

APPENDIX

GENERATIONS:

Unlocking the Productivity Potential of a Multigenerational Workforce

Dr Daniel Jolles and Dr Grace Lordan
The Inclusion Initiative, London School of Economics



This online appendix offers detailed information about the research in *GENERATIONS: Unlocking the Productivity Potential of a Multigenerational Workforce*. This includes information about data collection and participant demographics (Appendix A), the variables that were collected from participants for analysis (Appendix B), how the analysis that was conducted (Appendix C), and the values underlying the plots presented in the paper (Appendix D).

Appendix A: Data Collection and Demographics

Data for this study was collected from a total of 1,472 participants between 14th March 2023 and 24th April 2023. Participants were recruited via the Kantar Lifepoints Panel and completed the survey via Qualtrics. This Qualtrics survey was administered by Citi Research with support from The Inclusion Initiative at London

School of Economics (LSE). Research questions were designed by the authors and members of The Inclusion Initiative at London School of Economics (LSE). This research received ethical approval from the LSE Department of Psychological and Behavioural Science (Reference: 166625).

Prior to answering the study questions, participants were screened to confirm they were currently employed in a for-profit company, in either the Finance, Technology, or Professional Services industries in either the US or UK.

Table A1: Participant demographics across the UK and US

	US: 865 participants	UK: 607 participants
Age	M = 45, SD = 12	M = 42, SD = 10
Generation	GenZ, 5%; Millennial, 35%; GenX, 44%; Baby Boomer 14%; Silent Generation 1%	GenZ, 5%; Millennial, 44%; GenX, 45%; Baby Boomer 5%
Annual Salary	M = \$52,609	M = \$33,945, £28,283
Gender	Women, 70%, Men 29%; Other, 1%	Women, 65%, Men 34%; Other, 1%
Education	No higher degree, 35%; Technical Degree, 20%; Bachelors 30%; Graduate 14%	No higher degree 51%; Bachelors 35%; Graduate 14%
Seniority	Entry, 17%; Non-mgmt, 43%; Supervisor 15%; Jnr Mgmt, 8%; Department Mgmt, 9%; Director 4%; C-Suite/Exec 3%	Entry, 19%; Non-mgmt, 43%; Supervisor 14%; Jnr Mgmt, 11%; Department Mgmt, 10%; Director 2%; C-Suite/Exec 1%
Industry	Finance/Insurance, 23%; IT, 36%; Professional and/or business services 40%	Finance/Insurance, 32%; IT, 32%; Professional and/or business services 36%
Company Size	500+ Employees, 41%; 250-499 Employees 49%; < 250 Employees, 10%	500+ Employees, 48%; 250-499 Employees 42%; < 250 Employees, 10%
Race/Ethnicity	White, 83%; Black, 10%; Other, 7%	White, 83%; Black, 6%; Asian, 7%; Other/Mixed 4%

Note: Table A1 shows the Demographics of the employees who participated in the study.

Appendix B: Variables used in Analysis.

JOB SATISFACTION: Based on a single-item measure. Employees were asked, “All things considered, which number best describes how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with your present job overall?” and responded from ‘1 = Extremely dissatisfied’ to ‘5 = Extremely satisfied’.

PRODUCTIVITY: Based on a 5-item measure of job performance focused on supervisor ratings to reduce inflated self-evaluations.¹ Employees were asked, “How do you feel your performance is viewed by your supervisor? What does your supervisor (i.e., not you) think of the following aspects of your performance?” and responded from ‘1 = Very poor’ to ‘5 = Excellent’ to the following five areas; “Your overall work performance, Your effectiveness as a team member, Your relationships with co-workers?, The quality of your work, Your ability to complete work on time/meet deadlines.” The mean score of the 5-items was used as an overall measure of productivity. Those who provided an overall mean score response less than ‘4 = Very Good’ were categorised as having low productivity.

