

# QVT Survey- “Let’s Talk About Work”

## Inria- October 2024

### Introduction

This survey, addressed to all Inria staff, took place from September 17 to October 15, 2024 and collected 477 valid responses. A quick count was carried out on October 17, on the simple statistics (histograms) from the responses. This document <sup>1</sup>is a report of the analysis, containing in particular the synthesis of the numerous comments collected.

We plan to replay this survey annually, in order to estimate the evolution of the results over time, hoping that the number of participants will also have a positive curve.

We thank everyone who responded to this survey.

### Respondent Statistics

The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first in particular allows us to verify that the distribution of respondents is consistent with the Inria landscape, with the Single Social Report 2023 (RSU 2023) being taken as a reference.

The survey was completed by 447 people <sup>2</sup>, for a total population of 4999 personnel (PP, physical personnel in the sense of the RSU). Overall, 9.5% of the personnel therefore responded to the survey.

Researchers have statistically expressed themselves much less than non-researchers. They represent 70% of Inria staff and only 48% of respondents:

	survey responses		RSU 2023	
Researchers	194	48.6%	3498	70%
Non-researchers	205	51.4%	1501	30%
No answer	48	-	-	-

---

<sup>1</sup> This document is an automatic (thanks to Google translate) translation of the French version of the survey results, reviewed by a human. We hope there are not too many translation errors..

<sup>2</sup> Please note that a significant number (640) of people consulted the survey, without answering any questions, and 3 people did not complete/validate their answers. We will have to ask ourselves why this large number of non-answers.

Permanent staff participated slightly more than non -permanent staff:

	survey responses		RSU 2023	
Permanent	266	62.0%	2375	47.5%
Non-permanent	163	38.0%	2624	52.5%
No answer	18	-	-	-

Regarding the distribution by center, it is fairly homogeneous and close to that provided by the RSU. Note a slight over-representation of the Headquarters, consistent with the difference in representation of Researchers/Non-researchers.

	survey responses		RSU 2023 (as a reminder)
Bordeaux	34	8.1%	8.2%
Grenoble	22	5.2%	7.8%
Lille	33	7.8%	6.4%
Lyon	23	5.5%	5.8%
Nancy	23	5.5%	8.1%
Paris	42	10.0 %	12.4%
Rennes	54	12.8%	15.3%
Saclay	35	8.3%	11.4%
Sophia	68	16.2%	12.8%
Seat	87	20.7%	11.8%

Regarding the seniority of respondents, the distribution is as follows (this information is not available in the RSU):

	survey responses	
less than 1 year	73	17.1%
less than 3 years	94	22.1%
less than 5 years old	56	13.1%
less than 10 years old	49	11.5%
under 20 years old	76	17.8%
under 30	51	12.0%
over 30 years	27	6.3%
no answer	21	-

Other information collected in this section was not used in the analysis of the questionnaire:

- gender,
- belonging organisation,
- department/team of belonging <sup>3</sup>: too disparate and potentially a source of lifting of anonymity.

<sup>3</sup> This question will certainly be deleted in the 2025 questionnaire.

## Your answers

Are you satisfied with your current job?

Overall statistic:

Very satisfied	118	26.6%
Satisfied)	231	52.0%
Not satisfied	84	18.9%
Not at all satisfied	11	2.5%
No answer	3	-

If we look a little more closely:

A little more dissatisfaction for non-researchers than for researchers:

	Researcher	Non-researcher
Very satisfied	32.7%	20.7%
Satisfied)	49.7%	54.7%
Not satisfied	16.6%	20.7%
Not at all satisfied	1.0 %	3.9%

Correlation between seniority and dissatisfaction: **one in four people with more than 5 years** of seniority are little or not at all satisfied with their current job.

	< 1 year	< 3	< 5	< 10	< 20	< 30	> 30 years old
Very satisfied	41.7%	27.7%	26.8%	21.3%	17.1%	29.4%	25.9%
Satisfied)	52.7%	54.3%	48.2%	51.1%	60.5%	39.2%	48.2%
Not satisfied	4.2%	16.0%	25.0%	23.4%	22.4%	25.5%	25.9%
Not at all satisfied	1.4%	2.0%	-	4.2%	-	5.9%	-

Summary of comments (77 comments or 16% of respondents ):

- Work overload and excessive administrative burden: many people report a high workload, having to work outside of normal working hours with an accumulation of administrative tasks that encroach on their main mission and are disconnected from the core business, particularly on the research side.
- Impact of frequent changes: work processes and tools, subject to frequent modifications, increase the mental load, experienced as stressful and unproductive.
- Uninteresting and stressful work: many comments concerning the lack of interest in the work, repetitiveness, questions about the "meaning of work", lack of time to carry out tasks properly, need to do a lot of useless things.

