E1b: Faculty respect for minority grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.4	44.9%	48.7%	5.7%	0.8%	265

E1b: Faculty respect for minority grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.4	48.1%	46.0%	5.3%	0.5%	187
Female	3.3	39.2%	52.7%	6.8%	1.4%	74

E1b: Faculty respect for minority grad students	Mean	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.3	39.2%	54.1%	6.8%		74
Students of Color	3.4	47.1%	46.6%	5.2%	1.0%	191

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	35.6%	55.9%	8.5%		59
Middle class	3.3	42.3%	51.5%	4.6%	1.5%	130
Upper middle/Upper class	3.5	56.7%	36.7%	6.7%		60

^{*} 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)	3.4	50.0%	41.7%	6.4%	1.9%	264

E1c: Faculty respect for female students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.5	55.4%	40.3%	3.2%	1.1%	186
Female	3.1	37.8%	43.2%	14.9%	4.1%	74

E1c: Faculty respect for female students		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.2	43.2%	39.2%	12.2%	5.4%	74
Students of Color	3.5	52.6%	42.6%	4.2%	0.5%	190

E1c: Faculty respect for female students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.4	48.3%	44.8%	6.9%		58
Middle class	3.4	49.2%	42.3%	6.9%	1.5%	130
Upper middle/Upper class	3.3	50.0%	38.3%	6.7%	5.0%	60

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

E1e: Graduate student respect for minority faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.4	45.8%	47.0%	6.4%	0.8%	264

E1e: Graduate student respect for minority faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.5	51.1%	43.0%	5.9%		186
Female	3.2	33.8%	55.4%	8.1%	2.7%	74

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	47.9%	47.9%	4.1%		73
Students of Color	3.4	45.0%	46.6%	7.3%	1.0%	191

E1e: Graduate student respect for minority faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.4	44.1%	49.2%	5.1%	1.7%	59
Middle class	3.3	41.9%	49.6%	7.8%	0.8%	129
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	48.3%	45.0%	6.7%		60

^{*} 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	49.1%	44.2%	6.4%	0.4%	265

E1f: Graduate student respect for female faculty	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.5	54.0%	41.2%	4.8%		187
Female	3.2	37.8%	50.0%	10.8%	1.4%	74

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	41.9%	47.3%	10.8%		74
Students of Color	3.5	51.8%	42.9%	4.7%	0.5%	191

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	42.4%	50.8%	5.1%	1.7%	59
Middle class	3.4	47.7%	45.4%	6.9%		130
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	50.0%	41.7%	8.3%		60

^{*} 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)	3.0	27.1%	51.8%	18.0%	3.1%	255

E1g: Undergrad respect for minority TAs		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.0	29.3%	49.2%	17.7%	3.9%	181
Female	3.0	21.4%	57.1%	20.0%	1.4%	70

E1g: Undergrad respect for minority TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	2.8	18.3%	50.7%	23.9%	7.0%	71
Students of Color	3.1	30.4%	52.2%	15.8%	1.6%	184

E1g: Undergrad respect for minority TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.1	30.4%	51.8%	14.3%	3.6%	56
Middle class	3.0	22.0%	55.9%	19.7%	2.4%	127
Upper middle/Upper class	3.1	32.8%	44.8%	17.2%	5.2%	58

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

E1h: Undergrad respect for female TAs		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.2	31.0%	54.9%	12.9%	1.2%	255

E1h: Undergrad respect for female TAs		4: Excellent	3. Good	2· Fair	1. Poor	Total (N)
	itating	LACCHCIIC	3. G00a	Z. I all	1. 1 001	i Otai (it)
Gender						
Male	3.2	34.3%	54.1%	10.5%	1.1%	181
Female	3.0	24.3%	54.3%	20.0%	1.4%	70

E1h: Undergrad respect for female TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.0	23.9%	56.3%	16.9%	2.8%	71
Students of Color	3.2	33.7%	54.3%	11.4%	0.5%	184

E1h: Undergrad respect for female TAs	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.2	35.7%	51.8%	10.7%	1.8%	56
Middle class	3.1	26.0%	60.6%	13.4%		127
Upper middle/Upper class	3.1	36.2%	43.1%	17.2%	3.4%	58

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	39.7%	49.0%	9.7%	1.6%	257

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	44.8%	46.4%	7.1%	1.6%	183
Female	3.1	25.7%	55.7%	17.1%	1.4%	70

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	41.7%	45.8%	12.5%		72
Students of Color	3.3	38.9%	50.3%	8.6%	2.2%	185

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	3.3	38.6%	54.4%	5.3%	1.8%	57
Middle class	3.3	37.8%	52.0%	8.7%	1.6%	127
Upper middle/Upper class	3.2	43.1%	37.9%	17.2%	1.7%	58

^{*} 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	35.3%	51.9%	11.6%	1.2%	258

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	39.3%	47.5%	12.6%	0.5%	183
Female	3.1	25.4%	62.0%	9.9%	2.8%	71

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	3.2	33.3%	51.4%	15.3%		72
Students of Color	3.2	36.0%	52.2%	10.2%	1.6%	186

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	32.8%	55.2%	10.3%	1.7%	58
Middle class	3.2	31.5%	57.5%	10.2%	0.8%	127
Upper middle/Upper class	3.3	44.1%	39.0%	15.3%	1.7%	59

^{*} 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	33.8%	46.8%	15.2%	4.2%	263

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	36.6%	46.2%	13.4%	3.8%	186
Female	3.0	28.8%	46.6%	19.2%	5.5%	73

E1k: Friendships between grad students of different racial/ethnic groups		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.1	35.1%	45.9%	14.9%	4.1%	74
Students of Color	3.1	33.3%	47.1%	15.3%	4.2%	189

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	32.8%	48.3%	15.5%	3.4%	58
Middle class	3.0	27.1%	51.2%	16.3%	5.4%	129
Upper middle/Upper class	3.3	50.0%	35.0%	13.3%	1.7%	60

^{*} 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)	3.0	28.0%	49.2%	19.7%	3.1%	254

E1I: Friendships between heterosexual and GLBT grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.1	31.3%	46.9%	18.4%	3.4%	179
Female	2.9	21.1%	52.1%	23.9%	2.8%	71

E1I: Friendships between heterosexual and GLBT grad students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.0	25.0%	51.4%	22.2%	1.4%	72
Students of Color	3.0	29.1%	48.4%	18.7%	3.8%	182

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	3.1	28.1%	56.1%	12.3%	3.5%	57
Middle class	2.9	22.0%	51.2%	22.0%	4.9%	123
Upper middle/Upper class	3.2	36.7%	41.7%	21.7%		60

