Driver Injury in Automobile Accidents Involving Certain Car Models

,

by B. 1. Campbell

Chapel Hill, North Carolina University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center 1970

Publication number: UNC/HSRC--70/12/1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

 $\overline{}$

 $\sim 10^6$

Page

Page

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$, $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study involved preparation of a large amount of data, and it is therefore understandable that its completion depended on intensive cooperation by a number of people in a number of state agencies. Without this cooperation this study could not have been undertaken, much less completed.

The North Carolina Department of Motor Vehicles provided the basic data for this study. Sincere appreciation is expressed to Mr. Laeron Roberts, Data Processing Director, and to several members of his staff for their time and talents in supervising preparation of cards, processing tape and many other contributions. Likewise, a debt is owed to Hr. Joe Register and his staff for many-fold assistance in gaining access to the accident data.

Among the staff of the UNC Highway Safety Research Center, many contributed heavily. Programming was done by Mrs. Janice Behrman and Mr. William Fischer. Analytical procedures were refined by Dr. Gary Koch and his colleagues in Biostatistics and by Mr. Donald Reinfurt of HSRC. Several other staff members at HSRC have worked on the data in these final days, and thanks are due to them all.

Finally, acknowledgment is due to the North Carolina Governor's Highway Safety Program which provided partial financial support during the final months of this three-year effort, and thereby assisted in speeding the completion date of this report.

ABSTRACT

This study deals with the variation in injury to unbelted drivers involved in crashes while driving various car makes and models. Data were extracted from a pool of reports on 270 thousand vehicles involved in crashes in North Carolina in 1966 and 1968.

Driver injury in each car make was compared to driver injury in the aggregate of all vehicles, and the comparisons were made on the basis of a set of crash circumstances, similar as to speed, impact site, and accident type.

Index scores for many make-year combinations were calculated. It was found that indices ranged among car models from ⁵⁰ or less (half as frequent injury as in the aggregate) up to 200 or more (twice as frequent injury as in the aggregate).

Injury values tended (as would be expected) to be less frequent among heavier cars and more frequent among lighter cars, and to be less frequent among later model cars and more frequent among earlier model cars. In terms of body style, among the standard Chevrolet, Ford, and Plymouth, drivers of station wagons and hardtops were injured significantly less frequently than in the aggregate.

DRIVER INJURY IN AUTOMOBILE ACCIDENTS INVOLVING CERTAIN CAR MODELS

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years increasing attention has been given to passenger car safety design, with emphasis on items intended to reduce injury resulting from a crash. Some of these injury-reducing features are common to all newer cars, such as seat belts and head restraints. Other relevant items such as the configuration of control knobs, instrument panel shape and padding, steering wheel stiffness and others are more uniquely identified with the interior design of specific car makes and models.

This is a study of car accidents from the standpoint of the frequency and severity of injury to unbelted drivers. The sample is divided into many subgroups according to the specific make and year of the car driven. The assumption is that if the subgroups are compared on the basis of similar accident situations (speed, impact site, and accident type), then resulting differences in driver injury may be related to car factors. This would seem especially likely if shifts in resulting driver injury coincided with identifiable car changes.

The study is based on analyses of official accident reports filed by police agencies all over the state, and collected by the North Carolina Department of Motor Vehicles.

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF THIS STUDY

Two Collisions: Foremost in understanding what this study is and what it is not, is the difference between "the first collision" and "the second collision." These terms are used to separate accident causation factors from factors that operate during the collision to determine whether the persons involved will be killed, injured, or will escape injury. The second collision is the impact between the human occupant and the

interior of the car, and occurs a split second after the "first" collision of the car with some external object.

