

Benchmarking report 2026

- Stress Indicator Tool (SIT)
- Home and Hybrid Working Tool (HHW)
- Safety Climate Tool (SCT)



Introduction

The 2026 benchmarking report for the Stress Indicator Tool (SIT), Home and Hybrid Working Tool (HHW) and Safety Climate Tool (SCT) supplements the all-industry benchmarking data available in the system-generated report. The data in this report is based on validated and usable survey responses collected up to 1 July 2026.

Why benchmarking is important

Benchmarking helps you understand the level of performance being achieved by other organisations. You can use this information to identify gaps in your own results and where improvements may be needed.

Do not focus only on the lowest-scoring factor in your organisation. This may not be the most effective way to improve work-related stress or strengthen your safety culture. Comparing your scores with benchmarking and industry data can help you identify the areas with the greatest opportunity for improvement. It can also provide evidence to help secure support from senior leaders and drive meaningful change.

Use your score analysis to inform discussions with working groups and stakeholders. However, survey data only provides part of the picture. You should also engage with your workers to understand the underlying issues and identify the most appropriate improvements.

The benchmarking data comes from organisations that use the tools. These organisations vary in size, sector and available resources, from large organisations with dedicated health and safety programmes to smaller organisations with more limited capacity.

Do not assume that the benchmarked scores represent good, adequate or poor performance. A score above the average does not necessarily mean your organisation is performing well, and a score below the average does not necessarily mean it is performing poorly. Instead, focus on improving your performance over time.

The overall purpose of benchmarking is to support continuous improvement in how your organisation manages health and safety risks.

For more information on using and interpreting this data, contact the products team.

Email: hseorders@tso.co.uk | Phone: +44 (0)333 202 5070

Contents

Stress Indicator Tool (SIT).....4

Home and Hybrid Working Tool (HHW)19

Safety Climate Tool (SCT)24

Stress Indicator Tool (SIT)

Benchmarking report 2026



Contents

All data	6
Private sector.....	8
Public sector	9
Charity and not-for-profit.....	10
Chemical and pharmaceutical	10
Construction	10
Education.....	11
Emergency services (police, fire and rescue)	12
Energy.....	12
Government	12
Healthcare	13
Housing.....	13
Local authority.....	13
Manufacturing	14
Professional services (financial, legal, science, research, and IT)	14
Utilities.....	14
Examples and observations.....	15

Stress Indicator Tool (SIT)

All data

The all-industry data set comprises 83,452 responses across 329 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	2.06	1.83	2.78	3.34	3.24	3.32	2.09
Mean	3.25	3.67	3.78	3.99	4.12	4.16	3.25
Max	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.14

Mean scores by year

Interpret mean scores by year with caution. The results are affected by changes in the mix of organisations using the tool over time. Organisations start using the tool at different points in their improvement journey. Some use it to establish a baseline, while others use it after making significant changes. This means that the organisations contributing to the annual average are not the same each year. As a result, changes in mean scores between years are more likely to reflect differences in the organisations taking part than changes in performance over time. For this reason, year-on-year comparisons of mean scores are not a reliable measure of overall trends. They should not be used on their own to benchmark performance or assess progress over time. Instead, focus on changes in your organisation's own results and the actions taken to drive improvement.

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
2018	3.20	3.67	3.73	3.93	3.97	4.16	3.20
2019	3.13	3.70	3.74	3.96	4.11	4.02	3.16
2020	3.30	3.85	3.85	4.07	4.21	4.25	3.50
2021	3.20	3.58	3.80	4.01	4.12	4.24	3.32
2022	3.32	3.68	3.79	4.01	4.16	4.21	3.32
2023	3.31	3.66	3.78	3.98	4.13	4.17	3.31
2024	3.36	3.71	3.84	4.03	4.16	4.19	3.35
2025	3.14	3.60	3.74	3.95	4.10	4.15	3.09

All-industry percentiles

Compare your score with a relevant reference population to understand where it sits relative to similar organisations. The percentile ranking shows whether your result is low, average or high. For example, if your score is at the 5th percentile, only 5% of comparable organisations scored lower, while 95% scored higher. This means your score is lower than that of most organisations in the comparison group.

All industry percentiles	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
0%	2.06	1.83	2.78	3.34	3.24	3.32	2.09
5%	2.72	3.02	3.35	3.70	3.66	3.78	2.63
10%	2.88	3.25	3.48	3.77	3.82	3.87	2.84
15%	3.00	3.34	3.54	3.80	3.89	3.94	2.90
20%	3.06	3.44	3.61	3.83	3.94	3.98	2.98
25%	3.11	3.52	3.66	3.87	4.00	4.02	3.02
30%	3.13	3.58	3.69	3.92	4.05	4.04	3.11
35%	3.15	3.64	3.71	3.94	4.08	4.09	3.15
40%	3.20	3.68	3.74	3.96	4.10	4.11	3.19
45%	3.22	3.71	3.79	3.98	4.13	4.13	3.23
50%	3.25	3.74	3.81	4.00	4.16	4.16	3.29
55%	3.29	3.77	3.83	4.02	4.18	4.18	3.31
60%	3.32	3.80	3.85	4.03	4.21	4.21	3.34
65%	3.36	3.83	3.87	4.05	4.23	4.25	3.38
70%	3.41	3.85	3.90	4.07	4.25	4.27	3.46
75%	3.47	3.88	3.94	4.10	4.28	4.31	3.51
80%	3.50	3.91	3.97	4.12	4.31	4.36	3.55
85%	3.55	3.95	4.00	4.18	4.35	4.42	3.62
90%	3.60	3.99	4.04	4.24	4.41	4.48	3.69
95%	3.76	4.06	4.16	4.31	4.48	4.57	3.80
100%	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.14

Private sector

The private sector data set comprises 31,953 responses across 204 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	2.33	2.47	2.78	3.36	3.28	3.32	2.09
Mean	3.36	3.73	3.79	4.00	4.15	4.21	3.36
Max	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.50	4.75	4.71	4.14

