Chart: The chart shows how ORNL's answers in the 1999 survey compare with the '97 survey. Dark green indicates improvement, shaded means little or no change, and gray denotes lost ground. The numbers in parentheses represent the percentage of staff who answered in a more positive or negative fashion than in '97. (—) or (1) means no change. Where there is no number, a percentage is not applicable. Barred questions were not asked in '97 and thus can't be compared.

<ul> <li>■ Favorable</li> <li>■ Neutral</li> <li>■ Unfavorable</li> <li>■ Unfavorable</li> </ul> Ethics Survey Comparison ORNL in 1999 and 1997		
Morale	1 Frequency of values (+3 to+7)	5 Observed Violations (—)
	2 Individual commitment	12 LM commitment to ethics (-5)
	3 Pressure to compromise (+2)	15 Ethics training
	4 Cause of pressure	
Open	6 Type of misconduct	1 <del>4 Fear of reprisal</del>
Environment	7 Report of observations (+6)	27 Survey-related changes (+3)
	8 Whom to report to	30 Work group values diverse
		perspectives (+3)
	11 Why not report	32 Growth & learning encouraged (+3)
Job	25 Good use of skills (+2)	31 Pay satisfaction (+1)
Satisfaction	26 job satisfaction (+1)	
Involvement	24 Link to company's objectives	37 Involvement in decisions (—)
	33 Personal accomplishment	38 Authority to make decisions (—)
Recognition	28 Recognition satisfaction (+3)	29 Feel values (-1)
Company	9 Company response	23 Compare LM to other companies (+9)
Satisfaction	10 Satisfaction with response (+3)	34 Better job availability
	13 Factors leading to commit-	35 Benefits information
	ment change (+1 to +25)	36 Satisfaction with benefits
	16 Characteristics of LM	
	17 Overall satisfaction with LM (+4)	
Management	18 Satisfactory info from mgmt. (+5)	20 Supervisor communicates goals (+2)
	19 Clear picture from sr. mgmt. (+3)	21 Feedback for improvement
	22 Job done by supervisor	

