

APPENDIX

Bridging the **GENERATIONAL AI GAP**

Unlocking Productivity for All Generations

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



The Inclusion
Initiative

protiviti®

This online appendix offers detailed information about the research in [***Bridging the Generational AI Gap: Unlocking Productivity for All Generations***](#). This includes information about data collection and participant demographics (Appendix A), the variables that were collected from participants for analysis (Appendix B), and regression analysis that was conducted (Appendix C).

Appendix A: Data Collection and Demographics

Data for this study was collected from a total of 3,031 participants between 29th January 2025 and 21st May 2025. Participants were recruited via the professional networks of the London School of Economics (LSE) and Protiviti via partners and connections on LinkedIn. Further data was collected via the Prolific platform, with screeners for professional workers at large companies (250+ employees) in the following sectors: Business Management & Administration, Finance, Government & Public Administration, Information Technology and Legal.

All participants completed the survey via Qualtrics administered by the The Inclusion Initiative (TII) at LSE. Research questions were designed by the authors and members of The Inclusion Initiative at London School of Economics (LSE) with input from the team at Protiviti. This research received ethical approval from the LSE Department of Psychological and Behavioural Science (Reference: 184085).

Participants answered specific questions based on their role as either a professional employee or executive. Participants with a role of either HR Leader, Director, C-Suite, Executive or Board Member at a company with at least 250+ employees were directed to answer ‘Executive’ questions.

Table A1: Participant Demographics

	Employees (key countries):	Employees (all countries):	Executives (all countries):
Participants	2,634	2,794	240
Age	$M = 41, SD = 12$	$M = 40, SD = 12$	$M = 46, SD = 10$
Generation	GenZ, 17%; Millennial, 48%; GenX, 30%; Baby Boomer, 6%	GenZ, 17%; Millennial, 48%; GenX, 29%; Baby Boomer, 6%	GenZ, 4%; Millennial, 40%; GenX, 49%; Baby Boomer, 8%
Annual Salary (\$USD)	<i>Median Range = \$50,000-\$74,999</i>	<i>Median Range = \$50,000-\$74,999</i>	<i>Median Range = \$100,000-\$149,999</i>
Gender	Women, 41%; Men, 58%; Other Gender Identity, 1%; Prefer not to say, 0%	Women, 41%; Men, 58%; Other Gender Identity, 1%; Prefer not to say, 0%	Women, 40%; Men, 57%; Other Gender Identity, 1%; Prefer not to say, 2%
Education	No higher degree, 11%; Technical/Associate’s degree, 4%; Bachelor’s degree, 32%; Graduate degree, 46%; Doctoral degree, 12%	No higher degree, 14%; Technical/Associate’s degree, 8%; Bachelor’s degree, 40%; Graduate degree, 35%; Doctoral degree, 4%	No higher degree, 7%; Technical/Associate’s degree, 4%; Bachelor’s degree, 31%; Graduate degree, 46%; Doctoral degree, 13%

Seniority/Role	Entry-Level, 4%; Non-mgmt, 31%; Supervisor 15%; Jnr Mgmt, 21%; Department Mgmt, 23%; Other senior leader 5%	Entry-Level, 5%; Non-mgmt, 31%; Supervisor 15%; Jnr Mgmt, 21%; Department Mgmt, 23%; Other senior leader 4%	HR leader, 20%; Director, 55%; C-Suite/Exec, 23%
Organisation Type	Government, 15%; Public-for-profit (publicly traded), 26%; Public-for-profit (privately held), 53%; Not for profit, 4%; Self-employed, 1%	Government, 15%; Public-for-profit (publicly traded), 26%; Public-for-profit (privately held), 53%; Not for profit, 4%; Self-employed, 1%	Government, 10%; Public-for-profit (publicly traded), 26%; Public-for-profit (privately held), 60%; Not for profit, 3%
Company Size	10,000+ Employees, 19%; 2,501-10,000 Employees, 21%; 250-2,500 Employees, 31%; 51-250 Employees, 18%; < 50 Employees, 11%	10,000+ Employees, 18%; 2,501-10,000 Employees, 20%; 250-2,500 Employees, 30%; 51-250 Employees, 19%; < 50 Employees, 12%	10,000+ Employees, 16%; 2,501-10,000 Employees, 36%; 250-2,500 Employees, 48%
Sector	Technology, 20%; Government, 12%; Professional Services, 9%; Power & Utilities, 9%; Financial Services, 9%; Telecommunications & Data Infrastructure, 7%; Pharma, 6%; Others (various), 30%	Technology, 20%; Government, 11%; Professional Services, 10%; Power & Utilities, 8%; Financial Services, 8%; Telecommunications & Data Infrastructure, 7%; Pharma, 6%; Others (various), 30%	Pharma, 15%; Technology, 24%; Professional Services, 14%; Financial Services, 8%; Manufacturing, 6%; Government, 6%; Others (various), 37%
Race/Ethnicity	White, 75%; Black, 8%; Latino/Hispanic, 3%; Other/Mixed, 13%; Prefer not to say, 1%	White, 74%; Black, 8%; Latino/Hispanic, 3%; Other/Mixed, 12%; Prefer not to say, 2%	White, 71%; Black, 6%; Prefer not to say, 5%; Other, 18%
Country of Residence	United Kingdom, 37%; United States, 36%; Italy, 15%; Germany, 7%; Australia, 4%	United Kingdom, 35%; United States, 34%; Italy, 14%; Germany, 7%; Australia, 4%; Others 3%	United States, 43%; United Kingdom, 24%; Italy, 14%; Germany, 7%; Australia, 4%; France, 3%; Others, 5%

Note: Table A1 shows the demographics of the employees who participated in the study. We received 3 responses from employees of the ‘silent generation’ (aged 80+); these responses were excluded from analysis due to the small number and the study focus on generations.

Table A2: Artificial Intelligence (AI) Employee Sample Sizes

Reason	Sample Size (key countries)	Sample Size (all countries)
Employees	2,634	2,791
Employees using AI for work	1,820	1,946
Employees involved in AI teams/projects for work	1,004	1,060
Not using AI in job role	814	845

Note: Table A2 shows the demographics of the employees who participated in the study. We received 3 responses from employees of the ‘silent generation’ (aged 80+), these responses were excluded from analysis due to the small number and the study focus on generations. Executives were not asked about AI habits/behaviours.

Appendix B: Variables Used in Analysis

AI ADOPTION:

Employees were asked, “Are you using Artificial Intelligence (AI), including generative AI, in your job role? This could be using technologies such as ChatGPT, Microsoft Copilot, Google Gemini or other AI tools to help you complete tasks, undertake research, design, or manage your time and personal wellbeing at work.” and responded ‘yes’ or ‘no’.

AI FOR COMMON TASKS:

Employees were asked, “Please select the categories that best describe how you currently use AI technologies in your job role.” The following categories were available for selection: *Writing and Content Creation* (e.g. writing assistance, grammar/tone, content generation, summaries), *Communication and Collaboration* (e.g. emails, presentations, language translation), *Project Management and Organisation* (e.g. task automation, scheduling, meeting summaries), *Data Analysis and Visualisation* (e.g. analysis, predictions, dashboards, forecasts), *Creative Design and Visual Work* (e.g. graphics, layouts, designs), *Customer Engagement and Sales* (e.g. marketing content, tracking customers, client follow-ups), *IT Development and Programming* (e.g. code generation, troubleshooting), *Learning and Development* (e.g. finding learning resources or courses, learning new skills), *Workplace Wellbeing* (e.g. managing stress, work-life balance or health goals), *Industry or Market Research* (e.g. trends, customer behaviours, competitor analysis), *Other* (please describe).

INVOLVED IN AI INITIATIVES:

Employees were asked, “Are you involved in the building, creation, sales, training, or promotion of AI technologies, including generative AI, in your job role? This could be for application within the organisation or as a supplier of AI products or services to other organisations.” and responded ‘yes’ or ‘no’.

PROPORTION OF TIME SPENT WORKING ON AI INITIATIVES:

Employees were asked, “What proportion (%) of time in your job role is spent working on the building, creation, sales, training, or promotion of AI technologies?” and responded on a sliding scale from 0 to 100%.

TYPE OF INVOLVEMENT IN AI INITIATIVES:

Employees were asked, “Please select the category that best describes your primary involvement in AI technologies in your job role.” The following categories were available for selection: *AI Strategy and Leadership* (incl. governance, policy, compliance, ethics and legal), *Data Science and Machine Learning Development* (incl. data collection, model development), *Data Infrastructure and Engineering* (incl. cloud, databases, platform management), *User Experience* (incl. UX/UI design, customer product support), *AI Research and Innovation* (incl. theoretical or applied research, product testing, security), *AI Project Management* (incl. planning and coordination of AI projects), *AI Product Development* (incl. product management, user research, market analysis), *AI-Specific Sales, Marketing, and Customer Engagement* (incl. sales or marketing AI products, account management), *Training and Development* (incl. employee or customer training, technical workshops).

PROPORTION OF TASKS FOR WHICH AI IS USED:

Employees were asked, “For what proportion (%) of your day-to-day tasks do you use AI technologies?” and responded on a sliding scale from 0 to 100%.

HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE:

Employees were asked, “How many hours do you work in a **typical week** on your current job?” and “How many hours a week do you believe your use of AI technologies saves you in your job role?” The hours per week saved by AI technologies were divided by the number of hours per week the employee reported working. (e.g., an employee who reported saving 5 hours per week and working 20 hours per week saves 25% of their time¹).

ANNUAL COST SAVED FROM AI USE:

Employees were asked, “What is your current annual salary (including bonuses) before tax and other deductions from your employer(s)? (in \$USD)”. They then selected their salary from one of the following ranges; *Less than \$25,000*, *\$25,000-\$49,999*, *\$50,000-\$74,999*, *\$75,000-\$99,999*, *\$100,000-\$149,999*, *\$150,000-\$250,000*, *\$250,000 or more*. 93 participants did not report their salary and selected “Prefer not to say.” In order to calculate the variable, we recoded each salary range as a new variable representing a dummy value at the mid-point of each range (e.g., \$87,500 for range \$75,000-\$99,999).² Once a single salary figure was coded for each employee, this was multiplied by the **HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE** to determine the saving. (e.g., an employee earning \$100,000 who reported saving 25% of their time would be saving \$25,000. The mean for each generation represents the mean saving across all employees³).

PROPORTION WHO HAVE RECEIVED AI SKILLS TRAINING (PAST 12 MONTHS):

Employees were asked, “Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the below statements” and responded to the item “I have undertaken skills training in AI tools to enhance my job performance within the past 12 months” on a Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Those who provided a response of either 4 or 5 were categorized as having received AI training within the past 12 months.

¹ A small number of employees (18 representing <1% of responses) reported working more than 80 hours per week. These responses were excluded from the analysis.

² The value of \$20,000 was used for “Less than \$25,000” (107 responses, 4%) selections and \$250,000 for “\$250,000 or more” (27 responses, 1%).

³ This explains why annual cost savings credited to Baby Boomer employees are greater than Gen Z, despite Gen Z saving more hours per week. For both groups the time saved is proportionate to hours worked and approximately 25%. Because Baby Boomers have higher average salaries, the annual cost saving from AI productivity is greater.

PROPORTION WHO HAVE AN INTEREST IN LEARNING/USING AI TOOLS:

Employees were asked, “*To what extent does your personal interest in learning and using AI tools motivate you to adopt them in your job?*” and responded on a Likert scale (1 = Not at all motivated, 2 = Slightly motivated, 3 = Moderately motivated, 4 = Very motivated, 5 = Extremely motivated). Those who provided a response of either 4 or 5 were categorized as having an interest in learning/using AI tools.

PROPORTION WHO BELIEVES THAT AI IMPROVES THEIR DECISION-MAKING:

Employees were asked, “*To what extent do you believe AI improves your decision-making in your role?*” and responded on a Likert scale (1 = not at all, 5 = very much). Those who provided a response of either 4 or 5 were categorized as having the belief that AI improves their decision-making.

AI TEAM PRODUCTIVITY:

Employees working on AI were asked, “*How productive do you consider these team(s) that you work with on the building, creation, sales, training, or promotion of AI technologies?*” and responded on a Likert scale (1 = Very unproductive, 5 = Very productive). Those who provided a response of either 4 or 5 were categorized as belonging to a productive AI team.

AI TEAM GENERATIONAL DIVERSITY:

To measure the generational diversity reported for AI project teams, we asked participants “*As best as possible, please classify the team(s) that you work with on the building, creation, sales, training, or promotion of AI technologies into the following age categories ...*”, with categories of between 16 and 19 years, 20 and 27 years, 28 and 43 years, 44 and 59 years, 60 and 78 years and above 79 years. The total had an auto-sum to 100% and participants were not able to proceed unless the sum of responses for each category was equal to 100%. This gave us the proportion of the meeting attendees from the different age groups associated with each generation.⁴ The two youngest generations were combined (as they both pertain to Gen Z). We next calculated the Blau Index, a commonly used metric for assessing heterogeneity within categorical variables.⁵ The index is defined as,

$$B = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^k p_i^2$$

p is the proportion of team members belonging to each generational category

k denotes the number of generational categories

The index ranges from 0 to 1, where 0 indicates perfect homogeneity (i.e., all team members belong to the same generation), and 1 reflects maximum diversity (i.e., team members are evenly distributed across all generations). To calculate the Blau Index, we squared the proportion of each generational category reported on teams and summed the squared proportions. We then performed a median split to create an additional variable consisting of two group designations, those where diversity is high and those where diversity is low.

⁴ There is no official taxonomy of generation start and end dates, however these dates have shaped popular understanding and originate with the Pew Research Center, a US Think Tank. See more at <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/>

⁵ Blau, P. M. (1977). A macrosociological theory of social structure. *American journal of sociology*, 83(1), 26-54.

PROPORTION WHO ARE NOT CURRENTLY INVOLVED IN AI INITIATIVES WHO WANT TO WORK ON AI IN FUTURE:

Employees were asked, *“Please indicate how much you would like to be involved in the building, creation, sales, training, or promotion of AI technologies as part of your job role in future? This could be for application within the organisation or as a supplier of AI products or services to other organisations.”* and responded on a Likert scale (1 = Definitely not, 2 = Probably not, 3 = Might or might not, 4 = Probably yes, 5 = Definitely yes). Those who provided a response of either 4 or 5 were categorized as wanting to work on AI Initiatives in future.

PROPORTION OF TIME EMPLOYEES WANT TO SPEND WORKING ON AI INITIATIVES:

Employees were asked, *“Please indicate what proportion (%) of time in your job role you would like to spend working on the building, creation, sales, training, or promotion of AI technologies?”* and responded on a sliding scale from 0 to 100%. Responses were split by those already working on AI initiatives and those not working on AI initiatives.

PROPORTION WHO HAVE CONFIDENCE IN ACCURACY AND RELIABILITY OF AI DECISIONS:

Employees were asked, *“How confident are you in the accuracy and reliability of AI-driven decisions?”* and responded on a Likert scale (1 = Not at all confident, 5 = Extremely confident). Those who provided a response of either 4 or 5 were categorized as having trust in AI decisions. These responses were split by AI adopters/non-adopters.

WHAT WOULD INCREASE TRUST IN AI:

Employees were asked, *“What would increase your trust in AI? (Please select up to 5).”* The following categories were available for selection: *Clear Explanations: Providing understandable explanations of how AI systems make decisions, especially for non-technical users, Access to Processes: Allowing users to see how the AI processes data and arrives at outcomes (e.g., visual decision trees, summaries), Open Source or Auditable Models: Offering open-source tools or detailed documentation to verify AI's functioning, Error Rates and Improvements: Being transparent about the AI's accuracy, error rates, and updates made to address identified issues, Bias Transparency: Acknowledging and addressing potential biases in AI algorithms, Third-Party Audits: Using independent audits to validate fairness and impartiality in AI decision-making, Human Oversight: Ensuring a human-in-the-loop approach where critical decisions involve human review, Clear Liability: Defining responsibility for AI decisions, especially in high-stakes environments (e.g., healthcare, legal systems), Data Protection: Guaranteeing that sensitive data is securely stored, anonymized, or encrypted, Minimal Data Collection: Using only the data necessary for the AI's purpose to reduce privacy concerns, Alignment with User Values: Ensuring AI decisions and recommendations align with the ethical standards and values of users, Explainable Value Judgments: Making ethical trade-offs or value-based decisions comprehensible to users, Ethical AI Certifications: Obtaining certifications from reputable bodies verifying the system's adherence to ethical AI principles, Success Stories: Sharing examples where AI has delivered positive outcomes, especially in similar industries or tasks, Peer Usage: Demonstrating widespread and successful adoption by peers or competitors, Training Programs: Offering accessible training to help users understand the AI's capabilities and limitations, Gradual Introduction: Rolling out AI tools incrementally to let users build confidence, Other (please state).*

EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT:

Employees were asked, *“Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the below statements”* and responded on a Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) to 12 statements. These statements fell into four groups, 1) **COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION**; I feel a strong sense of loyalty to my organisation, I would recommend my organisation as a great

place to work, I take pride in being a part of this organisation, My personal values align with those of the organisation, 2) **COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP**; I trust the leadership team to make decisions that benefit the organisation, I admire the way the leadership team matches their behaviours to the firm's values, The leadership team provides a clear and inspiring vision for the future, I feel supported by the organisation's leadership, 3) **COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER**; I trust my direct manager to have my best interests in mind, My manager communicates expectations and feedback clearly and effectively, My manager supports my professional growth and development, My manager treats all team members fairly, 4) **BELONGING**, I feel a sense of belonging in the organisation because I am accepted as I am, I can be my authentic self at work without fear of judgment or exclusion, I feel valued for the unique skills and perspectives I bring to the organisation, My sense of belonging in the organisation comes primarily from my own acceptance rather than external validation. Those who provided a response of either 4 or 5 were categorized as being committed/having belonging.

