

v1: 26 February 2026

Review Article

Evolution of Occupational Health: From Industrial Medicine to the Digital Era

Ashish Trivedi¹, Aadhya Trivedi²

1. Occupational Health Division, Ministry of Health, Brunei Darussalam; 2. Laksamana College of Business, Brunei Darussalam

Preprinted: 1 December 2025

Peer-approved: 26 February 2026

© The Author(s) 2026. This is an Open Access article under the CC BY 4.0 license.

Qeios, Vol. 8 (2026)
ISSN: 2632-3834

The conceptualisation of occupational health has evolved substantially over the past three centuries, involving both regulatory frameworks and practical occupational safety and health measures. It has transitioned from narrow industrial medicine approaches focused on physical injuries and acute health problems to broader frameworks addressing physical, mental, social, and organisational wellbeing. This article explores the historical evolution of occupational health definitions, highlighting key milestones from the World Health Organisation and International Labour Organisation (WHO-ILO) Joint Committee's 1950 definition through its expansion in 1995 and the 2022 recognition of occupational safety and health as a fundamental principle and right at work, while analysing scientific, socio-political, and economic drivers for these changes. The article proposes that occupational health requires a further conceptual expansion to address the challenges posed by digitalisation, platform-based gig work, and artificial intelligence, including algorithmic management, data rights, and non-standard employment arrangements. The article concludes with proposed recommendations for an improved framework on occupational health in the 21st century, which integrates principles of digital fairness, human oversight, and universal access to preventive services, aiming to safeguard worker health, dignity, and equity in an increasingly technology-mediated world.

Correspondence: papers@team.qeios.com — Qeios will forward to the authors

Introduction

Occupational health definitions provide basic conceptual frameworks that define professional responsibilities, influence legislation, guide resource allocation, and shape societal understandings of worker protection. From its early roots in the Industrial Revolution and grounded in Bernardino Ramazzini's recognition of occupational diseases, occupational health has continually evolved in response to transforming work environments and advancing scientific knowledge. As the world of work transitions from traditional factories to digital ecosystems shaped by artificial intelligence (AI) and global interconnectivity, existing definitions must be critically examined and expanded to remain relevant and inclusive ^{[1][2]}.

Transition from Industrial Medicine to Holistic Occupational Health

Phase I (1700-1940s, Industrial Medicine): The book “De Morbis Artificum” by Bernardino Ramazzini in 1700 provided the basic premises in occupational medicine by cataloguing diseases across 54 occupations. However, industrial medicine emerged as a distinct speciality only during the Industrial Revolution from the mid-18th to the early 20th century, characterised by reactive medical treatment of acute injuries and disease, an employer-centric orientation, and a narrow focus on production workers in manufacturing sectors. Early factory acts and workers' compensation systems (late 1800s-early 1900s) formalised medical examination processes but perpetuated biomedical reductionism that neglected environmental control and organisational factors [3][4].

Phase II (1950 WHO/ILO Definition: Occupational Health): The first joint World Health Organisation (WHO) and International Labour Organisation (ILO) Committee on Occupational Health (1950) produced a landmark definition:

“Occupational health should aim at the promotion and maintenance of the highest degree of physical, mental and social well-being of workers in all occupations; the prevention amongst workers of departures from health caused by their working conditions; the protection of workers in their employment from risks resulting from factors adverse to health; the placing and maintenance of the worker in an occupational environment adapted to his physiological and psychological capabilities and; to summarize: the adaptation of work to man and of each man to his job” [1][5].

This definition advanced beyond the limited focus of industrial medicine, incorporating the WHO's holistic health concept, extending coverage to all workers in all occupations, emphasising health promotion and prevention, and establishing ergonomic principles. The definition, however, largely retained an individualist approach, and very little attention was given to organisational, psychosocial, and systemic determinants of worker health.

