Generational Differences in the Workplace: A Critical Review and Evidence-Based Framework for Organizational Practice

Jonathan H. Westover *

Posted Date: 31 March 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

Keywords: generational differences; age diversity; workplace values; Baby Boomers; Generation X; Millennials; Generation Z; lifespan development; evidence-based management; intersectionality

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

Article

Generational Differences in the Workplace: A Critical Review and Evidence-Based Framework for Organizational Practice

Jonathan H. Westover

Nexus Institute for Work & AI – Catalyst Center for Work Innovation; jon.westover@gmail.com

Abstract

The concept of generational differences has become deeply embedded in organizational discourse, shaping human resource practices, leadership development programs, and workplace policies. This article provides a comprehensive critical review of the empirical literature on generational differences in workplace values, attitudes, and behaviors. Synthesizing evidence from meta-analyses, longitudinal studies, and cross-cultural research, we find that the prevailing narrative of distinct generational cohorts with fundamentally different work orientations is largely unsupported by rigorous empirical evidence. Effect sizes for generational differences are consistently small, typically explaining less than 2% of variance in workplace outcomes, while within-generation heterogeneity substantially exceeds between-generation differences. We critically examine the "digital native" construct and its application to younger workers, finding limited empirical support for claims of inherent technological superiority. We further address the cultural specificity of Western generational frameworks and their limited applicability in non-Western contexts. The article proposes a contextual contingency framework that reconceptualizes age-related workplace dynamics through the integration of lifespan development theory, career stage models, sociohistorical context analysis, and intersectional perspectives. We provide specific attention to Generation Z's workforce entry amid unprecedented circumstances and examine implications for remote and hybrid work arrangements. Practical implications for evidence-based management are discussed, including recommendations for replacing generation-based interventions with approaches grounded in individual differences, life stage considerations, and organizational context. A detailed methodological agenda for future research addresses the age-period-cohort identification problem and proposes specific designs for advancing knowledge in this domain.

Keywords: generational differences; age diversity; workplace values; Baby Boomers; Generation X; Millennials; Generation Z; lifespan development; evidence-based management; intersectionality

Introduction

Few topics in contemporary organizational discourse have captured as much attention as the presumed differences among generational cohorts in the workplace. Popular press articles, consulting reports, and management books routinely assert that Baby Boomers, Generation X, Millennials, and Generation Z possess fundamentally different values, work styles, communication preferences, and career expectations (Twenge, 2010). These claims have spawned a substantial industry of generational consulting, with organizations investing significant resources in training programs, policy modifications, and management practices designed to accommodate presumed generational differences (Costanza & Finkelstein, 2015).

The practical implications of these generational narratives extend across virtually every domain of human resource management. Recruitment strategies are tailored to appeal to different generations, with distinct messaging, platform selection, and value propositions (Ng & Parry, 2016). Performance management systems are modified based on assumptions about generational feedback

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

preferences. Leadership development programs incorporate modules on managing multigenerational teams. Compensation and benefits packages are designed with generational preferences in mind. The cumulative organizational investment in generation-based interventions represents a substantial commitment of resources and strategic attention.

Yet the empirical foundation underlying these widespread practices remains remarkably contested within the academic literature. A growing body of rigorous research, including comprehensive meta-analyses and carefully designed longitudinal studies, has raised fundamental questions about the validity of generational categories as meaningful predictors of workplace behavior (Costanza et al., 2012; Rudolph et al., 2018). These studies consistently find that effect sizes for generational differences are small to negligible, that within-generation variance far exceeds between-generation variance, and that apparent generational effects often confound age, period, and cohort influences in ways that preclude causal interpretation.

This disconnect between popular discourse and empirical evidence presents a significant challenge for evidence-based management practice. Organizations making decisions based on generational stereotypes may not only waste resources on ineffective interventions but may also inadvertently reinforce age-based stereotypes, contribute to discrimination, and overlook the individual differences that more powerfully predict workplace outcomes (Rudolph & Zacher, 2017). The potential for harm extends beyond organizational efficiency to encompass fundamental questions of workplace equity and inclusion.

This article provides a comprehensive critical review of the empirical literature on generational differences in workplace values, attitudes, and behaviors. Our objectives are fourfold. First, we examine the conceptual foundations of generational theory as applied to workplace contexts, identifying both its theoretical roots and its inherent limitations. Second, we synthesize the empirical evidence from meta-analyses, longitudinal studies, and cross-cultural research to assess the magnitude and consistency of generational effects. Third, we critically examine specific claims, including the "digital native" narrative and the cultural specificity of Western generational frameworks. Fourth, we propose a contextual contingency framework that offers a more nuanced and empirically grounded approach to understanding age-related workplace dynamics, incorporating intersectional perspectives and attention to emerging cohorts. Throughout, we maintain focus on practical implications, offering specific recommendations for evidence-based organizational practice that replace generational stereotypes with approaches grounded in individual differences, developmental considerations, and contextual analysis.

Conceptual Foundations of Generational Theory

Defining Generations: Theoretical Origins and Contemporary Applications

The concept of social generations traces its intellectual origins to the sociological work of Karl Mannheim (1952), whose seminal essay "The Problem of Generations" established the theoretical foundation for understanding how shared historical experiences during formative years might create lasting cohort-based worldviews. Mannheim proposed that individuals who experience significant historical events during late adolescence and early adulthood—a period he identified as particularly formative for identity development—may develop distinctive perspectives that persist throughout their lives. This "generational consciousness" emerges not merely from chronological proximity but from shared participation in the social and intellectual currents of a particular historical moment.

Mannheim's (1952) framework distinguished between *generational location*, the objective fact of being born within a particular historical period; *generational actuality*, the shared experience of participating in common historical and social circumstances; and *generational units*, subgroups within a generation that process shared experiences in distinct ways. This nuanced theoretical architecture recognized that not all individuals born within a particular period would necessarily share identical worldviews, acknowledging the role of social position, geography, and individual circumstance in mediating generational experience.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

Contemporary applications of generational theory in organizational contexts have largely departed from Mannheim's (1952) sophisticated framework, instead adopting a more deterministic approach that assumes relatively uniform characteristics within generationally defined cohorts (Rudolph et al., 2018). The popular generational categories commonly referenced in workplace discourse—Baby Boomers (typically defined as those born 1946-1964), Generation X (1965-1980), Millennials or Generation Y (1981-1996), and Generation Z (1997 onward)—are treated as meaningful categorical predictors of workplace values, attitudes, and behaviors (Twenge, 2010). These boundaries, while widely used, lack theoretical justification for their specific demarcation points and primarily reflect U.S.-centric historical periodization.

The Age-Period-Cohort Identification Problem

A fundamental methodological challenge confronting generational research involves the statistical confounding of age, period, and cohort effects—commonly termed the age-period-cohort (APC) identification problem (Bell & Jones, 2013). Any observed difference between individuals of different birth cohorts at a single point in time simultaneously reflects three distinct influences: *age effects*, changes associated with biological and psychological development across the lifespan; *period effects*, influences of the contemporary historical moment that affect all age groups simultaneously; and *cohort effects*, lasting influences of formative experiences unique to particular birth cohorts.

