

**AN INVESTIGATION
INTO THE
APPLICATION OF ERGONOMIC PRINCIPLES
TO THE USE OF
DESKTOP KEYBOARD-OPERATED
COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY
WITHIN ORGANISATIONS**

A Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Janet Kaye Sawyer

BA (Acc), Grad Dip T, M Ed Studies

Department of Public Health

The University of Adelaide

December 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iv
DECLARATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	xv
Chapter	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Background to the Empirical Studies	3
The Nature of Ergonomics	6
The Nature of Computer-Related Disorders	9
Ergonomic Factors Relevant to the Prevention of Computer-Related Disorders	24
Work Station Design	26
Posture and the Design/Layout of Furniture and Equipment	28
Physical Work Environment	40
Software Ergonomics and Mouse Use	42
Job Design	44
Job Training	48
Psychosocial Work Environment	52
The Significance of the Studies in their Time	54
2 DESIGN AND METHOD	62
Nature and Purpose	65
Studies I and II	65
Study III	66
Study IV	67
Study V	68
Study VI	69

Sample Selection	70
Studies I and II	70
Study III	71
Studies IV and V	71
Study VI	72
Data Collection	73
Studies I and II	74
Study III	78
Studies IV	79
Study V	83
Study VI	84
Validation of Questionnaire	90
Administration of Questionnaires	93
Statistical Analysis	96
Studies I and II	96
Study III	97
Study IV	98
Study V	101
Study VI	102
Summary	104
3 FINDINGS: STUDIES I AND II	105
Findings Relating to Knowledge of Ergonomics	109
Findings Relating to Priority given to Ergonomics	124
Summary of the Findings	140
4 FINDINGS: STUDY III	149
Findings Relating to Knowledge of Ergonomics	151
Findings Relating to Priority given to Ergonomics	163
Summary of the Findings	172
5 FINDINGS: STUDY IV	177
Findings Relating to Knowledge of Ergonomics	180
Findings Relating to Priority given to Ergonomics	190
Psychosocial and Physical Health Aspects of Computer Use	195
Summary of the Findings	207

6 FINDINGS: STUDY V	212
Findings Relating to Knowledge of Ergonomics	216
Findings Relating to Priority given to Ergonomics	225
Summary of the Findings	232
7 FINDINGS: STUDY VI	237
Findings in relation to Ergonomic Knowledge and Behaviour	241
Findings Relating to Compliance	253
Findings in relation to Psychological Well-being and Job Satisfaction	263
Findings Relating to Physical Health Symptoms	269
Findings in relation to the Work Environment	279
Summary of the Findings	283
8 CONCLUSIONS	291
Collective Significance of the Empirical Studies	291
The Context of the Findings of the Empirical Studies	316
Recent Developments in the field of Ergonomics	323
Theory versus Practice	329
Final Remarks	333
REFERENCES	337
APPENDICES	353
APPENDIX 1: <i>Ergonomics and Computer Technology</i> Questionnaire	355
APPENDIX 2: <i>An Analysis of Ergonomic Principles</i> <i>and Work</i> Questionnaire	364
APPENDIX 3: List of Thesis Publications	384

ABSTRACT

Procedures for the ergonomic use of desktop computer technology are well documented. The design of computer workstations, positioning of the body, and ergonomic work practices have received a great deal of attention and the relevant ergonomic principles are extensively covered in books, manuals, information guides, and web sites. Despite the proliferation of material, however, there is a wide gap between theory and practice. This thesis investigates the reasons why by comparing the knowledge of practice, derived from four field studies at different times in different kinds of organisation, with the extensive literature on ergonomics that was available at the time.

The studies showed that levels of ergonomic knowledge and the priority given to ergonomic computer use were low, irrespective of location, but generally better in public-sector organisations. However, academic staff and post-graduate students reported least awareness of ergonomic principles, were least likely to have received training in ergonomics provided by their organisation, and experienced the highest proportion of physical health symptoms. Most workers did not know whether their organisation had written policies and procedures regarding the ergonomic use of computers. The majority believed ergonomic computer use was not given sufficient priority within their organisation and that they needed to spend more time in training on ergonomics. Most were satisfied with their job; the work was interesting and there was a variation of tasks. The work environments were generally supportive and the people had adequate job control, although urgencies and deadlines dominated the organisation of work. Overall, the respondents were methodical, thorough, conscientious people who demonstrated generally compliant behaviour in other health promotion areas.