E1m: Graduate student respect for transgender students		4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.1	29.0%	50.8%	18.3%	2.0%	252

E1m: Graduate student respect for transgender students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.1	34.3%	46.1%	18.0%	1.7%	178
Female	2.9	17.1%	60.0%	20.0%	2.9%	70

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	27.1%	48.6%	24.3%		70
Students of Color	3.1	29.7%	51.6%	15.9%	2.7%	182

E1m: Graduate student respect for transgender students	Mean Rating	4: Excellent	3: Good	2: Fair	1: Poor	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.2	28.1%	61.4%	8.8%	1.8%	57
Middle class	3.0	25.8%	47.6%	24.2%	2.4%	124
Upper middle/Upper class	3.1	35.1%	45.6%	17.5%	1.8%	57

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

E2a: NCSU Supportiveness: African American students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	35.5%	46.1%	15.2%	2.7%	0.4%	256

E2a: NCSU Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	39.4%	43.9%	14.4%	2.2%		180
Female	4.0	26.4%	51.4%	16.7%	4.2%	1.4%	72

E2a: NCSU Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.1	33.3%	47.2%	13.9%	5.6%		72
Students of Color	4.2	36.4%	45.7%	15.8%	1.6%	0.5%	184

E2a: NCSU Supportiveness: African American students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	32.1%	51.8%	14.3%		1.8%	56
Middle class	4.2	36.2%	47.7%	14.6%	1.5%		130
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	35.0%	41.7%	15.0%	8.3%		60

E2b: NCSU Supportiveness: Asian students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	30.2%	47.1%	20.0%	2.4%	0.4%	255

E2b: NCSU Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	33.0%	44.1%	20.7%	1.7%	0.6%	179
Female	4.0	23.6%	54.2%	18.1%	4.2%		72

E2b: NCSU Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	25.4%	52.1%	21.1%	1.4%		71
Students of Color	4.1	32.1%	45.1%	19.6%	2.7%	0.5%	184

E2b: NCSU Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	26.8%	53.6%	14.3%	3.6%	1.8%	56
Middle class	4.1	30.2%	48.1%	20.9%	0.8%		129
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	30.5%	45.8%	20.3%	3.4%		59

E2c: NCSU Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	29.5%	49.2%	18.9%	2.0%	0.4%	254

E2c: NCSU Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	33.7%	44.4%	19.7%	2.2%		178
Female	4.0	20.8%	61.1%	15.3%	1.4%	1.4%	72

E2c: NCSU Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	25.0%	51.4%	18.1%	5.6%		72
Students of Color	4.1	31.3%	48.4%	19.2%	0.5%	0.5%	182

E2c: NCSU Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*							
Poor/Working class	4.0	23.2%	60.7%	14.3%		1.8%	56
Middle class	4.1	29.5%	51.2%	18.6%	0.8%		129
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	30.5%	40.7%	22.0%	6.8%		59

E2d: NCSU Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students	Mean			3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	30.2%	44.3%	22.7%	1.2%	1.6%	255

E2d: NCSU Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	33.9%	42.8%	20.0%	1.7%	1.7%	180
Female	3.9	22.5%	47.9%	28.2%		1.4%	71

E2d: NCSU Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	25.4%	40.8%	29.6%	2.8%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	4.1	32.1%	45.7%	20.1%	0.5%	1.6%	184

E2d: NCSU 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	30.4%	55.4%	12.5%		1.8%	56
Middle class	4.0	29.5%	46.5%	21.7%	0.8%	1.6%	129
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	31.7%	33.3%	31.7%	3.3%		60

E2e: NCSU Supportiveness: White students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	42.0%	40.0%	15.3%	1.6%	1.2%	255

E2e: NCSU Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	43.0%	38.0%	15.6%	1.7%	1.7%	179
Female	4.3	41.7%	44.4%	12.5%	1.4%		72

E2e: NCSU Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.0	36.1%	37.5%	18.1%	5.6%	2.8%	72
Students of Color	4.3	44.3%	41.0%	14.2%		0.5%	183

E2e: NCSU Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.2	35.7%	50.0%	12.5%	1.8%		56
Middle class	4.2	40.3%	39.5%	17.8%	1.6%	0.8%	129
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	51.7%	35.0%	13.3%			60

E2f: NCSU Supportiveness: International students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	34.1%	49.8%	12.9%	2.0%	1.2%	255

E2f: NCSU Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	38.0%	44.1%	14.0%	2.2%	1.7%	179
Female	4.1	25.0%	62.5%	11.1%	1.4%		72

E2f: NCSU Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.2	29.2%	56.9%	13.9%			72
Students of Color	4.1	36.1%	47.0%	12.6%	2.7%	1.6%	183

E2f: NCSU Supportiveness: International 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%	1.8%	3.5%	57
Middle class	4.2	33.1%	54.3%	9.4%	2.4%	0.8%	127
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	38.3%	43.3%	16.7%	1.7%		60

E2g: NCSU Supportiveness: Female students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	38.0%	48.2%	12.9%	0.4%	0.4%	255

E2g: NCSU Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.3	42.5%	43.6%	13.4%	0.6%		179
Female	4.1	27.8%	59.7%	11.1%		1.4%	72

E2g: NCSU Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.1	29.2%	52.8%	15.3%	1.4%	1.4%	72
Students of Color	4.3	41.5%	46.4%	12.0%			183

E2g: NCSU Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.3	35.7%	53.6%	10.7%			56
Middle class	4.3	38.0%	52.7%	8.5%	0.8%		129
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	38.3%	38.3%	21.7%		1.7%	60

E2h: NCSU Supportiveness: Male students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	37.0%	47.6%	13.0%	1.2%	1.2%	254

E2h: NCSU Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	38.8%	44.4%	14.6%	0.6%	1.7%	178
Female	4.2	34.7%	54.2%	8.3%	2.8%		72

E2h: NCSU Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	31.9%	48.6%	13.9%	2.8%	2.8%	72
Students of Color	4.2	39.0%	47.3%	12.6%	0.5%	0.5%	182

E2h: NCSU Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.2	35.7%	53.6%	8.9%	1.8%		56
Middle class	4.1	33.1%	47.2%	16.5%	1.6%	1.6%	127
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	45.0%	48.3%	6.7%			60

E2i: NCSU Supportiveness: Transgender students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	26.4%	40.0%	28.0%	5.6%	250

E2i: NCSU Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.9	30.9%	35.4%	27.4%	6.3%	175
Female	3.8	16.9%	49.3%	29.6%	4.2%	71

E2i: NCSU Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.7	18.1%	43.1%	25.0%	13.9%	72
Students of Color	4.0	29.8%	38.8%	29.2%	2.2%	178

