

ABSTRACT

OCCUPATIONAL ATTITUDES OF OVER-THE-ROAD TRUCK DRIVERS: AN EXPLORATORY SURVEY

by Lewis M. Latta

Studies of occupational attitudes are characterized by two rather persistent tendencies: (1) research among blue-collar workers other than craftsmen has been largely confined to the manufacturing industries, and (2) researchers are prone to generalizing the results of their studies of factory workers to be applicable to all industrial workers. Although the first tendency is most likely a matter of convenience, the second requires an implicit assumption that the nature and conditions of the work itself and of the environment within which it is performed have little or no impact on the attitudes, interests, and aspirations of the persons engaged in the work, or that these factors vary so little from one industry to another as to be negligible.

This study was based upon the proposition that the environment within which over-the-road truck driving is performed and the nature of the work itself may exert significant influences on the attitudes of over-the-road truck drivers toward their work. In

conjunction with the investigation of occupational attitudes, selected characteristics of the background and socio-economic status of over-the-road truck drivers were examined for possible relationships to their occupational attitudes and occupational choice.

Three different measures of occupational attitudes were administered to a sample of 349 over-the-road truck drivers employed by 16 common and contract carriers of interstate motor freight. The focus of the three attitudinal measures and the major finding from each are as follows:

1. Over-the-road truck driving as a social role:

Only one of every eight respondents selected his work and workplace as a central life interest.

2. Over-the-road truck driving as a source of psychological identification:

Seven of every eight respondents were classified as moderately-to-highly involved in their work.

3. Over-the-road truck driving as a career:

Seven of every eight respondents were classified as highly-to-moderately committed to their work in preference to other possible fields of employment.

Examination of selected background and status characteristics of the sample provided no evidence that over-the-road truck drivers are a unique species. Neither were any of the characteristics examined found to be of value as predictors of the existence or

strength of the attitudes expressed by the three attitudinal measures. Besides being comparatively free from strong and/or disproportional influence by characteristics of the respondents, the three instruments were found to be independent of each other in that scores on one measure were of no value as predictors of scores on either of the others.

The evidence shows, however, that characteristics of this segment of the trucking industry and of over-the-road driving are major factors in the development of occupational attitudes. In fact, the very characteristics of the work and its environment which make the job unique in comparison to other industrial occupations preclude the recognition of over-the-road truck driving as a central life interest. On the other hand, these same characteristics provide a logical basis for psychological identification with over-the-road truck driving and the development of a commitment to the occupation as a career.

The findings of this study then support the proposition that the nature of the work and the work environment do, in fact, exert significant influences on the occupational attitudes of over-the-road truck drivers. Although the present study is unquestionably an extreme example, there is no reason to believe that less drastic differences among other occupational milieux do not exert proportional degrees of influence on the respective employees' attitudes.

OCCUPATIONAL ATTITUDES
OF OVER-THE-ROAD TRUCK DRIVERS:
AN EXPLORATORY SURVEY

By

Lewis M. Latta

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Department of Management

1968

6 5274
1/15/69

Copyright by
LEWIS M. LATTA
1969

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank the members of my committee for their guidance of this dissertation: Professor Darab B. Unwalla, Chairman; Professor William A. Faunce; and Professor Richard F. Gonzalez.

A special thanks is due the officers and members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters whose cooperation made the research possible.

I am deeply indebted to Dr. John G. Maurer for his encouragement and innumerable favors; to Mrs. Peggie McAllen, Executive Secretary of the Department of Management, for coordinating communications and assuming responsibility for a multitude of details; to Mrs. Louise Plachta for secretarial and editorial assistance; and to Mrs. Jeanne Bournazos for typing the manuscript.

I dedicate this work to my wife, Loretta, whose encouragement and devotion contributed greatly to its successful completion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. THE CONTEXT AND CONTENT OF OVER- THE-ROAD TRUCK DRIVING	1
Introduction	
Economic and Social Significance of Motor Freight Transportation	
Structure of the Industry	
Unionization of the Trucking Industry	
A Brief Commentary	
Nature of the Work	
II. RESEARCH PROBLEM, CONCEPTUAL FRAME- WORK, AND RESEARCH DESIGN	26
The Research Problem	
The Conceptual Framework	
Research Design and Procedures	
III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE OF OVER- THE-ROAD TRUCK DRIVERS	68
Selective Summary of Findings	
Time Factors	
Income	
Marital Status, Dependents, Home Ownership and Religious Preferences	
Education	
Occupational Mobility	
Social Participation	

Chapter		Page
IV.	OCCUPATIONAL ATTITUDES OF OVER- THE-ROAD TRUCK DRIVERS	94
	Work as a Central Life Interest of Over- the-Road Truck Drivers	
	Job Involvement of Over-the-Road Truck Drivers	
	Career Orientation of Over-the-Road Truck Drivers	
V.	COMPARATIVE ANALYSES OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS	127
	Characteristics of the Sample and Occupational Attitudes	
	Inter-Instrument Comparisons of Occu- pational Attitudes	
	Interpretation of the Results	
	Work as a central life interest	
	Job involvement	
	Career orientation	
VI.	SUMMARY, FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	172
	Summary	
	Further Considerations	
	Recommendations	
	APPENDIXES	188
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	200

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1 Total central life interest and subordinate experience patterns from six studies using the "Central Life Interests" Schedule--in percentages	47
3.1 Selected characteristics of over-the-road truck drivers. Summary statistics in years . .	71
3.2 Education of over-the-raod truck drivers and of their fathers, mothers and wives. Percentage distribution by years of school completed and summary statistics	76
3.3 Education of over-the-road truck drivers and of the general population. Percentage distribution by years of school completed . . .	78
3.4 Distribution of over-the-road truck drivers by first full-time job, in percentages	81
3.5 Distribution of over-the-road truck drivers by first job in trucking, in percentages	83
3.6 Occupations of the fathers, fathers' fathers, mothers' fathers, and wives' fathers of over- the-road truck drivers. Percentage distribu- tion by two occupational groupings	84
3.7 Percentage distribution of over-the-raod drivers by number of organizational member- ships, attendance, and offices held, with summary statistics	88

Table		Page
4.1	Total Central Life Interest and subordinate experience patterns for over-the-road truck drivers and industrial workers, in percentages	98
4.2	Percentage distribution of over-the-road truck drivers by total job involvement score . .	108
4.3	Percentage distribution of over-the-road truck drivers by job-involvement level with class ranges and class means	111
4.4	Distribution of over-the-road truck drivers by response to questions concerning their feelings and opinions about work, and by career orientation, in percentages	115
4.5	Percentage distribution of over-the-road truck drivers by total career-orientation scores	121
4.6	Percentage distribution of over-the-road truck drivers by career-orientation level with class ranges and class means	122
5.1	Coefficients of correlation between characteristics of over-the-road truck drivers and three measures of occupational attitudes	130
5.2	Coefficients of correlation between characteristics of over-the-road truck drivers and components of Career-Orientation Index	131
5.3	Coefficients of correlation among three measures of occupational attitudes and selected components	138
5.4	Distribution of scores on three instruments measuring occupational attitudes, in percentages	143
6.1	Summary of seven applications of the Central Life Interests questionnaire--in percentages . .	179

CHAPTER I

THE CONTEXT AND CONTENT OF OVER-THE-ROAD TRUCK DRIVING

Introduction

Much time and energy has been devoted to the study of human beings at work. The focus of interest and attention has varied from broad attempts to determine why people work, to microscopic examinations of specific organizations and occupations in an effort to account for observable variations in individual behavior and attitudes within narrowly circumscribed job situations. Hundreds of jobs and occupations have been scrutinized from various viewpoints.

Industries examined range from those employing only a handful of workers to major industries employing literally hundreds of thousands of production workers. However, a search of the literature has revealed no behavioral studies of motor freight transportation, either as an industry or as an occupation. This in itself would appear to be sufficient justification for an occupational study of the industry. In 1950 Delbert Miller and William Form

wrote in the preface to their text:

In many ways it is unfortunate that most of the research in industrial sociology has been done on the factory. This has led to a semantic confusion--one of identifying research on the factory with industrial sociology. Already many of us are prone to look at the factory as the main locus of work. The fact is that not more than one-quarter of the workers in the United States are employed in factories. The workers in trade, transportation, government, and other services constitute significant proportions of the labor force.

We prefer to use the word "industrial" in its broader meaning; as referring to all forms of economic activity, including financial, commercial, productive, and professional enterprises generally.¹

In spite of this admonition, the tendency toward such a narrow research focus still persists. While there has been a proliferation of studies in the white-collar occupations, research among blue-collar workers is still largely confined to the manufacturing industries. The importance of the problem is increased further by the fact that the proportions of workers in the non-manufacturing and service industries are increasing more rapidly than the proportion of production workers in manufacturing.

An even more important consequence of the narrow focus of most industrial research is the tendency of the researchers to generalize the results of their studies of factory workers to be applicable to all industrial workers. Such generalization must be based on the assumption that the nature and conditions of the work itself and of the environment within which it is performed have

¹Delbert C. Miller and William H. Form, Industrial Sociology: An Introduction to the Sociology of Work Relations (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951), p. ix.

little or no impact on the attitudes, interests, and aspirations of the persons engaged in the work, or that these factors vary so little from industry to industry as to be negligible.

The validity of such assumptions is, at least, open to question in view of observable differences between the occupational environments of manufacturing industries and the environment of the trucking industry. It is this question which provides the basis for the present study.

This study, then, is based upon the proposition that the environment within which over-the-road truck driving is performed and the nature of the work itself may exert significant influences on the attitudes of over-the-road truck drivers toward their work. In conjunction with this investigation, selected characteristics of the background and socio-economic status of over-the-road truck drivers will be examined for possible relationships to their occupational attitudes and their occupational choice.

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to a discussion of the significance of the trucking industry, its structure, and characteristics of the industry and of over-the-road truck driving which distinguish the occupation from manufacturing employment.

Economic and Social Significance of Motor Freight Transportation

Just as the automobile has become the basic mode of personal transportation, so has the motor truck become an integral and

indispensable part of the system by which all sorts of raw materials and foodstuff are moved from their sources through the channels of production, processing, and distribution to the ultimate consumer. Every community, large and small, is at least partially dependent upon motor-truck transportation for the satisfaction of its needs. At the same time, there are thousands of communities which depend entirely upon truck service for everything that they consume. As a matter of fact, there are very few products or commodities available today which have not traveled at least part of the way from their origin to their destination by motor truck.

Fifty years ago there were only about 600,000 trucks in use, most of which were engaged in local delivery service. At present there are approximately 15 million privately-owned motor trucks and combination vehicles in operation in the United States. Of this number, less than 10 percent are for hire while the remainder are privately operated by producers, distributors, utilities, stores, farmers, and non-commercial owners. However, more than half of the one million combination vehicles with three or more axles (tractors and trailers or semi-trailers) are in the for-hire service.²

Gross revenues of the for-hire motor carriers regulated by

²American Trucking Associations, Inc., Department of Research and Transport Economics, American Trucking Trends: 1966 (Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 5.

the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1967 were almost eleven billion dollars. This figure, representing more than 48 percent of the total amount paid to all types of federally regulated transportation media, exceeds the gross operating freight revenue of all railroads by more than a billion dollars.³ Although it is virtually impossible to calculate the total value of the service rendered by motor freight transportation, the American Trucking Associations, Inc. estimates that the total value of all motor carrier services would at least triple the gross revenues of federally regulated for-hire carriers.⁴

The impact of truck transportation upon the economy is scarcely less evident from the consumption side. For example, in 1965 private and for-hire trucking purchases included some 20.5 billion gallons of motor fuel, plus 350 million gallons of lubricating oil at a total cost of over 4.6 billion dollars, excluding taxes. Purchases of new trucks and trailers, replacement parts and accessories, and tires and tubes accounted for another 8.4 million dollars of purchases. At the same time, the nation's trucks generated over 3.8 billion dollars in federal and state taxes for highway use, exclusive of property, income, sales, and

³The Daily Tribune (Royal Oak, Michigan), June 28, 1968, p. 14.

⁴American Trucking Trends: 1966, op. cit., p. 9.

local taxes.⁵

However impressive these figures may be, they are dwarfed by the immeasurable importance of motor truck transportation as a vital link in the chain of production and distribution of this nation's output.

Structure of the Industry

From the previous section it becomes apparent that, in general, truck transportation may be divided into two broad categories--"private" and "for hire."

Private carriers, which account for a large majority of vehicles in the industry, are defined as those companies and individuals who operate vehicles which they own or lease and directly control for the transportation of their own materials, products, or equipment. Thus, private carriers include manufacturers, processors, merchants, utilities, farmers, and other truck operators whose principal business is not transportation, and whose transportation service is not for hire to the public.

For-hire carriers are those providing transportation, for compensation, of freight that is owned by someone else. Their operations may be classified as local cartage, intrastate carriage and interstate carriage. As the name implies, local cartage involves pickup and delivery service within the limits of a metropolitan

⁵Ibid., p. 1.

area or commercial zone. Intrastate carriage is restricted to the movement of property wholly within the confines of a single state, while interstate carriage involves the movement of property between states of the United States.

Carriers in the first two categories are usually regulated by local or state authorities, while interstate carriers are regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC). However, most inter-city trucking and even some local operations are classified as interstate commerce.

Under federal law, for-hire carriers in interstate commerce are classified as common carriers, contract carriers and exempt carriers. Interstate common and contract carriers are regulated by the ICC as to rates, routes, types of service, and types of commodities transported, as well as to hours of service for employees, equipment standards, and safety of operations. Exempt carriers in certain specific types of service are subject to safety, equipment, and hours of service rules, as are private carriers, but are not subject to the Interstate Commerce Commission's economic regulation.

Common carriers must offer their services impartially to all shippers to transport, at published rates, a given type of freight between points within their operating authority. Such authority may be for service on a regular basis over designated highways (regular route service) or for non-scheduled operation between designated

points or areas (irregular route service). In order to operate, every interstate common carrier must qualify for a certificate of public convenience and necessity granted by the ICC.

Contract carriers limit their offers of service to particular shippers under continuing contracts and need not serve all shippers equally. By providing special services or vehicles to the shipper, a contract carrier often designs a unique service to meet the specific needs of individual customers. To qualify for a permit to operate, an interstate contract carrier must satisfy the ICC that the proposed service is consistent with the public interest and that the carrier is capable to properly perform the service.

Common and contract carriers can be further categorized by commodities transported or types of service provided. General freight carriers may haul a wide variety of merchandise and packaged goods, usually called general commodities, but their rights often exclude certain freight such as bulk commodities, household goods, and heavy, dangerous, or other articles requiring special equipment or special handling. These and other types of freight may be handled by carriers who specialize in transporting specific items such as petroleum, chemicals, milk, frozen products, automobiles, bulk flour, sugar, syrup, cement, gravel, coal, and many others.

It is readily apparent that generalization about truck driving, per se, is impossible. Many driving jobs are as regular as factory

work with respect to hours and duties; other jobs, such as household goods moving may keep a driver away from home for periods of up to six weeks or more. Likewise, the types of equipment utilized range from pickup trucks to multiple-trailer trains weighing fifty tons or more.

For the purpose of this study, attention is confined to over-the-road drivers for inter-city common carriers and inter-city contract carriers. The reasons for this limitation are several. First, the limitations of time and money for research required that the project be restricted to manageable proportions. Second, the types of carrier selected for the survey are the most rigidly and uniformly regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, thus minimizing the differences in working conditions and constraints short of a case study in a single firm. Third, over-the-road drivers are the highest paid category of driver personnel in the industry, making this job the most attractive in terms of economic rewards. Fourth, to further provide uniformity of working conditions and basic wages among respondents, all of the drivers selected for inclusion in this survey are members of the same union and operate under a National Master Freight Agreement negotiated between their union and the carriers for which they work. A brief account of the structure and bargaining methods of the union follows.

Unionization of the Trucking Industry

The dominant labor organization in the trucking industry is the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, hereinafter referred to as the Teamsters, or The Union. By far the largest independent union in the nation, the Teamsters Union has some 50 percent more members than either the United Auto Workers or the United Steel Workers--the largest unions affiliated with the AFL-CIO. The Teamsters' 1,800,000 members, of whom about one-third are over-the-road drivers, are distributed by states in about the same proportions as the dispersion of the national population.⁶

The Teamsters Union is organized into four sections: the international union, four area conferences, about 50 city and state joint councils, and some 900 local unions.⁷ In small cities where no one craft is large enough to support its own local union, all organized drivers may belong to a single general union regardless of their specific type of employment. In larger cities, however, there may be a number of locals, each of which represents a single craft such as milk drivers, bakery drivers, over-the-road drivers, local cartage drivers, or an affiliated trade such as hotel and

⁶Sam Romer, The International Brotherhood of Teamsters: Its Government and Structure (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962), p. 4.

⁷Ibid., passim.

restaurant workers, and office workers. These locals are joined together in a Joint Council which may include all Teamster-affiliated unions in a state. Locals representing a single craft or trade are also united in one of the area or national trade divisions which form the core of the four area conferences.⁸ All affiliated locals and joint councils in the United States and its territories are represented in one of the area conferences each of which is directed by a vice-president of the International Union.⁹

Collective bargaining is conducted, to a certain extent, at all levels of the organization with a continuing trend toward national contracts with uniform nationwide conditions. For example, in the motor freight division, in 1967, negotiations between the International Unions' National Over-the-road and City Cartage Policy and Negotiating Committee and Trucking Employers, Inc., representing some 30 employer associations resulted in the National Master Freight Agreement Covering Over-the-road and Local Cartage Employees of Private, Common, Contract and Local Cartage Carriers. This agreement was then expanded and explicated by the addition of a number of supplements such as the Central States Area Over-the-road Supplemental Agreement, the National Iron and Steel and Special Commodity Supplemental Agreement, and others, negotiated by the same committees with the addition of appropriate

⁸Ibid., p. 92.

⁹Ibid., p. 56.

regional or special interest representatives. The supplemental agreements, in turn, contain special clauses, riders, or exceptions, to account for unique circumstances or conditions obtaining in a more limited area or a more specific segment of the industry.

Local and individual-employer contracts may be further modified to meet the unique requirements of a specific employment situation by the addition of special riders or clauses, but only with the express approval of the international officers. However, such modifications or restrictions are not encouraged, and where they do exist, probably result as often from concessions to local power sources in the union, as from an interest in tailoring the contract to individually fit specific situations.

Although the Teamsters Union accounts for only a fraction of the employees in the trucking industry, it wields a great deal of power. Through control over strategic segments of channels of production and distribution, the union is able to exert tremendous pressure on a for-hire carrier who is caught between the union's demands and the demands of customers for uninterrupted service. A manufacturer whose operations depend upon a steady flow of materials into, or products out of, his plant will not usually tolerate an interruption of that flow caused by a carrier's difficulties with the union; he will instead seek an alternative means of transportation. Thus, the constant threat of losing its customers

is an effective deterrent to a sustained stand against the union's demands by a single carrier.

The keenness of intra-industry competition as well as competition between motor carriers and other modes of freight transportation largely explains why motor carriers have been amenable to the nationalization of bargaining with the Teamsters. In addition to keeping the union from playing off one carrier against another in contract negotiations, each carrier knows that he is at least no worse off competitively than any other company operating under the same contract terms.

The union, however, maintains its power position to break a stalemate in negotiations by threatening selective strike action against recalcitrant carriers. In 1967, this strategy forced the employers to call a nationwide lockout and thereby assume responsibility for the resulting work stoppage.

The point to be made was well expressed in a business magazine in 1941:

There is simply no substitute for truck transportation. That is the nub of the union's power. Furthermore, it must be supplied continuously. It cannot be stored up like oil or wheat or coal. The railroads may continue to run and carry freight but the Teamsters can effectively halt its movement at any time. In the case of most unions, a strike is just a strike. In the case of the Teamsters, it can be a death warrant for the opposition.¹⁰

¹⁰ Fortune, May, 1941, p. 97. Quoted in Romer, op. cit., p. 4.

Although various legal restraints have considerably diminished the threat to the national economy, to the individual carrier it is still very real.

In this same vein it is worth noting that the potential for the exercise of power is not lost upon the union's membership. Unfortunately, the potency of the various legal restraints is not equally apparent, giving rise to frequent charges by the rank and file that the union's leadership has "gone soft" in their dealings with the carriers--that they are not militant enough in contract negotiations nor aggressive enough in the settlement of grievances.

For purposes of the present study the existence of a national contract covering all over-the-road drivers serves primarily to reduce the number of variables in the occupational environment which impinge upon the attitudes and opinions of the subjects of this survey.

A Brief Commentary

The foregoing sections of this chapter have attempted to set a generalized picture of the trucking industry together with some of the unique conditions which influence the occupational milieu within which the present study was conducted. As it is seen today, the industry is almost purely a product of the 20th Century. Despite its roots in wagon haulage, only the development of modern motor trucks and highways to accommodate them have made the growth

of the industry to its present magnitude and importance possible-- both as an individual entity and as an adjunct to other modes of freight transportation. Even the newest mode, i. e. , air freight, is totally dependent upon trucks to initiate its shipments at their source and to terminate the movements at the destinations. Federal and state regulation of the public elements of the industry have developed and increased as trucking has grown in public interest. The industry is presently in a period of consolidations and mergers as strong organizations expand their operations and weak or inefficient operators are absorbed into larger networks.¹¹ Union strategy has kept pace with developments by continually expanding the scope and area of negotiations with industry representatives.

Within the trucking industry there are several additional factors at work which serve to differentiate truck driving, and particularly over-the-road driving from most other industrial occupations. First, there is no formal hierarchy of jobs in the industry through which an employee must, or can, progress to reach the highest paid positions among the production workers. Many companies do not have a formal training program for inexperienced drivers. Training programs often start with a test of the prospective driver's knowledge of traffic laws and ICC safety

¹¹ A concise discussion of the present state of the industry and current trends is presented in "Here Come the Trucks," Forbes, December 1, 1964, p. 24 ff.

regulations. Successful completion of oral or written tests may be followed by a driving test and/or several road trips with a driver-trainer before final acceptance of an applicant. Prior experience may have been obtained in any of a variety of ways, including local hauling, construction driving, unregulated over-the-road hauling, or even hostling trailers around a terminal.

Second, there is no precise relationship between the skill requirements of different driving jobs and the wages they command. Rather, the higher pay for over-the-road driving seems to reflect compensation for unorthodox work schedules and erratic hours more than for superior ability or qualifications.

Third, the over-the-road agreement is one of the few, if not the only, union contracts which makes no specific provisions for overtime pay. The ICC limits over-the-road drivers to 10 hours driving in a single shift after which a driver must have at least 8 hours off. Driving hours are also limited to 60 hours in any seven days, but if the driver is a regular employee, it makes no difference whether the hours are worked by day or by night, or on which days of the week. A single hourly rate covers the entire span of driving time.

Last, but not least, outside the industry there is little or no distinction among the variety of occupational roles and statuses that actually exist under the generic title of truck driver. To many people, there is little or no difference between a driver of a pickup

delivery truck who may work for the minimum allowable wage rate and the driver of a large highway tractor-trailer unit who may earn up to \$15,000 a year.¹² They are both truck drivers despite the difference in at least the economic part of their socio-economic statuses.

Within this environmental framework, attention is now turned to over-the-road truck driving as a separate and distinct occupation in the industry.

Nature of the Work¹³

Most of the 600,000 over-the-road drivers presently employed by private and for-hire motor carriers throughout the United States

¹² Lest one is led to wonder how a maximum of 60 hours per week x \$3.25 (the hourly wage rate in 1965) can total \$15,000, it should be noted that the pay rate for many runs is based on the number of miles driven, rather than the number of hours actually worked. Rates that were developed years ago when trucks could average only 25 to 30 miles per hour of elapsed time have been preserved through union pressure. Thus, it is sometimes possible for a driver to earn almost double the nominal rate per hour. The union justifies its position by the claim that not only are drivers often hauling much heavier loads than they used to haul, but that the company is also enabled to increase substantially the utilization of its equipment and to render much faster service to its customers. That these claims are at least partially justified is evidenced by the fact that although the average annual wage per employee in the trucking industry has more than tripled since 1945 (from \$2,545 in 1945 to \$8,030 in 1964), total wage costs as a percentage of revenue have risen only from 52.9% to 61.6% during the same period. (c.f. American Trucking Trends: 1966, op. cit., pp. 23-24.

¹³ This section is based in part on the job description in the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1966-67 edition, Bulletin No. 1450, pp. 423-27.

operate gasoline or diesel-powered truck-tractors in combination with various kinds of cargo-carrying vehicles. In general, a tractor-trailer, or "semi," consists of a short-chassis power unit and a semi-trailer, the front of which rests on a coupling device known as a fifth wheel attached to the tractor frame so that part of the weight of the cargo is borne by the power unit. A truck-trailer, or "double bottom," consists of a longer power unit with an integral cargo-carrying body, in combination with a full trailer which is towed behind the power unit. A combination made up of a power unit and two trailing vehicles is known as a "train." Tractors alone may cost as much as \$25,000, and complete "rigs" may cost \$50,000. The cargo they carry is often valued at \$100,000 or more.

The drivers of these rigs are on their own practically all the time; they are away from direct supervision, and must accept responsibility for the equipment and cargo entrusted to them. Considerable initiative and judgment are also required, not only because of the value of the equipment and the freight, but also because customers depend on safe and prompt delivery of the goods and materials which are necessary for the operation of their stores and factories.

In many cases, the speed and flexibility of motor freight transportation have made it an integral link in the chain of continuous production and distribution processes. At the same time, the

attendant reduction in warehousing places a premium on the reliability of the service provided by the carrier.

Over-the-road drivers spend most of their working time driving. Runs between terminals of a carrier and relay runs rarely involve loading or unloading freight unless a pickup or delivery is made at an intermediate point enroute. In terminal-to-terminal or relay operations a driver's responsibility for the vehicle and its load usually ends when the sealed trailer is delivered to the destination terminal or is turned over to a relief driver at a relay station.

Drivers such as steel haulers, household goods movers, and others who make the complete movement of a load from its origin to its destination, often have to assist or supervise the loading and unloading of the freight. For these drivers, responsibility for the cargo continues until it is accepted by the consignee. However, these drivers generally arrange their schedules so that most of their waiting time may be used for required rest periods. Thus, they too spend most of their working time driving.

Much over-the-road driving is done at night to avoid traffic congestion as well as to make early morning deliveries to destination points. Hours of work are generally quite irregular because of variations in the length of runs, irregularity of demand for service, and restraints upon driving time imposed by regulatory agencies. Interstate Commerce Commission regulations provide

that no driver may drive more than 10 hours following eight consecutive hours off duty, or drive for any period after having been on duty 15 hours following eight consecutive hours off duty.¹⁴

The regulations further provide that no driver shall be on duty more than 60 hours in any seven consecutive days, except that carriers operating vehicles every day in the week may permit drivers to remain on duty for a total of not more than 70 hours in any eight consecutive days.¹⁵

Drivers subject to hours of service regulations are required to maintain a continuous daily log of their time and work-related activities. These include driving time, on-duty-not-driving time, and time spent in a sleeper berth, as well as off-duty time.¹⁶ Hours of service include both driving time and on-duty-not-driving time. The latter includes time spent in work-related activities such as loading, unloading, waiting, inspecting, and the time during which a driver is directly responsible for the equipment he operates, even though he is not actually driving. Over-the-road drivers typically try to be conservative in their allocations of time to on-duty-not-driving because these hours are counted in hours of

¹⁴Interstate Commerce Commission, Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (1952 ed. revised) (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965), sec. 195.3(a), p. 65.