It was concluded that the computer users would be more likely than not to apply ergonomic principles to their work if given appropriate information, training and encouragement. The findings highlighted the prevalence of non-ergonomic computer work and provided insights into the nature and extent of the computer-related health problems being experienced. They could have fuelled more commitment to ergonomic computer use within organisations and the development of a workplace culture that took this aspect of work safety seriously and put the proliferating information available into action.

DECLARATION

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by any other person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give my consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being available for loan and photocopying.

Janet Sawyer

December 2004

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the following people for their support in undertaking this thesis:

Dr Neville Hicks, my supervisor, for his valuable guidance and advice;

Mr John Petkov, for his help with the statistical analysis;

Mr Digby Wilson, Dr June Stephenson, Dr Maureen Dollard and Ms Pam Zubrinich for their encouragement;

My employer, the University of South Australia, for providing a variety of resources;

My family for their faith and patience; and

The Managers and Computer Operators who participated in the studies, for the time and thought given to their responses.

For Rod

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1.1	Number and Cost to Date of WorkCover Claims of Non-exempt Employers where the Agency was Computers and Keyboards for all Industries for period 1995-1996	57
Table 1.2	Number and Cost of WorkCover Claims of Non-exempt Employers for the Agency of Computers and Keyboards for period 1991-92 to 1996-97 by Gender and Time Lost	58
Table 1.3	RSI Cases in the US, Years 1978 to 1990	59
Table 1.4	National Occupational Injury and Disease Cases in Australia 1987-88 to 1994-95	60
Table 3.1	Number of Questionnaires Returned and Response Rates for Types of Organisation (Private or Government) ordered by Size (Small and Medium-Large)	106
Table 3.2	Number and Percentage of Respondents by Age, Gender and Position within Organisation	107
Table 3.3	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting Where Respondents Learnt to Operate a Computer	109
Table 3.4	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting Attendance at Education/Training Sessions Provided by their Organisation	110
Table 3.5	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether they Believed they Needed More Time in Training/Update Sessions	111
Table 3.6	Responses Reporting how Respondents Applied their Knowledge of Ergonomics to their Work Situation	112
Table 3.7	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether they were Aware of the Principles of Ergonomics relating to the Use of Computers	113
Table 3.8	Responses Reporting how Respondents Received their Knowledge of Ergonomics relating to Computer Use	113
Table 3.9	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether they had Read Documents on Ergonomic Computer Use	114

Table 3.10	Responses Reporting Factors Considered by Respondents in Organising their Work Day	115
Table 3.11	Responses Reporting How Often Rest Breaks should be Taken	116
Table 3.12	Activities Respondents Believed could be Undertaken in Rest Breaks	117
Table 3.13	Responses Reporting Factors Considered by Respondents when Choosing Office Furniture and Equipment	118
Table 3.14	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting whether Respondents carried out Pause Gymnastics or Exercised when Using Computers	124
Table 3.15	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting the Priority Placed on the Importance of Ergonomics by their Organisation	125
Table 3.16	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether Ergonomic Principles were given Sufficient Priority in their Organisation	125
Table 3.17	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting whether Organisation had a Written Policy on Ergonomics and the Use of Computers	126
Table 3.18	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting whether Organisation in process of Formulating a Written Policy on Ergonomics and Computer Use	127
Table 3.19	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting whether Organisation had a Written Policy on Rehabilitation of Employees Affected by Computer-Related Injury	127
Table 3.20	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting whether Organisation in process of Formulating a Written Policy on Rehabilitation of Employees Affected by Computer-Related Injury	128
Table 3.21	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting whether Organisation Stresses the Importance of Ergonomic Work Practices	128
Table 3.22	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting whether a Person had been Delegated Responsibility for Ensuring Ergonomic Practices are Followed	129