E2i: NCSU Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	21.8%	43.6%	29.1%	5.5%	55
Middle class	3.9	25.6%	40.8%	28.8%	4.8%	125
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	30.0%	36.7%	25.0%	8.3%	60

E2j: NCSU Supportiveness: GLB students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	28.4%	38.8%	28.8%	3.6%	0.4%	250

E2j: NCSU Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	33.0%	34.7%	27.8%	4.0%	0.6%	176
Female	3.8	18.6%	45.7%	32.9%	2.9%		70

E2j: NCSU Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.8	20.8%	45.8%	25.0%	8.3%		72
Students of Color	4.0	31.5%	36.0%	30.3%	1.7%	0.6%	178

E2j: NCSU Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	25.0%	46.4%	23.2%	3.6%	1.8%	56
Middle class	3.9	25.6%	40.0%	30.4%	4.0%		125
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	33.9%	32.2%	30.5%	3.4%		59

E2k: NCSU Supportiveness: Christian students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	39.4%	41.8%	16.9%	1.6%	0.4%	249

E2k: NCSU Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	41.7%	39.4%	17.1%	1.1%	0.6%	175
Female	4.1	35.7%	44.3%	17.1%	2.9%		70

E2k: NCSU Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.9	29.2%	44.4%	19.4%	5.6%	1.4%	72
Students of Color	4.3	43.5%	40.7%	15.8%			177

E2k: NCSU Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	35.7%	46.4%	17.9%		56
Middle class	4.1	37.9%	41.1%	18.5%	2.4%	124
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	44.1%	44.1%	10.2%	1.7%	59

E2I: NCSU Supportiveness: Jewish students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	29.3%	40.70/	27.6%	0.4%	246

E2I: NCSU Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	33.1%	38.4%	27.9%	0.6%	172
Female	3.9	21.4%	51.4%	27.1%		70

E2I: NCSU Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.7	15.5%	45.1%	38.0%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	4.1	34.9%	41.7%	23.4%		175

E2I: NCSU Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	26.8%	44.6%	28.6%		56
Middle class	4.0	24.6%	45.9%	29.5%		122
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	40.7%	37.3%	20.3%	1.7%	59

E2m: NCSU Supportiveness: Muslim students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	27.8%	15 2%	23.0%	3.6%	0.4%	248

E2m: NCSU Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	29.9%	44.8%	21.8%	3.4%		174
Female	3.8	22.9%	45.7%	25.7%	4.3%	1.4%	70

E2m: NCSU Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	21.4%	42.9%	31.4%	4.3%		70
Students of Color	4.0	30.3%	46.1%	19.7%	3.4%	0.6%	178

E2m: NCSU Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	28.6%	46.4%	19.6%	3.6%	1.8%	56
Middle class	4.0	25.8%	49.2%	21.0%	4.0%		124
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	29.3%	39.7%	27.6%	3.4%		58

Su	E2n: NCSU ipportiveness: Other Ion-Christian students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive	3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)

E2n: NCSU Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	29.3%	40.8%	26.4%	3.4%	174
Female	3.9	20.3%	52.2%	26.1%	1.4%	69

E2n: NCSU Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.6	14.1%	40.8%	39.4%	5.6%	71
Students of Color	4.1	31.3%	46.0%	21.0%	1.7%	176

E2n: NCSU Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.9	22.2%	50.0%	25.9%	1.9%	54
Middle class	3.9	25.0%	45.2%	26.6%	3.2%	124
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	32.2%	44.1%	22.0%	1.7%	59

E2o: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with disabilities	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	39.2%	46.4%	13.6%	0.4%	0.4%	250

E2o: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.3	43.1%	43.7%	12.1%	0.6%	0.6%	174
Female	4.1	30.6%	52.8%	16.7%			72

E2o: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.0	27.8%	47.2%	23.6%	1.4%		72
Students of Color	4.3	43.8%	46.1%	9.6%		0.6%	178

E2o: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.2	33.9%	51.8%	12.5%		1.8%	56
Middle class	4.3	41.1%	49.2%	9.7%			124
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	38.3%	40.0%	20.0%	1.7%		60

E2p: NCSU Supportiveness: Poor/working class students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	26.5%	41.4%	25.3%	5.6%	1.2%	249

E2p: NCSU Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.9	29.1%	39.4%	24.6%	5.1%	1.7%	175
Female	3.8	20.0%	45.7%	27.1%	7.1%		70

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	18.3%	43.7%	26.8%	11.3%		71
Students of Color	3.9	29.8%	40.4%	24.7%	3.4%	1.7%	178

E2p: NCSU Supportiveness: Poor/working class students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	26.8%	41.1%	26.8%	1.8%	3.6%	56
Middle class	3.9	23.4%	45.2%	25.8%	4.8%	0.8%	124
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	30.5%	39.0%	22.0%	8.5%		59

E2q: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle class students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	28.4%	45.6%	23.6%	1.6%	0.8%	250

E2q: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	30.1%	43.2%	24.4%	1.7%	0.6%	176
Female	4.0	24.3%	51.4%	21.4%	1.4%	1.4%	70

E2q: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	26.8%	47.9%	23.9%		1.4%	71
Students of Color	4.0	29.1%	44.7%	23.5%	2.2%	0.6%	179

E2q: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	28.6%	46.4%	23.2%	1.8%		56
Middle class	3.9	25.0%	46.0%	25.8%	1.6%	1.6%	124
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	32.2%	50.8%	16.9%			59

E2r: NCSU Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	36.5%	43.8%	18.5%	0.8%	0.4%	249

E2r: NCSU Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	40.0%	38.9%	20.0%	0.6%	0.6%	175
Female	4.1	30.0%	54.3%	14.3%	1.4%		70

E2r: NCSU Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.2	38.0%	43.7%	16.9%	1.4%		71
Students of Color	4.1	36.0%	43.8%	19.1%	0.6%	0.6%	178

E2r: NCSU Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.2	37.5%	46.4%	16.1%			56
Middle class	4.0	30.6%	46.0%	21.8%	0.8%	0.8%	124
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	45.8%	42.4%	11.9%			59

E2s: NCSU Supportiveness: Nontraditional students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	28.2%	48.4%	19.4%	4.0%	252

E2s: NCSU Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	28.8%	46.3%	20.3%	4.5%	177
Female	4.1	28.2%	52.1%	16.9%	2.8%	71

E2s: NCSU Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.8	19.4%	50.0%	20.8%	9.7%	72
Students of Color	4.1	31.7%	47.8%	18.9%	1.7%	180

E2s: NCSU Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	26.8%	51.8%	19.6%	1.8%	56
Middle class	4.0	26.2%	50.8%	18.3%	4.8%	126
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	33.3%	43.3%	20.0%	3.3%	60

