

# A Comparison of Safety-and-Health Training of Painters In Alaska, Oregon, and Washington

# Rod Wolford and Marilyn Larson

FOF Communications, Washington, D.C. **Dooley Merrick** Paint-Safe, Seattle, Washington **Sandra Tillett** Occupational Health Foundation, Washington, D.C.

with contributions from

Sharon Morris and Matt Keiffer Northwest Center for Occupational Health & Safety, University of Washington, Seattle

January 1997

The Center to Protect Workers' Rights Suite 1000 8484 Georgia Ave. Silver Spring, MD 20910 301-578-8500 Fax: 301-578-8572 www.cpwr.com www.elcosh.org This study was conducted under a cooperative agreement between the Center to Protect Workers' Rights (CPWR) and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) and funded under NIOSH grants U02/CCU310982-02 and U02/CCU312014. The contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of NIOSH.

CPWR — the research and development arm of the Building and Construction Trades Department, — is uniquely situated to serve workers, contractors, and the scientific community. A major CPWR activity is to improve worker safety and health in the construction industry in the United States. This report is part of that effort.

Copies of this report may be obtained from Publications, The Center to Protect Workers' Rights,

# Contents

The Need for the Study, *Page 1* The Alaska Model, The Study, Painter recruitment, Participant groups, The training, Surveys used, Results, *4* 

Conclusions, 6

References, 7

Annexes

A. Year 3 Questionnaires

Instructions for Instructors, 9 Painter demographic/behavioral questionnaire (Pre-Training Questionnaire), 13 Knowledge test (Paint-Safe), 17 Painter telephone survey Trainee Follow-Up Questionnaire, 22

Non-Trainee Follow-Up Questionnaire, 22

B. Selected tables

B-1. Pre-training respirator use for work with oil-based paints and coatings by previous training, 30

B-2. Pre-training fan use for work with oil-based paints and coatings by previous training, 31

B-3. Previous training by state, 32

B-4. Previous training by participant group status, 33

B-5. Previous training by union status, 34

B-6. Relative risks-paint application by union status for work with oil-based paints and coatings, 34

B-7. Relative risks - union status by participant group status, 34

B-8. Relative risks - company size by any h&s training for work with oil-based paints and coatings, 35

B-9. Relative risks - company size by spray oil for work with oil-based paints and coatings, 36

B-10. Relative risks - company size by participant group status, 36

B-11. Cost comparisons three-state painter study, 37

B-12. Contractor expenditures per painter for health and safety by state, 37

sent to more than 1,100 painters in Oregon and more than 2,400 in Washington. The two state agencies handled the mailings to assure confidentiality of records. (The states billed Paint-Safe for postage.)

Painters who received announcements could call a toll-free number to enroll in scheduled classes. Class times and locations were flexible to accommodate recruits. Training was offered at reduced cost in Alaska and at no cost in Oregon and Washington.

#### **Participant groups**

Study participants were categorized in four groups, three for painters and one for employers. One group comprised non-union and union painters participating in mandatory certification training in Alaska between August 1994 and March 1995. This mandatory training group consisted of 128 painters applying for initial certification, eligible for renewal, or returning for renewal, plus nine painters in Oregon and Washington who were Alaska-certified and who worked sometimes in Alaska.

A second group, the voluntary training group, consisted of non-union and union painters who participated in a voluntary training program offered between August 1994 and March 1995 as part of the study in Oregon and Washington. The 231 volunteers were recruited from among workers who

## The training

The program approved by the state of Alaska was used to train 368 painters in the three states: 128 in Alaska, 102 in Oregon, and 138 in Washington. The program focused on using respirators and fans to reduce exposures while painting. Topics included the selection and use of personal protective equipment, such as respirators and gloves; the health hazards of painting, with an emphasis on recognizing and avoiding neurotoxic signs and symptoms of exposure; how to obtain and use a material safety data sheet (MSDS); and selection and use of fans for temporary ventilation. A 7-minute video produced for the training demonstrated correct ventilation using one or two portable fans; numbers on the screen showed exposure levels and how they changed during the demonstration. Training time was split between classroom and hands-on sessions.

#### Surveys used

Six survey instruments were used in this study, all during the study's second and third years. (Copies of the year 3 questionnaires are in annex A.)

