

**Miller, Diane M. (CDC/NIOSH/EID)**

---

**From:** eohtlg@gwumc.edu  
**Sent:** Monday, February 18, 2008 3:30 PM  
**To:** NIOSH Docket Office (CDC)  
**Cc:** Chen, Jihong (Jane) (CDC/NIOSH/EID) (CTR); Doyle, Glenn (CDC/NIOSH/EID)  
**Subject:** 132 - WorkLife Comments

**Name**  
Tee L. Guidotti

**Organization**  
George Washington University

**Email**  
eohtlg@gwumc.edu

**Address**  
2100 M St., NW, Ste. 203  
Washington, DC 20052  
USA

**Comments**  
The document would benefit by placing its content in context.

There are several reasons for moving toward a human-centered workplace. They include:

- + greater flexibility in achieving individual potential for productivity
- + greater likelihood of sustainable work career, which will become important as ratio of retired to economically productive workers increases
- + enhancing capacity of human resources personnel to deal with
- + individual situations
- + more likely compliance with occupational health and safety measures
- + greater affinity between employer and worker leading to more stable workforce.

However, there are reasons not to move in this direction which are not addressed in the paper;

- + human-centered workplace implies individualization, which opens the
- + door
- to discriminatory or preferential practices
- + employers have only the most limited valid interest in the personal lives of employees and this boundary is easily crossed
- + may introduce less labor flexibility and capacity for adaptation may
- + lead to less labor mobility in industries that are undergoing "creative destruction"
- + implies a capacity for anticipating or accommodating individual needs which may not exist

The US is far from a model of "industrial democracy" (to use an old term) which would be the ultimate expression of a human-centered workplace. The way that work is organized will be the biggest obstacle to achieving goal.