



Research Article

Laboratory employees' perception of occupational risk factors

 Hafize Boyaci¹,  Gonen Ilkar Dundar²,  Ilhan Kerem Senel³

¹Department of Health Management, Istanbul University-Cerrahpasa, Graduate Education Institute, Istanbul, Turkey

²Department of Human Resource Management, Istanbul University Faculty of Business Administration, Istanbul, Turkey

³Department of Health Management, Istanbul University-Cerrahpasa, Faculty of Health Sciences, Istanbul, Turkey

Abstract

Objectives: The purpose of this study was to assess the understanding and views of hospital laboratory workers related to risk factors in their work environment.

Methods: This quantitative analysis included 234 laboratory employees in a university hospital. The data were obtained using a survey consisting of 19 questions: 8 items solicited demographic characteristics of the respondents, 3 questions determined their observations about the work environment, and 8 questions asked about occupational risk perception. Risk perception was evaluated using a scale designed specifically for laboratory employees. Frequency, percentages, and averages were used to present descriptive data. A t-test and analysis of variance were used to analyze occupational risk perception according to participant characteristics and responses.

Results: A total of 162 women and 72 men (mean age: 40-49 years) participated in the study. The most common health problem observed was lower extremity pain. The occupational risk perception level was found to be above average (3.13 ± 0.68). There was a statistically significant difference between the occupational risk perception score and the length of employment in the unit ($p < 0.05$); however, no statistical significance was found between occupational risk perception and other variables (gender, age, field of work, education, or length of overall professional experience).

Conclusion: The occupational risk perception score of laboratory workers with 11-16 years of experience was higher than that of more recent employees. Training is known to be effective and would appear to be a valuable investment in the development of risk perception among laboratory employees to ensure a safe and effective environment.

Keywords: Hospital, health workers, laboratory, risk factors

Laboratories can be a source of risk to employee health and safety. Safe working conditions are necessary for healthcare staff to remain healthy and provide good services [1]. Employees in hospitals and healthcare institutions face several sources of risk, including physical, chemical, biological, psychological, and ergonomic factors [2-3]. Physical risk factors include noise, vibration, ventilation, dust, radiation, and improper electrical systems. Laboratory workers may be exposed to toxic, allergic, carcinogenic, or harmful effects of numerous chemicals (such as reagents, disinfectants, drugs, or anesthetics). Blood, tissue, or body fluid samples, as well as medical waste, pose a potential biological risk and represent the most important foci of infection for laboratory workers [4].

An individual's subjective judgment about the characteristics and severity of risks that could threaten their safety is defined as risk perception. A high level of risk perception generally indicates greater practice of safe behaviors [5].

The sensitivity of laboratory workers to work environment risks may differ according to demographic features. The present study examined the occupational risk perception of laboratory workers related to health problems arising from work environment risks and analyzed the effect of demographic characteristics and views on the work environment.

This study was designed to provide laboratory managers with measures to be implemented to mitigate work environment risks and encourage safe behavior.

Address for correspondence: Hafize Boyaci, Department of Health Management, Istanbul University Cerrahpasa, Graduate Education Institute, Istanbul, Turkey

Phone: +90 531 289 18 62 **E-mail:** hafize.boyaci@istanbul.edu.tr **ORCID:** 0000-0003-2362-7845

Submitted Date: August 21, 2020 **Accepted Date:** February 05, 2021 **Available Online Date:** March 18, 2021

©Copyright 2021 by International Journal of Medical Biochemistry - Available online at www.internationalbiochemistry.com

OPEN ACCESS This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.



Materials and Methods

The survey study was deemed appropriate as the data collection method in the study. After the permission number 65384569/4454 was obtained from the Istanbul University Faculty of Medicine Hospitals where the study was conducted, the questionnaire forms were distributed between 15-26 April 2013 after giving information about the study, and the participants were asked to read and answer these forms.

The quantitative analysis method was used to evaluate the data gathered in this descriptive research study. The survey comprised 2 components: a personal information form and an occupational risk perception scale.

The personal information form consisted of 11 items to record the demographic characteristics of the participants and the features of the work environment.

The occupational risk perception scale used is a subdimension of a risk perception scale developed by the principal author in 2014. The scale consists of 8 items scored using a 5-point Likert scale (1: strongly disagree, 2: disagree, 3: undecided, 4: agree, and 5: strongly agree). The occupational risk perception form used a scoring system of 1-5 for each item, where a score of 5 indicates the highest risk, and the mean was calculated [6-7].

