# ORIGINAL ARTICLE

# WORK-RELATED MUSCULOSKELETAL PROBLEMS AND THE ASSOCIATED RISK FACTORS AMONG RUBBER TAPPERS: A CASE STUDY AT A VILLAGE IN NORTHERN PENINSULAR MALAYSIA.

Ezrin Hani SUKADARIN¹\*, Sudaratt Pet TONG¹, Balqis Syahirah JAMALUDIN¹, Junaidah ZAKARIA¹ and Nur Syazwani Mohd NAWI²

<sup>1</sup>Occupational Safety and Health Program, Faculty of Industrial Sciences and Technology (FIST), Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Malaysia.

<sup>2</sup>Pusat Pengajian Pengurusan Teknologi dan Logistik, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia

\*Corresponding author: <a href="mailto:ezrin@ump.edu.my">ezrin@ump.edu.my</a>

# **ABSTRACT**

Rubber tapping involves repetitive and high paced work, static muscle loading, non-neutral body postures, forceful physical exertion, and many other potential risk factors for development of work-related musculoskeletal problems (WRMP). In this research, a cross-sectional study was carried out to identify the prevalence of WRMP among rubber tappers, to determine the psychosocial factors that contribute to WRMP, and to explore the relationship between psychosocial factors and physical factors among rubber tappers. Data collection was done using three instruments, namely Nordic Musculoskeletal Questionnaire (NMQ), Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ) and Rapid Upper Limb Assessment Tools (RULA). In total, 70 rubber tappers participated in this study. Results obtained in study revealed that majority of the rubber tappers suffering from lower back pain whereas in terms of psychosocial factors they have low social support and high job and physical demand. WRMP among rubber tappers are cannot be doubtable, however the risk can be reduced if the management of occupational safety and health risk is managed properly.

# Keywords: WRMPs, NMQ, RULA, JCQ

# INTRODUCTION

Work-related musculoskeletal problems (WRMP) are refer to conditions where the workers have experienced discomfort in one or multiple body parts such as neck, shoulder, back, elbow, hand, hip, and knee. The agriculture sector is a physically demanding occupation in which the work tasks may cause WRMP and also work disability (Park et al., 2010). It is commonly reported that rubber tappers received massive amounts of physical and mental workload which caused them to develop WRMP. Exposure to one ergonomic risk factor may not be enough to cause the WRMP, but there is some evidence showed that when there is the combination of few risk factor (i.e. forceful exertions, repetition, and awkward posture) occurring at high levels the WRMP likely to occur (Shan et al., 2011; Sukadarin et al., 2016a). For example, rubber tapper that performing the tapping task involves repetitive trunk bending and twisting with considerable arm extension at the same time.

Other ergonomic risk factors that present in the rubber tapping activity includes an age of the trees, height of tapping areas, the numbers of an area being tapped, uneven ground and the techniques used to perform the tapping process (Reddy, 2012; Shan et al., 2011; Asyraf et al., 2007). Incorrect postural practices at work such

as tapping the rubber trees at a low level, tapping rubber tree above head level due to the condition of the tree working with the hand above the shoulder height among women farmers (Shan et al., 2011).

In 2012, Meksawi et al. had conducted a research in Southern Thailand among 427 respondents, and the result showed that the low back area is the most prevalent with 52.9% of body region for WRMP development followed by legs (14.8%), upper arms (18.9%), neck (3.0%), wrists (2.3%) and lower arms (2.1%). Same finding was also found in a study by Shan et al. (2011) which conducted among 419 rubber tappers in Malaysia, had shown the results of 12 months the symptoms of Musculoskeletal Diseases (MSDs) prevalence was commonly reported at the neck area (59.9%) followed by lower back (56.3%), shoulders (54.9 %), knee (45.8%), ankles/feet (34.4 %), elbow (33.2%), upper back (30.8%), wrists (30.1 %), and hip/thighs (15.3%). Reddy et al., (2012) and Nair et al., (2015) also conducted among 343 and 154 of rubber tappers respectively in India and found that the results of 12 months the symptoms of MSDs prevalence also found higher at the neck (72.2%), followed by lower back (66.2%), shoulder(44.9%), knee (55.8%), ankles/feet (34.4%), elbow (33.2%), upper back (30.8%), wrists(50.1%), and hip/thighs(15.3%).

