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Abstract: Purpose: To compare ergonomics of an electrically adjustable sit-stand workstation with a traditional workstation in video display unit (VDU) work.

Methods: Twelve female workers (aged 27-53 years) participated in this experimental study. Electromyography, wrist postures, subjective assessments, and productivity were used to make the ergonomic comparison.

Results: The muscle activity of the right trapezius (p=0.01) and left wrist extensors (p=0.02), extension of the right (p=0.05) and left (p=0.002) wrist, and perceived strain of the arms (p=0.05) were lower and productivity was better (p=0.02) when the workers used a low-sitting, high-sitting, or standing posture at the sit-stand workstation than when using a low-sitting posture at the traditional workstation. In the whole, the subjects were more satisfied (p=0.05) with the sit-stand workstation than with the traditional workstation.

Conclusions: Working both in sitting and standing postures was more productive and caused lower strain of the workers’ upper limbs than work only in a sitting posture. The electrically adjustable sit-stand workstation offers the possibility to reduce the sedentary behavior and inactivity in VDU work.
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INTRODUCTION

Epidemiological evidence suggests that decrease in sedentary behavior is beneficial for health [1]. Objectively measured data show that people spend in USA and Australia on average 7.7 h/day and 8.1 h/day in sedentary behavior, respectively [2, 3]. Finni et al. [4] have shown that exercise for fitness, regardless of its duration, does not decrease the inactivity time during normal daily life. Further, different counseling interventions have been carried out to decrease sedentary behavior [5].

Sit-stand workstations offer one possibility of decreasing sedentary behavior and varying work postures during work day [6-9]. Workers can select low-sitting, high-sitting, and standing postures according to their needs and tasks and adjust the work station height easily [9, 10]. Ergonomic sitting and standing postures are typically used in the prevention of musculoskeletal disorders such as low-back pain and upper-limb disorders [6, 11, 12]. According to Callaghan and McGill [9], sitting resulted in higher (p<0.001) low back compressive loads than those experienced by the lumbar spine during standing.

Further, good forearm support has been shown to reduce the musculoskeletal exposure, and discomfort in VDU work [13-16] Dainoff et al. [7] reported about an ergonomic intervention, which included also a use of motorized adjustable workstations in VDU work, that musculoskeletal pain among the VDU workers reduced significantly. According to Schofield et al. [17] standing and typing produced an average of 13% higher energy expenditure than sitting and typing did, and it can therefore reduce the risk of weight gain. According to the review of Reid et al. [18] both prolonged standing and sitting can cause discomfort of the lower extremities. Leg swelling is also more typical during long-lasting standing [19].

The ergonomics of sit-stand workstations have been evaluated earlier for VDU work [6, 9, 20]. According to Wilks et al. [9], 60% of the workers used the sit-stand function of the table once monthly or less, and the frequency was even lower among the older participants. Also pain experienced during the past year and education on the use of the worktable increased the use of the adjustability function [8]. According to Straker et al. [6], use of sit-stand desks was associated with better sedentary behavior in call center workers, however ergonomics awareness did not enhance the effect. In other occupations, use of an electrically adjustable worktable in microscope work decreased the muscle strain of neck and upper limbs among laboratory workers [21]. Jung
The subjects were 12 healthy female workers (aged 27–53 years) from one office (Table 1). They were all right-handed and used a traditional mouse and keyboard. They were accustomed to work at both an electrically adjustable sit-stand workstation and a traditional workstation. During their normal work, the participants adjusted the height of their sit-stand workstation an average of 6 (0–20) times a day in a simulated situation (Fig. 1). During the measurements, all 12 subjects worked for 42 minutes at both work stations, six subjects first worked at the sit-stand workstation, and six first at the traditional workstation.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Subjects**

The subjects were 12 healthy female workers (aged 27–53 years) from one office (Table 1). They were all right-handed and used a traditional mouse and keyboard. They were accustomed to work at both an electrically adjustable sit-stand workstation and a traditional workstation. During their normal work, the participants adjusted the height of their sit-stand workstation an average of 6 (0–20) times a week, mainly due to perceived tiredness and strain. The volunteer subjects were individually informed of the study, and they gave their written consent to participate before the study began. Before the measurements, the subjects were assigned to two study groups of six participants each, the study began. Before the measurements, all 12 subjects worked for 42 minutes at both work stations, six subjects first worked at the sit-stand workstation, and six first at the traditional workstation.

### Table 1. Background Factors of the Participants (n =12). The values are Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27 - 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>158 - 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50 - 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in VDU work (years)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in using a sit-stand workstation (months)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 - 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Methods**

The sit-stand workstation was evaluated with the use of musculoskeletal exposure measurements (electromyography, wrist angles), subjective evaluations (perceived musculoskeletal strain, and satisfaction), and productivity (a mouse and a typing task).