¹⁵Ibid., sec 195.3(b), p. 65.

¹⁶Ibid., sec. 195.8, pp. 66-67.

service, thus reducing time available for actual driving.

To provide service within the regulatory framework, and to meet the needs of their particular operations in terms of lengths of runs, frequency, regularity and type of service provided, carriers have adopted a variety of methods of scheduling runs, which have tremendous impact on the drivers' hours and conditions of work.

Turn-around runs are usually established between points which are close enough to enable a driver to complete a round trip within ten hours driving time. Between more distant points which may take up to ten hours driving one way, the driver must lay over for the required eight hour rest period before making the trip back to his home terminal. On regular through-runs of this type, which keep a driver away from home for 24 hours or more, the carrier provides sleeping accommodations in a company dormitory or at a hotel. In recent years there has been an increasing tendency to convert this type of run to a relay operation wherein two drivers start out from opposite ends of the run and meet at a designated intermediate point to exchange rigs. Each driver then returns to his home terminal with the load from the other terminal, completing his run within the prescribed hours of service.

On very long distance runs, some carriers establish a two-man operation to speed the movement of freight and to achieve increased equipment utilization. In this type of operation, two men

are assigned as a team to a tractor equipped with a built-in sleeper berth in which one man may rest while the other is driving. These teams typically alternate between driving and resting at four-hour intervals, with the time spent in an approved sleeper berth being equivalent to off-duty time in hours of service regulations.¹⁷ Total hours of service rules are applicable, however, and provide some limitation on the length of a continuous tour of duty. Even so, drivers on two-man operations may spend a major part of their time away from home.

Because of the nature or direction of movement of a commodity, the kind of equipment utilized, or limitations on the carrier's rights to offer service, the transportation provided may be primarily a one-way operation. Automobile transport, livestock hauling, produce hauling from some areas, and much steel hauling are examples. In such cases the driver, upon completing delivery of a cargo, must "deadhead" home, that is, he must make the return trip without a load. The hours of service regulations apply equally to both parts of the run, but typically the driver selects his own time and place to make necessary rest stops within the requirements of the regulations.

In certain kinds of irregular operations, such as household goods moving and other long distance hauling over irregular routes

¹⁷Ibid., sec. 195.3(a), p. 65.

where the driver handles the complete movement of freight from origin to destination, prescheduling of the entire run is often impossible. A tour of duty may involve a circuitous route, taking from several days to several weeks to complete, with the driver deciding the direction and duration of the tour after the initial outbound load is delivered.

If a return load is not immediately available, he may elect to wait for one; he may "deadhead" to another point to pick up a load; or he may take an available load to another destination in hopes of getting a homeward-bound load from that point. This type of operation is often conducted by drivers who own their equipment and are paid on the basis of tonnage hauled and miles traveled, rather than on an hourly basis. Carriers in this type of operation usually develop a national dispatching system to provide loads for their drivers to and from all parts of the country. When a driver does return home, he may take one or two days off for each week spent on the previous trip before starting another run.

For over-the-road drivers subject to ICC regulation, safe driving practices and safety of the equipment which they operate are of primary importance. Drivers must inspect their vehicles before and after each trip and make out a report on their condition at the end of a run.¹⁸ In addition to a running log of daily activities,

¹⁸Ibid., secs. 192.7, 192.8, 196.7 and 196.9, pp. 11, 73-75.

detailed reports of any accidents are required,¹⁹ and special precautions must be observed in transporting and handling flammables, explosives, or other hazardous materials.²⁰ On occasion, drivers may have to prepare way bills for the shipper, collect transportation charges and C.O.D. payments, and obtain signed delivery receipts from consignees.

Minimum qualifications for over-the-road drivers are prescribed by the ICC.²¹ A driver must be at least 21 years old, able bodied, with good hearing, and vision of at least 20/40 with or without glasses. He must be able to read and speak English, and he must have at least one year's driving experience and a good driving record.

Many companies establish requirements more stringent than the prescribed minimum. For example, many companies will not hire over-the-road drivers under age 25.²² Some specify height and weight limitations. Minimum educational requirements and several years' experience driving the particular type of vehicles a driver would be operating in over-the-road service are demanded by a number of companies.

¹⁹Ibid., secs. 192.40(e) and sec. 194, pp. 16, 60-63.

²⁰Ibid., sec. 197, pp. 76-78.

²¹Ibid., sec. 191, pp. 5-10.

²²Of 349 respondents in the survey sample, only two were under 25 years of age.

Over-the-road driving is considered a senior driving job, and most such drivers have had previous experience in local driving, or in driving for private unregulated carriers. Very few trucking companies offer extensive training programs for the neophyte; however, in recent years specialized schools for training highway drivers have been developed in some areas. Of course, a young man with some capital or good credit may sometimes circumvent the age and experience requirements by purchasing a tractor and leasing it to a carrier as an owner-operator.

Inasmuch as over-the-road driving is the top operating job in the trucking industry, opportunities for promotion are almost non-existent. A few drivers may advance to jobs as safety supervisors, driver supervisors, or dispatchers, but these jobs are often unattractive because the starting pay is usually less than driver wages. Most drivers can only look forward to moving up, on the basis of seniority, to driving runs that provide increased earnings or preferred schedules and working conditions. Also, the Teamsters Union has been quite successful in maintaining and improving wages of its members, thereby enhancing their position relative to other occupations.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH PROBLEM, CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK, AND RESEARCH DESIGN

The Research Problem

This dissertation is primarily concerned with an exploratory investigation of the attitudes of over-the-road truck drivers toward their work. It is based on the proposition that the environment within which over-the-road driving is performed and the nature of the work itself may exert significant influences on their attitudes.

From the foregoing description of the industry and the job, it is readily apparent that over-the-road truck driving differs in significant aspects of its content and context from most factory employment. Most notable among these differences are:

1. The actual work of an over-the-road truck driver is done in isolation from fellow workers and supervisory personnel. As a consequence, he has a considerable amount of freedom as well as responsibility.
2. Despite his freedom from close supervision in the

performance of his work, an over-the-road driver is under the direct or indirect jurisdiction of three distinct entities: his employer, state and federal regulatory agencies, and the Teamsters Union.

3. Most over-the-road drivers work irregular hours and erratic schedules which do not conform to any orthodox patterns of work and leisure.
4. Although over-the-road driving is the highest paid operating job in the trucking industry, it is not part of a formal hierarchy of jobs with opportunities for further advancement, nor is it accorded any particular prestige outside the industry itself.

These differences suggest that over-the-road driving involves rather unique relationships between the driver, his work and its environment, his fellow workers, his employer, and the environment external to his work. In view of the fact that these relationships are also interrelated and impinge upon one another, it becomes obvious that no simple measure of occupational attitudes is adequate to explore the complexities of this work situation.

During the preliminary planning stage of this research project, several interviews were conducted with representatives of the trucking industry and executives of a number of trucking companies to explore the feasibility of the study itself, as well as the means of collecting the data required to accomplish the purpose of the

research. It may be noted in passing that company executives were generally receptive (although several were somewhat less than enthusiastic) to the idea of an attitude survey of their employees-- providing that it did not cause any trouble with the Union.

In the course of these interviews it became apparent that to conduct the research by means of personal interviews would be virtually impossible. In the first place, the problems involved in setting up interviews at the homes of respondents would be almost insurmountable because of the irregularity of their work schedules and the wide geographical dispersion of their residences. One company, for example, employed drivers working from its Detroit terminal who lived in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana. Other company executives were rather doubtful that the addresses in their personnel files were the actual places of residence of many of their drivers. At the same time, it was proposed that many potential respondents might consider a home interview an intrusion on their leisure time as well as an unwarranted invasion of their privacy.

The possibility of conducting interviews at the companies' terminals was also rejected. Many companies do not have facilities suitable to the conduct of private interviews on the premises, and if available, they would have to be staffed by an interviewer on almost a 24-hour basis over a period of time to meet most of the prospective interviewees. It was also pointed out that some over-

the-road drivers rarely come to the companies' terminals; many who do appear occasionally are not there long enough to participate in an interview; and those who do hang around the terminal are apt to have different attitudes and opinions about their work than do those who do not. Consequently, the idea of personal interviews as the means of collecting the desired data was abandoned in favor of a questionnaire survey.

This decision raised another set of problems, not the least of which was again the problem of gaining access to potential respondents. Opportunities to administer a questionnaire to groups of over-the-road truck drivers are scarce. Although some companies hold regular safety meetings which all drivers are supposed to attend, personnel directors and safety supervisors revealed that such meetings are not uniformly scheduled by all companies, and that they are rather poorly attended in those companies that do hold them. This finding suggests that those drivers who do attend safety meetings might express quite different attitudes toward their work than do those who do not attend. Consequently, it was decided to forego the opportunities for a mass administration of a questionnaire that might be available to avoid the possible introduction of bias into the data.

Preliminary interviews with industry representatives, then, yielded two major guidelines for the development of the proposed research project. First, the most feasible method of data collection

would be by a mailed questionnaire, even though there seemed to be some doubt about the effectiveness of this approach. Several industry representatives suggested that if their own experiences with getting log-sheets turned in and accident reports completed were any indicators, a ten percent response to a voluntary survey questionnaire would be an optimistic estimate. There was almost a consensus that over-the-road truck drivers have an aversion for paper work.

The second point on which there was almost universal agreement was that it would be mandatory that the Teamsters Union endorse the study before any attempt was made to establish contact with potential respondents. It is interesting to note, with respect to this point, many executives felt that an endorsement by the company might have a negative influence on the drivers' willingness to participate in the survey, whereas the Union's approval would be essential to any success at all.

The decision to utilize a questionnaire for the collection of the desired data immediately raised the problem of selecting an instrument or instruments appropriate to the aims of the study and within the capability and willingness of the subjects to answer. To satisfy the requirements of the proposition that the nature of the work and its environment may influence the attitudes of over-the-road truck drivers; and to avoid, at the same time, a charge that the design of the questionnaire dictated the desired responses, it

seemed imperative to select a measure or measures of job attitudes that had been applied to more conventional occupations. To this end attention is turned now to the literature in the field.

The Conceptual Framework

In the preceding chapter it was noted that efforts to define, describe, and evaluate the relationship of man to his work have been numerous and varied as to focus, technique, and results. Aside from a plethora of philosophizing, moralizing, and impressionistic writing about work congruous to the development of various political, religious, and economic doctrines, very little in the nature of systematic investigation was accomplished prior to World War I.

The past fifty years, however, have been marked by an increasing number of more or less "objective" attempts to find out how the worker himself feels about his job and about work in general. This increase has been so rapid that in the bibliographies of a review of research and opinion on job attitudes to 1955, some 1500 items are listed.¹ There is no evidence that the pace of

¹Frederick Herzberg, Bernard Mausner, Richard O. Peterson, and Dora F. Capwell, Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion (Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957). It should be noted that the figure stated is the approximate total of items listed at the end of all chapters of the book. Because each chapter is a somewhat discrete unit reflecting a different approach to the subject matter, there is of necessity considerable duplication in the separate listings. On the other hand, the authors make no claim that theirs is an exhaustive review of the literature.

investigation, nor even its rate of acceleration have diminished in the last decade.

The magnitude of the task undertaken by Herzberg and his associates can be better appreciated by considering briefly a few of the problems with which they were confronted in their attempt to bring some sort of order to the almost chaotic mass of research evidence under examination. Besides the diversity of purpose and methodology mentioned previously, a major difficulty in comparing research results arose from the lack of consensus in defining precisely what was being measured.

It may be fairly stated that the research purposes ranged from simply trying to find out why workers quit their jobs, through assessments of morale, motivation, and mental health, to attempts to evaluate the place and importance of work in the total life concept of individuals. Likewise, methods of investigation varied from asking a single direct question such as "Why did you quit your job?" to the utilization of depth interviews and projective techniques intended to tap the innermost and often unconscious feelings of respondents. As a consequence, results of the researchers were often stated in terms which made comparison extremely difficult.

Since Herzberg was more concerned with casting the results of the studies into comparable form than with a critique of the methods by which the data were obtained, relatively little attention was given to the differences in purpose and methodology of the

studies reviewed. However, a contemporary study of motivation and morale by Morris S. Viteles complements the work of Herzberg in that more attention is addressed to the methodology of data collection and its attendant problems.²

Overshadowing and contributing to the diversity of research evidence was, and still is, the problem identified by Robert Guion as "confusion of concept" which "makes communication collapse and argument inevitable."³

To illustrate the extent of confusion in defining a single concept, Professor Guion listed the following definitions in vogue at the time:

1. Morale is the absence of conflict.
2. Morale is a feeling of happiness.
3. Morale is good personal adjustment.
4. Morale is ego-involvement in one's job.
5. Morale is the extent of "we feeling" or cohesiveness of the group.
6. Morale is a collection of job-related attitudes.
7. Morale is the personal acceptance of the goals of the group.
8. Morale is the extent to which an individual's needs are satisfied and the extent to which the individual perceives that satisfaction as stemming from his total job situation.⁴

Needless to say, the last of these definitions is the most pleasing to Professor Guion.

²Morris S. Viteles, Motivation and Morale in Industry (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1953). See especially Chapter 12 for a concise, comprehensive discussion of employee-attitude surveys.

³Robert M. Guion, "Industrial Morale--The Problem of Terminology," Personnel Psychology, XI (1958), 60.

⁴Ibid., 60-62.

In general, Frederick Herzberg accommodated this diversity by equating job attitudes, in whatever terms defined in the literature, with job satisfaction. That this method is not unusual even today is well stated by Professor Victor Vroom:

The terms job satisfaction and job attitudes are typically used interchangeably. Both refer to affective orientations on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying. Positive attitudes toward the job are conceptually equivalent to job satisfaction and negative attitudes toward the job are equivalent to job dissatisfaction.⁵

The problem of classifying evidence from the studies for tabulation and comparison was solved by separating the studies into two categories. Studies which attempted a broad general assessment of job satisfaction were separated from those which were primarily concerned with identifying specific elements of the job or work environment that seemed to contribute to the development of favorable or unfavorable attitudes.

Herzberg noted that studies in the first category generally included three types of questions. First, "Are you satisfied with your job?" Second, "If you could do it over, would you go into the same job?" Third, "Are you interested in your job?" Although the wording of questions varies, all are aimed at evoking a global assessment by the individual of his feelings about his job.⁶

⁵Victor H. Vroom, Work and Motivation (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964), p. 99.

⁶Herzberg, et al., op. cit., p. 2. Herzberg's second category of studies consisted of some 155 researches conducted between

Questions such as these provide the basis for the determination of the prevalence of job dissatisfaction in the intermittent reviews of job satisfaction research which appear in Personnel and Guidance Journal.⁷

The forerunner of these reviews was reported in 1935 by Robert Hoppock in conjunction with his own study of job attitudes in New Hope, Pennsylvania.⁸ Hoppock's examination of 32 studies yielded 77 separate percentages which, in his words, "might conceivably be considered to indicate the proportion of dissatisfied workers in the various samplings." A simple average of the 77 percentages yielded a mean of 26 percent and a median of 19 percent of workers dissatisfied with their jobs.⁹

By 1953 the cumulative median of 266 percentages had

1920 and 1954. From these the reviewers identified 134 descriptive phrases or "aspects" of the job situation which could be subsumed under ten major headings or "job factors." Because these factors were found to contribute in varying degrees to the development of both favorable and unfavorable job attitudes on the part of workers, it was decided that this methodology is beyond the scope of the present research. Therefore, this category of studies will not be discussed in detail in this report.

⁷The first ten reviews appeared in Occupations between April, 1938 and May, 1952. Beginning in September, 1953, they appeared in Personnel and Guidance Journal. For the most recent review see H. Alan Robinson, Ralph P. Connors, and G. Holly Whitacre, "Job Satisfaction Researches of 1964-65," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLV (December, 1966), 371-79.

⁸Robert Hoppock, Job Satisfaction (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1935).

⁹Ibid., p. 215.

decreased to 13 percent dissatisfied workers. In the most recent review the cumulative total had risen to 494 percentages with the median percentage of dissatisfied workers holding stable at 13 percent.¹⁰

Both the validity and the utility of such global assessments of job satisfaction have been questioned repeatedly. Herzberg notes that the percentage of respondents dissatisfied seems to vary from study to study according to the type of question used. He further suggests that the use of a dichotomy of "yes" or "no" responses to the "Are you satisfied with your job?" type of question pushes workers who are only partly satisfied with their jobs into the satisfied category of respondents.¹¹

Herzberg's examination of the literature revealed that workers in lower level occupations are the least satisfied with their jobs. Since lower status jobs predominate in business and industry, the Hoppock-Robinson estimate of the level of dissatisfaction among all workers is probably understated to the extent that the makeup of individual samples included in the estimate are disproportional to the numbers of workers in the various occupational levels.¹²

In a perceptive but less extensive review of the literature, Robert Blauner suggests that over-all assessments of job attitudes

¹⁰H. Alan Robinson, et al., op. cit., p. 372.

¹¹Herzberg, et al., op. cit., p. 4. ¹²Ibid.

are apt to be distorted by a cultural bias toward indicating contentment. He comments as follows:

There is a certain naivete in expecting frank and simple answers to job satisfaction questions in a society where one's work is so important a part of one's self that to demean one's job is to question one's very competence as a person.¹³

Blauner concludes that even though it is difficult to reject evidence that a sizable majority of American workers are at least moderately satisfied in their work, in his words,

. . . such a finding is neither particularly surprising nor sociologically interesting. Under "normal" conditions there is a natural tendency for people to identify with, or at least to be somewhat positively oriented toward, those social arrangements in which they are implicated.¹⁴

In spite of these qualifications, two conclusions evolve from the studies of the over-all level of job satisfaction which appear to be of considerable interest and importance within the framework of the present research. The first of these, noted by both Herzberg and Blauner, is that job satisfaction tends to vary with occupational level. Herzberg states his conclusion as follows:

One unequivocal fact emerges from the studies of job satisfaction; the higher the level of occupation, the higher the morale. Of the 18 studies in which evidence as to level of occupation is presented, only one fails to report higher job satisfaction at higher levels. The 17 positive studies cover

¹³Robert Blauner, "Work Satisfaction and Industrial Trends in Modern Society," Labor and Trade Unionism, ed. Walter Galenson and Seymour Lipsit (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960), p. 355.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 341.

a wide range of occupations ranging from unskilled laborers through professional and managerial positions.¹⁵

Blauner similarly reports:

When a scale of relative job satisfaction is formed, based on general occupational categories, the resulting rank order is almost identical with the most commonly used occupational status classification--the Edwards Scale of the Bureau of the Census.¹⁶

Of even greater significance to the present study is the conclusion evolving from Blauner's qualifications of the foregoing statement:

Although this generalization is, to an impressive extent, supported by the evidence, it does not hold unfailingly. We can note occupations with relatively high prestige whose general level of satisfaction is lower than would be expected, whereas some low-status jobs seem to be highly satisfying.¹⁷

In a different but related context, Blauner also comments:

Although railroading is a high-status industrial occupation--railroaders have historically been part of the labor aristocracy--its occupational prestige is below most white-collar occupations. On the other hand, truck driving is a lower-status manual occupation (truck drivers are classified as semi-skilled operatives by the census, and the popular stereotypes of this occupation are somewhat derogatory), and yet in the Hoppock survey the satisfaction of truck drivers outranked all industrial occupations except railroading and was approximately the same level as that of salesmen.¹⁸

Blauner's reference is to Hoppock's original study of job satisfaction in New Hope, Pennsylvania. Although this study

¹⁵Herzberg, et al., op. cit., p. 21.

¹⁶Blauner, op. cit., p. 341.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 345.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 348.

included only five truck drivers (not otherwise identified), the implications of the findings would seem to require the inclusion of a measure of job satisfaction in the present survey questionnaire.¹⁹

It becomes obvious, however, that, alone, a measure of job satisfaction is an inadequate determinant of workers' attitudes toward their work. Three specific clues to this inadequacy are provided by Blauner. Although two of these have been cited previously, they are worthy of repetition.

First, Blauner suggests that there is a natural tendency for people to identify with, or at least to be somewhat positively oriented toward, those social arrangements in which they are implicated.²⁰ In the context of this statement, Blauner is implying that "identification with" and "positive orientation toward" work as a social arrangement are virtually synonymous with job satisfaction.

In another comment Blauner points directly to the inadequacy of job satisfaction as an over-all indicator of occupational attitudes as follows:

But, work has significant positive meanings to persons who do not find overall satisfaction in their immediate job. A still viable consequence of the Protestant ethic in our society is that its work ethic (the notion of work as a calling, an obligation to one's family, society, and self-respect,

¹⁹Robert Hoppock, op. cit., pp. 237ff. The questions used by the author to construct his Job Satisfaction Index are presented in Appendix A.

²⁰Blauner, op. cit., p. 341.

if no longer to God), retains a powerful hold.²¹

Blauner's third clue to the inadequacy of job satisfaction questions, alone, appears in his reference to the influence of a cultural bias toward reporting satisfaction (see above, p. 37). Here he refers to the importance of one's work to one's self as being something distinct from job satisfaction.

The concepts implicit in these comments provide the rationale for the selection of the research instruments used in this exploration into the occupational attitudes of over-the-road truck drivers.

It must be noted that the foregoing comments by Blauner are not unique. As a matter of fact, they are typical of almost the entire field of job attitude literature. For example, four years prior to Blauner's study, Robert Dubin, in the introduction to his own research report, remarked:

It is a commonplace to note that work has long been considered a central life interest for adults in most societies, and certainly in the Western world. Indeed, the capitalist system itself is asserted to rest upon the moral and religious justification that the Reformation gave to work, as Weber and Tawney have pointed out.²²

Dubin continued, however, with this comment:

²¹Ibid., p. 353. Italics are Blauner's.

²²Robert Dubin, "Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the 'Central Life Interests' of Industrial Workers," Social Problems, III (January, 1956), 131. Dubin's references preceded his writing by nearly 30 years. They are: R. H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (New York: Harcourt, 1926), and Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (London: Geo. Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1930).

Our research shows that for almost three out of every four industrial workers studied, work and the workplace are not central life interests.²³

In this report, published about the same time as the Herzberg review of the literature on job attitudes, Dubin not only takes issue with the validity of the Protestant ethic, but he questions the utility of management activity in personnel and industrial relations directed at "restoring work to the status of a central life interest." He further challenges the efforts of "human relationists" whose major purpose is to "center primary human relationships in work and make it functional for productivity."²⁴

The bases for these criticisms are the results of a study of 491 workers in three diversified manufacturing plants located in different urban midwestern communities. The results were obtained by the administration of a 40-item Central Life Interests questionnaire designed "to determine whether the job and workplace were central life interests of workers or whether other areas of their social experience were important to them."²⁵

The forty items dealt with four categories of experience: formal aspects of membership and behavior in organizations, technological aspects of the environment, informal group life experiences, and general everyday experiences. According to Dubin,

Each question represented an activity that had an approximately equal likelihood of occurring in connection with

²³Ibid.

²⁴Ibid., p. 140.

²⁵Ibid., p. 134.

some aspect of the job or workplace, or at some definite point in the community outside of work.²⁶

With a third choice added to represent an indifferent or neutral answer, responses to each question were individually scored as job-oriented, non-job-oriented or indifferent, according to the respondent's expressed preference for a given locale or situation in carrying out the designated activity. Responses to the items in each of the four categories were summed and similarly scored. Respondents who selected a job-oriented response to at least 50 percent of the items in each category, and those who had at least 70 percent of their answers made up of job-oriented and indifferent responses with at least 40 percent job-oriented, were designated as job-oriented workers. Those workers who did not meet either of these criteria were classified as non-job-oriented. The same criteria were used to determine whether a respondent was classified as job-oriented or non-job-oriented in his total pattern of responses to all forty questions.²⁷

Dubin developed theoretical support for his study from two basic axioms: (1) social experience is inevitably segmented, that is, the social world of urban man is continuously subdivided into areas of activity and interest, with each social segment lived out more or less independently of the rest, and (2) an individual's social participation may be necessary in one or more sectors of his social

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Ibid.

experience but may not be important to him.²⁸

From these two axioms Dubin derived three general propositions which, in turn, generated five testable hypotheses. The propositions, hypotheses, and empirical findings in support of the hypotheses are as follows:

1. Proposition: . . . individuals will exhibit adequate social behavior in sectors of social experience in which participation is mandatory but not valued.²⁹

Hypothesis: . . . a significant proportion of industrial workers will be classified as non-job-oriented when central life interest is measured with the CLI questionnaire.

Measure: The entire 40 item CLI questionnaire.

Finding: . . . only 24 percent of all the workers studied could be labelled job-oriented in their life interests. Thus, three out of four of this group of industrial workers did not see their jobs and work places as central life interests for themselves. They found their preferred human associations and preferred areas of behavior outside of employment.

2. Proposition: . . . an individual's attachment to a situation in which his social experience is not valued by him will be to the most physically and directly obvious characteristics of that situation.

²⁸Ibid., p. 132.

²⁹Dubin assumes that continued employment is evidence of the adequacy of social behavior at work and that holding a paying job is evidence of conformity both to societal mandates that most male adults should work for a living, and to the imperatives and requirements of the job.

- Hypothesis:** . . . a significant proportion of industrial workers will score job-oriented for their organizational experience when measured on the organizational section of the CLI schedule.
- Measure:** Seven items of the CLI questionnaire.
- Finding:** More than three out of five of the workers were scored as job-oriented with respect to their experiences in organizations: 61 percent chose their companies as the most meaningful context to them when their life experiences in organizations were brought into focus.
- Hypothesis:** . . . a significant proportion of industrial workers will be job-oriented for their experiences with technological aspects of their environments when measured on the technological section of the CLI questionnaire.
- Measure:** Ten items of the CLI questionnaire.
- Finding:** In the technological sector, 63 percent of the respondents were scored as job-oriented. . . . almost two out of three of the workers studied identified their workplace as the locale of their preferred relationships with the purely technical aspects of their environment.
3. **Proposition:** . . . primary human relations take place only in situations where social experience is valued by the individual.
- Hypothesis:** . . . a significant proportion of industrial workers [will be] non-job-oriented with respect specifically to informal group experiences when measured on the relevant portion of the CLI questionnaire.
- Measure:** Fourteen items of the CLI questionnaire.
- Finding:** Only 9 percent of the industrial workers in the sample prefer the informal group life

that is centered in the job. Nine out of ten of those studied clearly indicated that their preferred informal human associations and contacts were found in the community, among friends, and in the family.

Hypothesis: . . . a significant proportion of industrial workers will not respond to work as a valued social experience when this is tested by the general experience sector of the CLI questionnaire.

Measure: Nine items of the CLI questionnaire.

