1 **Title:**
2 **Association between Preventive Measures against Workplace Infection and**
3 **Preventive Behavior against Personal Infection**

4
5 **Running title:** workplace infection control measures and preventive behavior

6
7 Mika Kawasumi¹, MD; Tomohisa Nagata¹, MD, PhD; Hajime Ando², MD, MOH,
8 PhD; Ayako Hino³, MD, PhD; Seiichiro Tateishi⁴, MD, PhD; Mayumi Tsuji⁵, MD,
9 PhD; Shinya Matsuda⁶, M.D, PhD; Yoshihisa Fujino⁷, MD, MPH, PhD; Koji Mori¹,
10 MD, PhD; for the CORoNaWork project

11
12 **Affiliations:**

13 1 Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial
14 Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

15 2 Department of Work Systems and Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,
16 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

17 3 Department of Mental Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University
18 of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

19 4 Department of Occupational Medicine, School of Medicine, University of
20 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

21 5 Department of Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of
22 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

23 6 Department of Public Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and
24 Environmental Health, Japan

25 7 Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological
26 Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

27

28 Correspondence: T. Nagata, Department of Occupational Health Practice and
29 Management, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational
30 and Environmental Health, Japan, 1-1 Iseigaoka, Yahatanishi-ku, Kitakyushu 807-8555,
31 Japan.

32 Email: tomohisa@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp; Tel: +81-93-603-1611; Fax: +81-93-603-2155

33 Category: Original Article

34 Number of words in the abstract: 224

35 Number of words in the text: 2,830

36 Number of tables and figures: two tables, no figure

37 Authors' contribution: MK; analysis and writing the manuscript, TN; creating the
38 questionnaire, analysis, drafting the manuscript and advice on interpretation, HA, AH,
39 ST, MT, and SM; Review of manuscripts, and advice on interpretation, YF; overall
40 survey planning, creating the questionnaire, and review of manuscripts, KM; drafting
41 the manuscript, review of manuscripts, and advice on interpretation.

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 **Abstract**

50 **Objectives:** To prevent the spread of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) infection, it
51 is necessary for each individual to adopt infection prevention behavior. We investigated
52 the effect of infection control measures implemented in the workplace on personal
53 infection prevention behavior.

54 **Methods:** We conducted a self-administered questionnaire survey through the Internet
55 from December 22 to 25, 2020, during which period COVID-19 was spreading. Among
56 respondents aged 20 to 65 years (n=27,036), a total of 21,915 workers were included in
57 the analysis after excluding self-employed workers (n=2,202), workers in small/home
58 offices (n=377), and agriculture, forestry, and fisheries workers (n=212), etc., whose
59 personal infection prevention behavior was almost the same as infection control
60 measures taken in the workplace.

61 **Results:** The results showed that as the number of infection control measures in the
62 workplace increased, implementation of infection prevention behavior by individuals
63 also significantly increased. However, the relationship differed depending on the type of
64 personal infection prevention behavior. Specifically, infection control measures against
65 COVID-19 in the workplace may affect personal infection prevention behavior.

66 **Conclusion:** Implementation of infection control measures in the workplace appears to
67 deepen personal understanding of infection prevention behaviors, and increases
68 awareness of the importance of individual infection prevention behavior and its
69 implementation by all individuals. These findings may be applicable not only to
70 COVID-19 measures but also to responses to other emerging infections and seasonal
71 influenza.

72 **Keywords:** COVID-19, personal infection prevention behavior, infection control

73 measures, workplace, pandemic

74 **Introduction**

75 An outbreak of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) occurred in Wuhan, China in
76 December 2019, and the World Health Organization (WHO) declared a “Public Health
77 Emergency of International Concern” on January 30, 2020.¹ The WHO recommends
78 taking all measures, such as avoiding the 3Cs (closed spaces, crowded places, and
79 close-contact settings), wearing a mask, and opening windows, to protect the individual
80 and others from COVID-19. In order to prevent the spread of the infection, it is
81 necessary not only to take measures nationally and regionally, such as prohibiting travel
82 or outings around the world, but also to ensure that infection prevention behavior is
83 implemented at an individual level.²