Variable Descriptives

Variable Description	Type	N	M	SD	Min	Max
AI ADOPTION	Binary	2,794	0.69	0.6	0	1
INVOLVED IN AI INITIATIVES	Binary	2,794	0.38	0.49	0	1
PROPORTION OF TIME SPENT WORKING ON AI INITIATIVES	Continuous	1,056	34.51	24.48	0	100
PROPORTION OF TASKS FOR WHICH AI IS USED	Continuous	1,949	31.164	24.223	0	100
HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE (raw reported)	Continuous	1,949	7.553	8.912	1	200
HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE (% of hours worked)	Continuous	1,942	0.21	0.26	.01	3
AI TEAM GENERATIONAL DIVERSITY	Continuous	1,062	0.46	0.23	0	1
BELONGING	Continuous	2,794	3.74	0.87	1	5
COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER	Continuous	2,794	3.88	0.97	1	5
COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP	Continuous	2,794	3.70	1.01	1	5
COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION	Continuous	2,794	3.55	1.04	1	5

Appendix C: Analysis

1. AI Adoption

We performed a linear regression predicting the binary outcome of **AI ADOPTION** from employee generation (1 = Gen Z, 2 = Millennial, 3 = Gen X, 4 = Baby Boomer) with Bonferroni correction for comparison between groups.

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_{2i} + \beta_2 D_{3i} + \beta_3 D_{4i} + \varepsilon_i$$

AI ADOPTION	
2. generation (Millennial)	-0.0840*** (0.0241)
3. generation (X)	-0.212*** (0.0260)
4. generation (Baby Boomer)	-0.296*** (0.0419)
Constant	0.816*** (0.0207)
Observations	2,791
R-squared	0.034
Standard errors in parentheses	
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1	

	Contrast	Bonferroni		Bonferroni		
		Std.err	t	p>t	95% CI	
2 vs 1	-0.084	0.024	-3.490	0.003	-0.147	-0.020
3 vs 1	-0.212	0.026	-8.140	0.000	-0.280	-0.143
4 vs 1	-0.296	0.042	-7.080	0.000	-0.407	-0.186
3 vs 2	-0.128	0.020	-6.370	0.000	-0.181	-0.075
4 vs 2	-0.212	0.038	-5.530	0.000	-0.314	-0.111
4 vs 3	-0.085	0.040	-2.130	0.198	-0.189	0.020

We performed a linear regression predicting the binary outcome of **AI ADOPTION** from employee generation (1 = Gen Z, 2 = Millennial, 3 = GenX, 4 = Baby Boomer) and controls; gender (1= men, 2 = other gender, 3 = women), country of birth (foreign born), company size, seniority/role (1 = Entry-Level, 2 = Non-mgmt, 3 = Supervisor, 4 = Jnr Mgmt, 5 = Department Mgmt, 6 = HR Leader, 7 = Director, 8 = Executive), org type (1 = Not for profit, 2 = Government, 3 = Public-for-profit publicly traded, 4 = Public-for-profit privately held, 5 = Self-employed), education (1 = No degree, 2 = Degree, 3 = Graduate/Postgraduate degree), country (1 = US, 2 = UK, 3 = Italy, 4 = Australia, 5 = Germany), and sector (1 = Financial services, 2 = Growth, 3 = Energy, 4 = Defensives, 5 = Cyclical).

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_{2i} + \beta_2 D_{3i} + \beta_3 D_{4i} + \gamma' C_i + \varepsilon_i$$

Note: To ensure robustness and interpretability, only responses from key countries where there were sufficient responses (see A1) were used in this regression analysis. Sector was grouped into 5 categories, Cyclical (Consumer Discretionary, Materials, Industrials, Real Estate), Defensives (Health Care, Consumer Staples, Utilities), Growth & Innovation (Information Technology, Communication Services), Financials, and Energy. Education was grouped into 3 categories. Baseline categories for those in which there are more than 2 categories are denoted with “= 1” and omitted from regression.

AI ADOPTION		
2. generation (Millennial)	-0.0403*** (0.0126)	-0.0379*** (0.0123)
3. generation (X)	-0.0717*** (0.00903)	-0.0580*** (0.00904)
4. generation (Baby Boomer)	-0.0735*** (0.0107)	-0.0591*** (0.0105)
2. gender (other)		-0.186** (0.0808)
3. gender (women)		-0.0333* (0.0174)
4. foreign born		0.0639** (0.0320)
Company size		0.000336 (0.00779)
2. role (non mgmt.)		-0.0120 (0.0438)
3. role (supervisor)		0.130*** (0.0472)
4. role (jnr mgmt.)		0.138*** (0.0455)
5. role (dept mgmt.)		0.210*** (0.0459)
6. role (hr lead)		0.161* (0.0956)
7. role (director)		0.191** (0.0809)
8. role (exec)		0.107 (0.0741)
2. org type (gov)		-0.0773 (0.0491)
3. org type (public comp)		-0.0934* (0.0486)
4. org type (privately held comp)		-0.0976** (0.0461)
5. role (self emp.)		-0.166* (0.0897)
2. education (degree)		0.0568** (0.0269)

3. education (post-degree)		0.135*** (0.0274)
2. country (UK)		-0.0593*** (0.0208)
3. country (IT)		0.0430 (0.0344)
4. country (Aus)		0.0219 (0.0451)
5. country (Germany)		0.121*** (0.0352)
2. sector (growth)		0.0752*** (0.0278)
3. sector (energy)		-0.224*** (0.0455)
4. sector (defensive)		-0.0969*** (0.0279)
5. sector (cyclical)		0.0143 (0.0281)
Constant	0.811*** (0.0217)	0.754*** (0.0727)
Observations	2,634	2,634
R-squared	0.035	0.149

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: *Baseline categories for each variable are as follows; generation = Gen Z, gender = men, country of birth = born in country of residence, seniority/role = Entry-level, org type = Not for profit, education = No degree, country = US, and sector = Financial services.*

2. AI Involvement for Job Role

We performed a linear regression predicting the binary outcome of **INVOLVED IN AI INITIATIVES** and the continuous outcome of **PROPORTION OF TIME SPENT WORKING ON AI INITIATIVES** from employee generation (1 = Gen Z, 2 = Millennial, 3 = GenX, 4 = Baby Boomer) with Bonferroni correction for comparison between groups (see C1).

	INVOLVED IN AI INITIATIVES	PROPORTION OF TIME SPENT WORKING ON AI INITIATIVES
2. generation (Millennial)	-0.0685*** (0.0256)	-5.544*** (1.932)
3. generation (X)	-0.174*** (0.0277)	-9.453*** (2.251)
4. generation (Baby Boomer)	-0.168*** (0.0446)	-9.778** (3.896)
Constant	0.473*** (0.0220)	39.91*** (1.626)
Observations	2,791	1,054
R-squared	0.017	0.018

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

INVOLVED IN AI INITIATIVES

	Bonferroni					
	Contrast	Std.err	t	P>t	[95% CI]	
gen						
2 vs 1	-0.068	0.026	-2.670	0.046	-0.136	-0.001
3 vs 1	-0.174	0.028	-6.270	0.000	-0.247	-0.101
4 vs 1	-0.168	0.045	-3.760	0.001	-0.285	-0.050
3 vs 2	-0.105	0.021	-4.930	0.000	-0.162	-0.049
4 vs 2	-0.099	0.041	-2.420	0.094	-0.207	0.009
4 vs 3	0.006	0.042	0.150	1.000	-0.106	0.118

PROPORTION OF TIME SPENT WORKING ON AI INITIATIVES

	Bonferroni					
	Contrast	Std.err	t	P>t	[95% CI]	
gen						
2 vs 1	-5.544	1.932	-2.870	0.025	-10.650	-0.437
3 vs 1	-9.453	2.251	-4.200	0.000	-15.403	-3.503
4 vs 1	-9.778	3.896	-2.510	0.073	-20.077	0.520
3 vs 2	-3.910	1.875	-2.090	0.224	-8.865	1.046
4 vs 2	-4.235	3.691	-1.150	1.000	-13.992	5.523
4 vs 3	-0.325	3.868	-0.080	1.000	-10.550	9.900

We performed a linear regression predicting the binary outcome of **INVOLVED IN AI INITIATIVES** and the continuous outcome of **PROPORTION OF TIME SPENT WORKING ON AI INITIATIVES** from employee generation (1 = Gen Z, 2 = Millennial, 3 = GenX, 4 = Baby Boomer) and controls (see C1).