Private sector percentiles

Private sector percentiles	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
0%	2.33	2.47	2.78	3.36	3.28	3.32	2.09
5%	2.86	3.27	3.36	3.67	3.71	3.85	2.79
10%	3.03	3.37	3.46	3.77	3.82	3.94	2.92
15%	3.12	3.47	3.52	3.80	3.90	3.99	3.01
20%	3.14	3.52	3.57	3.83	3.95	4.04	3.13
25%	3.18	3.58	3.64	3.87	4.02	4.08	3.18
30%	3.23	3.63	3.69	3.93	4.07	4.10	3.23
35%	3.25	3.68	3.72	3.95	4.09	4.12	3.27
40%	3.30	3.72	3.78	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.31
45%	3.33	3.74	3.81	3.98	4.15	4.16	3.33
50%	3.36	3.78	3.84	4.01	4.18	4.20	3.37
55%	3.39	3.81	3.86	4.02	4.21	4.24	3.42
60%	3.42	3.84	3.88	4.05	4.24	4.26	3.48
65%	3.48	3.85	3.90	4.06	4.27	4.29	3.52
70%	3.50	3.88	3.94	4.09	4.29	4.32	3.54
75%	3.52	3.91	3.97	4.11	4.32	4.37	3.60
80%	3.56	3.95	3.99	4.16	4.36	4.42	3.64
85%	3.61	3.98	4.03	4.21	4.42	4.47	3.67
90%	3.74	4.04	4.11	4.26	4.45	4.54	3.73
95%	3.80	4.13	4.21	4.33	4.51	4.58	3.84
100%	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.50	4.75	4.71	4.14

Public sector

The public sector data set comprises 51,499 responses across 125 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	2.06	1.83	3.01	3.34	3.24	3.55	2.10
Mean	3.08	3.56	3.75	3.97	4.08	4.09	3.08
Max	3.64	4.19	4.33	4.49	4.71	4.75	3.90

Public sector percentiles

Private sector percentiles	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
0%	2.06	1.83	3.01	3.34	3.24	3.55	2.10
5%	2.45	2.92	3.35	3.72	3.64	3.75	2.46
10%	2.71	2.99	3.51	3.75	3.79	3.81	2.67
15%	2.84	3.14	3.56	3.79	3.88	3.87	2.82
20%	2.94	3.25	3.63	3.83	3.91	3.91	2.87
25%	3.00	3.34	3.67	3.87	3.95	3.94	2.90
30%	3.03	3.44	3.69	3.91	4.01	3.97	2.94
35%	3.06	3.53	3.70	3.93	4.05	4.01	3.01
40%	3.10	3.60	3.72	3.94	4.08	4.03	3.03
45%	3.12	3.66	3.74	3.96	4.10	4.06	3.06
50%	3.13	3.70	3.77	3.98	4.12	4.09	3.11
55%	3.14	3.71	3.79	4.01	4.16	4.11	3.14
60%	3.16	3.74	3.81	4.01	4.17	4.15	3.17
65%	3.20	3.77	3.83	4.03	4.20	4.18	3.21
70%	3.21	3.78	3.85	4.04	4.21	4.20	3.24
75%	3.23	3.83	3.87	4.06	4.22	4.21	3.30
80%	3.27	3.85	3.92	4.09	4.24	4.25	3.33
85%	3.32	3.88	3.94	4.13	4.25	4.29	3.38
90%	3.40	3.92	3.99	4.16	4.30	4.36	3.47
95%	3.51	3.97	4.03	4.28	4.35	4.43	3.54
100%	3.64	4.19	4.33	4.49	4.71	4.75	3.90

Industries

Charity and not-for-profit

The charity and not-for-profit data set comprises 2,209 responses across 19 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	3.09	3.37	3.43	3.63	3.36	3.85	3.01
Mean	3.48	3.74	3.88	4.03	4.07	4.32	3.43
Max	3.85	4.09	4.29	4.29	4.34	4.66	3.88

Chemical and pharmaceutical

The chemical and pharmaceutical data set comprises 2,037 responses across 10 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	3.14	3.10	3.36	3.71	3.85	3.83	2.56
Mean	3.30	3.53	3.65	3.94	4.05	4.05	3.10
Max	3.50	3.79	3.96	4.08	4.17	4.19	3.38

Construction

The construction data set comprises 1,733 responses across 18 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	2.86	3.27	3.26	3.57	3.56	3.95	2.91
Mean	3.35	3.74	3.75	3.95	4.17	4.24	3.40
Max	3.64	4.05	4.02	4.27	4.50	4.57	3.96

Education

The education data set comprises 8,922 responses across 45 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	2.55	2.88	3.29	3.66	3.67	3.56	2.45
Mean	3.18	3.50	3.73	4.00	4.08	4.16	3.20
Max	3.66	4.02	4.27	4.49	4.52	4.75	3.90

Universities only

The universities data set comprises 4,554 responses across 22 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	2.55	3.27	3.29	3.66	3.67	3.56	2.45
Mean	3.16	3.69	3.66	3.91	4.00	4.03	3.15
Max	3.66	4.02	3.97	4.16	4.32	4.53	3.67

Observation

Universities tend to use the Stress Indicator Tool via multiple, separate departmental surveys rather than one single organisation-wide survey. While this approach can provide insight into individual departments, it limits the ability to understand and manage work-related stress across the organisation as a whole. It also does not meet the requirement for an organisation's work-related stress risk assessment.

The Stress Indicator Tool is intended to support the assessment and management of work-related stress at an organisational level. Conducting a single organisation-wide survey enables an overall assessment of psychosocial risks while still allowing results to be analysed by demographic groups, such as department, faculty or staff group, provided there are enough responses to maintain confidentiality. This approach provides both an organisation-wide view of risk and the detailed information needed to identify areas requiring targeted intervention.

Relying solely on separate departmental surveys can make it difficult to establish an overall organisational baseline, benchmark performance accurately and identify systemic issues that may extend beyond individual departments. For these reasons, organisations are encouraged to administer a single organisation-wide survey and use demographic reporting filters to generate department-level insights when needed.

Emergency services (police, fire and rescue)

The emergency services data set comprises 2,044 responses across 6 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	2.72	3.11	3.46	3.72	3.57	3.86	2.60
Mean	3.10	3.31	3.69	3.88	3.97	4.08	3.03
Max	3.58	3.67	3.92	4.04	4.20	4.26	3.32

Energy

The energy data set comprises 1,641 responses across 20 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	2.91	3.38	3.46	3.81	3.91	3.78	2.81
Mean	3.47	3.88	3.86	4.04	4.28	4.18	3.43
Max	3.89	4.06	4.14	4.31	4.54	4.65	4.00

Government

The government data set comprises 38,655 responses across 73 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	2.06	1.83	3.01	3.34	3.24	3.32	2.10
Mean	3.00	3.61	3.71	3.91	4.06	3.98	2.99
Max	3.64	4.19	4.11	4.29	4.47	4.46	3.55

Healthcare

The healthcare data set comprises 1,742 responses across 15 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	2.33	2.88	3.52	3.72	3.72	3.82	3.17
Mean	3.14	3.56	3.81	3.94	4.06	4.40	3.49
Max	3.67	4.15	4.22	4.34	4.49	4.71	3.90

