F1a: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interacation with students in class	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	15.0%	54.2%	25.0%	4.2%	1.7%	120

F1a: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interacation with students in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.7	14.8%	44.4%	33.3%	7.4%		27
Female	3.8	14.0%	59.3%	23.3%	2.3%	1.2%	86

F1a: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interacation 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	3.7	12.9%	57.0%	23.7%	4.3%	2.2%	93
Students of Color	3.9	22.2%	44.4%	29.6%	3.7%		27

F1a: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interacation 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	3.4	6.3%	50.0%	31.3%	6.3%	6.3%	32
Middle class	3.9	12.5%	66.1%	21.4%			56
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	29.0%	38.7%	22.6%	9.7%		31

F1b: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	19.0%	47.9%	25.6%	5.0%	2.5%	121

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)
Gender							
Male	3.6	17.9%	39.3%	32.1%	7.1%	3.6%	28
Female	3.8	19.8%	51.2%	24.4%	3.5%	1.2%	86

F1b: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.7	13.8%	53.2%	23.4%	6.4%	3.2%	94
Students of Color	4.0	37.0%	29.6%	33.3%			27

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	3.5	12.1%	42.4%	36.4%	3.0%	6.1%	33
Middle class	3.9	19.6%	55.4%	21.4%	3.6%		56
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	25.8%	41.9%	19.4%	9.7%	3.2%	31

F1c: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	20.0%	45.0%	31.7%	1.7%	1.7%	120

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)
Gender							
Male	3.7	17.9%	42.9%	32.1%	3.6%	3.6%	28
Female	3.9	20.0%	47.1%	31.8%	1.2%	-	85

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	3.8	18.3%	47.3%	30.1%	2.2%	2.2%	93
Students of Color	3.9	25.9%	37.0%	37.0%			27

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)
Socioeconomic Background*							
Poor/Working class	3.5	12.1%	33.3%	48.5%		6.1%	33
Middle class	4.0	20.0%	56.4%	23.6%			55
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	29.0%	38.7%	25.8%	6.5%		31

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	22.4%	42.2%	33.6%	1.7%	116

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.6	14.3%	42.9%	39.3%	3.6%	28
Female	3.9	24.7%	42.0%	33.3%		81

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.8	19.1%	44.9%	33.7%	2.2%	89
Students of Color	4.0	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%		27

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*						
Poor/Working class	3.4	12.5%	31.3%	50.0%	6.3%	32
Middle class	4.0	22.6%	50.9%	26.4%		53
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	33.3%	40.0%	26.7%	-	30

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	Mean Rating			3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	3.5	7.6%	45.4%	42.0%	3.4%	1.7%	119

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence				Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.4	7.1%	42.9%	39.3%	7.1%	3.6%	28
Female	3.6	7.1%	47.1%	43.5%	2.4%		85

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)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.5	5.4%	48.4%	40.9%	3.2%	2.2%	93
Students of Color	3.6	15.4%	34.6%	46.2%	3.8%		26

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	3.2	3.0%	30.3%	60.6%		6.1%	33
Middle class	3.6	5.6%	55.6%	37.0%	1.9%		54
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	16.1%	45.2%	32.3%	6.5%	•	31

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	33.3%	50.0%	15.8%	0.8%	120

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	wean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*					
Male	4.0	28.6%	46.4%	25.0%	28
Female	4.2	36.5%	50.6%	12.9%	85

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	wean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	29.0%	54.8%	15.1%	1.1%	93
Students of Color	4.3	48.1%	33.3%	18.5%		27

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	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	3.8	21.2%	48.5%	27.3%	3.0%	33
Middle class	4.3	38.2%	52.7%	9.1%		55
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	35.5%	48.4%	16.1%		31

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Living in residence halls	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.5	9.8%	46.1%	34.3%	8.8%	1.0%	102

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Living in residence halls	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.5	11.1%	37.0%	40.7%	11.1%	27
Female	3.6	8.8%	51.5%	32.4%	7.4%	68

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Living in residence halls	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.5	6.3%	48.1%	34.2%	10.1%	1.3%	79
Students of Color	3.8	21.7%	39.1%	34.8%	4.3%		23

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Living in residence halls	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*							
Poor/Working class	3.3		44.4%	40.7%	11.1%	3.7%	27
Middle class	3.8	11.1%	55.6%	33.3%			45
Upper middle/Upper class	3.5	16.7%	33.3%	30.0%	20.0%		30

