Edinburgh Research Explorer

Moving the Boundaries of I-O, or of work itself?

Moving the Boundaries of I-O, or of *work itself*?

Ishbel McWha-Hermann (corresponding author)

University of Edinburgh Business School

29 Buccleuch Place, Edinburgh, EH8 9JS

United Kingdom

Email: Ishbel.McWha@ed.ac.uk

Phone: +44 131 651 5466

Ines Meyer

University of Cape Town

South Africa

Stuart C. Carr

Massey University

New Zealand

Rosalind Searle

University of Glasgow

United Kingdom

We concur with the authors that I-O psychology needs to expand its boundaries. It is encouraging that over the past 15 years, increasingly, I-O research and practice have been used as a force for good, including by linking with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Those who wish to read about or expand their work into this area can choose from numerous publications in the field of humanitarian work psychology (HWP) (e.g., Blustein & Flores, 2023; Carr, et al, 2012; Carr et al, 2023; McWha-Hermann, et al, 2015; Olson-Buchanan, et al, 2013; Reichman, 2014). There are also countless special issues and many influential papers which are too numerous to list here. We agree that the SDGs can be a helpful frame of reference for understanding the grand challenges as they stand today, however we propose that moving the boundaries of our discipline is not sufficient - a bolder shift is needed in order to address the seismic challenges in the world of work since the current goals came into force. These changes are the grand challenges of the future - indeed many are already here.

We frame our commentary around three points: first, we argue for a more ambitious role for I-O psychology that looks beyond the current SDGs, to proactively shaping goals for the future. Second, we emphasize the need to shift beyond 'the job' and 'organization,' to much broader and more inclusive conceptualizations of work. Finally, we draw out the importance of fostering pathways and partnerships for influence, building on existing networks and relationships.

I-O Psychology for future (not current) goals

We propose that the boundaries of I-O psychology should be stretched <u>beyond</u> the SDGs and urge our discipline to be more ambitious and strategic in where we set our sights and agendas for influence. The SDGs are a time-limited framework. They came into force in 2015 designed to run until 2030. Just as the SDGs replaced their predecessor (the

M(illennium)DGs) so too will the SDGs be replaced by something new - one imagines a further set of goals developed from an evaluation of the progress made and fresh global consultations, to identify the most pressing emerged issues – including Climate Action (currently SDG-13). Rather than focusing on the current goals, we should instead be anticipating the future and ensuring we play a proactive role in shaping the next global development agenda. To do this we must articulate our vision for the future of work, taking into consideration what work is likely to look like in 10, 20, 50 years in light of the changed and changing nature of work.

I-O Psychology beyond 'the job'

In I-O psychology to-date, and in the current SDGs, much reliance has been placed on 'the job.' As early as 2012, the International Labour Organization (ILO) stated that the nature of work has shifted from a standard employment relationship - based on permanent employment and security - to precarious work arrangements, a short-term focus, with a lack of security or future prospects, and a stronger neo-liberal agenda. Some argue that the Covid-19 pandemic has accelerated this change. In addition to this shift away from the standard employment relationship, for the majority of those who work the standard employment relationship has never existed at all. Two thirds of the world's population work in the informal sector (OECD, 2023a). Our traditional focus on formal employment in 'jobs' therefore already overlooks the vast majority of the world's actual workforce. Is it appropriate, then, for I-O psychology to consider permanent and secure work in a 'job' as the standard?

I-O psychologists are already prioritizing alternative conceptualizations such as decent work (e.g. Ferraro, et al., 2018; Blustein, et al, 2016), and sustainable livelihoods (Carr et al., 2021; DiFabio, 2017; Haar, et al., 2018). These broader and more inclusive

alternatives allow greater flexibility to adapt with the changing nature of work, thinking more holistically about what it means to work. They are well aligned with current development goals, and they are likely to be of key importance in future development agendas.