Phase III (1950-1995): Drivers of Evolution in Occupational Health Definition:

The third phase in the evolution of occupational health was shaped by three major drivers:

(A) Scientific Progress (B) International Legal Framework (C) Work Organisation Paradigm Shifts

A. Scientific Progress – Expanding the Determinants of Employee Health

Since the 1950s, the scope of occupational health has progressively broadened from physical and chemical hazards to encompass psychosocial, behavioural, and organisational determinants of health. Landmark studies, including those carried out by the Whitehall researchers, demonstrated social gradients in cardiovascular disease associated with job control and demand, and Karasek and Theorell's (1990) Job Demand–Control Model established psychosocial work characteristics like job design and control as independent health determinants. These findings also highlighted psychosocial risk assessment and management as a preventive tool, demonstrating the role of work organisation, job control, and social climate on injury risk, absenteeism, and long-term health outcomes and integrating the psychosocial dimension into occupational health practice. Advances in the fields of occupational cancer epidemiology, reproductive toxicology, and musculoskeletal disorder studies have widened the scope of

worker health ^{[6][7]}. These developments led the WHO/ILO Joint Committee to go beyond the 1950 definition's focus on physical, mental, and social well-being, towards a more multidimensional and dynamic understanding of worker health.

B. International Legal Framework - Preventive and Participatory Strategy

The 1980s marked the beginning of an important transition in international occupational health policy through the adoption of two key ILO conventions. Convention 155 on Occupational Safety and Health (1981) formalised the need for comprehensive national Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) policies, emphasising systematic risk prevention, worker participation, and continuous improvement. This convention also introduced the principles of a systemic risk assessment and management approach for workplace hazards, which has been widely adopted and incorporated into various occupational health and safety management standard frameworks. Convention 161 on Occupational Health Services (1985) formalised occupational health services as essentially preventive, promoting multidisciplinary collaboration and adaptation of work to workers' physical and mental capacities. Collectively, these conventions upgraded the conceptual foundation of occupational health from curative and hazard-specific interventions towards integrated, preventive systems and human-centred work design, principles that directly influenced subsequent WHO/ILO deliberations in the 1990s ^{[8][9]}.

C. Work Organisation Paradigm Shifts - Structural and Demographic Changes

The growth in the service industry since 1970 has led to the emergence of psychosocial hazards, different from traditional industrial exposures. Globalisation created transnational production networks, challenging national regulatory systems and identifying disparities in workers' protection across borders. The rising participation of the female workforce highlighted the need for greater attention to gender-specific occupational health issues, including reproductive health and work-family conflict. Simultaneously, technological transformation through computerisation created new occupational health concerns like ergonomic and mental health issues, such as repetitive strain injuries and technostress ^[10]. These developments, in sum, exemplified that workers' health and well-being depend as much on psychosocial and organisational adaptation as on the control of physical and chemical hazards.

D. Health Policy Innovations - Health Promotion and Equity in Mainstream Practices

Two major landmarks in global health policy catalysed occupational health's expansion beyond disease prevention. The Alma-Ata Declaration (1978) redefined health as a fundamental human right and emphasised equity, community participation, and intersectoral collaboration. These principles closely align with occupational health's preventive ethos, underscoring the need for universal access and service availability for all categories of workers. The Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion (1986) introduced health promotion as distinct from disease prevention, focusing on enabling individuals to gain greater control over their health through supportive environments, policy advocacy, and personal skill development. Together, these frameworks advanced occupational health towards a comprehensive, participatory, and empowerment-based model—linking

worker health not only with hazard control but also with workplace culture, social justice, and organisational well-being ^{[11][12]}.

Phase IV: (The 1995 Definition: A Holistic Approach): The Twelfth Session of the Joint ILO/WHO Committee in 1995 reaffirmed the 1950 definition while introducing critical expansions articulating three main objectives:

- i. The maintenance and promotion of workers' health and working capacity;
- ii. The improvement of the working environment and work to become conducive to safety and health, and
- iii. Development of work organisations and working cultures in a direction which supports health and safety at work and, in doing so, also promotes a positive social climate and smooth operation and may enhance the productivity of the undertakings.

