

Occupational biopsychosocial factors associated with neck pain intensity, neck-disability, and sick leave: a cross-sectional study of construction labourers in an African population

*Chinonso N Igwesi-Chidobe PhD^{1,2}, Excellence Effiong BMRPT², Joseph O Umunnah PhD³, Benjamin C Ozumba MBBS,FRCOG^{2,4}

1. School of Allied Health Professions and Midwifery, Faculty of Health Studies, University of Bradford, United Kingdom.

2. Global Population Health (GPH) Research Group, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria.

3. Department of Medical Rehabilitation, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nnewi Campus, Nnewi, Anambra State, Nigeria

4. Faculty of Medicine, College of Medicine, University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus, Nigeria.

*Corresponding author: Dr Chinonso Igwesi-Chidobe.

E-mail: c.igwesi-chidobe@bradford.ac.uk; chinonso.chidobe@unn.edu.ng

Running head

Occupational biopsychosocial neck pain factors

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

28 **Abstract**

29 **Introduction**

30 The burden and impact of neck pain is high in African countries including Nigeria. This study
31 investigated the occupational biomechanical and occupational psychosocial factors
32 associated with neck pain intensity, neck disability and sick leave amongst construction
33 labourers in an urban Nigerian population.

34 **Methods**

35 This cross-sectional study measured clinical neck pain outcomes, occupational
36 biomechanical factors, and occupational psychosocial factors. Descriptive, and
37 univariate/multivariate inferential statistical analyses were conducted.

38 **Results**

39 Significant independent factors associated with neck pain intensity were order and pace of
40 tasks being dependent on others ($\beta= 0.35$; $p<0.0001$); inability to take breaks in addition to
41 scheduled breaks ($\beta= 0.25$; $p<0.0001$); inability to work because of unexpected events ($\beta=$
42 0.21 ; $p<0.0001$); inability to control the order and pace of tasks ($\beta= 0.20$; $p<0.0001$); and
43 weight of load ($\beta= 0.17$; $p<0.0001$); accounting for 53% of the variance in neck pain
44 intensity. Significant independent factors associated with neck disability were weight of load
45 ($\beta= 0.30$; $p<0.0001$); duration of load carriage ($\beta= 0.16$; $p=0.01$); working under time
46 pressure/deadlines ($\beta= 0.16$; $p=0.02$); and accounting for 20% of the variance in neck
47 disability. Significant independent factor associated with sick leave was duration of load
48 carriage ($\beta=0.15$; $p= 0.04$), in a non-significant regression model explaining -4% of the
49 variance in sick leave. Addition of pain intensity significantly explained more variance in
50 neck disability (31.0%) but less variance in sick leave (-5%), which was not statistically
51 significant ($F(10, 190)= 0.902$, $p=0.533$).

52 **Conclusions**

53 Occupational biomechanical factors may be more important than occupational psychosocial
54 factors in explaining neck disability and sick leave. In contrast, occupational psychosocial
55 factors may be more important than occupational biomechanical factors in explaining neck
56 pain intensity in this population in Nigeria.

57

58

59 **Keywords:** Occupational factors; biomechanical factors; psychosocial factors; Neck pain;
60 Nigeria.

61

62 **Introduction**

63

64 Globally, neck pain is the second most common musculoskeletal cause of disability-adjusted
65 life-years (DALYs) in the working population, behind low back pain (LBP)[1]. Neck pain
66 (defined as ‘activity-limiting neck pain with or without radiation to the upper limbs lasting
67 for at least 24 hours) is a major public health concern globally due to significant direct and
68 indirect individual and societal costs, and the negative impact on overall health, function,
69 well-being and quality of life[2,3]. There is a wide variation in the overall prevalence of neck
70 pain in the general population ranging from 0.4% to 86.8% (mean: 23.1%)[4]. Point
71 prevalence rates range between 0.4% and 41.5% (mean = 14.4%); with 1 year prevalence
72 rates ranging between 4.8% and 79.5% (mean= 25.8%)[3]. As of 2019, neck pain had an age-
73 standardised prevalence rate of 27.0 per 1000 population[4].

74 The prevalence of spinal disorders, particularly back and neck pain is an increasing concern
75 in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs)[5]. Reasons for the concern in these countries

76 include the ageing population, increasing prevalence of spinal pain, high poverty levels
77 combined with a high burden of infectious diseases in environments with limited health
78 resources and health information[6–11]. The consequences of spinal pain are potentially
79 even more devastating in sub-Saharan African countries due to maladaptive pain beliefs,
80 dangerous living and working conditions, plus high poverty levels and limited health
81 services[8,12,13]. In Nigeria, studies have investigated the prevalence of neck pain amongst
82 specific population groups including university students, dentists, and rural farmers with
83 prevalence rates ranging from 10% to 82%[14–16]. The construction industry is associated
84 with a high burden of neck pain-related injury in high-income countries[17]. The burden of
85 neck pain in low and middle-income countries including Nigeria[18–20] may be associated
86 with nearly non-existent occupational health policies and dangerous working conditions.
87 However, studies have not investigated the biomechanical factors alongside psychosocial
88 factors associated with multiple neck pain outcomes in any population group including
89 construction workers in Nigeria.

90 A previous study investigated the biomechanical and psychosocial factors associated with
91 disability amongst people with chronic LBP in rural Nigeria[8]. The results showed that
92 psychosocial factors were the most important factors associated with both self-reported
93 and performance-based disability, explaining 62.5% of self-reported disability and 49.1% of
94 performance-based disability[8]. Unexpectedly, occupational biomechanical factors were
95 not associated with self-reported or performance-based disability[8] which contradicted the
96 findings from the qualitative studies[12,13] in this population. However, the rural Nigerian
97 population studied were all peasant farmers either on a full-time or part-time basis, which
98 might have obfuscated associations with occupational biomechanical factors[8,12]. The

99 involvement of mostly farmers might have implied that a higher value of occupational
100 biomechanical factors might have been reflecting people still in active farming. Conversely,
101 lower biomechanical factors might have been reflecting those who were no longer farming
102 in that population-based cross-sectional study that did not measure sick leave[8]; which was
103 also suggested in qualitative studies conducted in this population [12,13]. This has been
104 termed ‘healthy worker’ effect[21]. Furthermore, the use of total scoring (rather than
105 individual items) of the occupational risk factor questionnaire (ORFQ) may have obscured
106 the relevance of occupational biomechanical factors in explaining chronic LBP disability[8].
107 This could be due to different individuals having different aggravating biomechanical
108 factors. For instance, the aggravating biomechanical factors in some individuals may be
109 protective in some other individuals. A total score of biomechanical exposure could
110 therefore cancel out the impact of individual biomechanical factors which might explain the
111 limited relevance of biomechanical factors in explaining chronic LBP disability in that
112 study[8]. This underscores the importance of biomechanical exposure outcome measures
113 that can capture this level of nuanced measurement. Moreover, the fact that participants
114 with limited literacy found the questionnaire items difficult to understand[22] may have
115 contributed to the lack of relevance of biomechanical factors in predicting chronic LBP in
116 that study[8]. These previous results could also simply imply that occupational
117 biomechanical factors are not important in explaining chronic LBP disability as suggested in
118 that study[8] but may be important in other spinal pain outcomes. The latter is supported
119 by a more recent study in Nigeria suggesting that occupational biomechanical factors may
120 be the strongest independent factors associated with a different spinal pain outcome – a
121 current episode of LBP[23]. The utilization of a total scoring of biomechanical exposure
122 (ORFQ) in that study prohibited an understanding of the relative importance of individual

123 biomechanical factors. Furthermore, the lack of any objective measurement of
124 biomechanical exposure in that study increased the risk of recall bias[23].

125 Evidence suggests that biomechanical factors including sustained flexion and rotation, and
126 spinal loading[24–30], and job-related psychosocial factors including work pressure and
127 stress [24,25,31,32] may be associated with spinal pain outcomes including pain intensity,
128 disability and sick leave. Previous evidence from a rural Nigerian population suggests that
129 spinal pain intensity may be an independent predictor of disability[8]. These factors
130 informed the proposed theoretical model depicted in Figure 1 below which underpins this
131 study.

132 [Figure 1]

133 This model proposes that biomechanical and psychosocial factors would each be
134 independently associated with neck pain intensity, neck disability and sick leave.
135 Furthermore, the model proposes that neck pain intensity would be independently
136 associated with each of the other dependent neck pain outcomes – neck disability and sick
137 leave. This study will therefore clarify the findings from the previous studies and further
138 improve an understanding of the factors driving different spinal pain outcomes in Nigeria. It
139 was important to investigate other populations such as urban Nigerian population groups
140 with other common spinal pain conditions apart from back pain such as neck pain.
141 Utilization of other measures of exposure to biomechanical factors that include an objective
142 component – the actual weight of the load, rather than a complete dependence on the
143 perception of weight, and separating the different categories of biomechanical exposure
144 rather than using a total score, might clarify the importance of specific biomechanical

145 factors for specific spinal pain outcomes in this population. Including a broader range of
146 outcomes apart from disability such as sick leave and pain intensity would help to clarify the
147 importance of biomechanical factors relative to psychosocial factors for different spinal pain
148 outcomes in Nigeria. In view of these, this study aimed to determine the occupational
149 biomechanical and occupational psychosocial factors associated with neck pain intensity,
150 neck-disability, and sick leave amongst construction labourers in an urban Nigerian
151 population. This study is reported according to the guidelines in Strengthening the
152 Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement[33].

153 **Materials and Methods**

154 **Ethical considerations**

155 Ethical approval was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee of the University of
156 Nigeria Teaching Hospital (Ref: UNTH/HREC/2021/01/13). Written informed consent was
157 obtained from all participants.

158 **Study design**

159 Cross-sectional study amongst construction labourers in an urban Nigerian setting.

160 **Study setting**

161 This study took place in the three largest estates being constructed in Enugu metropolis
162 between August 2021 and January 2022 with each estate having about 30 constructions
163 sites. Attempts were made to recruit people from all 90 construction sites in the three
164 estates. Enugu is the capital city of Enugu state, southeastern Nigeria. It has seventeen
165 Local Government Areas (LGAs) with about 202 communities. Three of these LGAs – Enugu
166 east, Enugu north, Enugu south are located in the metropolis [34]. The state is generally

167 residential with few industries but having several estates and construction sites, making it a
168 reliable location for this study.

169 **Sample size**

170 A priori sample size calculation was performed with G power version 3.1 software[35]. A
171 sample size of 189 would give a 95% power to detect a medium regression effect size (f^2) of
172 0.15 at alpha (α) of 0.05 with tested predictors of 13 based on the biopsychosocial
173 theoretical model of pain and research evidence that were previously explained. Thirteen
174 independent variables were chosen to account for the 6 occupational biomechanical factors
175 (for each participant), 5 occupational psychosocial factors overall, and a couple of socio-
176 demographic factors that might have significant associations with each dependent outcome
177 (neck pain intensity, neck disability or sick leave). Arrangement was made to recruit up to
178 201 participants to account for potential data loss due to incomplete or incorrect data
179 collection.

