Background and objectives

Periodically, BINDT chooses to survey its members, and others with whom it engages, to gain insight into and an understanding of the importance and relevance of BINDT and its products and services to its members and the wider NDT/CM/SHM community and also to establish how well it is serving the needs of all those working in the industry.

The purpose of carrying out the survey in 2016 was to:

- Gather some baseline diversity data, specifically age, gender and ethnicity information, about our members and others working in the industry
- Understand how and why BINDT members and others engage with the Institute
- Gauge how members rate the services offered to them by BINDT
- Find out how important these services are to them in their professional life
- Provide members with an opportunity to tell BINDT what it should do to improve the services offered to members and the wider NDT/CM/SHM community
- Find out to what extent being a member of BINDT serves a useful purpose.

The following is a summary of the results of the BINDT Survey conducted in September/October 2016.

BINDT staff will review the detailed results of the survey in terms of the scoring and individual comments to inform planning future activities and assist with focusing on, refining and adapting the services it currently offers.

Survey method

The survey was devised in-house, in consultation with members of the Staff Executive Committee in respect of the questions relating to Institute activities and with reference to guidelines given by the Office for National Statistics with regard to the diversity questions and asking them in an appropriate and effective way.

The survey was conducted online via Survey Monkey. It was communicated directly to BINDT members in all grades via email, including corporate member nominees, with a reminder email sent halfway through the live period and one week before the survey closed. The link to the survey was also publicised through our social media channels and a prominent link was given on our website home page at www.bindt.org

Data was collected and recorded anonymously.

Summary of survey results

The main results of the survey are summarised in the following sections, broken down by question or set of questions as appropriate. There were 725 respondents in total, of which 70% are members of the British Institute of Non-Destructive Testing (BINDT).

The responses to the open-ended questions have been edited and collated for clarity and ease of reporting but the nature of the comments has not been altered. Some comments expressed by single individuals have not been included in the results or recorded or noted here as it is felt they would not serve to inform BINDT or assist the Institute in improving its products and services, but relevant BINDT staff will have access to all comments made to take action as appropriate.
**Q1 to Q8. Diversity**

The first set of questions asked related to diversity and inclusion and asked respondents to select categories based on their gender, age and ethnicity. Those responding were also given the opportunity to not answer these questions if they preferred.

**Gender**

Of the respondents, 92.28% (669) were male, with 7.45% (54) female. Two people preferred not to answer this question.

**Age group**

Over half (53.93%) of the people taking part in the survey were aged between 45 and 64. In order from the largest age group to the smallest, the results are as follows:

- **55-64:** 28.69% (208)
- **45-54:** 25.24% (183)
- **35-44:** 18.48% (134)
- **25-34:** 12.41% (90)
- **65-74:** 11.17% (81)
- **75-84:** 1.79% (13)
- **16-24:** 1.66% (12)
- **85+:** no responses
- **4 people preferred not to answer.**

**Ethnicity**

In terms of ethnicity, 88.41% of those answering the question indicated that they were of a white ethnic origin, with the next largest group being Asian/Asian British at 6.21% of the total number of responses. There were a small number of responses in each of the other categories. 20 people preferred not to give an answer.

The breakdown within each of the selected ethnic groups is as follows:

- **White** (total 641 responses):
  - 88.14% (565): English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British
  - 6.08% (39): European
  - 2.5% (16): Other (a wide range of white ethnic backgrounds were specified, with only South African selected by more than one respondent)
  - All other white ethnic options were selected by less than 10 respondents each.

- **Asian/Asian British** (total 45 responses):
  - 33.33% (15): Indian
  - 26.67% (12): Chinese
  - 24.44% (11): Other (a wide range of Asian/Asian British ethnic backgrounds were specified, with only Malaysian selected by more than one respondent)
  - 8.89% (4): Pakistani
  - 2.22% (2): Bangladeshi.

- **Other** (total 11 responses):
  - 27.27% (3): Arab
  - 45.45% (5): Other (each of the 5 respondents indicated a different ethnic background).

- **Mixed/multiple ethnic** (total 5 responses):
  - 60% (3): Other (a wide range of individual mixed ethnic backgrounds were specified)
  - 20% (1): White and Black African
  - 20% (1): White and Asian.

