



Diversity and Inclusion Survey

Report 2025-2026

Introduction

Annual Diversity and Inclusion (D&I) Survey EKA for research staff was organised in May 2026.

The 2026 Diversity and Inclusion Survey was completed by nine representatives of the EKA Scientific Institution (Q1-Q9): eight women and one man. Five respondents belonged to the 46-65 age group, while four were aged 25-45. Regarding research experience, two respondents had worked as researchers for less than three years, four for three to five years, one for five to ten years, and two for more than ten years. Six respondents held researcher positions and three were leading researchers.

One respondent identified as an LGBTIQ person, six did not, and two preferred not to disclose this information. Three respondents identified as having a racial or ethnic minority background, five did not, and one preferred not to answer. The same distribution was recorded for belonging to a religion or belief: three respondents answered positively, five negatively, and one preferred not to answer.

Two respondents reported having a dependant with a disability or developmental delay that hindered their activities, while seven did not. None of the respondents reported having a long-term disability; one respondent indicated having a short-term or temporary impairment, while eight reported no disability or impairment.

Experience and views of diversity and inclusion

Five respondents (56%) knew EKA's diversity and inclusion activities and their content (Q10), three (33%) had never heard of them and one (11%) had heard of them without knowing their content. Awareness remains uneven.

One respondent (11%) had attended diversity and inclusion training (Q11), three (33%) had not but were interested, four (44%) had not attended and one preferred not to answer. Accessible, practical training could improve participation.

Table 1. Researchers' perceptions of diversity at EKA

Statement, Q12	0	1-3	4-5
EKA is sufficiently diverse in terms of age	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)
EKA is sufficiently diverse in terms of gender	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)
EKA is sufficiently diverse in terms of racial or ethnic origin	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)
EKA is sufficiently diverse in terms of sexual orientation	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)
EKA is sufficiently diverse in terms of religion or belief	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)
EKA is sufficiently diverse in terms of disability	0 (0%)	5 (56%)	4 (44%)

Note: 0 – prefer not to answer/do not know; 1-3 – neutral or negative assessment; 4-5 – positive assessment

Positive ratings were highest for age, gender and racial or ethnic diversity (78% each), followed by sexual orientation and religion or belief (67% each). Disability diversity received 44% positive ratings and 56% neutral or negative ratings, suggesting an area for attention (Table 1).

Table 2. Researchers' perceptions of the importance given to diversity by EKA

Statement, Q13	0	1–3	4–5
EKA makes efforts to create a diverse and inclusive workplace regarding age	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)
EKA makes efforts to create a diverse and inclusive workplace regarding gender	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)
EKA makes efforts to create a diverse and inclusive workplace regarding racial or ethnic origin	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)
EKA makes efforts to create a diverse and inclusive workplace regarding sexual orientation	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)
EKA makes efforts to create a diverse and inclusive workplace regarding disability	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)
EKA makes efforts to create a diverse and inclusive workplace regarding religion or belief	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)

Note: 0 – no answer/do not know; 1–3 – neutral or negative assessment; 4–5 – positive assessment.

EKA's inclusion efforts were rated positively by 89% for age, 78% for gender and racial or ethnic origin, and 67% for sexual orientation, disability and religion or belief. The results are generally positive, with room to strengthen visibility and consistency (Table 2).

Table 3. Researchers' perceptions of respect, equal opportunities and inclusive treatment at EKA

Statement, Q14	0	1–3	4–5
At work, I feel personally respected and valued and have the same opportunities as others, irrespective of my personal characteristics	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)
At work, I feel that everyone is respected and valued and has the same opportunities, irrespective of their personal characteristics	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)
Inappropriate attitudes and jokes related to personal characteristics are not tolerated at work	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)
Management is committed to inclusive and equal treatment of all staff members and fights discrimination in all its forms	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)

Note: 0 – no answer/do not know; 1–3 – neutral or negative assessment; 4–5 – positive assessment.

Personal respect and equal opportunities received 89% positive ratings. Equal treatment of all staff and non-tolerance of inappropriate attitudes or jokes each received 78%. Management's commitment received 67% positive and 33% neutral ratings, suggesting that its actions could be more visible (Table 3).

