

GALLUP PEOPLE AND PLANET 5

ESG Reporting on the Will of the People

Public Reporting Standards Recommended by Gallup

James K. Harter, Ph.D.

Sangeeta Agrawal, M.S.

Jim Asplund, M.A.

Ellyn Maese, M.A.

Marco Nink, M.A.

Stephanie K. Plowman, M.A.

Ben Wigert, Ph.D.

Dan Witters, M.S.

COPYRIGHT STANDARDS

This document contains proprietary research, copyrighted and trademarked materials of Gallup, Inc. Accordingly, international and domestic laws and penalties guaranteeing patent, copyright, trademark and trade secret protection safeguard the ideas, concepts and recommendations related within this document.

The materials contained in this document and/or the document itself may be downloaded and/or copied provided that all copies retain the copyright, trademark and any other proprietary notices contained on the materials and/or document. No changes may be made to this document without the express written permission of Gallup, Inc.

Any reference whatsoever to this document, in whole or in part, on any webpage must provide a link back to the original document in its entirety. Except as expressly provided herein, the transmission of this material shall not be construed to grant a license of any type under any patents, copyright or trademarks owned or controlled by Gallup, Inc.

The Gallup Culture Asset Index, Gallup National Health and Well-Being Index, and Gallup Q¹² items are Gallup proprietary information and are protected by law. You may not administer a survey with the Culture Asset Index, Gallup National Health and Well-Being Index, or Q¹² items or reproduce them without written consent from Gallup.

Gallup®, CliftonStrengths® and each of the 34 CliftonStrengths theme names, Culture Asset Index™, Gallup National Health and Well-Being Index™, Gallup Panel™, and Q¹²® are trademarks of Gallup, Inc. All rights reserved. All other trademarks and copyrights are property of their respective owners.

Table of Contents

- Environmental, Social and Governance Responsibility in Business 2**
- Ethics and compliance survey item 4
- Diversity, equity and inclusion survey item 5
- Employee development survey item 6
- Wellbeing survey item 7
- Environment survey item 9

- Reliability and Validity Estimates..... 10**
- Meta-Analysis..... 13
- Discussion..... 15

- References..... 16**

- Items Included in the Research..... 19**

Environmental, Social and Governance Responsibility in Business

Five decades ago, Nobel Prize winning economist Milton Friedman famously wrote that the social responsibility of a business is to increase its profits (Friedman, 1970). Two decades later, a concept called corporate social responsibility (CSR) evolved into a set of principles and values that outline an organization's impact on society beyond financial returns (Wood, 1991; Post and Collins, 1991). CSR provided the starting point for businesses to take ownership of their impact on society. The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) was created in 1997 to establish criteria to hold organizations accountable for responsible environmental business practices. Guidelines for socially conscious investors have recently and commonly been referred to as environmental, social and governance (ESG) criteria. CSR created the roots for ESG, which has aimed to develop measurable criteria for organizational accountability.

Meta-analyses of over 2,000 empirical studies suggest consistent relationships between ESG responsibility and financial performance across time and geographies (Friede et al., 2015). Gallup has found the new workforce highly regards an organization's purpose when choosing where to work. This is especially true for millennial and Gen Z employees (Robison, 2019; O'Boyle, 2021).

What happens inside an organization now spreads very quickly through social media. An organization's real purpose and culture become its employment brand very quickly — and its reputation through corporate social responsibility also impacts the organization's financial performance (Orlitzsky et al., 2003).

Several organizations have initiated efforts aimed at ESG standard-setting, including the World Economic Forum (WEF), the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB) and many others. In September 2020, the WEF published a report with input from CEOs of 120 companies, in collaboration with the big-four accounting firms (Deloitte, EY, KPMG and PwC). The report outlines a path for creating consistent metrics and reporting for sustainable value creation. Based on four pillars — principles of governance, planet, people and prosperity — the report presents 21 core metrics and 34 expanded metrics across the four pillar categories.

More broadly, the National Association of Corporate Directors (NACD) has taken steps to change the definition of a "successful" organization from one that focuses primarily on wealth creation to a one that focuses on sustainable investing or stakeholder capitalism — where the culture of the organization is thought of as an asset that drives ethics, integrity and impact on the world.

The metrics listed within the pillars of ESG in the WEF report currently list accounting metrics, such as stated organizational purpose, training on anticorruption, greenhouse gas emissions, employee turnover, gender pay, diversity counts, wage levels, injury rates and participation in programs. These are all very important metrics, but they do not specify the voice of the employee, which is often a leading indicator of many accounting outcomes. The purpose of this report is to provide that necessary specificity.

Gallup has spent more than 80 years designing and fielding questions to measure the will of the people in a variety of contexts, from global wellbeing to employees' perceptions of their work experiences. The Gallup World Poll is the only annual, representative survey of the views of the people — and how their lives are going — to provide official statistics on the state of the world's citizens. Gallup has also spent more than five decades conducting in-depth studies in thousands of organizations, linking workplace employee perceptions to important organizational outcomes. Further, Gallup has conducted stakeholder interviews with many of the world's top senior scientists and leaders to get insight into the most salient societal issues and scientific findings in ESG and related areas.