- **Black/African/Caribbean/Black British** (total 4 responses):
  - 50% (2): African
  - 50% (2): Caribbean.
Q9 to Q15. Membership status

70.44% of those taking the survey are members of the British Institute of NDT, a total of 510 respondents. 214 people are non-members, representing 29.56% of the total number of responses.

Of those members of the Institute that stated their grade of membership (a total of 500 respondents), the largest proportion are at Member grade (55.6% or 278 individuals), followed by Affiliate (including BINDT-Registered Practitioners) at 14.8% (74), 8.2% (41) at Fellow grade, 8% (40) at Graduate (Legacy) grade and 7.2% (36) at Associate grade. There were small numbers of responses (<10) at each of the other grades.

All respondents, members and non-members, were also asked whether they are members of other professional bodies/institutes: 46.27% (329) indicated that they are, with the most common being (in order of frequency):

- ASNT – American Society for Nondestructive Testing (60)
- TWI – The Welding Institute (60)
- IMechE – Institution of Mechanical Engineers (24)
- CQI – Chartered Quality Institute (20)
- IAQP – International Association of Quality Practitioners (19)
- IOP – Institute of Physics (15)
- IET – Institution of Engineering and Technology (13)
- ASME – American Society of Mechanical Engineers (10)
- Engineering Council (10)
- IOM3 – Institute of Materials, Minerals & Mining (10).

Some respondents were members of more than one other institution.

When asked if they are registered with the Engineering Council, 34.47% (243) indicated that they are:

- 42.74% (103) at EngTech level
- 28.63% (69) at IEng level
- 23.65% (57) at CEng level.

22.64% of those surveyed (158) confirmed they are Licensed Engineering Practitioners (LEPs).

Q16 to Q23. Employment status and certification

Employment status

82.09% (573) of those taking part in the survey are currently employed in NDT, CM and/or SHM, in the following roles:

- Practitioner: 27.23% (156)
- Manager: 23.21% (133)
- Supervisor: 15.36% (88)
- Other: 15.36% (88) – a wide range of other roles were specified, including (most frequently) engineer (11), consultant (10), inspector (8), QA/QC (7), auditing (6) and sales (5)
- Director: 7.33% (42)
- Teaching/training/examining: 5.76% (33)
- Research: 4.19% (24)
- Student: 1.22% (7)
- Apprentice: 0.35% (2).
Industry sectors

All industrial sectors were represented by those responding to the survey, see Figure 2.

In order from the most represented to the least, the respondents, or their employers, operate in the following industries:

- Offshore oil & gas: 55.65% (345)
- Petrochemical: 40.48% (251)
- Power generation: 39.52% (245)
- Manufacturing: 37.42% (232)
- Service inspection: 32.42% (201)
- Nuclear: 29.84% (185)
- Aerospace: 25.65% (159)
- Process industries: 23.06% (143)
- Civil engineering: 21.13% (131)
- Materials: 21.13% (131)
- Defence: 20.48% (127)
- Chemicals: 20.16% (125)
- Education & Training: 17.58% (109)
- Transport: 15.48% (96)
- Automotive: 14.19% (88)
- Water supplies/utilities: 13.55% (84)
- Laboratory: 13.06% (81)
- Agriculture/mining: 9.68% (60)
- Government/research council: 7.58% (47).

The numbers also indicate that many of the respondents, or their employers, operate in more than one industry sector.

Other sectors noted in addition to the options given included universities, ship building, education and training, onshore oil & gas and medical/healthcare.
Certification

Of those surveyed, 69.26% (480) hold NDT and/or CM certification, through:

- **PCN**: 84.8% (385)
- **ASNT**: 24.45% (111)
- **In-house approval**: 15.86% (72)
- **NAS 410**: 8.59% (39).

The most common other certifications used were: CSWIP (45) and EN 4179 (11), plus a number of other schemes with less than 5 responses each.

The majority of NDT certificates are held in magnetic particle testing (328), ultrasonic testing (316) and liquid penetrant testing (314), with smaller but significant numbers held in all other methods: radiography (191), electromagnetic (134) and visual testing (126) – see Figure 3. It can be seen from the numbers of certificates held by the respondents that many hold certificates in more than one method.

The most frequent methods detailed in the ‘Other’ category included thermography, eddy current testing, TOFD/phased array, radiographic interpretation, ACFM and vibration analysis, among others.

Smaller numbers of respondents hold certificates in condition monitoring methods, with thermography being the most common (83), followed by vibration analysis (49), acoustic emission (35) and lubrication management (21) – see Figure 4.

