Electronic Logging Devices and Driver Harassment

2015 Transportation Research Board 94th Annual Meeting
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration
Analysis, Research, and Technology Forum
January 13, 2015

Office of Research and Information Technology

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.

- <u>Initial test stage:</u> 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).

Driver Results, continued

- 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 <u>and</u> 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.*

Contact Information

For more information, please contact:

Gene Bergoffen, Principal
MaineWay Services
bergoffen@roadrunner.com
(207) 935-7948

Frank Lynch, Senior Analyst
Abt SRBI
f.lynch@srbi.com
(646) 486-8431

Information about the study and related documents can be found at:
http://www.regulations.gov/#!documentDetail;D=FMCSA-2010-0167-2255