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)	3.9	24.6%	53.0%	16.4%	3.8%	2.2%	183

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	3.9	18.5%	63.0%	13.0%	3.7%	1.9%	54
Female	4.0	28.6%	49.6%	16.0%	3.4%	2.5%	119

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	3.9	20.8%	56.9%	16.9%	3.8%	1.5%	130
Students of Color	4.0	34.0%	43.4%	15.1%	3.8%	3.8%	53

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	2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	23.7%	47.5%	20.3%	3.4%	5.1%	59
Middle class	4.0	22.8%	62.0%	11.4%	3.8%		79
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	26.8%	48.8%	19.5%	2.4%	2.4%	41

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)	4.0	27.8%	51.7%	13.3%	6.1%	1.1%	180

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	4.0	22.6%	60.4%	13.2%	1.9%	1.9%	53
Female	4.0	31.6%	47.9%	12.0%	7.7%	0.9%	117

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	3.9	25.0%	53.1%	14.1%	7.0%	0.8%	128
Students of Color	4.1	34.6%	48.1%	11.5%	3.8%	1.9%	52

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	3.9	24.1%	51.7%	15.5%	6.9%	1.7%	58
Middle class	4.1	29.5%	55.1%	12.8%	2.6%		78
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	27.5%	47.5%	12.5%	10.0%	2.5%	40

F1c: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence			2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	31.3%	50.5%	15.9%	1.6%	0.5%	182

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)
Gender							
Male	4.1	31.5%	50.0%	16.7%		1.9%	54
Female	4.2	33.1%	51.7%	12.7%	2.5%		118

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	4.1	29.5%	50.4%	17.8%	1.6%	0.8%	129
Students of Color	4.2	35.8%	50.9%	11.3%	1.9%		53

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	4.0	31.0%	48.3%	15.5%	3.4%	1.7%	58
Middle class	4.2	30.4%	55.7%	13.9%			79
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	31.7%	46.3%	22.0%			41

F1d: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	25.3%	48.8%	24.1%	1.2%	0.6%	170

F1d: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty outside class	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	4.0	24.5%	52.8%	20.8%		1.9%	53
Female	4.0	26.9%	50.0%	21.3%	1.9%		108

F1d: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	23.5%	49.6%	25.2%	0.8%	0.8%	119
Students of Color	4.0	29.4%	47.1%	21.6%	2.0%		51

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	3.9	25.5%	43.6%	27.3%	1.8%	1.8%	55
Middle class	4.1	26.3%	53.9%	19.7%			76
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	20.0%	48.6%	31.4%			35

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	Mean Rating			3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	23.5%	48.6%	24.6%	1.6%	1.6%	183

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	3.9	22.2%	48.1%	27.8%		1.9%	54
Female	4.0	25.2%	48.7%	23.5%	2.5%		119

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	24.6%	49.2%	22.3%	1.5%	2.3%	130
Students of Color	3.9	20.8%	47.2%	30.2%	1.9%		53

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	3.8	16.9%	52.5%	25.4%	1.7%	3.4%	59
Middle class	4.0	32.9%	40.5%	25.3%		1.3%	79
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	14.6%	58.5%	24.4%	2.4%		41

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence			1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.3	42.2%	46.7%	8.3%	2.2%	0.6%	180

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	4.3	36.5%	55.8%	5.8%		1.9%	52
Female	4.3	47.5%	42.4%	6.8%	3.4%		118

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.3	40.3%	48.8%	7.8%	2.3%	0.8%	129
Students of Color	4.3	47.1%	41.2%	9.8%	2.0%		51

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	4.2	35.6%	52.5%	10.2%		1.7%	59
Middle class	4.4	46.8%	46.8%	5.2%	1.3%		77
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	41.5%	41.5%	12.2%	4.9%	-	41

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Living in residence halls	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	21.3%	40.4%	29.8%	7.1%	1.4%	141

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	3.6	7.7%	53.8%	30.8%	5.1%	2.6%	39
Female	3.8	28.0%	35.5%	26.9%	8.6%	1.1%	93

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	3.7	18.8%	41.7%	32.3%	6.3%	1.0%	96
Students of Color	3.8	26.7%	37.8%	24.4%	8.9%	2.2%	45

