



**HAL**  
open science

## Contribution of situational operational leeway for ergonomic assessment in the evaluation of work situations

Maxime Norval, Mohsen Zare, René Brunet, Fabien Coutarel, Yves Roquelaure

### ► To cite this version:

Maxime Norval, Mohsen Zare, René Brunet, Fabien Coutarel, Yves Roquelaure. Contribution of situational operational leeway for ergonomic assessment in the evaluation of work situations. *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science*, 2021, 22 (2), pp.139-160. 10.1080/1463922X.2020.1785039 . halshs-02919783

**HAL Id: halshs-02919783**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-02919783v1>**

Submitted on 11 Sep 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## Original Article

# Contribution of Situational Operational Leeway for Ergonomic Assessment in the Evaluation of Work Situations

Maxime Norval<sup>a</sup>, Mohsen Zare<sup>b\*</sup>, René Brunet<sup>a</sup>, Fabien Coutarel<sup>c</sup>, and Yves Roquelaure<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Univ Angers, CHU Angers, Univ Rennes, Inserm, Ehesp, Irset (Institut de recherche en santé, environnement et travail - Research Institute for Environmental and Occupational Health), UMR\_S 1085, F-49000 Angers, France; <sup>b</sup> ERCOS Research Group (Pôle), Laboratory of ELLIAD-EA4661, UTBM-University of Bourgogne Franche-Comté, 90010 Belfort, France; <sup>c</sup> ACTÉ, University of Clermont-Auvergne, 63100 Clermont-Ferrand, France

\*Corresponding author. Tel.: +33787722141; e-mail: mohsen.zare@utbm.fr

### Biographical note.

**M. Norval:** is a doctor of ergonomics and a lecturer in Ergonomics at the University of Orléans, France. He also intervenes in various industries as ergonomists for the prevention of MSDs.

**M. Zare:** is an assistance professor in ergonomics at the UTBM in France. His research area is workstation design and MSDs prevention.

**R. Brunet:** is a lecturer and practitioner in occupational health and ergonomics. He also intervenes in the industries for the prevention of MSDs.

**F. Coutarel:** is an associate professor of Ergonomics at the University of Clermont-Ferrand. His research area is the prevention of MSDs and workplace intervention.

**Y. Roquelaure:** is a full professor of Occupational medicine and ergonomics at the University of Angers and head of the ESTER research laboratory. His research area is ergonomics, prevention of MSDs, and epidemiology of MSDs.

## Contribution of Situational Operational Leeway for Ergonomic Assessment in the Evaluation of Work Situations

### Abstract

This study investigates the problems related to identifying MSD risk factors using simple risk assessment tools. The purpose is to study the contribution of situational operational leeway (SOL) indicators as a complementary method to the information provided by simple MSD risk assessment tools and to show how SOL might be a supplement to these established tools.

Eight simple tools (OSHA, RULA, REBA, QEC, CE, EAWS, NIOSH, and MAC) were used to evaluate ten workstations in the metallurgy industry. The indicators of SOL, derived from the human-centred activity model, were also explored in the same workstations to define whether SOL is adequate. The results of these two approaches were compared to identify the difference between them.

Analysing the risk of MSD on ten workstations using eight simple tools showed the variability of exposure between tools for identical work situations. We analysed the same workstations with the SOL indicators, and disagreement was found in judgment between the two approaches of MSD risk identification. The SOL indicators estimated a lower risk of MSD than the simple tools. This study proposes that SOL indicators might improve the phase of MSD risk identification as a complement to the current simple tools.

Keywords: Critical situation, risk assessment tool, Musculoskeletal Disorders, Situational Operational Leeway

## Introduction

Risk prevention approaches for musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) aim to improve working situations (Aptel, Gerling, and Cail 2000; St-Vincent et al. 2011). In the majority of preventative models, risk evaluation is the first step in MSD risk prevention. This initial assessment phase determines the risk level using simple assessment tools and directs the prevention approach towards the most critical work situations. The most commonly used MSD risk assessment tools are paper-based observational methods, self-reported questionnaires, and in-house methods (G. C. David 2005; Malchaire et al. 2011; Takala et al. 2010). These simple tools identify MSD risk based on characteristics of the work activity. The majority of observational tools evaluate the worker's exposure to MSD risk factors using a checklist. These tools primarily consider a limited number of biomechanical and physiological parameters (G. C. David 2005; Denis, Lortie, and Rossignol 2000; Malchaire et al. 2011). The questionnaire/self-assessment tools gather information on the task and establish a risk level based on the perceptions and feelings of the workers (Descatha et al. 2009; Hansson et al. 2001; Roman-Liu 2014). Large industrial groups have created in-house tools compatible with their specific activity (Berlin et al. 2009; Hägg 2003; Törnström et al. 2008). In-house ergonomic methods often use a triangulation of data that is gathered by observations, questionnaires (asking for the perception of workers), and direct measurements to evaluate risk levels.

Previous studies have criticized the reliability and repeatability of simple tools (Barrero, Katz, and Dennerlein 2009; Chiasson et al. 2012; Zare et al. 2017). The results of these tools have been often questioned because of inter and intra-individual variability, the variations of the technical-organizational system (e.g., unexpected mishaps/incidents arising from machines and materials), and the diversification of products (Badets, Merlo, and Pilniere 2017; Koukoulaki 2014; Mathiassen 2006; Zare,

1  
2  
3 Sagot, and Roquelaure 2018). Furthermore, scientific knowledge of the etiological  
4 model of MSDs has been gradually expanded, leading to a consensus on the multi-  
5 causality of MSD risk factors (J. Bodin et al. 2018; Julie Bodin et al. 2017; Karsh 2006;  
6 Roquelaure 2018). The variability of activity (e.g., individual variability, production,  
7 and organizational variations) and multi-causality of MSDs question the use of simple  
8 assessment tools solely in MSD risk estimation. These tools might be little  
9 representative of the non-ergonomic situation in a workplace and may not facilitate  
10 monitoring and following the effects of changes/interventions on risk exposure.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 Following a systematic and developmental approach and focusing not only on  
22 the constraints, which simple tools often evaluate, but also on the resources of the work  
23 situation provide the possibility for activity regulation (despite the individual,  
24 environmental, and organizational constraints). Thus, the activity of the operator is not  
25 as simple as applying prescribed instructions but is a regulatory process aimed at the  
26 achievement of objectives (either personal or set by the company) by managing the  
27 system and individual variations (Hubault and Bourgeois 2013; Roquelaure 2018;  
28 Snelwar and Hubault 2015; Daniellou \* 2005). The notion of situational operational  
29 leeway (SOL) arises from the convergence of the characteristics of a professional  
30 environment and those of the worker (Coutarel et al. 2015; Vézina et al. 2016; Coutarel  
31 2004). This merging is entirely situational, and it has been defined as follows:  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 ‘Situational operational leeway constitutes the possibility for the operator to  
49 develop an efficient mode of operation in a specific work situation (or work  
50 strategy). “Efficient” meaning effective in the performance of tasks and protecting  
51 oneself at work’ (Coutarel et al. 2015).  
52  
53  
54

55 This definition refers to the human-centred activity model (Vézina 2001). Figure  
56 1 shows 46 representative indicators of this model, frequently used for ergonomics  
57 interventions (Coutarel, Roquelaure, and Daniellou 2013; St-Vincent et al. 2011; Vézina  
58  
59  
60

2001). We suggest the possibility of using three components of this model for the risk assessment phase: the work strategies developed by individuals to overcome the work constraints, the effects of activity on health and the effects on performance. This approach might respond to the difficulties discussed above regarding the simple MSD risk assessment tools. We assume that using this model to assess MSD risk factors might improve the identification phase of critical situations. The previous study demonstrated that none of the simple tools currently used by companies for MSD risk assessment consider whether SOL is sufficient in a work situation (Norval et al. 2019). Furthermore, these tools do not evaluate the number of operational strategies available to the operator in dealing with a situation in a suitable manner.

This study aims to investigate the contribution of SOL indicators compared to the information provided by simple risk assessment tools and to show how SOL might be a supplement to these tools. The risk of MSDs was measured by eight simple tools and by three components of the SOL. The results were then compared to find the differences between these methodologies to estimate MSD risks.

