DESCRIPTION AND PERSONS ASSESSMENT

HUMAN ERGOLOGY

VOL.49

NO.2

DECEMBER, 2020

Published by THE HUMAN ERGOLOGY SOCIETY

JOURNAL OF HUMAN ERGOLOGY

Vol.49, No.2 2020

CONTENTS

Originals

29 ANTHROPOMETRIC POSITIONAL DIMENSIONS OF DENPASAR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN 2016

I Made Muliarta and Gede Wirata

37 PREVALENCE OF RESPIRATORY SYMPTOMS AND PULMONARY FUNC-TION OF RUBBER INDUSTRY WORKERS

Amitava Pal, Afzalun Nesha Mollick and Prakash C. Dhara

45 WORK-RELATED MUSCULOSKELETAL PROBLEMS AMONG CONCH SHELL WORKERS; AN UNDERMINED ISSUE

Prithe Chakraborty, Piya Majumdar, Sasangbaha Mandi and Subhashis Sahu

Communications

53 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EMPATHY, GUILT AND HELPING BEHAVIOUR OF WITNESSES OF OSTRACISM: DO EMPATHY AND GUILT LEAD TO HELPING BEHAVIOUR?

Kenta Tsumura

Reviewer Acknowledgement

JOURNAL OF HUMAN ERGOLOGY

Editor-in-Chief:

Masahiro SHIMODA (Tokyo Univ. Agri. Tech.)

Associate Editors:

Macky KATO (Waseda Univ.), Masanori KAWAHARA (Toyama Univ.), Tsuyoshi KAWAKAMI (ILO), Yujiro KAWATA (Juntendo Univ.), Kohya KISHIDA (Chukyo Univ.), Kazuo MAIE (Otsusma Women's Univ.), Motoki MIZUNO (Juntendo Univ.), Ryutaro OHTSUKA (Jpn. Wildlife Res. Cent.), Akira OKADA (Osaka City Univ.), Kazuyoshi SAKAMOTO (Univ. of Electro-Communications), SHIN HongSon (Tokiwa Univ.), Norihade TACHI (Chukyo Univ.), Hideyuki TANAKA (Tokyo Univ. Agri. Tech.), Toshiki YAMAOKA (Kyoto Women's Univ.)

Editorial Secretary:

Naoso SHOЛ (Asahi Univ.)

Editorial Advisers:

Kazutaka KOGI (Inst. Sci. Labour), Akiyoshi MATSUMURA (Kanagawa Univ.), Morihiko OKADA (Tsukuba Univ.)

The Journal of Human Ergology is published by the Human Ergology Society, founded in 1970.

The journal is issued as a semiannual series.

The editors welcome original papers and reports dealing with significant areas of human orgological and ergonomics research, especially studies concerning man's working and living behaviour and its interrelationship with human nature in human evolution, adaptation, and development.

Abstracting and Indexing services

The Journal of Human Ergology is indexed for MEDLINE until 2015.

All articles published in this journal are available from J-STAGE (http://jstage.jst.go.jp/browse/jhe/-char/en).

To Subscribers

The subscription price per volume (usually 2 issues) is US\$74.00 including postage and handling. Subscriptions should be sent to the address below:

Mainichi Academic Forum inc.

Palaceside Building 2F, 1-1-1,

Hitotsubashi, Chiyoda-ku,

Tokyo 100-0003, Japan

FAX: +81-3-6267-4555/ Email: maf-sales@mycom.co.jp

Issues from the current and previous volume are available. Please contact the distributor for further details.

General Information

Please go to the Journal's website (http://www.humanergology.com/jhe_journal_e).

Copyright © 2016, by The Human Ergology Society. Printed in Japan.

ANTHROPOMETRIC POSITIONAL DIMENSIONS OF DENPASAR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN 2016

I MADE MULIARIA1", GEDE WIRATA2

 Departement of Physiology, Medical Faculty, Universitas Udayana P.B. Sudirman Street, Dangin Puri Kauh, Denpasar-Bali, Indonesia *Email: imd.muliarta2019@gmail.com
 Departement of Anatomy, Medical Faculty, Universitas Udayana

ABSTRACT

Ergonomic aspects, especially anthropometric measures, are essential factors indesigning a workstation. The most facilities in junior high schools often remain unchanged or not adjusted for
new students. Those facilities include tables, chairs, boards, etc. The study aims to know about
anthropometric dimensions of students in junior high schools in Denpasar in 2016. The research
is descriptive (anthropometric survey) involving junior high school students amounting to 901
at ten junior high schools in Denpasar as a sample determined by random cluster sampling. These
901 volunteered test subjects are divided into 480 male and 421 female students. Among 15-dimensional indicators in a standing position, only 3 dimensions did not show significant results
between the two genders, namely lower leg length, chest circumference and buttocks circumference. In a sitting position, among 21 dimension indicators, only 7 dimensions did not show
significant results between the two genders. Anthropometric measurements of junior high school
students in Denpasar had significantly different results in the sitting and standing dimensions
for both genders.