Housing

The housing data set comprises 1,827 responses across 9 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	3.20	3.60	3.67	3.93	3.91	4.12	3.18
Mean	3.38	3.86	3.90	4.06	4.13	4.34	3.45
Max	3.78	4.19	4.17	4.31	4.24	4.57	4.14

Local authority

The local authority data set comprises 7,420 responses across 28 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	3.00	3.12	3.50	3.73	3.50	3.97	2.84
Mean	3.23	3.68	3.81	4.05	4.09	4.23	3.27
Max	3.57	4.13	4.33	4.47	4.71	4.60	3.81

Manufacturing

The manufacturing data set comprises 3,240 responses across 15 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	2.86	2.47	2.78	3.36	3.28	3.85	2.58
Mean	3.35	3.61	3.62	3.94	4.06	4.24	3.27
Max	3.84	4.25	4.10	4.42	4.49	4.69	3.88

Professional services (financial, legal, science, research, and IT)

The professional services data set comprises 1,856 responses across 18 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	2.92	3.25	3.56	3.70	3.94	3.81	2.89
Mean	3.45	3.87	4.02	4.15	4.35	4.24	3.58
Max	3.88	4.26	4.51	4.50	4.75	4.48	3.97

Utilities

The utilities data set comprises 5,009 responses across 16 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Min	2.84	3.17	3.12	3.47	3.46	3.50	2.09
Mean	3.33	3.72	3.76	3.92	4.17	4.13	3.31
Max	4.05	3.89	4.00	4.17	4.41	4.59	3.80

Examples and observations

This section presents examples from organisations that have used the Stress Indicator Tool (SIT) and tracks how their scores have changed over time. Each example includes a comparison with all industry percentile rankings, showing how performance relates to the wider benchmarking dataset.

Alongside each example, an observation section highlights key insights, learning points and considerations. These examples can help you understand what the scores mean, how they have changed over time and what improvements have been achieved. Importantly, even a relatively small change in scores can represent a significant improvement when viewed against the all-industry 5th percentile benchmark.

You can apply the same analysis to your own data by comparing the results from your baseline (first) survey with your most recent survey. This allows you to demonstrate performance trends, assess how your organisation compares with the wider benchmarking population and understand the direction of travel. The analysis can support decision-making, demonstrate progress and identify areas where further action may be needed.

When reviewing your own results, it is important to consider not only whether scores have improved, but also the magnitude of that improvement and how the results compare with the all-industry benchmarking data.

The examples demonstrate that positive outcomes can be achieved through sustained focus and targeted action. They also highlight the importance of maintaining momentum, as improvements can be difficult to sustain if the activities and interventions that contributed to the initial gains are not continued.

A small business process outsourcing company

Mean scores by factor	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Year 1	3.26	3.68	3.84	4.08	4.21	4.33	3.21
Year 2	3.27	3.84	4.15	4.20	4.36	4.21	3.58
Year 3	3.51	3.93	4.28	4.33	4.62	4.46	3.66

Observations

- this organisation has improved across all stress Management Standards
- managers' support, peer support and relationships have all improved to the 95th percentile
- the main factors to focus on for further improvement are demands and control, followed by role and change

All industry percentiles	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
100%	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.14
95%	3.76	4.06	4.16	4.31	4.48	4.57	3.80
90%	3.60	3.99	4.04	4.24	4.41	4.48	3.69
85%	3.55	3.95	4.00	4.18	4.35	4.42	3.62
80%	3.50	3.91	3.97	4.12	4.31	4.36	3.55
75%	3.47	3.88	3.94	4.10	4.28	4.31	3.51
70%	3.41	3.85	3.90	4.07	4.25	4.27	3.46
65%	3.36	3.83	3.87	4.05	4.23	4.25	3.38
60%	3.32	3.80	3.85	4.03	4.21	4.21	3.34
55%	3.29	3.77	3.83	4.02	4.18	4.18	3.31
50%	3.25	3.74	3.81	4.00	4.16	4.16	3.29
45%	3.22	3.71	3.79	3.98	4.13	4.13	3.23
40%	3.20	3.68	3.74	3.96	4.10	4.11	3.19
35%	3.15	3.64	3.71	3.94	4.08	4.09	3.15
30%	3.13	3.58	3.69	3.92	4.05	4.04	3.11
25%	3.11	3.52	3.66	3.87	4.00	4.02	3.02
20%	3.06	3.44	3.61	3.83	3.94	3.98	2.98
15%	3.00	3.34	3.54	3.80	3.89	3.94	2.90
10%	2.88	3.25	3.48	3.77	3.82	3.87	2.84
5%	2.72	3.02	3.35	3.70	3.66	3.78	2.63
0%	2.06	1.83	2.78	3.34	3.24	3.32	2.09

A large college

Mean scores by factor	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Year 1	3.12	3.52	3.72	4.03	4.09	4.17	3.16
Year 2	3.14	3.65	3.89	4.06	4.20	4.20	3.38
Year 3	3.17	3.62	3.83	4.06	4.13	4.19	3.23
Year 4	3.26	3.60	4.00	4.18	4.30	4.26	3.38
Year 5	No survey						
Year 6	3.35	3.58	3.92	4.15	4.19	4.20	3.34

Observations

- this organisation did not survey their workers in year 5, which has negatively affected scores across several factors
- this organisation has improved significantly in demands, managers' support, peer support, relationships and change
- the main factor to focus on for further improvement is control, followed by relationships, role and change

All industry percentiles	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
100%	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.14
95%	3.76	4.06	4.16	4.31	4.48	4.57	3.80
90%	3.60	3.99	4.04	4.24	4.41	4.48	3.69
85%	3.55	3.95	4.00	4.18	4.35	4.42	3.62
80%	3.50	3.91	3.97	4.12	4.31	4.36	3.55
75%	3.47	3.88	3.94	4.10	4.28	4.31	3.51
70%	3.41	3.85	3.90	4.07	4.25	4.27	3.46
65%	3.36	3.83	3.87	4.05	4.23	4.25	3.38
60%	3.32	3.80	3.85	4.03	4.21	4.21	3.34
55%	3.29	3.77	3.83	4.02	4.18	4.18	3.31
50%	3.25	3.74	3.81	4.00	4.16	4.16	3.29
45%	3.22	3.71	3.79	3.98	4.13	4.13	3.23
40%	3.20	3.68	3.74	3.96	4.10	4.11	3.19
35%	3.15	3.64	3.71	3.94	4.08	4.09	3.15
30%	3.13	3.58	3.69	3.92	4.05	4.04	3.11
25%	3.11	3.52	3.66	3.87	4.00	4.02	3.02
20%	3.06	3.44	3.61	3.83	3.94	3.98	2.98
15%	3.00	3.34	3.54	3.80	3.89	3.94	2.90