### **Material and Methods**

This study was carried out in a French company that produces and assembles diesel engines. The production lines consisted of the main engine parts (i.e., cylinder heads, engine blocks, and connecting rods), a complete engine assembly line, and a trim line. We used eight MSD risk assessment tools and SOL indicators on a sample of ten workstations. These workstations were selected in collaboration with the company's occupational health and safety experts based on the difficulties encountered by workers. Having worked with the company for three years, we had in-depth knowledge of the selected case studies. Before starting the experimentation, the research ergonomist and the operators defined the reference situation for each workstation. The reference

1  
2  
3 situation represented the situation most exposed to MSD risks among all the scenarios  
4  
5 encountered at the workstation. Each workstation in our sample was firstly evaluated  
6  
7 using eight simple tools, and then, the reference situation selected on this workstation  
8  
9 was examined by the SOL questionnaire. The ten cases studied correspond to the ten  
10  
11 reference situations chosen from ten workstations (Table 1).  
12  
13

14  
15 The sample consisted of two workstations for rod machining (Connecting rod  
16  
17 finishing and Connecting rod drafting), one workstation in the engine painting area  
18  
19 (Pre-paintwork covering), four workstations for final engine assembly (Final engine  
20  
21 assembly line, Engine wiring unit assembly, Engine injector kit preparation, and  
22  
23 Manifold/turbo assembly preparation), one workstation in the engine preparation area  
24  
25 before testing (Fixtures/equipment pre-testing), and two workstations in the engine kit  
26  
27 preparation area (Preparation of small parts orders and Fixtures packaging). The ten  
28  
29 selected workers were experienced operators (having worked at the workstations, at  
30  
31 least, for more than six months), without any restriction (incapacity to perform the  
32  
33 activity) and volunteered to participate in this study (Table 1). The written informed  
34  
35 consent was obtained from all participants. We studied only one operator per  
36  
37 workstation because of the industrial restrictions and the qualitative nature of this study.  
38  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 Each workstation was observed for 2 to 2.5 hours (nine identical cycles  
44  
45 separately for each tool) during the evaluation by the simple tools. The first observed  
46  
47 cycle on a workstation was recorded, and then the eight other cycles selected for  
48  
49 assessments were verified to be as same as possible with the recorded film. SOL  
50  
51 indicators were then investigated over 1.5 to 2 hours on ten identical cycles (the same  
52  
53 cycles as for the simple tools) using an SOL checklist and interviews with the operators.  
54  
55  
56 The parameters for the study, such as the method for selecting the reference situation,  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the assessor, the evaluation tools (simple tools and the SOL questionnaire), and the  
4  
5 methodology for approaching the operators were similar for ten workstations.  
6  
7

### 8 9 ***MSD risk assessment tools***

10  
11 The following observational methods were used to evaluate MSD risk factors in this  
12 study: Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) checklist (Silverstein  
13 1997), an in-house tool called Ergonomic Criticality (CE), Quick Exposure Checklist  
14 (QEC) (G. David et al. 2008), Rapid Upper Limb Assessment (RULA) (McAtamney  
15 and Corlett 1993), Rapid Entire Body Assessment (REBA) (Hignett and McAtamney  
16 2000), Ergonomic Assessment Worksheet (EAWS) (Schaub et al. 2013), the revised  
17 NIOSH equation (Waters et al. 1993), and Manual handling Assessment Charts (MAC)  
18 (Monnington et al. 2003). Table 2 shows the indicators evaluated by each of the  
19 selected tools.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 The same researcher used eight simple MSD risk evaluation tools, one after the  
33 other for each workstation. The worst situation (i.e., the riskiest posture, the highest  
34 force exerted, and the more repetitions) was considered as risk factors when a simple  
35 tool was applied in a workstation. To compare the results and study their variations, we  
36 codified the interpretation scales for all of the tools across three levels: 1. Low-risk  
37 situation (acceptable), 2. Moderately risky situation (requires further investigation), and  
38 3. High-risk situation (changes required). Table 3 shows the interpretation scales  
39 formulated by the tool developers and the codifying carried out in this study. We used  
40 only the whole-body score of the EAWS tool and excluded the score of upper limbs  
41 because the whole-body score was more representative of risk factors at the  
42 workstations.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### ***Indicators of situational operational leeway (SOL)***

The assessor interviewed each worker about the three elements of SOL indicators: work strategy, effects on the health and performance (Figure 1; supplementary document 1) to determine whether there was adequate, potentially inadequate, or inadequate SOL. The SOL indicators collected two types of information: semi-quantitative information (a four-level system with ratings of 0-3; the lowest score being the most detrimental regarding SOL) and qualitative data to investigate the given status in more detail. This information was collected through 12 indicators for the work strategy process, four indicators for effects on health, and three indicators for impact on performance (see supplementary document 1; (Norval et al. 2019).

#### *Semi-quantitative evaluation*

The SOL indicator scores (semi-quantitative data) were transcribed to explore the adequacy of SOL for each of the ten reference situations (Table 4). The total scores were calculated separately for each of three components (the method for score calculation is explained in the supplementary document 2). We created an interpretation scale through three levels (low, moderate, and high) for each of the components based on the distribution of scores to ten reference situations. Given the effective distribution observed across three ranges of fairly distinct scores, we distributed “low,” “moderate,” and “high” scores in three groups of the same size (Table 4).

The results of the three components provided the general interpretation and classification of SOL for each reference situation:

- Inadequate SOL for a situation where at least one of the SOL components gives a “low” score

- Potentially inadequate SOL where at least two components give “moderate” scores
- Adequate SOL where at least two components give “high” scores

### *Qualitative evaluation*

We created a model consisting of three components of SOL (work strategy process, direct effect on health, and performance) to reinforce the conclusions derived from the semi-quantitative data. The qualitative data obtained during the interview using the SOL indicators were transcribed to make the SOL model (figure 2), which provided a close look at the SOL classifications initially obtained from the semi-quantitative data. Company occupational health experts contributed to interpreting the components. The interpretation of each component was carried out based on the expertise of the ergonomists (the knowledge of ergonomist about SOL, population, workstations) and the indices gathered from the qualitative data.

Figure 2 shows an example of the reference situation Unscrewing connecting rods in the Connecting rod finishing workstation. Inadequate SOL is justified in this reference situation because of negative indices identified by three components of SOL. The negative indices observed for the work strategy process component were lack of variations in the work strategies, work pace with highly changeable rhythm (acceleration/deceleration), impossible to do the task in another way, few suggestions for improvements accepted, low levels of exchange between operators about the best practice, and low level of assistance between close colleagues. Regarding the direct effects on health component, intermittent pain and discomfort in the shoulders were identified, and significant fatigue was observed following the implementation of the reference situation. We recognized difficulties in keeping up with the rhythm of work

1  
2  
3 pace (feeling of always lagging), baseline productivity sometimes not achieved, and a  
4  
5 quantity of negative feedback on the quality of the products produced, which were the  
6  
7 negative indices for the direct effects on performance. The same models were created  
8  
9 for ten reference situations under study.  
10  
11

12 A status of inadequate, potentially inadequate or adequate SOL was recorded for  
13  
14 each reference situation using three components observed separately:  
15  
16

- 17 • Inadequate SOL where three components are negative
  - 18 • Potentially inadequate SOL where at least one component is negative
  - 19 • Adequate SOL where three components are positive
- 20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

### 26 ***Data analysis***

27  
28 The results of eight simple tools were descriptively analysed to study the difference  
29  
30 between tools for risk evaluation in the same workstations. The SOL indicators were  
31  
32 analysed with the semi-quantitative data, and a further level of analysis was provided  
33  
34 using the qualitative data. The results were qualitatively compared to study the  
35  
36 agreement/disagreement between the level of risk assessed by the simple tools and the  
37  
38 level of SOL adequacy found by the SOL indicators.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

### 44 **Results**

#### 45 ***Simple tools for evaluating MSD risk***

46  
47 The results of eight simple tools showed the variability between the results of different  
48  
49 simple tools (inter-tool variance) for the same workstation (Table 5). The  
50  
51 Manifold/turbo assembly preparation workstation was evaluated using ten different  
52  
53 tools which gave identical results, while the evaluation of the Connecting rod finishing  
54  
55 and Fixtures packaging workstations provided different results from one tool to another.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Our results showed little variability in the results of the specific tools for manual  
4 material handling for six workstations involving manual handling tasks (Table 5).  
5  
6

7  
8 The variability in the average score of the tools for ten workstations indicated a  
9 difference between tools (inter-tool variability). Figure 3 shows the distribution of risk  
10 status between low, moderate, and high risk for each simple tool. The OSHA checklist  
11 and REBA rendered the highest number of extreme risk situations, with 8 and 6 out of  
12 10 workstations, respectively. The Ergonomic Criticality tool and QEC identified 7 out  
13 of 10 workstations as having low-risk status. The NIOSH equation and MAC (tools  
14 specific to manual material handling tasks) classified ten workstations as low or  
15 moderate risk (Figure 3).  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 The OSHA checklist resulted in little variance between ten workstations  
27 (SD=0.3), while RULA gave a standard deviation of 0.7. The results from the NIOSH  
28 equation (SD=0.3) and MAC (SD=0.5) also showed the variability between  
29 workstations (Table 5).  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

### 37 ***Investigation of SOL indicators: semi-quantitative and qualitative data***

#### 38 *SOL assessed by the semi-quantitative method*

39  
40 The results of three components of SOL indicators for each reference situation showed  
41 that 50% of the reference situations had inadequate SOL (Unscrewing connecting rods,  
42 Attaching engine to overhead conveyor, Injector assembly, and Equipping engine  
43 flywheel pre-testing), 40% had potentially inadequate SOL (Connecting rod drilling,  
44 Top end fitting and connecting, and Installation of turbo onto manifold), and 10% had  
45 adequate SOL (Packaging of a small part). The score of each component of the SOL  
46 indicators varies from low to high scores. For example, the reference situation  
47 Unscrewing connecting rods for the workstation Connecting rod finishing had  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 inadequate SOL. The low score was for the work strategy process and direct effect on  
4 performance components, and a moderate score was given for the direct effect on health  
5 component (Table 6).  
6  
7  
8  
9