180 **Participants and recruitment**

181 The target population was construction labourers working in construction sites in Enugu
182 metropolis, where construction labourers usually carry load such as concrete, sand, blocks
183 on their head to assist building engineers in construction. Verbal and written information
184 about the study were presented to eligible participants in all 90 construction sites in the
185 three selected building estates. They were given 3 days to decide participation or not.
186 Written informed consent was obtained. Eligible participants that decided to participate
187 signed the consent forms or thumb printed on the consent forms and were then recruited
188 using simple random sampling (the lottery method). This involved counting the number of
189 interested eligible participants in all 90 construction sites. Numbers 1 – 486 (number that
190 was interested and eligible) were written in separate pieces of paper which were folded, put

191 into a box, and mixed. Lastly, each participant randomly selected a folded paper from the
192 box. Those who chose the range of numbers within the sample size (1 – 201) were recruited
193 into the study.

194 Participants were eligible if they were ≥ 18 years of age, and their construction labourer job
195 typically involved carrying load on the head daily which is the norm in this population.
196 Participants were excluded if they had congenital or acquired musculoskeletal deformity
197 such as kyphosis, lordosis, scoliosis, or kyphoscoliosis; previous neck trauma, recent neck
198 trauma including whiplash injury; a previous surgery around the neck; or they had other
199 serious underlying pathologies such as malignancy, infection, fracture, spinal stenosis, or
200 metabolic disorders.

201 **Variables and outcome tools**

202 The socio-demographic variables for which data were collected included age, sex, and
203 education. Patient-reported outcome measures were cross-culturally adapted and validated
204 prior to use.

205 Pain intensity was measured with the Numerical Rating Scale-11 (NRS-11) which is a one-
206 item, one-dimensional patient-reported scale used for assessing self-reported pain
207 intensity[36]. The NRS consists of eleven numbers (0 – 10) with verbal descriptors
208 representing the entire possible range of pain intensity with 0 indicating “no pain” and 10
209 indicating “maximum pain”[37]. NRS can be administered verbally or in a written format, is
210 simple and easily understood, and is easy to administer and score[38]. The measure has
211 excellent reliability and validity in this population[22,39,40].

212 Neck disability was assessed with the Neck Disability Index (NDI) which is a patient-reported
213 questionnaire consisting of 10 items that measures neck pain related disability with items
214 including personal care, lifting, reading, work, driving, sleeping, recreational activities, neck
215 pain intensity, concentration and headache[41,42]. Each item is scored on an incremental
216 scale from 0 (no disability for the item) to 5 (maximum disability for the item) for a
217 maximum total score of 50. The total score is reported as either out of 50 or as a percentage
218 out of 100 with higher scores indicating greater self-reported disability due to neck pain.
219 The severity of neck disability include 0-4 points (0-8%) – no disability, 5-14 points (10-28%)
220 – mild disability, 15-24 points (30-48%) – moderate disability, 25-34 points (50-64%) –
221 severe disability, 35-50 points (70-100%) – complete disability[42,43]. NDI has excellent
222 validity, reliability and is clinically responsive[44–46].

223 Occupational psychosocial factors were assessed with the first 5 items of the ORFQ[47]. The
224 Igbo-version of items 1-5 of the ORFQ which measure work organizational factors such as
225 work pressure and stress was used by scoring individual items, yes or no[8,22]. These items
226 were: (1) Can you usually take breaks in your job in addition to the scheduled breaks? (2) Do
227 you often find that you cannot work because of unexpected events, such as machine break
228 down or material not delivered? (3) Can you usually control the order and pace of your
229 tasks? (4) Is the order and pace of your tasks usually dependent on others (machines,
230 computers, customers)? (5) Do you usually work under time pressure and deadlines?
231 Although appearing similar, item 3 'Can you usually control the order and pace of your
232 tasks?' is different from item 4 'Is the order and pace of your tasks usually dependent on
233 others (machines, computers, customers)?' Whilst item 3 focuses on an internal locus of
234 control such as the ability of participants to decide which tasks to do first and which ones to

235 do later at different work phases, item 4 focuses on an external locus of control such as the
236 order and pace of participants' tasks being dependent on external factors such as machines,
237 computers, customers etc[48]. During the field work, it was found that the labourers' order
238 and pace of tasks was mainly dependent on the needs of the builder (construction
239 Engineer). For instance, if the builder needed a heavy object, the labourers would provide
240 this. The builders determined how many blocks the labourers would carry and the number
241 of the bags of cement they would mix per day. Therefore, the two questions were aimed at
242 distinguishing participants' perception of personal control in the order and pace of tasks
243 e.g., the number of blocks or bags of cement each labourer mixed per hour or how long they
244 worked to meet the builder's daily expectations or any other personal adaptations they
245 could make to meet the builder's daily demands. Research suggests good validity and
246 reliability of the psychosocial content of the tool[22,47,49,50].

247 Exposure to occupational biomechanical factors was measured by combining objective and
248 subjective procedures. Head load carriage history was assessed with a self-developed
249 questionnaire with 3 items assessing the intensity (weight in kilograms), frequency (number
250 of days per week), and duration (number of hours per day) of carrying a weight subjectively
251 described as heavy by each participant which was then objectively measured with the
252 weighing scale. The three questionnaire items were: a) Do you usually carry any load that
253 you feel is heavy for you (described object is then weighed with a weighing scale)? b) How
254 many days do you carry this load in a week? c) How many hours do you carry this load in a
255 day? Weight of head load was measured with a USB digital body weight scale of weighing
256 range 0.1-180KG (Mitronics Global). Neck posture history was assessed with the self-
257 developed questionnaire with 3 items assessing predominant neck posture, frequency

258 (number of days per week) of the neck in that posture, and duration (number of hours per
259 day) of working with the neck in that position. The three items were: a) Do you often have
260 to work with your neck bent forward (flexion), bent backwards (extension) or twisted (trunk
261 rotation – rotating the trunk to either side) [select one predominant position]? b) How many
262 days in a week do you keep your head in this predominant position? c) How many hours in a
263 day do you assume this predominant position? The construct of biomechanical exposure
264 measured by this questionnaire is evidence-based[47,51–57] and the test-retest reliability
265 was confirmed by a sub-sample of 50 participants (Intraclass Correlation Coefficient= 0.536;
266 internal consistency [Cronbach’s alpha]= 0.632).

267 Sick leave was measured with a single item in the self-developed questionnaire which asked
268 how many days in the past four weeks participants have stayed off from work due to neck
269 pain and disability, which aligns with the World Health Organisation Disability Assessment
270 Schedule and is found to be valid and reliable in this population[40].

271 **Data collection procedures**

272 The leader of each construction site was visited, and the study procedures and implications
273 were explained to them. On getting their approval for the study, announcements were then
274 made to labourers explaining the aims of the study and the procedures involved. The
275 announcements also emphasized the voluntary nature of the study and the eligibility
276 criteria. Informed consent was subsequently obtained from the construction labourers who
277 indicated interest in participating in the study. They were then screened against the
278 eligibility criteria. Eligible participants who were literate self-completed the patient-
279 reported questionnaires whilst trained research assistants interviewer-administered the

280 questionnaires for the participants with limited literacy. All questionnaires were collected
281 on the same day they were given or administered to participants.

282 **Statistical analyses**

283 Data were analysed with the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (IBM SPSS), version 23.0
284 using two-tailed analyses. Normality of data was investigated using the normal distribution
285 curve to inform the descriptive summary statistics and the inferential statistics conducted.
286 Frequencies and percentages, and median and interquartile ranges were used to summarise
287 socio-demographic characteristics. Exposure to occupational biopsychosocial factors, and
288 neck pain outcomes of neck pain intensity, neck disability and sick leave were summarized
289 with means and standard deviations, median and interquartile ranges, and/or frequencies
290 and percentages.

291 Bivariate associations between each of the dependent variables (neck pain intensity, neck
292 disability or sick leave) and each of the socio-demographic variables were investigated.
293 Spearman's correlation was used to find bivariate relationships between the dependent
294 variables and the continuous socio-demographic variables – age. Mann-Whitney U was used
295 to determine if the dependent variables varied according to the dichotomous categorical
296 sociodemographic variables – sex. Kruskal-Wallis test was used to determine if the
297 dependent variables differed according to the polychotomous categorical sociodemographic
298 variables – educational status. The socio-demographic variables with associations at $p \leq 0.25$
299 with the neck pain outcomes (dependent variables) were entered into sequential multiple
300 regression analyses to account for their effects. We used a p-value cut-off point of 0.25 for
301 inclusion into the regression models, as the traditional cut-off level of 0.05 can fail in
302 identifying variables known to be important[58–60].

303 Bivariate associations between each of the dependent variables (neck pain intensity, neck
304 disability or sick leave) and each of the independent variables were investigated. Spearman
305 correlation analysis was used to investigate the associations between the dependent neck
306 pain outcomes (neck pain intensity, neck disability and sick leave) and the continuous
307 independent variables – all occupational biomechanical factors except predominant neck
308 posture. Mann-Whitney U was used to investigate if the dependent neck pain outcome
309 variables differed according to the dichotomous categorical independent variables – all the
310 occupational psychosocial factors. Kruskal Wallist test was used to determine whether the
311 dependent neck pain outcome variables differed according to the polychotomous
312 categorical independent variables – predominant neck posture which is one of the
313 occupational biomechanical factors.

314 A bivariate correlation matrix was used for the initial investigation of multicollinearity
315 between the independent biomechanical and psychosocial variables. Spearman correlation
316 analysis was used to determine the relationship between all the independent biomechanical
317 and psychosocial variables (categorical variables were dummy coded). Multicollinearity was
318 said to be present when any resulting correlation coefficient was greater than 0.8[61].
319 Multicollinearity was further investigated with tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF)
320 in three standard regression analyses inputting all the independent biomechanical and
321 psychosocial variables for the three dependent variables – neck pain intensity, neck
322 disability and sick leave. A tolerance close to 1 indicates very little multicollinearity, whereas
323 a value close to zero suggests that multicollinearity may be a threat. A value of VIF
324 exceeding 10 was interpreted as the presence of multicollinearity, with values above 2.5

325 regarded as a cause for concern[61,62]. There are no formal cutoff values of tolerance and
326 VIF for determining the presence of multicollinearity[61].

327 In line with the biopsychosocial theoretical model underpinning this study (which proposes
328 that biomechanical and psychosocial factors would each be independently associated with
329 neck pain intensity, neck disability and sick leave), all the occupational biomechanical and
330 psychosocial variables were entered into three sequential multiple regression analyses with
331 neck pain intensity, neck disability and sick leave as the criterion variables after controlling
332 for any significant ($p \leq 0.25$) socio-demographic variables. Two additional sequential multiple
333 regression analyses were conducted for neck disability and sick leave with pain intensity
334 included as an independent variable. This aligns with the biopsychosocial theoretical model
335 underpinning this study (which proposes that neck pain intensity would be independently
336 associated with each of the other dependent neck pain outcomes – neck disability and sick
337 leave). Alpha levels were set at 0.05.