A large UK regulator

Mean scores by factor	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
Year 1	3.10	3.78	3.67	3.88	4.03	4.06	3.03
Year 2	3.21	3.85	3.94	4.01	4.22	4.15	3.33

Observations

- this organisation is at the start of its journey and has begun to improve across all factors in its first year
- this organisation has shown significant improvement in managers' support, peer support, relationships and change
- the main factors to focus on for further improvement are demands, followed by peer support, relationships, role and change

All industry percentiles	Demands	Control	Managers' support	Peer support	Relationships	Role	Change
100%	4.05	4.38	4.51	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.14
95%	3.76	4.06	4.16	4.31	4.48	4.57	3.80
90%	3.60	3.99	4.04	4.24	4.41	4.48	3.69
85%	3.55	3.95	4.00	4.18	4.35	4.42	3.62
80%	3.50	3.91	3.97	4.12	4.31	4.36	3.55
75%	3.47	3.88	3.94	4.10	4.28	4.31	3.51
70%	3.41	3.85	3.90	4.07	4.25	4.27	3.46
65%	3.36	3.83	3.87	4.05	4.23	4.25	3.38
60%	3.32	3.80	3.85	4.03	4.21	4.21	3.34
55%	3.29	3.77	3.83	4.02	4.18	4.18	3.31
50%	3.25	3.74	3.81	4.00	4.16	4.16	3.29
45%	3.22	3.71	3.79	3.98	4.13	4.13	3.23
40%	3.20	3.68	3.74	3.96	4.10	4.11	3.19
35%	3.15	3.64	3.71	3.94	4.08	4.09	3.15
30%	3.13	3.58	3.69	3.92	4.05	4.04	3.11
25%	3.11	3.52	3.66	3.87	4.00	4.02	3.02
20%	3.06	3.44	3.61	3.83	3.94	3.98	2.98
15%	3.00	3.34	3.54	3.80	3.89	3.94	2.90
10%	2.88	3.25	3.48	3.77	3.82	3.87	2.84
5%	2.72	3.02	3.35	3.70	3.66	3.78	2.63
0%	2.06	1.83	2.78	3.34	3.24	3.32	2.09

**PUBLICATIONS AND
PRODUCTS FROM**



Home and Hybrid Working Tool (HHW)

Benchmarking report 2026



Contents

All-industry21

Public sector21

Private sector..... 22

Home and Hybrid Working Tool (HHW)

All-industry

The all-industry data set comprises 17,862 responses across 75 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Remote demands	Remote control	Remote peer support	Remote management support	Remote relationships	Remote change	Work/home interface	Remote monitoring
Min	2.31	3.00	2.87	2.54	2.61	2.89	3.22	3.07
Mean	3.28	3.94	3.88	3.86	3.64	3.46	3.93	3.64
Max	3.77	4.35	4.29	4.52	4.06	4.02	4.36	4.20

Public sector

The public sector data set comprises 9,045 responses across 26 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Remote demands	Remote control	Remote peer support	Remote management support	Remote relationships	Remote change	Work/home interface	Remote monitoring
Min	2.89	3.41	3.41	3.20	3.04	3.05	3.43	3.07
Mean	3.30	3.97	3.85	3.85	3.65	3.42	3.89	3.65
Max	3.77	4.32	4.09	4.12	4.06	3.89	4.36	4.20

Private sector

The private sector data set comprises 8,246 responses across 49 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Remote demands	Remote control	Remote peer support	Remote management support	Remote relationships	Remote change	Work/home interface	Remote monitoring
Min	2.31	3.00	2.87	2.54	2.61	2.89	3.22	3.10
Mean	3.27	3.93	3.89	3.87	3.64	3.49	3.95	3.64
Max	3.57	4.35	4.29	4.52	4.05	4.02	4.35	4.17

All-industry perecentiles

Compare your score with a relevant reference population to understand where it sits relative to similar organisations. The percentile ranking shows whether your result is low, average or high. For example, if your score is at the 5th percentile, only 5% of comparable organisations scored lower, while 95% scored higher. This means your score is lower than that of most organisations in the comparison group.

All industry percentiles	Remote demands	Remote control	Remote peer support	Remote management support	Remote relationships	Remote change	Work/home interface	Remote monitoring
0%	2.31	3.00	2.87	2.54	2.61	2.89	3.22	3.07
5%	2.92	3.57	3.55	3.52	3.35	3.05	3.49	3.20
10%	3.06	3.69	3.62	3.56	3.40	3.15	3.65	3.38
15%	3.10	3.73	3.69	3.58	3.43	3.21	3.70	3.46
20%	3.16	3.75	3.73	3.68	3.50	3.27	3.73	3.49
25%	3.19	3.82	3.75	3.70	3.52	3.31	3.82	3.53
30%	3.22	3.90	3.81	3.78	3.55	3.33	3.84	3.55
35%	3.24	3.91	3.86	3.81	3.58	3.34	3.86	3.56
40%	3.28	3.93	3.89	3.84	3.62	3.39	3.92	3.60
45%	3.30	3.95	3.90	3.87	3.65	3.44	3.94	3.62
50%	3.31	3.98	3.92	3.89	3.67	3.47	3.96	3.64
55%	3.32	3.99	3.93	3.91	3.69	3.51	3.98	3.66
60%	3.33	4.00	3.96	3.94	3.70	3.53	4.00	3.67
65%	3.34	4.03	3.97	3.95	3.72	3.59	4.05	3.68
70%	3.38	4.04	3.99	3.99	3.74	3.60	4.08	3.71
75%	3.40	4.05	4.01	4.01	3.76	3.62	4.09	3.75
80%	3.42	4.12	4.03	4.04	3.77	3.66	4.13	3.79
85%	3.45	4.15	4.06	4.11	3.84	3.68	4.17	3.90
90%	3.48	4.22	4.08	4.16	3.91	3.76	4.19	3.98
95%	3.54	4.27	4.14	4.30	3.98	3.90	4.25	4.02
100%	3.77	4.35	4.29	4.52	4.06	4.02	4.36	4.20

**PUBLICATIONS AND
PRODUCTS FROM**



Safety Climate Tool (SCT)

Benchmarking report 2026



Contents

All-industry	26
Private sector.....	29
Public sector	30
Chemicals and pharmaceuticals.....	31
Construction	31
Defence	32
Education (universities).....	32
Emergency services (fire and rescue).....	32
Energy (all).....	33
Engineering (all)	34
Hospitality, tourism and retail.....	35
Manufacturing (all).....	35
Maritime (including ports).....	36
Professional, scientific and technical	37
Rail (operators and construction).....	37
Real estate and facilities management.....	37
Transportation	38
Utilities.....	38
Warehousing and distribution	38
Waste management.....	39
Examples and observations	40