Survey instrument	Description
Year 2	
Painter questionnaire	Cross-sectional survey in Alaska, Oregon, and Washington; questions include type of work, application methods, contractor size, types of training (if any), years in the trade, union status, protective practices (respirators, fans, gloves, long-sleeve shirts, and so on).
Contractor questionnaire	Used with 206 contractors in Alaska, Oregon, and Washington; questions include company size, type of work, application methods, state worked in the most, training and protective- practice policies, spending for safety-and-health and production equipment, and attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge.
Year 3	
Painter demographic/behavioral questionnaire	Pre-training; selection of questions from the year 2 painter survey questionnaire.
Painter reading-level test	Pre-training; SelectABLE, standardized reading test (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich), which groups trainees into three levels.
Knowledge test	Pre- and post-training; questions from the Alaska certi- fication exam on health hazards of painting, reading and understanding material safety data sheets, and respirator and fan use.
Painter follow-up telephone survey	Given 44 to 340 days after training (an average of 180 days after); selected questions from the demographic/behavioral questionnaire (see above, this chart), used as baseline for nontrainees and as follow-up for trainees.

In year 2 of the study, researchers at the University of Washington compared surreptitious observations of painter work practices with self-reporting by the same painters on mailed questionnaires two to three weeks later. The comparison showed that the observations and the self-reports were in substantial agreement, beyond what would be expected by chance. The results indicated that painters' self-reports could be relied upon in the study. Questions from the validated questionnaire continued to be used in all subsequent painter questionnaires for years 2 and 3 (Keiffer and others 1996).

Painters were grouped for statistical comparisons, based on information obtained from the demographic, knowledge-test, and contractor surveys. Self-reported protective practices related to respirator and fan use — reported by painters on the questionnaire — were the primary dependent **demof of7Certka** 

praar4(u27 dcht1(ar4(o27 dir likelyTuaesters on tie kaTJ-24.1 T 94D0.0011 Tc 0 116Tc40 praously, 8(p).7

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Other results of the study not presented here include pre- and post-training comparisons of knowledge and protective practices among the study trainees and evaluations of training features, the validity and reliability of the Alaska Certification Examination, and the relationship between a contractor's size and policy and painters' protective practices.

respirators and use fans, contractors in Alaska spent less per painter on safety-and-health equipment and training than did contractors in Oregon and Washington.

# Conclusions

This study has demonstrated the following:

- Safety-and-health training improves painters' self-protective behaviors, such as respirator and fan use. Trained workers appear to better protect themselves from exposures to toxic substances, thus reducing the risks to themselves and their offspring of serious and costly long-term work-related health effects.
- Mandatory training is more effective than voluntary training in improving self-protective behaviors overall and in reaching a wide range of painters, regardless of previous training, union status, or company size. Voluntary training tends to draw mainly "true believers" workers with previous training, better protective practices, and lower exposure risks.
- A mandatory system costs less for recruitment and produces much higher participation rates.
- C Under Alaska's mandatory training system, employers appear to spend less per worker on safety-and-health supplies and training. This issue warrants further investigation.

Although this study covers only a six-year period, the authors believe the findings about worker self-protective practices will continue to apply for the longer term.

The findings have clear implications for efforts to provide training or improve safety and health for painters and other construction workers. The key lesson is that the construction industry, employees, and society can benefit substantially — in terms of costs and worker quality of life — from a well-designed government-mandated safety-and-health certification training program.

\* \* \*

This report is the first of a planned series based on the three-year study.

## References

Englund, Anders, Knut Ringen, and Myron A. Mehlman, eds. 1983. *Occupational Health Hazards of Solvents*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Scientific Publishers, p. 157.

International Agency for Research on Cancer, World Health Organization. 1989. *IARC Monographs* on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans: Some Organic Solvents, Resin Monomers, and Related Compounds, Pigments and Occupational Exposures in Paint, Manufacturing, and Painting. Lyon, France: IARC, 47: 329-442.

Keiffer, Matthew, and others. 1996. "Validation of a self-administered questionnaire for assessing health and safety behavior among construction painters." Northwest Center for Occupational Health and Safety, University of Washington. Mimeo.

Selikoff, Irving J. 1975. *Investigations of Health Hazards in the Painting Trades*. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Stockwell, H.G., and G.M. Matanoski. 1985. A case-controlled study of lung cancer in painters. *Journal of Occupational Medicine*, 27:125-26.