338 **Results**

339 Figure 2 below illustrates how participants were recruited at the different stages and the
340 response rates.

341 [Figure 2]

342

343 Tables 1 – 3 summarize the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants, exposure
344 to occupational biomechanical and psychosocial factors, and the dependent variables of
345 pain intensity, neck disability and sick leave, respectively. Majority of the participants were
346 male and had attended secondary school. The mean weight carried at once was 39kg for 9
347 hours per day and 6 days per week, with the neck predominantly in a twisted (rotated)

348 position. Majority of the participants were exposed to all occupational psychosocial factors.
349 The median pain intensity was 6 with majority having moderate neck disability but were
350 only 1 day off work in the past 4 weeks.

351

352 **Table 1: Sociodemographic characteristics of participants**

Socio-demographic variables n=201	Median (IQR)	Frequency (%)
Age(years)	38 (29-49)	
Sex		
Male		189 (94.00)
Female		12 (6.00)
Educational status		
Primary school		63 (31.30)
Secondary school		111 (55.20)
Tertiary institution		27 (13.40)

353 IQR: InterQuartile Range; n= sample size

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367 **Table 2: Descriptive summary of exposure to occupational biopsychosocial factors**

Variable; n= 201	Category	Frequency (%)	Mean (SD)	Median (IQR)
Summary of exposure to occupational biomechanical factors				
Head load carriage history				
Weight of load (kilogram)			39.26 (12.09)	
Frequency of load carriage (number of days per week)				6.00 (5-6)
Duration of load carriage (number of hours per day)				9.00 (8-10)
Neck posture history				
Neck in predominantly forward posture		7.00 (3.50)		
Neck in predominantly extended posture		4.00 (2.00)		
Neck in predominantly twisted(rotated) posture		190.00 (94.50)		
Frequency of neck in predominant posture (number of days per week)				6.00 (1.00)
Duration of neck in predominant posture (number of hours per day)				9.00 (2.00)
Summary of the occupational psychosocial factors				
Can you usually take breaks in your job in addition to the scheduled breaks?	Yes	31 (15.40)		
	No	170 (84.60)		
Do you often find that you cannot work because of unexpected events, such as machine breakdown or material not delivered?	Yes	193 (96.00)		
	No	8 (4.00)		
Can you usually control the order and the pace of your tasks?	Yes	153 (76.10)		
	No	48 (23.90)		
Is the order and pace of your tasks usually dependent on others (machines, computers, customers)?	Yes	148 (73.60)		
	No	23 (26.40)		
Do you usually work under time pressure and deadlines?	Yes	146 (72.60)		
	No	55 (27.40)		

368 SD: standard deviation; IQR: interquartile range;

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377 **Table 3: Descriptive summary of the dependent neck pain outcomes – neck pain intensity,**
378 **neck disability and sick leave**

Variable; n= 201	Categories	Frequency (%)	Median (IQR)
Neck pain intensity			6.00 (5-8)
Neck disability			18.00 (14-24)
	None	0 (0)	
	Mild	53 (26.40)	
	Moderate	98 (48.80)	
	Severe	42 (20.90)	
	Complete	8 (4.00)	
Sick leave			1.00 (0-3)

379 IQR: interquartile range

380

381

382 Table 4 shows the bivariate associations between each of the socio-demographic
383 characteristics, occupational biomechanical factors, occupational psychosocial factors, and
384 each of the dependent variables (neck pain intensity, neck disability and sick leave),
385 respectively. The significant ($p \leq 0.25$) sociodemographic factors associated with neck pain
386 intensity were age and educational status. There was no significant ($p \leq 0.25$)
387 sociodemographic factor associated with neck disability and sick leave.

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396 **Table 4: Bivariate associations between each of the socio-demographic variables,**
 397 **occupational biomechanical factors, occupational psychosocial factors, and each of the**
 398 **dependent variables (neck pain intensity, neck disability and sick leave)**

Variable; n=201	Neck pain intensity	Neck disability	Sick leave
Socio-demographic characteristics			
	r_s(P-value)		
Age (years)	0.15(0.02)	0.01(0.89)	0.03(0.64)
	U (P-value)		
Sex	973.50(0.40)	0717.50(0.30)	930.00(0.38)
	H (p-value)		
Educational status	-0.14(0.04)	3.52(0.74)	-0.00(0.55)
Occupational biomechanical factors			
Head load carriage history			
Weight of Load (kilogram)	0.29(0.00)	0.33(0.00)	0.05(0.41)
Frequency of load Carriage (number of days per week)	0.20(0.00)	0.15(0.03)	-0.06(0.35)
Duration of load carriage (number of hours per day)	0.02(0.73)	0.16 (0.03)	0.06(0.41)
Neck posture history			
Frequency of neck posture (number of days per week)	-0.20(0.00)	0.09(0.17)	-0.11(0.06)
Duration of neck posture (number of hours per day)	-0.04(0.57)	0.06(0.34)	-0.02(0.97)
Neck forward posture	-0.17 (0.02)	-0.16 (0.02)	-0.05 (0.46)
Neck backward posture	-0.15 (0.04)	-0.14 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.50)
Neck twisted (rotated) posture	0.21(0.00)	0.20(0.00)	0.06(0.35)
	H (p-value)		
Predominant neck posture	11.82 (0.00)	4.82 (0.01)	0.52 (0.59)
Occupational psychosocial factors			
	U (p-value)		
Can you usually take breaks in your job in addition to the scheduled breaks?	991.00 (0.00)	2567.50 (0.82)	2401.500 (0.41)
Do you often find that you cannot work because of unexpected events, such as machine break down or material not delivered?	99.50 (0.00)	350.50 (0.01)	615.500 (0.31)
Can you usually control the order and the pace of your tasks?	1831. 50 (0.00)	2666.50 (0.00)	3278.00 (0.24)
Is the order and pace of your tasks usually dependent on others (machines, computers, customers)?	1156.50 (0.00)	2802.00 (0.00)	3634.500 (0.40)
Do you usually work under time pressure and deadlines?	2348.50 (0.00)	2534.50 (0.00)	3571.500 (0.20)

399 r_s= Spearman's correlation; U: Mann-Whitney U test; H: Kruskal Wallis test

400

401

402

403

404 Tables 5 and 6 present the bivariate associations between each of the independent
405 biomechanical and psychosocial variables, and the collinearity diagnostics for the three
406 regression models, respectively. In Table 5, association between neck posture frequency
407 and frequency of load carriage had a positive correlation coefficient ≥ 0.8 ; and the
408 association between neck twisted (rotated) posture and duration of load carriage had a
409 negative correlation coefficient ≥ 0.8 . Furthermore, VIF values of approximately 7 for
410 frequency of load carriage and neck posture frequency in the three regression models
411 indicate multicollinearity with the presence of frequency of load carriage and neck posture
412 frequency. Therefore, these variables (frequency of load carriage and neck posture
413 frequency) were removed from the final regression models to eliminate multicollinearity.

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427 **Table 5: Bivariate correlation matrix** **r_s (p-value)** r_s = Spearman ranking correlation was used for all variables. Categorical (binary) variables were transformed into dummy variables.

Variables	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1.Weight of load (kilogram)	0.15 (0.026)	-0.02 (0.75)	- 0.06 (0.37)	- 0.14 (0.04)	0.13 (0.05)	0.13 (0.06)	-0.02 (0.76)	0.55 (0.41)	0.15 (0.03)	0.11 (0.10)	0.11 (0.10)	0.05 (0.44)
2.Frequency of load carriage (number of days per week)	--	0.25 (0.00)	-0.06 (0.38)	- 0.04 (0.56)	0.07 (0.28)	0.89 (0.00)	0.23 (0.00)	0.07 (0.31)	0.10 (0.15)	0.14 (0.04)	-0.04 (0.95)	0.18 (0.00)
3.Duration of load carriage (number of hours per day)	--	--	0.05 (0.46)	0.07 (0.32)	- 0.88 (0.24)	0.17 (0.01)	0.70 (0.00)	0.01 (0.87)	0.14 (0.04)	0.05 (0.44)	0.08 (0.23)	0.06 (0.33)
4.Forward neck posture	--	--	--	- 0.27 (0.70)	-0.78 (0.00)	-0.05 (0.48)	0.07 (0.34)	-0.19 (0.00)	-0.19 (0.00)	-0.23 (0.00)	-0.08 (0.25)	-0.11 (0.13)
5.Extended neck posture	--	--	--	--	-0.59 (0.00)	-0.03 (0.61)	0.02 (0.50)	-0.23 (0.00)	-0.16 (0.02)	0.03 (0.68)	-0.06 (0.40)	-0.08 (0.26)
6.Twisted (rotated) neck posture	--	--	--	--	--	0.06 (0.37)	-0.09 (0.23)	0.29 (0.00)	0.25 (0.00)	0.18 (0.01)	0.10 (0.14)	0.14 (0.06)
7.Neck posture frequency (number of days per week)	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.28 (0.00)	0.11 (0.13)	0.09 (0.19)	0.14 (0.06)	0.01 (0.84)	0.14 (0.05)
8.Neck posture duration (number of hours per day)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.00 (0.98)	0.13 (0.07)	0.03 (0.64)	0.11 (0.14)	-0.02 (0.80)
9.Do you usually work under time pressure and deadlines?	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.26 (0.00)	0.22 (0.00)	0.11 (0.13)	0.21 (0.00)
10.Is the order and pace of your tasks usually dependent on others (machines, computers, customers)?	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.18 (0.01)	0.16 (0.02)	0.20 (0.00)
11.Do you often find that you cannot work because of unexpected events, such as machine break down or material not delivered?	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.09 (0.22)	0.11 (0.10)
12. Can you usually take breaks in your job in addition to the scheduled breaks?	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.02 (0.79)
13.Can you usually control the order and pace of your tasks?	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

428

429

Table 6: Collinearity diagnostics for the regression models

Model summary				Neck pain intensity		
R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the Est.	variables	Tolerance	VIF
.752	.565	.537	1.60806	Weight of load (kilogram)	.921	1.086
				Load carriage frequency (number of days per week)	.143	6.996
				Duration of load carriage (number of hours per day)	.861	1.162
				Neck forward flexion	.885	1.130
				Neck backward posture	.892	1.121
				Neck twisted (rotated) posture	.962	1.040
				Neck posture frequency (number of days per week)	.148	6.778
				Neck posture duration (number of hours per day)	.943	1.060
				Break from work	.950	1.052
				Unexpected events	.878	1.139
				Order of task control	.889	1.125
				Task dependency on others	.830	1.205
				Time pressure	.801	1.248
Model summary				Neck disability		
R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the Est.	variables	Tolerance	VIF
.504	.254	.206	.70975	Weight of load	.921	1.086
				Load carriage frequency	.143	6.996
				Load carriage duration	.861	1.162
				Neck forward flexion	.885	1.130
				Neck backward posture	.892	1.121
				Neck twisted (rotated) posture	.962	1.040
				Neck posture frequency	.148	6.778
				Neck posture duration	.943	1.060
				Break from work	.950	1.052
				Unexpected events	.878	1.139
				Order of task control	.889	1.125
				Task dependency on others	.830	1.205
				Time pressure	.801	1.248
Model summary				Sick leave		

