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• This year’s survey was designed to assess the current campus climate of the university

• Results are intended to
  – Provide an overall picture of CSU’s employment experiences and perceptions
  – Further CSU’s commitment to institutional accountability
  – Inform policies, initiatives, and opportunities that will provide an exceptional and equitable work environment
  – Provide a small benchmark for longitudinal data collection and comparison for perceptions of diversity
Climate Survey designed by the Assessment Group for Diversity Issues

Administered via Campus Labs in Fall 2016
- Spanish and hard copy versions available
- 15 minutes to complete
- Anonymous
- Results are reported in aggregate and no identifying information reported (e.g. small cell sizes)
- Email initiation sent by President Frank
- Two week follow-up reminder sent by councils to their employee listserv
### Employee Category Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Category</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th># of CSU Employees</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>2,191</td>
<td>7,224</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Professional</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>3696</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Classified</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Respondents may not have completed the entire survey; therefore, respondent counts will vary depending on the topic/question.*
## Respondent Overview

- 8.9% are not full-time appointment
- 7.2% work off-campus
- Approximately a quarter of respondents each are in their 30s (26%), 40s (23%), and 50s (25%)
  - 14% are 60+
  - 12% are under 30
- 38.4% are a primary caretaker of a minor and/or an adult
- 40% are CSU Alumni

### Employee Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Characteristics</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>CSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>n = 2,191</td>
<td>n = 7,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender, Non-Binary, Self-Identify</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Underrepresentation Status (Race &amp; Ethnicity)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Underrepresented</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Professional (includes RA and postdocs)</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Classified</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Employed at CSU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two years or less</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 years</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more years</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Valid percent reported (excludes missing data)*
Survey Framework

- Workload
- Work Respect
- Leadership
- Search Committee
- Physical Campus Environment
- Diversity in Your Work Environment
- Campus Trainings
- Campus and Department Perceptions
- Personal and Employee Characteristics
### Survey Framework

**Construct** | **Factors** | **#** | **Mean** | **Std. Dev.** | **# of Items** | **Cronbach's Alpha** | **Variance Explained**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
**Workload*** | Work Overload | 2,155 | 3.11 | 1.09 | 5 | 0.95 | 71.40% | 71.40%
 | Time Demands & Expectations | 2,124 | 2.85 | 1.03 | 4 | 0.86 | 10.87% | 10.87%
**Work Respect** |  | 2,049 | 3.79 | 0.98 | 4 | 0.91 | 72.90% | 72.90%
**Leadership** | Executive Leadership | 1,411 | 3.11 | 0.83 | 8 | 0.91 | 46.28% | 56.60%
 | Accountability Standards | 1,672 | 3.03 | 0.88 | 4 | 0.81 | 10.32% | 10.32%
**Physical Environment** |  | 1,884 | 3.72 | 0.72 | 8 | 0.87 | 46.85% | 46.85%
**Campus Perceptions** | CSU | 1,326 | 3.66 | 0.71 | 8 | 0.91 | 10.98% | 59.85%
 | Department/Unit | 1,523 | 3.51 | 0.87 | 8 | 0.93 | 48.87% | 48.87%

*Items worded in support of construct. A higher mean can be interpreted as a more negative response.

**All questions were asked on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree & 5 = Strongly Agree)
• **Work Overload**
  – The amount of work I have to do interferes with the quality I want to maintain  
    (45% Agree, 38% Disagree)
  – My workload is too heavy  
    (39% Agree, 39% Disagree)
  – I don't have time to finish my job  
    (37% Agree, 41% Disagree)
  – I'm rushed in doing my job  
    (43% Agree, 37% Disagree)
  – I feel overburdened in my job  
    (41% Agree, 37% Disagree)

• **Time Demands & Expectations**
  – I am expected to work more than 40 hours a week  
    (40% Agree, 40% Disagree)
  – I feel pressure to be reachable for work purposes throughout the day and evening  
    (40% Agree, 42% Disagree)
  – I have to stay too many extra hours at my job  
    (31% Agree, 46% Disagree)
  – I am expected to put my job ahead of my family or personal life  
    (18% Agree, 60% Disagree)
On average, faculty report significantly higher means for Work Overload and Time Demands & Expectations than Administrative Professional and Staff Classified (effect sizes ($d$) respectively: Work Overload = .42 & .45; Time Demands & Expectations = .65 & .99).