Keywords: Ergonomic aspects; anthropometry; student posture

INTRODUCTION

Ergonomic aspects, especially anthropometry in work facility design, are an important factor in supporting the improvement of production services. Attention to this in the present decade is something that cannot be delayed any longer. Anthropometry thus has many uses, such as conducting tool/work facility design. The suitability of the size of a tool against people who will use it will provide satisfaction in the form of comfort and health viewed from the point of view of anatomy, physiology, psychology, occupational health and safety, design and management and preventing complaints due to the size of the anthropometrical device of people who use it (Grandjean, 1997; Nurmianto, 2004).

In junior high schools, the facilities available are still facilities that have been around for a long time and have not been replaced. These facilities include benches, seating, blackboards, and so on. Many of these facilities may not be suitable for use. Even if they can still be used, the size is not necessarily suitable for junior high school students nowadays, because as to the anthropometric measures of students now and those that have changed again until now in Indonesia there are no definitive anthropometric measures of Indonesian people (Sutjana and Susila, 2010). So far, we still use estimated anthropometric measures (Pederson and Gore, 1996; Norton, 2004). For this reason, to plan the procurement of facilities as substitutes for existing facilities and the procurement of new facilities, it is very necessary to pay attention to the anthropometric aspects of the people who will use them, in this case, junior high school students.

MI (JLO), Yujiro s Univ.), Motoki ity Univ.), Kazuy-TACHI (Chukyo

(Tsukuba Univ.)

d and ergonomics a human nature in

har/en).

bscriptions should

etails

METHODS

This research was conducted in July-September 2016 in the Municipality of Denpasar, The design of this study was an anthropometric survey (descriptive) to measure the anthropometric measurements of junior high school students in the Municipality of Denpasar. The study population was Denpasar City junior high school students, and the sample determination was taken by random cluster sampling, and the number of schools used was at least 20% of the total number of junior high schools (40 × 20% = 8 schools). Of the 40 junior high schools in Denpasar City, there are 11 public middle schools and 29 private junior high schools and 10 junior high schools (4 public middle schools and 6 private middle schools) are used in this study. Of all the schools selected as samples, 901 students were taken apart as measured samples.

The study was conducted after receiving approval from the Research Ethics Committe, Medical Faculty, Universitas Udayana/Sanglah General Hospital. We then described the characteristics of study participants. Before starting this study, all participants gave informed consent. Prior to measurements, we first asked for permission from the respective head of school to measure some anthropometric measurements of the students. After obtaining the approval from each school principal, we made measurements following the agreement, namely at certain lesson hours we informed each school student to do measurements of several anthropometric dimensions, and at that time measurements were taken directly on 1st, 2nd and 3rdyear students. The tools used were an anthropometer and a metal meter. The measurements were carried out on each sample in standing and sitting positions (Abernethy et al., 2004; Kamal, 2004). Data in each position were then analyzed by the Mann-Whitney test (significance, p<0.05). This revealed the comparable data between male and female students.

RESULTS

Of the 40 junior high schools (Sekolah Menengah Pertama, SMP, in Indonesian) in Denpasar, there are 11 public middle schools (27.5%) and 29 private middle schools (72.5%) with 23,576 students, consisting of 12,271 male students (52 %) and 11,305 female students (48%) (Denpasar City Education Office data, 2005). Anthropometric measurements have been carried out on 10 SMPs (4 public middle schools and 6 private middle schools) with a sample of 901 people with details such as in Table 1.

Table 1. Characteristics of the samples

No.	Class/Gender	Number	Percentage (%)
	Ist Class		
1	-Male	170	56.1
-1	-Female	133	43.9
	Subtotal	303	100
	2nd Class		
2	-Male	134	48
	-Female	145	52
	Subtotal	279	100
	3rd Class		
3	-Male	176	55.2
ಿ	-Female	143	44.8
	Subtotal	319	100
	All participants	20120	00781
4	-Male	480	53.3
	-Female	421	46.3
	Total	901	100

Tabi pasar jun mensions buttocks the two g der heigh not show Table 2 shows a ∞ mparison of the anthropometric dimensions of male and female students in Denpasar junior high schools in 2016. These results indicate are results divided into 15 standing position dimensions and 21 sitting position dimensions. In the standing position, the dimensions of lower leg length buttocks circumference and chest circumference did not show a statistically significant difference between the two genders (p>0 05). On the other hand, in the sitting position, stature, sitting eye height, sitting shoulder height, elbow-elbow distance, buttock-knee length, buttock-popliteal length, and hip thickness also did not show a statistically significant difference between the two genders (p>0 05).

