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What I plan to talk about

- Crashes, accidents and their definition
- Causes and their definitions
- The evolvement of crash causation study methods and analysis
- Culminating in the NDS approach: it’s hopes, promises, and pitfalls.
- Its embodiment in SHRP2 - Safety
What is an Accident?

**American Heritage Dictionary:**

An unexpected and undesirable event, especially one resulting in damage or harm: (such as) car accidents on icy roads... an unforeseen incident... (involving) lack of intention; chance”

**Oxford online dictionary:**

An unfortunate incident that happens unexpectedly and unintentionally; 2. an incident that happens by chance or without apparent cause. 3 chance.”

**Dictionary.com**

an undesirable or unfortunate happening that occurs unintentionally and usually results in harm, injury, damage, or loss;...unexpectedly, without a deliberate plan or cause... chance.
Why is a Crash ≠ Accident?

- Evans 1993 – "The word crash indicates in a simple factual way what is observed, while accident seems to suggest in addition a general explanation of why it occurred without any evidence to support such an explanation."

- NHTSA 1996 - “accidents imply random activity beyond human influence and control” while crashes are “predictable results of specific actions”.

- BMJ 2001- “Accidents are not unpredictable... we are banning the inappropriate use of ‘accident’ in our pages... in favor of the descriptive and more neutral terms ‘crash’ and ‘collision’”
What is a Cause? David Hume
(An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding, 1748).

- We cannot deny the concept of causation, but we cannot prove it sufficiently. This is because basing causation on induction, assumes that the future will resemble the past. We have no proof for this. Inductions – unlike deductions – can at best prove probability.

- Example; Unemployment is a good predictor of crashes (Partyke, 1984) or not (Partyke, 1991).
What is a ‘cause’? John Stuart Mill. Logical contingencies for causation (1843)

1. Method of agreement: if a single common factor (e.g. DWI) exists in all cases where a phenomenon occurs (e.g. crash), then we can attribute the phenomenon to that factor (necessary condition).

2. Method of difference: if one set of circumstances (e.g. DWI) leads to a given phenomenon (e.g. crash) and another set of circumstances (e.g. driving sober) does not (e.g., no crash), and the sets differ only in a single factor (alcohol) that is present in the first set and not in the second set, then the phenomenon (crash) can be attributed to that factor (sufficient condition).
What’s a ‘cause’? John Stuart Mill.

Logical contingencies for causation (1843)

3. **Joint method of agreement and difference:** when both conditions exist

4. **Method of residue:**—if several factors account for several phenomena and there is one phenomenon left and one factor left, then it causes it (e.g. fatigue-related fatal crashes).

5. **Method of concomitant variations:** if a set of phenomena vary in accordance with a set of factors then the latter causes it (*Dose-response relationship*).
How strong is causality in crashes?

In highway Safety Research Support for crash causation is based on:

- shaky-theory, and
- statistically-based causality.
What’s a highway traffic crash Cause?

- Pat Waller’s baseball umpires analogy
- Highway Safety Research Approach to crash causation depends on:
  - Who you ask: crash investigator vs. data base analyst
  - The tools you have: objective observable case details vs. interviews vs. statistical controls
  - The orientation: focus on ‘why’ vs. prevention
Cause is in the Eye of the Beholder: The Oxfordshire crash data - Police

An INVESTIGATION and REPORT on FOUR YEARS’ FATAL ACCIDENTS IN OXFORDSHIRE

- Study analyzed the causes of 148 fatal accidents in Oxfordshire over a 4-year period
- Definition: a contributory factor is one that had it been removed the accident would have been prevented
- Study background: according to the police “fewer than 1% of accidents are primarily due to road defects and that in only 3% of cases are road defects contributory to any degree”
It is probably correct to say that personal error is a contributory cause in every accident other than those due entirely to “Act of God”.

Unless we are to assume that the behavior of road users is capable of being perfected, there is little significance in this statement.

There were 146 accidents with personal error but that does not mean that the error was in the nature of gross carelessness or misbehavior.

