14

THE EVOLUTION OF WORKER WELL-BEING AND WORK-LIFE ISSUES

Leslie B. Hammer and Jacquelyn M. Brady

Introduction

The addition of worker well-being and work-life satisfaction (WLS) to this second edition of the *Historical Perspectives in Industrial and Organizational Psychology* was deliberate and mirrors the growing recognition of the importance of the topic to industrial and organizational (I-O) psychology. While traditionally the field was referred to as industrial psychology, with a focus on the measurement of individual differences and performance, the addition of the "O" helped bring more attention to ways of understanding how the organization of work influences individual behavior. Organizational psychology reflects how employees experience their environment, how they think, feel, behave, and act and, thus, where worker well-being and WLS squarely fall.

The method of historical analysis used in this chapter is based on a combination of primary and secondary sources. Secondary sources are used for identification of thematic trends and then point us to key primary sources. Given that the history of I-O psychology is considered relatively new from a historical perspective, we can mostly rely on primary sources. We focus on recounting the historical development of the interest in worker well-being and WLS, which notoriously was not reflected in early developments of I-O psychology. This chapter is different than a review chapter in that it places a special focus on the sociopolitical context as it relates to the development of the field.

Prior to 1999, worker health, safety, well-being, and WLS were absent from the 25 competencies listed in *Guidelines for Education and Training in Industrial-Organizational Psychology* (Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology [SIOP], 1985). Occupational safety and health was introduced in the second revision in 1999 (SIOP, 1999), where it was called out under the occupational safety and health competency #18, at which time the competency was completely focused on how safety and health impact *performance* at work rather than how working conditions can affect worker safety and health. Furthermore, the term work-family processes was mentioned in the 1999 guidelines under the occupational safety and health competency. Later this term was removed in the 2016 edition, however the term *well-being* was introduced (SIOP, 2016).

This historical analysis also relies on national movements such as the women's rights movement in the United States (U.S.) and developing recognition of the importance of worker

well-being, which advanced more quickly among the European Union and Nordic countries of Sweden and Norway. Thus, this historical analysis draws on original works that go back to 1911 and reports on national and international regulations, mandates, and proclamations that have led to the development of the areas of worker well-being and WLS. This is different from a strict literature review of worker well-being and WLS, as it brings the reader through the important journey of key historical trigger points that have moved the field, which was traditionally focused on measurement of individual differences and workplace efficiency to a field that greatly values the employee experience.

Worker Well-Being as a Neglected Topic in I-O Psychology

The Definition of Worker Well-Being

Worker well-being has taken on many meanings. In the most general sense, Warr (2011) refers to well-being as defined by the World Health Organization (WHO), as a combination of physical, mental, and social health. It has taken on definitions such as a general state of happiness (Cropanzano & Wright, 1999), a positive state of existence (Chari et al., 2018), and a general feeling of pleasure (Warr, 2007). More recently Chari et al. (2018) describe the emergence of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) conceptual framework of worker well-being, which relies on concepts such as "job satisfaction, employee engagement, positive emotions, good physical or mental health, and quality of social relationships" (p. 589). Chari et al. (2018) define worker well-being as "an integrated concept that characterizes quality of life with respect to an individual's health and work-related environmental, organizational, and psychosocial factors" (p. 590). These authors also argue that there is a lack of theoretical clarity and a lack of appropriate measures of the concept of worker well-being and, thus, have worked to develop a national framework. Their proposed framework identifies five domains that cut across work and non-work settings and include both subjective perceptions and objective environmental conditions. The five domains of well-being include workplace physical environment and safety climate, workplace policies and culture, health status, work evaluation and experience, and the broader home-community-society (Chari et al., 2018).

The History of Worker Well-Being

When considering the history of I-O psychology with respect to worker well-being and WLS, we reach back to 1911 and the publication of *The Principles of Scientific Management* by Frederick Taylor (Taylor, 1911). Eventually referred to Taylorism, many have argued that this approach emphasized the value of production over the costs of unsafe, monotonous work to employee health, safety, and well-being (e.g., Barling & Griffiths, 2011). Others, however, argued that Taylor was one of the first to recognize the importance of the management–employee relationship, and his work actually led to improved health and well-being of workers via shorter work hours (Locke, 1982). On the other end of the spectrum another important yet often overlooked influential scholar was making history. Arthur Kornhauser was a pioneer in work emphasizing worker well-being and was a strong proponent of the importance of worker well-being over organizational interest (for overview of Kornhauser's career see Zickar, 2003). Regardless of one's perspective, it is important to realize that Taylor (1911, 1914) brought some of the first scholarly attention to the management-employee relationship and the structure of work, while Kornhauser was one of the first psychologists focused on worker well-being.

In the early 1900s, unions also evolved out of the need to protect workers from physical hazards, child labor, extreme work hours, and low pay. Soon attention expanded to worker protections from psychosocial hazards. The study of these psychosocial hazards, as a result of social and economic workplace conditions, has evolved as we have developed our understanding of the effects of the workplace on worker health, as well as on worker well-being. The field of psychology has led these scholarly developments along with increased understanding from public health and medicine that environmental conditions are significant contributors to chronic disease. This led to the physiological study of stress processes (Selye, 1946), followed by further refinement of the study of working conditions and their effects on physiological and psychological mechanisms of stress. Thus, along with the interest in physical health, interest also eventually developed in psychological health. While psychopathology is one aspect of psychological health, so is occupational health and well-being. A desire for not just understanding the working conditions that impacted disease but also the working conditions that contributed to well-being developed first in Europe with an emphasis on prevention of safety and health hazards (Levi, 2011).

Another important milestone for worker well-being is the Hawthorne Studies (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). Western Electric was interested in the effects of lighting levels on productivity. What they found, however, was that regardless of the lighting levels implemented, productivity increased because workers were happy that management and researchers were paying attention to their efforts. These studies occurred during the 1930s when workers were not expected to be treated well, had to unionize to gain support for health and safety standards, and management–employee relations were tenuous, at best. These findings led to what is now referred to as the "human relations" movement, where it was finally realized that worker well-being – and paying attention to worker needs – was important to the functioning of workplaces. (See chap. 10 for another perspective on the Hawthorne Studies.) This was mirrored by work in the United Kingdom at the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations (Trist & Bamforth, 1951). Trist and Bamforth (1951) introduced the importance of social relations in the coal-mining industry where work systems were changed to be less autonomous. They concluded that the participation in decision making with higher degrees of autonomy were important to worker health and well-being.

Development of Occupational Health Psychology

Occupational Health Psychology and Worker Well-Being

In the 1960s role theory was developed to address the impact of the social environment of work on worker well-being (Katz & Kahn, 1966, 1978). Kahn et al.(1964) defined psychosocial role stressors that included role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload and their impacts on workers. Similarly, Quinn and Staines (1979), in their work at the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, conducted the 1977 Quality of Employment Survey to assess the effects of labor standards on employee job outcomes, including job satisfaction. These ideas were emerging at the same time as job design theory and the job characteristics model introduced by Hackman and Oldham (1976, 1980). In 1979, Karasek introduced the job demand-control model, which was later elaborated into the job demand-control-support model (Karasek, 1979; Karasek & Theorell, 1990). Social support theory was also emerging as an important theory given the critical relationship between social relationships and health (Cohen & Wills, 1985). All these emerging scholarly empirical and theoretical developments contributed to more interest in the effects of various working conditions on work well-being.

In their review of the history of occupational health psychology (OHP), Barling and Griffiths (2011) note that much of the initial research developments in the area of psychosocial workplace factors related to worker health and well-being originated in Europe and in the Nordic countries where people such as Karasek had originally studied. NIOSH defines OHP as a field involving the application of psychological principles to improving the quality of work-life and promoting the safety, health, and well-being of people at work. OHP is a multidisciplinary field, and OHP researchers and practitioners draw from the domains of public health, preventive medicine, nursing, industrial engineering, law, epidemiology, sociology, gerontology, and psychology to promote worker safety, health, and well-being. Sauter and Hurrell (1999) suggested that OHP emerged in response to three key developments: increased recognition of the relationship between occupational stress and health; increased recognition that psychosocial factors contribute to musculoskeletal disorders; and changes in the organization of work contributing to job stress and workplace safety.

