

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>		<b>Page</b>
3.1	Sample Response Status	22
3.2	Result of Sample Data Analysis Pertaining to Laterality Characteristic of the Subjects.	23
4.1.1.1	Mean muscular fatigue expressed in IEMG units at different inclination levels of both the conventional and uni-shaped keyboards (Study-1).	36
4.1.1.2	Summary of the analysis of variance pertaining to the effect of sex on human performance when operators performed the data entry task on the conventional and unishaped keyboards (Study-1).	37
4.1.1.3	Summary of the analysis of simple main effect (Study-1).	38
4.1.1.4	Mean human fatigue expressed in IEMG-units pooled over males and females at different inclination levels under conventional and unishaped keyboard (Study-1).	39
4.1.1.5	Statistics related to the best fit curves of Figure 4.1.1.2. (Study-1)	40
4.1.1.6	Summary of analysis of variance pertaining to the effect of tilt angle of "unishaped" keyboard on human performance (Substudy of Study-1).	44
4.1.2.1	Mean muscular fatigue (In IEMG- units) of operators working on computer under the environment of different inclination levels of both the conventional and split - shaped keyboards (Study-2).	46
4.1.2.2	Summary of the analysis of variance pertaining to the effect of sex on human performance when operators performed the data entry task on both the conventional and split- shaped keyboards (Study-2).	47
4.1.2.3	Mean human muscular fatigue expressed in IEMG- units pooled over males and females at different inclination levels under conventional and split-shaped keyboard designs(Study-2).	48
4.1.2.4	Statistics related to the best fit curves of Figure 4.1.2.2. (Study-2)	51
4.2.1.1	Mean muscular fatigue measured in IEMG-units for the four age groups at varying inclination levels of the keyboard design under conventional and uni-shaped keyboards (Study-3).	60
4.2.1.2	Summary of analysis of variance for muscular fatigue expressed in IEMG-units when operators performed data entry task under conventional and unishaped keyboards (Study-3).	61

<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>	
4.2.1.3	Summary of the analysis of simple main effects when operators performed the data entry task on both the conventional and unishaped keyboards (Study-3).	62
4.2.1.4	Mean muscular fatigue (IEMG-units) pooled over the four levels of age-groups of operators at different inclination levels under conventional and unishaped keyboards design (Study-3).	63
4.2.1.5	Mean muscular fatigue (In IEMG-units) for the four levels of age-groups of operators at different inclination (tilt angle) levels under conventional keyboard (Study-3).	64
4.2.1.6	Statistics related to the best fit curves of figures 4.2.1.2 and 4.2.1.3 (Study-3).	69
4.2.2.1	Mean muscular fatigue measured in IEMG-units for four age groups at varying inclination (tilt/base angles) levels of the keyboard design under conventional and split-shaped keyboards (Study-4).	72
4.2.2.2	Summary of analysis of variance for muscular fatigue expressed in IEMG-units when operators performed data entry task under conventional and split-shaped keyboards (Study-4).	73
4.2.2.3	Summary of the analysis of simple main effects when operators performed the data entry task on both the conventional and split-shaped keyboards (Study-4).	74
4.2.2.4	Mean muscular fatigue in IEMG -units pooled over the four levels of age-groups of operators at different inclination levels under conventional and split-shaped keyboards (Study-4).	75
4.2.2.5	Mean muscular fatigue in IEMG-units for the four levels of age groups operators at different inclination(tilt angle)levels under conventional keyboard (Study-4).	76
4.2.2.6	Statistics related to the best -fit curves of figures 4.2.2.2 and 4.2.2.3 (Study-4).	81
4.3.1.1	Mean muscular fatigue (in IEMG-units) of right and left-motor-sided operators at different levels of inclination (tilt/base angles) of the conventional and unishaped keyboards (Study-5).	88
4.3.1.2	Summary of analysis of variance for muscular fatigue expressed in IEMG-units when operators performend data entry task under conventional and unishaped keyboards(Study-5).	89
4.3.1.3	Summary of the analysis of simple main effects when operators performed the data entry task on both the conventional and unishaped keyboards (Study-5).	90
4.3.1.4	Mean muscular fatigue values in (IEMG -units) pooled over right and left-motor-sided operators at different inclination levels (tilt/base angles) under conventional and unishaped keyboards (Study-5).	91

<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>	
4.3.1.5	Mean muscular fatigue values (expressed in IEMG-units) at different inclination (tilt angle) levels conventional design of the keyboard employed by right and left-motor sided individuals (Study-5).	92
4.3.1.6	Statistics related to the best fit curves of Figures 4.3.1.2 and 4.3.1.4 (Study-5).	97
4.3.2.1	Mean muscular fatigue values (in IEMG-units) of right and left motor-sided operators at different levels (tilt/base angles) of inclination under conventional and split-shaped keyboards (Study-6).	99
4.3.2.2	Summary of analysis of variance for muscular fatigue expressed in IEMG-units when operators performed data entry task under conventional and split-shaped keyboards designs (Study-6).	100
4.3.2.3	Summary of the analysis of simple main effects when operators performed the data entry task on both the conventional and split-shaped keyboards (Study-6).	101
4.3.2.4	Mean muscular fatigue values (in IEMG -units) pooled over right and left-motor-sided operators at different inclination (tilt/base angles) levels under conventional and split-shaped keyboards (Study-6).	102
4.3.2.5	Muscular fatigue values expressed in IEMG-units for right and left-motor -sided subjects under different inclination (tilt angle) levels of the conventional keyboard (Study-6).	107
4.3.2.6	Statistics related to the best-fit curves of Figures 4.3.2.2 and 4.3.2.4 (Study-6).	108
4.4.1	Summary of mean muscular fatigue values (in IEMG- units) obtained at lowest (Level 1) and highest (level 4) inclination (tilt/ base angles) levels of different keyboards used in present study.	115
4.4.2	Summary of slope and intercept parameters obtained for different human performance models for conventional, “unishaped” and “split-shaped” keyboard designs employed in the six studies presented in the current chapter (Chapter IV)	117