- Poor prospects for development and recognition: lack of prospects for advancement and promotion, experience and expertise not valued.

- positive remarks (30% of comments): come almost exclusively from researchers (but who also complain about too much administration as indicated above)

### How do you rate your Quality of Life at Work?

Overall statistic:

Very satisfied	114	26.9%
Satisfied)	247	58.3%
Not satisfied	63	14.9%
Not at all satisfied	0	0%
No answer	23	-

No significant difference between the researcher/non-researcher responses and a very slight correlation between seniority and negative evaluation (but less pronounced than in the previous question).

Correlation between QVT assessment and general satisfaction: strong correlation.

Overall satisfaction ->	Very satisfied	Satisfied)	Not satisfied	No way
QVT: Very satisfied	62.3%	35.1%	2.6%	0%
QVT: Satisfied	17.1%	67.1%	15.0%	0.8%
QVT: Not very satisfied	4.8%	31.7%	57.1%	6.3%
QVT: Not at all	7.1%	14.3%	42.9%	35.7%

The analysis of free comments (67 comments or 14% of respondents):

- Physical working conditions and environment: Infrastructure and furniture (desks, chairs, unsuitable temperature, etc.) are sometimes considered inadequate, causing discomfort and sometimes health problems. Requests for workstation adjustments are difficult and take a long time to obtain (a lot of frustration for small changes, a lot of wasted time and suffering). Some premises/offices are perceived as dilapidated or unsuitable (windowless open space), and some equipment, such as the canteen, lacks hygiene and diversity.

- Workload and stress: Overwork and understaffing are again cited, as well as disorganization and fragmentation of working time, making it difficult to do substantive work, and pushing some to work outside scheduled hours. Having to provide the same information several times in different formats is also cited. Overcrowded offices further add to the difficulty of concentrating due to ambient noise.

- Relationships and work environment: some remarks on relationships with the N+1 (pressure from the hierarchy, does not help, dysfunctional manager and maintained despite the increasingly complicated climate, micro-management), some people speak of loss of meaning

of work and a declining feeling of belonging and collective. A remark on the inappropriate reception of new people.

- Work-life balance and telework: Flexibility in terms of telework. Some people are asking for more telework, or even cite this solution as a way to keep going (fortunately there is telework). Flexibility is cited as positive (both among researchers and non-researchers). Hyperconnection is nevertheless cited as harmful, making it difficult to separate personal and professional life. Some reports of people in a situation of professional isolation (isolated in my geographical center)

- gap between the display and posters and QVT (QVT non-existent, neither as a reality nor as a concern).

- slightly fewer positive comments (16%) than for the previous section: the most positive aspects are teleworking and ATT, flexibility, AGOS, subsidized cafeterias.

In recent years, would you say that your Quality of Life at Work... (is evolving and in what direction)

Overall statistic : more **than one in three people** think that QVT is deteriorating (31.8% for researchers, 38.0% for non-researchers)

Improving	73	18.2%
Stay stable	192	47.9%
Deteriorates	136	33.9%
No answer	46	-

Correlation with seniority: **almost** one in two people with more than 5 years of seniority at Inria believe that QVT is deteriorating.

	< 1 year	< 3	< 5	< 10	< 20	< 30	> 30 years old
Improving	38.6%	18.3%	15.1%	4.2%	16.0%	19.6%	29.6%
Stay stable	61.4%	62.2%	50.9%	47.9%	34.7%	43.1%	22.2%
Deteriorates	-	19.5%	34.0%	47.9%	49.3%	37.3%	48.2%

Correlation between evolution of QVT and general satisfaction: improvement of QVT impacts satisfaction positively, deterioration of QVT has less impact on the overall estimate.

Overall satisfaction ->	Very satisfied	Satisfied)	Not satisfied	No way
QVT: Improving	41.6%	54.2%	4.2%	0%
QVT: Remains stable	30.2%	58.3%	11.0%	0.5%
QVT: Deteriorating	7.4%	45.6%	40.4%	6.6%

Summary of free comments ( 88 comments or 18% of respondents ):

The reasons given which contribute to the deterioration of QVT are:

- Work overload: the increase in workload with ever-reduced resources is cited extensively. The lack of anticipation of departures (retirement, maternity leave) and the failure to replace staff on sick leave are cited in particular. This leads to increased pressure on staff.
- Too much administration: on the researcher side, complaints concern "too much administration", on the non-researcher side, complaints concern process changes, increasing constraints and unsuitable tools.
- Decreased local support: lack of availability of services ("you can no longer ask for help"), loss of links with centralized services, difficulties with FSD requests (stricter, brake on recruitment, "black box" advice, errors on visa information)

The only element contributing to the improvement of QVT:

- Positive effects of teleworking: once again, teleworking is often cited as a gain, making it possible to overcome face-to-face constraints (lack of space for example). Teleworking is therefore popular with a request to increase the number of annual days.