Throughout this history is the scholarly attention given to the critical interface of working conditions in the form of workplace hazards, both physical and psychological, and worker health, safety, and well-being. We argue that these are inextricably intertwined, as one type of hazard is likely to heighten another. For example, threats to safety, whether they are physical threats in the way of unsafe working conditions or workplace violence, can impact health through stress mechanisms. Likewise, threats to well-being, such as work-family conflict, can have an impact on safety (e.g., Cullen & Hammer, 2007). Indeed, OHP addresses workplace stress from the organizational and individual perspectives and utilizes primary prevention approaches, as opposed to taking a secondary or tertiary approach as do wellness programs that aim at individual behavior change (e.g., smoking cessation programs, dietary changes, exercise) alone. For example, if we focus on the causes of the stressors that lead to unhealthy behaviors, as opposed to the behaviors themselves, we can eliminate the hazard, which is a primary prevention approach. Thus, addressing psychosocial stress and worker well-being from a primary prevention approach includes job design strategies such as reducing workload and work pace, work schedule design to provide flexibility, providing opportunity for social interactions at work, and providing jobs that are meaningful to workers (Sauter et al., 1990).

The developments in the 1990s across the globe were remarkable in cementing the clear impact of work on worker well-being and the field of OHP, which was strongly supported by NIOSH and the American Psychological Association (APA). These two institutions collaborated on providing initial seed funding for 13 universities to develop curriculum in the area of OHP. The European Academy of OHP was established in 1998, and in 2005 the Society for OHP (SOHP) was formed. The NIOSH-APA conference on Work, Stress, and Health is now a biannual conference, has been in existence since 1992, and is the main conference for SOHP. OHP remains an emerging discipline with tremendous potential to contribute to occupational health and safety and serves as part of the foundation for Total Worker Health®.

Total Worker Health® and Worker Well-Being

Total Worker Health® (TWH) was launched by NIOSH in 2011 (Schill & Chosewood, 2013). TWH is defined as policies, programs, and practices that integrate protection from work-related safety and health hazards with promotion of injury and illness prevention efforts to advance worker well-being (NIOSH, 2018; Tamers et al., 2019). The concept of TWH was introduced because there was a growing recognition that physical and psychosocial workplace risk factors interact with non-work, family, and individual health factors to affect worker safety, health, and well-being. Thus, this expanded focus of occupational safety and health was born (Schulte

et al., 2019). The term TWH was specifically introduced by NIOSH Director John Howard, and many of the tenants grew out of OHP and the Organization of Work NIOSH priority area. In addition, TWH goes beyond traditional occupational safety and health by including personal risk factors plus organization of work risk factors, as well as broader societal and economic risk factors. There have also been recent calls by NIOSH for further capacity building and workforce development in the area of TWH (NIOSH, 2016; Tamers et al., 2019).

Practitioners of TWH define and implement policies, programs, and practices to improve work-related safety (injury reduction) and promote physical health (illness prevention) to improve workforce productivity, performance, and quality of life (Schill, 2017). TWH research focuses on topics such as stress, physical activity, sleep, pain, work-life balance, physical environment, and ergonomics on outcomes such as job turnover, job satisfaction, absenteeism/presenteeism, and injury (Feltner et al., 2016; NIOSH, 2016; Tamers et al., 2019). TWH efforts address the four domains of 1) research, 2) practice, 3) policy, and 4) capacity building (NIOSH, 2015; Schill, 2017). TWH is a multidisciplinary field that draws heavily on the traditional disciplines in the field of occupational safety and health such as ergonomics, occupational medicine, occupational health nursing, epidemiology, and industrial hygiene with the primary focus on safety.

TWH takes the approach that the workplace, working conditions, and social relationships all contribute to the social determinants of health. The idea that the workplace contributes to health, while drawing on historical accounts, goes back 100 years and is still a fairly new perspective. Scholarly research on the effects of work schedules, hours, stress, co-worker and supervisor relationships, and workload are now well-established with most of the research occurring in I-O psychology and OHP, and over the past 20–30 years that has extended beyond work-related outcomes to the well-being of workers, their families, and their communities. Much of the arguments center around interventions that benefit workers also tend to have beneficial effects on the workplace. While hazard reduction is the first step in any TWH approach, it is important to realize that such hazards are not always safety hazards but can be psychosocial stress hazards associated with unhealthy work that directly affect worker health and well-being and can be just as debilitating as physical hazards (Schnall et al., 2009), such as work-life stress (Hammer & Sauter, 2013).

NIOSH recently updated the graphic depicting the "Issues Relevant to Advancing Worker Well-being Through *Total Worker Health*®" (NIOSH, 2020; see Figure 14.1). This list represents the NIOSH expanded focus for TWH, including new technologies, new working conditions, changing demographics, and issues across the "work-life continuum" such as unemployment, underemployment, and job insecurity, which are all risks to worker safety, health and well-being (Schulte et al., 2019). This expanded focus takes a systems approach by recognizing that there are linkages between health conditions, work, non-work, society, and the economy that can be further exasperated by working conditions and that it is critical to take a multidisciplinary approach. This expanded view of TWH recognizes the interrelationship between work and non-work—further cementing the importance of work-life integration as part of TWH – and is referred to by Schulte et al. (2019) as a paradigm expansion in occupational safety and health to include worker well-being.

The Hierarchy of Controls, originally developed to inform the field of occupational safety and health about categories of occupational hazards and how to control them, has since been adapted to reflect this expanded view of occupational safety and health, referred to as the TWH Hierarchy of Controls (Lee et al., 2016; NIOSH, 2016; Schill, 2017; Tamers et al., 2019; see Figure 14.2). The model calls for first focusing on the elimination of working conditions that cause or contribute to worker illness and injury or otherwise negatively impact well-being, and

Issues Relevant to Advancing Worker Well-Being Using *Total Worker Health*® Approaches

Prevention and Control of Hazards and Exposures
- Biological Agents
- Chemicals
- Ergonomic Factors
- Physical Agents
- Psychosocial Factors
- Risk Assessment and Management

Built Environment Supports
- Accessible and Affordable Health Enhancing Options
- Clean and Equipped Breakrooms, Restrooms, and Lactation Facilities
- Healthy Workspace Design and Environment
- Inclusive and Universal Design
- Safe and Secure Facilities

Community Supports
- Access to Safe Green Spaces and Pathways
- Healthy Community Design
- Safe and Clean Environment (Air and Water Quality, Noise Levels, Tobacco-Free)
- Safe, Healthy, and Affordable Housing Options
- Transportation and Commuting Assistance

Compensation and Benefits
- Adequate Wages and Prevention of Wage Theft
- Affordable, Comprehensive, and Confidential Healthcare Services
- Chronic Disease Prevention and Management Programs
- Continual Learning, Training, and (Re-)Skilling Opportunities
- Disability Insurance (Short- and Long-Term)
- Employee Assistance and Substance Use Disorder Programs
- Equitable Pay, Performance Appraisals, and Promotions
- Minimum Guaranteed Hours
- Paid Time Off (Sick, Vacation, Caregiving, Parental)
- Prevention of Healthcare Cost Shifting to Workers
- Retirement Planning and Benefits
- Work-Life Programs
- Workers' Compensation Benefits

Healthy Leadership
- Collaborative and Participatory Environment
- Corporate Social Responsibility
- Responsible Business Decision-Making
- Supportive Managers, Supervisors, and Executives
- Training
- Worker Recognition, Appreciation, and Respect

Organization of Work
- Adequate Breaks
- Comprehensive Resources
- Fatigue, Burnout, Loneliness, and Stress Prevention
- Job Quality and Quantity
- Meaningful and Engaging Work
- Safe Staffing
- Work Intensification Prevention
- Work-Life Fit

Policies
- Elimination of Bullying, Violence, Harassment, and Discrimination
- Equal Employment Opportunity
- Family and Medical Leave
- Human and Natural Resource Sustainability
- Information Privacy
- Judicious Monitoring of Workers and Biomonitoring Practices
- Optimizing Function and Return-to-Work
- Prevention of Stressful Job Monitoring Practices
- Reasonable Accommodations
- Transparent Reporting Practices
- Whistleblower Protection
- Worker Well-Being Centered
- Workplace Supported Recovery Programs

Technology
- Artificial Intelligence
- Robotics
- Sensors

Work Arrangements
- Contracting and Subcontracting
- Free-Lance
- Global and Multinational
- Multi-Employer
- Non-Standard
- Organizational Restructuring, Downsizing, and Mergers
- Precarious and Contingent
- Small- and Medium-Sized Employers
- Temporary
- Unemployment and Underemployment
- Virtual

Workforce Demographics
- Diversity and Inclusivity
- Multigenerational
- Productive Aging across Lifecourse
- Vulnerable Workers
- Workers with Disabilities

CDC NIOSH

Updated January 2020

Total Worker Health® is a registered trademark of the US Department of Health and Human Services

FIGURE 14.1 NIOSH Issues

FIGURE 14.2 NIOSH Hierarchy of Controls Applied to TWH

if elimination is not possible, then substituting unsafe, unhealthy conditions or practices with safer, health-enhancing policies, programs, and practices that promote safety and health in the workplace. If elimination or substitution is not possible, then it is time to redesign the work environment to promote safety, health, and well-being. The next approach is to educate leadership and workers about psychosocial, safety, and health hazards to improve knowledge. The last strategy is to encourage personal change for improvements to health, safety, and well-being, including support for healthy decision making.