# **Annex B. Selected Tables**

#### B-1. PRE-TRAINING RESPIRATOR USE FOR WORK WITH OIL-BASED PAINTS AND COATINGS BY PREVIOUS TRAINING -CROSSTABS YR03 TRAINEES [PRE-TRNG] AND YR03 NON-TRAINED AND YR02 SURVEY RESPONDENTS \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ + + - - -

PREVIOUS -	I	PRE-TRAINING RESPIRA (YES/NO)	ATOR USE	
TRAINING (YES/NO)	ODDS RATIO	95% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL	CHI-SQUARE PEAR / LR	N= YES/NO
AK CERT TRNG(1) AK CERT=YES NO TRNG=NO	2.72683	1.95028- 3.81257	.00000*/.00000*	323/ 415
OTHER TRNG(2) OTHER TRNG(2) NO TRNG=NO RESPIR SELECT VENTILATION TR HEALTH HZD PTG ASBESTOS ABATE LEAD ABATEMENT HAZ COM TRNG MSDS TRAINING EMP INITIAL TR ANY H&S TRG RSP+VNT+HZDS VOC TRG Y/N (3) APPR TRG Y/N(3)	$\begin{array}{c} 1.37085\\ 1.51026\\ 1.39091\\ 1.47612\\ 1.47417\\ 1.50461\\ 1.32800\\ 1.59287\\ 1.39074\\ 1.33138\\ 0.94849\\ 1.45285\end{array}$	1.02612- 1.83139 1.09239- 2.08798 1.01873- 1.89906 0.92975- 2.34356 1.03528- 2.09912 1.07355- 2.10876 0.99198- 1.77784 1.14397- 2.21792 1.06080- 1.82330 1.01258- 1.75057 0.68481- 1.31371 1.03449- 2.04041	.03259*/.03240* .01239*/.01196* .03754*/.03698* .09749 /.09400 .03096*/.02987* .01740*/.01674* .05642 /.05614 .00571*/.00564* .01683*/.01690* .04020*/.03994* .75034 /.75033 .03079*/.03020*	385/ 412 272/ 412 300/ 412 102/ 412 207/ 412 371/ 412 307/ 307 496/ 415 421/ 477 314/ 298 249/ 352

EMP INITIAL TRG, VOC TRG, and APPR TRG include year 03 non-trained follow up group.

(1)Compares respirator wear between all AK-certified painters and all painters with no previous training in the three states.
(2)Compares respirator wear between all painters with each type of other training and all painters with no previous training in the three states.
(3)Compares respirator wear between all painters with apprentice or vocational training and all painters without in the three states.

B-2. PRE-TRAINING FAN USE FOR WORK WITH OIL-BASED PAINTS AND COATINGS BY PREVIOUS TRAINING - CROSSTABS YR03 TRAINEES [PRE-TRNG] AND YR03

+				+
	PARTICIPANT STATE (ALASKA VS WASHINGTON-OREGON)			
PREVIOUS TRG (YES/NO)	ODDS RATIO	95% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL	CHI-SQUARE PEAR / LR	N= AK/WA-OR
RESP SELECT TR	6.17889	4.68627- 8.14691	.00000*/.00000*	420/958
VENTILATION TR	6.48003	5.01414- 8.37448	.00000*/.00000*	420/958
HLTH HZDS PTG	6.66549	5.13098- 8.65891	.00000*/.00000*	420/958
HAZ COM TRG	3.47119	2.72720- 4.41815	.00000*/.00000*	420/958
MSDS TRAINING	5.14313	3.94991- 6.69681	.00000*/.00000*	420/958
EMP INITIAL TR	1.37142	1.07902- 1.74305	.00972*/.01001*	392/933
ASBESTOS AB TR	1.94785	1.41011- 2.69063	.00004*/.00007*	420/958
LEAD ABTMNT TR	1.04897	0.79736- 1.37999	.73528 /.73302	420/958
ANY H&S TRG	5.34615	3.94481- 7.24529	.00000*/.00000*	421/992
RSP+VNT+HZDS	6.89969	5.12917- 9.28137	.00000*/.00000*	420/958
VOC TRG Y/N	0.85189	0.66814- 1.08617	.19575 /.19410	425/996
APPR TRG Y/N	1.13605	0.88015- 1.46634	.32714 /.32903	425/996
T				+

#### B-3. PREVIOUS TRAINING BY STATE - CROSSTABS YR03 TRAINEES [PRE-TRAINING] AND YR02 SURVEY RESPONDENTS

EMP INITIAL TR, VOC TRG, APPR TRG include year 03 non-trained follow up group.