#### 10 11 *SOL assessed by the qualitative method*

12 Table 7 presents a summary of the qualitative information used to classify the adequacy  
13 of SOL in work situations. Our findings showed inadequate SOL for two reference  
14 situations (Unscrewing the connecting rods and Injector subassembly), the possible  
15 inadequacy of SOL for four reference situations (Roll top motor covering, Attaching  
16 engine to overhead conveyor, Installation of turbo onto manifold, and Fixtures  
17 bagging), and the adequacy of SOL for four reference situations (Connecting rod  
18 drilling, Top end fitting and connecting, Equipping engine flywheel pre-testing, and  
19 Packaging of a small part; Table 7).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 For ten reference situations studied, the direct effects on health component had  
33 negative consequences for half of the reference situations (five negative statuses) and  
34 most influenced on SOL inadequacy. Four negative statuses were found for the work  
35 strategy process component and four for the direct effects on performance component.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

#### 42 43 *Comparison between SOL assessed by the semi-quantitative method and the* 44 *qualitative method*

45 The qualitative data confirms the status given by the semi-quantitative data for five  
46 reference situations in our sample. For the other five situations, the qualitative data  
47 identified higher SOL adequacy than with semi-quantitative data. We retain the results  
48 of the qualitative analysis in case of disagreement between semi-quantitative and  
49 qualitative data. We considered that the qualitative results were more precise because  
50 they were extracted based on the knowledge of the ergonomist (who observed and  
51 analysed the workstations) and the discussion with the operators.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### *Comparison between simple tools and the examination of SOL indicators*

Contradictions between the results of the simple tools and SOL indicators were observed in the case of the OSHA checklist, the NIOSH equation, QEC, and REBA, with 90%, 84%, 80%, and 80% contradiction, respectively. The least contradictions were observed for the EC, RULA, and EAWS, at 60%. The average contradictions within the results of eight simple tools for evaluating MSD risk and the examination of SOL indicators was 72.6%. Among these differences, 42.6% of cases had a higher risk with the simple tools compared to the SOL indicators, and 30% had a lower risk with the simple tools compared to the SOL indicators (Table 8). For example, the OSHA checklist showed eight high-risk stations and two moderate-risk stations, while the SOL indicators showed two situations with an inadequacy, four situations with a possible inadequacy, and four situations with the adequacy of SOL. These results reflect the non-concordance (90%) of data and a higher risk estimate with OSHA compared to the SOL examination (80% of contradictions).

## **Discussion**

### *Variability of results between simple tools*

This study showed the variability of results between similar simple tools for MSD risk assessment in the same work situation. These results are compatible with the hypothesis that the simple tools might be improved for assessing MSD risks (Bao et al. 2009; Barriera-Viruet et al. 2006; Chiasson et al. 2012; Zare et al. 2017; Zare, Sagot, and Roquelaure 2018). Three factors can explain the variability of results: the nature of the simple tools (e.g., more sensitive to a given situation, the different focus of the theoretical model of each tool, the aetiology of MSDs, low repeatability/reliability of simple tools) (Aptel, Aublet-Cuvelier, and Cnockaert 2002; G. C. David 2005; Malchaire et al. 2011), the criteria related to using these tools (e.g., choice of tool,

1  
2  
3 observation period, deployment method, distinguishing the scope of observation,  
4 interpretation, and use of results), and the variability of work strategies between  
5 operators (different ways of doing an activity by individuals) (Bao et al. 2009;  
6 Bourgeois et al. 2006; Gaudez, Gilles, and Savin 2016; Zare, Sagot, and Roquelaure  
7 2018). We observed low variability between the results of the tools specific to manual  
8 material handling tasks. The risk factors evaluated by these tools were quite similar  
9 between three tools (mostly biomechanical and physical factors), whereas simple  
10 observation tools look for slightly varying parameters. Furthermore, the tools specific to  
11 manual material handling evaluate one situation, while simple tools evaluate several  
12 situations together. Other studies, such as those by Mohammadi et al. (2013), and  
13 Kadikon & Rahman (2016) have reported similar results (Kadikon and Rahman 2016;  
14 Mohammadi et al. 2013).

### 31 ***Examinations of SOL indicators***

32 Although SOL and its link with preventing MSDs have been recognized in the previous  
33 literature, practitioners rarely invested in SOL in the workplace (Cuny-Guerrier 2016;  
34 Cuny-Guerrier et al. 2015; Lux et al. 2017; Major and Vézina 2015; Vezina et al. 2016).  
35 The reason might be that few kinds of literature developed the model or indicators of  
36 SOL to encourage ergonomists and practitioners to use the concept of SOL in a real  
37 setting. Vézina (2001) created a model of SOL, consisting of five components (Figure  
38 1), for ergonomics intervention. We used three components of this model (work strategy  
39 process, direct effect on health, and direct effect on performance) to study the state of  
40 SOL adequacy, which allows identification of critical situations for MSDs. We  
41 excluded the internal and external determinant components of Vézina's model (Figure  
42 1) because they are unsuitable for recognizing critical situations and risk factors for  
43 MSDs. Indeed, an ergonomic analysis of work that identifies the determinants of  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

workers' empowerment (Roquelaure 2018) is not the aim of the risk assessment although a few simple tools explore some determinants (Norval et al. 2019).

Considering the activity's determinants implies that we can establish their number and nature from the start, which means taking into account determinants of determinants (which are sometimes remote in time and space); it also means understanding the complex interaction of determinants among themselves and the role and consequences of variability (production and individual) on these determinants. When seeking to identify critical situations, we do not aim to know the extent of SOL (characterized by the complicated relationship between the internal and external determinant and three components of SOL), but the state of SOL adequacy, which makes it possible to limit the consequences of the activity on health and performance (characterized by three SOL components). Determinants of the work situation (internal and external) can be studied during the ergonomic analysis prioritized for improvement in a critical situation.

In this study, we proposed to consider 19 indicators that are representative of three SOL components to complete the exposure evaluation derived from simple tools and understand how individuals encounter the constraints of the work situation. The SOL indicators used (Figure 1) were taken from the study by Norval et al. (2019) and are considered to be representative of work strategy processes and their effects on health and performance (Coutarel 2004; Cuny-Guerrier 2016; Durand et al. 2009; Gouédard and Rabardel 2012; Lux et al. 2017; Major and Vézina 2015; Tomás and Fernandez 2015). The indicators proposed are broad enough to avoid the restriction of the fields of study and to facilitate examination.

SOL exploration was conducted using a semi-quantitative and a qualitative method, which resulted in differing SOL adequacy in five reference situations. The

1  
2  
3 contradictions observed can be explained by the accuracy of the examination methods.  
4  
5 Although the study of semi-quantitative data reveals a trend relating to the state of SOL  
6  
7 adequacy (differences always in the same direction), it seems crucial to take an in-depth  
8  
9 look at the trends obtained through qualitative information, which are more accurate,  
10  
11 contextual, and interrelated (Hignett \* and Wilson 2004; Messing et al. 2005). The most  
12  
13 suitable method for studying SOL indicators is analysing the work by combining the  
14  
15 qualitative observations (such as auto-confrontation; (Clot et al. 2000)) and discussion  
16  
17 with workers (qualitative analyses). This qualitative analysis specifies the detailed  
18  
19 information in a multifactorial, systemic, and participatory approach that is consistent  
20  
21 with existing literature and the development of etiological models (St-Vincent et al.  
22  
23 2011; Vézina 2001; Hignett and Wilson 2004).

### ***Comparison of simple tools and the examination of SOL indicators***

24  
25  
26 We found differences in the estimation of MSD risk between the results of simple tools  
27  
28 and the state of SOL adequacy. Simple tools tend to estimate the MSD risk to be higher  
29  
30 compared to the assessment of SOL adequacy. This finding is consistent with the idea  
31  
32 that SOL considers restrictions by integrating the resources of the work activity  
33  
34 (Sznalwar and Hubault 2015; Daniellou \* 2005). The use of simple tools is based on  
35  
36 considering essential constraints (mostly biomechanical factors) in an observation  
37  
38 window described as “here and now.” SOL, on the other hand, is based on work  
39  
40 strategies (a strategy used when encountering the constraints) and the effects of a  
41  
42 particular work situation by distinguishing between the workstation and critical  
43  
44 situations among all the situations that constitute a workstation (Coutarel, Roquelaure,  
45  
46 and Daniellou 2013; Cuny-Guerrier 2016; Vézina 2001). To target critical situations in  
47  
48 this study, we distinguish between the workstation and the most critical situations  
49  
50 (reference situations), which makes it possible to be more representative than an overall  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 view of the exposure in the workstation.  
4