84 Workplaces where many workers share the same space are generally vulnerable
85 to the spread of infectious diseases. Therefore, from the perspective of business
86 continuity, companies need to actively adopt telework, in accordance with the
87 guidelines issued by the government and related organizations and checklists of the
88 specific infection control measures, etc. If telework is not possible, it is necessary to
89 implement feasible infection control measures to prevent infection in the workplace, in
90 addition to basic measures (social distancing, wearing a mask, washing hands).³
91 However, disease clusters in the workplace are still being reported: for an approximately
92 one-month period around December 2020, the Japanese media reported a total of 95
93 workplace-related disease clusters with five or more people, involving 1,103 persons in
94 Japan.⁴ Reasons for these disease clusters were eating while talking face-to-face without
95 wearing a mask, staying in a poorly ventilated room, seating close to other workers, and
96 failure to disinfect shared items and equipment, etc.⁵

97 However, even if the infection control measures in the workplace are properly
98 implemented, infection cannot be completely prevented if workers do not adopt
99 appropriate infection prevention behavior, or if infection prevention behavior outside
100 the workplace is not appropriate. It has been demonstrated that the establishment of a
101 safe and healthy work environment under a policy of health maintenance and promotion
102 in the workplace has a positive impact on the health of individual workers,⁶⁻⁸ and this
103 may also be applicable to infection control measures for COVID-19. In other words,
104 good infection control measures in the workplace may lead to personal prevention
105 behavior against infection among workers. It has been reported that training managers is
106 an effective and efficient way to educate workers about health issues in the workplace.⁹
107 Furthermore, it has been reported that when managers reach out to their workers,
108 influenza vaccination rates increase.¹⁰

109 In a survey of Chinese occupational fields, China at the time of a factory restart
110 after lockdown for COVID-19, it was reported that the number of preventive measures
111 implemented by the factory in Shenzhen was associated with self-reported compliance
112 with all four personal preventive measures (wearing a face mask consistently in any
113 public space; sanitizing hands every time after returning from public spaces or touching
114 installations; avoiding social and meal gatherings with people who do not live together;
115 and avoiding crowded places).¹¹ Since this survey only included factory workers in one
116 city in China at the time of factory restart after a lockdown in which strict measures
117 were imposed, further investigations were deemed necessary to generalize the
118 association between workplace infection control measures and workers' personal
119 infection prevention behavior. Here therefore, we conducted an Internet survey during
120 the period when COVID-19 infection was spreading in Japan and examined the

relationship between infection control measures in the workplace and personal infection prevention behavior.

Materials and Methods

A research group from the University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, conducted a prospective cohort study, known as the Collaborative Online Research on Novel-coronavirus and Work study (CORoNaWork study), as a self-administered questionnaire survey via an internet survey company (Cross Marketing Inc.; Tokyo, Japan). During the baseline survey, conducted from December 22 to 25, 2020, Japan was in the midst of its third wave of the pandemic, at which point the number of COVID-19 infections and deaths was markedly higher than in the first and second waves, and the country was accordingly on high alert.

A portion of the baseline survey responses from the CORoNaWork study was used to conduct the present cross-sectional study. The study protocol, including the sampling plan and subject recruitment procedure, has been reported elsewhere in detail. Participants were aged 20-65 years who were working at the time of the baseline survey (n = 33,087 total). For participation in the CORoNaWork study, they were stratified by disease cluster sampling for gender, age, region, and occupation. After excluding 6,051 initial subjects who provided invalid responses, we included 27,036 in the database.

The flow diagram of this study is shown in Figure 1. Respondents were asked to answer yes/no to the following two questions about COVID-19 infection: “Have you had COVID-19?” and “Have you come in close contact with a person infected with COVID-19?” Those who answered yes to either question were excluded from the study (n=399). We also excluded self-employed workers (2,202), workers in small/home offices (377) and those in agriculture, forestry, and fishing (212) because of the need to

145 evaluate infection control measures in the workplace. Workplaces with four or fewer
146 employees were excluded from the analysis because it can be assumed that infection
147 control measures in the workplace and personal infection prevention behavior were
148 closely similar (one employee (n=2524) and 2-4 employees (n=1974)). We finally
149 analyzed 21,915 workers.

150 **Assessment of infection control measures in the workplace**

151 For each of the following nine infection control measures in the workplace, respondents
152 were asked to choose whether or not the measures were being implemented: (1)
153 prohibition/restriction of business trips; (2) prohibition/restriction of visitors; (3)
154 prohibition of holding or limiting the number of people participating in social
155 gatherings and banquets; (4) restriction on face-to-face meetings; (5) requirement to
156 always wear masks during working hours; (6) installation of partitions and change of
157 workplace layout; (7) recommendation for daily temperature check; (8)
158 recommendation to telecommute; and (9) Request not to come to work when sick.
159 Implementation was classified into the five categories of 0, 1-2, 3-4, 5-7, and 8-9
160 measures implemented.