# Psychosocial factor

Working in the agriculture sector is known to be a physically and mentally demanding job. Psychosocial factors are identified to be one of the risk factors for developing WRMP (Eatough et al., 2012; Fernandes et al., 2010; Hansson et al., 2010; Meksawi et al., 2012; Shan et al., 2011). The research by Meksawi et al., (2012) found that fatigue was shown to increase the risk of WRMP with one-half of participants had a high level of perceived fatigue due to the high physical load of performing the tapping task. The factors that may contribute to the fatigue are inadequate time for rest, low level of social support, and inadequate income due to the rubber market prices fall down.

Psychosocial factors such as high job strain, high job dissatisfaction and feeling less enthusiasm about work which can lead to sickness absence (Choobineh et al., 2013). Psychosocial factors cannot be seen as risk factor just by themselves but however, when it combined with the physical risk factor, they can raise up the risk of injuries (Nunes & Bush, 2011). An excess of long hours working not only as a stressor or psychosocial problems but it also can lead to fatal accident, depending on the type of work (García-di, 2015). Therefore, in helping to ease their considerable WRMP burden, a greater focus will need to be placed on job satisfaction; job security, occupational stress, as well as the hazard drop strategies should be implemented on the manual tools, handling work tasks and other.

High mental demands also increased the risk of WRMP (Smith et al., 2006), especially when paired with low rewards (Simon et al., 2008). Due to economic unstable, it also lowered the income level of rubber growers and latex harvesting workers. In addition, as can be seen in the study of Stain et al., (2008) weather conditions can differ considerably, that may also affect workers' emotion and contributing towards work-related stress symptoms. Besides, Irwin & Poots, (2015) had revealed that lone working is associated with several risks including the possibility of assault, accident or injury, and the higher workload when it compared with working with a partner. In addition, working with partner(s) will make workers somehow less stress by making friends with others.

In view of limited study on the prevalence of WRMP among rubber tappers in Malaysia, this study is attempted to determine the prevalence of WRMP psychosocial risk factors. Therefore, the objectives of this study are 1) to determine the prevalence of WRMP among rubber tappers; 2) to determine the psychosocial risk factor that can contribute to

WRMP; 3) to assess postural problem among rubber tappers.

# **METHODS**

**Participants** 

A cross-sectional study is conducted among seventy (n=70) rubber tappers of different age, gender, height, weight, education level, underlying disease, smoking habit, working hours per day, length of working, trees tapped per day and level of tapping. The respondents were randomly selected to participate in this study. Previous studies showed that cross-sectional study is commonly used, where researchers focused on normal ergonomics problems occurrences in real-time (Sukadarin et al., 2016b).

Subjective Assessment on Musculoskeletal Complaint

Musculoskeletal Complaints (MSCs) were collected using the Nordic Musculoskeletal Questionnaire (NMQ) (Kuorinka et al., 1987). Previous researchers found that, even though NMQ was not developed as a clinical tool to diagnose MSDs problems, it can be used to identify body musculoskeletal problems similar to periodic check-ups (Sukadarin et al., 2016b).

Assessment of Psychosocial Factors.

The assessment of psychosocial factors is conducted using the Malay version of Karasek's Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ). The JCQ contains 4 main psychosocial factors. There are job control, psychological job demand, social support, and physical demands. A Likert-scale of 1 to 5 was used (1=strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= Neutral 4= agree and 5= strongly agree) to measure all items that related to psychosocial risk factors.

# Assessment of Physical Factors

RULA method by McAtamney and Corlett (1993) has been used to evaluate the level of ergonomic risk by observation of the posture of the respondent while they were tapping the rubber trees at their plantations.

# **RESULTS**

In total, there are 70 respondents that involved in this study. Table 1 shows the demographic data of respondents. Of all respondents, 55.7% of them are male. Most of the respondents have BMI in the normal range (50%). However, only 35.7% of them are smoking. In terms of educational level, 32.9% had no official education history, other 32.9% obtained SPM (Secondary Education in Malaysia) level. Most of the participants had in the range of 6-10 years' experience in rubber tapping.