Finding: Only 15 percent of the workers give job-oriented preferences. The rest--about eleven in thirteen--saw experiences of theirs that were sampled in the study as taking place somewhere away from the workplace.³⁰

On the basis of these findings, Dubin concludes:

The industrial workers' world is one in which work and the workplace are not central life interests for a vast majority. In particular, work is not a central life interest for industrial workers when we study the informal group experiences and the general social experiences that have some affective value for them. Industrial man seems to perceive his life history as having its center outside of work for his intimate human relationships and for his feelings of enjoyment, happiness, and worth. On the other hand, for his experiences with the technological aspects of his life space and for his participation in formal organizations, he clearly recognizes the primacy of the workplace. In short, he has a well-developed sense of attachment to his work and workplace without a corresponding sense of total commitment to it.³¹

³⁰Ibid., pp. 135-38. These propositions, hypotheses, and findings were scattered throughout the pages noted. They have been grouped here for expository purposes.

³¹Ibid., p. 140.

This research has since been replicated a number of times, and includes separate studies of Registered Nurses,³² Cooperative Extension Agents,³³ Industrial Education Teachers,³⁴ Industrial Production Supervisors,³⁵ and Lumber Workers.³⁶ The results of these researches are summarized in Table 2.1.

The results of these studies are presented here, not for the purpose of detailed comparison, but primarily to illustrate that the Central Life Interests schedule does discriminate among different occupational groups. In one of the first replications of Dubin's study, Louis Orzack reported that "for four out of every five nurses studied, work and the workplace are central life interests."³⁷ Except for a slight preference for non-work settings

³²Louis H. Orzack, "Work as a 'Central Life Interest' of Professionals," Social Problems, VII, No. 2 (Fall, 1959), 135-32.

³³Raymond R. Ranta, "The Professional Status of the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1960).

³⁴Hilding E. Nelson, "Occupational Self-Images of Teachers: A Study of the Occupational Involvements and Work Role Orientations of Michigan Industrial Education Teachers" (Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, Dept. of Education, Michigan State University, 1962).

³⁵John G. Maurer, "Work as a 'Central Life Interest' of Industrial Supervisors," forthcoming in Academy of Management Journal, XI, No. 3 (September, 1968).

³⁶Nelson, op. cit. Data from an unpublished study of 400 lumber workers by Kenji Ima, provided by Dr. Robert Dubin.

³⁷Orzack, op. cit., p. 127.

TABLE 2.1.1.--Total central life interest and subordinate experience patterns from six studies using the "Central Life Interests" Schedule--in percentages

Interest Pattern	Coopera- tive Extension Agents	Profes- sional Nurses	Produc- tion Super- visors	Indus- trial Educ. Teachers	Indus- trial Workers	Lumber Workers
	RANTA	ORZACK	MAURER	NELSON	DUBIN	IMA
Total CLI						
Job-oriented	85	79	54	24	24	14
Non-job-oriented	15	21	46	76	76	86
Informal relations						
Job-oriented	52	45	05	12	09	05
Non-job-oriented	48	55	95	88	91	95
General relations						
Job-oriented	77	67	57	23	15	11
Non-job-oriented	23	33	43	77	85	89
Formal relations						
Job-oriented	94	91	76	67	61	62
Non-job-oriented	06	09	24	33	39	38
Technological relations						
Job-oriented	87	87	87	69	63	54
Non-job-oriented	13	13	13	31	37	46
N	232	150	111	230	491	400

Note: Data for this table taken from sources cited in footnotes in preceding references.

as a source of informal social relations, the nurses scored heavily job-oriented in terms of general social experiences, formal work relations and technological experiences (column 2 of Table 2.1).

On the basis of his study, Orzack concludes:

The differences between Dubin's findings for industrial workers and the current findings for professional nurses imply a greater commitment to work by these and perhaps other professionals. Many facets of the professionals' lives are affected by the nature of their work and the extent of their commitment to it and to their places of work. Work is obviously a highly-valued, demanding and important feature of the many roles played in our society by professionals.³⁸

Work and the workplace are central life interests for an even greater percentage of the Cooperative Extension Agents included in Ranta's study (column 1 of Table 2.1). The agents studied also scored correspondingly larger percentages job-oriented on the sub-sectors of the CLI schedule.

Perhaps the most striking facet of Table 2.1 is the similarity between the CLI scores and general status ranking of the occupations. Large percentages of workers in the at least semi-professional occupations are scored as job-oriented, as opposed to the small percentages of job-oriented respondents in the manual occupations, with Maurer's Production Supervisors standing intermediate to the two extremes. Except for the Industrial Education Teachers, the CLI scores reported suggest a pattern such as that reported for job satisfaction levels by Herzberg and his associates,

³⁸Ibid., p. 131.

and by Robert Blauner.

This suggestion raises the question as to what kind of responses might be expected when this instrument is administered to over-the-road truck drivers. On the one hand, if the results presented in Table 2.1 truly represent a pattern, it would be expected that CLI patterns for over-the-road drivers would be similar to those of Dubin's industrial workers. On the other hand, if over-the-road drivers digress from the norm with this instrument as suggested by Blauner with respect to job satisfaction, one might expect considerably larger percentages of these subjects to be scored as job-oriented on the CLI schedule. Despite the fact that prediction of the outcome of its application to the present research problem is impossible, the Central Life Interests questionnaire would appear to add a distinctive dimension to the exploration of occupational attitudes of over-the-road truck drivers.

It is not to be implied, however, that Dubin's Central Life Interests questionnaire is universally accepted as the measure of occupational attitudes. It has, in fact, been subjected to several criticisms with respect to both methodology and results. Prominent among its critics are Harold Wilensky, Arthur Kornhauser, and Robert Blauner.

Wilensky suggests that the measure may be weak. He feels that

Dubin's assumption that each question represents an activity that is as likely to occur "in connection with some aspect of the job or workplace" as "at some definite point in the community outside of work" seems dubious. Also, it is possible that a friendship in the neighborhood or a social club was originally formed in the workplace, and many "community" answers should have been coded "job oriented."³⁹

In spite of his criticism, Wilensky reports that his own research, "which relates feelings about work to actual patterns of social life, supports Dubin's polemic: . . . the core of life for most men in the middle mass is not the job."⁴⁰

In a similar vein, Kornhauser offers the following criticism of Dubin's study:

In our opinion, the methods and data of that research do not all justify the conclusion that work is not of central significance for workers. What the results indicate is that workers find their pleasures and intimate personal relationships more in non-work situations than at work. A clear distinction must be made between the subjective importance of work and the satisfactions it provides. Dubin defines "central life interest" to refer to "expressed preferences" for work relationships. Our own results, on the other hand, indicate how large the job looms in the worker's life, including its negative implications as well as the positive, and including feelings about the job's importance as a source of economic gratifications, its contribution to a sense of personal worth, and its implications regarding the worker's place in the community.⁴¹

³⁹Harold L. Wilensky, "Varieties of Work Experience," Institute of Industrial Relations, Reprint No. 231 (Berkeley: University of California, 1964), p. 152. Reprinted from Henry Borow (ed.), Man in a World of Work (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1964), pp. 125-54.

⁴⁰Ibid.

⁴¹Arthur Kornhauser, Mental Health of the Industrial Worker: A Detroit Study (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965), p. 328.

Blauner's criticism of the Dubin study focuses primarily on the basic axiom that social experience is inevitably segmented and that the various segments are relatively independent. He comments as follows:

It is fashionable to argue that work alienation is not an important present or potential problem because work has lost its former position as "the central life-interest," particularly for manual workers. It is the hope of many that the opportunities for self-expression and creativity denied by modern technology and bureaucracy can be found again in the freely chosen pursuits of leisure time. . . . The problem with the leisure solution is that it underestimates the fact that work remains the single most important life activity for most people, in terms of time and energy, and ignores the subtle ways in which the quality of one's worklife affects the quality of one's leisure, family relations, and basic self-feelings.⁴²

Now it must be noted that the research problems with which these critics were dealing at the time, as well as their respective frames of reference, were distinctly different from Dubin's inquiry into his subjects' "expressed preferences for a given locale or situation in carrying out an activity."

Wilensky was primarily concerned with the measurement of work alienation-indifference-attachment in terms of the impact and importance of specific features of the work situation upon five attributes of his interviewees' self images.⁴³

⁴²Robert Blauner, Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 183-84.

⁴³Wilensky, op. cit., p. 140.

Kornhauser, in addition to the differences pointed out in the quotation above, comments as follows:

. . . it [work] also performs essential psychological functions. It operates as a great stabilizing, integrating, ego-satisfying central influence in the pattern of each person's life. If the job fails to fulfill these needs of the personality, it is problematic whether men can find adequate substitutes to provide a sense of significance and achievement, purpose and justification for their lives.⁴⁴

With this kind of a predisposition, it is understandable that Kornhauser would be critical of research findings which, in his eyes, appear to disagree. However, he offers as evidence of the psychological salience of the job for his sample of factory workers the finding that in response to broad questions asking how the individual feels about his life and the way it has been working out, 26 percent of the volunteered comments referred to the man's job, in contrast to 74 percent pertaining to other sectors of his life interests. Again, by counting only those topics that respondents particularly stressed or mentioned repeatedly, 22 percent of their salient ideas referred to the job while 78 percent dealt with other sectors of their life interests.⁴⁵

Blauner, on the other hand, appears to be more critical of the extent to which Dubin and others have generalized the results of the Central Life Interests questionnaire to all industrial workers

⁴⁴Kornhauser, op. cit., p. 7.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 8.

than he is of the methodology of the study itself.⁴⁶ According to Blauner, his own comparative analyses of alienating tendencies in four different industrial settings show that an employee's industry decides the nature of his work and affects the meaning which that work has for him. He further concludes that the industry in which a man is employed

. . . greatly influences the extent to which he is free in his work life and the extent to which he is controlled by technology or supervision. It also influences his opportunity for personal growth and development--to learn, to advance, to take on responsibility. His industry even affects the kind of social personality he develops, since an industrial environment tends to breed a distinctive type.⁴⁷

Considered together, these opposing views immediately suggest an additional dimension of the problem of job attitude measurement. Wilensky's concept of self-image, Kornhauser's concept

⁴⁶That such criticism is not entirely unjustified is amply evidenced in Dubin's own conclusions from his research findings (see above, p. 45). From his usage of the terms one can either conclude that "factory workers" are the only kind of "industrial workers" there are, or that his findings pertaining to factory workers are indeed applicable to workers in all other industries. Dubin also appears to go beyond the scope of his research evidence in his observation that "Factory work may now very well be viewed by industrial workers as a means to an end--a way of acquiring income for life in the community. The factory as a locale for living out a lifetime seems clearly secondary to other areas of central life interest. The factory and factory work as sources of personal satisfaction, pride, satisfying human associations, perhaps even of pleasure in expressing what Veblen called the 'instinct of workmanship,' seem clearly subordinated in the American scene." (p. 135)

⁴⁷Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, op. cit., p. 166.

of ego-satisfaction, and Blauner's concept of alienation, all suggest an evaluation of one's work role from a different perspective than that involved in either a measure of job satisfaction or the Central Life Interests schedule. Unfortunately, none of the studies cited employed, for that part of their research, a technique adaptable to the needs of the present project.

Both Kornhauser and Wilensky collected their data from extensive personal interviews with their subjects, while Blauner combined participant-observation with data from secondary sources for his comparative analyses in four industries.

However, the concepts embodied in the foregoing criticisms of Dubin's study appear to provide the framework upon which Lodahl and Kejner construct their Job-Involvement Scale.⁴⁸ They define job-involvement first, as "the degree to which a person is identified psychologically with his work, or the importance of work in his total self-image."⁴⁹ They further state that "job involvement is the internalization of values about the goodness of work or the importance of work in the worth of the person."⁵⁰ They further comment that for this work, "job involvement was defined as the degree to which a person's work performance affects his self-esteem."⁵¹

⁴⁸Thomas M. Lodahl and Mathilde Kejner, "The Definition and Measurement of Job Involvement," Journal of Applied Psychology, XLIX, No. 1 (1965), 24-33.

⁴⁹Ibid., 24.

⁵⁰Ibid.

⁵¹Ibid., 25.

In support of their conceptualization Lodahl and Kejner note its similarity to Allport's concept of ego-involvement, French and Kahn's ego-involved performance, and Guion's definition of morale as ego involvement. In summarizing, they assert:

These definitions have a common core of meaning in that they describe the job-involved person as one for whom work is a very important part of life, and as one who is affected very much personally by his whole job situation: the work itself, his co-workers, the company, etc. On the other hand, the non-job-involved worker does his living off the job. Work is not as important a part of his psychological life. His interests are elsewhere, and the core of his self-image, the essential part of his identity, is not greatly affected by the kind of work he does or how well he does it.⁵²

Considerable evidence of the "conceptual confusion" referred to by Guion (see above, page 33) appears in Lodahl and Kejner's development of the framework for their study. In the present instance, apparently legitimate criticisms of Dubin's Central Life Interests formulation give rise to the search for a measure of job-involvement. Now Lodahl and Kejner, in their approach to the construction of such a measure, draw theoretical support from Dubin's research.

Furthermore, Lodahl and Kejner assert that job involvement "operationalizes the 'Protestant Ethic.'"⁵³ At the same time, Dubin, whose research they cite in support of their conceptualization of job involvement, strongly implies that his findings refute those very tenets (see above, page 45). However, in spite of this

⁵²Ibid.

⁵³Ibid.

confusion, there is further evidence that the Lodahl-Kejner approach to the measurement of job attitudes does, in fact, differ from Dubin's.

The rationale for a distinction between the conceptualizations of Dubin's Central Life Interests questionnaire and the Lodahl-Kejner Job Involvement Scale is contained in Friedmann and Havighurst's distinction between the functions of work and its meanings for the individual. According to the authors, the functions or characteristics of any job include the provision of income or economic return, the regulation of life-activity, the identification of the person in his group (status), the fixing of patterns of association, and the provision of a set of meaningful life-experiences, i. e., a source of contacts with persons, objects, and ideas.⁵⁴

Although these functions are posited as being found in any work situation, Friedmann and Havighurst propose that the significance of the job, as interpreted by the worker himself, varies first according to his recognition of the functions of the job and the importance which he attaches to them.⁵⁵ The importance of work as a source of meaningful life-experiences is, of course, the basis for Dubin's Central Life Interests questionnaire.

⁵⁴Eugene A. Friedmann and Robert J. Havighurst, The Meaning of Work and Retirement (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), p. 4.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 5.

The significance of the job also varies according to the type of evaluation the worker makes of his work. All the functions of work are surrounded by a cluster of emotional experiences. From the job the worker derives such feelings as success, failure, accomplishment, frustration, good fellowship, aesthetic pleasure, and boredom.⁵⁶ The direction and strength of these types of emotional experiences appear to provide the content of the worker's psychological identification with his work and the importance of his work to his total self-image. In other words, these are the means by which the worker can test his self-esteem in the workplace.

The Lodahl-Kejner Job Involvement Scale was constructed by submitting a list of 87 statements potentially related to job involvement to a panel of 22 "expert" judges who were instructed to judge each statement as to the degree of job involvement it expressed. On the basis of their ratings, 40 items with low Q values and medians tending toward the extremes of the distribution were retained.⁵⁷

These 40 items were cast into a Likert-type format with four categories of response (strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree; scored 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively). This 40-item scale was administered to 137 nursing personnel in a large general hospital. Total scores summed over the 40 items were

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 6

⁵⁷Lodahl and Kejner, op. cit., p. 26.

obtained and together with the data from the individual items were intercorrelated and factor analyzed.⁵⁸

On the basis of these results, the scale was reduced to 20 items and administered to 70 engineers in an advanced development laboratory.⁵⁹ The final 20 items were also rescored for the sample of nursing personnel to make the two sets of data comparable. Analysis revealed low inter-item correlations (averaging about .17) and relatively high item-total correlations. As a result, most of the variance in total job-involvement score appeared on the first (unrotated) principal axis.⁶⁰ Similarity of factorial structure suggests that job involvement has at least three dimensions: (1) non-acceptance of items expressing very high involvement, (2) an indifferent response to work, and (3) for nurses, duty-bound positive involvement; for engineers, a rejection of extra duties and of the notion of work as a measure of self.⁶¹

The authors conclude that the reliability of the 20-item scale is adequate although not extremely high. Validity is indicated in that the scale discriminates among groups and has plausible correlations with other variables.⁶²

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 27.

⁵⁹The 20-item scale is presented in Appendix B.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 28.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 30.

⁶²Ibid., p. 32.

Research Design and Procedure

In Chapter I it was stated that in conjunction with this investigation of occupational attitudes of over-the-road truck drivers, selected characteristics of their background and socio-economic status would be examined for possible relationships to their attitudes and occupational choice. To this end, the questionnaire included a number of questions designed to elicit specific information which might exert an influence on the occupational attitudes under investigation. However, it would seem to be almost equally important to know that such influences do not exist if that is the case.

The Questionnaire⁶³

The research questionnaire consisted of two parts. Part I was made up of questions pertaining to specific characteristics of the respondents and selected members of their families. The information requested included the following:

1. What is your present age?
2. At what age did you become completely self-supporting?
3. What was your first full-time job?
4. At what age did you get your first job in the trucking industry?
5. What was your first job in the trucking industry?
6. How many years have you been an over-the-road truck driver?
7. How many years have you been driving for your present employer?

⁶³The questionnaire included a number of items which have no relevance to the present problem; therefore, the entire questionnaire is not presented here.

8. How many trucking companies have you worked for full-time?
9. How many full-time jobs have you had outside of the trucking industry?
10. Are you single, married, widowed, divorced, or separated?
11. How many other persons depend on you for a major part of their support?
12. Do you own your home, rent, live with relatives, room or board?
13. List the organizations you belong to and check the ones you attend regularly and the ones you hold, or have held, office in.
14. What is the highest grade of school completed by you, your wife, your father, and your mother?
15. What is, or was, the major occupation of your father, your father's father, and your wife's father:
 - Unskilled worker or farm hand
 - Semiskilled worker or machine operator
 - Skilled craftsman or mechanic
 - Truck or bus driver
 - Policeman, fireman, mailman, custodian or guard
 - Farm owner or manager
 - Foreman or supervisor
 - Office worker or salesman
 - Junior or minor executive
 - Owner of small business (sales under \$100,000)
 - Owner of large business (sales over \$100,000)
 - Profession (Engineer, Teacher, Doctor, Lawyer, etc.)
 - Career military service
 - Other occupation
16. What is your total annual income (before taxes) from your work?
17. What is your religious preference?

Questions 3 and 5 provided blank spaces for the respondents to write in their first full-time job and their first job in the trucking industry, respectively. These responses were coded according to the check list provided for the occupations of others in the respondent's family (question 15). Question 16 provided a check list of incomes in brackets of \$2,000 from \$5,000 to "More than \$21,000."

Two of the measures of occupational attitudes used in the

survey were included in Part I of the questionnaire. The first of these consisted of an abbreviated version of the Lodahl-Kejner Job Involvement Scale. This scale is made up of items 3, 6, 8, 11, 15, and 18 of the 20-item scale presented in Appendix B. These items were selected by the authors because they had the highest loadings on the first (unrotated) principal component in the 20-item analyses of both their samples.⁶⁴

When these six items were rescored as a single scale for both the engineers and nursing personnel, the corrected split-half correlation yielded a reliability estimate of .73. The correlation between the 6-item total and the 20-item total is .87. Lodahl and Kejner conclude that with about 76 percent of the variance in the 20-item total accounted for in the six items, it is reasonable to substitute the 6-item scale where space is at a premium.⁶⁵

The 6-item scale was administered and scored exactly as specified by Lodahl and Kejner in their original study except that in the present study the item scores are reversed so that high scores on positively worded items indicate stronger agreement with the item, and a high score on the one negatively stated item indicates stronger disagreement with the statement.

The scale was preceded in the questionnaire by the following instructions:

⁶⁴Lodhal and Kejner, op. cit., p. 30.

⁶⁵Ibid.

Read each of the following statements carefully and place a check in the column which best expresses your own feelings about the statement. If none of the choices exactly fits your feelings right now, check the one that shows how you feel about each statement most of the time. Please check one and only one choice for each statement.

The second attitude measure included in this section of the questionnaire consisted of four questions dealing with the respondent's feelings and opinions about his work in comparison to other fields of work:⁶⁶

Compared to other possible fields of work, how satisfying is your work in trucking?

How sure do you feel that you will stay in the trucking industry until you retire?

How easily could you be persuaded to go into some field other than trucking?

How often do you think you might like some other work better than truck driving?

The respondent had a choice of checking "Very," "Fairly," "Not very," and "Not at all" in response to the questions cited above.

A detailed presentation of the rationale and interpretation of these questions will be reserved to Chapter IV where the results are presented. For the present it is sufficient to note that this measure combines the standard "satisfaction" question, which has been subjected to so much criticism, with other questions which,

⁶⁶These questions were adapted from "The Cornell Study of the Hospital Administrator" (an undated, unpublished questionnaire, Sloan Institute of Hospital Administration, Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.), p. 9.

taken together, provide a longer time perspective for the consideration of job satisfaction as well as the opportunity to express dissatisfaction without self-castigation.

Part II of the questionnaire is devoted entirely to the presentation of Dubin's Central Life Interests schedule. The 40-item instrument is headed with the original instructions for completing the schedule. A few, very minor modifications of some questions were necessary to make them appropriate to the trucking industry, but none were sufficient to alter the original meaning of the questions. This schedule is reproduced in its entirety, with the modifications, in Appendix C.

Sample and Procedure

This study is confined to over-the-road truck drivers who are union members in the employ of common or contract carriers which are regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) and have an office, but not necessarily their headquarters, in the Detroit metropolitan area. Within these constraints, which were imposed to provide some homogeneity to the sample and to facilitate the research procedures, an effort was made to include in the sample drivers from large and small companies, a variety of operations including one-man through runs requiring layovers away from home, relay and turnaround runs, and two-man sleeper operations. General commodities carriers, steel haulers, and

some special products carriers were included in the sample. Although no claim can be made that the sample is either random, representative, or proportional, neither is there any reason to believe that it is atypical of the industry or particularly biased in any specific direction.

The officers and business agents of Teamsters Local 299 in Detroit were of inestimable help in the selection of companies to be sampled, establishing contacts with company executives, and encouraging the membership to participate in the survey. The Secretary-Treasurer of Local 299 provided a personal letter of introduction to the operating executives of the companies included in the survey, as well as an open letter of introduction to the membership which was reproduced and mailed to prospective respondents with the survey questionnaire. In addition, an opportunity was made available to the researcher to speak at a mass meeting of the membership of Local 299 to explain the purpose and methodology of the research project.

A pretest of the survey questionnaire was made at a relay station of a large company where incoming drivers were asked to complete the questionnaire in the presence of the writer and encouraged to criticize its construction and to ask for assistance with any question that was unclear. As a result of this pretest, a few minor changes were made in the questionnaire to improve its clarity, and a mass distribution was planned.

A list of trucking companies was drawn from the telephone directory. Companies on the list were discussed with union officials familiar with their operations to determine their suitability for inclusion in the sample. Some of these were rejected because they employ no over-the-road drivers at the local terminal. Others were eliminated because peculiarities of their operation might distort the sample. In some cases, particular companies or divisions were sought to provide the desired variety of operations.

In all, 19 different companies were contacted, of which 16 companies comprising 21 different divisions agreed to participate. In most cases, the divisions within a company differed according to the commodities hauled or the type of service rendered, but in one instance, multiple divisions of the same company were selected because of geographical differences as well as differences in the types of operations. The sample included two companies with fewer than ten over-the-road drivers in their employ and several from among the largest in the nation.

The initial contact with most of the companies selected was made by telephone. A personal interview was requested to explain the nature and purpose of the research, and to enlist cooperation. One large company refused to participate on the grounds that it was undergoing an extensive reorganization which was apparently arousing a great deal of hostility in the company. The local

managers of two companies declined on the grounds that authorization for a survey of this type could only be granted by the main office of the company. To avoid the rather lengthy trips to these companies' headquarters for interviews to gain that authorization, these two companies were dropped.

Fifteen of the participating company divisions supplied lists of the home addresses of their over-the-road drivers. Two companies addressed and mailed the questionnaires to their drivers themselves, and four companies hand-distributed the questionnaires to their drivers with their pay. In all cases, the questionnaires were delivered in sealed envelopes with a copy of the union's letter of introduction and a stamped envelope enclosed.

A total of 1092 questionnaires were distributed in the first mailing. Of these, 9 were returned undelivered, leaving an assumed net distribution of 1083 questionnaires. Respondents returned 380, or 35 percent, of the net mailing. Of these, 31 were unanswered or only partly answered. Thus, the net sample consisted of 349 usable responses, for a net return of 32.2 percent. Before this return was achieved, however, follow-up letters were sent to almost all of the first mailing, and a second questionnaire was distributed to nearly 700 of the prospective respondents.

It is worth noting that the sampling was conducted during and immediately after the lock-out resulting from the breakdown in contract negotiations between the union and the carriers in the

Spring of 1967. Certainly, this would not appear to be the most opportune time to conduct an attitude survey in the trucking industry.

CHAPTER III

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE OF OVER-THE-ROAD TRUCK DRIVERS

Although a variety of background information has been obtained from respondents to the survey questionnaire, the purpose of this research is not to make an exhaustive study of the genealogical, demographic, and socio-economic origins of over-the-road truck drivers. The purpose is, instead, to inquire into specific aspects of respondents' backgrounds which might be found to be associated with reported differences in their present attitudes and orientations toward this particular type of work.

Because this study is primarily exploratory and descriptive rather than experimental and analytical, no control group of non-over-the-road drivers was established to which the sample could be directly compared. Neither was any effort expended in casting the questions or the sample into a format comparable to other studies reporting similar kinds of information. Rather typically, researchers impose limitations on their data or on their sample which seriously impair the transfer and comparability of their findings to different research efforts. For example, Arthur Kornhauser, in his study

of Detroit factory workers, collected much data similar to that of the present study. However, he restricted his respondents to "predescribed job categories: white, native-born men on payroll at least three years, and in one of two age categories, 20-29 or 40-49."¹ A feat such as this would be extremely difficult to duplicate, especially when lists containing only names and addresses of potential respondents were available for use in this work.

On the other hand, it is practical, in light of the foregoing descriptions of motor freight transportation as an industry, and over-the-road truck driving as an occupation, to describe the men who occupy positions as over-the-road truck drivers. This description, then, is the purpose of the present chapter. It must be emphasized that the sampling methods of this survey preclude any inference that the findings can be generalized to all truck drivers or even to any other specific group of over-the-road drivers. At the same time it is felt that the survey sample was drawn from a base of such breadth and diversity that a conclusion that the respondents are, in fact, atypical of over-the-road drivers in general would be totally unjustified.

Selective Summary of Findings

A brief summary of some of the more important findings from

¹Kornhauser, op. cit., p. 19.

questions asked about the background and characteristics of over-the-road drivers is presented here, rather than following the discussion of specific items, to enable the reader to consider the particular data presented later within the context of a generalized view of the research results.

A rough profile generated from selected measures of central tendency reveals that the man who might be termed a "typical" respondent to the survey questionnaire was born about 42 years ago in a rural area, or in a town of less than 10,000 population. His father was a farmer or a blue-collar worker who had completed eight years of school. Generally speaking, the respondent dropped out of his third year of high school to become self-supporting at age 17. His first full-time job was in farming, unskilled, or semi-skilled work. He had worked at two or three jobs before taking his first job in the trucking industry at age 21. After four years at other jobs in the industry, he became an over-the-road driver, the job he presently holds. He has worked for three different trucking companies and has been with his present employer about nine years.