Table 2. Denpasar junior high school students' anthropometric standing dimensions

OHR 18 ST 11 EYH 14 WH EBH HFH CLLL FR SR NC CC CC WC HCC HCC HCC HCC HCC HCC HCC H	5	J. S.			Male					Female			
183.54 12.74 163.11 183.9 204 178.26 8.14 165.72 1 154.81 10.11 139.01 155.45 170 151.63 6.69 141.52 1 142.25 10.84 125.34 143.1 157.6 139.31 8.5 128.51 1 97.22 8.6 84 75.5 109.6 97.03 10.15 87 92.43 9.87 80.52 93.15 104.19 91.31 8.16 82.51 66.18 7.18 57.5 66.2 74.98 65.06 6.83 57.32 87.76 8.28 75.6 88.5 99 87.55 6.03 77.71 56.03 4.25 49 56.66 54.29 49.11 56.03 4.36 48.2 55.4 61.99 53.48 4.2 47.71 31.36 3.06 26.71 31.1 36.7 29.66 2.46 26.7 66.85	0	Dimension	Mean	SD	5th	50th	95th	Mean	SD	5th	50th	95th	d
154.81 10.11 139.01 155.45 170 151.63 6.69 141.52 142.25 10.84 125.34 143.1 157.6 139.31 8.5 128.51 1 97.22 8.6 84 75.5 109.6 97.03 10.15 87 92.43 9.87 80.52 93.15 104.19 91.31 8.16 82.51 66.18 7.18 57.5 66.2 74.98 65.06 6.83 57.32 87.76 8.28 75.6 88.5 99 87.53 6.03 77.71 56.03 4.25 49 56 62.49 54.65 4.29 49.11 55.09 4.36 48.2 55.4 61.99 53.48 4.2 47.71 31.36 3.06 26.71 31.1 36.7 29.66 2.46 26.7 92.43 10.59 77.31 91.5 111.48 89.41 8.61 77.8 66.85 10.58 56.04 66.35 91.98 66.83 89.5 56	_	OHR	183.54	12.74	163.11	183.9	204	178.26	8.14	165.72	178.4	191.45	*000.0
142.25 10.84 125.34 143.1 157.6 139.31 8.5 128.51 97.22 8.6 84 75.5 109.6 97.03 10.15 87 92.43 9.87 80.52 93.15 104.19 91.31 8.16 82.51 66.18 7.18 57.5 66.2 74.98 65.06 6.83 57.32 87.76 8.28 75.6 62.49 87.53 60.3 77.11 56.03 4.25 49 56.62 62.49 87.53 60.3 77.71 55.09 4.36 48.2 55.4 61.99 53.48 4.2 47.71 31.36 3.06 26.71 31.1 36.7 29.66 2.46 26.7 92.43 10.59 77.31 91.5 111.48 89.41 8.61 77.82 66.85 10.58 56.04 66.35 91.98 66.83 89.5 56 80.6 10.54 66.7 80 99.95 80.54 82.1 68 45.14 7.	2	ST	154.81	10.11	139.01	155.45	170	151.63	69.9	141.52	151.6	161.7	*000.0
97.22 8.6 84 75.5 109.6 97.03 10.15 87 92.43 9.87 80.52 93.15 104.19 91.31 8.16 82.51 66.18 7.18 57.5 66.2 74.98 65.06 6.83 57.32 87.76 8.28 75.62 88.5 99 87.53 6.03 77.71 56.03 4.25 49 56 62.49 54.65 42.9 49.11 55.09 4.36 48.2 55.4 61.99 53.48 4.2 47.71 31.36 3.06 26.71 31.1 36.7 29.66 2.46 26.7 92.43 10.59 77.31 91.5 111.48 89.41 8.61 77.82 76.33 9.43 63.3 75 94 76.5 77.5 65.45 80.6 10.58 56.04 66.35 91.98 66.83 89.5 56 45.14 7.25 35	3	EYH	142.25	10.84	125.34	143.1	157.6	139.31	8.5	128.51	140	149.29	*000.0
92.43 9.87 80.52 93.15 104.19 91.31 8.16 82.51 66.18 7.18 57.5 66.2 74.98 65.06 6.83 57.32 87.76 8.28 75.62 88.5 99 87.53 6.03 77.71 56.03 4.25 49 56 62.49 84.65 4.29 49.11 55.09 4.36 48.2 55.4 61.99 53.48 4.2 47.71 31.36 3.06 26.71 31.1 36.7 29.66 2.46 26.7 92.43 10.59 77.31 91.5 111.48 89.41 8.61 77.82 76.33 9.43 63.3 75 94 76.5 77.5 65.45 80.6 10.58 56.04 66.35 91.98 66.83 89.5 56 80.6 10.54 7.25 35 44 57.99 43.89 6.4 34.53	4	WH	97.22	9.8	84	75.5	9.601	97.03	10.15	87	96.5	105.69	0.016*
