	31
Female	3.2	35.5%	53.2%	9.7%	1.6%	62

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	44.0%	48.0%	6.7%	1.3%	75
Students of Color	3.0	26.1%	52.2%	13.0%	8.7%	23

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	39.4%	51.5%	3.0%	6.1%	33
Middle class	3.2	40.0%	40.0%	17.1%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	37.5%	62.5%			24

<sup>\*</sup> 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)	3.2	38.1%	48.5%	9.3%	4.1%	97

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	51.6%	35.5%	6.5%	6.5%	31
Female	3.1	32.8%	52.5%	11.5%	3.3%	61

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	42.7%	45.3%	9.3%	2.7%	75
Students of Color	3.0	22.7%	59.1%	9.1%	9.1%	22

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	3.2	37.5%	46.9%	12.5%	3.1%	32
Middle class	3.1	40.0%	42.9%	8.6%	8.6%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	37.5%	62.5%			24

<sup>\*</sup> 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	35.4%	41.7%	19.8%	3.1%	96

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	38.7%	45.2%	16.1%		31
Female	3.0	33.3%	41.7%	20.0%	5.0%	60

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	36.5%	44.6%	17.6%	1.4%	74
Students of Color	2.9	31.8%	31.8%	27.3%	9.1%	22

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	31.3%	50.0%	18.8%		32
Middle class	3.0	34.3%	34.3%	25.7%	5.7%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.2	37.5%	50.0%	8.3%	4.2%	24

<sup>\*</sup> 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	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.2	40.9%	41.9%	17.2%	93

E1I: Friendships between heterosexual and GLBT grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	Total (N)
Gender					
Male	3.4	45.2%	45.2%	9.7%	31
Female	3.2	38.6%	42.1%	19.3%	57

E1I: Friendships between heterosexual and GLBT grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	3.3	42.5%	42.5%	15.1%	73
Students of Color	3.1	35.0%	40.0%	25.0%	20

E1I: Friendships between heterosexual and GLBT grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	3.4	48.4%	38.7%	12.9%	31
Middle class	3.1	32.4%	44.1%	23.5%	34
Upper middle/Upper class	3.3	43.5%	47.8%	8.7%	23

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

E1m: Graduate student respect for transgender students		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	2.9	27.8%	43.3%	22.2%	6.7%	90

E1m: Graduate student respect for transgender students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.1	36.7%	40.0%	16.7%	6.7%	30
Female	2.9	23.6%	45.5%	23.6%	7.3%	55

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	28.6%	42.9%	24.3%	4.3%	70
Students of Color	2.8	25.0%	45.0%	15.0%	15.0%	20

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	30.0%	36.7%	30.0%	3.3%	30
Middle class	2.8	24.2%	42.4%	21.2%	12.1%	33
Upper middle/Upper class	3.1	27.3%	59.1%	13.6%		22

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

E2a: NCSU Supportiveness: African American	Mean	5: Strongly		3:	2: Nonsupportive	Total (NI)
students	Rating	Supportive	Supportive	Neutrai	Nonsupportive	I Otal (IV)

E2a: NCSU Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	29.0%	48.4%	12.9%	9.7%	31
Female	3.8	16.7%	50.0%	25.0%	8.3%	60

E2a: NCSU Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.9	25.0%	48.6%	18.1%	8.3%	72
Students of Color	3.7	12.5%	50.0%	29.2%	8.3%	24

E2a: NCSU Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*						
Poor/Working class	3.9	36.4%	36.4%	12.1%	15.2%	33
Middle class	3.9	22.9%	51.4%	17.1%	8.6%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	4.2%	58.3%	37.5%		24

E2b: NCSU Supportiveness: Asian students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	24.2%	45 20/	25.3%	5.3%	95

E2b: NCSU Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	32.3%	41.9%	19.4%	6.5%	31
Female	3.8	18.6%	47.5%	28.8%	5.1%	59

E2b: NCSU Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	28.2%	42.3%	26.8%	2.8%	71
Students of Color	3.7	12.5%	54.2%	20.8%	12.5%	24

E2b: NCSU Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	37.5%	37.5%	18.8%	6.3%	32
Middle class	3.8	22.9%	42.9%	28.6%	5.7%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	12.5%	62.5%	25.0%		24

E2c: NCSU Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students	Mean			3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	20.0%	41.1%	32.6%	5.3%	1.1%	95

E2c: NCSU Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.9	29.0%	38.7%	25.8%	6.5%		31
Female	3.6	13.6%	44.1%	35.6%	5.1%	1.7%	59

E2c: NCSU Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	25.0%	38.9%	29.2%	5.6%	1.4%	72
Students of Color	3.5	4.3%	47.8%	43.5%	4.3%		23

E2c: NCSU Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	33.3%	36.4%	18.2%	9.1%	3.0%	33
Middle class	3.8	20.6%	38.2%	38.2%	2.9%		34
Upper middle/Upper class	3.6	4.2%	50.0%	45.8%			24

E2d: NCSU Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students	Mean			3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	20.0%	38.9%	33.7%	7.4%	95

E2d: NCSU Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.9	29.0%	38.7%	25.8%	6.5%	31
Female	3.6	13.6%	40.7%	39.0%	6.8%	59

E2d: NCSU Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.7	21.1%	36.6%	36.6%	5.6%	71
Students of Color	3.7	16.7%	45.8%	25.0%	12.5%	24

E2d: NCSU Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	37.5%	34.4%	21.9%	6.3%	32
Middle class	3.5	14.3%	37.1%	37.1%	11.4%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	8.3%	50.0%	41.7%		24