The typical driver married a girl with a background similar to his own. She attended school about one year longer than he did. He has three dependents, owns his home, and earns more than \$11,000 a year. He is a Protestant, and belongs to two organizations, one of which is the Teamsters Union. He attends meetings of only one of the organizations on a regular basis.

Time Factors

Measures of central tendency (means and medians) from which the preceding profile of a typical respondent was, in part, created, and their corresponding measures of dispersion (standard deviations and ranges) for selected distributions of sample data are presented in Table 3.1.

TABLE 3.1. --Selected characteristics of over-the-road truck drivers. Summary statistics in years.

Sample characteristic	N*	Median	Mean	S.D.	Range
Present age	347	41.9	42.7	8.88	21-63
Age self-supporting	346	17.4	17.5	1.97	12-27
Age first job in trucking	345	20.8	21.6	5.17	14-48
Years as over-the-road driver	347	16.7	16.9	8.77	1-42
Years with present employer	348	7.9	9.8	7.95	1-42

*Variations in N (number of respondents) result from unanswered questions on survey questionnaire.

In general, it may be noted that a fairly close coincidence between the mean and median values indicates comparatively little distortion of the means caused by extreme values in the distributions. Where comparison of the range to the mean reveals some skewing of a distribution, it is generally in the direction to be expected. At the same time the size of several of the standard deviations suggests a

lack of concentration of values around the corresponding means.

The median age of over-the-road drivers is somewhat higher than the median age of all "truck drivers and deliverymen" (37.1 years) as reported by the Bureau of the Census.² Inasmuch as over-the-road driving is considered the top driving job in the industry, it is to be expected that these positions would tend to be occupied by older employees who have high seniority. The median age of the over-the-road drivers is also higher than the median age of all "operatives and kindred workers" (38.4 years),³ the general census classification to which they are assigned. In fact, the median age of survey respondents closely corresponds to that of "craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers" in industry as a whole (41.8 years).⁴ Since accession to most jobs in this census category also comes with experience and seniority, there appears to be little difference in the age grading and job progression of the over-the-road drivers in comparison with other industrial occupations in general.

Table 3.1 indicates that survey respondents became self-supporting at an average age of 17.5 years, and took their first jobs in the trucking industry at an average age of 21.6 years. The difference between these two figures suggests that respondents

²U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1967, Table 330, p. 234.

³Ibid., p. 233.

⁴Ibid.

worked an average of four years before taking their first job in the trucking industry. However, approximately 30 percent of the respondents reported that truck driving was their first full-time job when they became self-sufficient. Therefore, if these respondents who spent NO years in some other occupation prior to their entry into the trucking industry are eliminated from the calculations, the average tenure in another occupation of those who held such a job before entering the trucking industry is increased to approximately six years.

From the data in Table 3.1 it can be determined that respondents worked an average of 4.2 years in the trucking industry prior to their accession to over-the-road driving. Utilizing the means, present age (42.7 years) minus age first job in trucking (21.6 years) yields an average number of years in the trucking industry of 21.1 years. The average time as an over-the-road driver is reported as 16.9 years. The difference between the latter figures (4.2 years) may be interpreted as the mean number of years in jobs other than over-the-road driving within the trucking industry. However, this conclusion is subject to some qualification, in that the calculations involve the implication that respondents have remained in the industry continuously from the time of original entry. That this assumption is not completely tenable can be determined from the data.

It was noted above that 30 percent of the respondents reported

their first full-time job as truck driving, which means that 70 percent of the sample took their first full-time job in a non-trucking occupation. At the same time, 83 percent of the sample reported that they had worked for at least one employer outside the trucking industry. Therefore, at least 13 percent (83 percent less 70 percent) of the sample must have taken their first full-time job in the trucking industry but, at some time during their career, had tried another kind of work outside the trucking industry.

While specific data pertinent to this type of movement was not accumulated, an over-all view of the data suggests that complete withdrawal from the industry followed by re-entry is comparatively infrequent and when it does occur, the period of absence is of relatively short duration. Some support for this view is afforded by comments of respondents:

Truck driving isn't even an occupation--it's a disease--uncurable, too.

I quit once--took a regular job in a factory--lasted two full weeks, then back on the road.

I quit about every other trip, but I haven't missed a run for years.

Income

Annual earnings of the 311 over-the-road drivers who reported their approximate earnings average \$11,500.⁵ This figure

⁵The arithmetic mean is \$11,479; the median is \$11,496. However, because the data were reported in classes, the use of

is 43 percent greater than the average annual wage of \$8,030 paid to full-time employees by for-hire carriers--intrastate, interstate, and local--and by public warehousing companies in 1965.⁶ In the same place, the average annual wage per employee in the trucking industry is reported to be 40.7 percent higher than the average of \$5,706 for all private industry. Therefore, average annual earnings of over-the-road driver-respondents are more than twice as high as the average for all private industrial employees.

Marital Status, Dependents, Home Ownership
and Religious Preference

Of the 345 respondents who reported their marital status, all but eight are, or have been, married. Only 16 of the 340 respondents reporting have no dependents; for those who have dependents, the average is 3.5 per respondent. Eighty-five percent of all respondents either own, or are buying their home. Of the 329 drivers who stated their religious preference, 81 percent are Protestant, and 13 percent are Catholic. All but three of the remainder reported no religious preference.

these figures might imply a degree of accuracy not warranted by the data.

⁶American Trucking Trends: 1966, op. cit., p. 23.

Education

Table 3.2 presents information pertaining to the education of respondents, their parents, and their wives. Examination of the means reveals that respondents received roughly two years more schooling than did their fathers, and one year more than their mothers, but almost a year less than their wives. The wives, in both cases, had more schooling than did their respective husbands.

TABLE 3.2. --Education of over-the-road truck drivers and of their fathers, mothers and wives. Percentage distribution by years of school completed and summary statistics.

Years of School Completed	Over-the-road Truck Drivers	Drivers' Fathers	Drivers' Mothers	Drivers' Wives
Less than 8	4.1	23.1	15.7	0.0
8	14.8	43.0	40.5	8.8
9-11	40.1	9.0	9.8	28.1
12	32.3	17.7	26.6	53.4
13-15	8.1	3.6	4.4	8.8
16 or more	.6	3.6	3.0	.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N*	344	277	274	320
Median	10.8	8.1	8.3	11.7
Mean	10.6	8.7	9.3	11.3
Std. Dev.	1.91	3.03	2.91	1.54
Range	5-17+	0-17+	0-17+	8-17+

*Number of respondents on which percentages are based.

Accumulating percentages from Table 3.2 reveals that 41 percent of the respondents completed 12 or more years of school. In contrast, less than 25 percent of their fathers, and 34 percent of

their mothers finished high school. On the other hand, almost 63 percent of the wives of drivers had completed 12 or more years of school.

Data pertaining to the education of white males 25 years old and over in the general population of the United States and of over-the-road truck driver respondents to the survey questionnaire are presented in Table 3.3. From the table, the median years of school completed by the total white male population 25 years old and over is 12 years, compared to 10.8 years for survey respondents, which suggests that the general population is better educated than over-the-road truck drivers. However, such a comparison can be misleading because the difference is primarily accounted for by the fact that comparatively few of the truck drivers in the sample attended college.

Respondents who have completed up to 12 years of school make up a considerably larger proportion of the sample than the comparable proportion in the total white male population 25 years of age and older. Of all drivers reporting, 95.9 percent completed elementary school (8 years), compared to 83.6 percent of the total white male population. Further, 81.1 percent of the respondents completed one to three years of high school, compared to 67.2 percent of all white males. It is at the next step that the truck drivers begin to lag; only 41.0 percent of those reporting completed high school (12 years) compared to 50.2 percent of the white male

population. Thus, it appears that substantially more of the driver respondents attended school up to the twelfth grade but did not graduate from high school nor did they continue to college in the same proportion as did the general population.

TABLE 3.3. --Education of over-the-road truck drivers and of the general population. Percentage distribution by years of school completed.

Years of school completed	White males	
	25 years old and over*	Over-the-road truck drivers
Less than 5	6.1	0.0
5-7	10.3	4.1
8	16.4	14.8
9-11	17.0	40.1
12	28.2	32.3
13-15	9.3	8.1
16 or more	12.7	.6
Total	100.0	100.0
Median	12.0	10.8

*This column was abstracted from Table 155 in the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1967, p. 113.

It is virtually impossible to make any meaningful comparisons between the sample and the general population in terms of education, age, and income combined. In the first place, there is almost no relationship between age and income nor between education and income among respondents in the sample (product-moment correlations are .027 and .132 respectively). Secondly, in the distribution of incomes of all males 25 years of age and older, by years of school

completed, the median income for those with five years or more of college is only \$9,613, compared with the median income of \$11,496 for all respondents in the sample.⁷ Furthermore, of those males 25 years old and older who earn between \$10,000 and \$14,999, more than 50 percent have completed four or more years of college, and 66 percent have had some college education.⁸

Occupational Mobility

In Chapter I it was suggested that for much of the general population specific gradations within the generic classification "truck driver" have little or no meaning. In the occupational classification of the Bureau of the Census, truck drivers and deliverymen (including tractor drivers) are combined categorically under the heading "Operatives and Kindred Workers."⁹ Also, none of the generally used techniques for scaling or ranking occupations in terms of prestige, status, or socioeconomic position differentiate among the numerous truck-driving jobs. Moreover, such devices typically place truck drivers on a par with, or below, most semi-skilled, routine machine-operator types of jobs.¹⁰

⁷Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1967, op. cit.,
Table 161, p. 117.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., Table 330, p. 234.

¹⁰W. Lloyd Warner gives truck drivers an assigned rating of 6, along with baggagemen, night policemen, and watchmen, gas station attendants, waitresses and small tenant farmers, outranking

According to Theodore Caplow, vertical mobility is

. . . a movement of the individual upward or downward, with a gain or loss in social rank. . . . The simplest kind . . . is a change of occupation which involves a change in social position. . . .¹¹

Further, he defines horizontal mobility thus:

[It is] . . . a change in function, including both the technical and the social functions which arise from group membership. . . . Horizontal mobility of the simplest type involves a change in employment within the same occupation. . . .¹²

Either of these types of mobility may occur between successive generations or within the work life of the individual himself.

Table 3.4 presents information pertaining to the full-time jobs taken by over-the-road truck drivers when they first became self-supporting.

only migrant workers, miners, janitors, scrub-women and news-boys. W. Lloyd Warner, Marcia Meeker and Kenneth Eells, Social Class in America (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1949), reprinted as Harper Torchbook, 1960, pp. 140-41. The North-Hatt prestige scale assigns "truck-driver" the rank of 70, between "restaurant cook" and "lumberjack" and seven ranks below "machine operator in factory." Albert J. Reiss, Jr., Occupational and Social Status (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., a division of the Crowell-Collier Publishing Company, 1961), p. 57. In this same source Otis Dudley Duncan assigns "truck- and tractor-drivers" a socio-economic index of 15, on a par with low-ranking "operatives and kindred workers," but outranking most "laborers."

¹¹Theodore Caplow, The Sociology of Work (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1954), p. 59.

¹²Ibid., p. 60.

TABLE 3.4. --Distribution of over-the-road truck drivers by first full-time job, in percentages.*

Occupation or type of work performed	Percentage of over-the-road drivers in respective occupations
Unskilled worker or farm hand	37.1
Semi-skilled worker or machine operator	19.0
Truck driver	29.8
Skilled craftsman, mechanic, or fireman	3.9
Farm owner or manager	0.6
Office worker or salesman	0.6
Owner of small business	0.6
School teacher	0.3
Military service	8.1
Total	100.0

*Percentages based on 332 responses.

Of 332 drivers responding, nearly 49 percent reported their first full-time job as truck driving or some other semi-skilled occupation of approximately equal status. These drivers, then, have not demonstrated any significant upward mobility since gaining their own initial occupational status.

Another 37 percent of the sample reported their first full-time job as unskilled laborer or farm hand. This group could be identified as experiencing at least some upward, intragenerational mobility when they began their truck-driving career. Six percent

of the respondents began their full-time work career in various skilled trades--as farm owners, office workers, small business owners or school teachers. These would largely be classified as experiencing downward mobility upon transferring to truck driving. The remaining eight percent of the respondents reported their first full-time jobs as military service, which is not readily comparable to civilian occupations. For this group, occupational status typically would not be established until their entry into civilian jobs. Because many of these respondents entered the trucking industry upon completion of their military service, relatively little vertical mobility would have been involved.

Turning now to another potential source of vertical mobility, it will be seen that Table 3.5 presents available data to relate respondents' first jobs in the trucking industry to their present occupation. The classifications used in Table 3.5 attempt to rank the jobs according to conventional job scaling techniques, rather than by intra-industry standards. In these terms then, 8.4 percent of the respondents may have achieved a minimal amount of upward mobility since taking their first job in the trucking industry, while 1.7 percent have experienced downward mobility.

A number of those who started as drivers reported their first jobs in the industry as "truck driving," without further elaboration. Thus the 89.9 percent in this classification in Table 3.5 includes those respondents who entered the industry as dump truck drivers,

coal, lumber, or milk haulers, local delivery men and others, as well as those who began their careers in freight transportation or over-the-road driving. For this group, then, it is impossible to relate first job in trucking to present position. However, although job changes within this category are recognized and rewarded in the industry, according to conventional occupational scaling practices, such movements would be viewed as primarily horizontal mobility.

TABLE 3.5. --Distribution of over-the-road truck drivers by first job in trucking, in percentages.

First job or type of work performed in the trucking industry	Percentages of over-the-road drivers performing respective jobs
Helper, dockworker, gas station attendant, or service man	8.4
Truck driver	89.9
Mechanic or office worker	1.7
Total	100.0

N = 346

Table 3.6 presents the occupational origins of survey respondents as represented by two generations of their familial ancestors. Since the respondents themselves represent a single occupational classification, three generations of occupations are actually encompassed. The four pairs of columns in Table 3.6 show the occupational distribution, in percentages, of respondents' fathers, fathers' fathers, mothers' fathers, and fathers-in-law.

TABLE 3.6. --Occupations of the fathers, fathers' fathers, mothers' fathers, and wives' fathers of over-the-road truck drivers. Percentage distribution by two occupational groupings.

Occupation or type of work performed	Respondent's father		Father's father		Mother's father		Wives' father		
	Occupational groups	13	6	Occupational groups	13	6	Occupational groups	13	6
Unskilled worker or farm hand	11.8	28.7		28.9	65.3		26.9	12.7	30.0
Farm owner or manager	16.9			36.4			39.9	17.3	
Semi-skilled worker or machine operator	11.8	20.3		6.4	7.1		7.1	16.0	21.5
Truck driver	8.5			0.7			0.0	5.5	
Skilled craftsman or mechanic	19.0			9.3			11.7	23.1	
Policeman, fireman, or mailman	3.9	30.2		2.9	14.0		3.9	4.3	35.2
Foreman or supervisor	7.3			1.8			2.8	7.8	
Owner of small business	11.2	11.2		8.2	8.2		4.6	6.8	6.8
Office worker or salesman	4.2	5.4		0.4	1.5		1.1	2.6	4.6
Junior executive	1.2			1.1			0.0	2.0	
Owner of large business	0.6			0.7			0.0	0.0	
Professional	3.3	4.2		3.2	3.9		2.1	1.6	1.9
Career military	0.3			0.0			0.0	0.3	
Total	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0	100.0
N	331			280			283	307	

The first column of each pair presents the distribution among the 13 occupational groups of the survey questionnaire. In the second column of each pair, these occupations are combined into 6 broader categories for convenience of discussion.

Occupations of the respondents' fathers-in-law are included in the table for two reasons. First, there is some evidence that the occupation of a young man's father-in-law (or prospective father-in-law) is often influential in his own occupational choice. Secondly, these data illustrate the similarity of the backgrounds of the respondents and their wives. Perhaps the most striking facet of this table is the similarity in the two occupational distributions from each of the generations represented.

Unskilled labor and farming are listed as occupations for almost two-thirds of the paternal and maternal grandfathers of over-the-road truck drivers. These same occupations employ less than 30 percent of the fathers of respondents and their wives. Although this combination of occupations may appear to be unusual, it is justified by the research data.

Examination of the completed questionnaires suggests that some respondents experienced difficulty in distinguishing between "farm hand" and "farm manager" for purposes of classifying relatives' occupations. This difficulty arose, possibly, from the omission of "sharecropper" and "tenant farmer" from the available choices. However, the combination of the two groups includes all

types of farm workers though it does not exclude a minority of other unskilled workers.

The remaining categories show increases from the grandfather's generation to that of the respondents' fathers in the percentages engaged in the occupation. By far the largest proportion of the movement out of the unskilled labor and farming classification is accounted for by increases in the semi-skilled and skilled occupations. Although there are substantial increases in the percentages of fathers in white collar jobs and owners of small businesses, relative to the grandfathers similarly employed, these increases account for less than one-fifth of the decrease in farm employment.

It should also be noted that Table 3.6 takes no account of movements between intermediate occupational classifications. That is, the increased number of respondents' fathers in the business-owner and white-collar categories may originate from grandfathers in the skilled-worker or foreman classifications with the movement being obscured by the greater shift into the skilled occupations from the unskilled and farming category. Detailed considerations of such changes are beyond the scope and purpose of the present discussion.

Only 8.5 percent of the over-the-road drivers directly succeeded their fathers in the occupation. Another five percent may have followed their fathers-in-law into truck driving inasmuch as

only two respondents report both their fathers and fathers-in-law as drivers. It is impossible, however, to draw any conclusions from these findings relative to the attraction of the sons to the fathers' occupations. The entire history of the trucking industry spans scarcely 50 years while its rapid growth has occurred almost entirely within the present generation.

Twelve percent of the respondents have experienced horizontal intergenerational mobility in that their fathers were employed in semi-skilled occupations at the same level as truck driving. Twelve percent of the fathers of over-the-road truck drivers are classified as unskilled workers or farm hands--the only category of occupations in Table 3.6 that is clearly subordinate to truck driving in terms of accepted status scaling techniques--while the remaining 68 percent occupy positions superior to the occupations of their sons. Thus, over two-thirds of the respondents have experienced downward, intergenerational mobility in that they now work at less prestigious occupations than did their fathers. Twenty percent are on the same occupational level as their fathers, and twelve percent have achieved a minimum of upward occupational mobility in comparison with their fathers.

Social Participation

Some measure of an individual's orientation toward the social life of his community is provided by information about the number

and kinds of voluntary organizations to which he belongs. A measure of his involvement in these activities may be provided by the extent to which he participates by attending meetings and holding offices in these organizations. Table 3.7 provides summary information of these types for 309 respondents to the survey questionnaire.

TABLE 3.7. --Percentage distribution of over-the-road drivers by number of organizational memberships, attendance, and offices held, with summary statistics.

Number of organizations	Memberships	Attended regularly	Offices held
0	0.0	52.4	76.7
1	36.9	25.2	15.5
2	20.1	12.9	4.9
3	19.1	7.1	2.9
4	8.7	1.6	0.0
5 or more	6.2	0.7	0.0
N	309	309	309
Mean	2.22	.82	.34
S.D.	1.31	1.08	.71

Two qualifications are in order regarding the data. First, it may be noted that Table 3.7 reports that all respondents belong to at least one organization. Respondents who reported no organizational affiliations were credited with membership in the Teamsters Union, as were all respondents to the question, whether or not such membership was indicated in the response. The rationale of this decision was, in part, to distinguish those who responded to the

question from those who did not respond. Strictly speaking, then, memberships in purely voluntary organizations are, in all cases, one less than the number indicated in the table.

Although union membership is compulsory, and therefore not comparable with memberships in voluntary organizations, attendance at meetings and office-holding in the union are not mandatory. These activities, then, are properly includable with voluntary participation in other organizations as indicators of social involvement.

In the case of an individual whose only organizational activity is attendance and/or office-holding in the union, it would be incongruous to report the activity without a corresponding organizational affiliation. Neither would it be correct to omit the activities. Consequently, the data in Table 3.7 include regular attendance and office-holding in the union as reported by respondents.

A second qualification of the data in Table 3.7 pertains to church affiliation. Respondents were requested to indicate memberships, attendance and office-holding in church related groups such as choirs, ushers' clubs, youth groups, etc., but were not asked to indicate membership in the church itself. The reasoning here is that for some persons, religious activity is personal and private, rather than a social activity. For some, church membership may involve an element of compulsion, and even attendance may stem from a sense of duty quite different from the motivations to

participate in voluntary activities. Furthermore, information regarding religious affiliation was requested elsewhere in the questionnaire.

In some cases respondents did include church membership in the listing. In those instances where only church membership and attendance were reported, they were not included in the tabulation. On the other hand, where the listing included church membership, regular attendance and office-holding such as Elder, Deacon, Sunday School Superintendent or Teacher, the listings were included as indications of activity of a voluntary nature similar to union office-holding. The data are incomplete, however, to the extent that all respondents may not have included such information.

Taking account of these qualifications, then, it may be noted that 63 percent of the drivers responding to this item belong to at least one organization other than the union. About half (47.6 percent) of the respondents regularly attend meetings of at least one organization, and 22.3 percent attend meetings of two or more organizations. Furthermore, 23.3 percent of the drivers now hold, or have held, office in at least one of their organizations.

These data standing alone, however, are not very meaningful. The irregularity and uncertainty of working hours and schedules inherent in the occupation might be expected to impose strong constraints on over-the-road drivers' regular attendance and active participation in the social organizations of the community. The

effectiveness of these constraints or of the respondents' efforts to overcome them can only be measured by comparison to others not subject to such constraints. To this end the reported social participation of workers in other industrial occupations may prove enlightening.

In his study of Detroit factory workers, Kornhauser reports that for seven age-occupation categories, percentages of respondents belonging to more than two organizations range from 20 percent of young, ordinary semi-skilled workers to 42 percent of middle-aged, skilled workers.¹³ Although Kornhauser specifically includes church membership in his listing, only 24 percent of his sample reported memberships in more than two organizations.¹⁴ In comparison, 34 percent of over-the-road truck drivers report memberships in more than two organizations, exclusive of their church memberships, except as noted above.

Regarding his findings, Kornhauser noted the following:

Actually, . . . only 17 of the 407 Detroit factory workers refer to any active organizational participation away from work, anything that goes beyond attending church services or occasional meetings and social events. Only four workers mention spending any time on labor-union affairs or labor political action; six men are active in church work, five in political or civic organizations (with no union connections), three in lodges, and two in Boy Scout work (three individuals appear twice in these figures).¹⁵

¹³Kornhauser, op. cit., p. 63.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 196.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 200-201.

Kornhauser's evidence suggests that only four percent of the Detroit factory workers in his study are active in any social organizations, and less than one percent are active in two organizations. In contrast to these findings, Table 3.7 shows that more than 23 percent of the over-the-road drivers in the present survey are active to the extent of holding office in at least one organization, while nearly eight percent hold, or have held, office in two or more organizations.

Disregarding the previously mentioned occupational constraints against social participation, it is apparent that the over-the-road truck drivers take a more active interest in social organizations than is expressed by the Detroit factory workers. However, the effectiveness of these constraints is very much in evidence in the survey responses.

A number of over-the-road drivers appear to be very aware of, and even resent, their inability to take a more active part in various organizational activities. In addition to oral comments by interviewees, several respondents wrote on the questionnaire, or attached notes explaining their reactions to the question. Typical of these are the following:

This [the question] is ridiculous. You can't attend meetings on the road.

Question 16 in Part I is almost impossible to answer because a truck driver (as you should know) seldom gets to hold an office or attend regularly anything.

The following comment appeared at the bottom of a list of several organizations, with attendance and office-holding checked.

I used to be active in all of these, but I had to give them all up since I started driving truck.

For at least some of the respondents, then, the absence of social participation seems to be less a matter of choice than a consequence of the erratic and uncertain schedules their work demands, which make membership in any organization with regular meetings difficult, if not entirely impossible, to maintain.

CHAPTER IV

OCCUPATIONAL ATTITUDES OF OVER-THE-ROAD
TRUCK DRIVERS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results obtained from the administration of three measures of occupational attitudes to a single sample of over-the-road truck drivers. The findings reported are primarily exploratory and descriptive, rather than a testing of specific hypotheses. However, in the first section some meaningful comparisons are made between the present sample of truck drivers and Robert Dubin's sample of factory workers relative to the hypotheses of his original study. Comparative examination of the three sets of findings will be undertaken in the chapter following.

In preceding chapters attention has been largely confined to two aspects of the research problem: (1) the nature of over-the-road truck driving and the environment in which the work is performed as distinct from other industrial occupations, and (2) characteristics of the sample of individuals engaged in the occupation in terms of their demographic and socioeconomic backgrounds and status. Within this framework attention is now directed to

investigating attitudinal relationships of the incumbents to their occupation. Three different but conceptually related instruments are utilized to measure the existence and strength of pertinent occupational attitudes and opinions of the survey sample.

The first area of investigation involves the relationships of over-the-road truck drivers to truck driving as a social role. These relationships are examined in terms of the importance of over-the-road driving and its environment, first, as preferred sources of valued social experience and second, as the preferred location for technological experiences and for participation in formal organizations. The instrument used to measure these relationships is Robert Dubin's Central Life Interests questionnaire.¹ The findings are also compared with the results of Dubin's original study of factory workers.

The second area of investigation deals with the degree to which respondents identify psychologically with their work, or the importance of work in the total self-image of over-the-road truck drivers. These relationships are measured by the shortened version of a job-involvement scale developed by Thomas Lodahl and Mathilde Kejner for a study of nursing personnel, engineers, and graduate students.² There is, however, no basis provided for direct comparisons between their findings and the results of the present survey.

¹Dubin, op. cit.

²Lodahl and Kejner, op. cit.

The third area of investigation deals with the extent to which over-the-road truck drivers view their occupation as a life's work or career. Measures of the existence and strength of respondents' long-term commitment to over-the-road truck driving are provided by an adaptation of questions from a Cornell University study of hospital administrators.³ Responses to these questions are then scaled to create an index of career orientation.

Work as a Central Life Interest of
Over-the-road Truck Drivers

It has been noted previously that in many respects the physical environment and conditions within which over-the-road truck driving is performed differ significantly from other occupational settings. The lack of "social opportunity" in the work environment leads to the expectation that these drivers would express strong preferences for non-work situations as the sources of socially satisfying experiences. On the other hand, the social deprivation stemming from irregular and uncertain schedules necessitated by their occupations, suggests that over-the-road drivers might seek to maximize their interaction with similarly situated others. Mere recognition of such contending forces, however, offers few clues to their relative strength. Moreover, although opportunity for social interaction may be necessary to its occurrence, it is not sufficient to a determination of preferences among existing opportunities, nor does it

³"The Cornell Study," op. cit.

preclude an expression of preference for situations embodying relatively little opportunity.

