

A COMPUTING TASK ERGONOMIC RISK ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR
ASSESSING RISK FACTORS OF WORK RELATED MUSCULOSKELETAL
DISORDERS

SITI SHAFIKA BINTI MOHAMAD

A thesis submitted in
fulfillment of the requirement for the award of the
Master in Mechanical Engineering

Faculty of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering
Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia

AUGUST 2018



PTT ALITHM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUN HUSSEIN ONN AMINAH

Dedicate this especially to beloved family and my friends.

The encouragement and the sacrifices that given etched in the hearts

Forever

Thank you for the support that has been given

Will be remembered the sacrifices that given to the end of life



PTTA UTHM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUNKU TUN AMINAH

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

With a sincere heart, I express my deepest appreciation and gratitude to my supervisor in my Master Research, Dr. Mohd Nasrull Bin Abdol Rahman for his guidance, assistance and guidance given during this research period. I am grateful to be given a supervisor who is fairly concerned about the welfare of the students under his supervision. With ample counselling, opinion, and guidance from Dr Nasrull, I managed to complete my thesis successfully. Besides that, I'm really appreciating his willingness to share information and expert opinions. It was very easy to communicate with him throughout the supervision for this research.

My appreciation also goes to office workers who were willing to cooperate and give special permission to carry out ergonomic assessments. In addition, I express my thanks to the undergraduate student of mechanical student (fourth year student) from UTHM for willing to review the assessment tool (OFFERA) and offer suggestions for the further improvement.

Lastly, I would like to thank all the people who were involved either directly or indirectly in the success of this master research. The cooperation from all of you is very much appreciated.



ABSTRACT

Observation method remains to be the most widely applied method in assessing exposure to risk factors for work-related musculoskeletal disorders (WMSDs) related to office works because it is inexpensive and applicable to wide range of office jobs. However, the existing research that applied this method was mainly focused to a limited range of office components and computer accessories such as seat pan, keyboards, mouse, monitor and telephone. In addition, further testing of reliability and validity of the observational method was less reported. This study was conducted to propose the new office ergonomic risk assessment (OFFERA) method to assess a wide range of office risk factors related to WMSDs, which include office components and office environment where this method covers both right and left side of the body part. The initial development of OFFERA method was divided into two stages, the development of OFFERA system components and psychometric properties of OFFERA method. In reliability testing, the results of inter and intra observer reliability recorded good ($K=0.62-0.78$) and very good ($K=0.81-0.96$) agreement among the observers. Meanwhile, in validity testing, the relationship of the final score of OFFERA to the musculoskeletal symptoms statistically shows a significant value for wrists/hands ($\chi^2=7.942$; $p=0.047$), lower back ($\chi^2=13.478$; $p=0.000$), knees ($\chi^2=7.001$; $p=0.008$), and ankle/leg ($\chi^2=5.098$; $p=0.024$). The usability testing shows that the OFFERA method was easy and quick to be used (mean 4.48 ± 0.821) and applicable for wide range of office working activities (mean 4.02 ± 0.952). Based on the results obtained, it can be concluded that the OFFERA method was found to be practically reliable and applicable for wide range of office work-related activities.

ABSTRAK

Kaedah pemerhatian kekal menjadi kaedah yang paling banyak digunakan untuk menaksir faktor risiko pendedahan terhadap *Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders (WMSDs)* yang berkaitan dengan kerja-kerja di pejabat kerana ianya merupakan kaedah yang mudah dan dapat digunakan untuk kelompok kerja pejabat yang meluas. Namun, penyelidikan sedia ada yang menggunakan kaedah ini kebanyakan menjurus kepada barangan pejabat dan aksesori komputer yang terhad seperti *seat pan*, papan kekunci, tetikus, monitor dan telefon. Tambahan pula, ujian mendalam mengenai kebolehpercayaan dan kesahan kaedah pemerhatian tidak banyak dilaporkan. Kajian ini dijalankan untuk mengusulkan kaedah yang baru iaitu *Office Ergonomic Risk Assessment (OFFERA)* untuk menaksir kelompok besar faktor risiko di pejabat yang berkaitan dengan WMSDs, termasuk komponen dan persekitaran pejabat, di mana kaedah ini merangkumi kedua-dua belah bahagian badan. Pembangunan awal kaedah OFFERA ini dibahagikan kepada dua peringkat, iaitu perkembangan sistem komponen OFFERA dan ciri psikometrik kaedah OFFERA. Dalam ujian kebolehpercayaan, keputusan kebolehpercayaan inter dan intra pemerhati menunjukkan persetujuan yang baik ($K=0.62-0.78$) dan sangat baik ($K=0.81-0.96$) dalam kalangan pemerhati. Manakala dalam ujian kesahan, hubungkait antara markah akhir OFFERA dengan simptom muskuloskeletal menunjukkan statistik yang jelas untuk lengan/tangan ($\chi^2=7.942$; $p=0.047$), bawah belakang ($\chi^2=13.478$; $p=0.000$), lutut ($\chi^2=7.001$; $p=0.008$), and buku lali/kaki ($\chi^2=5.098$; $p=0.024$). Ujian kebolegunaan menunjukkan bahawa kaedah OFFERA mudah dan cepat untuk digunakan (min 4.48 ± 0.821), dan ianya boleh digunapakai untuk kelompok aktiviti kerja pejabat yang luas (min 4.02 ± 0.952). Berdasarkan keputusan yang dicapai, ia boleh disimpulkan bahawa kaedah OFFERA terbukti boleh dikatakan dipercayai dan boleh digunakan untuk kelompok kerja pejabat yang lebih luas.