Engaging with broader level questions like how work is conceptualized, matters as we recognize that I-O psychology theory and practice are based on a particular view of employment and employee. We need to reconsider the concept of work to be more inclusive of different cultures and contexts, and to include activities which have not historically been under the purview of I-O psychology, yet are *work*. Scholars in other fields have already begun to expand conceptualizations of work, for example by looking at surrogacy in India as a form of work (limki, 2018) or of organizations as entities providing care rather than entities in which human beings' performance needs to be managed (Elley-Brown & Pringle, 2021). Engagement with such issues is important as it might protect us, for example, from unwittingly contributing to reinforcing unsustainable economic models and systems and potentially destructive practices – despite our best intentions. It might assist us to contribute towards more decent and livelihood-sustaining work for all; work, not jobs, which serves as a source of dignity, security, and hope for future generations, in a constantly changing world.

Basic Income, for example, is not included in the SDGs, but is likely to become a key conversation, alongside living hours - not bare minimum wages (ILO, 2022).   Alongside this is an increasing reliance on the platform economy, and the role of gig work (ILO, 2021). As well as shifting away from 'jobs', this brings into question the continued relevance of a focus on 'the organization'. If people work in platforms rather than organizations, concepts like 'organizational commitment' need to change, rendered as redundant in an environment where spans of control encompass tens of thousands of task workers, and raising questions if platform workers can be considered employees at all (Carr, 2023). Furthermore, the rapidly changing technological landscape, including the rise of AI, will bring unprecedented and

unexpected changes to the world of work, opening up new pathways of vulnerability (Weibal, et al, 2023).

Additionally, work also both affects and is affected by the climate, an issue of increasing priority for policymakers. Work can potentially regenerate an ecosystem, for example by executing work through a truck powered with green hydrogen instead of diesel, or through building carbon offsetting into workforce planning. Hence, in addition to inclusion of alternative forms of work, future conceptualizations of work will need to fundamentally rethink the way work is organized to reflect its carbon intensity, contributions to society, etc. (Aust, et al, 2020; Carr, et al, 2023).

Pathways and partnerships for influence

As well as articulating our vision for the future of work, we must develop and deepen pathways to influence global development agendas so that we play a proactive and leading role in shaping those agendas. Existing pathways should be strengthened and amplified. One such pathway is through partnering with other psychological associations and leveraging shared resources to amplify our science. SIOP already engages in this work through active membership in the Alliance for Organizational Psychology, and through NGO status with the United Nations and membership of the Psychology Coalition at the UN. Beyond existing partnerships, the European Association of Work and Organisational Psychology (EAWOP) Impact Incubator, offers a platform for translating psychological research to be digestible and accessible for policymakers – utilizing novel and engaging methodologies to translate the latest psychological research to policymakers across Europe. By partnering with the EAWOP Impact Incubator the SIOP UN team could create evidence-based resources which can help influence the UN. We must leverage existing partnerships through deepening dialogues, to understand what is needed by the UN and generate knowledge in response. Beyond dialogue

with the UN directly we must look to our relationships with businesses, small and medium enterprises (SMEs), social enterprises, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to create stronger partnerships for sustainable livelihoods (OECD, 2023b).

A proactive approach to shaping the future agenda is required, both, through working with other psychological associations, but also through ensuring our vision for the future of work is articulated clearly and simply in order to be accessible to decision makers.

Future global development agendas will not be apolitical, and neither are the SDGs (Blustein, et al, 2016). They are not neutral but are the result of extensive lobbying by multiple stakeholders. I-O psychologists such as Walter Reichman, Mary O'Neill Berry and John Scott lobbied for representation of psychology in the SDGs. By drawing on the breadth of research evidence now available in the field of humanitarian work psychology and by being deliberate about the kind of ideologies in relation to work which we as I-O psychology researchers and practitioners want to reflect, our discipline is now even better positioned to contribute to this future agenda.