Gallup data reveal that the effective running of an organization requires the insights employees bring, which aren't at the immediate disposal of leaders. For example, employees often know about issues related to ethics, compliance and safety well before leaders do. Without employee input, leaders cannot get ahead of issues before they escalate into scandals or legal challenges that are costly to organizations' long-term brands. Large-scale meta-analyses of organizational units find positive relationships between job attitudes and a variety of performance outcomes, including customer perceptions, employee retention, safety, productivity and profit (Harter et al., 2002; Whitman et al., 2010; Harter et al., 2010; Harter et al., 2020). Further, job attitudes predict organizational citizenship behaviors, which partially mediate the relationship between job attitudes and financial performance (Whitman et al., 2010).

Having validated metrics across organizations is vital to establishing credible reporting and robust benchmarks. Gallup has accumulated a database of 46 million employee surveys across thousands of organizations that can serve as a source for informing ESG people standards. Gallup's database includes employee perceptions of the following areas, which are directly related to ESG concepts and comprise the People and Planet 5:

- 1 ethics and compliance
- 2 diversity, equity and inclusion
- 3 employee development
- 4 wellbeing at work and in life
- 5 environment

For each of the above five categories, Gallup has examined its databases to find the best survey item for measuring each dimension. In the sections that follow, we delineate the rationale and research behind each item and the associated database. Each item is asked on a standard 1- to 5-point agreement scale, with "1" labeled "strongly disagree" and "5" labeled "strongly agree," with a sixth "don't know/does not apply" option.

ETHICS AND COMPLIANCE SURVEY ITEM:

“If I raised a concern about ethics and integrity, I am confident my employer would do what is right.”

Database: Since 2010, Gallup’s database includes census survey data from 979,739 employees on 160,994 teams across 162 unique organizations (239 survey administrations) with respondents in 111 different countries.

Doing the right thing is a business necessity. Businesses spend billions of dollars on litigation each year, and the cost of lawsuits has risen significantly. Ethics and compliance issues quickly become safety, trust, productivity, legal, culture and brand issues. The culture of an organization’s day-to-day operations reflects its reputation. Zero tolerance for noncompliance starts at the top because leaders’ behaviors demonstrate what is acceptable for those throughout the rest of the organization. The best leaders and managers model and demand the highest integrity for their culture; they intentionally build trust and resolve conflicts before they escalate.

Gallup found 14% of employees disagree or strongly disagree that their employer would do what is right if they raise a concern about ethics/integrity. Only 42% of these employees say they have reported noncompliance when they have seen it in the past 12 months. A belief that reporting would be fruitless results in a lack of reporting, which breeds a culture in which unethical behavior can proliferate unchecked — and leaders may be unaware before it is too late. In addition, studies have shown the following related impacts of organizations’ ethics and compliance culture and reputation:

- Consumers choose to purchase from organizations with attributes that match their own values (Ashforth and Mael, 1989; Homberg et al., 2009; Shirazi et al., 2013).
- There is a positive relationship between corporate values and financial performance (Donker et al., 2007).
- Research suggests that moral reasoning and ethics can be taught, and that those with higher ethical development are less susceptible to situational pressures to engage in unethical behavior (Abolmohammadi and Reeves, 2000; Boyd, 1981-1982; Dellaportas, 2006; Fraedrich et al., 2005; Pettifor et al., 2011; Rest, 1984; Trevino, 1986).
- Adherence to ethical standards needs to be communicated by all levels of management, with midlevel leaders having a particularly large influence on the organization as a whole (Mozumder, 2018).

DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND INCLUSION SURVEY ITEM:

“At work, I am treated with respect.”

Database: Since 2010, Gallup’s database includes census survey data from 1.7 million employees on 243,461 teams in 180 unique organizations (283 survey administrations), with respondents in 139 different countries.

Disrespect is toxic; it provokes intense feelings and damages relationships. Having a high percentage of employees who feel disrespected at work is a warning sign that there may be more harmful issues in the organization. No organization can prevent all forms of disrespect, but when leaders demand a culture of respect, workplaces thrive.

There is a compelling “business case” for making respect an imperative of organizational structure. Respect is the foundational element of inclusiveness — a strategy to engage and leverage a diverse workforce. Inclusive cultures create a competitive advantage by valuing the unique perspectives and contributions of all employees and incorporating the needs of all groups into the fabric of the organization. Gallup has found the following:

- Ninety percent of disrespected employees say they have experienced some type of discrimination or harassment at work in the past year.
- Forty-nine percent of those who strongly agree they are treated with respect say they are extremely satisfied with their place of work; only 8% of those who do not strongly agree they are treated with respect are extremely satisfied.
- Ensuring employees feel treated with respect sets them up to be the best contributors they can be. In fact, employees who strongly agree they are treated with respect are more likely to be engaged (65%) than those who do not strongly agree (13%).
- Employees who do not feel fully respected are an attrition risk. Among those who do not strongly agree they are treated with respect at work, 59% are watching for opportunities or actively looking for opportunities, compared with 33% of those who strongly agree they are treated with respect.
- When employees feel respected at work, they are also better brand ambassadors. Fifty-eight percent of those who strongly agree they are treated with respect say they strongly agree with, “I would recommend my organization as a great place to work”; only 10% of those who do not strongly agree they are treated with respect strongly agree with, “I would recommend my organization.”
- The cost of the average settlement for discrimination and harassment claims is \$125k and the average lawsuit costs organizations \$200k or more in legal fees (Hiscox, 2015). Approximately 50% of D&H claims are settled outside of court (Kotkin, 2007). For every 1,000 employees in the average organization, disrespect at work can cost from \$1.6 to \$2 million in discrimination and harassment settlements or losses, if legal action is taken (EEOC, 2016; Zheng, 2020).

EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT SURVEY ITEM:

“There is someone at work who encourages my development.”

Database: Since 2010, Gallup’s database includes census survey data from 28.2 million employees on 3.7 million teams in 2,483 unique organizations (6,897 survey administrations) with respondents in 211 different countries.

Development is part of the unwritten social contract workers expect when they are hired. However, personal and professional development does not occur in a vacuum. It takes effort and attention. Employees need help navigating their career, whether that is through sponsorship, coaching, protection, exposure, visibility or challenging work assignments. One common misunderstanding about this element of engagement is that “development” means “promotion.” But they are not the same thing. A promotion is a one-time event. Development is a process of understanding each person’s unique talents and strengths and finding roles, positions and projects that allow employees to apply them.

Development comes back to the manager-employee relationship, which should include defining goals, improving performance and assessing progress. Great managers discuss employees’ professional growth and development with them more than once a year. They have ongoing conversations with employees and create opportunities for them to learn, grow, acquire new skills, try different ways of doing things and take on exciting challenges. The best managers don’t look at development as a finished product — they coach their employees by identifying wins and misses, motivating them to go beyond what they think they can do, connecting them with potential mentors and holding them accountable for their performance.

- Gallup’s meta-analysis has revealed strong linkages between employee development and higher business-unit customer engagement and profitability and lower absenteeism, for example. Employee development is also linked to higher employee wellbeing and organizational citizenship behaviors.
- Gallup data show lack of development and career growth is the No. 1 reason employees leave a job.
- A meta-analysis of 166 studies found individuals with mentors had substantially higher performance, intentions to stay with their organization, cooperation with coworkers, positive attitudes toward their career, overall motivation and better health practices (Eby et al., 2008).

WELLBEING SURVEY ITEM:

“My organization cares about my overall wellbeing.”

Database: Since 2010, Gallup’s database includes census survey data from 1,057,095 employees on 124,162 teams in 246 organizations (449 unique survey administrations) with respondents in 123 different countries.

The wellbeing of workers is an important, stated component of most ESG frameworks. But wellbeing is not just an altruistic endeavor for leaders. **Workplace wellbeing is linked to healthcare costs, performance and many other organizational outcomes** (Clifton and Harter, 2021; Pfeffer, 2018; Sears et al., 2014).

“My organization cares about my overall wellbeing” is a single metric that has many valuable uses in the measurement and understanding of workers’ experiences. This item does not directly measure the wellbeing of employees, but is an excellent indicator of the organization’s culture of wellbeing. It is a starting point for employers to influence the wellbeing of their workforce, and an element every leader and manager can act on through direct interactions and in steering employees to the right organizational resources for them. And, importantly, it reflects many other aspects of work-life beyond employee engagement and is a clear influencer of key worker outcomes that are of keen interest to employers.

U.S. workers’ attitudes about their employers’ regard for their wellbeing jumped considerably during the COVID-19 era. After a decade of languishing below 30% strong agreement, attitudes soared over 20 percentage points by the spring of 2020, mirroring the initial surge of the coronavirus and initial economic shutdown. Notably, however, as many employers have reopened their workplaces for in-person activity, these perceptions have eroded, falling to 41% by October 2020.

Perceptions of particular aspects of employers’ responses to the COVID-19 pandemic greatly influence whether employees feel cared about. For example, in a study of over 47,000 working American adults, of those who strongly agreed that their “employer has communicated a clear plan of action in response to the coronavirus (COVID-19),” 73% also strongly agreed that that their employer cared about their wellbeing. This dropped to just 12% among those who disagreed that a clear plan of action had been communicated. Similarly, of those who strongly agreed that their immediate supervisor kept them “informed about what is going on” inside of the organization, 78% also strongly agreed that their wellbeing was cared about. Again, the level of feeling cared about plummeted to just 7% when employees disagreed that their supervisor was keeping them informed.

What's the business impact?

The potential business impact of a workforce that believes their employer authentically cares about their wellbeing is far-ranging. Workers who strongly agree their wellbeing is cared about, compared with other workers, are:

- **36% more likely** to be thriving in their overall lives (72% vs. 53%)
- **five times more likely** to strongly advocate for their organization as a place to work (71% vs. 12%)
- **four times more likely** to feel extremely satisfied with their place of employment (59% vs. 11%)
- **three times more likely** to be engaged at work (74% vs. 19%) and nearly one-twentieth as likely to be actively disengaged at work (1% vs. 21%)
- **five times more likely** to strongly agree they trust the leadership of their organization (60% vs. 10%)
- **less than one-third as likely** to report experiencing job burnout “very often” or “always” (10% vs. 34%)
- **less than one-third as likely** to be actively searching for a new employer (4% vs. 13%)

Large case study

In a top retailer employing hundreds of thousands of workers, Gallup measured the culture of wellbeing and linked it to many important organizational outcomes.