5 Our results show a lower risk during the SOL examination compared to the  
6 results of simple tools. Simple tools mainly studied exposures to the physical risk  
7 factors of the activity and direct the users' attention towards specific characteristics of  
8 the activity (mainly biomechanical factors) that the tools' developers consider to be the  
9 MSD risk factors (Norval et al. 2019). Nevertheless, the work activity mobilizes the  
10 individual at all levels (physical, cognitive, subjective, and social, all of which are  
11 inseparably linked) and is built within a framework of objectives, constraints, and  
12 resources (Coutarel, Roquelaure, and Daniellou 2013; Sznelwar and Hubault 2015). The  
13 work strategies studied during SOL examination are the result of the encounter between  
14 constraints (environmental, organizational, and individual) and the resources used by  
15 the individual to handle the activity and its variabilities (Cuny-Guerrier 2016;  
16 Roquelaure 2018). Examples of resources are the possibility of assistance from close  
17 colleagues, the possibility of changing the order of tasks, varying one's work strategies,  
18 managing the work pace, using the available devices for manual tasks, and changing  
19 workstations in the event of pain/discomfort. Furthermore, the development of an  
20 efficient work strategy can be dependent on the internal and external determinants (such  
21 as individual characteristics, organizational/environmental features). For example, the  
22 operator's knowledge of the operation (gained through the experience at a workstation)  
23 and the empowerment may arise from being at a company longer might help them to  
24 develop strategies for a specific work condition.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 Hence why SOL presents results with lower risk compared to simple tools: SOL  
52 considers the activity's resources that "compensate" for the constraints. Coutarel et al.  
53 (2015) also showed the activity's resources to complement the activity's constraints to  
54 prevent MSDs.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The concept of SOL offers a paradigm shift; it is not “only” to reduce  
4 constraints or exposure to specific risk factors, but it also proposes to prevent MSDs by  
5 developing the individuals (e.g., expertise, knowledge, self-esteem) through developing  
6 their professional activities (e.g., improving one’s work strategies, capacity to regulate a  
7 task, and possibility of encountering the constraints of work) (Coutarel, Roquelaure, and  
8 Daniellou 2013). In this developmental approach, introducing flexible production  
9 systems takes priority over introducing systems adapted to a given nominal situation to  
10 give resources to the workers’ future SOL (Badets, Merlo, and Pilniere 2017; Lux et al.  
11 2017).

### 22 *Study limitations and perspectives*

23  
24  
25 This exploratory study has several limitations. The investigation of SOL indicators  
26 through other reference work situations (other than the one chosen) may produce  
27 different results. Furthermore, SOL was examined through a unique work situation—  
28 selected by the researcher together with the workers as being the reference situation  
29 with the highest risk or with the most constraints among all the situations that  
30 comprised the workstation—and only one worker per situation. Studying the more risky  
31 situations with several operators might provide the other results and insight our eyes  
32 into the different aspects of work activity. We believe that it is more representative to  
33 assess the critical situations (most at risk) instead of calculating an average of risks of  
34 all the scenarios.

35  
36  
37 It should be noted that the checklist used to study the SOL adequacy must be  
38 validated (repeatability, reliability) if it is to be re-used by occupational safety and  
39 health experts in companies. Further study is needed to investigate the suspected role of  
40 SOL adequacy in the appearance of MSDs. Another limitation might be related to the  
41 focus of different simple tools used. Some simple tools differ in what is evaluated. For  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 example, RULA evaluates the upper body, while EAWS and QEC evaluate several  
4  
5 body parts, and it would be a source of difference between the results of the various  
6  
7 simple tools  
8  
9

## 11 **Conclusion**

13  
14 The results of simple MSD risk assessment tools were compared with the state of SOL  
15  
16 adequacy. Considering the resources used by workers by work strategy process  
17  
18 indicators, combined with information about the effects of activity on health and  
19  
20 performance, increases the representativeness of the risk identification phase. The  
21  
22 disagreement of results from the simple tools and the SOL examinations showed the  
23  
24 importance of suggesting a supplement to the simple tools currently used in companies.  
25  
26 This study proposes to improve the quality of risk evaluation and the targeting of  
27  
28 critical situations by considering the state of SOL adequacy, which supplements the risk  
29  
30 evaluation by simple tools.  
31  
32  
33

## 35 **Acknowledgments**

37  
38 The authors would like to thank all the staff of the factory under study (John Deere  
39  
40 Orléans-Saran) for their kind collaboration in performing this study. Our special thanks  
41  
42 go to the operators who consented to participate in this experimentation. We declare no  
43  
44 potential conflict of interest.  
45  
46

## 47 **Funding**

49  
50 This work was supported by the French National Research Agency (ANR: Agence  
51  
52 Nationale de la Recherche) under Grant [2014/0579]; and John Deere group.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

- Aptel, Michel, Agnès Aublet-Cuvelier, and Jean-Claude Cnockaert. 2002. "Les Troubles Musculosquelettiques Du Membre Supérieur Liés Au Travail." *Revue Du Rhumatisme* 69 (12): 1181–1190.
- Aptel, Michel, Anne Gerling, and François Cail. 2000. "Méthode de prévention. Généralités et principes." *Documents pour la médecine du travail* 83: 189–194.
- Badets, Patrick, Christophe Merlo, and Véronique Pilniere. 2017. "Human Efficiency for Reducing Lean Limits." In *12e Congrès International de Génie Industriel*. Compiègne, France. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01655230>.
- Bao, Stephen, Ninica Howard, Peregrin Spielholz, Barbara Silverstein, and Nayak Polissar. 2009. "Interrater Reliability of Posture Observations." *Human Factors* 51 (3): 292–309.
- Barrero, Lope H., Jeffrey N. Katz, and Jack T. Dennerlein. 2009. "Validity of Self-Reported Mechanical Demands for Occupational Epidemiologic Research of Musculoskeletal Disorders." *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health* 35 (4): 245.
- Barriera-Viruet, Heriberto, Tarek M. Sobeih, Nancy Daraiseh, and Sam Salem. 2006. "Questionnaires vs Observational and Direct Measurements: A Systematic Review." *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science* 7 (3): 261–284.
- Berlin, Cecilia, Roland Örtengren, Dan Lämkkull, and Lars Hanson. 2009. "Corporate-Internal vs. National Standard—A Comparison Study of Two Ergonomics Evaluation Procedures Used in Automotive Manufacturing." *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics* 39 (6): 940–946.
- Bodin, J., R. Garlantézec, N. Costet, A. Descatha, J. F. Viel, and Y. Roquelaure. 2018. "724 Validation of a Conceptual Model for Shoulder Pain Risk Factors in Three Independent French Working Populations." *Occup Environ Med* 75 (Suppl 2): A274–A274. doi:10.1136/oemed-2018-ICOHabstracts.783.
- Bodin, Julie, Ronan Garlantézec, Nathalie Costet, Alexis Descatha, Jean-François Viel, and Yves Roquelaure. 2017. "Risk Factors for Shoulder Pain in a Cohort of French Workers: A Structural Equation Model." *American Journal of Epidemiology* 187 (2): 206–213.
- Bourgeois, F., C. Lemarchand, F. Hubault, C. Brun, A. Polin, J. M. Fauchoux, P. Douillet, and C. Albert. 2006. *Troubles Musculosquelettiques et Travail. Quand La Santé Interroge l'organisation*. Collection . ANACT. Outils et Méthodes. Lyon.
- Chiasson, Marie-Ève, Daniel Imbeau, Karine Aubry, and Alain Delisle. 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.
- Clot, Yves, Daniel Faïta, Gabriel Fernandez, and Livia Scheller. 2000. "Entretiens en autoconfrontation croisée : une méthode en clinique de l'activité." *Perspectives interdisciplinaires sur le travail et la santé* 2 (1). doi:10.4000/pistes.3833.
- Coutarel, Fabien. 2004. "La prévention des troubles musculo-squelettiques en conception : quelles marges de manœuvre pour le déploiement de l'activité ?" Phdthesis, Université Victor Segalen - Bordeaux II. <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-00821248/document>.
- Coutarel, Fabien, Sandrine Caroly, Nicole Vézina, and François Daniellou. 2015. "Marge de manœuvre situationnelle et pouvoir d'agir : des concepts à l'intervention ergonomique." *Le travail humain* 78 (1): 9–29. doi:10.3917/th.781.0009.