The inclusion of working capacity addresses the recognition that health and functional capacity are related, though different, concepts, and this has become increasingly important in supporting work ability throughout one's lifespan, particularly in an ageing workforce with chronic illnesses. Emphasis on work environment improvement reflected a shift towards proactive, continuous advancement beyond mere regulatory compliance, aligning occupational health with principles of total quality management and continuous system improvement. Most notably, the addition of work organisation and culture formally recognised organisational values, management systems, and psychosocial climate as legitimate determinants of occupational health, reflecting growing evidence that these factors influence worker well-being and productivity independently of technical or engineering controls ^{[5][13]}.

Current Challenges: Digitalisation, the Gig Economy, and Artificial Intelligence

Despite the incorporation of important refinements in the 1995 ILO/WHO definition, contemporary developments in work organisation and technology have exposed enduring conceptual and practical limitations in current frameworks on occupational health. The definition presumes stable employment relationships, identifiable employers, and physically bounded workplaces; however, such assumptions are, in effect, progressively becoming less adequate in light of the increasingly fragmented, digital, and globally networked mode of work.

Concurrently, the World Health Assembly (WHA) Resolution 60.26 (2007) drew attention to the uneven coverage, quality, and accessibility of occupational health services worldwide and urged their universal extension through the Global Plan of Action on Workers' Health (2008-2017). Today, almost two decades later, these concerns remain significant, as less than one-third of the global workforce has access to basic occupational health services, and the goal of achieving universal coverage is further challenged by non-standard, platform-based, and remote work arrangements. These shifts challenge the foundational assumptions of occupational health practice, specifically who the "worker" is, where "work" occurs, and how responsibility for worker health is defined and enforced ^{[14][15]}. Demographic changes in the workforce, including an ageing population as well as the entry of a younger generation such as Gen Z, also require the reshaping of occupational health policies. Ageing workers face challenges related to chronic health conditions, functional ability and job accommodations, while Gen Z

brings expectations for flexible work, digitalisation and participatory decision-making. Addressing these changes requires tailored health and wellbeing strategies across all age groups, integrating psychosocial, ergonomic and organisational aspects [16].

The gaps in existing occupational health (OH) frameworks have become increasingly evident in the face of developments in digitalisation, the rise in non-standard employment, and the emergence of algorithmic management. Digital technologies have transformed how work is organised, monitored, and delivered and have fragmented the traditional employer–employee relationship, giving rise to new forms of work that operate across multiple jurisdictions, often outside conventional regulatory and social protection systems [17][18][19].

Gig and platform workers, remote freelancers, and crowd workers engage in an algorithmically mediated environment where work conditions, number of hours worked, and work risks remain unclear and fluctuating [20]. The use of AI-driven management systems has increased across different sectors, and the automation process has extended from the physical tasks in the factory environment to the decision-making and supervision tasks within the management domain. Today, the AI management system oversees the assignment process, boosts worker productivity, and enables performance analysis and prediction. While AI management systems can enhance safety through predictive analytics and personalised interventions, there could be risks of novel threats, including work intensification, algorithmic discrimination, privacy intrusion through continuous digital surveillance, workers' deskilling, loss of worker autonomy, and accountability gaps when AI systems make decisions affecting health and safety [17][21][22]. These aspects challenge the foundational principles of occupational health, particularly the accountability of employers, the scope of preventive services, and the mechanisms for worker participation and representation, as well as blurring the boundary between human and machine agency, challenging existing ethical and regulatory safeguards in occupational health practice and necessitating a re-examination of how occupational health is defined, delivered, and governed in the digital age.




Figure 1. Showing the Evolution of Occupational Health

Inadequacies in Existing Frameworks

Although comprehensive for its time, the 1995 ILO/WHO definition of occupational health no longer fully reflects contemporary work realities. The change in the world of work brought about by the digitalisation of labour and the rise of non-standard and platform-based work has challenged the assumptions included in the conventional framework: stable employment, fixed workplaces, and clear employer accountability. The key gaps include:

- i. **Employment relationships:** The platform and gig work relationship often lacks an employment relationship, hence constraining statutory OH responsibilities.
- ii. **Workplace boundaries:** Virtual and mobile work complicates ergonomic and environmental risk assessments.
- iii. **Organisational belonging and participation:** Work culture and collective participation mechanisms presume stable membership, which is absent in task-based or transient work.
- iv. **Algorithmic management:** Automated decision-making lacks transparency, challenging oversight of workload, performance, and safety.
- v. **Data governance:** Increasing reliance on digital monitoring raises ethical and legal concerns regarding privacy, consent, and discrimination.