66.18 7.18 57.5 66.2 74.98 65.06 6.83 57.32 87.76 8.28 75.62 88.5 99 87.53 6.03 77.71 56.03 4.25 49 56 62.49 54.65 4.29 47.71 55.09 4.36 48.2 55.4 61.99 53.48 4.2 47.71 31.36 3.06 26.71 31.1 36.7 29.66 2.46 26.7 92.43 10.59 77.31 91.5 111.48 89.41 8.61 77.82 76.33 9.43 63.3 75 94 76.5 77.5 65.45 66.85 10.58 56.04 66.35 91.98 66.83 89.5 56 80.6 10.54 66.7 80 99.95 80.54 82 43.53 45.14 7.25 35 44 57.99 43.89 6.4 34.53	5	EBH	92.43	9.87	80.52	93.15	104.19	91.31	8.16	82.51	91.5	8.66	*000.0
87.76 8.28 75.62 88.5 99 87.53 6.03 77.71 56.03 4.25 49 56 62.49 54.65 4.29 49.11 55.09 4.36 48.2 55.4 61.99 53.48 4.2 47.71 31.36 3.06 26.71 31.1 36.7 29.66 2.46 26.7 92.43 10.59 77.31 91.5 111.48 89.41 8.61 77.82 76.33 9.43 63.3 75 94 76.5 7.75 65.45 66.85 10.58 56.04 66.35 91.98 66.83 89.5 56 80.6 10.54 66.7 80 99.95 80.54 821 68 45.14 7.25 35 44 57.99 43.89 6.4 34.53	9	HFH	66.18	7.18	57.5	66.2	74.98	65.06	6.83	57.32	64.8	72.78	*000.0
56.03 4.25 49 56 62.49 54.65 4.29 49.11 55.09 4.36 48.2 55.4 61.99 53.48 4.2 47.11 31.36 3.06 26.71 31.1 36.7 29.66 2.46 26.7 92.43 10.59 77.31 91.5 111.48 89.41 8.61 77.82 76.33 9.43 63.3 75 94 76.5 7.75 65.45 66.85 10.58 56.04 66.35 91.98 66.83 8.95 56 80.6 10.54 66.7 80 99.95 80.54 821 68 45.14 7.25 35 44 57.99 43.89 6.4 34.53	7	TTT	87.76	8.28	75.62	88.5	66	87.53	6.03	77.71	88	96.39	0.481
55.09 4.36 48.2 55.4 61.99 53.48 4.2 47.71 31.36 3.06 26.71 31.1 36.7 29.66 2.46 26.7 92.43 10.59 77.31 91.5 111.48 89.41 8.61 77.82 76.33 9.43 63.3 75 94 76.5 7.75 65.45 66.85 10.58 56.04 66.35 91.98 66.83 8.95 56 80.6 10.54 66.7 80 99.95 80.54 821 68 45.14 7.25 35 44 57.99 43.89 6.4 34.53	00	FR	56.03	4.25	49	99	62.49	54.65	4.29	49.11	54.8	60.56	*000.0
31.36 3.06 26.71 31.1 36.7 29.66 2.46 26.7 92.43 10.59 77.31 91.5 111.48 89.41 8.61 77.82 76.33 9.43 63.3 75 94 76.5 7.75 65.45 66.85 10.58 56.04 66.35 91.98 66.83 8.95 56 80.6 10.54 66.7 80 99.95 80.54 821 68 45.14 7.25 35 44 57.99 43.89 6.4 34.53	6	SR	55.09	4.36	48.2	55.4	61.99	53.48	4.2	47.71	53.6	59	*000.0
92.43 10.59 77.31 91.5 111.48 89.41 8.61 77.82 76.33 9.43 63.3 75 94 76.5 7.75 65.45 66.85 10.58 56.04 66.35 91.98 66.83 8.95 56 80.6 10.54 66.7 80 99.95 80.54 821 68 45.14 7.25 35 44 57.99 43.89 6.4 34.53	10	NC	31.36	3.06	26.71	31.1	36.7	29.66	2.46	26.7	29.6	33.8	*000.0
76.33 9.43 63.3 75 94 76.5 7.75 65.45 7 66.85 10.58 56.04 66.35 91.98 66.83 8.95 56 6 80.6 10.54 66.7 80 99.95 80.54 8.21 68 8 45.14 7.25 35 44 57.99 43.89 6.4 34.53 4		SC	92.43	10.59	77.31	91.5	111.48	89.41	8.61	77.82	68	102	*000.0
66.85 10.58 56.04 66.35 91.98 66.83 8.95 56 6 80.6 10.54 66.7 80 99.95 80.54 8.21 68 8 45.14 7.25 35 44 57.99 43.89 6.4 34.53 6	12	CC	76.33	9.43	63.3	75	94	76.5	7.75	65.45	92	88.18	0.252
80.6 10.54 66.7 80 99.95 80.54 8.21 68 8 45.14 7.25 35 44 57.99 43.89 6.4 34.53	13	WC	66.85	10.58	56.04	66.35	91.98	66.83	8.95	99	65.5	82.2	0.022*
45.14 7.25 35 44 57.99 43.89 6.4 34.53	4	BC	9.08	10.54	2.99	80	99.95	80.54	8.21	89	80	94.9	0.618
	15	HC	45.14	7.25	35	44	57.99	43.89	6.4	34.53	43.8	53.3	0.042*

