

1 Estimating the burden of United States workers exposed to infection or disease: a key factor in  
2 containing risk of COVID-19 infection

3

4 Marissa G. Baker<sup>1</sup>\*, Trevor K. Peckham<sup>1</sup>, and Noah S. Seixas<sup>1</sup>

5

6 <sup>1</sup>Department of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences, University of Washington,  
7 Seattle, WA, USA

8 \*Corresponding author

9 Email: [bakermg@uw.edu](mailto:bakermg@uw.edu) (MGB)

10

11

12

13

14

## 15 Abstract

### 16 Introduction

17 With the global spread of COVID-19, there is a compelling public health interest in quantifying  
18 who is at increased risk of disease. Occupational characteristics, such as interfacing with the  
19 public and being in close quarters with other workers, not only put workers at high risk for  
20 disease, but also make them a nexus of disease transmission to the community. This can  
21 further be exacerbated through presenteeism, the term used to describe the act of coming to  
22 work despite being symptomatic for disease. Understanding which occupational groups are  
23 exposed to infection and disease in the workplace can help to inform public health risk response  
24 and management for COVID-19, and subsequent infectious disease outbreaks.

### 25 Methods

26 To estimate the burden of United States workers exposed to infection and disease in the  
27 workplace, national employment data (by Standard Occupational Classification) maintained by  
28 the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) was merged with BLS O\*NET survey data, which ranks  
29 occupations with particular physical, ergonomic, and structural exposures. For this analysis,  
30 occupations reporting exposure to infection or disease more than once a month was the focus.

### 31 Results

32 Based on our analyses, approximately 10% (14.4 M) of United States workers are employed in  
33 occupations where exposure to disease or infection occurs at least once per week.  
34 Approximately 18.4% (26.7 M) of all United States workers are employed in occupations where  
35 exposure to disease or infection occurs at least once per month. While the majority of exposed  
36 workers are employed in healthcare sectors, other occupational sectors also have high  
37 proportions of exposed workers. These include protective service occupations (e.g. police  
38 officers, correctional officers, firefighters), office and administrative support occupations (e.g.  
39 couriers and messengers, patient service representatives), education occupations (e.g.  
40 preschool and daycare teachers), community and social services occupations (community  
41 health workers, social workers, counselors), and even construction and extraction occupations  
42 (e.g. plumbers, septic tank installers, elevator repair).

43

44

## 45 **Conclusions**

46 The large number of persons employed in a wide variety of occupations with frequent exposure  
47 to infection and disease underscore the importance of all workplaces developing risk response  
48 plans for COVID-19. This work also serves as an important reminder that the workplace is a key  
49 locus for public health interventions, which could protect both workers and the communities they  
50 serve.

51

## 52 **Introduction**

53 As COVID-19 spreads globally, there is public health importance in characterizing the role of the  
54 workplace in disease transmission, given the amount of time people spend at work, and the  
55 variety of work tasks that could promote the spread of infectious disease (e.g., interfacing with  
56 customers, patients, and co-workers; preparing food). Presenteeism, reporting to work despite  
57 being symptomatic for disease, commonly occurs in the workplace, and can contribute to the  
58 transmission of infectious disease, and potentially to the spread of epidemics or pandemics  
59 (1,2). One analysis examined the role of workplace transmission in the 2009 H1N1 pandemic,  
60 estimating that about 8 million employees in the United States worked while infected, and that  
61 these workers may have caused the infection of as many as 7 million of their co-workers (3).

62 The United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has published interim  
63 guidance for businesses and employers to plan and respond to COVID-19, including guidance  
64 for actively encouraging employees to stay home, separating sick employees, encouraging  
65 respiratory and hand hygiene for all employees, performing environmental cleaning, and  
66 providing specific advice for employees who need to travel (4). However, the best guidance for  
67 workplaces will be geared to be specific to a particular occupational sector that could be  
68 exposed to COVID-19. It is known that those working in healthcare settings are at increased risk  
69 for exposure to infectious diseases such as COVID-19, but may also have better infectious  
70 disease protection plans than other occupational settings. In 2007, Rebmann et al. (5) surveyed  
71 633 Infection and Prevention Control Professionals that work at hospitals to understand the  
72 infection control policies at hospitals across the country. Rebmann et al. found that most  
73 hospitals employ infection control professionals, have a health care worker prioritization plan for  
74 vaccines or antivirals, and have plans in place to stockpile N95 respirators and medication, all of  
75 which could help control exposure for workers in the hospital. While important, these measures

76 may be inadequate for the effective prevention of infection for such high risk occupations (6).  
77 Other occupational groups which may have more sporadic exposure to infection or disease may  
78 not have the same level of planning, or even think that an infection disease control plan is  
79 warranted for their workplace. Therefore, it is important to understand which occupations could  
80 be exposed to infection or disease in order to encourage these occupational sectors to develop  
81 and implement an infectious disease response plan for disease outbreaks such as COVID-19.

