North Carolina State University
2015 Campus Climate Survey (Undergraduate Students)
College of Education
Section F: Shaping Attitudes about Diversity
Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

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)
Total (N)	4.2	34.5%	51.7%	13.8%	29

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)
Gender*					
.....Male	3.7	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	6
.....Female	4.3	39.1%	56.5%	4.3%	23

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	4.3	36.4%	54.5%	9.1%	22
.....Students of Color	4.0	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	7

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	3.5	.	50.0%	50.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.3	36.8%	52.6%	10.5%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.5	50.0%	50.0%	.	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 1

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)
Total (N)	4.1	31.0%	51.7%	17.2%	29

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	3.8	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	6
.....Female	4.2	34.8%	52.2%	13.0%	23

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	4.1	31.8%	50.0%	18.2%	22
.....Students of Color	4.1	28.6%	57.1%	14.3%	7

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)
Socioeconomic Background					
.....Poor/Working class	3.5	.	50.0%	50.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.2	31.6%	57.9%	10.5%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	6

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

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	20.7%	65.5%	13.8%	29

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	.	66.7%	33.3%	6
.....Female	4.2	26.1%	65.2%	8.7%	23

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)
Race/Ethnicity					
.....White/Caucasian	4.2	27.3%	63.6%	9.1%	22
.....Students of Color	3.7	.	71.4%	28.6%	7

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	3.8	.	75.0%	25.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.1	21.1%	68.4%	10.5%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 3

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)
Total (N)	3.9	17.9%	57.1%	25.0%	28

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	3.6	.	60.0%	40.0%	5
.....Female	4.0	21.7%	56.5%	21.7%	23

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)
Race/Ethnicity					
.....White/Caucasian	4.0	23.8%	47.6%	28.6%	21
.....Students of Color	3.9	.	85.7%	14.3%	7

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)
Socioeconomic Background					
.....Poor/Working class	3.8	.	75.0%	25.0%	4
.....Middle class	3.9	22.2%	50.0%	27.8%	18
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 4

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)
Total (N)	4.0	17.2%	62.1%	20.7%	29

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	3.5	.	50.0%	50.0%	6
.....Female	4.1	21.7%	65.2%	13.0%	23

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	4.0	22.7%	54.5%	22.7%	22
.....Students of Color	3.9	.	85.7%	14.3%	7

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	4.0	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	4
.....Middle class	3.9	15.8%	57.9%	26.3%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	16.7%	83.3%	.	6

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

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.4	51.7%	37.9%	10.3%	29

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Gender					
.....Male	4.0	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	6
.....Female	4.5	56.5%	39.1%	4.3%	23

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
.....White/Caucasian	4.5	54.5%	36.4%	9.1%	22
.....Students of Color	4.3	42.9%	42.9%	14.3%	7

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*					
.....Poor/Working class	3.5	.	50.0%	50.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.5	52.6%	42.1%	5.3%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.8	83.3%	16.7%	.	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 6

North Carolina State University
2015 Campus Climate Survey (Undergraduate Students)
College of Education
Section F: Shaping Attitudes about Diversity
Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	24.0%	52.0%	20.0%	4.0%	25

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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
.....Male	3.8	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	.	5
.....Female	4.0	25.0%	55.0%	15.0%	5.0%	20

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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
.....White/Caucasian	4.0	27.8%	50.0%	16.7%	5.6%	18
.....Students of Color	3.9	14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	.	7

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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
.....Poor/Working class	3.7	.	66.7%	33.3%	.	3
.....Middle class	4.0	29.4%	47.1%	17.6%	5.9%	17
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	.	5

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 7

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	46.4%	32.1%	14.3%	7.1%	28

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
.....Male	3.5	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	16.7%	6
.....Female	4.4	54.5%	31.8%	9.1%	4.5%	22

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
.....White/Caucasian	4.3	52.4%	28.6%	14.3%	4.8%	21
.....Students of Color	3.9	28.6%	42.9%	14.3%	14.3%	7

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	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	2.8	.	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.3	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	.	18
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.7	66.7%	33.3%	.	.	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 8

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)
Total (N)	4.2	46.4%	32.1%	14.3%	7.1%	28

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)
Gender						
.....Male	3.7	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	6
.....Female	4.3	50.0%	36.4%	9.1%	4.5%	22

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)
Race/Ethnicity						
.....White/Caucasian	4.2	47.6%	33.3%	14.3%	4.8%	21
.....Students of Color	4.0	42.9%	28.6%	14.3%	14.3%	7

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	2.8	.	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.3	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	.	18
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.7	66.7%	33.3%	.	.	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 9

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)
Total (N)	4.2	40.7%	40.7%	18.5%	27

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	4.0	40.0%	20.0%	40.0%	5
.....Female	4.3	40.9%	45.5%	13.6%	22

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	4.3	45.0%	40.0%	15.0%	20
.....Students of Color	4.0	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	7

