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	25.5%	66.0%	8.5%	47

F1a: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interacation with students in class	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Gender					
Male	4.4	38.9%	61.1%		18
Female	4.0	17.9%	67.9%	14.3%	28

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	29.0%	67.7%	3.2%	31
Students of Color	4.0	18.8%	62.5%	18.8%	16

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	4.2	27.3%	63.6%	9.1%	11
Middle class	4.2	27.3%	63.6%	9.1%	22
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	15.4%	76.9%	7.7%	13

 $^{^{\}star}$ 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	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.3	34.0%	61.7%	4.3%	47

F1b: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students outside class	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Gender					
Male	4.4	44.4%	55.6%		18
Female	4.2	28.6%	64.3%	7.1%	28

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	4.2	29.0%	64.5%	6.5%	31
Students of Color	4.4	43.8%	56.3%		16

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	4.5	45.5%	54.5%		11
Middle class	4.3	36.4%	59.1%	4.5%	22
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	15.4%	76.9%	7.7%	13

^{*} 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	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	32.6%	47.8%	19.6%	46

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	4.3	41.2%	47.1%	11.8%	17
Female	4.0	28.6%	46.4%	25.0%	28

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	40.0%	43.3%	16.7%	30
Students of Color	3.9	18.8%	56.3%	25.0%	16

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	4.1	27.3%	54.5%	18.2%	11
Middle class	4.2	38.1%	42.9%	19.0%	21
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	23.1%	53.8%	23.1%	13

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

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)	4.1	32.6%	48.8%	18.6%	43

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)
Gender					
Male	4.3	38.9%	55.6%	5.6%	18
Female	4.0	29.2%	41.7%	29.2%	24

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	4.2	35.7%	50.0%	14.3%	28
Students of Color	4.0	26.7%	46.7%	26.7%	15

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	4.0	27.3%	45.5%	27.3%	11
Middle class	4.3	40.0%	45.0%	15.0%	20
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	18.2%	63.6%	18.2%	11

^{*} 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	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	25.0%	45.8%	27.1%	2.1%	48

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)
Gender						
Male	4.1	33.3%	44.4%	22.2%		18
Female	3.8	20.7%	48.3%	27.6%	3.4%	29

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)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	29.0%	38.7%	32.3%		31
Students of Color	3.8	17.6%	58.8%	17.6%	5.9%	17

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	4.0	27.3%	45.5%	27.3%		11
Middle class	3.8	21.7%	47.8%	26.1%	4.3%	23
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	23.1%	46.2%	30.8%		13

^{*} 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			3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.5	51.1%	44.7%	4.3%	47

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	4.6	55.6%	44.4%		18
Female	4.4	50.0%	42.9%	7.1%	28

F1f: Influence on thinking about diversity: Friendships/acquaintances	wean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*					
		0.4 =0/	00.00/	0.00/	24
White/Caucasian	4.6	64.5%	32.3%	3.2%	31

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	4.3	36.4%	54.5%	9.1%	11
Middle class	4.5	54.5%	40.9%	4.5%	22
Upper middle/Upper class	4.5	53.8%	46.2%		13

^{*} 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	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	21.4%	57.1%	16.7%	4.8%	42

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Living in residence halls	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	_	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.9	17.6%	58.8%	23.5%		17
Female	4.0	24.0%	56.0%	12.0%	8.0%	25

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Living in residence halls	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	28.6%	53.6%	14.3%	3.6%	28
Students of Color	3.7	7.1%	64.3%	21.4%	7.1%	14

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Living in residence halls	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	20.0%	70.0%	10.0%		10
Middle class	3.9	26.3%	42.1%	26.3%	5.3%	19
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	16.7%	66.7%	8.3%	8.3%	12

^{*} 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	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.3	43.2%	45.5%	11.4%	44

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	4.4	44.4%	50.0%	5.6%	18
Female	4.3	44.0%	40.0%	16.0%	25

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)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	4.3	39.3%	46.4%	14.3%	28
Students of Color	4.4	50.0%	43.8%	6.3%	16

F1h: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus orgs/clubs	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	4.5	54.5%	45.5%		11
Middle class	4.3	47.4%	36.8%	15.8%	19
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	30.8%	53.8%	15.4%	13

^{*} 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		3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	34.0%	46.8%	19.1%	47

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	4.3	38.9%	50.0%	11.1%	18
Female	4.1	32.1%	46.4%	21.4%	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	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Courseion	4.2	38.7%	45.2%	16.1%	31
White/Caucasian	4.2	30.7 /0	70.270	10.170	0.