Central life interest is determined by the 40-item questionnaire designed by Robert Dubin for his study of factory workers.⁴ With this instrument respondents are scored as "job-oriented," "non-job-oriented," or "indifferent" with respect to their responses to 40 statements involving their work and the social relationships generated therein. The statements deal with formal organizational relationships, the technological environment, informal group participation and general everyday experiences. Individual scores are computed for each of these categories of experience and for the questionnaire as a whole. A respondent is designated as job-oriented if 50 percent or more of his responses are job-oriented or if at least 40 percent of his answers are job-oriented and 30 percent are indifferent. Those respondents whose answers do not meet either of these criteria are designated as non-job-oriented. This scoring method and the criteria used here are exactly as prescribed in the original report.⁵

Central life interest patterns obtained from 349 over-the-road truck drivers are presented in Table 4.1. To facilitate comparisons,

⁴ Dubin, op. cit. The original questionnaire has been made available by Professor Dubin of the University of Oregon. The rationale and methodology of the study are discussed in detail in Chapter II, but a recapitulation of the sectors and scoring technique is apropos.

⁵ Ibid., p. 134.

the results of Dubin's study of 491 factory workers are included in the same table.⁶ In general, when the Central Life Interests questionnaire is scored according to the foregoing criteria, the findings of the present study provide strong support for Dubin's three general propositions, and for four of his five specific hypotheses. Moreover, the single hypothesis which the evidence does not support, is not entirely disproven but must be rejected, instead, because it is inappropriate to the occupational milieu within which the present study was conducted.

TABLE 4.1. -- Total Central Life Interest and subordinate experience patterns for over-the-road truck drivers and industrial workers, in percentages.

Interest Pattern	Over-the-road Truck Drivers	Industrial Workers (Dubin)
Total Central Life Interest		
Job-oriented	12.0	24.0
Non-job-oriented	88.0	76.0
Informal relations		
Job-oriented	8.0	9.0
Non-job-oriented	92.0	91.0
General relations		
Job-oriented	18.0	15.0
Non-job-oriented	82.0	85.0
Formal relations		
Job-oriented	34.0	61.0
Non-job-oriented	66.0	39.0
Technological relations		
Job-oriented	62.0	63.0
Non-job-oriented	38.0	37.0
N	349	491

⁶Ibid., passim. The results are not presented in table form in the original report.

Results

As measured by the pattern of responses to all 40 questions, only 12 percent of the over-the-road drivers can be classified as job-oriented in their life interests. This figure is just one-half as large as the 24 percent of factory workers similarly labeled in Dubin's sample. In terms of Dubin's hypothesis that "a significant proportion of industrial workers will be classified as non-job-oriented when central life interest is measured with the CLI questionnaire,"⁷ seven of every eight over-the-road drivers in the sample are non-job-oriented. Undoubtedly this proportion is more significant than the three of four of his group of factory workers who did not see their jobs or workplaces as central life interests for themselves.

It should be noted that nowhere does Dubin prescribe a criterion for the determination of the significance of a "proportion." From his use of the term, it appears that he actually means "a simple majority." In the present instance the difference between corresponding percentages of over-the-road drivers and of factory workers is statistically significant at considerably less than the one percent level. Judging by responses to the CLI questionnaire, it may be said that a significantly larger proportion of over-the-road drivers, compared to factory workers, is non-job-oriented.

⁷Ibid., p. 134.

Examination of Table 4.1 reveals, however, that this relationship does not persist uniformly throughout the four component categories of the CLI questionnaire. In three of the four sectors of experience, the differences between the reported percentages are negligible; in the formal sector the percentage of job-oriented truck drivers is markedly smaller than the percentage of job-oriented factory workers.

Informal and general relationships

Dubin hypothesized that a significant proportion of industrial workers will be non-job-oriented with respect to informal group experiences. He defined group experiences as "those relations between people that are not directly a product of an official relationship in an organization or related positions in a division of labor."⁸ Although the difference is insignificant, an even smaller percentage of over-the-road drivers than of factory workers selected their work environment as the setting for preferred human associations and contacts. Conversely, a slightly larger percentage of over-the-road drivers than of factory workers is scored as non-job-oriented in the informal category of experience.

Closely related to this component of the CLI questionnaire is the sector designated as "general experience" and defined by Dubin

⁸Ibid., p. 135.

as "dealing with activities giving pleasure, satisfaction, or general rewards, which may be pursued in varying places and at varying times."⁹ With respect to these activities Dubin again hypothesized that a significant proportion of industrial workers will not respond to work as a valued social experience. In response to questions in this sector, 82 percent of the over-the-road drivers expressed non-job-oriented preferences in comparison to 85 percent of the factory workers in Dubin's survey. Despite the three percentage points difference, it can hardly be concluded that the proportion of non-job-oriented truck drivers is much less significant than the corresponding proportion of factory workers.

The findings of the present study, then, provide more than adequate support for both of the relevant and related hypotheses. For over-the-road truck drivers, as for factory workers, the workplace is not the preferred location for informal social relations, such as those involving small-talk, leisure-time behavior, friendship interactions, and affectional attachments. Nor is it the situs of valued social experience, that is, general activities of emotional importance to these individuals are not identified with the work environment.

⁹Ibid., , p. 136.

Formal and technological
relations

Regarding formal organizational experiences, the findings of the present study are the least congruous with the results of Dubin's study of factory workers. Experience in this sector encompasses a variety of relationships between an organization, its officials, and its members, such as hiring, joining, firing, disciplining, rewarding, directing, and ordering. In response to questions dealing with this kind of relationship, Dubin found that 61 percent of his sample chose their companies as the most meaningful, or preferred, context for the described activities. In contrast, only 34 percent of the sample of over-the-road drivers are scored as job-oriented in this category of organization experiences. Thus, only one of every three truck drivers identifies the company he works for as the most significant formal organization with which he comes in contact; more than three of every five factory-worker respondents made similar choices.

Dubin's relevant hypothesis is that "a significant proportion of industrial workers will score job-oriented for their organizational experience when measured on the organizational section of the CLI questionnaire."¹⁰ Despite the lack of a criterion for determining the size of a significant proportion, the 34 percent of the

¹⁰Ibid., p. 137.

over-the-road drivers scored as job-oriented in this sector can hardly be considered significant. Inasmuch as Dubin concludes that the 61 percent of his respondents who are job-oriented constitutes a significant proportion, it appears that the 66 percent of non-job-oriented truck drivers is at least equally significant. Therefore, it may be concluded that a significant proportion of the sample of over-the-road truck drivers is non-job-oriented in terms of their formal organizational experiences and attachments.

The final component of the CLI questionnaire deals with relations between the respondents and the technical and physical aspects of their environments. Concern for economy, efficiency, improvement, and cleanliness of the work itself, as well as the care and maintenance of tools and equipment are examples of the relationships encompassed in this segment of environmental experience.

Again, in this sector of experience, the findings of the present study parallel the results obtained in Dubin's study of factory workers. Sixty-two percent of the over-the-road drivers and 63 percent of the factory workers are scored as job-oriented in terms of their preferences with respect to the technological sector of experience. This finding, it should be noted, substantiates Dubin's pertinent hypothesis.

Summary of Findings and a Conclusion

When the Central Life Interests questionnaire is administered, scored, and interpreted according to Dubin's criteria, work and the

workplace are not central life interests for a large majority of the sample of over-the-road truck drivers. As measured by their patterns of responses to the whole questionnaire, the larger proportion of non-job-oriented truck drivers provides even stronger support for Dubin's major hypothesis than the proportion of non-job-oriented factory workers in his own study.

In three of the four component sectors of experience included in the CLI questionnaire, the findings of the present study tend to support the relevant hypotheses from the original study of factory workers. In fact, re-examination of Table 4.1 suggests that such close correspondence between comparative percentages in the informal, the general, and the technological sectors would hardly be expected if the two samples were drawn from the same population.

The results reported in the formal sector, however, create somewhat of an anomaly; in this sector, the relevant hypothesis is forcefully rejected by the evidence. Even more provocative is the fact that the rejected hypothesis and the affirmed hypothesis pertaining to relations with the technical aspects of the environment are similar and were developed from the same general proposition. Dubin stated this proposition in the following manner.

. . . An individual's attachment to a situation in which his social experience is not valued by him will be to the most physically and directly obvious characteristics of that situation.¹¹

¹¹Ibid., p. 133.

In preceding chapters a number of unique characteristics of over-the-road truck driving and its environment have been described. It has been noted that an over-the-road driver works most of the time in isolation from his fellow workers, his superiors, and the environment of his employing organization. He may have no regular boss or foreman in the same sense as a factory worker does, and his interaction with supervisory personnel is irregular and infrequent, as well as impersonal.

Furthermore, the rules and regulations which guide and sanction his work behavior are formulated and often enforced by agencies of government (the Interstate Commerce Commission, State Public Service Commissions and Highway Safety Departments) and by his union, rather than by his employer. All these factors operate to obscure the visibility and importance of the formal organization in the occupational perspective of the over-the-road truck driver.

It appears that the apparently weak attachment of over-the-road truck drivers to their employing organizations is not attributable to attitudinal differences between truck drivers and factory workers. It is, instead, more likely to be a consequence of the fact that for over-the-road truck drivers the formal organization is not one of the most physically and directly obvious characteristics of the work situation. Dubin's hypothesis, then, is not disproven, but it is rejected as inappropriate to the occupational milieu within which the present study was conducted.

Job Involvement of Over-the-road
Truck Drivers

The findings reported in the preceding section of the chapter can now be taken as a given: For the over-the-road truck drivers responding to this survey, work is not a central life interest nor is it a source of valued social experience. What attachment does exist is centered in relationships to the technological aspects of the work environment.

Questions may now be raised as to the degree to which these respondents identify psychologically with their work. Of what importance is work in the total self-image of an over-the-road truck driver? To what degree does his work performance affect his self-esteem? It is to this type of question that Lodahl and Kejner addressed themselves in constructing their job involvement scale.

In its final form their instrument consists of twenty items cast into a Likert-type format with four categories of response (strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree; scored 1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively).¹² From this 20-item scale, the authors extracted six items which they endorse as a reasonable substitute for the larger instrument. Their recommendation is based on a correlation

¹²Lodahl and Kejner, op. cit., pp. 26-28. Although the authors do not so state, it is most likely that the scoring sequence was reversed for negatively worded items.

of .87 between the 6-item total scores and the 20-item total scores.¹³

The 6-item scale was administered to the sample of over-the-road truck drivers exactly as it was developed by Lodahl and Kejner with a single exception. In the present study the item scores are reversed so that high scores on positively worded items indicate stronger agreement with the statements, and a high score on the single negatively stated item indicates stronger disagreement with the statement. The effect of this modification is that high total scores on the six items are indicative of high job involvement, whereas under the Lodahl-Kejner scoring system high scores indicate lower involvement.

Results

The distribution of scores obtained by administering the 6-item job involvement scale to 343 over-the-road truck drivers is presented in Table 4.2. Total scores range from 6 to 24 with a midpoint of 15. The median score for all respondents is 15.9 and the arithmetic mean is 15.99 with a standard deviation of 3.0. Unfortunately, Lodahl and Kejner provide a minimum of comparable statistics from their own applications of the scale, inasmuch as their analysis was primarily limited to factor analysis of the results on

¹³Ibid., p. 30.

the 20-item version. Only by assuming that the mean total score of the 6-item scale is proportional to the mean of the 20-item scale can any comparison be made between means of this and the original studies.

TABLE 4.2. --Percentage distribution of over-the-road truck drivers by total job involvement score.

Six-item total score	Percentage of respondents
24	.9
23	1.2
22	3.5
21	2.9
20	3.2
19	7.0
18	9.0
17	14.9
16	11.6
15	13.4
14	14.0
13	6.1
12	7.0
11	3.8
10	.3
9	.6
8	..0
7	.3
6	.3
Total	100.0

N = 343

By projecting the mean total score of the present sample on this basis and inverting it to match the Lodahl-Kejner scoring method, it may be estimated roughly that over-the-road truck drivers are

someehat less job-involved than either the nurses or the engineers surveyed by Lodahl and Kejner, but they are slightly more involved than the sample of graduate students. Mean scores for the four samples are as follows:¹⁴

<u>Survey sample</u>	<u>Mean total score</u>
Nurses (N=137)	43.37
Engineers (N=70)	42.62
Students (N=46)	48.06
Truck drivers (N=343)	46.70

It may be recalled that under the Lodahl-Kejner scoring system low scores indicate higher involvement.

Of greater significance than the foregoing nebulous comparison is the obvious difficulty of making any comparisons at all between replications and the original study data. This is particularly distressing when the authors present their instrument with the suggestion that it offers promising possibilities as an improved measure of job involvement.

Although Lodahl and Kejner do not present the supporting evidence, they report that "examination of the correlation matrices revealed low interitem correlations (averaging about .17) and relatively high item-total correlations."¹⁵ Insofar as comparisons are possible, interitem correlations of the 6-item scale in the present study range from .09 to .60 with a mean of .31. Item-total

¹⁴Ibid., Table 2, p. 30.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 28.

correlations range from .43 to .76 with a mean of .65.¹⁶ It is, of course, impossible to compare the latter to Lodahl and Kejner's "relatively high item-total correlations."

Examination of Table 4.2 reveals a heavy concentration of scores around the midpoint of the distribution with some skewing toward the upper end of the scale. Thus, it may be noted that 32.4 percent of the total scores fall below the midpoint, while 54.2 percent are above the midpoint. In the absence of any prescribed criteria for evaluating individual scores in terms of the degrees of job involvement they represent, an arbitrary decision is required.

For purposes of this report, respondents with scores of 18 or more on this scale are designated as exhibiting high job involvement; those who score between 13 and 17 are designated as exhibiting medium job involvement; and those who score 12 or less are designated as exhibiting low job involvement. The rationale of this decision is that a score of 18 or higher represents an average score of 3 (a mildly positive response) on each of the six items in the scale. This does not mean that negative responses are ruled out, but they must be offset by strongly positive responses to achieve a total score of 18 over all six items. Similarly, a total score of 12 represents an average item score of 2 (a mildly negative response) over the 6-item scale. Here, any positive responses must be offset

¹⁶The correlation matrix for the present sample scores is presented in Appendix D, Table 1.

by strongly negative responses to hold the total score to 12 or below.

Those respondents whose scores meet neither of these criteria, that is, whose scores are concentrated around the midpoint of the scoring range are the medium job-involved. The over-all justification for this method of classification is based on the assumption that the mere presence of a respondent in the survey sample--the mere fact that he is employed in over-the-road truck driving--represents some minimal amount of job involvement. Categorizing the data from Table 4.2 according to these criteria yields the distribution presented in Table 4.3.

TABLE 4.3. --Percentage distribution of over-the-road truck drivers by job-involvement level with class ranges and class means.

Job-involvement level	Percent of respondents	Class range	Class mean score
High	28.0	18-24	19.7
Medium	60.0	13-17	15.3
Low	12.0	6-12	11.2
Total	100.0		

N = 343

To further emphasize the concentration of scores around the midpoint of the total distribution, Table 4.3 also shows the class range and the arithmetic mean of the scores included in each of the three categories. The inclusion of these class mean scores also serves to avoid any inclination to interpret the midpoints of the

extreme categories as being representative of all the values contained therein.

Summary

As measured by the abbreviated version of the Lodahl-Kejner Job Involvement scale, then, Table 4.3 shows that 28 percent of the over-the-road truck drivers in the present sample are classified as highly job-involved, 60 percent are moderately job-involved, and 12 percent exhibit low job involvement. It must be emphasized that these classifications are purely arbitrary and, for lack of comparable information, are in no way relatable to the findings of the original study from which the instrument is borrowed.

Career Orientation of Over-the-road Truck Drivers

Given the nature of over-the-road truck driving, the rewards it offers, the demands it places upon workers, and the practical non-existence of further promotional opportunities, to what extent do incumbents view their positions as permanent? To what extent is truck driving considered a career or life's work by those who have reached the top in the occupation? This section is addressed to questions such as these.

From the preceding chapter, it becomes obvious that for the most part, entry into the trucking industry by over-the-road drivers

has not been the result of ancestral inheritance, that is, the son following in the occupational footsteps of his father. Neither does the occupation demand the early commitment in terms of preparation and training that is required of professions such as medicine, law, teaching, et cetera. Nor does truck driving even require the apprenticeship necessary to a craft or skilled trade. It would almost appear that for most of the respondents in this sample entry into the industry constituted a drift into an available job, without much consideration of their occupational future. On this basis, then, it is logical to conclude that any presently-existing commitment to over-the-road driving has largely developed after the fact, as a consequence of experience in the occupation and acceptance of, or adjustment to, the demands and constraints of the work.

A variety of evidence relative to the existence and strength of the respondents' occupational commitment or career orientation toward over-the-road truck driving can be extracted from the survey data. The most direct evidence is provided by the answers given to four questions designed to tap the respondent's feelings and opinions about his work without reference to his employer or to specific factors in his job environment.¹⁷ The four questions and

¹⁷ Although these questions were adapted from the Cornell Study of Hospital Administrators questionnaire cited in footnote 3, above, the scoring and interpretation are the sole responsibility of the writer and bear no necessary relationship to the utilization intended in the original study.

the percentage distribution of answers by 348 respondents are presented in Table 4.4.

The format of the questions provides four categories of response (very, fairly, not very, and not at all) as measures of the strength of feeling or opinion evoked by each question. The first two questions are positively stated so that the most favorable responses to the questions indicate the most favorable attitude and strongest commitment toward the respondent's work. The third and fourth questions are negatively stated so that the most favorable responses to the questions signify a lack of commitment to the respondent's work.

In the survey questionnaire, the response alternatives for each of the four questions were arranged in the order given above--most favorable to least favorable. Thus, if respondents tended to answer all questions affirmatively or to check answers down the same column of alternatives, any distortive effect on occupational commitment from the first two answers would be nullified by an opposite effect from the third and fourth answers. Examination of the completed questionnaires suggests that the respondents did, in fact, discriminate among the alternative responses with considerable consistency. Interitem correlations range from .45 to .76 and average .56.¹⁸

¹⁸The correlation matrix for the present sample scores is presented in Appendix D, Table 2.

TABLE 4.4. --Distribution of over-the-road truck drivers by response to questions concerning their feelings and opinions about work, and by career orientation, in percentages.

Questions	Percentage distribution by response to each question*				Percent distribution by career orientation	
	1 Not at all	2 Not very	3 Fairly	4 Very	5 Low	6 High
Compared to other possible fields of work, how <u>satisfying</u> is your work in trucking?	2.6	8.6	37.6	51.2	11	89
How <u>sure</u> do you feel that you will stay in the trucking industry until you retire?	4.3	8.3	27.9	59.5	13	87
How <u>easily</u> could you be persuaded to go into some field other than trucking?	14.7	18.1	41.9	25.3	33	67
How often do you think you might like <u>some</u> other work better than trucking?	19.0	19.8	37.1	24.1	39	61

*Percentages are based on 348 responses to each question.

Results

For convenience of interpretation, the sequence of alternative answers to the first two questions has been reversed in Table 4.4. Reading from left to right, all four sets of responses indicate a progressively stronger positive attitude or commitment to over-the-road truck driving on the part of the respondents. Thus, the three percent who get no satisfaction from their work, the four percent who are not at all sure they are going to stay in the industry, the fifteen percent who could very easily be persuaded to change jobs, and the nineteen percent who very often think they would prefer some other work are exhibiting a very poor attitude and a lack of commitment toward their work. At the other extreme the percentages in column 4 of Table 4.4 are interpreted as the proportions of respondents expressing a very favorable attitude and strong commitment toward their work.

Choosing between the extremes of the alternatives would be expected to be quite easy. On the other hand, making a choice between the intermediate alternatives might be expected to be considerably more difficult, and therefore not as consistently performed as the former. However, comparisons between percentages in columns 2 and 3 of Table 4.4 for questions involving related content generally indicate that respondents were consistently able to choose between alternatives representing milder degrees of feeling or opinion about their work.

Because of the extremely small percentages in some cells of Table 4.4, the percentages in columns 1 and 2 are combined in column 5, and the percentages in columns 3 and 4 are combined in column 6. Column 5, then, contains the proportions of respondents who express a poor attitude or weak commitment to over-the-road truck driving. These respondents are labeled as low-career oriented. Conversely, the proportions of respondents in column 6, being favorably disposed or strongly committed to their work, are identified as high-career oriented toward over-the-road truck driving.

In terms of these criteria 89 percent of the respondents--those who get a great deal of satisfaction from their work--are career oriented. Likewise, the 87 percent who are reasonably sure that they are going to remain in the industry until they retire, the 67 percent who could not readily be persuaded to go into some other work, and the 61 percent who rarely think that they would like another kind of work better than truck driving, are classified as career oriented in terms of the relevant factors.

It should be noted that the third and fourth questions appear to be biased rather heavily toward evoking the non-career-oriented responses, which may account for the larger percentages in this category. For example, the third question goes considerably beyond mere consideration of the desire for a different kind of work. Implicit to the concept of persuasion is the element of an offer made--a definite opportunity--coupled with the exertion of at least some pressure

or inducement to make a change. Thus, each respondent's answer to this question would tend to be conditioned as much by the attractiveness of the offer and the strength of the inducement to make a change which he visualizes as by his commitment to his present work and its attendant perquisites.

In a similar vein, the fourth question does not necessarily involve the consideration of either the opportunity or the feasibility of actually making the change to some other work visualized as more desirable. The question is stated broadly enough to encompass day-dreaming and wishful thinking without regard for the practicalities of implementing the notion. At the same time it seems that frequent thought about other kinds of work that might be more desirable than truck driving does not necessarily imply dissatisfaction with, or disassociation from, one's present occupation.

To test the reality of the desire for change which may be implied in their answers to this question, respondents were asked what kind of work they would prefer if they often think they might like some other work better than truck driving. Of the 135 respondents indicating that they fairly often or very often think of a different kind of work, 22 expressed no specific preference and 15 were undecided. The expressed preferences of the remaining 98 respondents are as follows:

<u>Type of Work Preferred</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>
Factory or construction	3
Mechanic	36
Policeman or fireman	3
Foreman in a shop	3
Farming	5
Sales or office work	17
Owner of a small business	26
Professions (engineer, teacher, lawyer)	5
Total	98

While several of these selections may well involve some wishful thinking on the respondents' part, only a very few can be classified as probably out of reach or beyond their capabilities. At least one of the five respondents expressing a preference for a profession already possesses the necessary educational qualifications, and at least one other is young enough to have a reasonable chance of acquiring the necessary education if he were strongly motivated. For the other three respondents in this category, the possibility of achieving such positions seems quite remote.

On the other hand, several respondents report that they are already established in the preferred occupation on a part-time basis or in a small way, and are developing the activity in preparation for retirement or as a hedge against forced withdrawal from over-the-road driving. There is also a strong possibility that many of the respondents who express a preference for another kind of work, either specific or not, are really verbalizing their dissatisfaction with some particular aspect of their present occupation rather than

a general dislike for the work.

Some evidence to support this view is contained in both oral and written comments of respondents who expressed a preference for "any kind of job with regular hours" or "a job that would give me more time with my family." Other respondents added a touch of reality with comments such as "Sure, I'd like a job with a regular starting time and a regular quitting time like other people have, but what could I do that would pay me half as much as I make driving?"

In summary, then, career oriented responses to each of the four questions are in a decisive majority. Eight of every nine respondents report that over-the-road truck driving is a fairly or very satisfying occupation, and seven of every eight of the drivers expect to remain in the industry until they retire. In spite of the negative bias in the third and fourth questions, two of every three respondents could not easily be persuaded to leave the industry, and three of five seldom even think that they might like some other work better than truck driving.

An Index of Career Orientation

For further analysis and comparison to other measures of occupational attitudes, responses to these four questions were scaled to form a single composite measure of career orientation. The four alternative answers to each question were scored 1, 2, 3, and 4 in the order they appear in the first four columns of Table 4.4.

Individual scores on each of the four questions were then summed to provide a total score ranging from a minimum of 4 to a maximum of 16. The percentage distribution of respondents by total scores is presented in Table 4.5.

TABLE 4.5. --Percentage distribution of over-the-road truck drivers by total career-orientation scores.*

Four-item total score	Percentage of respondents
16	14.4
15	11.5
14	14.4
13	14.4
12	11.5
11	6.0
10	8.3
9	7.2
8	3.8
7	3.4
6	2.9
5	1.1
4	1.1
Total	100.0

*N = 348

The median score of this distribution of 348 responses is 12.8, and the mean total score is 12.2 with a standard deviation of 2.98. These statistics, and Table 4.5 itself, show a strong concentration of scores toward the upper end of the scale. Only 19.5 percent of the total scores fall below the midpoint of the distribution, while 72.2 percent are above the midpoint. This finding follows

and sustains the pattern established by responses to the individual questions as reported in Table 4.4. Item-total correlations range from .73 to .89, and average .82.¹⁹

In the interest of consistency, these data are interpreted by the same criteria applied to the Lodahl-Kejner job-involvement scale in the preceding section of this chapter. A respondent whose total score on the four questions is 12 or higher is designated as exhibiting high career orientation; one who scores between 9 and 11 is designated as moderately career oriented; and a respondent who scores 8 or lower is classified as exhibiting low career orientation. Combining the percentages from Table 4.5 according to these criteria and rounding to the nearest whole number yields the distribution presented in Table 4.6.

TABLE 4.6. --Percentage distribution of over-the-road truck drivers by career-orientation level with class ranges and class means.

Level of career orientation	Percent of respondents	Class range	Class mean score
High	66.0	12-16	14.0
Moderate	22.0	9-11	9.9
Low	12.0	4-8	6.6
Total	100.0		

N = 348

This scaling method does not differ significantly from that

¹⁹The correlation matrix is presented in Appendix D, Table 2.

employed in interpreting responses to the individual questions which comprise the index of career orientation. To be classified as highly career oriented, a respondent must, on the average, score each of the four questions at least moderately career-oriented (3). To be classified as expressing low career orientation, a respondent can average no better than slightly career oriented (2) on each of the four questions. These two classifications are similar to the dichotomization of responses adopted in the discussion of responses to the individual questions. The introduction of the moderately career oriented category simply accommodates those respondents whose total scores are so close to the midpoint of the distribution that a clear distinction between high and low career orientation cannot be justified.

Although the criteria for classifying career-orientation scores are the same as those applied to the Lodahl-Kejner scale, the rationale supporting the interpretation differs considerably from that applied to the job-involvement data. The mere fact of employment as an over-the-road truck driver does not signify any commitment at all to the occupation as a career. A respondent could as well consider his employment in the industry as very temporary while he waits for the right opportunity to make a change. Even after years of service in the occupation it is conceivable that some drivers might rationalize that they are really cut out to be chicken farmers, or politicians, or salesmen, or whatever, and will be

when the time is ripe.

However, the alternative responses provided for the career-orientation questions do not call for degrees of agreement or disagreement with an idea or a concept as is required in the job-involvement instrument. Rather, the alternative answers to the career-orientation questions are unidirectional in the measurement of the strength of the attitude or opinion evoked by the questions. Thus, the respondents who select the least career-oriented response to all four questions might well be classified as non-career oriented. To these workers, over-the-road truck driving appears to be just a job, and possibly, a quite distasteful one. If this interpretation is valid, the one percent of the sample who responded to the questions in this way (those with a total scores of 4) perhaps ought to be placed in a separate category and labeled as non-career oriented.

Table 4.6 shows, then, that 66 percent of the over-the-road truck drivers sampled are classified as highly career-oriented. Taking account of the distribution of responses to the four component questions (Table 4.4) and the item-total correlations, these respondents generally derive a great deal of satisfaction from their work and are quite sure that they are going to remain in the industry until they retire. They could not easily be persuaded to change occupations and seldom even think that a change would be desirable.