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|--------------|
| TITLE | i |
| DECLARATION | ii |
| DEDICATION | iii |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENT | iv |
| ABSTRACT | v |
| ABSTRAK | vi |
| CONTENTS | vii |
| LIST OF TABLES | xiii |
| LIST OF FIGURE | xv |
| LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS | xviii |
| LIST OF APPENDICES | xx |
| CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 Background of study | 1 |
| 1.2 Problem statement | 3 |
| 1.3 Objective of study | 4 |
| 1.4 Scope of study | 4 |
| 1.5 Significance of study | 5 |
| 1.6 Organization of Thesis | 6 |
| CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW | 9 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 9 |



PTTA UTHM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUNKU TUN AMINAH

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 2.2 | Existing techniques of the observational methods for assessing exposure to risk factors of WMSDs related to office works. | 10 |
| 2.2.1 | Rapid Upper Limb Assessment (RULA) | 12 |
| 2.2.2 | Rapid Entire Body Assessment (REBA) | 15 |
| 2.2.3 | Ergonomic Checklist for Computer (VDT) Workstation | 18 |
| 2.2.4 | Computer Workstation e-Tool | 20 |
| 2.2.5 | Quick Exposure Checklist (QEC) | 22 |
| 2.2.6 | Assessment Repetitive Task (ART) | 25 |
| 2.2.7 | Office Ergonomic Assessment (OEA) | 27 |
| 2.2.8 | Rapid Office Strain Assessment (ROSA) | 29 |
| 2.2.9 | Summary of critical review for existing techniques of the observational method related to office works | 31 |
| 2.3 | Risk factors of WMSDs related to office works | 34 |
| 2.3.1 | Seat pan / Chair | 37 |
| | 2.3.1.1 Seat pan height | 38 |
| | 2.3.1.2 Seat pan depth | 38 |
| | 2.3.1.3 Backrest | 38 |
| | 2.3.1.4 Armrest | 40 |
| 2.3.2 | Workstation / Desk | 41 |
| | 2.3.2.1 Desk or work surface area | 41 |
| | 2.3.2.2 Desk height | 42 |
| 2.3.3 | Monitor | 43 |
| 2.3.4 | Keyboard | 44 |
| 2.3.5 | Mouse | 45 |
| 2.3.6 | Accessories | 46 |
| | 2.3.6.1 Telephone | 46 |
| | 2.3.6.2 Document holder | 47 |
| | 2.3.6.3 Footrest | 48 |
| | 2.3.6.4 Wrist rest | 48 |



| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 2.3.7 | Environmental Factors | 49 |
| | 2.3.7.1 Lighting | 49 |
| | 2.3.7.2 Temperature | 50 |
| | 2.3.7.3 Noise | 50 |
| 2.3.8 | Summary of critical review for risk factors of WMSDs related to office works | 51 |

CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY **54**

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 3.1 | Introduction | 54 |
| 3.2 | Review on existing techniques of observational methods for assessing exposure to risk factors for WMSDs related to office works | 56 |
| 3.2.1 | Selection literature from database | 56 |
| 3.2.2 | Developing the evaluation criteria | 56 |
| 3.2.1 | The evaluation process | 57 |
| 3.3 | Stage 1: Development of Office Ergonomic Risk Assessment (OFFERA) system components | 57 |
| 3.3.1 | Identification of the domains and items | 57 |
| 3.3.2 | Selection of the Items | 58 |
| 3.3.3 | Specification and assigning rating scores | 61 |
| | 3.3.3.1 Seat pan (chair) score | 65 |
| | 3.3.3.2 Desk score | 65 |
| | 3.3.3.3 Monitor score | 66 |
| | 3.3.3.4 Device input score | 67 |
| | 3.3.3.5 Accessories score | 67 |
| | 3.3.3.6 Environmental factors score | 68 |
| | 3.3.3.7 Task duration score | 69 |
| 3.3.4 | Generation OFFERA final score and action level | 69 |
| 3.3.5 | Establish format form & instruction | 73 |
| 3.3.6 | The prototype of OFFERA method | 74 |
| 3.4 | Stage 2: Psychometric properties of OFFERA method | 76 |



| | | |
|---------|--|----|
| 3.4.1 | Reliability and usability testing of the OFFERA method | 76 |
| 3.4.1.1 | Study design and data collection | 76 |
| 3.4.1.2 | Data analysis | 80 |
| 3.4.2 | Validity testing of the OFFERA method | 82 |
| 3.4.2.1 | Study design and data collection | 82 |
| 3.4.2.2 | Data analysis | 85 |
| 3.5 | OFFERA method Version 1 | 87 |
| 3.6 | Concluding remarks | 87 |

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION **88**

| | | |
|---------|--|-----|
| 4.1 | Introduction | 88 |
| 4.2 | Reliability and usability analysis of OFFERA method | 89 |
| 4.2.1 | Demographic item | 89 |
| 4.2.2 | Inter and Intra observer reliability analysis of OFFERA method | 89 |
| 4.2.2.1 | Reliability analysis of Job A | 90 |
| 4.2.2.2 | Reliability analysis of Job B | 92 |
| 4.2.2.3 | Reliability analysis of Job C | 94 |
| 4.2.3 | Usability analysis of OFFERA method | 95 |
| 4.2.3.1 | Feedback survey for usability of OFFERA method | 96 |
| 4.2.3.2 | General comments and suggestion for OFFERA method | 99 |
| 4.2.3.3 | Specific comments and suggestion for OFERRA method | 101 |
| 4.3 | Validity analysis of OFFERA method | 106 |
| 4.3.1 | Demographic data | 106 |
| 4.3.2 | Results of Nordic Musculoskeletal Disorders Questionnaire (NMDQ) | 107 |
| 4.3.2.1 | Number of self-reported symptoms | 107 |
| 4.3.2.2 | Reported lower back, neck and shoulder | 109 |



| | | |
|--|--|------------|
| 4.3.3 | Results of Office Ergonomic Risk Assessment (OFFERA) | 111 |
| 4.3.3.1 | Section A scores for chair analysis | 111 |
| 4.3.3.2 | Section B scores for desk analysis | 112 |
| 4.3.3.3 | Section C scores for input device analysis | 113 |
| 4.3.3.4 | Section D scores for monitor analysis | 113 |
| 4.3.3.5 | Section E scores for accessories analysis | 114 |
| 4.3.3.6 | Section F scores for environment analysis | 115 |
| 4.3.3.7 | OFFERA final score and action level | 115 |
| 4.3.4 | Relationship between OFFERA and NMDQ | 116 |
| 4.3.4.1 | Chair scores and musculoskeletal symptoms | 116 |
| 4.3.4.2 | Desk scores and musculoskeletal Symptoms | 118 |
| 4.3.4.3 | Input device scores and musculoskeletal symptoms | 119 |
| 4.3.4.4 | Monitor scores and musculoskeletal symptoms | 121 |
| 4.3.4.5 | Accessories scores and musculoskeletal symptom | 122 |
| 4.3.4.6 | Environment scores and musculoskeletal symptoms | 124 |
| 4.3.4.7 | OFFERA final scores and musculoskeletal symptoms | 126 |
| 4.4 | Office Ergonomic Risk Assessment (OFFERA) method Version 1 | 128 |
| 4.5 | Concluding remarks | 141 |
| CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS | | 142 |
| 5.1 | Introduction | 131 |
| 5.2 | Conclusion | 131 |
| 5.3 | Future works | 133 |



| | |
|-------------------|------------|
| REFERENCES | 146 |
| APPENDIX A | 156 |
| APPENDIX B | 165 |
| APPENDIX C | 167 |
| APPENDIX D | 169 |
| APPENDIX E | 176 |
| APPENDIX F | 177 |
| APPENDIX G | 181 |
| APPENDIX H | 183 |