R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the Est.	variables	Tolerance	VIF
.250	.063	.003	2.26169	Weight of load	.921	1.086
				Load carriage frequency	.143	6.996
				Load carriage duration	.861	1.162
				Neck forward flexion	.885	1.130
				Neck backward posture	.892	1.121
				Neck twisted (rotated) posture	.962	1.040
				Neck posture frequency	.148	6.778
				Neck posture duration	.943	1.060
				Taking additional breaks	.950	1.052
				Unexpected events	.878	1.139
				Order and pace control	.889	1.125
				Task dependency	.830	1.205
				Time pressure	.801	1.248

430 Taking additional breaks= Can you usually take breaks in your job in addition to the scheduled breaks? Unexpected events= Do you often find that you cannot work because of unexpected
431 events, such as machine break down or material not delivered? Order and pace control= Can you usually control the order and pace of your tasks? Task dependency= Is the order and pace of
432 your tasks usually dependent on others (machines, computers, customers)? Time pressure= Do you usually work under time pressure and deadlines?

433

434

435

436

437

438

439 Tables 7 – 9 show the sequential multiple linear regression analyses with the three criterion
440 variables – neck pain intensity, neck disability, and sick leave respectively. In model 1 of
441 Table 7, the demographic variables (age and education) significantly ($p \leq 0.25$) associated
442 with neck pain intensity were entered into the first block of a sequential multiple regression
443 to control their effects. This model explained 12% of the variance in neck pain intensity
444 (adjusted $R^2=0.12$), and was significant ($F(2, 198)=14.96, p < 0.0001$). Model 2, in which all
445 the occupational biomechanical factors were added, explained significantly more variance
446 (R^2 change= 0.08, $F(5, 195)=10.47, p < 0.0001$) with the model explaining 19% of the variance
447 in neck pain intensity (adjusted $R^2=0.19$). Model 3, in which all the occupational psychosocial
448 factors were added, explained significantly more variance (R^2 change= 0.35, $F(10,$
449 $190)=24.01, p < 0.0001$) with the model explaining 53% of the variance in neck pain intensity
450 (adjusted $R^2=0.53$). The significant factors associated with neck pain intensity were ‘Is the
451 order and pace of your tasks usually dependent on others (machines, computers,
452 customers)?’ ($\beta=0.35; p < 0.0001$), ‘Can you usually take breaks in your job in addition to the
453 scheduled breaks?’ ($\beta=0.25; p < 0.0001$), ‘Do you often find that you cannot work because of
454 unexpected events, such as machine break down or material not delivered?’ ($\beta=0.21;$
455 $p < 0.0001$), Can you usually control the order and pace of your tasks? ($\beta=0.20; p < 0.0001$),
456 and weight of load ($\beta=0.17; p < 0.0001$) (Table 7).

457 In model 1 of Table 8, the occupational biomechanical factors were entered into the first
458 block of a sequential multiple regression (no significant socio-demographic factor to control
459 for [$p > 0.25$]). This model explained 16% of the variance in neck disability (adjusted $R^2=0.16$),
460 and was significant ($F(4, 196)=10.241, p < 0.0001$). Model 2, in which all the occupational
461 psychosocial factors were added, explained significantly more variance (R^2 change= 0.06; F

462 (9, 191)=6.474, $p<0.0001$) with the model explaining 20% of the variance in neck disability
463 (adjusted $R^2=0.20$). The significant factors associated with neck disability were weight of
464 load ($\beta=0.30$; $p<0.0001$), duration of load carriage ($\beta=0.16$; $p=0.01$), Do you usually work
465 under time pressure and deadlines? ($\beta=0.16$; $p=0.02$), (Table 8).

466 In model 1 of Table 9, the occupational biomechanical factors were entered into the first
467 block of a sequential multiple regression (no significant socio-demographic factor to control
468 for [$p>0.25$]). This model explained 1% of the variance in sick leave (adjusted $R^2=0.01$), and
469 was not significant ($F(4, 196)=1.522$, $p=0.197$). Model 2, in which all the occupational
470 psychosocial factors were added, explained less variance which was not significant (R^2
471 change= 0.01; $F(9, 191)=0.909$, $p=0.519$) with the model explaining -4% of the variance in
472 sick leave (adjusted $R^2=-0.04$). The significant factor associated with sick leave was duration
473 of load carriage ($\beta=0.15$; $p=0.04$) (Table 9).

474 **Table 7: Sequential multiple regression analysis with neck pain intensity as the criterion variable**

Variable, n=201	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	B (95% CI)	SEB	β (p value)	B (95% CI)	SEB	β (p value)	B (95% CI)	SEB	β (p value)
Age	0.01(-0.02-0.05)	0.02	0.07(0.43)	0.02(-0.01-0.05)	0.02	0.12(0.13)	0.01 (-0.02-0.03)	0.01	0.03(0.63)
Education (primary school) (Others=reference)	0.73(-0.12-1.59)	0.44	0.14(0.09)	0.40(-0.39-1.19)	0.40	0.08(0.32)	0.27(-0.34-0.88)	0.31	0.05(0.38)
Weight of load (kilogram)				0.06(0.03-0.09)	0.02	0.28(<0.0001)	0.04(0.02-0.06)	0.01	0.17(<0.0001)
Duration of load carriage (number of hours per day)				0.05(-0.14-0.23)	0.09	0.03(0.60)	-0.08(-0.23-0.06)	0.07	-0.06(0.25)
Twisted neck posture (yes) (No=reference)				2.95(1.62-4.27)	0.67	0.28(<0.0001)	0.88(-0.20-1.96)	0.55	0.09(0.11)
Neck posture duration (number of hours per day)				0.01(-0.04-0.05)	0.02	0.02(0.75)	0.01(-0.03-0.05)	0.02	0.03(0.56)
Taking additional breaks (No) (Yes=reference)							1.60(0.96-2.24)	0.32	0.25(<0.0001)
Unexpected events (Yes) (No=reference)							2.50(1.29-3.70)	0.61	0.21(<0.0001)
Order and pace control (No) (Yes=reference)							1.12(0.56-1.67)	0.28	0.20(<0.0001)
Task dependency (yes) (No=reference)							1.88(1.31-2.45)	0.29	0.35(<0.0001)
Time pressure (yes) (No=reference)							0.52(-0.03-1.08)	0.28	0.10(0.07)
R ²	0.13			0.21			0.56		
R ² change	0.13			0.08			0.35		
Adjusted R ²	0.12			0.19			0.53		
F for change in R ²	F (2, 198) 14.96 (<0.0001)			F (5, 195) 10.47 (<0.0001)			F (10, 190) 24.01 (<0.0001)		

475 B-unstandardised beta, β -standardised beta, SEB-Standard error of beta. B-unstandardised beta, β -standardised beta, SEB-Standard error of beta. Taking additional breaks= Can you usually
476 take breaks in your job in addition to the scheduled breaks? Unexpected events= Do you often find that you cannot work because of unexpected events, such as machine break down or
477 material not delivered? Order and pace control= Can you usually control the order and pace of your tasks? Task dependency= Is the order and pace of your tasks usually dependent on others
478 (machines, computers, customers)? Time pressure= Do you usually work under time pressure and deadlines?

479
480

481

482 **Table 8: Sequential multiple regression analysis with neck disability as the criterion variable**

Variable, n=201	Model 1			Model 2		
	B (95% CI)	SEB	β (p value)	B (95% CI)	SEB	β (p value)
Weight of load (kilogram)	0.20(0.12-0.28)	0.04	0.32(<0.0001)	0.19(0.12-0.27)	0.04	0.30(<0.0001)
Duration of load carriage (number of hours per day)	0.71(0.18-1.24)	0.27	0.18(0.01)	0.66(0.13-1.19)	0.27	0.16(0.01)
Twisted neck posture (yes) (No=reference)	5.42(1.60-9.24)	1.94	0.19(0.01)	3.34(-0.64-7.32)	2.02	0.11(0.10)
Neck posture duration (number of hours per day)	-0.07(-0.20-0.07)	0.07	-0.07(0.32)	-0.07(-0.20-0.06)	0.07	-0.07(0.29)
Taking additional breaks (No) (Yes=reference)				-1.60(-3.96-0.76)	1.20	-0.09(0.18)
Unexpected events (Yes) (No=reference)				1.29(-3.15-5.73)	2.25	0.04(0.57)
Order and pace control (No) (Yes=reference)				2.03(-0.02-4.07)	1.04	0.13(0.05)
Task dependency (yes) (No=reference)				0.57(-1.50-2.64)	1.05	0.04(0.59)
Time pressure (yes) (No=reference)				2.41(0.36-4.46)	1.04	0.16(0.02)
R ²	0.17			0.23		
R ² change	0.17			0.06		
Adjusted R ²	0.16			0.20		
F for change in R ²	F (4, 196) 10.241			F (9, 191) 6.474		
	(<0.0001)			(<0.0001)		

483 B-unstandardised beta, β -standardised beta, SEB-Standard error of beta. B-unstandardised beta, β -standardised beta, SEB-Standard error of beta. Taking additional breaks= Can you usually
484 take breaks in your job in addition to the scheduled breaks? Unexpected events= Do you often find that you cannot work because of unexpected events, such as machine break down or
485 material not delivered? Order and pace control= Can you usually control the order and pace of your tasks? Task dependency= Is the order and pace of your tasks usually dependent on others
486 (machines, computers, customers)? Time pressure= Do you usually work under time pressure and deadlines?