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 15

#### North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Humanities and Social Sciences Section E: Campus Climate

#### **Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile**

E2e: NCSU Supportiveness: White students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.3	52.6%	33.7%	8.4%	4.2%	1.1%	95

E2e: NCSU Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	43.3%	40.0%	6.7%	6.7%	3.3%	30
Female	4.4	55.0%	33.3%	10.0%	1.7%		60

E2e: NCSU Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.3	53.4%	31.5%	8.2%	5.5%	1.4%	73
Students of Color	4.4	50.0%	40.9%	9.1%			22

E2e: NCSU Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.2	56.3%	21.9%	9.4%	9.4%	3.1%	32
Middle class	4.4	51.4%	37.1%	8.6%	2.9%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	47.8%	47.8%	4.3%			23

E2f: NCSU Supportiveness: International students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	31.6%	45.3%	17.9%	5.3%	95

E2f: NCSU Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	40.0%	36.7%	16.7%	6.7%	30
Female	4.0	26.7%	51.7%	16.7%	5.0%	60

E2f: NCSU Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	34.7%	47.2%	15.3%	2.8%	72
Students of Color	3.7	21.7%	39.1%	26.1%	13.0%	23

E2f: NCSU Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	42.4%	36.4%	15.2%	6.1%	33
Middle class	4.0	34.3%	37.1%	22.9%	5.7%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	17.4%	69.6%	13.0%		23

E2g: NCSU Supportiveness: Female students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	27.1%	49.0%	19.8%	4.2%	96

E2g: NCSU Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	32.3%	51.6%	12.9%	3.2%	31
Female	3.9	23.3%	48.3%	23.3%	5.0%	60

E2g: NCSU Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	30.1%	46.6%	19.2%	4.1%	73
Students of Color	3.9	17.4%	56.5%	21.7%	4.3%	23

E2g: NCSU Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	39.4%	39.4%	15.2%	6.1%	33
Middle class	3.9	23.5%	47.1%	23.5%	5.9%	34
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%		24

#### North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Humanities and Social Sciences Section E: Campus Climate

Tables of Results by	Student	<b>Demographic Profile</b>
----------------------	---------	----------------------------

E2h: NCSU Supportiveness: Male students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	43.2%	36.8%	15.8%	3.2%	1.1%	95

E2h: NCSU Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	38.7%	38.7%	16.1%	3.2%	3.2%	31
Female	4.2	42.4%	39.0%	15.3%	3.4%		59

E2h: NCSU Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.2	45.8%	31.9%	16.7%	4.2%	1.4%	72
Students of Color	4.2	34.8%	52.2%	13.0%			23

E2h: NCSU Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.3	60.6%	21.2%	9.1%	6.1%	3.0%	33
Middle class	4.1	40.0%	37.1%	20.0%	2.9%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	21.7%	60.9%	17.4%			23

E2i: NCSU Supportiveness: Transgender students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.3	15.1%	22.6%	39.8%	19.4%	3.2%	93

E2i: NCSU Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.5	29.0%	16.1%	38.7%	12.9%	3.2%	31
Female	3.1	7.0%	26.3%	42.1%	22.8%	1.8%	57

E2i: NCSU Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.3	16.9%	21.1%	40.8%	16.9%	4.2%	71
Students of Color	3.2	9.1%	27.3%	36.4%	27.3%		22

E2i: NCSU Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	32.3%	22.6%	29.0%	12.9%	3.2%	31
Middle class	3.0	8.6%	17.1%	45.7%	25.7%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.2	4.3%	30.4%	47.8%	13.0%	4.3%	23

E2j: NCSU Supportiveness: GLB students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.6	19.1%	36.2%	33.0%	11.7%	94

E2j: NCSU Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.8	32.3%	29.0%	22.6%	16.1%	31
Female	3.6	10.3%	43.1%	37.9%	8.6%	58

E2j: NCSU Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.7	20.8%	37.5%	30.6%	11.1%	72
Students of Color	3.5	13.6%	31.8%	40.9%	13.6%	22

E2j: NCSU Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*						
Poor/Working class	4.0	40.6%	28.1%	18.8%	12.5%	32
Middle class	3.4	11.4%	34.3%	40.0%	14.3%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.5	4.3%	47.8%	43.5%	4.3%	23

E2k: NCSU Supportiveness: Christian students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	42.6%	26.6%	25.5%	5.3%	94

E2k: NCSU Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	48.4%	19.4%	22.6%	9.7%	31
Female	4.1	37.9%	31.0%	29.3%	1.7%	58

E2k: NCSU Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	45.8%	25.0%	22.2%	6.9%	72
Students of Color	4.0	31.8%	31.8%	36.4%		22

E2k: NCSU Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	50.0%	25.0%	18.8%	6.3%	32
Middle class	3.9	40.0%	20.0%	31.4%	8.6%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	39.1%	34.8%	26.1%		23

E2I: NCSU Supportiveness: Jewish students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.6	14.3%	05.00/	44.0%	5.5%	1.1%	91

E2I: NCSU Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.7	23.3%	30.0%	40.0%	3.3%	3.3%	30
Female	3.5	8.8%	38.6%	47.4%	5.3%		57

E2I: NCSU Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.6	15.7%	37.1%	38.6%	7.1%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	3.5	9.5%	28.6%	61.9%			21

E2I: NCSU Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*							
Poor/Working class	3.7	30.0%	23.3%	33.3%	10.0%	3.3%	30
Middle class	3.5	8.6%	34.3%	51.4%	5.7%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.6	4.3%	52.2%	43.5%			23