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the occupational risk perception scale was 0.73. The significance value of Bartlett's test was $\chi^2=2249.33$ ($p<0.000$). The Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin sampling value of the survey data was determined to be 0.78.

Statistical analysis

The study data were analyzed using SPSS for Windows, Version 15.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Percentages, means, and frequency values were used in evaluation of the meta-data. Independent sample t-test and independent sample analysis of variance were performed in order to analyze the occupational risk perception of the laboratory workers based on their demographic characteristics. Tukey's test was used as post-hoc test to determine any differentiation. Statistical significance was defined as $p<0.05$.

Results

The distribution of the demographic characteristics of the participants is presented in Table 1. In the study group, 40.6% were between the ages of 40 and 49 years, 69.2% were women, 38.5% held an associate degree, and 40.4% were employed as a laboratory technician. The mean length of employment of 44% of the participants had been working in the profession for 17 years. 42.7% of the participants had been employed in the same unit for less than 5 years.

Table 2 illustrates the distribution of responses related to the work environment. It was determined that 65.4% of the participants chose their position (it was not an assignment) and were satisfied.

Table 1. Distribution of the demographic characteristics of the participants (n=234)

Variations	n	Percentage (%)
Female	162	69.2
Male	72	30.8
Age (years)		
20-29	70	29.9
30-39	49	20.9
40-49	95	40.9
≥ 50	20	8.5
Department		
Emergency laboratory	16	6.8
Biochemistry-genetics research	20	8.5
Microbiology	34	14.5
Blood center	26	11.1
Pediatric biochemistry	19	8.1
Service laboratories	21	9.0
Position		
Biologist-chemist	72	32.0
Other lab worker	15	7.1
Laboratory technician	97	40.4
Nurse	25	9.8
Engineer	6	2.7
Doctor	19	8.1
Education		
Medical vocational high school	30	12.8
Associate's degree	90	38.5
Bachelor's degree	66	28.2
Postgraduate/doctorate and above	48	20.5
Employment in the profession		
0-5 years	61	26.0
6-10 years	35	15.0
11-16 years	35	15.0
≥ 17 years	103	44.0
Employment in the department		
0-5 years	100	42.7
6-10 years	36	15.4
11-16 years	28	12.0
≥ 17 years	70	29.9

The participants were asked to identify factors they thought were risks in their work experience: infectious samples, work environment conditions, (noise, lighting, ergonomics, etc.), radiation exposure, chemical use, sharp-object injuries, contact with patients, and inadequate safety protocols/procedures. The most common health problems noted were lower extremity pain, diseases potentially caused by air conditioning quality, and upper extremity pain.

Table 3 provides the distribution of the occupational risk perception. The mean score was 3.13 ± 0.677 ; the participants perceived their work environment as hazardous. The statement

Table 2. Findings related to the participants' work environment (n=234)

Variations	n	Percentage (%)
Employees' satisfaction level and choice of position		
I chose voluntarily and I am satisfied	153	65.4
I chose voluntarily and I am not satisfied	29	12.4
I did not choose voluntarily but I am satisfied	36	15.4
I did not choose voluntarily and I am not satisfied	16	6.8
Risk factors employees think have an impact on their health in the working environment*		
Infectious samples	133	61.1
Sharp-object injuries	21	9.6
Chemicals	38	17.4
Work environment conditions, (noise, lighting, ergonomics, etc.)	112	52.6
Contact with patient	13	5.9
Inadequate safety protocols/procedure	5	2.3
Health problems experienced by laboratory employees due to the work environment*		
Hepatitis	42	17.9
Eczema	23	9.8
Upper extremity (hand, arm) pain	67	28.6
Varicosis	47	20.1
Psychological disorders	42	17.9
Diseases sourced to air conditioning	76	32.5
Lower extremity (foot, leg) pain	85	36.3
Other	19	8.1

*More than one option could be selected.

Table 3. Distribution of occupational risk perception average (n=234)

Occupational risk perception In the laboratory where I work,	Mean	SD
I think the noise caused by the devices is excessive.	3.59	1.27
I have health problems due to insufficient air conditioning/ventilation.	3.42	1.36
I think that the quality of the personal cleaning agents (hand disinfectants, etc.) used is low, which increases my risk of getting an infection.	3.34	1.32
I think my infection risk is greater because I have contact with patients.	3.27	1.29
I think my infection risk is greater than that of employees of other departments due to exposure to blood and body fluids.	3.13	1.34
I think there are hazardous substances in the workplace that threaten my health.	2.88	1.28
I think I am exposed to infection risk due to working with inadequate equipment and materials.	2.84	1.38
I think I am exposed to radiation (radioactive agents).	2.61	1.45
Totally score	3.13	0.677

"I think the noise caused by the devices is excessive" was the perceived risk with the highest score (3.59±1.27), and the statement "I think I have been exposed to radiation" was the lowest (2.61±1.45).