Administrative Professional have significantly higher mean scores for Time Demands & Expectations than Staff Classified ($d = .35$), but Work Overload does not significantly differ.
Work Respect

• My work contribution is appreciated (69% Agreement)
• I am cared about at work (67% Agreement)
• I am treated with respect at work (75% Agreement)
• My supervisor supports me and advocates on my behalf (68% Agreement)
Administrative Professionals have significantly higher mean scores for Respect than Staff Classified or Faculty ($d = .29$ and $d = .31$ respectively)
My employment category is treated with respect by other employment categories
My job type is not treated with the same respect as other jobs at CSU
There are inequities between employment categories
Accountability is different for different employee categories

Percent who Responded Strongly Agree or Agree

- My employment category is treated with respect by other employment categories: 57.6%
- My job type is not treated with the same respect as other jobs at CSU: 61.9%
- There are inequities between employment categories: 68.3%
- Accountability is different for different employee categories: 69.5%

- AP: 35.7%
- SC: 39.6%
- Faculty: 39.2%

- AP: 68.3%
- SC: 69.5%
- Faculty: 73.6%

- AP: 63.0%
- SC: 66.7%
- Faculty: 74.7%
Disrespectful Experiences

An individual or a group of individuals…

- Put you or others down or was condescending to you or others in some way: 37% Observed, 36% Experienced
- Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion: 46% Observed, 36% Experienced
- Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others: 24% Observed, 17% Experienced
- Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately: 22% Observed, 25% Experienced
- Ignored or excluded you or others: 28% Observed, 37% Experienced
- Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity: 20% Observed, 26% Experienced
- Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters: 13% Observed, 17% Experienced
- Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others: 13% Observed, 16% Experienced
Disrespectful Experiences by Gender

An individual or a group of individuals…

- Put you or others down or was condescending to you or others in some way
- Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion
- Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others
- Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately
- Ignored or excluded you or others
- Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity
- Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters
- Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Put you or others down or was condescending to you or others in some way</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignored or excluded you or others</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disrespectful Experiences by Underrepresentation (Race/Ethnicity)

An individual or a group of individuals…

- Put you or others down or was condescending to you or others in some way: 35% (Non-Underrepresented), 40% (Underrepresented)
- Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion: 45% (Non-Underrepresented), 50% (Underrepresented)
- Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others: 15% (Non-Underrepresented), 25% (Underrepresented)
- Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately: 24% (Non-Underrepresented), 29% (Underrepresented)
- Ignored or excluded you or others: 35% (Non-Underrepresented), 40% (Underrepresented)
- Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity: 24% (Non-Underrepresented), 32% (Underrepresented)
- Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters: 16% (Non-Underrepresented), 20% (Underrepresented)
- Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others: 12% (Non-Underrepresented), 15% (Underrepresented)
Leadership

• Executive Leadership
  – CSU leadership communicates institutional goals (58% Agree)
  – CSU's strategic goals are taking CSU in a positive direction (55% Agree)
  – CSU leadership is transparent in decision-making (23% Agree)
  – CSU is committed to shared governance (32% Agree)
  – CSU's major strategic initiatives are broadly communicated (55% Agree)
  – University leaders are held accountable for CSU's outcomes (29% Agree)
  – CSU leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace (53% Agree)
  – University leaders address issues of inequities (43% Agree)

• Accountability Standards
  – Employees are held accountable for negative or inappropriate behavior in the workplace (50% Disagree)
  – Employees are held accountable for poor performance in the workplace (50% Disagree)
  – University leaders adequately address negative or inappropriate behavior in the workplace (32% Disagree)
  – Employees in my immediate work environment act ethically and honestly in the workplace (14% Disagree)
• Administrative Professionals have significantly higher mean scores for their perceptions of Executive Leadership and Accountability Standards than Staff Classified or Faculty (effect sizes (d) respectively: EAL = .34 and .49; AS = .20 and .30)
• My physical environment supports my successful completion of tasks (18% Disagree)
• I am physically comfortable in my work space (16% Disagree)
• My physical environment promotes collaboration (23% Disagree)
• I have the proper equipment and resources available to complete my work (15% Disagree)
• My physical environment is welcoming of employees from different backgrounds (10% Disagree)
• My physical environment meets my personal needs (access, bathroom, prayer, lactation) (9% Disagree)
• My physical environment (e.g. signage, construction hazards, lighting, parking) supports my sense of safety (13% Disagree)
• Employees respect shared space (e.g. classrooms) (10% Disagree)
• **Administrative Professionals** have significantly higher mean scores for perceptions of their Physical Environment than **Staff Classified** or **Faculty** 
  \( (d = .30 \text{ and } .35 \text{ respectively}) \)
51.1% of respondents have served on a search committee in the past five years
- 33.3% of State Classified, 63.6% of Faculty, and 60.1% of Administrative Professional