This distinction is made because it bears on the reason for studying the car itself. While it is possible that car factors play ^a relatively minor role in the causation of the first collision, it is evident that they play a prominent role in determining the outcome of the "second collision," through safety features, interior design, structural crash properties, etc. This study has no bearing on car factors in accident causation, but deals solely with the matter of resultant driver injuries.*

Determiners of Injury: Several factors influence presence or absence of driver injury, as well as injury degree. Speed is important as is the part of the car sustaining the impact. It is generally worse for car drivers if ^a truck rather than another car is struck. It is usually worse to strike a fixed object than to strike another car, etc. Thus, one set of factors influencing injury is situational in nature, pertaining to the character of the accident event.

In addition, car variables can playa role. The presence or absence of safety features such as padding on the instrument panel, safety door latches, energy absorbing steering wheels, etc., have a collective influence on driver injury. In addition to these specific characteristics of the driver station, other less "visible" features could be relevant, such as the stiffness and size of the structure. By statistically controlling for the aforementioned situational factors, the stage is set for emergence of car-associated variables in the production of driver injury.

Finally, there is at least the possibility of driver-related injury variables. Under most circumstances one would assume that if a person hits an object, say a broken windshield, the potential for injury should be about the same for one person as for another. However, there is evidence that in roughly comparable accidents, older persons more often die than do younger people.** This possibility was examined by calculating the average driver age for each car group to see whether older drivers are disproportionately represented in car groups that manifest higher injury ratings. It was found that the opposite is true, and older drivers if anything are slightly more associated with cars with lower index values.

* Another study, now underway at HSRC, will take at least the first step toward dealing with car factors in the "first collision," by amassing data to show the accident rate per million vehicle miles for cars of various makes. In that study the complex relationship between the car and the driver in the production of accidents will be discussed.

** Driver Age and Sex Related to Accident Time and Type," by B. J. Campbell, Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc., Report VJ-1823- R-l9, Buffalo, New York 1964.

report is submitted if someone is injured or killed, or if property damage exceeds \$100.00. More than 100,000 accidents were reported in each of the years in question, most involving two vehicles.

For this analysis cases were eliminated if data were so incomplete that they could not be properly classified. Also, due to computer processing problems, some vehicles were excluded in crashes involving more than four vehicles. However, in a rural state like North Carolina, this did not constitute much of an exclusion. Some accidents involve only one vehicle, most involve two vehicles, and some more than two.

The basic data pool from which the rest of the study proceeds consists of information on 270,697 drivers and their vehicles involved in accidents in North Carolina in 1966 or 1968. This large reference set includes drivers of passenger cars, trucks, and other motor vehicles (excluding bicycle and motorcycle operators), and is representative of the whole data eet from those years.

In the specific analysis by car models, only passenger cars are compared to the overall reference set. Aleo, because of insufficient numbers, certain cars were not shown in the analysis though they were included in the reference set. Moreover, cars prior to 1960 models were not analyzed individually, but they, too, were in the reference set.

IV. DATA PROCESSING

As a part of the in-processing routine of all accident reports received by the North Carolina Department of Motor Vehicles, certain information on each driver and each vehicle is keypunched and later transferred to computer tape. This data processing is done jointly by the Department of Motor Vehicles and the State Highway Commission. Ae a part of the process, copies of the cards or tape are provided to the University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center for use in many special research projects of which this is one.

Unfortunately, not all information necessary to this study is routinely punched from the report forms onto cards. The key missing variable is the car's Vehicle Identification Number (VIN). It was therefore necessary to prepare 300,000 or more supplementary punched cards to add the necessary information. These supplementary cards were transferred to tape, then they were matched. item by item to the original materials in order to join the VINs with the proper accident cases. Once the data were on tape. an extensive process of classifying, editing, and data analysis began. This is described in the next section.

Driver injury data in this study are quite general, and do not reflect either the specific part of the body involved or the part of the car contacted in producing the injury. Therefore, this analysis must be regarded as more of an overall indication of any car-injury association, rather than a direct evaluation of particular car features.

Statistical Association and Cause and Effect: A word should be said as to the general question of any association between driver injury and certain car groups. In a purely statistical study such as this one, an association may be shown, and the data may suggest possible explanations for the relationship. However, the statistical results must also be considered in view of known engineering features and structural characteristics of the cars in question.