Overall, are you satisfied with your working conditions (hours, material conditions, training, etc.)?

Overall statistics:

Very satisfied	155	35.3%
Satisfied)	226	51.5%
Not satisfied	49	11.2%
Not at all satisfied	9	2.1%
No answer	8	-

Depending on the public sector corps:

	Researcher	Non-researcher
Very satisfied	38.7%	31.5%
Satisfied)	49.8%	53.5%
Not satisfied	9.4%	13.5%
Not at all satisfied	2.1%	1.5%

Correlation between working conditions and general satisfaction:

Overall satisfaction ->	Very satisfied	Satisfied)	Not satisfied	No way
conditions: very satisfied	53.6%	40.0%	5.8%	0.6%
conditions: satisfied	14.2%	64.0%	20.0 %	1.8%
conditions: few	4.1%	44.9%	49.0%	2.0 %
conditions: not at all	11.1%	22.2%	44.5%	22.2%

Summary of free comments (89 comments or 19% of respondents):

- Training: this is the point that comes up most frequently (25% of comments). People who have followed training are satisfied with it, but 22% of respondents indicate that they have not followed training for several years, do not find interesting training, and believe that "national" training does not correspond to their needs.
- Deterioration of support: some deplore a deterioration of support services with the equipment having to be managed by the team or having to work with personal equipment.
- Office premises and equipment: comments on unsuitable chairs (causing health problems) and poorly ergonomic desks. Problems with unsuitable temperatures and overcrowding in the premises are also noted. The fact of having to "wait for the center to move" for things to move is not fully satisfactory.
- Access to the center(s): several comments from researchers concerning opening hours which should be extended.
- Career and salaries: comments on salaries that are too low (salary/inflation gap) and the lack of visibility of ISFP career developments.
- In addition, several comments (6%) on the fact that working conditions at Inria are better than in equivalent institutes.

How would you define the working atmosphere within the team or department?

Overall statistics: more than 90% of respondents rate the working atmosphere in their team/department as good or very good.

Good	237	54.6%
Pretty good	155	35.7%
Pretty bad	31	7.1%
Bad	11	2.6%
No answer	13	-

Correlation between team atmosphere and overall satisfaction: team atmosphere has a major impact on overall satisfaction.

Overall satisfaction ->	Very satisfied	Satisfied)	Not satisfied	No way
Good atmosphere	42.2%	51.1%	6.3%	0%
Pretty good atmosphere	7.1%	63.4%	27.9%	1.3%
Rather bad atmosphere	9.7%	19.3%	61.3%	9.7%
Bad atmosphere	9.1%	18.2%	27.3%	45.4%

Summary of comments (70 comments or 15% of respondents):

- Positive atmosphere within teams: The vast majority of respondents appreciate the atmosphere with their direct colleagues, some citing it as "exceptional". They describe an atmosphere of support, solidarity and complicity that helps to face challenges ("solidarity in the galley"). Some ITA staff indicate that this is what allows them to resist.
- Tensions due to lack of resources and workload: nevertheless, the lack of personnel and resources is cited as a source of tension in certain services.
- Interpersonal relationships and management: some people cite management issues (dysfunctional), lack of courage to manage colleagues deemed harmful and having a negative impact on the life of the structure, the difference in treatment between contract and permanent staff is also mentioned.

How would you define your professional relationships with the other structures of the institute (other teams, services, departments)?

Overall statistics: professional relations with other structures are still generally judged to be good or very good (88.4%)...

Good	126	31.1%
Pretty good	232	57.3%
Pretty bad	37	9.1%
Bad	10	2.5%
No answer	42	-

From the researchers/non-researchers point of view

	Researchers	Non-researchers
Good	37.0%	25.8%
Pretty good	47.4%	63.7%
Pretty bad	11.0%	9.5%
Bad	4.6%	1.0 %

Correlation between professional relations with other structures and general satisfaction:



Overall satisfaction ->	Very satisfied	Satisfied)	Not satisfied	No way
Good relations	52.4%	40.5%	6.3%	0.8%
Pretty good relations	18.2%	59.8%	20.3%	1.7%
Rather bad relations	20.0 %	30.0%	40.0%	10.0 %
Bad relationships	52.3%	40.5%	6.3%	7.9%