п	┌~	h	۱.	- 1

Variable         N (%)           Age ( Years)         20-29           30-39         20(28.6)           40-49         16(22.9)           50-59         12(17.1)           60 and above         15(20)           BMI (Body Mass Index)         Underweight ( BMI less than 18.5)           Normal ( BMI 18.5 to 24.9)         35(50)           Overweight( BMI 25 to 29.9)         20(28.6)           Obese(BMI 30 or greater)         9(12.9)           Years of Working         25 Years           6-10 Years         20(28.6)           11-15 Years         9(12.9)           16-20 Years         8(11.4)           >21 Years         15(21.4)           Sex         Male         39(55.7)           Female         31(44.3)           Education Level         No education         23(32.9)           Primary School         34(48.6)           Current Smoker         Yes         25(35.7)           No         45(64.3)	I able I	
20-29       8(11.4)         30-39       20(28.6)         40-49       16(22.9)         50-59       12(17.1)         60 and above       15(20)         BMI (Body Mass Index)       Underweight (BMI less than 18.5)         Normal (BMI 18.5 to 24.9)       35(50)         Overweight(BMI 25 to 29.9)       20(28.6)         Obese(BMI 30 or greater)       9(12.9)         Years of Working       20(28.6)         11-15 Years       18(25.7)         6-10 Years       20(28.6)         11-15 Years       9(12.9)         16-20 Years       8(11.4)         >21 Years       15(21.4)         Sex       Male         Female       31(44.3)         Education Level       No education         Primary School       34(48.6)         Current Smoker       7es		N (%)
30-39	Age ( Years)	
40-49 50-59 12(17.1) 60 and above BMI (Body Mass Index) Underweight (BMI less than 18.5) Normal (BMI 18.5 to 24.9) Overweight(BMI 25 to 29.9) Obese(BMI 30 or greater) Years of Working < 5 Years 6-10 Years 11-15 Years 16-20 Years 9(12.9) 16-20 Years 20(28.6) 11-15 Years 15(21.4) Sex Male Female Sex Male Female Sex Male Female Sex Male Sex Sex Male Sex Sex Male Sex Male Sex Sex Male Sex Sex Sex Sex Male Sex Sex Sex Sex Sex Sex Sex Sex Sex Se	20-29	8(11.4)
50-59	30-39	20(28.6)
60 and above  BMI (Body Mass Index) Underweight (BMI less than 18.5) Normal (BMI 18.5 to 24.9) 35(50) Overweight(BMI 25 to 29.9) 20(28.6) Obese(BMI 30 or greater) 9(12.9) Years of Working < 5 Years 18(25.7) 6-10 Years 20(28.6) 11-15 Years 9(12.9) 16-20 Years 8(11.4) >21 Years 15(21.4) Sex Male 39(55.7) Female 31(44.3) Education Level No education 23(32.9) Primary School 34(48.6)) Current Smoker Yes 25(35.7)	40-49	16(22.9)
BMI (Body Mass Index)         Underweight (BMI less than       6(8.6)         18.5)       35(50)         Normal (BMI 18.5 to 24.9)       35(50)         Overweight (BMI 25 to 29.9)       20(28.6)         Obese (BMI 30 or greater)       9(12.9)         Years of Working       20(28.6)         1-10 Years       20(28.6)         11-15 Years       9(12.9)         16-20 Years       8(11.4)         >21 Years       15(21.4)         Sex       Male         Male       39(55.7)         Female       31(44.3)         Education Level         No education       23(32.9)         Primary School       34(48.6)         Current Smoker       25(35.7)	50-59	12(17.1)
Underweight ( BMI less than 18.5)  Normal ( BMI 18.5 to 24.9) 35(50)  Overweight( BMI 25 to 29.9) 20(28.6)  Obese(BMI 30 or greater) 9(12.9)  Years of Working  < 5 Years 18(25.7) 6-10 Years 20(28.6) 11-15 Years 9(12.9) 16-20 Years 8(11.4) >21 Years 15(21.4)  Sex  Male 39(55.7) Female 31(44.3)  Education Level  No education 23(32.9)  Primary School 34(48.6))  Current Smoker Yes 25(35.7)	60 and above	15(20)
18.5) Normal ( BMI 18.5 to 24.9) Overweight( BMI 25 to 29.9) Obese(BMI 30 or greater) Years of Working  < 5 Years 6-10 Years 11-15 Years 16-20 Years 9(12.9) 16-20 Years Male Sex Male Female 130(55.7) Female 144.3) Education Level No education Primary School Secondary School Current Smoker Yes 20(28.6) 18(25.7) 9(12.9) 9(12.9) 16(21.4) 52(21.4)	BMI (Body Mass Index)	