E2t: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with children	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	27.1%	41.4%	25.5%	5.2%	0.8%	251

E2t: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.9	26.9%	41.7%	26.9%	3.4%	1.1%	175
Female	3.9	27.8%	40.3%	22.2%	9.7%		72

E2t: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.6	15.5%	40.8%	32.4%	9.9%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	4.0	31.7%	41.7%	22.8%	3.3%	0.6%	180

E2t: NCSU Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	23.2%	51.8%	19.6%	5.4%		56
Middle class	3.9	25.4%	44.4%	23.8%	5.6%	0.8%	126
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	32.2%	28.8%	32.2%	5.1%	1.7%	59

E2u: NCSU Supportiveness: Students who are veterans	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	39.9%	41.9%	17.4%	0.4%	0.4%	253

E2u: NCSU Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.3	44.1%	39.0%	15.8%	0.6%	0.6%	177
Female	4.1	31.9%	47.2%	20.8%			72

E2u: NCSU Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.1	30.6%	50.0%	18.1%		1.4%	72
Students of Color	4.3	43.6%	38.7%	17.1%	0.6%		181

E2u: NCSU Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	35.7%	42.9%	21.4%			56
Middle class	4.2	37.3%	46.0%	15.9%		0.8%	126
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	46.7%	36.7%	15.0%	1.7%		60

E2v: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	26.6%	47.3%	22.3%	3.9%	256

E2v: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	31.1%	43.3%	21.7%	3.9%	180
Female	3.8	16.7%	55.6%	23.6%	4.2%	72

E2v: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.9	23.6%	45.8%	23.6%	6.9%	72
Students of Color	4.0	27.7%	47.8%	21.7%	2.7%	184

E2v: NCSU Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	26.8%	51.8%	19.6%	1.8%	56
Middle class	3.9	23.8%	50.8%	20.8%	4.6%	130
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	30.0%	41.7%	23.3%	5.0%	60

E3a: Grad Prog Supportiveness: African American students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	33.1%	47.8%	15.9%	2.0%	1.2%	251

E3a: Grad Prog Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	38.3%	43.4%	14.9%	2.3%	1.1%	175
Female	4.0	20.8%	58.3%	18.1%	1.4%	1.4%	72

E3a: Grad Prog Supportiveness: African American students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	28.2%	52.1%	15.5%	4.2%		71
Students of Color	4.1	35.0%	46.1%	16.1%	1.1%	1.7%	180

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	32.1%	53.6%	10.7%		3.6%	56
Middle class	4.1	35.2%	43.8%	20.3%	0.8%		128
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	30.0%	51.7%	11.7%	5.0%	1.7%	60

E3b: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Asian students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	33.2%	50.2%	14.6%	1.2%	0.8%	253

E3b: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	36.7%	46.3%	15.3%	0.6%	1.1%	177
Female	4.1	25.0%	59.7%	12.5%	2.8%		72

E3b: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Asian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.3	36.6%	53.5%	9.9%			71
Students of Color	4.1	31.9%	48.9%	16.5%	1.6%	1.1%	182

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	30.4%	50.0%	16.1%		3.6%	56
Middle class	4.1	30.2%	53.5%	15.5%	0.8%		129
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	41.7%	45.0%	10.0%	3.3%		60

E3c: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	28.0%	47.6%	20.7%	2.4%	1.2%	246

E3c: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	31.8%	42.8%	21.4%	2.9%	1.2%	173
Female	3.9	20.0%	58.6%	18.6%	1.4%	1.4%	70

E3c: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Hispanic/Latino students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	22.9%	48.6%	22.9%	5.7%		70
Students of Color	4.0	30.1%	47.2%	19.9%	1.1%	1.7%	176

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	29.1%	49.1%	18.2%		3.6%	55
Middle class	4.0	26.4%	48.0%	24.0%	1.6%		125
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	30.5%	45.8%	16.9%	5.1%	1.7%	59

E3d: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	31.7%	43.8%	22.1%	1.2%	1.2%	249

E3d: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Native American/Alaska Native students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	35.4%	38.9%	23.4%	1.1%	1.1%	175
Female	4.0	23.9%	54.9%	18.3%	1.4%	1.4%	71

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	3.9	23.9%	40.8%	32.4%	2.8%		71
Students of Color	4.1	34.8%	44.9%	18.0%	0.6%	1.7%	178

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	34.5%	50.9%	10.9%		3.6%	55
Middle class	4.1	30.5%	44.5%	25.0%			128
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	32.2%	37.3%	23.7%	5.1%	1.7%	59

E3e: Grad Prog Supportiveness: White students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.3	40.0%	46.8%	12.0%	0.8%	0.4%	250

E3e: Grad Prog Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.3	42.9%	42.9%	12.6%	1.1%	0.6%	175
Female	4.3	34.7%	55.6%	9.7%			72

E3e: Grad Prog Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.2	33.8%	50.7%	12.7%	2.8%		71
Students of Color	4.3	42.5%	45.3%	11.7%		0.6%	179

E3e: Grad Prog Supportiveness: White students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	35.7%	53.6%	8.9%	1.8%	56
Middle class	4.2	40.2%	44.1%	15.7%		127
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	44.1%	49.2%	6.8%		59

E3f: Grad Prog Supportiveness: International students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	37.8%	48.2%	11.2%	2.0%	0.8%	249

E3f: Grad Prog Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	40.8%	45.4%	10.9%	1.7%	1.1%	174
Female	4.1	30.6%	55.6%	11.1%	2.8%		72

E3f: Grad Prog Supportiveness: International students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.3	38.9%	55.6%	5.6%			72
Students of Color	4.1	37.3%	45.2%	13.6%	2.8%	1.1%	177

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	36.8%	47.4%	12.3%		3.5%	57
Middle class	4.2	34.9%	51.6%	11.1%	2.4%		126
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	40.7%	45.8%	10.2%	3.4%		59

E3g: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Female students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	38.5%	44.5%	14.6%	1.2%	1.2%	247

E3g: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.3	43.6%	41.3%	13.4%	1.2%	0.6%	172
Female	4.0	26.4%	52.8%	16.7%	1.4%	2.8%	72

E3g: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	33.8%	42.3%	19.7%	2.8%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	4.2	40.3%	45.5%	12.5%	0.6%	1.1%	176

E3g: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Female students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	32.1%	57.1%	7.1%		3.6%	56
Middle class	4.2	39.2%	43.2%	16.8%	0.8%		125
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	40.7%	37.3%	18.6%	1.7%	1.7%	59

E3h: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Male students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	36.8%	48.2%	13.8%	0.8%	0.4%	247