Table 3.23	Responses Reporting how Organisation Responds to Breaches of Recommended Work Practices	130
Table 3.24	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting whether Computer Users are Required to Report Incidents of Computer-Related Injury	130
Table 3.25	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting whether Organisation Keeps Records Relating to Computer-Related Injury	131
Table 3.26	Percentage of Respondents Rating each Item to Reflect the Importance they Believed their Organisation Placed on the Item	132
Table 3.27	Rotated Factor Loadings Relating to Rating of Items by Respondents	134
Table 3.28	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting whether Respondents ever had a Work-related Complaint of Pain in some Part of the Body	136
Table 3.29	Work-related Complaints of Pain in various Parts of the Body	138
Table 4.1	Number of Questionnaires Returned and Response Rates By Type of Respondent	150
Table 4.2	Number and Percentage of Respondents by Age, Gender and Faculty/Campus	150
Table 4.3	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether they had Received Educational Training in Ergonomics provided by the University	151
Table 4.4	Responses reporting How Respondents Applied their Knowledge of Ergonomics	152
Table 4.5	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting Time Spent in Educational Training in Ergonomics Provided by the University	153
Table 4.6	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether they Believed they Needed more Time in Educational Training	153
Table 4.7	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether they were Aware of the Principles of Ergonomics relating to the Use of Computers	154

Table 4.8	Responses Reporting how Respondents Received their Knowledge of Ergonomics relating to Computer Use	154
Table 4.9	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether they had Read Documents on Ergonomic Computer Use	155
Table 4.10	Responses Reporting Factors Considered by Respondents in Organising their Work Day	156
Table 4.11	Responses Reporting How Often Rest Breaks Should be Taken	157
Table 4.12	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting Taking Rest Breaks	157
Table 4.13	Activities Respondents Believed could be Undertaken in Rest Breaks	158
Table 4.14	Responses Reporting Factors Considered by Respondents when Choosing Office Furniture and Equipment	159
Table 4.15	Rotated Factor Loadings relating to Correct Responses to scenarios in Survey Questionnaire number 15 (a) to (i) and number 16 (a) to (i)	162
Table 4.16	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting how often they carry out Pause Gymnastics or Exercise when using a Computer	163
Table 4.17	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether University had a Written Policy on Ergonomics and Computer Use	164
Table 4.18	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting the Priority they believe is placed on Ergonomics and Computer Use by the University	164
Table 4.19	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether they believed Ergonomic Principles relating to Computer Use were given Sufficient Priority within the University	165
Table 4.20	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting Computer-related Complaints of Pain	168
Table 4.21	Computer-Related Complaints of Pain Reported by Respondents	169

Table 5.1	Number of Questionnaires Returned and Response Rates for Type of Organisations (Private or Government) ordered by Size (Small and Medium to Large)	178
Table 5.2	Number and Percentage of Respondents by Age, Gender and Position within Organisation	178
Table 5.3	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting Where Respondents Learnt to Operate a Computer	180
Table 5.4	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting Attendance at Education/Training Sessions Provided by their Organisation	181
Table 5.5	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether they Believed they Needed More Time in Training/Update Sessions	181
Table 5.6	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether they were Aware of the Principles of Ergonomics relating to the Use of Computers	182
Table 5.7	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether they Take Rest Breaks away from Computer	183
Table 5.8	Responses to Questions Relating to the Priority Given to Ergonomics within the Organisation	192
Table 5.9	Results of the GHQ-12 for all Respondents	195
Table 5.10	Results of the GHQ-12 Psychological Distress - all Respondents	196
Table 5.11	Rotated Factor Loadings Relating to GHQ-12	197
Table 5.12	Percentage of Respondents Reporting Physical Health Symptoms	198
Table 5.13	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting Job Satisfaction	200
Table 5.14	Global Job Satisfaction - all Respondents	200
Table 5.15	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting Job Security	200
Table 5.16	Responses Regarding the Work Environment	201

Table 5.17	Rotated Factor Loadings Relating to Ergonomics and Work Environment	203
Table 5.18	Rotated Factor Loadings Relating to Physical Health Symptoms	206
Table 5.19	Ridge Regression Summary regarding Hours of Daily Computer Use and Physical Health Symptoms	207
Table 6.1	Percentage of Respondents by Age, Gender and Position within Organisation	214
Table 6.2	Number and Percentage of Respondents using a Computer for Four or More Hours Daily	215
Table 6.3	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether they are Aware of the Principles of Ergonomics relating to the Use of Computers	216
Table 6.4	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting Attendance at Education/Training Sessions Provided by their Organisation	217
Table 6.5	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether they Believed they Needed More Time in Training/Update Sessions	218
Table 6.6	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting Where Respondents Learnt to Operate a Computer	219
Table 6.7	Number and Percentage of Respondent Reporting whether they had Read Documents on Ergonomic Computer Use	219
Table 6.8	Number and Percentage of Respondent Reporting whether they Take Rest Breaks away from Computer	219
Table 6.9	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether Organisation had a Written Policy on Ergonomics and the Use of Computers	225
Table 6.10	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting whether Computer Users were Required to Report Incidents of Computer-Related Disorders	226
Table 6.11	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting whether Organisation Keeps Records Relating to Computer-Related Disorders	227
Table 6.12	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting whether Organisation had a Written Policy on Rehabilitation of Employees Affected by Computer-Related Disorders	228