	INVOLVED IN AI INITIATIVES		PROPORTION OF TIME SPENT WORKING ON AI INITIATIVES	
2. generation (Millennial)	-0.0410*** (0.0133)	-0.0329*** (0.0124)	-2.871*** (0.989)	-1.556* (0.907)
3. generation (X)	-0.0645*** (0.00956)	-0.0515*** (0.00911)	-3.192*** (0.768)	-2.211*** (0.720)
4. generation (Baby Boomer)	-0.0460*** (0.0114)	-0.0333*** (0.0106)	-2.537** (0.985)	-1.797** (0.915)
2. gender (other)		-0.0307 (0.0814)		-4.247 (7.332)
3. gender (women)		-0.0229 (0.0175)		3.045** (1.436)
4. foreign born		0.00348 (0.0322)		4.783* (2.497)
Company size		-0.0361*** (0.00785)		-2.606*** (0.655)
2. role (non mgmt.)		-0.0412 (0.0441)		-2.421 (4.302)
3. role (supervisor)		0.120** (0.0475)		-1.736 (4.389)
4. role (jnr mgmt.)		0.146*** (0.0459)		-0.777 (4.236)
5. role (dept mgmt.)		0.252*** (0.0462)		2.495 (4.244)
6. role (hr lead)		0.236** (0.0964)		7.814 (6.722)
7. role (director)		0.267*** (0.0816)		-4.940 (6.116)
8. role (exec)		0.221*** (0.0747)		-4.222 (5.867)

2. org type (gov)		-0.0611		-0.689
		(0.0495)		(4.171)
3. org type (public comp)		-0.0405		-1.994
		(0.0490)		(3.954)
4. org type (privately held comp)		-0.0529		-0.964
		(0.0465)		(3.744)
5. role (self emp.)		-0.0546		0.169
		(0.0904)		(6.778)
2. education (degree)		0.0382		-1.388
		(0.0271)		(2.662)
3. education (post-degree)		0.122***		2.167
		(0.0276)		(2.666)
2. country (UK)		-0.127***		-13.93***
		(0.0210)		(1.725)
3. country (IT)		0.0115		-14.28***
		(0.0347)		(2.741)
4. country (Aus)		-0.136***		-9.691**
		(0.0455)		(3.813)
5. country (Germany)		-0.104***		-17.88***
		(0.0355)		(2.860)
2. sector (growth)		0.167***		3.490*
		(0.0280)		(1.945)
3. sector (energy)		-0.232***		-6.718
		(0.0459)		(4.672)
4. sector (defensive)		-0.112***		-8.578***
		(0.0281)		(2.372)
5. sector (cyclical)		-0.0289		-6.793***
		(0.0284)		(2.175)
Constant	0.489***	0.559***	40.25***	54.48***
	(0.0230)	(0.0732)	(1.663)	(6.520)
Observations	2,634	2,634	999	999
R-squared	0.020	0.218	0.019	0.249

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Baseline categories for each variable are as follows; generation = Gen Z, gender = men, country of birth = born in country of residence, seniority/role = Entry-level, org type = Not for profit, education = No degree, country = US, and sector = Financial services.

3. AI Task Use and Hours Saved

We performed a linear regression predicting the continuous outcomes of **PROPORTION OF TASKS FOR WHICH AI IS USED** and **HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE (raw reported)** and **HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE (% of hours worked)** from employee generation (1 = Gen Z, 2 = Millennial, 3 = GenX, 4 = Baby Boomer) with Bonferroni correction for comparison between groups (see C1).

	PROPORTION OF TASKS FOR WHICH AI IS USED	HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE (raw reported)	HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE (% of hours worked)
2. generation (Millennial)	-8.024*** (1.424)	-1.475*** (0.532)	-0.0536*** (0.0153)
3. generation (X)	-14.01*** (1.612)	-2.037*** (0.603)	-0.0779*** (0.0174)
4. generation (Baby Boomer)	-10.66*** (2.920)	-0.946 (1.092)	-0.000934 (0.0317)
Constant	39.19*** (1.205)	8.859*** (0.450)	0.254*** (0.0130)
Observations	1,946	1,946	1,939
R-squared	0.038	0.006	0.012

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

PROPORTION OF TASKS FOR WHICH AI IS USED

	Bonferroni					
	Contrast	Std.err	t	P>t	[95% CI]	
gen						
2 vs 1	-8.024	1.424	-5.640	0.000	-11.784	-4.264
3 vs 1	-14.010	1.612	-8.690	0.000	-18.268	-9.752
4 vs 1	-10.657	2.920	-3.650	0.002	-18.369	-2.946
3 vs 2	-5.986	1.313	-4.560	0.000	-9.454	-2.519
4 vs 2	-2.633	2.766	-0.950	1.000	-9.938	4.672
4 vs 3	3.353	2.868	1.170	1.000	-4.220	10.926

HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE (raw reported)

	Bonferroni					
	Contrast	Std.err	t	P>t	[95% CI]	
gen						
2 vs 1	-1.475	0.532	-2.770	0.034	-2.882	-0.069
3 vs 1	-2.037	0.603	-3.380	0.004	-3.630	-0.445
4 vs 1	-0.946	1.092	-0.870	1.000	-3.830	1.937
3 vs 2	-0.562	0.491	-1.140	1.000	-1.859	0.735
4 vs 2	0.529	1.034	0.510	1.000	-2.203	3.261
4 vs 3	1.091	1.072	1.020	1.000	-1.741	3.923

HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE (% of hours worked)

	Bonferroni					
	Contrast	Std.err	t	P>t	[95% CI]	
gen						
2 vs 1	-0.054	0.015	-3.490	0.003	-0.094	-0.013
3 vs 1	-0.078	0.017	-4.490	0.000	-0.124	-0.032
4 vs 1	-0.001	0.032	-0.030	1.000	-0.085	0.083
3 vs 2	-0.024	0.014	-1.720	0.510	-0.062	0.013
4 vs 2	0.053	0.030	1.750	0.481	-0.027	0.132
4 vs 3	0.077	0.031	2.470	0.081	-0.005	0.159

We performed a linear regression predicting **PROPORTION OF TASKS FOR WHICH AI IS USED** and **HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE (raw reported)** and **HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE (% of hours worked)** from employee generation (1 = Gen Z, 2 = Millennial, 3 = GenX, 4 = Baby Boomer) and controls (see C1).

	PROPORTION OF TASKS FOR WHICH AI IS USED		HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE (raw reported)		HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE (% of hours worked)	
2. generation (Millennial)	-3.801*** (0.747)	-2.944*** (0.697)	-0.778*** (0.246)	-0.721*** (0.236)	-0.0256*** (0.00758)	-0.0229*** (0.00733)
3. generation (X)	-4.542*** (0.561)	-3.883*** (0.543)	-0.835*** (0.185)	-0.851*** (0.184)	-0.0266*** (0.00569)	-0.0262*** (0.00570)
4. generation (Baby Boomer)	-2.610*** (0.747)	-2.272*** (0.695)	-0.256 (0.246)	-0.327 (0.236)	0.00118 (0.00766)	-0.000886 (0.00737)
2. gender (other)		-0.472 (5.835)		-1.102 (1.977)		-0.0153 (0.0612)
3. gender (women)		0.912 (1.058)		-0.339 (0.359)		0.00713 (0.0111)
4. foreign born		-0.0630 (1.824)		1.103* (0.618)		0.0191 (0.0191)
Company size		-2.880*** (0.468)		-0.629*** (0.159)		-0.0264*** (0.00491)
2. role (non mgmt.)		-4.254 (2.810)		0.609 (0.952)		0.0161 (0.0295)
3. role (supervisor)		-0.314 (2.980)		1.660 (1.010)		0.0358 (0.0313)
4. role (jnr mgmt.)		0.252 (2.855)		1.615* (0.967)		0.0432 (0.0300)
5. role (dept mgmt.)		3.299 (2.886)		3.171*** (0.978)		0.0875*** (0.0303)
6. role (hr lead)		7.273 (5.535)		2.112 (1.876)		0.0702 (0.0581)
7. role (director)		-1.587 (4.795)		2.606 (1.625)		0.0311 (0.0503)
8. role (exec)		-1.222 (4.560)		3.368** (1.545)		0.0865* (0.0479)
2. org type (gov)		-1.511 (2.925)		1.305 (0.991)		0.0239 (0.0307)
3. org type (public comp)		-1.769 (2.876)		0.288 (0.974)		-0.0137 (0.0302)
4. org type (privately held comp)		-1.876 (2.721)		0.808 (0.922)		-0.0105 (0.0286)
5. role (self emp.)		-6.398 (5.588)		0.999 (1.894)		0.00471 (0.0586)
2. education (degree)		1.805 (1.777)		0.116 (0.602)		0.00422 (0.0187)
3. education (post- degree)		4.923*** (1.790)		0.397 (0.606)		0.0175 (0.0189)
2. country (UK)		-12.05*** (1.272)		-3.649*** (0.431)		-0.102*** (0.0134)
3. country (IT)		-10.87*** (2.062)		-2.958*** (0.699)		-0.0830*** (0.0217)
4. country (Aus)		-8.442*** (2.617)		-2.317*** (0.887)		-0.0703** (0.0275)

5. country (Germany)		-12.13*** (1.962)		-4.503*** (0.665)		-0.132*** (0.0206)
2. sector (growth)		4.115*** (1.582)		0.798 (0.536)		0.00623 (0.0166)
3. sector (energy)		-4.830* (2.922)		-2.007** (0.990)		-0.0702** (0.0308)
4. sector (defensive)		-6.779*** (1.732)		-1.797*** (0.587)		-0.0675*** (0.0182)
5. sector (cyclical)		-5.504*** (1.651)		-1.699*** (0.559)		-0.0524*** (0.0173)
Constant	38.94*** (1.268)	54.62*** (4.564)	8.997*** (0.418)	11.21*** (1.546)	0.251*** (0.0129)	0.371*** (0.0479)
Observations	1,820	1,820	1,820	1,820	1,814	1,814
R-squared	0.035	0.227	0.011	0.163	0.014	0.154

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Baseline categories for each variable are as follows; generation = Gen Z, gender = men, country of birth = born in country of residence, seniority/role = Entry-level, org type = Not for profit, education = No degree, country = US, and sector = Financial services.