Another 22 percent of the respondents, designated as moderately career-oriented, also get considerable satisfaction from their

work and are reasonably sure that they will stay in the industry until retirement. These drivers, however, may often view another occupation as more attractive than truck driving and could more easily be persuaded to make a change of occupations.

The remaining 12 percent of the survey respondents apparently derive little or no satisfaction from their work and are not sure that they will remain in the industry. These drivers may well be somewhat preoccupied with thoughts of more attractive employment possibilities and would readily respond to an offer in a different field of employment.

Whether the attitudes expressed by these drivers who are classified as low career-oriented is limited to their feelings and opinions about their work, or whether it may be indicative of a more general dissatisfaction with their whole environment is indeterminate within the confines of the present research. There is, however, a strong possibility that the latter interpretation may be the more valid, at least in some cases. When the subject of negative attitudes was broached during an interview with one trucking company executive, he commented thus:

. . . Of course we do have a few employees who seem to have a negative attitude toward everything. They complain when they are working, and then scream their heads off when they aren't working. They gripe about the trips they make, and gripe about the trips they don't get. They complain that they aren't making enough money and then take time off when we need them most. They talk as though they would quit completely at the drop of a hat, but the truth of the matter is, you couldn't drive them away with a club.

That there is considerable basis in fact for such a commentary was borne out in some of the informal interviews with respondents and also with non-respondents to the survey questionnaire. In one instance, an interviewee, explaining why he would not participate in the survey, became so vociferous in his denunciation of prying interviewers, communists, government at all levels, politicians, capitalists, et cetera, as to be overheard by several other drivers who were waiting to be interviewed.

When the next interviewee entered, he laughingly remarked, "I guess Jack isn't going to help you with your project, is he?" After some discussion of the necessity for voluntary participation, the interviewee said:

I would be very much surprised if Jack had agreed to participate--in fact I'm surprised that he even came in to talk to you. He's been with the company a long time, and he's a good worker, but he's the only man I ever knew who's so suspicious that he won't even accept his paycheck if he thinks it's short a dollar.

Later, the terminal manager apologized to the interviewer for Jack's behavior, but explained:

I should have warned you--I thought Jack would act the way he did, but he would have been mad at everyone around here for a month if he hadn't been invited to talk to you.

CHAPTER V

COMPARATIVE ANALYSES OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

The survey findings presented in the preceding chapter provide a relatively rare research opportunity--the opportunity to compare data from the administration of three distinct research instruments to a single sample of respondents. Except for minor adjustments for missing data, no qualifications or reservations need be made about the findings and their comparability because of differences in size, composition or disposition of the survey sample.

To determine whether and to what extent the responses evoked by the research instruments are uniformly or differentially influenced by the background and status of the respondents, the three measures will be compared first in terms of correlations with sample characteristics which were presented in Chapter III. Secondly, the attitude measures will be inter-correlated to determine the degree of association or independence among the instruments themselves. Finally, the results will be examined for interpretable similarities and differences in the response sets evoked by the three measures of occupational attitudes.

Characteristics of the Sample
and Occupational Attitudes

One of the major purposes of this study is to determine whether or not significant relationships are discernible between selected aspects of socio-economic origin and present status characteristics of respondents and their evaluation of and attitudes toward their work and its environment. In Chapter IV it was suggested that in general respondents to this survey had apparently drifted into truck driving as an available job without much consideration of their future. Consequently, to the extent that these respondents have developed a career orientation toward their work, it has developed after the fact as a consequence of, or adjustment to, the demands and constraints of the work. In view of the findings now reported pertinent to career orientation as well as to other occupational attitudes, it is appropriate to reexamine the background characteristics of the respondents for possible associations or relationships to the attitudes expressed.

Two basic correlation techniques have been used to measure relationships between continuous variables from the background data and each of the three attitude survey results. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed to relate these variables to the Lodahl-Kejner Job Involvement Scale and to the Career Orientation Index and its components. Because the Central Life Interests questionnaire responses are dichotomized into job-

oriented and non-job-oriented classifications which do not form a continuous distribution, point biserial correlation coefficients were computed to compare these scores to the background variables.¹

Findings

Table 5.1 presents the coefficients of correlation between selected sample characteristics and each of the three attitude measures as well as the four component sectors of experience from the Central Life Interests questionnaire. Table 5.2 presents correlation coefficients between the same sample characteristics and the components of the Career Orientation Index.

Only variables with at least one statistically significant coefficient, or in which the lack of significance seems to be especially pertinent are presented in the tables. Coefficients for none of the other variables are statistically significant at even the .05 level.

Examination of Tables 5.1 and 5.2 reveals a number of the coefficients which are statistically significant well beyond the .001 level, despite their small size. It is quite possible that this finding results from the relatively large sample size in combination with the narrow ranges of many variables. However, none of the

¹N. M. Downie and R. W. Heath, Basic Statistical Methods (2nd ed.; New York: Harper and Row, 1965), pp. 189-93. The authors state: "This coefficient is a product-moment correlation coefficient and is used and interpreted just as the Pearson r is." [p. 191]

TABLE 5.1. --Coefficients of correlation between characteristics of over-the-road truck drivers and three measures of occupational attitudes. ^a

Sample Characteristic	Career Orientation Index ^b	Lodahl-Kejner Job Involvement Scale ^b	Dubin Central Life Interest Schedule ^c				
			CLI Total	Categories of Experiences			
				Informal	General	Formal	Technical
Present age	.20 ^f	.14 ^e	.03	.05	.11 ^d	.08	
Years as an over-the-road driver	.23 ^f	.15 ^e	.01	.04	.11 ^d	.06	
Years w/present employer	.14 ^e	.02	.02	.02	.07	.03	
Number of organization memberships	.04	.10	-.07	-.08	-.12 ^d	-.01	
Number of organizations attended	.06	.07	-.06	.01	-.03	.08	
Number of offices held	.09	.16 ^e	.05	.00	.04	.06	
Size of birthplace	-.08	-.07	-.05	-.04	-.09	-.13 ^d	
Years of schooling	-.17 ^e	-.15 ^e	-.09	.00	-.11 ^d	-.08	
Wife's years of schooling	-.15 ^e	-.10	-.09	.00	-.12 ^d	-.12 ^d	
Annual earnings	.09	-.04	-.02	-.01	-.15 ^e	-.07	

^aDue to missing data, N varies from 304 to 347

^bProduct-moment correlation coefficients

^cPoint biserial correlation coefficients

^dSignificant at .05 level

^eSignificant at .01 level

^fSignificant at .001 level

TABLE 5.2. -- Coefficients of correlation between characteristics of over-the-road truck drivers and components of Career-Orientation Index. ^a

Sample Characteristic	How <u>satisfying</u> is your work in trucking?	How <u>sure</u> do you feel you will stay in trucking until retirement?	How <u>easily</u> could you be <u>persuaded</u> to go into a non- trucking field? ^b	How <u>often</u> do you think you might like something other than truck- ing? ^b
Present age	.06	.36 ^e	.20 ^e	.06
Years as an over-the-road driver	.08	.34 ^e	.21 ^e	.12 ^c
Years w/ present employer	.07	.22 ^e	.15 ^d	.05
Number of organization memberships	.04	.06	-.02	.02
Number of organizations attended	.09	.06	-.01	-.03
Number of offices held	.11 ^c	.09	.01	.06
Size of birthplace	-.07	-.07	-.06	-.08
Years of schooling	-.10	-.19 ^e	-.13 ^c	-.14 ^d
Wife's years of schooling	-.07	-.18 ^e	-.14 ^d	-.10
Annual earnings	.06	.04	.11 ^c	.09

^aDue to missing data, N varies from 304 to 347

^bCorrelations indicate negative responses, i.e., not easily and not often

^cSignificant at .05 level

^dSignificant at .01 level

^eSignificant at .001 level or beyond

coefficients indicate any more than a small but definite relationship between the paired variables.²

Although the correlation coefficients are too small to be of value for predictive purposes, there are several tendencies revealed which are worth noting. Two characteristics of the sample, age and education, correlate significantly with total scores on all three research instruments.

The consistently positive relationships between total scores on the attitude measures and respondent's age mean that these variables tend to move in the same direction suggesting that older drivers tend to score higher, or to be more favorably disposed toward their work. Dubin entertains a similar idea in commenting about changing life interests of workers:

In entering on his permanent work career, the individual may still be community-oriented. However, as he develops his career and finds gratification in work, he may shift his interests more and more to a work-centered outlook.³

Lodahl and Kejner also report a significant correlation between job-involvement and age ($r = .26$, $p < .01$) among the sample of nursing

²J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (3d ed.; New York: McGraw Hill, 1956), p. 145. Abraham N. Franzblau, in A Primer of Statistics for Non-Statisticians (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1958), p. 88, states: "Actually, in attempting to predict one measure from another, coefficients below .40 do not yield a guess even 10 per cent better than chance."

³Robert Dubin, The World of Work (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958), p. 259.

personnel in their study.⁴

Significant correlations would, of course, be expected between Career Orientation and age, experience, and seniority. A driver who is approaching retirement would be expected to be more certain that he is not going to change jobs. Similarly, the ancillary attractions to the job, such as choice of runs, longer vacations, and pension rights, which increase with seniority in the industry and company should make it more difficult to entice the older worker to leave the industry.

These suggestions are supported by the relatively large coefficients of correlations between the pertinent variables in Table 5.2. However, it may also be noted that these considerations apparently do not contribute proportionally to satisfaction with the work, nor do they appear to reduce the frequency of thoughts that some other work might be preferable to over-the-road driving.

Tables 5.1 and 5.2 reveal a similar pattern of relationships between total scores on the attitude measures, the components of Career Orientation and respondents' education, except that the coefficients are negative. This suggests that respondents with less education tend to have more positive or favorable attitudes toward their work. However, such a conclusion must be approached with caution. There is also a significant negative correlation ($r = -.24$)

⁴Lodahl and Kejner, op. cit., p. 31.

between respondents' age and education, that is, older drivers tend to have had less formal schooling. Thus the relationship between attitudes and education may be merely concomitant to the age-attitude relationship previously discussed. On the other hand, the less educated driver may place a higher evaluation on his present position relative to the limited occupational alternatives available to him.

The similarity of the patterns of correlations for respondent's education and wife's education across all columnar variables in Tables 5.1 and 5.2 is to be expected. It was noted in Chapter III that over-the-road driver respondents in general appear to have married women from socio-economic backgrounds quite similar to their own. Furthermore, education of the marriage partners shows a small but definite degree of inter-correlation ($r = .26$); therefore, no particular significance is attributable to the pattern or magnitude of the correlations between the respondents' occupational attitudes and their wives' education.

Notable for their lack of correlation with the measures of occupational attitudes are the sample characteristics pertaining to income and social participation.

Annual earnings exhibits a slight but statistically significant correlation with only two columnar variables in the tables. Table 5.1 shows that earnings tend to be inversely associated ($r_{pbs} = -.15$) with recognition of the respondents' employer as the most significant

formal organization in his social world. Table 5.2 shows that the degree of correlation ($r = .11$) between annual earnings and the attractiveness of over-the-road truck driving, although statistically significant, is almost negligible. Here, a much higher correlation might well be expected. Aside from the two coefficients noted, there appear to be virtually no relationship between annual earnings and any of the three measures of occupational attitudes.

Somewhat more provocative is the absence of significant correlations between the three measures of social participation and total scores on the Central Life Interests schedule. Table 5.1 shows only slight and insignificant inverse relationships between job-oriented responses on the Central Life Interests total and number of organizational memberships ($r_{pbs} = -.09$), while the number of offices held appears to be completely independent of the measure of Central Life Interests. The implications of these findings will be discussed in a later section of this report.

Conclusion

In Table 5.2, two components of the Career Orientation Index show small but definite degrees of correlation with age, work experience and seniority of the survey respondents. While these relationships are reflected in the correlations between the same sample characteristics and scores on the Career Orientation Index itself, their import is not sufficient to make them of predictive value.

In view of the observation that the over-the-road drivers in this sample do not appear to have entered the industry with an inherent career-orientation, and the proposition that to whatever extent respondents have developed a career-oriented attitude toward over-the-road driving, it has emerged as a consequence of, or adjustment to, the demands and constraints of the work, it is to be expected that career orientation would increase with age, experience and seniority. In fact, the degree of relationship could be expected to be much higher than is shown in the tables.

Therefore, none of the characteristics of the survey sample that have been identified in this study is correlated with any of the three measures of occupational attitudes to a degree that knowledge of the characteristic would be of significant value in predicting the existence or strength of the attitude measured by the instrument. Career Orientation, Job Involvement, and work as a Central Life Interest, as measured by these instruments, appear to be equally independent of the socio-economic background and status characteristics of this sample of over-the-road truck drivers.

Inter-instrument Comparisons of Occupational Attitudes

With the finding that scores on the three measures of occupational attitudes are comparatively free from strong and/or disproportional influence by characteristics of the sample, attention may now be directed to comparisons among the research instruments

themselves. The purpose of such comparisons is, of course, to determine whether or not, and to what degree, the three attitudinal measures are related to one another. Stated differently, the purpose of these inter-instrument comparisons is to determine whether the instruments are all measuring the same attitudes or whether each is tapping different areas of feeling and opinion about the respondents' work.

To measure the degree of association among the three instruments, the results were paired and inter-correlated. Pearson product-moment coefficients of correlation were computed to compare the continuously distributed scores on the Lodahl-Kejner Job Involvement scale to the scores on the Career Orientation Index and its four components. Point biserial correlation was used to compare all of these to the dichotomized responses to the Central Life Interests schedule and the four sub-sectors thereof. These coefficients of correlation are presented in Table 5.3.

Findings

The most notable characteristics of Table 5.3 are the large proportion of statistically significant coefficients of correlation and the consistency among the patterns of association shown. Of the 35 coefficients presented, 28 are statistically significant beyond the .05 level, but again, none of the coefficients is of sufficient size to indicate any more than a small but definite relationship

TABLE 5.3. --Coefficients of correlation among three measures of occupational attitudes and selected components*

Instrument or Component	Lodahl-Kejner Job Involvement Scale**	Dubin Central Life Interests Schedule			
		CLI Total	Categories of Experiences		
			Informal	General	Formal Technical
Lodahl-Kejner Job- Involvement Scale	 	.31 ^d	.25 ^d	.37 ^d	.23 ^d
Career Orientation Index	.36 ^d	.17 ^b	.17 ^b	.17 ^b	.15 ^b
How <u>satisfying</u> is your work in trucking?	.35 ^d	.17 ^b	.17 ^b	.16 ^b	.11 ^a
How sure do you feel you will stay in trucking until retirement?	.27 ^d	.13 ^a	.06	.19 ^c	.17 ^b
How easily could you be persuaded to go into a non-trucking field?	.23 ^d	.14 ^b	.14 ^b	.11 ^a	.12 ^a
How often do you think you might like something other than trucking?	.35 ^d	.15 ^b	.18 ^c	.13 ^a	.09

*Due to missing data, N varies from 343 to 349.

**This column contains Pearson product-moment coefficients of correlation; other columns contain point-biserial correlation coefficients.

^aSignificant at .05 level^cSignificant at .001 level^bSignificant at .01 level^dSignificant at .0001 level or beyond

between the correlated variables.⁵

The ten largest coefficients in Table 5.3 appear in the pairing of job involvement scores with Career Orientation and its components and with the Central Life Interests total and its subsectors. Although none of the coefficients are large enough to be of predictive value, they do show a consistently similar and definite relationship between job involvement and the other measures of occupational attitudes.

Support for the contention that these coefficients are of little or no predictive value is provided by a test of their reliability. Standard errors of the coefficients of correlation appearing in Table 5.3 range from .05361 to .05399, which means that three times the largest standard error is slightly more than .16 ($3\sigma_r = .162$). Therefore, there is a probability of only .01 that different samples from the same population would yield a coefficient of correlation even as large as .53 ($.37 + .16$) which could be interpreted as a moderate degree of correlation.⁶

On the other hand, the coefficient of correlation between the Career Orientation Index and a job-oriented posture on the Central Life Interests total ($r_{pbs} = .17$) shows a considerably smaller degree of association than occurs when either of these measures is paired

⁵See footnote 2 above.

⁶Franzblau, op. cit., p. 79. The author further states: "To yield a prediction which is 25 percent better than a chance or random guess, the correlation must be at least .66." [p. 88]

with the index of job involvement. Correlations between the sub-categories of Central Life Interests and components of Career Orientation are correspondingly small and consistent, with a single exception. Five of the seven coefficients which are not even statistically significant appear in the column relating attachment to the employing organization to career-orientation and its components. Even in the technological sector of the Central Life Interests schedule, where the proportion of job-oriented respondents is most proportional to their scores on the other instruments as well as the components of the Career-Orientation Index, there is a notable lack of meaningful correlation. The implications of these findings will be considered in the following section of this chapter.

Conclusion

The evidence presented in Table 5.3 suggests, then, that the three measures of occupational attitudes under consideration are independent of each other. Although there are many statistically significant associations among the scales, none are large enough to enable the prediction of scores on any of the instruments from scores on either of the others.

A certain amount of consistency among the measures is to be expected since the three instruments were administered to a single sample of respondents. It seems highly unlikely that large proportions of the sample would be deeply involved in their work without

showing some interest in it, or that they would be highly career-oriented without being somewhat involved in their work.

Even though there may be a great deal of truth in Lodahl's suggestion that "very angry people may be just as involved in their jobs as very happy ones,"⁷ when it is applied to individual cases, one would hardly expect such a combination to prevail as the general attitude of several hundred workers in 15 or more different companies.

On the other hand, a considerably higher degree of correlation might be expected between the Lodahl-Kejner Job Involvement scale and Dubin's Central Life Interests schedule. The rationale as well as the theoretical framework of the Lodahl-Kejner study are largely based upon Dubin's study of "central life interests." It would be only natural that some effort would be exerted to cast pertinent attitudinal concepts from his questionnaire into the Likert-type scale used by Lodahl and Kejner.

In spite of what might have been expected, none of the instruments are correlated to the degree that scores on one measure would be valid predictors of scores on another. Furthermore, there is only one chance in a hundred that further sampling of the same population would yield correlations of even a moderate degree.

Therefore, it may be concluded that these three instruments are not only independent of each other in their respective scores, but

⁷Lodahl and Kejner, op. cit., p. 25.

each of them is apparently measuring something different from either of the others.

Interpretation of the Results

In the preceding sections of this chapter it has been demonstrated that the three research instruments are comparatively free from significant influence by characteristics of the survey sample as well as independent of each other. Now, whatever similarities or differences appear in the research findings ought to be attributable to the response sets evoked by the instruments or to their interpretation, that is, to similarities or differences in the occupational attitudes of the respondents.

For convenient reference, the major findings reported in Chapter IV are presented in Table 5.4. To summarize these findings: in terms of responses to Dubin's questionnaire, work is not a "central life interest" for a vast majority of the over-the-road truck drivers surveyed, nor is it a source of valued informal and general social experiences. A majority of the respondents do not recognize their employing company as the most significant formal organization in their social world. It is only with respect to their relations with technological aspects of their work and workplace that a majority of drivers experience a sense of attachment to their occupation.

Despite the reported lack of interest in the social aspects of their work, a large majority of the respondents are classified as

TABLE 5.4. --Distribution of scores on three instruments measuring occupational attitudes, in percentages.

Instrument	Percentages of Over-the-road Truck Drivers
<u>Dubin Central Life Interest Total^a</u>	
Job-oriented	12%
Non-job-oriented	88
Informal Social Experiences	
Job-oriented	8%
Non-job-oriented	92
General Social Experiences	
Job-oriented	18%
Non-job-oriented	82
Formal Organizational Experiences	
Job-oriented	34%
Non-job-oriented	66
Technological Experiences	
Job-oriented	62%
Non-job-oriented	38
<u>Lodahl-Kejner Job Involvement Scale^b</u>	
High Involvement	28%
Medium Involvement	60
Low Involvement	12
<u>Career Orientation Index^c</u>	
High Orientation	66%
Medium Orientation	22
Low Orientation	12
How <u>satisfying</u> is your work?	
High commitment	89%
Low commitment	11
How <u>sure</u> to stay in trucking?	
High commitment	87%
Low commitment	13
How <u>easily</u> persuaded to change?	
High commitment	67%
Low commitment	33
How <u>often</u> think of other work?	
High commitment	61%
Low commitment	39

^aN = 349^bN = 343^cN = 348

being moderately-to-highly involved psychologically in their jobs, as measured by the Lodahl-Kejner Job Involvement scale.

A sizable majority of the respondents are designated as highly career-oriented, and a large minority are moderately career-oriented in terms of the Career Orientation Index created for this study. It may be noted that only 12 percent of the sample of drivers is classified as exhibiting low job involvement and low career orientation in the respective distributions.

To determine whether or not the research instruments used in this study really measure what they profess to measure is not within the scope of this report. The ability of the Central Life Interests schedule to discriminate among samples from different occupational groups has been well demonstrated by the several replications of Dubin's original study. Lodahl and Kejner report that their Job Involvement scale demonstrates a similar ability to discriminate among different occupational groups. Since this is its only application as formulated, no such claim can be made for the Career Orientation Index. However, comparisons among the findings of the three instruments in the present study lead to the conclusion that the Career Orientation Index measures something different from either of the other instruments.

Without making any judgment as to whether or not the Dubin Central Life Interests schedule is truly sociologically oriented and the Lodahl-Kejner Job Involvement scale is truly psychologically

oriented, a basis for further comparisons can be developed by combining the stated objectives of the authors of each instrument with the findings from the previous section wherein the independence of the instruments was established. In these terms, then, the Central Life Interests schedule distinguishes over-the-road truck drivers who identify their work and the workplace as the most important social activity and setting in their lives from those drivers who choose otherwise, but it is not a measure of job involvement or of career orientation as herein defined.

The Job Involvement scale measures the degree to which over-the-road drivers identify psychologically with their work, or the importance of work in their total self-image, but it is not a measure of the social value of work or of career orientation.

The Career Orientation Index measures the extent to which over-the-road truck drivers express a preference for or commitment to their present occupation as the locus for their life's work, but it is not a measure of either the social or psychological value of work.⁸

Thus, the complementarity of the three research instruments provides a considerably broader base from which to examine the

⁸ The only reference point prescribed in this instrument is comparison to other fields of work. Specific jobs or occupations compared and the criteria for comparison are within the realm of choice of each respondent. Therefore, the basis for comparison might be physiological, psychological or sociological, or some combination of the three.

occupational attitudes of over-the-road truck drivers than is usually afforded by similar researches. At the same time, this complementarity of the research instruments poses the problem of accounting for, or explaining, the seeming diversity of the findings reported in Chapter IV and summarized in Table 5.4, above.

Work as a Central Life Interest

The finding that over-the-road truck drivers do not identify their work and workplace as central life interests is not surprising. In the description of the nature of the work it was noted that over-the-road drivers spend most of their working time in comparative isolation from their fellow workers, their supervisors, and other personnel of the employing organization. Thus the relative absence of social opportunity is an inherent characteristic of the occupation to which incumbents must make some sort of adjustment. That a satisfactory accommodation has been achieved is demonstrated by the evidence that most drivers (89 percent) find their work quite satisfying.

Further evidence that social deprivation is, at worst, not a crucial factor in their evaluation of their work is found in the percentage of over-the-road drivers scoring high on the Career Orientation Index (66 percent). If the absence of opportunity for social interaction in the workplace was of primary importance to the respondents, it is unlikely that such a large percentage of them would

favor their present work in preference to other occupational opportunities.

On the other hand, there is no evidence that non-job-oriented truck drivers display any stronger preference for or commitment to non-work-oriented social activities than job-oriented respondents.

Correlations between responses to the Central Life Interests schedule and the measures of social participation in Table 5.1 (organization memberships, attendance and office holding) are too small to be meaningful. Apparently, job-oriented over-the-road drivers are as apt to be active in such outside organizations as the non-job-oriented respondents.

It may be recalled that off-the-job social deprivation is a consequence of over-the-road truck driving, if not an inherent characteristic. The erratic schedules and irregular hours of work which are characteristic of the occupation impose strong constraints against regular attendance and active participation in many kinds of social activities organized and scheduled to conform to orthodox work schedules.

The impact of off-the-job social deprivation upon the central life interests posture, or, in fact, upon the other attitudinal measures, cannot be estimated from the data at hand. Social deprivation is not an absolute, but undoubtedly varies with the degree of a respondent's recognition of it, its importance to him, his adjustment to it, and the success of his efforts to circumvent it. However,

it is improbable that off-the-job social deprivation would enhance a respondent's social attachment to over-the-road driving, since social opportunity is unavailable in the work environment.

On the other hand, off-the-job social deprivation might well increase a respondent's psychological identification with his work. With restricted opportunities for developing and maintaining a meaningful self-image in non-work sectors of his life space, an over-the-road driver might be expected to maximize the importance of his work in his total self image.⁹

Job Involvement

By its very nature, one's self-image is neither developed nor maintained in a vacuum. It is a value judgment about one's worth, for which there must be some reference point and some basis for comparative evaluation within the total framework of experience. If an individual's work is to be of major importance to his self-image, his job and job environment must provide some means and

⁹ Although the relationship of over-the-road truck driving to other major roles such as husband, father, and head of a family were not a part of the present study, the impact of unorthodox work schedules on these and other social roles has been thoroughly documented in numerous studies of specific occupations, as well as in studies of the subject itself. A classic example of the former is W. F. Cottrell, The Railroader (Stanford: The Stanford University Press, 1940). Recent examples of the latter are Paul E. Mott et al., Shift Work: The Social, Psychological, and Physical Consequences (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1965), and Clyde Daukert, Floyd Mann, and Herbert Northrop (eds.), Hours of Work (New York: Harper and Row, 1965).

opportunity for testing and reinforcing his self esteem.

Preceding descriptions of the trucking industry and the nature of the work suggest that over-the-road truck driving is singularly lacking in a number of major role characteristics which frequently serve as criteria for testing self-esteem.¹⁰

Truck driving as a whole is a relatively low-status occupation wherein intra-occupational gradations are largely unrecognized by the general public. Although over-the-road driving is the highest paid operating job in the industry, it is not really part of a hierarchy of jobs through which a worker must advance. It is also a dead-end job in that there is no opportunity for promotion to a higher paying position. Thus, except for the earnings associated with it, over-the-road driving is not particularly prestigious either within or outside the industry.

In over-the-road driving there is little basis for differentiating work role performance in terms of quality--a trip is either completed and the freight delivered, or it is not--there is little room for variation in the process and little opportunity for demonstrating superior ability.

There is room for considerable ambiguity in the definition of

¹⁰ Much of this analysis is based on concepts derived from William A. Faunce, "Occupational Involvement and the Selective Testing of Self Esteem," Paper presented at the Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Chicago, Illinois, September, 1959.

successful role performance--the goals of regulatory agencies, the union, and the employer, all of whom participate in prescribing work role performance, are not necessarily identical nor even compatible at all times.

Most evaluations of role performance are indirect and remote audiences (the groups who prescribe successful performance) who are not considered as reference groups.