Comments (83 comments or 17% of respondents):

- Overall perception:
  - Positive relationships: Some mention very good relationships with colleagues and other departments, especially at joint events.
  - Difficult relationships: Others highlight almost non-existent or deteriorated relationships, particularly with management and certain administrative services.
- Recurring problems:
  - Insufficient communication: Many reports indicate a lack of communication between departments or between teams and departments, which creates frustrations. Divergence of objectives is cited as a barrier to cooperation and understanding.
  - Work overload: Work overload, particularly in support services, is frequently cited as a barrier to productive interactions, by the services themselves, but also (and above all) by the users of these services.
  - Working in silos and lack of consideration for others are also cited as obstacles to good relationships.
- Administration:
  - Administrative difficulties: Complex ("gross") and sometimes slow administrative processes are often mentioned as major obstacles to effective collaborations.
- Directions:
  - Negative remarks concerning relations with management (under all the terms: General Management, Center Management, Headquarters Management), often described as disconnected from reality, considering the services as "subcontractors".

Do you feel part of a collective?

Overall statistics <sup>4</sup>:

Yes	120	27.8%
Rather yes	181	41.9%
Rather not	97	22.5%
No	34	7.9%
No answer	15	-

<sup>4</sup> The fact of being a researcher or not, permanent or not, seniority do not show any disparity compared to these overall figures.

Correlation between belonging to a collective and general satisfaction:

Overall satisfaction ->	Very satisfied	Satisfied)	Not satisfied	No way
Collective: Yes	47.5%	47.5%	5.0 %	0%
Collective: Rather yes	26.7%	58.9%	14.4%	0%
Collective: Rather not	11.3%	48.4%	35.1%	5.2%
Collective: No	2.9%	35.3%	47.1%	14.7%

Summary of comments (59 comments or 12% of respondents):

- the collective is the team! Very strong feeling of belonging to a team/department (45%), but the wider the zoom, the less the notion of collective persists. The center is still part of the collective to a lesser extent. The departments are almost systematically cited in a negative way (vertical organization, having its own objectives, the line with the researchers is cut, considers the others as "little hands", disconnected policy: Inria has become a startup-nation).

- elements of vigilance: many believe that the situation is deteriorating over time, citing: bureaucracy, the culture of every man for himself, the negative impact of ERCs, the difficulty of the language for foreign researchers in their interactions with the services.

Do you understand how your activity contributes to the institute's missions?

Overall statistics :

Yes	218	50.0%
Rather yes	158	36.2%
Rather not	46	10.6%
No	14	3.2%
No answer	11	-

By public sector corps: one in five researchers feels that they do not understand how their activities contribute to the Institute's missions.

	Researchers	Non-researchers
Yes	44.4%	54.8%
Rather yes	34.9%	38.2%
Rather not	14.8%	5.5%
No	5.8%	1.5%

Correlation between understanding of its activities in relation to the institute's missions and general satisfaction:

Overall satisfaction ->	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	No way
activity /mission: yes	39.4%	48.6%	11.4%	0.4%
activity /mission: rather yes	15.9%	62.4%	19.8%	1.9%
activity /mission: rather no	15.2%	43.5%	34.8%	6.5%
activity /mission: no	0%	28.6%	50.0%	21.4%

Summary of comments (45 comments or 9% of respondents ):

- Understanding of missions: Some respondents understand how their work fits into the institute's missions, particularly in support of research and training.

- New missions of the institute: the new orientations of the institute (program agency, support for public policies) are very poorly perceived (45% of respondents). The comments are acerbic: Barnum-style announcements, mishmash, false missions, startup nation... The explanation for the lack of communication is sometimes mentioned, but the overall feeling is incomprehension and apprehension of the disappearance of the notion of research in the institute. The orientation towards "trendy" and single-objective subjects (e.g. AI) is also perceived as a fear for the future.

Has your activity been impacted by the developments carried out in the institute in recent years?

Overall statistics <sup>5</sup>:

Yes	122	36.2%
Rather yes	106	31.4%
Rather not	69	20.5%
No	40	11.9%
No answer	110	-

More specifically: a very big difference between the perception of researchers (43% are not impacted by the institute's developments) and that of non-researchers (82% say they are impacted)

	Researchers	Non-researchers
Yes	21.8%	52.1%
Rather yes	34.5%	30.2%
Rather not	28.2%	11.8%
No	15.5%	5.9%

Also a big disparity between permanent and non-permanent

	Permanent	Non-permanent
Yes	42.2%	18.8%
Rather yes	37.1%	19.8%
Rather not	14.2%	36.4%
No	6.5%	25.0%

<sup>5</sup> Nearly 40% of respondents did not answer this question.

