Staff Satisfaction Survey

Results 2026

Introduction

EKA's annual academic and scientific staff satisfaction survey was organised to assess overall satisfaction with various aspects of research activities and the research environment in the 2025/2026 academic year. The survey was conducted in May 2026.

The survey was sent in Latvian to researchers at EKA's Scientific Institution, and 13 completed, valid questionnaires were received. The survey was anonymous, and the results were analysed in aggregate form. As the number of respondents is small and does not cover all scientific staff, the results are interpreted as indications of trends in EKA researchers' satisfaction.

The survey consisted of seven question blocks, each containing two to five questions. The aspects assessed were: 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.

Respondents rated each item using a Likert scale: 1 — Strongly disagree; 2 — Disagree; 3 — Neutral; 4 — Agree; 5 — Strongly agree; or 0 — Do not know / No answer.

The survey included two open-ended questions. Researchers could suggest improvements to the research environment and ways to increase researchers' motivation.

Results analysis

Table 1. Mission, vision and strategy (frequencies)

Rating groups: 0 — Do not know / No answer; 1–3 — Negative or neutral rating; 4–5 — Positive rating. The tables show response counts and percentages.

Statement	0	1–3	4–5
I am familiar with EKA's research strategy.	0	1 (8%)	12 (92%)
EKA's strategic research objectives align with my research interests.	1 (8%)	0	12 (92%)
I know EKA's research mission and vision.	0	2 (15%)	11 (85%)
EKA's research mission and vision align with my personal goals.	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	11 (84%)

Ratings of EKA's research mission, vision and strategy (Table 1) are very positive overall. Most respondents state that they know EKA's research mission and vision, are familiar with its research strategy and consider that EKA's strategic research objectives align with their research interests. Some items received a few neutral or lower ratings, as well as "Do not know / No answer" responses, but these are few in number and do not substantially alter the overall positive trend.

Table 2. Research governance and structure (frequencies)

Rating groups: 0 — Do not know / No answer; 1–3 — Negative or neutral rating; 4–5 — Positive rating. The tables show response counts and percentages.

Statement	0	1–3	4–5
I am free to choose my research areas and priorities.	0	2 (15%)	11 (85%)
I am satisfied with the frequency of communication with my research group coordinator.	0	5 (38%)	8 (62%)
I feel involved in decision-making processes concerning research activities at EKA.	0	6 (46%)	7 (54%)
I am satisfied with the frequency and quality of training activities aimed at strengthening research competences.	0	6 (46%)	7 (54%)
I am satisfied with communication with other researchers within my research group or groups.	1 (8%)	5 (38%)	7 (54%)
I consider collaboration with my research group coordinator to be positive and supportive.	2 (15%)	5 (38%)	6 (46%)

Research governance and structure (Table 2) were rated moderately positively overall. The freedom to choose research areas and priorities received the highest rating, with 85% of respondents giving a positive rating. Involvement in decision-making and the frequency and quality of training activities were rated positively by 54% of respondents, indicating opportunities to improve these aspects as well. Communication and collaboration within research groups received lower ratings, particularly collaboration with the group coordinator. The results indicate a need to strengthen regular communication and collaboration within research groups.

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

Rating groups: 0 — Do not know / No answer; 1–3 — Negative or neutral rating; 4–5 — Positive rating. The tables show response counts and percentages.

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	13 (100%)
I consider the Vice-Rector for Science and the Scientific Institution's administration to be available for consultation and discussion.	0	1 (8%)	12 (92%)
I am satisfied with the frequency of general meetings of researchers.	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	11 (85%)
I am satisfied with the existing communication support at EKA.	0%	4 (31%)	9 (69%)
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.).	0	53 (8%)	8 (62%)

Research areas and priorities, scientific staff management and communication (Table 3) were rated positively overall. All respondents stated that they know where to seek support and advice about their research work, while 92% rated management's availability for consultation positively. The frequency of general meetings of researchers was rated positively by 85%, and existing communication support by 69%. The opportunity to openly express views to management

about unsatisfactory aspects of work received a comparatively lower rating (62%), suggesting that strengthening open dialogue and communication support would be beneficial.

Table 4. Ethics and integrity (frequencies)

Rating groups: 0 — Do not know / No answer; 1–3 — Negative or neutral rating; 4–5 — Positive rating. The tables show response counts and percentages.

Statement	0	1–3	4–5
I know which ethics and integrity standards are established at EKA.	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	11 (85%)
If I have questions about research ethics and integrity, I know where to seek support.	0	2 (15%)	11 (85%)

Ethics and research integrity (Table 4) were rated positively overall. Both statements received positive ratings from 85% of respondents, indicating good knowledge of ethics and integrity standards and accessible support on research ethics issues. At the same time, 8% of respondents could not assess their familiarity with the standards established at EKA.

Table 5. Dissemination of research findings (frequencies)

Rating groups: 0 — Do not know / No answer; 1–3 — Negative or neutral rating; 4–5 — Positive rating. The tables show response counts and percentages.