Evaluation of work role performance is relatively infrequent, and such recognition of superior performance as is afforded, e.g., safe driving awards, etc., is often belatedly bestowed.

In the absence of strong social attachment to them, it is improbable that fellow workers serve either as an audience of evaluation or as a reference group for the self-evaluation of work role performance.

Despite the apparent absence of prime criteria as well as opportunities for comparative evaluation of their work and work role performance, over-the-road truck drivers do tend to identify psychologically with their jobs. The evidence demonstrates that a vast majority of the respondents to this survey are moderately-to-highly involved in their work and consider it important to their total self image.

Upon what basis, then, is the reported psychological identification with over-the-road driving established? What factors in the occupational environment are conducive to the development of

job involvement and provide criteria for testing self esteem?

Although the present study was not designed to provide answers to questions such as these, the most plausible suggestions seem to be grounded in the structure of the trucking industry itself and the very nature of over-the-road driving.

The evidence shows that the characteristics of the trucking industry and of over-the-road truck driving, which make the job unique in comparison to other industrial occupations, are major factors in the development of job involvement. Despite the seeming incongruity of the statement, the absence of specific criteria for judging the quality of work role performance as well as ambiguity in the definition of successful role performance also serve to enhance an over-the-road truck driver's attachment to, and involvement in, his work.

The same characteristic of the work that contributes most to social deprivation--the fact that over-the-road drivers spend most of their working time in isolation from their fellow workers, their supervisors and other personnel of the employing organization--appears to be the most crucial factor in the development of job involvement.

Because he works alone and away from direct supervision, an over-the-road driver is on his own most of the time. Within certain limits, he is able to exercise a great deal of control over the technical and social aspects of his work environment. He controls his

own work pace as well as the speed of his equipment. He may take his relief breaks and his lunch periods when and where he chooses. If he is hungry, he may stop at the nearest restaurant. If he thinks the food is better or the waitresses more congenial at a more distant eating place, he may postpone his lunch until he arrives there. In some cases he may exercise his own discretion as to when, where, how long, and even whether or not, he sleeps.

An over-the-road driver not only has the opportunity to, but he must, exercise some independent thought and action in coping with problems encountered in the course of his work. In short, he is in charge, and he is responsible for the equipment he drives and the freight he hauls while he is on the highway.

During most of his working time, then, an over-the-road driver enjoys a considerable measure of autonomy and responsibility which enhance the importance of his work in his total self-image.

At the same time, working in isolation affords an over-the-road driver a great deal of protection. He is protected from the consequences of his own mistakes and errors of judgment as well as from the sanctions that might be imposed for willful violations of rules. Contributing to this protection are the absence of direct supervision and ambiguity in the definitions of successful work role performance.

In the absence of close supervision, delays on the road are

unavoidable; errors are made by someone else; even accidents are caused by faulty equipment, careless driving by others, or conditions beyond one's control; but the over-the-road driver is rarely at fault.

The goals of those agencies and individuals who have authority over the behavior of over-the-road truck drivers are different and at times even incompatible. Regulatory agencies are primarily concerned with safe and lawful operation of the vehicles on the highway. The union is interested in adherence to the contract and the work rules, as well as in maximizing the earnings of its members. The trucking company is primarily concerned with fast and economical transportation of the freight. However, none of these is close enough to the work scene to consistently evaluate a driver's work role performance in any of these aspects.

Unless an infraction of company rules is severe, the union protects its member from the arbitrary exercise of authority by employers. On the other hand, the company may sanction violations of both union work rules and official regulations if such violations serve to expedite the movement of freight. These ambiguities may provide opportunities for the over-the-road driver to hedge in his individual responsibilities to all three.

It must not be implied from the foregoing that poor work performance and irresponsible behavior are characteristic of the trucking industry as a whole or of all over-the-road drivers.

Undoubtedly the vast majority of over-the-road truck drivers are mature self-disciplined workers who conscientiously strive to fulfill their responsibilities to their employers and to the public.

This discussion is intended to illustrate how the lack of precise qualitative measures of work role performance, ambiguous prescriptions of successful work performance and the absence of direct supervision may be used to provide protection from the consequences of poor performance if it should occur.

The combination of poorly defined criteria for success and the reduced risk of failure should make it somewhat easier to maintain a favorable self-image in the role of over-the-road truck driver.

The absence of specific criteria for judging the quality of work role performance also protects an over-the-road driver from the necessity of making potentially unfavorable comparisons between his own work role performance and that of other drivers. He is thus spared the pain of unfavorable evaluations of a self-image which may, in truth, be unrealistically favorable. If he gets his job done at all, he may rationalize that he has done it well.

In addition to providing a sheltered climate for the maintenance of a favorable self-image in the intra-industry environment, the criteria outlined provide an over-the-road truck driver a unique opportunity for testing his self-esteem in comparison to other occupations. Of particular importance in view of the social deprivation inherent in his occupation, is the fact that a specific audience of

evaluation or reference group is not a necessity for selective testing of his self-esteem in almost any sector of his total life space in terms of the established criteria. His relatives, friends, ex-schoolmates, neighbors, or others who work regular shifts under direct supervision, who are told how, when, and where to work, how much work to do, or who are otherwise restrained in the performance of their work, are subject to unfavorable comparison to over-the-road truck driving.

With respect to income, the average driver can compare himself favorably to almost any blue-collar worker and even to the lower levels of supervisory personnel. In terms of income, over-the-road driving compares favorably to many white-collar occupations, and even where favorable comparisons are impossible, the over-the-road driver may uphold his self-image by rationalization such as "So he makes a few dollars more a month than I do, but look what he has to give up to get it. I wouldn't have his job for twice the money."

Before the reader is led to ask why, under these circumstances, all over-the-road truck drivers are not highly involved in their work, it must be admitted that, for the sake of exposition, this analysis of the evidence does present a somewhat idealized picture of the prevailing work situation. Although no reservations need be made concerning the analysis, some qualifications of the criteria are appropriate.

First, the data in Chapter III show that annual earnings of survey respondents range in classes from \$5,000 to over \$21,000. This means, of course, that an over-the-road driver at the upper end of the scale is afforded opportunities to make objective comparisons of his economic prowess to a much wider range of jobs and occupations than is available to a driver whose earnings are near the lower end of the scale. However, in the first section of this chapter it is reported that there is no discernible relationship between occupational involvement and annual earnings (see Table 5.1). This finding suggests that over-the-road drivers are selective in their choice of reference groups or reference points against which to test their self-esteem, or that income from their work is not among the criteria by which they evaluate the importance of their job in their total self-image.

The second qualification of the analysis pertains to the criteria by which over-the-road truck drivers evaluate their work or which provide the basis for the development of job involvement. The factors which have been advanced as most likely to contribute to job involvement, namely autonomy and responsibility, are by no means uniformly available to all survey respondents.

The degree of autonomy an over-the-road driver may exercise is, of course, conditioned by such factors as the length and type of run he makes, the kind of freight hauled, and delivery schedules over which he has no control. Furthermore, many companies have begun

to consciously impose restraints upon this independence to achieve a larger measure of control over their over-the-road operations and to expedite the movement of freight.

Among these restraints are the conversion of long runs to relay operations wherein each driver is responsible for specific portions of the total distance and may be required to adhere to a definite schedule. Some companies establish check points along their regular routes where a driver must punch a time clock to verify his log book or where he must call a dispatch office to report his position and justify any delay. Some companies install automatic devices in their tractors to record details such as speed, stops, elapsed time, etc. for each trip. Companies also employ their own safety patrolmen to check their trucks along principal routes. These and other methods are used to increase the efficiency of over-the-road operations, but they serve to reduce the autonomy enjoyed by over-the-road drivers. To the extent that autonomy in the performance of his work is differentially available, it should differ in its contribution to the job involvement of an over-the-road driver.

A final and closely related qualification of this analysis pertains to the respondents themselves. It is highly improbable that the factors suggested as a basis for the development of job involvement are universally or uniformly valued by over-the-road truck drivers. Only to the extent that autonomy and responsibility are

perceived as important and valued characteristics of the work would they be effective contributors to involvement in over-the-road driving. In fact, for a worker with tendencies toward dependence and the avoidance of responsibility, the presence of these factors in the work environment would be expected to exert a negative influence on his self-evaluation.

Therefore, the affectivity of the factors suggested as potential contributors to job involvement and their utility as criteria for testing self-esteem are conditioned by the extent of their perceived presence in the work situation and the extent to which they are valued by an over-the-road truck driver.

Although the present study does not provide a test of these suggestions, the mere fact that they seem to offer the most plausible explanation for the finding that over-the-road truck drivers are psychologically involved in their work is of special interest. If, in the context of over-the-road driving, job involvement arises from factors associated with or resulting from the isolated nature of the work which also gives rise to social deprivation (apparently the major factor in a non-job-oriented stance on the Central Life Interests schedule), then job-involvement cannot be equated with Dubin's concept of job orientation.

Career Orientation

As a measure of occupational attitude, the Career Orientation

Index employs a strikingly different focus from either of the other instruments used in the present study. The Central Life Interests schedule focuses attention on work and the work environment in opposition to other areas of a respondent's life as the source of satisfying and valued social experiences and activities. Similarly, the Job Involvement scale focuses attention on the importance of work to the individual as opposed to the importance of unspecified non-work activities.

In contrast, the Career Orientation Index limits a respondent's attention to comparisons between his present occupation and other kinds of work. Of the four component questions only one, "How sure do you feel that you will stay in the trucking industry until you retire?" does not contain a specific reference to another field of work. Even here the stage has been set by a reference to other fields of work in the preceding question. Thus, there is no suggestion that the respondent is not going to work at some kind of work until he retires. He is under some inducement to think in terms of a choice between the trucking industry and some other kind of work.

An objection may be raised that this format makes no provision for the possibility that a respondent might prefer not to work at any job. Such an objection may be deemed irrelevant in the context of the present study. The fact that the respondent is now working and has been working is evidence that he chooses to work in preference to not working. An unemployed person might justify not working with

the excuse that he cannot find a job, but the argument cannot be reversed to accommodate the employed person's situation. On the other hand, if a man does happen to be working under some kind of compulsion, he is under no more pressure to work in the trucking industry than in any other.

One problem that the format of the Career Orientation Index does pose is that it provides no uniform basis for analysis of the findings. Respondents express their attitudes or opinions in each of the components of the index without any explanation. Each respondent is privileged to provide his own frame of reference and his own criteria for evaluating his present job. Because neither his frame of reference nor his criteria of evaluation are identifiable from his response, there is no way to determine the bases for his personal evaluation of his work situation.

It is difficult to conceive an effective method of avoiding or overcoming this problem short of specifying the occupations to be used as a frame of reference as well as the criteria by which the respondent is to make his judgment. The weakness of pre-specification is that one might not include either the correct jobs or the criteria by which all respondents actually formulate their preferences. On the other hand, asking respondents to explain their own reasons for their opinions and attitudes is equally impractical in a survey questionnaire. Even if the respondents were able to articulate their own criteria, it is doubtful that the results would represent a

consensus. Hundreds of studies among thousands of workers in a wide variety of occupations have not yet produced a universally agreed upon set of variables to account for variations in job attitudes.¹¹

In reviewing the literature preparatory to a comparative study of workers' attitudes, Robert Blauner noted that most studies attempt to explain variations in job satisfaction among individual employees in the same company or occupation.¹² To satisfy his own need for a means of explaining gross differences in work attitudes among employees in different occupations and industries, Blauner abstracted four factors which appeared to him to be useful for this purpose. Briefly stated, they are as follows:

1. Occupational prestige relative to other occupations
2. Control in its most important dimensions: (a) Control over time, physical movement and pace of work, (b) Control over technical and social environment, and (c) Control as freedom from direct supervision

¹¹ A list of 134 specific aspects of ten major factors of the job situation identified as contributing to job attitudes is presented in Herzberg *et al.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-40. The most recent review of research findings in the field lists 73 topics which were investigated for the presence or absence of relationships to job satisfaction alone during 1964 and 1965. See Robinson *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 372.

¹² Blauner, "Work Satisfaction and Industrial Trends in Modern Society," *op. cit.*, p. 343.

3. Integrated work groups
4. Occupational communities.¹³

That these four factors are useful in making inter-industry comparisons is amply demonstrated in Blauner's recent comparative study of occupational attitudes among workers in four technologically and structurally different industries.¹⁴ It would not be illogical, then, to suppose that workers themselves might utilize the same or similar factors to evaluate their own occupation in comparison to other potential fields of work. Therefore, it should be meaningful to examine the evidence of the present study in terms of the factors listed above.

Occupational prestige

Blauner suggests that occupational prestige is the one best measure of job satisfaction because of the generally marked association between the two.¹⁵ However, he qualifies his generalization

¹³Ibid., pp. 344-52. Blauner noted, on page 357, that the omission of other factors such as skill, variety of operations, wages, and job security does not imply that they are unimportant. He suggests that besides being closely related to occupational prestige and control, they do not seem as useful in explaining gross occupational differences.

¹⁴Blauner, Alienation and Freedom, op. cit.

¹⁵Blauner, "Work Satisfaction and Industrial Trends in Modern Society," op. cit., p. 344.

by noting that truck driving is an example of a relatively low-status occupation in which job satisfaction is unusually high.¹⁶ This qualification of the proposition appears to describe the over-the-road drivers in this study quite precisely.

The generally low status ascribed to truck driving in general and the lack of intra-occupational differentiation have been discussed previously. However, the findings of the Central Life Interests schedule suggest that survey respondents are little concerned about social prestige either on the job or off the job. At the same time, only 11 percent of the respondents report that they derive little or no satisfaction from their work. In contrast, the most recent summary of published studies of job satisfaction reports that the total of 494 percentages accumulated over the past 31 years yields a median percentage of 13 percent of workers judged to be dissatisfied with their jobs.¹⁷ These studies span the entire spectrum of prestige rankings and yield individual percentages ranging from 0 to 92 percent dissatisfied.

Control

According to Blauner, the fact that some low status jobs seem to be highly satisfying suggests that in these cases other factors play a role even more important than occupational prestige.¹⁸ Considering

¹⁶Ibid., p. 348.

¹⁷Robinson et al., op. cit., p. 372.

¹⁸Blauner, "Work Satisfaction and Industrial Trends in Modern Society," op. cit., p. 345.

the dimensions of his second factor, control, one would almost suspect that he is referring specifically to over-the-road truck driving.

Freedom from direct supervision is an inherent characteristic of the occupation. Working in isolation, away from direct supervision, not only makes it possible but also mandatory for an over-the-road driver to exercise control over his own work performance and to cope with environmental conditions encountered in the performance of his work. Where he is restricted only by the demands of the work itself and the restraints of regulatory agencies, the freedom of an over-the-road driver would seem to approximate that of an executive or a self-employed person.

In the preceding section of this chapter a variety of constraints were listed which may be imposed on over-the-road operations by the employer. However, under even the most stringent of these constraints, over-the-road driving would compare favorably to most blue-collar occupations in terms of the criteria of control. Thus there is little doubt that these dimensions of control are crucial to an over-the-road driver's evaluation of his occupation in comparison to other possible fields of work.

Integrated work groups

The third factor listed generates the proposition that the greater the extent to which workers are members of integrated

work teams on the job, the higher the level of job satisfaction.¹⁹ This proposition is virtually meaningless in the context of over-the-road truck driving. Although most drivers work alone, even those employed on two-man operations do not evidence any greater commitment to their work as a consequence of their close association during relatively long tours of duty.

Occupational communities

Blauner suggests that occupational communities tend to develop in occupations that are isolated, either spatially or on the basis of peculiar hours of work. The essential features of an occupational community are: (1) workers tend to socialize among their own kind in their off-work time; (2) its participants "talk shop" in their off-hours; (3) as a little world in itself, the occupation is the reference group, and its standards of behavior, and its system of status and rank guide the conduct of its members.²⁰

Although over-the-road truck driving meets, in a sense, both the criteria for the development of an occupational community, it has been pointed out that these same characteristics inhibit the development of communality in the occupation. Besides working in isolation from each other, over-the-road drivers do not even share the affiliations of working the same hours or the same shifts

¹⁹Ibid., p. 349.

²⁰Ibid., p. 351.

or of close residence that might be associated with a mill- or a mining-town environment. Respondents to this survey demonstrate no notable tendency to reside in clusters either close to their bases of operations or at any other place in the larger communities.

Responses to the Central Life Interests questionnaire again offer ample evidence that the work and work environment are not conducive to the development of occupational communities of over-the-road truck drivers. Only 21 percent of the respondents express a preference for talking shop during their free time on the job, and only 13 percent prefer to talk about their work when away from the job. In response to items concerning off-the-job social activities, no more than 11 percent of the over-the-road drivers prefer to socialize with co-workers in their leisure activities.

The relevance of the third feature of an occupational community--as a little world in itself wherein the occupation itself is the reference group with its own standards of behavior and its own system of status and rank to guide its members--is more difficult to assess in the context of the present research. As it stands within the conceptual framework of a social community of over-the-road truck drivers, it seems to have no validity or interpretative potential in terms of the research data. However, with its social connotations stripped away, the concept of the occupation as a little world in itself offers several interesting possibilities in explanation of the survey findings.

Standing apart from its social aspects, then, over-the-road truck driving becomes a very private world rather than a social world. It becomes a psychological frame of reference rather than a social source of identification. Its standards of behavior and its system of status and rank represent the internalized value system by which incumbents evaluate their behavior and measure their worth as working members of the larger society.

This interpretation does not require reading into the concept of occupational community something which is not included in its original formulation. It is, instead, simply separating out the sociological elements and leaving the psychological elements of the concept to stand alone. In his suggested mechanisms by means of which occupational communities increase job satisfaction, Blauner states:

An effect of the isolation of the occupation is that workers are able to develop and maintain a pride in and devotion to their line of work; at the same time, isolation insulates them from having to come to grips with the general public's image of their status, which is likely to be considerably lower than their own. . . . In such worlds one's skill and expertise in doing the actual work becomes an important basis of individual status and prestige. Finally, unlike the "alienated" assembly line worker, who is characterized by a separation of his work sphere from his non-work sphere--the work and leisure interests of those in occupational communities are highly integrated.²¹

The points included in this quotation lend themselves to individual examination in terms of the research data. While there is no

²¹Ibid., p. 352.

direct evidence available concerning the amount of pride that over-the-road drivers take in their work, neither is there any evidence that they are ashamed of it. There is no doubt, however, about the respondents' devotion to their occupation.

The extent to which they are job-involved and the strength of their commitment to over-the-road driving as evidenced by the Career Orientation Index provide ample support for this observation. Furthermore, the components of the Career Orientation Index preclude any notion that their devotion is shallow or superficial. It may also be recalled that the respondents have been employed as over-the-road drivers for an average of nearly 17 years. In the face of this evidence of devotion to their occupation, it would almost seem preposterous to assume that over-the-road drivers do not take pride in their work as well.

In the preceding discussion of job involvement it was shown that isolation served to insulate an over-the-road driver from the necessity of comparing himself to other drivers in terms of his work role performance. In other words, he is enabled to maintain a favorable self-image--to take pride in his own expertise, without subjecting himself to potentially unfavorable objective comparisons. Inasmuch as he is socially and physically isolated from the general public, an over-the-road driver need not concern himself about its evaluation of his position. At the same time, he may make his own comparisons to other occupations in terms of the dimensions of

control outlined above.

Using the dimensions of control as criteria, over-the-road driving can be favorably compared to most other occupations within the scope of a driver's acquaintance. Thus, in his private world, the over-the-road truck driver is insulated from direct challenges to his self-esteem, while he is privileged to make almost unlimited tests of his self-image against individuals and occupations on his own terms. From such a position, it is small wonder that commitment to over-the-road driving is so strong.

The proposition embodied in the last sentence of the above quotation is untenable as stated. It has been shown that the isolation inherent in over-the-road truck driving prevents the development of integrated work groups and occupational communities within the work sphere itself. Similarly, the demands of the work inhibit social participation in the non-work sphere of over-the-road drivers. In view of the evidence, then, it is more appropriate to hypothesize that the social interests, both work and non-work, of over-the-road truck drivers are subordinated to the demands of their work.²² So stated, of course, the proof precedes the hypothesis.

²² This formulation is comparable to Becker's observations about another isolated occupational group, the jazz musicians: "Musicians tend to feel that the imperatives of their work must take precedence over those of their families, and they act accordingly. . . . The family, then, as an institution which demands that the musician behave conventionally, creates problems for him of conflicting pressures, loyalties and self-conceptions. The individual's response to these problems has a decisive effect, in terms

To summarize to this point, it has been shown that the dominant characteristic of over-the-road truck driving--isolation--causes social deprivation in both the work and the non-work spheres of an over-the-road driver's life. At the same time, isolation and its concomitants--primarily, control--are functional to psychological identification with the occupation as well as to job satisfaction.

However, in view of the conclusion that the social interests of an over-the-road driver must be subordinated to the demands and requirements of the work itself, one wonders at the strength of the long-term commitment to over-the-road driving which is evidenced by the Career Orientation Index. The rationale for a possible answer to this question is offered by Theodore Caplow:

We may note, in passing, that work tends to be regarded as an end in itself precisely in those spheres where it is highly rewarded, and as a painful necessity wherever it is meanly paid.²³

That over-the-road truck drivers are highly paid is unquestionable. In Chapter III it was shown that they are the highest paid operating employees in the trucking industry. Annual earnings reported by survey respondents also compare very favorably with the earnings of other industrial workers and with all working males

of duration and direction, on the development of his career." Howard S. Becker, "Some Contingencies of the Professional Dance Musician's Career," Human Organization, XII (Spring, 1953), 26.

²³Caplow, op. cit., p. 133.

having considerably more education and technical training than the respondents.

However, it was pointed out in Chapter I that there is no precise relationship between the skill requirements of different driving jobs and the wages they command. Rather, the higher pay for over-the-road driving seems to reflect compensation for unorthodox work schedules and erratic hours more than for superior ability or qualifications.

Now, it would be unseemly to suppose that over-the-road drivers themselves are unaware of this situation. To assume that they think they are being paid only for work they do is to conclude that they are unable to make reasonable judgments about the relative worth of a man or the relative value of a job. Such a conclusion negates the whole idea of psychological identification based on comparative evaluations of one's self in terms of others.

On the other hand, if an over-the-road driver recognizes that his earnings consist of more than remuneration for his physical efforts, this in itself, may be a source of pride and self-satisfaction. Even though he may be unable to justify, in his own mind, his earnings on the basis of his education, his technical training, or his expertise in the performance of his work, they are justified by the personal sacrifices required to earn them. Thus, the apparently negative aspects of over-the-road truck driving become the basis for the development and maintenance of a career orientation toward the occupation.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The major objective of this study--an exploratory survey of occupational attitudes of over-the-road truck drivers--has been accomplished. Three measures of occupational attitudes have been administered to a sample of 349 union over-the-road truck drivers employed in 21 divisions of 16 companies of various sizes engaged in for-hire, interstate motor freight transportation.

In terms of responses to the three research instruments, over-the-road truck driving is not a "central life interest" for a vast majority of the sample. The work environment is neither the situs nor the source of valued general and informal social experiences for most respondents, nor do they identify with their employing organization. However, a majority of the respondents experience a sense of attachment to the technological aspects of their work and workplace.

At the same time, a large majority of these drivers find their

work psychologically rewarding and important to their self-image; in other words, they are job-oriented. Furthermore, an equally large majority is highly-to-moderately career-oriented in that they find their work satisfying, expect to stay in the industry until they retire, could not easily be persuaded to leave the industry, and do not often think they would prefer a different kind of work.

The second objective of this study was to examine selected characteristics of the background and socio-economic status of over-the-road truck drivers for possible relationships to their occupational attitudes and their occupational choice. This investigation failed to reveal anything even suggestive of a predisposition toward over-the-road truck driving as either an occupation or a career. Entry into the industry was characterized as a drift into an available job rather than a conscious embarkation upon a truck-driving career. Neither were any of the characteristics of the respondents found to be related to the three attitudinal measures to a degree that knowledge of the characteristic would be of significant value as a predictor of the strength, or even the existence, of any of the occupational attitudes under investigation.

What might be termed a third objective, or an obligation, of this research stems from the proposition advanced in Chapter I that the environment within which over-the-road truck driving is performed and the nature of the work itself may exert significant influences on the attitudes of the respondents toward their work. In

Chapter IV, it was shown that while certain characteristics of over-the-road driving and its environment were undoubtedly unique by comparison to most factory jobs, the direction and strength of their influence on the occupational attitudes of the incumbents was almost impossible to predict.

However, it was shown that the physical isolation inherent in over-the-road truck driving could explain the one major discrepancy between the findings of this study and the results of Dubin's original study of factory workers. Apparently because their contacts are often irregular and infrequent, a much smaller proportion of over-the-road drivers than of factory workers identify their employing company as the most significant formal organization in their lives.

In Chapter V it was further shown that unique characteristics of over-the-road driving (primarily isolation and its consequences) could explain apparent inconsistencies among the findings of the three measures of occupational attitudes. Thus, it has been proposed and demonstrated that occupational attitudes are differentially influenced by the nature of the work and the work environment.

Further Considerations

Now the problem is to account for the close similarity between over-the-road truck drivers and factory workers in terms of their response patterns on the Central Life Interests Total and three of the four categories of experiences it encompasses. Unfortunately,

the explanation of differences is somewhat easier than the explanation of similarities. There are available, however, a number of clues which may serve not only to explain these similarities, but also to shed some light upon the differences to be found among other replications of Dubin's research.

For a large majority of industrial workers, and particularly for those who deal primarily with products or impersonal services, the first two components (the informal and general sectors) of the CLI questionnaire involve relationships which are almost purely voluntary. A worker may, at his own discretion, seek out or even reject opportunities for interaction with his fellow employees involving the activities described in these sectors of experience without detriment to his job performance and without jeopardizing his position in the formal organization. Even in work situations requiring group cooperation to achieve task completion, common civility to his co-workers is likely to be sufficient to avoid conflict, even though the non-participant may be branded a "loner."

On the other hand, so much freedom of choice is not available with respect to the other two components of the questionnaire. Some concern for, and involvement with, the formal and technological aspects of the work and workplace are basic requirements of most industrial occupations. From the time (usually designated by the formal organization) a worker arrives at the work site until he leaves at the end of his shift, the worker is exposed to countless unavoidable

contacts with the formal organization and the technology surrounding his work. Rules and routines prescribed by both of these must be followed to some degree, not only to assure coordination of activities and the completion of tasks, but also to guarantee the continued employment of the worker in the organization.

Meeting these requirements is what Dubin apparently means in the operationalization of his proposition:

. . . individuals will exhibit adequate social behavior in sectors of social experience in which participation is mandatory but not valued. Remunerative work is mandatory both in the general sense that most male adults (or female heads of households) are expected to work for a living and in the specific sense that each job is surrounded by many imperatives and requirements for its performance. We have thus assumed that continued employment is evidence of adequacy of social behavior and that holding a paying job is evidence of mandatory participation in the two senses mentioned.¹

While the strength of these mandates is within the realm of choice of each individual worker, the same cannot be said for the adequacy of the behavior required to fulfill the mandates.