In many, indeed the error was such that any normal person might commit under the stress of circumstances or owing to momentary lack of attention.
Cause is in the Eye of the Beholder: The Oxfordshire crash data - Engineering

In this analysis of 148 fatal accidents:

- ‘Ordinary’ road defects were contributory to 36% of the accidents.
- ‘Major’ road defects were contributory to another 17% of the accidents.
- ‘Major and ordinary’ road defects were contributory to 23% of the accidents.
- ‘Ordinary and/or major’ road defects were contributory to 76% of the accidents.

Approaches to cause attribution and causal analysis

- Theory-based clinical case analysis
- Statistical ‘theory-free’ data-base analysis and over-involvement
- Prospective in-vehicle monitoring of driver behavior.
Some background to the IU study and clinical analysis

- Unsafe at Any Speed (1965)
- Naturally, the first large-scale study on causes of traffic accidents focused on the safety defects of the American automobile
How the Indiana University study started

PIs: John R. Treat and Kent B. Joscelyn
Indiana University Study: What they looking for?

Abstract:

- PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES DEVELOPED IN CONJUNCTION WITH A TRI-LEVEL ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION PROGRAM ARE REPORTED. INCLUDED ARE PRINCIPAL DATA COLLECTED FORMS, CRITERIA, AND INSTRUCTIONS.
- THE TRI-LEVEL INVESTIGATION PROGRAM HAS AS ITS OBJECTIVE THE IDENTIFICATION OF ALL PRE-CRASH ACCIDENT-CAUSATIVE FACTORS.
- PARTICULAR INTEREST IS FOCUSED ON ACCURATELY IDENTIFYING THE ROLE PLAYED BY VEHICULAR FACTORS.
- Treat, J.R. and Joscelyn, K.B.
Indiana University Study: What they looking for? What did they find?

- “Human factors were implicated by far the most frequently.”
- “Vehicular factors were implicated the least frequently.”
- “ Environmental factors were implicated to an intermediate extent.”
THÉ IU study: Tri-Level Study of the Causes of Traffic Accidents

TRI-LEVEL STUDY OF THE CAUSES OF TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS: FINAL REPORT

VOLUME I: Causal Factor Tabulations and Assessments
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IU Study – subjective but very structured.

- Inclusion criteria: time of arrival, cooperation
- Evaluation of H E V contributions by experts
- Group decision on
  - Probability of Presence: \( p(p) \)
  - Probability of Causation given presence: \( p(c|p) \)
  - Causal attribution: \( p(c, p) = p(c|p) * p(p) \)

- Categorization
  - Definite \( p(c, p) = >.95 \)
  - Probable \( p(c, p) = .80-.94 \)
  - Possible \( p(c, p) = .20-.79 \)
Percentage of Combined Phase II, III, IV, & V Accidents Caused by Human, Vehicular, and Environmental Factors

On-Site: N = 2258 Accidents
In-Depth: N = 420 Accidents

% of Accidents

1. Human
   - In-Depth: 70.7%
   - On-Site: 92.6%

2. Environment (Incl. Slick Roads)
   - In-Depth: 12.4%
   - On-Site: 18.9%

3. Vehicle
   - In-Depth: 4.5%
   - On-Site: 4.1%

*“Definite” Results
†“Probable” Results
Why there are >100% of causes
Why there are >100% of causes
In-Depth Analysis: UK vs. US
(Rumar, 1985)

Sabey and Staughton, 1975, Interacting roles of road environment, vehicle, and road user in accidents.

Treat et al., 1977, Tri-Level Study of Causes of Traffic Accidents
The IU Tri-Level Study Model
(Treat, Tumbas, McDonald, Shinar, Hume, Meyer, Stansifer, and Castellan, 1977)

Causal Factor Tree for Human Direct Causes

- Human Direct Causes
  - Performance (Action) Errors
    - Inadequate Directional Control
    - Other
  - Decision Errors
    - Errors
  - Recognition Errors
    - Delays in Recognition for Other or Unknown Reasons
      - Delays (Reasons Noted)
      - Suicidal Attempt or Intentional Collision
      - Blackout or Dozing
    - Performance (Action) Errors
      - Inadequate Directional Control
      - Overcompensation
      - Panic or Freezing
      - Other
      - Performance (Action) Errors
    - Failure to Turn On Headlights
    - Pedestrian Ran Into Traffic
    - Other
  - Non-Accident
    - Inattention
    - Internal Distraction
    - External Distraction
    - Improper Lookout
      - False Assumption
      - Improper Maneuver
      - Inadequately Defensive Driving Technique
      - Excessive Speed
      - Excessive Acceleration
      - Improper Evasive Action
      - Tailgating
      - Misjudgment
IU Study: Top 5 Specific Direct Human Causes (Phases II-V)