PTTA UTHM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUNKU TUN AMINAH

LIST OF TABLES

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 2.1 | Case studies using ergonomic method to office work or computer work | 12 |
| 2.2 | ROSA action level | 29 |
| 2.3 | Summary of critical review for pen-and- paper based observational method for office | 32 |
| 2.4 | Inclusion criteria for developing the OFFERA method | 33 |
| 2.5 | Epidemiologic studies of work-related musculoskeletal disorders in computer work. | 35 |
| 2.6 | Dimension of work surface area for fully adjustable height and fixed height | 41 |
| 2.7 | Summary of risk factors for office workstation | 51 |
| 3.1 | Selection of the item | 59 |
| 3.2 | Specification of each items | 61 |
| 3.3 | Prototype of OFFERA method action level | 72 |
| 3.4 | Instruction of the OFFERA method | 74 |
| 4.1 | Demographic data of the observers in training session (N=44) | 89 |
| 4.2 | Inter-observer and intra-observer reliability Job A (N=44 observer) | 91 |
| 4.3 | Inter-observer and intra-observer reliability Job B (N=44 observer) | 83 |
| 4.4 | Inter-observer and intra-observer reliability Job C (N=44 observer) | 95 |
| 4.5 | Feedback survey on the usability of the OFFERA method | 96 |
| 4.6 | Feedback comments from observer | 99 |
| 4.7 | General comments and suggestion from observer | 101 |



| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 4.8 | Comments and suggestion for Part A | 102 |
| 4.9 | Comments and suggestion for Part B | 103 |
| 4.10 | Comments and suggestion for Part C | 104 |
| 4.11 | Comments and suggestion for Part D | 104 |
| 4.12 | Comments and suggestion for Part E | 105 |
| 4.13 | Comments and suggestion for Part F | 106 |
| 4.14 | Demographic data for office worker (N=108) | 107 |
| 4.15 | Number of self-reported symptoms (N=108) | 109 |
| 4.16 | Reported lower back, neck and shoulder (N=108) | 110 |
| 4.17 | Score for chair analysis (N=108) | 112 |
| 4.18 | Score for desk analysis (N=108) | 112 |
| 4.19 | Score for input device analysis (N=108) | 113 |
| 4.20 | Score for monitor analysis (N=108) | 114 |
| 4.21 | Score for accessories analysis (N=108) | 114 |
| 4.22 | Score for environment analysis (N=108) | 115 |
| 4.23 | OFFERA final score and action level (N=108) | 116 |
| 4.24 | Relationship between chair scores and musculoskeletal symptoms (N=108) | 117 |
| 4.25 | Relationship between desk scores and musculoskeletal symptoms (N=108) | 119 |
| 4.26 | Relationship between input device scores and musculoskeletal symptoms (N=108) | 120 |
| 4.27 | Relationship between monitor scores and musculoskeletal symptoms (N=108) | 122 |
| 4.28 | Relationship between accessories scores and musculoskeletal symptoms (N=108) | 123 |
| 4.29 | Relationship between environment scores and musculoskeletal symptoms (N=108) | 125 |
| 4.30 | Relationship between OFFERA final scores and musculoskeletal symptoms (N=108) | 127 |
| 4.31 | Improvement made on the OFFERA method Version 1 | 130 |
| 4.32 | Specification of each item (OFFERA method Version 1) | 137 |



LIST OF FIGURES

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 1.1 | Thesis organization | 8 |
| 2.1 | Eight techniques of the pen-and-paper based observational method for assessing exposure to the risk factors of WMSDs related to office works or computer from 1993 until 2012 | 11 |
| 2.2 | The posture score for body part in Group A and Group B | 13 |
| 2.3 | RULA employee assessment worksheet | 14 |
| 2.4 | Group A and B body part diagram | 16 |
| 2.5 | REBA employee assessment worksheet | 17 |
| 2.6 | Ergonomic Checklist for Computer (VDT) Workstation | 19 |
| 2.7 | Computer Workstation e-Tool worksheet | 21 |
| 2.8 | QEC development process | 22 |
| 2.9 | Quick Exposure Checklist (QEC) | 24 |
| 2.10 | Traffic light system for risk factor score | 25 |
| 2.11 | The Assessment of Repetitive Task (ART) flow chart | 26 |
| 2.12 | Office Ergonomic Assessment Worksheet | 28 |
| 2.13 | ROSA assessment form | 28 |
| 2.14 | ROSA scoring form | 28 |
| 2.15 | Risk factor for WMSDs related to office work | 37 |
| 2.16 | Improper seating position when seat pan was adjusted too high | 38 |
| 2.17 | The dimension of the seat pan depth | 39 |
| 2.18 | The dimension for lumbar pad and seat back | 40 |
| 2.19 | Armrest position | 40 |



| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 2.20 | Suitable desk surface area | 42 |
| 2.21 | Standard height desk for office workstation | 42 |
| 2.22 | The distance between user's eye and monitor | 43 |
| 2.23 | Position of wrist during typing | 44 |
| 2.24 | Position of mouse | 46 |
| 2.25 | Awkward posture while using the telephone | 47 |
| 2.26 | The position of the document holder | 47 |
| 2.27 | Sitting posture including footrest | 48 |
| 2.28 | Wrist rest for keyboard and mouse | 49 |
| 2.29 | Direct and indirect glare | 50 |
| 3.1 | The development and evaluation process of Ergonomic Risk Assessment (OFFERA) method Version 1 | 55 |
| 3.2 | Identification of the items | 58 |
| 3.3 | Selection of items | 56 |
| 3.4 | Risk factors rating scores for the seat pan height item of OFFERA method (prototype) | 65 |
| 3.5 | Risk factors rating scores for the desk height item of OFFERA method (prototype) | 66 |
| 3.6 | Risk factors rating scores for the monitor position item of OFFERA method (prototype) | 66 |
| 3.7 | Risk factors rating scores for the keyboard item of OFFERA method (prototype) | 67 |
| 3.8 | Risk factors rating scores for the telephone item of OFFERA method (prototype) | 68 |
| 3.9 | Risk factors rating scores for the lighting item of OFFERA method (prototype) | 68 |
| 3.10 | Risk factors rating scores for the task duration domain of OFFERA method (prototype) | 69 |
| 3.11 | Summary of final score | 70 |
| 3.12 | Scoring sheet for OFFERA method (prototype) | 71 |



| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 3.13 | Format form for the front page of OFFERA method (prototype) | 73 |
| 3.14 | Format form for the back page of OFFERA method (prototype) | 73 |
| 3.15 | Front page of OFFERA method (prototype) | 75 |
| 3.16 | Back page of OFFERA method (prototype) | 75 |
| 3.17 | Inter-observer reliability training session | 77 |
| 3.18 | Intra-observer reliability training session | 78 |
| 3.19 | Research design and data collection for the training session | 79 |
| 3.20 | Data analysis for reliability and usability study | 81 |
| 3.21 | The example of job activity for office worker: sitting position (a), monitor distance (b), mousing posture (c) and typing posture (d) | 83 |
| 3.22 | Study design and data collection validity testing | 84 |
| 3.23 | Data analysis for validity study | 86 |
| 4.1 | Feedback survey on the usability of OFFERA method | 97 |
| 4.2 | Self-reported symptoms among office worker | 108 |



LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| | | |
|--------|---|---|
| p | - | Probability Level |
| χ | - | Chi-square test |
| K | - | Cohen Kappa Coefficient |
| X | - | Mean |
| % | - | Percentage |
| AEC | - | Appropriate Ergonomic Configuration |
| ANSI | - | American National Standards Institute |
| ART | - | Assessment of Repetitive Tasks |
| CCOHS | - | Canadian Centre of Occupational Health and Safety |
| CI | - | Confidence Interval |
| CTDs | - | Cumulative Trauma Disorders |
| ERFs | - | Ergonomic Risk Factors |
| MSDs | - | Musculoskeletal Disorders |
| NMDQ | - | Nordic musculoskeletal disorders questionnaire |
| OEA | - | Office Ergonomic Assessment |
| OFFERA | - | Office Ergonomic Risk Assessment |
| OR | - | Odd Ratio |
| OSHA | - | Occupational Safety and Health Administration |
| OWAS | - | Ovako Working Posture System |
| QEC | - | Quick Exposure Checklist |
| REBA | - | Rapid Entire Body Assessment |
| ROSA | - | Rapid Office Strain Assessment |
| RSI | - | Repetitive Strain Injury |
| RULA | - | Rapid Upper Limb Assessment |
| SD | - | Standard Deviation |
| SPSS | - | Statistical Package for Social Sciences |
| SOCISO | - | Social Security Organization |

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| TO | - | Training Outcome |
| ULDs | - | Upper Limb Disorder |
| UTHM | - | Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia |
| VDU | - | Visual Display Unit |
| VDT | - | Visual Display Terminal |
| WMSDs | - | Work-related Musculoskeletal Disorders |
| WRULDs | | Work-Related Upper Limb Disorders |



PTTA UTHM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUNKU TUN AMINAH

LIST OF APPENDICES

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| A | Summary table of pen-and-paper based observational method that assessing office work 1993 to 2012 | 156 |
| B | Prototype of OFFERA method | 165 |
| C | Feedback survey for usability of the Office Ergonomic Risk Assessment (OFFERA) Method | 167 |
| D | Sample size (108 office workers) | 169 |
| E | Table for determining sample size from a given population | 176 |
| F | Standardized Nordic Musculoskeletal Disorders Questionnaire (NMDQ) | 177 |
| G | General comment and suggestion from 44 observer | 181 |
| H | OFFERA method Version 1 | 183 |



CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Study

Work-related musculoskeletal disorders (WMSDs) are injuries or dysfunctions affecting the nerves, tendons, muscles, and joints that cause discomfort, pain, swelling, numbness, and fatigue among workers (Tittiranonda *et al.*, 1999; Piligian *et al.*, 2000; da Costa and Vieira, 2010). Work-related musculoskeletal disorders (WMSDs) are common health problems experienced by the workers and have long been a major cause of suffering in many countries (Benard, 1997; Kuorinko 1998; Chiasson *et al.*, 2012; Rahman *et al.*, 2012). WMSDs usually occur when the cumulative damage caused by the over exposure of the physical, individual, psychosocial, and organizational risk factors related to the workplace (Wahlstrom, 2005; Waersted *et al.*, 2010). Physical risk factors are the exposure to the physical demands while performing task including awkward posture, forceful exertions, repetitive actions, contact stress, prolonged sitting and standing, and prolonged task (Punnet & Wegman, 2004; da Costa & Vieira, 2010). Generally, musculoskeletal disorders are associated with an upper limb, head and neck and back posture (Gerr *et al.*, 2002; Jensen *et al.*, 2002; Korhonen *et al.*, 2003; Wahlstrom, 2005). Over the past few years, work-related musculoskeletal disorders (WMSDs) among office workers have increased mainly due to the frequent use of computer at workstations (Buckle & Devereux, 2002; Gerr *et al.*, 2004).

According to the statistics reported by Social Security Organization (SOCSO), musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) are one of the most common occupational diseases in Malaysia at 15% compare to other diseases (SOCSO, 2006).

The prevalence of reported work-related musculoskeletal pain is seen to be on the rise in Malaysia. Malaysia Institute of Occupational Safety and Health Organization has recorded a ten-fold rise in cases of musculoskeletal pain, a total number of 194 cases in 2012, compared to only 16 cases in 2016 (NIOSH, 2012). Musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) provide a risk to office workers and computer users where soft tissue injuries may affect the neck, shoulders, elbows, hands, wrists, and fingers. Moreover, there were two types of MSDs associated with computer users and office workers which include the carpal tunnel syndrome (CTs) and tendonitis (Tittiranonda *et al.*, 1999; Chiasson *et al.*, 2012). The main factors that lead to MSDs among office workers and computer users include prolonged static seating posture, awkward posture of the head, neck and upper limbs, repetitive movement of the wrist and fingers (Village *et al.*, 2005; Loghmani *et al.*, 2013; Sonne *et al.*, 2012), increasing of muscular activity at the upper back and shoulder, as well as the pressure due to heavy workload (Punnet & Wegman, 2004). Besides, computer users often faced health problems related to MSDs caused by the inappropriate posture and movement retained throughout a long period of working hours (Robertson *et al.*, 2009; Chaiklieng & Krusun, 2015; Matos & Pedro, 2015; Poochada & Chaiklieng, 2015). Most office components such as chairs, desks, keyboards, mouse and telephones exert certain risks to office workers (Amell & Kumar, 2000; Cook *et al.*, 2000; Ferreira & Saldiva, 2002). In fact, several studies suggested that the increased prevalence of muscle symptoms is associated with the frequently used of the computer mouse (Jensen *et al.*, 2002). In addition, problems associated with the eyes could also occur due to the worker's behaviour of focusing on the monitor for a long time. This consequently results in visual discomfort and symptoms such as eye strain, blurriness, dryness, and difficult to focus while using the monitor (Amick *et al.*, 2012; Robertson *et al.*, 2013).