Electromyography (EMG) was recorded from four muscles of the upper body bilaterally (m. erector spinae, m. trapezius pars descendens, m. extensor digitorum communis, m. erector spinae trunci) with a portable ME3000P device with a video option (Mega Electronics, Finland) [29]. The EMG was recorded using the averaged mode, a sampling frequency of 1000 Hz, a time interval of 0.1 seconds, and a bipolar setting of disposable surface electrodes (M-OO-S, Medicotest, Denmark). The positions of the electrodes were defined according to the recommendations of Zipp [30]. The maximal muscular activity of the three muscles was registered during their maximal isometric voluntary contractions (MVC) and standardized as the percentage of the MVC (%MVC). The studied worktasks were video-recorded with a Panasonic S-VHS-C video camera. The EMG data were transferred via an optic link to a computer. The analyses and calculations were performed by attached software.

Wrist extension/flexion and ulnar/radial deviation were measured using a two-channel electronic goniometer (Type XM110, Penny & Giles Blackwood Ltd, UK) attached to the wrists of the worker with skin adhesive tape [31]. The output from the goniometers was sampled with a portable device (ME3000P, Mega Electronics Ltd, Finland) at a frequency of 250 Hz, using the averaged mode and a time constant of 0.1 seconds, and stored on a computer for analysis with ME3000P software.

Visual analogue scales (VAS) were used to determine the musculoskeletal strain, and satisfaction with the sit-stand and the traditional workstation [32]. The workers rated their perceived strain on modified VAS, the result of each scale being reported in millimeters (range 0-100 mm with end points of “0 not at all strainful - 100 very strainful”). Satisfaction with the workstation was asked with the question “How satisfied you are with the workstation (VAS, “0 not at all satisfied – 100 very satisfied”)?

Productivity was evaluated using the number of right strokes per 42 minutes during the standardized mouse and typing tasks. In the mouse task (Fig. 3), developed for this study, the participants used the mouse to delete the middle digit from each item in a special order (111>11, j0>jj.
was used to determine the writing speed [33].

212>22, i0i>i1, etc.) In the typing task, the same Finnish text was used to determine the writing speed [33].

The results were analyzed using the GLM procedure of SAS (Statistical Analysis System v6.12). The means, standard deviations, and ranges were used for the descriptive
evaluation. The independent variable in all of the analyses was the workstation model (sit-stand workstation, traditional workstation). The dependent variables were the muscular activity of the three muscles, the angle of the wrists, the perceived musculoskeletal strain in different body parts, satisfaction, and the number of correct strokes. The differences between the sit-stand and traditional workstations and the testing order were tested using a paired t-test. The differences were considered statistically significant if p<0.05.

RESULTS

The test order of the workstation (sit-stand, traditional) had no statistically significant effect on the outcome variables. There were statistically significant differences in the %MVC values when the workstations are compared. The muscle activity of the right trapezius (p=0.01) and the left extensor digitorum communis (p=0.02) were lower when the participants worked at the sit-stand workstation than when they worked at the traditional workstation (Table 2). There were no statistically significant differences in the activity of the other muscles when the subjects worked at these two workstations.

The extension of both wrists was significantly lower when the subjects worked at the sit-stand workstation compared to the traditional workstation (Table 3). No differences were found in wrist deviation of the subjects when the two workstations were compared.

There was a statistically significant difference in perceived musculoskeletal strain of two body parts between the workstations. The subjects perceived lower (p=0.05) strain in their arms when they worked in different postures (low-sitting, high-sitting, standing) at the electrically adjustable sit-stand workstation than in work at the traditional workstation (Table 4). However, work at the sit-stand workstation caused higher (p=0.01) perceived strain in lower limbs than work in low-sitting posture at the traditional workstation. No statistical differences were found in other body parts between the workstations. In the whole, the participants were more satisfied (p=0.05) with the sit-stand workstation than with the traditional workstation.

Productivity measured with the correct strokes per 42 minutes (mouse task and typing task) was 10% better (p=0.02) at the adjustable sit-stand workstation than at the traditional workstation.

DISCUSSION

With increasing VDU work in most jobs, sitting has become a main part of most working environments. Accordingly, any activity that decreases inactivity time, like sitting, may benefit health [1-5, 13].

This study showed that work productivity and satisfaction were better and musculoskeletal exposure was lower during VDU work alternately in low-sitting, high-sitting, and standing positions than during the work in the sitting position. Especially the muscular strain and perceived strain in the upper limbs was lower at the sit-stand workstation.