E2m: NCSU Supportiveness: Muslim students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.6	17.4%	37 ∩0/	35.9%	8.7%	1.1%	92

E2m: NCSU Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.7	26.7%	30.0%	33.3%	10.0%		30
Female	3.6	12.3%	40.4%	40.4%	5.3%	1.8%	57

E2m: NCSU Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.7	19.7%	40.8%	31.0%	8.5%		71
Students of Color	3.2	9.5%	23.8%	52.4%	9.5%	4.8%	21

E2m: NCSU Supportiveness: Muslim students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	32.3%	25.8%	29.0%	12.9%		31
Middle class	3.6	14.3%	37.1%	40.0%	8.6%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	4.3%	47.8%	39.1%	4.3%	4.3%	23

E2n: NCSU Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive	3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
			39.1%	10.9%	1.1%	92

E2n: NCSU Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.7	24.1%	31.0%	34.5%	6.9%	3.4%	29
Female	3.4	8.6%	36.2%	44.8%	10.3%		58

E2n: NCSU Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.6	18.6%	35.7%	32.9%	11.4%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	3.3	4.5%	27.3%	59.1%	9.1%		22

E2n: NCSU Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	29.0%	32.3%	19.4%	16.1%	3.2%	31
Middle class	3.5	11.4%	34.3%	45.7%	8.6%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	4.3%	34.8%	56.5%	4.3%		23

E2o: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with disabilities	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	28.3%	40.2%	27.2%	4.3%	92

E2o: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	30.0%	50.0%	13.3%	6.7%	30
Female	3.8	26.3%	35.1%	35.1%	3.5%	57

E2o: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	29.6%	42.3%	25.4%	2.8%	71
Students of Color	3.7	23.8%	33.3%	33.3%	9.5%	21

E2o: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	38.7%	35.5%	19.4%	6.5%	31
Middle class	3.9	28.6%	31.4%	37.1%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	17.4%	60.9%	17.4%	4.3%	23

E2p: NCSU Supportiveness: Poor/working class students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.5	18.5%	30.4%	35.9%	15.2%	92

E2p: NCSU Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.8	30.0%	26.7%	40.0%	3.3%	30
Female	3.4	12.3%	33.3%	35.1%	19.3%	57

E2p: NCSU Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.6	22.5%	31.0%	33.8%	12.7%	71
Students of Color	3.1	4.8%	28.6%	42.9%	23.8%	21

E2p: NCSU Supportiveness: Poor/working class students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	29.0%	35.5%	22.6%	12.9%	31
Middle class	3.5	20.0%	22.9%	40.0%	17.1%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.2	4.3%	30.4%	47.8%	17.4%	23

E2q: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle class students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	37.0%	40.2%	19.6%	3.3%	92

E2q: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	40.0%	30.0%	26.7%	3.3%	30
Female	4.1	33.3%	45.6%	17.5%	3.5%	57

E2q: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.2	40.8%	40.8%	14.1%	4.2%	71
Students of Color	3.9	23.8%	38.1%	38.1%		21

E2q: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.3	45.2%	41.9%	9.7%	3.2%	31
Middle class	4.0	34.3%	37.1%	25.7%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	26.1%	43.5%	26.1%	4.3%	23

E2r: NCSU Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)			33.3%	12.9%	5.4%	93

E2r: NCSU Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	43.3%	33.3%	13.3%	10.0%	30
Female	4.3	48.3%	36.2%	12.1%	3.4%	58

E2r: NCSU Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.3	53.5%	29.6%	9.9%	7.0%	71
Students of Color	4.1	31.8%	45.5%	22.7%		22

E2r: NCSU Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.4	58.1%	25.8%	9.7%	6.5%	31
Middle class	4.3	48.6%	37.1%	11.4%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	33.3%	37.5%	20.8%	8.3%	24

E2s: NCSU Supportiveness: Nontraditional students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.5	14.9%	39.4%	29.8%	14.9%	1.1%	94

E2s: NCSU Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.6	20.0%	40.0%	26.7%	10.0%	3.3%	30
Female	3.5	11.9%	40.7%	32.2%	15.3%		59

E2s: NCSU Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.6	18.3%	39.4%	28.2%	12.7%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	3.3	4.3%	39.1%	34.8%	21.7%		23

E2s: NCSU Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	21.9%	40.6%	18.8%	18.8%		32
Middle class	3.4	17.1%	28.6%	34.3%	17.1%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.5	4.2%	54.2%	33.3%	8.3%		24

E2t: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with children	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.5	17.0%	30.9%	40.4%	9.6%	2.1%	94

E2t: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.7	20.0%	36.7%	40.0%	3.3%		30
Female	3.4	15.3%	28.8%	40.7%	13.6%	1.7%	59

E2t: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.6	21.1%	29.6%	42.3%	5.6%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	3.1	4.3%	34.8%	34.8%	21.7%	4.3%	23

E2t: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*							
Poor/Working class	3.7	28.1%	25.0%	34.4%	12.5%		32
Middle class	3.4	14.3%	22.9%	51.4%	11.4%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.5	8.3%	50.0%	33.3%		8.3%	24

•	E2u: NCSU Supportiveness: Students who are veterans	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
7	Total (N)	3.9	24.5%	46.8%	24.5%	4.3%	94

E2u: NCSU Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.9	26.7%	40.0%	30.0%	3.3%	30
Female	3.9	22.0%	52.5%	22.0%	3.4%	59

E2u: NCSU Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	28.2%	45.1%	22.5%	4.2%	71
Students of Color	3.7	13.0%	52.2%	30.4%	4.3%	23

