



Coaching Generation Z: Practice from a different perspective and base

Michael McDougall & Milla Saarinen

To cite this article: Michael McDougall & Milla Saarinen (2024) Coaching Generation Z: Practice from a different perspective and base, Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 36:3, 429-439, DOI: [10.1080/10413200.2024.2329537](https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2024.2329537)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2024.2329537>



© 2024 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.



Published online: 19 Mar 2024.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1150



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

NOTE



Coaching Generation Z: Practice from a different perspective and base


Michael McDougall^a and Milla Saarinen^b

^aThe University of Stirling; ^bNorwegian School of Sport Sciences

ARTICLE HISTORY Received 19 January 2024; Accepted 26 January 2024

We would like to sincerely thank Gould et al. (2023) for their considered and reflexive response to our commentary. Stating that they took a pragmatic approach to trying to understand the phenomenon of coaching Gen Z athletes, trying to answer questions for a very applied audience, Gould et al. outlined several areas of agreement, as well as some areas of strong disagreement. In terms of alignment, Gould et al. reiterated that a more diverse sample (currently, single sport; high economic status) is needed and alerted readership to a forthcoming second study that involves interviewing college coaches and athletes from different sports. They were appreciative of the critical literature that we introduced and concurred that researchers should employ a range of frameworks to understand the topic of generation going forward. There were other areas of consensus. These included the need for greater emphasis on the possibility of generational stereotyping, being cognizant of the potential for generational power imbalances, and acknowledging the critically important role of the environment in the contextualization of knowledge and knowledge utilization. In particular though, Gould et al. disagreed with our assertion that ‘generation’ could be a conceptually problematic or oversimplified category for analysis. They also rejected our assertions of objectivism and determinism, as well as the observation that some coach participants in their descriptions almost seemed to pathologize young people’s behavior in the form of negative, problematizing generalizations. Overall, in spite of several concerns we presented (e.g., definitional and conceptual unclarity, mixed evidence, limited predictability, the possibility of generational concepts to do harm and conflate explanatory phenomenon), Gould et al. retain a steadfast overall faith in the their construct of generation and study of it; drawing on their own observations to make useful clarifications and additional reflections on the original article and using recent work by Jean Twenge to dispel concerns and to argue for the continued usefulness of studying generations.

Our own position is that what generations are and whether and how they should be used is not a settled matter, and certainly not within sport, where the topic area is nascent. After reading Gould et al.’s response carefully, we maintain that the “hot topic” of Gen Z and related knowledge ought to be critiqued with rigor and depth

CONTACT Milla Saarinen  milla.saarinen@nih.no  Department of Sport and Social Sciences, Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, Oslo, Norway.

© 2024 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

and generational knowledge applied with caution. Moreover, and as stated in our first reply, we wanted to critique taken-for-granted generational ideas and Gen Z research findings with the ultimate and express aim of sharpening any applied practices that might ensue.

Hence, although we thoroughly respect the practitioner position of Gould et al., as well as their combined practical experiences and accomplishments, we disagree with their binary presentation of our perspective as academic and theirs as more practice focused. We are practitioners (and educators) too, albeit operating from a different base of expertise, understanding, and philosophical positioning. Author 1 is a lecturer, researcher, and an organizational consultant, delivering services in culture analysis, re-positioning, change, and strategy, often in an advisory capacity. This work is informed by critical and cultural theories and practices, often from interpretivist traditions, and draws extensively on organizational, complexity, system, and interdisciplinary knowledge bases. Author 2 is a gender and youth scholar with substantial experience of working with both sport coaches and Gen Z athletes and students. Naturally, we have preferences that shape our thoughts about working with young people and the practices we use to do so, and consequently, there are aspects of 'generation' that we lean into and others we are reluctant to subscribe to. As stated in our first commentary, however, we do not see these inflections as academic; our intent was to explore ways to make the concept more meaningful and useful for sport researchers *and* practitioners. In this final round of dialogue, we concentrate our efforts on this endeavor and work around the margins of areas of agreement and disagreement to flesh out some of the practice considerations raised by Gould et al. in their own response. The structure of this response is organized as follows: First, we attend to some key points made by Gould et al. offering some clarifications and refinements of our own. We do this to reduce the possibility of us talking past each other on key issues and hope we, and readers, can find further areas of consensus. Second, we reflect on our own base of practice in relation to generational theory and Gen Z and how we might approach relevant issues in our own work.