Because chronological age, historical period, and birth cohort are linearly dependent (knowing any two perfectly determines the third), their independent effects cannot be statistically separated using standard regression techniques without imposing untestable identifying assumptions (Bell & Jones, 2013). This identification problem is not merely a technical nuisance but represents a fundamental conceptual barrier to causal inference about generational effects. Cross-sectional studies comparing workers of different ages at a single point in time cannot distinguish whether observed differences reflect genuine cohort effects, developmental age effects, or period-specific influences.

Attempts to resolve the APC problem have employed various methodological strategies, including hierarchical age-period-cohort models, accelerated longitudinal designs, and theory-driven constraints on particular effects (Yang & Land, 2013). However, none of these approaches fully resolves the fundamental identification problem, and different analytical strategies can yield substantially different conclusions from the same data (Bell & Jones, 2013). Researchers examining generational differences must therefore exercise considerable caution in drawing causal inferences, a caution often absent in popular discourse about workplace generations.

Generations as Social Constructions

Beyond methodological concerns, critical scholars have argued that generational categories themselves represent social constructions that may obscure more than they reveal (Rudolph & Zacher, 2017). The boundaries between generations are arbitrary rather than empirically derived, typically reflecting media narratives and marketing categories rather than observed discontinuities in attitudes or behaviors. The very act of labeling and characterizing generations may create self-fulfilling prophecies, as individuals internalize generational stereotypes and organizations develop policies based on presumed generational characteristics.

Lyons and Kuron (2014) observed that generational stereotypes often reflect broader cultural anxieties about social change, with each new generation portrayed as fundamentally different from (and often inferior to) its predecessors. This pattern of generational complaint extends back through recorded history, suggesting that contemporary concerns about Millennials or Generation Z may reflect perennial intergenerational dynamics rather than genuine cohort-specific transformations. Indeed, ancient Greek philosophers expressed remarkably similar concerns about the younger generations of their time, suggesting a recurring pattern of intergenerational critique that may reveal more about the critics than the critiqued.

The social construction of generations also reflects and reinforces existing power dynamics. Generational narratives are typically produced by members of older generations interpreting and

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

characterizing younger cohorts (Rudolph et al., 2018). These characterizations may serve ideological functions, justifying existing organizational hierarchies or deflecting attention from structural factors such as economic inequality, labor market conditions, or organizational practices. When younger workers express dissatisfaction with workplace conditions, attributing this to generational characteristics diverts attention from potential organizational or systemic causes that might otherwise require managerial response.

Empirical Evidence: Meta-Analytic and Longitudinal Findings

Meta-Analytic Synthesis of Generational Differences

The most rigorous assessment of generational differences in workplace outcomes comes from meta-analytic syntheses that aggregate findings across multiple studies, providing more reliable estimates of effect sizes and their consistency. Costanza and colleagues (2012) conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis examining generational differences in job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to turnover. Their analysis, encompassing data from over 20,000 participants across multiple studies, found minimal support for the generational differences hypothesis. Effect sizes were uniformly small, with generational membership explaining less than 2% of variance in any workplace outcome examined.

Importantly, Costanza and colleagues (2012) found that the direction of generational differences was often inconsistent across studies, with some finding higher job satisfaction among younger workers and others finding the reverse. This heterogeneity in findings suggests that observed differences may reflect study-specific factors such as sample characteristics, measurement timing, or organizational context rather than genuine cohort effects. The pattern of results led the authors to conclude that "the relationships between generational membership and work-related outcomes are moderate to small, essentially zero in many cases" (Costanza et al., 2012, p. 375).

Rudolph and colleagues (2018) extended this meta-analytic work, examining generational differences across a broader range of work-related variables including work centrality, work ethic, and organizational citizenship behavior. Their findings reinforced and extended Costanza and colleagues' (2012) conclusions, documenting uniformly small effect sizes and substantial heterogeneity across studies. Notably, when age was statistically controlled, generational effects became even smaller, suggesting that much of the observed variance attributed to generations actually reflects age-related developmental processes rather than cohort-specific characteristics.

Longitudinal Evidence on Value Stability and Change

Longitudinal studies that track individuals or cohorts over time provide valuable evidence regarding the stability of generational characteristics and the relative contributions of age and cohort effects. Twenge and colleagues (2010) analyzed data from the Monitoring the Future study, examining work values among high school seniors from 1976 to 2006. They found evidence of cohort differences in certain work values, with more recent cohorts reporting higher leisure values and lower work centrality. However, effect sizes remained modest, and alternative interpretations involving period effects could not be definitively excluded.

Importantly, longitudinal research has demonstrated that many work-related attitudes show substantial change across the adult lifespan, a pattern inconsistent with the generational perspective's emphasis on stable cohort characteristics. Ng and Feldman (2010) meta-analyzed relationships between age and work-related attitudes, finding that attitudes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work-family conflict showed systematic variation with age. These age-related patterns likely reflect developmental processes, life stage transitions, and accumulating work experience rather than cohort-specific values.

The distinction between age effects and cohort effects carries substantial practical implications. If observed differences between younger and older workers primarily reflect developmental processes, then these differences would be expected to diminish as younger workers age, and

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

interventions targeting presumed generational characteristics would be misguided. Current evidence suggests that much of what is attributed to generational differences may indeed reflect age-related development, career stage, and life circumstances rather than stable cohort characteristics (Rudolph et al., 2018).

The Problem of Within-Generation Heterogeneity

A frequently overlooked consideration in generational discourse involves the substantial heterogeneity within any defined generational cohort. Generations as typically defined span 15-20 years of birth, encompassing individuals with vastly different life experiences, socioeconomic backgrounds, cultural contexts, and individual characteristics. Someone born in 1981 shares the Millennial label with someone born in 1996, yet these individuals came of age in substantially different economic, technological, and social contexts.

Research consistently demonstrates that within-generation variance in work-related attitudes and behaviors substantially exceeds between-generation variance (Costanza & Finkelstein, 2015). Individual differences in personality, values, education, occupation, and life circumstances prove far more predictive of workplace outcomes than generational membership. This pattern suggests that treating generational categories as meaningful predictors of individual behavior involves substantial stereotyping, attributing to individuals characteristics that describe, at best, modest central tendencies within highly heterogeneous groups.

Zabel and colleagues (2017) examined generational differences in personality traits, finding that any cohort differences in traits such as conscientiousness, agreeableness, and neuroticism were dwarfed by individual variation within cohorts. The practical implication is that knowing an individual's generation provides minimal predictive value for understanding that person's personality or likely workplace behavior. The same conclusion emerges across domains of work values, career preferences, and organizational attitudes.

Technology Competence and the Digital Native Myth

Origins and Claims of the Digital Native Concept

Perhaps no generational claim has achieved greater cultural penetration than the notion that younger generations, having grown up with digital technology, possess fundamentally different cognitive characteristics and superior technological abilities compared to older "digital immigrants" (Prensky, 2001). This digital native narrative has profoundly influenced organizational practices, from technology training programs that assume older workers require remedial instruction to recruitment strategies that presume younger workers will more readily adapt to technological innovation.