The distribution of the demographic variance and occupational risk perception is given in Table 4. A comparison of the occupational risk perception scale mean score and demographic characteristics revealed that there was a statistically significant difference only in the duration of employment in the specific department. Participants who had worked in the same department for 11-16 years had a higher risk perception than those employed for 0-5 years (p<0.05). There was no sig-

nificant difference between age, gender, education, marital status, work in another unit, the length of overall employment at the institution, or the duration of employment in the profession.

Discussion

This research of hospital laboratory workers' perceptions of occupational risk factors related to the work environment was performed to provide guidance to anticipate risks that may arise in the future and to take the necessary measures to provide a safe laboratory environment. The results of our survey indicated that 40.6% of the participants were between the ages

Table 4. Comparison of demographic variances and occupational risk perception average (n=234)

	Occupational risk perception (mean±SD)	f	t	p
Gender			1.06	0.5
Female	3.10±0.716			
Male	3.20±0.577			
Age		1.16		0.32
20-29 years	3.15±0.563			
30-39 years	3.28±0.68			
40-49 years	3.05±0.769			
≥50 years	3.13±0.529			
Department	1.072		0.380	
Central laboratory	3.11±0.702			
Emergency laboratory	3.30±0.506			
Biochemistry-genetics research	2.98±0.816			
Microbiology	3.24±0.589			
Blood center	3.27±0.533			
Pediatric biochemistry	3.14±0.600			
Service laboratories	2.92±0.853			
Position		1.493		0.193
Biologist-chemist	3.16±0.579			
Other lab worker	3.08±0.668			
Laboratory technician	3.18±0.712			
Nurse	3.16±0.833			
Engineer	3.29±0.452			
Doctor	2.74±0.626			
Education		0.169		0.918
Medical vocational high school	3.14±0.818			
Associate's degree	3.15±0.710			
Bachelor's degree	3.16±0.584			
Postgraduate –doctorate and above	3.07±0.655			
Employment in the profession		2.369		0.071
0 - 5 years	3.06±0.552			
6 - 10 years	3.21±0.628			
11 - 16 years	3.39±0.675			
≥17 years	3.07±0.743			
Employment in the department		3.130		0.026*
0 - 5 years(a)	3.04±0.640			
6 - 10 years	3.06±0.721			
11 - 16 years(b)	3.46±0.671			
≥17 years	3.18±0.678			

*P<0.05 was considered significant. Tukey=(b>a). f: Frequency; t: Student's t test.

of 40 and 49 years, 69.2% were women, 38.5% had an associate's degree, and 40.4% were employed as a laboratory technician.

Infection-infected samples, work environment conditions, radiation and chemical exposure, and sharp-object injuries were considered risk factors in the working environment. In other research in Turkey, Çokluk et al. [8] found that the risk factors most cited were infection, sharp-object injuries, contact with body fluids, exposure to chemicals, and musculoskeletal problems.

Kılıç et al. [9] reported that the greatest risks in the work environment were sharp-object, biological, psychosocial, physical, and chemical injuries. Pedrosa et al. [10] observed in a study conducted in Brazil that 92% of blood-borne infections occurred in hospitals. According to Gündüz [11], 40.9% of health workers had a work accident; 84.5% reported sharp-object injuries, 33% experienced musculoskeletal injuries, and 36.9% had exposure to contamination with blood or body fluids. Turhan [12] found

that among 988 healthcare employees, 64% were infected at least once due to exposure to blood or body fluid. In our survey, infectious samples were reported as the greatest source of risk. This is consistent with previous studies. However, our study differed from other research in that sharp-object injuries were found to present a low risk.

A study conducted on chemical exposure in a research laboratory in Italy yielded a response that 54.4% felt very exposed to chemical risk [13]. Our results revealed a relatively low ratio of perceived chemical risk (17.4%).

In our research, the most common health problem identified was lower extremity pain (36.3%). Healthcare workers have a significantly greater exposure to musculoskeletal disorders than some other occupations [14]. The number of lower extremity injuries reported in our survey may be related to a lack of sufficient training about how to avoid such injuries. The routine activities of healthcare employees can cause musculoskeletal disorders over the course of time [15].

