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)
Total (N)	3.9	19.3%	55.3%	23.7%	1.8%	114

F1a: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interacation with students in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.8	14.6%	56.3%	27.1%	2.1%	48
Female	4.0	23.8%	57.1%	17.5%	1.6%	63

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	19.1%	56.2%	22.5%	2.2%	89
Students of Color	3.9	20.0%	52.0%	28.0%		25

F1a: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interacation with students in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*						
Poor/Working class	3.5	10.5%	36.8%	47.4%	5.3%	19
Middle class	4.1	20.8%	66.0%	13.2%		53
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	22.5%	50.0%	25.0%	2.5%	40

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star}$  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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	22.1%	59.3%	15.9%	2.7%	113

F1b: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with students outside class	Mean	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.9	17.0%	57.4%	21.3%	4.3%	47
Female	4.2	27.0%	63.5%	7.9%	1.6%	63

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%	58.0%	19.3%	3.4%	88
Students of Color	4.3	32.0%	64.0%	4.0%		25

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	3.9	21.1%	52.6%	26.3%		19
Middle class	4.0	18.9%	69.8%	7.5%	3.8%	53
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	27.5%	50.0%	20.0%	2.5%	40

<sup>\*</sup> 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	<b>M</b> ean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	21.1%	52.6%	21.9%	4.4%	114

F1c: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty in class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	3.7	16.7%	47.9%	27.1%	8.3%	48
Female	4.1	25.4%	58.7%	14.3%	1.6%	63

F1c: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty in class	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.9	19.1%	52.8%	22.5%	5.6%	89
Students of Color	4.1	28.0%	52.0%	20.0%		25

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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background*						
Poor/Working class	3.6	21.1%	26.3%	42.1%	10.5%	19
Middle class	4.0	22.6%	58.5%	18.9%		53
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	20.0%	57.5%	15.0%	7.5%	40

<sup>\*</sup> 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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	21.0%	50.5%	26.7%	1.9%	105

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	3.8	16.3%	46.5%	34.9%	2.3%	43
Female	4.1	25.4%	55.9%	16.9%	1.7%	59

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	3.9	20.7%	46.3%	30.5%	2.4%	82
Students of Color	4.1	21.7%	65.2%	13.0%		23

F1d: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interaction with faculty outside class	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	25.0%	37.5%	31.3%	6.3%	16
Middle class	3.9	19.2%	53.8%	26.9%		52
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	22.9%	51.4%	22.9%	2.9%	35

<sup>\*</sup> 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				Total (N)
Total (N)	3.6	11.2%	44.0%	41.4%	2.6%	0.9%	116

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.6	6.3%	50.0%	41.7%	2.1%		48
Female	3.7	15.4%	41.5%	38.5%	3.1%	1.5%	65

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	3.6	12.2%	41.1%	43.3%	2.2%	1.1%	90
Students of Color	3.7	7.7%	53.8%	34.6%	3.8%		26

F1e: Influence on thinking about diversity: Course materials	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	1: Very negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.5	10.0%	30.0%	55.0%	5.0%		20
Middle class	3.7	9.3%	51.9%	37.0%	1.9%		54
Upper middle/Upper class	3.7	15.0%	42.5%	37.5%	2.5%	2.5%	40

<sup>\*</sup> 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		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.3	40.0%	48.7%	10.4%	0.9%	115

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	40.4%	46.8%	10.6%	2.1%	47
Female	4.3	41.5%	49.2%	9.2%		65

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)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.2	34.8%	51.7%	12.4%	1.1%	89
	4.5	57.7%	38.5%	3.8%		26

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	4.3	45.0%	40.0%	10.0%	5.0%	20
Middle class	4.3	37.7%	56.6%	5.7%		53
Upper middle/Upper class	4.3	42.5%	42.5%	15.0%		40

<sup>\*</sup> 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		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	22.5%	41.6%	25.8%	9.0%	1.1%	89

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	3.7	27.0%	35.1%	24.3%	10.8%	2.7%	37
Female	3.8	20.4%	46.9%	24.5%	8.2%		49

F1g: Influence on thinking about diversity: Living in residence halls	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.7	21.4%	42.9%	25.7%	8.6%	1.4%	70
Students of Color	3.8	26.3%	36.8%	26.3%	10.5%		19

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	3.8	25.0%	33.3%	33.3%	8.3%		12
Middle class	3.7	21.3%	44.7%	23.4%	8.5%	2.1%	47
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	21.4%	42.9%	25.0%	10.7%		28