Total crashes caused by inattention (including 4.3% external distraction) = 51.4%
## Human Direct Causes – Top 10: Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improper Lookout</td>
<td>Delayed recognition due to failure to perform an adequate visual search in a situation that requires a distinct visual surveillance (e.g., in intersections and pulling out of a parking space)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Speed</td>
<td>Speed that is excessive relative to the traffic, roadway, and ambience conditions – regardless of the legal speed limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattention</td>
<td>Delayed recognition due to preoccupation with irrelevant thoughts or wandering of the mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Evasive Action</td>
<td>Failing to take an emergency action that is apparent and within the capabilities of an adequately trained and alert driver (e.g., locking the brakes and as a result losing control of the car, in a situation where steering could have prevented the accident)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Distraction</td>
<td>Delayed recognition due to an attentional shift to an event, activity, object, or person within the vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Driving Technique</td>
<td>Engaging in an improper control of vehicle path or speed, in an habitual maneuver (e.g., cresting hills while driving in the center of the road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequately Defensive Driving Technique</td>
<td>Unnecessarily placing the vehicle in a position where there is a foreseeable and substantial risk of collision if another driver performs contrary to normal expectorations, or failing to check that another driver is not engaged in such an unexpected action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Assumption</td>
<td>Taking action on the basis of an assumption that is not valid – even if it is based on the traffic system rules (e.g., pulling in front of a driver who is signaling a turn but does not in fact turn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Maneuver</td>
<td>Willfully choosing a vehicle path that is wrong, since it increases the chance of a collision (e.g., turning from the wrong lane, driving the wrong way in a one-way street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcompensation</td>
<td>Improper reactions to emergency situations that cause loss of control, such as overbraking or oversteering (e.g., oversteering back into the highway after going off into the road shoulder)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IU Study: Human Conditions and States in Percent of Accidents

- Alcohol-Impairment: 3.1%
- Other Drug Impairment: 2.1%
- Fatigue: 1.7%
- Driver Inexperience: 1.4%
- In-Hurry: 1.0%
- Emotional Upset: 1.2%
- Vehicle Unfamiliarity: 1.0%
- Pressure From Other Drivers: 1.1%
- Road Area Unfamiliarity: 2.1%
- Reduced Vision: 0.2%
**IU Study: Environmental Causes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>In-Depth</th>
<th>On-Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View Obstructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slick Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special/Transient Hazards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Hindrances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of Combined Phase II, III, IV, & V Accidents Caused by Specific Environmental Causal Factors**

- **View Obstructions**
  - In-Depth: 3.6%
  - On-Site: 5.8%
- **Slick Roads**
  - In-Depth: 3.8%
  - On-Site: 6.2%
- **Special/Transient Hazards**
  - In-Depth: 1.9%
  - On-Site: 3.4%
- **Design Problems**
  - In-Depth: 1.9%
  - On-Site: 1.4%
- **Control Hindrances**
  - In-Depth: 1.2%
  - On-Site: 1.3%
IU Study: Vehicular Causes

Figure 3-9

Percentage of Combined Phase II, III, IV, & V Accidents Caused by Deficiencies in Major Vehicular Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicular Factors</th>
<th>In-Depth</th>
<th>On-Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brake System</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tires &amp; Wheels</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communication Systems</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Steering System</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Body &amp; Doors</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Power Train</td>
<td>.2/2</td>
<td>.1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Suspension Problems</td>
<td>.0/2</td>
<td>.0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Driver Seating &amp; Controls</td>
<td>.0/2</td>
<td>.1/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What has been done since the IU study?

