EKONOMIKAS UN KULTŪRAS AUGSTSKOLA

Staff Satisfaction Survey

Results 2025

Introduction

The EKA academic and scientific staff satisfaction survey aims to identify researchers' views on the research environment and work-related aspects. The 2025 data file analysed contains eight completed questionnaires, submitted between 26 November and 5 December 2025. The results are analysed in aggregate form. Given the small number of respondents, they should be interpreted as indications of trends. The total number of staff invited is not specified in the data file, so the response rate has not been calculated.

The survey includes seven thematic blocks with 27 statements to be rated, a question on length of service and two open-ended questions. The thematic blocks are: mission, vision and strategy; research governance and structure; research areas and priorities, scientific staff management and communication; ethics and research integrity; dissemination of research findings; support for researchers; and monitoring of research work.

Response scale: 1 — Strongly disagree; 2 — Disagree; 3 — Neutral; 4 — Agree; 5 — Strongly agree; 0 — Do not know / No answer. In the frequency tables, ratings are combined into three groups: 0, 1–3 and 4–5. Each group shows the number of responses and the percentage of all eight respondents. One response represents 12.5%. All 27 statements were answered; "Do not know / No answer" is retained as a separate category. Neutral responses should not be equated with dissatisfaction.

Half of the respondents (4; 50.0%) have held an elected position at EKA for 6–10 years. Two respondents (25.0%) have worked for less than one year, one (12.5%) for 2–5 years and one (12.5%) for more than 11 years.

Results analysis

Table 1. Mission, vision and strategy

Rating groups: 0 — Do not know / No answer; 1–3 — Negative or neutral rating; 4–5 — Positive rating.

Statement	0	1–3	4–5
I am familiar with EKA's research strategy.	0 (0.0%)	1 (12.5%)	7 (87.5%)
EKA's strategic research objectives align with my research interests.	0 (0.0%)	1 (12.5%)	7 (87.5%)
I know EKA's research mission and vision.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (100.0%)
EKA's research mission and vision align with my personal goals.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (100.0%)

All eight respondents (100.0%) gave positive ratings for their knowledge of EKA's research mission and vision and its alignment with their personal goals. Seven (87.5%) gave positive ratings for familiarity with the strategy and the alignment of strategic objectives with their research interests; one respondent gave a neutral response to each of these statements.

Table 2. Research governance and structure

Rating groups: 0 — Do not know / No answer; 1–3 — Negative or neutral rating; 4–5 — Positive rating.

Statement	0	1–3	4–5
I am free to choose my research areas and priorities.	0 (0.0%)	1 (12.5%)	7 (87.5%)
I am satisfied with the frequency of communication with my research group coordinator.	1 (12.5%)	3 (37.5%)	4 (50.0%)
I feel involved in decision-making processes concerning research activities at EKA.	0 (0.0%)	4 (50.0%)	4 (50.0%)
I am satisfied with the frequency and quality of training activities aimed at strengthening research competences.	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	6 (75.0%)
I am satisfied with communication with other researchers within my research group or groups.	1 (12.5%)	4 (50.0%)	3 (37.5%)
I consider collaboration with my research group coordinator to be positive and supportive.	1 (12.5%)	2 (25.0%)	5 (62.5%)

The freedom to choose research areas and priorities received the highest rating (7; 87.5%), followed by activities to develop research competences (6; 75.0%). Five respondents (62.5%) rated collaboration with their group coordinator positively, while four (50.0%) rated the frequency of communication with the coordinator and involvement in decision-making positively. Three (37.5%) rated communication with other group researchers positively; three gave a neutral response, one a negative response and one a “Do not know” response. The results indicate a need to strengthen group communication and participation in decision-making.

Table 3. Research areas and priorities; scientific staff management and communication

Rating groups: 0 — Do not know / No answer; 1–3 — Negative or neutral rating; 4–5 — Positive rating.

Statement	0	1–3	4–5
If I have questions about my research work, I always know where to seek support and advice.	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (100.0%)
I consider the Vice-Rector for Science and the Scientific Institution’s administration to be available for consultation and discussion.	0 (0.0%)	2 (25.0%)	6 (75.0%)
I am satisfied with the frequency of general meetings of researchers.	0 (0.0%)	1 (12.5%)	7 (87.5%)
I am satisfied with the existing communication support at EKA.	0 (0.0%)	2 (25.0%)	6 (75.0%)
If I am dissatisfied with any aspect of my work, I can openly express my views to management (the Vice-Rector for Science, the Head of the Scientific Institution, etc.).	1 (12.5%)	3 (37.5%)	4 (50.0%)

All respondents (100.0%) know where to seek support and advice about their research work. Seven (87.5%) rated the frequency of general meetings of researchers positively, while six (75.0%) rated management availability and communication support positively. Four (50.0%) rated the opportunity to openly express their views to management about unsatisfactory aspects of work positively; three were neutral and one could not answer. Promoting open dialogue is an area for further improvement.

Table 4. Ethics and research integrity

Rating groups: 0 — Do not know / No answer; 1–3 — Negative or neutral rating; 4–5 — Positive rating.

Statement	0	1–3	4–5
I know which ethics and integrity standards are established at EKA.	0 (0.0%)	1 (12.5%)	7 (87.5%)
If I have questions about research ethics and integrity, I know where to seek support.	0 (0.0%)	2 (25.0%)	6 (75.0%)

Seven respondents (87.5%) rated their knowledge of ethics and integrity standards positively, while six (75.0%) rated their awareness of available support positively. The remaining responses were neutral; no negative or “Do not know” responses were given.

