



Diversity and Inclusion Survey

Report 2024

Introduction

The survey was conducted in October 2024 among EKA Scientific Institution staff. Nine of 16 researchers participated (56%): eight women (89%) and one man (11%). Six respondents (67%) were aged 25–45 and three (33%) were aged 46–65. Five held researcher positions, three were leading researchers and one was a research assistant. Reported research experience was less than three years for one respondent, three to five years for two, five to ten years for four and more than ten years for one. These experience counts total eight; the source does not specify the ninth response.

One respondent identified as LGBTIQ, seven did not and one preferred not to say. Four respondents identified as having a racial or ethnic minority background, four did not and one preferred not to say; the same distribution applied to religion or belief. None reported a dependant with a disability or developmental delay. One reported a long-term physical disability that was not visible and required no special support, one reported a temporary impairment and seven reported no disability or impairment.

Six respondents (67%) had heard of EKA's diversity and inclusion activities without knowing their content; one (11%) was familiar with the content, one had never heard of them and one preferred not to say. One respondent had attended relevant training, five (56%) had not but were interested, and three (33%) had not attended.

Table 1 Researchers' perceptions of diversity at EKA

Response key: 0 = Prefer not to say; 1 = Disagree; 2 = Slightly disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Slightly agree; 5 = Agree. Blank cells indicate no recorded responses.

Statement	0	1	2	3	4	5
Age				2 (22%)	2 (22%)	5 (56%)
Gender				1 (11%)	3 (33%)	5 (56%)
Sexual orientation	1 (11%)		1 (11%)	5 (56%)		2 (22%)
Disability	1 (11%)	1 (11%)		5 (56%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)
Religion or belief	2 (22%)		1 (11%)	3 (33%)		3 (33%)
Racial or ethnic origin			2 (22%)	4 (44%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)

Age diversity received seven positive ratings (78%) and gender diversity eight (89%). Responses concerning sexual orientation and disability were mainly neutral (56% each), with positive ratings of 22% for each. Religion or belief and racial or ethnic diversity each received three positive ratings (33%). The findings suggest uneven perceptions across diversity dimensions.

Table 2 Researchers' perceptions of EKA's inclusion efforts

Response key: 0 = Prefer not to say; 1 = Disagree; 2 = Slightly disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Slightly agree; 5 = Agree. Blank cells indicate no recorded responses.

Statement	0	1	2	3	4	5
Age			1 (11%)	2 (22%)	2 (22%)	4 (44%)
Gender				1 (11%)	3 (33%)	5 (56%)
Sexual orientation			1 (11%)	5 (56%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)
Disability			4 (44%)	4 (44%)		1 (11%)
Religion or belief				4 (44%)	1 (11%)	4 (44%)
Racial or ethnic origin		1 (11%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	4 (44%)

Positive ratings were highest for gender-related efforts (89%), followed by age (67%), religion or belief (56%) and racial or ethnic origin (56%). Sexual orientation received 33% positive ratings. Disability-related efforts received only 11% positive ratings, with 44% neutral and 44% slightly negative responses, indicating an area for attention.

Table 3 Respect equal opportunities and inclusive treatment

Response key: 0 = Prefer not to say; 1 = Disagree; 2 = Slightly disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Slightly agree; 5 = Agree. Blank cells indicate no recorded responses.

Statement	0	1	2	3	4	5
At work, I feel that I am personally respected, valued and that I have the same opportunities as others, irrespective of my personal characteristics.			1 (11%)		3 (33%)	5 (56%)
At work, I feel that everybody is respected, valued and have the same opportunities, irrespective of their personal characteristics.			1 (11%)		4 (44%)	4 (44%)
At work, inappropriate attitudes and jokes related to age, gender, sexual orientation, disability, religion or belief, ethnic or racial origin, are not tolerated			1 (11%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	5 (56%)
My management is committed to an inclusive and equal treatment of all staff members, and fights any discrimination in all of its forms.					5 (56%)	4 (44%)

Eight respondents (89%) rated personal respect and equal opportunities positively, and eight (89%) also rated equal treatment of all staff positively. Six (67%) positively assessed the non-tolerance of inappropriate attitudes and jokes; two (22%) were neutral and one (11%) slightly disagreed. All nine respondents positively assessed management's commitment to inclusion and non-discrimination.

Seven respondents (78%) had not observed discriminatory or unequal treatment during the previous five years, one had observed it but generally did not react, and one preferred not to say. In the follow-up question, one respondent identified sexual orientation as a ground for unequal treatment and three preferred not to say.

Four respondents (44%) reported accessibility barriers: three partially and one fully; five reported none. Four mentioned building access, one IT access and one preferred not to say. One respondent had refrained from applying for a vacancy, project or training because of personal characteristics, six had not and two preferred not to say. In the follow-up, one selected “other reason” and four preferred not to say.

Table 4 Requests for special arrangements

Characteristic	Prefer not to say	No	No, I would not dare to ask	Not applicable	Yes
AGE (e.g., adapted working conditions, specific training...)		7 (78%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	
GENDER (e.g., adapted working conditions, specific training, paternity leave, medical intervention linked to transgender....)	1 (11%)	6 (67%)		2 (22%)	
SEXUAL ORIENTATION (e.g., adoption of a child, same gender marriage, parental leave...)	1 (11%)	6 (67%)		2 (22%)	
DISABILITY, if any (e.g., adapted working conditions, adapted missions...)	1 (11%)	6 (67%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	
RELIGION or BELIEF (e.g., days off for a religious celebration, special diet, praying room/space...)	1 (11%)	6 (67%)		2 (22%)	
Other issues	1 (11%)	6 (67%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	

Most respondents (67–78%) had not requested special arrangements. No positive requests were recorded in the table. One respondent would not dare to ask for arrangements related to age, disability or other issues. Non-disclosure and “not applicable” responses were also recorded. Absence of requests does not establish absence of need.

