

Safety Climate: What Do Our Everyday Responses Tell Us?

Todd Jerome Jenkins | v1.0 | Reviewed October 9, 2026 | Discussion + field checks

Why this matters

Everyday decisions send a safety message: what happens when a check delays the job or someone asks for help. Compare a stated expectation with the response. Use the difference to improve a practice without scoring people or declaring the workplace safe.

Objective: Identify the message sent by one everyday decision and verify a practical change that supports the stated safety expectation.

Key hazards or failure points

Pressure hidden behind reassuring words; different treatment across crews; promises without resources; fear of speaking openly; personal details exposed; one positive story treated as proof of effective controls.

Practical controls

- Choose one ordinary work decision and the expectation that should guide it. Use an anonymous or fictional example if needed. Explain how discussion notes will be used and provide a private route for concerns.
- Ask what happened next: what work paused, what help arrived and what the crew understood. Let different experiences remain visible. Do not demand agreement or treat silence as approval.
- Agree one observable leadership action, such as arranging required support before release. Assign an owner and review point. Keep the task's technical controls and authorization requirements in place while improving the response.

Verify It in the Field

Compare the stated expectation with a factual decision record and affected workers' accounts. Distinguish the promised action, actual action and unknown details. Remove unnecessary personal identifiers from shared notes.

For the agreed improvement, define what can be checked safely: support actually provided, a restriction maintained or a promised update delivered. Have the responsible person record the result and time. Use governing task criteria for any physical-control check.

At the review point, ask affected workers what they experienced after the change. Check whether the action occurred under relevant work pressure and whether any gap remains. A favorable comment or low report count does not verify technical protection.

Stop and reassess

Address an uncontrolled hazard through the site's safe process immediately; do not wait for a culture discussion. Pause the conversation if it pressures disclosure or becomes a personal accusation. Escalate unresolved protection or reporting concerns through the appropriate route, with required checks before affected work resumes.

Ask the crew

1. What did the actual decision tell the crew mattered most?
2. Did people experience the response differently?
3. What observable action will make the next response more useful?

Use the task plan and required specialist decisions before exposure.

Sources: DOE-HDBK-1028-2009, Vol. 2, pp. 103–111 (reference only); OSHA Management Leadership and Program Evaluation.

Free next step: [JHA/JSA planning & field-verification worksheet](#)

Expanded guidance and separate forms: toddjeromejenkins.com/toolbox-talks/safety-climate-everyday-leadership-responses

Based on DOE-HDBK-1028-2009, Vol. 2 (June 2009). No claim to authorship or copyright ownership of original U.S. Government work. Todd Jerome Jenkins adaptation; no government endorsement implied.