In our study, noise, insufficient ventilation, contact with dangerous substances, cleaning materials used, and patient contact were perceived as risky. Hazardous materials, inadequate equipment, and radiation were not perceived as great sources of risk. The occupational risk perception scale results indicated that noise was perceived as the greatest risk and radiation exposure was considered the lowest risk. Ilgar [16] also noted that noise ranked first among the important risk factors defined by healthcare professionals. In the study conducted by Vehid et al., [17] noise was a high-risk factor. It has also been reported that medical waste, electrical devices, noise, and air conditioning systems were sources of potential exposure to injury for nurses [18]. In our study, the mean occupational risk perception of nurses was high (3.16 ± 0.833). Results in the literature support our findings.

Aluko et al. [19] reported that 96.2% respondents said they believed they were at risk due to an occupational hazard and 40% stated that the basic safety equipment in the workplace was insufficient. In our study, the laboratory workers perceived the risk due to inadequate equipment to be low.

A comparison of the demographic variables of the participants and the occupational risk perception scores indicated that male employees reported a higher perception of occupational risk than females. Occupational risk perception was found to be higher in the 30-39 age range, those with an associate's degree, those with a title of laboratory technician, and those working in the unit for 11-16 years. Buxton et al. [20] observed that laboratory technicians have significant expertise and experience in the laboratory. However, a study conducted in Egypt in 2019 reported that there was no statistically significant relationship between risk perception score and the frequency of occupational accidents [21].

The occupational risk perception scale used in this study was developed by the principal researcher and to our knowledge, it is the only risk perception scale specifically designed for laboratory workers. The mean score was 3.13 ± 0.677 in our study,

which indicates that laboratory workers high risk in the environment.

Saygılı and Çelik [22] used an individual workload perception scale in 2011 and Mollaoğlu et al. [23] assessed the perceptions of nurses working in hospitals about their working environment. A statistically significant relationship was found between the perception of the general work environment and the general level of job satisfaction. According to Taylor and Snyder [24], the relationship between risk perception and safety behavior is uncertain. We found no previous study in the literature specifically examining the occupational risk perception of laboratory workers.

We observed a significant difference between occupational risk perception and the length of time working in the department: The occupational risk perception of the laboratory workers with 11-16 years of experience was higher ($p < 0.005$). Considering the role of the training in individuals' behavior, short training sessions at regular intervals may help to develop and maintain greater risk perception. There was no statistically significant difference for the demographic variables of age, gender, department, position, length of employment in the profession, or educational status.

Aktürk and Karadağ [25] stated that there is no relationship between the actual risk faced by the employees and the Employment Period in the department. In our study, a relationship was found between occupational risk perception and length of employment in the unit.

Conclusion

In conclusion, additional, more comprehensive studies should be conducted to eliminate the existing deficiencies regarding the risks faced and perceived by laboratory employees. Training should be provided to inform employees of occupational risks, particularly new laboratory workers, to provide the safest and most effective environment possible.

Conflict of Interest: There is no conflict of interest.

Ethics Committee Approval: This Study permission number 65384569/4454 was obtained from the Istanbul University Cerrahpasa Medical Faculty within the scope of thesis project.

Financial Disclosure: None declared.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Authorship Contributions: Concept – H.B., G.I.D.; Design – H.B., G.I.D.; Supervision – H.B., G.I.D., I.K.S.; Funding – H.B., G.I.D.; Materials – H.B., G.I.D.; Data collection &/or processing – H.B.; Analysis and/or interpretation – H.B.; Literature search – H.B.; Writing – H.B., G.I.D.; Critical review – H.B., G.I.D., I.K.S.

References

1. Adıgüzel O, Keklik B. The job satisfaction of the health institutions' staff and an application. [Article in Turkish]. Dumlupınar University Journal of Social Sciences 2011;29:305–18.