487

488

489

490 **Table 9: Sequential multiple regression analysis with sick leave as the criterion variable**

Variable, n=201	Model 1			Model 2		
	B (95% CI)	SEB	β (p value)	B (95% CI)	SEB	β (p value)
Weight of load (kilogram)	0.01(-0.03-0.04)	0.02	0.02(0.75)	0.00(-0.03-0.03)	0.02	0.01(0.87)
Duration of load carriage (number of hours per day)	0.21(0.01-0.40)	0.10	0.15(0.04)	0.23(0.01-0.41)	0.10	0.15(0.04)
Twisted neck posture (yes) (No=reference)	0.84(-0.56-2.25)	0.71	0.09(0.24)	0.53(-0.98-2.04)	0.77	0.05(0.49)
Neck posture duration (number of hours per day)	-0.03(-0.08-0.02)	0.03	-0.08(0.27)	-0.03(-0.08-0.02)	0.03	-0.08(0.26)
Taking additional breaks (No) (Yes=reference)				0.31(-0.59-1.20)	0.45	0.05(0.50)
Unexpected events (Yes) (No=reference)				0.11(-1.57-1.80)	0.85	0.01(0.90)
Order and pace control (No) (Yes=reference)				0.01(-0.77-0.79)	0.39	0.00(0.98)
Task dependency (yes) (No=reference)				-0.02(-0.81-0.77)	0.40	-0.00(0.96)
Time pressure (yes) (No=reference)				0.46(-0.32-1.24)	0.40	0.09(0.24)
R ²	0.03			0.04		
R ² change	0.03			0.01		
Adjusted R ²	0.01			-0.04		
F for change in R ²	F (4, 196) = 1.522 (0.197)			F (9, 191) = 0.909 (0.519)		

491 B-unstandardised beta, β-standardised beta, SEB-Standard error of beta. B-unstandardised beta, β-standardised beta, SEB-Standard error of beta. Taking additional breaks= Can you usually
492 take breaks in your job in addition to the scheduled breaks? Unexpected events= Do you often find that you cannot work because of unexpected events, such as machine break down or
493 material not delivered? Order and pace control= Can you usually control the order and pace of your tasks? Task dependency= Is the order and pace of your tasks usually dependent on others
494 (machines, computers, customers)? Time pressure= Do you usually work under time pressure and deadlines?

495 Tables 10 and 11 show the sequential multiple linear regression analyses involving neck pain
496 intensity with neck disability and sick leave as the criterion variables respectively. In model 1
497 of Table 10, the occupational biomechanical factors were entered into the first block of a
498 sequential multiple regression (no significant socio-demographic factor [$p > 0.25$] to control
499 for). This model explained 16% of the variance in neck disability (adjusted $R^2 = 0.16$), and was
500 significant ($F(4, 196) = 10.241, p < 0.0001$). Model 2, in which all the occupational
501 psychosocial factors were added, explained significantly more variance (R^2 change = 0.06; F
502 (9, 191) = 6.474, $p < 0.0001$) with the model explaining 20% of the variance in neck disability
503 (adjusted $R^2 = 0.20$). Model 3, in which pain intensity was added, explained significantly more
504 variance (R^2 change = 0.11; $F(10, 190) = 10.017, p < 0.0001$) with the model explaining 31% of
505 the variance in neck disability (adjusted $R^2 = 0.31$). The significant factors associated with neck
506 disability after accounting for pain intensity were neck pain intensity ($\beta = 0.52; p < 0.0001$),
507 weight of load ($\beta = 0.22; p < 0.0001$), Can you usually take breaks in your job in addition to the
508 scheduled breaks? ($\beta = -0.22; p < 0.0001$), duration of load carriage ($\beta = 0.20; p < 0.0001$), Is
509 the order and pace of your tasks usually dependent on others (machines, computers,
510 customers)? ($\beta = 0.15; p = 0.03$) (Table 10).

511 In model 1 of Table 11, the occupational biomechanical factors were entered into the first
512 block of a sequential multiple regression (no significant socio-demographic factor [$p \leq 0.25$]
513 to control for). This model explained 1% of the variance in sick leave (adjusted $R^2 = 0.01$),
514 and was not significant ($F(4, 196) = 1.522, p = 0.197$). Model 2, in which all the occupational
515 psychosocial factors were added, explained less variance which was not significant (R^2
516 change = 0.01; $F(9, 191) = 0.909, p = 0.519$) with the model explaining -4% of the variance in
517 sick leave (adjusted $R^2 = -0.04$). Model 3, in which pain intensity was added, explained less

518 variance (R^2 change= 0.004; $F(10, 190)=0.902$, $p=0.533$) with the model explaining -5% of
519 the variance in sick leave (adjusted $R^2= -0.05$). The significant factor associated with sick
520 leave after accounting for pain intensity was duration of load carriage ($\beta= 0.16$; $p= 0.04$
521 (Table 11).

522 **Table 10: Sequential multiple regression analysis involving neck pain intensity with neck disability as the criterion variable**

Variable, n=201	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	B (95% CI)	SEB	β (p value)	B (95% CI)	SEB	β (p value)	B (95% CI)	SEB	β (p value)
Weight of load (kilogram)	0.20(0.12-0.28)	0.04	0.32(<0.0001)	0.19(0.11-0.27)	0.04	0.30(<0.0001)	0.14(0.06-0.21)	0.04	0.22(<0.0001)
Duration of load carriage (number of hours per day)	0.71(0.18-1.24)	0.27	0.18(0.01)	0.66(0.13-1.19)	0.27	0.16(0.01)	0.79(0.30-1.27)	0.25	0.20(<0.0001)
Twisted neck posture (yes) (No=reference)	5.42(1.60-9.24)	1.94	0.19(0.01)	3.34(-0.64-7.32)	2.02	0.11(0.10)	2.07(-1.62-5.76)	1.87	0.07(0.27)
Neck posture duration (number of hours per day)	-0.07(-0.20-0.07)	0.07	-0.07(0.32)	-0.07(-0.20-0.06)	0.07	-0.07(0.29)	-0.09(-0.21-0.03)	0.06	-0.09(0.14)
Taking additional breaks (No) (Yes=reference)				-1.60(-3.96-0.76)	1.20	-0.09(0.18)	-3.96(-6.26- -1.65)	1.17	-0.22(<0.0001)
Unexpected events (Yes) (No=reference)				1.29(-3.15-5.73)	2.25	0.04(0.57)	-2.50(-6.77-1.77)	2.17	-0.07(0.25)
Order and pace control (No) (Yes=reference)				2.03(-0.02-4.07)	1.04	0.13(0.05)	0.42(-1.54-2.37)	0.99	0.03(0.67)
Task dependency (yes) (No=reference)				0.57(-1.50-2.64)	1.05	0.04(0.59)	-2.33(-4.46- -0.19)	1.08	0.15(0.03)
Time pressure (yes) (No=reference)				2.41(0.36-4.46)	1.04	0.16(0.02)	1.65(-0.26-3.55)	0.97	0.11(0.09)
Neck pain intensity							1.47(0.98-1.96)	0.25	0.52(<0.0001)
R ²	0.17			0.23			0.35		
R ² change	0.17			0.06			0.11		
Adjusted R ²	0.16			0.20			0.31		
F for change in R ²	F (4, 196) 10.241 (<0.0001)			F (9, 191) 6.474 (<0.0001)			F (10, 190) 10.017(<0.0001)		

523 B-unstandardised beta, β -standardised beta, SEB-Standard error of beta. Taking additional breaks= Can you usually take breaks in your job in addition to the scheduled breaks? Unexpected
524 events= Do you often find that you cannot work because of unexpected events, such as machine break down or material not delivered? Order and pace control= Can you usually control the
525 order and pace of your tasks? Task dependency= Is the order and pace of your tasks usually dependent on others (machines, computers, customers)? Time pressure= Do you usually work
526 under time pressure and deadlines?
527
528

529

530

531

532 **Table 11: Sequential multiple regression analysis involving neck pain intensity with sick leave as the criterion variable**

Variable, n=201	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	B (95% CI)	SEB	β (p value)	B (95% CI)	SEB	β (p value)	B (95% CI)	SEB	β (p value)
Weight of load (kilogram)	0.01(-0.03-0.04)	0.02	0.02(0.75)	0.00(-0.03-0.03)	0.02	0.01(0.87)	0.00(-0.03-0.03)	0.02	0.01(0.92)
Duration of load carriage (number of hours per day)	0.21(0.01-0.40)	0.10	0.15(0.04)	0.21(0.01-0.41)	0.10	0.15(0.04)	0.21(0.01-0.41)	0.10	0.16(0.04)
Twisted neck posture (yes) (No=reference)	0.84(-0.56-2.25)	0.71	0.09(0.24)	0.53(-0.98-2.04)	0.77	0.05(0.49)	0.51(-1.01-2.04)	0.77	0.05(0.51)
Neck posture duration (number of hours per day)	-0.03(-0.08-0.02)	0.03	-0.08(0.27)	-0.03(-0.08-0.02)	0.03	-0.08(0.26)	-0.03(-0.08-0.02)	0.03	-0.08(0.26)
Taking additional breaks (No) (Yes=reference)				0.31(-0.59-1.20)	0.45	0.05(0.50)	0.27(-0.69-1.22)	0.48	0.04(0.58)
Unexpected events (Yes) (No=reference)				0.11(-1.57-1.80)	0.85	0.01(0.90)	0.05(-1.72-1.82)	0.90	0.00(0.96)
Order and pace control (No) (Yes=reference)				0.01(-0.77-0.79)	0.39	0.00(0.98)	-0.02(-0.83-0.79)	0.41	-0.00(0.97)
Task dependency (yes) (No=reference)				-0.02(-0.81-0.77)	0.40	-0.00(0.96)	-0.07(0.95-0.81)	0.45	-0.01(0.88)
Time pressure (yes) (No=reference)				0.46(-0.32-1.24)	0.40	0.09(0.24)	0.45(-0.34-1.24)	0.40	0.09(0.26)
Neck pain intensity							0.03(-0.18-0.23)	0.10	0.03(0.81)
R ²	0.03			0.04			0.05		
R ² change	0.03			0.01			0.004		
Adjusted R ²	0.01			-0.04			-0.05		
	F (4, 196)			F (9, 191)			F (10, 190)		
	1.522(0.197)			0.909(0.519)			0.902(0.533)		

533 B-unstandardised beta, β -standardised beta, SEB-Standard error of beta. B-unstandardised beta, β -standardised beta, SEB-Standard error of beta. Taking additional breaks= Can you usually
534 take breaks in your job in addition to the scheduled breaks? Unexpected events= Do you often find that you cannot work because of unexpected events, such as machine break down or
535 material not delivered? Order and pace control= Can you usually control the order and pace of your tasks? Task dependency= Is the order and pace of your tasks usually dependent on others
536 (machines, computers, customers)? Time pressure= Do you usually work under time pressure and deadlines?
537

538

539 **Discussion**

540 This study investigated the occupational biopsychosocial factors associated with multiple
541 neck pain outcomes (neck pain intensity, functional disability, and sick leave) amongst
542 construction labourers in an urban African population.

543 The results aligned with the proposed biopsychosocial theoretical model, except for sick
544 leave which had a statistically non-significant regression model. The significant independent
545 factors associated with neck pain intensity were order and pace of tasks usually being
546 dependent on others (e.g., machines, computers, customers), usually unable to take breaks
547 in the job in addition to the scheduled breaks, cannot work because of unexpected events
548 such as machine break down or material not delivered, usually unable to control the order
549 and the pace of tasks, and the weight of load (kilograms). These factors included all the
550 psychosocial factors (except usually working under time pressure and deadlines), and one
551 biomechanical factor, and together explained 54.0% of the variance in neck pain intensity.