Safety Climate Tool (SCT)

All-industry

The all-industry data set comprises 540,993 responses across 1,160 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	2.51	2.55	2.66	2.46	2.68	2.85	2.85	2.29
Mean	3.76	3.50	3.66	3.27	3.70	3.72	3.67	3.52
Max	4.82	4.75	4.79	4.75	4.72	4.75	4.79	4.81

Mean scores by year

Interpret mean scores by year with caution. The results are affected by changes in the mix of organisations using the tool over time. Organisations start using the tool at different points in their improvement journey. Some use it to establish a baseline, while others use it after making significant changes. This means that the organisations contributing to the annual average are not the same each year. As a result, changes in mean scores between years are more likely to reflect differences in the organisations taking part than changes in performance over time. For this reason, year-on-year comparisons of mean scores are not a reliable measure of overall trends. They should not be used on their own to benchmark performance or assess progress over time. Instead, focus on changes in your organisation's own results and the actions taken to drive improvement.

All	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
2014	3.62	3.37	3.52	3.09	3.52	3.56	3.53	3.26
2015	3.72	3.40	3.62	3.17	3.66	3.58	3.63	3.41
2016	3.71	3.40	3.58	3.18	3.65	3.57	3.63	3.37
2017	3.73	3.43	3.63	3.21	3.67	3.61	3.62	3.36
2018	3.73	3.44	3.62	3.27	3.66	3.66	3.64	3.46
2019	3.81	3.57	3.70	3.32	3.75	3.78	3.73	3.61
2020	3.74	3.51	3.64	3.25	3.69	3.73	3.65	3.49
2021	3.81	3.57	3.73	3.30	3.75	3.78	3.70	3.62
2022	3.80	3.54	3.72	3.33	3.71	3.79	3.70	3.57
2023	3.78	3.52	3.68	3.33	3.72	3.74	3.72	3.63
2024	3.78	3.51	3.66	3.28	3.71	3.78	3.69	3.53
2025	3.84	3.57	3.73	3.33	3.77	3.82	3.73	3.62
2026	3.77	3.54	3.69	3.32	3.67	3.76	3.67	3.51

All-industry perecentiles

Compare your score with a relevant reference population to understand where it sits relative to similar organisations. The percentile ranking shows whether your result is low, average or high. For example, if your score is at the 5th percentile, only 5% of comparable organisations scored lower, while 95% scored higher. This means your score is lower than that of most organisations in the comparison group.

All	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
0%	2.51	2.55	2.66	2.46	2.68	2.85	2.85	2.29
5%	3.28	2.96	3.12	2.84	3.26	3.24	3.22	2.98
10%	3.40	3.10	3.25	2.93	3.37	3.37	3.32	3.10
15%	3.47	3.19	3.34	2.99	3.42	3.44	3.39	3.16
20%	3.53	3.25	3.41	3.05	3.48	3.49	3.44	3.22
25%	3.59	3.29	3.46	3.09	3.52	3.54	3.50	3.28
30%	3.63	3.35	3.51	3.13	3.56	3.58	3.54	3.32
35%	3.66	3.38	3.56	3.17	3.60	3.63	3.58	3.38
40%	3.70	3.43	3.60	3.20	3.64	3.66	3.61	3.42
45%	3.74	3.47	3.63	3.23	3.67	3.70	3.65	3.46
50%	3.79	3.51	3.68	3.26	3.71	3.73	3.68	3.50
55%	3.82	3.55	3.71	3.29	3.74	3.76	3.71	3.56
60%	3.85	3.58	3.75	3.32	3.77	3.79	3.74	3.59
65%	3.88	3.63	3.78	3.36	3.80	3.82	3.79	3.64
70%	3.91	3.66	3.82	3.40	3.84	3.86	3.82	3.69
75%	3.95	3.71	3.87	3.44	3.88	3.89	3.86	3.74
80%	4.00	3.76	3.91	3.49	3.91	3.93	3.90	3.80
85%	4.04	3.80	3.97	3.53	3.94	3.99	3.94	3.87
90%	4.10	3.87	4.04	3.59	4.00	4.04	3.99	3.95
95%	4.19	3.99	4.14	3.71	4.11	4.12	4.10	4.08
100%	4.82	4.75	4.79	4.75	4.72	4.75	4.79	4.81

Private sector

The private sector data set comprises 511,852 responses across 1,111 assessments.

Min, mean and max

Private	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	2.51	2.55	2.66	2.46	2.68	2.85	2.85	2.29
Mean	3.77	3.50	3.67	3.27	3.71	3.72	3.69	3.53
Max	4.82	4.75	4.79	4.75	4.72	4.75	4.79	4.81

Private sector percentiles

Private	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
0%	2.51	2.55	2.66	2.46	2.68	2.85	2.85	2.29
5%	3.28	2.96	3.12	2.84	3.26	3.24	3.22	2.98
10%	3.40	3.10	3.25	2.93	3.37	3.37	3.32	3.10
15%	3.47	3.19	3.34	2.99	3.42	3.44	3.39	3.16
20%	3.53	3.25	3.41	3.05	3.48	3.49	3.44	3.22
25%	3.59	3.29	3.46	3.09	3.52	3.54	3.50	3.28
30%	3.63	3.35	3.51	3.13	3.56	3.58	3.54	3.32
35%	3.66	3.38	3.56	3.17	3.60	3.63	3.58	3.38
40%	3.70	3.43	3.60	3.20	3.64	3.66	3.61	3.42
45%	3.74	3.47	3.63	3.23	3.67	3.70	3.65	3.46
50%	3.79	3.51	3.68	3.26	3.71	3.73	3.68	3.50
55%	3.82	3.55	3.71	3.29	3.74	3.76	3.71	3.56
60%	3.85	3.58	3.75	3.32	3.77	3.79	3.74	3.59
65%	3.88	3.63	3.78	3.36	3.80	3.82	3.79	3.64
70%	3.91	3.66	3.82	3.40	3.84	3.86	3.82	3.69
75%	3.95	3.71	3.87	3.44	3.88	3.89	3.86	3.74
80%	4.00	3.76	3.91	3.49	3.91	3.93	3.90	3.80
85%	4.04	3.80	3.97	3.53	3.94	3.99	3.94	3.87
90%	4.10	3.87	4.04	3.59	4.00	4.04	3.99	3.95
95%	4.19	3.99	4.14	3.71	4.11	4.12	4.10	4.08
100%	4.82	4.75	4.79	4.75	4.72	4.75	4.79	4.81

Public sector

The public sector data set comprises 29,141 responses across 41 assessments.