- The Unsafe Driving Acts (UDA) study - 1999
- The National Motor Vehicle Crash Causation Study (NMVCCS) - 2008
Unsafe Driving Acts (UDA) Study
(Freedman, Fell, and Hendricks, 1999)

- NASS Special Study
- 12-Months data: April 1996- March 1997
- 1284 Drivers involved in 723 Crashes
- Special Study form added to on-site investigation included 78 Unsafe Driving Acts
- Research Team added 13 more.
Unsafe Driving Acts Study vs. Tri-Level Study  (Hendricks, Freedman, Zador, Fell, 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Type/Study</th>
<th>% of Crashes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDA</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Level</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDA</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Level</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor Type/Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Crashes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# UDA Study: Most Frequent Causes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Category</th>
<th>Assignment Level</th>
<th>% of Drivers Contributing To Causation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIVER INATTENTION</td>
<td>Primary (Sole Factor)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary (In Combination)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributory</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE SPEED</td>
<td>Primary (Sole Factor)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary (In Combination)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributory</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALCOHOL IMPAIRMENT</td>
<td>Primary (Sole Factor)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary (In Combination)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributory</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCEPTUAL ERRORS</td>
<td>Primary (Sole Factor)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Looked, Did Not See)</td>
<td>Primary (In Combination)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributory</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted Inadequate Gap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECISION ERRORS</td>
<td>Primary (Sole Factor)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Turn/Cross With Obstructed View)</td>
<td>Primary (Sole Factor)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Violated Red Signal)</td>
<td>Primary (Sole Factor)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Attempted To Beat Phasing Signal)</td>
<td>Primary (Sole Factor)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Violated Stop Sign)</td>
<td>Primary (Sole Factor)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### UDA vs. IU: Most Common Causes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Factor Study</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four Common Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Inattention: UDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Inattention/Distraction: Tri-Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Speed: UDA</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Speed: Tri-Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptual Errors: UDA</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Lookout: Tri-Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Errors: UDA</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Assumption: Tri-Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assignment Frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDA - 67.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Level - 66.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Two of Six Most Frequent UDA Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>10</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Impairment: UDA</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Impairment: Tri-Level</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incapacitated: UDA</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Non-Performance: Tri-Level</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assignment Frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDA - 29.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Level - 7.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Rationale: “nearly 30 years have passed since the last on-scene crash causation study was conducted (the Indiana University Tri-Level Study in 1979).”
- IU study was not nationally representative
- Vehicle fleet and vehicle technologies have changed
- Driver behavior has changed due to a variety of telematics.
The NMVCCS Method (1)

- Qualifying crashes
  - Moving vehicle involved
  - One of 1st 3 vehicles is light passenger car
  - Tow-away with injury
  - Police-reported
  - EMS called and police present at arrival of investigator
The NMVCCS Method (2)

- Nationally representative sample, based on NASS PSUs
- 6,950 crashes, July 3, 2005 – December 31, 2007
- On-scene investigation by trained investigators includes, interviews, vehicle + scene inspection + official records
- Over 600 variables + photos + narratives relating to driver, vehicle, environment
The NMVCCS Method (3)

- Identified pre-crash:
  - Movement - straight, negotiating curve, stopped in traffic, etc.
  - critical event – that makes the collision unavoidable
  - critical reason for that event.

- Critical Reason ≠ Cause: Only one per crash. May not reflect the cause of the crash
## The NMVCCS - Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Reason</th>
<th>Weighted % Factors/reasons</th>
<th>Primarily</th>
<th>Followed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driver Errors</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recognition</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Inadequate surveillance</td>
<td>Internal Distraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decision</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Too fast for conditions</td>
<td>Too fast for curve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Performance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Over-compensation</td>
<td>Poor direction control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental conditions</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Tires</td>
<td>Brakes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

David Shinar
Summary of 4 post-hoc clinical studies of crash causation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Causation based on ‘theory free’ statistical associations

- Rely only on observable, objectively measurable, data elements.
- Draw conclusions based on logistic regressions, relative risks, odds ratios
- Unless the conclusions rely on Hill’s requirements – and these include theory – they are likely to be spurious.
7 safeguards for Causation from Statistical Associations (Hill, 1965)

To imply causation from the observation of association we should consider seven features:

1. Strength
2. Consistency
3. Specificity – of conditions
4. Temporality – the order of events
Safeguards for Causation from Statistical Associations (Hill, 1965)

5. Biological Gradient - dose-response relationship,
6. Theoretical plausibility, and
7. Coherence – the consistency with other related phenomena.