Prensky (2001) originally proposed that individuals who grew up with digital technology "think and process information fundamentally differently from their predecessors" (p. 1). This claim extended beyond mere familiarity with technology to suggest neurological differences in how digital natives process information, multitask, and learn. The digital native framework has been enthusiastically adopted in organizational contexts, with technology companies and consulting firms promoting the idea that younger workers bring inherent technological advantages to the workplace.

Empirical Critique of Digital Native Claims

Rigorous empirical examination of digital native claims has consistently failed to support their central tenets. Kirschner and De Bruyckere (2017) conducted a comprehensive review of the evidence base for digital native assumptions, concluding that the concept lacks empirical support and should be abandoned. Their analysis revealed several critical problems with digital native claims.

First, the assumption that all members of younger generations possess high levels of technological proficiency conflates *exposure* with *competence*. Research examining actual digital

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

literacy among young people finds substantial variation, with many lacking sophisticated skills despite extensive technology use (Hargittai, 2010). Familiarity with social media platforms or smartphone applications does not automatically translate into proficiency with enterprise software systems, data analysis tools, or complex technological problem-solving.

Second, the claim that digital technology has fundamentally rewired young people's brains lacks neuroscientific support. While the brain exhibits plasticity in response to experience throughout life, there is no evidence of categorically different neural architecture among digital natives compared to digital immigrants (Kirschner & De Bruyckere, 2017). The developing brain does respond to environmental inputs, but this plasticity operates continuously across the lifespan rather than creating fundamental cognitive differences between generational cohorts.

Third, research on multitasking—often cited as a digital native strength—consistently demonstrates that multitasking impairs performance for individuals of all ages, and younger individuals show no superior ability to multitask effectively (Ophir et al., 2009). Indeed, some research suggests that heavy media multitaskers, regardless of age, show reduced ability to filter irrelevant information and switch between tasks efficiently.

Technology Adoption Across Age Groups

Research on technology adoption in workplace contexts reveals a more nuanced picture than digital native stereotypes suggest. While younger workers may initially show greater familiarity with specific consumer technologies, age differences in adopting workplace technologies are generally modest and heavily influenced by factors such as job demands, training quality, and organizational support (Morris & Venkatesh, 2000). Older workers who receive adequate training and perceive technology as useful for their work demonstrate comparable adoption rates and proficiency to younger colleagues.

Charness and Boot (2009) reviewed research on aging and technology use, finding that while older adults may require more time to learn new technologies initially, they can achieve comparable performance levels with appropriate training and support. Age differences in technology adoption reflect experiential and motivational factors rather than fundamental cognitive limitations. Critically, attitudes toward technology—influenced by organizational culture, training experiences, and perceived usefulness—prove more predictive of technology adoption than age or generation.

Wang and colleagues (2013) examined technology acceptance among workers of different ages, finding that perceived usefulness and ease of use predicted technology adoption across age groups. When organizational support and training were adequate, age differences in technology acceptance were minimal. This research suggests that organizations seeking to promote technology adoption would benefit more from investing in training and support than from targeting interventions based on generational assumptions.

Cross-Cultural Perspectives and Non-Western Generational Frameworks

Cultural Specificity of Western Generational Categories

The generational categories dominating organizational discourse—Baby Boomers, Generation X, Millennials, Generation Z—emerged from and primarily reflect United States historical experience and cultural periodization. The defining events used to characterize these generations, such as the post-World War II economic boom, the Vietnam War and counterculture movement, the fall of communism, and the rise of the internet, represent specifically Western and often specifically American historical experiences (Lyons & Kuron, 2014). The assumption that these categories translate meaningfully to non-Western contexts represents a significant conceptual limitation.

Parry and Urwin (2011) critically examined the cross-cultural applicability of generational categories, noting that individuals born in the same years but in different countries experienced vastly different formative circumstances. The formative experiences of someone born in 1985 in the United States differ dramatically from someone born the same year in China, India, Nigeria, or Brazil.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

Economic conditions, political systems, educational structures, cultural values, and technological access all varied substantially, creating fundamentally different developmental contexts that undermine assumptions about globally uniform generational characteristics.

Research examining generational differences across cultural contexts has produced inconsistent findings that often contradict Western-derived expectations. Becton and colleagues (2014) found that generational differences in work values observed in U.S. samples did not replicate consistently in international samples, with some studies finding reversed patterns or no significant differences. This cross-cultural variability suggests that apparent generational effects may be substantially confounded with culturally specific historical circumstances.

Alternative Generational Frameworks: China as Example

Several non-Western countries have developed indigenous generational frameworks that reflect their specific historical experiences. China provides an instructive example, where generational discourse centers on categories such as the *post-80s* (八零后, *bālínghòu*) and *post-90s* (九零后, *jiǔlínghòu*) generations (Rosen, 2009). These frameworks reflect China's particular historical trajectory, including the Cultural Revolution, the one-child policy, the Reform and Opening period, and rapid economic transformation.

The post-80s generation in China came of age during early economic reforms and experienced childhoods significantly more prosperous than their parents while maintaining exposure to traditional values. The post-90s generation, by contrast, grew up during China's accelerated economic growth, widespread internet access, and increasing global cultural integration (Moore, 2005). Importantly, these generations' defining experiences differ fundamentally from their Western counterparts born in similar years, making Western generational labels potentially misleading when applied to Chinese workers.

Research on Chinese generational differences reveals both similarities and differences compared to Western patterns. Yi and colleagues (2010) found that younger Chinese workers expressed greater individualism and career mobility orientation than older workers, but these differences existed within a cultural context that remained substantially more collectivist than Western societies. The meaning and implications of increased individualism among young Chinese workers cannot be straightforwardly equated with Western individualism, as both the baseline cultural orientation and the sociohistorical drivers differ substantially.

Implications for Multinational Organizations

For organizations operating across multiple countries, the cultural specificity of generational frameworks carries significant practical implications. Management practices designed around Western generational stereotypes may prove ineffective or counterproductive in non-Western contexts. Assuming that a Millennial employee in Singapore shares the same values and expectations as a Millennial employee in the United States imposes a false homogeneity that ignores profound cultural and historical differences.

Researchers have called for the development of culturally grounded generational frameworks that attend to local historical experiences rather than importing Western categories (Lyons & Kuron, 2014). Such frameworks would identify the specific sociohistorical events that shaped coming-of-age experiences in particular national or regional contexts, recognizing that globalization has not eliminated meaningful cross-cultural variation in formative experiences. Until such frameworks are developed and validated, organizations should exercise considerable caution in applying generation-based practices across cultural boundaries.

Empirically grounded recommendations for multinational organizations include: conducting local research to understand age-related dynamics in specific cultural contexts rather than assuming Western patterns apply; engaging local employees and managers in identifying relevant generational or cohort experiences; avoiding the imposition of Western generational labels in employee

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

communications and training materials; and focusing on individual differences and contextual factors that may prove more consistent predictors of workplace behavior across cultural boundaries.