- 1  
2  
3 Coutarel, Fabien, Yves Roquelaure, and François Daniellou. 2013. "Le défi  
4 ergonomique face aux TMS d'origine professionnelles." In *Ergonomie : Travail,*  
5 *Conception, Santé*, Octarès, 255–267. A. Drouin. [https://halshs.archives-](https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-01122119)  
6 [ouvertes.fr/halshs-01122119](https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-01122119).  
7  
8 Cuny-Guerrier, Aude. 2016. "Régulations et marges de manœuvre situationnelles des  
9 encadrants de proximité en sous-traitance : un enjeu de prévention des TMS."  
10 Grenoble, France: Grenoble.  
11 Cuny-Guerrier, Aude, Sandrine Caroly, Fabien Coutarel, and Agnès Aublet-Cuvelier.  
12 2015. "Quelle Prévention Des TMS Dans l'activité de l'encadrement de  
13 Proximité En Sous-Traitance Interne? Un Cas Dans Le Secteur de La Découpe  
14 de Viande." *Perspectives Interdisciplinaires Sur Le Travail et La Santé*, no. 17–  
15 2.  
16  
17 Daniellou \*, François. 2005. "The French-Speaking Ergonomists' Approach to Work  
18 Activity: Cross-Influences of Field Intervention and Conceptual Models."  
19 *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science* 6 (5). Taylor & Francis: 409–427.  
20 doi:10.1080/14639220500078252.  
21  
22 David, G. C. 2005. "Ergonomic Methods for Assessing Exposure to Risk Factors for  
23 Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders." *Occupational Medicine* 55 (3): 190–  
24 199. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqi082.  
25  
26 David, Geoffrey, Valerie Woods, Guangyan Li, and Peter Buckle. 2008. "The  
27 Development of the Quick Exposure Check (QEC) for Assessing Exposure to  
28 Risk Factors for Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders." *Applied*  
29 *Ergonomics* 39 (1): 57–69.  
30  
31 Denis, Denys, Monique Lortie, and Michel Rossignol. 2000. "Observation Procedures  
32 Characterizing Occupational Physical Activities: Critical Review." *International*  
33 *Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics* 6 (4): 463–491.  
34  
35 Descatha, Alexis, Yves Roquelaure, Sandrine Caroly, Bradley Evanoff, Diane Cyr, Jean  
36 Mariel, and Annette Leclerc. 2009. "Self-Administered Questionnaire and Direct  
37 Observation by Checklist: Comparing Two Methods for Physical Exposure  
38 Surveillance in a Highly Repetitive Tasks Plant." *Applied Ergonomics* 40 (2):  
39 194–198.  
40  
41 Durand, M. J., N. Vézina, R. Baril, P. Loisel, M. C. Richard, and S. Ngomo. 2009.  
42 "Margin of Manoeuvre Indicators in the Workplace during the Rehabilitation  
43 Process: A Qualitative Analysis." *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 19  
44 (2): 194–202. doi:10.1007/s10926-009-9173-4.  
45  
46 Gaudetz, C., M. A. Gilles, and J. Savin. 2016. "Intrinsic Movement Variability at Work.  
47 How Long Is the Path from Motor Control to Design Engineering?" *Applied*  
48 *Ergonomics* 53 (March): 71–78. doi:10.1016/j.apergo.2015.08.014.  
49  
50 Gouédard, Catherine, and Pierre Rabardel. 2012. "Pouvoir d'agir et Capacités d'agir:  
51 Une Perspective Méthodologique?. Illustration Dans Le Champ de La Santé,  
52 Sécurité et Conditions de Travail." *Perspectives Interdisciplinaires Sur Le*  
53 *Travail et La Santé*, no. 14–2.  
54  
55 Hägg, Göran M. 2003. "Corporate Initiatives in Ergonomics—an Introduction." *Applied*  
56 *Ergonomics* 34 (1): 3–15.  
57  
58 Hansson, Gert-Åke, Istvan Balogh, Jeannette Unge Byström, Kerstina Ohlsson,  
59 Catarina Nordander, Paul Asterland, Simon Sjölander, et al. 2001.  
60 "Questionnaire versus Direct Technical Measurements in Assessing Postures  
and Movements of the Head, Upper Back, Arms and Hands." *Scandinavian*  
*Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 30–40.

- 1  
2  
3 Hignett \*, Sue, and John R. Wilson. 2004. "The Role for Qualitative Methodology in  
4 Ergonomics: A Case Study to Explore Theoretical Issues." *Theoretical Issues in*  
5 *Ergonomics Science* 5 (6). Taylor & Francis: 473–493.  
6 doi:10.1080/14639220412331303382.  
7
- 8 Hignett, Sue, and Lynn McAtamney. 2000. "Rapid Entire Body Assessment (REBA)."  
9 *Applied Ergonomics* 31 (2): 201–205. doi:10.1016/S0003-6870(99)00039-3.  
10
- 11 Hubault, François, and Fabrice Bourgeois. 2013. "L'activité, ressource pour le  
12 développement de l'organisation du travail." In *Ergonomie constructive*, 89–  
13 102. Presses Universitaires de France. [https://www.cairn.info/ergonomie-  
14 constructive--9782130607489-p-89.htm](https://www.cairn.info/ergonomie-constructive--9782130607489-p-89.htm).
- 15 Kadikon, Yusof, and Mohd Nasrull Abdol Rahman. 2016. "Manual Material Handling  
16 Risk Assessment Tool for Assessing Exposure To." *Journal of Engineering and*  
17 *Applied Sciences* 100 (10): 2226–2232.
- 18 Karsh, B.-T. 2006. "Theories of Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders: Implications  
19 for Ergonomic Interventions." *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science* 7 (1):  
20 71–88.  
21
- 22 Koukoulaki, Theoni. 2014. "The Impact of Lean Production on Musculoskeletal and  
23 Psychosocial Risks: An Examination of Sociotechnical Trends over 20 Years."  
24 *Applied Ergonomics*, Advances in Socio-Technical Systems Understanding and  
25 Design: A Festschrift in Honour of K.D. Eason, 45 (2, Part A): 198–212.  
26 doi:10.1016/j.apergo.2013.07.018.
- 27 Lux, Aurélien, Ismail El Mouayni, Bruno Daille Lefevre, Jonathan Savin, Alain  
28 Etienne, and Ali Siadat. 2017. "Santé et Sécurité Au Travail: Quatre Approches  
29 En Conception Pour Spécifier et Simuler Des Marges de Manoeuvre Pour Les  
30 Futurs Opérateurs de Production." In *CIGI2017 12ème Edition Du Congrès*  
31 *International de Génie Industriel*, 8p.  
32
- 33 Major, Marie-Eve, and Nicole Vézina. 2015. "Analysis of Worker Strategies: A  
34 Comprehensive Understanding for the Prevention of Work Related  
35 Musculoskeletal Disorders." *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics* 48  
36 (July): 149–157. doi:10.1016/j.ergon.2015.05.003.  
37
- 38 Malchaire, Jacques, Roland Gauthy, Alain Piette, and Fabio Strambi. 2011.  
39 *Classification of the Methods for Evaluation and Prevention of Musculoskeletal*  
40 *Disorders*. Bruxelles: European Trade Union Institute.
- 41 Mathiassen, Svend Erik. 2006. "Diversity and Variation in Biomechanical Exposure:  
42 What Is It, and Why Would We like to Know?" *Applied Ergonomics*, Special  
43 Issue: Meeting Diversity in Ergonomics, 37 (4): 419–427.  
44 doi:10.1016/j.apergo.2006.04.006.  
45
- 46 McAtamney, Lynn, and E. Nigel Corlett. 1993. "RULA: A Survey Method for the  
47 Investigation of Work-Related Upper Limb Disorders." *Applied Ergonomics* 24  
48 (2): 91–99.
- 49 Messing, Karen, Ana María Seifert, Nicole Vézina, Ellen Balka, and Céline Chatigny.  
50 2005. "Qualitative Research Using Numbers: An Approach Developed in France  
51 and Used to Transform Work in North America." *NEW SOLUTIONS: A Journal*  
52 *of Environmental and Occupational Health Policy* 15 (3). SAGE Publications  
53 Inc: 245–260. doi:10.2190/F2QB-P8YX-MVWU-TYAW.
- 54 Mohammadi, Heidar, Majid Motamedzade, Mohammad Amin Faghih, Hadi Bayat,  
55 Majid Habibi Mohraz, and Saeed Musavi. 2013. "Manual Material Handling  
56 Assessment among Workers of Iranian Casting Workshops." *International*  
57 *Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics* 19 (4): 675–681.  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Monnington, S. C., C. J. Quarrie, A. D. Pinder, and L. A. Morris. 2003. "Development  
4 of Manual Handling Assessment Charts (MAC) for Health and Safety  
5 Inspectors." In *Contemporary Ergonomics*, Taylor & Francis, 3–8. London: Paul  
6 T.McCabe.
- 7  
8 Norval, Maxime, Mohsen Zare, René Brunet, Fabien Coutarel, and Yves Roquelaure.  
9 2019. "Operational Leeway in Work Situations: Do Ergonomic Risk Assessment  
10 Tools Consider Operational Leeway for Job Analysis?" *International Journal of  
11 Occupational Safety and Ergonomics* 25 (3). Taylor & Francis: 429–442.  
12 doi:10.1080/10803548.2017.1387392.
- 13  
14 Roman-Liu, Danuta. 2014. "Comparison of Concepts in Easy-to-Use Methods for MSD  
15 Risk Assessment." *Applied Ergonomics* 45 (3): 420–427.  
16 doi:10.1016/j.apergo.2013.05.010.
- 17  
18 Roquelaure, Y. 2018. "1645e Health Promotion and Constructive Ergonomics: An  
19 Integrated Developmental Perspective to Improve Sustainable Working  
20 Conditions and Well-Being at Work." *Occup Environ Med* 75 (Suppl 2): A216–  
21 A217. doi:10.1136/oemed-2018-ICOHabstracts.616.
- 22  
23 Schaub, Karlheinz, Gabriele Caragnano, Bernd Britzke, and Ralph Bruder. 2013. "The  
24 European Assembly Worksheet." *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science* 14  
25 (6): 616–639.
- 26  
27 Silverstein, B. 1997. "The Use of Checklists for Upper Limb Risk Assessment." In  
28 *Proceedings of the 13th Triennial Congress of the International Ergonomics  
29 Association.*, 4:109–111. Tampere, Finland.
- 30  
31 St-Vincent, Marie, Nicole Vézina, Marie José Bellemare, Denys Denis, Élise Ledoux,  
32 and Daniel Imbeau. 2011. *L'intervention en ergonomie*. Québec: MultiMonde.  
33 <http://multim.com/titre/?ID=344>.
- 34  
35 Sznclwar, Laerte Idal, and François Hubault. 2015. "Work Activities as a Resource for  
36 Work Organization Design and for Strategic Decisions?" *IIE Transactions on  
37 Occupational Ergonomics and Human Factors* 3 (1). Taylor & Francis: 37–44.  
38 doi:10.1080/21577323.2014.971981.
- 39  
40 Takala, Esa-Pekka, Irmeli Pehkonen, Mikael Forsman, Gert-\AAake Hansson, Svend  
41 Erik Mathiassen, W. Patrick Neumann, Gisela Sjøgaard, Kaj Bo Veiersted, Rolf  
42 H. Westgaard, and Jørgen Winkel. 2010. "Systematic Evaluation of  
43 Observational Methods Assessing Biomechanical Exposures at Work."  
44 *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 3–24.
- 45  
46 Tomás, Jean-Luc, and Gabriel Fernandez. 2015. "Du Pouvoir d'agir Aux Marges de  
47 Manoeuvre: Une Proposition Pour Le Développement Psychologique Des  
48 Gestes." *Activités* 12 (12–2).
- 49  
50 Törnström, Linda, Joakim Amprazis, Marita Christmansson, and Jörgen Eklund. 2008.  
51 "A Corporate Workplace Model for Ergonomic Assessments and  
52 Improvements." *Applied Ergonomics* 39 (2): 219–228.
- 53  
54 Vézina, Nicole. 2001. "La Pratique de l'ergonomie Face Aux TMS: Ouverture à  
55 l'interdisciplinarité." *Comptes Rendus Du Congrès SELF-ACE*.  
56 <http://www.academia.edu/download/35036059/v1-05a-vezina.pdf>.
- 57  
58 Vezina, Nicole, Marie José Durand, Marie-Christine Richard, and Bénédicte Calvet.  
59 2016. "Comprendre La Marge de Manoeuvre Situationnelle : Une Question de  
60 Retour Durable Au Travail." *Archives Des Maladies Professionnelles et de  
l'Environnement*, 34e Congrès National de Médecine et Santé au Travail, 77 (3):  
362–363. doi:10.1016/j.admp.2016.03.019.