Gallup assessed the culture of wellbeing across the workforce by administering the item, “My organization cares about my overall wellbeing,” in addition to other preexisting survey items. Conducting individual- and location-level analyses, we assessed the relationship between a wellbeing culture and various performance, retention, customer, health, safety, giving and organizational citizenship outcomes.

Findings: When a location had a strong culture of wellbeing (scored a 4.0 or better on a 5-point scale), the location:

- reported fewer safety incidents
- had fewer workers' compensation claims
- experienced fewer reported safety incidents by customers
- had better customer satisfaction scores and realized an increase of more than double that of locations with lower perceptions of wellbeing
- achieved significantly stronger growth in same-store sales

Employees who perceived a strong wellbeing culture were more engaged, perceived the employer to have a culture of inclusion and had a higher sense of work-life balance.

Employees who strongly disagreed their employer fosters a culture of wellbeing were more likely to say they would leave within six months. Employees who strongly agreed their employer fosters a culture of wellbeing were significantly more likely to say they would stay more than five years. Potential total turnover cost savings attributed to a wellbeing culture were estimated at more than \$150 million.

Each one-point increase in an employee's response to, "My organization cares about my overall wellbeing," meant substantially greater odds that the person pledged time and/or money to employer-sponsored community activities.

Employees who perceived a strong wellbeing culture had a lower probability of hypertension, depression and obesity, lower drug costs, and fewer workers' compensation claims, compared with those who didn't perceive a strong wellbeing culture.

Employees who strongly agreed their employer cares about their overall wellbeing were more likely to participate in the organization's health program.

All the above findings were obtained after controlling for a variety of external factors, including demographics, tenure, location, market and socioeconomics.

ENVIRONMENT SURVEY ITEM:

"My organization makes a positive impact on people and the planet."

Estimated database that uses a highly correlated item with a similar distribution: Since 2010, Gallup's database includes census survey data from 28.2 million employees on 3.7 million teams in 2,483 unique organizations (6,897 survey administrations) with respondents in 211 different countries.

One in three job seekers say it is extremely important that their organization has a positive impact on communities. Consequently, ESG has become an executive leadership and board responsibility because ESG provides a proven business advantage. Investing in ESG has helped organizations develop new competencies, systems and capabilities. Sustainability starts with organizations being good stewards of their own practices, resources and stakeholders. However, the true benefits of sustainability practices are realized only when they extend beyond organizational walls to affect society at large. Affecting society at large includes responsibility to a range of issues that make companies sustainable — child labor laws, treatment of farmers and workers in other countries, and all the various physical environment issues, such as pollution.

- Companies need to integrate ESG into their corporate strategies to reduce risk. Otherwise, they are exposing themselves to a variety of potential negative impacts on their reputations, such as environmental accidents, issues related to labor conditions or gender inequality, fraud, and compensation schemes (Lee and Faff, 2009).

- Organizations with better CSR reputations outperform peers on key financial metrics. (Orlitzky et al., 2003).
- A meta-analysis of 2,200 studies focused on the relationship between ESG and corporate financial performance (CFP) found that, 90% of the time, a non-negative relationship existed between ESG and CFP. This contrasts the commonly held, neoclassical economics-based belief that social responsibility negatively impacts CFP. (Gunnar et al., 2015).
- A recent Gallup study of job seekers found that, to 71% of people, a company's or employer's environmental record matters in their decision whether to take a job with that company; 26% say the environmental record is a major factor to them in picking where to work.
- Employees who strongly agree their organization makes a positive impact on people and the planet, compared with other workers, are:
 - **two times more likely** to be engaged at work (65% vs. 21%)
 - **5.6 times more likely** to strongly agree they trust their company's leadership (53% vs. 8%)
 - **3.6 times more likely** to recommend their organization as a place to work (65% vs. 14%)
 - **57% more likely** to intend to not be looking for another job (69% vs. 44%)
 - **3.1 times more likely** to be extremely satisfied with their organization as a place to work (53% vs. 13%).
 - **half as likely** to be burned out often or always (15% vs. 34%)

Reliability and Validity Estimates

In addition to Gallup's organizational database, each of the People and Planet 5 items has been studied in multiple samples of working populations — including random and opt-in samples in different parts of the world. The major concentration of these studies is in the U.S. and Europe, but respondents reside in 95 countries throughout the world. In summary, the data contained in the initial reliability and validity research comes from the following sources:

- **Gallup U.S. Panel:** nationally representative samples of working adults
- **Gallup European Workplace surveys:** nationally representative samples in Germany, France, Spain and the U.K.
- **Gallup Strengths recontact sample:** global opt-in sample including respondents from 95 countries

Across these sources, People and Planet 5 items have been studied in relationship to other items that measure common constructs and relevant outcome items. Outcome items include employee engagement (Gallup Q^{12*}), self-reported individual, team and organizational performance, intentions to stay with the organization, likelihood to recommend the organization, wellbeing, burnout, reports of discrimination and

harassment, and reporting of noncompliant behaviors. Table 1 presents reliability and validity statistics, where available, for each of the People and Planet 5 items.