Working around the margins: the possibility of objectifying, determinism, stereotyping

- Much of Gould et al.'s reply responds to certain strong claims: that we think generations are objectivist, an overly simple category of analysis, and deterministic. An important qualification here is that we were not contending that *all* study of generation, or even the concept(s)/construct(s) of generation, are always objectivist, overly simplistic, or deterministic. Specifically, we are arguing that the perspective and presentation of generation they adopt can fall prey to these tendencies. We agree that the study of generation can contribute valuable understanding and practices relating to youth participation in sport within the social and cultural milieu and broader historical context. We are not alone in these assertions. Lyons et al. (2015) argue that the problems we have described "lie within the assumptions of cohort-focused research, not with the construct of generation itself" and that for the potential of generational study (and practices)

to be realized, it must move away from “descriptions of intergenerational differences toward a deeper consideration of what generations are and how they affect change” (Lyons & Kuron, 2014, p. 347).

- In responding to possibilities of objectivism, Gould et al. reiterated that they did not provide the characteristics described or the strategies recommended; coach participants did in qualitative interviews. Objectivism is not only a matter of intent though. Theoretical orientations, experiences, and discourse, shape and place limits on knowledge production, and themes from research do not just inductively emerge. Importantly, qualitative methods used in generation study cannot sidestep the possibility of objectification if the whole aim is to understand young people’s behavior through the typical generational lens. In other words, it is *generation* as used by Gould et al. and (possibly) understood by participants (through research inferences, pop culture, and media, for example) that is doing the bulk of objectifying work; as a kind of invisible underlaborer, through its embeddedness in popular and taken-for-granted discourse because at its core the underlying idea is to use it to look for similarities across individuals that are strongly stereotypical, and often implicitly assumed.
- Similarly, responding to the possibility of stereotyping, Gould et al. clarified when presenting their findings that they emphasize to coaches the importance of not falling into the trap of stereotyping young people and ensuring that they attend to the individual. We heed closely here ISSP positionality and warnings that any overly simplified approach, “utilizing a singular characteristic or one that is generalized across a group, tends to exclude much of what constitutes cultural understanding, resulting in unethical services that do not align, nor meet the end needs of the participant” (Ryba et al., 2013, p. 129). More details about how Gould et al. encourage the balance between using generation to understand the social and cultural milieu without diminishing the individuality and cultural-contextual dimensions of unique individuals would be highly instructive and we look forward to further practice reflections down the line.
- Relatedly, although we share Gould et al.’s observations that coaches generally operate from a base of concern and trying to help their athletes, we think that stereotyping remains a live possibility. Ageism against the young may be the most prevalent, yet underrecognized and neglected form of ageism (Bratt et al., 2020). Ageist attitudes toward the young are subtle, often based around the assumptions (often implicit) by adults that the young are naïve, inexperienced, and somehow incompetent, and thus require intervention from adults (de la Fuente-Núñez et al., 2021). Generational stereotypes can be a path toward reverse ageism and discrimination experienced by young people, often due to negative characteristics associated with them (Raymer et al., 2017). Emerging literature in the area also suggests that generational identity is a plausible, accessible social identity that people draw on as they interpret and react to events and interactions in the social sphere, particularly if they have had exposure to generational discourse. We continue to wonder then, about the potential negative internalizations that young people may experience in relation to the generational discourses they hear about themselves (Lyons et al., 2019).

Science, pragmatism, and the ongoing need for skepticism and criticality

- Respecting the pragmatic orientation of Gould et al., we think it needs fleshed out a bit to help ensure careful knowledge transfer in the study of generation. Although pragmatism is grounded in foundations of what constitutes usefulness and what works (or in relation to coaching or sport psychology practice, the difference new knowledge makes to practice (Collins et al., 2022), pragmatism also rests on other key tenets. Skepticism and criticality are two vital pillars of a pragmatic approach and are needed in the consideration of generational ideas because they are essential to pragmatist evaluation of whether something *actually* works. In a highly informative paper that examines pragmatic interaction with knowledge claims, Collins et al. (2022) channel Carl Sagan (1997) to express how:
At the heart of science is an essential balance between two seemingly contradictory attitudes—an openness to new ideas, no matter how bizarre or counterintuitive they may be, and the most ruthless skeptical scrutiny of all ideas, old and new. This is how deep truths are winnowed from deep nonsense (p. 304).