Statement	0	1–3	4–5
I am satisfied with the circulation of information about upcoming research activities (conferences, seminars, publication opportunities, etc.).	0	2 (15%)	11 (85%)

Dissemination of research findings (Table 5) was rated positively: 85% of respondents are satisfied with the circulation of information about research activities, including conferences, seminars and publication opportunities. The results suggest that information circulation is generally effective, although the lower ratings given by 15% of respondents indicate scope for further improvement.

Table 6. Support for researchers (frequencies)

Rating groups: 0 — Do not know / No answer; 1–3 — Negative or neutral rating; 4–5 — Positive rating. The tables show response counts and percentages.

Statement	0	1–3	4–5
The principles of financial support at EKA are clear and understandable to me.	0	3 (23%)	10 (77%)
I am satisfied with the opportunities to develop my research career at EKA.	2 (15%)	1 (8%)	10 (77%)
EKA provides sufficient financial support to attend conferences and present my research findings.	1 (8%)	4 (31%)	8 (62%)
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.).	1 (8%)	5 (38%)	7 (54%)
EKA provides sufficient financial support for publishing research.	1 (8%)	5 (38%)	7 (54%)

Support for researchers (Table 6) was rated moderately positively overall. The clarity of financial support principles and opportunities to develop a research career at EKA received the highest ratings, with 77% of respondents giving positive ratings. Financial support for conference participation was rated positively by 62%, while technical support and financial support for publishing research were rated positively by 54%. The results indicate a need to improve technical support and review the financial support available to researchers for preparing publications.

Table 7. Monitoring of research work (frequencies)

Rating groups: 0 — Do not know / No answer; 1–3 — Negative or neutral rating; 4–5 — Positive rating. The tables show response counts and percentages.

Statement	0	1–3	4–5
I understand how and how regularly research work is assessed at EKA.	0	0	13 (100%)
I consider that EKA management assesses and supports scientific staff objectively and fairly.	0	5 (38%)	8 (62%)
I feel that EKA's current research assessment process helps improve the quality of my research.	0	7 (54%)	6 (46%)
I consider the assessment system at EKA to be objective.	0	7 (54%)	6 (46%)

Ratings of research monitoring were mixed. All respondents stated that they understand how and how regularly research work is assessed at EKA. However, only 46% rated the assessment process's contribution to improving research quality and the objectivity of the system positively. The results indicate that, while retaining clear assessment procedures, the developmental role of assessment should be strengthened by linking results to feedback and researchers' future professional development goals.

Open-ended questions

- **What improvements would you suggest for EKA's research environment?**
- **What suggestions would you make to improve the existing research motivation system?**

The open-ended questions received few suggestions, so these reflect individual respondents' views rather than overall trends. The suggestions concerned improving research infrastructure, encouraging more active communication within research groups and orienting the motivation system towards high-quality publications in Q1 and Q2 journals. Respondents proposed placing greater emphasis on publication quality rather than achieving a set number of publications, and increasing financial rewards for high-level publications.

Trends

Given the small number of respondents, the results should be interpreted as indications of trends. Overall, they suggest that EKA's academic and scientific staff are satisfied with the research environment. The highest ratings concerned familiarity with EKA's research mission, vision and strategy, ethics and research integrity issues, the circulation of information about research activities and management's availability for consultation. All respondents know where to seek support for research work and understand the research assessment procedures. The freedom to choose research areas and priorities was also rated positively.

More moderate ratings were given for communication and collaboration within research groups, involvement in decision-making, activities to develop research competences and the technical and financial support available to researchers. Although the research assessment procedures are clear, fewer than half of respondents consider that the assessment process helps improve research quality and that the system is objective. The open-ended responses also highlighted the need to improve research infrastructure, strengthen research group activities and place greater emphasis on high-quality publications in the motivation system.

Aspects requiring attention

- Strengthen regular communication and practical collaboration within research groups, including collaboration with group coordinators.
- Promote researchers' involvement in decision-making and open dialogue with management, and continue improving communication support.
- Review the frequency and content of activities to develop research competences and their relevance to researchers' needs.
- Improve the technical support available to researchers and review options for financial support for preparing publications and participating in conferences.
- Strengthen the developmental role of research assessment by providing clear feedback and linking assessment to researchers' professional development goals.
- Consider placing greater emphasis on publication quality in the motivation system, including publications in Q1 and Q2 journals, while noting that this suggestion was made in only a small number of open-ended responses.

Comparison with the previous year's survey results

Given the differing and small numbers of respondents, the observed changes should be interpreted as possible trends rather than statistically demonstrated increases or decreases in the indicators.

Improvements: satisfaction increased with the frequency of general meetings of researchers, financial support for conference participation and opportunities to develop a research career.

No progress achieved (areas for improvement): communication and practical collaboration within research groups, collaboration with group coordinators and the contribution of research assessment to improving research quality. Ratings remain moderate for activities to develop research competences, technical support and financial support for preparing publications.

Aspects rated most critically: researchers' involvement in decision-making and the objectivity of the assessment system.