Intersectionality: Generational Dynamics Across Multiple Identity Dimensions

Theoretical Foundations of Intersectionality

Intersectionality theory, originating in Black feminist scholarship, provides a critical lens for understanding how multiple identity dimensions interact to shape individual experiences and opportunities (Crenshaw, 1989). Rather than treating social categories such as age, gender, race, and class as independent and additive influences, intersectionality recognizes that these dimensions interact in complex ways that cannot be understood by examining any single dimension in isolation. The experience of a young Black woman in the workplace cannot be adequately understood by separately considering age effects, gender effects, and race effects, as these identities are lived simultaneously and their intersection creates qualitatively distinct experiences.

Applied to generational dynamics, intersectional analysis reveals that age-related workplace experiences vary substantially based on other identity dimensions (Zaniboni et al., 2019). The experience of aging in the workplace differs for men and women, with women facing the dual burden of age bias and gender bias that compound in ways that exceed their additive combination. Workers from racial and ethnic minority backgrounds may experience age-related dynamics differently than white workers, as racialized stereotypes interact with age-based assumptions in context-specific ways.

Gender and Age Interactions

Research on age and gender interactions in workplace contexts reveals distinctive patterns that challenge uniform generational characterizations. Finkelstein and colleagues (2013) found that age stereotypes operate differently for men and women, with women facing a "double jeopardy" of age and gender bias that accelerates negative career consequences at younger ages than men experience. While older workers generally face stereotypes about reduced competence and adaptability, older women face these stereotypes more intensely and earlier in their careers.

For younger workers, gender moderates the experience of youth in consequential ways. Young women may face assumptions about imminent family formation that affect hiring, assignment to challenging projects, and career development opportunities (Hoobler et al., 2011). Young men may face different stereotypes regarding maturity and professionalism. These gendered experiences of being young in the workplace cannot be captured by generation-level analyses that aggregate across gender.

Research on work-life balance and career trajectories further illuminates gender-age interactions. While generational narratives often portray Millennials as uniformly valuing work-life balance, the experience and consequences of work-life negotiations differ substantially by gender. Women continue to face greater work-family conflict and career penalties for caregiving responsibilities regardless of generation (Eby et al., 2005). Generational framings that ignore these gender dynamics risk obscuring persistent structural inequalities.

Race, Ethnicity, and Generational Experience

Generational categories as typically deployed also obscure significant racial and ethnic variation in experiences and opportunities. The defining events used to characterize generations were experienced differently across racial groups. The post-World War II economic boom that provided the foundation for Baby Boomer prosperity was characterized by explicit racial exclusion from housing, education, and employment opportunities (Katznelson, 2005). The economic anxiety attributed to Millennials reflects differential impacts, with young workers from marginalized racial

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

backgrounds facing substantially higher unemployment rates and wealth gaps than white counterparts.

Research on workplace diversity has documented persistent racial disparities in hiring, advancement, and workplace treatment that transcend generational boundaries (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004). These disparities mean that the workplace experiences of Black, Hispanic, Asian, and Indigenous workers differ systematically from white workers within every generational cohort. Generation-focused analyses that aggregate across racial categories may obscure these disparities and the organizational practices that perpetuate them.

Remedial implications of intersectional analysis suggest that organizations seeking to create inclusive workplaces cannot simply address age diversity and racial diversity as separate initiatives. Understanding how age and race interact in specific organizational contexts requires attention to the particular ways that stereotypes, opportunities, and workplace climate affect individuals at specific intersections of identity. A young Black professional's experience may be shaped as much by navigating racial dynamics as by any generational characteristic, and interventions focused on generational difference may miss the more consequential factors shaping that experience.

Socioeconomic Class and Generational Opportunity

Socioeconomic class represents another dimension that powerfully moderates generational experiences. The economic circumstances shaping young adulthood varied enormously within any generational cohort based on family wealth, educational access, and geographic location. The Millennial experience of economic precarity, while genuine for many, describes a substantially different reality for those from wealthy families than for those from working-class or impoverished backgrounds (Houle, 2014).

Intergenerational economic mobility patterns reveal that the opportunities available to young workers depend substantially on their parents' socioeconomic position. Research has documented declining intergenerational mobility in the United States, meaning that young workers' economic prospects are increasingly determined by family background rather than individual effort or generational membership (Chetty et al., 2017). Generational narratives that treat cohorts as homogeneous obscure these class-based disparities in opportunity and experience.

For organizations, attention to class intersections suggests that practices designed around generational assumptions may differentially affect workers from different socioeconomic backgrounds. Benefits packages that assume savings capacity, professional development opportunities that require unpaid time investments, or networking events that presume cultural capital access may disadvantage working-class employees regardless of their generation. Understanding how class interacts with age in specific organizational contexts provides more actionable insights than generational categorization.

Generation Z and the Post-Pandemic Workforce

Characteristics and Circumstances of Generation Z's Workforce Entry

Generation Z, typically defined as those born from approximately 1997 onward, has begun entering the workforce in significant numbers, with the oldest members now in their late twenties (Schroth, 2019). This cohort's formative experiences differ substantially from preceding generations, including growing up with smartphones and social media as ubiquitous features of social life, experiencing the Great Recession during childhood, and entering adulthood amid increasing awareness of climate change and social justice movements.

However, any claims about Generation Z's workplace characteristics must be tempered by significant epistemic humility. The empirical research base on this cohort's work attitudes and behaviors remains extremely limited, as large-scale longitudinal studies have not yet accumulated sufficient data on Generation Z's workplace experiences. Much of what is asserted about Generation Z in popular discourse extrapolates from adolescent samples, consumer behavior research, or

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

anecdotal observation rather than rigorous workplace studies (Schroth, 2019). Researchers and practitioners should therefore treat claims about Generation Z work characteristics as preliminary hypotheses requiring empirical validation rather than established facts.

The COVID-19 Pandemic and Early Career Disruption

Generation Z's workforce entry has been uniquely shaped by the COVID-19 pandemic, which disrupted labor markets precisely as many members of this cohort were entering employment for the first time. The pandemic's effects on early career experiences include: entry into labor markets during economic contraction and uncertainty; initial workplace experiences characterized by remote work, physical distancing, and reduced informal interaction; limited access to in-person mentorship, networking, and observational learning; and educational disruptions affecting final years of schooling and transition to work (Akkermans et al., 2020).

Research on career development has established that early career experiences have lasting effects on subsequent career trajectories, organizational attitudes, and skill development (Ng & Feldman, 2007). The pandemic's disruption of normal early career experiences for Generation Z may have distinctive long-term consequences that cannot be predicted from prior generational patterns. The lack of traditional workplace socialization, the predominance of virtual interaction, and the economic anxiety surrounding workforce entry represent genuinely novel circumstances that merit systematic research attention.

Preliminary evidence suggests that pandemic-era workforce entrants may face distinctive challenges. Reduced opportunities for informal learning and relationship building, difficulty establishing professional identities in virtual environments, and the psychological toll of isolation during formative career years represent potential sources of lasting impact (Rudolph et al., 2021). However, the research base remains insufficient to draw confident conclusions about long-term effects.

Implications for Organizational Practice

Organizations seeking to effectively integrate Generation Z workers should recognize both the genuine distinctiveness of this cohort's circumstances and the dangers of overgeneralizing from limited evidence. Practical recommendations based on current understanding include:

Enhanced onboarding and socialization: Given that many Generation Z workers entered workplaces during periods of remote or hybrid work, organizations should ensure robust onboarding processes that provide the organizational knowledge, relationship connections, and cultural understanding that new employees previously acquired through informal in-person interaction. Explicit attention to helping newer workers understand organizational norms, build professional networks, and access mentorship may be particularly valuable.