We question, whether there is room, still, to be more skeptical in the face of presented concerns. Afterall, in a pragmatic approach, the practical utility of knowledge claims ought to be assessed through wide ranging critiques from competing frameworks and alternate viewpoints (Shier, 2017, as cited in Collins et al., 2022).

- For example, although a seminal figure whose work necessitates close reading by supporters and detractors alike, Gould et al. again rely (and arguably over rely) on Twenge (2023) in their response. Specifically, they draw on her use of large data sets and argument that by looking at data patterns and conclusions about multiple generations across time (a method known as Cross Temporal Meta Analysis; CTMA), generation and age contributions can be unraveled. Broadly speaking, CTMA assumes that after holding chronological age more-or-less constant, birth cohort effects are stronger than period effects, and therefore, year-by-outcome effects are more plausibly attributable to cohort membership than contemporaneous period influences (Rudolph et al., 2020). Others disagree. In their conceptual and empirical critique, Rudolph et al. (2020) argued that CTMA is not able to clearly disentangle age, period, and cohort effects. Moreover, they claim that the results of a Monte Carlo study they conducted showed that even if CTMA was able to disentangle developmental influences, it is likely to systematically overestimate confounded period-cohort effects. The authors therefore recommend “that a great deal of caution should be exercised in applying CTMA” (Rudolph et al., 2020, p. 747) in relation to the study of generations. Other, more moderate commentators and supporters of generational ideas and concepts support this exercising of caution. Lyons et al. (2015) have noted, how, psychologists for several decades now, have sought to disentangle these confounded effects through increasingly elaborate research designs and statistical procedures, including CTMA, as a means of offering improved insights into generational change over time; but contend that none of these approaches

adequately controls for historical period, because it is impossible to step “outside of history” to observe the variance that a historical period creates.

- Relatedly, Gould et al. stated in their reply that they were not aware of many of the criticisms we raised and point out that most of the critical literature we cited is from articles published after they conducted their study. This is a fair point (although we also cited several articles from the early 2010s) and we do respect the immediacy and dynamic nature of applied work (cf. Collins & Collins, 2019), especially in a nascent area. Critical literature in the area is either new or emerging (e.g., Costanza et al., 2012; Costanza & Finkelstein, 2015), and there is foundational literature (e.g., Mannheim, 1952/1928) as well as literature that looks to refine and re-purpose these original ideas (e.g., Kelan, 2014; Woodman, 2016) in novel ways. Not only can this body of work help us critique and remain skeptical, it can help us build beyond current concerns. For example, many researchers increasingly bypass the described age, period, cohort, confound and in the spirit of Mannheim (1952/1928), the father of modern generational theory, conceptualize generation as a more holistic concept, whereby the need to untangle different variables is not supposed. Rather, Mannheim proposed that for generation to be a useful construct above and beyond age and period, it has to be viewed as a kind of gestalt, as a fundamental confluence of biology and history. From this perspective, the aim is not disentanglement of confounding variables, but to lean into the gestalt, examining the joint influences of age within cohort within period (Lyons et al., 2015).
- Finally, and continuing the pragmatic thread, is there a need for greater skepticism and criticality in those we present generational findings to in sport? Reinforcing their confidence in Gen Z findings, Gould et al. (2023) stated that when they presented the findings from these studies in coaching workshops in the US and Europe the “results resonated well with what they are experiencing as coaches and, we receive resounding and unquestionable reactions of agreement” (p. 2). On the one hand, this could be encouraging. On the other hand, Collins and Collins (2019) argued that coach criticality and skepticism are essential when coaches first interact with new knowledge to consider whether something works. Although a strong positive response from coaches/workshop attendees could be interpreted as a mark of success (and an indicator pragmatic usefulness), we might also re-frame that same unquestioning attitude as a cause for concern. Per our original response, it is observed how the salience and convenience of generational explanations can lead to unquestioning attitudes about the behavior of young athletes and the social conditions that produce them so that when people hear them again, they recognize them and are more likely to accept them as good explanations.