2. Kaplan M, Emin EM. The effect of the perception of occupational health and safety on job stress: a research in a public hospital. [Article in Turkish]. *Mukaddime* 2018;9(2):181–94.
3. Yıldız A. Impact of empowerment on ensuring of occupational health and safety in hospitals: a study on nurses. [Article in Turkish]. PhD thesis. Ankara: Hacettepe University Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Health Management; 2017.
4. Harrington JM, Shannon HS. Incidence of tuberculosis, hepatitis, brucellosis, and shigellosis in British laboratory workers. *BMJ* 1976;1:759–62.
5. Arezes PM, Miguel AS. Risk perception and safety behaviour: a study in an occupational environment. *Safety Sci* 2008;46(6):900–7.
6. Karaman M. Basic laboratory safety and general survey of the Turkish laboratory safety status. [Article in Turkish]. *JCAM* 2011;2(3):130–134.
7. Öztürk H, Babacan E, Özdaş Anahar E. The occupational safety of health personnel in hospital. [Article in Turkish]. *GUSBD* 2012;1(4):252–68.
8. Çokluk E, Çokluk S, Şekeroğlu R, Huyut Z. Risk perception in health services sector: hospital laboratory preliminary study. [Article in Turkish]. *J Turkish Clin Biochem* 2016;14(2):125–30.
9. Kılıç D, Karabulut N, Köse S. Study of professional risk health problems and preventive behaviours of nurses. [Article in Turkish]. *Actual Medicine* 2014;3:32–9.
10. Pedrosa PBS, Cardoso TAO. Viral infections in workers in hospital and research laboratory settings: a comparative review of infection modes and respective biosafety aspects. *IJID* 2011;15(6):366–76.
11. Gündüz R. Evaluation of occupational accidents in health workers (case of T. U. education and research hospital). [Article in Turkish]. Master's thesis. Kırklareli: Kırklareli University Health Sciences Institute Public Health Department, Public Health Program; 2019. p. 7–93.
12. Turhan F. The evaluation of behaviours and occupational risk factors of Baskent University Hospital employees. [Article in Turkish]. Master's thesis. Ankara: Baskent University Health Science Institute Department of Public Health; 2006. p. 50–92.
13. Papadopoli R, Nobile CGA, Trovato A, Pileggi C, Pavia M. Chemical risk and safety awareness, perception, and practices among research laboratories workers in Italy. *J Occup Med Toxicol* 2020;15(17):4–11.
14. Çetin G. Defining the views on positive work atmosphere of the nurses working in the hospitals. Master's thesis. Istanbul: Halic University Institute of Health Sciences, Department of Nursing; 2008. p. 96–101.
15. Shakuntala AC. Health hazards among health care personnel. *J Mahatma Gandhi Inst Med Sci* 2016;21(1):19–24.
16. Ilgar RA. Preliminary study noise pollution source for urban vehicle traffic in Çanakkale. [Article in Turkish]. *ZfWT* 2012;4(1):253–65.
17. Vehid S, Erginöz E, Yurtseven E, Çetin E, Köksal S, Kaypmaz A. Noise level of hospital environment. [Article in Turkish]. *TAF Prev Med Bull* 2011;10(4):409–14.
18. Özkan Ö, Emiroğlu ON. Occupational health and safety services towards hospital health employees. [Article in Turkish]. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi* 2006;10(3):43–51.
19. Aluko OO, Adebayo AE, Adebisi TF, Ewegbemi MK, Abidoye AT, Popoola BF. Knowledge, attitudes and perceptions of occupational hazards and safety practices in Nigerian healthcare workers. *BMC Res Notes* 2016;9:71.
20. Buxton JA, Bonnie H, Crabtree A, Waheed A, Coulthart M. Using qualitative methods to investigate risk perception of Canadian medical laboratory workers in relation to current prion disease infection control policies. *J Toxicol Environ Health A* 2011;74(2–4):241–47.
21. Jafari MJ, Saghi F, Alizadeh E, Zayeri F. Relationship between risk perception and occupational accidents: a study among foundry workers. *J Egypt Public Health Assoc* 2019;24(94):24.
22. Saygılı M, Çelik Y. The evaluation of relationship between job satisfaction and perceptions relating to working environment of health staff working in hospitals. [Article in Turkish]. *Hacettepe Journal of Health Administration* 2011;14(1):40–69.
23. Mollaoğlu M, Fertelli K T, Tuncay Ö F. Assessment of perception relating work environment of nurses working in hospital. [Article in Turkish]. *Firat Journal of Health Services* 2010;5:18–27.
24. Taylor DW, Snyder L A. The influence of risk perception on safety: A laboratory study. *Safety Sci* 2017;95:116–24.
25. Aktürk S, Karadağ F. Evaluation of physical risk factors for work health and safety and an example of implementation. [Article in Turkish]. *Çukurova Üniversitesi, Fen ve Mühendislik Bilimleri Dergisi* 2020;39:1–8.