INTERGENERATIONALLY INCLUSIVE WORK PRACTICES: Based on a 4-item measure of age-inclusive management.² Employees were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with four statements from ‘1 = Strongly Disagree’ to ‘5 = Strongly agree’;

“Our company makes it easy for people from diverse age groups to fit in and be accepted, Where I work, employees are developed and advanced without regard to the age of the individual, Managers in our company demonstrate through their actions that they want to hire and retain an age-diverse workforce, I feel that my immediate manager/supervisor does a good job of managing people with diverse backgrounds (in terms of age).” The mean score of the 4-items was used as an overall measure of intergenerationally inclusive work practices. If an employee reported a mean score across the four items above 3.5 (3 = ‘Neither agree nor disagree’, 4 = ‘Somewhat agree’), they were categorised as coming from a firm with intergenerationally inclusive work practices. If an employee’s mean score across the four items was 3.5 or below, they were categorised as coming from a firm without intergenerationally inclusive work practices. This left 599 employees in firms without intergenerationally inclusive work practices vs. 868 employees in firms with intergenerationally inclusive work practices.

TURNOVER INTENTIONS: A 2-item measure asked employees, “Please indicate the degree to which you personally agree or disagree with each of the following statements” and responded from ‘1 = Strongly disagree’ to ‘5 = Strongly agree’ to the following; “I often

think about leaving the organisation, It is likely that I will look for a new job next year”. The mean score of the 2-items was used as an overall measure of turnover intention (intention to leave the firm). Those who responded as either ‘1 = Strongly disagree or 2 = Somewhat disagree’ to likely that I will look for a new job next year were categorised as unlikely to look for a new job in the coming year.

EMPLOYEE-MANAGER AGE GAP: Employees reported their age and their best estimate of the age of their manager (if unknown). The age of the employee was subtracted from the (estimated) age of the manager.

CONTROL VARIABLES: In regression analyses, we controlled for employee gender, country (US/UK), education, tenure with the firm, years in occupation, and level of seniority. We also controlled for firm characteristics including size, and existing gender and age diversity.

EXCLUSIONS: Data was collected from five employees belonging to the ‘Silent Generation’ (aged between 77 and 86 years old). Due to the small number of observations for this generation, data was excluded from analysis. This reduced the total participants from 1,472 to 1,467 in the analysis.

¹ Adapted from: Laguerre, R. A., Barnes-Farrell, J. L., & Hughes, J. M. (2023). An examination of the predictive validity of subjective age and core self-evaluations on performance-related outcomes. *Work, Aging and Retirement*, 9(1), 95-117.

² Li, Y., Gong, Y., Burmeister, A., Wang, M., Alterman, V., Alonso, A., & Robinson, S. (2021). Leveraging age diversity for organisational performance: An intellectual capital perspective. *Journal of applied psychology*, 106(1), 71.

Table B1: Summary of Variables (by Generation)