E2u: NCSU Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*						
Poor/Working class	3.9	34.4%	37.5%	15.6%	12.5%	32
Middle class	3.9	25.7%	34.3%	40.0%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	12.5%	70.8%	16.7%		24

	E2v: NCSU upportiveness: liddle Eastern students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
То	otal (N)	3.8	21.1%	44.2%	27.4%	7.4%	95

E2v: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	32.3%	41.9%	19.4%	6.5%	31
Female	3.7	13.6%	47.5%	32.2%	6.8%	59

E2v: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.9	25.4%	40.8%	29.6%	4.2%	71
Students of Color	3.5	8.3%	54.2%	20.8%	16.7%	24

E2v: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	37.5%	34.4%	18.8%	9.4%	32
Middle class	3.7	17.1%	45.7%	31.4%	5.7%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.6	8.3%	54.2%	29.2%	8.3%	24

E3a: Grad Prog Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	39.2%	38.1%	15.5%	4.1%	3.1%	97

E3a: Grad Prog Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	46.9%	34.4%	12.5%		6.3%	32
Female	4.0	33.3%	40.0%	18.3%	6.7%	1.7%	60

E3a: Grad Prog Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.2	46.6%	34.2%	12.3%	4.1%	2.7%	73
Students of Color	3.7	16.7%	50.0%	25.0%	4.2%	4.2%	24

E3a: Grad Prog Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*							
Poor/Working class	4.1	52.9%	23.5%	11.8%	2.9%	8.8%	34
Middle class	4.0	37.1%	31.4%	28.6%	2.9%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	20.0%	72.0%	4.0%	4.0%		25

E3b: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Asian students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	34.4%	35.4%	24.0%	5.2%	1.0%	96

E3b: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	40.6%	31.3%	21.9%	6.3%		32
Female	3.9	30.5%	39.0%	23.7%	5.1%	1.7%	59

E3b: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.1	39.7%	32.9%	23.3%	4.1%		73
Students of Color	3.6	17.4%	43.5%	26.1%	8.7%	4.3%	23

E3b: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	48.5%	24.2%	21.2%	3.0%	3.0%	33
Middle class	3.9	31.4%	31.4%	31.4%	5.7%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	16.0%	60.0%	20.0%	4.0%		25

E3c: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students	Mean	0,		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	33.7%	34.7%	24.2%	4.2%	3.2%	95

E3c: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	43.8%	31.3%	18.8%	3.1%	3.1%	32
Female	3.8	27.6%	39.7%	24.1%	5.2%	3.4%	58

E3c: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	38.9%	31.9%	23.6%	4.2%	1.4%	72
Students of Color	3.6	17.4%	43.5%	26.1%	4.3%	8.7%	23

E3c: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	45.5%	24.2%	21.2%	6.1%	3.0%	33
Middle class	3.9	34.3%	31.4%	28.6%	2.9%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	12.5%	58.3%	25.0%	4.2%		24

E3d: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	34.4%	32.3%	27.1%	3.1%	3.1%	96

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	43.8%	21.9%	28.1%	3.1%	3.1%	32
Female	3.9	28.8%	40.7%	25.4%	1.7%	3.4%	59

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	4.0	39.7%	28.8%	27.4%	2.7%	1.4%	73
Students of Color	3.6	17.4%	43.5%	26.1%	4.3%	8.7%	23

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	4.1	45.5%	24.2%	24.2%	3.0%	3.0%	33
Middle class	3.8	34.3%	22.9%	34.3%	5.7%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	16.0%	60.0%	24.0%			25

E3e: Grad Prog Supportiveness: White students				3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.4	51.0%	39.8%	8.2%	1.0%	98

E3e: Grad Prog Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	4.5	56.3%	37.5%	6.3%		32
Female	4.4	49.2%	41.0%	9.8%		61

E3e: Grad Prog Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.4	55.4%	35.1%	8.1%	1.4%	74
Students of Color	4.3	37.5%	54.2%	8.3%		24

E3e: Grad Prog Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.5	61.8%	29.4%	5.9%	2.9%	34
Middle class	4.3	40.0%	45.7%	14.3%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	44.0%	52.0%	4.0%		25

	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	37.9%	32.6%	16.8%	10.5%	2.1%	95

E3f: Grad Prog Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	48.4%	35.5%	6.5%	9.7%		31
Female	3.8	32.2%	33.9%	20.3%	10.2%	3.4%	59

E3f: Grad Prog Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.1	44.4%	29.2%	18.1%	8.3%		72
Students of Color	3.4	17.4%	43.5%	13.0%	17.4%	8.7%	23

E3f: Grad Prog Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	48.5%	27.3%	12.1%	9.1%	3.0%	33
Middle class	3.8	34.3%	31.4%	20.0%	11.4%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	25.0%	45.8%	16.7%	12.5%		24

E3g: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Female students			3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	41.2%	13.4%	2.1%	97

E3g: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.4	45.2%	48.4%	6.5%		31
Female	4.1	37.7%	41.0%	18.0%	3.3%	61

E3g: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.3	48.6%	39.2%	9.5%	2.7%	74
Students of Color	3.9	17.4%	56.5%	26.1%		23

E3g: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.4	51.5%	33.3%	15.2%		33
Middle class	4.1	31.4%	48.6%	20.0%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	40.0%	56.0%		4.0%	25

### North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Graduate Students) College of Humanities and Social Sciences Section E: Campus Climate

### **Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile**

Support			5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N	)	4.3	46.9%	41.7%	7.3%	3.1%	1.0%	96

E3h: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	4.5	54.8%	41.9%		3.2%		31
Female	4.3	43.3%	43.3%	11.7%	1.7%		60