And also for seniority: very strong correlation between seniority and the feeling of being impacted by developments

	< 1 year	< 3	< 5	< 10	< 20	< 30	> 30 years
Yes	13.6%	23.1%	27.6%	32.6%	41.6%	47.9%	66.6%
Rather yes	27.3%	20.0%	38.3%	39.5%	40.3%	29.2%	25.0%
Rather not	31.8%	30.8%	23.4%	18.6%	15.3%	16.7%	4.2%
No	27.3%	26.1%	10.7%	9.3%	2.8%	6.2%	4.2%

Correlation between being impacted by recent developments at the institute and overall satisfaction: no notable correlation. Since the potential impact of developments can be felt as positive or negative, this non-correlation is easily understandable.

Overall satisfaction ->	Very satisfied	Satisfied)	Not satisfied	No way
impact: yes	20.6%	44.6%	29.8%	5.0 %
impact: rather yes	21.7%	57.5%	20.7%	0%
impact: rather no	24.6%	56.5%	15.9 %3	3.9%
impact: no	32.5%	40.0%	22.5%	5.0 %

As to whether the impact is positive or negative, we must look at the comments (83 comments or 17% of respondents):

- decrease in funding: the decrease in the budget and the reduction in the allocation of teams is felt negatively. The teams once again cite the "trendy" themes which seem to be the only ones to attract funding.

- the new Inria political orientations are once again cited negatively (program agency, fusion with the university)

- too much administration: Many people report a significant increase in administrative tasks, complicated by management tools and software perceived as poorly adapted (many comments to this effect) or even non-existent (budget monitoring). The most cited processes are recruitment, particularly of doctoral students and post-docs, and mission feedback.

- Replacement of jobs by processes: Some respondents feel a loss of professional identity, particularly in jobs where tasks are reduced to repetitive processes. This feeling is particularly expressed in the business lines of human resources and support functions, where work is increasingly standardized, leading to a loss of meaning (comparison to a "robot")

- some random remarks:

- Automatisation seems to disappear from the name Inria,
- The aircraft engine is changed in mid-flight (REPR, Program Agency),
- going through helpdesk tickets is dehumanizing,
- IT security measures are poorly perceived (and circumvented).

- some positive elements:
  - teleworking is once again cited as having had a positive impact
  - the increase in the number of recruitments for civil service positions is appreciated.

Do you think your manager cares about your working conditions?

Overall statistics:

Yes	199	46.6%
Rather yes	143	33.5%
Rather not	59	13.8%
No	26	6.1%
No answer	20	-

No notable difference between researchers and non-researchers on this response.

	< 1 year	< 3	< 5	< 10	< 20	< 30	> 30 years old
Yes	59.4%	52.8%	46.4%	39.2%	41.7%	39.2%	38.5%
Rather yes	33.3%	39.3%	30.3%	34.8%	34.7%	27.5%	34.6%
Rather not	4.4%	5.6%	17.9%	13.0%	20.8%	25.5%	19.2%
No	2.9%	2.3%	5.4%	13.0%	2.8%	7.8%	7.7%

On the other hand, there is a clear difference between respondents with less than 3 years of experience, nearly 93% of whom believe that their line manager is concerned about working conditions, and respondents with more than 3 years of experience, nearly 25% of whom believe that this is not the case (fairly uniformly across all seniority brackets above this threshold).

Correlation between concern for hierarchy and general satisfaction:

Overall satisfaction ->	Very satisfied	Satisfied)	Not satisfied	No way
N+1: yes	49.0%	42.4%	8.6%	0%
N+1: rather yes	9.8%	75.6%	14.0%	0.6%
N+1: rather not	5.1%	42.4%	47.4%	5.1%
N+1: no	7.7%	11.5%	61.6%	19.2%

Summary of comments (51 comments or 11% of respondents):

- Positive perception of direct managers:
  - many have a positive opinion of their direct manager (62%)
  - but, many (1/3 of these 62%) indicate at the same time that N+1s have few means to concretely resolve problems or implement sustainable solutions, mainly due to institutional blockages.

- some have a more nuanced opinion: my N+1 is too busy, my N+1 is remote, "maybe once a year during the annual review", "in words, but not in actions"...

- Perceived disconnection from middle and upper hierarchy:
  - among the 62% having a positive opinion of their direct manager, 1/3 think that the higher level (N+2, center or functional director, general management) is not at all concerned about their working conditions
  - overall, 45% of the comments are negative towards senior management: "management is aware but it is not changing, quite the contrary", "the less we say, the better off we are", "management refuses to see certain things"...
  - some comments on services without a manager for several months.