These structural and ethical gaps highlight the need for policies that extend the coverage of the fundamental principles of occupational health in relation to all workers, ensuring digital equity, protecting the data rights of workers, and achieving universal access for all to preventive services, in line with the WHO Global Plan of Action on Workers' Health and the ILO Future of Work agenda ^[14]_[23].

Towards 21st-Century Occupational Health in the Digital Era

Building on historical evolution and emerging challenges, occupational health in the 21st century requires an integrated, systems-level policy response rather than merely revising conceptual definitions. The World Health Assembly (WHA) Resolution 60.26 (2007) and the Global Plan of Action on Workers' Health (2008–2017) emphasised universal coverage, a preventive focus, and intersectoral collaboration as pillars of worker health protection. Despite these frameworks, persistent inequities and emerging risks from digitalisation, platform-based employment, and artificial intelligence (AI) call for renewed commitments. International occupational health and safety management standards, such as OHSAS 18001/18002 and ISO 45001, provide a foundation for extending risk-based approaches to emerging challenges, including digital work, gig platforms, and AI-mediated employment ^[8]_{[14][15][16][17]}.

1. Broadening Universal Coverage to All Forms of Employment

Policies need to ensure that all workers, irrespective of their employment status or contractual forms, have access to occupational health services. This could include community and sector-specific frameworks related to occupational health, mobile and digital service delivery, and integration with primary healthcare, in accordance with WHO's "Health for All" strategy and the ILO's Decent Work agenda ^[12]_[23].

2. Strengthening Governance and Accountability in Digital Work

National frameworks should clarify employer responsibilities in algorithmically managed or multi-party work arrangements. Regulatory innovations such as the EU's Platform Work Directive (2021) and algorithmic transparency requirements offer models for ensuring accountability and protecting worker rights ^{[24][25]}.

3. Protection of Employee Data, Privacy, and Freedom

The integration of artificial intelligence and digital surveillance needs the development of updated standards of data governance, consent and ethical oversight. The WHO report on "Ethics and Governance of Artificial Intelligence for Health" provides principles that should extend to occupational settings, prioritising transparency, fairness, and human oversight ^[26].

4. Psychosocial and Organisational Integration

With the changes in social relations brought about by remote and gig work, psychosocial risk management, organisational justice, and work-life balance must become vital elements of occupational health policy. This is in alignment with the ILO's Centenary Declaration on the Future of Work in 2019, which calls for human-centred approaches to digital transformation ^[27].

5. Research, Capacity Building, and Multi-Stakeholder Engagement

In the future, policies should focus on resource investment in the area of digital work-related health outcomes, training of OH professionals in AI ethics and digital ergonomics, and strengthening collaboration among governments, employers, worker representatives, and technology developers ^[17].

Conclusion

Occupational health has continually evolved in response to transformations in work organisation, technology, and social expectations, from Ramazzini's early recognition of occupational diseases to the industrial and organisational health paradigms of the 20th century. The current digital transformation, encompassing platform work, automation, and algorithmic governance, marks an era of changes comparable in magnitude to the industrial revolution. The bulk of workers in non-standard and/or digitally mediated work categories are at risk of being excluded from basic health protections.

Integrating principles of digital fairness, accountability in algorithmic governance, and universal access to occupational health services into policy frameworks can strengthen resilience and equity in the future of work. Initiatives such as the EU Platform Work Directive (2021) and other emerging models of participatory governance provide evidence that regulatory innovation can align flexibility with social protection ^{[23][24]}.

The 21st-century vision of occupational health must focus on the protection of all types of workers, irrespective of the work arrangement, embedding worker participation and human oversight in the application of technology, capacity building for digital risk assessment within occupational health services, and strengthening data governance and ethical accountability mechanisms. Ultimately, the goal is to prevent harm and to foster human flourishing in a digital world, where work promotes dignity, fairness, social protection, and

environmental sustainability, echoing the spirit of the Sustainable Development Goals ^{[17][19][23]}.

