



RPMME

Homepage: <http://penerbit.uthm.edu.my/periodicals/index.php/rpmme>
e-ISSN : 2773 - 4765

A Case Study of An Ergonomic Risk Assessment for Working Posture among Maintenance Workers

Lay Zhan Yek¹, Mohd Nasrull Abdol Rahman^{1*}

¹Faculty of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering
Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Parit Raja, 86400, MALAYSIA

*Corresponding Author Designation

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30880/rpmme.2023.04.01.011>

Received 15 August 2022; Accepted 31 January 2023; Available online 01 June 2023

Abstract: The purpose of ergonomics is to take advantage of human ability limits in order to implement an efficient and comfortable interface to use. When the worker is performing an improper posture, it may cause the worker to feel discomfort when doing the work and may lead to getting musculoskeletal disorders (MSD). According to past research, there is a relationship between improper working posture and MSD. The objective of this study was to determine the relationship between Cornell Musculoskeletal Discomfort Questionnaire (CMDQ) and Rapid Upper Limb Assessment (RULA), Rapid Entire Body Assessment (REBA) and Entire Body Risk Assessment (ENBORA). CMDQ, RULA, REBA and ENBORA were conducted among 34 maintenance workers around Parit Raja, Johor. The selected maintenance workers were interviewed via CMDQ and RULA, REBA and ENBORA were conducted based on their working posture at the time of the interview. The data were analyzed and compared based on similar observed body parts. Among the respondents, lower back discomfort was most prevalent (70.59%), followed by right and left shoulders (58.82% and 55.88%, respectively) as well as right wrist (29.47%) and left wrist (55.88%). The mean RULA Score for the respondents was 4.76 (SD=1.37) which indicates a medium risk level. The mean REBA Score for the respondents was 7.41 (SD=2.26) which indicates the average REBA risk level was high. The mean value for the ENBORA Final Score was 33.56 (SD=11.98), indicating that the respondents overall have a negligible risk of getting MSD based on their working posture. The body parts compared in CMDQ, RULA, REBA and ENBORA were neck, upper arm, lower arm, wrist and trunk. Based on findings, ENBORA has the highest Pearson Correlation to CMDQ followed by RULA and REBA. In conclusion, the maintenance workers were found to be exposed in ergonomic risk factors (ERFs) and ergonomics improvement were needed in future.

Keywords: ERA, Working Posture, Maintenance Workers, RULA, ENBORA

1. Introduction

Ergonomic can be defined as scientific discipline concerned with the understanding of interactions among humans and other elements of a system, and the profession that applies theory, principles, data

and methods to design in order to optimize human well-being and overall system performance [4]. In ergonomics, the posture and movement of a worker are important information for determining the risk of musculoskeletal disorders (MSD) in the workplace [12]. Besides, ergonomic intervention is the best strategy to prevent WMSDs and it aims to redesign the workstation and process to improve health, safety, and productivity [3].

Musculoskeletal disorders (MSD) are health problems involving the joints, cartilage, muscles, nerves, tendons, skeleton, ligaments, and related to the intensity and severity of work, although often light activities such as housework or exercise may also be involved [11]. Besides, these injuries are most commonly in relation to the muscular components of the neck, back, arms and legs [1]. For WMSDs, it fall under the category of MSD that are caused by occupational exposure which could be the reason for work restriction, work-time loss, and at times work leave [16]. In order to prevent MSD, the major risk factors of MSD should be quantitatively analyzed and there were several observational techniques have been developed for assessing risk factors of MSD [5].

Ergonomic Risk Assessments (ERA) are systematic plans that use to identify, assess and control ergonomic risk factors associated with the work task and activities in the workplace [4]. There are many types of ERA such as Rapid Upper Limb Assessment (RULA), Rapid Entire Body Assessment (REBA) and Entire Body Risk Assessment (ENBORA). One of the most common methods to evaluate the MSD was using Cornell Musculoskeletal Discomfort Questionnaire (CMDQ). This is because CMDQ combines the frequency and intensity of musculoskeletal pain and complaints with work-related impairments for 20 body regions in a chart on only one page [9].