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	4.2	36.4%	45.5%	18.2%	11
Middle class	4.2	36.4%	50.0%	13.6%	22
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	30.8%	46.2%	23.1%	13

^{*} 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		4: Positive influence		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	31.8%	52.3%	13.6%	2.3%	44

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)
Gender						
Male	4.4	41.2%	52.9%	5.9%		17
Female	4.0	26.9%	53.8%	15.4%	3.8%	26

F1j: Influence on thinking about diversity: College/department activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.3	42.9%	42.9%	14.3%		28

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	4.1	18.2%	72.7%	9.1%		11
Middle class	4.1	47.4%	26.3%	21.1%	5.3%	19
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	23.1%	69.2%	7.7%		13

^{*} 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			4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	38.6%	36.4%	25.0%	44

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Gender					
Male	4.4	50.0%	37.5%	12.5%	16
Female	4.0	33.3%	37.0%	29.6%	27

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)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	4.2	46.7%	30.0%	23.3%	30
		21.4%	50.0%	28.6%	14

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	4.1	30.0%	50.0%	20.0%	10
Middle class	4.2	45.0%	25.0%	30.0%	20
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	38.5%	38.5%	23.1%	13

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

F1I: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with/messages from admin				3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	26.7%	44.4%	26.7%	2.2%	45

F1I: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with/messages from admin		5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	23.5%	64.7%	11.8%		17
Female	3.9	29.6%	33.3%	33.3%	3.7%	27

F1I: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with/messages from admin	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	35.7%	39.3%	25.0%		28
Students of Color	3.6	11.8%	52.9%	29.4%	5.9%	17

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	4.0	27.3%	45.5%	27.3%		11
Middle class	4.0	35.0%	40.0%	20.0%	5.0%	20
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	15.4%	46.2%	38.5%		13

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

F1m: Influence on thinking about diversity: Family/home town experiences	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence			2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.7	19.1%	46.8%	21.3%	10.6%	2.1%	47

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	22.2%	50.0%	11.1%	11.1%	5.6%	18
Female	3.8	17.9%	46.4%	28.6%	7.1%		28

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	3.8	22.6%	38.7%	32.3%	6.5%		31
Students of Color	3.6	12.5%	62.5%		18.8%	6.3%	16

F1m: Influence on thinking about diversity: Family/home town experiences	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.4	18.2%	45.5%		27.3%	9.1%	11
Middle class	3.9	22.7%	50.0%	18.2%	9.1%		22
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	15.4%	38.5%	46.2%			13

^{*} 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				2: Negative influence	1: Very negative	9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	6.7%	22.2%	55.6%	2.2%	4.4%	8.9%	45

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)
Gender								
Male	3.7	12.5%	18.8%	56.3%		6.3%	6.3%	16
Female	3.8	3.4%	24.1%	55.2%	3.4%	3.4%	10.3%	29

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	4.0	3.4%	20.7%	58.6%		3.4%	13.8%	29
Students of Color	3.3	12.5%	25.0%	50.0%	6.3%	6.3%		16

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				9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*								
Poor/Working class	3.7	30.0%	30.0%	30.0%		10.0%		10
Middle class	4.3		22.7%	54.5%	4.5%		18.2%	22
Upper middle/Upper class	2.9		8.3%	83.3%		8.3%		12

^{*} 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		4: Positive influence				Total (N)
Total (N)	3.3	7.3%	24.4%	61.0%	2.4%	4.9%	41

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)
Gender							
Male	3.3	13.3%	20.0%	60.0%		6.7%	15
Female	3.2	3.8%	26.9%	61.5%	3.8%	3.8%	26

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who read book)	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.2	4.0%	24.0%	68.0%	4.0%	25

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	3.7	30.0%	30.0%	30.0%		10.0%	10
Middle class	3.2		27.8%	66.7%	5.6%		18
Upper middle/Upper class	2.9		8.3%	83.3%		8.3%	12

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

F3a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends			4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	41.7%	41.7%	14.6%	2.1%	48

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	33.3%	44.4%	22.2%		18
Female	4.3	48.3%	37.9%	10.3%	3.4%	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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.3	45.2%	38.7%	16.1%		31
Students of Color	4.1	35.3%	47.1%	11.8%	5.9%	17

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.4	45.5%	45.5%	9.1%		11
Middle class	4.1	43.5%	34.8%	17.4%	4.3%	23
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	38.5%	46.2%	15.4%		13

^{*} 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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	35.4%	52.1%	8.3%	4.2%	48

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.8	16.7%	61.1%	16.7%	5.6%	18
Female	4.3	48.3%	44.8%	3.4%	3.4%	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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.2	38.7%	48.4%	9.7%	3.2%	31
Students of Color	4.1	29.4%	58.8%	5.9%	5.9%	17

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	36.4%	54.5%		9.1%	11
Middle class	4.1	39.1%	43.5%	13.0%	4.3%	23
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	30.8%	61.5%	7.7%		13

