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	15.4%	54.0%	27.0%	2.1%	1.4%	285

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	3.8	14.0%	51.7%	31.5%	1.7%	1.1%	178
Female	4.0	19.8%	60.4%	16.5%	2.2%	1.1%	91

F1a: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interacation with students in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	15.7%	53.9%	27.9%	1.5%	1.0%	204
Students of Color	3.8	14.8%	54.3%	24.7%	3.7%	2.5%	81

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	3.6	9.8%	56.9%	25.5%	2.0%	5.9%	51
Middle class	3.9	18.7%	52.2%	27.6%	1.5%		134
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	14.4%	55.6%	26.7%	2.2%	1.1%	90

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

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		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	19.3%	55.4%	20.4%	4.3%	0.7%	280

F1b: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students outside class	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.8	17.2%	54.6%	23.6%	4.6%		174
Female	4.1	25.6%	60.0%	11.1%	2.2%	1.1%	90

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	19.3%	51.5%	24.8%	4.0%	0.5%	202
Students of Color	4.0	19.2%	65.4%	9.0%	5.1%	1.3%	78

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	3.7	10.0%	64.0%	18.0%	4.0%	4.0%	50
Middle class	4.0	23.3%	54.1%	19.5%	3.0%		133
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	20.7%	54.0%	20.7%	4.6%		87

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

F1c: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	15.6%	47.5%	33.3%	2.8%	0.7%	282

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)
Gender							
Male	3.7	14.1%	45.2%	37.3%	2.8%	0.6%	177
Female	3.9	20.0%	51.1%	26.7%	2.2%		90

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	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	16.3%	46.8%	33.0%	3.9%		203
Students of Color	3.7	13.9%	49.4%	34.2%		2.5%	79

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	11.5%	38.5%	38.5%	7.7%	3.8%	52
Middle class	3.8	17.6%	49.6%	31.3%	1.5%		131
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	13.5%	51.7%	32.6%	2.2%		89

^{*} 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	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	15.9%	43.9%	38.3%	1.5%	0.4%	264

F1d: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.7	12.8%	44.5%	41.5%	1.2%	164
Female	3.9	24.1%	42.5%	32.2%	1.1%	87

F1d: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty outside class	Mean	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.7	15.4%	41.5%	42.0%	1.1%		188
Students of Color	3.8	17.1%	50.0%	28.9%	2.6%	1.3%	76

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	3.5	11.4%	40.9%	40.9%	4.5%	2.3%	44
Middle class	3.8	18.4%	45.6%	36.0%			125
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	15.3%	44.7%	37.6%	2.4%		85

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

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence			1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.4	8.5%	33.2%	53.1%	3.7%	1.5%	271

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.4	7.2%	32.9%	55.7%	3.6%	0.6%	167
Female	3.5	11.4%	35.2%	50.0%	2.3%	1.1%	88

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	9.8%	32.5%	53.6%	3.1%	1.0%	194
Students of Color	3.4	5.2%	35.1%	51.9%	5.2%	2.6%	77

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	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	3.2	4.3%	28.3%	58.7%	4.3%	4.3%	46
Middle class	3.5	10.9%	35.2%	48.4%	4.7%	0.8%	128
Upper middle/Upper class	3.4	5.7%	33.3%	57.5%	2.3%	1.1%	87

^{*} 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	wean		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	35.8%	47.2%	16.0%	1.1%	282

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	4.2	34.9%	46.9%	17.1%	1.1%	175
Female	4.3	40.7%	49.5%	8.8%	1.1%	91

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	4.1	34.2%	47.5%	17.3%	1.0%	202

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	28.6%	46.9%	22.4%	2.0%	49
Middle class	4.3	39.6%	48.5%	11.2%	0.7%	134
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	34.4%	46.7%	17.8%	1.1%	90

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

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Living in residence halls			4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	22.1%	41.4%	31.9%	4.2%	0.4%	263

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	3.8	23.9%	38.0%	33.7%	4.3%	163
Female	3.9	21.2%	49.4%	25.9%	3.5%	85

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Living in residence halls	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	21.8%	41.0%	32.4%	4.8%		188
Students of Color	3.8	22.7%	42.7%	30.7%	2.7%	1.3%	75

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	22.2%	31.1%	40.0%	4.4%	2.2%	45
Middle class	3.9	24.2%	39.5%	33.9%	2.4%		124
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	18.4%	52.9%	24.1%	4.6%		87