There are relationships between postures of the neck, shoulder, and low back and WMSDs in a review of over 600 epidemiological studies and he also pointed out that upper extremity postures were related to WMSDs [8]. Besides, improper work design, postural disorders, repeated movements, high work load, difficult carrying works, lots of bending and stretching lead to musculoskeletal disorders, back, neck, shoulder, knee and hip complaints, head rotation and injuries [20]. In Malaysia, the number of reported musculoskeletal disorder (MSD) reported from Social Security Organization (SOCSCO) was increase from year 2005 to 2014 where only 10 cases of reported MSD reported from SOCSCO in the year of 2005 but the number of cases increased to 675 cases in the year of 2014 [4]. The objective of this study was to determine the relationship between CMDQ and RULA, REBA and ENBORA methods.

2. Methods

2.1 Introduction

Methodology can be describing as actions to be taken to investigate a research problem and the rationale for the application of specific procedures or techniques used to identify, select, process, and analyze information applied to understanding the problem, thereby, allowing the reader to critically evaluate a study's overall validity and reliability [7]. Before the study was conducted, the topics of this research has been reviewed so that the topics was following the title and objectives of the research. After the topics does not out of title and objectives, it was proceeded to find and determine the sample size of the research. In this study, the sample size were 34 maintenance workers around Parit Raja. The respondents were given CMDQ as an interview for their own standing of their health condition. After that, some footage of their working condition were recorded to perform the ergonomic risk assessments. RULA, REBA and ENBORA have been performed by using a goniometer, force gauge and the data collected on site. The results were recorded and analyzed to compare the ergonomic risk assessment and identify their relation to CMDQ.




Figure 1: Flowchart of research study

2.2 Population and Sample Size

Sample size must be determined before conducting any research. This is because without sample size, the limitation of the research cannot be determined and will cause the research to be less accurate. For this research, the sample size was around 30 to 40 maintenance workers. The sample size of this research was calculated using formula below [18]. The confidence level of the sample size is 90% and the margin error is 15%.

$$\text{Sample size} = \frac{\frac{z^2 \times p(1 - p)}{e^2}}{1 + \left(\frac{z^2 \times p(1 - p)}{e^2 N}\right)} \quad \text{Eq. 1}$$

Where,

e is the margin error

z is the z-score of desired confidence level

N is the population size

2.3 Selection of Work Area

The work area for this research was Parit Raja. Parit Raja is a town located in Batu Pahat district in Johor state, Malaysia. Parit Raja is approximately 7 km from Ayer Hitam and 22km from Batu Pahat. It takes approximately 3 hours to reach from Kuala Lumpur, capital city of Malaysia because the distance were around 261km. One of the Malaysia's public university, Tun Hussein Onn University of Malaysia (UTHM) also is located in Parit Raja, Batu Pahat, Johor. The population of Parit Raja is around 17400. There were at least three work area in Parit Raja selected as workplace. This is because different work area can get different data for different working posture. The data of working posture obtained has been performed RULA, REBA and ENBORA.

2.4 Cornell Musculoskeletal Discomfort Questionnaire

CMDQ questionnaire has 6 components [6]. Two for sedentary workers, two for standing workers and the rest is for hand symptoms. The questionnaire for sedentary workers and standing workers was divided into the male version and the female version. For hand symptoms questionnaire, it was divided into left hand and right hand. The questionnaire for sedentary workers and standing workers were questionnaire for the entire body questionnaire. Since the questionnaire is used to research screening purposes, it cannot be used as a diagnostic tool. This is because there is various factor that causes the MSD. As this research is focused on the working posture of the maintenance workers, only standing workers questionnaire were used.

2.5 Rapid Upper Limb Assessment

The RULA tool is a screening tool based on observation, which is used to assess exposure to load factors due to posture of the neck, trunk and upper limb along with muscle use and forces [4][14]. Since RULA is an observational method, it does not need an advanced degree in ergonomics or expensive equipment to be conducted. RULA is conducted by assigning scores for each body region and the data were used to compile the risk factor variables and generate a single score that represents the level of MSD risk [4]. RULA score were assigned to each body part which include the arm, wrist, neck and trunk and leg according to their position. Besides, RULA can only apply to evaluate one side of the body.