Our base of practice and the concept and the (possible) use of ‘generation’

In the original article by Gould et al., coaches listed several commonly observed Gen Z characteristics that although acknowledged as hard to generalize across a generation, were nonetheless presumed to be prevalent. One identified characteristic was time

management deficiencies. Coaches perceived Gen Z athletes as mostly responsible and acknowledged that they had much to balance (tennis practice, schoolwork, family, and social life). They also felt that Gen Z athletes failed to manage their time well and this was not perceived as intentional; rather, that Gen Z athletes were unaware of the importance of time management and lacked the skills necessary to effectively manage their time.

Let's examine this issue further, using an anecdote, which we will then build on by adding some generation and practice reflections.

A few years ago, at a small liberal arts college, where the first author used to work, I (Author 1) asked the class what they thought the media, as well as members of other generations said about their generation, Gen Z. They were more or less on the money: "that we slack off and don't want to work," "poor communicators," "want things given to us," "good with technology," "that we're not resilient or able to cope with stuff," "snowflakes," one student, corrected. One student, who was outstanding and a high achiever, and who was usually incredibly engaged, was quieter than usual. As she had been for the last few weeks. Usually on top of everything, she had even missed some classes, and a few weeks later, unusually handed an assignment in late, without much of an excuse "I've just been really busy." We had forged a good relationship over the last couple of years so I asked her to stop by my office for a catch up, and to check-in. As she was coming up to an important time in her academic career (with postgraduate applications on the horizon) and she had always been so focused on school (hell bent on maintaining a 4.0 GPA, to be more accurate), I thought she could do with a bit of a nudge. A gentle reminder to focus at this key stage of her college life. I knew students were generally busy, so perhaps she could even benefit from some time management techniques and tips. Two minutes into the conversation, she pulled out her planner and showed me what her semester looked like, neatly laid out and all color coded. She was doing six courses, instead of the typical and recommended five, as she had the opportunity to graduate early and save on tuition. She played two sports (one in the fall and one in the spring), dedicating over 25 h a week to sport related activity. She was a Resident Assistant, working in the dorms to offset the cost of living on campus, worked part-time, and was just about to begin an internship to boost her college application to highly competitive graduate programs. Across her six classes, she had carefully marked out the deadline dates of over 30 assignments, much of what she termed 'busy', not meaningful work that was given out by her instructors. She had confided in me that she was utterly burned out, overwhelmed. "How do I manage all this?" she asked.

- In our original response, we identified time management capability as a developmental issue, rather than a generational one, as it is typically learned and improved upon as people age. We argued that many adults, such as coaches (who are typically older than athletes) tend to think that young athletes have an inability to manage their time, because comparatively speaking, they do. Just as coaches own younger selves did. Being cognizant of a developmental perspective may have several effects. Framed developmentally, we are more likely to view it as something that is likely to change over time, and indeed, is already in the process of changing, not something that is necessarily lacking/absent because of the generational

category that youth are proposed to belong to. Understanding this qualitative difference may also shape coaches' perception that they have a responsibility to "fill in and facilitate where they're missing things." (Gould et al., 2020, p. 13). We also suspect that framing such 'characteristics', when appropriate and evidence based, in developmental terms, rather than generational ones, may also contribute to healthier and more balanced discourses about the youth of today.