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

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	22.4%	49.0%	23.9%	3.9%	0.8%	259

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	3.8	20.5%	46.0%	29.2%	3.1%	1.2%	161
Female	4.0	24.4%	59.3%	11.6%	4.7%		86

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	3.8	20.7%	46.7%	28.3%	3.8%	0.5%	184
Students of Color	4.0	26.7%	54.7%	13.3%	4.0%	1.3%	75

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	3.6	15.9%	43.2%	27.3%	11.4%	2.3%	44
Middle class	3.9	24.4%	48.8%	23.6%	2.4%	0.8%	123
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	21.4%	53.6%	22.6%	2.4%		84

^{*} 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		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	17.1%	48.7%	30.0%	3.0%	1.1%	263

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)
Gender*							
Male	3.7	11.3%	47.5%	37.5%	2.5%	1.3%	160
Female	4.0	26.7%	54.4%	15.6%	3.3%		90

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)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.7	15.1%	47.8%	32.8%	3.2%	1.1%	186
Students of Color	3.9	22.1%	50.6%	23.4%	2.6%	1.3%	77

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		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*							
Poor/Working class	3.5	11.4%	43.2%	31.8%	9.1%	4.5%	44
Middle class	3.9	21.4%	49.2%	26.2%	2.4%	0.8%	126
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	12.9%	52.9%	32.9%	1.2%		85

^{*} 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			3: Neither positive nor negative influence		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	12.3%	45.6%	39.5%	1.9%	0.8%	261

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	8.5%	44.5%	44.5%	1.8%	0.6%	164
Female	3.9	21.2%	48.2%	28.2%	2.4%		85

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%	42.7%	42.7%	2.2%		185
Students of Color	3.7	11.8%	52.6%	31.6%	1.3%	2.6%	76

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		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*							
Poor/Working class	3.4	6.8%	38.6%	43.2%	6.8%	4.5%	44
Middle class	3.7	13.5%	44.4%	40.5%	1.6%		126
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	12.2%	51.2%	36.6%			82

^{*} 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		5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	13.8%	49.6%	35.1%	1.1%	0.4%	268

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.7	10.8%	50.0%	38.0%	1.2%	166
Female	3.9	21.8%	49.4%	27.6%	1.1%	87

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)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	15.0%	46.1%	37.8%	1.0%		193
Students of Color	3.8	10.7%	58.7%	28.0%	1.3%	1.3%	75

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	3.6	10.6%	51.1%	31.9%	4.3%	2.1%	47
Middle class	3.8	14.3%	50.8%	34.1%	0.8%		126
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	13.8%	49.4%	36.8%			87

^{*} 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				3: Neither positive nor negative influence		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.6	13.6%	42.5%	38.5%	3.7%	1.8%	273

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	3.6	10.2%	43.1%	41.3%	4.2%	1.2%	167
Female	3.8	20.9%	45.1%	31.9%	2.2%		91

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	3.6	12.7%	39.1%	43.1%	3.0%	2.0%	197
Students of Color	3.8	15.8%	51.3%	26.3%	5.3%	1.3%	76

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	3.4	10.2%	38.8%	38.8%	6.1%	6.1%	49
Middle class	3.7	15.5%	44.2%	35.7%	3.1%	1.6%	129
Upper middle/Upper class	3.6	11.6%	43.0%	41.9%	3.5%		86

F1m: Influence on thinking about diversity: Family/home town experiences	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	20.1%	43.5%	25.4%	8.8%	2.1%	283

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	18.2%	40.9%	30.7%	8.5%	1.7%	176
Female	3.8	23.1%	48.4%	15.4%	11.0%	2.2%	91

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	3.7	17.8%	43.1%	27.2%	10.4%	1.5%	202
Students of Color	3.8	25.9%	44.4%	21.0%	4.9%	3.7%	81

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	_	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.5	16.0%	36.0%	30.0%	14.0%	4.0%	50
Middle class	3.8	25.4%	40.3%	25.4%	6.7%	2.2%	134
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	14.4%	52.2%	22.2%	10.0%	1.1%	90

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who were assigned a Common Reading)	Mean Rating				2: Negative influence	1: Very negative	9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Total (N)	5.0	4.2%	18.0%	43.7%	2.3%	1.5%	30.3%	261

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	4.9	3.1%	17.9%	48.1%	2.5%	0.6%	27.8%	162
Female	5.1	7.0%	18.6%	38.4%	2.3%	2.3%	31.4%	86