161 **Assessment of personal infection prevention behavior**

162 For each of the following seven personal infection prevention behaviors, respondents
163 were asked to select from among four options (almost always; almost often; not often;
164 or almost never) of how often they had performed the behavior in the last month: (1)
165 wearing a mask in the presence of others; (2) disinfecting hands with alcohol before
166 going indoors; (3) washing hands after using the toilet; (4) gargling when returning
167 home; (5) opening windows and doors to ventilate the room; (6) carrying alcohol
168 disinfectant when going out; and (7) disinfecting hands and washing hands after

169 touching things that many people have touched. We created a binary variable by
170 defining almost always as having good behavior, and the other responses as not having
171 good behavior.

172

173 **Assessment of covariates**

174 Covariates included demographics, socioeconomic factors, occupation and number of
175 employees in the workplace. Age was expressed as a continuous variable. Yearly
176 household income was classified into four categories: <2.50 million Japanese yen
177 (JPY); ≥2.50 and <3.75 million JPY; ≥3.75 and <5.00 million JPY; and ≥5.00 million
178 JPY. Education was classified into four categories: junior high school or high school,
179 vocational school, junior college or technical school, and university or graduate school.
180 Marital status was classified into three categories: married; divorce or widowed; or
181 unmarried. In this survey, participants chose 1 occupation from among 10 options:
182 general employee; manager; executive manager; public employee, faculty member, or
183 non-profit organization employee; temporary or contract employee; self-employed;
184 small office home office (SOHO); agriculture, forestry, or fishing; professional
185 occupation (lawyer, tax accountant, medical-related, etc.); and other occupations. Three
186 of these categories were excluded from this study, as mentioned above, so occupation
187 was ultimately classified into seven categories. The number of employees in the
188 workplace was classified into four categories: 5-9, 10-99, 100-999, and ≥1000. In
189 addition, the cumulative incidence rate of COVID-19 infection one month prior to the
190 conduct of the survey in the prefecture of residence was used as a community-level
191 variable. Information was collected from the websites of public institutions.

192 **Statistical analyses**

193 The odds ratios (ORs) of having good personal infection prevention behavior associated
 194 with infection control measures in the workplace were estimated using a multilevel
 195 logistic model nested in the prefectures of residence. An analysis was conducted for
 196 each of the seven personal infection prevention behaviors. The multivariate model was
 197 adjusted for age and sex, income (by category), educational background (by category),
 198 marital status, occupation and number of employees in the workplace (by category). The
 199 incidence rate of COVID-19 by prefecture was also used as a prefecture-level variable.
 200 A trend test was performed by conducting the same analysis for each of the seven
 201 personal infection prevention behaviors in the workplace using the number of infection
 202 control measures in the workplace (0-9) as a continuous variable. A p-value less than
 203 0.05 was considered statistically significant. All analyses were conducted using Stata
 204 (Stata Statistical Software release 16; StataCorp LLC, TX, USA).

205 The present study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of
 206 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (reference No. R2-079 and R3-006).
 207 Informed consent was obtained from all participants.

208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216

217

218

219

220

221 **Results**

222 Table 1 shows participant characteristics by category of the number of infection control
223 measures in the workplace. Of the 21,915 participants, 7,484 (34%) were in a workplace
224 with eight or nine infection control measures, and 1,313 (6%) were in a workplace with
225 no infection control measures.

226 Table 2 shows the proportion of each good personal infection preventive
227 behavior and the association between category of infection control measures in the
228 workplace and good personal infection preventive behavior. The number of infection
229 control measures in the workplace was associated with wearing a mask in the presence
230 of others (1-2 measures: aOR=2.12, 95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.81-2.49, $p<0.001$;
231 3-4 measures: 3.22 (2.77-3.75), $p<0.001$; 5-7 measures: 5.21 (4.52-6.01), $p<0.001$; 8-9
232 measures: 6.75 (5.80-7.86), $p<0.001$, reference to no measures). A dose-response
233 relationship was observed in this association (p for trend; $p<0.001$).

234 The number of infection control measures in the workplace was positively
235 associated with carrying alcohol disinfectant when going out (1-2 measures: 0.90
236 (0.76-1.06), $p=0.193$; 3-4 measures: 0.95 (0.82-1.11), $p=0.526$; 5-7 measures: 1.01
237 (0.88-1.15), $p=0.941$; 8-9 measures: 1.73 (1.51-1.99), $p<0.001$, refer to no measures). A
238 dose-response relationship was observed for this association (p for trend; $p<0.001$).