Reporting discrimination was a multiple-response question. Four respondents (44%) would report informally and one (11%) would report but did not know how. Two (22%) answered no; one (11%) was unsure what counts as discrimination; and one (11%) feared negative consequences and doubted that action would follow. Clear formal procedures and guidance are needed.

Four respondents (44%) felt sufficiently informed and supported on diversity and inclusion, two (22%) felt informed only on some aspects, and three (33%) did not feel sufficiently informed.

Conflict situations were reported sometimes by four respondents (44%), seldom by one (11%), almost never by two (22%) and never by two (22%). These responses support continued attention to workplace communication and conflict resolution.

Table 5 Harassment prevention and awareness of support

Response key: 1 = Disagree; 2 = Slightly disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Slightly agree; 5 = Agree. Original column order is retained.

Statement	1	2	4	5	3
I feel that my organisation takes the matter of prevention and fight against psychological harassment seriously	1 (11%)		1 (11%)	4 (44%)	3 (33%)

Statement	1	2	4	5	3
I feel that my organisation takes the matter of prevention and fight against sexual harassment seriously	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	4 (44%)	2 (22%)
I know how to obtain information on support and procedures to address psychological and sexual harassment at my workplace	2 (22%)		1 (11%)	4 (44%)	2 (22%)

Five respondents (56%) positively assessed prevention of psychological harassment and five (56%) prevention of sexual harassment. Awareness of support and procedures also received five positive ratings (56%), while two respondents (22%) disagreed and two were neutral. Information about support and reporting procedures should be more visible.

Table 6 Psychological harassment experienced or witnessed

Statement	No, I did not experience nor witness that behavior	Yes, I directly witnessed that behavior	Yes, I experienced that behavior
Offensive or degrading comments, particularly in public, bullying, antagonism, pressure, offensive behaviour	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	
Refusal to communicate	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	
Degrading remarks related to your competences	6 (67%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)
Threatening remarks	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	
Being set unrealistic work objectives	7 (78%)		2 (22%)
Not being given work at all or being given work that does not correspond to my post	9 (100%)		
Being isolated, set apart, excluded, rejected, ignored, disparaged, or humiliated	8 (89%)		1 (11%)

Most respondents had neither experienced nor witnessed the listed behaviours. Two (22%) experienced unrealistic work objectives, one (11%) experienced degrading remarks about competence, and one experienced isolation or exclusion. Offensive comments were witnessed by two respondents; degrading competence-related remarks by two; and refusal to communicate and threatening remarks by one each. None reported being denied work or assigned work inappropriate to their position.

All nine respondents reported neither experiencing nor witnessing any of the seven listed sexual harassment behaviours: reward or reprisal linked to sexual favours, suggestive remarks or innuendo, obscene language or gestures, persistent appearance-related compliments, unwanted physical contact, voyeurism or exhibitionism, and use of pornographic materials.

In the follow-up about who carried out harassment, three respondents (33%) preferred not to say and one (11%) described an experience outside EKA. These answers do not identify the source of the workplace behaviours reported above.

Table 7 Perceived effectiveness of workplace measures

Response key: 1 = Not effective; 2 = Not so effective; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Somehow effective; 5 = Very effective.

Measure	1	2	3	4	5
The organisation making clear which behaviours are unacceptable or inappropriate in the workplace				2 (22%)	7 (78%)
Managers addressing swiftly unacceptable or inappropriate behaviours in the workplace				3 (33%)	6 (67%)
Compulsory training on conflict resolution for all staff with management responsibilities	1 (11%)		2 (22%)	2 (22%)	4 (44%)
Compulsory training on harassment prevention for all staff	1 (11%)		1 (11%)	3 (33%)	4 (44%)
Encouraging early, informal ways to resolve conflicts		1 (11%)	2 (22%)	3 (33%)	3 (33%)
Develop recourse to the mediation service		1 (11%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	3 (33%)
Raising staff's awareness on what different behaviours may constitute harassment and where to find help or information				2 (22%)	7 (78%)
Effective disciplinary procedures			2 (22%)	2 (22%)	5 (56%)

All respondents positively rated clear expectations about unacceptable behaviour, prompt management action and staff awareness. Positive ratings were lower for mediation (56%), conflict-resolution training and early informal resolution (67% each), harassment-prevention training (78%) and disciplinary procedures (78%).

All nine respondents would recommend EKA as an employer regarding diversity, inclusion and respect: seven (78%) fully and two (22%) for some aspects only.

Main findings

The findings indicate positive personal experiences of respect and equal opportunities, alongside uneven perceptions of diversity, limited familiarity with inclusion activities, accessibility barriers and individual reports of inappropriate workplace behaviour. With nine respondents, the results should be treated as indicative rather than representative of all staff.

Aspects to consider

Priorities include clearer communication of diversity and inclusion activities, practical training, accessible complaint and support procedures, improved building and IT accessibility, and guidance on harassment prevention and conflict resolution.