F1a: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence			2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	27.7%	51.4%	17.3%	3.2%	0.4%	249

F1a: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	28.6%	50.3%	18.9%	1.7%	0.6%	175
Female	4.0	24.3%	55.7%	14.3%	5.7%	-	70

F1a: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	18.6%	52.9%	21.4%	7.1%		70
Students of Color	4.1	31.3%	50.8%	15.6%	1.7%	0.6%	179

F1a: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	33.9%	44.6%	17.9%	3.6%		56
Middle class	4.0	24.2%	54.7%	19.5%	0.8%	0.8%	128
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	31.7%	51.7%	10.0%	6.7%		60

F1b: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	32.8%	49.0%	15.8%	2.0%	0.4%	247

F1b: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence				Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	33.9%	48.9%	16.1%	0.6%	0.6%	174
Female	4.0	29.0%	49.3%	15.9%	5.8%		69

F1b: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	4.0	32.9%	40.0%	21.4%	5.7%		70
Students of Color	4.2	32.8%	52.5%	13.6%	0.6%	0.6%	177

F1b: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	32.1%	51.8%	14.3%	1.8%		56
Middle class	4.1	32.3%	47.2%	18.1%	1.6%	0.8%	127
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	36.2%	50.0%	10.3%	3.4%		58

F1c: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	31.3%	46.7%	20.7%	1.2%	246

F1c: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty in class	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	33.7%	44.8%	20.9%	0.6%	172
Female	4.0	24.3%	52.9%	20.0%	2.9%	70

F1c: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty in class	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.9	22.1%	42.6%	33.8%	1.5%	68

F1c: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	34.5%	41.8%	23.6%		55
Middle class	4.1	28.6%	50.0%	19.8%	1.6%	126
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	37.3%	42.4%	18.6%	1.7%	59

F1d: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty outside class	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	30.9%	43.9%	24.0%	1.2%	246

F1d: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	32.2%	45.4%	21.8%	0.6%	174
Female	3.9	26.5%	41.2%	29.4%	2.9%	68

F1d: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	U U	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.8	23.5%	38.2%	33.8%	4.4%	68
Students of Color	4.1	33.7%	46.1%	20.2%		178

F1d: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	32.7%	45.5%	21.8%		55
Middle class	4.0	29.6%	42.4%	28.0%		125
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	35.0%	43.3%	16.7%	5.0%	60

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	19.5%	29.8%	49.8%	0.9%	215

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.7	18.8%	29.5%	51.0%	0.7%	149
Female	3.7	19.4%	30.6%	48.4%	1.6%	62

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.4	10.7%	16.1%	71.4%	1.8%	56
Students of Color	3.8	22.6%	34.6%	42.1%	0.6%	159

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*						
Poor/Working class	3.7	14.0%	44.0%	42.0%		50
Middle class	3.7	19.6%	28.6%	51.8%	-	112
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	26.5%	20.4%	49.0%	4.1%	49

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	35.7%	46.6%	15.7%	2.0%	249

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	wean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	•	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	4.2	38.3%	44.6%	17.1%		175
Female	4.0	28.6%	51.4%	12.9%	7.1%	70

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.2	38.6%	41.4%	17.1%	2.9%	70
Students of Color	4.2	34.6%	48.6%	15.1%	1.7%	179

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.3	39.3%	48.2%	12.5%		56
Middle class	4.1	35.2%	46.9%	15.6%	2.3%	128
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	35.6%	45.8%	15.3%	3.4%	59

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	26.0%	43.7%	27.4%	2.3%	0.5%	215

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	27.7%	45.8%	23.9%	1.9%	0.6%	155
Female	3.8	19.6%	39.3%	37.5%	3.6%		56

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.7	17.5%	36.8%	40.4%	5.3%		57
Students of Color	4.0	29.1%	46.2%	22.8%	1.3%	0.6%	158