Developed in 2018 and drawing on the TWH approach, the NIOSH Healthy Work Design and Well-Being (HWD) Cross-Sector Program aims to advance worker safety, health, and well-being by improving the design of work, management practices, and the physical and psychosocial work environment. The HWD's holistic perspective focuses on how work affects overall health and well-being, including physical, psychological, social, and economic aspects (NIOSH, 2019).

Finally, the importance of worker well-being rose to a level of national prominence in 2019 when the U.S. Surgeon General reported that the National Academy of Medicine and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration have identified worker well-being as a "nationally important health issue" and that working conditions in particular can improve or damage individual well-being (Adams, 2019, p. 583). The Surgeon General's report on worker well-being emphasized the importance of the addition of well-being to occupational safety and health, stating the important connection between well-being and health and productivity (Adams, 2019). Adams (2019) refers to the NIOSH TWH program as the "science of worker well-being" (p. 584).

Central to advocating for TWH and worker well-being, it is critical to understand the detrimental effects of workplace stress. Given our early knowledge of the effects of stress on the body (Selye, 1946) and the increased understanding of the negative impact of workplace psychosocial conditions such as long work hours, low control over work, and role stress (e.g., Katz & Kahn,

1978) on both worker health and organizational outcomes, addressing workplace stress became more important to both organizational scholars and practitioners. Workplace stress is closely related to worker well-being and costs up to $190 billion in annual U.S. healthcare costs—one of the biggest factors is work-life stress, which costs up to $24 billion (Goh et al., 2015). In their meta-analysis, Goh et al. found that job insecurity increases the odds of reporting poor health by about 50%, high job demands raise the odds of having a physician-diagnosed illness by 35%, and long work hours increase mortality by almost 20% (Goh et al., 2015). A review of research on the work-related stress associated with many psychosocial work organization factors shows a large impact on workplace and societal costs with the projected cost per working person ranging from $17.79 to upward of $1,211.84 (Hassard et al., 2018). Ganster and Rosen (2013) found in their review of work stress and health consistent evidence that job stressors predict several indicators of Cardio Vascular Disease (CVD), even after controlling for an array of CVD risk factors (Ganster & Rosen, 2013). In addition, employees experiencing higher levels of job stress are more at risk for depression, type 2 diabetes, and higher employee health care costs (Ganster & Rosen, 2013). However, it is important to note that lifestyle factors such as exercise and diet are also affected by poor worker well-being (e.g., work-life stress), which can also affect poor health outcomes such as CVD and therefore serve as occupational health hazards (e.g., Hammer & Sauter, 2013).

Work-Life Issues

As we have argued previously, worker well-being is both implicitly and explicitly tied to both work and non-work lives, and one component of this is worker WLS. For the purpose of this section, we define WLS as an umbrella term that incorporates several constructs in the work-life literature. Our definition is for ease of describing the literature broadly rather than being a well-defined and empirically supported concept as a stand-alone, and we refer the reader to work by Greenhaus and Allen (2011) to emphasize that many constructs in the work-family literature exist and the absence of conflict or presence of enrichment is not all inclusive for understanding unique concepts such as work-life balance. Specifically, in their review of the literature, the authors noted that work-family balance is a frequently used term without a clear definition. That is, balance is something written into self-help blogs and popular press, yet balance has represented many different constructs in the literature, including lack of work-family conflict. We chose to focus on WLS in this chapter for the broad reason that it is more inclusive of a range of issues individuals face when managing their work and non-work lives. Indeed scholarship suggests that policies serving only to focus on family benefits may produce backlash (Perrigino et al., 2018), and one potential route to reduce these harmful effects while still providing support and be inclusive of all individuals is focusing on how to support and achieve WLS. In the following section, we highlight several historical perspectives, including a social-political and scholarly background, which have been heavily focused on the work-family interface. Thus, although this section is titled WLS, much of the background will be referred to as it was originally conceptualized.

Sociopolitical Climate

Understanding the challenges faced by individuals as they attempt to balance their work and home began gaining increasing scholarly attention and traction during the 1970s, a trend following the women's rights movement in the 1960s and 70s, where societal pressures and movements were in place demanding equal rights and opportunity for women. In the period during and following

such revolutionary movements, there was an acute and prolific rise in dual-earner households. In the U.S. the increase of married women in the labor force jumped from approximately 25% in 1960 to approximately 60% by 1990 (Pew, 2015), lending credence to the importance of understanding work and family domains, as women were traditionally ascribed homemaker roles. By the 1980s interest and research on the work-life interface saw an expansive upsurge that coincided with research and governmental agendas focused on the "Quality of work-life" (QWL; discussed next). Today, the gender demographics of women in dual earner families of the United States' have varied only slightly since the year 2000, with the percentage of total women in the workforce finally topping that of men according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (Toossi & Morisi, 2017). Topics in the work-life interface are varied, with gender and identity partially responsible for initial momentum and interest in the larger work-family domain, remaining relevant with newer perspectives on gender becoming increasingly accepted and popular. However, the prevailing focus of work and life is about understanding the dynamic interplay between one's work and non-work lives (not just family), and aches for advancement in theoretical perspectives. Over the decades the field has shifted from focusing solely on the negative effects of work on home – and home on work – to understanding how work and home are both central to individuals' personal, psychological, and economic growth. In the following section, we provide a brief historical overview of work-life literature topics and describe the state of research and future directions that have been born out of the historical contexts and events that influence the work-life literature.

Rise of Topics in the Work-Life Interface

As previously mentioned, QWL was partially responsible for the development of interest in worker well-being. QWL can also be linked to WLS. However, QWL was initially defined in many ambiguous terms. The first definition was as a variable, arising in part from the University of Michigan Quality of Employment Study (Quinn & Staines, 1979), followed by organizational approaches, then methods, a movement, and finally a global concept referring to many other concepts (Nadler & Lawler, 1983). Although it can be conceptualized in various forms, in terms of individuals, it is employee perceptions of workplace factors such as control, satisfaction, involvement, work-life balance, and their ties to well-being (Hammer & Sanchez, 2015). More broadly, the QWL movement has been strongly tied to work-life and work-family integration (Kossek, 2016). For example, Kossek (2016) highlights that quality of work-life issues were of the first that were focused on worker satisfaction and resources (e.g., greater flexibility) as important for individuals and families. From there, researchers branched out and began focusing on the intersection of work and non-work life (e.g., family) more specifically, and work-life effectively replaced the term QWL (Kossek, 2016).

Work-Family Conflict

The organization of work has long reflected the ideology that one's work was completely distinct from one's home life or that, when one was at work, their family life was not a factor. In response to this assumption, Kanter (1977) wrote a seminal overview discussing the "myth of separate worlds," where work and family life domains were thought to represent two divergent worlds, lacking meaningful overlap outside of decision making (Kanter, 1977; Kossek, 2016). Indeed, Kanter described thoughts on the dynamic interplay between work and home, and although some work-life perspectives have been changed and clarified over the years, Kanter's view that dynamic relationships between one's work and home exist remains a central pillar in the work-life literature.

The focus on work-family conflict specifically can be traced back to the post-World War II (WWII) era, when the U.S. experienced a profound economic boom. This boom coincided with

a remarkable increase in the number of women in the workforce. In 1948 only 28.6% of the labor force was made up of women, but by 1979 this number was up to 42.1% (U. S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 2017). At the time, women were considered to be central family caretakers, and thus questions began to arise on how participation in the labor force might affect ones' ability to satisfy family role responsibilities. Thus, following Kanter's (1977) piece, much of the early research in the work-life sphere focusing on the interplay between work and home domains has been housed under the idea that work and family interfere with one another (e.g., inter-role conflict; Kahn et al., 1964), in which the responsibilities and pressures in one role make it difficult to meet the needs in the other role(s). Indeed, role conflict perspectives can be credited with inspiring one of the first and most frequently used definitions of work-family conflict: "a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect . . . participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role" (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p. 77). Additionally, the authors described three major forms of work-family conflict: 1) time-based conflict, 2) strain-based conflict, and 3) behavior-based conflict. Work-family or work-life conflict can thus be considered bi-directional, and it is important here to note that it has been the most predominantly studied phenomena captured in the study of the work-life interface. While work-to-family conflict (WTFC) and work-interference with family (WIF) refers to the extent in which work interferes with one's family role, family-to-work conflict (FTWC) and family interference with work (FIW) refers to the extent in which one's family role interferes with their work role. Although the definition of work-family conflict is bidirectional, the literature has been plagued by utilizing the same words to identify different constructs. For instance, the use of the term work-family conflict is broad, but researchers have used it interchangeably to describe only one direction or both, and early on there was an overall lack of attention to utilizing validated measures (Kopelman et al., 1983). Today, it is well understood that work-family or work-life conflict is a type of work-life stress that boasts poorly for employee well-being and has been clarified as an occupational hazard (Hammer & Sauter, 2013). Fortunately, researchers have uncovered a plethora of information that sheds insight into the antecedents and consequences of work-life conflict.