- 1  
2  
3 Waters, Thomas R., Vern Putz-Anderson, Arun Garg, and Lawrence J. Fine. 1993.  
4 “Revised NIOSH Equation for the Design and Evaluation of Manual Lifting  
5 Tasks.” *Ergonomics* 36 (7): 749–776.  
6  
7 Zare, Mohsen, Sophie Biau, Rene Brunet, and Yves Roquelaure. 2017. “Comparison of  
8 Three Methods for Evaluation of Work Postures in a Truck Assembly Plant.”  
9 *Ergonomics* 60 (11): 1551–1563. doi:10.1080/00140139.2017.1314023.  
10  
11 Zare, Mohsen, Jean-Claude Sagot, and Yves Roquelaure. 2018. “Within and between  
12 Individual Variability of Exposure to Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorder  
13 Risk Factors.” *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public  
14 Health* 15 (5): 1003. doi:10.3390/ijerph15051003.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 1. Description of individual characteristics and case studies

| Workstation                         | Description of tasks   | Reference situation  | Workstations  | Primary constraints observed at the workstation following first meeting with the operator   | Individual characteristics  |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|
|                                     |  | Description  | Selection criteria  |   |   |
| Connecting rod finishing            | Unscrewing, deburring, engine washing, check, sorting  | Unscrewing for manual deburring and washing preparation                      | Most frequent reference and highest risk situation according to the operator  | Heavy manual activity (carrying heavy loads), six different references  | T <sup>a</sup> , 25 years old, M <sup>b</sup> , 175cm, R <sup>c</sup> , one year in the workstation, one year in the company    |
| Connecting rod drafting             | Rod drilling, diameter check, threading, notching, manual removal of trolley   | Rod drilling   | Most frequent reference and most demanding situation according to the operator  | Manual handling, movement, work rate and management of time spent using machinery, six different references   | T, 28 years old, M, 178cm, R, one year in the workstation, one year in the company  |
| Pre-paintwork covering              | Tape protection preparation, cover/roll-top motor, cover/roll lower motor, check, progression to painting  | Mask top engine (upper part)   | Reference with the most area to protect. Very high work rate according to the operator  | Very high reference variability, risk of omission or error and increased impact   | P <sup>a</sup> , 41 years old, M, 185cm, L, eight years in the workstation, eight years in the company                          |
| Final engine assembly line          | Finishing of harness casing and checks, preparation of bracket spacing, push buttons, attach a hook on the motor, motor moved to the end of the line | Attachment and motor transfer to overhead conveyor                           | Most frequent and highest risk situation according to the operator  | Trampling, advance bracket spacing (3, 4 and 6cyl), handling height and linked constraining postures  | P, 30 years old, M, 165cm, R, six months in the workstation, 11 years in the company  |
| Engine wiring unit assembly         | Supply harness, positioning and screwing, harness connections and engine casing, visual inspection   | Connecting harnesses and engine casing                                       | Reference with the most connection tasks. Reference to anticipate due to being the longest and most demanding task to achieve according to the operator | High variability of references, high and variable work rate, a variable number of connections, knowledge of the manufacturing process and production diversity required | P, 39 years old, M, 165cm, R, one year in the workstation, ten years in the company   |
| Engine injector kit preparation     | Consult production checklist, preparation of parts, assembly of injectors, preparation of assembly kits, sent to the assembly line                   | Assembly of injector   | Most frequent reference. Most constraining situation according to the operator  | The high number of essential tasks, high variation of the work rate stipulated by the assembly line, very high reference variability                                    | P, 52 years old, F <sup>b</sup> , 164cm, R, three years in the workstation, 11 years in the company                             |
| Manifold/turbo assembly preparation | Skid preparation, manifold placement, turbo-manifold assembly, screw and gasket installation, flexible positioning, assembly line preparation        | Double turbo installation on the manifold (handling and installation)        | Most constraining situation. Most demanding task according to the operator  | Number of essential tasks, very high reference diversities, trampling, high and variable work rate stipulated by the production line                                    | T, 20 years old, M, 177cm, R, seven months in the workstation, seven months in the company                                      |
| Fixtures/equipment pre-testing      | Fitting/unfitting of engine flywheel and belt, sealing and emptying after tests, visual inspection   | Handling and positioning of the engine flywheel                              | Most constraining situation. Most demanding task according to the operator  | Variable work rate, the variability of references, assisted load handling and equipment, static posture for drilling with vibration                                     | P, 54 years old, M, 176cm, R, a genetic condition (Forestier's disease), nine years in the workstation, 12 years in the company |
| Preparation of small parts orders   | Order taking, parts preparation, packing of parts per unit, put into boxes of six, preparation of kits and shipments                                 | One piece package for kit preparation  | Most frequently occurring and repetitive situation. Most representative reference according to the operator   | Small and fragile parts, the variability of references, the repetitiveness of movements, autonomy in preparation  | P, 52 years old, M, 174cm, R, two years in the workstation, 11 years in the company   |
| Fixtures packaging                  | Prepare small parts order, e.g., screws for customer shipments, parts and machine preparation, semi-manual bagging and order shipping                | Semi-manual bagging (part pick up, deposit in bag and press button closures) | Most frequent situation and highest risk reference according to the operator  | Highly repetitive bagging task, a high number of references (screws and gaskets), high work rate and frequency of movements   | P, 53 years old, M, 178cm, R, , 11 years in the workstation, 14 years in the company  |

<sup>a</sup>Status T/P: Temporary or permanent employment status.

<sup>b</sup>Sex M/F: Male or female sex.

<sup>c</sup>R/L: Right or left hand of dominant use.

Table 2. Risk factors evaluated by the simple risk assessment tools used in this study

| Evaluation tools / Variable | Force | Posture | Duration | Frequency | Load handling | Psychosocial | Operator feeling | Others <sup>a</sup> |
|-----------------------------|-------|---------|----------|-----------|---------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------|
| OSHA checklist              | x     | x       | x        |           |               |              |                  | x                   |
| Ergonomic criticality       | x     | x       | x        |           | x             |              | x                | x                   |
| QEC                         | x     | x       |          | x         | x             | x            | x                | x                   |
| RULA                        | x     | x       |          |           |               |              |                  |                     |
| REBA                        | x     | x       |          |           |               |              |                  |                     |
| EAWS                        | x     | x       | x        | x         | x             |              |                  | x                   |
| Revised NIOSH equation      |       | x       | x        | x         | x             |              |                  | x                   |
| MAC                         |       | x       | x        |           | x             |              |                  | x                   |

<sup>a</sup>Other factors: Gripping, distance carried, precision of activity, nature of the task, working environment, cycle time.