Table 6.13	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether Organisation Stresses the Importance of Ergonomic Work Practices	229
Table 6.14	Number and Percentage of Responses Reporting whether a Person had been Delegated Responsibility for Ensuring Ergonomic Practices are Followed	229
Table 6.15	Number and Percentage of Respondents reporting whether Ergonomic Principles related to Computer Use are given Sufficient Priority within their Organisation	231
Table 7.1	Number and Percentage of Respondents by Age, Gender, Position within Organisation and Educational Qualifications	238
Table 7.2	Reporting of Respondents in relation to wearing Glasses, Fitness levels, and perceptions of their Position within the Organisation	239
Table 7.3	Percentage of Respondents Wearing Glasses who Reported Neck and Shoulder Problems	240
Table 7.4	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether they were Aware of the Principles of Ergonomics relating to the Use of Computers	242
Table 7.5	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting Attendance at Education/Training Sessions Provided by their Organisation	243
Table 7.6	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether they Believed they Needed More Time in Training/Update Sessions	243
Table 7.7	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether they had Read Documents on Ergonomic Computer Use	244
Table 7.8	Responses Reporting how Respondents Applied their Knowledge of Ergonomics to their Work Situation	249
Table 7.9	Activities Respondents Believed could be Undertaken in Rest Breaks	251
Table 7.10	Ergonomic Knowledge and Application of Ergonomics	252
Table 7.11	Compliance Scale: Responses relating to Sun Exposure, Smoking Cigarettes, and Drinking Alcohol	254

Table 7.12	Rotated Factor Loadings Relating to Compliance Scale	256
Table 7.13	Responses Relating to the Personality factors of Extraversion, Emotionality, Openness, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness	258
Table 7.14	The Quick Scales Personality Results - all Respondents	260
Table 7.15	The Quick Scales: Means and Medians	260
Table 7.16	Personality and Application of Ergonomics	262
Table 7.17	GHQ-12 Responses from the Majority of Respondents	264
Table 7.18	Results of the GHQ-12 Psychological Distress - all Respondents	265
Table 7.19	GHQ-12 scores from other Studies: Means and Standard Deviations	265
Table 7.20	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting Job Satisfaction	267
Table 7.21	Global Job Satisfaction Results - all Respondents	267
Table 7.22	Global Job Satisfaction from other Studies: Means and Standard Deviations	268
Table 7.23	Percentage of Respondents Reporting Physical Health Symptoms	270
Table 7.24	Physical Health Symptoms and Personality	273
Table 7.25	Physical Health Symptoms and Ergonomic Knowledge	273
Table 7.26	Percentage of Respondents Reporting whether Part of Body Hurt in an Accident Unrelated to Work	275
Table 7.27	Percentage of Respondents Prevented from doing Normal Activities and the Number of Days involved	276
Table 7.28	Percentage of Respondents Consulting a Health Professional and Number of Consultations	277
Table 7.29	Percentage of Respondents Changing Jobs/Duties and Number of Work Days Lost	278
Table 7.30	Percentage of Responses Regarding the Work Environment	279

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
Figure 1.1	Consequences of Failure to Apply Anthropometry to Design of Workstations	28
Figure 1.2	Diagram showing the Seating Posture Recommended for Keyboard Work	35
Figure 2.1	Example of Survey Questions	76
Figure 2.2	Example of Questions containing Scenarios	77
Figure 3.1	Diagrams (a), (b), (f) and (i) Survey Question Number 15	120
Figure 3.2	Diagrams (a), (d) and (i) Survey Question Number 16	120
Figure 3.3	Percentage of Correct Responses to Scenarios Regarding Sitting Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists (Survey Questionnaire Number 15 (a) to 15 (i))	121
Figure 3.4	Percentage of Correct Responses to Scenarios Regarding Posture and the Layout of Equipment (Survey Questionnaire Number 16 (a) to 16 (i))	121
Figure 3.5	Percentage of Correct Responses to Scenarios Regarding Sitting Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists by Organisational Structure (Survey Questionnaire Number 15 (a) to 15 (i))	122
Figure 3.6	Percentage of Correct Responses to Scenarios Regarding Posture and the Layout of Equipment by Organisational Structure (Survey Questionnaire Number 16 (a) to 16 (i))	123
Figure 4.1	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Sitting Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists (Survey Questionnaire Number 15 (a) to 15 (i))	160
Figure 4.2	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Posture and the Layout of Equipment (Survey Questionnaire Number 16 (a) to (i))	160
Figure 5.1	Hours of Daily Use of a Desktop Computer Reported by all Respondents	179
Figure 5.2	Hours of Daily Computer Use by Position	180