Note: * significance < 0.05; SD, standard of deviation

OHR. Overhead reach; ST, Stature: EYH. eye height; Wh, Waist height; EBH. elbow height; HFH. Handfist height;
LLL. Lower leg length; FR, Forward reach; SR, side reach; NC, Neck circumference; SC, Shoulder circumference;
CC, Chest circumference; WC, Waist circumference; BC, Buttocks circumference; HC, Hip circumference.

npasar, there tudents concation Office iddle schools

he design of

ments of jun-

r City junior

d the number ools) Of the giunior high e used in this ples.
Medical Factor study partents we first leasurements nts following

surements of 2nd and 3rdwere carried Data in each comparable

	Total Indiana				- Annual Control	- Artist Service						
		Meun	SD	Sth	50th	95th	Menn	SD	Sth	Sorh	95th	
_	OHR	153.93	9.32	141.52	154	166.6	151.53	6.54	142.01	152.1	159.8	*0000.0
er.	ST	124.04	7,62	116.2	124	133,6	124,37	5,74	9'911	124.4	131.18	0.539
ve-	EVH	111.83	8.78	102.72	112.1	121.5	111.58	7.15	103.31	112.4	117.8	0.933
	SH	96.41	10.9	18'08	8'96	104.4	96.54	6.11	89.12	8.96	102.38	0.507
in:	WH	68.67	6.63	63.31	68.8	75.3	70.14	5.65	99	2,0	75.97	0.000%
	EBH	63.6	5.72	58.91	63.6	66,39	64,49	5.13	565	64.4	5.69	0.000*
To.	KH	48.12	55	41.11	98	54.2	45.99	3.53	40.3	94	50,78	00000
ne.	PH	40,62	3.93	36	40.5	45	39,35	2.39	35,4	39.4	42.7	0.000*
~	OSS	37,15	4.95	31	36.85	43.6	35,57	3/83	31	35.4	40	0.000*
0	EED	36.82	7,73	239	35,35	47.5	36.15	5.05	29.7	35.5	44.49	0.87
-	WW	22.52	4.16	17,61	21.7	29.8	21.88	3.54	17.21	21	29.2	0.002*
64	BW	29.75	3,65	24.61	29.3	36.5	303	4.49	25.51	30	35.66	0,044*
177	BKL	52.17	5.4	44.31	\$2.15	9.69	51.75	4.79	45,41	52.3	57.5	0.281
4	BPL	43.12	4.18	37.21	43	49.5	43,42	4.81	37.8	43.5	49.58	0.099
40	HT	12.78	2,68	9,2	12.2	17.5	12.98	4.75	9.41	12.6	16.99	0.378
9	b	17.75	3.2	14.21	17.2	23.19	18.72	2.61	14.91	18.5	22.79	0.000*
-	AT	18.12	3,73	13.81	17.3	25,39	17.57	3.46	13.3	17	23.8	0.047*
90	DEL	32.05	2.87	27.5	32,05	36.5	31.13	2.4	27.11	31.4	34,4	0.000*
5	EWL	29,33	4,22	22.8	29.2	36	28.77	3,44	23.5	28.6	34.3	0.037*
0	EFL	43.31	3,54	37.6	43.5	48.7	41.65	2.3	37.01	41.9	45.4	0.000*
	ETL	37.45	3.17	31.7	37.5	42.5	36.09	2.56	32.51	36	39,49	0.000
Ante: " su SHR, O.	igm/ficance < 0.0) verhoad reach; SI we helight; PH, Ps	5; SD, stans Z. Stativec; E. splitted heig	Ord of den TH, eye h hr; SSD, S	nithon ergylir; SH, hordider-sil	shoulder I	selghr; W7f, tance; EED,	Raist height, E.B.H., eibow hei E.Bon-elbow distance; 1FP,	EBH, elb	on height	sruidki. B	golic France wieble, BFF, Burtouck wieble	widelic