E3h: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.4	54.8%	32.9%	6.8%	4.1%	1.4%	73
Students of Color	4.1	21.7%	69.6%	8.7%			23

E3h: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.4	57.6%	33.3%	6.1%		3.0%	33
Middle class	4.1	37.1%	40.0%	14.3%	8.6%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	41.7%	58.3%				24

E3i: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Transgender students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	29.8%	36.2%	24.5%	9.6%	94

E3i: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	38.7%	38.7%	16.1%	6.5%	31
Female	3.8	24.1%	37.9%	29.3%	8.6%	58

E3i: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.9	36.1%	30.6%	25.0%	8.3%	72
Students of Color	3.6	9.1%	54.5%	22.7%	13.6%	22

E3i: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	46.9%	25.0%	18.8%	9.4%	32
Middle class	3.7	22.9%	37.1%	31.4%	8.6%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	16.7%	54.2%	25.0%	4.2%	24

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 42

E3j: Grad Prog Supportiveness: GLB students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	34.0%	40.4%	23.4%	2.1%	94

E3j: Grad Prog Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.3	41.9%	41.9%	16.1%		31
Female	3.9	27.6%	41.4%	27.6%	3.4%	58

E3j: Grad Prog Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.2	41.7%	34.7%	20.8%	2.8%	72
Students of Color	3.8	9.1%	59.1%	31.8%		22

E3j: Grad Prog Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive	4: Supportive	3: Neutral	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	4.3	50.0%	31.3%	18.8%	32
Middle class	3.9	25.7%	40.0%	34.3%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	25.0%	58.3%	16.7%	24

E3k: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Christian students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	29.8%	36.2%	26.6%	6.4%	1.1%	94

E3k: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	4.0	38.7%	32.3%	19.4%	9.7%		31
Female	3.8	25.9%	37.9%	31.0%	5.2%		58

E3k: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	34.7%	30.6%	25.0%	8.3%	1.4%	72
Students of Color	3.8	13.6%	54.5%	31.8%			22

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	40.6%	28.1%	25.0%	3.1%	3.1%	32
Middle class	3.7	25.7%	31.4%	34.3%	8.6%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	20.8%	58.3%	16.7%	4.2%		24

<sup>\*</sup> 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)	4.0	30.1%	 30.1%	2.2%	93

E3I: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	4.2	41.9%	35.5%	19.4%	3.2%	31
Female	3.9	24.1%	39.7%	36.2%		58

E3I: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	35.2%	32.4%	29.6%	2.8%	71
Students of Color	3.8	13.6%	54.5%	31.8%		22

E3I: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	45.2%	32.3%	22.6%		31
Middle class	3.8	25.7%	34.3%	34.3%	5.7%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	16.7%	54.2%	29.2%		24

E3m: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Muslim students	Mean			3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	31.9%	33 00/	33.0%	2.1%	94

E3m: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	4.1	41.9%	32.3%	22.6%	3.2%	31
Female	3.9	25.9%	36.2%	37.9%		58

E3m: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.0	38.9%	27.8%	30.6%	2.8%	72
Students of Color	3.7	9.1%	50.0%	40.9%		22

E3m: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.3	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%		32
Middle class	3.8	25.7%	31.4%	37.1%	5.7%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%		24

E3n: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	32.6%	35.8%	30.5%	1.1%	95

E3n: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	4.2	41.9%	32.3%	25.8%		31
Female	3.9	27.1%	39.0%	33.9%		59

E3n: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	4.1	40.3%	30.6%	27.8%	1.4%	72
Students of Color	3.7	8.7%	52.2%	39.1%		23

E3n: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.3	48.5%	30.3%	21.2%		33
Middle class	3.8	25.7%	31.4%	40.0%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	20.8%	54.2%	25.0%		24

E3o: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with disabilities	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	36.6%	40.9%	18.3%	4.3%	93

E3o: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.3	45.2%	41.9%	12.9%		31
Female	4.0	31.6%	40.4%	21.1%	7.0%	57

E3o: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.2	40.3%	40.3%	15.3%	4.2%	72
Students of Color	3.9	23.8%	42.9%	28.6%	4.8%	21

E3o: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.3	48.4%	35.5%	12.9%	3.2%	31
Middle class	3.9	31.4%	34.3%	31.4%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	29.2%	62.5%	4.2%	4.2%	24

<sup>\*</sup> 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	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	31.6%	37.9%	20.0%	7.4%	3.2%	95

E3p: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	45.2%	35.5%	12.9%	3.2%	3.2%	31
Female	3.8	25.4%	42.4%	22.0%	6.8%	3.4%	59

E3p: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.0	37.5%	33.3%	22.2%	5.6%	1.4%	72
Students of Color	3.5	13.0%	52.2%	13.0%	13.0%	8.7%	23

E3p: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	42.4%	33.3%	12.1%	6.1%	6.1%	33
Middle class	3.8	28.6%	37.1%	22.9%	8.6%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	20.8%	45.8%	25.0%	8.3%		24

	E3q: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle class students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
1	Total (N)	4.2	40.0%	42.1%	15.8%	2.1%	95

E3q: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.4	48.4%	41.9%	6.5%	3.2%	31
Female	4.1	35.6%	44.1%	18.6%	1.7%	59

E3q: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.3	47.2%	37.5%	13.9%	1.4%	72
Students of Color	3.9	17.4%	56.5%	21.7%	4.3%	23

E3q: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.4	54.5%	33.3%	9.1%	3.0%	33
Middle class	4.0	31.4%	40.0%	25.7%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	29.2%	58.3%	12.5%		24