Flexibility with intentional connection: While Generation Z workers may be comfortable with digital communication and remote work, they may also have unmet needs for in-person connection and community that their early career experiences did not provide. Organizations should balance flexibility with opportunities for meaningful face-to-face interaction and relationship building.

Avoiding premature generational characterization: Organizations should resist the temptation to develop elaborate Generation Z management strategies based on unvalidated assumptions. As the research base develops, evidence-based practices can be refined, but current practice should emphasize individual assessment and responsiveness rather than generation-based policies.

Attention to economic anxiety: Generation Z entered the workforce during economic uncertainty and may carry heightened concerns about job security and economic stability. Transparent communication about organizational stability, clear pathways for advancement, and attention to fair compensation may address concerns that reflect labor market conditions rather than inherent generational characteristics.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

Remote and Hybrid Work Across Age Groups

The Pandemic Transformation of Work Arrangements

The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated a fundamental transformation in work arrangements, with remote and hybrid work shifting from exceptional accommodations to mainstream practice for many knowledge workers (Kniffin et al., 2021). This shift has generated substantial speculation about differential generational preferences for remote versus in-person work, with some commentators suggesting that younger, technologically fluent workers embrace remote work while older workers prefer traditional arrangements, and others asserting the reverse pattern.

Empirical research on remote work preferences and effectiveness across age groups reveals a more complex picture than simple generational narratives suggest. Allen and colleagues (2015) meta-analyzed research on telecommuting, finding that the relationship between telecommuting and various outcomes was moderated by multiple factors including job type, family circumstances, and individual preferences, but not straightforwardly by age or generation. The effectiveness and desirability of remote work depends more on individual circumstances than generational membership.

Age-Related Considerations in Remote Work

Research on remote work does identify certain age-related dynamics that merit organizational attention, though these reflect life stage and career development factors rather than stable generational characteristics:

Early career workers: Employees in early career stages, regardless of generation, may face distinctive challenges in remote environments. Skill development, organizational learning, network building, and identity formation processes that traditionally occurred through in-person observation and interaction may be impaired in fully remote contexts (Wang et al., 2021). Organizations should consider how to support developmental needs that transcend technological proficiency.

Workers with caregiving responsibilities: Remote work can provide flexibility that benefits workers managing childcare, eldercare, or other caregiving responsibilities. These benefits may vary by life stage, with mid-career workers often facing peak caregiving demands. Gender intersects significantly here, as women continue to bear disproportionate caregiving burdens and may experience differential impacts of remote work arrangements (Shockley et al., 2021).

Experienced workers and tacit knowledge transfer: Senior workers possess tacit knowledge and organizational memory that has traditionally been transmitted through informal interaction and mentorship. Remote work may impair knowledge transfer processes, creating organizational risks regarding succession and capability preservation. Organizations should intentionally design mechanisms for knowledge transfer that function effectively in remote and hybrid contexts.

Evidence-Based Approaches to Remote Work Policy

Rather than designing remote work policies around generational assumptions, organizations benefit from approaches grounded in job requirements, individual circumstances, and empirical evidence:

Job-based assessment: The feasibility and appropriateness of remote work varies substantially by job type, with some roles requiring physical presence and others highly amenable to remote execution. Task analysis provides a more rational basis for remote work policy than employee age or generation.

Individual preference and circumstance: Workers' remote work preferences and needs vary based on personal circumstances including housing situation, family structure, and individual work style. Policies that enable individual choice where operationally feasible respect this heterogeneity.

Team and collaboration needs: Some work activities benefit substantially from in-person collaboration, while others can be effectively conducted remotely. Designing policies around

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

collaboration requirements rather than demographic characteristics provides a more defensible and effective approach.

Continuous evaluation: Organizations should systematically assess the effects of remote work arrangements on productivity, employee wellbeing, equity, and other outcomes, using data rather than assumptions to guide policy refinement.

A Contextual Contingency Framework for Age-Related Workplace Dynamics

Beyond Generational Categories: An Integrative Approach

The limitations of generational frameworks documented in the preceding sections suggest the need for alternative conceptualizations that more accurately capture age-related workplace dynamics. We propose a contextual contingency framework that integrates insights from lifespan development theory, career stage models, sociohistorical context analysis, and intersectional perspectives. This framework recognizes that age-related differences in workplace behavior emerge from complex interactions among developmental processes, life circumstances, historical context, and multiple identity dimensions.

The contextual contingency framework rests on four foundational principles. First, *developmental plasticity*: human development continues throughout the lifespan, with attitudes, capabilities, and preferences subject to ongoing change rather than fixed by generational membership. Second, *contextual embeddedness*: workplace behavior is shaped by immediate organizational context, job characteristics, and life circumstances rather than determined by cohort membership. Third, *individual variation*: within-group differences exceed between-group differences, making individual assessment more valuable than categorical generalization. Fourth, *intersectional complexity*: age-related dynamics are inseparable from other identity dimensions and must be understood in their intersection.

Component 1: Lifespan Development Theory

Lifespan development theory provides a robust framework for understanding age-related changes in motivation, goals, and behavior that complements and often supersedes generational explanations (Baltes et al., 2006). Key developmental processes operating across the adult lifespan include:

Socioemotional selectivity: Carstensen's (1995) socioemotional selectivity theory proposes that as individuals perceive their future time as increasingly limited, they prioritize emotionally meaningful goals and relationships over instrumental or exploratory objectives. This shift manifests in workplace behavior through increased focus on meaningful work, closer relationships with valued colleagues, and reduced interest in expanding professional networks. These patterns emerge from developmental processes operating across all cohorts rather than from generational characteristics.

Selection, optimization, and compensation: The SOC model (Baltes & Baltes, 1990) describes adaptive strategies that individuals employ to manage changing resources and goals across the lifespan. Older workers may strategically select domains for continued investment, optimize performance through deliberate practice and accumulated expertise, and compensate for declining resources in some areas by leveraging strengths in others. Understanding these adaptive processes provides more actionable insights than generational stereotypes.

Generativity: Erikson's (1963) concept of generativity describes a developmental motivation emerging in midlife to contribute to future generations through mentoring, teaching, and legacy creation. This generative motivation can explain age-related patterns in organizational citizenship behavior, knowledge sharing, and mentorship engagement without recourse to generational explanations.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

Component 2: Career Stage Models

Career stage models recognize that workers' attitudes, needs, and priorities evolve as they progress through their careers, regardless of their generational membership (Super, 1980). These models identify predictable transitions and challenges associated with different career phases:

Exploration and establishment: Early career stages involve identity development, skill acquisition, and organizational learning. Workers in this phase, regardless of generation, typically show high learning orientation, career uncertainty, and need for feedback and development. What might appear as Millennial or Generation Z characteristics may reflect career stage dynamics that preceding generations also experienced at comparable career points.