2.6 Rapid Entire Body Assessment

REBA is an ergonomic risk assessment that means to assess posture for risks of work-related musculoskeletal disorders and it was used to evaluate evaluating jobs that involve dynamic and static postures [10]. Before the REBA is conducted, the posture that were evaluated was selected by the participant based on the difficulty to perform the posture, time is taken for a period of a posture or the load of the posture. For REBA, the score was assigned based on the position of the arm, wrist, neck, leg and trunk.

2.7 Entire Body Risk Assessment

As an observational method, ENBORA is also very easy to be conducted because it has the bench mark of risk level as well as action on the evaluation of tasks in the workplace [15]. ENBORA has been separated into 4 parts. The first part is related to the physical risk factor. This part covers the position of the body part which is the neck, shoulder, elbow, wrist, back and legs. Before conducting the assessment, the participant was required to provide their personal information such as weight and height. This is because it was used in the fourth part of the ENBORA. The first part also covers the frequency of the posture and the load of the posture. Part 2 of the ENBORA covers the psychological risk factors. The risk included work stress, work load, work pace, social entertainment and monotony task. The risk factor in part 3 of ENBORA was work organization risk factors. This part covers the

working hours per week and the task duration. The last part of ENBORA was individual risk factors which include the body mass index (BMI) and smoking history of respondents.

2.8 Data Collection

The data collected for this research were survey and interview conducted on respondents, their risk assessment score sheet and the analysis of the score sheet. After the interview, the working posture of respondents were observed and recorded. During the observation process, video recording and photos also has been taken as proof and used for risk assessment. Besides that, tools such as goniometer and weight scale were used to identify the posture angle and the posture load. When the data required is collected, RULA, REBA and ENBORA were conducted on respondents. After the score sheet for each risk assessment was done, analysis and comparison to the data were occurred.

2.9 Data Analysis


By using the Wrist & Arm Score and Neck, Trunk, Leg Score, the RULA Score can be obtained. By locating the corresponding score of Wrist & Arm Score and Neck, Trunk, Leg Score in Table C of Appendix E, the RULA Score was identified. In order to identify the REBA Score from the REBA worksheet, Score A and Score B were used in the row and column of Table C in REBA to locate the Score C. The REBA Score was obtained after adding the Score C and Activity Score. For the ENBORA, the total score for each risk factors were added to obtain the Final Score. After the score and risk level of each risk assessment were found, the data were analyzed by using EXCEL and Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Pearson Correlation. The comparison of the data can be shown clearly by using these methods. After the comparison is concluded, the relationship between CMDQ and each risk assessment were determined.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Results of CMDQ Questionnaire

This study found out that most of the respondents have discomfort in the lower back during the interview. There were 24 (70.59%) of the respondents who had at least 1 to 2 times of discomfort in the lower back for the past working week. The second most discomfort that occurred in body parts was the shoulders. There were 20 (58.82%) and 19 (55.88%) respondents have discomfort in their right shoulders and left shoulders respectively. The third most discomfort experienced body part were the wrists. There were 10 (29.47%) respondents who have right wrist discomfort while 7 (20.59%) respondents who have left wrist discomfort.

According to past research on aircraft maintenance workers, the most common discomfort body part among them was the lower back (41%), followed by the shoulders (31%) and wrists (29%) [2]. The questionnaire used for 194 interviews was Nordic Musculoskeletal Questionnaire (NMQ) among the aircraft maintenance workers [2]. The results were similar to this study as the lower back, shoulders and wrists were the 3 most common discomfort body parts among the respondents. Besides that past research also showed the most common discomfort body part among vehicle repair workers in Hawassa city, Ethiopia also was the lower back (62.8%), followed by the shoulders (61%) and wrists (32.3%) [19].