E3h: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.2	38.4%	45.3%	15.1%	0.6%	0.6%	172
Female	4.2	34.7%	54.2%	9.7%	1.4%		72

E3h: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.2	33.8%	52.1%	12.7%	1.4%		71
Students of Color	4.2	38.1%	46.6%	14.2%	0.6%	0.6%	176

E3h: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Male students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.2	32.1%	58.9%	7.1%		1.8%	56
Middle class	4.1	32.8%	47.2%	19.2%	0.8%		125
Upper middle/Upper class	4.4	49.2%	42.4%	8.5%			59

E3i: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Transgender students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	28.9%	39.4%	27.2%	3.3%	1.2%	246

E3i: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	32.7%	35.1%	28.1%	2.9%	1.2%	171
Female	3.8	20.8%	48.6%	25.0%	4.2%	1.4%	72

E3i: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.7	18.3%	42.3%	32.4%	7.0%		71
Students of Color	4.0	33.1%	38.3%	25.1%	1.7%	1.7%	175

E3i: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Transgender students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*							
Poor/Working class	4.0	28.6%	48.2%	19.6%		3.6%	56
Middle class	3.9	26.4%	36.8%	33.6%	2.4%	0.8%	125
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	33.9%	37.3%	20.3%	8.5%		59

E3j: Grad Prog Supportiveness: GLB students				3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	27.8%	42.9%	25.3%	2.4%	1.6%	245

E3j: Grad Prog Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	31.2%	38.8%	25.9%	2.4%	1.8%	170
Female	3.9	20.8%	51.4%	23.6%	2.8%	1.4%	72

E3j: Grad Prog Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	18.3%	47.9%	31.0%	2.8%		71
Students of Color	4.0	31.6%	40.8%	23.0%	2.3%	2.3%	174

E3j: Grad Prog Supportiveness: GLB students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*							
Poor/Working class	3.9	26.8%	51.8%	16.1%		5.4%	56
Middle class	3.9	25.8%	38.7%	33.1%	1.6%	0.8%	124
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	32.2%	44.1%	16.9%	6.8%		59

E3k: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Christian students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	33.7%	44.0%	20.6%	0.8%	0.8%	243

E3k: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	35.7%	41.1%	21.4%	1.2%	0.6%	168
Female	4.1	30.6%	50.0%	18.1%		1.4%	72

E3k: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	23.9%	50.7%	22.5%	1.4%	1.4%	71
Students of Color	4.2	37.8%	41.3%	19.8%	0.6%	0.6%	172

E3k: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	32.1%	51.8%	14.3%		1.8%	56
Middle class	4.0	30.9%	41.5%	25.2%	1.6%	0.8%	123
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	41.4%	43.1%	15.5%			58

E3I: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Jewish students				3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	30.8%	46.2%	22.7%	0.4%	247

E3I: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	33.1%	43.0%	23.3%	0.6%	172
Female	4.1	26.4%	52.8%	20.8%		72

E3I: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	22.5%	50.7%	26.8%		71
Students of Color	4.1	34.1%	44.3%	21.0%	0.6%	176

E3I: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Jewish students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	28.6%	51.8%	17.9%	1.8%	56
Middle class	4.0	28.8%	46.4%	24.8%		125
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	37.3%	42.4%	20.3%		59

E3m: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Muslim students	Mean			3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	32.4%	47 ∩ 0/ ₂	18.2%	1.2%	1.2%	247

E3m: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	32.9%	45.1%	20.2%	0.6%	1.2%	173
Female	4.1	32.4%	50.7%	12.7%	2.8%	1.4%	71

E3m: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	25.4%	52.1%	19.7%	2.8%		71
Students of Color	4.1	35.2%	44.9%	17.6%	0.6%	1.7%	176

E3m: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Muslim students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	32.1%	50.0%	12.5%	1.8%	3.6%	56
Middle class	4.1	31.2%	48.0%	20.0%	0.8%		125
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	37.3%	42.4%	16.9%	1.7%	1.7%	59

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)	4.1	31.0%	46.8%	21.4%	0.4%	0.4%	248

E3n: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	32.4%	44.5%	22.0%	0.6%	0.6%	173
Female	4.1	29.2%	51.4%	19.4%			72

E3n: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Other Non-Christian students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	25.7%	48.6%	25.7%			70
Students of Color	4.1	33.1%	46.1%	19.7%	0.6%	0.6%	178

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	4.1	28.6%	51.8%	17.9%		1.8%	56
Middle class	4.1	30.2%	46.0%	23.0%	0.8%		126
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	37.3%	44.1%	18.6%			59

	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	33.6%	47.4%	17.8%	0.8%	0.4%	247

E3o: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	36.6%	43.0%	19.2%	0.6%	0.6%	172
Female	4.1	27.8%	56.9%	13.9%	1.4%		72

E3o: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	25.4%	52.1%	21.1%	1.4%		71
Students of Color	4.2	36.9%	45.5%	16.5%	0.6%	0.6%	176

E3o: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with disabilities		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	28.6%	55.4%	14.3%		1.8%	56
Middle class	4.1	33.6%	45.6%	20.0%	0.8%		125
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	37.3%	45.8%	15.3%	1.7%		59

E3p: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Poor/working class students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	30.0%	43.7%	23.5%	2.0%	0.8%	247

E3p: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Poor/working class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	33.1%	40.7%	23.3%	1.7%	1.2%	172
Female	3.9	23.6%	50.0%	23.6%	2.8%		72

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	26.8%	50.7%	18.3%	4.2%		71
Students of Color	4.0	31.3%	40.9%	25.6%	1.1%	1.1%	176

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	28.6%	48.2%	19.6%		3.6%	56
Middle class	3.9	26.4%	42.4%	28.8%	2.4%		125
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	37.3%	44.1%	15.3%	3.4%		59

E3q: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle class students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	30.4%	45.3%	21.9%	1.6%	0.8%	247

E3q: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	32.6%	43.6%	20.3%	2.3%	1.2%	172
Female	4.0	26.4%	48.6%	25.0%			72

E3q: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.1	26.8%	54.9%	16.9%	1.4%		71
Students of Color	4.0	31.8%	41.5%	23.9%	1.7%	1.1%	176

E3q: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle class students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	30.4%	48.2%	17.9%	1.8%	1.8%	56
Middle class	3.9	25.8%	43.5%	28.2%	1.6%	0.8%	124
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	40.7%	47.5%	11.9%			59

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	33.5%	44.5%	21.2%	0.4%	0.4%	245

E3r: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Upper class/wealthy students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	36.3%	41.5%	21.1%	0.6%	0.6%	171
Female	4.1	28.2%	50.7%	21.1%			71