Statements and Declarations

Funding

No specific funding was received for this work.

Potential Competing Interests

No potential competing interests to declare.

Data Availability

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Author Contributions

Ashish Trivedi contributed to the conceptualisation, literature review, and finalisation of the manuscript. Aadhya Trivedi contributed to the literature review and drafting of the manuscript.

References

1. ^{a, b}Kopias JA (2001). "Multidisciplinary Model of Occupational Health Services. Medical and Non-Medical Aspects of Occupational Health." *Int J Occup Med Environ Health*. **14**(1):2328. <https://cybra.lodz.pl/dlibra/publication/12892/edition/10028>.
2. ^ΔLaDou J, Harrison R (2021). *Current Diagnosis & Treatment: Occupational & Environmental Medicine*. 6th ed. New York: McGraw Hill. ISBN 9781260143430.
3. ^ΔFelton JS (1997). "The Heritage of Bernardino Ramazzini." *Occup Med*. **47**(3):1671-79. doi:[10.1093/occmed/47.3.167](https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/47.3.167).
4. ^ΔJoint ILO/WHO Committee on Occupational Health (1981). *Education and Training in Occupational Health, Safety and Ergonomics: Eighth Report of the Joint ILO/WHO Committee on Occupational Health [Held in Geneva From 2 to 9 March 1981]*. Geneva: World Health Organization. ISBN 9241206632. <https://kohahq.sear.who.int/bib/15151>.
5. ^{a, b}Faculty of Occupational Health Nursing (FOHN) (n.d.). "Occupational Health: What Is Occupational Health." FOHN. <https://fohn.org.uk/occupational-health/>.
6. ^ΔMarmot MG, Davey Smith G, Stansfeld S, Patel C, North F, Head J, White I, Brunner E, Feeney A (1991). "Health Inequalities Among British Civil Servants: The Whitehall II Study." *Lancet*. **337**(8754):1387-1393. doi:[10.1016/0140-6736\(91\)93068-K](https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-6736(91)93068-K).
7. ^ΔKarasek R, Theorell T (1992). *Healthy Work: Stress, Productivity, and the Reconstruction of Working Life*. New York: Basic Books. ISBN 9780465028979.
8. ^{a, b}Grny A (2015). "Occupational Health and Safety Management in the International Condition (Consistent With Objectives the ISO 45001 Standard)." *Mod Manag Rev*. **22**(4):7388. doi:[10.7862/rz.2015.mmr.55](https://doi.org/10.7862/rz.2015.mmr.55).
9. ^ΔInternational Labour Organization (ILO) (2009). *ILO Standards on Occupational Safety and Health: Promoting a Safe and Healthy Working Environment*. Geneva: International Labour Office. ISBN 9789221206347. https://ftp.cdc.gov/pub/Documents/OEL/12.%20Niemeier/References/ILO_2009_standards%20on%20occupational%20safety%20and%20health.pdf.