552 Occupational psychosocial factors appeared to be the most important independent factors
553 associated with neck pain intensity with all but one of the questionnaire items (usually
554 working under time pressure and deadlines) significantly associated with neck pain
555 intensity. This concurs with evidence in high income countries[31,63,64]. Weight of load was
556 also significantly associated with neck pain intensity but did not appear to be as important
557 as the psychosocial factors. This agrees with evidence from both high and lower income
558 countries [65,66]. In contradiction, a study in a high income country that also included
559 physiological factors found that negative affectivity, greater neck flexor activity during
560 cranio-cervical flexion, and longer duration of symptoms, but not work-related psychosocial
561 factors were predictors of neck pain[67]. However, that study may have been

562 underpowered to predict the large number of variables included. Moreover, the presence of
563 neck pain which was the construct measured in that study is different from the intensity of
564 neck pain assessed in the present study[67]. The comparatively higher predictive power of
565 the regression model for pain intensity (54%) in the present study implies the inclusion of
566 relatively more relevant factors associated with pain intensity.

567 The significant independent factors associated with neck disability were weight of load
568 (kilograms), usually working under time pressure and deadlines, and duration of load
569 carriage (number of hours per day). These factors included two biomechanical factors and
570 one psychosocial factor which together explained 20.0% of the variation in neck disability.
571 All except one of the occupational psychosocial factors (usually unable to take breaks in the
572 job in addition to the scheduled breaks) had significant bivariate associations with neck
573 disability. However, the only occupational psychosocial factor (usually working under time
574 pressure and deadlines) that retained statistical significance in the neck disability regression
575 model was the only occupational psychosocial factor which was not associated with neck
576 pain intensity in the neck pain intensity regression model. The addition of neck pain
577 intensity as an independent variable to the neck disability regression model explained
578 significantly more variation in neck disability (31.0%), with neck pain intensity having the
579 strongest association with neck disability. Weight of load and the duration of load carriage
580 consistently explained neck disability in the two models (with and without pain intensity as
581 an independent variable). However, the addition of pain intensity as an independent
582 variable to the neck disability regression model changed the occupational psychosocial
583 factors associated with neck disability. 'Usually unable to take breaks in the job in addition
584 to the scheduled breaks', and 'order and pace of tasks usually being dependent on others

585 (e.g., machines, computers, customers)', which were not previously associated with neck
586 disability (in the neck disability regression model) but were the two factors with the
587 strongest associations with neck pain intensity (in the neck pain intensity regression model),
588 became the only occupational psychosocial factors associated with neck disability. These
589 results suggest that these occupational psychosocial factors are strongly associated with
590 neck pain intensity.

591 Pain intensity was the strongest independent factor associated with neck disability, which
592 agrees with previous finding amongst people with back pain in Nigeria[8]. Without pain
593 intensity as an independent variable in the regression model, weight of load was the
594 strongest independent factor associated with neck disability and was significantly associated
595 with neck pain intensity. This aligns with evidence in other African populations showing that
596 increasing load-carrying is associated with increasing neck disability[65]. Duration of load
597 carriage was another significant occupational biomechanical factor, showing statistically
598 significant associations with neck disability, and was the only factor significantly associated
599 with sick leave, but had no association with neck pain intensity. This also concurs with
600 evidence in low and middle-income countries suggesting that the daily duration of exposure
601 to load-carrying is associated with neck disability[65,68].

602 Our results contradict results in a high income country showing no consistent associations
603 between physical and psychological job demands and clinically meaningful improvements in
604 neck disability[69]. The contradicting results could be due to different population
605 characteristics and study designs. For instance, the previous study[69] was conducted
606 amongst primary care patients in the USA with potentially lower exposure levels to physical
607 and psychological risk factors in the workplace. This is possibly due to strict occupational

608 health and safety regulations in high income countries which is nearly non-existent in
609 Nigeria. Another reason for the different results could be the potentially less severe
610 implication of job loss to the patients in the USA who may have access to a social welfare
611 system. In contrast, participants in the current study have no similar access to an alternative
612 means of livelihood and survival through a social welfare system. Finally, in contrast to the
613 present observational study that investigated the independent factors associated with neck
614 disability, the USA study[69] was an intervention study which aimed at determining whether
615 job demands influenced the clinical outcomes of treatment. Moreover, a different outcome
616 tool and scoring criteria were utilized in that study to measure job demands[69]. An
617 observational study in another high income country showed associations between other
618 occupational psychosocial factors including lower workplace social support and job
619 satisfaction, and severity of neck disability[70].

620 The lower predictive power of the model for neck disability could be due to the non-
621 inclusion of other potentially important independent factors associated with neck disability
622 into the regression model. Non-occupational factors may have been important in explaining
623 neck disability in this population. For instance, illness perceptions, catastrophizing, fear
624 avoidance beliefs, and anxiety which predicted self-reported back pain disability in this
625 population[8]; and self-efficacy[71], duration of pain[67,72], size of painful areas[73], quality
626 of life and sleep[74], concurrent back pain or shoulder pain[75], emotional distress[76],
627 stress[68,75], vigorous leisure-time physical activity[70], which were associated with neck
628 disability in other populations; may have been relevant in this population.

629 Unexpectedly, there was nearly no reported sick leave, and this could explain the surprising
630 finding that none of the two regression models with sick leave as the criterion variable (with

631 or without pain intensity as an independent variable) was statistically significant.
632 Surprisingly, the regression models with sick leave as the criterion variable reduced from
633 explaining 2% of the variation in sick leave with the occupational biomechanical factors as
634 independent variables, to explaining 1% of the variation in sick leave with the addition of
635 occupational psychosocial factors to explaining 0% of the variation in sick leave with the
636 addition of pain intensity. The duration of load carriage remained the only factor that
637 approached statistical significance ($p=0.04$) within the two non-significant regression
638 models predicting sick leave (Tables 9 and 11). These results suggest that despite the very
639 low levels of sick leave reported, occupational biomechanical factors may be more
640 important than occupational psychosocial factors in explaining sick leave.

641 The very low level of sick leave found in this study contradicts the evidence in high-income
642 countries[77–80]. This could be due to participants' low paying informal self-employment
643 meaning that they had to work every day irrespective of neck pain to earn a living in a
644 country with no social benefit system. This partly supports findings that self-employment in
645 high income countries was associated with a lower risk of sick leave[81]. Another reason for
646 the very limited relevance of sick leave in this study could be due to the possible presence of
647 the healthy worker effect. As data collection happened at the construction sites rather than
648 at participants' homes, people who were on sick leave during data collection would not
649 have been captured. However, sick leave was measured by asking participants how many
650 days in the past four weeks they had stayed off from work due to neck pain. This was
651 expected to have counteracted the healthy worker effect as the period captured the past
652 rather than the present. Despite this, it is possible that recall bias[23,82,83] was present
653 with the participants potentially answering the question in line with their present work

654 status on the day that data were collected. Therefore, the best ways of measuring the
655 construct of sick leave and the broader construct of work-related disability to minimize bias
656 need further exploration in this population. Similar to the previous population-based cross-
657 sectional study in rural Nigeria involving mostly farmers[8], the participants in this urban-
658 based study in Nigeria likely had similar levels of exposure to occupational biomechanical
659 factors from construction work. A cross-sectional study amongst adolescents in Brazil found
660 that not being in work was a protective factor associated with acute LBP but not chronic LBP
661 [84].

662 **Strengths and limitations**

663 The strength of this study includes its novelty involving a rarely studied population in a
664 lower middle-income country setting, and the confidence in the estimates due to the robust
665 sample size. However, this study has several limitations. The cross-sectional design of this
666 study constrains the establishment of causality. The involvement of mostly male
667 participants due to the nature of the occupation where very few females are employed in
668 this occupation in Nigeria limits the generalizability of findings. This sample may not be
669 representative of the entire Nigerian population which is multi-state and multi-cultural. The
670 use of self-reported measures increased the risk of recall bias[23,82,83]. The use of a work
671 site-based study design increased the risk of the healthy worker effect that probably
672 obfuscated the impact of sick leave in this population. The modest prediction accuracy of
673 the regression models with neck disability and sick leave as the criterion variables suggest
674 the existence of other more important factors.

675 **Implications for practice and policy**

676 Occupational health regulators need to address the occupational psychosocial and
677 biomechanical factors associated with adverse neck pain outcomes in Nigeria. The
678 occupational psychosocial factors increase work pressure and reduce the ability of the
679 construction labourers to control aspects of their work. These include usually working under
680 time pressure and deadlines, the order and pace of tasks usually being dependent on
681 external factors such as machines, computers, customers etc, often being unable to work
682 because of unexpected events, such as machine break down or material not delivered,
683 usually unable to take breaks in addition to the scheduled breaks at work, and usually
684 unable to control the order and pace of tasks at work. The occupational biomechanical
685 factors associated with adverse neck pain outcomes were weight of load and duration of
686 load carriage. Occupational health regulators in Nigeria may need to enforce employers'
687 compliance with international labour standards on occupational safety and health including
688 the need for workers to have some autonomy in the workplace, implementation of
689 economic compensation for sick and injured workers in line with the international labour
690 organization's guidelines, and implementation of a maximum weight to be lifted at a time
691 and a maximum number of hours that the weight can be lifted per day, to align with
692 evidence-based occupational health and safety regulations. Finally, the findings from this
693 study may be a call for occupational health regulators to facilitate the mechanization of the
694 construction industry in Nigeria, which has been the case in high income countries.

695 **Implications for future research**

696 Future research may need to utilize longitudinal study designs with much larger sample
697 sizes to test a greater number of relevant biopsychosocial factors. These studies may need
698 to utilize more sophisticated statistical analyses such as structural equation modelling to

699 establish temporal or causal relationships between the occupational biomechanical and
700 psychosocial factors, and the neck pain outcomes. The use of population-based (as opposed
701 to work site-based) study designs can help to reduce the healthy worker effect and recall
702 bias, thereby clarifying the role of sick leave and the factors associated with it in this
703 population. The broader construct of work-related disability may need to be investigated in
704 these studies.

705 **Conclusion**

706 Occupational psychosocial factors were associated with neck pain intensity and neck
707 disability, but no occupational psychosocial factor was associated with sick leave.
708 Occupational psychosocial factors appeared to be more important than occupational
709 biomechanical factors in explaining neck pain intensity. Occupational biomechanical factors
710 appeared to be more important than occupational psychosocial factors in explaining neck
711 disability and sick leave. Weight of load was associated with neck pain intensity and neck
712 disability, whereas duration of load carriage was associated with neck disability and sick
713 leave. 39 kilograms was the average weight lifted by the workers at each point in time, for
714 an average of 9 hours per day.