Table 3. Codification of interpretation scales (three levels system rating) for comparison of results between different tools

| Simple tools           | Interpretation scale provided by tool developer                                      | Codification across three levels |                   |               |
|------------------------|--|----------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
|                        |  | Low risk (1)                     | Moderate risk (2) | High risk (3) |
|                        | < 3: no risk.  |                                  |                   |               |
| OSHA checklist         | < 5: no presumed risk.   | < 5                              | ≥ 5 and ≤ 9       | > 9           |
|                        | ≥ 5: significant risk, occupational medicine must act promptly                       |                                  |                   |               |
|                        | > 9: very high risk and immediate action is required                                 |                                  |                   |               |
|                        | Between 30 and 90 roles are considered low risk                                      |                                  |                   |               |
| CE                     | Between 90 and 112 roles are considered moderately risky                             | < 90                             | ≥ 90 and < 112    | ≥ 112         |
|                        | > 112 roles are considered high risk   |                                  |                   |               |
|                        | <40%: Acceptable level   |                                  |                   |               |
| QEC                    | 40-49%: Practicable action   | <49%                             | ≥49 and ≤69%      | ≥70%          |
|                        | 49-69%: timely action required   |                                  |                   |               |
|                        | >70%: Immediate action required  |                                  |                   |               |
|                        | 1 and 2 = Acceptable   |                                  |                   |               |
| RULA                   | 3 and 4 = Investigate further  | ≥1 and ≤4                        | ≥5 and ≤6         | ≥7            |
|                        | 5 and 6 = Investigate further and change soon  |                                  |                   |               |
|                        | 7 = Investigate and change immediately   |                                  |                   |               |
|                        | 1 = Negligible risk  |                                  |                   |               |
| REBA                   | 2 or 3 = Low risk, take action on confirmation                                       |                                  |                   |               |
|                        | 4 to 7 = Moderate risk, action required  | ≥1 and ≤3                        | ≥4 and ≤7         | ≥8 and ≤15    |
|                        | 8 to 10 = High risk, short-term action required                                      |                                  |                   |               |
|                        | 11 to 15 = Very high risk, immediate action required                                 |                                  |                   |               |
| EAWS <sup>a</sup>      | 0-25 points: Low risk, no action required  |                                  |                   |               |
|                        | 25-50 points: Potential risk, further investigation needed to evaluate risk.         | 0-25 points                      | 25-50 points      | >50 points    |
|                        | >50 points: High risk, risk reduction action required                                |                                  |                   |               |
| Revised NIOSH equation | < 1 = acceptable handling  |                                  |                   |               |
|                        | >1 = Chronic risk  | ≤1                               | >1 and ≤3         | >3            |
|                        | >3 = Acute risk  |                                  |                   |               |
| MAC                    | <7: Low risk: Examine any of the constituent parts of the activity to reduce risk    |                                  |                   |               |
|                        | Between 7 and 11: Moderate risk: examine the risk situations and minimize the degree | <7                               | ≥7 and <11        | >11           |
|                        | >11: High risk: analyze all high-risk situations and lessen the degree               |                                  |                   |               |

<sup>a</sup>Upper limb score of EAWS tool was excluded from the analysis.

1  
2  
3 Table 4: The cutoff point for assigning the SOL score for each component. The cutoff  
4  
5 point was determined based on the distribution of scores in three groups of the same  
6  
7 size  
8  
9

| Components                            | Maximum score | Low score | Moderate scores     | High scores |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|
| Work strategy (12 indicators)         | 36            | $\leq 20$ | = 21                | $\geq 22$   |
| Effects on performance (3 indicators) | 9             | $\leq 5$  | = 6                 | $\geq 7$    |
| Effects on health (4 indicators)      | 12            | $\leq 5$  | $\geq 6$ and $< 11$ | $\geq 11$   |

Table 5. The results of eight simple MSDs risk assessment tools for each workstation

| Workstation                                    | Reference situation                   | Simple observational tools <sup>a</sup> |           |           |           |           |           | Manual material handling tools       |           |           |                                      |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------------------|
|  |                                       | OSHA                                    | CE        | QEC       | RULA      | REBA      | EAWS      | Final score of workstation mean(±SD) | NIOSH     | MAC       | Final score of workstation mean(±SD) |
| Connecting rod finishing                       | Unscrewing connecting rods            | 3                                       | 1         | 2         | 3         | 3         | 3         | 2.5 (0.7)                            | 2         | 2         | 2 (0)                                |
| Connecting rod drafting                        | Connecting rod drilling               | 3                                       | 1         | 2         | 3         | 3         | 2         | 2.3 (0.7)                            | 2         | 2         | 2 (0)                                |
| Pre-paintwork covering <sup>b</sup>            | Roll top motor covering               | 3                                       | 1         | 2         | 2         | 3         | 2         | 2.2 (0.6)                            | 1         | 1         | 1 (0)                                |
| Final engine assembly line                     | Attaching engine to overhead conveyor | 3                                       | 2         | 2         | 2         | 3         | 2         | 2.3 (0.4)                            | 1         | 2         | 1.5 (0.5)                            |
| Engine wiring unit assembly                    | Top end fitting and connecting        | 3                                       | 2         | 3         | 3         | 3         | 3         | 2.8 (0.3)                            | 1         | 2         | 1.5 (0.5)                            |
| Engine injector kit preparation                | Injector assembly                     | 2                                       | 1         | 2         | 1         | 2         | 2         | 1.7 (0.4)                            | 1         | 1         | 1 (0)                                |
| Manifold / turbo assembly preparation          | Installation of turbo onto manifold   | 3                                       | 3         | 3         | 3         | 3         | 3         | 3 (0)                                | 1         | 2         | 1.5 (0.5)                            |
| Fixtures / equipment pre-testing <sup>b</sup>  | Equipping engine flywheel pre-testing | 3                                       | 1         | 2         | 2         | 2         | 2         | 2 (0.3)                              | 1         | 1         | 1 (0)                                |
| Preparation of small parts orders <sup>b</sup> | Packaging of a small part             | 2                                       | 1         | 2         | 1         | 2         | 1         | 1.5 (0.5)                            | 1         | 1         | 1 (0)                                |
| Fixtures packaging <sup>b</sup>                | Fixtures bagging                      | 3                                       | 1         | 3         | 1         | 2         | 1         | 1.8 (0.8)                            | 1         | 1         | 1 (0)                                |
| Final cores for ten workstations mean(±SD)     |                                       | 2.8 (0.3)                               | 1.4 (0.6) | 2.3 (0.4) | 2.1 (0.7) | 2.6 (0.5) | 2.1 (0.5) | -                                    | 1.2 (0.3) | 1.5 (0.5) | -                                    |

<sup>a</sup>Interpretation scale: 1-low risk; 2-moderate risk; 3-high risk.

<sup>b</sup>No manual material handling tasks (designated low risk)

Table 6. Semi-quantitative assessment by SOL indicators for the reference situation of ten workstations

| Workstation                         | Reference situation                   | Score work strategy process <sup>a</sup> | Score direct effect on performance <sup>b</sup> | Score of direct effect on health <sup>c</sup> | SOL adequacy of situation <sup>d</sup> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Connecting rod finishing            | Unscrewing connecting rods            | 17 (Low)                                 | 3 (Low)   | 8 (Moderate)                                  | Inadequate                             |
| Connecting rod drafting             | Connecting rod drilling               | 26 (High)                                | 6 (Moderate)                                    | 11(High)                                      | Adequate                               |
| Pre-paintwork covering              | Roll top motor covering               | 22 (High)                                | 5 (Low)   | 11 (High)                                     | Inadequate                             |
| Final engine assembly line          | Attaching engine to overhead conveyor | 20 (Low)                                 | 6 (Moderate)                                    | 6 (Moderate )                                 | Potentially inadequate                 |
| Engine wiring unit assembly         | Top end fitting and connecting        | 21(Moderate)                             | 9 (High)  | 5 (Low)                                       | Inadequate                             |
| Engine injector kit preparation     | Injector assembly                     | 16 (Low)                                 | 6 (Moderate)                                    | 4 (Low)                                       | Inadequate                             |
| Manifold/turbo assembly preparation | Installation of turbo onto manifold   | 21(Moderate)                             | 5 (Low)   | 11(High)                                      | Inadequate                             |
| Fixtures/equipment pre-testing      | Equipping engine flywheel pre-testing | 22 (High)                                | 6 (Moderate)                                    | 2 (Low)                                       | Inadequate                             |
| Preparation of small parts orders   | Packaging small parts                 | 24 (High)                                | 7 (High)  | 10 (Moderate)                                 | Adequate                               |
| Fixtures packaging                  | Fixtures bagging                      | 21 (Moderate)                            | 5 (Low)   | 12 (Low)                                      | Inadequate                             |

<sup>a</sup>1. Low scores  $\leq 20$ ; 2. Moderate scores between = 21 ; 3. High scores  $\geq 22$  (maximum score: 36 points).

<sup>b</sup>1. Low scores  $\leq 5$ ; 2. Moderate scores between = 6 ; 3. High scores  $\geq 7$  (maximum score: 9 points).

<sup>c</sup>1. Low scores  $\leq 5$ ; 2. Moderate scores between  $\geq 6$  and  $< 11$  ; 3. High scores  $\geq 11$  (maximum score: 12 points).

<sup>d</sup>SOL is inadequate if at least one column shows a low score; SOL is potentially inadequate if at least the scores of two columns are moderate; SOL is adequate if at least two columns show a high score.