Meta-analytic evidence has provided valuable insight into understanding the predictors of work-life conflict. For instance, Michel et al. (2011) found that those experiencing role stressors were more likely to experience conflict. That is, role stressors (both work and family) and lack of support predict both work-to-family and family-to-work conflict. Additionally, it appears that certain individuals may be more susceptible to experiencing conflict. Allen et al. (2012) found that those who have higher levels of trait negative affect and neuroticism tend to experience more work-family conflict, and those with higher levels of trait positive affect and self-efficacy tend to experience less work-family conflict. Other meta-analytic evidence suggests that there are some very small gender differences in terms of experiencing work-family conflict (Byron, 2005); however, a recent meta-analysis by Shockley et al. (2017) showed that this relationship may be overstated in the literature, that is, work-life conflict experiences do not vary much across gender, although there are situations in which women tend to experience greater levels of FIW (e.g., presence of children). Finally, strain appears to be both an antecedent and consequence of WIF and FIW (both work to family and family to work).

Whereas FTWC is more strongly related to family outcomes and WTFC is more strongly related to work outcomes, both FTWC and WTFC exhibit cross domain effects (e.g., family interference with work is associated with poorer organizational commitment; Amstad et al., 2011). Researchers have also found that there are day-level associated consequences that arise from experiencing more work-family conflict, including physiological reactivity, negative affect, and sleep latency (Almeida et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2017). Finally, research has also shown that there are associations between experiencing work-life stress and poor health behaviors such as smoking, poor food choices, reduced exercise, and less sleep (Hammer & Sauter, 2013).

Work-Life Enrichment

Despite work-family conflict and stress research accounting for the large majority of the literature, the concept of work-life enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006) is also an important topic, which coincided with the positive psychology movement (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). The positive psychology movement began in 1988 when Martin Seligman was nominated as the APA president and announced that positive psychology would be the theme of his term. Positive psychology utilizes a positive orientation to research, focusing on peoples' virtues and how people can be happy and fulfilled. The movement was a response to the field of psychology focusing solely on a disease model of curing mental illness following WWII and was consistent with humanistic psychological perspectives that psychology had been far too long focused on negative outcomes and processes and that there was work to be done to understand virtues and psychological height (Maslow, 1954). Following this influential movement in psychology more generally, researchers in the work-life sphere have also become increasingly interested in understanding the predictors and outcomes associated with the positive side of the work-life interface. That is, researchers have begun focusing on synergy between work and home life domains. Work-family enrichment is perhaps the most prevalent characterization of the positive side of the work-life interface and is defined as the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). As is the case with work-family conflict, work-family enrichment can be classified in terms of directionality. Whereas experiences in one's home or family life that promote quality of life in one's work role can be conceptualized as family-to-work enrichment (FTWE), experiences in one's work life that promote improved quality of life in one's family role are referred to as work-to-family enrichment (WTFE). Like work-family conflict, WTFE and FTWE are multidimensional (Carlson et al, 2006). Both WTFE and FTWE include work-family development and work-family affect, which differ in directionality coinciding with each construct. The third dimension in WTFE is work-to-family capital (e.g., helps me feel personally fulfilled, and this helps to be a better family member), whereas the third FTWE dimension is family-to-work efficiency (e.g., pushes me to minimize distractions while working, and this helps me be a better worker).

Work-family enrichment researchers have been interested in both the predictors and consequences of work-family enrichment to understand how to promote the positive aspects of the work-life interface and establish its positive effects. In terms of factors that promote work-family enrichment, both schedule flexibility and family supportive supervisor behaviors have demonstrated associations with work-family enrichment and subsequent job and family outcomes (Carlson et al., 2010; Odle-Dusseau et al., 2012). In terms of outcomes, McNall et al.'s (2010) meta-analysis demonstrated that WTFE and FTWE positively predicted job satisfaction, affective commitment, family satisfaction, and physical and mental health. Similar to the pattern of effects observed with same and cross domain conflict, McNall et al. (2010) found that same domain associations tend to be more strongly observed; specifically, whereas work-to-family enrichment tends to be more strongly related to work outcomes, family-to-work enrichment tends to be more strongly related to family outcomes.

Intra-Individual and Crossover Effects

Thus far this section has described the organizational and individual predictors of work-life interface variables and organizational and individual outcomes. These processes, where effects are limited primarily to the individual in and outside of the work domain, are broadly housed

under spillover perspectives (Crouter, 1994). Spillover perspectives focus on the intra-individual effects work or family has on cross or across domain outcomes (e.g., work-to-family enrichment facilitates positive experiences at home or psychological health; see Carlson et al., 2006, for a discussion on conceptual distinctions). However, researchers have also been interested in inter-individual effects in the work-life sphere, that is, the research tends to focus on the issues that serve to promote or hinder individual work-life well-being and subsequent consequences. However, social relationships, particularly family relationships, are central to health and well-being (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2011), and therefore understanding the role that work plays on these relationships through the work life interface is also important. Consistent with the disease perspective mentioned earlier and like the early work on the individual outcomes associated with work-life stress, researchers were primarily interested in understanding the negative consequences of work on family. Repetti (1989) found that higher levels of work load were associated with poor day-level behavioral responses to spouses. That is, on days with higher work load, individuals behaviorally expressed more withdrawal and anger toward spouses, though the response appeared to differ dependent on whether there was higher spouse support that day. Additionally, mothers and fathers tend to become more withdrawn from their pre-school children when they have higher levels of job stress (Repetti, 1987; Repetti & Wood, 1997). Studies such as these demonstrate support for an overarching systems perspective. For instance, Bronfenbrenner (1979) described a model in which individuals were part of larger systems including the microsystem (e.g., family, peers,), mesosystems, (e.g., work), exosystems (e.g., neighbors, media), and finally macrosystems (e.g., cultural ideologies). Thus, the previously mentioned research was in part conceptualized with similar frameworks and demonstrates that work can have important cross-domain and individual effects not only on an employee but their family.

Works such as those mentioned earlier have led to important advancements in theoretical understanding of how one's work can affect close others. Crossover is broadly defined as an inter-individual effect where experiences in one domain (positive or negative) affect the experiences and states of others in the alternate domain (Westman, 2001). Similar to other psychological research, crossover was originally conceptualized and focused on how one individual's stress or strain could cross over to affect close others (Bolger et al., 1989). However, again coinciding with the positive psychology movement, the definition of crossover was expanded to include positive states and phenomenon (Westman, 2001). Crossover is thought to occur via multiple possible mechanisms. First, direct crossover occurs between close others via empathy; second, crossover can occur via intervening mechanisms (e.g., indirectly, behaviorally, or in intervening variables); or, finally, it is not the transmission of states from one individual to another, but rather that a stressor or positive factor is mutually shared (Westman, 2001). Despite the expansion of crossover to include positive states and experiences, crossover research in the work-life sphere has tended to produce more research focused on negative crossover, focusing more strongly on work-family conflict among dual earner couples given the demographic makeup of the workforce (e.g., rise in dual earner households; Bakker et al., 2009; Hammer et al., 1997; Matthews et al., 1996; Westman & Etzion, 2005). As crossover research continues to advance, it will be important for scholars to consider how to best refine and predict the theoretical mechanisms at play (e.g., identifying variables such as work-family conflict, which can serve as a spurious stressor for couples). Additionally, considering dual earners have been the focus of crossover research, another challenge is to consider the generalizability of research that focuses on dual-career couples. Oftentimes, researchers place an emphasis on dual-career households (e.g., both members of a couple work), citing rapid increases over the past several decades, however, we call to attention the relative halt in this demographic since the early 2000's. Indeed,

Pew (2015) research indicates that many (e.g., 36–37%) of households with children are single earners.