239 The number of infection control measures in the workplace was also associated
240 with disinfection of hands and washing hands after touching things that many people

241 had touched under conditions wherein infection control in the workplace is thoroughly
 242 implemented (1-2 measures: 0.96 (0.82-1.13), $p=0.627$; 3-4 measures: 1.08 (0.93-1.25),
 243 $p=0.322$; 5-7 measures: 1.36 (1.19-1.56), $p<0.001$; 8-9 measures: 2.33 (2.03-2.68),
 244 $p<0.001$, reference to no measures). A dose-response relationship was observed in this
 245 association (p for trend; $p<0.001$).

246 The number of infection control measures in the workplace was positively
 247 associated with all the good personal infection prevention behaviors (p for trend;
 248 $p<0.001$).

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269 **Discussion**

270 In this study, we classified the implementation status of infection control measures in
271 the workplace by the number of implementation items and investigated the relationship
272 of this classification with the implementation of personal infection prevention behavior.
273 Results showed that implementation of infection prevention behavior by individuals
274 significantly increased as the number of infection control measures in the workplace
275 increased. Specifically, it was suggested that infection control measures against
276 COVID-19 in the workplace may affect personal infection prevention behavior.

277 With regard to the significant relationship found between workplace infection
278 control measures and personal infection prevention behavior, it has been reported that
279 workplace-initiated health promotion programs encourage workers to adopt better
280 health behavior.⁶⁻⁸ In a survey of Japanese people, it was reported that “the number of
281 workplace measures taken in response to COVID-19 was positively associated with
282 global fear of COVID-19.”¹² In a survey of Ethiopian waiters, it was reported, with
283 regard to good preventive behavior, that knowledge of COVID-19 was not high but risk
284 perception was high.¹³ On the other hand, in a survey of Chinese occupational fields, it
285 was reported that knowledge about transmission routes of COVID-19 was correlated
286 with all four personal infection prevention behaviors (wearing a face mask consistently
287 in any public space; sanitizing hands every time after returning from public spaces or
288 touching installations; avoiding social and meal gatherings with people who do not live

289 together; and avoiding crowded places) but the perceived severity of COVID-19 was
 290 not associated with consistent face mask wearing or sanitizing hands.¹¹ Considering
 291 these previous studies, thorough implementation of infection control measures may
 292 increase knowledge and awareness of risks of COVID-19 infection, resulting in the
 293 adoption of personal infection prevention behavior. Raising awareness to change the
 294 behavior of employees is recommended as a measure of COVID-19 control in the
 295 workplace.^{14,15} Therefore, it is possible that guidance may be provided as part of
 296 infection prevention measures for individuals in those workplaces where infection
 297 control measures are actively implemented, and this may have had a direct effect on the
 298 behavior of individuals.

299 In this survey, the number of infection control measures in the workplace was
 300 found to be associated with good personal infection prevention behavior. The same
 301 result was also obtained in the above-mentioned survey of Chinese occupational
 302 fields.¹¹ However, the association in our present survey varied according to the items of
 303 infection prevention behaviors. Compared to the situation in which the number of
 304 infection control measures in the workplace was 0, significant differences when the
 305 number of infection control measures in the workplace was 1-2 were seen wearing a
 306 mask and washing hands after using the toilet. These items were high implementation
 307 rates. Further, when there were 3-4 workplace measures, significant differences were
 308 additionally seen for alcohol hand disinfection, gargling when returning home, and
 309 room ventilation. These findings indicate that personal items that can be implemented
 310 relatively easily with a larger overall number of workplace implementations are more
 311 susceptible to the effect of the number of workplace infection control measures.

312 In the future, attainment of herd immunity through vaccination is considered to

313 be the most effective way to prevent COVID-19.¹⁶ However, given the time required to
 314 acquire herd immunity in many countries and the impact of variants on vaccine
 315 effectiveness, it can be said that a thorough implementation of personal behavior aimed
 316 at infection prevention will continue to be an essential measure against pandemic.¹⁷ In
 317 Japan, even at the end of March 2020, when the government's request for cooperation
 318 was made, Japanese people in general had changed their behavior, indicating that
 319 understanding of the need for each individual to take action against COVID-19 was
 320 already widespread, thanks to the influence of mass media and social media.¹⁸ The
 321 present findings indicate that to encourage people who are not ready to change their
 322 behavior, it is important to strengthen infection control measures in the workplace
 323 where workers spend many hours of the day. In addition, it is desirable to combine
 324 multiple infection control measures, as it has been reported that the pandemic can be
 325 delayed by implementing a strategy that combines multiple measures rather than
 326 individual measures.¹⁹ In such cases, there are levels of difficulty in implementing
 327 infection control measures differ among different industries and job types, such as
 328 restrictions on telecommuting and interviews, and it is considered more effective to
 329 increase the number of measures to be implemented in accordance with the actual
 330 circumstances of the workplace. Although there are differences in the likelihood that the
 331 effects of workplace infection control measures influence the item of personal infection
 332 prevention behavior, it is important that workplace infection control measures are
 333 thoroughly implemented.