4. AI Training and Motivation

We performed a linear regression predicting **HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE (% of hours worked)** from employee generation (1 = Gen Z, 2 = Millennial, 3 = GenX, 4 = Baby Boomer), controls (see C1) and a) **AI SKILLS TRAINING (PAST 12 MONTHS)**, b) **CONFIDENCE IN ACCURACY AND RELIABILITY OF AI DECISIONS**, c) **INTEREST IN LEARNING/USING AI TOOLS**, and d) **BELIEF THAT AI IMPROVES DECISION-MAKING**.

	HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE (% of hours worked)
2. generation (Millennial)	-0.0178** (0.00693)
3. generation (X)	-0.0197*** (0.00540)
4. generation (Baby Boomer)	0.00341 (0.00696)
2. gender (other)	-0.0151 (0.0578)
3. gender (women)	0.0168 (0.0105)
4. foreign born	-0.0189 (0.0181)

Company size	-0.0206*** (0.00467)
2. role (non mgmt.)	0.0376 (0.0279)
3. role (supervisor)	0.0322 (0.0295)
4. role (jnr mgmt.)	0.0440 (0.0283)
5. role (dept mgmt.)	0.0728** (0.0286)
6. role (hr lead)	0.0625 (0.0549)
7. role (director)	0.0115 (0.0475)
8. role (exec)	0.0810* (0.0452)
2. org type (gov)	0.0156 (0.0290)
3. org type (public comp)	-0.0174 (0.0285)
4. org type (privately held comp)	-0.0164 (0.0270)
5. role (self emp.)	0.0227 (0.0553)
2. education (degree)	-0.00523 (0.0177)
3. education (post-degree)	0.00150 (0.0179)
2. country (UK)	-0.0598*** (0.0129)
3. country (IT)	-0.0294 (0.0211)
4. country (Aus)	-0.0124 (0.0262)
5. country (Germany)	-0.0948*** (0.0197)
2. sector (growth)	0.00895 (0.0157)
3. sector (energy)	-0.0611** (0.0291)
4. sector (defensive)	-0.0431** (0.0173)
5. sector (cyclical)	-0.0343** (0.0165)
a) AI SKILLS TRAINING (PAST 12 MONTHS)	0.0620*** (0.0115)
b) CONFIDENCE IN ACCURACY AND RELIABILITY OF AI DECISIONS	0.0381*** (0.0125)
c) INTEREST IN LEARNING/USING AI TOOLS	0.0567*** (0.0123)
d) BELIEF THAT AI IMPROVES DECISION-MAKING	0.0684*** (0.0129)

Constant	0.215*** (0.0500)
Observations	1,814
R-squared	0.249

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Baseline categories for each variable are as follows; generation = Gen Z, gender = men, country of birth = born in country of residence, seniority/role = Entry-level, org type = Not for profit, education = No degree, country = US, and sector = Financial services.

5. AI Team Diversity and Productivity

We performed a linear regression predicting **AI TEAM PRODUCTIVITY** from **AI TEAM GENERATIONAL DIVERSITY**, employee generation (1 = Gen Z, 2 = Millennial, 3 = GenX, 4 = Baby Boomer), controls (see C1).

AI TEAM PRODUCTIVITY		
AI TEAM GENERATIONAL DIVERSITY	0.412*** (0.0600)	0.170*** (0.0623)
2. generation (Millennial)		-0.0258 (0.0172)
3. generation (X)		-0.0213 (0.0136)
4. generation (Baby Boomer)		-0.00657 (0.0174)
2. gender (other)		-0.164 (0.139)
3. gender (women)		0.00963 (0.0272)
4. foreign born		0.0424 (0.0474)
Company size		-0.0457*** (0.0124)
2. role (non mgmt.)		0.145* (0.0816)
3. role (supervisor)		0.142* (0.0833)
4. role (jnr mgmt.)		0.126 (0.0804)
5. role (dept mgmt.)		0.183** (0.0804)
6. role (hr lead)		0.142 (0.128)
7. role (director)		0.149 (0.116)
8. role (exec)		0.156

		(0.110)
2. org type (gov)		-0.0667
		(0.0792)
3. org type (public comp)		-0.124*
		(0.0751)
4. org type (privately held comp)		-0.0427
		(0.0711)
5. role (self emp.)		-0.0547
		(0.129)
2. education (degree)		0.0271
		(0.0506)
3. education (post-degree)		0.0362
		(0.0507)
2. country (UK)		-0.142***
		(0.0332)
3. country (IT)		-0.292***
		(0.0523)
4. country (Aus)		-0.205***
		(0.0730)
5. country (Germany)		-0.247***
		(0.0544)
2. sector (growth)		0.0375
		(0.0369)
3. sector (energy)		-0.00787
		(0.0886)
4. sector (defensive)		-0.0493
		(0.0451)
5. sector (cyclical)		-0.0743*
		(0.0413)
Constant	0.535***	0.824***
	(0.0304)	(0.127)
Observations	1,060	1,004
R-squared	0.043	0.171

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Baseline categories for each variable are as follows; generation = Gen Z, gender = men, country of birth = born in country of residence, seniority/role = Entry-level, org type = Not for profit, education = No degree, country = US, and sector = Financial services.

6. AI and Employee Commitment

We performed a linear regression predicting the binary commitment outcomes (**COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION**, **COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP**, **COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER**, and **BELONGING**) from employee generation (1 = Gen Z, 2 = Millennial, 3 = GenX, 4 = Baby Boomer) with Bonferroni correction for comparison between groups (see C1).

	BELONGING	COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION	COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP	COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER
2. generation (Millennial)	-0.0362 (0.0266)	-0.0692*** (0.0264)	-0.00753 (0.0266)	-0.0872*** (0.0260)
3. generation (X)	-0.0498* (0.0288)	-0.109*** (0.0286)	0.00439 (0.0288)	-0.132*** (0.0281)
4. generation (Baby Boomer)	0.0141 (0.0463)	-0.0687 (0.0460)	0.0932** (0.0463)	-0.112** (0.0452)
Constant	0.531*** (0.0229)	0.517*** (0.0227)	0.504*** (0.0229)	0.690*** (0.0223)
Observations	2,791	2,791	2,791	2,791
R-squared	0.002	0.005	0.002	0.008

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

BELONGING

	Bonferroni					
	Contrast	Std.err	t	P>t	[95% CI]	
gen						
2 vs 1	-0.036	0.027	-1.360	1.000	-0.107	0.034
3 vs 1	-0.050	0.029	-1.730	0.505	-0.126	0.026
4 vs 1	0.014	0.046	0.300	1.000	-0.108	0.136
3 vs 2	-0.014	0.022	-0.610	1.000	-0.072	0.045
4 vs 2	0.050	0.043	1.180	1.000	-0.062	0.163
4 vs 3	0.064	0.044	1.450	0.878	-0.052	0.180

COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION

	Bonferroni					
	Contrast	Std.err	t	P>t	[95% CI]	
gen						
2 vs 1	-0.069	0.026	-2.620	0.053	-0.139	0.001
3 vs 1	-0.109	0.029	-3.800	0.001	-0.184	-0.033
4 vs 1	-0.069	0.046	-1.490	0.813	-0.190	0.053
3 vs 2	-0.039	0.022	-1.790	0.442	-0.098	0.019
4 vs 2	0.001	0.042	0.010	1.000	-0.111	0.112
4 vs 3	0.040	0.044	0.920	1.000	-0.075	0.155

COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP

	Bonferroni				
	Contrast	Std.err	t	P>t	[95% CI]
gen					
2 vs 1	-0.008	0.027	-0.280	1.000	-0.078 0.063
3 vs 1	0.004	0.029	0.150	1.000	-0.072 0.080
4 vs 1	0.093	0.046	2.010	0.265	-0.029 0.215
3 vs 2	0.012	0.022	0.540	1.000	-0.047 0.070
4 vs 2	0.101	0.043	2.370	0.107	-0.012 0.213
4 vs 3	0.089	0.044	2.020	0.259	-0.027 0.205

COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER

DMCommitment	Bonferroni				
	Contrast	Std.err	t	P>t	[95% CI]
gen					
2 vs 1	-0.087	0.026	-3.360	0.005	-0.156 -0.019
3 vs 1	-0.132	0.028	-4.680	0.000	-0.206 -0.057
4 vs 1	-0.112	0.045	-2.490	0.077	-0.232 0.007
3 vs 2	-0.044	0.022	-2.050	0.244	-0.101 0.013
4 vs 2	-0.025	0.041	-0.610	1.000	-0.135 0.084
4 vs 3	0.019	0.043	0.450	1.000	-0.094 0.132

We performed a linear regression predicting **AI ADOPTION** from employee generation (1 = Gen Z, 2 = Millennial, 3 = GenX, 4 = Baby Boomer), controls (see C1), commitment (**COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION, COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP, COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER, and BELONGING**) and **AI SKILLS TRAINING (PAST 12 MONTHS)**, b) **CONFIDENCE IN ACCURACY AND RELIABILITY OF AI DECISIONS**, c) **INTEREST IN LEARNING/USING AI TOOLS**, and d) **BELIEF THAT AI IMPROVES DECISION-MAKING**. We also include analysis for each generation separately.