Table 5. Dissemination of research findings

Rating groups: 0 — Do not know / No answer; 1–3 — Negative or neutral rating; 4–5 — Positive rating.

Statement	0	1–3	4–5
I am satisfied with the circulation of information about upcoming research activities (conferences, seminars, publication opportunities, etc.).	0 (0.0%)	1 (12.5%)	7 (87.5%)

Seven respondents (87.5%) rated the circulation of information about research activities, including conferences, seminars and publication opportunities, positively. One respondent (12.5%) gave a neutral rating; there were no negative responses.

Table 6. Support for researchers

Rating groups: 0 — Do not know / No answer; 1–3 — Negative or neutral rating; 4–5 — Positive rating.

Statement	0	1–3	4–5
The principles of financial support at EKA are clear and understandable to me.	0 (0.0%)	1 (12.5%)	7 (87.5%)
I am satisfied with the opportunities to develop my research career at EKA.	0 (0.0%)	3 (37.5%)	5 (62.5%)
EKA provides sufficient financial support to attend conferences and present my research findings.	0 (0.0%)	2 (25.0%)	6 (75.0%)
I am satisfied with the technical support EKA provides for research (I can use laboratory facilities and computers, request the necessary software and equipment, etc.).	0 (0.0%)	3 (37.5%)	5 (62.5%)
EKA provides sufficient financial support for publishing research.	0 (0.0%)	4 (50.0%)	4 (50.0%)

Seven respondents (87.5%) rated the clarity of financial support principles positively, six (75.0%) rated support for conference participation positively, and five (62.5%) rated technical support and career development opportunities positively. Financial support for publications received four positive ratings (50.0%), two neutral and two negative ratings. Publication funding and research infrastructure are important areas for improvement; the open-ended responses also highlighted the need to clearly publish funding limits.

Table 7. Monitoring of research work

Rating groups: 0 — Do not know / No answer; 1–3 — Negative or neutral rating; 4–5 — Positive rating.

Statement	0	1–3	4–5
I understand how and how regularly research work is assessed at EKA.	0 (0.0%)	1 (12.5%)	7 (87.5%)
I consider that EKA management assesses and supports scientific staff objectively and fairly.	0 (0.0%)	3 (37.5%)	5 (62.5%)
I feel that EKA's current research assessment process helps improve the quality of my research.	0 (0.0%)	3 (37.5%)	5 (62.5%)
I consider the assessment system at EKA to be objective.	0 (0.0%)	3 (37.5%)	5 (62.5%)

Seven respondents (87.5%) understand the research assessment procedures; one gave a neutral response. For each statement on the assessment process's contribution to research quality, the objectivity of the system and fair treatment by management, five respondents (62.5%) gave positive ratings, two were neutral and one disagreed. The developmental role and transparency of assessment need improvement.

Table 8. What improvements would you suggest for EKA's research environment?

Respondent's suggestion
Additional software; a dedicated office for researchers with computers, software, etc.
Make the assessment process transparent.
Clearly publish the available funding opportunities. What is the cap on article processing charges (APCs)? What are the funding caps for conferences, etc.?

Substantive responses were provided by 3 respondents (37.5%); the other 5 left this question blank.

Table 9. What suggestions would you make to improve the existing research motivation system?

Respondent's suggestion
Review the competitiveness of pay to keep pace with other higher education institutions.
Assess the number of publications as a three-year average. Use the average over three years rather than the number in a particular year.

Substantive responses were provided by 2 respondents (25.0%); the other 6 left this question blank.

The open-ended responses suggested providing additional software and a dedicated workspace for researchers, making assessment transparent and clearly publishing funding limits for publications and conferences. Suggestions concerning motivation included competitive pay and assessing publication numbers as an average over a three-year period. These are suggestions from individual respondents, rather than a shared view of all researchers.

Trends

The highest-rated areas are knowledge of the research mission and vision and their alignment with personal goals, as well as knowing where to obtain support for research work: all respondents gave positive ratings for these statements. Freedom to choose research areas, the frequency of general meetings, knowledge of ethics standards and the circulation of information were also rated positively.

Results were more moderate for communication within research groups, involvement in decision-making and the opportunity to openly express views to management. Half of the respondents rated financial support for publications positively. Most respondents understand the assessment procedures, but their contribution to improving research quality and their objectivity were rated more cautiously. The 1–3 group includes both neutral and negative responses and therefore must not be interpreted solely as dissatisfaction.

Aspects requiring attention

- Strengthen regular communication and practical collaboration within research groups.
- Promote researchers' involvement in decision-making and open dialogue with management.
- Review the availability of technical support, software and workspaces for researchers.
- Clearly publish the conditions and limits of financial support for publications and conferences.
- Strengthen assessment transparency, feedback and links to professional development.
- Review the competitiveness of pay and the assessment of publications over a longer period, noting that these suggestions were made in individual responses.

Comparison with the previous period's results

The 2024 survey had 22 respondents, while the 2025 data file contains eight. The 2024 report mainly presents mean ratings, whereas this report analyses grouped response frequencies. The proportions of positive responses therefore cannot be directly compared with the previous report's mean scores or used to conclude that there has been a statistically demonstrated improvement or deterioration.

Similar areas for improvement remain in both reports: collaboration within research groups, the technical and financial support available to researchers and the contribution of assessment to research quality. In both periods, the availability of management and advisory support, ethics and integrity issues and the circulation of information were rated positively. This is a comparison of thematic findings, rather than an analysis of changes in identical statistical indicators.