334 There are two limitations to this study. First, those who did not have Internet
 335 access or were not registered as monitors were excluded from the study. However, since
 336 subject bias was reduced by random sampling for each region/occupation/prefecture

337 based on the incidence of infections, our results appear to be generalizable within Japan.
 338 However, since the survey was conducted in a Japanese population, generalizability to
 339 other countries appears limited. It is said that Japanese people characteristically adjust
 340 themselves to others easily,²⁰ and that the implementation of infection control measures
 341 in the workplace might therefore be strongly related to personal infection prevention
 342 behavior. This study appears to support this idea, given that implementation of
 343 workplace infection control measures tended to promote personal infection prevention
 344 behavior. The findings of this study are likely to be utilized in the future not only for
 345 COVID-19 control but also for other infections, including emerging infectious diseases
 346 and seasonal influenza.

347 **Conclusions**

348 We found a positive association between a greater the number of COVID-19 measures
 349 implemented in the workplace and higher likelihood of personal infection prevention
 350 behavior. This was because knowledge about effective personal infection prevention
 351 behavior is increased by implementing infection control measures in the workplace. and
 352 increased individual awareness of the risk of infection is linked to personal behavior.
 353 This in turn suggests the importance of active promotion of infection control measures
 354 in the workplace. These findings may be applicable not only to COVID-19 measures but
 355 also to responses to other emerging infections and seasonal influenza.

356

357 **Acknowledgements**

358 This study was supported and partly funded by the University of Occupational and
 359 Environmental Health, Japan; General Incorporated Foundation (Anshin Zaidan); The
 360 Development of Educational Materials on Mental Health Measures for Managers at

361 Small-sized Enterprises; Health, Labour and Welfare Sciences Research Grants;
362 Comprehensive Research for Women's Healthcare (H30-josei-ippa-002); Research for
363 the Establishment of an Occupational Health System in Times of Disaster
364 (H30-roudou-ippa-007); and scholarship donations from Chugai Pharmaceutical Co.,
365 Ltd., the Collabo-Health Study Group, and Hitachi Systems, Ltd.

366 Current members of the CORoNaWork Project (in alphabetical order) are: Dr.
367 Yoshihisa Fujino (present chairperson of the study group), Dr. Akira Ogami, Dr. Arisa
368 Harada, Dr. Ayako Hino, Dr. Hajime Ando, Dr. Hisashi Eguchi, Dr. Kazunori Ikegami,
369 Dr. Kei Tokutsu, Dr. Keiji Muramatsu, Dr. Koji Mori, Dr. Kosuke Mafune, Dr. Kyoko
370 Kitagawa, Dr. Masako Nagata, Dr. Mayumi Tsuji, Ms. Ning Liu, Dr. Rie Tanaka, Dr.
371 Ryutaro Matsugaki, Dr. Seiichiro Tateishi, Dr. Shinya Matsuda, Dr. Tomohiro Ishimaru,
372 and Dr. Tomohisa Nagata. All members are affiliated with the University of
373 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan.

374

375 **Ethical approval:** This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University
376 of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (reference No. R2-079 and R3-006).

377 **Informed Consent:** Informed consent was obtained in the form of the website.

378 **Registry and the Registration No. of the study/Trial:** N/A

379 **Animal Studies:** N/A

380 **Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest associated with this
381 manuscript.