*Note:* A large number of respondents selected the ‘Other’ category but did not specify a condition monitoring method. This was due to an error when setting up the survey, which did not allow respondents with no CM certificates to skip the question.

The certification held by respondents is primarily applicable to weldments (344), pre- and in-service inspection (242), forgings and wrought products (240) and castings (216), with much smaller numbers holding certificates relating to all other sectors – see Figure 5.

Sectors specified in the ‘Other’ category include veterinary, power generation, civil & construction and marine.
Q24 to Q29. How important are the services BINDT offers?

The following set of questions asked respondents to indicate how important they considered the main BINDT services to be to them, on a scale of 1 to 5:

- 1 = Does not interest me
- 2 = Not very important to me
- 3 = Sometimes important
- 4 = Mostly important
- 5 = Extremely worthwhile.

### Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership services and discount scheme</td>
<td>9.67%</td>
<td>13.11%</td>
<td>28.85%</td>
<td>22.46%</td>
<td>16.07%</td>
<td>9.84%</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional engineering registration</td>
<td>9.84%</td>
<td>11.31%</td>
<td>18.36%</td>
<td>20.98%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information letters/emails to members</td>
<td>5.74%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>32.46%</td>
<td>30.98%</td>
<td>14.92%</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch meetings/events</td>
<td>11.97%</td>
<td>24.75%</td>
<td>28.20%</td>
<td>17.21%</td>
<td>9.34%</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the membership services the Institute offers, the information provided to members by letter or email was considered to be the most important, with 78.36% of respondents rating the service either sometimes important, mostly important or extremely worthwhile.

Professional engineering registration was considered to be sometimes important, mostly important or extremely worthwhile to 69.34% of respondents, and membership services and discount schemes were sometimes important, mostly important or extremely worthwhile to 67.38% of those taking part in the survey. Over half (54.75%) of those asked considered Branch meetings and events to be of importance to them.

However, a proportion of those responding did not express an opinion on the importance of membership services and if we consider just those responses where an opinion has been given and exclude the ‘don’t know’ responses, then the importance of membership services is considered to be sometimes important or more to:

- Information letters/emails to members: 83.27%
- Professional engineering registration: 76.63%
- Membership services and discount scheme: 74.73%
- Branch meetings and events: 59.86%

giving an average overall of 73.62% of respondents considering BINDT membership services to be important to them.
The Institute's main publications, Insight and NDT News, are considered to be important to Institute members, with NDT News being rated as sometimes important, mostly important or extremely worthwhile to 85.09% of respondents and Insight to 76.06%.

The BINDT Yearbook and text books are also rated highly by those participating in the survey, with 63.93% and 60%, respectively, rating them as sometimes important, mostly important or extremely worthwhile.

The Branch Meetings Booklet and Conference Proceedings CDs are also important to some respondents, with 46.4% and 44.59%, respectively, rating them as sometimes important, mostly important or extremely worthwhile.

Condition Monitor and IJCM appear to be less important, being rated as important by only 36.56% and 28.85% of respondents, respectively, but a high number of survey participants indicated that they didn't know how important these titles are to them. If we consider just those responses where an opinion has been given and exclude the 'don't know' responses, then the Institute's publications are considered to be sometimes important, mostly important or extremely worthwhile to:

- **NDT News**: 89.79%
- **Insight**: 83.61%
- **BINDT Yearbook**: 74.15%
- **Text books**: 72.19%
- **Conference Proceedings CDs**: 56.78%
- **Branch Meetings Booklet**: 56.15%
- **Condition Monitor**: 51.98%
- **IJCM**: 47.57%

giving an average overall of 66.53% of respondents considering BINDT publications to be important to them.
Online services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website: <a href="http://www.bindt.org">www.bindt.org</a></td>
<td>4.43%</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td>19.18%</td>
<td>31.15%</td>
<td>36.39%</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smartphone/tablet apps</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
<td>15.74%</td>
<td>21.15%</td>
<td>16.89%</td>
<td>13.11%</td>
<td>16.39%</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media presence</td>
<td>22.13%</td>
<td>16.39%</td>
<td>21.15%</td>
<td>14.92%</td>
<td>8.69%</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The BINDT website at www.bindt.org is seen as very important to the respondents, with 86.72% rating it as sometimes important, mostly important or extremely worthwhile. Around half of those taking part in the survey considered BINDT’s mobile apps and social media presence to be important, with them being rated as sometimes important, mostly important or extremely worthwhile by 51.15% and 44.76% of respondents, respectively.