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	29.6%	50.7%	19.7%			71
Students of Color	4.1	35.1%	42.0%	21.8%	0.6%	0.6%	174

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	4.1	32.7%	50.9%	14.5%		1.8%	55
Middle class	4.0	29.8%	42.7%	26.6%	0.8%		124
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	42.4%	44.1%	13.6%			59

E3s: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Nontraditional students	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	30.5%	51.0%	16.1%	1.6%	0.8%	249

E3s: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	31.6%	49.4%	16.1%	1.7%	1.1%	174
Female	4.1	29.2%	52.8%	16.7%	1.4%		72

E3s: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Nontraditional students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.1	25.0%	59.7%	11.1%	4.2%		72
Students of Color	4.1	32.8%	47.5%	18.1%	0.6%	1.1%	177

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	26.3%	52.6%	19.3%		1.8%	57
Middle class	4.1	31.0%	49.2%	17.5%	1.6%	0.8%	126
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	33.9%	54.2%	10.2%	1.7%		59

E3t: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with children	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	30.1%	46.6%	20.1%	1.6%	1.6%	249

E3t: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	31.0%	45.4%	21.3%	0.6%	1.7%	174
Female	4.0	29.2%	48.6%	16.7%	4.2%	1.4%	72

E3t: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students with children		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	23.6%	51.4%	19.4%	4.2%	1.4%	72
Students of Color	4.1	32.8%	44.6%	20.3%	0.6%	1.7%	177

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	29.8%	47.4%	17.5%	1.8%	3.5%	57
Middle class	4.0	28.6%	46.8%	23.0%	1.6%		126
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	33.9%	45.8%	15.3%	1.7%	3.4%	59

E3u: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students who are veterans	Mean	5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	35.3%	44.6%	18.9%	0.4%	0.8%	249

E3u: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	36.8%	42.5%	19.0%	0.6%	1.1%	174
Female	4.2	33.3%	48.6%	18.1%			72

E3u: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Students who are veterans		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.1	26.8%	53.5%	19.7%			71
Students of Color	4.2	38.8%	41.0%	18.5%	0.6%	1.1%	178

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	30.4%	50.0%	17.9%		1.8%	56
Middle class	4.1	35.4%	44.1%	19.7%	0.8%		127
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	39.0%	42.4%	16.9%		1.7%	59

E3v: Grad P Supportiven Middle East students	ess: ern Mear	5: Strongly		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.	1 32.4%	50.0%	16.4%	0.4%	0.8%	250

E3v: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	33.1%	47.4%	17.7%	0.6%	1.1%	175
Female	4.2	31.9%	55.6%	12.5%			72

E3v: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.2	32.4%	54.9%	12.7%			71
Students of Color	4.1	32.4%	48.0%	17.9%	0.6%	1.1%	179

E3v: Grad Prog Supportiveness: Middle Eastern students		5: Strongly supportive		3: Neutral	2: Nonsupportive	1: Very nonsupportive	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	30.4%	51.8%	16.1%		1.8%	56
Middle class	4.1	30.5%	50.8%	18.0%	0.8%		128
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	39.0%	49.2%	10.2%		1.7%	59

E4a: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	86.7%	9.8%	2.3%	0.4%	0.8%	256

E4a: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.2	87.8%	9.4%	2.2%	0.6%		180
Female	1.3	86.1%	8.3%	2.8%		2.8%	72

E4a: Faculty/instructors 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	1.1	90.3%	9.7%				72
Students of Color	1.2	85.3%	9.8%	3.3%	0.5%	1.1%	184

E4a: Faculty/instructors 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	1.2	84.2%	10.5%	3.5%		1.8%	57
Middle class	1.2	86.9%	9.2%	2.3%	0.8%	0.8%	130
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	86.7%	11.7%	1.7%			60

E4b: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	87.5%	8.2%	2.7%	0.8%	0.8%	256

E4b: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	1.2	86.7%	10.6%	1.7%	1.1%		180
Female	1.2	90.3%	1.4%	5.6%		2.8%	72

E4b: Faculty/instructors 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	1.1	91.7%	8.3%				72
Students of Color	1.2	85.9%	8.2%	3.8%	1.1%	1.1%	184

E4b: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.2	87.7%	8.8%	1.8%		1.8%	57
Middle class	1.2	86.2%	8.5%	3.8%	0.8%	0.8%	130
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	88.3%	8.3%	1.7%	1.7%		60

E4c: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.4	73.0%	16.4%	9.0%	0.4%	1.2%	256

E4c: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.4	72.2%	16.1%	10.6%	0.6%	0.6%	180
Female	1.4	76.4%	15.3%	5.6%		2.8%	72

E4c: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never		3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.3	77.8%	16.7%	5.6%			72
Students of Color	1.5	71.2%	16.3%	10.3%	0.5%	1.6%	184

E4c: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd			2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.5	70.2%	12.3%	15.8%		1.8%	57
Middle class	1.3	76.9%	14.6%	6.9%		1.5%	130
Upper middle/Upper class	1.5	65.0%	26.7%	6.7%	1.7%		60

E4d: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.4	66.8%	23.4%	9.0%	0.4%	0.4%	256

E4d: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.4	67.8%	25.0%	6.7%	0.6%		180
Female	1.5	65.3%	18.1%	15.3%		1.4%	72

E4d: Faculty/instructors 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	1.5	63.9%	25.0%	11.1%			72
Students of Color	1.4	67.9%	22.8%	8.2%	0.5%	0.5%	184

E4d: Faculty/instructors 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	1.4	66.7%	26.3%	7.0%			57
Middle class	1.4	70.0%	20.0%	9.2%		0.8%	130
Upper middle/Upper class	1.6	58.3%	28.3%	11.7%	1.7%		60

E4e: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.3	79.7%	14.5%	4.3%	0.8%	0.8%	256

E4e: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally		5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.3	81.1%	13.9%	3.9%	0.6%	0.6%	180
Female	1.3	77.8%	13.9%	5.6%	1.4%	1.4%	72

E4e: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.4	72.2%	19.4%	8.3%			72
Students of Color	1.3	82.6%	12.5%	2.7%	1.1%	1.1%	184

E4e: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never		3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.2	84.2%	10.5%	3.5%	1.8%		57
Middle class	1.3	77.7%	16.2%	4.6%	0.8%	0.8%	130
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	78.3%	15.0%	5.0%		1.7%	60

E4f: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally		5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	85.5%	8.6%	4.7%	0.4%	0.8%	256

E4f: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.2	84.4%	10.0%	5.0%	0.6%		180
Female	1.2	88.9%	4.2%	4.2%		2.8%	72