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391 **References**

- 392 1. World Health Organization. 2019-nCoV outbreak is an emergency of international
393 concern [internet]. 31 Jan 2020. Available from:
394 [https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/pages/news/news/20](https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/pages/news/news/2020/01/2019-ncov-outbreak-is-an-emergency-of-international-concern)
395 [20/01/2019-ncov-outbreak-is-an-emergency-of-international-concern](https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/pages/news/news/2020/01/2019-ncov-outbreak-is-an-emergency-of-international-concern)
- 396 2. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) advice for the public
397 [internet]. 26 March 2021. Available from:
398 [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/advice-for-publi](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/advice-for-public)
399 [c](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/advice-for-public)
- 400 3. Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, Japan. Checklist for Preventing the Spread
401 of Novel Coronavirus Infections in the Workplace [in Japanese internet]. Available
402 from: <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/11302000/000630736.pdf>
- 403 4. Cabinet Secretariat, Japan. Subcommittee on Countermeasures for New
404 Coronavirus Infections (21st meeting) [in Japanese internet]. 8 Jan 2021. Available
405 from: <https://www.cas.go.jp/jp/seisaku/ful/bunkakai/corona21.pdf>
- 406 5. Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, Japan. A case of disease clusters in the
407 workplace related to novel coronavirus infection (COVID-19) [in Japanese internet].
408 Available from: <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/000725573.pdf>

- 409 6. Steven G Aldana, David R Anderson, Troy B Adams, et al. A Review of the
410 Knowledge Base on Healthy Worksite Culture. J Occup Environ Med. 2012
411 Apr;54(4):414-19. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0b013e31824be25f>
- 412 7. Soler RE, Leeks KD, Razi S, et al. Task Force on Community Preventive Services.
413 A systematic review of selected interventions for worksite health promotion. The
414 assessment of health risks with feedback. Am J Prev Med 2010;38(Suppl):S237–62.
415 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2009.10.030>
- 416 8. Michael Edward Hall, Randall J. Bergman, Samantha Nivens. Worksite Health
417 Promotion Program Participation: A Study to Examine the Determinants of
418 Participation. 2013 November 14. Available from:
419 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839913510721>
- 420 9. Lin Li, Wenti Xu, Abram L. Wagner, et al. Evaluation of health education
421 interventions on Chinese factory workers’ knowledge, practices, and behaviors
422 related to infectious disease. Journal of Infection and Public Health, 2019; 12,
423 70-76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2018.09.004>
- 424 10. Sarah J. D’Heilly, Kristin L. Nichol. Work–Site–Based Influenza Vaccination in
425 Healthcare and Non–Healthcare Settings. Infection Control and Hospital
426 Epidemiology, Vol. 25, No. 11 (November 2004), pp.941-945
- 427 11. Yihang Pan, Yuan Fang , Meiqi Xin, et al. Self-Reported Compliance With Personal
428 Preventive Measures Among Chinese Factory Workers at the Beginning of Work
429 Resumption Following the COVID-19 Outbreak: Cross-Sectional Survey Study. J
430 Med Internet Res 2020 Sep 29;22(9):e22457. Available from:
431 <https://www.jmir.org/2020/9/e22457/>
- 432 12. Natsu Sasaki, Reiko Kuroda, Kanami Tsuno, Norito Kawakami. Workplace

- 433 responses to COVID-19 associated with mental health and work performance of
434 employees in Japan. J Occup Health. 2020 Jan;62(1):e12134. doi:
435 10.1002/1348-9585.12134. Available from:
436 <https://doi.org/10.1002/1348-9585.12134>
- 437 13. Qaro Qanche, Adane Asefa, Tadesse Nigussie, et al. Knowledge of COVID-19 and
438 preventive behaviors among waiters working in food and drinking establishments in
439 Southwest Ethiopia. PLoS One 2021 Jan 25;16(1):e0245753. Available from:
440 <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0245753>
- 441 14. World Health Organization. Getting your workplace ready for COVID-19: How
442 COVID-19 spreads. 19 March 2020 | COVID-19: Schools, businesses and
443 institutions. Available from:
444 <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/getting-your-workplace-ready-for-covid-19-how-covid-19-spreads>
445
- 446 15. Japan Society for Occupational Health. Manual for prevention and control of novel
447 coronavirus infection in the workplace Series 1: Manual for prevention and control
448 of novel coronavirus infection in office work [in Japanese internet]. Available from:
449 <https://www.sanei.or.jp/images/contents/444/COVID19MANUAL1-OFFICE.PDF>
- 450 16. Ji-Ming Chen , Ying-Xue Sun, Ji-Wang Chen. Potential for elimination of
451 SAR-CoV-2 through vaccination as inspired by elimination of multiple influenza
452 viruses through natural pandemics or mass vaccination. J Med Virol. 2020
453 Nov;92(11):2453-2457. doi: 10.1002/jmv.26162. Epub 2020 Jun 29.
- 454 17. Noreen Qualls, Alexandra Levitt, Neha Kanade et al. Community Mitigation
455 Guidelines to Prevent Pandemic Influenza - United States, 2017. MMWR Recomm
456 Rep. 2017 Apr 21;66(1):1-34. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.rr6601a1.