Advancement and maintenance: Mid-career stages involve deepening expertise, increasing responsibility, and often managing work-family integration challenges. Workers in this phase across generations show similar patterns of balancing advancement aspirations with life demands.

Late career and transition: Later career stages involve legacy considerations, knowledge transfer, potential role changes, and preparation for retirement. The attitudes and behaviors associated with this phase reflect career positioning rather than generational characteristics.

Integrating career stage perspectives with generational analysis reveals that much of what is attributed to generational differences likely reflects career stage effects. A 30-year-old worker in 2024 occupies a similar career stage to a 30-year-old worker in 1994, and many apparent differences between them may reflect changed labor market conditions, organizational practices, or economic circumstances rather than inherent generational characteristics.

Component 3: Sociohistorical Context Analysis

Rather than treating cohort membership as a direct cause of workplace characteristics, sociohistorical context analysis examines how specific historical circumstances shape opportunities, challenges, and adaptive responses (Elder et al., 2003). This approach identifies particular historical conditions that may affect workplace experiences:

Economic conditions at labor market entry: Research on career scarring demonstrates that entering the labor market during recessions has lasting effects on earnings trajectories, career progression, and organizational attitudes (Kahn, 2010). These effects reflect economic circumstances rather than generational characteristics per se, and similar effects would be expected for any cohort entering employment during economic downturns.

Technological environment: The technological context of skill development shapes competencies, but not in the deterministic manner suggested by digital native narratives. Workers who developed skills with particular technologies carry those competencies forward while showing variable capacity for acquiring new technological capabilities based on individual differences, training opportunities, and motivational factors.

Educational and credentialing norms: Changes in educational requirements, credential inflation, and skills expectations shape how different cohorts prepare for and enter the workforce. These structural factors affect career entry and development without implying fundamental value differences between generations.

Component 4: Intersectional Integration

The fourth component of the contextual contingency framework integrates intersectional analysis, recognizing that age-related dynamics are inseparable from other identity dimensions. Applying an intersectional lens to age-related workplace dynamics involves:

Disaggregating analyses: Rather than treating generational cohorts as homogeneous, examining how age-related patterns vary by gender, race, class, and other dimensions reveals important heterogeneity and identifies which groups face particular advantages or disadvantages.

Examining compound effects: Understanding how age bias intersects with other forms of discrimination to create distinctive experiences for individuals at particular identity intersections. For

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

example, older women of color may face a "triple jeopardy" of compounding biases that cannot be understood by examining age, gender, or race effects in isolation.

Contextualizing opportunities: Recognizing that the opportunities available to workers at different ages vary substantially based on other identity dimensions and sociohistorical position. The career possibilities available to a young white man differ from those available to a young Black woman, even within the same generational cohort.

Practical Implications for Evidence-Based Organizational Practice

Reconceptualizing Human Resource Management Approaches

The evidence reviewed in this article suggests that organizations should fundamentally reconceptualize their approach to age-related workplace dynamics, moving away from generation-based interventions toward strategies grounded in individual differences, developmental considerations, and organizational context. This reconceptualization carries implications across human resource management domains:

Recruitment and selection: Rather than tailoring recruitment messages to presumed generational preferences, organizations benefit from clearly communicating actual job characteristics, organizational culture, and employment conditions that enable candidates to assess fit based on individual preferences. Recruitment strategies should focus on reaching diverse candidate pools and enabling informed self-selection rather than manipulating messaging based on generational stereotypes.

Onboarding and socialization: Onboarding practices should attend to career stage and individual needs rather than assuming generational uniformity. Early career workers require developmental support regardless of their birth year, while experienced hires need different integration assistance. Personalized onboarding that assesses individual needs provides more value than generationally differentiated programs.

Training and development: Training approaches should accommodate individual learning preferences and prior knowledge rather than assuming generational learning styles. The myth of generational learning style differences lacks empirical support (Kirschner & De Bruyckere, 2017), and effective training design focuses on evidence-based instructional principles applicable across age groups. Organizations should also recognize that technology training needs vary by prior experience and current role requirements rather than by generation.

Practical Illustrations

To ground these recommendations in practical application, we offer illustrative scenarios that demonstrate the framework's application:

Scenario 1: Mentoring Program Design

Generation-based approach: An organization designs a reverse mentoring program specifically to have Millennials teach Baby Boomers about technology.

Evidence-based alternative: The organization assesses specific knowledge gaps and expertise across its workforce, identifying individuals with particular technological competencies and those seeking to develop such skills, then creates mentoring pairs based on actual knowledge differentials rather than generational assumptions. This approach may identify technically skilled older workers who can mentor younger colleagues and younger workers who would benefit from mentorship in areas beyond technology.

Scenario 2: Flexible Work Policy

Generation-based approach: An organization assumes Millennials and Generation Z want remote work while Baby Boomers prefer in-office work, designing policies accordingly.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

Evidence-based alternative: The organization surveys employees about their individual work arrangement preferences and circumstances, discovers substantial variation within all age groups, and designs policies that enable individual choice where operationally feasible. The organization identifies that preferences correlate more strongly with job type, caregiving responsibilities, and commute length than with age.

Scenario 3: Benefits Package Design

Generation-based approach: An organization creates different benefits packages targeting presumed generational priorities—student loan assistance for Millennials, childcare support for Generation X, retirement benefits for Baby Boomers.

Evidence-based alternative: The organization offers flexible benefits that enable employees to allocate resources according to individual priorities, recognizing that workers of any age may face student loans, childcare needs, or retirement planning concerns. This approach accommodates individual circumstances rather than imposing generational assumptions.

Addressing Age Discrimination: Beyond Stereotypes

The evidence that generational stereotypes lack empirical support carries significant implications for age discrimination in employment. Age discrimination remains prevalent in workplaces, with older workers facing disadvantages in hiring, retention, and advancement (Posthuma & Campion, 2009). While legal frameworks such as the Age Discrimination in Employment Act in the United States prohibit discrimination against workers over 40, age bias operates through subtle mechanisms that legal protections may not fully address.

Generational stereotypes may contribute to age discrimination by providing apparently neutral language for expressing age bias. Characterizing older workers as technologically inept, resistant to change, or lacking energy expresses negative age stereotypes while appearing to reference generational rather than age-based characteristics. Similarly, stereotypes about younger workers as entitled, disloyal, or lacking work ethic can disadvantage early career workers. Organizations committed to reducing age discrimination should critically examine how generational discourse may serve as a vehicle for age stereotyping.

Research on age discrimination identifies several organizational practices associated with reduced bias: structured selection processes that minimize subjective judgment; age-diverse interview panels and decision-making groups; explicit organizational commitment to age inclusion; and training that addresses age stereotypes specifically (Fisher et al., 2017). These practices focus on organizational systems and decision processes rather than attempting to manage presumed generational differences.

Creating Age-Inclusive Climates

Beyond avoiding discrimination, organizations can actively cultivate age-inclusive climates that enable workers across the age spectrum to contribute effectively. Boehm and colleagues (2014) defined age-inclusive climates as organizational environments in which employees of all ages perceive that they are valued, included, and have access to development and advancement opportunities. Key components of age-inclusive climates include:

Age-diverse leadership: Representation of workers across age groups in leadership positions signals organizational commitment to age inclusion and provides diverse perspectives in decision-making.