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		9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity								
White/Caucasian	4.9	4.9%	17.4%	44.6%	2.7%	2.2%	28.3%	184
Students of Color	5.3	2.6%	19.5%	41.6%	1.3%		35.1%	77

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	5.4	2.4%	19.0%	40.5%	2.4%		35.7%	42
Middle class	4.9	6.3%	16.7%	42.9%	3.2%	2.4%	28.6%	126
Upper middle/Upper class	5.1	2.3%	20.5%	44.3%	1.1%	1.1%	30.7%	88

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

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who read book)	Mean Rating				2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.3	6.0%	25.8%	62.6%	3.3%	2.2%	182

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	3.3	4.3%	24.8%	66.7%	3.4%	0.9%	117
Female	3.4	10.2%	27.1%	55.9%	3.4%	3.4%	59

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		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.3	6.8%	24.2%	62.1%	3.8%	3.0%	132
Students of Color	3.4	4.0%	30.0%	64.0%	2.0%		50

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)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.3	3.7%	29.6%	63.0%	3.7%		27
Middle class	3.3	8.9%	23.3%	60.0%	4.4%	3.3%	90
Upper middle/Upper class	3.3	3.3%	29.5%	63.9%	1.6%	1.6%	61

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

of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
F3a: Influence					

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	3.7	17.3%	38.0%	41.9%	1.7%	1.1%	179
Female	4.0	25.8%	53.9%	19.1%	1.1%		89

F3a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends	Mean	5: Very positive influence			2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.7	19.7%	38.4%	38.9%	2.0%	1.0%	203
Students of Color	3.8	19.8%	51.9%	24.7%		3.7%	81

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	3.7	17.3%	42.3%	36.5%		3.8%	52
Middle class	3.8	21.5%	39.3%	37.0%	1.5%	0.7%	135
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	18.9%	47.8%	28.9%	2.2%	2.2%	90

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	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	25.0%	42.3%	29.6%	1.8%	1.4%	284

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	3.8	21.2%	42.5%	34.1%	1.1%	1.1%	179
Female	4.1	32.6%	44.9%	19.1%	3.4%		89

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)
Race/Ethnicity*							
White/Caucasian	3.8	24.6%	38.4%	34.5%	1.0%	1.5%	203
Students of Color	4.0	25.9%	51.9%	17.3%	3.7%	1.2%	81

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%	40.4%	32.7%	1.9%	3.8%	52
Middle class	3.9	27.4%	39.3%	31.1%	0.7%	1.5%	135
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	24.4%	50.0%	22.2%	3.3%		90

F3c: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of notifying others about offensive language	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	14.5%	46.8%	35.1%	1.1%	2.5%	282

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	3.6	11.8%	43.3%	41.0%	1.7%	2.2%	178
Female	3.9	19.1%	58.4%	21.3%		1.1%	89

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	3.7	14.9%	45.0%	36.6%	1.5%	2.0%	202
Students of Color	3.7	13.8%	51.3%	31.3%		3.8%	80

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	11.5%	40.4%	42.3%		5.8%	52
Middle class	3.8	17.0%	46.7%	33.3%	1.5%	1.5%	135
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	12.4%	53.9%	31.5%		2.2%	89

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)	3.8	17.3%	47.0%	33.6%	1.8%	0.4%	283

F3d: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of initiating conversation with student of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.7	15.2%	46.1%	37.1%	1.7%	178
Female	4.0	23.6%	52.8%	21.3%	2.2%	89

F3d: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of initiating conversation with student of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence				Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	17.8%	45.0%	35.6%	1.5%		202
Students of Color	3.8	16.0%	51.9%	28.4%	2.5%	1.2%	81

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	3.7	21.2%	38.5%	34.6%	3.8%	1.9%	52
Middle class	3.8	16.3%	51.1%	31.1%	1.5%		135
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	16.7%	47.8%	34.4%	1.1%		90

F3e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	25.1%	47.7%	25.1%	1.1%	1.1%	279

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	3.9	24.1%	46.0%	28.2%	0.6%	1.1%	174
Female	4.1	29.2%	52.8%	15.7%	2.2%		89

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	3.9	24.1%	45.7%	28.1%	1.5%	0.5%	199
Students of Color	4.0	27.5%	52.5%	17.5%		2.5%	80

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		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.8	23.5%	45.1%	27.5%		3.9%	51
Middle class	4.0	28.4%	44.8%	24.6%	1.5%	0.7%	134
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	20.5%	55.7%	22.7%	1.1%		88