E4f: Faculty/instructors 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	1.1	90.3%	8.3%	1.4%			72
Students of Color	1.3	83.7%	8.7%	6.0%	0.5%	1.1%	184

E4f: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.3	82.5%	10.5%	5.3%		1.8%	57
Middle class	1.2	84.6%	8.5%	6.2%		0.8%	130
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	88.3%	8.3%	1.7%	1.7%		60

E4g: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	83.5%	12.2%	2.4%	0.8%	1.2%	255

E4g: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.2	83.2%	12.8%	2.2%	0.6%	1.1%	179
Female	1.2	86.1%	8.3%	2.8%	1.4%	1.4%	72

E4g: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.2	86.1%	12.5%	1.4%			72
Students of Color	1.3	82.5%	12.0%	2.7%	1.1%	1.6%	183

E4g: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.2	80.7%	15.8%	1.8%	1.8%		57
Middle class	1.3	82.2%	12.4%	3.1%	0.8%	1.6%	129
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	88.3%	8.3%	1.7%		1.7%	60

^{*} 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	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.4	70.3%	22.3%	5.9%	0.4%	1.2%	256

E4h: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.3	72.8%	22.2%	4.4%		0.6%	180
Female	1.6	65.3%	20.8%	9.7%	1.4%	2.8%	72

E4h: Faculty/instructors 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	1.5	63.9%	23.6%	11.1%	1.4%		72
Students of Color	1.4	72.8%	21.7%	3.8%		1.6%	184

E4h: Faculty/instructors make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.4	71.9%	22.8%	3.5%		1.8%	57
Middle class	1.4	73.1%	18.5%	7.7%		0.8%	130
Upper middle/Upper class	1.5	61.7%	30.0%	5.0%	1.7%	1.7%	60

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)	1.3	79.5%	14.1%	4.0%	1.6%	0.8%	249

E5a: Grad students make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally		5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.3	78.4%	15.3%	4.0%	1.7%	0.6%	176
Female	1.3	82.6%	10.1%	4.3%	1.4%	1.4%	69

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	1.2	81.9%	15.3%	2.8%			72
Students of Color	1.3	78.5%	13.6%	4.5%	2.3%	1.1%	177

E5a: Grad students make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating			3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.3	79.6%	16.7%	1.9%	1.9%		54
Middle class	1.4	77.3%	14.8%	4.7%	1.6%	1.6%	128
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	81.4%	11.9%	5.1%	1.7%		59

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)	1.5	68.8%	16.0%	10.4%	2.4%	2.4%	250

E5b: Grad students make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.5	69.9%	16.5%	10.2%	2.3%	1.1%	176
Female	1.7	65.7%	14.3%	11.4%	2.9%	5.7%	70

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	1.3	75.0%	16.7%	6.9%	1.4%		72
Students of Color	1.6	66.3%	15.7%	11.8%	2.8%	3.4%	178

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	1.5	72.7%	16.4%	5.5%	1.8%	3.6%	55
Middle class	1.6	65.6%	18.0%	10.9%	2.3%	3.1%	128
Upper middle/Upper class	1.5	69.5%	11.9%	15.3%	3.4%		59

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)	1.7	57.0%	20.1%	16.5%	4.0%	2.4%	249

E5c: Grad students make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally		5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.7	56.8%	21.0%	17.6%	2.8%	1.7%	176
Female	1.9	56.5%	17.4%	14.5%	7.2%	4.3%	69

E5c: Grad students make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.6	61.1%	22.2%	15.3%	1.4%		72
Students of Color	1.8	55.4%	19.2%	16.9%	5.1%	3.4%	177

E5c: Grad students make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating			3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.6	64.8%	20.4%	11.1%		3.7%	54
Middle class	1.8	57.0%	17.2%	17.2%	5.5%	3.1%	128
Upper middle/Upper class	1.8	47.5%	27.1%	20.3%	5.1%		59

E5d: Grad students make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	2.0	45.6%	23.2%	22.0%	7.6%	1.6%	250

E5d: Grad students make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally		5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.9	47.7%	23.3%	21.6%	7.4%		176
Female	2.2	38.6%	22.9%	24.3%	8.6%	5.7%	70

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	1.8	47.2%	25.0%	23.6%	4.2%		72
Students of Color	2.0	44.9%	22.5%	21.3%	9.0%	2.2%	178

E5d: Grad students make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating			3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.9	45.5%	25.5%	21.8%	3.6%	3.6%	55
Middle class	2.1	43.8%	20.3%	24.2%	10.2%	1.6%	128
Upper middle/Upper class	1.8	45.8%	28.8%	20.3%	5.1%		59

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	60.8%	22.8%	10.4%	4.4%	1.6%	250

E5e: Grad students make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally		5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.6	60.2%	25.6%	9.1%	4.0%	1.1%	176
Female	1.7	61.4%	15.7%	14.3%	5.7%	2.9%	70

E5e: Grad students make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.7	58.3%	22.2%	15.3%	4.2%		72
Students of Color	1.6	61.8%	23.0%	8.4%	4.5%	2.2%	178

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	1.4	69.1%	25.5%	3.6%		1.8%	55
Middle class	1.7	57.0%	22.7%	10.9%	7.8%	1.6%	128
Upper middle/Upper class	1.6	61.0%	20.3%	15.3%	1.7%	1.7%	59

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	65.6%	16.8%	12.0%	2.8%	2.8%	250

E5f: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally		5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.6	67.6%	17.0%	10.2%	2.8%	2.3%	176
Female	1.8	60.0%	15.7%	17.1%	2.9%	4.3%	70

E5f: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.4	70.8%	18.1%	9.7%	1.4%		72
Students of Color	1.7	63.5%	16.3%	12.9%	3.4%	3.9%	178

E5f: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation				3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.6	69.1%	18.2%	3.6%	5.5%	3.6%	55
Middle class	1.6	63.3%	18.8%	12.5%	1.6%	3.9%	128
Upper middle/Upper class	1.6	64.4%	11.9%	20.3%	3.4%		59

E5g: Grad students make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.4	71.9%	16.9%	8.0%	2.0%	1.2%	249

E5g: Grad students make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.4	71.6%	18.2%	8.0%	1.1%	1.1%	176
Female	1.5	72.5%	13.0%	8.7%	4.3%	1.4%	69

E5g: Grad students make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.3	76.1%	19.7%	4.2%			71
Students of Color	1.5	70.2%	15.7%	9.6%	2.8%	1.7%	178