715 **Figure Legends**

716 Figure 1: The biopsychosocial theoretical model informing the study

717 Figure 2: Summary of the sampling and response rates

718 **Acknowledgements**

719 **Funding**

720 The lead author was partly supported with personal grant from the 2020 Nature Research
721 Award for Driving Global Impact.

722 **Conflicts of interest**

723 The authors report no conflicts of interest.

724 **Data availability statement**

725 The data supporting this study can be obtained via reasonable request to the corresponding
726 author due to ethical restrictions.

727

728

729 **References**

730 1. Vos T, Lim SS, Abbafati C, Abbas KM, Abbasi M, Abbasifard M, et al. Global burden of 369 diseases
731 and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden
732 of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet. Elsevier*; 2020;396:1204–22.

733 2. Ehsani F, Mosallanezhad Z, Vahedi G. The prevalence, risk factors and consequences of neck pain
734 in office employees. *Middle East J Rehabil Heal. Briefland*; 2017;4.

735 3. Hoy D, Protani M, De R, Buchbinder R. The epidemiology of neck pain. *Best Pract Res Clin
736 Rheumatol. Elsevier*; 2010;24:783–92.

737 4. Kazeminasab S, Nejadghaderi SA, Amiri P, Pourfathi H, Araj-Khodaei M, Sullman MJM, et al. Neck
738 pain: global epidemiology, trends and risk factors. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord. BioMed Central*;
739 2022;23:1–13.

740 5. Hurwitz EL, Randhawa K, Torres P, Yu H, Verville L, Hartvigsen J, et al. The Global Spine Care
741 Initiative: a systematic review of individual and community-based burden of spinal disorders in rural
742 populations in low-and middle-income communities. *Eur Spine J. Springer*; 2018;27:802–15.

743 6. Hartvigsen J, Hancock MJ, Kongsted A, Louw Q, Ferreira ML, Genevay S, et al. What low back pain
744 is and why we need to pay attention. *Lancet. Elsevier*; 2018;391:2356–67.

745 7. Igwesi-Chidobe CN, Kengne AP, Sorinola IO, Godfrey EL. Physical activity containing behavioural
746 interventions for adults living with modifiable chronic non-communicable diseases in Africa: A
747 systematic mixed-studies review. *Int Health. 2018*;10.

748 8. Igwesi-Chidobe CN, Coker B, Onwasigwe CN, Sorinola IO, Godfrey EL. Biopsychosocial factors
749 associated with chronic low back pain disability in rural Nigeria: A population-based cross-sectional
750 study. *BMJ Glob Heal. 2017*;2.

751 9. Igwesi-Chidobe C. Obstacles to obtaining optimal physiotherapy services in a rural community in
752 southeastern Nigeria. *Rehabil Res Pract. Hindawi*; 2012;2012.

753 10. Abegunde DO, Mathers CD, Adam T, Ortegón M, Strong K. The burden and costs of chronic
754 diseases in low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet. Elsevier*; 2007;370:1929–38.

755 11. Katzmarzyk PT, Friedenreich C, Shiroma EJ, Lee I-M. Physical inactivity and non-communicable
756 disease burden in low-income, middle-income and high-income countries. *Br J Sports Med. BMJ*

- 757 Publishing Group Ltd and British Association of Sport and Exercise Medicine; 2022;56:101–6.
- 758 12. Igwesi-Chidobe CN, Kitchen S, Sorinola IO, Godfrey EL. “A life of living death”: the experiences of
759 people living with chronic low back pain in rural Nigeria. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2017;39.
- 760 13. Igwesi-Chidobe CN, Sorinola IO, Kitchen S, Godfrey EL. Unconventional Practitioners’ Causal
761 Beliefs and Treatment Strategies for Chronic Low Back Pain in Rural Nigeria. *Heal Serv Insights.*
762 2018;11.
- 763 14. Ayanniyi O, Mbada CE, Iroko OP. Neck Pain Occurrence and Characteristics in Nigerian University
764 Undergraduates. *TAF Prev Med Bull.* 2010;9.
- 765 15. Abiodun-Solanke IM, Agbaje JO, Ajayi DM, Arotiba JT. Prevalence of neck and back pain among
766 dentists and dental auxiliaries in South-western Nigeria. *Afr J Med Med Sci.* 2010;39:137–42.
- 767 16. Ogwumike OO, Kaka B, Adeniyi AF, Fawole HO, Idowu OA. Prevalence of neck pain in a rural
768 community in Northwest Nigeria. *J Med Biomed Res.* 2015;14:104–16.
- 769 17. Goldsheyder D, Weiner SS, Nordin M, Hiebert R. Musculoskeletal symptom survey among
770 cement and concrete workers. *Work.* IOS Press; 2004;23:111–21.
- 771 18. Ekpenyong CE, Inyang UC. Associations between worker characteristics, workplace factors, and
772 work-related musculoskeletal disorders: a cross-sectional study of male construction workers in
773 Nigeria. *Int J Occup Saf Ergon.* Taylor & Francis; 2014;20:447–62.
- 774 19. Aaron FE, Madume AKM, Ijah RFOA. Evaluation of Musculoskeletal pain, Health and Safety
775 measures among workers at construction sites in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. *Niger Heal J.* 2022;22:397–
776 406.
- 777 20. Egwuonwu A V, Mbaoma CP, Abdullahi A. Prevalence and associated risk factors of work-related
778 musculoskeletal disorders among road construction workers in a Nigerian community. *Ergon SA J*
779 *Ergon Soc South Africa.* Ergonomics Society of South Africa; 2016;28:25–37.
- 780 21. Hartvigsen J, Bakketeig LS, Leboeuf-Yde C, Engberg M, Lauritzen T. The association between
781 physical workload and low back pain clouded by the “healthy worker” effect: population-based
782 cross-sectional and 5-year prospective questionnaire study. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* LWW;
783 2001;26:1788–92.
- 784 22. Igwesi-Chidobe CN. Development and preliminary evaluation of a self-management programme
785 for people with non-specific chronic low back pain in rural Nigeria. King’s College London; 2017.
- 786 23. Igwesi-Chidobe CN, Ifeanyichukwu CN, Ozumba BC. Prevalence and biopsychosocial factors
787 associated with a current episode of low back pain amongst adults with previous history of low back
788 pain: an exploratory cross-sectional study of market traders in an African population. Unpublished
789 study.
- 790 24. Steenstra I, de Bruin L, Mahood Q, Irvin E, Hogg-Johnson S, Heijmans M, et al. Prognostic factors
791 for duration of sick leave in patients sick listed with acute low back pain: an update of a systematic
792 review of the literature. *Occup Environ Med.* BMJ Publishing Group Ltd; 2011;68:A74–5.
- 793 25. Steenstra IA, Verbeek JH, Heymans MW, Bongers PM. Prognostic factors for duration of sick
794 leave in patients sick listed with acute low back pain: a systematic review of the literature. *Occup*
795 *Environ Med.* BMJ Publishing Group Ltd; 2005;62:851–60.
- 796 26. McNee P, Shambrook J, Harris EC, Kim M, Sampson M, Palmer KT, et al. Predictors of long-term

- 797 pain and disability in patients with low back pain investigated by magnetic resonance imaging: a
798 longitudinal study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. BioMed Central; 2011;12:1–12.
- 799 27. Adams MA, Mannion AF, Dolan P. Personal risk factors for first-time low back pain. *Spine (Phila*
800 *Pa 1976)*. LWW; 1999;24:2497.
- 801 28. Fransen M, Woodward M, Norton R, Coggan C, Dawe M, Sheridan N. Risk factors associated with
802 the transition from acute to chronic occupational back pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. LWW;
803 2002;27:92–8.
- 804 29. Carragee EJ, Alamin TF, Miller JL, Carragee JM. Discographic, MRI and psychosocial determinants
805 of low back pain disability and remission: a prospective study in subjects with benign persistent back
806 pain. *spine J. Elsevier*; 2005;5:24–35.
- 807 30. Sabbath EL, Glymour MM, Descatha A, Leclerc A, Zins M, Goldberg M, et al. Biomechanical and
808 psychosocial occupational exposures: joint predictors of post-retirement functional health in the
809 French GAZEL cohort. *Adv Life Course Res*. Elsevier; 2013;18:235–43.
- 810 31. Yang H, Hitchcock E, Haldeman S, Swanson N, Lu M, Choi B, et al. Workplace psychosocial and
811 organizational factors for neck pain in workers in the United States. *Am J Ind Med*. Wiley Online
812 Library; 2016;59:549–60.
- 813 32. Iles RA, Davidson M, Taylor NF. Psychosocial predictors of failure to return to work in non-
814 chronic non-specific low back pain: a systematic review. *Occup Environ Med*. BMJ Publishing Group
815 Ltd; 2008;65:507–17.
- 816 33. Von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP, et al. The
817 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement:
818 guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Int J Surg*. Elsevier; 2014;12:1495–9.
- 819 34. Enugu State Government. Enugu State Government, State official website. 2023.
- 820 35. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Buchner A, Lang A-G. Statistical power analyses using G* Power 3.1: Tests for
821 correlation and regression analyses. *Behav Res Methods*. Springer; 2009;41:1149–60.
- 822 36. Hjermstad MJ, Fayers PM, Haugen DF, Caraceni A, Hanks GW, Loge JH, et al. Studies comparing
823 numerical rating scales, verbal rating scales, and visual analogue scales for assessment of pain
824 intensity in adults: a systematic literature review. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. Elsevier; 2011;41:1073–
825 93.
- 826 37. Pathak A, Sharma S, Jensen MP. The utility and validity of pain intensity rating scales for use in
827 developing countries. *Pain reports*. Wolters Kluwer Health; 2018;3.
- 828 38. Lazaridou A, Elbaridi N, Edwards RR, Berde CB. Pain assessment. *Essentials pain Med*. Elsevier;
829 2018. p. 39–46.
- 830 39. Igwesi-Chidobe CN, Obiekwe C, Sorinola IO, Godfrey EL. Assessing self-reported disability in a
831 low-literate population with chronic low back pain: cross-cultural adaptation and psychometric
832 testing of Igbo Roland Morris disability questionnaire. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2019;41.
- 833 40. Igwesi-Chidobe CN, Kitchen S, Sorinola IO, Godfrey EL. World Health Organisation Disability
834 Assessment Schedule (WHODAS 2.0): development and validation of the Nigerian Igbo version in
835 patients with chronic low back pain. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2020;
- 836 41. Vernon H, Mior S. The Neck Disability Index: a study of reliability and validity. *J Manipulative*