10. [△]Quinlan M, Mayhew C, Bohle P (2001). "The Global Expansion of Precarious Employment, Work Disorganization, and Consequences for Occupational Health: A Review of Recent Research." *Int J Health Serv.* 31(2):335-414. doi:[10.2190/607H-TTV0-QCN6-YLT4](https://doi.org/10.2190/607H-TTV0-QCN6-YLT4).
11. [△]European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (n.d.). "Workplace Health Promotion." European Agency for Safety and Health at Work. <https://oshwiki.osha.europa.eu/en/themes/workplace-health-promotion>.
12. [△][♁]Puras D (2016). "Universal Health Coverage: A Return to Alma-Ata and Ottawa." *Health Hum Rights.* 18(2):710. PMID [28559672](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28559672/).
13. [△]International Labour Organization (ILO) (1995). "Report of the Joint ILO/WHO Committee on Occupational Health (Twelfth Session, Geneva, 57 April 1995). Governing Body, 264th Session, Document GB.264/STM/4." Geneva: ILO. <https://webapps.ilo.org/public/libdoc/ilo/GB/264/GB.264/STM4-engl.pdf>.
14. [△][♁][♂]World Health Organization (WHO) (2007). "Sixtieth World Health Assembly Resolution WHA60.26: Workers Health: Global Plan of Action." World Health Organization (WHO). https://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/wha60/a60r26-en.pdf.
15. [△][♁]World Health Organization (WHO) (n.d.). "[WHO Global Plan of Action on Workers Health (2008-2017): Baseline for Implementation]." WHO. <https://iris.who.int/server/api/core/bitstreams/fba78914-28d1-4e45-b6af-536c6f9cb3/content>.
16. [△][♁]Dobre E (2025). "The Impact of Demographic Changes on HR Processes: A Highlight on Management of Multigenerational Workforce." *Manag Stud.* 13(1):3140. doi:[10.17265/2328-2185/2025.01.004](https://doi.org/10.17265/2328-2185/2025.01.004).
17. [△][♁][♂][♃][♄]International Labour Organization (ILO) (2025). "Revolutionizing Health and Safety: The Role of AI and Digitalization at Work (Safe Day 2025 Report)." International Labour Organization. https://www.ilo.org/sites/default/files/2025-04/ILO_Safeday25_Report_EN_r8%20%281%29_compressed_0.pdf.
18. [△]Koivusalo M, Ssynarenko A, Mbare B, Perki M (2024). "Globalization, Platform Work, and Wellbeing A Comparative Study of Uber Drivers in Three Cities: London, Helsinki, and St Petersburg." *Glob Health.* 20(1):18. doi:[10.1186/s12992-024-01021-3](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-024-01021-3).
19. [△][♁]Charles L, Xia S, Coutts AP (2022). *Digitalization and Employment: A Review.* International Labour Organization. ISBN 9789220372524. <https://www.ilo.org/sites/default/files/wcmsp5/groups/public/@edemp/documents/publication/wcms854353.pdf>.
20. [△]De Stefano V (2015). "The Rise of the Just-in-Time Workforce: On-Demand Work, Crowd Work and Labour Protection in the Gig-Economy." *SSRN Electron J.* doi:[10.2139/ssrn.2682602](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2682602).
21. [△]Kellogg KC, Valentine MA, Christin A (2020). "Algorithms at Work: The New Contested Terrain of Control." *Acad Manag Ann.* 14(1):366-410. doi:[10.5465/annals.2018.0174](https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174).
22. [△]European Parliamentary Research Service (EPRS) (2025). "Digitalisation, Artificial Intelligence and Algorithmic Management in the Workplace: Shaping the Future of Work (Study PE 774.670)." European Parliament. doi:[10.2861/0136788](https://doi.org/10.2861/0136788). [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2025/774670/EPRS_STU\(2025\)774670_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2025/774670/EPRS_STU(2025)774670_EN.pdf).
23. [△][♁][♂][♃]International Labour Organization (ILO) (n.d.). "Future of Work Issue Briefs." ILO. <https://www.ilo.org/topics/future-work/future-work-issue-briefs>.
24. [△][♁]European Council (2021). "Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on Improving Working Conditions in Platform Work (ST-1445

0/2021-INIT)." European Council. <https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-14450-2021-INIT/en/pdf>.

25. [^]Adams-Prassl J (2022). "Regulating Algorithms at Work: Lessons for a European Approach to Artificial Intelligence." *Eur Labour Law J*. 13(1):3050. doi:[10.1177/20319525211062558](https://doi.org/10.1177/20319525211062558).
26. [^]World Health Organization (2021). *Ethics and Governance of Artificial Intelligence for Health: WHO Guidance*. World Health Organization. ISBN 9789240029200. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240029200>.
27. [^]International Labour Organization (ILO) (2019). "Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work." ILO. https://www.ilo.org/sites/default/files/wcmsp5/groups/public/%40ed_norm/%40relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_711674.pdf.

Declarations

Funding: No specific funding was received for this work.

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.