Normal ( BMI 18.5 to 24.9) 35(50) Overweight( BMI 25 to 29.9) 20(28.6) Obese(BMI 30 or greater) 9(12.9)  Years of Working < 5 Years 18(25.7) 6-10 Years 20(28.6) 11-15 Years 9(12.9) 16-20 Years 8(11.4) >21 Years 15(21.4)  Sex Male 39(55.7) Female 31(44.3)  Education Level No education 23(32.9) Primary School 34(48.6)) Current Smoker Yes 25(35.7)	Underweight (BMI less than	6(8.6)
Overweight( BMI 25 to 29.9)       20(28.6)         Obese(BMI 30 or greater)       9(12.9)         Years of Working       18(25.7)         6-10 Years       20(28.6)         11-15 Years       9(12.9)         16-20 Years       8(11.4)         >21 Years       15(21.4)         Sex         Male       39(55.7)         Female       31(44.3)         Education Level         No education       23(32.9)         Primary School       14(20)         Secondary School       34(48.6)         Current Smoker       7es	18.5)	
Obese(BMI 30 or greater)       9(12.9)         Years of Working       18(25.7)         6-10 Years       20(28.6)         11-15 Years       9(12.9)         16-20 Years       8(11.4)         >21 Years       15(21.4)         Sex         Male       39(55.7)         Female       31(44.3)         Education Level         No education       23(32.9)         Primary School       14(20)         Secondary School       34(48.6))         Current Smoker       7es	Normal (BMI 18.5 to 24.9)	35(50)
Years of Working         < 5 Years	Overweight (BMI 25 to 29.9)	20(28.6)
Years of Working         < 5 Years	Obese(BMI 30 or greater)	9(12.9)
<ul> <li>5 Years</li> <li>6-10 Years</li> <li>10 Years</li> <li>11-15 Years</li> <li>16-20 Years</li> <li>16-20 Years</li> <li>15(21.4)</li> <li< td=""><td></td><td>, ,</td></li<></ul>		, ,
11-15 Years 9(12.9) 16-20 Years 8(11.4) >21 Years 15(21.4)  Sex Male 39(55.7) Female 31(44.3)  Education Level No education 23(32.9) Primary School 14(20) Secondary School 34(48.6)) Current Smoker Yes 25(35.7)		18(25.7)
16-20 Years       8(11.4)         >21 Years       15(21.4)         Sex       Male         Male       39(55.7)         Female       31(44.3)         Education Level         No education       23(32.9)         Primary School       14(20)         Secondary School       34(48.6))         Current Smoker         Yes       25(35.7)	6-10 Years	20(28.6)
>21 Years 15(21.4)  Sex Male 39(55.7) Female 31(44.3)  Education Level No education 23(32.9) Primary School 14(20) Secondary School 34(48.6)) Current Smoker Yes 25(35.7)	11-15 Years	9(12.9)
Sex         Male       39(55.7)         Female       31(44.3)         Education Level       23(32.9)         No education       23(32.9)         Primary School       14(20)         Secondary School       34(48.6))         Current Smoker         Yes       25(35.7)	16-20 Years	8(11.4)
Male       39(55.7)         Female       31(44.3)         Education Level       23(32.9)         No education       23(32.9)         Primary School       14(20)         Secondary School       34(48.6))         Current Smoker         Yes       25(35.7)	>21 Years	15(21.4)
Female 31(44.3)  Education Level  No education 23(32.9)  Primary School 14(20)  Secondary School 34(48.6))  Current Smoker  Yes 25(35.7)	<u>Sex</u>	
Education LevelNo education23(32.9)Primary School14(20)Secondary School34(48.6))Current Smoker25(35.7)	Male	39(55.7)
No education 23(32.9) Primary School 14(20) Secondary School 34(48.6)) Current Smoker Yes 25(35.7)	Female	31(44.3)
Primary School 14(20) Secondary School 34(48.6)) Current Smoker Yes 25(35.7)	Education Level	
Primary School 14(20) Secondary School 34(48.6)) Current Smoker Yes 25(35.7)	No education	23(32.9)
Secondary School 34(48.6)) <u>Current Smoker</u> Yes 25(35.7)	Primary School	
Yes 25(35.7)		` '
	Current Smoker	
No 45(64.3)	Yes	25(35.7)
` ,	No	45(64.3)