In conclusion, we applaud the authors for further developing the scope of our discipline, plus as we have highlighted through this commentary, we argue that framing this around the SDGs is limiting, because they will become dated, and soon their replacement will be in the works. We should thus be actively shaping the agenda for these next goals, advocating for sustainable livelihoods, wellbeing and a new conceptualization of work which is inclusive of all types of work in all geographic contexts – paid and unpaid, formal and informal, rural and urban, and all others.

References

Aust, I., Matthews, B., & Muller-Camen, M. (2020). Common Good HRM: A paradigm shift in Sustainable HRM?. *Human Resource Management Review*, *30*(3), 100705.

Blustein, D. L., & Flores, L. Y. (Eds.). (2023). *Rethinking Work: Essays on Building a Better Workplace*. Taylor & Francis.

Blustein, D. L., Olle, C., Connors-Kellgren, A., & Diamonti, A. J. (2016). Decent work: A psychological perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*, 407.

Carr, S. C. (2023, May). Closing Plenary Keynote. *What makes a livelihood sustainable*? EAWOP (European Association of Work and Organisational Psychology), Katowice, Poland.

Carr, S. C., MacLachlan, M., & Furnham, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Humanitarian work psychology*. Springer.

Carr, S. C., Hodgetts, D. J., Potgieter, J., & Meyer, I. (2021). Macropsychology for Decent Work: Sustainable Livelihood. *Macropsychology: A Population Science for Sustainable Development Goals*, 213-231.

Carr, S.C., Hopner, V., Hodgetts, D. & Young, M. (Eds). (2023). *Tackling Precarious Work: Toward Sustainable Livelihoods*. Routledge.

DiFabio, A. (2017). The psychology of sustainability and sustainable development for well-being in organizations. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, Article 1534.

Elley-Brown, M.J. & Pringle, J.K. (2021). Sorge, Heideggerian Ethic of Care: Creating More Caring Organizations, *Journal of Business Ethics*, *168*(1), 23-35.

Ferraro, T., Pais, L., Rebelo Dos Santos, N., & Moreira, J. M. (2018). The Decent Work Questionnaire: Development and validation in two samples of knowledge workers. *International Labour Review*, *157*(2), 243-265.

Haar, J., Carr, S. C., Arrowsmith, J., Parker, J., Hodgetts, D., & Alefaio-Tugia, S. (2018). Escape from working poverty: Steps toward sustainable livelihood. *Sustainability*, *10*(11), 4144.

ILO (2012). *From Precarious Work to Decent Work: Outcome Document to the Workers'
Symposium on Policies and Regulations to combat Precarious Employment*. International
Labour Office; Bureau for Workers' Activities.

ILO (2021). *World Employment and Social Outlook 2021: The role of digital labour
platforms in transforming the world of work*. International Labour Office – Geneva: ILO.

ILO. (2022). *Setting adequate wages: The question of living wages*. Geneva: ILO.

Limki, R. (2018). On the coloniality of work: Commercial surrogacy in India. *Gender, Work
& Organization, 25*(4), 327-342.

McWha-Hermann, I., Maynard, D. C., & Berry, M. O. N. (Eds.). (2015). *Humanitarian work
psychology and the global development agenda: Case studies and interventions*. Routledge.

OECD. (2023a). *Informality and globalisation: In search of a new social contract*. Paris:
OECD.

OECD. (2023b). *21st-century governance*. Paris: OECD.

Olson-Buchanan, J. B., Bryan, L. L. K., & Thompson, L. F. (Eds.). (2013). *Using industrial-
organizational psychology for the greater good: Helping those who help others*. Routledge.

Reichman, W. (Ed.). (2014). *Industrial and organizational psychology help the vulnerable:
Serving the underserved*. Springer.

Weibel, A., Schafheitle, S. and van der Werff, L. (2023), Smart Tech is all Around us –
Bridging Employee Vulnerability with Organizational Active Trust-Building. *Journal of
Management Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12940