ARTICLE IN PRESS

JSR-01400; No of Pages 10

Journal of Safety Research xxx (2017) xxx-xxx



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Safety Research

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jsr



The need for detailed gender-specific occupational safety analysis

Fernanda Cruz Rios, * Wai K. Chong, David Grau

School of Sustainable Engineering and the Built Environment, Arizona State University, 660 S College Ave., Tempe, AZ 85281, United States

4

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 14 January 2017

Received in revised form 12 March 2017

Accepted 6 June 2017

10 Available online xxxx

29

Keywords:

30 Gender equality31 Safety

32 Occupational health

33 Women

34 Construction

ABSTRACT

The female workers are growing in number in the United States. Therefore, the occupational health and 16 safety entities must start to analyze gender-specific data related to every industry, especially to nontraditional 17 occupations. Women working in nontraditional jobs are often exposed to extreme workplace hazards. These 18 women have their safety and health threatened because there are no adequate policies to mitigate gender-19 specific risks such as discrimination and harassment. Employers tend to aggravate this situation because they 20 often fail to provide proper reporting infrastructure and support. According to past studies, women suffered 21 from workplace injuries and illnesses that were less prominent among men. Statistics also confirmed that men 22 violence and murders by personal acquaintances were significantly higher among women. In this paper, the 24 authors analyze prior public data on fatal and nonfatal injuries to understand why we need to differentiate 25 genders when analyzing occupational safety and health issues. Also, the reader will become aware of the current 26 lack of data and knowledge about injuries and illnesses separated by gender and industry.

© 2017 National Safety Council and Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. 28

36 37 **O**6

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48 49

50

52 53

54

55 56

57

59

60 61

62

63

07

1. Introduction

The global labor force had 126% more women in 1997 compared to 1960 (World Bank, 2001), and 47% (68.6 million) of the U.S. labor force in 2014 were women (U.S. Department of Labor, 2015b). Projections indicate that the number of female workers will surpass 92 million by 2050 in the United States (U.S. Department of Labor, 2002). Although women represent almost half of the national workforce, they are underrepresented in some industries and occupations.

Workers are often exposed to occupational safety and health hazards regardless of gender. However, men and women deal with different characteristics of such exposure risks (Bond, Punnett, Pyle, Cazeca, & Cooperman, 2004; Messing et al., 2009; Messing & Mager Stellman, 2006; Messing & Ostlin, 2006). Hoskins (2005) showed that women suffered from workplace injuries, illnesses, and fatalities that were particular to the gender. According to Messing and Mager Stellman (2006), several researchers have argued that we know less about occupational health issues in women than in men. The World Health Organization published a report with an extensive list of recommendations for sex-disaggregated data collection and analysis for occupational exposures, illnesses and injuries (Messing & Ostlin, 2006). Still, we fail to understand gender-specific healthy and safety issues. The U.S. Department of Labor's gender-specific safety and health data (published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics — BLS) are not comprehensive enough to provide extensive knowledge on the issues (Sugerman, Jenkins, & Osorio, 1999). BLS statistics do not breakdown

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: fcrios@asu.edu (F.C. Rios).

the data into gender-specific details nor describe event and sectors 64 that are helpful to exploring gender-related health and safety issues. 65

In the United States, a study on workplace violence (WPV) has also 66 evidenced a gap between male and female workers. The authors proved 67 that WPV is one of the major causes of female workers' injuries but not 68 male workers' injuries (U.S. Department of Labor, 2015a; Tiesman, 69 Gurka, Konda, Coben, & Amandus, 2012). Even as WPV is considered a 70 major injury category, less than 30% of the surveyed employers had a 71 formal policy against it (U.S. Department of Labor, 2005).