Based on observation, it was found that 44.3% of the respondents were tapped the rubber trees at the level of waist to eyes. While, 30% of the respondents were tapped the rubber tree awkwardly with both hands are most of the time at above eyes level. This is due to most of the rubber trees are old and tall. Time required to tab a matured rubber tree increased as they need to conduct the tapping process either above their head or below their waist. The older the trees, time that required were more as they need to conduct the rubber tapping process above their head or some maybe below their waist. The times that they used to work per day are 3-4 hours daily with

Table 2

Variable	N (%)			
Working hours per day				
1-2 Hr/Day	9(12.9)			
3-4 Hr/ Day	50(71.4)			
5-6 Hr/Day	10(14.3)			
7-10 Hr/ Day	1(1.4)			
Number of trees tapped per day				
< 200	5(7.1)			
200-399	24(34.3)			
400-599	20(28.6)			
>600	21(30.0)			
Current common level of tapping				
Below waist	9(12.9)			
Waist to Eyes	31(44.3)			
Above Eyes	9(12.9)			
Mixed Level	21(30.0)			

the highest number of tapped trees at 200-399 trees each person everyday (Table 2).

# MSCs (Musculoskeletal Complaints) among rubber tappers

Table 3 shows the distribution of MSCs on various parts of the body among respondents. Low back pain is the most common MSCs (64.3%), followed by knees (62.9%), neck (55.7%), wrists / hand (55.7%), shoulder (45.7%), ankles / feet (32.9%), elbows (28.6%), hips / thighs (22.9%), and upper back (15.7%).

Table 3

N (%)
39 (55.7)
32 (45.7)
20 (28.6)
39 (55.7)
11 (15.7)
45 (64.3)
16 (22.9)
44 (62.9)
23 (32.9)

# Postural Analysis among Rubber Tappers

Table 4 shows the RULA score for rubber tappers activities. For tapping 65.7% of the respondents had a total score 3 which indicate that the process is needed further investigation and changes to avoid serious harm. Furthermore, 28.6% of respondents is required further investigation and changes soon the work practices to avoid serious physical damage.

Table 4

RULA Score	Level of Action	Action required	(N)( %)
3-4	2	Further investigation and changes needed	46(65.7)
5-6	3	Further investigation and changes soon	20(28.6)
7	4	Investigate and change immediately	4(5.7)

# Psychosocial Risk Factors Analysis of Rubber Tappers

#### Job control

For the job control demand scale, 81.4% of the respondents agreed that their job requires them to learn new things. Based on the face to face interview, the respondents also said that when there is a mistake while do the tapping; they need to fix it as soon as possible. This situation somehow is challenging to them. Because of that also, the result shows, in total, 60.0% of them agree that they must be creative to do the tapping. 84.3% of respondents were agreed that their job requires a lot of repetitive work. Most of them (64.3%) also agreed that their job requires them to make their own decisions. From the face to face interview, respondents revealed that they have to make their own decisions for collect the latex and decide the timing to sell the latex. 47.1% of respondents agreed that in order to have a good tapping skill they need a lot of While, 34.3% of respondents practice. disagreed that their work required them to do various work in the same time. This is because of normally the workers will do the tapping activity for a minimum a week before they do the latex collection in the next following week.

# Job demands

Result showed that 47.1% of respondents agreed that they need to work fast to ensure all trees are tapped on time. This is because of some of the respondents need to tap two to three plantations in a same day to have extra income to support their living expenses. Majority of the respondents started their work early in the morning. The reason is that, some of the rubber trees are old, and the old rubber trees will yield less latex when afternoon. 71.4% agreed that they need to work very hard. This is due to the rubber market prices nowadays are unstable. So, they need to have to work extra times and efforts to gain extra income. Might be due to that, half of respondents (50%) agreed that the job is very hectic.

# Social support

In terms of social support, it can be concluded that, most of them had low social support but they are still thankful to have very supportive family at their sides. This result is in line with the study conducted by Meksawi et al., (2012). The reasons for them to have low levels of social support because most of them work alone and they have their own rubber plantations. In terms of superior control, 74.3% and 91.4% of the respondents strongly disagreed that their supervisor is are paying attention for what they do and they need and

helping them to get the job done respectively. In addition, 44.3% of respondents agreed that their colleagues are very skilful in doing their work without the help of others. Besides that, they (45.7%) also agreed that the people they work with are friendly. Mostly the pair workers who work together are normally husband and wife, or son or daughter with their parents and they are helpful in getting the job done.