If you have a professional difficulty, who would you most likely turn to to talk about it?

Overall statistics: colleagues and management (weighted by seniority, see below) are the preferred contacts.

My colleagues	201	50.2%
My supervision	146	35.6%
To the HRD/HR Manager	25	6.2%
To the staff representatives (SR)	28	7.0%
No answer	47	-

Depending on the public sector corps :

	Researchers	Non-researchers
My colleagues	31.2%	39.6%
My supervision	56.7%	46.2%
To the HRD/HR Manager	6.9%	7.1%
To the staff representatives (SR)	5.2%	7.1%

More seniority increases, the less management is called upon and the more staff representatives are called upon (1 in 5 people respond in this sense in the 20-30 year seniority bracket):

	< 1 year	< 3	< 5	< 10	< 20	< 30	> 30 years old
My colleagues	47.1%	45.4%	55.1%	58.1%	48.6%	41.5%	70.8%
My supervision	48.6%	42.1%	38.8%	30.2%	31.4%	26.8%	16.7%
To the HRD/HR Manager	2.9%	9.1%	2.0%	9.3%	5.7%	12.2%	4.2%
To the RP	1.4%	3.4%	4.1%	2.4%	14.3%	19.5%	8.3%

Summary of comments (77 comments or 16% of respondents ):

- the (natural?) order of requests is: colleague, management, HR, PR.
- Colleagues as first support
  - colleagues are called upon, sometimes colleagues outside the department or former colleagues (to avoid "polluting" the immediate work atmosphere), often for moral support ("helps to put things into perspective")
- Direct supervision
  - direct managers are often mentioned as people to whom respondents turn after their colleagues. Several respondents indicate that their intervention capacities are sometimes limited by organizational constraints.
- Opinions on the HR department are mixed: Some find that HR departments lack efficiency and commitment, with responses often delayed or inappropriate. This perception leads to a certain reluctance to contact HR, especially for human or relational problems. In particular, people who do not speak French fluently, report communication difficulties, feeling that the department lacks openness to international staff.
- Staff representatives:
  - low use of staff representatives: Staff representatives are generally contacted as a last resort, particularly if approaches with management or HR have not been successful. Some people express low visibility of PRs, and others perceive limited effectiveness on their part.
  - PRs are mainly called upon for questions of relations with the hierarchy or for structural problems.
- autonomy is sometimes claimed to manage difficulties alone.
- it is noted several times that the fact that the interlocutor chooses depends on the problem encountered.
- Cited only twice: occupational medicine...

Are you considering changing your career direction in the near future?

Overall statistics:

No	233	64.9%
Yes, in internal mobility	40	11.1%
Yes, in external mobility	86	24.0%
No answer	88	-

More finely:

	Researchers	Non-researchers
No	69.3%	62.6%
Yes, in internal mobility	6.8%	16.5%
Yes, in external mobility	23.9%	20.9%

Depending on the status:

	Permanent	Non-Permanent
No	72.2%	54.4%
Yes, in internal mobility	13.0%	8.0%
Yes, in external mobility	14.8%	37.6%

Depending on seniority:

	< 1 year	< 3	< 5	< 10	< 20	< 30	> 30 years old
No	72.6%	57.1%	54.5%	55.6%	73.0%	61.9%	91.7%
Yes, internal mobility	8.1%	4.3%	18.2%	22.2%	11.1%	16.7%	0%
Yes, external mobility	19.3%	38.6%	27.3%	22.2%	15.9%	21.4%	8.3%

Correlation between change of professional orientation and general satisfaction: the desire/need for internal or external mobility is not an element impacting general satisfaction.

Overall satisfaction ->	Very satisfied	Satisfied)	Not satisfied	No way
No (no mobility)	38.2%	53.2%	8.2%	0.4%
Yes, internal mobility	20.0 %	47.5%	27.5%	5.0 %
Yes, external mobility	10.6%	42.3%	41.2%	5.9%

Summary of comments (66 comments or 14% of respondents):

- internal/external mobility: The most frequently cited reasons are:
  - personal reasons (42% of comments): sectoral mobility, geographic mobility, desire for advancement, etc.
  - precariousness (21%): end/limit of fixed-term contract or thesis, most often without hope of joining Inria
  - salary reason (7.6%)
  - lack of prospects for development (few interesting choices in internal mobility proposals)
- end of career (12% of comments):
  - all the comments of this type express relief.
  - some even regret not having done it earlier (now it's too late) and express relief at leaving ("the system is just waiting for that")



Would you recommend people to come and work at Inria?