Variable Name	Variable Description	Total			Generation											
		N	M	SD	Gen Z			Millennial			Gen X			Baby Boomers		
		N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Primary Variables of Interest																
Job Satisfaction	Overall Job Satisfaction	1,467	3.65	0.95	76	3.58	0.97	574	3.61	0.96	663	3.65	0.93	154	3.83	0.98
Productivity	Self-Reported Productivity Scale (Q1-4)	1,467	4.17	0.67	76	3.92	0.75	574	4.12	0.68	663	4.19	0.65	154	4.37	0.60
• Productivity Q1	Overall work performance	1,467	4.13	0.77	76	3.78	0.99	574	4.12	0.76	663	4.14	0.77	154	4.31	0.66
• Productivity Q2	Effectiveness as a team member	1,467	4.14	0.77	76	3.99	0.86	574	4.09	0.81	663	4.17	0.73	154	4.26	0.71
• Productivity Q3	Relationships with co-workers	1,467	4.11	0.80	76	3.93	0.96	574	4.06	0.82	663	4.11	0.78	154	4.37	0.66
• Productivity Q4	Quality of work	1,467	4.21	0.77	76	3.96	0.90	574	4.16	0.78	663	4.23	0.75	154	4.41	0.68
• Productivity Q5	Ability to complete work on time/meet deadlines	1,467	4.24	0.81	76	3.93	1.11	574	4.17	0.84	663	4.28	0.75	154	4.48	0.67
Intergenerationally Inclusive Work Practices	Overall Intergenerationally Inclusive Work Practices	1,467	3.75	0.89	76	3.63	0.86	574	3.71	0.89	663	3.77	0.90	154	3.89	0.87
• Intergen. Inclusion Q1	Company makes it easy for people from diverse age groups to fit in and be accepted	1,467	3.90	1.00	76	3.68	1.07	574	3.84	1.01	663	3.94	0.99	154	4.01	0.97
• Intergen. Inclusion Q2	Employees are developed and advanced without regard to the age of the individual	1,467	3.77	1.06	76	3.80	0.99	574	3.71	1.05	663	3.77	1.08	154	3.95	1.00
• Intergen. Inclusion Q3	Managers in our company demonstrate through their actions that they want to hire and retain an age-diverse workforce	1,467	3.62	1.06	76	3.53	1.10	574	3.58	1.07	663	3.63	1.05	154	3.75	1.03
• Intergen. Inclusion Q4	Immediate manager/supervisor does a good job of managing people with diverse backgrounds (in terms of age)	1,467	3.74	1.11	76	3.50	1.27	574	3.72	1.08	663	3.75	1.12	154	3.87	1.05
Turnover Intentions	Employee Intention to leave the firm	1,467	2.79	1.28	76	3.35	1.17	574	3.01	1.22	663	2.72	1.30	154	1.70	0.84
• Turnover Intention Q1	I often think about leaving the organisation.	1,467	2.85	1.37	76	3.33	1.36	574	3.01	1.31	663	2.80	1.38	154	2.25	1.32
• Turnover Intention Q2	It is likely that I will look for a new job next year.	1,467	2.73	1.37	76	3.38	1.30	574	3.00	1.30	663	2.63	1.38	154	1.86	1.17
Age	Employee Age	1,467	43.88	11.46	76	22.67	1.94	574	35.08	4.32	663	48.64	4.15	154	81.40	3.65
Manager Age	Employee's Estimate of Manager Age	1,467	47.68	10.95	76	39.12	9.98	574	45.78	9.81	663	49.29	10.88	154	52.08	12.11
Manager Age Distance	Difference between Employee Age and Manager Age	1,467	3.94	13.66	76	16.45	9.92	574	10.70	10.46	663	0.65	11.45	154	-13.31	12.93
Control Variables used in Analysis																
Education	Level of education (combined across US/UK)	1,467	6.78	2.67	76	6.26	2.70	574	6.66	2.56	663	6.71	2.70	154	7.73	2.75
Years with Organisation	Number of years working for organisation	1,467	8.73	9.16	76	3.27	3.66	574	6.56	8.64	663	9.83	8.34	154	14.77	11.93
Years in Occupation	Number of years working in occupation	1,467	12.92	10.45	76	3.57	3.12	574	8.41	6.81	663	15.33	9.74	154	23.92	13.86
Seniority	Level of seniority in company	1,467	2.67	1.45	76	2.34	1.26	574	2.68	1.44	663	2.65	1.43	154	2.86	1.64
Company Size	Size of the company (employees/grouped)	1,467	5.21	1.01	76	4.95	1.29	574	5.27	0.95	663	5.29	0.87	154	4.79	1.41
Company Age Diversity	Level of age diversity in org (Blau index)	1,467	0.61	0.20	76	0.58	0.22	574	0.60	0.20	663	0.62	0.19	154	0.63	0.20

Note: Table B1 shows the N (number), M (mean) and SD (standard deviation) for key measures used in the study in total and by generation.

Table B2: Summary of Variables (by Country)