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		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	19.0%	42.9%	28.6%	9.5%		42
Middle class	3.8	25.8%	39.4%	28.8%	3.0%	3.0%	66
Upper middle/Upper class	3.6	13.8%	41.4%	34.5%	10.3%		29

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating			3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	31.0%	46.2%	18.4%	2.5%	1.9%	158

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)
Gender*							
Male	4.0	27.1%	50.0%	16.7%	4.2%	2.1%	48
Female	4.1	34.7%	47.5%	14.9%	2.0%	1.0%	101

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	3.9	27.0%	48.6%	18.9%	2.7%	2.7%	111
Students of Color	4.2	40.4%	40.4%	17.0%	2.1%		47

F1h: 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	3.9	28.0%	46.0%	22.0%		4.0%	50
Middle class	4.1	34.8%	46.4%	17.4%	1.4%		69
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	25.7%	51.4%	17.1%	5.7%		35

F1i: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus-wide activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence			2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	24.7%	46.4%	24.1%	3.6%	1.2%	166

F1i: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus-wide activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence				Total (N)
Gender*							
Genuei							
Male	3.8	16.7%	54.2%	25.0%	2.1%	2.1%	48

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	3.9	22.8%	50.9%	22.8%	1.8%	1.8%	114
Students of Color	3.9	28.8%	36.5%	26.9%	7.7%	-	52

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			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	21.6%	43.1%	27.5%	3.9%	3.9%	51
Middle class	4.1	28.8%	50.7%	19.2%	1.4%	-	73
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	18.4%	44.7%	31.6%	5.3%	-	38

F1j: Influence on thinking about diversity: College/department activities/events	Mean Rating			3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	19.4%	48.1%	28.1%	3.1%	1.3%	160

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	3.8	14.3%	57.1%	26.5%	2.0%	49

F1j: Influence on thinking about diversity: College/department activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	15.8%	53.5%	26.3%	2.6%	1.8%	114
Students of Color	3.9	28.3%	34.8%	32.6%	4.3%	-	46

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	3.6	16.3%	36.7%	40.8%	2.0%	4.1%	49
Middle class	4.0	23.6%	54.2%	20.8%	1.4%	-	72
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	13.9%	52.8%	27.8%	5.6%		36

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff			4: Positive influence				Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	22.9%	49.1%	26.3%	1.1%	0.6%	175

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.9	22.6%	47.2%	28.3%		1.9%	53
Female	4.0	24.8%	53.1%	20.4%	1.8%		113

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	3.9	22.2%	51.6%	23.8%	1.6%	0.8%	126
Students of Color	3.9	24.5%	42.9%	32.7%			49

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)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	21.4%	41.1%	33.9%	1.8%	1.8%	56
Middle class	4.0	25.0%	53.9%	21.1%			76
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	20.5%	51.3%	28.2%	•		39

F1I: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with/messages from admin			4: Positive influence			1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	22.3%	44.0%	29.7%	2.9%	1.1%	175

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	3.8	22.6%	43.4%	32.1%		1.9%	53
Female	3.9	23.0%	46.0%	27.4%	2.7%	0.9%	113

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	3.8	19.2%	45.6%	30.4%	4.0%	0.8%	125
Students of Color	4.0	30.0%	40.0%	28.0%		2.0%	50

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	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	21.1%	40.4%	29.8%	5.3%	3.5%	57
Middle class	3.9	24.0%	44.0%	32.0%			75
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	23.1%	48.7%	25.6%	2.6%		39

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)	3.7	28.3%	36.1%	18.3%	12.8%	4.4%	180

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	3.7	24.5%	39.6%	18.9%	11.3%	5.7%	53
Female	3.7	30.5%	33.9%	17.8%	14.4%	3.4%	118

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)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.6	24.2%	32.8%	22.7%	14.8%	5.5%	128
Students of Color	4.1	38.5%	44.2%	7.7%	7.7%	1.9%	52

F1m: Influence on thinking about diversity: Family/home town experiences	Mean	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	3.7	25.0%	41.1%	19.6%	10.7%	3.6%	56
Middle class	3.8	27.8%	39.2%	16.5%	15.2%	1.3%	79
Upper middle/Upper class	3.5	29.3%	26.8%	22.0%	9.8%	12.2%	41