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	.	50.0%	50.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.4	47.1%	41.2%	11.8%	17
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 10

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	31.0%	41.4%	24.1%	3.4%	29

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
.....Male	3.7	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	.	6
.....Female	4.1	34.8%	43.5%	17.4%	4.3%	23

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
.....White/Caucasian	4.0	31.8%	40.9%	22.7%	4.5%	22
.....Students of Color	4.0	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	.	7

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions 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	3.3	.	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.1	36.8%	36.8%	26.3%	.	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	.	6

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

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	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	24.1%	48.3%	27.6%	29

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	Total (N)
Gender					
.....Male	3.7	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	6
.....Female	4.0	26.1%	52.2%	21.7%	23

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	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
.....White/Caucasian	4.0	27.3%	45.5%	27.3%	22
.....Students of Color	3.9	14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	7

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	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
.....Poor/Working class	3.8	.	75.0%	25.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.0	31.6%	36.8%	31.6%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 12

North Carolina State University
2015 Campus Climate Survey (Undergraduate Students)
College of Education
Section F: Shaping Attitudes about Diversity
Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	31.0%	41.4%	24.1%	3.4%	29

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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
.....Male	3.7	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	.	6
.....Female	4.1	34.8%	43.5%	17.4%	4.3%	23

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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
.....White/Caucasian	4.0	31.8%	40.9%	22.7%	4.5%	22
.....Students of Color	4.0	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	.	7

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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
.....Poor/Working class	3.8	.	75.0%	25.0%	.	4
.....Middle class	3.8	26.3%	36.8%	31.6%	5.3%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.7	66.7%	33.3%	.	.	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 13

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	2: Negative influence	9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Total (N)	5.1	13.0%	4.3%	47.8%	4.3%	30.4%	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	2: Negative influence	9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Gender							
.....Male	4.6	20.0%	.	60.0%	.	20.0%	5
.....Female	5.2	11.1%	5.6%	44.4%	5.6%	33.3%	18

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	2: Negative influence	9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
.....White/Caucasian	4.6	11.8%	5.9%	52.9%	5.9%	23.5%	17
.....Students of Color	6.3	16.7%	.	33.3%	.	50.0%	6

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	2: Negative influence	9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
.....Poor/Working class	6.0	.	.	50.0%	.	50.0%	2
.....Middle class	4.8	13.3%	.	53.3%	6.7%	26.7%	15
.....Upper middle/Upper class	5.5	16.7%	16.7%	33.3%	.	33.3%	6

* 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	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.4	18.8%	6.3%	68.8%	6.3%	16

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)
Gender						
.....Male	3.5	25.0%	.	75.0%	.	4
.....Female	3.3	16.7%	8.3%	66.7%	8.3%	12

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)
Race/Ethnicity						
.....White/Caucasian	3.3	15.4%	7.7%	69.2%	7.7%	13
.....Students of Color	3.7	33.3%	.	66.7%	.	3

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	3.0	.	.	100.0%	.	1
.....Middle class	3.3	18.2%	.	72.7%	9.1%	11
.....Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.	4

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

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)
Total (N)	4.2	34.5%	55.2%	3.4%	6.9%	29

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)
Gender						
.....Male	3.7	16.7%	50.0%	16.7%	16.7%	6
.....Female	4.3	39.1%	56.5%	.	4.3%	23

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)
Race/Ethnicity						
.....White/Caucasian	4.2	36.4%	54.5%	4.5%	4.5%	22
.....Students of Color	4.0	28.6%	57.1%	.	14.3%	7

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	3.3	.	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.3	36.8%	57.9%	.	5.3%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.5	50.0%	50.0%	.	.	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 16

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)
Total (N)	4.3	41.4%	44.8%	13.8%	29

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)
Gender					
.....Male	4.0	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	6
.....Female	4.3	43.5%	47.8%	8.7%	23

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	4.3	45.5%	36.4%	18.2%	22
.....Students of Color	4.3	28.6%	71.4%	.	7

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)
Socioeconomic Background*					
.....Poor/Working class	3.8	.	75.0%	25.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.2	31.6%	52.6%	15.8%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	5.0	100.0%	.	.	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 17

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)
Total (N)	4.0	31.0%	34.5%	34.5%	29

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)
Gender*					
.....Male	3.3	16.7%	.	83.3%	6
.....Female	4.1	34.8%	43.5%	21.7%	23

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	4.0	31.8%	31.8%	36.4%	22
.....Students of Color	4.0	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	7

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)
Socioeconomic Background					
.....Poor/Working class	3.5	.	50.0%	50.0%	4
.....Middle class	3.9	26.3%	36.8%	36.8%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.5	66.7%	16.7%	16.7%	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 18

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)
Total (N)	4.0	27.6%	48.3%	24.1%	29

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	3.7	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	6
.....Female	4.1	30.4%	52.2%	17.4%	23