	Gen Z	Millennial	Gen X	Baby Boomers	Total
VARIABLES	AI ADOPTION				
2. gender (other)	-0.127 (0.170)	-0.145 (0.113)	-0.130 (0.144)	0.0690 (0.370)	-0.138* (0.0761)
3. gender (women)	-0.0234 (0.0355)	-0.0521** (0.0238)	-0.0179 (0.0316)	0.0296 (0.0925)	-0.0266 (0.0164)
4. foreign born	-0.0586 (0.0565)	-0.0926** (0.0407)	0.0178 (0.0687)	-0.325 (0.407)	-0.0624** (0.0301)
Company size	-0.00377 (0.0158)	0.00319 (0.0106)	0.0201 (0.0146)	-0.0102 (0.0420)	0.00733 (0.00736)
2. role (non mgmt.)	0.0396 (0.0601)	0.0418 (0.0677)	-0.0120 (0.107)	-0.00142 (0.394)	0.00732 (0.0412)
3. role (supervisor)	0.0531 (0.0747)	0.116 (0.0717)	0.162 (0.111)	-0.0448 (0.398)	0.0959** (0.0445)
4. role (jnr mgmt.)	0.149** (0.0646)	0.139** (0.0698)	0.144 (0.112)	-0.00669 (0.411)	0.119*** (0.0429)

5. role (dept mgmt.)	0.132*	0.122*	0.234**	0.0874	0.147***
	(0.0743)	(0.0707)	(0.109)	(0.401)	(0.0434)
6. role (hr lead)	0.0708	0.201	0.0182	0.255	0.136
	(0.194)	(0.131)	(0.193)	(0.514)	(0.0902)
7. role (director)	0.328	0.0654	0.267*	-0.166	0.130*
	(0.225)	(0.119)	(0.159)	(0.446)	(0.0763)
8. role (exec)	-0.187	0.0708	0.217	-0.0283	0.0979
	(0.196)	(0.116)	(0.139)	(0.434)	(0.0700)
2. org type (gov)	-0.135	-0.110*	0.0377	-0.0227	-0.0774*
	(0.130)	(0.0624)	(0.0929)	(0.216)	(0.0463)
3. org type (public comp)	-0.166	-0.104*	-0.0391	0.0618	-0.0951**
	(0.128)	(0.0614)	(0.0936)	(0.212)	(0.0457)
4. org type (privately held comp)	-0.147	-0.0887	-0.0566	-0.0684	-0.102**
	(0.124)	(0.0576)	(0.0891)	(0.203)	(0.0434)
5. role (self emp.)	-0.384	-0.167	-0.00313	0.157	-0.126
	(0.298)	(0.134)	(0.143)	(0.356)	(0.0845)
2. education (degree)	0.151**	0.0780**	-0.0305	0.0755	0.0476*
	(0.0664)	(0.0389)	(0.0447)	(0.112)	(0.0254)
3. education (post-degree)	0.202***	0.105***	0.0794*	0.170	0.110***
	(0.0676)	(0.0400)	(0.0453)	(0.120)	(0.0259)
2. country (UK)	0.00275	0.0256	-0.0229	0.0194	0.00917
	(0.0485)	(0.0288)	(0.0389)	(0.104)	(0.0201)
3. country (IT)	0.230***	0.113**	-0.0312	0.243	0.0990***
	(0.0828)	(0.0452)	(0.0632)	(0.225)	(0.0330)
4. country (Aus)	-0.0595	0.110*	0.117	0.198	0.0968**
	(0.0891)	(0.0579)	(0.0967)	(0.265)	(0.0429)
5. country (Germany)	0.115*	0.186***	0.100	0.000323	0.160***
	(0.0655)	(0.0436)	(0.0943)	(0.300)	(0.0334)
2. sector (growth)	0.0548	0.0544	0.0741	0.0670	0.0653**
	(0.0508)	(0.0368)	(0.0564)	(0.166)	(0.0262)
3. sector (energy)	-0.0907	-0.190***	-0.188**	-0.290	-0.203***
	(0.110)	(0.0603)	(0.0821)	(0.274)	(0.0430)
4. sector (defensive)	-0.0406	-0.0662*	-0.0199	0.100	-0.0411
	(0.0641)	(0.0371)	(0.0524)	(0.147)	(0.0265)
5. sector (cyclical)	0.0663	0.0391	-0.00944	0.116	0.0429
	(0.0549)	(0.0369)	(0.0563)	(0.147)	(0.0266)
a) AI SKILLS TRAINING (PAST 12 MONTHS)	0.225***	0.245***	0.331***	0.296**	0.264***
	(0.0409)	(0.0267)	(0.0371)	(0.116)	(0.0189)
b) CONFIDENCE IN ACCURACY AND RELIABILITY OF AI DECISIONS	0.0135	0.168***	0.135***	0.133	0.132***
	(0.0435)	(0.0258)	(0.0356)	(0.107)	(0.0184)
BELONGING	0.0291	-0.0349	0.0179	0.0313	-0.00159
	(0.0523)	(0.0325)	(0.0416)	(0.120)	(0.0224)
COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION	0.0563	-0.0685**	0.0316	0.344**	0.0123
	(0.0554)	(0.0340)	(0.0442)	(0.137)	(0.0235)
COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER	0.00146	-0.00236	-0.0485	-0.0135	-0.0147
	(0.0489)	(0.0304)	(0.0408)	(0.109)	(0.0212)

COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP	-0.0466 (0.0569)	0.0725** (0.0347)	-0.0427 (0.0421)	-0.123 (0.114)	-0.0116 (0.0233)
2. generation (Millennial)					-0.0205*
					(0.0116)
3. generation (X)					-0.0425*** (0.00858)
4. generation (Baby Boomer)					-0.0442*** (0.00994)
Constant	0.612*** (0.178)	0.571*** (0.109)	0.321* (0.168)	0.477 (0.622)	0.592*** (0.0762)
Observations	438	1,259	786	151	2,634
R-squared	0.230	0.223	0.300	0.326	0.249

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Baseline categories for each variable are as follows; generation = Gen Z, gender = men, country of birth = born in country of residence, seniority/role = Entry-level, org type = Not for profit, education = No degree, country = US, and sector = Financial services.

We performed a linear regression predicting **HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE (% of hours worked)** from employee generation (1 = Gen Z, 2 = Millennial, 3 = GenX, 4 = Baby Boomer), controls (see C1), commitment (**COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION, COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP, COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER, and BELONGING**) and **AI SKILLS TRAINING (PAST 12 MONTHS)**, b) **CONFIDENCE IN ACCURACY AND RELIABILITY OF AI DECISIONS**, c) **INTEREST IN LEARNING/USING AI TOOLS**, and d) **BELIEF THAT AI IMPROVES DECISION-MAKING**. We also include analysis for each generation separately.

	Gen Z	Millennial	Gen X	Baby Boomers	Total
HOURS SAVED FROM AI USE (% of hours worked)					
2. gender (other)	-0.0681 (0.139)	0.0205 (0.0841)	-0.0579 (0.0943)	-0.414 (0.597)	-0.0121 (0.0579)
3. gender (women)	0.0342 (0.0289)	0.0314** (0.0144)	0.0190 (0.0155)	-0.170 (0.132)	0.0173 (0.0105)
4. foreign born	-0.0737 (0.0453)	0.0207 (0.0228)	-0.0328 (0.0339)	-0.366 (0.452)	-0.0183 (0.0181)
Company size	-0.0194 (0.0128)	-0.0199*** (0.00623)	-0.0200*** (0.00726)	0.0442 (0.0668)	-0.0199*** (0.00470)
2. role (non mgmt.)	0.000495 (0.0504)	0.0702 (0.0445)	0.0651 (0.0752)	-0.171 (0.619)	0.0378 (0.0279)
3. role (supervisor)	0.0281 (0.0623)	0.0424 (0.0462)	0.0822 (0.0756)	0.0320 (0.690)	0.0296 (0.0296)
4. role (jnr mgmt.)	0.00711 (0.0531)	0.0761* (0.0451)	0.0741 (0.0756)	0.0253 (0.687)	0.0437 (0.0284)
5. role (dept mgmt.)	0.112* (0.0599)	0.0991** (0.0455)	0.0712 (0.0743)	0.00849 (0.678)	0.0706** (0.0287)