Several ergonomic risk assessment tools have been developed to assess the working posture in order to assess the risk factors of WMSDs (Eyal *et al.*, 2012, Rahman and Mohamad, 2017). Ergonomic risk assessment tool has been used to analyse the ergonomic risk especially among employees working in an awkward posture, repetitive actions or forceful exertion (McAtamney and Corlett, 1993; Hignett and McAtamney, 2000; Sonne *et al.*, 2012). Seven ergonomic risk assessment tools have been widely used for WMSDs related to office workstation between the year 1992 until 2015 including Rapid Upper Limb Assessment (RULA)

(McAtamney and Corlett, 1993); Rapid Entire Body Assessment (REBA) (Hignett and McAtamney, 2000); Computer Workstation e-Tool (OSHA, 2003); Quick Exposure Checklist (QEC) (David *et al.*, 2008); Assessment of Repetition Tasks (ART) (Ferreira *et al.*, 2009); Office Ergonomic Assessment (OEA) (Robertson *et al.*, 2009); and Rapid Office Strain Assessment (ROSA) (Sonne *et al.*, 2012).

1.2 Problem Statement

The pen-and-paper based observational method is a one of the existing method for assessing the exposure to the risk factors associated with WMSDs related to office works. This method is less expensive to be carried out and is more practical to be used in a wide range of workplaces so that the postural assessment can be made without disrupting the workers (Li and Buckle, 1999; David *et al.*, 2005; Burdorf, 2010). It is necessary to assess a wide range of office risk factors candidate including administrative assistant, accountant, and research assistant.

However, the existing tools only covered limited range of office components and computer accessories among computer users or office workers, including the office components (seat pan height, seat pan depth, backrest, armrest, desk depth, desk height, monitor, keyboard, mouse, telephone, document holder, keyboard wrist rest, and mouse wrist rest) and office environment (lighting, temperature, and noise). ROSA tool was also lacking in parameters to assess the office workstation such as work area (desk) and the environment (lighting, temperature, and noise) (Sonne *et al.*, 2012). As an example, RULA and REBA tools were used to assess the worker's interaction with a computer in the office. Nevertheless, the ergonomic risks among office workers cannot be properly identified using RULA or REBA since the assessment tool was not specific for office environment (McAtamney and Corlett, 1993; Hignett and McAtamney, 2000).

In addition, the most important part in developing a tool is to validate the exposure assessment techniques. However, a few of the existing observational methods did not assess their reliability and validity there are (Computer Workstation e-tool, Office Ergonomic Assessment (OEA), Ergonomic Checklist for Computer (VDT)). Based on the reliability and validity previously studied, only four tools were found to have examined both testing which are RULA, REBA, QEC, and ROSA.

The lacking of validity and reliability leads to poor performance of exposure assessment tool (David, 2005; Burdorf, 2010; Takala *et al.*, 2010). Besides, the existing methods did not cover the right and the left side of the body part. Most of the methods can only assess the right and left side region separately where there was no methods available to combine these scores or data (Takala *et al.*, 2010).

Therefore, this research aims to develop a new type of office ergonomic risk assessment tool that covers the wide range of risk factors among office work which include office components and office environment associated with WMSDs and covers both right and left side of the body part. Other than that, this research also establishes the reliability and validity of the tool during the development process.

1.3 Objective of the study

The main objectives of this study are:

- i. To develop a new office ergonomic risk assessment (OFFERA) method in assessing the risk factors of work-related musculoskeletal disorders (WMSDs) related to office works.
- ii. To evaluate the inter and intra observer reliability of OFFERA method.
- iii. To establish the concurrent validity analysis of OFFERA method.

1.4 Scope of the study

The scopes of this study are:

- i. Pen-and-paper based observational method was used to develop OFFERA method.
- ii. OFFERA method focused on the sitting computing work only (not assessed for standing computer work).
- iii. The risk factors of OFFERA method covered office components (seat pan height, seat pan depth, backrest, armrest, desk height, working area, monitor position, monitor distance/screen distance, keyboard, mouse position, mouse size, telephone position, document holder, keyboard wrist rest, and mouse wrist rest) and environment (lighting, temperature, and noise).

- iv. OFFERA method assessed for computing works only, not for other jobs such as photocopying, document binding, etc.
- v. OFFERA method assessed physical factors only (individual and psychosocial are excluded)
- vi. OFFERA method covered both right and left side of the body part.
- vii. The selection items of the risk factor were based on the strength of association (Odd Ratio (OR) and 95% Confident Interval (CI) value)
- viii. The development of a scoring system for OFFERA method using the summation score of weighted item scores.
- ix. Inter and intra observer reliability was used to assess the reliability testing of OFFERA method.
- x. The training for inter and intra observer reliability was conducted by non-expert (undergraduate student of Mechanical Engineering from UTHM)
- xi. Three different jobs including administrative counter, accountant, and a research assistant have been assessed using OFFERA method in order to determine the reliability
- xii. Cohen's Kappa coefficient was used to assess the level of agreement for inter- and intra- observer reliability using 18 items of the OFFERA risk factors.
- xiii. Concurrent validity was used to assess the validity testing's of the OFFERA method.
- xiv. The sample size for validity testing is 108 selected among office workers.

1.5 Significance of the study

The proposed method for this study contributed to the new knowledge of method in the ergonomic risk assessment tools. This is because; the lack in well-designed existing techniques is a primary issue for epidemiological studies on work-related musculoskeletal disorders (WMSDs) among office workers (Burdorf, 2010; Takala *et al.*, 2010). Previous studies show that no tools have been developed to cover all of the office risk factors of WMSDs and to carry out the reliability and validity studies during the development process of the tool.