Variable Name	Variable Description	Total			Country					
		N	M	SD	United States			United Kingdom		
		N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Primary Variables of Interest										
Job Satisfaction	Overall Job Satisfaction	1,467	3.65	0.95	860	3.76	0.97	607	3.49	0.89
Productivity	Self-Reported Productivity Scale (Q1-4)	1,467	4.17	0.67	860	4.26	0.63	607	4.03	0.69
• Productivity Q1	Overall work performance	1,467	4.13	0.77	860	4.24	0.74	607	3.99	0.79
• Productivity Q2	Effectiveness as a team member	1,467	4.14	0.77	860	4.24	0.74	607	4.00	0.79
• Productivity Q3	Relationships with co-workers	1,467	4.11	0.80	860	4.20	0.78	607	3.99	0.82
• Productivity Q4	Quality of work	1,467	4.21	0.77	860	4.30	0.72	607	4.08	0.81
• Productivity Q5	Ability to complete work on time/meet deadlines	1,467	4.24	0.81	860	4.34	0.78	607	4.09	0.83
Intergenerationally Inclusive Work Practices	Overall Intergenerationally Inclusive Work Practices	1,467	3.75	0.89	860	1.62	0.49	607	1.55	0.50
• Intergen. Inclusion Q1	Company makes it easy for people from diverse age groups to fit in and be accepted	1,467	3.90	1.00	860	3.96	1.01	607	3.80	0.99
• Intergen. Inclusion Q2	Employees are developed and advanced without regard to the age of the individual	1,467	3.77	1.06	860	3.82	1.07	607	3.69	1.03
• Intergen. Inclusion Q3	Managers in our company demonstrate through their actions that they want to hire and retain an age-diverse workforce	1,467	3.62	1.06	860	3.68	1.08	607	3.54	1.03
• Intergen. Inclusion Q4	Immediate manager/supervisor does a good job of managing people with diverse backgrounds (in terms of age)	1,467	3.74	1.11	860	3.81	1.14	607	3.64	1.06
Turnover Intentions	Employee Intention to leave the firm	1,467	2.79	1.28	860	2.74	1.35	607	2.86	1.18
• Turnover Intention Q1	I often think about leaving the organisation.	1,467	2.85	1.37	860	2.78	1.42	607	2.96	1.28
• Turnover Intention Q2	It is likely that I will look for a new job next year.	1,467	2.73	1.37	860	2.71	1.44	607	2.77	1.27
Age	Employee Age	1,467	43.88	11.46	860	45.07	11.86	607	41.88	10.44
Manager Age	Employee's Estimate of Manager Age	1,467	47.68	10.95	860	48.73	11.22	607	46.21	10.37
Manager Age Distance	Difference between Employee Age and Manager Age	1,467	3.94	13.66	860	3.66	14.19	607	4.33	12.87
Control Variables used in Analysis										
Education	Level of education (combined across US/UK)	1,467	6.78	2.67	860	7.81	2.92	607	5.31	1.22
Years with Organisation	Number of years working for organisation	1,467	8.73	9.16	860	8.78	9.18	607	8.66	9.14
Years in Occupation	Number of years working in occupation	1,467	12.92	10.45	860	13.37	10.46	607	12.27	10.43
Seniority	Level of seniority in company	1,467	2.67	1.45	860	2.73	1.53	607	2.58	1.33
Company Size	Size of the company (employees/grouped)	1,467	5.21	1.01	860	5.18	1.02	607	5.27	0.98
Company Age Diversity	Level of age diversity in org (Blau index)	1,467	0.61	0.20	860	0.60	0.21	607	0.62	0.19

Note: Table B2 shows the N (number), M (mean) and SD (standard deviation) for key measures used in the study in total and by generation

Table B3: Summary of Variables (by Gender)