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	25.5%	48.9%	25.5%			47
Middle class	3.9	25.0%	42.9%	28.6%	2.7%	0.9%	112
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	28.0%	42.0%	26.0%	4.0%		50

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus-wide activities/events	Mean Rating			3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	23.7%	46.1%	27.9%	2.3%	219

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus-wide activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.9	24.0%	47.4%	26.0%	2.6%	154
Female	3.9	21.3%	44.3%	32.8%	1.6%	61

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus-wide activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.6	14.3%	39.3%	42.9%	3.6%	56
Students of Color	4.0	27.0%	48.5%	22.7%	1.8%	163

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus-wide activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.9	23.4%	48.9%	25.5%	2.1%	47
Middle class	3.9	23.0%	46.0%	29.2%	1.8%	113
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	25.9%	46.3%	25.9%	1.9%	54

F1i: Influence on thinking about diversity: College/department activities/events	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	25.1%	48.1%	25.5%	1.3%	235

F1i: Influence on thinking about diversity: College/department activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	27.6%	46.0%	25.2%	1.2%	163
Female	3.9	19.1%	52.9%	26.5%	1.5%	68

F1i: Influence on thinking about diversity: College/department activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.8	21.0%	41.9%	35.5%	1.6%	62
Students of Color	4.0	26.6%	50.3%	22.0%	1.2%	173

F1i: Influence on thinking about diversity: College/department activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	24.5%	50.9%	24.5%		53
Middle class	3.9	25.2%	45.4%	28.6%	0.8%	119
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	27.1%	49.2%	20.3%	3.4%	59

F1j: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with staff			4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	25.9%	48.5%	24.3%	1.3%	239

F1j: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with staff	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	4.1	27.7%	51.8%	20.5%		166
Female	3.8	20.3%	42.0%	33.3%	4.3%	69

F1j: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with staff	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.8	16.9%	44.6%	36.9%	1.5%	65
Students of Color	4.1	29.3%	50.0%	19.5%	1.1%	174

F1j: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with staff	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	23.6%	54.5%	18.2%	3.6%	55
Middle class	3.9	25.0%	43.3%	31.7%		120
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	31.7%	51.7%	15.0%	1.7%	60

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with/messages from admin				3: Neither positive nor negative influence		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	25.3%	44.0%	29.0%	0.8%	0.8%	241

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with/messages from admin	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.9	27.4%	41.7%	29.8%		1.2%	168
Female	3.9	20.3%	49.3%	27.5%	2.9%		69

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with/messages from admin	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.7	17.9%	37.3%	41.8%	1.5%	1.5%	67
Students of Color	4.0	28.2%	46.6%	24.1%	0.6%	0.6%	174

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with/messages from admin	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	25.9%	44.4%	27.8%	1.9%		54
Middle class	3.9	24.4%	42.3%	31.7%	0.8%	0.8%	123
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	28.3%	48.3%	23.3%			60

F1I: Influence on thinking about diversity: Family/home town experiences	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	30.3%	46.1%	19.5%	3.3%	0.8%	241

F1I: Influence on thinking about diversity: Family/home town experiences	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	30.8%	43.8%	20.7%	3.6%	1.2%	169
Female	4.1	27.9%	52.9%	17.6%	1.5%		68

F1I: Influence on thinking about diversity: Family/home town experiences	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.8	20.9%	47.8%	22.4%	9.0%		67
Students of Color	4.1	33.9%	45.4%	18.4%	1.1%	1.1%	174

F1I: Influence on thinking about diversity: Family/home town experiences	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	25.9%	48.1%	20.4%	3.7%	1.9%	54
Middle class	4.0	30.2%	43.7%	21.4%	4.0%	0.8%	126
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	35.7%	51.8%	10.7%	1.8%		56

F2a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends			4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	22.8%	46.3%	28.0%	2.8%	246

F2a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.9	22.8%	44.4%	30.4%	2.3%	171
Female	3.9	21.1%	52.1%	22.5%	4.2%	71