- 837 Physiol Ther. Mosby Publishing Company; 1991;
- 838 42. Vernon H. The Neck Disability Index: state-of-the-art, 1991-2008. J Manipulative Physiol Ther.
839 Elsevier; 2008;31:491-502.
- 840 43. Silveira A, Gadotti IC, Armijo-Olivo S, Biasotto-Gonzalez DA, Magee D. Jaw dysfunction is
841 associated with neck disability and muscle tenderness in subjects with and without chronic
842 temporomandibular disorders. Biomed Res Int. Hindawi; 2015;2015.
- 843 44. Howell ER. The association between neck pain, the Neck Disability Index and cervical ranges of
844 motion: a narrative review. J Can Chiropr Assoc. The Canadian Chiropractic Association;
845 2011;55:211.
- 846 45. Young IA, Dunning J, Butts R, Mourad F, Cleland JA. Reliability, construct validity, and
847 responsiveness of the neck disability index and numeric pain rating scale in patients with mechanical
848 neck pain without upper extremity symptoms. Physiother Theory Pract. Taylor & Francis;
849 2019;35:1328-35.
- 850 46. Lim HHR, Tang ZY, Hashim MABM, Yang M, Koh EYL, Koh KH. Cross-cultural adaptation,
851 reliability, validity, and responsiveness of the Simplified-Chinese Version of Neck Disability Index.
852 Spine (Phila Pa 1976). Wolters Kluwer Health; 2020;45:541.
- 853 47. Halpern M, Hiebert R, Nordin M, Goldsheyder D, Crane M. The test-retest reliability of a new
854 occupational risk factor questionnaire for outcome studies of low back pain. Appl Ergon. Elsevier;
855 2001;32:39-46.
- 856 48. Lefcourt HM. Locus of control. Academic Press; 1991.
- 857 49. Vazquez ACS, Pianezolla M, Hutz CS. Assessment of psychosocial factors at work: A systematic
858 review. Estud Psicol. SciELO Brasil; 2018;35:5-13.
- 859 50. Sasaki N, Imamura K, Watanabe K, Huong NT, Kuribayashi K, Sakuraya A, et al. Validation of the
860 Job Content Questionnaire among hospital nurses in Vietnam. J Occup Health. Japan Society for
861 Occupational Health; 2020;62:e12086.
- 862 51. Crawford JO. The Nordic musculoskeletal questionnaire. Occup Med (Chic Ill). Oxford University
863 Press; 2007;57:300-1.
- 864 52. Ribeiro DC, Aldabe D, Abbott JH, Sole G, Milosavljevic S. Dose-response relationship between
865 work-related cumulative postural exposure and low back pain: a systematic review. Ann Occup Hyg.
866 Oxford University Press; 2012;56:684-96.
- 867 53. Wai EK, Roffey DM, Bishop P, Kwon BK, Dagenais S. Causal assessment of occupational bending
868 or twisting and low back pain: results of a systematic review. Spine J. Elsevier; 2010;10:76-88.
- 869 54. Bakker EWP, Verhagen AP, van Trijffel E, Lucas C, Koes BW. Spinal mechanical load as a risk
870 factor for low back pain: a systematic review of prospective cohort studies. Spine (Phila Pa 1976).
871 LWW; 2009;34:E281-93.
- 872 55. Waters T, Yeung S, Genaidy A, Callaghan J, Barriera-Viruet H, Deddens J. Cumulative spinal
873 loading exposure methods for manual material handling tasks. Part 1: is cumulative spinal loading
874 associated with lower back disorders? Theor issues Ergon Sci. Taylor & Francis; 2006;7:113-30.
- 875 56. Kwon BK, Roffey DM, Bishop PB, Dagenais S, Wai EK. Systematic review: occupational physical
876 activity and low back pain. Occup Med (Chic Ill). Oxford University Press; 2011;61:541-8.

- 877 57. Da Costa BR, Vieira ER. Risk factors for work-related musculoskeletal disorders: a systematic
878 review of recent longitudinal studies. *Am J Ind Med*. Wiley Online Library; 2010;53:285–323.
- 879 58. Bursac Z, Gauss CH, Williams DK, Hosmer DW. Purposeful selection of variables in logistic
880 regression. *Source Code Biol Med*. Biomed central; 2008;3:1–8.
- 881 59. Bendal RB, Afifi AA. Comparison of stopping rules in forward regression. *J Am Stat Assoc*.
882 1977;72:46–53.
- 883 60. Mickey RM, Greenland S. A study of the impact of confounder-selection criteria on effect
884 estimation. *Am J Epidemiol*. JOHNS HOPKINS UNIV SCHOOL HYGIENE PUB HEALTH 111 MARKET
885 PLACE, STE 840 ...; 1987. p. 737.
- 886 61. Midi H, Sarkar SK, Rana S. Collinearity diagnostics of binary logistic regression model. *J Interdiscip*
887 *Math*. Taylor & Francis; 2010;13:253–67.
- 888 62. Daoud JI. Multicollinearity and regression analysis. *J Phys Conf Ser*. IOP Publishing; 2017. p.
889 12009.
- 890 63. Bernal D, Campos-Serna J, Tobias A, Vargas-Prada S, Benavides FG, Serra C. Work-related
891 psychosocial risk factors and musculoskeletal disorders in hospital nurses and nursing aides: a
892 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Nurs Stud*. Elsevier; 2015;52:635–48.
- 893 64. Vignoli M, Guglielmi D, Balducci C, Bonfiglioli R. Workplace bullying as a risk factor for
894 musculoskeletal disorders: the mediating role of job-related psychological strain. *Biomed Res Int*.
895 Hindawi; 2015;2015.
- 896 65. Kadota JL, McCoy SI, Bates MN, Mnyippembe A, Njau PF, Prata N, et al. The impact of heavy load
897 carrying on musculoskeletal pain and disability among women in Shinyanga Region, Tanzania. *Ann*
898 *Glob Heal*. Ubiquity Press; 2020;86.
- 899 66. Meo SA, Alsaaran ZF, Alshehri MK, Khashouji MA, Almeterk AAZ, Almutairi SF, et al. Work-
900 related musculoskeletal symptoms among building construction workers in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.
901 *Pakistan J Med Sci*. Professional Medical Publications; 2013;29:1394.
- 902 67. Johnston V, Jimmieson NL, Jull G, Souvlis T. Contribution of individual, workplace, psychosocial
903 and physiological factors to neck pain in female office workers. *Eur J Pain*. Elsevier; 2009;13:985–91.
- 904 68. Medin-Ceylan C, Korkmaz MD, Sahbaz T, Cigdem Karacay B. Risk factors of neck disability in
905 computer-using office workers: a cross-sectional study. *Int J Occup Saf Ergon*. Taylor & Francis;
906 2023;29:44–9.
- 907 69. Hurwitz EL, Goldstein MS, Morgenstern H, Chiang L-M. The impact of psychosocial factors on
908 neck pain and disability outcomes among primary care patients: results from the UCLA Neck Pain
909 Study. *Disabil Rehabil*. Taylor & Francis; 2006;28:1319–29.
- 910 70. Xie Y, Coombes BK, Thomas L, Johnston V. Time Course and Risk Profile of Work-Related Neck
911 Disability: A Longitudinal Latent Class Growth Analysis. *Phys Ther*. Oxford University Press;
912 2022;102:pzac050.
- 913 71. Gustavsson C, Bergström J, Denison E, von Koch L. Predictive factors for disability outcome at
914 twenty weeks and two years following a pain self-management group intervention in patients with
915 persistent neck pain in primary health care. *J Rehabil Med*. 2013;45:170–6.
- 916 72. Bot SDM, van der Waal JM, Terwee CB, van der Windt DAWM, Scholten RJPM, Bouter LM, et al.

- 917 Predictors of outcome in neck and shoulder symptoms: a cohort study in general practice. *Spine*
918 (Phila Pa 1976). *LWW*; 2005;30:E459–70.
- 919 73. Hansen IR, Barbero M, Falla D, Larsen MH, Kraft MN, Sjøgaard K, et al. Pain extent is more
920 strongly associated with disability, psychological factors, and neck muscle function in people with
921 non-traumatic versus traumatic chronic neck pain: a cross-sectional study. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med*.
922 EdizioniMinerva Medica; 2019;55:71–8.
- 923 74. Kanaan SF, Almhdawi KA, Khader YS, Jain TK, Jaber AF, Almomani F. Predictors of neck disability
924 among undergraduate students: A cross-sectional study. *Work*. IOS Press; 2022;72:1119–28.
- 925 75. Luo X, Edwards CL, Richardson W, Hey L. Relationships of clinical, psychologic, and individual
926 factors with the functional status of neck pain patients. *Value Heal*. Wiley Online Library; 2004;7:61–
927 9.
- 928 76. Johansen JB, Røe C, Bakke ES, Mengshoel AM, Storheim K, Andelic N. The determinants of
929 function and disability in neck patients referred to a specialized outpatient clinic. *Clin J Pain*. *LWW*;
930 2013;29:1029–35.
- 931 77. Ariëns GAM, Bongers PM, Hoogendoorn WE, Van Der Wal G, Van Mechelen W. High physical and
932 psychosocial load at work and sickness absence due to neck pain. *Scand J Work Environ Health*.
933 JSTOR; 2002;222–31.
- 934 78. Bergström G, Bodin L, Bertilsson H, Jensen IB. Risk factors for new episodes of sick leave due to
935 neck or back pain in a working population. A prospective study with an 18-month and a three-year
936 follow-up. *Occup Environ Med*. BMJ Publishing Group Ltd; 2007;64:279–87.
- 937 79. Moll LT, Jensen OK, Schiøttz-Christensen B, Stapelfeldt CM, Christiansen DH, Nielsen CV, et al.
938 Return to work in employees on sick leave due to neck or shoulder pain: a randomized clinical trial
939 comparing multidisciplinary and brief intervention with one-year register-based follow-up. *J Occup*
940 *Rehabil*. Springer; 2018;28:346–56.
- 941 80. Schluter PJ, Dawson AP, Turner C. Pain-related psychological cognitions and behaviours
942 associated with sick leave due to neck pain: findings from the Nurses and Midwives e-Cohort Study.
943 *BMC Nurs*. Springer; 2014;13:1–11.
- 944 81. Holmberg SAC, Thelin AG. Predictors of sick leave owing to neck or low back pain: a 12-year
945 longitudinal cohort study in a rural male population. *Ann Agric Environ Med*. Instytut Medycyny Wsi;
946 2010;17:251–7.
- 947 82. Te Braak P, van Tienoven TP, Minnen J, Glorieux I. Data quality and recall bias in time-diary
948 research: The effects of prolonged recall periods in self-administered online time-use surveys. *Sociol*
949 *Methodol*. SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA; 2023;53:115–38.
- 950 83. Hunger M, Schwarzkopf L, Heier M, Peters A, Holle R, Group KS. Official statistics and claims data
951 records indicate non-response and recall bias within survey-based estimates of health care
952 utilization in the older population. *BMC Health Serv Res*. Springer; 2013;13:1–11.
- 953 84. Meziat Filho N, Coutinho ES, Azevedo e Silva G. Association between home posture habits and
954 low back pain in high school adolescents. *Eur Spine J*. Springer; 2015;24:425–33.
- 955
- 956

957

958



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.21.23298858>; this version posted November 22, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure 1




Figure 2