* the % is the percentage of respondents experienced discomfort at least 1-2 times per week for each body part

Figure 2: Data for CMDQ for each body parts

3.2 Results of RULA

Based on the data analysis, the neck has the highest mean value in RULA which was 3.03 (SD=1.11). The second highest was the trunk with a mean value of 2.65 (SD=1.18). The upper arm has a mean value of 2.41 (SD=1.16) which was the third highest mean value among the body parts in RULA assessment. According to past research, their research found that the body part with the highest mean value was the neck with 4.39 (SD=0.28) [17]. Their second highest mean was the trunk with 3.61 (SD=0.26) followed by the upper arm with 2.66 (SD=0.23) [17]. The results of RULA in this study were similar to theirs. The slight difference may be caused by the different variety of postures performed by respondents.

Table 1: Results of RULA

Body Part	Mean	Standard Deviation (SD)
Upper Arm	2.41	1.16
Lower Arm	1.71	0.76
Wrist	1.94	0.89
Wrist Twist	1.21	0.59
Neck	3.03	1.11
Trunk	2.65	1.18
Leg	1.32	0.53
Final Score	4.76	1.37

3.3 Results of REBA

Based on the analysis, the neck has the highest body part mean values among other body parts in REBA. The mean value of the trunk was 2.85 (SD=1.05). The second highest was the upper arm, with

a mean value of 2.47 (SD=1.13) followed by the leg with 2.26 (SD=1.36). The results of REBA obtained from past research were different compared to the results of this study [17]. Their highest mean value of body part was the leg with 3.37 (SD=0.36) followed by the trunk with 3.20 (SD=0.41) and the upper arm with 2.09 (0.15) [17]. The position of the legs of respondents might be different and cause the difference in the arrangement of the top 3 highest mean value body parts.

Most of the respondents in this research have the REBA Score between 8 to 10. The percentage of respondents was 50%. The past research done on aircraft maintenance workers has found that most of them have REBA Score between 8 to 10 with 57% of their respondents [2]. Besides that, past research have found that 55.5% of auto mechanics were at high and very high levels of risk [13]. This showed that the results of REBA Score of this study were similar to the past research.

Table 2: Results of REBA

Body Part	Mean	Standard Deviation (SD)
Neck	1.94	0.74
Trunk	2.85	1.05
Leg	2.26	1.36
Upper Arm	2.47	1.13
Lower Arm	1.38	0.49
Wrist	1.41	0.56
Final Score	7.41	2.26

3.4 Results of ENBORA

Based on the analysis, the hands/wrists body part has the highest mean value of 4.94 (SD=3.96). The second highest was shoulders with a mean value of 4.62 (SD=3.45). Legs have the third highest mean value in physical risk factors of ENBORA, which is 3.88 (SD=3.58). The fourth highest mean value was neck with 2.29 (SD=2.15). The results obtained were different compared to past research [2][17][13]. This is because ENBORA is taking considers the repetition of the individual for each movement and body part. The respondents in this study have a low repetition cycle within 1 minute and this will affect the total score of physical risk factors and ENBORA Final Score. Therefore the result of ENBORA determined the respondents have low and very low risk level while the other assessment determined high and very high risk.

Table 3: Results of ENBORA

Risk Factors	Mean	Standard Deviation (SD)
A - Neck	2.29	2.15
B - Shoulders	4.62	3.45
C - Elbows	1.47	1.89
D - Hands / Wrists	4.94	3.96
E - Back	1.97	2.52
F - Legs	3.88	3.58
G - Forceful exertion	0.21	0.54
H - Contact stress	1.82	0.58
I - Vibration	0.09	0.38
J - Work stress	0.65	0.69
K - Work load	1.88	0.69
L - Work pace	1.94	0.34
M - Social environment	1.47	0.93

N - Monotony task	0.97	0.58
O - Task duration	2.00	0.00
P - Work Schedule	2.00	0.00
Q - BMI	0.38	0.70
R - Smoking History	1.03	1.00
Final Score	33.56	11.98