F2a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.6	13.2%	38.2%	41.2%	7.4%	68
Students of Color	4.0	26.4%	49.4%	23.0%	1.1%	178

F2a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.9	17.9%	57.1%	25.0%		56
Middle class	3.9	22.7%	45.3%	28.9%	3.1%	128
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	28.8%	40.7%	28.8%	1.7%	59

F2b: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of abstaining from using offensive language	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence			2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	27.3%	45.3%	26.9%	0.4%	245

F2b: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of abstaining from using offensive language	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	28.1%	44.4%	26.9%	0.6%	171
Female	4.0	24.3%	47.1%	28.6%		70

F2b: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of abstaining from using offensive language	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.7	14.7%	41.2%	44.1%		68
Students of Color	4.1	32.2%	46.9%	20.3%	0.6%	177

F2b: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of abstaining from using offensive language	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.9	21.4%	50.0%	28.6%		56
Middle class	4.0	28.3%	44.1%	26.8%	0.8%	127
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	32.2%	44.1%	23.7%		59

F2c: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of notifying others about offensive language	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	23.0%	42.6%	32.8%	1.2%	0.4%	244

F2c: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of notifying others about offensive language	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.9	24.1%	40.6%	33.5%	1.2%	0.6%	170
Female	3.8	18.6%	47.1%	32.9%	1.4%		70

F2c: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of notifying others about offensive language	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.6	11.8%	38.2%	45.6%	2.9%	1.5%	68
Students of Color	4.0	27.3%	44.3%	27.8%	0.6%		176

F2c: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of notifying others about offensive language	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	23.2%	41.1%	35.7%			56
Middle class	3.8	20.6%	44.4%	33.3%	1.6%		126
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	28.8%	40.7%	27.1%	1.7%	1.7%	59

F2d: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of initiating conversation with student of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	25.6%	45.9%	26.4%	0.8%	1.2%	246

F2d: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of initiating conversation with student of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.9	27.5%	42.7%	27.5%	1.2%	1.2%	171
Female	3.9	19.7%	53.5%	25.4%		1.4%	71

F2d: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of initiating conversation with student of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	20.6%	42.6%	36.8%			68
Students of Color	4.0	27.5%	47.2%	22.5%	1.1%	1.7%	178

F2d: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of initiating conversation with student of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.0	23.2%	57.1%	17.9%		1.8%	56
Middle class	3.9	25.8%	42.2%	30.5%		1.6%	128
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	27.1%	45.8%	23.7%	3.4%		59

F2e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds							Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	28.0%	47.7%	21.8%	2.1%	0.4%	243

F2e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.0	30.8%	43.2%	23.1%	2.4%	0.6%	169
Female	4.0	20.0%	58.6%	20.0%	1.4%	-	70

F2e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	20.6%	50.0%	26.5%	2.9%		68
Students of Color	4.1	30.9%	46.9%	20.0%	1.7%	0.6%	175

F2e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.1	27.3%	54.5%	16.4%	1.8%		55
Middle class	4.0	26.0%	49.6%	22.0%	1.6%	0.8%	127
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	34.5%	39.7%	24.1%	1.7%		58

F2f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean		4: Positive influence				Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	29.6%	46.9%	22.2%	0.8%	0.4%	243

F2f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	•	•	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	32.4%	44.1%	22.9%		0.6%	170

F2f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.8	23.5%	36.8%	36.8%	1.5%	1.5%	68
Students of Color	4.1	32.0%	50.9%	16.6%	0.6%		175

F2f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	32.7%	43.6%	23.6%		55
Middle class	4.0	27.0%	51.6%	20.6%	0.8%	126
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	32.2%	42.4%	23.7%	1.7%	59

F2g: Influence of NCSU: Ability to work in job with people of diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	33.9%	44.5%	20.8%	0.8%	245