<sup>\*</sup> 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)	4.1	27.6%	53.3%	19.0%	105

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	23.8%	54.8%	21.4%	42
Female	4.2	31.7%	53.3%	15.0%	60

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	4.1	25.9%	54.3%	19.8%	81
Students of Color	4.2	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	24

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	4.2	35.3%	47.1%	17.6%	17
Middle class	4.0	21.2%	57.7%	21.2%	52
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	35.3%	50.0%	14.7%	34

<sup>\*</sup> 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	5: Very positive influence		3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	19.3%	57.8%	22.0%	0.9%	109

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	4.0	16.3%	65.1%	18.6%		43
Female	4.0	22.2%	54.0%	22.2%	1.6%	63

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	3.9	16.9%	59.0%	22.9%	1.2%	83
Students of Color	4.1	26.9%	53.8%	19.2%		26

F1i: Influence on thinking about diversity: Campus-wide activities/events	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.9	22.2%	44.4%	33.3%		18
Middle class	4.0	17.3%	67.3%	15.4%		52
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	21.1%	52.6%	23.7%	2.6%	38

<sup>\*</sup> 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		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	18.7%	52.3%	29.0%	107

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	13.6%	56.8%	29.5%	44
Female	4.0	23.3%	51.7%	25.0%	60

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*					
race, Ethinolty					
White/Caucasian	3.8	15.9%	47.6%	36.6%	82

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	4.1	31.3%	43.8%	25.0%	16
Middle class	4.0	19.2%	57.7%	23.1%	52
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	13.5%	51.4%	35.1%	37

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff			4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	18.8%	48.2%	32.1%	0.9%	112

F1k: Influence on thinking about diversity: Interactions with staff	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.8	15.2%	45.7%	39.1%		46
Female	4.0	22.2%	52.4%	23.8%	1.6%	63

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	3.8	16.1%	48.3%	34.5%	1.1%	87
Students of Color	4.0	28.0%	48.0%	24.0%		25

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	22.2%	33.3%	44.4%		18
Middle class	3.9	17.3%	57.7%	25.0%		52
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	20.0%	45.0%	32.5%	2.5%	40

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

### **North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Undergraduate Students) Poole College of Management Section F: Shaping Attitudes about Diversity**

### **Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile**

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)	3.8	21.2%	48.7%	25.7%	1.8%	2.7%	113

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	21.7%	41.3%	32.6%	2.2%	2.2%	46
Female	3.9	21.9%	56.3%	17.2%	1.6%	3.1%	64

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	18.4%	50.6%	27.6%	1.1%	2.3%	87
Students of Color	3.9	30.8%	42.3%	19.2%	3.8%	3.8%	26

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	3.5	15.8%	31.6%	42.1%	5.3%	5.3%	19
Middle class	4.1	23.1%	59.6%	17.3%			52
Upper middle/Upper class	3.8	22.5%	45.0%	27.5%		5.0%	40

<sup>\*</sup> 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		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	26.3%	43.9%	21.9%	7.0%	0.9%	114

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%	42.2%	20.0%	13.3%	2.2%	45
Female	4.0	30.3%	47.0%	19.7%	3.0%		66

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	20.5%	43.2%	26.1%	9.1%	1.1%	88
Students of Color	4.4	46.2%	46.2%	7.7%			26

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	3.9	42.1%	21.1%	26.3%	10.5%	19
Middle class	3.9	16.7%	61.1%	16.7%	5.6%	54
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	33.3%	33.3%	28.2%	5.1%	39

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

### North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Undergraduate Students) Poole College of Management Section F: Shaping Attitudes about Diversity

### Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

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			2: Negative influence	1: Very negative	9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	5.4%	25.8%	47.3%	5.4%	3.2%	12.9%	93

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	4.2	7.5%	27.5%	37.5%	7.5%	5.0%	15.0%	40
Female	4.0	4.0%	26.0%	54.0%	2.0%	2.0%	12.0%	50

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	4.0	5.5%	21.9%	49.3%	5.5%	4.1%	13.7%	73
Students of Color	4.1	5.0%	40.0%	40.0%	5.0%		10.0%	20

F2: Extent to which Common Reading contrib to appreciation/awareness of diversity (among those who were assigned a Common Reading)	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence		9: Did not read the book for my year	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background								
Poor/Working class	3.3		33.3%	58.3%	8.3%			12
Middle class	4.3	2.1%	29.8%	44.7%	4.3%	2.1%	17.0%	47
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	11.8%	17.6%	47.1%	5.9%	5.9%	11.8%	34