If the statistics indicate that a certain model car appears much better in one year than in the preceding year, then the question is whether relevant engineering changes occurred between those years which might have accounted for the injury shift. Sometimes a design change may be quite obvious, such as addition of an energy absorbing steering assembly. Other times the change in injury might be associated with a much less obvious car characteristic, such as a change in the stiffness of the structure.

Sometimes of course the injury shift may appear when no known relevant engineering change was introduced, or on the other hand, no injury shift may be detected when in fact a significant structural change was made. In these cases, the injury data could be called into more serious question. When there is a correspondence between a shift in injury statistics and a physical change in the car, then the indications could be regarded as stronger.

III. THE DATA BASE

Data for this study are based on police reported accidents that occurred in North Carolina in 1966 and 1968. The data base contains materials from all reporting police agencies including the State Highway Patrol, city police and others. Accident reports submitted by the police are public documents under North Carolina law, and nearly all police agencies use the standard form specified by the North Carolina Department of Motor Vehicles. (A copy is shown as Appendix 1.)

Reporting is widespread, and there are no known "holes" in the reporting system in the sense of sizable cities not reporting, etc. The quality of reporting varies over the range that one expects in this kind of data. Some reports are very poor while others are quite good. A

V. STUDY VARIABLES

The variables in this study include:

- 1. Speed of car
- 2. Site of impact on car
- 3. Type of accident
- 4. Injury to driver
- 5. Year of car
- 6. Hake and body style of car

1. Speed of Car: The police officer is provided a space on the accident report form for the estimated speed of each vehicle just before onset of the accident process. For analysis purposes, in single vehiclecrashes, this speed is used directly. In two-vehicle front-rear crashes, the difference in the two speeds is used. In front-side or front-front crashes, the highest speed reported for either car is assigned to both cars. Thus, if ^a parked car (zero mph) is struck by a car traveling ³⁰ mph, then the value of 30 mph is assigned to both cars.* This is not a particularly sophisticated way of handling speeds, but is felt to be refined enough, considering possible errors in speed estimates, and also considering the fact that the speeds were rather grossly grouped as follows.

> Lower Speed Group - 0 to 29 mph Middle Speed Group - 30 to 49 mph Higher Speed Group - 50 mph and greater Unspecified Speed Group - speed not reported

2. Site of Impact on Car: Each car was classified according to the part of the car on which the principal damage was located. The groupings were **as** follows:

> Front Right Side Left Side Rear Unspecified

Obviously in some crashes, damage is sustained on more than one part of the car, but the officer usually only reports one area of damage, and that is usually the area of most severe damage. Note that the unspecified category is more than just those cases in which no report is made. It includes most of the single-vehicle, ran off-road-crashes, and therefore includes most of the overturn accidents.

^{*} Because of complications, in the event of ^a 3-or-more car crash, each car was assigned its own speed without reference to the other cars. All these cars are placed in the multiple-vehicle category.

3. Type of Accident: The data were also classified according to type of crash, and the following categories were used:

 $\frac{1}{2}$.

Car ran off roadway Car hit fixed object (in roadway area; including railway trains) Car hit other object (in roadway area) Car collided with other car Car collided with truck Cars in crashes involving 3 or more cars Other crashes

The first category includes all vehicles that ran off the roadway before striking any object, and includes those that went off the road and struck a tree as well as those that went off the road and rolled over without striking anything.

In reference to the "multiple" vehicle category, all cars in a 3 -or-more vehicle crash are included in the Multiple-Vehicle class. When the number of cars exceeded 4, the cara depicted on the "trailer carda" were eliminated because of processing difficulties.

Both vehicles in a car-to-car crash are classified. If one car strikes the other in the side, both are placed in the car-vs.-car category. One is classed as having struck with the front, and the other is classed as having been struck on the side. If a car and a truck collide, both are placed in the car-vs.-truck category (for purposes of defining the reference group). If two trucks collide, both are placed in the "other" category.