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating			3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	23.7%	45.8%	27.1%	2.5%	0.8%	118

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.8	14.8%	51.9%	29.6%	3.7%	27
Female	3.9	26.2%	44.0%	27.4%	2.4%	84

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.8	17.6%	51.6%	26.4%	3.3%	1.1%	91
Students of Color	4.1	44.4%	25.9%	29.6%			27

F1h: 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)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.6	15.6%	37.5%	37.5%	6.3%	3.1%	32
Middle class	4.0	22.2%	55.6%	20.4%	1.9%		54
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	32.3%	38.7%	29.0%			31

F1i: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus-wide activities/events	Mean Rating				2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	17.1%	51.3%	28.2%	2.6%	0.9%	117

F1i: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus-wide activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.9	22.2%	44.4%	29.6%	3.7%	27
				27.4%	2.4%	84

F1i: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus-wide activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	13.3%	56.7%	26.7%	2.2%	1.1%	90
Students of Color	3.9	29.6%	33.3%	33.3%	3.7%	-	27

F1i: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus-wide activities/events	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	3.4	9.4%	34.4%	46.9%	6.3%	3.1%	32
Middle class	4.0	18.5%	61.1%	18.5%	1.9%		54
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	23.3%	50.0%	26.7%			30

F1j: Influence on thinking about diversity: College/department activities/events	wean			3: Neither positive nor negative influence		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	15.7%	43.5%	38.3%	1.7%	0.9%	115

F1j: 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	3.6	11.1%	33.3%	55.6%		27
·····Wale	0.0	11.170	00.070			

F1j: 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	3.7	12.4%	47.2%	38.2%	1.1%	1.1%	89
Students of Color	3.8	26.9%	30.8%	38.5%	3.8%		26

F1j: 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	3.5	16.7%	30.0%	46.7%	3.3%	3.3%	30
Middle class	3.9	14.8%	57.4%	27.8%		-	54
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	-	-	30

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff				3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	16.0%	48.7%	33.6%	0.8%	0.8%	119

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.7	14.3%	42.9%	42.9%			28
Female	3.8	16.7%	51.2%	31.0%	1.2%	-	84

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	14.0%	51.6%	33.3%		1.1%	93
Students of Color	3.8	23.1%	38.5%	34.6%	3.8%	•	26

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff	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	3.6	12.5%	37.5%	46.9%	3.1%	32
Middle class	3.9	16.7%	57.4%	25.9%		54
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	18.8%	46.9%	34.4%		32

F1I: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with/messages from admin			4: Positive influence			1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	15.5%	44.0%	36.2%	3.4%	0.9%	116

F1I: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with/messages from admin		5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.5	10.7%	39.3%	42.9%	7.1%	28
Female	3.8	17.1%	46.3%	34.1%	2.4%	82

F1I: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with/messages from admin	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.7	14.1%	45.7%	37.0%	2.2%	1.1%	92
Students of Color	3.7	20.8%	37.5%	33.3%	8.3%		24

F1I: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with/messages from admin	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	3.5	12.5%	31.3%	53.1%		3.1%	32
Middle class	3.8	13.2%	58.5%	24.5%	3.8%		53
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	23.3%	33.3%	40.0%	3.3%		30

F1m: Influence on thinking about diversity: Family/home town experiences	Mean		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.6	20.0%	37.5%	28.3%	12.5%	1.7%	120

F1m: 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	3.4	21.4%	21.4%	35.7%	17.9%	3.6%	28
Female	3.7	20.0%	42.4%	28.2%	9.4%		85

F1m: 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	3.5	17.2%	35.5%	29.0%	16.1%	2.2%	93
Students of Color	4.0	29.6%	44.4%	25.9%	-	-	27

F1m: 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)
Socioeconomic Background*							
Poor/Working class	3.4	15.6%	28.1%	40.6%	12.5%	3.1%	32
Middle class	3.9	25.5%	45.5%	25.5%	1.8%	1.8%	55
Upper middle/Upper class	3.3	15.6%	31.3%	21.9%	31.3%		32

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who were assigned a Common Reading)	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.3	8.2%	17.5%	56.7%	1.0%	16.5%	97