We need to analyze gender-specific data to understanding health 73 and safety gaps between female and male workers. Policy-makers will 74 also benefit from gender-specific data analyses by creating policies 75 and inspiring actions that contemplate the differences between men 76 and women at the workplace. Women working in nontraditional 77 occupations will yield even greater benefits from gender-specific poli-78 cies. The U.S. Department of Labor defines nontraditional occupations 79 as any occupations in which women comprise less than 25% of the 80 workforce (U.S. Department of Labor, n.d.). Health and safety data do 81 not accurately represent such minority. Construction, mining, and 82 transportation industries have several examples of nontraditional occu- 83 pations for women. Women account for less than 10% of the workforce 84 in the construction industry (less than any other industry), and most of 85 them work in managerial and office occupations. Less than 3% of these 86 women work in the trades (EEOC, 2015). The injuries data in the 87 construction industry thus do not accurately represent the portion of 88 female casualties on site. Female workers in nontraditional industries 89 are very few, and studies and data on women's occupational safety 90 and health in these occupations are even fewer. Additionally, owners 91 and other stakeholders, including safety and health regulatory agencies, 92

L-man dadress, ichos@a

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2017.06.002

0022-4375/© 2017 National Safety Council and Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Please cite this article as: Rios, F.C., et al., The need for detailed gender-specific occupational safety analysis, *Journal of Safety Research* (2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2017.06.002

93 94

95

96 97

98 99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

119

120

121

122

123

124

125 126

127

128

129 130

131

132 133

134 135

136

137

08

139 140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

do not appropriately address workplace challenges that are unique to women (Moir, Thomson, & Christa, 2011).

2. Objectives

In this study, we aim to enlighten the differences between male and female workers when it comes to workplace injuries. Policy-makers and regulatory entities need gender-specific data analyses such as the ones in this paper to align regulations and policies with gender gaps in healthy and safety. However, the U.S. Department of Labor failed to provide detailed gender-specific information in its occupational safety and health public database, and these limitations were addressed in the final sections of this paper.

A brief literature review on women's occupational safety and health is presented in the first section of this paper. We focused on nontraditional industries and gave more emphasis to construction occupations because all the authors of this paper have a background in the construction industry. Moreover, gendered studies are rarer in nontraditional research fields when compared to social sciences, for example. The second part of this paper focuses on the data analysis on gender-based fatal and nonfatal occupational injuries and workplace violence (WPV) documented from all industries using the most recent data published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). The WPV data include homicides and nonfatal physical assaults. We analyzed the data according to the following characteristics: 1. Characteristics of injuries; 2. Characteristics of events; 3. Types of aggressors; and 4. Industrial sectors. The analyses are used to show the importance of separating detailed information on workplace safety and health hazards between female and male workers.

3. Women's participation in the labor force

The total labor force in the U.S. has dramatically increased because of the substantial growth of the female workforce after the 1960s (U.S. Department of Labor, 2002). The World Bank registered a similar rise globally, as women's participation in the workforce was raised by 126% between 1960 and 1997 (World Bank, 2001). Recent World Bank's data showed that women accounted for 44% of the estimated global working population in all sectors excluding agriculture. However, this number varied from countries to countries. The rate of female workers is as low as 13% in Oatar and Saudi Arabia, and as high as 54% in Latvia and Moldova. The United States ranked 36th position out of the 99 listed countries. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) predicted that by 2050, female workforce will rise from 68.6 million (2014) to 92 million (U.S. Department of Labor, 2002).

Although men and women have similar shares of the labor force in the U.S., the earnings among male workforce are generally higher than the women's for the same occupation (U.S. Department of Labor, 2015b). A full-time female employee earned 82% of the income compared with the equivalent full-time male employee in 2013 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014a, 2014b). Because of this difference, women sometimes apply for blue collar, well-paid jobs. However, employers still avoid to recruit female workforce to nontraditional occupations such as construction, engineering, mining and transportationrelated jobs.