If we consider just those responses where an opinion has been given and exclude the ‘don’t know’ responses, then the importance of online services is considered to be sometimes important, mostly important or extremely worthwhile to:

- **Website – www.bindt.org**: 89.97%
- **Mobile apps**: 61.18%
- **Social media presence**: 53.73%

giving an average overall of 68.29% of respondents considering BINDT’s online services to be of some importance to them.

Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual NDT Conference</td>
<td>12.48%</td>
<td>18.23%</td>
<td>24.63%</td>
<td>17.57%</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition Monitoring Conference</td>
<td>22.46%</td>
<td>19.02%</td>
<td>21.15%</td>
<td>9.18%</td>
<td>6.23%</td>
<td>21.97%</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Testing Exhibition</td>
<td>12.81%</td>
<td>18.72%</td>
<td>25.29%</td>
<td>16.09%</td>
<td>11.33%</td>
<td>15.76%</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Certification Conference</td>
<td>17.46%</td>
<td>18.78%</td>
<td>27.18%</td>
<td>12.19%</td>
<td>8.07%</td>
<td>16.31%</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Events</td>
<td>26.16%</td>
<td>20.36%</td>
<td>16.23%</td>
<td>9.44%</td>
<td>8.28%</td>
<td>19.54%</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Workshops</td>
<td>28.36%</td>
<td>21.23%</td>
<td>15.59%</td>
<td>8.13%</td>
<td>7.13%</td>
<td>19.57%</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Meetings</td>
<td>16.97%</td>
<td>22.24%</td>
<td>25.04%</td>
<td>11.37%</td>
<td>8.73%</td>
<td>15.65%</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Institute events</td>
<td>15.92%</td>
<td>19.40%</td>
<td>25.04%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>5.31%</td>
<td>23.22%</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The BINDT events most highly rated by those taking part in the survey are the Annual NDT Conference and Materials Testing Exhibition, being rated as sometimes important, mostly important or extremely worthwhile to 55.99% and 52.71% of the respondents, respectively.

The UK Certification Conference is considered to be sometimes important, mostly important or extremely worthwhile to 47.44% of respondents and Branch Meetings to 45.14%. The Annual CM Conference, Aerospace Events and Aerospace Workshops are considered to be of some importance to 36.56%, 33.95% and 30.85% of respondents, respectively.
For all events, a number of people did not express an opinion on the importance of the events to them. If we consider just those responses where an opinion has been expressed and exclude the ‘don’t know’ responses, then the responses indicate that the events are considered to be of importance to:

- **Annual NDT Conference**: 64.59%
- **Materials Testing Exhibition**: 62.57%
- **UK Certification Conference**: 56.7%
- **Other Institute Events**: 53.99%
- **Branch Meetings**: 50.52%
- **Annual CM Conference**: 46.84%
- **Aerospace Events**: 42.18%
- **Aerospace Workshops**: 38.35%

giving an average overall of 51.97% of respondents considering BINDT events to be of some importance to them.

### Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue of certificates/renewals</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.36%</td>
<td>6.07%</td>
<td>12.46%</td>
<td>25.25%</td>
<td>40.33%</td>
<td>7.54%</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of information/advice</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
<td>6.39%</td>
<td>19.51%</td>
<td>27.70%</td>
<td>28.69%</td>
<td>9.18%</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Approved Training Organisations (ATOs)/Authorised Qualifying Bodies (AQBs)</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
<td>6.89%</td>
<td>15.08%</td>
<td>25.25%</td>
<td>33.61%</td>
<td>10.66%</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of schemes available</td>
<td>8.69%</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>19.67%</td>
<td>28.69%</td>
<td>22.79%</td>
<td>12.46%</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Around three quarters of respondents rated all the certification services provided by BINDT as sometimes important, mostly important or extremely worthwhile in all categories, with the issue of certificates/renewals being of most importance (78.04%), followed by the provision of information and advice at 75.9%, the quality of ATOs and AQBs at 73.94% and the range of schemes available at 71.15%.