REFERENCES

- Alazawi, S. A. (2012). Prevalence of Musculoskeletal Symptoms among Visual Display Terminal Users. *Tikrit Medical Journal*, 18(1).
- Altman, D.G. (1991). *Practical Statistics for Medical Research*. Chapman and Hall, London.
- Amell, T. K., & Kumar, S. (2000). Cumulative trauma disorders and keyboarding work. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 25(1), 69-78.
- Amick, B. C., Menéndez, C. C., Bazzani, L., Robertson, M., DeRango, K., Rooney, T., & Moore, A. (2012). A field intervention examining the impact of an office ergonomics training and a highly adjustable chair on visual symptoms in a public sector organization. *Applied ergonomics*, 43(3), 625-631.
- ANSI (2007). *Chair Checklist and Work surface Checklist*. Cornell University, Dept. Design & Environment Analysis, Ithaca NY 14850, USA.
- ANSI (2014). *Ergonomic Guidelines for arranging a Computer Workstation- 10 steps for users*. Cornell University Ergonomics web Retrieved from : <http://ergo.human.cornell.edu/ergoguide.html>.
- Bhattacharya, A. & McGlothlin, J.D. (2012). *Occupational ergonomics: theory and applications* (NO. 27). CRC Press.
- Blatter, B. M., & Bongers, P. M. (2002). Duration of computer use and mouse use in relation to musculoskeletal disorders of neck or upper limb. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 30(4), 295-306.



PTTA UTHM
 PERPUSTAKAAN FUNKSIONAL MINAH

- Bernard, B.P.(1997). *Musculoskeletal disorders and workplace factors: a critical review of epidemiologic evidence for work-related musculoskeletal disorders of the neck, upper extremity, and low back*. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). Cincinnati, OH
- Brodie, D. M. (2008). Ergonomics Risk Assessment: Determining When, Why, And How You Should Perform One. In *ASSE Professional Development Conference and Exhibition*. American Society of Safety Engineers.
- Buckle, P. W., & Devereux, J. J. (2002). The nature of work-related neck and upper limb musculoskeletal disorders. *Applied ergonomics*, 33(3), 207-217.
- Burdorf, A. (2010). The role of assessment of biomechanical exposure at the workplace in the prevention of musculoskeletal disorders. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 36(1), 1-2.
- British Standard 3044 (1990). *Ergonomics principles in the design and selection of office furniture*. BSI 389 Chiswick High road London W4 4AL UK
- British Standard EN 527-1 (2011). *Office furniture work tables and desks. Part 1: Dimension*. British Standard Institution, BSI Group Headquarters 399 389 Chiswick High road London W4 4AL UK
- Cagnie, B., Danneels, L., Van Tiggelen, D., De Loose, V., & Cambier, D. (2007). Individual and work related risk factors for neck pain among office workers: a cross sectional study. *European Spine Journal*, 16(5), 679-686.
- Canadian Centre of Occupational Health and Safety (CCOHS) (2017). *Computer Mouse – Selection and Use*. Retrived from <https://www.ccohs.ca/html>
- Chaiklieng, S., & Krusun, M. (2015). Health Risk Assessment and Incidence of Shoulder Pain Among Office Workers. *Procedia Manufacturing*, 3, pp.4941-4947.
- Chiasson, M. È., Imbeau, D., Aubry, K., & Delisle, A. (2012). Comparing the results of eight methods used to evaluate risk factors associated with musculoskeletal disorders. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 42(5), 478-488.



- Cho, C.Y., Hwang, Y.S., & Cherng, R.J. (2012). Musculoskeletal symptoms and associated risk factors among office workers with high workload computer use. *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological therapeutics*, 35(7), 534-540.
- Clifton R. Lacy, M.D., James E. McGreevey and Albert G. Kroll, (2003). *Cumulative Trauma Disorders in Office Workers*. Public Employees Occupational Safety and Health Program.
- Cohen, J., (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, second ed. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Cook, C., Burgess-Limerick, R. and Chang, S., (2000). The prevalence of neck and upper extremity musculoskeletal symptoms in computer mouse users. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 26(3), 347-356.
- d'Errico, A., Caputo, P., Falcone, U., Fubini, L., Gilardi, L., Mamo, C., & Coffano, E. (2010). Risk factors for upper extremity musculoskeletal symptoms among call center employees. *Journal of Occupational Health*, 52(2): 115-124
- da Costa, B. R., & Vieira, E. R. (2010). Risk factors for work-related musculoskeletal disorders: a systematic review of recent longitudinal studies. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 53(3), 285-323.
- Dartt, A., Rosecrance, J., Gerr, F., Chen, P., Anton, D. and Merlino, L. (2009). Reliability of assessing upper limb postures among workers performing manufacturing tasks. *Applied Ergonomics*, 40(3), 371-378.
- Dalkiliniç, M., Bumin, G., Kayihan, H., (2002). The effects of ergonomic training and preventive physiotherapy in musculoskeletal pain. *The Pain Clinic*, 14(1), 75-79.
- David, G. C. (2005). Ergonomic methods for assessing exposure to risk factors for work-related musculoskeletal disorders. *Occupational Medicine*, 55(3), 190-199.
- David, G., Woods, V., Li, G., & Buckle, P. (2008). The development of the Quick Exposure Check (QEC) for assessing exposure to risk factors for work-related musculoskeletal disorders. *Applied Ergonomics*, 39(1), 57-69.



PTTA (Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan)
BERPUSTAKAAN TUNBUKTIIN AMANAH

Delleman, N. J., Haslegrave, C. M., & Chaffin, D. B. (Eds.). (2004). *Working Postures and Movements*. CRC Press.

Dockrell, S., O'Grady, E., Bennett, K., Mullarkey, C., Mc Connell, R., Ruddy, R., & Flannery, C. (2012). An investigation of the reliability of Rapid Upper Limb Assessment (RULA) as a method of assessment of children's computing posture. *Applied Ergonomics*, 43(3), 632-636.

Department of Occupational Safety and Health (1996), *Guidelines on Occupational Safety and Health in the Office*, Ministry of Human Resources Malaysia. Retrieved from <http://www.dosh.gov.my/index.php/>

Department Of Occupational Safety And Health Ministry Of Human Resources Malaysia. (2004) *Guidelines On Occupational Safety And Health In The Service Sector*. Retrieved from: <http://www.dosh.gov.my/index.php/>

Drost, E.A., (2011). Validity and Reliability in Social Science Research. *California State University, Los Angeles. Education Research and Perspectives*, 38(1).