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 50

E3r: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	36.2%	40.4%	19.1%	3.2%	1.1%	94

E3r: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	4.1	35.5%	45.2%	16.1%	3.2%		31
Female	4.1	34.5%	41.4%	20.7%	3.4%		58

E3r: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.1	43.1%	34.7%	16.7%	4.2%	1.4%	72
Students of Color	3.9	13.6%	59.1%	27.3%			22

E3r: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.3	50.0%	31.3%	15.6%		3.1%	32
Middle class	3.9	22.9%	45.7%	28.6%	2.9%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	33.3%	45.8%	12.5%	8.3%		24

E3s: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Nontraditional students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	31.3%	40.6%	14.6%	12.5%	1.0%	96

E3s: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	4.2	41.9%	41.9%	12.9%		3.2%	31
Female	3.8	26.7%	43.3%	15.0%	15.0%		60

E3s: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	38.4%	37.0%	13.7%	9.6%	1.4%	73
Students of Color	3.5	8.7%	52.2%	17.4%	21.7%		23

E3s: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	39.4%	36.4%	12.1%	9.1%	3.0%	33
Middle class	3.8	25.7%	40.0%	20.0%	14.3%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	29.2%	50.0%	8.3%	12.5%		24

E3t: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with children	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	33.7%	37.9%	15.8%	10.5%	2.1%	95

E3t: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	4.2	41.9%	41.9%	12.9%		3.2%	31
Female	3.9	30.5%	39.0%	16.9%	13.6%		59

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	41.7%	33.3%	13.9%	8.3%	2.8%	72
Students of Color	3.5	8.7%	52.2%	21.7%	17.4%		23

E3t: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	42.4%	30.3%	15.2%	9.1%	3.0%	33
Middle class	3.8	28.6%	37.1%	20.0%	14.3%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	29.2%	50.0%	8.3%	8.3%	4.2%	24

	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	33.7%	38.9%	25.3%	1.1%	1.1%	95

E3u: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students who are veterans				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	4.2	38.7%	45.2%	12.9%	3.2%		31
Female	4.0	32.2%	37.3%	30.5%			59

E3u: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.2	41.7%	34.7%	22.2%		1.4%	72
Students of Color	3.7	8.7%	52.2%	34.8%	4.3%		23

E3u: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	39.4%	36.4%	21.2%		3.0%	33
Middle class	3.9	28.6%	37.1%	31.4%	2.9%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	33.3%	45.8%	20.8%			24

E3v: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	37.5%	31.3%	26.0%	2.1%	3.1%	96

E3v: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	50.0%	25.0%	18.8%	3.1%	3.1%	32
Female	3.9	30.5%	37.3%	27.1%	1.7%	3.4%	59

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	43.8%	27.4%	26.0%	1.4%	1.4%	73
Students of Color	3.6	17.4%	43.5%	26.1%	4.3%	8.7%	23

E3v: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.2	51.5%	21.2%	21.2%	3.0%	3.0%	33
Middle class	3.9	37.1%	25.7%	31.4%	2.9%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	16.0%	56.0%	28.0%			25

E4a: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	87.4%	9.5%	3.2%	95

E4a: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender*					
Male	1.1	93.5%	6.5%		31
Female	1.1	89.8%	6.8%	3.4%	59

E4a: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.2	87.5%	8.3%	4.2%	72
Students of Color	1.1	87.0%	13.0%		23

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	90.9%	9.1%		33
Middle class	1.1	94.3%	2.9%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	76.0%	20.0%	4.0%	25

<sup>\*</sup> 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	82.3%	9.4%	6.3%	2.1%	96

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	90.6%	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%	32
Female	1.3	83.1%	10.2%	5.1%	1.7%	59

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	1.3	81.9%	8.3%	6.9%	2.8%	72
Students of Color	1.2	83.3%	12.5%	4.2%		24

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	1.3	82.4%	8.8%	5.9%	2.9%	34
Middle class	1.2	85.7%	5.7%	8.6%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	80.0%	16.0%	4.0%		25

<sup>\*</sup> 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	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	86.3%	10.5%	3.2%	95

E4c: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender*					
Male	1.1	90.3%	6.5%	3.2%	31
Female	1.2	88.1%	8.5%	3.4%	59

E4c: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.1	88.9%	9.7%	1.4%	72
Students of Color	1.3	78.3%	13.0%	8.7%	23

E4c: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd			2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.2	84.8%	12.1%	3.0%	33
Middle class	1.2	85.7%	8.6%	5.7%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	1.1	88.0%	12.0%		25

<sup>\*</sup> 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	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.3	74.0%	17.7%	8.3%	96

E4d: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender*					
Male	1.2	87.5%	3.1%	9.4%	32
Female	1.4	71.2%	20.3%	8.5%	59

E4d: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.3	77.8%	15.3%	6.9%	72
Students of Color	1.5	62.5%	25.0%	12.5%	24

E4d: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.4	76.5%	11.8%	11.8%	34
Middle class	1.4	71.4%	20.0%	8.6%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	76.0%	24.0%		25

<sup>\*</sup> 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	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.4	72.6%	14.7%	11.6%	1.1%	95

E4e: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	1.5	67.7%	12.9%	19.4%		31
Female	1.3	81.4%	11.9%	6.8%		59

E4e: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.5	68.1%	15.3%	15.3%	1.4%	72
Students of Color	1.1	87.0%	13.0%			23

E4e: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.4	78.8%	9.1%	9.1%	3.0%	33
Middle class	1.5	68.6%	11.4%	20.0%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	72.0%	24.0%	4.0%		25