Min, mean and max

Public	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	3.19	2.78	3.04	2.75	2.98	3.19	2.93	2.51
Mean	3.61	3.42	3.53	3.17	3.49	3.61	3.42	3.22
Max	4.05	3.70	4.02	3.67	4.01	4.05	4.02	3.83

Public sector percentiles

Public	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
0%	3.19	2.78	3.04	2.75	2.98	3.19	2.93	2.51
5%	3.35	3.09	3.14	2.79	3.21	3.22	3.01	2.96
10%	3.37	3.19	3.24	2.87	3.25	3.32	3.09	2.98
15%	3.43	3.21	3.30	2.93	3.33	3.46	3.17	2.98
20%	3.46	3.25	3.35	2.97	3.37	3.48	3.25	3.00
25%	3.49	3.26	3.38	3.03	3.39	3.54	3.28	3.04
30%	3.49	3.29	3.41	3.06	3.42	3.55	3.29	3.09
35%	3.54	3.36	3.44	3.06	3.43	3.56	3.32	3.16
40%	3.57	3.38	3.54	3.07	3.44	3.57	3.34	3.17
45%	3.58	3.44	3.55	3.10	3.45	3.59	3.38	3.20
50%	3.61	3.45	3.55	3.11	3.46	3.62	3.40	3.21
55%	3.62	3.49	3.59	3.12	3.48	3.65	3.42	3.21
60%	3.65	3.53	3.60	3.16	3.50	3.66	3.43	3.24
65%	3.66	3.55	3.61	3.21	3.51	3.67	3.45	3.27
70%	3.69	3.55	3.63	3.33	3.54	3.69	3.51	3.31
75%	3.76	3.58	3.67	3.39	3.56	3.72	3.52	3.32
80%	3.77	3.60	3.70	3.42	3.63	3.73	3.59	3.37
85%	3.78	3.63	3.73	3.43	3.66	3.80	3.65	3.47
90%	3.84	3.65	3.82	3.53	3.81	3.83	3.74	3.57
95%	3.96	3.67	3.89	3.57	3.87	3.95	3.97	3.68
100%	4.05	3.70	4.02	3.67	4.01	4.05	4.02	3.83

Industries

Chemicals and pharmaceuticals

The chemicals and pharmaceuticals data set comprises 65,320 responses across 132 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	3.07	2.80	2.93	2.71	3.07	3.10	3.07	2.93
Mean	3.82	3.60	3.75	3.38	3.80	3.83	3.76	3.74
Max	4.55	4.44	4.60	4.28	4.50	4.62	4.56	4.81

Construction

The construction data set comprises 65,725 responses across 281 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	2.88	2.64	2.74	2.59	3.02	2.85	3.01	2.62
Mean	3.84	3.45	3.70	3.25	3.77	3.64	3.75	3.49
Max	4.45	4.13	4.43	3.99	4.57	4.36	4.33	4.33

Construction (road)

The construction (road) data set comprises 10,848 responses across 18 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	3.33	3.21	3.24	2.81	3.18	3.46	3.15	3.10
Mean	3.82	3.53	3.66	3.15	3.73	3.84	3.61	3.47
Max	4.18	3.79	4.17	3.60	4.00	4.17	3.83	3.86

Defence

The defence data set comprises 1,097 responses across 4 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	3.39	3.01	3.35	3.02	3.37	3.44	3.38	2.91
Mean	3.66	3.40	3.57	3.18	3.54	3.74	3.52	3.24
Max	3.85	3.64	3.78	3.34	3.70	3.86	3.63	3.45

Education (universities)

The education (universities) data set comprises 5,794 responses across 12 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	3.34	3.05	3.31	3.00	3.24	3.40	3.31	2.92
Mean	3.52	3.38	3.54	3.21	3.42	3.61	3.50	3.19
Max	3.84	3.69	3.86	3.55	3.67	3.80	3.84	3.37

Emergency services (fire and rescue)

The emergency services data set comprises 4,126 responses across 9 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	3.36	3.19	3.17	2.77	3.22	3.19	3.09	2.97
Mean	3.72	3.54	3.68	3.09	3.53	3.49	3.45	3.36
Max	3.97	3.79	4.02	3.36	3.78	3.80	3.72	3.59

Energy (all)

The energy (all) data set comprises 90,156 responses across 149 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	3.25	3.03	3.07	2.63	3.26	3.38	3.09	2.70
Mean	3.87	3.67	3.78	3.35	3.78	3.90	3.72	3.61
Max	4.37	4.24	4.38	4.01	4.30	4.34	4.39	4.37

Energy (gas/oil/petroleum)

The energy (gas/oil/petroleum) data set comprises 24,847 responses across 45 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	3.25	3.03	3.07	2.75	3.29	3.38	3.09	2.70
Mean	3.82	3.62	3.71	3.34	3.76	3.88	3.74	3.56
Max	4.27	4.15	4.21	3.61	4.08	4.22	4.05	4.26

Energy (electric grid)

The energy (electric grid) data set comprises 29,885 responses across 25 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	3.50	3.16	3.18	2.91	3.49	3.50	3.31	2.98
Mean	3.85	3.63	3.63	3.22	3.80	3.83	3.67	3.55
Max	4.34	3.99	4.38	3.88	4.30	4.21	4.39	4.37

Energy (nuclear)

The energy (nuclear) data set comprises 23,717 responses across 24 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	3.58	3.21	3.35	2.96	3.26	3.57	3.22	2.88
Mean	3.82	3.65	3.73	3.34	3.69	3.91	3.60	3.41
Max	4.09	4.03	3.99	3.84	3.95	4.13	3.90	3.87

Energy (renewables)

The energy (renewables) data set comprises 5,420 responses across 25 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	3.25	3.08	3.10	2.63	3.33	3.44	3.33	3.29
Mean	3.98	3.78	3.98	3.48	3.83	3.95	3.83	3.79
Max	4.26	4.24	4.25	4.01	4.11	4.26	4.17	4.24

Engineering (all)

The engineering (all) data set comprises 25,541 responses across 70 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	2.97	2.62	2.74	2.46	3.08	3.21	3.06	2.94
Mean	3.90	3.64	3.79	3.33	3.83	3.82	3.82	3.65
Max	4.82	4.75	4.79	4.75	4.72	4.75	4.79	4.79

Engineering (civil)

The civil engineering data set comprises 7,655 responses across 35 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	2.97	2.62	2.74	2.46	3.08	3.21	3.06	2.94
Mean	3.88	3.59	3.73	3.31	3.85	3.81	3.84	3.70
Max	4.82	4.75	4.79	4.75	4.72	4.75	4.79	4.79