Eyal, L., Ribak, J., & Badihi, Y. (2012) Remote online ergonomic assessment in the office environment as compared to face-to-face ergonomic assessment. *Work: A Journal of Prevention, Assessment and Rehabilitation*, 41(1), 516-523.

Fagarasanu, M. and Kumar, S. (2002). Measurement instruments and data collection: a consideration of constructs and biases in ergonomics research. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 30(6), 355-369.

Ferreira, M., & Saldiva, P. H. (2002). Computer–telephone interactive tasks: predictors of musculoskeletal disorders according to work analysis and workers' perception. *Applied Ergonomics*, 33(2), 147-153.

Ferreira, J. G., Hunter, M., Birtles, L. M., & Riley, D. (2009). *Development of an assessment tool for repetitive tasks of the upper limbs (ART)*. Derbyshire: Health and Safety Executive.

Garvgani, V.Z., Nazari, J., Jafarabadi, M.A. and Rastegari, F. (2013). Is Librarian's health affected by ergonomic factors at the workplace? *Library Philosophy and Practices (e-journal)*. pp 893

- Harrison, D.D., Harrison, S.O., Croft, A.C., Harrison, D.E., Troyanovich, S.J., (1999). Sitting biomechanics part 1: review of the literature. *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutic*. 22(9), 594-609.
- Hartvigsen, J., Lings, S., Leboeuf-Yde, C., & Bakketeig, L. (2004). Psychosocial factors at work in relation to low back pain and consequences of low back pain; a systematic, critical review of prospective cohort studies. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 61(1), e2-e2
- Hemingway, H., & Marmot, M. (1999). Evidence based cardiology: psychosocial factors in the aetiology and prognosis of coronary heart disease: systematic review of prospective cohort studies. *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, 318(7196), 1460-1467
- Hignett, S., & McAtamney, L. (2000). Rapid entire body assessment (REBA). *Applied Ergonomics*, 31(2), 201-205.
- Janowitz, I. L., Gillen, M., Ryan, G., Rempel, D., Trupin, L., Swig, L., & Blanc, P. D. (2006). Measuring the physical demands of work in hospital settings: Design and implementation of an ergonomics assessment. *Applied Ergonomics*, 37(5), 641-658.
- Jensen, C., Finsen, L., Sogaard, K., & Christensen, H. (2002). Musculoskeletal symptoms and duration of computer and mouse use. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 30(4), 265-275.
- Juul-Kristensen, B., Sogaard, K., Stoyer, J., & Jensen, C. (2004). Computer users' risk factors for developing shoulder, elbow and back symptoms. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 390-398.
- Kee, D., & Karwoski, W. (2007). A comparison of three observational techniques for assessing postural loads in industry. *International Journal Occupational Safety Ergonomic*, 13(1), 3-14
- Korhonen, T., Ketola, R., Toivonen, R., Luukkonen, R., Hakkanen, M., & Viikari-Juntura, E. (2003). Work related and individual predictors for incident neck pain among office employees working with video display units. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 60(7), 475-482.



- Krejcie, R. and Morgan, D. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 30(3), 607-610.
- Kroemer, K. H., Kroemer, H. B., & Kroemer-Elbert, K. E. (2001). *Ergonomics: how to design for ease and efficiency*. Pearson College Division.
- Kuorinka, I., Jonsson, B., Kilbom, A., Vinterberg, H., Biering-Sørensen, F., Andersson, G. and Jørgensen, K.(1987). Standardised Nordic questionnaires for the analysis of musculoskeletal symptoms. *Applied Ergonomics*, 18(3), 233-237.
- Kuorinka, I. (1998). The influence of industrial trends on work-related musculoskeletal disorders (WMSDs). *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 21(1), 5-9.
- Lapointe, J., Dionne, C.E., Brisson, C.,& Montreuil,S., (2009). Interaction between postural risk factors and job strain on self-reported musculoskeletal symptoms among users of video display units: a three-year prospective study. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 134-144.
- Li, G., & Buckle, P. (1999). Current techniques for assessing physical exposure to work-related musculoskeletal risks, with emphasis on posture-based methods. *Ergonomics*, 42(5), 674-695.
- Li, G., & Buckle, P. (2005). Quick exposure checklist (QEC) for the assessment of workplace risks for work-related musculoskeletal disorders (WMSDs). *Handbook of Human Factors and Ergonomics Methods*. USA: CRC PRESS. p, 6-1.
- Liebrechts, J., Sonne, M., & Potvin, J. R. (2016). Photograph-based ergonomic evaluations using the Rapid Office Strain Assessment (ROSA). *Applied Ergonomics*, 52, 317-324.
- Loghmani, A., Golshiri, P., Zamani, A., Kheirmand, M., & Jafari, N. (2013). Musculoskeletal symptoms and job satisfaction among office-workers: A Cross-sectional study from Iran. *Acta Medica Academica*, 42(1), 46-54.



- Malaysian National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) (2012). *Musculoskeletal Disorders (MSD) Report of Statistics among Occupation in Malaysia*. Retrieved from www.niosh.com.my
- Malaysia Standard ISO 9241-4 (2005). *Ergonomic Requirements for Office work with visual display terminal (VDTs) – Part 4: Keyboard requirements* (ISO 9241-4:1998 and its technical corrigendum 1:2000, IDT)
- Malaysia Standard ISO 9241-5 (2005); *Ergonomic Requirements for Office work with visual display terminal (VDTs) – Part 5: Workstation layout and postural requirements* (ISO 9241-5:1998, IDT)
- Malaysia Standard ISO 9241-6 (2005), *Ergonomic Requirements for Office work with visual display terminal (VDTs) – Part 11: Guidance on the work environment* (ISO 9241-6:1999, IDT)
- Malaysia Standard ISO 9241-9 (2006), *Ergonomic Requirements for Office work with visual display terminal (VDTs) – Part 9: Requirements for non-keyboard input devices* (ISO 9241-9:2000, IDT)
- Malaysia Standard ISO 9241-11 (2006). *Ergonomic Requirements for Office work with visual display terminal (VDTs) – Part 11: Guidance on usability* (ISO 9241-11:1998, IDT)
- Marras, W.S. and Karwowski, W. (2006). The Washington State Sharp Approach to Exposure Assessment, *Fundamentals and assessment tools for occupational ergonomics*. CRC Press, 44(1-21)
- Matos, M., & Arezes, P. M. (2015). Ergonomic evaluation of office workplaces with Rapid Office Strain Assessment (ROSA). *Procedia Manufacturing*, 3, 4689-4694.
- McAtamney, L. and Corlett, E. N. (1993) RULA: A survey method for investigation of work-related upper limb disorders. *Applied Ergonomics*, 24(2), 91 – 99
- McKeown, C. (2008). *Office ergonomics: practical applications*. CRC Press.
- McKeown, C. (2011). *Ergonomics in action: A practical guide for the workplace*. Iosh Taylor & Francis group