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)
Race/Ethnicity					
.....White/Caucasian	4.0	27.3%	45.5%	27.3%	22
.....Students of Color	4.1	28.6%	57.1%	14.3%	7

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)
Socioeconomic Background*					
.....Poor/Working class	3.8	.	75.0%	25.0%	4
.....Middle class	3.8	15.8%	52.6%	31.6%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.8	83.3%	16.7%	.	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 19

North Carolina State University
2015 Campus Climate Survey (Undergraduate Students)
College of Education
Section F: Shaping Attitudes about Diversity
Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

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)
Total (N)	4.3	41.4%	48.3%	10.3%	29

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	4.2	50.0%	16.7%	33.3%	6
.....Female	4.3	39.1%	56.5%	4.3%	23

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)
Race/Ethnicity					
.....White/Caucasian	4.3	40.9%	50.0%	9.1%	22
.....Students of Color	4.3	42.9%	42.9%	14.3%	7

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	3.5	.	50.0%	50.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.3	36.8%	57.9%	5.3%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.8	83.3%	16.7%	.	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 20

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	41.4%	41.4%	10.3%	3.4%	3.4%	29

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender							
.....Male	3.8	50.0%	16.7%	16.7%	.	16.7%	6
.....Female	4.2	39.1%	47.8%	8.7%	4.3%	.	23

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
.....White/Caucasian	4.2	40.9%	40.9%	13.6%	4.5%	.	22
.....Students of Color	4.0	42.9%	42.9%	.	.	14.3%	7

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	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	2.5	.	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.3	36.8%	52.6%	10.5%	.	.	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.8	83.3%	16.7%	.	.	.	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 21

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)
Total (N)	4.3	48.3%	37.9%	10.3%	3.4%	29

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)
Gender*						
.....Male	3.7	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	6
.....Female	4.5	52.2%	43.5%	4.3%	.	23

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)
Race/Ethnicity						
.....White/Caucasian	4.5	59.1%	31.8%	9.1%	.	22
.....Students of Color	3.7	14.3%	57.1%	14.3%	14.3%	7

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	3.5	.	50.0%	50.0%	.	4
.....Middle class	4.3	42.1%	47.4%	5.3%	5.3%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	5.0	100.0%	.	.	.	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 22

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)
Total (N)	4.4	48.3%	41.4%	10.3%	29

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	4.2	50.0%	16.7%	33.3%	6
.....Female	4.4	47.8%	47.8%	4.3%	23

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	4.4	50.0%	40.9%	9.1%	22
.....Students of Color	4.3	42.9%	42.9%	14.3%	7

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	3.5	.	50.0%	50.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.4	42.1%	52.6%	5.3%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	5.0	100.0%	.	.	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 23

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	2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	27.6%	44.8%	20.7%	3.4%	3.4%	29

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	2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender							
.....Male	3.3	.	66.7%	16.7%	.	16.7%	6
.....Female	4.0	34.8%	39.1%	21.7%	4.3%	.	23

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	2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
.....White/Caucasian	4.0	31.8%	36.4%	27.3%	4.5%	.	22
.....Students of Color	3.7	14.3%	71.4%	.	.	14.3%	7

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	2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
.....Poor/Working class	3.0	.	50.0%	25.0%	.	25.0%	4
.....Middle class	3.9	21.1%	52.6%	21.1%	5.3%	.	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.5	66.7%	16.7%	16.7%	.	.	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 24

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)
Total (N)	4.2	27.6%	62.1%	10.3%	29

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)
Gender					
.....Male	4.2	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	6
.....Female	4.2	26.1%	65.2%	8.7%	23

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)
Race/Ethnicity					
.....White/Caucasian	4.1	22.7%	63.6%	13.6%	22
.....Students of Color	4.4	42.9%	57.1%	.	7

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	4.0	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.1	15.8%	73.7%	10.5%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.7	66.7%	33.3%	.	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 25

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)
Total (N)	4.1	31.0%	51.7%	17.2%	29

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	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	6
.....Female	4.2	34.8%	52.2%	13.0%	23

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	4.1	31.8%	50.0%	18.2%	22
.....Students of Color	4.1	28.6%	57.1%	14.3%	7

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)
Socioeconomic Background*					
.....Poor/Working class	3.5	.	50.0%	50.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.1	21.1%	63.2%	15.8%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	4.8	83.3%	16.7%	.	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 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)
Total (N)	4.3	37.9%	51.7%	10.3%	29

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)
Gender					
.....Male	4.0	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	6
.....Female	4.3	39.1%	56.5%	4.3%	23

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	4.3	36.4%	54.5%	9.1%	22
.....Students of Color	4.3	42.9%	42.9%	14.3%	7

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	3.5	.	50.0%	50.0%	4
.....Middle class	4.2	26.3%	68.4%	5.3%	19
.....Upper middle/Upper class	5.0	100.0%	.	.	6

* Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group
Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Page 27