Percent who responded Strongly Agree or Agree

- The unfilled positions in my area are not being filled quickly enough: 67.9%
- The power dynamics of the search committee dictate the decision-making process: 48.5%
- I witnessed bias/discrimination during the search process: NU: 22%, U: 36%

NU = Non-Underrepresented
U = Underrepresented
The search process identifies the best talent for the position

Equal Opportunity (EO) Coordinators are effective

The hiring authority respectfully considers the recommendations of the search committee

I am comfortable voicing concerns about bias/discrimination to members of the search committee

The search process is fair

Selection of committee members is fair

The search committee allows members to voice concerns about bias/discrimination if it arises
Perceptions of Diversity

Percent who responded Strongly Disagree or Disagree

- CSU understands the importance/value of diversity: 5.3%
  - NU: 4%, U: 11%

- The campus offers sufficient opportunity for diversity training: 8.0%
  - NU: 7%, U: 15%

- Upper-level administrators promote respect for cultural differences at CSU: 9.0%
  - NU: 7%, U: 17%

- Employees of color are treated fairly at CSU: 10.8%
  - NU: 7.5%, U: 26.2%

- There is respect for religious differences here at CSU: 11.3%
  - NU: 9%, U: 18%

- Employees at CSU treat each other with respect: 11.6%
  - NU: 10%, U: 20%

- Prejudice and/or acts of bigotry are not tolerated on this campus: 14.3%
  - NU: 12%, U: 27%

- My supervisor communicates the importance of valuing diversity: 16.3%
  - NU: 16%, U: 18%

- My supervisor promotes a work environment where all employees feel included: 18.4%
  - NU: 18%, U: 18%

- Women employees are treated fairly at CSU: 22.9%
  - NU: 13% of males, 27% females, 43% SI/Transgender/NB
8.5%

15.7%

21.6%

I feel pressure to change the way I speak, act, or dress in order to "fit in" at CSU

There is racial conflict among employees here at CSU

Sexual assault and/or sexual misconduct among employees is problematic at CSU

Percent who responded Strongly Agree or Agree

8% NU; 12% U

8% M; 8% F; 32% T/NB/SI

8% NU; 37% U

19% NU; 33% U
I observed and/or experienced negative treatment or behavior based on:
I experienced negative treatment or behavior based on:

- Age
- Race and/or ethnicity
- Religion
- Gender
- Sexual orientation
- Disability
- Socioeconomic status
- Job function
- Years of experience
- Unit or college
- Country of origin
- English as 2nd language
- Appearance
- Caregiver status
- Gender identity
I experienced negative treatment or behavior based on:

- Age: 14% (Underrepresented: 21%), 17% (Non-Underrepresented: 24%)
- Race and/or ethnicity: 22% (Underrepresented: 24%), 2% (Non-Underrepresented: 17%)
- Religion: 8% (Underrepresented: 14%), 4% (Non-Underrepresented: 19%)
- Gender: 14% (Underrepresented: 19%), 1% (Non-Underrepresented: 4%)
- Sexual orientation: 2% (Underrepresented: 1%), 3% (Non-Underrepresented: 4%)
- Disability: 5% (Underrepresented: 11%), 0% (Non-Underrepresented: 1%)
- Socioeconomic status: 23% (Underrepresented: 27%), 17% (Non-Underrepresented: 24%)
- Job function: 17% (Underrepresented: 24%), 0% (Non-Underrepresented: 20%)
- Years of experience: 13% (Underrepresented: 20%), 6% (Non-Underrepresented: 12%)
- Unit or college: 7% (Underrepresented: 12%), 4% (Non-Underrepresented: 5%)
- Country of origin: 3% (Underrepresented: 7%), 1% (Non-Underrepresented: 3%)
- English as 2nd language: 1% (Underrepresented: 4%), 1% (Non-Underrepresented: 4%)
- Appearance: 1% (Underrepresented: 5%), 1% (Non-Underrepresented: 6%)
- Caregiver status: 1% (Underrepresented: 5%), 1% (Non-Underrepresented: 6%)
- Gender identity: 1% (Underrepresented: 5%), 1% (Non-Underrepresented: 6%)
Percent who responded Strongly Agree or Agree

There are obstacles that prevent me from participating in on-campus training and/or prof. dev. 44.0%

CSU offers training opportunities aimed at enhancing my ability to work well with others 60.8%

CSU offers training opportunities aimed at enhancing my ability to do a good job 62.8%

Diversity training should be required of all supervisors 77.5%

Supervisory training should be required of all supervisors 91.4%

U: 87%
Perceptions were asked for both CSU and Unit/Department
- Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds
- Retains diverse employees
- Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds
- Improves the campus climate for all employees
- Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees
- Encourages discussions related to diversity
- Provides employees with a positive work experience
- Recommend as a place of employment
• Administrative Professional and State Classified, on average, have significantly more favorable CSU climate perceptions than Faculty ($d = .34$ and $.35$ respectively)