- Although we are less willing to accept cohort-focused research's reporting of objective generational differences, we are more interested in perception of generational difference as interpersonal phenomena. We regard coach, athletes, and other sport personnel's perceptions regarding generational differences, whether accurate or not, as having real implications for practice and worthy of study. In our practices, then, we would listen for evidence of generation talk within coach and athlete discourses, remaining open to the possibility that an awareness of the use of generational prototypes is a sensemaking tool that can facilitate deeper connections that might bridge the gap between superficial generational differences (Lyons et al., 2019).
- We would emphasize a base of practice that is mindful of the need for cultural competencies that integrates the notion of context-driven practice, considering the intersectionality of athletes (Ryba et al., 2013; Schinke & Stambulova, 2017). For example, Author 2's experience and research into gender and discourse (Saarinen et al., 2023) would demand that we consider gender differentials in relation to burnout. In particular, how young female athletes experience burnout more often, and more severely than their male counterparts; largely because they report attempting to balance multiple domains (instead of just focusing on one) and because they feel they have to do so, in part, due to the prevailing societal discourses. Author 2's research shows how coaches, can unintentionally reinforce such discourses through their practices. So, although we agree with Gould et al., that most coaches are operating from a base of good intentions and desire to help Gen Z athletes in their charge, we are also aware unintentional consequences of our interventions. Such as in the anecdote above, where it was Author 1's first instinct to intervene and fix through time management education and upskilling. In this case, how attempting to improve Gen Z time management strategies, although intuitive and borne of good intent, could be particularly damaging to young female athletes especially because it risks reinforcing wider societal discourse and expectations that they already experience and, whereby they feel they must balance everything and excel in all domains.
- In Gould et al.'s response, they agree that attention to the wider environment, structures, and systems is necessary to pay attention to social and organizational forces that act upon athletes. What might this look like? Our base of practice emphasizes deep consideration of organizational, cultural, and social systems, as well as the need to appreciate complexity, cautioning us against *fixing* and *controlling*; recognizing that consistent with systems thinking practices, interventions have unexpected consequences. Utilizing organizational sport psychology, for instance, we would be looking to build and maintain working relationships with a systematic collective of social agents (Wagstaff, 2019) (perhaps, here, there is

opportunity for consideration of generational perceptions and discourses and their influence on generational interactions). Organizational sport psychology is concerned also with understanding underreported macro level processes and concepts and their influence on individual behavior (Wagstaff, 2019; Wagstaff & Quartiroli, 2023). Understanding that there are multiple interacting complex systems in play, we are therefore wary of reducing time management issues as a problem anchored to the young athlete and instead, would also try to see the system as a client (Wagstaff & Quartiroli, 2023). At this exploration of ‘the problem’ stage, we are therefore acutely aware that there is a bigger picture and likely messier problem to grapple with (“Why are student athletes so busy anyway?” “Is there a construction of an ideal athlete or student that student athletes are expected to conform to, and where does this come from?”). Through investigation, perceived time management issues may be a second order (less important) issue (perhaps more important problems could be, for instance, concerned with well-being, such as burnout, or that important actors, e.g., students, coaches, faculty are talking past each other, each seeing the situation differently). Although delivering psych-education and workshops could be useful and is often the traditional domain of the sport psychologist, our own expertise lies in organizational level work, where if allowed, we would try to attend to the interrelationships of system parts and subgroups; which involves seeking multiple perspectives and surfacing visible and invisible influences such temporality, performativity, and competing values, and how shifting patterns of behaviors may be variably perceived by different groups (Wagstaff & Quartiroli, 2023). Consistent with a critical base, there is an inherent orientation toward democratization in such an approach, because it attends to the system, rather than the needs and perspectives of any one group specifically.

Where else would or could the use of generation and Gen Z thinking fit into these practices? We are not certain at this stage but tend to think that generation may be most useful as a flexible sensemaking device that can help meet C.W. Mills well-known call to address the gap between biography and history, ‘the personal troubles of milieu and the public issues of social structure’ (Mills, 1959, p. 8). From a sensemaking perspective, the aim is not disentanglement of confounding variables, but perhaps to lean into the gestalt, examining the joint influences of age within cohort within period (Lyons et al., 2015; Mannheim, 1952/1928).

Theory development has offered several more ways that can further our understanding of generation as a phenomenon far richer and more complex than a base in demographic categorization. For example, generation can be thought of as a label, a heuristic, a stereotype, or prototype, and can relate to identity (personal, social, or even, more latterly, generational). It can alert us to social formations and dominating and hidden narratives. It can be a discursive device, or even discursive field, to be examined and through which we can pay closer attention to intergenerational communication and how generations are spoken about, from different vantage points, both in terms of social grouping or through time. It can be a means to examine power or collective memory or consciousness and can focus attention on the most pressing social and historical events

of the time. Gould et al. have usefully identified many of these (e.g., technology adoption, social media, the growing mental health crisis). This flexible use of generation is consistent with assertions “that generation is a conceptual device used to ‘perform’ several tasks” (Timonen & Conlon, 2015). As these authors outline, it can be deployed to “apportion blame, to express pity, concern, and solidarity, highlight unfairness and inequity, and to depict differential degrees of agency” (p. 9).