Figure 5.3	Number of Respondents Reporting Awareness of Ergonomic Principles by Position	182
Figure 5.4	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Sitting Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists (Survey Questionnaire Number 13 (a) to 13 (i))	184
Figure 5.5	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Posture and the Layout of Equipment (Survey Questionnaire Number 14 (a) to 14 (i))	184
Figure 5.6	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Sitting Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists by Organisational Structure (Question Number 13 (a) to (i))	186
Figure 5.7	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Posture and the Layout of Equipment by Organisational Structure (Question Number 14 (a) to (i))	186
Figure 5.8	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists by Organisational Size (Question Number 13 (a) to (i))	187
Figure 5.9	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Posture and the Layout of Equipment by Organisational Size (Question Number 14 (a) to (i))	187
Figure 5.10	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Sitting Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists by Attendance at an Educational Program/Training Session (Question Number 13 (a) to (i))	188
Figure 5.11	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Posture and the Layout of Equipment by Attendance at an Educational Program (Question Number 14 (a) to (i))	188
Figure 5.12	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Sitting Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists by Gender (Question Number 13 (a) to (i))	189
Figure 5.13	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Posture and the Layout of Equipment by Gender (Question Number 14 (a) to (i))	189
Figure 5.14	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Sitting Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists by Position (Question Number 13 (a) to (i))	190

Figure 5.15	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Posture and the Layout of Equipment by Position (Question Number 14 (a) to (i))	190
Figure 5.16	Number of Respondents Reporting Existence of Written Policy on Ergonomic Computer Use by Organisational Type	192
Figure 5.17	Number of Respondents Reporting whether Delegation of Responsibility for Ergonomic Work Practices by Organisational Type	193
Figure 5.18	Number of Respondents Reporting whether Emphasis on Importance of Ergonomic Computer Use by Organisational Type	194
Figure 5.19	Number of Respondents Reporting whether Records Kept of Computer-Related Disorders by Organisational Type	194
Figure 5.20	Number of Respondents Reporting Existence of Written Rehabilitation Policy by Organisational Type	194
Figure 6.1	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Sitting Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists	221
Figure 6.2	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Posture and the Layout of Equipment	221
Figure 6.3	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Sitting Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists by Organisational Structure	222
Figure 6.4	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Posture and Layout of Equipment by Organisational Structure	222
Figure 6.5	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Sitting Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists by Organisational Size	223
Figure 6.6	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Posture and Layout of Equipment by Organisational Size	223
Figure 6.7	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Sitting Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists by Gender	224
Figure 6.8	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Posture and Layout of Equipment by Gender	224

Figure 6.9	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Sitting Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists by Position	225
Figure 6.10	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Posture and Layout of Equipment by Position	225
Figure 7.1	Theoretical Model of the Relationships between Ergonomic Knowledge, the Application of Ergonomic Knowledge and Health Symptoms	237
Figure 7.2	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Sitting Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists	245
Figure 7.3	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Posture and the Layout of Equipment	245
Figure 7.4	Diagrams (b), (i) and (c) Survey Question Number 12	246
Figure 7.5	Diagrams (b), (a) and (i) Survey Question Number 13	247
Figure 7.6	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Sitting Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists by Gender	247
Figure 7.7	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Posture and Layout of Equipment by Gender	247
Figure 7.8	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Sitting Posture and Positioning of the Arms and Wrists by Position	248
Figure 7.9	Percentage of Correct Answers to Scenarios Regarding Posture and Layout of Equipment by Position	248
Figure 7.10	The Quick Scales: Structural Equation Model	263
Figure 7.11	GHQ-12: Structural Equation Model	266
Figure 7.12	Physical Health Symptoms: Structural Equation Model	272
Figure 7.13	Work Environment Scale: Structural Equation Model	282