Special Issues and Public Policy

Other topics in the work-family sphere can be linked to public policy or lack thereof. For instance, although the signing of Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) by President Bill Clinton in 1993 was a symbolic moment in history, it trails far behind the benefits afforded to families in other developed and industrialized countries such as Canada and several countries in Europe, which afford a full year of paid leave. Furthermore, it does not sufficiently deal with the challenges those taking leave may face, including lost wages. This can lead to a lack of utilization of the policy. The sandwiched generation is an excellent example of where this lack of sufficient policy to support families can have detrimental effects. The sandwiched generation refers to individuals who have both child care and aging adult care responsibilities (Hammer & Neal, 2008), and although identifying those classified as sandwich generation members can be challenging, statistics tend to reflect between 10–20% of the population as making up this demographic (Burke & Calvano, 2017). While the introduction of a child has received increased policy support and is expected to continue to do so in the U.S., there are few policies established to support the challenges of managing eldercare, despite the significant increases in the aging of the population. This is a critical gap in terms of work-life well-being and policy, as workers with eldercare caregiving responsibilities face significant financial strain (Parker & Patten, 2013). Further, eldercare has disproportionately fallen on daughters' as opposed to sons' shoulders, which researchers argue also increases the financial, physical, and psychological load carried by women (Grigoryeva, 2014), coupled with the numerous potential career costs (National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine, 2016). Further, the APA's 2007 Stress in America survey showed that women in the sandwich generation feel more stress than any other group as they balance caring for both aging parents and children (APA, 2008). This highlights again the disadvantages faced by women in the work-life sphere and the important consequences.

Another special topic in the work-life sphere related to policy is the introduction of children or family emergencies requiring leave. Following WWII and the increasing prevalence of women in the workforce, considering the role of pregnancy became an important topic for organizations, which considered pregnant employees to be costly. As described previously, following years of back and forth between policy makers, since 1993 eligible U.S. employees can receive up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave in a year afforded by FMLA, but this policy fails to account for the financial hardship families may face during these times. Indeed, paid family leave has been a popular press topic as the 2020 presidential race heats up (Ballotpedia, 2020). Individual states have begun instituting policy that financially supports workers following the addition of a child (e.g., California, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Rhode Island), with Oregon being the first state to pass a mandated parental leave policy in 2019 that requires 100% of wages be paid to low-income workers (HB 2005-B, 2019). In addition to the financial burden placed on workers with families, there are also known constructs such as the motherhood penalty and fatherhood bonus, where gender earning gaps that exist in the U.S. (Menendian et al., 2018) expand in light of parenthood (Budig & England, 2001). Men may be disadvantaged in terms of taking leave, however, as they are frequently cited as taking less leave than women, which may be due to several reasons (e.g., wage gap, fear of colleagues perceptions; Ray et al., 2008; Rudman & Mescher, 2013; Wayne & Cordeiro, 2003). Employees identifying as LGBTQ+ also face unique challenges, as their adoption of a child can be perceived as less legitimate than natural childbirth,

The beliefs of supervisors and coworkers around "non-normative" family leave—including supervisors' misinformation regarding how to enforce FMLA and gender differences in policies that can adversely affect male–male couples—can result in reduced use of benefits and increased family strain (Maxwell et al., 2018).

Historical Gaps

One historical gap in the work-life literature, similar to that of public policy, is that the unique experiences of non-normative families (e.g., single parents, non-heteronormative or cis couples) are largely ignored, which may be reflective in part of the sociopolitical context and a lack of understanding how one's identity may play a role in work-life experiences. Regarding the socio-political context, some types of non-normative marital relationships were increasingly outlawed in states instead offered domestic partnerships (e.g., Hawaii). It was not until 2015 that the U.S. Supreme Court made same-sex marriages legal in all 50 states (i.e., *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 2015). Still, researchers have become increasingly aware of such issues, with works dedicated solely to the unique experiences of underrepresented individuals who may face a host of additional challenges as they navigate the work-life interface. (See chap. 9 for more information about LGBTQ+ workers). For instance, recent chapters have examined the unique challenges of LGBTQ+ individuals and parenting (Huffman et al., in press), holding a status of advanced maternal age and pregnancy in the workplace (Arena et al., 2018), and sandwich generation employees (Parker & Patten, 2013), which have coincided with changes in societal values toward inclusivity.

Another prevalent criticism in the work-family literature is the overreliance on single-source and cross-sectional data (Casper et al., 2007). In recent years, however, there has been an increase in the utilization of multi-source and longitudinal or time-lagged data analyses in top journals, particularly focusing on phenomena such as crossover (e.g., for example, see Carlson et al., 2019). The abilities of analytic software, including multi-level software such as Mplus (Muthén & Muthén, 1998) and free software such as R (R Core Team, 2014), allows for more novel questions to be answered and more rigorous tests to be done. Specifically, researchers are now more able to uncover reciprocal effects, examine multi-level influences, and clarify mechanisms and theoretical processes, and therefore Kanter's (1977) assertion that work and life are dynamically connected is increasingly able to be realized. Still, researchers employing such complex approaches should be aware that they require more of participants and take steps to improve compliance and reduce participant dropout and reactivity.

Researchers are calling out the ambiguous terms used to describe different concepts leading to confusion surrounding definitions of terms such as work-family balance (e.g., Wayne et al., 2017). We highlight this issue here and suggest that researchers focused on work-life would benefit the research community by focusing on theoretical advancement and refinement of concepts in order to provide frameworks to further our understanding the concepts housed under the work-life interface more broadly. For instance demonstrating a framework for WLS after synthesizing the literature and perhaps building off of models such as Wayne et al. (2017) or Hirschi et al.'s (2018) action regulation model of balance.

Organizational Approaches to Improving Work-Life Well-Being

Based on Kanter's (1977) piece and given the general consensus that work and home lives are intertwined and increasing recognition that, as described earlier, both individuals and organizations can suffer negative consequences if they do not effectively manage work-life policies,

researchers have taken approaches to understand how to support improvements in the links between work and home lives. For instance, schedule flexibility is a resource that organizations can offer that serves to benefit all employees and may also be critical for those managing high home life demands, such as family illness, young children, elder, or sandwich care (Hammer & Neal, 2008). In addition to the benefits of family and social support highlighted earlier in terms of work-family conflict and enrichment, it has been established that organizations offering family supportive policies are perceived to be family supportive, and their employees experience higher levels of job satisfaction and affective commitment and lower levels of work-family conflict (Allen, 2001). While supportive policies and supervisors have positive effects on employees, in terms of work-family constructs such as work-family conflict, family-specific support at the supervisory and organizational level is more strongly related to work-family conflict than general support (Kossek et al., 2011). Additionally, intervention work in the work-family sphere is generally regarded as an effective approach that intervenes at the supervisory level and is geared toward reducing the negative consequences associated with work-life conflict (for reviews see Hammer et al., 2016; Hammer & Perry, 2019). Supervisors are in unique positions to connect employees to both organizational resources and emotional support, so their leverage is thought to be critical for employees as they manage their work and home lives. Indeed, supervisor family-supportive behaviors have been linked to many work, non-work, and health outcomes (Crain & Stevens, 2018). Intervention work focusing on training supervisors to be supportive of work and non-work needs has shown that, for individuals who experience increased levels of work-family conflict, the training promotes their job and individual well-being (Hammer et al., 2011), while also suggesting that training supervisors to support employees' work and life needs can facilitate improved supervisor attitudes toward the employees (Hammer et al., 2020).

Lessons Learned From History and Future Directions

We conclude our chapter by highlighting some key take-away messages from this historical overview and future directions as they relate to worker well-being and WLS. As it has been established through a long history of both research and sociopolitical movements, worker well-being is strongly tied to work experiences. That is, we know that workplace conditions and physical, social, and psychological experiences are all linked to worker well-being. For example, reducing hours at work was one of the early missions of unions, aiming to limit the work week. In 1938, the Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted, which required overtime pay for working more than 40 hours per week. However, not much has changed since then; with adults in the U.S. spending long hours at work consistently over recent years (i.e., the average American works 47 hours per week according to Gallup; Saad, 2014), it is expected that worker well-being will remain a critical topic of interest to scholars and the public more generally. I-O psychology has reflected the progression of knowledge development on the critical role of the structure and conditions of work on worker well-being and WLS. In this section we briefly review some key future directions that were born from the history of worker well-being and the work-life interface for this field in light of the important role that I-O psychologists play in affecting worker well-being and WLS. These technological advances have and will continue to play a role in the future of work.