In Table 2, we report estimates of the relationship of each item to team- or unit-level outcomes of customer perceptions, productivity, profitability, employee turnover and safety, where available, from organizational data. For many of these item-outcome combinations, we were able to conduct meta-analyses of multiple studies.

First, at the top of Table 1, we report reliability estimates for each of the five items calculated at the individual level — the correlation of each item with a composite of items measuring the same factor. While most construct measures reported in academic literature include multi-item indicators, researchers have found, if well developed, individual items can exhibit high reliabilities (Wanous and Hudy, 2001; Wanous and Reichers, 1996). When calculated across individual respondents, item reliabilities range from .68 to .78. The Cronbach's alpha reliability of a composite of the People and Planet 5 at the individual level is .87. As such, the People and Planet 5 is useful for both individual-item and overall-scale reporting.

Job attitude data are typically reported at the team or organizational level. Gallup has found that the correlation between individual items and composite indexes increases by 16% when data are aggregated to the team level. When aggregated from the individual level to the organizational level, correlations increase by 26%. Using these general parameters, we provide reliability estimates for team- and organizational-level aggregation, which range from .79-.90 at the team level and .85-.97 at the organizational level.

Next, we study the validity of each item by calculating its correlation to various expected outcomes. The correlations reported in Table 1 have not been corrected for measurement error and, as such, should be considered attenuated in comparison to the true score correlations. All five items correlate in the hypothesized direction with key employee outcomes (positive to employee engagement, performance, intentions to stay, likelihood to recommend, wellbeing and reporting noncompliant behavior; negative to burnout and discrimination/harassment experiences).

Table 1. Reliability and Validity Estimates for People and Planet 5 Items
Sample size weighted average correlations across studies

	Ethics and compliance (n=2,693)	Diversity, equity and inclusion (n= 14,306)	Wellbeing (n=12,815)	Employee development (n=9,867)	Environment (n=1,220)
Single-item reliability — individual level	0.68	0.72	0.74	0.78	0.70
Single-item reliability — team level	0.79	0.83	0.86	0.90	0.81
Single-item reliability — company level	0.85	0.89	0.92	0.97	0.87

Validity Outcomes	Ethics and compliance		Diversity, equity and inclusion		Wellbeing		Employee development		Environment	
	n	r	n	r	n	r	n	r	n	r
Team engagement (Gallup Q ¹²)*	18,314	.55	18,434	.63	18,380	.64	14,827	.73	5,868	.60
Organizational engagement*	18,155	.53	18,319	.57	18,243	.60	14,686	.49		
Performance — self	10,420	.16	10,577	.20	10,500	.19	10,227	.17	5,208	.17
Performance — team	9,973	.32	10,116	.36	10,050	.35	9,829	.32	4,991	.30
Performance — organization	10,353	.53	10,504	.50	10,440	.57	10,174	.42	5,179	.51
Intent to stay*	15,429	.30	15,595	.33	15,517	.34	15,238	.27	5,179	.32
Likelihood to recommend company*	15,382	.57	15,535	.58	15,466	.65	15,192	.51	5,216	.63
Life evaluation	10,472	.28	10,638	.32	10,560	.33	10,282	.27	5,238	.30
Burnout*	15,370	-.28	15,533	-.33	15,458	-.35	15,190	-.24	5,208	-.32
Discrimination/ harassment experiences	1,850	-.36	1,924	-.33			1,878	-.20		
Noncompliant behavior reporting	3,498	.15	3,492	.10			3,494	.13		

*Variables include data from international samples; other variables are part of Gallup U.S. Panel data collection.

Meta-analysis

Table 2 provides the team- or unit-level correlation of each item to business outcomes. Where multiple studies were conducted on each People and Planet 5 item-outcome pair, we conducted meta-analysis using the Hunter-Schmidt meta-analysis approach (Schmidt and Hunter, 2015) and followed the artifact distribution method protocol used in the prior Gallup Q¹² meta-analyses (Harter et al., 2020). We present the observed correlation and standard deviation of each item-outcome pair and correct the observed correlation and standard deviation for sampling and measurement error to estimate the true score correlation for each construct-outcome combination. There have been no corrections made for range variation in job attitudes across organizations, which means the reported true score correlations are likely underestimates. As more studies are added to the database, we will seek to add this feature to the analysis, as we have with our Q¹² meta-analyses. Definitions of the outcome variables are consistent with those detailed in Harter et al. (2020). In total, the studies contained in this analysis include 11 organizations across four industries (financial, retail, manufacturing and healthcare).

In Table 2, results are presented for each People and Planet 5 outcome combination where there was one or more study available for an item conceptually aligned with a People and Planet 5 item. Across item-outcome pairs, results consistently demonstrate correlations in the hypothesized direction, with strong evidence of generalizability in the magnitude of the correlations across multiple studies — positive correlations between People and Planet 5 and customer perceptions, profitability and productivity and negative correlations between People and Planet 5 and employee turnover and safety incidents. The magnitude of the correlations is generally consistent with prior item-level meta-analyses Gallup has conducted that yield substantial utility to organizations (Harter et al., 2010). Gallup will continue to expand and report meta-analytic findings as more studies become available. It should also be noted that the items contained in People and Planet 5 are highly convergent with Gallup's Q¹² employee engagement and overall organizational satisfaction metrics, which have historically shown substantial and generalizable relationships with a wide variety of important organizational outcomes — those included in this analysis, in addition to absenteeism, shrinkage, quality (defects), patient safety, organizational citizenship and employee wellbeing (Harter et al., 2020).