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

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	25.0%	54.2%	18.8%	2.1%	48

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.9	16.7%	61.1%	22.2%		18
Female	4.0	31.0%	48.3%	17.2%	3.4%	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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	22.6%	51.6%	25.8%		31
Students of Color	4.1	29.4%	58.8%	5.9%	5.9%	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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.2	36.4%	45.5%	18.2%		11
Middle class	3.9	21.7%	56.5%	17.4%	4.3%	23
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	23.1%	53.8%	23.1%		13

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

F3d: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of initiating conversation with student of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	18.8%	45.8%	33.3%	2.1%	48

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	22.2%	61.1%	16.7%		18
Female	3.6	17.2%	34.5%	44.8%	3.4%	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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.8	22.6%	35.5%	41.9%		31
Students of Color	3.8	11.8%	64.7%	17.6%	5.9%	17

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.9	18.2%	54.5%	27.3%		11
Middle class	3.8	21.7%	47.8%	26.1%	4.3%	23
Upper middle/Upper class	3.6	15.4%	30.8%	53.8%		13

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

F3e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds			4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	34.8%	54.3%	8.7%	2.2%	46

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)
Gender						
Male	4.1	29.4%	52.9%	17.6%		17
Female	4.3	39.3%	53.6%	3.6%	3.6%	28

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)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.3	35.5%	54.8%	9.7%		31
Students of Color	4.1	33.3%	53.3%	6.7%	6.7%	15

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	4.5	45.5%	54.5%			11
Middle class	4.2	39.1%	47.8%	8.7%	4.3%	23
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%		12

^{*} 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				Total (N)
Total (N)	4.2	29.8%	63.8%	4.3%	2.1%	47

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)
Gender						
Male	4.2	29.4%	64.7%	5.9%		17
Female	4.2	31.0%	62.1%	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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.3	32.3%	64.5%	3.2%		31

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	4.4	36.4%	63.6%			11
Middle class	4.1	30.4%	56.5%	8.7%	4.3%	23
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	23.1%	76.9%			13

^{*} 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		3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.3	40.4%	48.9%	8.5%	2.1%	47

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	4.2	35.3%	47.1%	17.6%		17
Female	4.3	44.8%	48.3%	3.4%	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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.4	45.2%	45.2%	9.7%		31
			56.3%		6.3%	16

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	4.5	45.5%	54.5%			11
Middle class	4.2	39.1%	47.8%	8.7%	4.3%	23
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	38.5%	46.2%	15.4%		13

^{*} 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)	4.1	34.0%	48.9%	14.9%	2.1%	47

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	23.5%	58.8%	17.6%		17
Female	4.2	41.4%	41.4%	13.8%	3.4%	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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.2	35.5%	48.4%	16.1%		31

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.5	45.5%	54.5%			11
Middle class	4.0	30.4%	47.8%	17.4%	4.3%	23
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	30.8%	46.2%	23.1%		13

^{*} 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	M ean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	34.0%	44.7%	19.1%	2.1%	47

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	29.4%	41.2%	29.4%		17
Female	4.1	37.9%	44.8%	13.8%	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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.2	35.5%	45.2%	19.4%		31
Students of Color	3.9	31.3%	43.8%	18.8%	6.3%	16

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.3	45.5%	36.4%	18.2%		11
Middle class	4.1	39.1%	39.1%	17.4%	4.3%	23
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	15.4%	61.5%	23.1%		13

^{*} 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		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	27.7%	48.9%	21.3%	2.1%	47

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.1	29.4%	47.1%	23.5%		17
Female	4.0	27.6%	48.3%	20.7%	3.4%	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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.1	32.3%	45.2%	22.6%		31
Students of Color	3.8	18.8%	56.3%	18.8%	6.3%	16

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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.4	36.4%	63.6%			11
Middle class	4.0	30.4%	43.5%	21.7%	4.3%	23
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	15.4%	46.2%	38.5%		13

^{*} 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			2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	31.9%	51.1%	12.8%	2.1%	2.1%	47

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	4.2	35.3%	47.1%	17.6%			17
Female	4.0	31.0%	51.7%	10.3%	3.4%	3.4%	29

F3k: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different religion	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence		1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	4.2	38.7%	45.2%	16.1%			31
Students of Color	3.8	18.8%	62.5%	6.3%	6.3%	6.3%	16

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	4.4	36.4%	63.6%				11
Middle class	4.0	39.1%	34.8%	17.4%	4.3%	4.3%	23
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	15.4%	69.2%	15.4%			13

^{*} 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		4: Positive influence			Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	31.9%	55.3%	10.6%	2.1%	47

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)
Gender						
Male	4.1	29.4%	52.9%	17.6%		17
Female	4.2	34.5%	55.2%	6.9%	3.4%	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	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.3	38.7%	51.6%	9.7%		31
		18.8%	62.5%	12.5%	6.3%	16

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	4.4	36.4%	63.6%			11
Middle class	4.1	34.8%	47.8%	13.0%	4.3%	23
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	23.1%	61.5%	15.4%		13

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