82 While several groups have broadly characterized the burden of occupational injury or illness (7–  
83 9) fewer groups have characterized the burden of occupational exposure, and rarely do these  
84 burden of exposure estimates include exposure to biologic agents, disease, or infection in the  
85 workplace (10,11). Montano (2014) systematically reviewed which occupational groups in  
86 Europe have risk of exposure to biological agents, finding workers in healthcare, biotechnology,  
87 agriculture, elementary education, craft work, operators, and the armed forces were exposed to  
88 various pathogens; the number of workers exposed and frequency of exposure was not  
89 reported (12). Focusing on outcome as opposed to exposure, Anderson et al. characterized the  
90 distribution of influenza-like illness (ILI) by occupation in Washington state, finding janitors,  
91 cleaners, and janitors more likely to catch ILI (13).

92 Understanding the burden of occupational exposure to infection and disease, including how  
93 many workers are potentially exposed and what occupations they work in, allows for upstream  
94 prevention measures, such as workplaces developing appropriate infectious disease response  
95 plans, integrating infectious disease trainings into other workplace trainings, and beginning to  
96 develop workplace policies that can support a workforce potentially exposed to COVID-19. This  
97 will help reduce the transmission of infectious disease from and within the workplace.

98 Previously, state-level employment data were utilized to estimate the number of workers  
99 exposed to a host of occupational exposures in Federal Region X (WA, OR, ID, AK), spanning  
100 chemical, physical, ergonomic, and psychosocial hazards (14). Here, utilizing the same data  
101 analysis methods as previously detailed in Doubleday et al., the number of workers across the  
102 United States exposed to disease or infection at work more than once a month is estimated. We  
103 believe this analysis is valuable for informing risk assessments and protective actions that  
104 occupational sectors can take during infectious disease outbreaks, such as COVID-19.

105

106

## 107 Methods

108 Two sources of data were utilized for this analysis, and are detailed below.

109 United States employment data was obtained from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS)  
110 Occupational Employment Statistics database (15). The most current employment data at the  
111 time of analysis was from May 2018, and is organized by 2010 Standard Occupational  
112 Classification codes (2010 SOC). SOC codes are hierarchical, ranging from two-digits (Major  
113 Group Code) to six digits (Detailed Occupation Code), with the six-digit codes being the most  
114 detailed (16).

115 To estimate exposure to disease and infection in the workplace, we used data within the O\*NET  
116 database. O\*NET is a job characterization tool, with rich information on tasks performed, skills  
117 needed, and job characteristics for different occupations, in order to inform job seekers or  
118 researchers (17). As nearly 600 six-digit SOC occupations are updated each year, the entire  
119 O\*NET database is completely refreshed every few years (18). Between 2001 and 2011, nearly  
120 160,000 employees from 125,000 workplaces had responded to O\*NET questionnaires, and no  
121 SOC codes are missing from the data (19).

122 To characterize risk of workplace exposure to infectious disease, we used the following O\*NET  
123 question: "How often does this job require exposure to disease/infections?" Respondents could  
124 select from the following multiple choice answers: Never; Once a year or more but not every  
125 month; Once a month or more but not every week; Once a week or more but not every day;  
126 Every day (20). Within O\*NET, these data are converted to a 0-100 score, representing  
127 weighted-average frequency or intensity of the metric for each SOC code. For this analysis,  
128 occupations were retained that had a score of 50-100, representing exposure to  
129 disease/infection more than once a month. SOC codes were merged with the national  
130 employment data to calculate the total number of workers employed in the occupations with  
131 exposure to disease/infection at more than once a month.