Table 2. Meta-Analysis of People and Planet 5 and Team of Unit-Level Outcomes

CUSTOMER ENGAGEMENT/ LOYALTY	n	k	r	sd	true score correlation	true score sd	90% CV
Ethics and compliance	4,643	3	0.08	0.01	0.12	0.00	0.12
Diversity, equity and inclusion	1,908	1	0.35		0.49		
Employee development	24,157	88	0.13	0.08	0.33	0.10	0.16
Wellbeing	10,003	5	0.09	0.02	0.13	0.00	0.13

PROFITABILITY	n	k	r	sd	true score correlation	true score sd	90% CV
Ethics and compliance	10,849	4	0.10	0.05	0.12	0.05	0.06
Diversity, equity and inclusion	4,422	3	0.10	0.02	0.12	0.00	0.12
Employee development	30,787	78	0.07	0.06	0.09	0.04	0.04
Wellbeing	12,066	3	0.06	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.07

PRODUCTIVITY	n	k	r	sd	true score correlation	true score sd	90% CV
Ethics and compliance	17,722	5	0.08	0.03	0.10	0.02	0.07
Diversity, equity and inclusion	4,205	3	0.07	0.03	0.09	0.00	0.09
Employee development	50,989	138	0.10	0.07	0.14	0.05	0.06
Wellbeing	10,418	3	0.07	0.02	0.08	0.01	0.07

TURNOVER	n	k	r	sd	true score correlation	true score sd	90% CV
Ethics and compliance	1,066	1	-0.20		-0.32		
Diversity, equity inclusion	1,493	1	-0.23		-0.35		
Employee development	59,632	117	-0.05	0.06	-0.10	0.06	-0.02
Wellbeing	9,694	2	-0.05	0.00	-0.08		

SAFETY INCIDENTS	n	k	r	sd	true score correlation	true score sd	90% CV
Ethics and compliance	244	1	-0.17		-0.22		
Employee development	10,679	54	-0.10	0.08	-0.15	0.05	-0.07
Wellbeing	129	1	-0.34		-0.43		
Environment	244	1	-0.17		-0.22		

Discussion

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of the rationale and technical features of Gallup’s proposed *people* pillar of ESG. The items contained in the People and Planet 5 are available for use by any organization on whichever platform they choose. Gallup will provide regular database updates for comparison purposes and ongoing research updates. The People and Planet 5 items can be considered basic requirements within the *people* pillar of ESG. For each of the five constructs — ethics/compliance, DEI, employee development, wellbeing and environment — there is enormous potential depth of knowledge an organization can uncover through additional measurements and diagnosis of variance within the organization.

Future studies will expand the size and breadth of the current studies to continue to understand the impact of these ESG concepts on various important outcomes.

References

- Abdolmohammadi, M. J., & Reeves, M. F. (2000). Effects of education and intervention on business students' ethical cognition: A cross sectional and longitudinal study. *Teaching Business Ethics*, 4(3), 269-284.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20-39.
- Boyd, D. P. (1981). Improving ethical awareness through the business and society course. *Business & Society*, 20(2), 27-31.
- Clifton, J., Harter, J. (2021). *Wellbeing at Work: How to build resilient and thriving teams*. Gallup Press. New York, NY.
- Dellaportas, S. (2006). Making a difference with a discrete course on accounting ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 65(4), 391-404.
- Donker, H., Poff, D., & Zahir, S. (2008). Corporate values, codes of ethics, and firm performance: A look at the Canadian context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82(3), 527-537.
- Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Evans, S. C., Ng, T., & DuBois, D. L. (2008). Does mentoring matter? A multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72(2), 254-267.
- Fraedrich, J., Cherry, J., King, J., & Guo, C. (2005). An empirical investigation of the effects of business ethics training. *Marketing Education Review*, 15(3), 27-35.
- Friede, G., Busch, T., & Bassen, A. (2015). ESG and financial performance: aggregated evidence from more than 2000 empirical studies. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 5(4), 210-233.
- Friedman, M. (1970). The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *The New York Times*.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Agrawal, S., Plowman, S. K., & Blue, A. T. (2020). Increased business value for positive job attitudes during economic recessions: A meta-analysis and SEM analysis. *Human Performance*, 33(4), 307-330.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Asplund, J. W., Killham, E. A., & Agrawal, S. (2010). Causal impact of employee work perceptions on the bottom line of organizations. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(4), 378-389.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268.

Hiscox (2015). *Employee charge trends across the United States*.

<https://www.hiscox.com/documents/The-2015-Hiscox-Guide-to-Employee-Lawsuits-Employee-charge-trends-across-the-United-States.pdf>

Homburg, C., Wieseke, J., & Hoyer, W. D. (2009). Social identity and the service-profit chain. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(2), 38-54.