- 457 18. Muto K, Yamamoto I, Nagasu M, Tanaka M, Wada K (2020) Japanese citizens'
458 behavioral changes and preparedness against COVID-19: An online survey during
459 the early phase of the pandemic. PLoS ONE 15(6): e0234292. Available from:
460 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234292>
- 461 19. Vernon J Lee, David C Lye, Annelies Wilder-Smith. Combination strategies for
462 pandemic influenza response - a systematic review of mathematical modeling
463 studies. BMC Med. 2009 Dec 10;7:76. Available from:
464 <https://bmcmedicine.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1741-7015-7-76>
- 465 20. Toshiko Kinoshita. The effects of group cohesiveness and importance of the tasks
466 upon conformity behavior. Jap. J. Psychol. 1964;35(4):181-93. Available from:
467 https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/jjpsy1926/35/4/35_4_181/_pdf/-char/ja
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

Table 1. Participants' characteristics by category of infection control measures in the workplace

	Number of infection control measures in the workplace				
	0	1-2	3-4	5-7	8-9
Number of subjects	1313	1984	3263	7871	7484
Age, mean (SD)	46.7 (10.2)	46.1 (10.1)	46.0 (10.5)	46.2 (10.7)	46.5 (10.6)
Sex, Men	736 (56.1%)	988 (49.8%)	1558 (47.7%)	3757 (47.7%)	3861 (51.6%)
Equivalent income (million JPY)					
<2.50	411 (31.3%)	522 (26.3%)	743 (22.8%)	1333 (16.9%)	970 (13.0%)
≥2.50 and <3.75	392 (29.9%)	663 (33.4%)	1056 (32.4%)	2265 (28.8%)	1861 (24.9%)
≥3.75 and <4.99	289 (22.0%)	444 (22.4%)	747 (22.9%)	2103 (26.7%)	2005 (26.8%)
≥4.99	221 (16.8%)	355 (17.9%)	717 (22.0%)	2170 (27.6%)	2648 (35.4%)
Educational background					
Junior high or high school	556 (42.3%)	737 (37.1%)	1041 (31.9%)	1999 (25.4%)	1528 (20.4%)
Vocational school, junior college or technical school	303 (23.1%)	508 (25.6%)	832 (25.5%)	1899 (24.1%)	1579 (21.1%)
University	418 (31.8%)	697 (35.1%)	1263 (38.7%)	3570 (45.4%)	3758 (50.2%)
Graduate School	36 (2.7%)	42 (2.1%)	127 (3.9%)	403 (5.1%)	619 (8.3%)
Marital status					
married	652 (49.7%)	1012 (51.0%)	1671 (51.2%)	4439 (56.4%)	4617 (61.7%)
widowed/divorced	149 (11.3%)	249 (12.6%)	367 (11.2%)	833 (10.6%)	630 (8.4%)
unmarried	512 (39.0%)	723 (36.4%)	1225 (37.5%)	2599 (33.0%)	2237 (29.9%)
Occupation					
General employee	947 (72.1%)	1311 (66.1%)	1793 (54.9%)	3899 (49.5%)	3741 (50.0%)
Manager	95 (7.2%)	146 (7.4%)	249 (7.6%)	795 (10.1%)	1157 (15.5%)
Executive manager	27 (2.1%)	69 (3.5%)	104 (3.2%)	171 (2.2%)	179 (2.4%)
Public employee, faculty member, or non-profit organization employee	56 (4.3%)	119 (6.0%)	418 (12.8%)	1302 (16.5%)	824 (11.0%)
Temporary/contract employee	132 (10.1%)	245 (12.3%)	507 (15.5%)	1012 (12.9%)	906 (12.1%)
Professional occupation (lawyer, tax accountant, medical-related, etc.)	43 (3.3%)	76 (3.8%)	167 (5.1%)	613 (7.8%)	625 (8.4%)
Other occupation	13 (1.0%)	18 (0.9%)	25 (0.8%)	79 (1.0%)	52 (0.7%)
Number of employees in the workplace					
5-9	273 (20.8%)	362 (18.2%)	369 (11.3%)	328 (4.2%)	146 (2.0%)
10-99	576 (43.9%)	998 (50.3%)	1405 (43.1%)	2469 (31.4%)	1316 (17.6%)
100-999	272 (20.7%)	415 (20.9%)	881 (27.0%)	2757 (35.0%)	2700 (36.1%)
≥1000	192 (14.6%)	209 (10.5%)	608 (18.6%)	2317 (29.4%)	3322 (44.4%)