It was possible to classify nearly all cases with respect to these variables. The principal cases that were discarded in this edit-check process were those that had "illegal" punches on the card, some vehicles in 4or-more vehicle crashes, and vehicles that struck bicyclists, pedestrians, or animals.

4. Injury to Driver: Driver injuries are classified by the officer at the scene (or on the basis of the officer's follow-up investigation). The classification follows the nationally used Manual on Classification of Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents, (USA Standards Institute Standard D 16.1), National Safety Council, Chicago, 1962. On page 14 of this manual, injuries are classified on a five-point scale as follows:

1. no injury

2. "c" injury. Non-Visible Injury - is a complaint of pain without visible signs of injury, or momentary unconsciousness.

3. "B" injury. Minor Visible Injury - is an abrasion, bruise, swelling, limping or obviously painful movement.

4. "A" injury. Serious Visible Injury - i8 a bleeding wound, distorted member, or any condition that requires the victim to be carried from the scene of the accident.

5. Fatal injury. An injury that results in death within 12 months of the accident.

It should be noted here that while the definitions manual provides that death within one year following the accident (and directly attributable thereto) is counted as a motor vehicle fatality, and while the state and national figures are corrected for such delayed fatalities, and while the relevant accident report forms themselves are corrected where possible, it is nevertheless true that the accident report itself may not always be corrected. Therefore, there may be at least some cases in which the driver is reported as having an "A" injury based on the situation a few days following the crash, but the patient eventually dies. In those cases in which the records are not updated such an event would sometimes be counted as an "A" injury.

In order to compare all driver injuries on the same basis, the study deleted from each specific make-model group those drivers who were reported as wearing a seat belt. A separate study will deal with seat belted drivers.

5. Year of Car: The accident report form includes a space for the officer to record the make and year of the vehicle in question. Whatever year the officer records is transcribed to computer tape and used in this study as the year of the car. There is, however, one circumstance in which the computer program overrides the officer's year designation. This is based on the fact that the VIN has a digit or letter denoting the year of the car.

Therefore, if all three of the following conditions hold, , the the computer program overrides the officer's year designation: (1) the officer's year designation is inconsistent with the VIN, (2) the VIN appears correct in every respect (this implies several consistency checks) and (3) the year indicated by the VIN is only one year different from the officer's entry.

When all these conditions are met, the computer program substitutes the year indicated in the VIN in place of the year indicated by the officer. If the officer's entry disagrees with the VIN by more than one year, the case is discarded.

This procedure is based on the assumption that with cars a few years old the officer may designate the correct make, and may be able to recall the "vintage" of that particular car within a year or so, but he may be unable to recall the specific year. Such an occurrence is reasonable in view of the fact that sometimes only minor styling changes differentiate the external appearance of one year's model from the next.

6. Make and Body Style of Car: On the accident report form, the officer is instructed to write down the make of the car, and of course many spelling variations are seen. For example, the officer may write down "Ford" or "Galaxie" to designate a standard-sized Ford, or he may write "Chevelle," "Malibu," "Chevrolet," "Chevy," or "Chevvy" to indicate the Chevelle series. The computer program first reads the officer's English language indication

of the make, using only the first four letters of the word. The program accepts many spellings. Thus, the following initial spellings would be accepted and would activate the computer search program:

> Dodg Ford GTO Dart Plym Must (ang)

Spellings to be used were decided with assistance of a dictionary of all spellings in the entire data file. All but the least common are included. The various spellings that might represent a particular make of ear are then channelled into the same computer program routine.

Next, the VIN written down by the officer is checked by the computer program. The question is two-fold. First, does the VIN indicate the same .
brand of car the officer indicated? And, second, is the VIN formatted properly and acceptably?