### Table 2. Mean Muscle Activity (Electromyography, EMG, %MVC) in Four Muscle Groups Bilaterally During the Standardized VDU Worktasks of the Participants (n=12) at the Electrically Adjustable Sit-Stand Workstation (in Low-Sitting, High-Sitting and Standing Positions) and at the Traditional Workstation (in Low-Sitting Position)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body Part/Muscle</th>
<th>Body Side</th>
<th>Sit-Stand Workstation</th>
<th>Traditional Workstation</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neck/Musculus Erector Spinae</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder/Musculus Trapezius</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm/Musculus Extensor Digitorum Communis</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back/Musculus Erector Spinae Trunci</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. Mean Wrist Extension and Ulnar Deviation (Degree) of the Participants (n=12) During the Standardized VDU Worktasks at the Electrically Adjustable Sit-Stand Workstation (in Low-Sitting, High-Sitting and Standing Positions) and at the Traditional Workstation (in Sitting Position)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wrist Posture</th>
<th>Body Side</th>
<th>Sit-Stand Workstation</th>
<th>Traditional Workstation</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Mean Perceived Musculoskeletal Strain (Visual Analogue Scales, VAS, mm, 0=Not at all Strainful - 100 Very Strainful) for Different Body Parts of the Participants (n=12) After the Standardized VDU Worktasks at the Sit-Stand Workstation (Low-Sitting, High-Sitting and Standing Positions) and at the Traditional Workstation (Low-Sitting Position).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body Part</th>
<th>Sit-Stand Workstation</th>
<th>Traditional Workstation</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neck-Shoulder</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper limbs</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower limbs</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The productivity of the participants was 10% better when the same tasks were done at the sit-stand workstation than it was at the traditional workstation. This finding is in line with...
the results of previous studies [9, 20]. However, in this study the productivity was measured using a quantitative method developed for this study in co-operation with the experts of technical ergonomics and psychology.

The participants were more satisfied (p=0.05) with the sit-stand workstation than with the traditional workstation. The adjustability offers the possibility to have an influence on own work behavior. The better satisfaction can also be due to the lower exposure and strain of upper limbs and possibility to vary the work postures according to the task and perceived strain.

The subjects perceived lower (p=0.05) strain in their arms and higher (p=0.01) strain in their lower limbs when they worked in different postures (low-sitting, high-sitting, standing) at the sit-stand workstation. The lower strain in the arms is obviously due to the lower static exposure of the arms. The electrically adjustable table offers possibilities to adjust the table height so that it is good for supporting the arms in different tasks. Resting the arms on the table surface has been found to be associated with a reduced risk of neck and shoulder pain and lower discomfort [13-16]. Possibility to support arms also increases the function of arms among persons with disabilities [25].

The subjects perceived higher strain in the lower limbs when they worked at the sit-stand workstation although they changed their working posture every 14 minutes and they had no overweight. This result is in accordance with the review of Reid et al. [18]. This shows that moving and dynamic movements are important both in standing and sitting postures [12, 18]. It would be important to develop new solutions to do activities in standing positions during VDU work.

The extension of both wrists was significantly lower when the subjects worked at the sit-stand workstation. This is an important result, because the bent postures of the wrists are main causation of carpal tunnel syndrome [7]. However, no differences were found in wrist deviation when the two workstations were compared. The suitable height of the working surface enabled the participants to keep their wrists in a more neutral position. This finding agrees with the results elicited during the use of arm rests [13]. It is obvious, that too low working surface in VDU work will cause greater extension of the wrists.

This study evaluated an electrically adjustable sit-stand workstation by comparing it with the traditional workstation. The study was planned in cooperation with researchers, workstation manufacturers, and experienced office workers in a participative way. The evaluation was made using the quantitative (EMG, wrist angle, VAS, productivity) methods. The 42-minute VDU task duration was chosen because it seemed to correspond to an average continuous VDU task in an actual work situation. All 12 subjects worked for 42 minute at both work stations and they had a pause between the workstations. The participants represented typical female workers in Finland and they were accustomed to using both of the tested workstations.

Sit-stand workstation offers the possibility to reduce the sedentary behavior and inactivity during the work day. These possibilities should be used when new office environments are designed or old offices are redesigned. Easily adjustable workstations are especially important in open offices where the same workstations are shared by several workers. However, the correct use of technical accessories such as adjustable workstations requires that all of the workers involved be well educated and systematically motivated. Sit-stand workstations can be used in the primary prevention when working comfort will be increased. In secondary prevention, the possibility to work also in high-sitting and standing positions is important, for example, for workers with acute back pain. In tertiary prevention, electrically adjustable workstations are proper workplace accommodations among persons with permanent disabilities [24].

CONCLUSIONS

Working both in sitting and standing postures was more productive and caused lower strain of the workers’ upper limbs than work only in a sitting posture. The electrically adjustable sit-stand workstation offers the possibility to reduce the sedentary behavior and inactivity in VDU work.
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