The level or degree of participation which constitutes adequate performance of the work role is determined in the main by the formal organization and the technology of the work itself. For the individual worker, freedom of choice enters into the determination of the degree of participation only after the prescribed level of adequate behavior has been surpassed. Thus, an individual's attachment to the formal and technological aspects of organizational

¹Dubin, "Industrial Workers' Worlds," op. cit., 134-35.

experience will be the sum of the participation required by the organizational role plus the voluntary participation which the occupant sees as appropriate to the role in light of his own expectations and aspirations.

For the worker who deals with personal services or whose face-to-face contacts in the workplace involve clients or customers as well as fellow workers, the situation may be perceived somewhat differently. In theory, at least, almost the same freedom of choice with respect to informal and general experiences and interactions with fellow employees should obtain. In practice, however, it may be difficult to distinguish between activities and interactions involving clients or customers that are required by the formal and technological aspects of the work environment and the informal and general experiences which may involve both clients or customers and co-workers. This difficulty may also tend to obscure or confuse the bases for attachment to the formal organization and the technological environment of the work situation in the sense that they are presented by Dubin.

Orzack provides support for this proposition in his description of professional preparation when he comments as follows:

Training as a professional may stress technological details as well as the learning of behaviors appropriate to future roles in work settings. Such training also encourages aspirants to professional status to prefer a work setting to other settings for the location of informal social relationships

and as sources of personal satisfactions. . . .²

On the strength of this observation, Orzack predicted that:

Professionals will be quite likely to prefer the environment of the workplace as the setting for technological and organizational experiences. They will to a lesser degree locate informal social relationships and general personal satisfactions within the arena of work.³

Examination of column 2 of Table 6.1 reveals that his prediction is substantiated by the results. Column 1 shows a strikingly similar pattern of responses from Ranta's sample of Cooperative Extension Agents. This group would be classified as at least semi-professional in their orientation, with the generally higher proportions in the job-oriented category of responses possibly accounted for by the fact that these respondents are men and are apt to be more job-oriented than women in the long run.

However, it is not the differences between these groups but the similarities that are significant. Both of these occupations may be identified as having a very high social content. Informal and general relationships with clients or patients may be almost indistinguishable from, and as important to success as, the fulfillment of the formal and technological requirements of the occupations.

At the other extreme are Ima's lumber workers and the present sample of over-the-road truck drivers. These two occupations appear to be almost equally devoid of social content except that

²Orzack, op. cit., p. 126.

³Ibid.

TABLE 6.1.--Summary of seven applications of the Central Life Interests questionnaire--in percentages

Interest Pattern	Coopera- tive Extension Agents	Profes- sional Nurses	Produc- tion Super- visors	Indus- trial Educ. Teachers	Indus- trial Workers	Lumber Workers	Over-the- road Truck Drivers
	RANTA	ORZACK	MAURER	NELSON	DUBIN	IMA	LATTA
Total CLI							
Job-oriented	85	79	54	24	24	14	12
Non-job-oriented	15	21	46	76	76	86	88
Informal relations							
Job-oriented	52	45	05	12	09	05	08
Non-job-oriented	48	55	95	88	91	95	92
General relations							
Job-oriented	77	67	57	23	15	11	18
Non-job oriented	23	33	43	77	85	89	82
Formal relations							
Job-oriented	94	91	76	67	61	62	34
Non-job-oriented	06	09	24	33	39	38	66
Technological relations							
Job-oriented	87	87	87	69	63	54	62
Non-job-oriented	13	13	13	31	37	46	38
N	232	150	111	230	491	400	349

the lumber workers are not isolated from their employing company as are the truck drivers.

Somewhat surprising is the close similarity of the response patterns of Dubin's factory workers and Nelson's sample of Industrial Education Teachers. It would seem more appropriate to find the teachers expressing a pattern of job-orientation in closer proximity to those of the nurses and cooperative extension agents. However, the pattern shown again emphasizes the danger in generalizing that common characteristics pervade an occupation without taking account of specific factors in the job situation which may exert significant influences on the occupational attitudes of the workers involved.

Although Nelson casts his analysis in terms of job-involvement, his efforts to explain his findings provide a firm basis for a conclusion that the nature of industrial education teaching and the environment in which the job is performed are not conducive to either psychological identification with, or social attachment to, the work and the workplace. The core of the argument is contained in Nelson's attempt to account for his finding that ". . . almost 90 percent of the industrial education teachers chose situations outside the work situation as the places most valued for their primary social interactions."⁴

⁴Nelson, op. cit., p. 96.

From his evidence, Nelson hypothesizes the possible existence of the following conditions:

1. The occupation may not offer opportunities conducive to the establishment of informal social relationships on the job.
2. Membership in the occupation of teaching may not provide recognized status for the teacher in his society.
3. The primary social relationship expectations of teachers may conflict with those of other teachers.
4. Competition for status recognition in the educational institution may exist among teachers.⁵

According to Nelson, the first condition may arise from lack of time and suitable rewards for the development and maintenance of close personal relationships on the job. The second condition may result from the fact that the position of school teacher is unranked in the public image.

Nelson proposes that the third condition may stem from conflicting value systems produced by differences in work experiences and formal education. Especially between the so-called academic and practical fields of education--not only may interests conflict, but subject specialists may have difficulty in communicating with, and evaluating the personal characteristics of, one another. At the same time, teachers in competition with one another for recognition and promotion within the school hierarchy may be reluctant to expose themselves to close scrutiny by their competitors. This is, of course, the fourth condition posited above.⁶

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., p. 97.

While there is undoubtedly an element of truth in all these hypotheses and their suggested causes, a more adequate explanation for the pattern of attitudes expressed by the industrial education teachers seems to reside in a characteristic of the work at which Nelson hints, but with which he never really comes to grips.

Taken together, the four hypotheses present a picture of the industrial education teacher as an isolate in the teaching unit.

Although physical isolation of the work station is probably inherent in many schools (the shops are often rather remote from the classrooms), if the teaching unit were a source of valued social experiences, opportunities to interact with other teachers could be created. However, if the experience is not valued, such opportunities for social interaction as do exist may be foregone.

With respect to Nelson's second hypothesis, the condition would not seem to result from the fact that different teaching positions are undifferentiated in the public image. School teachers generally enjoy relatively high occupational prestige in comparison to other occupations. A more plausible explanation is that positions are ranked within the occupation. Within the intra-occupational hierarchy, industrial education teaching is a relatively low-status job, in that the practical fields of specialization are not accorded the same prestige that accrues to the academic disciplines.

Nelson's evidence suggests that the industrial education teacher is further disadvantaged by differences in his work experience and

formal education. Besides being close to the bottom of the status hierarchy, he may be unable to communicate effectively with other members of the teaching unit and may feel that they are not qualified to evaluate his position or his performance as a member of the group.

At the same time, the industrial education teacher is forced to compete for recognition by his superiors and for promotions in an environment wherein he appears to be at a distinct disadvantage. Thus, it is small wonder that the industrial education teachers do not choose their workplace as the preferred situs for their primary social interactions.

The problem may be compounded by a lack of conviction of the worth of his position on the part of the industrial education teacher himself. Nelson notes that attachment to the technological aspects of the job tends to decrease with the acquisition of higher academic degree status. In other words, an industrial education teacher with a master's degree, apparently gaining greater acceptability among other members of his occupational hierarchy, is less apt to identify with his area of specialization.

The comparison of industrial education teaching to factory work discloses that two apparently widely divergent occupational environments evoke strikingly similar patterns of responses to the central life interests questionnaire. However, examination of the occupational environment of the teachers leads to the conclusion that the pattern of responses evoked should not be unexpected. Specific

factors in the work and its environment are not conducive to a job-oriented stance on the central life interests questionnaire. In a manner of speaking, it might also be concluded that industrial education teaching is a product-oriented occupation performed in relative isolation from significant others and thus, has a relatively low social content.

Now, in the case of Maurer's sample of production supervisors, a group of employees in an environment essentially identical to that of Dubin's factory workers exhibit a substantially different pattern of responses to the central life interests schedule. Except for the subsector dealing with informal experiences, the response pattern of production supervisors is somewhat closer to that of the professional nurses than it is to that of the factory workers. Again, however, the pattern exhibited should not be unexpected.

These respondents, comprising the three lower levels of management, are directly responsible for the effective functioning of the technological aspects of their respective environments. At the same time, they are undoubtedly very much aware of, and concerned with, the formal organization of which they are a part. Moreover, it is to be expected that their positions would provide a larger measure of satisfaction with the general aspects of the work environment since they have not only assumed these positions voluntarily, but in most instances, have consciously strived to attain them.

On the other hand, production supervision is still primarily a product-oriented occupation involving relatively little social content. In fact, the evidence suggests that the job is equivalent to over-the-road truck driving and lumber work in terms of on-the-job informal social experiences. In other words, much of a supervisor's working time may be spent in comparative isolation of one kind or another.

Despite the physical proximity of other members of the organization, hierarchical stratification and the nature of authority relationships serve to isolate the production supervisor from meaningful informal social interaction with either his superiors or his subordinates. At the same time, the physical separation of supervisory work stations plus the fact that other supervisors on the same level of the occupational hierarchy are apt to be viewed as competitors for recognition and promotion effectively isolate the supervisor from close personal relationships with his peers. Within the factory environment, then, the specific demands and constraints imposed by different jobs appear to exert significant influences on the occupational attitudes expressed by similarly situated respondents.

It is appropriate to interject a cautionary note lest one conclude that the social content of a job or occupation is proportional to its socio-economic status or prestige level. Although the results presented in Table 6.1 would seem to support such a proposition, its validity could not be established without a great deal more testing

among a wide variety of occupations.

With the findings that radically different occupational environments evoke similar attitudes toward one's work, and that similar environments evoke drastically different responses to the same measure of occupational attitudes, it becomes apparent that generalization from the results of any single study is extremely perilous. Furthermore, the present study has demonstrated that the administration of different measures of occupational attitudes to the same sample of respondents can produce widely divergent findings. Even though simultaneous analyses of the different patterns of responses obtained from three attitudinal measures shows that the findings are not incompatible, the results of any one of the measures, by itself, would yield an unrealistic appraisal of the occupational attitudes of over-the-road truck drivers.

From these results it becomes further apparent that none of the factors examined--the background and predisposition of the subjects, the nature of the work and the work environment, extrinsic and intrinsic rewards offered and constraints imposed by a particular job or occupation--is sufficient in itself to explain the attitudes of workers in that occupation without taking account of the influence exerted by each of the others.

Recommendations

It is customary to conclude a study such as this with a plea for further research and some indicators of the direction the recommended research should pursue. In the present instance, this privilege need not be exercised. The need for further research is obvious; the directions it may pursue are unlimited. As long as there are people engaged in remunerative employment, there will be a continuing need to learn why they work and how they feel about the work they do.

It is equally obvious, however, that there is a distinct need for greater care and precision in the specification of what is being investigated. Continued confusion of sociological and psychological conceptualizations offers little promise for the production of enlightening research results. At the same time, the present study has demonstrated that generalization of findings obtained within either frame of reference alone can lead to conclusions untenable in the light of additional knowledge.

APPENDIX A

Questions Used to Compute the Job Satisfaction Index in Robert Hoppock's Survey of Job Satisfaction, New Hope, Pennsylvania, 1933.¹

1. Choose the ONE of the following statements which best tells how well you like your job. Place a check mark (✓) in front of that statement:
 - I hate it.
 - I dislike it.
 - I don't like it.
 - I am indifferent to it.
 - I like it.
 - I am enthusiastic about it.
 - I love it.
2. Check one of the following to show HOW MUCH OF THE TIME you feel satisfied with your job:
 - All of the time
 - Most of the time
 - A good deal of the time
 - About half the time
 - Occasionally
 - Seldom
 - Never
3. Check the ONE of the following which best tells how you feel about changing your job:
 - I would quit this job at once if I could get something else to do.

¹Items 1 and 3 were scored from one to seven, and items 2 and 4 were scored from seven to one. The Job Satisfaction Index was expressed as the average of the four scores carried to two decimal places and the decimal point dropped. Hoppock, op. cit., pp. 245ff.

I would take almost any other job in which I could earn as much as I am earning now.

I would like to change both my job and my occupation.

I would like to exchange my present job for another job in the same line of work.

I am not eager to change my job, but I would do so if I could get a better job.

I cannot think of any jobs for which I would exchange mine.

I would not exchange my job for any other.

4. Check one of the following to show how you think you compare with other people:

No one likes his job better than I like mine.

I like my job much better than most people like theirs.

I like my job better than most people like theirs.

I like my job about as well as most people like theirs.

I dislike my job more than most people dislike theirs.

I dislike my job much more than most people dislike theirs.

No one dislikes his job more than I dislike mine.

APPENDIX B

THE LODAHL-KEJNER TWENTY ITEM

JOB INVOLVEMENT SCALE¹

1. I'll stay overtime to finish a job, even if I'm not paid for it.
2. You can measure a person pretty well by how good a job he does.
- *3. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.
4. For me, mornings at work really fly by.
5. I usually show up for work a little early, to get things ready.
- *6. The most important things that happen to me involve my work.
7. Sometimes I lie awake at night thinking ahead to the next day's work.
- *8. I'm really a perfectionist about my work.
9. I feel depressed when I fail at something connected with my job.
10. I have other activities more important than my work.
- *11. I live, eat, and breathe my job.
12. I would probably keep working even if I didn't need the money.
13. Quite often I feel like staying home from work instead of coming in.
14. To me, my work is only a small part of who I am.
- *15. I am very much involved personally in my work.
16. I avoid taking on extra duties and responsibilities in my work.
17. I used to be more ambitious about my work than I am now.
- *18. Most things in life are more important than work.

¹ Each item was followed by four categories of response: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree. The items preceded by asterisks comprise the short version recommended by the authors and used in the present study. Lodahl and Kejner, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-33.

19. I used to care more about my work, but now other things are more important to me.
20. Sometimes I'd like to kick myself for the mistakes I make in my work.

APPENDIX C

ROBERT DUBIN'S CENTRAL LIFE INTERESTS SCHEDULE

Directions: For each of the following statements, there are three possible answers. Please read each statement and the three answers very carefully. After you have read the statement and the three answers under it, pick out the answer which comes closest to your own feelings about the matter. Place a check in the space in front of this answer. Sometimes, none of the answers will exactly fit your own ideas, but you can pick out one which is closest to the way you feel, and check it. Please be sure to check one answer and only one answer to every statement. Do not skip any!

If I received a promotion that meant moving to another city
_____ my friendships wouldn't make any difference in my moving.
_____ I would most dislike leaving my friends at work.
_____ I would most dislike leaving my other friends.

I sometimes hope that
_____ I'll get to be a more important member in my club,
church, or lodge.
_____ I'll get a promotion at work.
_____ such things won't ever bother me.

I most enjoy keeping
_____ my things around the house in good shape.
_____ my equipment on the job in good shape.
_____ my mind off such things.

I would rather spend my evenings with
_____ different people, depending mainly on what we do.
_____ my family.
_____ people from work.

In order to get ahead in the world, I think

- ☐ you have to have a lot of luck.
- ☐ you have to be well liked and known about town.
- ☐ you have to be well liked where you work.

I like to read

- ☐ things about lots of different subjects.
- ☐ things about my job.
- ☐ things about what I most like to do.

I believe that

- ☐ the things I do away from the job are more important than anything else.
- ☐ most things are about equally important.
- ☐ my job is more important than anything else.

I most like

- ☐ talking with my friends about things that are happening.
- ☐ talking about whatever my friends want to talk about.
- ☐ talking shop with my friends.

In my spare time

- ☐ I often think up better ways of doing my job.
- ☐ I just prefer to relax.
- ☐ I often think about keeping my car in good shape.

The most pleasant things I do are concerned with

- ☐ things away from work.
- ☐ different things at different times.
- ☐ things about work.

I am happier if I am praised for doing a good job of

- ☐ something at work.
- ☐ something in an organization I belong to.
- ☐ anything, but it doesn't matter very much what.

In my free time at work, I would rather

- ☐ talk shop with the fellows.
- ☐ talk about whatever comes up.
- ☐ talk about things not concerned with truck driving.

I would most hate

- ☐ missing a day's work.
- ☐ missing a meeting of an organization I belong to.
- ☐ missing almost anything I usually do.

When I am doing some work, I usually try not to waste time
 _____ on my job.
 _____ seldom; I don't worry about wasting time.
 _____ on a project at home.

It is easier for me to take a bawling out from
 _____ an officer of an organization I belong to in town.
 _____ a policeman.
 _____ my supervisor.

I don't mind getting dirty
 _____ while working at home.
 _____ when working at my job.
 _____ hardly ever.

Noise bothers me most
 _____ when working at home.
 _____ when working at my job.
 _____ hardly ever.

I hope my sons can
 _____ be sure to work at the same kind of job as mine.
 _____ be sure to work at a different kind of job from mine.
 _____ work at any job, I don't care what.

I would enjoy taking classes to learn more about
 _____ my hobby or other interests.
 _____ my job.
 _____ only something very special and important.

I would rather take my vacation with
 _____ my family.
 _____ some friends from work.
 _____ by myself.

I get a bigger kick out of playing cards
 _____ with the fellows at work during free time.
 _____ only with people I can win from.
 _____ at home with friends.

It hurts me more if I am disliked by
 _____ the people at work.
 _____ the people around town.
 _____ anyone I know.

I would much rather be a leader in

- ☐ the employee activities of my company.
- ☐ an organization away from work.
- ☐ any organization, just so it's a good one.

I prefer talking to

- ☐ different people depending on what we talk about.
- ☐ my neighbors.
- ☐ the people I work with.

I do my best work

- ☐ when I am at my job.
- ☐ when I work around the house.
- ☐ when I'm not bothered by people.

When I am doing some work

- ☐ I am usually most accurate working at home.
- ☐ I seldom think about being accurate.
- ☐ I am usually most accurate working at my job.

I am most interested in

- ☐ things about my job.
- ☐ things I usually do around the house.
- ☐ anything I happen to be doing at the moment.

I prefer to join a club or lodge where

- ☐ people from my neighborhood are members.
- ☐ people from work are members.
- ☐ the members come from all over.

I prefer to have as friends

- ☐ people who do not work at the same place as I do.
- ☐ different people according to what they're like.
- ☐ people who work at my company.

If I have to work with someone else who is a slow worker to get a job done

- ☐ I am most annoyed on a job at work.
- ☐ I am most annoyed when working on a project at our church or club.
- ☐ I am annoyed regardless of where we are working.

I would prefer going to

- ☐ a company dance.
- ☐ any dance, depending on the orchestra.
- ☐ a dance at my lodge or other favorite organization.

If I get poor material or equipment to work with

- ☐ I am most annoyed when it slows me up at my job.
- ☐ I just accept it as a matter of bad luck.
- ☐ I am most annoyed when it makes me lose time on a project I am doing at home.

When I am not around them, the people I miss most are

- ☐ just people in general.
- ☐ my friends around town.
- ☐ my friends at work.

If a job I know about was giving everybody trouble, and I heard that another company had solved this problem

- ☐ I would tell my bosses about it.
- ☐ I don't worry about things and would forget the whole matter.
- ☐ I'm too busy to worry about company problems.

The people I would be most likely to borrow money from are

- ☐ the people I know around town.
- ☐ anyone who would lend it to me.
- ☐ the people I know at work.

Moving ahead on my job

- ☐ is so important that I'm willing to spend all the time necessary to make contacts and pick up information about my work,
- ☐ is not so important that I would give up time to make contacts and get information about my work.
- ☐ is not particularly important to me.

The people I can count on most when I need help are

- ☐ almost any of my friends.
- ☐ the friends I have around town.
- ☐ the friends I have at work.

I think that if I were suddenly to get a much better job

- ☐ probably my life would change and be better in lots of ways.
- ☐ probably my life would not change much except that I'd live a little better.
- ☐ I wouldn't know what would happen to my life.

When I am worried, it is usually about

- ☐ how well I'm doing on my job.
- ☐ just little things.
- ☐ things that happen to me away from my job.

It is more important to me that

- _____ I be tops at my job and that my friends know it.
- _____ I be good at other things (away from my job) and that my friends know this.
- _____ things go smoothly whether or not my friends think I'm good at them.

APPENDIX D

TABLE 1

Interrelations among component items and the composite Lodahl-Kejner scale of job-involvement of over-the-road truck drivers
(Product-moment correlation coefficients)

Components of Job-Involvement Scale	Correlation Coefficients					
	Inter-item					Item
	B	C	D	E	F	Total
A. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my work.	.60	.24	.43	.32	.22	.73
B. The most important things that happen to me involve my work.		.23	.49	.42	.18	.76
C. I'm really a perfectionist about my work.			.30	.31	.06	.54
D. I live, eat, and breathe my job.				.50	.12	.73
E. I am very much involved personally in my work.					.09	.67
F. Most things in life are more important than work.						.43

Inter-item range: .09 to .60; mean $r = .31$

Item-total range: .43 to .76; mean $r = .65$

APPENDIX D

TABLE 2

Interrelations among components and the composite index of career-orientation of over-the-road truck drivers. (Product-moment correlation coefficients)

Components of Career-Orientation Index	Correlation Coefficients			Item
	Inter-item			Total
	B	C	D	
A. Compared to other possible fields of work, how <u>satisfying</u> is your work in trucking?	.45	.47	.57	.73
B. How <u>sure</u> do you feel that you will stay in the trucking industry until you retire?		.60	.51	.77
C. How <u>easily</u> could you be persuaded to go into some field other than trucking?			.76	.88
D. How <u>often</u> do you think you might like some other work better than truck driving?				.89

Inter-item range: .45 to .76; mean $r = .56$

Item-total range: .73 to .89; mean $r = .82$

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Trucking Associations, Inc., Department of Research and Transport Economics. American Trucking Trends: 1966. Washington, D.C., 1967.

Becker, H. S. "Some Contingencies of the Professional Dance Musician's Career," Human Organizations, XII (Spring, 1953), 22-26.

Becker, H. S. and Strauss, A. L. "Careers, Personality, and Adult Socialization," American Journal of Sociology, LXII (November, 1956), 253-63.

Blauner, R. "Work Satisfaction and Industrial Trends in Modern Society," Labor and Trade Unionism. Edited by W. Galenson and S. Lipset. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1960.

_____. Alienation and Freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Caplow, T. The Sociology of Work. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.

Chapple, E. D. and Sayles, L. R. "The Man, the Job, and the Organization," Personnel (March-April, 1958), 72-79.

Chinoy, Eli. "The Tradition of Opportunity and the Aspirations of Automobile Workers," American Journal of Sociology, LVII (March, 1952), 453-59.

_____. Automobile Workers and the American Dream. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1955.

Cohen, M. A. and Lieberman, M. "Collective Bargaining in the Motor Freight Industry," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, III, No. 1 (October, 1949).

- Cottrell, W. F. The Railroader. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1940.
- Daukert, C., Mann, F. and Northrop, H. (eds.). Hours of Work. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- deGrazia, S. Of Man, Work, and Leisure. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1962.
- Downie, N. M. and Heath, R. W. Basic Statistical Methods. 2d ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Dubin, R. 'Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the 'Central Life Interests' of Industrial Workers,' Social Problems, III (January, 1956), 131-42.
- _____. The World of Work. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.
- _____. "Industrial Research and the Discipline of Sociology," Proceedings of the 11th Annual Meeting, 1958. Madison, Wisc." The Industrial Relations Research Association, 1959.
- Faunce, W. A. "Occupational Involvement and the Selective Testing of Self Esteem." Unpublished paper presented at the 1959 Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Chicago, September, 1959.
- Franzblau, A. N. A Primer of Statistics for Non-Statisticians. New York: Harcourt Brace and World, Inc., 1958.
- Friedmann, E. A., Havighurst, R. J., et al. The Meaning of Work and Retirement. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Goode, W. J. and Hatt, P. K. Methods in Social Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1952.
- Gross, E. Work and Society. New York: The Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1958.
- _____. Industry and Social Life. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1965.
- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. 3d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1956.

Guion, R. M. "Industrial Morale--The Problem of Terminology," Personnel Psychology, XI (1958), 59-61.

"Here Come the Trucks," Forbes (December 1, 1964), 24ff.

Heron, A. R. Why Men Work. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1948.

Herzberg, F., et al. Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.

Hoppock, R. Job Satisfaction. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1935.

Hudson, W. J. and Constantin, J. A. Motor Transportation: Principles and Practices. New York: Ronald Press, 1958.

Hughes, E. C. Men and Their Work. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958.

Interstate Commerce Commission. Motor Carrier Safety Regulations. 1952 ed. revised. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965.

Kornhauser, A. Mental Health of the Industrial Worker: A Detroit Study. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

Levenstein, A. Why People Work: Changing Incentives in a Troubled World. New York: The Crowell-Collier Publishing Company, 1962.

Levinson, H., et al. Men, Management, and Mental Health. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Lodahl, T. M. "Patterns of Job Attitudes in Two Assembly Technologies," Administrative Science Quarterly, VIII, No. 4 (March, 1964), 482-519.

Lodahl, T. M. and Kejner, M. "The Definition and Measurement of Job Involvement," Journal of Applied Psychology, XLIX, No. 1 (1965), 24-33.

Maurer, J. G. "Work as a 'Central Life Interest' of Industrial Supervisors," forthcoming in Academy of Management Journal, XI, No. 3 (September, 1968).

- Merton, R. K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Revised edition. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957.
- Miller, D. C. and Form, W. H. Industrial Sociology: An Introduction to the Sociology of Work Relations. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.
- Morse, N. C. and Weiss, R. S. "The Function and Meaning of Work and the Job," American Sociological Review, XX (April, 1955), 191-98.
- Mott, P. E., et al. Shift Work: The Social, Psychological and Physical Consequences. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.
- Nelson, H. E. "Occupational Self-Images of Teachers: A Study of the Occupational Involvements and Work Role Orientations of Michigan Industrial Education Teachers." Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, Michigan State University, 1962.
- Nosow, S. and Form, W. H. Man, Work, and Society. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1962.
- Orzack, L. H. "Work as a 'Central Life Interest' of Professionals," Social Problems, VII, No. 2 (Fall, 1959), 125-32.
- Ranta, R. R. "The Professional Status of the Michigan Cooperative Extension Service." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1960.
- Reiss, A. J., Jr. Occupations and Social Status. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1961.
- Robinson, H. A., et al. "Job Satisfaction Researches of 1964-65," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLV (December, 1966), 371-79.
- Romer, S. The International Brotherhood of Teamsters: Its Government and Structure. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.
- Selltiz, C., et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. Revised one-volume edition. New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1959.
- Taff, C. A. Commercial Motor Transportation. 3d ed. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1961.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Occupational Outlook Handbook. 1966-67 ed. Bulletin No. 1450.

Viteles, M. S. Motivation and Morale in Industry. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1953.

Vroom, V. H. Work and Motivation. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.

Walker, C. R. and Guest, R. H. The Man on the Assembly Line. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Warner, W. L., et al. Social Class in America. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Wilensky, H. L. "Work, Careers, and Social Integration," International Social Science Journal, XII (Fall, 1960), 543-60.

_____. "Varieties of Work Experience," Institute of Industrial Relations Reprint No. 231. Berkeley: University of California, 1964. Reprinted from Man in a World of Work, H. Borow (ed.). (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1964).

Zaleznik, A., et al. The Motivation, Productivity, and Satisfaction of Workers: A Prediction Study. Boston: Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration, 1958.