6. role (hr lead)	-0.0974 (0.163)	0.111 (0.0736)	0.218** (0.110)	0.237 (0.842)	0.0571 (0.0550)
7. role (director)	0.0622 (0.166)	0.0594 (0.0740)	-0.0167 (0.0880)	-0.170 (0.675)	0.00783 (0.0476)
8. role (exec)	0.0927 (0.195)	0.120* (0.0696)	0.0976 (0.0842)	-0.194 (0.627)	0.0764* (0.0454)
2. org type (gov)	0.0632 (0.102)	0.0207 (0.0362)	-0.0202 (0.0446)	0.0417 (0.318)	0.0151 (0.0290)
3. org type (public comp)	0.0599 (0.0997)	-0.0366 (0.0355)	-0.0220 (0.0447)	0.0529 (0.310)	-0.0177 (0.0285)
4. org type (privately held comp)	-0.00896 (0.0967)	-0.0341 (0.0332)	-0.00857 (0.0429)	0.317 (0.292)	-0.0180 (0.0270)
5. role (self emp.)	-0.136 (0.291)	-0.0884 (0.0839)	0.107 (0.0687)	0.556 (0.465)	0.0219 (0.0554)
2. education (degree)	0.0563 (0.0615)	-0.0154 (0.0249)	-0.00796 (0.0230)	-0.0633 (0.198)	-0.00455 (0.0177)
3. education (post-degree)	0.0170 (0.0618)	0.00525 (0.0254)	-0.0148 (0.0232)	0.172 (0.228)	0.00207 (0.0179)
2. country (UK)	-0.113*** (0.0410)	-0.0506*** (0.0174)	-0.0217 (0.0190)	-0.0992 (0.141)	-0.0579*** (0.0130)
3. country (IT)	-0.0401 (0.0646)	-0.0253 (0.0276)	0.0164 (0.0311)	-0.424 (0.304)	-0.0266 (0.0212)
4. country (Aus)	0.143* (0.0765)	-0.0366 (0.0334)	-0.0945** (0.0439)	0.0454 (0.363)	-0.0103 (0.0264)
5. country (Germany)	-0.135*** (0.0521)	-0.0833*** (0.0246)	-0.0733* (0.0411)	-0.0576 (0.539)	-0.0923*** (0.0198)
2. sector (growth)	0.0240 (0.0412)	0.0223 (0.0206)	0.000498 (0.0257)	-0.212 (0.210)	0.00870 (0.0157)
3. sector (energy)	-0.0706 (0.0913)	-0.0685* (0.0379)	-0.0799* (0.0437)	0.392 (0.452)	-0.0616** (0.0292)
4. sector (defensive)	0.0591 (0.0534)	-0.0680*** (0.0225)	-0.0375 (0.0263)	-0.149 (0.225)	-0.0424** (0.0173)
5. sector (cyclical)	0.0153 (0.0443)	-0.0286 (0.0212)	-0.0632** (0.0270)	-0.156 (0.191)	-0.0338** (0.0165)
a) AI SKILLS TRAINING (PAST 12 MONTHS)	0.0482 (0.0329)	0.0613*** (0.0154)	0.0590*** (0.0172)	-0.0699 (0.188)	0.0597*** (0.0116)
b) CONFIDENCE IN ACCURACY AND RELIABILITY OF AI DECISIONS	0.0603 (0.0380)	0.0299* (0.0167)	0.0374** (0.0185)	-0.0349 (0.154)	0.0346*** (0.0127)
c) INTEREST IN LEARNING/USING AI TOOLS	0.0645* (0.0349)	0.0482*** (0.0166)	0.0380** (0.0182)	0.0489 (0.164)	0.0555*** (0.0124)
d) BELIEF THAT AI IMPROVES DECISION-MAKING	0.0557 (0.0363)	0.0640*** (0.0169)	0.0790*** (0.0197)	0.258 (0.213)	0.0684*** (0.0129)
BELONGING	-0.00245 (0.0428)	0.0473** (0.0199)	-0.00116 (0.0202)	0.235 (0.191)	0.0240 (0.0146)

COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION	0.0180 (0.0457)	0.0113 (0.0206)	0.0220 (0.0223)	-0.189 (0.223)	0.0163 (0.0154)
COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER	-0.0211 (0.0410)	-0.0109 (0.0185)	-0.00115 (0.0210)	-0.0212 (0.169)	-0.0113 (0.0139)
COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP	0.0351 (0.0469)	-0.0460** (0.0214)	-0.000425 (0.0213)	0.00811 (0.221)	-0.0127 (0.0156)
2. generation (Millennial)					-0.0173** (0.00694)
3. generation (X)					-0.0193*** (0.00543)
4. generation (Baby Boomer)					0.00303 (0.00697)
Constant	0.168 (0.144)	0.140** (0.0702)	0.143 (0.0977)	0.433 (0.915)	0.208*** (0.0506)
Observations	354	917	467	76	1,814
R-squared	0.306	0.259	0.349	0.354	0.251

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Baseline categories for each variable are as follows; generation = Gen Z, gender = men, country of birth = born in country of residence, seniority/role = Entry-level, org type = Not for profit, education = No degree, country = US, and sector = Financial services.

We performed a linear regression predicting **AI ADOPTION** from commitment (**COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION**, **COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP**, **COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER**, and **BELONGING**) for each generation.

	Gen Z	Millennial	Gen X	Baby Boomers	Total
AI ADOPTION					
BELONGING	0.0394 (0.0439)	0.0269 (0.0262)	0.00958 (0.0398)	0.0342 (0.0820)	0.0248 (0.0195)
COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER	-0.0293 (0.0335)	-0.00767 (0.0201)	-0.0743*** (0.0262)	-0.0135 (0.0607)	-0.0261* (0.0142)
COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP	-0.0776** (0.0389)	-0.0106 (0.0247)	-0.0611* (0.0316)	-0.0726 (0.0685)	-0.0649*** (0.0169)
COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION	0.114*** (0.0395)	0.0360 (0.0236)	0.162*** (0.0299)	0.161** (0.0625)	0.115*** (0.0163)
Constant	0.649*** (0.0955)	0.573*** (0.0535)	0.518*** (0.0761)	0.155 (0.186)	0.538*** (0.0394)
Observations	478	1,343	816	154	2,791
R-squared	0.028	0.010	0.043	0.073	0.026

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

We performed a linear regression predicting **INVOLVEMENT IN AI INITIATIVES** from commitment (**COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION, COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP, COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER, and BELONGING**) for each generation.

	Gen Z	Millennial	Gen X	Baby Boomers	Total
INVOLVEMENT IN AI INITIATIVES					
BELONGING	0.0666 (0.0543)	0.0895*** (0.0283)	-0.0277 (0.0372)	0.0799 (0.0747)	0.0552*** (0.0202)
COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER	-0.102** (0.0414)	-0.0628*** (0.0217)	-0.0500** (0.0245)	-0.0522 (0.0553)	-0.0621*** (0.0147)
COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP	-0.0684 (0.0482)	-0.0360 (0.0267)	-0.0471 (0.0295)	-0.0489 (0.0624)	-0.0581*** (0.0176)
COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION	0.235*** (0.0489)	0.117*** (0.0254)	0.161*** (0.0280)	0.148** (0.0569)	0.159*** (0.0169)
Constant	0.0108 (0.118)	0.0317 (0.0578)	0.211*** (0.0711)	-0.133 (0.169)	0.0632 (0.0409)
Observations	478	1,343	816	154	2,791
R-squared	0.102	0.059	0.045	0.095	0.062

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

We performed a linear regression predicting **INVOLVEMENT IN AI INITIATIVES** from employee generation (1 = Gen Z, 2 = Millennial, 3 = GenX, 4 = Baby Boomer), controls (see C1), commitment (**COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION, COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP, COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER, and BELONGING**). We also include analysis for each generation separately.

	Gen Z	Millennial	Gen X	Baby Boomers	Total
INVOLVEMENT IN AI INITIATIVES					
2. gender (other)	0.113 (0.202)	-0.216* (0.126)	0.124 (0.140)	0.652** (0.324)	-0.0113 (0.0809)
3. gender (women)	-0.0139 (0.0422)	-0.0135 (0.0265)	-0.0347 (0.0307)	-0.0203 (0.0812)	-0.0209 (0.0174)
4. foreign born	-0.0257 (0.0670)	-0.0142 (0.0453)	0.0623 (0.0669)	-0.262 (0.350)	-0.00741 (0.0320)
Company size	-0.0238 (0.0188)	-0.0285** (0.0118)	-0.0449*** (0.0142)	-0.00382 (0.0368)	-0.0321*** (0.00782)
2. role (non mgmt.)	-0.0105 (0.0714)	-0.113 (0.0754)	-0.0747 (0.104)	-0.236 (0.343)	-0.0384 (0.0438)
3. role (supervisor)	0.340*** (0.0881)	0.0246 (0.0798)	0.00738 (0.108)	-0.106 (0.344)	0.103** (0.0473)
4. role (jnr mgmt.)	0.339*** (0.0758)	0.0194 (0.0777)	0.0848 (0.109)	-0.189 (0.359)	0.138*** (0.0456)