If we consider just those responses where an opinion has been expressed and exclude the ‘don’t know’ responses, then the certification services offered by BINDT are considered to be of some importance to:

- **Issue of certificates and renewals**: 84.4%
- **Provision of information and advice**: 83.58%
- **Quality of ATOs and AQBs**: 82.75%
- **Range of schemes available**: 81.27%

giving an average overall of 83% of respondents considering certification services to be of some importance to them.
Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishing/maintaining NDT courses and programmes at universities</td>
<td>8.03%</td>
<td>9.18%</td>
<td>21.31%</td>
<td>26.89%</td>
<td>23.77%</td>
<td>10.82%</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing links with government and other professional bodies</td>
<td>7.21%</td>
<td>8.36%</td>
<td>21.80%</td>
<td>27.70%</td>
<td>25.08%</td>
<td>9.84%</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining the benefits of NDT/CM/SHM to the general public</td>
<td>6.72%</td>
<td>6.89%</td>
<td>21.31%</td>
<td>28.69%</td>
<td>27.05%</td>
<td>9.34%</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other activities that BINDT is involved in are also seen as sometimes important, mostly important or extremely worthwhile to around three quarters of those taking part in the survey.

The most important activity, rated as sometimes important, mostly important or extremely worthwhile to 77.05% of respondents, is that of explaining the benefits of NDT/CM/SHM to the general public.

Establishing links with government and other professional bodies is seen as sometimes important, mostly important or extremely worthwhile to 74.58% and establishing/maintaining NDT courses and programmes at universities to 71.97%.

If we consider just those responses where an opinion has been expressed and exclude the ‘don’t know’ responses, then the other services provided by BINDT are considered to be of some importance to:

- **Explaining the benefits of NDT/CM/SHM to the general public**: 85%
- **Establishing links with government and other professional bodies**: 82.73%
- **Establishing/maintaining NDT courses and programmes at universities**: 80.7%

giving an average overall of 82.81% of respondents considering the other BINDT activities to be of some importance to them.
Q30 to Q35. How well do you feel BINDT is providing these services?

Respondents were asked to indicate how well they thought BINDT was providing its services to them, on a scale of 1 to 5:

- 1 = Not at all
- 2 = Poorly
- 3 = Satisfactory
- 4 = Very well
- 5 = Extremely well.

### Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership services and discount scheme</td>
<td>4.28%</td>
<td>10.43%</td>
<td>31.28%</td>
<td>23.09%</td>
<td>15.27%</td>
<td>15.64%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional engineering registration</td>
<td>3.91%</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
<td>28.68%</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
<td>18.99%</td>
<td>21.97%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information letters/emails to members</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
<td>35.57%</td>
<td>27.75%</td>
<td>12.85%</td>
<td>12.29%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch meetings/events</td>
<td>8.38%</td>
<td>9.87%</td>
<td>32.77%</td>
<td>17.69%</td>
<td>10.06%</td>
<td>21.23%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, 68.58% of those surveyed believe the Institute is providing services to members to a satisfactory level or higher, with 36.5% considering all services as being provided either very well or extremely well and relatively small numbers unsatisfied.

76.17% believe the information provided to members via letter or email is being provided either to a satisfactory level, very well or extremely well and similar numbers agree about the provision of both professional engineering registration and membership services and discount schemes, being rated highly by 67.97% and 69.64% of respondents, respectively.

Branch meetings are considered by 60.52% of respondents to be being provided to a satisfactory level or higher, with 27.75% feeling they are being provided very well or extremely well.

However, a proportion of those responding did not express an opinion on the provision of membership services and if we consider just those responses where an opinion has been given and exclude the ‘don’t know’ responses, then the provision of membership services is considered to be satisfactory or better to:

- **Professional engineering registration**: 87.1%
- **Information letters/emails to members**: 86.78%
- **Membership services and discount scheme**: 82.55%
- **Branch meetings and events**: 76.84%