E4f: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation		1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.3	82.3%	11.5%	4.2%	2.1%	96

E4f: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	1.2	90.6%	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%	32
Female	1.2	83.1%	13.6%	1.7%	1.7%	59

E4f: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.3	81.9%	11.1%	4.2%	2.8%	72
Students of Color	1.2	83.3%	12.5%	4.2%		24

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	82.4%	11.8%	2.9%	2.9%	34
Middle class	1.3	82.9%	8.6%	8.6%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	84.0%	16.0%			25

<sup>\*</sup> 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	73.7%	20.0%	4.2%	2.1%	95

E4g: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	1.4	64.5%	29.0%	6.5%		31
Female	1.2	84.7%	10.2%	3.4%	1.7%	59

E4g: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.4	70.8%	20.8%	5.6%	2.8%	72
Students of Color	1.2	82.6%	17.4%			23

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	75.8%	18.2%	3.0%	3.0%	33
Middle class	1.4	68.6%	22.9%	8.6%		35
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	76.0%	20.0%		4.0%	25

<sup>\*</sup> 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		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.6	61.5%	17.7%	18.8%	2.1%	96

E4h: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.4	75.0%	12.5%	9.4%	3.1%	32
Female	1.6	59.3%	18.6%	20.3%	1.7%	59

E4h: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	1110011		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.6	63.9%	16.7%	16.7%	2.8%	72
Students of Color	1.7	54.2%	20.8%	25.0%		24

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	1.6	67.6%	11.8%	17.6%	2.9%	34
Middle class	1.8	51.4%	22.9%	22.9%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	1.4	68.0%	20.0%	12.0%		25

E5a: Grad students make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.3	75.8%	17.9%	6.3%	95

E5a: Grad students make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender					
Male	1.3	74.2%	22.6%	3.2%	31
Female	1.3	79.7%	13.6%	6.8%	59

E5a: Grad students make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.3	72.2%	20.8%	6.9%	72
Students of Color	1.2	87.0%	8.7%	4.3%	23

E5a: Grad students make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.2	78.8%	21.2%		33
Middle class	1.3	77.1%	14.3%	8.6%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	1.4	72.0%	20.0%	8.0%	25

<sup>\*</sup> 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)	1.7	58.8%	20.6%	12.4%	5.2%	3.1%	97

E5b: Grad students make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally		5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.7	65.6%	18.8%	3.1%	6.3%	6.3%	32
Female	1.7	58.3%	18.3%	16.7%	5.0%	1.7%	60

E5b: Grad students make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.8	56.2%	21.9%	13.7%	4.1%	4.1%	73
Students of Color	1.6	66.7%	16.7%	8.3%	8.3%		24

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	64.7%	20.6%	8.8%	2.9%	2.9%	34
Middle class	1.9	57.1%	17.1%	14.3%	5.7%	5.7%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	1.6	60.0%	28.0%	4.0%	8.0%		25

E5c: Grad students make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.5	68.4%	18.9%	11.6%	1.1%	95

E5c: Grad students make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd		1: Never		3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.4	67.7%	25.8%	3.2%	3.2%	31
Female	1.5	69.5%	15.3%	15.3%		59

E5c: Grad students make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	1.4	69.4%	23.6%	6.9%		72
Students of Color	1.7	65.2%	4.3%	26.1%	4.3%	23

E5c: Grad students make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.3	75.8%	15.2%	9.1%		33
Middle class	1.6	60.0%	22.9%	14.3%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	1.4	68.0%	20.0%	12.0%		25

E5d: Grad students make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.8	45.4%	34.0%	17.5%	3.1%	97

E5d: Grad students make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.7	46.9%	40.6%	6.3%	6.3%	32
Female	1.8	46.7%	28.3%	23.3%	1.7%	60

E5d: Grad students make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.8	46.6%	32.9%	19.2%	1.4%	73
Students of Color	1.9	41.7%	37.5%	12.5%	8.3%	24

E5d: Grad students make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.6	50.0%	35.3%	14.7%		34
Middle class	2.0	37.1%	31.4%	22.9%	8.6%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	1.5	56.0%	36.0%	8.0%		25

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)	1.8	54.3%	22.3%	17.0%	4.3%	2.1%	94

E5e: Grad students make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally		5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.8	51.6%	25.8%	16.1%	3.2%	3.2%	31
Female	1.7	56.9%	20.7%	15.5%	5.2%	1.7%	58

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	1.9	45.1%	29.6%	19.7%	2.8%	2.8%	71
Students of Color	1.4	82.6%		8.7%	8.7%		23

E5e: Grad students make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never		3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.7	53.1%	21.9%	25.0%			32
Middle class	1.9	57.1%	17.1%	14.3%	5.7%	5.7%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	1.7	52.0%	32.0%	8.0%	8.0%		25

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	58.8%	23.7%	10.3%	5.2%	2.1%	97

E5f: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally		5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.6	65.6%	21.9%	3.1%	6.3%	3.1%	32
Female	1.7	56.7%	23.3%	13.3%	5.0%	1.7%	60

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	1.7	57.5%	23.3%	12.3%	4.1%	2.7%	73
Students of Color	1.6	62.5%	25.0%	4.2%	8.3%		24

E5f: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating			3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.5	64.7%	26.5%	5.9%	2.9%		34
Middle class	1.9	57.1%	17.1%	14.3%	5.7%	5.7%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	1.6	60.0%	32.0%		8.0%		25

E5g: Grad students make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status			2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.6	60.0%	25.3%	12.6%	2.1%	95