# B-4. PREVIOUS TRAINING BY PARTICIPANT GROUP STATUS - GROUP T-TESTS YR03 TRAINEES [PRE-TRAINING] VERSUS YR02 SURVEY RESPONDENTS

PREVIOUS TRAINING	PARTICIPANT GROUP (YR03 TRNS/YR02 SRVY)			N=
BY STATE	YR03 TRNS	YR02 SRVY	SIG.	TRN/SUR
AK ALASKA CERT TRGY/N(Mean)WA ALASKA CERT TRGY/N(Mean)OR ALASKA CERT TRGY/N(Mean)	.39 .02 .04	.94 .02 .03	.000* .845 .521	104/ 284 99/ 383 72/ 294
AK RESP SELECT TRG Y/N (Mean)WA RESP SELECT TRG Y/N (Mean)OR RESP SELECT TRG Y/N (Mean)		.83 .31 82	.264 .000* .39	104/ 284   99/ 383   .000*
AK VENTILATION TRNG Y/N         (Mean)           WA VENTILATION TRNG Y/N         (Mean)           OR VENTILATION TRNG Y/N         (Mean)	.65 .67 .69	.75 .19 .24	.064 .000* .000*	104/ 284 99/ 383 72/ 294

72/ 294

#### B-5. PREVIOUS TRAINING BY UNION STATUS - CROSSTABS FOR WORK WITH OIL-BASED PAINTS AND COATINGS YR03 TRAINEES [PRE-TRAINING] AND YR02 SURVEY RESPONDENTS

UNION STATUS (NO/YES)	

B-8. RELATIVE RISKS - COMPANY SIZE BY ANY H&S TRAINING FOR WORK WITH OIL-BASED PAINTS AND COATINGS YR03 TRAINING PRTCPNTS [PRE-TRAINING] AND YR02 SURVEY RESPONDENTS

#### B-9. RELATIVE RISKS - COMPANY SIZE BY SPRAY OIL FOR WORK WITH OIL-BASED PAINTS AND COATINGS YR03 TRAINEES [PRE-TRAINING] AND YR02 SURVEY RESPONDENTS

	+	SPRAY OIL-BASED PAINT (YES/NO)		
	ODDS RATIO	95% CONFIDENCE	CHI-SQUARE PEAR / LR	N= YES/NO
COMPANY SIZE: SM 1-4 PTRS MD 5-9 PTRS LG 10+ PTRS	1.45945 1.29621 0.61538	1.00716- 2.11486 0.87787- 1.91390 0.44437- 0.85221	.04511*/.04281* .19125 /.18739 .00336*/.00336*	460/216 460/216 460/216

# B-10. RELATIVE RISKS - COMPANY SIZE BY PARTICIPANT GROUP STATUS YR03 TRAINEES [PRE-TRAINING] AND YR02 SURVEY RESPONDENTS

+	PARTICIPANT GROUP STATUS (YR03 TRNG PARTICIPANTS/YR02 SURVEY RSPNDS)			+
COMPANY SIZE SM=1-4 PTRS MD=5-9 PTRS LG=10+ PTRS	ODDS RATIO	95% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL	CHI-SQUARE PEAR / LR	N= TRN/SUR
AK SMALL CNTR WA SMALL CNTR OR SMALL CNTR	1.84149 0.23843 0.59919	1.09591- 3.09432 0.12946- 0.43912 0.28488- 1.26026	.02056*/.02021* .00000*/.00000* .17381 /.16577	126/118 124/167 93/164
AK MEDIUM CNTR WA SMALL CNTR OR SMALL CNTR			2708 43159739 3/	/.13 4/167
AK MEDIUMLARGE WA SMALL LARGE OR SMALL LARGE			67250594*   5900*	

B-11. COST SPA6

#### The Paint-Safe Consortium

Northwest Conference of Painters International Brotherhood of Painters & Allied Trades Seattle

Northwest Center for Occupational Health & Safety University of Washington Seattle

> Paint-Safe Seattle

Occupational Health Foundation Washington, D.C.

> FOF Communications Washington, D.C.