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

### North Carolina State University 2015 Campus Climate Survey (Undergraduate Students) Poole College of Management

### Section F: Shaping Attitudes about Diversity Tables of Results by Student Demographic Profile

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	6.2%	29.6%	54.3%	6.2%	3.7%	81

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	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Gender							
Male	3.3	8.8%	32.4%	44.1%	8.8%	5.9%	34
Iviaie	5.5	0.070	JZ.7/0	1 1.1 70	0.070	0.070	• •

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		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity							
White/Caucasian	3.2	6.3%	25.4%	57.1%	6.3%	4.8%	63
vviiite/Caucasiaii	0.2	0.070	20.170	0,0	0.070		

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		33.3%	58.3%	8.3%		12
Middle class	3.3	2.6%	35.9%	53.8%	5.1%	2.6%	39
Upper middle/Upper class	3.3	13.3%	20.0%	53.3%	6.7%	6.7%	30

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

F3a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends			4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	25.0%	46.6%	26.7%	1.7%	116

F3a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.8	18.8%	47.9%	31.3%	2.1%	48
Female	4.1	30.8%	46.2%	21.5%	1.5%	65

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	3.8	18.9%	47.8%	31.1%	2.2%	90
Students of Color	4.3	46.2%	42.3%	11.5%		26

F3a: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of discussing diversity topics with friends	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.8	25.0%	35.0%	35.0%	5.0%	20
Middle class	4.0	20.0%	56.4%	23.6%		55
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	32.5%	40.0%	25.0%	2.5%	40

<sup>\*</sup> Statistically significant difference (p<.05) between group Prepared by Office of Institutional Research and Planning

F3b: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of abstaining from using offensive language	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	25.9%	51.7%	20.7%	1.7%	116

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)
Gender*						
Male	3.9	14.6%	62.5%	20.8%	2.1%	48
Female	4.2	35.4%	46.2%	16.9%	1.5%	65

F3b: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of abstaining from using offensive language	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	23.3%	52.2%	22.2%	2.2%	90
Students of Color	4.2	34.6%	50.0%	15.4%		26

F3b: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of abstaining from using offensive language	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.1	30.0%	50.0%	20.0%		20
Middle class	4.0	18.2%	63.6%	16.4%	1.8%	55
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	35.0%	35.0%	27.5%	2.5%	40

<sup>\*</sup> 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	•	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	3.8	18.1%	48.3%	29.3%	4.3%	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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender						
Male	3.7	10.4%	50.0%	35.4%	4.2%	48
Female	3.9	24.6%	47.7%	24.6%	3.1%	65

F3c: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of notifying others about offensive language	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence			Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	3.7	15.6%	46.7%	33.3%	4.4%	90
Students of Color	4.0	26.9%	53.8%	15.4%	3.8%	26

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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	3.6	20.0%	30.0%	40.0%	10.0%	20
Middle class	3.9	14.5%	60.0%	23.6%	1.8%	55
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	22.5%	42.5%	32.5%	2.5%	40

<sup>\*</sup> 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		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	21.7%	52.2%	25.2%	0.9%	115

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)
Gender						
Male	3.9	17.0%	55.3%	27.7%		47
Female	4.0	26.2%	50.8%	21.5%	1.5%	65

F3d: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of initiating conversation with student of different race/ethnicity	Mean	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity*						
White/Caucasian	3.8	15.7%	53.9%	29.2%	1.1%	89
Students of Color	4.3	42.3%	46.2%	11.5%		26

F3d: Influence of NCSU: Likelihood of initiating conversation with student of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	25.0%	45.0%	30.0%		20
Middle class	3.9	18.5%	57.4%	24.1%		54
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	25.0%	47.5%	25.0%	2.5%	40

<sup>\*</sup> 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	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	25.4%	54.4%	17.5%	2.6%	114

F3e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Gender						
Male	4.0	23.9%	54.3%	21.7%		46
Female	4.1	27.7%	55.4%	12.3%	4.6%	65

F3e: Influence of NCSU: Comfort working with students from diverse backgrounds	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	22.5%	57.3%	16.9%	3.4%	89
Students of Color	4.2	36.0%	44.0%	20.0%		25

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	4.0	20.0%	55.0%	25.0%		20
Middle class	4.1	26.4%	56.6%	15.1%	1.9%	53
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	27.5%	50.0%	17.5%	5.0%	40

<sup>\*</sup> 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		3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	24.8%	57.5%	16.8%	0.9%	113