Age-neutral performance management: Evaluation criteria and processes that focus on demonstrated performance and contribution rather than characteristics associated with age stereotypes.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

Inclusive development opportunities: Access to training, challenging assignments, and career advancement that is not constrained by age-based assumptions about developmental potential or time horizon.

Intergenerational collaboration: Work structures that enable workers of different ages to collaborate, share knowledge, and contribute complementary perspectives, without framing such collaboration in stereotypical generational terms.

Future Research Directions: A Methodological Agenda

Addressing the Age-Period-Cohort Problem

Advancing knowledge about age-related workplace dynamics requires methodological approaches that more effectively address the age-period-cohort identification problem. Future research should employ designs that enable more defensible separation of age, period, and cohort effects:

Accelerated longitudinal designs: These designs follow multiple birth cohorts over overlapping age ranges, enabling estimation of age trajectories while partially separating cohort effects (Duncan et al., 2006). For example, a study might follow cohorts born in 1960, 1970, 1980, and 1990 for 15 years each, creating overlapping age ranges that permit some disaggregation of age and cohort effects.

Cross-sequential designs: Combining cross-sectional and longitudinal data collection within a single study enables within-individual change assessment while also capturing between-cohort comparisons. These designs require sustained data collection over extended periods but provide richer data for addressing the APC problem.

Theory-driven constraints: When statistical identification is impossible, researchers can employ theoretical reasoning to impose constraints that enable estimation. For example, if theory strongly suggests that period effects should be minimal for a particular outcome, researchers might constrain period effects to zero, enabling estimation of age and cohort effects. Such constraints require transparent justification and sensitivity analysis.

Natural experiments: Specific historical events that affected particular cohorts but not others can provide quasi-experimental variation that helps identify cohort effects. Researchers should identify such natural experiments and design studies that leverage them for causal inference.

Specific Methodological Recommendations

We offer the following specific methodological recommendations for researchers investigating age-related workplace dynamics:

Measurement: Studies should employ validated measures with established psychometric properties across age groups. Measurement invariance testing should confirm that scales function equivalently for respondents of different ages, as apparent differences may otherwise reflect measurement artifacts rather than substantive differences.

Sampling: Samples should provide adequate representation across the age range of interest, avoiding the convenience samples of college students that characterize much psychological research. Occupational and organizational diversity within samples enhances generalizability. Sample size should be sufficient to detect the small effects typical in this literature, with power analysis guiding sample size determination.

Analysis: Effect sizes should be reported and interpreted, as statistical significance provides limited information when sample sizes are large enough to detect trivially small effects. Researchers should contextualize effect sizes by comparing variance explained by generation/age to variance explained by individual differences, job characteristics, and organizational factors.

Replication: Given the inconsistency of findings in this literature, replication studies are particularly valuable. Researchers should engage in direct replications of influential studies and constructive replications that test boundary conditions.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

Priority Research Questions

We identify several priority questions for future research:

1. To what extent do apparent generational differences reflect stable cohort characteristics versus age-related developmental processes? Longitudinal studies that track cohorts as they age are essential for addressing this question.
2. How do age-related workplace dynamics vary across cultural, national, and organizational contexts? Cross-cultural and cross-national research using comparable methodologies can identify boundary conditions for findings derived primarily from Western samples.
3. How do age-related patterns intersect with gender, race, class, and other identity dimensions? Intersectional research designs that examine interaction effects rather than treating demographic categories as independent can reveal important heterogeneity.
4. What are the long-term effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on Generation Z's career development and workplace attitudes? Longitudinal tracking of pandemic-era workforce entrants will reveal whether this cohort develops distinctive characteristics reflecting their unusual early career experiences.
5. What organizational practices most effectively promote age inclusion and reduce age discrimination? Intervention research that evaluates the effectiveness of specific practices for creating age-inclusive climates would provide actionable guidance for organizations.

Conclusion

The concept of generational differences has achieved remarkable influence in organizational discourse, shaping human resource practices, management training, and workplace policies. However, rigorous empirical examination reveals a substantial disconnect between popular narratives of distinct generational cohorts and the scientific evidence. Meta-analyses consistently find small effect sizes, typically explaining less than 2% of variance in workplace outcomes. Within-generation heterogeneity substantially exceeds between-generation differences. Apparent generational effects often cannot be distinguished from age-related developmental processes or period effects without untestable assumptions.

Popular claims about generational characteristics—including the digital native myth, assertions about generational technology preferences, and stereotypes about work ethic and organizational loyalty—lack consistent empirical support. Cross-cultural research reveals the cultural specificity of Western generational frameworks, which may not apply meaningfully in non-Western contexts with different historical experiences. Intersectional analysis demonstrates that age-related workplace dynamics are inseparable from gender, race, class, and other identity dimensions, making monolithic generational characterizations particularly misleading.

The emerging Generation Z workforce presents unique circumstances, having entered employment during the unprecedented disruption of the COVID-19 pandemic. While this cohort's distinctive early career experiences may have lasting effects, the current research base is insufficient to support confident claims about Generation Z workplace characteristics. Organizations and researchers should approach claims about this cohort with appropriate epistemic humility.

The contextual contingency framework proposed in this article offers an alternative approach grounded in lifespan development theory, career stage models, sociohistorical context analysis, and intersectional perspectives. This framework recognizes that age-related workplace dynamics emerge from complex interactions among developmental processes, life circumstances, historical context, and multiple identity dimensions. It enables more nuanced understanding while avoiding the oversimplifications inherent in generational categories.

Practical implications for organizations are substantial. Resources devoted to generation-based training and interventions might be more productively invested in evidence-based approaches that address individual differences, career development needs, and organizational climate. Human resource practices should emphasize personalization over generational segmentation, and age

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

inclusion over generational stereotyping. Leaders should be equipped to recognize age bias in its various manifestations, including the use of generational language to express age stereotypes.

Future research should employ methodological designs that more effectively address the age-period-cohort identification problem while examining how age-related dynamics vary across cultural contexts and intersect with other identity dimensions. Longitudinal studies tracking cohorts over time, cross-cultural comparative research, and intervention studies evaluating organizational practices would substantially advance knowledge in this domain.

The transition from generational mythmaking to evidence-based understanding of age-related workplace dynamics requires challenging deeply held assumptions and popular narratives. However, this transition promises both more effective organizational practices and greater workplace equity. By abandoning generational stereotypes in favor of approaches grounded in individual differences, developmental considerations, and contextual analysis, organizations can better serve all employees while avoiding the harms of age-based discrimination and assumption. The path forward lies not in better characterizing generations but in recognizing the limitations of generational thinking itself.

References

Akkermans, J., Richardson, J., & Kraimer, M. L. (2020). The Covid-19 crisis as a career shock: Implications for careers and vocational behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 119*, 103434.

Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 16*(2), 40-68.

Baltes, P. B., & Baltes, M. M. (1990). Psychological perspectives on successful aging: The model of selective optimization with compensation. In P. B. Baltes & M. M. Baltes (Eds.), *Successful aging: Perspectives from the behavioral sciences* (pp. 1-34). Cambridge University Press.