500

501 Table 2. Odds ratios by number of infection control measures in the workplace and good

502 personal infection prevention behavior

Number of infection control measures in the workplace	Personal infection preventive behaviors		Crude				Multi-variate adjusted*			
	n	%	OR	95%CI		p value	OR	95%CI		p value
(1) Wearing a mask in the presence of others										
0	812	61.8	reference			<0.001†	reference			<0.001†
1-2	1551	78.2	2.22	1.90	2.59	<0.001	2.12	1.81	2.49	<0.001
3-4	2762	84.6	3.41	2.95	3.95	<0.001	3.22	2.77	3.75	<0.001
5-7	7078	89.9	5.54	4.84	6.33	<0.001	5.21	4.52	6.01	<0.001
8-9	6878	91.9	6.97	6.06	8.01	<0.001	6.75	5.80	7.86	<0.001
(2) Disinfecting hands with alcohol before going indoors										
0	499	38.0	reference			<0.001†	reference			<0.001†
1-2	827	41.7	1.18	1.02	1.36	0.025	1.13	0.98	1.31	0.103
3-4	1595	48.9	1.57	1.38	1.79	<0.001	1.54	1.35	1.76	<0.001
5-7	4479	56.9	2.19	1.94	2.47	<0.001	2.18	1.93	2.48	<0.001
8-9	4932	65.9	3.19	2.82	3.60	<0.001	3.34	2.94	3.80	<0.001
(3) Washing hands after using the toilet										
0	852	64.9	reference			<0.001†	reference			<0.001†
1-2	1559	78.6	1.99	1.70	2.32	<0.001	1.94	1.65	2.28	<0.001
3-4	2753	84.4	2.92	2.52	3.39	<0.001	2.85	2.44	3.32	<0.001
5-7	6974	88.6	4.21	3.69	4.81	<0.001	4.18	3.63	4.82	<0.001
8-9	6753	90.2	5.00	4.36	5.73	<0.001	5.15	4.43	5.98	<0.001
(4) Gargling when returning home										
0	533	40.6	reference			<0.001†	reference			<0.001†
1-2	868	43.8	1.16	1.00	1.34	0.044	1.14	0.99	1.32	0.072
3-4	1512	46.3	1.29	1.13	1.48	<0.001	1.27	1.11	1.45	<0.001
5-7	3931	49.9	1.52	1.35	1.71	<0.001	1.48	1.30	1.67	<0.001
8-9	4458	59.6	2.18	1.93	2.46	<0.001	2.11	1.86	2.40	<0.001
(5) Opening windows to ventilate the room										
0	434	33.1	reference			<0.001†	reference			<0.001†
1-2	702	35.4	1.11	0.95	1.28	0.179	1.06	0.91	1.23	0.464
3-4	1257	38.5	1.28	1.12	1.46	<0.001	1.24	1.08	1.42	0.003
5-7	3413	43.4	1.58	1.39	1.78	<0.001	1.55	1.36	1.76	<0.001
8-9	4115	55.0	2.46	2.17	2.79	<0.001	2.56	2.24	2.92	<0.001
(6) Carrying alcohol disinfectant										
0	363	27.6	reference			<0.001†	reference			<0.001†
1-2	531	26.8	0.96	0.82	1.12	0.594	0.90	0.76	1.06	0.193
3-4	896	27.5	0.99	0.86	1.15	0.913	0.95	0.82	1.11	0.526
5-7	2195	27.9	1.02	0.89	1.16	0.807	1.01	0.88	1.15	0.941
8-9	2870	38.3	1.62	1.42	1.84	<0.001	1.73	1.51	1.99	<0.001
(7) Disinfecting hands and washing hands after touching things										
0	369	28.1	reference			<0.001†	reference			<0.001†
1-2	562	28.3	1.02	0.87	1.19	0.833	0.96	0.82	1.13	0.627
3-4	987	30.2	1.11	0.97	1.28	0.138	1.08	0.93	1.25	0.322
5-7	2723	34.6	1.37	1.20	1.56	<0.001	1.36	1.19	1.56	<0.001
8-9	3451	46.1	2.19	1.92	2.49	<0.001	2.33	2.03	2.68	<0.001

* Odds ratio adjusted for age and sex, equivalent income, educational background, marital status, occupation and number of employees in the workplace.

† p for trend

503