E5g: Grad students make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating			3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.4	70.4%	20.4%	7.4%	1.9%		54
Middle class	1.5	69.5%	18.0%	7.8%	3.1%	1.6%	128
Upper middle/Upper class	1.4	76.3%	13.6%	8.5%		1.7%	59

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)
Total (N)	1.7	55.8%	24.9%	12.4%	3.2%	3.6%	249

E4h: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally		5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.6	60.2%	24.4%	10.2%	3.4%	1.7%	176
Female	2.1	44.3%	25.7%	18.6%	2.9%	8.6%	70

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	47.2%	27.8%	16.7%	5.6%	2.8%	72
Students of Color	1.7	59.3%	23.7%	10.7%	2.3%	4.0%	177

E4h: Grad students make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating			_	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.7	58.2%	27.3%	7.3%	1.8%	5.5%	55
Middle class	1.7	57.5%	24.4%	12.6%	2.4%	3.1%	127
Upper middle/Upper class	1.9	50.8%	22.0%	18.6%	5.1%	3.4%	59

E6a: Staff make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	87.7%	9.1%	2.8%	0.4%	253

E6a: Staff make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.1	88.1%	9.0%	2.8%		177
Female	1.2	87.5%	8.3%	2.8%	1.4%	72

E6a: Staff make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.1	93.1%	6.9%			72
Students of Color	1.2	85.6%	9.9%	3.9%	0.6%	181

E6a: Staff make inappropriate comments about disability status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.2	84.2%	10.5%	5.3%		57
Middle class	1.2	86.7%	9.4%	3.1%	0.8%	128
Upper middle/Upper class	1.1	91.7%	8.3%			60

E6b: Staff make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity			2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	87.8%	7.9%	3.1%	1.2%	254

E6b: Staff make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.2	89.3%	6.7%	3.4%	0.6%	178
Female	1.3	84.7%	9.7%	2.8%	2.8%	72

E6b: Staff make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.1	93.1%	6.9%			72
Students of Color	1.2	85.7%	8.2%	4.4%	1.6%	182

E6b: Staff make inappropriate comments about gender/sexual identity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.2	87.7%	5.3%	5.3%	1.8%	57
Middle class	1.2	86.0%	9.3%	3.1%	1.6%	129
Upper middle/Upper class	1.1	90.0%	8.3%	1.7%		60

E6c: Staff make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.3	81.0%	13.8%	3.6%	0.8%	0.8%	253

E6c: Staff make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd				3: Occasionally		5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.2	82.5%	13.0%	3.4%	0.6%	0.6%	177
Female	1.3	77.8%	15.3%	4.2%	1.4%	1.4%	72

E6c: Staff make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.2	84.7%	15.3%				72
Students of Color	1.3	79.6%	13.3%	5.0%	1.1%	1.1%	181

E6c: Staff make inappropriate comments about immigration bkgrnd	Mean Rating	1: Never		3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.3	80.7%	14.0%	3.5%	1.8%		57
Middle class	1.3	80.5%	14.1%	3.9%		1.6%	128
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	81.7%	13.3%	3.3%	1.7%		60

^{*} Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 74

E6d: Staff make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.3	79.9%	14.2%	4.3%	0.4%	1.2%	254

E6d: Staff make inappropriate comments about race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.2	82.0%	12.9%	4.5%	0.6%		178
Female	1.4	75.0%	16.7%	4.2%		4.2%	72

E6d: Staff 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	1.2	84.7%	11.1%	4.2%			72
Students of Color	1.3	78.0%	15.4%	4.4%	0.5%	1.6%	182

E6d: Staff 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	1.4	75.4%	17.5%	3.5%		3.5%	57
Middle class	1.3	79.1%	15.5%	3.9%	0.8%	0.8%	129
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	83.3%	10.0%	6.7%			60

E6e: Staff make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	83.4%	12.3%	2.0%	0.8%	1.6%	253

E6e: Staff make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally		5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.2	85.3%	10.2%	2.3%	1.1%	1.1%	177
Female	1.3	79.2%	16.7%	1.4%		2.8%	72

E6e: Staff make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.1	87.5%	12.5%				72
Students of Color	1.3	81.8%	12.2%	2.8%	1.1%	2.2%	181

E6e: Staff make inappropriate comments about religion	Mean Rating	1: Never		3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	1.3	82.5%	12.3%	3.5%		1.8%	57
Middle class	1.3	80.5%	14.8%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	128
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	88.3%	8.3%	1.7%		1.7%	60

E6f: Staff make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation		1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	87.3%	8.3%	3.2%	0.4%	0.8%	252

E6f: Staff make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.2	88.1%	8.0%	3.4%	0.6%		176
Female	1.3	86.1%	8.3%	2.8%		2.8%	72

E6f: Staff make inappropriate comments about sexual orientation	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	1.1	90.3%	9.7%				72
Students of Color	1.2	86.1%	7.8%	4.4%	0.6%	1.1%	180

E6f: Staff 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	1.2	87.7%	5.3%	3.5%	1.8%	1.8%	57
Middle class	1.2	85.0%	11.0%	3.1%		0.8%	127
Upper middle/Upper class	1.1	90.0%	6.7%	3.3%			60

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

E6g: Staff make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status			2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.2	87.7%	7.5%	2.8%	2.0%	252

E6g: Staff make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	1.2	88.1%	7.9%	2.3%	1.7%	177
Female	1.3	87.3%	5.6%	4.2%	2.8%	71

E6g: Staff make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	1.1	94.4%	5.6%			72
Students of Color	1.3	85.0%	8.3%	3.9%	2.8%	180

E6g: Staff make inappropriate comments about socioeconomic status	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	5: Very often	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	1.2	84.2%	10.5%	3.5%	1.8%	57
Middle class	1.2	86.6%	7.9%	3.1%	2.4%	127
Upper middle/Upper class	1.2	91.7%	5.0%	1.7%	1.7%	60

E6h: Staff make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Total (N)	1.3	84.3%	9.8%	3.1%	1.2%	1.6%	254

E6h: Staff make inappropriate comments about sex (i.e., male, female)	Mean Rating		2: Rarely	3: Occasionally	4: Often	5: Very often	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	1.2	86.0%	10.1%	1.7%	1.7%	0.6%	178
Female	1.4	80.6%	8.3%	6.9%		4.2%	72

E6h: Staff 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	1.2	84.7%	9.7%	5.6%			72
Students of Color	1.3	84.1%	9.9%	2.2%	1.6%	2.2%	182

E6h: Staff 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	1.4	82.5%	10.5%	1.8%		5.3%	57
Middle class	1.2	84.5%	10.1%	3.1%	1.6%	0.8%	129
Upper middle/Upper class	1.3	83.3%	10.0%	5.0%	1.7%		60