132 All data analysis was conducted using the statistical software package R version 3.6.3.

133

134

## 135 Results

136 As of May 2018, there were a total of 144.7 million persons employed in the United States in  
137 employer-employee arrangements counted by BLS. Of these 144.7 million workers, an  
138 estimated 18.4% (26,669,810) were employed in occupations where exposure to disease or  
139 infection occurs more than once a month. As of May 2018, 10% (14,425,070) of the United  
140 States workforce was employed in occupations where exposure to disease or infection occurs at  
141 least once a week. Table 1 summarizes the major occupational sectors (two-digit SOC) that  
142 have detailed occupations (six-digit SOC) exposed to infection or disease more than once a  
143 month, and the number of workers this represents. Both Healthcare Practitioner and Technical  
144 Occupations, and Healthcare Support Occupations have more than 90% of workers exposed  
145 more than once a month, and more than 75% of workers exposed more than once a week.  
146 Other notable major occupation groups with high proportion of exposure are Protective Service  
147 Occupations (52% exposed more than once a month, including police officers, firefighters,  
148 transportation security screeners), Personal Care and Service Occupations (52% exposed more  
149 than once a month, including childcare workers, nannies, personal care aides), and Production  
150 Occupations (60% exposed more than once a month, including laundry and dry cleaning  
151 workers, wastewater treatment operators, dental technicians). The 16% of office and  
152 administrative support occupations with exposure to disease or infection more than once a  
153 month are patient representatives, couriers and messengers, and medical secretaries.

154

## 155 Discussion

156 During an infectious disease outbreak, the workplace can play an important role in both  
157 spreading the disease (21,22) and helping to stop the spread of disease through workplace  
158 practices and policies (23,24). Understanding the wide range of occupations that could be  
159 exposed to infection or disease due to work activities is important for planning risk management  
160 and communication to workers, in addition to prioritizing workplace response plans. This brief  
161 report estimates occupational groups that face increased risk of potential exposure to an  
162 infection or disease; however, estimates of the number of workers who fall ill due to such  
163 exposures are not possible in this analysis. However, a primary goal of public health, especially  
164 in the face of a global pandemic, is to prevent the spread of disease. Therefore, understanding  
165 who is potentially exposed is an important first step in being able to enact risk reduction

166 strategies prior to disease transmission occurring, and illness manifesting. Therefore, the results  
167 reported here have important public health implications.

168 Some limitations must be noted. O\*NET data were generated from self-reported subjective  
169 questionnaires and therefore are subject to bias and misclassification. Respondents may not  
170 realize they are exposed to infection or disease at work unless they are in a workplace where  
171 these hazards are communicated to them and protective equipment is provided (e.g., healthcare  
172 sectors) leading to potential differential misclassification across occupational groups.  
173 Additionally, information from the O\*NET database is applied at the occupation-level, and  
174 therefore does not account for within-job exposure variation (25).

175 BLS employment estimates do not capture data on all workers in the United States, including  
176 self-employed, undocumented, contingent, and domestic workers. These workers may be  
177 uniquely at risk to exposures to work because due to limited ability to take time off if they or a  
178 family member is ill (26). In Sweden and Norway, higher rates of presenteeism (coming to work  
179 when sick) were found among low-income and immigrant workers (27).

180 Access to paid leave, which could ameliorate the financial burden of staying home while sick,  
181 varies substantially by occupation, industry, employer, location, and worker sociodemographic  
182 profile (e.g., race/ethnicity) (28,29). Workers without access to paid leave have higher rates of  
183 presenteeism, and are less likely to receive preventative health services such as getting flu  
184 shots (30). Occupational sector also influences rates of presenteeism, with studies from various  
185 countries showing higher rates of presenteeism among workers in healthcare, public service,  
186 and educational sectors, as these essential services often do not have substitute workers  
187 available (31–33). Indeed, a recent systematic review identified occupation type as one of the  
188 strongest predictors of presenteeism (1). As many of these sectors are already at risk of  
189 exposure to disease due to work activities, it is important that disease response plans for these  
190 sectors include not only control methods to reduce exposures at work, but also contingency  
191 plans to ensure sick workers do not come back to work with disease. This could be  
192 accomplished through cross-training, providing extra paid sick leave during this time, ensuring  
193 flexible working conditions, and ensuring substitute workers are identified to fill in if essential  
194 workers fall ill.

195 In conclusion, our analysis shows that a large proportion of the United States workforce, across  
196 a variety of occupational sectors, are exposed to disease or infection at work more than once a  
197 month. These are workers that public health should consider especially at risk to exposure to

198 COVID-19. However, it should be noted that there are many other workers that could also be  
199 uniquely at risk to exposure to COVID-19, or encourage the spread of COVID-19, such as  
200 workers who are not given access to flexible working, workers who do not feel they can take  
201 sick time if they or a family member is sick, workers who do not have access to paid sick leave,  
202 or workers that perform essential services and do not have access to substitute workers. Work  
203 presented here underscores the importance of all workplaces developing sector-specific  
204 response plans to keep employees safe, halt the transmission of disease in the workplace, and  
205 ensure sick workers do not have to come to work. It also serves as a reminder that the  
206 workplace is an important locus for public health interventions, that can affect both the workers  
207 and the community.