Technology advances are an important consideration in the study of I-O psychology for many reasons, and the implications for worker well-being and WLS may be far-reaching. Technological advances are often thought to promote organizational and worker effectiveness and productivity. For instance, a report by the World Economic Forum (2013) reported that digitization was estimated to create millions of jobs and increase economic output by almost $200

billion dollars. But we draw on research, asking, at what cost? When we consider topics such as boundary management (e.g., do workers prefer to segment their work and non-work lives, and does this fit with the organization?), advances in technology are critical to understanding the challenges workers face as they segment or integrate their lives (e.g., Kossek et al., 2006). Indeed, we are more connected to our coworkers than ever, with organizations using communication tools such as Slack, keeping individuals across organizations constantly in touch with each other via multiple modes (e.g., private chats, group chats, and organizational chats). Whether or not an organization requires employees to be constantly connected is relevant, but workers may also be over-connecting on their own. For instance, people are increasingly reporting checking their emails during non-work times (Madden & Jones, 2008). Additionally, the effect that technology has on spouses is also gaining traction as an interesting topic in the work-life literature. For instance, when employees fail to have effective boundary management and allow workplace technology to interfere in home life, spouses have less commitment to the employees' work (Ferguson et al., 2015). Research has also shown that mobile work is associated with spouses' resentment toward an employees' work and subsequent higher levels of employee turnover intentions (Ferguson et al., 2016). Given the rapid rate of technological developments, organizations are faced with the challenge of how to manage (or not manage) their employees' connectedness during non-work time.

With increased globalization, technological developments leading to job displacement including artificial intelligence, rapid increases in the gig economy where work crosses boundaries with little to no benefits or security, and continued demographic changes in the workforce including older and more diverse workers, the *Future of Work* (also referred to as the 4th Industrial Revolution) has been a growing discussion among top corporate leaders, think tanks, the International Labor Organization, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), to name a few. The recognition of the importance of automation and its impact on workers has never been so evident, and these transformational changes also can be significant threats to worker well-being and WLS by impacting the way work is done, the location and time of work, and the availability of future work.

Given these many changes as they relate to the workforce, society, culture, and the socio-political climate, researchers are challenged with understanding the multi-layer and level issues in worker well-being and work-life interface. We share the perspective of researchers that suggest a more careful focus on *time* is desperately needed in the work-life sphere (Allen et al., 2019) and that coming up with theoretical models that allow for social and scholarly paradigm shifts in the way we are able to examine the boundary and level spanning effects of work on employee well-being (e.g., Mplus allows for novel approaches to empirically examine the cross-level influences on work-life well-being; Muthén & Muthén, 1998) is important to the scholarly development of our field.

Conclusion

By examining the history of worker well-being and the work-life interface, it is clear that the sociopolitical context played a major role in shaping research and perspectives on worker well-being and work-life integration. With the changing nature of work and the changing workforce demographics comes a greater need for I-O psychology to play a primary role in understanding how workplace and conditions and work-life integration impact worker well-being. I-O psychology has evolved over the past century to have an expanded view of worker well-being and WLS that can not only be seen in scholarly works but also in practice with large corporations focusing on the employee experience and even having positions such as

Director of Employee Experience. The importance of work to not only our economic, political, and societal environment has increased with the understanding of the importance of work to individual well-being and WLS.

Acknowledgments

This work was partly supported by the Oregon Institute of Occupational Health Sciences at Oregon Health & Science University via funds from the Division of Consumer and Business Services of the State of Oregon (ORS 656.630), the Oregon Healthy Workforce Center (NIOSH, grant number U19OH010154), and the Psychological Health/Traumatic Brain Injury Research Program under Award No. W81XWH-16-1-0720. Opinions, interpretations, conclusions, and recommendations are those of the authors and are not necessarily endorsed by the NIOSH or Department of Defense. We also would like to thank Lindsey Alley, M.S., for assistance in preparing this chapter.

Discussion Questions

1. What is I-O psychology's role in protecting worker well-being?
2. How can the TWH approach guide workplace initiatives in supporting worker well-being?
3. What are the benefits and drawbacks of focusing on work-life more broadly as opposed to work-family more specifically?
4. Why should organizations care about WLS concepts (e.g., work-family conflict, work-family enrichment, spillover, crossover)?
5. How do you see the Future of Work impacting I-O psychology going forward?

References

Adams, J. M. (2019). The value of worker well-being. *Public Health Reports, 134*(6), 583–586. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033354919878434

Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58*(3), 414–435. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2000.1774

Allen, T. D., French, K. A., Braun, M. T., & Fletcher, K. (2019). The passage of time in work-family research: Toward a more dynamic perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 110*(Part B), 245–257. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.11.013

Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., Saboe, K. N., Cho, E., Dumani, S., & Evans, S. (2012). Dispositional variables and work—family conflict: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*(1), 17–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.04.004

Almeida, D. M., Davis, K. D., Lee, S., Lawson, K. M., Walter, K. N., & Moen, P. (2016). Supervisor support buffers daily psychological and physiological reactivity to work-to-family conflict. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 78*, 165–179. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12252

American Psychological Association. (2008, May). *Sandwich generation moms feeling the squeeze*. American Psychological Association. www.apa.org/helpcenter/sandwich-generation

Amstad, F. T., Meier, L. L., Fasel, U., Elfering, A., & Semmer, N. K. (2011). A meta-analysis of work—family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus matching-domain relations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16*(2), 151–169. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022170

Arena, D. F., Brady, J. M., & Jones, K. P. (2018). Modern moms: Dissecting the experiences of older pregnant employees. In R. J. Burke & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Violence and abuse in and around organisations* (pp. 171–190). Routledge.

Bakker, A. B., Westman, M., & Hetty van Emmerik, I. J. (2009). Advancements in crossover theory. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 24*(3), 206–219. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940910939304

Ballotpedia. (2020, January 29). 2020 presidential candidates on paid leave. *Presidential Elections: Road to the White House*. https://ballotpedia.org/2020_presidential_candidates_on_paid_leave

Barling, J., & Griffiths, A. (2011). A history of occupational health psychology. In L. E. Tetrick & J. C. Quick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 21–34). American Psychological Association.

Bolger, N., DeLongis, A., Kessler, R. C., & Wethington, E. (1989). The contagion of stress across multiple roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51*(1), 175–183. https://doi.org/10.2307/352378

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *Ecology of human development*. Harvard University Press.

Budig, M. J., & England, P. (2001). The wage penalty for motherhood. *American Sociological Review, 66*(2), 204–225. https://doi.org/10.2307/2657415

Burke, R. J., & Calvano, L. M. (Eds.). (2017). *The sandwich generation: Caring for oneself and others at home and at work*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work—family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*(2), 169–198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.08.009

Carlson, D. S., Grzywacz, J. G., & Kacmar, K. M. (2010). The relationship of schedule flexibility and outcomes via the work-family interface. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25*(4), 330–355. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941011035278

Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Wayne, J. H., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2006). Measuring the positive side of the work—family interface: Development and validation of a work—family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*(1), 131–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.02.002

Carlson, D. S., Thompson, M. J., & Kacmar, K. M. (2019). Double crossed: The spillover and crossover effects of work demands on work outcomes through the family. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 104*(2), 214–228. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000348

Casper, W. J., Eby, L. T., Bordeaux, C., Lockwood, A., & Lambert, D. (2007). A review of research methods in IO/OB work-family research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 28–43. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.28

Chari, R., Chang, C.-C., Sauter, S., Petrun Sayers, E. L., Cerully, J., Schulte, P., Schill, A., & Uscher-Pines, L. (2018). Expanding the paradigm of occupational safety and health: A new framework for worker well-being [Data set]. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 60*(7), 589–593). https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000001330

Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 98*(2), 310–357. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.310

Crain, T. L., & Stevens, S. (2018). Family-supportive supervisor behaviors: A review and recommendations for research and practice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 39*(7), 869–888. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2320

Cropanzano, R., & Wright, T. A. (1999). A 5-year study of change in the relationship between well-being and job performance. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 51*(4), 252–265. https://doi.org/10.1037/1061-4087.51.4.252

Crouter, A. C. (1994). Processes linking families and work: Implications for behavior and development in both settings. In R. D. Parke & S. Kellam (Eds.), *Exploring family relationships with other social contexts* (pp. 55–79). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cullen, J. C., & Hammer, L. B. (2007). Developing and testing a theoretical model linking work-family conflict to employee safety. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(3), 266–278. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.3.266

Feltner, C., Peterson, K., Palmieri Weber, R., Cluff, L., Coker-Schwimmer, E., Viswanathan, M., & Lohr, K. N. (2016). The effectiveness of total worker health interventions: A systematic review for a national institutes of health pathways to prevention workshop. *Annals of Internal Medicine, 165*(4), 262. https://doi.org/10.7326/M16-0626

Ferguson, M., Carlson, D., Boswell, W., Whitten, D., Butts, M. M., & Kacmar, K. M. (2016). Tethered to work: A family systems approach linking mobile device use to turnover intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 101*(4), 520–534. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000075

Ferguson, M., Carlson, D., & Kacmar, K. M. (2015). Flexing work boundaries: The spillover and crossover of workplace support. *Personnel Psychology, 68*(3), 581–614. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12084

Ganster, D. C., & Rosen, C. C. (2013). Work stress and employee health: A multidisciplinary review. *Journal of Management, 39*(5), 1085–1122. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313475815

Goh, J., Pfeffer, J., Zenios, S. A., & Rajpal, S. (2015). Workplace stressors & health outcomes: Health policy for the workplace. *Behavioral Science & Policy, 1*(1), 43–52. https://doi.org/10.1353/bsp.2015.0001

Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work—family balance: A review and extension of the literature. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 165–183). American Psychological Association.

Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *The Academy of Management Review, 10*(1), 76–88. https://doi.org/10.2307/258214

Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review, 31*(1), 72–92. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.19379625

Grigoryeva, A. (2014). *When gender trumps everything: The division of parent care among siblings*. Center for the Study of Social Organization. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/034a/de5fdcf9ae619264d3a8a38d21afc0e1296b.pdf

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*(2), 250–279. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Addison-Wesley.

Hammer, L. B., Allen, E., & Grigsby, T. D. (1997). Work—family conflict in dual-earner couples: Within-individual and crossover effects of work and family. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50*(2), 185–203. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.1557

Hammer, L. B., Brady, J. M., & Perry, M. L. (2020). Training supervisors to support veterans at work: Effects on supervisor attitudes and employee sleep and stress. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 93*(2), 273–301. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12299

Hammer, L. B., Demsky, C. A., Kossek, E. E., & Bray, J. W. (2016). Work-family intervention research. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of work and family* (pp. 349–361). Oxford University Press.

Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Anger, W. K., Bodner, T., & Zimmerman, K. L. (2011). Clarifying work—family intervention processes: The roles of work—family conflict and family-supportive supervisor behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(1), 134–150. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020927

Hammer, L. B., & Neal, M. B. (2008). Working sandwiched-generation caregivers: Prevalence, characteristics, and outcomes. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal, 11*(1), 93–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/10887150801967324

Hammer, L. B., & Perry, M. L. (2019). Reducing work—life stress: The place for integrated interventions. In H. L. Hudson, J. A. S. Nigam, S. L. Sauter, L. C. Chosewood, A. L. Schill, & J. Howard (Eds.), *Total worker health* (pp. 263–278). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/0000149-016

Hammer, L. B., & Sanchez, D. (2015). Quality of work life. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 1290–1291). SAGE Publications.

Hammer, L. B., & Sauter, S. (2013). Total worker health and work—life stress: *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 55*, S25–S29. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000043

Hassard, J., Teoh, K. R. H., Visockaite, G., Dewe, P., & Cox, T. (2018). The cost of work-related stress to society: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 23*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000069

HB 2005-B. (2019). Oregon State Legislature Regular Session, 33 (2019). www.jacksonlewis.com/sites/default/files/docs/OregonHB2005Enrolled.pdf

Hirschi, A., Shockley, K. M., & Zacher, H. (2018). Achieving work-family balance: An action regulation model. *Academy of Management Review, 44*(1), 150–171. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2016.0409

Holt-Lunstad, J., Steffen, P. R., Sandberg, J., & Jensen, B. (2011). Understanding the connection between spiritual well-being and physical health: An examination of ambulatory blood pressure, inflammation, blood lipids and fasting glucose. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 34*(6), 477–488. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-011-9343-7

Huffman, A. H., Smith, N. A., & Howes, S. S. (in press). LGBT parents and the workplace. In A. E. Goldberg & K. R. Allen (Eds.), *LGBTQ-parent families: Possibilities for new research and implications for practice*. Springer.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. Wiley.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Work and family in the United States: A critical review and agenda for research and policy*. Russel Sage Foundation. www.jstor.org/stable/10.7758/9781610443265

Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*(2), 285–308. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392498

Karasek, R. A., & Theorell, T. (1990). *Healthy work: Stress, productivity, and the reconstruction of working life*. Basic Books.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. Wiley.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Kopelman, R. E., Greenhaus, J. H., & Connolly, T. F. (1983). A model of work, family, and interrole conflict: A construct validation study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 32*(2), 198–215. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(83)90147-2

Kossek, E. E. (2016). Managing work-life boundaries in the digital age. *Special Issue: Enabling Career Success, 45*(3), 258–270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2016.07.010

Kossek, E. E., Lautsch, B. A., & Eaton, S. C. (2006). Telecommuting, control, and boundary management: Correlates of policy use and practice, job control, and work-family effectiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*(2), 347–367. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.07.002

Kossek, E. E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T., & Hammer, L. B. (2011). Workplace social support and work–family conflict: A meta-analysis clarifying the influence of general and work–family-specific supervisor and organizational support. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(2), 289–313. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01211.x

Lee, M. P., Hudson, H., Richards, R., Chang, C.-C., Chosewood, L., & Schill, A. L. (2016). *Fundamentals of Total Worker Health approaches: Essential elements for advancing worker safety, health, and well-being* (Publication No. 2017–112; pp. 1–24). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. https://doi.org/10.26616/NIOSHPUB2017112

Lee, S., Crain, T. L., McHale, S. M., Almeida, D. M., & Buxton, O. M. (2017). Daily antecedents and consequences of nightly sleep. *Journal of Sleep Research, 26*(4), 498–509. https://doi.org/10.1111/jsr.12488

Levi, L. (2011). Forward: Narrowing the science-policy gap. In L. E. Tetrick & J. C. Quick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. xi–xvi). American Psychological Association.

Locke, E. A. (1982). The ideas of Frederick W. Taylor: An evaluation. *Academy of Management Review, 7*(1), 14–24. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1982.4285427

Madden, M., & Jones, S. (2008). *Networked workers*. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2008/09/24/networked-workers/

Maslow, A. H. (1954). The instinctoid nature of basic needs. *Journal of Personality, 22*, 326–347. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1954.tb01136.x

Matthews, L. S., Conger, R. D., & Wickrama, K. A. S. (1996). Work-family conflict and marital quality: Mediating processes. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 59*(1), 62–79. https://doi.org/10.2307/2787119

Maxwell, M. B., Johnson, Esq., A., Lee, M., & Miranda, L. (2018). *2018 U.S. LBGTQ paid leave survey* (p. 55). Human Rights Campaign Foundation, Public Education & Research. https://assets2.hrc.org/files/assets/resources/2018-HRC-LGBTQ-Paid-Leave-Survey.pdf

McNall, L. A., Nicklin, J. M., & Masuda, A. D. (2010). A meta-analytic review of the consequences associated with work—family enrichment. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*(3), 381–396. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9141-1

Menendian, S., Elsheikh, E., & Gambhir, S. (2018). *2018 inclusiveness index: Measuring global inclusion and marginality* (p. 52). Haas Institute. berkeley.edu/inclusivenessindex

Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A., & Baltes, B. B. (2011). Antecedents of work—family conflict: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32*(5), 689–725.

Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (1998). *Mplus user's guide* (8th ed.). Muthén & Muthén.

Nadler, D. A., & Lawler, E. E. (1983). Quality of work life: Perspectives and directions. *Organizational Dynamics, 11*(3), 20–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(83)90003-7

National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine. (2016). *Families caring for an aging America* (p. 366). The National Academies Press.

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. (2015, November). *Issues relevant to advancing worker well-being through Total Worker Health*. www.cdc.gov/niosh/twh/pdfs/TWH-Issues-4x3_10282015_final.pdf

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. (2016). *National Occupational Research Agenda (NORA), National Total Worker Health Agenda (2016–2026): A national agenda to advance Total Worker Health research, practice, policy, and capacity* (Publication No. 2016–114; pp. 1–19). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. https://doi.org/10.26616/NIOSHPUB2016114

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. (2018, December 18). *What is Total Worker Health?* www.cdc.gov/niosh/twh/totalhealth.html

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. (2019, January 4). *Healthy work design and well-being program* [Government]. NIOSH Program Portfolio. www.cdc.gov/niosh/programs/hwd/default.html

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. (2020). *Issues relevant to advancing worker well-being using Total Worker Health approaches.* www.cdc.gov/niosh/twh/pdfs/Issues-Graphic-2020_508.pdf

Obergefell v. Hodges. (2015). 576 U.S. __.