Hospitality, tourism and retail

The hospitality, tourism and retail data set comprises 836 responses across 8 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	3.52	3.29	3.53	3.06	3.39	3.54	3.32	2.96
Mean	3.66	3.49	3.66	3.37	3.55	3.75	3.59	3.44
Max	3.95	3.85	3.80	3.69	3.85	3.94	3.93	4.00

Manufacturing (all)

The all manufacturing industry data set comprises 134,819 responses across 222 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	2.51	2.55	2.68	2.48	2.85	3.05	2.89	2.29
Mean	3.60	3.33	3.49	3.17	3.57	3.59	3.57	3.43
Max	4.43	4.18	4.36	3.86	4.35	4.20	4.26	4.34

Manufacturing (drink)

The manufacturing (drink) data set comprises 23,306 responses across 17 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	2.92	2.91	3.09	2.85	2.85	3.26	3.16	2.91
Mean	3.77	3.47	3.63	3.33	3.77	3.76	3.71	3.60
Max	4.29	3.97	4.06	3.86	4.35	4.20	4.24	4.34

Manufacturing (food)

The manufacturing (food) data set comprises 20,820 responses across 65 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	2.98	2.59	2.85	2.48	3.01	3.05	2.89	2.79
Mean	3.52	3.22	3.40	3.11	3.52	3.55	3.45	3.42
Max	4.09	3.85	4.06	3.62	4.03	4.08	3.95	4.08

Maritime (including ports)

The maritime data set comprises 11,621 responses across 44 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	2.81	2.83	2.66	2.78	3.02	3.13	2.97	2.79
Mean	3.84	3.66	3.72	3.39	3.79	3.83	3.75	3.68
Max	4.73	4.43	4.65	4.28	4.65	4.51	4.58	4.61

Professional, scientific and technical

The professional, scientific and technical data set comprises 15,165 responses across 34 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	2.80	2.92	3.19	2.67	3.21	3.21	3.23	2.92
Mean	3.72	3.56	3.68	3.24	3.61	3.71	3.63	3.43
Max	4.24	4.19	4.26	3.75	4.04	4.12	4.12	4.01

Rail (operators and construction)

The rail data set comprises 20,830 responses across 22 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	2.82	2.92	2.83	2.80	2.68	3.36	2.85	2.97
Mean	3.62	3.47	3.49	3.20	3.52	3.74	3.53	3.49
Max	4.02	3.74	3.83	3.56	3.87	3.99	3.98	4.21

Real estate and facilities management

The real estate and facilities management data set comprises 45,177 responses across 66 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	3.31	3.04	3.11	2.81	3.28	3.21	3.16	3.00
Mean	3.78	3.57	3.72	3.38	3.67	3.79	3.63	3.45
Max	4.15	3.89	4.08	3.71	4.08	4.10	3.99	3.95

Transportation

The transportation data set comprises 12,525 responses across 23 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	2.82	2.72	2.83	2.80	2.68	3.27	2.85	2.97
Mean	3.52	3.38	3.39	3.15	3.45	3.68	3.43	3.42
Max	3.95	3.79	3.79	3.56	3.89	3.96	3.98	4.21

Utilities

The utilities data set comprises 23,378 responses across 25 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	3.31	2.90	3.04	2.69	3.29	3.24	3.17	2.78
Mean	3.71	3.40	3.57	3.14	3.66	3.65	3.61	3.32
Max	4.04	3.83	3.94	3.83	3.99	3.98	3.93	3.91

Warehousing and distribution

The warehousing and distribution data set comprises 5,454 responses across 15 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	3.32	2.66	3.10	2.87	3.27	3.13	3.36	2.83
Mean	3.62	3.37	3.59	3.21	3.57	3.56	3.60	3.47
Max	3.99	3.67	4.00	3.61	3.98	4.03	4.03	3.78

Waste management

The waste management data set comprises 5,593 responses across 14 assessments.

Min, mean and max

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Min	3.43	3.28	3.33	2.97	3.38	3.41	3.51	2.94
Mean	3.71	3.58	3.62	3.23	3.67	3.78	3.66	3.60
Max	3.92	3.89	3.80	3.44	3.89	4.04	3.86	3.87

Examples and observations

This section presents examples from organisations that have used the Stress Indicator Tool (SIT) and tracks how their scores have changed over time. Each example includes a comparison with all industry percentile rankings, showing how performance relates to the wider benchmarking dataset.

Alongside each example, an observation section highlights key insights, learning points and considerations. These examples can help you understand what the scores mean, how they have changed over time and what improvements have been achieved. Importantly, even a relatively small change in scores can represent a significant improvement when viewed against the all-industry 5th percentile benchmark.

You can apply the same analysis to your own data by comparing the results from your baseline (first) survey with your most recent survey. This allows you to demonstrate performance trends, assess how your organisation compares with the wider benchmarking population and understand the direction of travel. The analysis can support decision-making, demonstrate progress and identify areas where further action may be needed.

When reviewing your own results, it is important to consider not only whether scores have improved, but also the magnitude of that improvement and how the results compare with the all-industry benchmarking data.

The examples demonstrate that positive outcomes can be achieved through sustained focus and targeted action. They also highlight the importance of maintaining momentum, as improvements can be difficult to sustain if the activities and interventions that contributed to the initial gains are not continued.

A small manufacturing company

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Year 1	4.20	3.65	4.28	3.57	4.15	3.89	3.90	3.49
Year 2	4.60	4.09	4.60	3.84	4.49	4.13	4.38	4.13
Year 3	4.53	4.12	4.41	4.01	4.45	4.39	4.22	4.23
Year 4	4.68	4.43	4.65	4.18	4.54	4.38	4.48	4.40
Year 5	4.73	4.40	4.60	4.26	4.65	4.51	4.47	4.56

Observations

- this organisation's focus has resulted in scores at the 95th percentile across all factors
- continued focus, despite the good results in year 2, has delivered further improvements in subsequent years