Table 4. Experiences related to discrimination, accessibility and professional opportunities

Experience Q15 Q17 Q19	No	Yes or partially	Prefer not to say	Follow-up Q16 Q18 Q20
Observed behaviour, remarks or decisions resulting in discriminatory or unequal treatment	7 (78%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	Racial or ethnic background
Experienced accessibility barriers at EKA	5 (56%)	4 (44%)	0 (0%)	Digital and IT accessibility; access to meeting or study rooms and building facilities; suitability of corridors for wheelchair users
Refrained from applying for a vacancy, project or training because of personal characteristics	7 (78%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	Racial or ethnic background and one unspecified other reason

Seven respondents (78%) had not observed discriminatory or unequal treatment in the previous five years, one had observed it but generally did not react, and one preferred not to answer. Racial or ethnic origin was mentioned twice in follow-up responses (Q15–Q16).

Four respondents (44%) reported partial accessibility barriers and five (56%) reported none (Q17). Comments concerned digital and IT accessibility, meeting or study rooms, building facilities and corridors suitable for wheelchair users (Q18).

Seven respondents (78%) had not refrained from applying for a vacancy, project or training because of personal characteristics, one had and one preferred not to answer (Q19–Q20). Individual experiences and accessibility barriers remain areas to monitor.

Table 5. Requests for special arrangements based on personal characteristics or needs

Personal characteristic or need, Q21	Not applicable	No	Yes (with no problem)	Yes (had to convince management)
Age (e.g. adapted working conditions or specific training)	0 (0%)	8 (89%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)
Gender (e.g. adapted working conditions, paternity leave or medical intervention related to being transgender)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Sexual orientation (e.g. adoption, same-gender marriage or parental leave)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Disability (e.g. adapted working conditions or assignments)	0 (0%)	7 (78%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)
Religion or belief (e.g. religious holidays, special diet or prayer space)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other issues	1 (11%)	8 (89%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Requests for special arrangements concerned age and disability only: one age-related request required convincing management; one disability-related request met no difficulty and another required convincing management. No requests were recorded for other characteristics. Low request rates do not establish absence of need (Table 5).

Four respondents (44%) would report discrimination, two (22%) would report but did not know how, one (11%) would not report, and two (22%) said their response depended on circumstances; one suggested direct communication with the person involved (Q22). Clear reporting guidance remains necessary.

Six respondents (67%) felt sufficiently informed and supported on diversity and inclusion, two (22%) only on some aspects and one (11%) did not feel sufficiently informed (Q23). Guidance could cover a broader range of issues.

Respect at the workplace

Five respondents (56%) had never experienced workplace conflict in recent years, three (33%) experienced it sometimes and one (11%) very rarely (Q24). Four respondents (44%) had therefore encountered conflict at least occasionally.

Table 6. Perceptions of EKA's approach to psychological and sexual harassment

Statement, Q25	0	1–3	4–5
EKA takes the prevention of and fight against psychological harassment seriously	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)
EKA takes the prevention of and fight against sexual harassment seriously	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	8 (89%)
I know how to obtain information about support and procedures for addressing psychological and sexual harassment	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)

Note: 0 – prefer not to say/no answer; 1–3 – neutral or negative assessment; 4–5 – positive assessment.

Sexual harassment prevention received 89% positive ratings, with one non-response; psychological harassment prevention received 78%. Awareness of support and procedures received 67% positive and 33% neutral or negative ratings, indicating a communication priority (Table 6).

Table 7. Experiences and observations of psychological harassment-related behaviour

Behaviour, Q26	Neither experienced nor witnessed	Personally experienced	Directly witnessed	Prefer not to say
Offensive or degrading comments, public humiliation, bullying, antagonism, pressure or offensive behaviour	5 (56%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)
Refusal to communicate	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Degrading remarks related to professional competence	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Threatening remarks	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Being assigned unrealistic work objectives	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Not being given work or being assigned work that does not correspond to the position	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Behaviour, Q26	Neither experienced nor witnessed	Personally experienced	Directly witnessed	Prefer not to say
Being isolated, excluded, rejected, ignored, disparaged or humiliated	7 (78%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)

Most respondents had neither experienced nor witnessed the listed psychological harassment behaviours. Unrealistic objectives were experienced by two (22%); refusal to communicate, degrading competence-related remarks, threatening remarks, and isolation or exclusion by one each (11%). Offensive behaviour was experienced by one and witnessed by another; two preferred not to answer. None reported being denied work or assigned inappropriate tasks (Table 7).