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who were assigned a Common Reading)	Mean Rating			3: Neither positive nor negative influence			9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.7	6.7%	24.8%	40.9%	3.4%	1.3%	22.8%	149

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)
Gender								
Male	4.4	4.4%	26.7%	46.7%	2.2%	2.2%	17.8%	45
Female	4.7	8.3%	25.0%	39.6%	4.2%	1.0%	21.9%	96

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	2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity								
White/Caucasian	4.7	5.8%	25.0%	39.4%	4.8%	1.9%	23.1%	104
Students of Color	4.8	8.9%	24.4%	44.4%			22.2%	45

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	5.9	11.6%	18.6%	25.6%	2.3%		41.9%	43
Middle class	3.9	3.0%	28.4%	53.7%	3.0%	1.5%	10.4%	67
Upper middle/Upper class	4.8	8.1%	24.3%	35.1%	5.4%	2.7%	24.3%	37

* 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				Total (N)
Total (N)	3.4	8.7%	32.2%	53.0%	4.3%	1.7%	115

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	5.4%	32.4%	56.8%	2.7%	2.7%	37

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	7.5%	32.5%	51.3%	6.3%	2.5%	80
Students of Color	3.5	11.4%	31.4%	57.1%			35

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		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	20.0%	32.0%	44.0%	4.0%		25
Middle class	3.3	3.3%	31.7%	60.0%	3.3%	1.7%	60
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	10.7%	32.1%	46.4%	7.1%	3.6%	28

F3a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends			4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	36.7%	43.9%	17.2%	1.7%	0.6%	180

F3a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	4.0	29.6%	48.1%	20.4%		1.9%	54
Female	4.3	43.1%	40.5%	14.7%	1.7%		116

F3a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.1	34.4%	43.0%	21.1%	0.8%	0.8%	128
Students of Color	4.3	42.3%	46.2%	7.7%	3.8%		52

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	4.0	31.0%	46.6%	17.2%	3.4%	1.7%	58
Middle class	4.2	39.2%	44.3%	16.5%			79
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	39.0%	39.0%	19.5%	2.4%		41

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)
Total (N)	4.3	44.4%	37.2%	17.8%	0.6%	180

F3b: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of abstaining from using offensive language	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.2	42.6%	31.5%	25.9%		54
Female	4.3	48.3%	38.8%	12.1%	0.9%	116

F3b: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of abstaining from using offensive language	Mean	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.2	42.2%	37.5%	20.3%		128
		50.0%		11.5%	1.9%	52

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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	39.7%	41.4%	19.0%		58
Middle class	4.3	45.6%	34.2%	20.3%		79
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	48.8%	39.0%	9.8%	2.4%	41

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)
Total (N)	4.1	32.8%	45.6%	21.1%	0.6%	180

F3c: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of notifying others about offensive language	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	4.0	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%		54
Female	4.2	34.5%	50.9%	13.8%	0.9%	116

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	28.9%	46.1%	25.0%		128
Students of Color	4.3	42.3%	44.2%	11.5%	1.9%	52

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	4.2	36.2%	44.8%	19.0%		58
Middle class	4.1	30.4%	45.6%	24.1%		79
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	31.7%	46.3%	19.5%	2.4%	41

F3d: 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)	4.1	35.0%	37.8%	26.1%	1.1%	180

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	4.0	33.3%	35.2%	27.8%	3.7%	54
Female	4.1	37.9%	37.9%	24.1%		116

F3d: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of initiating conversation with student of different race/ethnicity	Mean	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	34.4%	35.9%	28.1%	1.6%	128
Students of Color	4.2	36.5%	42.3%	21.2%		52

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	4.1	36.2%	32.8%	31.0%		58
Middle class	4.1	32.9%	41.8%	25.3%	-	79
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	34.1%	39.0%	22.0%	4.9%	41

F3e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	36.3%	43.6%	19.0%	1.1%	179

F3e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	24.5%	52.8%	22.6%		53
Female	4.3	44.0%	38.8%	15.5%	1.7%	116

F3e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	37.8%	39.4%	22.0%	0.8%	127
Students of Color	4.2	32.7%	53.8%	11.5%	1.9%	52