Kotkin, M. J. (2007). Outing outcomes: An empirical study of confidential employment discrimination settlements. *Washington and Lee Law Review*, 64(111).

Lee, D. D., & Faff, R. W. (2009). Corporate sustainability performance and idiosyncratic risk: A global perspective. *Financial Review*, 44(2), 213-237.

Mozumder, N. A. (2018). A multilevel trust-based model of ethical public leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 153(1), 167-184.

O'Boyle, E. (2021, March). 4 things Gen Z and millennials expect from their workplace. Gallup.com.

<https://www.gallup.com/workplace/336275/things-gen-millennials-expect-workplace.aspx>

Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F. L., & Rynes, S. L. (2003). Corporate social and financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Organization Studies*, 24(3), 403-441.

Pettifor, J., McCarron, M., Schoepp, G., Stark, C., & Stewart, D. (2011). Ethical supervision in teaching, research, practice, and administration. *Canadian Psychology*, 52(3), 198-205.

Pfeffer, J. (2018). *Dying for a paycheck: How modern management harms employee health and company performance-and what we can do about it* (pp. 258). New York, NY: HarperBusiness, an imprint of HarperCollins Publishers.

Post, J. E., & Collins, D. (Eds.). (1991). *Research in corporate social performance and policy* (Vol. 12). Jai Press.

Rath, T., & Harter, J. (2010). *The economics of wellbeing*. Gallup Consulting.

Rest, J. R. (1984). Research on moral development: Implications for training counseling psychologists. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 12(3), 19-29.

Robison, J. (2019, October). Why millennials are job hopping. Gallup.com.

<https://www.gallup.com/workplace/267743/why-millennials-job-hopping.aspx>

Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (2015). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sears, L. E., Agrawal, S., Sidney, J. A., Castle, P. H., Rula, E. Y., Coberley, C. R., & Harter, J. K. (2014). The well-being 5: development and validation of a diagnostic instrument to improve population well-being. *Population health management*, 17(6), 357-365.

Shirazi, A., Zeynvand, L.H., & Karimi, M.A. (2013). Investigating the effects of brand identity on customer loyalty from social identity perspective. *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, 6(1), 153-178.

Trevino, L. K. (1986). Ethical decision making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist model. *Academy of management Review*, 11(3), 601-617.

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (2016). *Select task force on the study of harassment in the workplace*. <https://www.eeoc.gov/select-task-force-study-harassment-workplace>

Wanous, J. P., & Hudy, M. J. (2001). Single-item reliability: A replication and extension. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(4), 361-375.

Wanous, J. P., & Reichers, A. E. (1996). Estimating the reliability of a single-item measure. *Psychological Reports*, 78(2), 631-634.

Whitman, D. S., Van Rooy, D. L., & Viswesvaran, C. (2010). Satisfaction, citizenship behaviors, and performance in work units: A meta-analysis of collective construct relations. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(1), 41-81.

Wood, D. J. (1991). Corporate social performance revisited. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(4), 691-718.

World Economic Forum (2020). *Toward common metrics and consistent reporting of sustainable value creation*. Consultation draft, prepared in collaboration with Deloitte, EY, KPMG, and PwC. January, 2020. Cologny/Geneva, Switzerland.

Zheng (2020). Do your employees feel safe reporting abuse and discrimination? *Harvard Business Review*.

<https://hbr.org/2020/10/do-your-employees-feel-safe-reporting-abuse-and-discrimination>

Items Included in the Research

People and Planet 5

- 1) If I raised a concern about ethics and integrity, I am confident my employer would do what is right.
- 2) At work, I am treated with respect.
- 3) There is someone at work who encourages my development.
- 4) My organization cares about my overall wellbeing.
- 5) My organization makes a positive impact on people and the planet.

5 - Excellent

4

3

2

1 - Poor

Don't know/Does not apply

Outcome items

- 1) Being as objective as possible, on a 5-point scale, where "5" means "excellent" and "1" means "poor," please rate the overall performance of the following people or groups over the past 12 months.

1.1) Yourself

1.2) Your immediate team

1.3) Your organization

5 - Excellent

4

3

2

1 - Poor

Don't know/Does not apply

- 2) To what extent are you currently looking for a different job than the one you have now?

I am actively looking for another job.

I am watching for opportunities, but not actively looking.

I am not looking for another job.

3) I would recommend my organization as a great place to work.

5 - Strongly agree

4

3

2

1 - Strongly disagree

Don't know/Does not apply

4) Please imagine a ladder with steps numbered from zero at the bottom to 10 at the top. The top of the ladder represents the best possible life for you and the bottom of the ladder represents the worst possible life for you.

4.1) On which step of the ladder would you say you personally feel you stand at this time?

4.2) On which step do you think you will stand about five years from now?

10 - Best possible

9

8

7

6

5

4

3

2

1

0 - Worst possible

Don't know/Does not apply

5) I feel burned out at work.

Always

Very often

Sometimes

Rarely

Never

Does not apply

6.1) In the past 12 months, have you personally seen, or do you have firsthand knowledge of, employees or managers demonstrating unethical behavior?

Yes/No

6.2) Did you report it?