Table 8. Experiences and observations of sexual harassment-related behaviour

Behaviour, Q27	Neither experienced nor witnessed	Personally experienced	Directly witnessed	Prefer not to say
Promise of a reward in return for sexual favours or threat of reprisal for rejecting such a request	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Coarse or suggestive remarks or sexual innuendo	8 (89%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)
Crude or obscene language and gestures	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Exaggerated and persistent compliments regarding appearance	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Unwanted physical contact	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Voyeurism or exhibitionism	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Use of pornographic materials	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

No respondent reported experiencing or witnessing any listed sexual harassment behaviour. All nine reported no experience for six behaviours; for suggestive remarks or innuendo, eight reported none and one preferred not to answer (Table 8).

No respondent identified who carried out harassment (Q28). Six (67%) gave non-applicable responses and three (33%) preferred not to answer. The responses do not establish who was responsible for behaviours reported in preceding questions.

Table 9. Perceived effectiveness of measures for preventing and addressing harassment and workplace conflicts

Measure, Q29	0	1–3	4–5
Clearly identifying behaviours that are unacceptable or inappropriate in the workplace	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)
Managers responding promptly to unacceptable or inappropriate workplace behaviour	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)
Compulsory conflict-resolution training for staff with management responsibilities	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)

Measure, Q29	0	1–3	4–5
Compulsory harassment-prevention training for all staff	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)
Encouraging early and informal resolution of conflicts	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)
Developing access to mediation services	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)
Raising staff awareness of behaviours that may constitute harassment and available sources of assistance	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)
Ensuring effective disciplinary procedures	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)

Note: 0 – prefer not to say/no answer; 1–3 – neutral or negative assessment; 4–5 – positive assessment.

Measures received 78–89% positive ratings. Most were positively rated by eight respondents (89%); early informal conflict resolution and disciplinary procedures by seven (78%). Respondents supported clear expectations, management action, training, mediation and accessible information (Table 9).

Six respondents (67%) would fully recommend EKA as an employer regarding diversity, inclusion and respect, one (11%) for some aspects, one would not recommend it at all, and one preferred not to answer (Q30). At least partial endorsement was therefore 78%.

No substantive comments were provided in the final open-ended question (Q31). This does not establish that no improvements are needed.

Main findings

With nine respondents, results are indicative. Perceptions of personal respect, inclusion efforts and harassment prevention were predominantly positive, and 78% would recommend EKA at least partially as an employer.

Priorities are uneven awareness, low training participation, disability inclusion and accessibility, and clearer reporting procedures. Four respondents (44%) reported partial accessibility barriers and four had encountered conflict at least occasionally. Individual psychological harassment-related behaviours were reported; no sexual harassment experiences or observations were reported.

Aspects to consider

The following priorities could support further improvement:

- Make diversity and inclusion policies, support options and contact persons easy to find.
- Offer short, practical diversity and inclusion training.
- Review reported accessibility concerns in buildings, rooms, facilities and digital tools.
- Clarify the process for requesting special arrangements, particularly for age and disability.
- Explain discrimination and harassment reporting procedures and available support.
- Monitor workplace communication, unrealistic objectives, inappropriate remarks and exclusion.
- Provide guidance on early conflict resolution, mediation and inappropriate behaviour.
- Encourage broader survey participation while preserving anonymity for sensitive questions.

Comparison with 2024

Both surveys included nine respondents; differences are indicative and do not establish definitive institutional change.

Positive ratings increased for sexual orientation, disability, religion or belief, and racial or ethnic diversity, and for most inclusion efforts. Staff support, harassment prevention, training and mediation were rated more positively. The proportion reporting no conflict rose from 22% to 56%.

Personal respect and equal opportunities remained at 89% positive, and age diversity at 78%. No observed discrimination remained at 78%, accessibility barriers at 44%, training participation at 11%, and personally experienced unrealistic objectives at 22%. No sexual harassment was reported in either period.

Familiarity with inclusion activities increased from 11% to 56%, but lack of awareness also increased from 11% to 33%. Positive ratings declined for gender diversity and related efforts (89% to 78%), equal treatment of all staff (89% to 78%), management's commitment (100% to 67%; remaining 2026 responses were neutral), and at least partial willingness to recommend EKA (100% to 78%).

The comparison suggests progress in several areas alongside continuing accessibility and awareness gaps and lower ratings for management's visible commitment, equal treatment and employer recommendation.