Statistical Analysis of Vehicle Color as Crash Cause (Furness, Connors, Robinson, et al. 2003)

Association of car colour with car crash injury in Auckland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car colour</th>
<th>No (%) of cases (n=567)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>145 (25.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>31 (5.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>52 (9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>36 (6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>91 (16.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>85 (15.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>42 (7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>55 (9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>30 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Proportions of controls are adjusted for the cluster sampling design.
†Adjusted for driver's age, ethnicity, alcohol consumption in past 6 hours, seat belt use, vehicle speed, average driving time each week, driving license status, vehicle insurance status, and weather.
Statistical Analysis of Vehicle Color as Crash Cause (Furness, Connors, Robinson, et al. 2003)

Association of car colour with car crash injury in Auckland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car colour</th>
<th>No (%) of cases (n=567)</th>
<th>No (%) of controls* (n=588)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>145 (25.6)</td>
<td>146 (25.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>31 (5.5)</td>
<td>15 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>52 (9.2)</td>
<td>61 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>36 (6.4)</td>
<td>34 (5.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>91 (16.1)</td>
<td>96 (17.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>85 (15.0)</td>
<td>82 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>42 (7.4)</td>
<td>44 (7.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>55 (9.7)</td>
<td>49 (8.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>30 (5.3)</td>
<td>61 (11.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Proportions of controls are adjusted for the cluster sampling design.
†Adjusted for driver’s age, ethnicity, alcohol consumption in past 6 hours, seat belt use, vehicle speed, average driving time each week, driving licence status, vehicle insurance status, and weather.
Statistical Analysis of Vehicle Color as Crash Cause (Furness, Connors, Robinson, et al. 2003)

Assessment of car colour with car crash injury in Auckland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car colour</th>
<th>No (%) of cases (n=567)</th>
<th>No (%) of controls* (n=588)</th>
<th>Univariate odds ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>145 (25.6)</td>
<td>146 (25.9)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>31 (5.5)</td>
<td>15 (2.8)</td>
<td>2.0 (1.0 to 4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>52 (9.2)</td>
<td>61 (10.0)</td>
<td>0.9 (0.6 to 1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>36 (6.4)</td>
<td>34 (5.5)</td>
<td>1.2 (0.7 to 2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>91 (16.1)</td>
<td>96 (17.4)</td>
<td>0.9 (0.6 to 1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>85 (15.0)</td>
<td>82 (13.3)</td>
<td>1.1 (0.7 to 1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>42 (7.4)</td>
<td>44 (7.0)</td>
<td>1.1 (0.6 to 1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>55 (9.7)</td>
<td>49 (6.8)</td>
<td>1.4 (0.8 to 2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>30 (5.3)</td>
<td>61 (11.3)</td>
<td>0.5 (0.3 to 0.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P value: 0.04

*Proportions of controls are adjusted for the cluster sampling design.
†Adjusted for driver’s age, ethnicity, alcohol consumption in past 6 hours, seat belt use, vehicle speed, average driving time each week, driving licence status, vehicle insurance status, and weather.
### Statistical Analysis of Vehicle Color as Crash Cause

(Furness, Connors, Robinson, et al. 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car colour</th>
<th>No (%) of cases (n=567)</th>
<th>No (%) of controls* (n=588)</th>
<th>Univariate odds ratio</th>
<th>Multivariable odds ratio†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>145 (25.6)</td>
<td>146 (25.9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>31 (5.5)</td>
<td>15 (2.8)</td>
<td>2.0 (1.0 to 4.0)</td>
<td>0.8 (0.3 to 2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>52 (9.2)</td>
<td>61 (10.0)</td>
<td>0.9 (0.6 to 1.5)</td>
<td>0.6 (0.3 to 1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>36 (6.4)</td>
<td>34 (5.5)</td>
<td>1.2 (0.7 to 2.0)</td>
<td>2.0 (1.0 to 4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>91 (16.1)</td>
<td>96 (17.4)</td>
<td>0.9 (0.6 to 1.4)</td>
<td>0.9 (0.5 to 1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>85 (15.0)</td>
<td>82 (13.3)</td>
<td>1.1 (0.7 to 1.8)</td>
<td>0.7 (0.4 to 1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>42 (7.4)</td>
<td>44 (7.0)</td>
<td>1.1 (0.6 to 1.8)</td>
<td>1.8 (1.0 to 3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>55 (9.7)</td>
<td>49 (6.8)</td>
<td>1.4 (0.8 to 2.5)</td>
<td>2.1 (1.1 to 4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>30 (5.3)</td>
<td>61 (11.3)</td>
<td>0.5 (0.3 to 0.8)</td>
<td>0.4 (0.2 to 0.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Proportions of controls are adjusted for the cluster sampling design.
†Adjusted for driver’s age, ethnicity, alcohol consumption in past 6 hours, seat belt use, vehicle speed, average driving time each week, driving license status, vehicle insurance status, and weather.
Given consistent results from IU, UDA, and NMVCCS where to now?