Overall statistics:

Yes	160	39.7%
Rather yes	168	41.7%
Rather not	58	14.4%
No	17	4.2%
No answer	44	-

No significant difference between researcher/non-researcher responses.

	Permanent	Non-permanent
Yes	34.3%	48.7%
Rather yes	42.7%	40.8%
Rather not	19.7%	5.9%
No	3.3%	4.6%

Depending on seniority: the more seniority increases, the less Inria is recommended .

	< 1 year	< 3	< 5	< 10	< 20	< 30	> 30 years old
Yes	66.2%	46.1%	36.5%	27.3%	27.7%	36.2%	16.7%
Rather yes	25.0%	43.8%	48.1%	50.0%	49.2%	34.0%	50.0%
Rather not	7.3%	5.6%	13.5%	15.9%	21.5%	23.4%	33.3%
No	1.5%	4.5%	1.9%	6.8%	1.6%	6.4%	0%

Correlation between institute recommendation and overall satisfaction: strong correlation.

Overall satisfaction ->	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	No way
recommendation: yes	53.7%	44.4%	1.9%	0%
recommendation: rather yes	13.8%	70.1%	16.1%	0%
recommendation: rather no	6.9%	32.8%	53.4%	6.9%
recommendation: no	0%	23.5%	41.2%	35.3%

Summary of comments (55 comments or 12% of respondents ):

- Significant reservations regarding the overall recommendation
  - Unattractive salary conditions
  - Administrative burden
  - Lack of prospects for development
- Nuances depending on the professions and teams:

- Opinions are often more positive for research, doctoral and engineering positions. However, opinions are more reserved for administrative and technical professions.
- Recommendation of researchers:
  - Some researchers would recommend their team in particular, citing a good atmosphere, for others it is the exact opposite!
  - The CNRS is often cited as a better alternative
  - Another alternative cited: going abroad (more attractive) or into industry (salary and less administrative pressure)
- when they are mentioned, Inria's strengths are the stimulating environment and flexibility, teleworking ("but that's not what makes you proud of your work")

### What would be the priority issue for you to address to improve your working conditions?

No numerical statistics for this question, which generated 240 comments (50% of respondents). The most frequently mentioned remarks are (in order of importance):

- Increased salaries: This is the major concern! Many people are calling for more competitive salaries. They believe that low salaries and the lack of prospects for advancement are major obstacles to motivation and satisfaction. The revaluation of the index point is popular. Taking into account the increase in skills in bonuses, implementing a salary policy for permanent contracts, and offering a company health insurance plan are also requested measures.
- Simplification of administrative procedures: administrative burden is also a major concern. Agents are calling for more agile processes, particularly for recruitment, financing, and project management. There should be more trust in users and a reduction in time-consuming checks, which slow everyone down, adding to the mental load of researchers but also administrative staff. The lack of direct dialogue with administrative services (via dehumanized helpdesks), the slowness and adequacy of responses are often mentioned, as well as the lack of dialogue and understanding between users and services.
- Refocusing on science: many want the institute to redefine its priorities around scientific research, with more consultation with researchers, by ceasing to follow "fashionable" themes dictated by external funding. They recommend an increase in recurring budgets for teams, in order to reduce the time spent looking for funding.
- Computer tools and software simplification: Current digital tools, often considered unsuitable, contribute to the malaise of services. This problem adds to the slowness of the responses provided by the services.
- Career prospects and recognition of skills: the lack of career prospects, the few internal mobility opportunities and the non-recognition of skills are often cited.

- Workload and recruitment: The workload is often perceived as excessive and growing. Many people (researchers or ITAs) ask for administrative services to be better staffed, arguing that this would increase the quality of service and make life easier for everyone. The recruitment of permanent staff instead of fixed-term contracts and the rapid replacement of vacant positions so as not to increase the workload of other people in the department are often mentioned. The reduction of unnecessary meetings, better planning and organization are also mentioned.

- Improving management and strengthening managerial skills: several comments calling for mandatory training for managers, particularly in human management and communication. Some people regret that conflicts are not handled properly by the hierarchical chain.

- Better communication and transparency: Communication between management and field teams is often perceived as insufficient. Agents want greater listening from management and more transparency in strategic decisions, with regular exchanges to explain the directions taken by the institute.

- Improvement of material working conditions: the main remarks concerning the modernization of offices, overcrowded premises, poorly adapted equipment. Better-designed relaxation areas to encourage informal exchanges and well-being are requested. Reading spaces for researchers are also mentioned. Some remarks on collective catering (different prices depending on status, quality, variety, etc.).