Because the concept performs such a wide range of important communicative and symbolic functions it is a concept that calls for deeper understanding, not regurgitation, in part because powerful political actors have been quicker than academics to recognize the potential of the concept to generate new societal cleavages and to mobilize social forces (Timonen & Conlon, 2015). Along similar lines, we, like Gould et al., are cognizant of potential power imbalances between different generational cohorts. However, although Gould et al. recognize that power-hungry and abusive coaches exist, we raised the issue of power with slightly different concerns in mind. We intended to bring forth a consideration of power, less in the spirit of the ‘few bad apples’ arguments (whereby some abusive coaches inhabit sporting spaces and can be spotted and rooted out) and instead to prioritize the subtle and multifarious ways that power is deployed and infiltrates modern society (cf. Foucault, 1977, 1980, 2008). In Foucault’s theoretical framework, power is pervasive and relentless; there is no escape from power and nothing is outside of or uninfluenced by it (Ortner, 2016), inclusive of all coaches, academics, and sport psychology practitioners. Consequently, although Gould et al. feel that understanding generational differences is important for coaches to consider, we would place reflections on power and generational differences together in the same reflective act; because we agree with, and are worried about observations that powerful figures create and play on social tensions through emphasizing difference, including generational ones (Timonen & Conlon, 2015). In our practice reflections and in the development of generationally informed practices, it therefore is imperative to ask where the discourses on generation and Gen Z originate, how they shift over time, what their purposes may be and who might these discourses serve?

We do not place ourselves outside of these considerations and note, somewhat sheepishly, that we are presently involved in an ongoing exchange about members of a ‘generational cohort’ that we do not belong to. Thus, although we acknowledge the forthcoming developments in the study of Gen Z that Gould et al. indicate are in the works (more diverse samples, different sports, and coaches), we are conscious of the absence of the Gen Z voice. Perhaps it is now indeed time to talk to the young people to see what they make of it all. In a recent New York Times article, ‘Teenagers Are Telling Us That Something Is Wrong With America’, Dr. Jamieson Webster (2022) reminded us of the importance of hearing from youth:

Adolescents are lightning rods for the zeitgeist. They live at the fault lines of a culture, exposing our weak spots, showing the available array of solutions and insolubilities. They are holding up a mirror for us to see ourselves more clearly.

In sport research, we ask who is presently holding up the generational mirror and what might we think of the reflection if the mirror was turned on us? Time will tell.

Conclusion

To conclude, we thank Gould et al. for this exchange. Concurring with Lyons et al. (2015), just as our understanding of gender and other factors, such as ethnicity and socioeconomic status has evolved over time to become more nuanced and complete, so must our understanding of generation be refined and evolve. Thus, we do not quite agree with Gould et al. invocation of a well-known passage from Twenge: “Generational groupings are not perfect, and valid arguments can be made for doing them differently, but they persist because they are useful” (Twenge, 2023, p. 27). We more or less agree, but believing they persist for several reasons, offer a slight modification. We think they persist, not because they are *inherently* useful, but because they have the *potential* to be useful.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