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean			3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	22.3%	50.0%	25.2%	1.8%	0.7%	278

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Gender*							
Male	3.8	20.1%	47.7%	29.3%	2.3%	0.6%	174
Female	4.1	29.5%	55.7%	14.8%			88

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	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	3.9	20.7%	49.0%	27.8%	2.0%	0.5%	198

F3f: Influence of NCSU: Understanding of diversity	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	19.6%	43.1%	33.3%	2.0%	2.0%	51
Middle class	3.9	23.3%	49.6%	24.1%	2.3%	0.8%	133
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	22.7%	56.8%	19.3%	1.1%		88

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)
Total (N)	4.0	25.8%	47.7%	25.4%	1.1%	279

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.9	23.0%	47.7%	28.2%	1.1%	174
Female	4.2	32.6%	50.6%	16.9%		89

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.9	24.6%	45.7%	29.1%	0.5%	199
					2.5%	

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	19.6%	49.0%	27.5%	3.9%	51
Middle class	4.0	28.4%	47.0%	23.9%	0.7%	134
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	25.0%	51.1%	23.9%		88

^{*} 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			3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	26.2%	46.6%	25.4%	1.1%	0.7%	279

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	4.0	27.0%	43.7%	28.2%	0.6%	0.6%	174
Female	4.1	28.1%	56.2%	14.6%	1.1%		89

F3h: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	25.1%	44.2%	29.6%	0.5%	0.5%	199
Students of Color	4.1	28.8%	52.5%	15.0%	2.5%	1.3%	80

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	27.5%	41.2%	27.5%	2.0%	2.0%	51
Middle class	4.0	28.4%	44.8%	26.1%		0.7%	134
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	22.7%	54.5%	20.5%	2.3%		88

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

interacting with people of different sexual orientation Total (N)	Mean Rating 3.8	influence	influence	influence	Total (N) 279
F3i: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting			3:		

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	19.5%	39.7%	38.5%	1.1%	1.1%	174
Female	4.1	32.6%	42.7%	23.6%	1.1%		89

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	24.0%	34.0%	40.0%	1.5%	0.5%	200
Students of Color	3.9	21.5%	54.4%	20.3%	1.3%	2.5%	79

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	3.7	18.0%	42.0%	36.0%		4.0%	50
Middle class	3.8	23.9%	37.3%	36.6%	1.5%	0.7%	134
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	25.8%	43.8%	28.1%	2.2%		89

F3j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	17.4%	44.1%	37.7%	0.4%	0.4%	281

F3j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.8	14.8%	46.0%	38.6%	0.6%	176
Female	3.9	24.7%	41.6%	33.7%		89

F3j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.8	17.5%	42.0%	40.5%			200
Students of Color	3.8	17.3%	49.4%	30.9%	1.2%	1.2%	81

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	2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	17.6%	45.1%	33.3%	2.0%	2.0%	51
Middle class	3.8	19.3%	40.0%	40.7%			135
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	14.6%	50.6%	34.8%			89

religion Total (N)	Rating 3.9	influence 26.0%					Total (N) 281
F3k: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different	Mean	5: Very positive	4: Positive	3: Neither positive nor negative	2: Negative	1: Very negative	

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	3.9	23.9%	46.0%	29.0%		1.1%	176
Female	4.1	33.7%	47.2%	15.7%	3.4%		89

F3k: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different religion	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence			2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.9	24.0%	44.0%	29.5%	2.0%	0.5%	200
Students of Color	4.1	30.9%	49.4%	17.3%		2.5%	81

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	3.8	23.5%	45.1%	25.5%	2.0%	3.9%	51
Middle class	4.0	28.1%	41.5%	28.9%	0.7%	0.7%	135
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	24.7%	52.8%	20.2%	2.2%		89

F3I: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different country-of-origin	Mean		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	28.0%	48.4%	21.5%	1.4%	0.7%	279

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	27.6%	45.4%	25.9%	1.1%		174
Female	4.1	32.6%	53.9%	10.1%	2.2%	1.1%	89

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	4.0	28.8%	44.9%	24.7%	1.0%	0.5%	198
Students of Color	4.0	25.9%	56.8%	13.6%	2.5%	1.2%	81

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		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.9	28.0%	42.0%	26.0%	2.0%	2.0%	50
Middle class	4.1	28.1%	50.4%	20.7%	0.7%		135
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	28.4%	51.1%	17.0%	2.3%	1.1%	88