Variable Name	Variable Description	Total			Gender								
		N	M	SD	Women			Men			Other		
		N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Primary Variables of Interest													
Job Satisfaction	Overall Job Satisfaction	1,467	3.65	0.95	1,001	3.64	0.94	454	3.69	0.96	12	3.33	1.37
Productivity	Self-Reported Productivity Scale (Q1-4)	1,467	4.17	0.67	1,001	4.19	0.65	454	4.11	0.69	12	4.12	0.80
• Productivity Q1	Overall work performance	1,467	4.13	0.77	1,001	4.15	0.76	454	4.09	0.80	12	4.08	1.17
• Productivity Q2	Effectiveness as a team member	1,467	4.14	0.77	1,001	4.17	0.75	454	4.07	0.80	12	4.33	0.99
• Productivity Q3	Relationships with co-workers	1,467	4.11	0.80	1,001	4.13	0.79	454	4.06	0.81	12	4.17	0.94
• Productivity Q4	Quality of work	1,467	4.21	0.77	1,001	4.24	0.76	454	4.14	0.78	12	4.08	0.79
• Productivity Q5	Ability to complete work on time/meet deadlines	1,467	4.24	0.81	1,001	4.28	0.78	454	4.16	0.86	12	3.92	1.17
Intergenerationally Inclusive Work Practices	Overall Intergenerationally Inclusive Work Practices	1,467	3.75	0.89	1,001	1.61	0.49	454	1.57	0.50	12	3.13	0.97
• Intergen. Inclusion Q1	Company makes it easy for people from diverse age groups to fit in and be accepted	1,467	3.90	1.00	1,001	3.94	1.01	454	3.82	0.98	12	3.42	0.90
• Intergen. Inclusion Q2	Employees are developed and advanced without regard to the age of the individual	1,467	3.77	1.06	1,001	3.82	1.04	454	3.68	1.08	12	3.17	1.19
• Intergen. Inclusion Q3	Managers in our company demonstrate through their actions that they want to hire and retain an age-diverse workforce	1,467	3.62	1.06	1,001	3.66	1.05	454	3.55	1.05	12	2.67	1.37
• Intergen. Inclusion Q4	Immediate manager/supervisor does a good job of managing people with diverse backgrounds (in terms of age)	1,467	3.74	1.11	1,001	3.76	1.11	454	3.69	1.10	12	3.25	0.97
Turnover Intentions	Employee Intention to leave the firm	1,467	2.79	1.28	1,001	2.77	1.27	454	2.82	1.30	12	3.42	1.36
• Turnover Intention Q1	I often think about leaving the organisation.	1,467	2.85	1.37	1,001	2.81	1.34	454	2.92	1.41	12	3.67	1.56
• Turnover Intention Q2	It is likely that I will look for a new job next year.	1,467	2.73	1.37	1,001	2.73	1.37	454	2.72	1.37	12	3.17	1.47
Age	Employee Age	1,467	43.88	11.46	1,001	42.76	10.94	454	46.11	11.98	12	37.17	12.40
Manager Age	Employee's Estimate of Manager Age	1,467	47.68	10.95	1,001	47.20	10.97	454	48.96	10.78	12	39.75	9.75
Manager Age Distance	Difference between Employee Age and Manager Age	1,467	3.94	13.66	1,001	4.44	13.29	454	2.85	14.36	12	2.58	15.76
Control Variables used in Analysis													
Education	Level of education (combined across US/UK)	1,467	6.78	2.67	1,001	6.76	2.65	454	6.80	2.70	12	7.58	3.70
Years with Organisation	Number of years working for organisation	1,467	8.73	9.16	1,001	7.86	7.79	454	10.56	10.66	12	12.17	27.82
Years in Occupation	Number of years working in occupation	1,467	12.92	10.45	1,001	12.15	9.70	454	14.53	11.09	12	16.17	27.99
Seniority	Level of seniority in company	1,467	2.67	1.45	1,001	2.54	1.38	454	2.96	1.56	12	2.42	1.56
Company Size	Size of the company (employees/grouped)	1,467	5.21	1.01	1,001	5.22	1.01	454	5.18	1.02	12	5.67	0.49
Company Age Diversity	Level of age diversity in org (Blau index)	1,467	0.61	0.20	1,001	0.60	0.20	454	0.63	0.20	12	0.42	0.35

Note: Table B3 shows the N (number), M (mean) and SD (standard deviation) for key measures used in the study in total and by generation.

Table B4: Productivity by Generation/Intergenerational-Inclusion

All Firms										
	Total		Gen Z		Millennial		Gen X		Baby Boomer	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Low Productivity	364	25%	28	37%	172	30%	143	22%	21	14%
High Productivity	1,103	75%	48	63%	402	70%	520	78%	133	86%
Total	1,467		76		574		663		154	
Firms Without Intergenerationally Inclusive Work Practices										
	Total		Gen Z		Millennial		Gen X		Baby Boomer	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Low Productivity	252	42%	21	58%	128	52%	89	34%	14	26%
High Productivity	347	58%	15	42%	120	48%	173	66%	39	74%
Total	599		36		248		262		53	
Firms With Intergenerationally Inclusive Work Practices										
	Total		Gen Z		Millennial		Gen X		Baby Boomer	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Low Productivity	112	13%	7	18%	44	13%	54	13%	7	7%
High Productivity	756	87%	33	83%	282	87%	347	87%	94	93%
Total	868		40		326		401		101	

Note: Table B4 shows the N (number) and % of responses that were categorised as having low/high productivity overall and in each generation, and in firms with/without intergenerationally inclusive work practices.