References

- Bratt, C., Abrams, D., & Swift, H. J. (2020). Supporting the old but neglecting the young? The two faces of ageism. *Developmental Psychology*, 56(5), 1029–1039. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000903>
- Collins, D., Taylor, J., Ashford, M., & Collins, L. (2022). It depends coaching—The most fundamental, simple and complex principle or a mere copout? *Sports Coaching Review*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21640629.2022.2154189>
- Collins, L., & Collins, D. (2019). The role of ‘pracademics’ in education and development of adventure sport professionals. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 19(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14729679.2018.1483253>
- Costanza, D. P., & Finkelstein, L. M. (2015). Generationally based differences in the workplace: Is there a there there? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8(3), 308–323. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2015.15>
- Costanza, D. P., Badger, J. M., Fraser, R. L., Severt, J. B., & Gade, P. A. (2012). Generational differences in work-related attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27(4), 375–394. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-012-9259-4>
- de la Fuente-Núñez, V., Cohn-Schwartz, E., Roy, S., & Ayalon, L. (2021). Scoping review on ageism against younger populations. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(8), 3988. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18083988>
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge*. Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–79* (G. Burchell, Trans.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gould, D., Mignano, M., & Nalepa-Roth, J. (2023). Coaching Generation Z: A response to McDougall et al.’s commentary. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2023.2274461>
- Gould, D., Nalepa, J., & Mignano, M. (2020). Coaching Generation Z athletes. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 32(1), 104–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2019.1581856>
- Kelan, E. K. (2014). Organising generations—What can sociology offer to the understanding of generations at work? *Sociology Compass*, 8(1), 20–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12117>
- Lyons, S., & Kuron, L. (2014). Generational differences in the workplace: A review of the evidence and directions for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(1), 139–157. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1913>

- Lyons, S. T., Schweitzer, L., Urick, M. J., & Kuron, L. (2019). A dynamic social-ecological model of generational identity in the workplace. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 17(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15350770.2018.1500332>
- Lyons, S., Urick, M., Kuron, L., & Schweitzer, L. (2015). Generational differences in the workplace: There is complexity beyond the stereotypes. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8(3), 346–356. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2015.48>
- Mannheim, K. (1952/1928). The problem of generations. In P. Kecskemeti (Ed.), *Essays on the sociology of knowledge. Collected works of Karl Mannheim* (Vol. 5, pp. 276–322). Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. Oxford University Press.
- Ortner, S. B. (2016). Dark anthropology and its others: Theory since the eighties. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 6(1), 47–73. <https://doi.org/10.14318/hau6.1.004>
- Raymer, M., Reed, M., Spiegel, M., & Purvanova, R. K. (2017). An examination of generational stereotypes as a path towards reverse ageism. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 20(3), 148–175. <https://doi.org/10.1037/mgr0000057>
- Rudolph, C. W., Costanza, D. P., Wright, C., & Zacher, H. (2020). Cross-temporal meta-analysis: A conceptual and empirical critique. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 35(6), 733–750. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-019-09659-2>
- Ryba, T. V., Stambulova, N. B., Si, G., & Schinke, R. J. (2013). ISSP Position Stand: Culturally competent research and practice in sport and exercise psychology. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11(2), 123–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2013.779812>
- Saarinen, M., Ryba, T. V., Kavoura, A., & Aunola, K. (2023). “Women easily feel that they have lost a year if they don’t ski faster”: Finnish ski coaches’ discursive constructions of gendered dual career pathways. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 64, 102322. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2022.102322>
- Sagan, C. (1997). *The demon-haunted world: Science as a candle in the dark*. Ballantine Books.
- Schinke, R. J., & Stambulova, N. (2017). Context-driven sport and exercise psychology practice: Widening our lens beyond the athlete. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action*, 8(2), 71–75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21520704.2017.1299470>
- Shier, D. (2017). Beyond ‘crude pragmatism’ in sports coaching: Insights from C.S. Peirce, William James, and John Dewey: A commentary. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 12(1), 20–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1747954116684029>
- Timonen, V., & Conlon, C. (2015). Beyond Mannheim: Conceptualising how people ‘talk’ and ‘do’ generations in contemporary society. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 24, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2015.03.001>
- Twenge, J. M. (2023). *Generations*. Atria.
- Wagstaff, C. R. (2019). Taking stock of organizational psychology in sport. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 31(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2018.1539785>
- Wagstaff, C. R., & Quartiroli, A. (2023). A systems-led approach to developing psychologically informed environments. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action*, 14(4), 227–242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21520704.2023.2215715>
- Webster, J. (2022). Teenagers are telling us that something is wrong with America. *The New York Times*, October 11. <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/10/11/opinion/teenagers-mental-health-america.html>
- Woodman, D. (2016). The sociology of generations and youth studies. In *Routledge handbook of youth and young adulthood* (pp. 36–42). Routledge.