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	4.1	34.5%	41.4%	22.4%	1.7%	58
Middle class	4.2	35.9%	48.7%	15.4%	-	78
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	36.6%	39.0%	22.0%	2.4%	41

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean Rating				2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.3	44.1%	39.7%	15.1%	0.6%	0.6%	179

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	4.2	39.6%	43.4%	15.1%		1.9%	53
Female	4.4	49.1%	37.1%	13.8%			116

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.2	44.1%	38.6%	15.7%	0.8%	0.8%	127
Students of Color	4.3	44.2%	42.3%	13.5%	-		52

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	4.2	41.4%	37.9%	17.2%	1.7%	1.7%	58
Middle class	4.3	44.9%	39.7%	15.4%			78
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	43.9%	43.9%	12.2%			41

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)	4.2	44.7%	35.8%	19.0%	0.6%	179

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	Total (N)
Gender*					
Male	4.2	45.3%	30.2%	24.5%	53
Female	4.3	47.4%	36.2%	16.4%	116

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)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.2	46.5%	32.3%	20.5%	0.8%	127
Students of Color	4.3	40.4%	44.2%	15.4%		52

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		Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	39.7%	34.5%	24.1%	1.7%	58
Middle class	4.3	42.3%	42.3%	15.4%	-	78
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	53.7%	26.8%	19.5%		41

F3h: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	40.4%	38.2%	20.8%	0.6%	178

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	36.5%	38.5%	25.0%		52
Female	4.3	44.8%	37.1%	17.2%	0.9%	116

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	4.2	43.7%	33.3%	22.2%	0.8%	126
Students of Color	4.2	32.7%	50.0%	17.3%		52

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	4.1	34.5%	39.7%	25.9%		58
Middle class	4.2	41.6%	39.0%	19.5%	-	77
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	43.9%	36.6%	17.1%	2.4%	41

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)	4.1	36.5%	39.9%	21.9%	1.1%	0.6%	178

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	4.0	37.0%	35.2%	24.1%	1.9%	1.9%	54
Female	4.2	37.7%	43.9%	18.4%			114

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	4.1	35.4%	38.6%	24.4%	0.8%	0.8%	127
Students of Color	4.2	39.2%	43.1%	15.7%	2.0%		51

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	4.0	32.8%	34.5%	31.0%		1.7%	58
Middle class	4.2	38.0%	41.8%	19.0%	1.3%		79
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	38.5%	43.6%	15.4%	2.6%		39

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)	4.0	32.2%	40.0%	26.7%	1.1%	180

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	4.0	31.5%	37.0%	29.6%	1.9%	54
Female	4.1	34.5%	41.4%	23.3%	0.9%	116

F3j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	33.6%	36.7%	28.1%	1.6%	128
Students of Color	4.1	28.8%	48.1%	23.1%		52

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	27.6%	43.1%	29.3%		58
Middle class	4.1	35.4%	38.0%	26.6%		79
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	29.3%	41.5%	24.4%	4.9%	41

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)	4.1	38.3%	40.0%	20.0%	1.1%	0.6%	180

F3k: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different religion	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	4.0	31.5%	38.9%	27.8%	1.9%		54
Female	4.3	44.0%	40.5%	14.7%		0.9%	116

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	39.1%	35.9%	23.4%	1.6%		128
Students of Color	4.2	36.5%	50.0%	11.5%		1.9%	52

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	4.0	34.5%	39.7%	22.4%	1.7%	1.7%	58
Middle class	4.2	39.2%	41.8%	19.0%			79
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	39.0%	39.0%	19.5%	2.4%		41

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)	4.2	41.1%	40.0%	17.8%	0.6%	0.6%	180

F3I: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different country-of-origin	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence			Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	35.2%	38.9%	25.9%		54

F3I: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different country-of-origin	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.2	42.2%	37.5%	19.5%		0.8%	128
Students of Color	4.2	38.5%	46.2%	13.5%	1.9%	-	52

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	4.0	36.2%	36.2%	24.1%	1.7%	1.7%	58
Middle class	4.3	43.0%	41.8%	15.2%			79
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	41.5%	43.9%	14.6%			41