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	4.0	19.6%	58.7%	21.7%		46
Female	4.1	29.7%	57.8%	10.9%	1.6%	64

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	4.0	21.6%	58.0%	19.3%	1.1%	88
VVIIILE/Caucasiaii	4.0	21.070	00.070	10.070	11170	

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	4.0	20.0%	55.0%	25.0%		20
Middle class	4.1	26.4%	58.5%	15.1%		53
Upper middle/Upper class	4.0	25.6%	56.4%	15.4%	2.6%	39

<sup>\*</sup> 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		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	28.1%	57.9%	14.0%	114

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	4.1	26.1%	58.7%	15.2%	46
Female	4.2	30.8%	58.5%	10.8%	65

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)
Race/Ethnicity					
\A/I.: '4 - /O !	1 4 4	23.6%	59.6%	16.9%	89
White/Caucasian	4.1	23.0%	59.0%	10.976	09

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	25.0%	55.0%	20.0%	20
Middle class	4.2	28.3%	60.4%	11.3%	53
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	30.0%	55.0%	15.0%	40

<sup>\*</sup> 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		4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	28.9%	53.5%	15.8%	1.8%	114

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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	4.1	26.1%	58.7%	15.2%		46
Female	4.1	32.3%	52.3%	12.3%	3.1%	65

F3h: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different race/ethnicity	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence		Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity						
White/Caucasian	4.0	23.6%	55.1%	19.1%	2.2%	89
Students of Color	4.4	48.0%	48.0%	4.0%		25

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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%		20
Middle class	4.2	30.2%	54.7%	15.1%		53
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	30.0%	52.5%	12.5%	5.0%	40

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

F3i: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different sexual orientation	Mean Rating		4: Positive influence		2: Negative influence		Total (N)
Total (N)	3.9	23.9%	44.2%	29.2%	1.8%	0.9%	113

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	3.7	19.6%	41.3%	34.8%	2.2%	2.2%	46
Female	4.0	28.1%	48.4%	23.4%			64

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	3.9	21.8%	46.0%	29.9%	1.1%	1.1%	87
Students of Color	4.0	30.8%	38.5%	26.9%	3.8%		26

F3i: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different sexual orientation	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence			Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background							
Poor/Working class	3.7	20.0%	30.0%	45.0%	5.0%		20
Middle class	3.9	23.1%	53.8%	19.2%	1.9%	1.9%	52
Upper middle/Upper class	3.9	27.5%	37.5%	35.0%			40

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

F3j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	24.6%	56.1%	19.3%	114

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	21.7%	52.2%	26.1%	46
Female	4.2	27.7%	60.0%	12.3%	65

F3j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Race/Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	4.0	22.7%	58.0%	19.3%	88
Students of Color	4.1	30.8%	50.0%	19.2%	26

F3j: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people with disabilities	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	3.9	20.0%	45.0%	35.0%	20
Middle class	4.1	24.5%	56.6%	18.9%	53
Upper middle/Upper class	4.2	27.5%	60.0%	12.5%	40

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

F3k: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different religion	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Total (N)	4.0	24.8%	54.9%	20.4%	113

F3k: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different religion	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Gender					
Male	4.0	19.6%	56.5%	23.9%	46
Female	4.1	29.7%	54.7%	15.6%	64

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	4.0	23.0%	54.0%	23.0%	87
Students of Color	4.2	30.8%	57.7%	11.5%	26

F3k: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different religion	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background					
Poor/Working class	3.8	15.8%	52.6%	31.6%	19
Middle class	4.1	26.4%	56.6%	17.0%	53
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	27.5%	52.5%	20.0%	40

<sup>\*</sup> 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					Total (N)
Total (N)	4.1	31.6%	49.1%	16.7%	2.6%	114

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	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Gender*						
Male	4.0	28.3%	45.7%	23.9%	2.2%	46
Female	4.2	35.4%	53.8%	7.7%	3.1%	65

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	28.4%	48.9%	19.3%	3.4%	88
Students of Color	4.3	42.3%	50.0%	7.7%		26

F3I: Influence of NCSU: Comfort interacting with people of different country-of-origin	Mean Rating	5: Very positive influence	4: Positive influence	3: Neither positive nor negative influence	2: Negative influence	Total (N)
Socioeconomic Background						
Poor/Working class	4.0	35.0%	35.0%	25.0%	5.0%	20
Middle class	4.1	30.2%	52.8%	15.1%	1.9%	53
Upper middle/Upper class	4.1	32.5%	50.0%	15.0%	2.5%	40

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