As from 15-dimensional indicators in the standing position, only three dimensions did not show significant results between the two genders, namely lower leg length, chest circumference and buttocks circumference. In contrast, in the sitting position, from 21 dimension indicators, only seven dimensions were not significantly different between the two genders (p>0.05). In the dimensions of eye height and stature, the standing position had significant results as compared with the sitting one (p<0.05).

DISCUSSION

The observation technique has been used in many studies, including the evaluation of the anthropo-

metric dir and they the arrang resentable Faculty, U

The mostly his average re mostly m similar re for compocluding w

How the only s Lack of d of student close supi to waste t in their bo metric me

Low p-value w Carmeli (racy and) fective leg disorders lift.

Yang with visce among the faced with the propor 9.2% of the cation, pro-

Sexu variables, in designi phologica (Davoudii

Reis dards, whi problems positions, popliteal I study, but genders.

The dimension mining the of seat (M even though metric dimensions of students in the classroom. In this study, 901 volunteered test subjects are recruited, and they are divided as 480 male and 421 female students. They were observed while they are sitting on the arrangement seat and standing for approximately in a one minute duration. The observations are representable reflecting the standard technique applied as usual in the Department of Physiology, Medical Faculty, Universitas Udayana.

The result of the comparison showed that all average male's body dimensions of male students are mostly higher than those of female ones. However, in several sitting dimensions, while not significant, the average results of woman are slightly higher than those of men (Fuster et al., 1998). Those dimensions are mostly measured in sitting shoulder height, buttock-popliteal length and hip thickness dimensions. The similar results had been showed by Chuan et al. (2010) when twenty-four body dimensions were evaluated for comparison. It was shown that more than 50 percent of the dimensions were significantly different, including weight, stature, eye height, sitting height, sitting eye height, sitting shoulder height and others.

However, thus focused on health status, e.g., body mass index, of the students as well as gender was the only socio-demographic characteristic used to compare the differences in health status of the students. Lack of discipline and time, self-control and social support were reported as important influencing factors of students' eating behaviour (Amin and Negm, 2017). Younger female students in Bali generally receive close supervision from their parents regarding their discipline in maintaining health by not playing outside to waste their energy at all. The tendency of the female students' metabolism also affects the fat deposits in their bodies, especially the buttock and thigh area. The fact whether this trend makes sitting anthropometric measurements appear to be women who have a higher value is also not yet clearly known.

Lower leg length (LLL), chest circumference (CC) and buttocks circumference (BC) had insignificant p-value within this study. The measurements of standing dimensions are performed statically. Khamis and Carmeli (2017) accentuated that more comprehensive evaluations such as gait analysis can enhance accuracy and provide a detailed valid and reliable evaluation of deviations and the resultant change in the effective leg length. There are still differences of opinions as to the situation of LLL plays in musculoskeletal disorders and the recognized extent of LLL necessary to warrant corrective support such as a heel or shoe lift.

Yang et al. (2013) had stated that BC were anthropometric measurements that show greater correlation with visceral adipose tissue thickness than BMI. That statement is in accordance with the real situations among the junior high school's students involved within the study. Nowadays, Indonesian teenagers are faced with a shifting in nutritional intake problem. It was reflected by Sari and Sartika (2019) that mentioned the proportion of the nutritional status of teenagers in Indonesia (2007) was malnourished (90.8%), while 9.2% of them had better nutritional status. Besides, it showed a significant relationship between sex, education, protein intake, smoking, exercise and parental nutritional status with them.

Sexual dimorphism is apparent for height and weight as well as for the remaining anthropometric variables, reflecting a greater body size for males and more adiposity for females. This data can be adjusted in designing ergonomic workplaces according to students. This data is also the useful concept of the morphological posture of both males and females and should be considered comfortable set for learning (Davoudiantalab et al., 2013).