Table B5: Productivity by Country/Intergenerational-Inclusion

All Firms						
	Total		US		UK	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Low Productivity	364	25%	169	20%	195	32%
High Productivity	1,103	75%	691	80%	412	68%
Total	1,467		860		607	
Firms Without Intergenerationally Inclusive Work Practices						
	Total		US		UK	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Low Productivity	252	42%	114	35%	138	50%
High Productivity	347	58%	209	65%	138	50%
Total	599		323		276	
Firms With Intergenerationally Inclusive Work Practices						
	Total		US		UK	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Low Productivity	112	13%	55	10%	57	17%
High Productivity	756	87%	482	90%	274	83%
Total	868		537		331	

Note: Table B5 shows the N (number) and % of responses that were categorised as having low/high productivity overall and in each country, and in firms with/without intergenerationally inclusive work practices.

Appendix C: Analysis

1. Greater gaps, greater tensions

We performed a linear regression predicting the outcome variable (productivity or job satisfaction) from employee generation and the control variables (employee gender, country, education, tenure with the firm, years in occupation, level of seniority, firm size, and firm gender and age diversity), as well as intergenerational inclusion and the employee-manager age gap (and their interaction). The overall model explained significant variance in job satisfaction ($R^2 = .13$) and productivity ($R^2 = .21$). Employee-manager age gap, intergenerational inclusion, and their interaction were significant predictors of both job satisfaction and productivity. ($p < .01$)

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_1 X_{i1} + \beta_2 X_{i2} + \beta_3 X_{i3} (X_{i2} \times X_{i3}) + \epsilon_i$$

2. Firms with intergenerational inclusion outperform

Employees who provided the response '5 = Excellent' to *quality of your work* were categorised as excelling in their quality of work (see Appendix B, Productivity). Those who provided a response of '4= Very Good or 5 = Excellent' to *effectiveness as a team member* were categorised as effective team members (see Appendix B, Productivity). Employees who provided a response '4=Very Satisfied or 5 = Extremely Satisfied' were categorised as happy with their job (see Appendix B, Job Satisfaction). Those who responded as either '1 = Strongly disagree or 2 = Somewhat disagree' to *likely that I will look for a new job next year* were categorised as unlikely to

look for a new job in the coming year (see Appendix B, Productivity). Frequencies were used to show differences on specific productivity, job satisfaction and turnover intention items between employees who report intergenerational inclusion at their firms (vs. scores from employees at non inclusive firms).

We also performed a multivariate analysis of variance predicting the outcome variables (productivity, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions) from the control variables, employee generation and intergenerational inclusion. Intergenerational inclusion was a significant predictor of overall productivity ($\Delta R^2 = .14$), job satisfaction ($\Delta R^2 = .09$) and turnover intention ($\Delta R^2 = .04$), as well as individual items reported ($p < .001$).

$$y = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i X_i + \beta_2 X_{i2} + \epsilon_i$$

3. Intergenerational inclusion starts with direct managers

We performed a linear regression predicting the outcome variables (job satisfaction and productivity) from the control variables, employee generation and the four individual components of intergenerationally inclusive work practices (see Appendix B, Intergenerationally inclusive work practices). Agreement level with the statement "Our company makes it easy for people from diverse age groups to fit in and be accepted" predicted increased productivity. "Where I work, employees are developed and advanced without regard to the age of the individual" predicted increased job satisfaction and

productivity. "Managers in our company demonstrate through their actions that they want to hire and retain an age-diverse workforce" predicted increased job satisfaction and productivity. "I feel that my immediate manager/supervisor does a good job of managing people with diverse backgrounds (in terms of age)" predicted increased job satisfaction, and productivity. Relationships are ranked and represented in the diagram by significant contribution ($p < .01$) to the outcome (productivity/job satisfaction) based on size of the standardised coefficients.

$$y = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i X_i + \beta_2 X_{i2} + \beta_3 X_{i3} + \beta_4 X_{i4} + \beta_5 X_{i5} + \epsilon_i$$

4. The skills for successful productivity across GENERATIONS

Employees were asked to "indicate the degree to which you believe the following skills are important to getting promoted to a higher position in your organisation." and responded from '1 = Not at all important' to '5 = Extremely important' against the following 18 skills; Active Learning, Active Listening, Complex Problem Solving, Coordination, Critical Thinking, Instructing, Judgement and Decision Making, Learning Strategies, Management of Financial Resources, Management of Personnel Resources, Monitoring, Negotiation, Persuasion, Service Orientation, Social Perceptiveness, Speaking, Time Management, Writing.³

We ranked skills using the mean score for each skill by generation to identify the top skills.