PTTAAUTHIM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUNJUNGAN AMINAH

- Mirzaei, R., Najarkola, S. A. M., Khanoki, B. A., & Ansari, H. (2014). Comparative Assessment of Upper Limbs Musculoskeletal Disorders by Rapid Upper Limb Assessment Among Computer Users of Zahedan Universities. *Health Scope*, 3(4)
- Moom, R.K., Sing, L.P. and Moom, N., 2015. Prevalence of Musculoskeletal Disorder among Computer Bank Office Employees in Punjab (India): A Case Study. *Procedia Manufacturing*, 3, 6624-6631.
- Monnington, S. C., Pinder, A. D., & Quarrie, C. (2002). *Development of an inspection tool for manual handling risk assessment*. Health and Safety Laboratory.
- Noroozi, M.V., Hajibabaei, M., Saki, A. and Memari, Z., 2015. Prevalence of Musculoskeletal disorders among office workers. *Jundishapur Journal of Health Sciences*, 7(1).
- Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) (2000). *Ergonomics program standard*. Washington, DC: Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).
- Occupation Safety & Health Administration (2003). *Computer Workstation e-Tool Checklist*, United State Department of Labor. Retrived from <https://www.osha.gov>.
- Occupation Safety & Health Administration (2013). *Computer Workstation* United State Department of Labor. Retrived from <https://www.osha.gov>.
- Phelan, C., & Wren, J. (2006). Exploring reliability in academic assessment. *UNI Office of Academic Assessment*.
- Piligian, G., Herbert, R., Hearn, M., Dropkin, J., Landsbergis, P., & Cherniack, M. (2000). Evaluation and management of chronic work-related musculoskeletal disorders of the distal upper extremity. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 37(1), 75-93.
- Poochada, W., & Chaiklieng, S. (2015). Ergonomic Risk Assessment among Call Center Workers. *Procedia Manufacturing*, 3, 4613-4620.



PTTA UTHM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUNKU TUN AMINAH

- Punnett, L. & Wegman, D. H. (2004). Work-related musculoskeletal disorders: the epidemiologic evidence and the debate. *Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology*, 14(1), 13-23.
- Robertson, M., Amick, B. C., DeRango, K., Rooney, T., Bazzani, L., Harrist, R., & Moore, A. (2009). The effects of an office ergonomics training and chair intervention on worker knowledge, behavior and musculoskeletal risk. *Applied Ergonomics*, 40(1), 124-135.
- Robertson, M. M., Ciriello, V. M., & Garabet, A. M. (2013). Office ergonomics training and a sit-stand workstation: Effects on musculoskeletal and visual symptoms and performance of office workers. *Applied Ergonomics*, 44(1), 73-85.
- Roscoe, J. T. (1975). *Fundamental research statistics for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rineheart and Winston.
- Roth, Cynthia. (2011). *The Importance of Ergonomics for the Safety Professional*. EHS Today The Magazine for Environment, Health and Safety Leaders. Retrieved from <http://ehstoday.com/news/importance-ergonomics-safety-3009/>
- Schneider, E., Paoli, P., & Brun, E. (2005). *Noise in figures. risk observatory*. Thematic report. BE: European Agency for Safety and Health at Work.-2005.
- Shikdar, A. A., & Al-Kindi, M. A. (2007). Office ergonomics: deficiencies in computer workstation design. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics*, 13(2), 215-223.
- Social Security Organization (SOCISO) (2006). *Statistics of SOCISO Annual Report*. Occup Dis Asean. Retrieved from: sww.issa.int/wssf07/document/ppt/2presentationazman.atmp.pdf.
- Sonne, M., Villalta, D. L., & Andrews, D. M. (2012). Development and evaluation of an office ergonomic risk checklist: ROSA–Rapid office strain assessment. *Applied ergonomics*, 43(1), 98-108.
- Takala, E. P., Pehkonen, I., Forsman, M., Hansson, G. Å., Mathiassen, S. E., Neumann, W. P., & Winkel, J. (2010). Systematic evaluation of observational



methods assessing biomechanical exposures at work. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 3-24.

Thomas, J. R., Silverman, S., & Nelson, J. (2015). *Research methods in physical activity*, 7E. Human kinetics.

Tint, P., Traumann, A., Pille, V., Tuulik-Leisi, V. R., & Tuulik, V. (2012). Computer users' health risks caused by the simultaneous influence of inadequate indoor climate and monotonous work. In *Agronomy Research*, 10 (Special Issue 1), 261-268. Research Institute of Agriculture, Estoni

Tittiranonda, P., Burastero, S., Rempel, D., (1999). Risk factors for musculoskeletal disorders among computer users. *Occupational Medicine Philadelphia*, 14, 17-38.

Turhan, N., Akat, C., Akyuz, M., & Çakci, A. (2008). Ergonomic risk factors for cumulative trauma disorders in VDU operators. *International journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics*, 14(4), 417-422.

Viera, A. J., & Garrett, J. M. (2005). Understanding interobserver agreement: The kappa statistic. *Family Medicine*, 37(5), 360–363.

Village, J., Rempel, D., Teschke, K., (2005). Musculoskeletal disorders of the upper extremity associated with computer work: a systematic review. *Occupational Ergonomic*. 5, 205-218.

Wahlström, J. (2005). Ergonomics, musculoskeletal disorders and computer work. *Occupational Medicine*, 55(3), 168-176.

Wærsted, M., Hanvold, T. N., & Veiersted, K. B. (2010). Computer work and musculoskeletal disorders of the neck and upper extremity: a systematic review. *BMC musculoskeletal disorders*, 11(1), 79.

Winkel, J. and Mathiassen, S. E. (1994). Assessment of physical work load in epidemiologic studies: concepts, issues and operational considerations. *Ergonomics*. 37, 979-988.

Yuan, L. (2015). Reducing ergonomic injuries for librarians using a participatory approach. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 47, 93-103.



PTTA UTHM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUN HUSSEIN ONN