Reis et al. (2012) presented that teenagers used school tools that did not meet their ergonomic standards, which favored the adoption of incorrect postures and contributed to the emergence of musculoskeletal problems that can interfere with their educational process. It basically occurred while they were in sitting positions. The significant results affected by the unusual sitting positions included sacro-popliteal length, popliteal height, hip width, lumbar support height and elbow and thigh height. In contrast, in the present study, buttock-knee length, buttock-popliteal length and hip thickness had insignificant meaning in both genders.

The elbow height in standing positions for the human is used for designing work levels. Sitting position dimensions are important for designing office workstations, desks and chairs and are also used for determining the sitting workspace as well as are important dimensions of chairs such as chair height and length of seat (Marfell-Jones, 2004). But, that is not commonly found in the case of the elbow height dimension even though the difference is equally significant between the two genders. In a standing position, the height

ot show signuttocks cirnsions were and stature, is 1.1 cm different from the males. Conversely, the mean elbow height of females has a higher value of 0.8 cm than that of males in the sitting dimension. However, the distance between the two elbows is indeed not significant with the greatest value in men.

Although, Reis et al. (2012) still demonstrated these dimensional growths cannot be considered as linear. During the growth phase, the body segment grows faster than the head, followed by the trunk and, after six years of age, lower limbs grow more significantly, continuing to grow faster than other body segments until the onset of puberty, which, in turn, the trunk grows faster again. This indicates that at the different school phases until the beginning of puberty, they should pay

more attention to the height of the seat. The popliteal height has an essential participation in defining the seat height. According to the results of the present study, the average of both genders approached the 95th percentile, which means that the growth patterns around the limbs in both genders are in the same habituation at their age. The stature appeared to be a similar value in the 50th percentile. It seems that the posture while sitting in both genders was similar. But, the following phase of growth would change their stature apparently as the 95th percentile had not been achieved that time (Abdrahman et al., 2018).

In relation to the evaluation of human posture, the establishment of the postures can be conducted through the observation method. In this study, the common postures of students while both standing and sitting on the environment will be used in the ergonomics assessment to indicate whether the current movement, seat and desk design is suitable in adapting to these different dimensions (Romli and Aminian, 2018). The resulting posture will tend to improve performance, efficiency and children's well-being (Gonçalves and Arezes, 2012).

A basic rule of ergonomics is that there is no such thing as an "average" person. However, providing a chair specifically designed for each individual is not practical. The only solution is to provide everyone with fully adjustable chairs that can accommodate a maximum range of people. Nonetheless, the chair and its adjustment remain constant for the majority of setups in a typical office environment (Jung, 2005). The adjustable range is normally from the 5th to 95th percentile of measurements (typically around 90% of the population; workers falling in the ranges of 5% of the shortest and the tallest will need custom-made chairs). In students, desks and chairs with inappropriate dimensions can cause poor sitting posture, neck and back pain, and increased stress at 5th lumbar vertebrae, resulting in a loss of interest in learning (Wang et al., 2018). In addition, this limiting study did not present the feedback from both students and teachers about the comfortable use of their equipment in the school to optimize the measurements.

CONCLUSION

Anthropometric measurements in junior high school students in Denpasar mostly have reliable dimensions while sitting and standing. Both genders have thinly significantly different results. Both dimensions provide significance values that are easy enough to determine how comfortable students will be when learning in the classroom later. Moreover, ergonomic workspaces need to be stressed early on in order to create an effective and efficient learning ecology.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND AUTHORSHIP

The authors stated that there is no conflict of interest with regard to this study. There is no funding used in the process of this research. IMM has contribution in the idea, structure, editing and measurements, while GW has contribution in analytical process, data sinthesis and format.

REFERENCES

Abdrahman, NI, Duwal, S, Yusoff, N and Kamil, N (2018) Anthroposietric measurements among four Asian countries in de-

Abemethy, od. by 388 Amin WSN

Amin, WS5 dergn Comp Chuan, TK,

Davoudiant comp Fuster, V, J

Gonçalves, 41: 87

Grandjean, Grand Jung, HS (2

DOI: Kamal, K (Olds,

Khamis, S a https: Marfell-Jon

Sports Norton, K () Sports

Nurmianto, sian] Pederson, D

tralian Reis, P. Mo seated

Romli, F an

Sari, RI and (Secon Healt) Life S

Sutjana, DP sian] Wang, T-J, J

of the Yang, T-K, of dis

421-4

value of 0.8

nsidered as trunk and, r body segit at the dif-

in defining coached the ne same hams that the hange their 018).

conducted anding and trent movetian, 2018). (Gonçalves

providing the everyone the chair and 2005). The 90% of the ade chairs). It and back Vang et al., where about

reliable dioth dimenill be when in order to

no funding surements, signing sitting and standing workstations. Sadbana, 43. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12046-017-0768-8.