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who were assigned a Common Reading)	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	J		9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.7	15.0%	10.0%	65.0%	5.0%	5.0%	20
Female	4.5	5.7%	21.4%	52.9%		20.0%	70

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who were assigned a Common Reading)	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.4	6.8%	17.6%	56.8%	1.4%	17.6%	74
Students of Color	4.2	13.0%	17.4%	56.5%		13.0%	23

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who were assigned a Common Reading)	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	5.2	7.7%	15.4%	46.2%		30.8%	26
Middle class	4.1	4.4%	24.4%	57.8%	-	13.3%	45
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	15.4%	7.7%	65.4%	3.8%	7.7%	26

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning Page 14

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who read book)	Mean Rating			3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.4	9.9%	21.0%	67.9%	1.2%	81

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who read book)	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.4	15.8%	10.5%	68.4%	5.3%	19
Female	3.4	7.1%	26.8%	66.1%		56

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who read book)	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.4	8.2%	21.3%	68.9%	1.6%	61
Students of Color	3.5	15.0%	20.0%	65.0%		20

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who read book)	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	3.4	11.1%	22.2%	66.7%		18
Middle class	3.4	5.1%	28.2%	66.7%		39
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	16.7%	8.3%	70.8%	4.2%	24

F3a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends			4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	21.7%	40.8%	34.2%	3.3%	120

F3a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends	Mean Rating				2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.7	17.9%	39.3%	39.3%	3.6%	28
Female	3.9	23.3%	41.9%	32.6%	2.3%	86

F3a: 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	3.7	17.0%	43.6%	35.1%	4.3%	94
Students of Color	4.1	38.5%	30.8%	30.8%	-	26

F3a: 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	3.6	15.2%	33.3%	48.5%	3.0%	33
Middle class	3.9	23.2%	44.6%	28.6%	3.6%	56
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	25.8%	41.9%	29.0%	3.2%	31

F3b: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of abstaining from using offensive language	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	25.0%	42.5%	29.2%	2.5%	0.8%	120

F3b: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of abstaining from using offensive language	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.7	25.0%	28.6%	42.9%		3.6%	28
Female	4.0	25.6%	47.7%	24.4%	2.3%		86

F3b: 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)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	22.3%	43.6%	30.9%	2.1%	1.1%	94
Students of Color	4.0	34.6%	38.5%	23.1%	3.8%		26

F3b: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of abstaining from using offensive language	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	21.2%	36.4%	36.4%	6.1%		33
Middle class	4.0	26.8%	44.6%	26.8%	1.8%		56
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	25.8%	45.2%	25.8%		3.2%	31

F3c: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of notifying others about offensive language	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	19.2%	42.5%	34.2%	3.3%	0.8%	120

F3c: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of notifying others about offensive language	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.5	14.3%	32.1%	46.4%	3.6%	3.6%	28
Female	3.9	22.1%	46.5%	29.1%	2.3%	-	86

F3c: 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	3.8	18.1%	45.7%	30.9%	4.3%	1.1%	94
Students of Color	3.8	23.1%	30.8%	46.2%			26

F3c: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of notifying others about offensive language	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*							
Poor/Working class	3.5	15.2%	24.2%	54.5%	6.1%		33
Middle class	3.9	17.9%	57.1%	23.2%	1.8%		56
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	25.8%	35.5%	32.3%	3.2%	3.2%	31

F3d: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of initiating conversation with student of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	25.0%	42.5%	31.7%	0.8%	120

F3d: 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	25.0%	39.3%	35.7%	28
Female	4.0	24.4%	46.5%	29.1%	86

F3d: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of initiating conversation with student of different race/ethnicity	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.8	21.3%	41.5%	36.2%	1.1%	94
Students of Color	4.2	38.5%	46.2%	15.4%		26

F3d: 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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	21.2%	39.4%	36.4%	3.0%	33
Middle class	4.0	26.8%	48.2%	25.0%	-	56
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	25.8%	35.5%	38.7%		31

F3e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	26.3%	48.3%	24.6%	0.8%	118

F3e: 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	4.1	39.3%	32.1%	28.6%		28
Female	4.0	22.6%	56.0%	21.4%	•	84

F3e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	26.1%	46.7%	26.1%	1.1%	92
Students of Color	4.1	26.9%	53.8%	19.2%		26

F3e: 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	3.8	18.2%	51.5%	27.3%	3.0%	33
Middle class	4.1	29.1%	50.9%	20.0%	-	55
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	30.0%	40.0%	30.0%		30