E5g: Grad students make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.6	58.1%	29.0%	9.7%	3.2%	31
Female	1.5	62.7%	23.7%	11.9%	1.7%	59

E5g: Grad students make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.7	52.8%	29.2%	15.3%	2.8%	72
Students of Color	1.2	82.6%	13.0%	4.3%		23

E5g: Grad students make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.5	60.6%	27.3%	12.1%		33
Middle class	1.7	60.0%	20.0%	17.1%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	1.6	60.0%	32.0%	4.0%	4.0%	25

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 70

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	47.4%	26.8%	19.6%	5.2%	1.0%	97

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	1.8	43.8%	37.5%	9.4%	9.4%		32
Female	1.9	51.7%	18.3%	25.0%	3.3%	1.7%	60

E4h: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)		1: Never		3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.9	43.8%	27.4%	20.5%	6.8%	1.4%	73
Students of Color	1.6	58.3%	25.0%	16.7%			24

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	50.0%	32.4%	14.7%	2.9%		34
Middle class	2.1	40.0%	25.7%	22.9%	8.6%	2.9%	35
Upper middle/Upper class	1.7	56.0%	24.0%	16.0%	4.0%		25

E6a: Staff make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.1	89.4%	7.4%	3.2%	94

E6a: Staff make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender					
Male	1.1	90.3%	6.5%	3.2%	31
Female	1.1	91.4%	6.9%	1.7%	58

E6a: Staff make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.1	91.5%	7.0%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	1.3	82.6%	8.7%	8.7%	23

E6a: Staff make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.2	81.8%	15.2%	3.0%	33
Middle class	1.1	94.1%		5.9%	34
Upper middle/Upper class	1.1	92.0%	8.0%		25

<sup>\*</sup> 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	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.1	89.5%	7.4%	3.2%	95

E6b: Staff make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender*					
Male	1.2	90.6%	3.1%	6.3%	32
Female	1.1	91.4%	8.6%		58

E6b: Staff make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.1	91.5%	5.6%	2.8%	71
Students of Color	1.2	83.3%	12.5%	4.2%	24

E6b: Staff make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.2	82.4%	14.7%	2.9%	34
Middle class	1.1	94.1%		5.9%	34
Upper middle/Upper class	1.1	92.0%	8.0%		25

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 73

E6c: Staff make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.1	90.4%	7.4%	2.1%	94

E6c: Staff make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating			3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender*					
Male	1.1	90.3%	6.5%	3.2%	31
Female	1.1	93.1%	6.9%		58

E6c: Staff make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.1	91.5%	7.0%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	1.2	87.0%	8.7%	4.3%	23

E6c: Staff make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.2	84.8%	15.2%		33
Middle class	1.1	94.1%		5.9%	34
Upper middle/Upper class	1.1	92.0%	8.0%		25

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

E6d: Staff make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	85.3%	12.6%	2.1%	95

E6d: Staff make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender*					
Male	1.2	84.4%	12.5%	3.1%	32
Female	1.1	87.9%	12.1%		58

E6d: Staff make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.1	87.3%	11.3%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	1.3	79.2%	16.7%	4.2%	24

E6d: Staff make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*					
Poor/Working class	1.2	76.5%	23.5%		34
Middle class	1.1	91.2%	2.9%	5.9%	34
Upper middle/Upper class	1.1	88.0%	12.0%		25

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 75

E6e: Staff make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.1	88.3%	8.5%	3.2%	94

E6e: Staff make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender					
Male	1.2	87.1%	6.5%	6.5%	31
Female	1.1	91.4%	8.6%		58

E6e: Staff make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.1	88.7%	8.5%	2.8%	71
Students of Color	1.2	87.0%	8.7%	4.3%	23

E6e: Staff make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.2	78.8%	18.2%	3.0%	33
Middle class	1.1	94.1%		5.9%	34
Upper middle/Upper class	1.1	92.0%	8.0%		25

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 76

E6f: Staff make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.1	88.4%	8.4%	3.2%	95

E6f: Staff make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender					
Male	1.2	87.5%	6.3%	6.3%	32
Female	1.1	91.4%	8.6%		58

E6f: Staff make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.1	90.1%	7.0%	2.8%	71
Students of Color	1.2	83.3%	12.5%	4.2%	24

E6f: Staff make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.2	79.4%	17.6%	2.9%	34
Middle class	1.1	94.1%		5.9%	34
Upper middle/Upper class	1.1	92.0%	8.0%		25

<sup>\*</sup> 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	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.1	90.4%	7.4%	2.1%	94

E6g: Staff make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender*					
Male	1.1	90.3%	6.5%	3.2%	31
Female	1.1	93.1%	6.9%		58

E6g: Staff make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.1	91.5%	7.0%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	1.2	87.0%	8.7%	4.3%	23

E6g: Staff make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.2	84.8%	15.2%		33
Middle class	1.1	94.1%		5.9%	34
Upper middle/Upper class	1.1	92.0%	8.0%		25

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 78

E6h: Staff make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	86.3%	10.5%	3.2%	95

E6h: Staff make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Gender					
Male	1.2	84.4%	9.4%	6.3%	32
Female	1.1	89.7%	10.3%		58

E6h: Staff make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)		1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	1.1	88.7%	8.5%	2.8%	71
Students of Color	1.3	79.2%	16.7%	4.2%	24

E6h: Staff make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	1.2	79.4%	17.6%	2.9%	34
Middle class	1.1	94.1%		5.9%	34
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	84.0%	16.0%		25

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 79