F2g: Influence of NCSU: Ability to work in job with people of diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	35.9%	42.4%	21.2%	0.6%	170
Female	4.1	28.2%	50.7%	19.7%	1.4%	71

F2g: Influence of NCSU: Ability to work in job with people of diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	32.4%	36.8%	29.4%	1.5%	68
Students of Color	4.2	34.5%	47.5%	17.5%	0.6%	177

F2g: Influence of NCSU: Ability to work in job with people of diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	33.9%	39.3%	26.8%		56
Middle class	4.1	33.1%	48.0%	18.1%	0.8%	127
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	35.6%	44.1%	18.6%	1.7%	59

F2h: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating			3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	31.4%	48.6%	18.0%	1.6%	0.4%	245

F2h: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Gender							
Male	4.1	35.3%	45.3%	17.6%	1.2%	0.6%	170
Female	4.0	21.1%	56.3%	19.7%	2.8%		71

F2h: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.0	26.5%	45.6%	25.0%	2.9%		68
Students of Color	4.1	33.3%	49.7%	15.3%	1.1%	0.6%	177

F2h: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	•	•	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	4.2	35.7%	44.6%	19.6%			56
Middle class	4.1	29.9%	51.2%	15.7%	2.4%	0.8%	127
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	30.5%	49.2%	18.6%	1.7%		59

F2i: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different sexual orientation	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence			2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	25.9%	36.2%	36.6%	0.8%	0.4%	243

F2i: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different sexual orientation	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence				Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.9	27.8%	32.5%	38.5%	0.6%	0.6%	169
Female	3.8	20.0%	45.7%	32.9%	1.4%		70

F2i: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different sexual orientation	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.6	19.1%	26.5%	51.5%	2.9%		68
Students of Color	4.0	28.6%	40.0%	30.9%		0.6%	175

F2i: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different sexual orientation	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	19.6%	39.3%	41.1%			56
Middle class	3.8	24.8%	37.6%	35.2%	1.6%	0.8%	125
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	35.6%	30.5%	33.9%			59

F2j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean		4: Positive	3: Neither positive nor negative	Total (N)
uisabilities	Nating	innuence	innuence	innuence	
Total (N)	3.9	24.4%	41.3%	34.3%	242

F2j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Gender					
Male	3.9	26.8%	38.1%	35.1%	168
Female	3.8	17.1%	50.0%	32.9%	70

F2j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*					
White/Caucasian	3.5	14.7%	25.0%	60.3%	68
Students of Color	4.0	28.2%	47.7%	24.1%	174

F2j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	3.9	26.8%	41.1%	32.1%	56
Middle class	3.9	22.6%	45.2%	32.3%	124
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	27.1%	33.9%	39.0%	59

F2k: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different religion	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	29.1%	41.8%	28.3%	0.8%	244

F2k: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different religion	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	31.8%	37.6%	29.4%	1.2%	170
Female	4.0	21.4%	52.9%	25.7%		70

F2k: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different religion	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.8	22.1%	35.3%	42.6%		68
Students of Color	4.1	31.8%	44.3%	22.7%	1.1%	176

F2k: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different religion	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	26.8%	48.2%	25.0%		56
Middle class	4.0	28.6%	40.5%	29.4%	1.6%	126
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	33.9%	37.3%	28.8%		59

F2I: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different country-of-origin	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	33.6%	48.0%	18.4%	244

F2I: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different country-of-origin	Mean	5: Very positive	4: Positive	3: Neither positive nor negative	
	Rating	influence	influence	influence	Total (N)
Gender	Rating	influence	influence	influence	Total (N)
Gender Male	Rating 4.2				

F2I: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different country-of-origin	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	4.0	29.4%	44.1%	26.5%	68
Students of Color	4.2	35.2%	49.4%	15.3%	176

F2I: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different country-of-origin	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	4.1	33.9%	44.6%	21.4%	56
Middle class	4.1	31.7%	50.8%	17.5%	126
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	37.3%	45.8%	16.9%	59