Table 7. The qualitative examination of SOL indicators identified by the reconstruction of the human-centered activity model (Vézina 2001)

| Work Stations                       | Reference situation                   | Work strategy process   | Direct effects on performance   | Direct effects on health   | SOL adequacy <sup>a</sup> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|---------------------------|
| Connecting rod finishing            | Unscrewing connecting rods            | <p>=&gt; Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of variation in the work strategy</li> <li>- Lack of assistance</li> <li>- Wide variation in work rhythm</li> </ul>  | <p>=&gt; Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recurring delays in production</li> <li>- Negative representation of performance</li> <li>- Difficulty in adhering to the cycle time</li> </ul>   | <p>=&gt; Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recurring shoulder/arm pain</li> <li>- Feeling of fatigue</li> </ul>   | Inadequate                |
| Connecting rod drafting             | Connecting rod drilling               | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several strategies observed</li> <li>- Steady work rate</li> <li>- Assistance</li> <li>- Several resources for accomplishing the activity</li> </ul>  | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No difficulty achieving the required performance</li> <li>- No delays</li> <li>- Adherence to productivity and quality</li> </ul>   | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No health difficulties</li> <li>- No pain</li> </ul>   | Adequate                  |
| Pre-paintwork covering              | Roll top motor covering               | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several work strategies</li> <li>- Anticipations of actions</li> <li>- Steady work rate</li> <li>- Assistance,</li> <li>- The possibility of changing in the event of pain</li> </ul>   | <p>=&gt; Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Delay observed at the workstation during several cycle times with the same productions. Risk of forgetting the marouflage</li> <li>- Poor quality raised by the operator (marouflage tape)</li> </ul> | <p>=&gt; Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some recurring neck/shoulder pain</li> <li>- Fear of forgetting the marouflage, which causes stress</li> </ul>   | Potentially inadequate    |
| Final engine assembly line          | Attaching engine to overhead conveyor | <p>=&gt; Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of variability in work strategy</li> <li>- Impossible to change (technique)</li> <li>- No possibility of changing in the event of pain</li> <li>- Wide variation in work pace</li> </ul>   | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The risk of delay is frequent but compensated by the assistance</li> <li>- No quality problems</li> </ul>   | <p>=&gt; Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shoulder/back pain</li> <li>- Severe fatigue</li> <li>- Recurring stress according to the operator (many production diversity increase risk of line blockage)</li> </ul>                 | Potentially inadequate    |
| Engine wiring unit assembly         | Top end fitting and connecting        | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several work strategies</li> <li>- Frequent help and change in the event of pain</li> <li>- Steady work pace (no speeding up/slowing down and individual time management)</li> <li>- Possibility of changing the order of tasks</li> </ul>                                    | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Little return despite the risk of important errors</li> <li>- Recurring delays but very quickly caught up with significant assistance</li> </ul>  | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No pain</li> <li>- No discomfort or stress about the situation</li> </ul>  | Adequate                  |
| Engine injector kit preparation     | Injector assembly                     | <p>=&gt; Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of variation in the work strategy</li> <li>- Little or no assistance</li> <li>- Impossibility of changing the order of tasks</li> </ul>  | <p>=&gt; Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Perception of work delays</li> <li>- Difficulty in following work pace</li> <li>- Recurring quality problems</li> </ul>   | <p>=&gt; Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pain in several body regions (neck, shoulder, wrist, upper and lower back) related to this work situation</li> <li>- Stress linked to work pace</li> </ul>                               | Inadequate                |
| Manifold/turbo assembly preparation | Installation of turbo onto manifold   | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several work strategies</li> <li>- Much assistance</li> <li>- Steady work pace (individual time management)</li> <li>- Possibility of changing the order of tasks</li> </ul>  | <p>=&gt; Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some quality problems (missing clamping or missing piece)</li> <li>- Recurring delay according to production diversity</li> </ul>   | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No pain</li> <li>- No stress</li> <li>- Perfect representation of health</li> </ul>  | Potentially inadequate    |
| Fixtures / equipment pre-testing    | Equipping engine flywheel pre-testing | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several work strategies</li> <li>- Steady work pace</li> <li>- Assistance</li> <li>- Possibility of changing in the event of pain</li> <li>- Possibility of changing the order of tasks</li> </ul>  | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Slight delay compensated by the assistance</li> <li>- Productivity and quality by demand</li> </ul>   | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Severe and recurring pain but not related to the actual occupation (pain without relation to the situation)</li> <li>- No stress</li> <li>- Special attention from management</li> </ul> | Adequate                  |
| Preparation of small parts orders   | Packaging of a small part             | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several work strategies</li> <li>- Steady work pace (individual time management)</li> <li>- Significant assistance (possibility of working in pairs)</li> <li>- Possibility of changing the order of tasks</li> <li>- Possibility of changing in the event of pain</li> </ul> | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No order delay</li> <li>- Productivity by demand</li> <li>- A few quality problems (missing part)</li> </ul>  | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Significant recurring pain (without relation to the work situation)</li> <li>- No stress and a positive representation of work condition</li> </ul>                                      | Adequate                  |
| Fixtures packaging                  | Fixtures bagging                      | <p>=&gt; Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Distinct lack of variability of work strategy</li> <li>- No assistance</li> <li>- Impossibility of anticipating or changing the order of tasks</li> </ul>   | <p>=&gt; Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Highly productive (more than prescribed targets)</li> <li>- No quality problems</li> <li>- A feeling of efficiency by operators</li> </ul>  | <p>=&gt; Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Severe pain and fatigue after the observed work situation</li> <li>- Pathogenic history associated with pain</li> </ul>  | Potentially inadequate    |

<sup>a</sup>If three components are positive then SOL adequacy; if at least one component is negative then possible SOL inadequacy; if three components are negative then SOL inadequacy.

Table 8. Agreement/disagreement in the results of simple tools for evaluating MSDs risk and the exploration of SOL (situational operational leeway) indicators from qualitative data

| Tools                       | Workstation finishing | Connecting rod drafting | Connecting rod drafting | Pre-paintwork covering | Final engine assembly line | Engine wiring unit assembly | Engine injector kit preparation | Manifold/turbo assembly preparation | Fixtures / equipment pre-testing | Preparation of small parts orders | Fixtures packaging | Agreement/disagreement between simple tools and SOL indicators |            |            |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--|------------|------------|
|                             |                       |                         |                         |                        |                            |                             |                                 |                                     |                                  |                                   |                    | Tool = SOL   | Tool < SOL | Tool > SOL |
| SOL <sup>a</sup>            | 3                     | 1                       | 2                       | 2                      | 1                          | 3                           | 2                               | 1                                   | 1                                | 2                                 | -                  |  |            |            |
| OSHA checklist <sup>b</sup> | 3                     | 3                       | 3                       | 3                      | 3                          | 3                           | 2                               | 3                                   | 3                                | 2                                 | 3                  | 10%  | 10%        | 80%        |
| EC <sup>b</sup>             | 1                     | 1                       | 1                       | 2                      | 2                          | 1                           | 3                               | 1                                   | 1                                | 1                                 | 1                  | 40%  | 60%        | -          |
| QEC <sup>b</sup>            | 2                     | 2                       | 2                       | 2                      | 2                          | 3                           | 2                               | 3                                   | 2                                | 2                                 | 3                  | 20%  | 20%        | 60%        |
| RULA <sup>b</sup>           | 3                     | 3                       | 2                       | 2                      | 3                          | 1                           | 3                               | 2                                   | 1                                | 1                                 | 1                  | 40%  | 20%        | 40%        |
| REBA <sup>b</sup>           | 3                     | 3                       | 3                       | 3                      | 3                          | 3                           | 2                               | 3                                   | 2                                | 2                                 | 2                  | 20%  | 10%        | 70%        |
| EAWS <sup>b</sup>           | 3                     | 2                       | 2                       | 2                      | 3                          | 2                           | 3                               | 2                                   | 1                                | 1                                 | 1                  | 40%  | 20%        | 40%        |
| NIOSH equation <sup>b</sup> | 2                     | 2                       | No handling             | 1                      | 1                          | 1                           | 1                               | No handling                         | No handling                      | No handling                       | No handling        | 16%  | 67%        | 17%        |
| MAC <sup>b</sup>            | 2                     | 2                       | No handling             | 2                      | 2                          | 1                           | 2                               | No handling                         | No handling                      | No handling                       | No handling        | 33.4%  | 33.3%      | 33.3%      |
| Total average               |                       |                         |                         |                        |                            |                             |                                 |                                     |                                  |                                   |                    | 27.4%  | 30%        | 42.6%      |


<sup>a</sup>Interpretation scale for SOL: 1= Adequate; 2 = Potentially inadequate 3= Inadequate SOL.

<sup>b</sup>Interpretation scale for simple tools: 1= Low risk; 2 = Moderate risk; 3= High risk.


1  
2  
3 Figure 1. Human-centered model of work situations focused on the individuals and their  
4 work activity (N. Vézina, 2001). This study focused on 19 indicators of situational  
5 operational leeway.  
6  
7

8  
9 Figure 2. Reconstitution of the three components of SOL indicators for the reference  
10 situation of “Connecting rod finishing” (model adapted from N.Vézina, 2001).  
11  
12

13  
14 Figure 3. Distribution of the number of workstations identified as low, moderate and  
15 high-risk status by each simple risk assessment tools  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




**Figure 1.** Human-centered model of work situations focused on the individuals and their work activity (N. Vézina, 2001). This study focused on 19 indicators of situational operational leeway.



\*The indices used to define the adequacy of SOL for the 3 SOL components.


**Figure 2.** Reconstitution of the three components of SOL indicators for the reference situation of “Connecting rod finishing” (model adapted from N.Vézina, 2001).




**Figure 3.** Distribution of the number of workstations identified as low, moderate and high-risk status by each simple risk assessment tools

supplementary document:

The distribution of scores for the work strategy component (12 indicators; WS: workstation)



The distribution of scores for effect on performance component (3 indicators; WS: workstation)



The distribution of scores for effect on health component (4 indicators; WS: workstation)