4. Gender considerations in workplace safety

Workers of any gender are exposed to occupational safety and health risks. Such risks increase from increasing work intensity, repetitive movements, extreme temperatures, psychological stresses, and the presence of hazardous conditions. If a worker's condition changes (e.g. health issues and pregnancy), his or her potential workplace hazards can also increase. However, male and female have biological, psychological, and environmental vulnerability differences and thus, their bodies and minds respond differently to diverse conditions. Despite such differences, it is relevant to state that gender alone does 153 not determine safety and health hazards but the gender interaction 154 with social, biological, and environmental factors (Messing & Ostlin, 155 2006). The types of exposures facing female and male also differ. For 156 example, women's average body frame and size are generally smaller 157 than men's. As a result, women were neglected by many ergonomic 158 solutions and the size of personal protective equipment (PPE) and 159 tools (NYCOSH, 2014). Additionally, men and women faced different 160 types of psychological stresses. Women were subjected to more 161 incidents of harassment and discrimination, especially in nontraditional 162 occupations as some research highlighted (NYCOSH, 2014; Goldenhar & 163 Sweeney, 1996; Sugerman et al., 1999). On the other hand, men 164 and women are vulnerable to different types of toxins, men on toxins 165 that affect sperm quality, while women those affecting pregnancy or 166 breastfeeding (Sugerman et al., 1999; NYCOSH, 2014). Research also 167 showed that female workers suffered from different types of occupa- 168 tional hazards (Hoskins, 2005). More importantly, policy-makers lack 169 resources and research to address the needs of occupational safety 170 and health for women. Sugerman et al. (1999) pointed out that the 171 BLS would make a substantial contribution to the improvement of safety 172 and health policies focused on women whether they published detailed 173 gender-specific data. 174

Women also had their safety and health compromised by the malefemale wage gap. Lower comparable wage has been cited as a source of 176 stress among women, especially among single mothers (Messing & 177 Ostlin, 2006). Women often venture into blue-collar jobs for better 178 wages because of the low wage in occupations that traditionally hire 179 women. Some examples include engineering, technicians and trades. 180 While these higher paying occupations are more attractive and a diverse 181 workforce is a positive change, the industries are not prepared to 182 address the health and safety differences between the traditionally 183 men workforce and women workforce. The health and safety gaps will 184 become increasingly obvious as more women take up these occupa- 185 tions. "New" concerns, such as harassment and discrimination, may 186 become key concerns, and there could be a shift from traditional 187 physical safety and health issues to psychological stress and gender- 188 specific productivity and job satisfaction related safety and health issues 189 (Bond et al., 2004). Work related distractions and self-imposed injuries, 190 and workplace violence (e.g. verbal threats, rapes, or physical assaults) 191 could become more acute.

192

193

5. Workplace violence against women

The U.S. Department of Labor (2015a) found that the second leading 194 cause of workplace non-fatal and fatal injuries behind transportation- 195 related accidents in the United States is workplace violence (WPV). 196 According to the BLS, 15,980 employees (67% female) have suffered 197 trauma from nonfatal WPV in 2014 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014). 198 However, studies on WPV among women are extremely limited 199 (Tiesman et al., 2012). There are four main WPV categories, namely, 200 criminal intent (type I), customer/client (type II), co-worker (type III), 201 and personal relations (type IV). Studies failed to analyze gender- 202 specific data when found that "type IV" did not occur frequently in the 203 job site (Tiesman et al., 2012). Tiesman et al. (2012) analyzed workplace 204 homicides on female victims for all industries using 2003-2008 CFOI 205 data and found that 33% of women were killed by personal relations 206 (type IV) in the workplace, most of them in public buildings and parking 207 lots. Yet less than 30% of the American employers have formal programs 208 or policies that address workplace violence (U.S. Department of Labor, 209 2005). WPV not only represents a safety hazard for employees, but 210 also a financial risk for employers. In 2014, 23% of the nonfatal WPV 211 required more than 31 days away from work to recover (Bureau of Q9 Labor Statistics, 2014), and such lost days cost money to the businesses. 213 For example, employers had to pay \$400 million dollars in 2002 due to 214 direct and indirect costs of assaults and violent acts (CDC/NIOSH, 2006). 215

دريافت فورى ب متن كامل مقاله

ISIArticles مرجع مقالات تخصصی ایران

- ✔ امكان دانلود نسخه تمام متن مقالات انگليسي
 - ✓ امكان دانلود نسخه ترجمه شده مقالات
 - ✓ پذیرش سفارش ترجمه تخصصی
- ✓ امکان جستجو در آرشیو جامعی از صدها موضوع و هزاران مقاله
 - ✓ امكان دانلود رايگان ۲ صفحه اول هر مقاله
 - ✔ امکان پرداخت اینترنتی با کلیه کارت های عضو شتاب
 - ✓ دانلود فوری مقاله پس از پرداخت آنلاین
- ✓ پشتیبانی کامل خرید با بهره مندی از سیستم هوشمند رهگیری سفارشات