208

## 209 Acknowledgments

210 The authors gratefully acknowledge Annie Doubleday for developing the R code that supported  
211 this analysis.

## 212 References

- 213 1. Webster RK, Liu R, Karimullina K, Hall I, Amlot R, Rubin GJ. A systematic review of  
214 infectious illness Presenteeism: prevalence, reasons, and risk factors. *BMC Public*  
215 *Health*. 2019;19(799).
- 216 2. Bergström G, Bodin L, Hagberg J, Aronsson G, Josephson M. Sickness presenteeism  
217 today, sickness absenteeism tomorrow? A prospective study on sickness presenteeism  
218 and future sickness absenteeism. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2009;
- 219 3. Drago R, Miller K. Sick at work: infected employees in the workplace during the H1N1  
220 pandemic. *Inst Women's Policy Res*. 2010;B264.
- 221 4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Interim Guidance for Businesses and  
222 Employers to Plan and Respond to Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) [Internet].  
223 2019 [cited 2020 Feb 26]. Available from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/specific-groups/guidance-business-response.html)  
224 [ncov/specific-groups/guidance-business-response.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/specific-groups/guidance-business-response.html)
- 225 5. Rebmann T, Wilson R, LaPointe S, Russell B, Moroz D. Hospital infectious disease  
226 emergency preparedness: A 2007 survey of infection control professionals. *Am J Infect*  
227 *Control*. 2009;
- 228 6. Brousseau LM. Are powered air purifying respirators a solution for protecting healthcare  
229 workers from emerging aerosol transmissible disease? *Ann Work Expo Heal*. 2020;In  
230 press.
- 231 7. Rushton L, Hutchings SJ, Fortunato L, Young C, Evans GS, Brown T, et al. Occupational  
232 cancer burden in Great Britain. *Br J Cancer*. 2012;
- 233 8. Purdue MP, Hutchings SJ, Rushton L, Silverman DT. The proportion of cancer  
234 attributable to occupational exposures. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2015;
- 235 9. Concha-Barrientos M, Nelson DI, Fingerhut M, Driscoll T, Leigh J. The global burden due  
236 to occupational injury. *Am J Ind Med*. 2005;
- 237 10. Peters S, Carey RN, Driscoll TR, Glass DC, Benke G, Reid A, et al. The Australian work  
238 exposures study: Prevalence of occupational exposure to diesel engine exhaust. *Ann*  
239 *Occup Hyg*. 2015;
- 240 11. Driscoll TR, Carey RN, Peters S, Glass DC, Benke G, Reid A, et al. The Australian Work

- 241 Exposures Study: Prevalence of Occupational Exposure to Formaldehyde. *Ann Occup*  
242 *Hyg.* 2015;
- 243 12. Montano D. Chemical and biological work-related risks across occupations in Europe: A  
244 review. *Journal of Occupational Medicine and Toxicology.* 2014.
- 245 13. Anderson NJ, Bonauto DK, Fan ZJ, Spector JT. Distribution of Influenza-Like Illness (ILI)  
246 by Occupation in Washington State, September 2009-August 2010. *PLoS One.* 2012;
- 247 14. Doubleday A, Baker MG, Lavoué J, Siemiatycki J, Seixas NS. Estimating the population  
248 prevalence of traditional and novel occupational exposures in Federal Region X. *Am J Ind*  
249 *Med.* 2019;
- 250 15. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Occupational Employment Statistics [Internet]. [cited  
251 2020 Feb 25]. Available from: <https://www.bls.gov/oes/home.htm>
- 252 16. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2010 SOC User Guide [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2020 Feb  
253 25]. Available from: [https://www.bls.gov/soc/soc\\_2010\\_user\\_guide.pdf](https://www.bls.gov/soc/soc_2010_user_guide.pdf)
- 254 17. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. O\*NET Online [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2020 Feb 25].  
255 Available from: <https://www.onetonline.org>
- 256 18. O\*NET Resource Center. O\*NET Occupational Summary Update [Internet]. 2018 [cited  
257 2020 Feb 25]. Available from: <https://www.onetcenter.org/dataUpdates.html>
- 258 19. U.S. Department of Labor. O\*NET Data Collection Program [Internet]. 2012 [cited 2020  
259 Feb 25]. Available from:  
260 [https://www.onetcenter.org/sl\\_files/omb2011/Supporting\\_StatementA.pdf](https://www.onetcenter.org/sl_files/omb2011/Supporting_StatementA.pdf)
- 261 20. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. O\*NET Questionnaire [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2020 Feb  
262 25]. Available from: <https://www.onetcenter.org/questionnaires.html>
- 263 21. Kurgat EK, Sexton JD, Garavito F, Reynolds A, Contreras RD, Gerba CP, et al. Impact of  
264 a hygiene intervention on virus spread in an office building. *Int J Hyg Environ Health.*  
265 2019;
- 266 22. Danovaro-Holliday MC, LeBaron CW, Allensworth C, Raymond R, Borden TG, Murray  
267 AB, et al. A large rubella outbreak with spread from the workplace to the community. *J*  
268 *Am Med Assoc.* 2000;
- 269 23. Kumar S, Grefenstette JJ, Galloway D, Albert SM, Burke DS. Policies to reduce influenza