Yes/No

7) Discrimination (*Count yes for each of the items, range 0-35*)

Workplace discrimination is when an individual or group is treated less favorably than others because of personal characteristics, such as age, gender, race or ethnicity, national origin, disability, pregnancy, religion, or sexual orientation.

Discrimination can include being harassed, demoted, terminated, being paid less or being treated less favorably.

7.1) In the past 12 months, have you felt discriminated against at work? *Yes/No*

Still thinking about the past 12 months, were you discriminated against in any of the following ways?

- 7.2)** Age *Yes/No*
- 7.3)** Gender *Yes/No*
- 7.4)** Race and/or ethnicity *Yes/No*
- 7.5)** Family obligations *Yes/No*
- 7.6)** Disability *Yes/No*
- 7.7)** Religion *Yes/No*
- 7.8)** Pregnancy *Yes/No*
- 7.9)** Sexual orientation *Yes/No*
- 7.10)** Gender identity and/or gender expression *Yes/No*
- 7.11)** Political views *Yes/No*
- 7.12)** Personal appearance *Yes/No*
- 7.13)** Income *Yes/No*
- 7.14)** Education *Yes/No*
- 7.15)** Some other reason (please specify) *Yes/No*

Sexual harassment is any unwanted and unwelcome behavior that is linked to your gender or sexual orientation.

7.16) In the past 12 months, have you felt sexually harassed at work? *Yes/No*

Still thinking about your primary workplace, please answer some questions about unwelcome experiences that happen to some people at work.

- 7.17)** In the past 12 months, has anyone commented on your physical appearance in a way that made you feel uncomfortable? *Yes/No*
- 7.18)** In the past 12 months, has someone attempted to establish a romantic or sexual relationship with you, despite your efforts to discourage it? *Yes/No*
- 7.19)** In the past 12 months, have you been touched in a way that made you feel uncomfortable? *Yes/No*
- 7.20)** In the past 12 months, has anyone made inappropriate comments or jokes about you? *Yes/No*
- 7.21)** In the past 12 months, have you been asked to perform sexual acts in exchange for a promotion, raise or improved working conditions? *Yes/No*
- 7.22)** In the past 12 months, has a supervisor or boss ever attempted to establish a romantic or sexual relationship with you? *Yes/No*
- 7.23)** In the past 12 months, have you been sexually harassed in any other way not already described above? *Yes/No*

Nonsexual harassment is any unwanted and unwelcome behavior, which may range from unpleasant remarks to physical violence. Please briefly describe your experience with nonsexual harassment in the past 12 months.

7.24) In the past 12 months, have you felt harassed at work in a way that was not sexual in nature?

Yes/No

Still thinking about your primary workplace, please answer some questions about unwelcome experiences that happen to some people at work. In the past 12 months, have any of the following happened to you?

7.25) Personal insults *Yes/No*

7.26) Inappropriate physical contact *Yes/No*

7.27) Violent threats *Yes/No*

7.28) Inappropriate comments about your physical appearance *Yes/No*

7.29) Inappropriate jokes or comments made about you *Yes/No*

7.30) Offensive name calling *Yes/No*

7.31) Intimidation *Yes/No*

7.32) Threats to your employment *Yes/No*

7.33) Threats to your advancement *Yes/No*

7.34) Inappropriate criticism of your work that is shared with other people *Yes/No*

7.35) Other (please specify) *Yes/No*

Description of data sources

About the Gallup Panel™

Gallup launched the Gallup Panel in 2004 as a proprietary, probability based longitudinal panel of U.S. households that are selected using random digit-dial (RDD) and address-based sampling methods. The Gallup Panel is not an opt-in panel. Gallup randomly selects Panel households using outbound phone interviews that cover both landline and cellphone households. Panel members agree to participate in an average of three surveys per month via phone, web or mail. The Gallup Panel is a probability-based panel of U.S. adults who Gallup selects using address-based sampling methods and random-digit-dial phone interviews that cover landline and cellphones.

Gallup weights the obtained samples to correct for nonresponse. Nonresponse adjustments were made by adjusting the sample to match the national demographics of gender, age, race, Hispanic ethnicity, education and region. Demographic weighting targets were based on the most recent Current Population Survey figures for the aged-18-and-older U.S. population.

About Gallup European Workplace Surveys

Results are based on telephone interviews with a random sample of 1,000 employed adults per country (France, Germany, Spain and the U.K.). All respondents were living in the respective countries and selected using random-digit-dial sampling. Interviews are conducted with respondents on landline and cellular phones. The selection within a multiperson household was based on the next-birthday method. Samples are weighted by gender, age, region, profession (job type and role), employment status (full time and part time) and adults in the household. Demographic weighting targets are based on the most recently published data from the Statistics Office of the respective country.

About Gallup Strengths Recontact Sample

Gallup's strengths recontact source is a non-randomized sample of millions of people who complete Gallup's CliftonStrengths® assessment. Individuals opt-in to participation in future Gallup research. While this source is not used to establish survey item norms, it is useful in testing new items, studying inferential relationships between variables, and in learning about the impact of individual strengths on work and life outcomes.

GALLUP®

World Headquarters

The Gallup Building
901 F Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004

t +1.877.242.5587

f +1.888.500.8282

www.gallup.com