All industry	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
100%	4.82	4.75	4.79	4.75	4.72	4.75	4.79	4.81
95%	4.19	3.99	4.14	3.71	4.11	4.12	4.10	4.08
90%	4.10	3.87	4.04	3.59	4.00	4.04	3.99	3.95
85%	4.04	3.80	3.97	3.53	3.94	3.99	3.94	3.87
80%	4.00	3.76	3.91	3.49	3.91	3.93	3.90	3.80
75%	3.95	3.71	3.87	3.44	3.88	3.89	3.86	3.74
70%	3.91	3.66	3.82	3.40	3.84	3.86	3.82	3.69
65%	3.88	3.63	3.78	3.36	3.80	3.82	3.79	3.64
60%	3.85	3.58	3.75	3.32	3.77	3.79	3.74	3.59
55%	3.82	3.55	3.71	3.29	3.74	3.76	3.71	3.56
50%	3.79	3.51	3.68	3.26	3.71	3.73	3.68	3.50
45%	3.74	3.47	3.63	3.23	3.67	3.70	3.65	3.46
40%	3.70	3.43	3.60	3.20	3.64	3.66	3.61	3.42
35%	3.66	3.38	3.56	3.17	3.60	3.63	3.58	3.38
30%	3.63	3.35	3.51	3.13	3.56	3.58	3.54	3.32
25%	3.59	3.29	3.46	3.09	3.52	3.54	3.50	3.28
20%	3.53	3.25	3.41	3.05	3.48	3.49	3.44	3.22

A small mechanical repair company

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Year 1	3.54	3.55	3.39	3.16	3.62	3.63	3.45	3.39
Year 2	3.94	3.92	3.82	3.42	3.91	4.06	3.80	3.61
Year 3	4.24	4.23	4.20	3.78	4.14	4.30	4.04	3.94
Year 4	4.45	4.39	4.29	3.98	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.06
Year 5	4.49	4.33	4.36	4.04	4.49	4.37	4.43	4.26
Year 6	4.51	4.37	4.43	4.05	4.38	4.38	4.28	4.23
Year 7	4.48	4.29	4.42	4.08	4.35	4.35	4.26	4.10

Observations

- Scores at the 95th percentile across all factors demonstrate strong year-on-year improvement and organisational performance

All industry	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
100%	4.82	4.75	4.79	4.75	4.72	4.75	4.79	4.81
95%	4.19	3.99	4.14	3.71	4.11	4.12	4.10	4.08
90%	4.10	3.87	4.04	3.59	4.00	4.04	3.99	3.95
85%	4.04	3.80	3.97	3.53	3.94	3.99	3.94	3.87
80%	4.00	3.76	3.91	3.49	3.91	3.93	3.90	3.80
75%	3.95	3.71	3.87	3.44	3.88	3.89	3.86	3.74
70%	3.91	3.66	3.82	3.40	3.84	3.86	3.82	3.69
65%	3.88	3.63	3.78	3.36	3.80	3.82	3.79	3.64
60%	3.85	3.58	3.75	3.32	3.77	3.79	3.74	3.59
55%	3.82	3.55	3.71	3.29	3.74	3.76	3.71	3.56
50%	3.79	3.51	3.68	3.26	3.71	3.73	3.68	3.50
45%	3.74	3.47	3.63	3.23	3.67	3.70	3.65	3.46
40%	3.70	3.43	3.60	3.20	3.64	3.66	3.61	3.42
35%	3.66	3.38	3.56	3.17	3.60	3.63	3.58	3.38
30%	3.63	3.35	3.51	3.13	3.56	3.58	3.54	3.32
25%	3.59	3.29	3.46	3.09	3.52	3.54	3.50	3.28
20%	3.53	3.25	3.41	3.05	3.48	3.49	3.44	3.22
15%	3.47	3.19	3.34	2.99	3.42	3.44	3.39	3.16

A medium-sized waste management company

	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
Year 1	3.43	3.28	3.33	2.97	3.39	3.41	3.52	3.38
Year 2	3.72	3.38	3.59	3.07	3.67	3.57	3.63	3.56
Year 3	3.92	3.69	3.76	3.33	3.89	3.93	3.86	3.86

Observations

- over a short period, this organisation has improved significantly across all health and safety factors
- Review what led to this position and identify opportunities to share good practice

All industry	Organisational commitment	Health and safety oriented behaviours	Health and safety trust	Usability of procedures	Engagement in health and safety	Peer group attitude	Resources for health and safety	Accident and near miss reporting
100%	4.82	4.75	4.79	4.75	4.72	4.75	4.79	4.81
95%	4.19	3.99	4.14	3.71	4.11	4.12	4.10	4.08
90%	4.10	3.87	4.04	3.59	4.00	4.04	3.99	3.95
85%	4.04	3.80	3.97	3.53	3.94	3.99	3.94	3.87
80%	4.00	3.76	3.91	3.49	3.91	3.93	3.90	3.80
75%	3.95	3.71	3.87	3.44	3.88	3.89	3.86	3.74
70%	3.91	3.66	3.82	3.40	3.84	3.86	3.82	3.69
65%	3.88	3.63	3.78	3.36	3.80	3.82	3.79	3.64
60%	3.85	3.58	3.75	3.32	3.77	3.79	3.74	3.59
55%	3.82	3.55	3.71	3.29	3.74	3.76	3.71	3.56
50%	3.79	3.51	3.68	3.26	3.71	3.73	3.68	3.50
45%	3.74	3.47	3.63	3.23	3.67	3.70	3.65	3.46
40%	3.70	3.43	3.60	3.20	3.64	3.66	3.61	3.42
35%	3.66	3.38	3.56	3.17	3.60	3.63	3.58	3.38
30%	3.63	3.35	3.51	3.13	3.56	3.58	3.54	3.32
25%	3.59	3.29	3.46	3.09	3.52	3.54	3.50	3.28
20%	3.53	3.25	3.41	3.05	3.48	3.49	3.44	3.22
15%	3.47	3.19	3.34	2.99	3.42	3.44	3.39	3.16
10%	3.40	3.10	3.25	2.93	3.37	3.37	3.32	3.10
5%	3.28	2.96	3.12	2.84	3.26	3.24	3.22	2.98



Benchmarking data was correct at the time of publication.
Data is updated annually, with the latest information
included in your subscription at no extra cost.

For enquiries:

hseorders@tso.co.uk
+ 44 (0)333 202 5070

TSO is the Official Publisher for the
Health and Safety Executive (HSE)

 **williams lea** | **tso**
An RRD Company

Regulatory excellence



Scientific expertise



Real world experience

**RESEARCH AND
GUIDANCE** FROM 

Freely available to
help people comply
with health and
safety law

**PUBLICATIONS AND
PRODUCTS** FROM 

Books, tools and
software to educate
and protect employers
and workers

**TRAINING AND
EVENTS** FROM 

Training and events
to build competence,
ensure compliance
and protect people
and places

**TESTING AND
MONITORING** FROM 

Large-scale testing of
products, materials
and processes.
Laboratory-based
sample analysis and
exposure monitoring.
Proficiency testing
of third-party
laboratories

**BESPOKE RESEARCH AND
CONSULTANCY** FROM 

Using our scientific
expertise and
regulatory insight to
address health and
safety risks, for
organisations or as
part of a shared
research programme