- 270 in the workplace: Impact assessments using an agent-based model. *Am J Public Health*.  
271 2013;
- 272 24. Edwards CH, Tomba GS, De Blasio BF. Influenza in workplaces: Transmission, workers'  
273 adherence to sick leave advice and European sick leave recommendations. *European*  
274 *Journal of Public Health*. 2016.
- 275 25. Cifuentes M, Boyer J, Lombardi DA, Punnett L. Use of O\*NET as a job exposure matrix:  
276 A literature review. *Am J Ind Med*. 2010;53(9).
- 277 26. Biron C, Brun JP, Ivers H, Cooper C. At work but ill: Psychosocial work environment and  
278 well-being determinants of presenteeism propensity. *Journal of Public Mental Health*.  
279 2006.
- 280 27. Johansen V. Sickness presenteeism in Norway and Sweden. *Nord J Soc Res*. 2013;
- 281 28. O'Connor R, Hayes J, Gault B. Paid sick days access varies by race/ethnicity, sexual  
282 orientation, and job characteristics. *Inst Women's Policy Res*. 2014;B337.
- 283 29. Siqueira CE, Gaydos M, Monforton C, Slatin C, Borkowski L, Dooley P, et al. Effects of  
284 social, economic, and labor policies on occupational health disparities. *American Journal*  
285 *of Industrial Medicine*. 2014.
- 286 30. DeRigne LA, Stoddard-Dare P, Collins C, Quinn L. Paid sick leave and preventive health  
287 care service use among U.S. working adults. *Prev Med (Baltim)*. 2017;
- 288 31. Yang T, Guo Y, Ma M, Li Y, Tian H, Deng J. Job stress and presenteeism among chinese  
289 healthcareworkers: The mediating effects of affective commitment. *Int J Environ Res*  
290 *Public Health*. 2017;
- 291 32. Kinman G. Sickness presenteeism at work: Prevalence, costs and management. *British*  
292 *Medical Bulletin*. 2019.
- 293 33. Lui JNM, Andres EB, Johnston JM. Presenteeism exposures and outcomes amongst  
294 hospital doctors and nurses: A systematic review. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2018  
295  
296

**Table 1:** Number and percent of workers exposed to infection or disease more than one time per month, and more than one time per week, by major (2-digit) standard occupational classification code (SOC). Major SOCs which did not have any occupational groups exposed more than one time per month are not included in the above table.

2-digit SOC	total in SOC	Exposed > 1 time/month		Exposed > 1 time/week	
		#	%	#	%
11 Management	7,616,650	59,050	0.8%	--	--
13 Business and Financial Operations	7,721,300	300,900	3.9%	300,900	3.9%
15 Computer and Mathematical	4,384,300	587,970	13.4%	--	--
19 Life, Physical, and Social Science	1,171,910	159,970	13.7%	20,030	1.7%
21 Community and Social Services	2,171,820	704,280	32.4%	168,190	7.7%
25 Education, Training, and Library	8,779,780	2,048,070	23.3%	--	--
27 Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, and Media	1,951,170	57,140	2.9%	--	--
29 Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	8,646,730	7,911,430	91.5%	6,728,420	77.8%
31 Healthcare Support	4,117,450	3,958,560	96.1%	3,160,890	76.8%
33 Protective Service	3,437,410	1,789,490	52.1%	1,026,660	29.9%
37 Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	4,421,980	924,290	20.9%	--	--
39 Personal Care and Service	5,451,330	2,841,730	52.1%	29,810	0.5%
43 Office and Administrative Support	21,828,990	3,532,530	16.2%	2,871,400	13.2%
47 Construction and Extraction	5,962,640	491,990	8.3%	--	--
51 Production	622,790	371,480	59.6%	--	--
53 Transportation and Material Moving	10,244,260	930,930	9.1%	118,770	1.2%
All SOCs (including those not listed above)	144,944,620	26,669,810	18.4%	14,425,070	10.0%