# Physical demand

This part focuses on the physical demand that the rubber tappers or respondents face in their daily work routine. Their jobs always require a lot of physical effort when they did the tapping process (87.1%). Moreover, their job also need them to move or lifted a heavy load such as lifting any scrap rubber that more than 8 kg per time. 77.1% of respondents said they only lift heavy object sometimes and for some rubber tappers they will employed other people such as aborigines' people or young people in the village to collect the scrap rubber. 72.9% of respondents agreed that they need to lift and lower scrub rubbers to and from the ground floor. While 57.1% of respondents said that they also lift the scrap rubber with their shoulder. Part of it, 70.0% of the respondents also agreed that sometime when they do the scrap rubber collecting they will push or pull the heavy load if they cannot lift with their shoulder and mostly female rubber tappers did this because they do not have enough energy as a man. This issue reflects to the study of Zautra et al. (2007), which stated that high frequency of weight lifting (lifting any object more than 8 kg per time) is associated with affecting low back pain. This study found that the occurrence of LBP in this group of rubber tappers was high (64.31%). The factors that showed significant associations with LBP was level of tapping above the head and below the waist. This study is in line with the study reported by Meksawi et al., (2012). According to Hoogendorn et al., (2000), working above head level and below knee level require a certain degree of trunk flexion which stimulate the back muscle to work continuously and together with repetitive trunk flexion found among rubber tappers, this occupational factor could be a potential risk to LBP (Udom et al., 2016). The 57.1% of the respondents stated that sometimes they need to do the physical activity rapidly because they are rushing to finish tap work before afternoon. More than half of the respondents (65.7%) agreed that their job always involve with awkward body posture and awkward arms position. 72.9% agree that they always bend and twist the waist while doing the tapping process. Furthermore, 80.0% of respondents agreed that their tapping work requires a lot of repetitive movement of hand or wrists as well as they body which always need to bend and twist. At least 70% of respondents agreed that sometimes their job required them to stand up in the same position for a long time.

# **CONCLUSION**

This study shows that WRMP is a significant problem among rubber tappers and low back pain is found has highest prevalence if compared to other body regions. Education on back care and the appropriate working posture are needed among rubber tappers to prevent low back pain and get rest break while working to reduce the repetitive of movements. For psychosocial factors hazard, it can be reduced using the administrative control (for example). Where the rubber tappers can reduce their working hours by divide their work time into 2 times per days. Further studies should be carried out which may include anthropometry measurement and biomechanics in order to comprehensively understand the mechanism of WRMP and for developing new tools for rubber tapping.

# **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We would like to express our gratitude to the Faculty of Industrial Sciences and Technology (FIST), University Malaysia Pahang (UMP) Malaysia for the support in this study. Not to forget, our sincerest gratitude to all respondents who took part in this research.

# **COMPETING INTERESTS**

There is no conflict of interest.

# **REFERENCES**

Asyraf C. D., Rosnah M. Y., & Zulkiflle L. A. (2007). "Preliminary Of Prevalence of Musculoskeletal Disorders among Malaysia Rubber Tappers", Proceeding of Agriculture Ergonomics Development Conference IEA Press, Kuala Lumpur.

Choobineh, A. R., Daneshmandi, H., Aghabeigi, M., & Haghayegh, A. (2013). Prevalence of musculoskeletal symptoms among employees of Iranian petrochemical industries: October 2009 to December 2012. *International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 4(4), 195-204.

Eatough, E. M., Way, J. D., & Chang, C. (2012). Understanding the link between psychosocial work stressors and work-related musculoskeletal complaints. *Applied Ergonomics*, 43(3), 554-563. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2011.08.009

Fernandes, R. D. C. P., Assunção, A. A., Silvany Neto, A. M., & Carvalho, F. M. (2010).