- Can we do another/better Tri-Level In-Depth Multi-disciplinary study?
  - Yes, we are good at the methodology and can improve on representativeness and quality. Common worldwide

- Can we afford another such study?
  - Yes, the IU study cost was equivalent to the cost of a Chevy Impala per each in-depth investigation. 420 x 28,000 = $11,760

- Do we really want/need another study?
  - Yes. Vehicles, Environment, Drivers – have all changed
So why not a new in-depth study

- If we do another in-depth study, will we get the same results? If yes, are the results methodology-bound?
- Could we do better without resorting to drivers’ subjective recollections and researchers’ subjective introspection? E.g., Use the vehicle’s black box?
- Can we pick a new methodology? Yes – hence the NDS
NDS - Prospective, In-Vehicle Monitoring Approach

- Automate data recording and storage to analyze the last few seconds prior to a crash
- Obtain objective data from which behavior can be inferred
  - View scene as it was available to the driver and view the driver actions just before the crash
  - Obtain objective vehicle and roadway performance data
- But add insights from valid driver reports that can be corroborated with objective data
Are they feasible? Popular? Practical?

- They are feasible:
  - 100 Car - U.S. Study
  - PROLOGUE - EU Study

- They are popular
  - SHRP2 (U.S.A. and Canada)
  - UDRIVE
  - Beginnings in Australia and Japan

- Practical? – time will tell.
What have we learned from the 100-car study

- Crashes are rare events – especially police-reported crashes – (12 of 69 ‘crashes’ for ~2m vehicle-miles)
- The NDS provides a within-subject case control by providing exposure/control data for every crash
- Inattention is the major human factor – 78%
  - Secondary task engagement (e.g. wireless)
  - Fatigue
  - Driving-related inattention to roadway ahead (e.g. mirrors)
  - Non-specific eye glance (towards a blank area)
Main Conclusion (for me at least)

- If we want to focus on specific types of crashes in specific circumstances, with specific types of drivers we need a very very large sample
## IU Study vs. SHRP2

### Indiana University
- Retrospective
- Clinical
- Little corroboration of driver/occupant reports
- Somewhat representative
- Very limited geographic area
- Detailed environmental data – but missed transient cues
- No exposure data

### SHRP2
- Prospective
- Statistical
- Relies mostly on “hard” vehicle based recordings
- Skewed/biased
- Much greater and more varied catchment area
- Detailed environmental data – with transient cues
- Exposure data can be gotten from same drivers

---
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IU vs. SHRP: study questions

I.U. – What are the causes of highway traffic accidents?

SHRP2 >400 questions related to the role of:

- Road departure – e.g., how frequent are they for various sets of roadway variables?
- Intersection – e.g., how do traffic control devices influence braking?
- Driving performance - e.g., how is it affected by fatigue, topography, visual and auditory distraction, etc.?
- Interactions with advanced vehicle technology -
IU vs. SHRP: clinical insights vs. objective derivations

- IU – Independent variables (e.g., inattention) → Dependent measures (crashes). Key data reduction was a mental subjective group effort that generated psychologically meaningful concepts.