Giving an average overall of 83.32% of respondents being satisfied or better with the provision of BINDT membership services.
Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insight</td>
<td>2.98%</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
<td>24.95%</td>
<td>29.61%</td>
<td>24.77%</td>
<td>12.10%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDT News</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>2.79%</td>
<td>22.91%</td>
<td>34.64%</td>
<td>27.75%</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCM</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
<td>16.57%</td>
<td>10.43%</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
<td>52.51%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition Monitor</td>
<td>8.19%</td>
<td>8.01%</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>13.59%</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
<td>47.11%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BINDT Yearbook</td>
<td>6.33%</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
<td>22.72%</td>
<td>23.46%</td>
<td>22.72%</td>
<td>19.93%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Meetings Booklet</td>
<td>8.19%</td>
<td>9.31%</td>
<td>24.21%</td>
<td>16.39%</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
<td>30.54%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text books</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
<td>6.33%</td>
<td>23.84%</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
<td>10.99%</td>
<td>31.10%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Proceedings CDs</td>
<td>9.87%</td>
<td>8.19%</td>
<td>23.65%</td>
<td>14.53%</td>
<td>6.52%</td>
<td>37.24%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, 56.82% of those surveyed believe that all publications provided by the Institute are to a satisfactory standard or higher, with 34.78% considering the publications to be provided very well or extremely well.

NDT News, Insight and the BINDT Yearbook are all rated highly by respondents and considered to be being provided to a satisfactory level, very well or extremely well by 85.3%, 79.33% and 68.9%, respectively.

High numbers of those taking part in the survey indicated that they did not know how well the Institute's condition monitoring publications, IJCM and Condition Monitor, as well as some of the other publications, are being provided. If we consider just those responses where an opinion has been given and exclude the ‘don’t know’ responses, then the provision of publications is considered to be satisfactory or better to:

- **NDT News**: 94.24%
- **Insight**: 90.26%
- **BINDT Yearbook**: 86.04%
- **Text books**: 80%
- **Branch Meetings Booklet**: 74.79%
- **Conference Proceedings CDs**: 71.23%
- **Condition Monitor**: 69.36%
- **IJCM**: 68.62%

giving an average overall of 79.32% of respondents being satisfied or better with the provision of BINDT publications.

Online services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website: <a href="http://www.bindt.org">www.bindt.org</a></td>
<td>3.91%</td>
<td>3.91%</td>
<td>21.79%</td>
<td>33.15%</td>
<td>30.35%</td>
<td>6.89%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smartphone/tablet apps</td>
<td>7.64%</td>
<td>7.26%</td>
<td>21.23%</td>
<td>13.78%</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>40.60%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media presence</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>8.94%</td>
<td>19.55%</td>
<td>13.78%</td>
<td>6.33%</td>
<td>41.90%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The BINDT website at www.bindt.org is being provided to a satisfactory level or higher according to 85.29% of those taking part in the survey, with 63.5% rating it as being provided very well or extremely well. Over 40% of respondents did not express an opinion on the provision of mobile apps and the Institute’s social media presence, perhaps indicating that a large proportion of respondents are not using, or are unaware of, the mobile apps provided by the Institute and of its social media channels.

If we consider just those responses where an opinion has been given and exclude the ‘don’t know’ responses, then the provision of online services is considered to be satisfactory or better to:

- **Website – www.bindt.org**: 91.6%
- **Mobile apps**: 74.93%
- **Social media presence**: 68.26%

giving an average overall of 78.26% of respondents being satisfied or better with the provision of BINDT’s online services.

### Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual NDT Conference</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>26.63%</td>
<td>15.27%</td>
<td>23.84%</td>
<td>21.23%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>6.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition Monitoring Conference</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>46.46%</td>
<td>7.28%</td>
<td>13.62%</td>
<td>17.91%</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
<td>7.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Testing Exhibition</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>33.08%</td>
<td>11.78%</td>
<td>21.68%</td>
<td>20.93%</td>
<td>7.66%</td>
<td>4.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Certification Conference</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>39.55%</td>
<td>9.70%</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
<td>21.08%</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
<td>7.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Events</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>47.65%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>12.01%</td>
<td>17.26%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>9.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Workshops</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>48.68%</td>
<td>6.39%</td>
<td>11.28%</td>
<td>18.05%</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td>9.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Meetings</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>34.02%</td>
<td>10.15%</td>
<td>12.59%</td>
<td>25.94%</td>
<td>8.83%</td>
<td>8.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Institute events</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>44.69%</td>
<td>6.33%</td>
<td>11.92%</td>
<td>22.35%</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
<td>7.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, 45.08% of those taking part in the survey considered that all BINDT events were being provided to a satisfactory level or higher. However, in answer to this question in particular, high numbers of those taking part in the survey appeared to indicate that they did not know how well some of the Institute’s events are being provided, which has resulted in lower percentages being reported overall for each event than might otherwise have been expected.

