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Research Objectives

- To fulfill requirements for addressing harassment in Electronic Logging Devices (ELDs) Rulemaking.
- To investigate potential harassment, from the point of view of both drivers and carriers.
- To see if perceived harassment varies with and without ELDs.
- To assess attitudes about ELDs.
Methodology

- Intercept surveys of drivers at truck stops and collect Web-based surveys of carriers.

- **Initial test stage:** Conduct qualitative in-depth phone interviews with six drivers and two carriers.

- Quantitative interviews with drivers and carriers:
  - 628 drivers completed surveys at 24 truck stops across the United States (April and May, 2014).
  - 865 carrier personnel completed surveys online (recruited by mail, with sample from the Motor Carrier Management Information System [MCMIS]) in May and June, 2014.
Methodology, continued

- Core of the survey was a list of 14 interactions between drivers and carriers:
  - Rated for frequency of occurrence in a typical month (never, once, twice or more).
  - Asked whether each interaction is considered harassment by the drivers.
  - Asked ELD users whether harassment occurs due to hours of service (HOS) logging capabilities (not due to available fleet management system).
  - Framed interactions in both “negative” and “positive” cases.
Methodology – Management Interactions

- **Communications:**
  - Interrupt driver’s off-duty time with message at inappropriate time, or not.

- **Fatigue:**
  - Ask driver to operate while fatigued, or to shut down when fatigued.

- **Logging and Breaks:**
  - Ask driver to log hours inaccurately to get more work time or delay a break, or assure accuracy.
  - Change driver’s log record after it was made, or not change record to get more work time.
Methodology – Management Interactions

- **Schedules:**
  - Ask driver to meet an unrealistic customer schedule.
  - Or, adjust schedule to be more realistic.

- **Paid and Unpaid Times:**
  - Require wait times between loads for more than 2 hours without pay – or assure little delay time.
  - Require wait times for customer delays for more than 2 hours without pay, or pay for customer delays.
Driver Results

- No single interaction was considered harassment by more than 30% of drivers; 42% of drivers did not think ANY of the interactions were harassment.
- Few drivers regularly experience an interaction considered harassment.
  - For example, the most prominent was interruption with message while off-duty (12% at least once a month, 7% twice a month).
- Few differences between those drivers using paper and those using ELDs for experiencing harassing interactions.
- Three percent or less of drivers using ELDs associate the harassment they experience with the HOS-logging capabilities of the ELD (for each interaction).
Drivers’ attitudes toward ELDs are generally positive, the more so for drivers who use ELDs.

- Agreement with statements about less paperwork, saving time, and improved relationships with fleet management.

- Some skepticism regarding:
  1. Whether ELDs make the roads safer.
  2. That drivers are not overworking themselves.

- More paper users feel that ELDs:
  1. Give management too much insight into their days.
  2. Prevent them from doing their job as they want.
  3. Make them feel less independent.
Carrier Results

- Carriers reviewed the interactions in terms of whether their drivers might consider them harassment, from those they identified as occurring at least once a month for a “typical” driver at their company.
- 10-14% of the carriers say their “typical” driver might experience the most common “harassing” interactions in a month. The most prevalent of these included:
  - Interrupting drivers’ off-duty time with a message.
  - Requiring drivers to wait more than 2 hours between loads without pay.
  - Asking drivers to accurately log time even when they wanted more hours.
  - Asking drivers to meet unrealistic load schedules.
Carrier Results, continued

- Incidence of harassing interactions generally the same regardless of HOS logging method (paper or ELD), with some exceptions relating to whether the carrier was using both ELDs and paper logs.

- Carrier attitudes toward ELDs are also often positive:
  - Strong agreement on saving time and improving decisionmaking.
  - Even those using only paper understood positive aspects.
Conclusions

- Driver harassment is not broadly experienced, according to both drivers and carriers.
- Drivers using ELDs to log HOS generally have similarly limited occurrences of harassment as drivers using paper to log HOS.
- The evidence in this survey research does not support concluding that harassment occurs due to being in a situation where HOS are logged using ELDs.
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