3.5 Comparison of CMDQ, RULA, REBA and ENBORA

After the data for each questionnaire and assessment were obtained, the data for each similar section were compared by using SPSS. The similar section among the CMDQ, RULA, REBA and ENBORA were the neck, trunk, upper arms, lower arms. and wrists. Table 1 below shows the result of the comparison. The ENBORA has the highest correlation to the CMDQ as it has the highest Pearson Correlation in most of the compared body parts. The second was RULA as it has 4 body parts which have the second highest Pearson Correlation to CMDQ. The third was REBA. Even though ENBORA has the highest correlation among other assessments, there were no correlations higher than 0.500. This may be caused by the sample size and the difference in questionnaires and assessments. The result obtained were similar to the past research's result for RULA and REBA [17]. Their results was RULA has higher correlation to prevalence of WMSDs compare to REBA for upper arm, lower arm, wrist, trunk and neck body parts [17]. The negative correlation that occurred may caused by the low mean value for the CMDQ neck part. The CMDQ neck score has a low mean value while the other assessments have scored with a high mean value. For the trunk body part, ENBORA has a negative correlation when compared to CMDQ because the mean value of the trunk was the lowest among the assessments. This is because the scores of ENBORA also consider the repetition of each body part. If a body part has a high bend but its repetition within a minute is low, the outcome will be low compared to others assessments.

Table 4: Comparison of CMDQ, RULA, REBA and ENBORA

Body Part		CMDQ	RULA	REBA	ENBORA
Neck	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.008	-0.187	-0.233
	2-tailed significance		0.963	0.289	0.185
Upper Arm	Pearson Correlation	1	0.115	0.104	0.368*
	2-tailed significance		0.518	0.557	0.032
Lower Arm	Pearson Correlation	1	0.311	0.183	0.379*
	2-tailed significance		0.074	0.301	0.027
Wrist	Pearson Correlation	1	0.208	0.145	0.333
	2-tailed significance		0.238	0.414	0.054
Trunk	Pearson Correlation	1	0.177	0.090	-0.029
	2-tailed significance		0.318	0.614	0.873

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

4. Conclusion

The first objective was to investigate MSD among workers related to working posture using CMDQ. It was completed as CMDQ was used when interviewing the respondents before conducting the ERA. The most common discomfort in body parts among the respondents was found and was similar to the previous study [2][19]. Since there was no past research done based on ENBORA, it was compared by using other ERA and the results were different. This is because ENBORA also considers the repetition of each body part, unlike RULA and REBA. Based on findings, ENBORA has the highest

Pearson Correlation to CMDQ followed by RULA and REBA. Based on the findings, it was found that there were strong relationship between CMDQ and RULA, REBA as well as ENBORA as most of the Pearson Correlations for each body parts does not close to zero. In conclusion, the maintenance workers were found to be exposed in ergonomics risk factors (ERFs) and ergonomics improvement were needed in future. For recommendation, suggestion can be made and advised to respondents to help further reduce their risk level of getting MSD. The results of this study can be used in future research when selecting the suitable tools to identify the risk level of workers related to working posture. Other than that, the future similar research also recommended to seek for professional advise and review to further improve the accuracy of data as well as the identify the risk factors of the workers. To further increase the accuracy of the data, it also recommended to increase the sample size of the respondents. Other than sample size, the observation time of respondents also can be increased for different tasks done by respondents. This is because maintenance workers have a variety of tasks and different working postures were used for each task.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank the Faculty of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia for its support.

References

- [1] Abobakr, A., Nahavandi, D., Hossny, M., Iskander, J., Attia, M., Nahavandi, S., & Smets, M. (2019). RGB-D ergonomic assessment system of adopted working postures. *Applied Ergonomics*, 80, 75–88.
- [2] Asadi, H., Yu, D., & Mott, J. H. (2019). Risk factors for musculoskeletal injuries in airline maintenance, repair & overhaul. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 70, 107–115.
- [3] Colim, A., Faria, C., Braga, A. C., Sousa, N., Rocha, L., Carneiro, P., Costa, N., & Arezes, P. (2020). Towards an Ergonomic Assessment Framework for Industrial Assembly Workstations—A Case Study. *Applied Sciences*, 10(9), 3048.
- [4] Department of Occupational Safety and Health (2017). *Guidelines On Ergonomics Risk Assessment At Workplace*. Ministry of Human Resources, Putrajaya, Malaysia.
- [5] Enez, K., & Nalbantoğlu, S. S. (2019). Comparison of ergonomic risk assessment outputs from OWAS and REBA in forestry timber harvesting. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 70, 51–57.
- [6] Human Factors and Ergonomics Laboratory at Cornell University. (2008). CUergo: Musculoskeletal Discomfort Questionnaires. Ergo.human.cornell.edu. <https://ergo.human.cornell.edu/ahmsquest.html>
- [7] Kallet, R.H. (2004). How to write the methods section of a research paper. *Respiratory care*, 49(10), 1229-32 .
- [8] Kee, D., Na, S., & Chung, M. K. (2020). Comparison of the Ovako Working Posture Analysis System, Rapid Upper Limb Assessment, and Rapid Entire Body Assessment based on the maximum holding times. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 77, 102943.