If we consider just those responses where an opinion has been expressed and exclude the ‘don’t know’ responses, then the provision of events is considered to be satisfactory or better to:

- **Annual NDT Conference**: 82.23%
- **Materials Testing Exhibition**: 81.28%
- **UK Certification Conference**: 75%
- **Other Institute Events**: 73.4%
- **Branch Meetings**: 73.79%
- **Annual CM Conference**: 72.48%
- **Aerospace Events**: 70.25%
- **Aerospace Workshops**: 69.59%

giving an average overall of 74.75% of respondents being satisfied or better with the provision of all BINDT events.
Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue of certificates/renewals</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
<td>22.72%</td>
<td>23.09%</td>
<td>26.07%</td>
<td>16.57%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of information/advice</td>
<td>5.96%</td>
<td>5.77%</td>
<td>26.63%</td>
<td>26.44%</td>
<td>18.25%</td>
<td>16.95%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Approved Training Organisations (ATOs)/Authorised Qualifying Bodies (AQBs)</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
<td>23.65%</td>
<td>24.77%</td>
<td>19.37%</td>
<td>21.04%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of schemes available</td>
<td>5.21%</td>
<td>6.52%</td>
<td>26.26%</td>
<td>24.95%</td>
<td>14.53%</td>
<td>22.53%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Around two thirds of those surveyed are satisfied or better with the provision of all certification services, with the issue of certificates/renewals and the provision of information and advice being rated highest by 71.88% and 71.32% of respondents, respectively. The quality of ATOs and AQBs was rated as satisfactory or better by 67.79% of respondents and the range of schemes available is considered satisfactory or better to 65.74%.

If we consider just those responses where an opinion has been expressed and exclude the ‘don’t know’ responses, then the provision of certification services is considered to be satisfactory or better to:

- Issue of certificates and renewals: 86.16%
- Provision of information and advice: 85.87%
- Quality of ATOs and AQBs: 85.85%
- Range of schemes available: 84.85%

giving an average overall of 85.68% of respondents being satisfied or better with the provision of certification services.

Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishing/maintaining NDT courses and programmes at universities</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
<td>22.72%</td>
<td>21.97%</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
<td>30.17%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing links with government and other professional bodies</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td>24.95%</td>
<td>20.67%</td>
<td>13.97%</td>
<td>29.98%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining the benefits of NDT/CM/SHM to the general public</td>
<td>6.52%</td>
<td>7.64%</td>
<td>24.77%</td>
<td>19.55%</td>
<td>12.10%</td>
<td>29.42%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of those surveyed consider that the other services being provided by BINDT are to a satisfactory level or higher, with the provision of links being established with government and other professional bodies being rated highly by 59.59% of respondents, establishing and maintaining NDT courses and programmes at universities by 59.4% and explaining the benefits of NDT, CM and SHM to the general public by 56.42%.

If we consider just those responses where an opinion has been expressed and exclude the ‘don’t know’ responses, then the provision of other services by BINDT is considered to be satisfactory or better to:

- Establishing links with government and other professional bodies: 85.11%
- Establishing/maintaining NDT courses and programmes at universities: 85.07%
- Explaining the benefits of NDT/CM/SHM to the general public: 79.94%

giving an average overall of 83.37% of respondents being satisfied or better with the provision of other BINDT services.
**Q36. How useful do you find being a member of BINDT?**

Respondents were asked to give a single response to the question, on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being not at all useful and 5 being extremely worthwhile).

77.5% of respondents indicated that they felt being a member of BINDT was sometimes useful (144 responses), mostly useful (135 responses) or extremely worthwhile (137 responses). Only a small number of respondents indicated that they felt BINDT membership was not at all useful (26) or rarely useful (56). 39 people chose not to express an opinion.

**Q37. What could BINDT do differently to better serve its membership?**

This was an open-ended question, inviting respondents to express an opinion on anything they felt was relevant or that they wanted the Institute to know.