- Some more scattered remarks:

- desire for a more flexible teleworking policy (across the EU),
- the treatment of RPS is considered unsuitable,
- better separation of private life and professional life,
- the inclusion of non-French-speaking staff needs to be improved.

## Overall synthesis (in the form of a final wink)

All the verbatim was concatenated, then submitted to ChapGPT for synthesis, here is what comes out, transcribed without alteration:

*The paper presents a compilation of varied opinions on working conditions and job satisfaction within an organization, probably a research institute. The opinions cover several main themes, which can be summarized as follows:*

### 1. Job satisfaction:

- *Many respondents enjoy their job in itself, particularly in scientific research, which is seen as a stimulating and rewarding field.*
- *Some, however, feel disconnected from the initial values that attracted them to their work, citing a progressive loss of meaning.*

### 2. Workload and organization:

- *High costs: A majority denounce an overload of work, amplified by understaffing, the accumulation of missions, and administrative constraints.*
- *Excessive administration: Researchers, in particular, regret the time taken up by administrative tasks to the detriment of their core business.*
- *Frequent changes: Repeated changes in procedures, tools or strategic directions are sources of frustration and harm the continuity and quality of work.*

### 3. Material and environmental conditions:

- *Recurring infrastructure problems are noted: poorly adapted offices (temperature, furniture), dilapidated premises, lack of ergonomic spaces.*
- *Teleworking is often mentioned positively to overcome certain physical or organizational problems.*

### 4. Working environment and human relations:

- *Relationships within teams: The atmosphere is generally positive between colleagues, with teams united in adversity. However, tensions exist in some teams due to stress, difficult personalities, or inadequate management.*
- *Relations with management: Communication with management is frequently criticized for its lack of listening and responsiveness.*
- *Interdepartmental relations: These vary depending on the case. Administrative burdens and silos sometimes hinder collaboration.*

### 5. Professional development:

- *Opportunities for advancement are perceived as limited, often hampered by cumbersome processes (competitions, etc.).*
- *A feeling of lack of recognition of skills and efforts is regularly mentioned.*

### 6. Quality of life at work (QVT):



## Appendix A: 2024 questionnaire

### Part 1: Who are you?

A01: You are... ( *A man / A woman / Other / No answer* )

A02: You are... ( *Researcher / ITA / No response* )

A03: You are... ( *Inria / Non-Inria / No response* )

A04: You are... ( *Permanent / Contractual / No response* )

A05: Attachment center (*list of centers*)

A06: Team/Department/Management

A07: Seniority (*< 1 year, < 3 years, < 5 years, < 10 years, < 20 years, < 30 years, > 30 years, No response*)

### Part 2: Questionnaire

B01: Are you satisfied with your current job?

B02: How do you rate your Quality of Life at Work?

B03: In recent years, would you say that your Quality of life at work has... (evolution)?

B04: Overall, are you satisfied with your working conditions (hours, material conditions, training, etc.)?

B05: How would you define the working atmosphere within the team or department?

B06: How would you define professional relations with other structures of the institute (other teams, services, departments)?

B07: Do you feel part of a collective?

B08: Do you understand how your activity contributes to the institute's missions?

B09: Has your activity been impacted by the developments carried out in the institute in recent years?

B10: Do you think your manager is concerned about your working conditions?

B11: If you have a professional difficulty, who would you most likely turn to to talk about it?

B12: Are you considering changing your career direction in the near future?

B13: Would you recommend people to come and work at Inria?

B14: What would be the priority issue for you to address to improve your working conditions?

### Part 3: Conclusion

C01: Free comment on the questionnaire or any other subject.

## Appendix B: Some remarks on the counting

The document contains only the relevant cross-tabulations [correlation between questions or refinement of statistics by population (gender/status/corps/seniority)]. Irrelevant correlations are not displayed in most cases.

Although all the answers to the questions were optional, some people were upset by the lifting of anonymity through cross-referencing of data (concerning in particular the question on the department/team of belonging, the centre):

- the answers to these questions were not used during the counting
- the question "department/team of belonging" will be deleted in the future

The "center of belonging" data were only used to validate that the distribution of responses was homogeneous by center. No specific center-by-center study was carried out.

In order for the sum of the percentages in the tables to always add up to 100%, one of the data in the table has been rounded "to the best rounding".

Example :

- the distribution of satisfaction for researchers gives:  
0.326425 / 0.497409 / 0.165803 / 0.010363
- natural rounding to 1 decimal place would give :  
0.326 / 0.497 / 0.166 / 0.010, for a total of 0.999
- the chosen rounding: 0.327 / 0.497 / 0.166 / 0.010, favoring the number with the best "positive remainder" .