³ Josten, C., & Lordan, G. (2022). Automation and the changing nature of work. *Plos one*, 17(5), e0266326.

Appendix D: Data for Plots

Figure 1A: Association between self-reported employee-manager age gaps and productivity

		Firms With Intergenerationally Inclusive Work Practices		Firms Without Intergenerationally Inclusive Work Practices	
		M	SD	M	SD
Employees older than managers	> 15 years age gap	4.48	0.48	4.11	0.63
	1 - 15 years age gap	4.33	0.57	4.08	0.67
Employees younger than managers	1 - 15 years age gap	4.35	0.54	3.83	0.75
	> 15 years age gap	4.36	0.50	3.76	0.73

Figure 1B: Association between self-reported employee-manager age gaps and job satisfaction

		Firms With Intergenerationally Inclusive Work Practices		Firms Without Intergenerationally Inclusive Work Practices	
		M	SD	M	SD
Employees older than managers	> 15 years age gap	3.87	1.02	3.30	0.96
	1 - 15 years age gap	3.87	0.84	3.37	0.87
Employees younger than managers	1 - 15 years age gap	4.01	0.78	3.25	0.91
	> 15 years age gap	3.90	0.84	2.96	1.00

Figure 3: Productivity by generation

	Firms With Intergenerationally Inclusive Work Practices		Firms Without Intergenerationally Inclusive Work Practices	
	M	SD	M	SD
Gen Z	4.22	0.66	3.58	0.70
Millennials	4.37	0.53	3.78	0.69
Gen X	4.31	0.56	3.99	0.73
Baby Boomers	4.51	0.49	4.09	0.68

Table 1: The Top 3 skills employees view as important to productivity and career advancement.

Skill	Gen Z		Millennial		Gen X		Baby Boomer	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Active Learning	4.12	1.26	4.11	1.05	3.99	1.11	4.12	1.03
Active Listening	4.37	1.05	4.19	1.03	4.11	1.06	4.27	1.03
Complex Problem Solving	4.03	1.00	4.09	1.04	3.93	1.14	4.12	1.20
Coordination	4.12	0.99	4.08	1.02	4.01	1.10	4.13	1.08
Critical Thinking	3.82	1.30	4.13	1.05	4.00	1.11	4.11	1.16
Instructing	3.97	1.26	3.98	1.09	3.85	1.16	3.97	1.21
Judgement and Decision Making	4.08	1.15	4.18	1.02	4.14	1.11	4.39	1.02
Learning Strategies	3.93	1.33	4.09	1.04	3.98	1.14	4.05	1.17
Management of Financial Resources	3.89	1.37	3.89	1.23	3.73	1.42	3.90	1.52
Management of Personnel Resources	3.82	1.32	3.98	1.12	3.75	1.35	3.93	1.40
Monitoring	3.83	1.32	3.99	1.08	3.84	1.21	3.97	1.26
Negotiation	3.86	1.43	3.84	1.19	3.71	1.34	3.80	1.39
Persuasion	3.82	1.28	3.84	1.22	3.67	1.29	3.77	1.42
Service Orientation	3.86	1.20	3.98	1.15	3.94	1.22	4.14	1.26
Social Perceptiveness	3.84	1.28	3.97	1.10	3.87	1.23	3.90	1.31
Speaking	4.08	1.17	4.15	1.04	4.02	1.13	4.18	1.19
Time Management	4.01	1.18	4.26	0.97	4.21	1.04	4.33	1.08
Writing	3.80	1.33	3.93	1.20	3.74	1.23	3.94	1.43

protiviti®

www.protiviti.com



www.lse.ac.uk/TII