5. role (dept mgmt.)	0.405*** (0.0873)	0.168** (0.0787)	0.115 (0.106)	0.00945 (0.348)	0.230*** (0.0461)
6. role (hr lead)	0.596*** (0.230)	0.123 (0.145)	0.0142 (0.189)	0.0493 (0.444)	0.199** (0.0958)
7. role (director)	0.000841 (0.267)	0.154 (0.133)	0.156 (0.154)	0.106 (0.386)	0.232*** (0.0811)
8. role (exec)	0.0437 (0.232)	0.109 (0.129)	0.113 (0.136)	0.293 (0.377)	0.193*** (0.0744)
2. org type (gov)	-0.0987 (0.154)	-0.0882 (0.0695)	-0.0835 (0.0903)	0.243 (0.189)	-0.0550 (0.0492)
3. org type (public comp)	0.0586 (0.152)	-0.0518 (0.0684)	-0.0736 (0.0912)	0.207 (0.183)	-0.0344 (0.0486)
4. org type (privately held comp)	0.0190 (0.147)	-0.0389 (0.0642)	-0.141 (0.0868)	0.159 (0.174)	-0.0528 (0.0461)
5. role (self emp.)	0.0710 (0.352)	-0.267* (0.149)	-0.0356 (0.140)	0.701** (0.310)	-0.0399 (0.0898)
2. education (degree)	0.127 (0.0782)	0.0417 (0.0432)	0.0350 (0.0435)	-0.127 (0.0977)	0.0454* (0.0269)
3. education (post-degree)	0.161** (0.0797)	0.112** (0.0442)	0.190*** (0.0440)	-0.0647 (0.105)	0.128*** (0.0274)
2. country (UK)	-0.180*** (0.0564)	-0.0947*** (0.0318)	-0.0515 (0.0377)	-0.124 (0.0872)	-0.102*** (0.0211)
3. country (IT)	0.103 (0.0977)	0.0220 (0.0497)	0.0716 (0.0613)	-0.0649 (0.196)	0.0344 (0.0347)
4. country (Aus)	0.0138 (0.106)	-0.127** (0.0642)	-0.0907 (0.0940)	-0.253 (0.225)	-0.106** (0.0454)
5. country (Germany)	0.0409 (0.0777)	-0.106** (0.0484)	-0.127 (0.0917)	0.144 (0.260)	-0.0765** (0.0355)
2. sector (growth)	0.170*** (0.0603)	0.128*** (0.0410)	0.219*** (0.0546)	0.0263 (0.145)	0.163*** (0.0278)
3. sector (energy)	-0.207 (0.130)	-0.212*** (0.0672)	-0.314*** (0.0797)	-0.290 (0.240)	-0.236*** (0.0457)
4. sector (defensive)	0.0853 (0.0758)	-0.127*** (0.0412)	-0.110** (0.0506)	-0.217* (0.128)	-0.107*** (0.0279)
5. sector (cyclical)	-0.0271 (0.0644)	0.00502 (0.0410)	-0.0660 (0.0548)	-0.179 (0.128)	-0.0264 (0.0282)
BELONGING	-0.00240 (0.0621)	0.0829** (0.0361)	0.0295 (0.0405)	0.190* (0.104)	0.0628*** (0.0238)
COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION	0.0421 (0.0653)	0.0682* (0.0375)	0.0858** (0.0428)	-0.0288 (0.120)	0.0805*** (0.0248)
COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER	0.0103 (0.0581)	-0.0233 (0.0339)	-0.0604 (0.0397)	0.00318 (0.0952)	-0.0359 (0.0225)
COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP	0.0902 (0.0674)	0.0151 (0.0386)	0.00788 (0.0408)	0.0657 (0.0988)	0.0146 (0.0247)
2. generation (Millennial)					-0.0298** (0.0123)
3. generation (X)					-0.0479*** (0.00909)
4. generation (Baby Boomer)					-0.0323***

Constant	0.168 (0.210)	0.500*** (0.120)	0.441*** (0.162)	0.652 (0.522)	(0.0105) 0.478*** (0.0801)
Observations	438	1,259	786	151	2,634
R-squared	0.328	0.211	0.227	0.376	0.231

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

We performed a linear regression predicting **PROPORTION OF TIME SPENT WORKING ON AI INITIATIVES** from employee generation (1 = Gen Z, 2 = Millennial, 3 = GenX, 4 = Baby Boomer), controls (see C1), commitment (**COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION, COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP, COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER, and BELONGING**). We also include analysis for each generation separately.

	Gen Z	Millennial	Gen X	Baby Boomers	Total
	PROPORTION OF TIME SPENT WORKING ON AI INITIATIVES				
2. gender (other)	-5.921 (16.25)	-12.29 (22.24)	-8.589 (13.21)	19.92 (22.83)	-3.628 (7.307)
3. gender (women)	-2.440 (3.331)	7.135*** (2.121)	0.199 (3.011)	1.728 (8.679)	3.135** (1.432)
4. foreign born	-11.69** (5.225)	-3.086 (3.506)	1.125 (6.792)	-9.336 (20.85)	-5.395** (2.496)
Company size	-2.211 (1.571)	-2.271** (0.933)	-2.504* (1.424)	-4.930 (3.919)	-2.394*** (0.657)
2. role (non mgmt.)	-4.908 (7.779)	1.500 (6.677)	-8.139 (13.43)	-19.74 (29.14)	-2.389 (4.291)
3. role (supervisor)	-2.734 (8.483)	-2.256 (6.821)	-1.811 (13.50)	-44.51* (25.11)	-2.070 (4.393)
4. role (jnr mgmt.)	-2.837 (7.490)	-0.0145 (6.604)	-1.898 (13.36)	-31.74 (22.60)	-1.294 (4.230)
5. role (dept mgmt.)	0.569 (7.999)	2.281 (6.597)	0.742 (13.08)	-21.94 (21.48)	1.651 (4.255)
6. role (hr lead)	3.118 (13.97)	7.264 (9.838)	8.221 (18.12)		7.404 (6.729)
7. role (director)	8.530 (28.60)	-5.590 (9.367)	-12.77 (15.10)	-27.67 (24.19)	-6.142 (6.118)
8. role (exec)	11.97 (17.83)	0.207 (9.323)	-9.318 (14.64)	-36.69 (23.59)	-5.036 (5.898)
2. org type (gov)	-11.91 (13.52)	-1.502 (5.683)	3.433 (8.094)	50.94 (34.51)	-0.762 (4.158)
3. org type (public comp)	-15.73 (13.11)	-2.284 (5.294)	3.833 (8.059)	59.72 (36.23)	-2.129 (3.945)
4. org type (privately held comp)	-13.97 (12.91)	-1.699 (4.925)	2.236 (7.597)	64.49* (35.97)	-1.329 (3.739)
5. role (self emp.)	16.01 (27.63)	2.350 (13.97)	4.287 (10.93)	31.27 (38.76)	-0.267 (6.760)

2. education (degree)	2.070 (7.935)	-0.361 (3.871)	-6.268 (5.339)	-14.01 (12.52)	-1.589 (2.654)
3. education (post-degree)	4.538 (7.953)	3.052 (3.907)	0.0760 (5.173)	-7.331 (12.10)	1.862 (2.661)
2. country (UK)	-12.96*** (4.613)	-13.50*** (2.514)	-7.270* (3.727)	-28.43*** (8.792)	-13.15*** (1.751)
3. country (IT)	-18.88** (7.513)	-16.53*** (3.826)	-2.736 (5.777)	-15.73 (23.27)	-13.34*** (2.770)
4. country (Aus)	-11.57 (8.488)	-7.462 (5.398)	-8.017 (9.712)	-12.64 (21.01)	-8.699** (3.835)
5. country (Germany)	-17.45*** (6.276)	-19.92*** (3.897)	-14.17 (8.673)	4.016 (30.08)	-16.75*** (2.893)
2. sector (growth)	-1.788 (4.515)	5.954** (2.746)	8.812** (4.366)	-22.42* (10.87)	3.237* (1.939)
3. sector (energy)	-5.359 (13.94)	-6.565 (6.404)	-11.65 (9.631)	-38.58 (28.66)	-7.871* (4.668)
4. sector (defensive)	-6.801 (6.333)	-7.961** (3.283)	-11.73** (4.999)	-3.136 (15.92)	-8.950*** (2.369)
5. sector (cyclical)	-11.10** (5.069)	-3.729 (2.994)	-10.42** (5.064)	-14.85 (10.40)	-7.218*** (2.173)
BELONGING	-7.757 (5.151)	-0.587 (3.027)	-0.809 (4.046)	-12.36 (14.36)	-2.245 (2.071)
COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATION	9.214* (5.395)	0.940 (3.098)	2.086 (4.609)	-0.0629 (14.02)	2.395 (2.139)
COMMITMENT TO DIRECT MANAGER	-4.143 (4.857)	-1.766 (2.842)	-1.673 (4.188)	3.646 (12.20)	-2.430 (1.963)
COMMITMENT TO LEADERSHIP	7.312 (5.364)	3.799 (3.568)	4.410 (4.384)	12.45 (15.33)	5.332** (2.289)
2. generation (Millennial)					-1.474 (0.907)
3. generation (X)					-2.116*** (0.726)
4. generation (Baby Boomer)					-1.842** (0.913)
Constant	78.31*** (19.08)	48.41*** (10.15)	43.14** (17.85)	50.75 (49.65)	58.24*** (7.167)
Observations	212	510	231	46	999
R-squared	0.306	0.261	0.290	0.750	0.258

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1



The Inclusion
Initiative

protiviti®

Anyone using or referencing this whitepaper should cite: Jolles and Lordan (2025). Bridging the Generational AI Gap: Unlocking Productivity for All Generations. A report by The Inclusion Initiative at LSE.