Abernetby, P, Eden, B, Neill, M and Baines, L (2004) Anthropometry, Health and Body Composition. In: Anthropometrica, ed. by Norton, K, Olds, T and Australian Sports Commission, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney: pp. 365-388

Amin, WSM and Negm, ES (2017) 'Anthropometric Measurements and Food Consumption Pattern of Male and Female Undergraduates', The Qualitative Development of Higher Education Output in Egypt and Arab World in Light of Global Competitiveness, Mansoura University, Egypt, 12-13 April 2017, pp. 628-652.

Chain, TK, Hartono, M and Kumar, N (2010) Anthropometry of the Singaporean and Indonesian populations. Int. J. Inchastrial Ergonomics, 40: 757-766. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgon.2010.05.001

Davoudiantalab, A, Meshkani, M. Neurian, S and Mofidi, A (2013) Anthropometric dimensions of Immian male workers and comparison with three Asian countries. Int. J. Occup. Hygiene, 5: 166-171

Fuster, V., Jerez, A and Ortega, A (1998) Anthropometry and strength relationship: male-female differences. Anthropologischer Anxiger, 56: 49-56.

Gonçalves, MA and Arezes, PM (2012) Postural assessment of school children: an input for the design of farniture. Work, 41: 876-80. DOI: 10.3233/WOR-2012-0257-876.

Grandjean, E (1997) The design of workstation. In: Fitting the task to the human, 5th edition, ed. by Kroemer, KHE and Grandjean, E, Taylor and Francis, London: pp. 36-77

Jung, HS (2005) A prototype of an adjustable table and an adjustable chair for schools. Int. J. Int. Ergonomic 35: 955-969, DOI: 10.1016/j.ergon.2005.04.007.

Kamal, K (2004) Ergonomics: application of anthropometry to workplace design. In Anthropometrica, ed. by Norton, K, Olds, T and Australian Sports Commission, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney: pp. 259-283

Khamis, S and Carmeli, E (2017) A new concept for measuring leg length discrepancy. J. orthopositics, 14: 276–280. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jor.2017.03.008

Marfell-Jones, M (2004) Essential anatomy for anthropometrists. In Anthropometrico, ed. by Norton, K. Olds, T and Assuralian Sports Commission, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney: pp. 4-24

Norton, K. (2004) Measurement techniques in anthropometry. In Anthropometrica, ed. by Norton, K., Olds, T and Australian Sports Commission, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney: pp. 25-73

Nurmianto, E (2004) Antropometri: kalibrasi dimensi tubuh manusia. Candimas Metropole, Jakarta; pp. 48-91 [In Indonesian]

Pederson, D and Gore, C (1996) Anthropometry measurement error. In Anthropometrica, ed. by Norton, K., Olds, T and Australian Sports Commission, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney: pp. 77-96

Reis, P. Moro, AR, Do Silva, J. Paschourelli, L. Nunes Sobrinho, F and Peres, L. (2012) Anthropometric aspects of body sented in school. Work, 41: pp. 907-914. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3233/wor-2012-0262-907

Ramli, F and Aminian NO (2018) Ergosomic analysis of aircraft possenger seat: a Malaysian case study. Im. J. Pure and Appl. Mathematics, 119: 3749-3754.

Sari, RI and Surtika, RAD (2019) "Factors Associated with Nutritional Status of Adolescents Age 12-15 Years in Indonesia (Secondary Data Analysis of RISKESDAS 2007)" in The 2nd International Meeting of Public Health 2016: Public Health Perspective of Surtainable Development Goals: Challenges and Opportunities in Axia Pacific Region, KnE. Life Sciences, pages 359–366. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18502/kls.v4i10.3806

Sutjana, DP and Susila, IGN (2010) Pediman penguharan antropometri. IAIFI Komisuriat, Denpasar; pp. 1-7 [In Indonesian]

Wung, T-J, Lin, R and Lin, C-L (2018) Concept Model and Applied Design of Height-Adjustable Desks and Chairs, Journal of the Science of Design: 2 (1): 67-76.

Yang, T-K, Yang, H-J, Lee, L-M and Liao, C (2013) Body mass index and buttock circumference are independent predictors of disintegration failure in extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy for ureteral calculi. J Formosan Medical Assoc: 112: 421-425. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfma.2012.02.004.