- SHRP – multiple data items → intervening variables (e.g., inattention) → dependent measure (hopefully crashes). Algorithms needed to deduce meaningful concepts.
IU vs. SHRP: consider ‘looked but did not see’

- IU – Driver reported looking but not seeing – often corroborated by D2.
- SHRP - “rather than making a judgment as to where people are looking, the researchers have developed a video mask which overlays numeric coordinates on the driver’s face, which can provide objective data points relating to where the driver’s attention is focused.”
I.U. vs. SHRP - Where do expert opinions and insights come in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Throughputs</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IU Observed scene+vehicle Driver reports</td>
<td>Frequencies in preconceived categories</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHRP2 Recorded digital and video data</td>
<td><img src="brain.png" alt="Brain diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="computer.png" alt="Computer" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Both vehicle-based and infrastructure-based technologies will be used to gather pre-crash, crash, and exposure data. The data can then be analyzed and applied to safety countermeasures.”

“Naturalistic Driving Study (NDS) will allow us to record and study the driving behavior of a large sample of drivers in their personal vehicles”

- Projected >3,900 vehicle years (~3,000 vehicles)
- Projected ~ 150 crashes (currently 48 triggered crashes)
NDS Study Objectives

- to address the role of driver performance and behavior in traffic safety, including:
  - Developing an understanding of how the driver interacts with and adapts to the vehicle, traffic environment, roadway characteristics, traffic control devices, and the environment.
  - Assessing the changes in collision risk associated with each of these factors and interactions.
- This information will support the development of new and improved countermeasures with greater effectiveness.
SHRP2 NDS data expectations

- Amount expected to exceed 1 petabyte (million gigabytes).
- Will provide a wealth of information regarding driving behavior, lane departures, and intersection activities,
- Should be relevant to transportation safety researchers for at least 20 years
- But there will be access ‘issues’
NDS Analysis

- analyze the data to quantify the contribution of relevant driver, roadway, vehicle, and environmental factors to the research questions selected and assess the countermeasure implications of the findings
Biggest challenges to SHRP2

- Sample bias – safety-oriented older volunteers
- Sample size – too few crashes
- Data reduction – May be different for different questions. ‘Chunking’ is suggested by specific relevant conditions.
- Dissemination to stakeholders - “researchers, manufacturers, and lawmakers”.
  - Data base is complex
  - Privacy issues abound.
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Added value of NDS

- Almost 40 years later – all has changed
  - Cars are different (e.g., IIHS ‘59 Chevy Bel Air vs. ‘09 Malibu)
  - Infrastructure has changed (e.g., medians, traffic circles)
  - Traffic mix has changed (more pedestrians, cyclists)
  - Drivers have Changed too: safety oriented, uses belts, refrains from DWI, but time-shares, and goes as fast as ever.

- Things not considered before:
  - What if we find the same things? We will understand them better and plan better countermeasures
  - What if we don’t find the same things?
Where can we expect the ‘big’ payoff relative to driving behavior?

Not just in understanding crashes, but in understanding driving behavior in specific contexts and with specific vehicle systems - which is >99% of the time we are on the road.

We can study:

- Risky driving
- Adjusting to adverse weather and road conditions,
- Driving styles of men and women of different ages
- Impact of new technologies on behavior
- Driving while impaired
- Inattention in more details than ever before
Where can we expect the ‘big’ payoff relative to driving performance?

- In understanding driving *performance under pressure*: in the context of incidents, near-crashes, and crashes.

- We can study the impact on performance of:
  - Information overload and underload
  - Unfamiliar or unexpected situations
  - Gender, age, and driving skills
  - Impact of new e-safety technologies
  - Impairments
  - Inattention in more details than ever before
The #1 human factor: inattention? Is it increasing? Decreasing? The same?

- Inattention: due to much faster pace of life
- External distraction: electronic billboards, road-sharing with other vehicle types (that are less conspicuous), and multi-modal road sharing
- Internal distraction: infotainment systems
- Reduced alertness: due to more autonomous vehicles (e.g. parking), increase in collision warning and avoidance systems
But it’s certainly not new

- Remember the Oxfordshire report from 1937:
  - “In many, indeed the error was such that any normal person might commit under the stress of circumstances or owing to momentary lack of attention”
- SHRP may just give us the key to coping with it.
THANK YOU

David Shinar
Ben Gurion University of the Negev
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The growth of the “naturalistic driving study” – citations in www.scholar.google.com
Crash as a function of ‘circumstances’ and ‘lack of attention’/ human resource allocation  (from Blumenthal, 1968)