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	28.8%	45.8%	24.6%	0.8%	118

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*					
Male	4.1	35.7%	35.7%	28.6%	28
Female	4.0	26.2%	51.2%	22.6%	84

F3f: 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	4.0	26.1%	45.7%	27.2%	1.1%	92
Students of Color	4.2	38.5%	46.2%	15.4%		26

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.9	24.2%	42.4%	30.3%	3.0%	33
Middle class	4.1	27.3%	50.9%	21.8%		55
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	36.7%	40.0%	23.3%	-	30

F3g: 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	32.2%	43.2%	22.9%	1.7%	118

F3g: Influence of NCSU: Ability to work in job with people of diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	4.1	35.7%	39.3%	25.0%		28
Female	4.1	31.0%	47.6%	20.2%	1.2%	84

F3g: Influence of NCSU: Ability to work in job with people of diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	29.3%	43.5%	26.1%	1.1%	92
Students of Color	4.2	42.3%	42.3%	11.5%	3.8%	26

F3g: 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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.9	27.3%	42.4%	24.2%	6.1%	33
Middle class	4.1	34.5%	43.6%	21.8%	-	55
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	33.3%	43.3%	23.3%		30

F3h: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	29.9%	44.4%	24.8%	0.9%	117

F3h: 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	37.0%	33.3%	29.6%		27
Female	4.1	27.4%	51.2%	21.4%	•	84

F3h: 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)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	28.6%	42.9%	27.5%	1.1%	91
Students of Color	4.2	34.6%	50.0%	15.4%		26

F3h: 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	3.9	24.2%	45.5%	27.3%	3.0%	33
Middle class	4.1	29.1%	49.1%	21.8%	-	55
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	37.9%	34.5%	27.6%		29

F3i: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different sexual orientation	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence			2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	22.7%	41.2%	32.8%	2.5%	0.8%	119

F3i: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different sexual orientation	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.8	25.0%	39.3%	28.6%	3.6%	3.6%	28
Female	3.9	22.4%	44.7%	31.8%	1.2%		85

F3i: 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)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	20.4%	40.9%	35.5%	2.2%	1.1%	93
Students of Color	4.0	30.8%	42.3%	23.1%	3.8%		26

F3i: 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	3.6	15.2%	36.4%	42.4%	6.1%		33
Middle class	3.9	21.8%	47.3%	27.3%	1.8%	1.8%	55
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	32.3%	35.5%	32.3%		•	31

F3j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	17.6%	47.1%	34.5%	0.8%	119

F3j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*					
Male	3.9	25.0%	42.9%	32.1%	28
Female	3.8	15.3%	50.6%	34.1%	85

F3j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.8	14.0%	48.4%	36.6%	1.1%	93
Students of Color	4.0	30.8%	42.3%	26.9%		26

F3j: 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	3.5	6.1%	45.5%	45.5%	3.0%	33
Middle class	3.9	20.0%	49.1%	30.9%		55
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	25.8%	45.2%	29.0%		31

F3k: 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)
Total (N)	3.8	22.7%	42.9%	29.4%	4.2%	0.8%	119

F3k: 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	3.8	28.6%	35.7%	25.0%	7.1%	3.6%	28
Female	3.9	21.2%	47.1%	29.4%	2.4%		85

F3k: 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	20.4%	43.0%	30.1%	5.4%	1.1%	93
Students of Color	4.0	30.8%	42.3%	26.9%			26

F3k: 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		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	21.2%	36.4%	39.4%	3.0%		33
Middle class	3.8	21.8%	45.5%	25.5%	7.3%		55
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	25.8%	45.2%	25.8%		3.2%	31

F3I: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different country-of-origin	Mean Rating			3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	28.0%	44.1%	27.1%	0.8%	118

F3I: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different country-of-origin	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*					
Male	4.0	35.7%	32.1%	32.1%	28
Female	4.0	26.2%	50.0%	23.8%	84

F3I: 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	3.9	26.1%	43.5%	29.3%	1.1%	92
Students of Color	4.2	34.6%	46.2%	19.2%		26

F3I: 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	3.8	18.2%	48.5%	30.3%	3.0%	33
Middle class	4.1	31.5%	44.4%	24.1%		54
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	32.3%	38.7%	29.0%		31