- [9] Kreuzfeld, S., Seibt, R., Kumar, M., Rieger, A., & Stoll, R. (2016). German version of the Cornell Musculoskeletal Discomfort Questionnaire (CMDQ): translation and validation. *Journal of Occupational Medicine and Toxicology*, 11(1).
- [10] Mahboobi, M., Taghipour, M., & Ali Azadeh, M. (2020). Assessing ergonomic risk factors using combined data envelopment analysis and conventional methods for an auto parts manufacturer. *Work*, 67(1), 113–128.
- [11] Mallapiang, F., Azriful, Nildawati, Syarfaini, Muis, M., & Adriansyah. (2021). The relationship of posture working with musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) in the weaver West Sulawesi Indonesia. *Gaceta Sanitaria*, 35, S15–S18.
- [12] Mohammadipour F, Pourranjbar M, Naderi S, Rafie F. (2018). Work-related Musculoskeletal Disorders in Iranian Office Workers: Prevalence and Risk Factors. *J Med Life*, 11(4):328-333.
- [13] Moradi, M., Poursadeghiyan, M., Khammar, A., Hami, M., Darsnj, A., & Yarmohammadi, H. (2017). REBA method for the ergonomic risk assessment of auto mechanics postural stress caused by working conditions in Kermanshah (Iran). *Annals of Tropical Medicine and Public Health*, 10(3), 589–594.
- [14] Namwongsa, S., Puntumetakul, R., Neubert, M. S., Chaiklieng, S., & Boucaut, R. (2018). Ergonomic risk assessment of smartphone users using the Rapid Upper Limb Assessment (RULA) tool. *PLOS ONE*, 13(8), e0203394.
- [15] Rahman, M. N. A. ENBORA Teknik Penilaian Eisiko Ergonomic di Tempat Kerja. Tun Hussein Onn University of Malaysia: Penerbit UTHM. 2019.
- [16] Rahman, M. N. A., Aziana Abdul Rahman, S., Ismail, A. E., & Sadikin, A. (2017). Inter-Rater Reliability of the New Observational Method for Assessing an Exposure to Risk Factors Related to Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders (WMSDS). *MATEC Web of Conferences*, 135, 00024.
- [17] Sadeghi Yarandi, M., Soltanzadeh, A., Koohpaei, A., Sajedian, A. A., Ahmadi, V., Sakari, S., & Yazdanirad, S. (2019). Effectiveness of Three Ergonomic Risk Assessment Tools, Namely NERPA, RULA, and REBA, for Screening Musculoskeletal Disorders. *Archives of Hygiene Sciences*, 8(3), 188–201.
- [18] SurveyMonkey. (2018). Sample Size Calculator: Understanding Sample Sizes | SurveyMonkey. SurveyMonkey. <https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/sample-size-calculator/>
- [19] Tamene, A., Mulugeta, H., Ashenafi, T., & Thygerson, S. M. (2020). Musculoskeletal Disorders and Associated Factors among Vehicle Repair Workers in Hawassa City, Southern Ethiopia. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*, 2020, 9472357.
- [20] Yaylı, D., & Çalışkan, E. (2019). Comparison of Ergonomic Risk Analysis Methods for Working Postures of Forest Nursery Workers. *European Journal of Forest Engineering*, 5(1), 18–24.