A wide range of opinions were given, with the following being the most popular (in order of frequency):

- Make the certification/recertification process simpler and quicker, such as by launching online training and exams
- Promote the Institute more widely and more effectively
- Lower the cost of membership, make applying for membership easier and improve communication to members
- Publish more Insight articles aimed at a less academic audience, for instance case studies
- Provide better information and support to technicians, practitioners and contractors
- Expand the network of local Branches
- Provide assistance with the cost of training and certification, or reduce fees
- More rigorous auditing of overseas trainers and examiners to improve standards of overseas certificated personnel
- Improve the website navigation to make information easier to find
- Offer more assistance with applications for engineering registration and speed up the process of applying
- Better communication of new and developing methods
- Increase support for overseas members
- Offer more CPD opportunities
- Improve notification of changes to PCN documents
- Provide more apps and reference material.

**Q38. What is the most important benefit you receive as a member of BINDT?**

This again was an open-ended question and so respondents were free to comment on anything they felt was relevant and anything they wanted the Institute to know.

Again, a wide range of opinions were given, summarised below (in order of frequency):

- Access to information, technology updates and industry news
- Pride and status in the profession from being part of a recognised professional body
- Opportunity for professional engineering registration
- PCN qualifications and recognition of competency
- Networking opportunities
- Support
- Opportunities to be influential in industry
- Access to awards and scholarships.

**Q39. Any other comments?**

A number of comments were made which reflected and repeated those given in answer to previous questions and as such have not been repeated here.
Conclusions

The survey captured the thoughts and opinions of a relatively small number of the people with which the Institute engages. However, the results can be considered to be broadly representative of the views of the membership and other engaged communities and the wide range of opinions expressed highlights the broad nature of the sectors we are here to support and the wide ranging expectations.

In terms of our diversity, while the data gathered is not comprehensive, it provides a snapshot of those with whom we are engaging currently and will be used as a benchmark against which we can measure our progress as we roll out our diversity and inclusion policy and become more proactive in encouraging diversity and inclusion within the NDT/CM/SHM industry and in the wider engineering community in general. It should, however, be looked upon as positive that our diversity profile broadly matches that currently found in the UK’s engineering sector as a whole and so we should not be too concerned at, for instance, the relatively low numbers of female respondents or high numbers of those identifying as being of a white ethnic background.

In general, the services BINDT is offering to its membership are relevant and provided well, though it is clear that more engagement is required with the condition monitoring community as the responses to all questions relating to condition monitoring, whether industry questions or those about the BINDT products and services offered to support this sector, received fewer responses, indicating that we are not as engaged with or embedded in this community as we are with NDT and this is an area that BINDT could perhaps focus efforts in the future in order to achieve continued growth in its business.

Both BINDT publications aimed specifically at the condition monitoring community, IJCM and Condition Monitor, received far fewer opinions about their importance and provision than the Institute’s other publications, with very high numbers (around 50%) indicating that they did not have an opinion. These titles currently have a lower circulation due to there being fewer Institute members working in condition monitoring, which could be a reason for there being seemingly less interest in the content of these titles. Further work is required to fully understand the relevance and importance of these titles to their target market specifically.

Membership of the British Institute of NDT is highly valued by those who have joined, but cost is an issue for some, with calls for membership fees to be lowered and for the process of joining to be made simpler and quicker. More assistance with, and a speedier process for, applying for Engineering Council registration should also be a high priority, as should increasing the provision of services and support for overseas members.

Certification continues to be a major business area for the Institute and in general those needing certification are satisfied with the service the Institute provides, but comments received indicate that there is a need to speed up and simplify the certification process and give easier access to training and examinations, such as by providing online resources. The cost of attaining and maintaining certification has also been raised by a number of respondents and the impact of any future increases in fees and/or levies should be carefully considered. Concerns have been raised over the quality of the training being provided by overseas ATOs and action could be taken to address these issues and to communicate the rigorous auditing procedures that all ATOs, whether in the UK or overseas, are subjected to in order to maintain the high standards that PCN has become known for.

The Institute’s website at www.bindt.org is considered to be a particularly highly valued service that is being provided well, though ways of simplifying navigation and making information easier to access should be investigated.

A large number of respondents did not express an opinion on the provision of BINDT events, which may suggest that they do not attend the conferences, exhibitions, Branch meetings or workshops organised regularly by the Institute. The provision of events should be looked at in terms of their appeal to a greater number of members and how and where we advertise and promote the events to gain maximum coverage. Comments suggest that attending events is difficult for some and the provision of more easily accessible online content may be a way forward to be considered for the future, particularly for overseas members.

Relevant sections of the survey with detailed comments will be passed to appropriate BINDT staff members for further analysis and consideration of actions to take, if any.