Musculoskeletal disorders among workers in plastic manufacturing plants. *Rev Bras Epidemiol*, *13*(1), 11-20. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/206835

García-di, N. (2015). Social Science & Medicine The impact of poor psychosocial work environment on non-work-related sickness absence, 138, 210-216. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.06.009

Hansson, G.-åke, Balogh, I., Ohlsson, K., Granqvist, L., Nordander, C., Skerfving, S., ... Stro, U. (2010). International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics Physical workload in various types of work: Part II. Neck, shoulder and upper arm, 40, 267-281. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ergon.2009.11.002

Hoogendoorn WE, Bongers PM, de Vet HCW, et al. Flexion and Rotation of the Trunk and Lifting at Work Are Risk Factors for Low Back Pain: Results of a Prospective Cohort Study. Spine 2000; 25: 3087-3092. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

Irwin, A., & Poots, J. (2015). The human factor in agriculture: An interview study to identify farmers 'non-technical skills. Safety Science, 74, 114-121. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2014.12.008

Kuorinka, I, Jonsson, B et al. (1987). Standardised Nordic questionnaires for the analysis of musculoskeletal symptoms. *Appl. Ergon.* 1987; 18(3):233-237.

Meksawi, S., Tangtrakulwanich, B., & Chongsuvivatwong, V. (2012). Musculoskeletal problems and ergonomic risk assessment in rubber tappers: A community-based study in southern Thailand. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 42(1), 129-135. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ergon.2011.08.006

Mcatamney, L and Corlett, E. N. (1993). RULA: A survey method for the investigation of work-related upper limb disorders, *Appl. Ergon*; 24(2):91-99.

Nair, T. S., Garg, S., & Singh, M. M. (2016). A study of the health profile of rubber plantation workers in rural Kerala. *Asian Journal of Medical Sciences*, 7(3), 103. http://doi.org/10.3126/ajms.v7i3.13288

Nunes, I. L., & Bush, P. M. (2011). Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders Assessment and Prevention. *Ergonomics-A System Approach*, 1-31. http://doi.org/10.5772/2232

Park, J., Lim, H., & Lee, K. (2010). Work-

Related Musculoskeletal Symptoms Among Dairy Farmers in Gyeonggi Province, Korea, 43(3), 205-212.

http://doi.org/10.3961/jpmph.2010.43.3.205

Reddy, V.D., Kumar, B. S. and Uzma, N. (2012). Lung Function Parameters , Neck Pain And Associated Factors Among Male Rubber Tapping Workers In Kerala Study Design and Study Population. *Int J Pharm Med & Bio Sc*, 1(2), 43-48.

Roquelaure, Y., Ha, C., Rouillon, C., Fouquet, N., Leclerc, A., Descatha, A., ... Imbernon, E. (2009). Risk factors for upper-extremity musculoskeletal disorders in the working population. *Arthritis Care and Research*, 61(10), 1425-1434. http://doi.org/10.1002/art.24740

Shan, C. L., Adon, M. Y., Rahman, A. B. A., Hassan, S. T. S., & Ismail, K. (2011). Prevalence of Neck Pain and Associated Factors with Personal Charateristics, Physical Workloads and Pyschosocial Among Male Rubber Workers in FELDA Settlement Malaysia. *Global Journal of Health Science*, 4(1), 94-104. http://doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v4n1p94

Simon, M., Tackenberg, P., Nienhaus, A., Estryn-Behar, M., Maurice Conway, P., & Hasselhorn, H. M. (2008). Back or neck-pain-related disability of nursing staff in hospitals, nursing homes and home care in seven countries-results from the European NEXT-Study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 45(1), 24-34. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2006.11.003

Smith, D. R., Mihashi, M., Adachi, Y., Koga, H., & Ishitake, T. (2006). A detailed analysis of musculoskeletal disorder risk factors among Japanese nurses. *Journal of Safety Research*, 37(2), 195-200. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2006.01.004

Stain, H. J., Kelly, B., Lewin, T. J., Higginbotham, N., Beard, J. R., & Hourihan, F. (2008). Social networks and mental health among a farming population. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 43(10), 843-849. http://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-008-0374-5

Sukadarin, E. H., Deros, B. M., Ghani, J. A., Mohd Nawi, N. S., & Ismail, A. R. (2016)a. Postural assessment in pen-and-paper-based observational methods and their associated health effects: a review. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics*, 22(3), 389-398.

Sukadarin, E. H., Deros, B. M., Ghani, J. A., Ismail, A. R., Nawi, N. S. M., & Abdull, N. (2016)b. Validity test for Simple Ergonomics

Risk Assessment (SERA) method. *Malaysian Journal of Public Health Medicine*, 1(Specialissue1), 134-143

Udom, C., Janwantanakul, P., & Kanlayanaphotporn, R. (2016). The prevalence of low back pain and its associated factors in Thai rubber farmers. Journal of occupational health, 58(6), 534-542. doi:10.1539/joh.16-0044-OA