Baltes, P. B., Lindenberger, U., & Staudinger, U. M. (2006). Life span theory in developmental psychology. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (6th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 569-664). Wiley.

Becton, J. B., Walker, H. J., & Jones-Farmer, A. (2014). Generational differences in workplace behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 44*(3), 175-189.

Bell, A., & Jones, K. (2013). The impossibility of separating age, period and cohort effects. *Social Science & Medicine, 93*, 163-165.

Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *American Economic Review, 94*(4), 991-1013.

Boehm, S. A., Kunze, F., & Bruch, H. (2014). Spotlight on age-diversity climate: The impact of age-inclusive HR practices on firm-level outcomes. *Personnel Psychology, 67*(3), 667-704.

Carstensen, L. L. (1995). Evidence for a life-span theory of socioemotional selectivity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 4*(5), 151-156.

Charness, N., & Boot, W. R. (2009). Aging and information technology use: Potential and barriers. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 18*(5), 253-258.

Chetty, R., Grusky, D., Hell, M., Hendren, N., Manduca, R., & Narang, J. (2017). The fading American dream: Trends in absolute income mobility since 1940. *Science, 356*(6336), 398-406.

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.

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.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989*(1), 139-167.

Duncan, S. C., Duncan, T. E., & Hops, H. (2006). Analysis of longitudinal data within accelerated longitudinal designs. *Psychological Methods, 1*(3), 236-248.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980-2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*(1), 124-197.

Elder, G. H., Jr., Johnson, M. K., & Crosnoe, R. (2003). The emergence and development of life course theory. In J. T. Mortimer & M. J. Shanahan (Eds.), *Handbook of the life course* (pp. 3-19). Springer.

Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society* (2nd ed.). Norton.

Finkelstein, L. M., Ryan, K. M., & King, E. B. (2013). What do the young (old) people think of me? Content and accuracy of age-based metastereotypes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 22*(6), 633-657.

Fisher, G. G., Truxillo, D. M., Finkelstein, L. M., & Wallace, L. E. (2017). Age discrimination: Potential for adverse impact and differential prediction related to age. *Human Resource Management Review, 27*(2), 316-327.

Hargittai, E. (2010). Digital na(t)ives? Variation in Internet skills and uses among members of the "Net Generation." *Sociological Inquiry, 80*(1), 92-113.

Hoobler, J. M., Wayne, S. J., & Lemmon, G. (2011). Bosses' perceptions of family-work conflict and women's promotability: Glass ceiling effects. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*(5), 939-957.

Houle, J. N. (2014). Disparities in debt: Parents' socioeconomic resources and young adult student loan debt. *Sociology of Education, 87*(1), 53-69.

Kahn, L. B. (2010). The long-term labor market consequences of graduating from college in a bad economy. *Labour Economics, 17*(2), 303-316.

Katznelson, I. (2005). When affirmative action was white: An untold history of racial inequality in twentieth-century America. Norton.

Kirschner, P. A., & De Bruyckere, P. (2017). The myths of the digital native and the multitasker. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 67*, 135-142.

Kniffin, K. M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F., Antonakis, J., Ashford, S. P., Bakker, A. B., Bamberger, P., Bapuji, H., Bhave, D. P., Choi, V. K., Creary, S. J., Demerouti, E., Flynn, F. J., Gelfand, M. J., Greer, L. L., Johns, G., Kesebir, S., Klein, P. G., Lee, S. Y., ... Vugt, M. (2021). COVID-19 and the workplace: Implications, issues, and insights for future research and action. *American Psychologist, 76*(1), 63-77.

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*(S1), S139-S157.

Mannheim, K. (1952). The problem of generations. In P. Kecskemeti (Ed.), *Essays on the sociology of knowledge* (pp. 276-322). Routledge & Kegan Paul. (Original work published 1928)

Moore, R. L. (2005). Generation ku: Individualism and China's millennial youth. *Ethnology, 44*(4), 357-376.

Morris, M. G., & Venkatesh, V. (2000). Age differences in technology adoption decisions: Implications for a changing work force. *Personnel Psychology, 53*(2), 375-403.

Ng, E. S., & Parry, E. (2016). Multigenerational research in human resource management. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 34*, 1-41.

Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2007). The school-to-work transition: A role identity perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 71*(1), 114-134.

Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2010). The relationships of age with job attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 63*(3), 677-718.

Ophir, E., Nass, C., & Wagner, A. D. (2009). Cognitive control in media multitaskers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 106*(37), 15583-15587.

Parry, E., & Urwin, P. (2011). Generational differences in work values: A review of theory and evidence. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 13*(1), 79-96.

Posthuma, R. A., & Campion, M. A. (2009). Age stereotypes in the workplace: Common stereotypes, moderators, and future research directions. *Journal of Management, 35*(1), 158-188.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon, 9*(5), 1-6.

Rosen, S. (2009). Contemporary Chinese youth and the state. *The Journal of Asian Studies, 68*(2), 359-369.

Rudolph, C. W., Allan, B., Clark, M., Hertel, G., Hirschi, A., Kunze, F., Shockley, K., Shoss, M., Sonnentag, S., & Zacher, H. (2021). Pandemics: Implications for research and practice in industrial and organizational psychology. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 14*(1-2), 1-35.

Rudolph, C. W., Rauvola, R. S., & Zacher, H. (2018). Leadership and generations at work: A critical review. *The Leadership Quarterly, 29*(1), 44-57.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.2373.v1

Rudolph, C. W., & Zacher, H. (2017). Considering generations from a lifespan developmental perspective. *Work, Aging and Retirement, 3*(2), 113-129.

Schroth, H. (2019). Are you ready for Gen Z in the workplace? *California Management Review, 61*(3), 5-18.

Shockley, K. M., Clark, M. A., Dober, H., Hoffman, M., Jinkerson, A., Rosado, H., & Moran, R. (2021). The COVID-19 experience and parental work-life quality: Within-person processes and gender as a moderator. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 131*, 103655.

Super, D. E. (1980). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 16*(3), 282-298.

Twenge, J. M. (2010). A review of the empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*(2), 201-210.

Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., & Lance, C. E. (2010). Generational differences in work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of Management, 36*(5), 1117-1142.

Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology, 70*(1), 16-59.

Wang, Y. S., Wu, M. C., & Wang, H. Y. (2013). Investigating the determinants and age and gender differences in the acceptance of mobile learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 40*(1), 92-118.

Yang, Y., & Land, K. C. (2013). Age-period-cohort analysis: New models, methods, and empirical applications. CRC Press.

Yi, X., Ribbens, B., & Morgan, C. N. (2010). Generational differences in China: Career implications. *Career Development International, 15*(6), 601-620.

Zabel, K. L., Biermeier-Hanson, B. B., Baltes, B. B., Early, B. J., & Shepard, A. (2017). Generational differences in work ethic: Fact or fiction? *Journal of Business and Psychology, 32*(3), 301-315.

Zaniboni, S., Kmicinska, M., Truxillo, D. M., Kahn, K., Paladino, M. P., & Fraccaroli, F. (2019). Will you still hire me when I am over 50? The effects of implicit and explicit age stereotyping on resume evaluations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 28*(4), 453-467.