• Administrative Professional have significantly more favorable unit climate perceptions compared to State Classified and Faculty ($d$: CSU = $.18$ and $.46$ respectively)
• Overall, 77% of respondents would agree that they would recommend **CSU** as a place of employment
  • 56% would agree they recommend their **department** as a place of employment

• The majority of respondents agree that **CSU**’s (64%) and the **department**’s (68%) campus climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees

• 63% of respondents agree that **CSU** encourages discussions related to diversity and half of respondents agree that their **department** encourages these discussions
  • Smaller gap than in 2014 (12% vs. 17%)
CSU Campus Perceptions: 2016 vs. 2014

- Recommend as a place of employment: 2016: 77%, 2014: 79%
- Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees: 2016: 64%, 2014: 58%
- Provides employees with a positive work experience: 2016: 69%, 2014: 69%
- Encourages discussions related to diversity: 2016: 63%, 2014: 66%
- Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds: 2016: 67%, 2014: 64%
- Retains diverse employees: 2016: 53%, 2014: 53%
- Improves the campus climate for all employees: 2016: 62%, 2014: 62%
- Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds: 2016: 67%, 2014: 57%

- Bar chart showing the percentage of employees who strongly agree or agree with the statements.
2016 Employee Climate Survey

Recommend as a place of employment
- 2016: 56%
- 2014: 68%

Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees
- 2016: 68%
- 2014: 69%

Provides employees with a positive work experience
- 2016: 63%
- 2014: 63%

Encourages discussions related to diversity
- 2016: 50%
- 2014: 49%

Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds
- 2016: 63%
- 2014: 68%

Retains diverse employees
- 2016: 51%
- 2014: 55%

Improves the campus climate for all employees
- 2016: 58%
- 2014: 58%

Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds
- 2016: 57%
- 2014: 59%
### Average Responses by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Overload Time Demands &amp; Expectations</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Respect Executive Administration Leadership</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability Standards</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Physical Environment</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Perceptions</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept./Unit Perceptions</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sign: Differences by Employee Category:
- **AP:** Significant differences by gender for Accountability Standards, Unit Perceptions, CSU Perceptions (Males more favorable)
- **SC:** All means were significantly different (Females more favorable) except CSU Perceptions and Accountability Standards
- **Faculty:** No significant differences
### Average Responses by Underrepresentation (Race/Ethnicity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Underrepresented</th>
<th>Non-Underrepresented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Overload</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Demands &amp; Expectations</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Respect</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Administration Leadership</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability Standards</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Physical Environment</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Perceptions</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept./Unit Perceptions</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sign: Differences by Employee Category:**

*(All significant differences: underrepresented had less favorable means)*

- AP: Time Demands & Expectations, Accountability Standards, and CSU Perceptions all significantly differed
- SC: No significant differences
- Faculty: CSU Perceptions significantly differed
What impacts perceptions of work respect?

**Covariates**
- Gender
- Minority Status
- Alumni Status
- Less established (5 years or less) vs. established employee
- Dependent Status

- Work Overload
- Time Demands & Expectations
- Physical Environment
- Executive Leadership
- Accountability Standards

Work Respect
What impacts CSU perceptions?

Covariates
- Gender
- Minority Status
- Alumni Status
- Less established (5 years or less) vs. established employee
- Dependent Status

- Work Overload
- Time Demands & Expectations
- Physical Environment
- Executive Leadership
- Accountability Standards

CSU Perceptions
What impacts unit perceptions?

Covariates
- Gender
- Minority Status
- Alumni Status
- Less established (5 years or less) vs. established employee
- Dependent Status

- Work Overload
- Time Demands & Expectations
- Physical Environment
- Executive Leadership
- Accountability Standards
• **CSU alumni** have significantly more positive perceptions of the Executive Leadership and the Campus Climate than non-alumni \( (d = .11 \text{ and } .16 \text{ respectively}) \)
  – No significant findings among underrepresented employees

• On average, **employees with no dependents** have significantly more favorable mean scores for all constructs except physical environment than employees with dependents \( (d < .20) \)

• Employees who have **worked at CSU for five years or less** have significantly more favorable mean scores for all constructs than those who have worked at CSU for six or more years \( (d < .16 -.38) \)
Thoughts on Impact and Potential Action Items

- Workload
- Work Respect
- Leadership
- Search Committee
- Physical Campus Environment
- Diversity in Your Work Environment
- Campus Trainings
- Campus and Department Perceptions
- Personal and Employee Characteristics