Odle-Dusseau, H. N., Britt, T. W., & Greene-Shortridge, T. M. (2012). Organizational work—family resources as predictors of job performance and attitudes: The process of work—family conflict and enrichment. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 17*(1), 28–40. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026428

Parker, K., & Patten, E. (2013, January 30). The sandwich generation: Rising financial burdens for middle-aged Americans. *Pew Research Center, Social & Demographic Trends Project.* www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/01/30/the-sandwich-generation/

Perrigino, M. B., Dunford, B. B., & Wilson, K. S. (2018). Work—family backlash: The "dark side" of work—life balance (WLB) policies. *Academy of Management Annals, 12*(2), 600–630. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0077

Pew. (2015, November 4). Raising kids and running a household: How working parents share the load. *Pew Research Center, Social & Demographic Trends Project.* www.pewsocialtrends.org/2015/11/04/raising-kids-and-running-a-household-how-working-parents-share-the-load/

Quinn, R. P., & Staines, G. L. (1979). *The 1977 quality of employment survey.* University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015071885235

R Core Team. (2014). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing.* R Foundation for Statistical Computing. www.R-project.org/

Ray, R., Gornick, J. C., & Schmitt, J. (2008). *Parental leave policies in 21 countries: Assessing generosity and gender equality* (p. 23). Center for Economic and Policy Research. www.lisdatacenter.org/wp-content/uploads/parent-leave-report1.pdf

Repetti, R. L. (1987). Linkages between work and family roles. *Applied Social Psychology Annual, 7*, 98–127.

Repetti, R. L. (1989). Effects of daily workload on subsequent behavior during marital interaction: The roles of social withdrawal and spouse support. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*(4), 651–659. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.57.4.651

Repetti, R. L., & Wood, J. (1997). Effects of daily stress at work on mothers' interactions with preschoolers. *Journal of Family Psychology, 11*(1), 90–108. https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.11.1.90

Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. (1939). *Management and the worker.* Harvard University Press.

Rudman, L. A., & Mescher, K. (2013). Penalizing men who request a family leave: Is flexibility stigma a femininity stigma? *Journal of Social Issues, 69*(2), 322–340. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12017

Saad, L. (2014). The "40-hour" workweek is actually longer—by seven hours. *Gallup.* https://news.gallup.com/poll/175286/hour-workweek-actually-longer-seven-hours.aspx

Sauter, S. L., & Hurrell, J. J., Jr. (1999). Occupational health psychology: Origins, context, and direction. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 30*(2), 117–122. https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.30.2.117

Sauter, S. L., Murphy, L. R., & Hurrell, J. J. (1990). Prevention of work-related psychological disorders. *American Psychologist, 45*(10), 1146–1158. https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066x.45.10.1146

Schill, A. L. (2017). Advancing well-being through Total Worker Health®. *Workplace Health & Safety, 65*(4), 158–163. https://doi.org/10.1177/2165079917701140

Schill, A. L., & Chosewood, L. C. (2013). The NIOSH Total Worker Health™ Program: An overview. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 55*, S8–S11. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000037

Schnall, P. L., Dobson, M., & Rosskam, E. (2009). *Unhealthy work: Causes, consequences, cures.* Baywood Pub. Co.

Schulte, P. A., Delclos, G., Felknor, S. A., & Chosewood, L. C. (2019). Toward an expanded focus for occupational safety and health: A commentary. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16*(24), 4946. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16244946

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5

Selye, H. (1946). The general adaptation syndrome and the diseases of adaptation. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism, 6*(2), 117–230. https://doi.org/10.1210/jcem-6-2-117

Shockley, K. M., Shen, W., DeNunzio, M. M., Arvan, M. L., & Knudsen, E. A. (2017). Disentangling the relationship between gender and work—family conflict: An integration of theoretical perspectives using meta-analytic methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(12), 1601–1635. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000246

Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. (1985). *Guidelines for education and training at the doctoral level in industrial/ organizational psychology.* Author.

Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. (1999). *Guidelines for education and training at the doctoral level in industrial-organizational psychology.* Author. www.academia.edu/15399784/Guidelines_for_Education_and_Training_at_the_Doctoral_Level_in_Industrial-Organizational_Psychology

Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. (2016). *Guidelines for education and training in industrial-organizational psychology.* Author. www.siop.org/Portals/84/Educators/SIOP_ET_Guidelines_2017.pdf

Tamers, S., Chosewood, L., Childress, A., Hudson, H., Nigam, J., & Chang, C.-C. (2019). Total Worker Health® 2014–2018: The novel approach to worker safety, health, and well-being evolves. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16*(3), 321. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16030321

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management.* Harper & Row.

Taylor, Frederick W. (1914). Scientific management: Reply from Mr. F. W. Taylor. *The Sociological Review, 07*(3), 266–269. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.1914.tb02387.x

Toossi, M., & Morisi, T. L. (2017). Women in the workforce before, during, and after the great recession. *U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 21.* www.bls.gov/spotlight/2017/women-in-the-workforce-before-during-and-after-the-great-recession/pdf/women-in-the-workforce-before-during-and-after-the-great-recession.pdf

Trist, E. L., & Bamforth, K. W. (1951). Some social and psychological consequences of the longwall method of coal-getting: An examination of the psychological situation and defences of a work group in relation to the social structure and technological content of the work system. *Human Relations, 4*(1), 3–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675100400101

U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau (2017). *Civilian labor force by sex, 1948–2016 annual averages.* www.dol.gov/agencies/wb/data/facts-over-time/women-in-the-labor-force#civilian-labor-force-by-sex

Warr, P. (2007). Searching for happiness at work. *The Psychologist, 20*(12), 726–729.

Warr, P. B. (2011). *Work, happiness, and unhappiness.* Taylor & Francis.

Wayne, J. H., Butts, M. M., Casper, W. J., & Allen, T. D. (2017). In search of balance: A conceptual and empirical integration of multiple meanings of work—family balance. *Personnel Psychology, 70*(1), 167–210. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12132

Wayne, J. H., & Cordeiro, B. L. (2003). Who is a good organizational citizen? Social perception of male and female employees who use family leave. *Sex Roles, 49*(5/6), 233–246. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024600323316

Westman, M. (2001). Stress and strain crossover. *Human Relations, 54*(6), 717–751. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726701546002

Westman, M., & Etzion, D. (2005). The crossover of work-family conflict from one spouse to the other. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35*(9), 1936–1957. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02203.x

World Economic Forum. (2013). *The global information technology report 2013: Growth and jobs in a hyperconnected world* [Insight Report]. The World Economic Forum and INSEAD. http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GITR_Report_2013.pdf

Zickar, M. J. (2003). Remembering Arthur Kornhauser: Industrial psychology's advocate for worker well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(2), 363.

Series in Applied Psychology

Jeanette N. Cleveland, *Colorado State University*
Donald Truxillo, *Portland State University*
Edwin A. Fleishman, *Founding Series Editor (1987–2010)*
Kevin R. Murphy, *Emeritus Series Editor (2010–2018)*

Bridging both academic and applied interests, the Applied Psychology Series offers publications that emphasize state-of-the-art research and its application to important issues of human behavior in a variety of societal settings. To date, more than 50 books in various fields of applied psychology have been published in this series.

Patterns of Life History
The Ecology of Human Individuality
Michael D. Mumford, Garnett Stokes, and William A. Owens

Work Motivation
Uwe E. Kleinbeck, Hans-Henning Quast, Henk Thierry, and Hartmut Häcker

Teamwork and the Bottom Line
Groups Make a Difference
Ned Rosen

Aging and Work in the 21st Century
Edited by Kenneth S. Schultz and Gary A. Adams

Employee Retention and Turnover
Peter W. Hom, David G. Allen and Rodger W. Griffeth

Diversity Resistance in Organizations 2e
Kecia M. Thomas

Positive Psychological Science 2e
Stewart I. Donaldson, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi and Jeanne Nakamura

Historical Perspectives in Industrial and Organizational Psychology 2e
Edited by Laura Koppes Bryan

For more information about this series, please visit: www.routledge.com/Series-in-Applied-Psychology/book-series/SAP

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES IN INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

SECOND EDITION

Edited by Laura Koppes Bryan

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

First published 2021
by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2021 Taylor & Francis

The right of Laura Koppes Bryan to be identified as the author of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Koppes, Laura L. (Laura Leigh), 1961– editor.
Title: Historical perspectives in industrial and organizational psychology / [edited by] Laura Koppes Bryan.
Description: Second edition. | New York, NY : Routledge, 2021. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2020039078 (print) | LCCN 2020039079 (ebook) | ISBN 9780367146030 (hardback) | ISBN 9780367146054 (paperback) | ISBN 9780429052644 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Psychology, Industrial—History. | Organizational behavior—History.
Classification: LCC HF5548.8 .H53 2021 (print) | LCC HF5548.8 (ebook) | DDC 158.7—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2020039078
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2020039079

ISBN: 978-0-367-14603-0 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-367-14605-4 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-0-429-05264-4 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

This volume is dedicated to all individuals who advance the science, practice, teaching, and service of industrial and organizational psychology.