The VIN varies from 6 to 13 characters, and has both alpha and numeric characters. The format of the VIN varies from corporation to corporation within the same year, and from car line to car line within a single corporation in a single year. Sometimes, for example, the model year is indicated by a number and sometimes by a letter; sometimes the year designation is the first character in the string, and sometimes it is in another position.

In any event, for a car to be accepted as a given make, the VIN must be formatted properly for that particular car make in terms of number of characters, proper placement of alpha and numeric characters within the sequence, and also "legality" of characters in a given position. As an example, one corporation designates the factories where the car was made by a letter in a certain position, and not all letters are used; therefore, the program will accept only a correct letter in that particular position. For some campanies the VIN is just a sequence number which does not carry any information, and does not therefore lend itself to any checks.

Naturally, this detailed checking process resulted in the elimination of many cars because the reported VIN was not correctly formatted. The recording error could have been committed by the policeman at the scene, trying to copy the number under less-than-ideal conditions, or it could have been a clerical error in the various transcriptions of the data. Perhaps it is not beyond the realm of possibility that the number may even have been affixed erroneously at the factory.

In preparing the computer program to ascertain car make from VIN, the reference materials were:

Motor Vehicle Identification Manual, National Automobile Theft Bureau, published by Palmer Publications Company, Downers Grove, Illinois.

NADA Official Used Car Guide, published by National Automohile Dealers Used Car Guide Company, Washington, D. C.

Unfortunately, these two books did not always agree exactly as to VIN for a given make, but in such cases we allowed for both possibilities. (Appendix 2 gives further details of how the computer program works.)

As a result of the computer program, very many make-model-body style combinations were uniquely identified **--** several hundred, in fact. These were eventually consolidated into 49 American and 6 foreign car groups. Each of these 55 groups were subdivided according to model year beginning with 1960 models and going through and including 1968 models. (The reference group, however, included models prior to 1960.)

Of the 55 car groups, there were many for which the sample size was not sufficient for analysis. No data were shown for any make-year combination if fewer than 100 cases were available. As a result, only 35 of the 55 car groups are presented in this analysis. Later reports, based on a larger sample, will include models not shown in this initial report.

These 35 groups represent a great reduction from the hundreds (if not thousands) of groups that would have resulted if data had permitted use of every single variation in car "nameplate." Even for the 35 groups used, we adopted a process of consolidating models where the basic car is very much the same except for trim variations or luxury features. For example, in the case of the standard-size Chevrolet, we combined the Impala, Biscayne, Bel-Air and Caprice. The group was called standard Chevrolet and included all body styles of these cars. In defining the group of large Pontiacs (those with the longest wheel base), the Star Chief and the Bonneville designations were combined. A complete constituency of the make-model groups is given in Appendix J.

VI. ANALYTICAL DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The general approach of the study is to define a large reference group which is, as nearly as possible, the aggregate of all crashes. Injuries of all drivers in this reference group are depicted. Then, one by one, the drivers of individual groups of specified passenger cars are compared to the reference group. This is done by comparing injuries of unbelted drivers of each given car make to injuries in the reference group. The reference group depicts injuries to 270,697 drivers whose injury distribution is as follows:

Table 1: Reference Group: Driver Injury Distribution

As can be seen in Table I, more than 80 percent of the drivers escaped injury altogether, and one-half of one percent were killed. About seven and one-half percent suffered class "A" injuries -- the most serious category short of death. Combining the two most serious categories (as will be done throughout this report) reveals that nearly eight percent of all drivers sustained serious injury or were killed.

The total reference group is, of course, an "average" summed over all types of accident conditions. Some specific accident conditions are milder than average, and some are more serious than average. To illustrate this, the 270,697 drivers are divided according to the speed categories as earlier defined. Forty-five percent were in the lowest speed group, 32% in the middle group, 16% in the highest group, with about 8% not specified. The injury results for these speed groups are shown below:

Table 2: Reference Group: Driver Injury Distributions for Varying Speed Categories

Table 2 shows that in the lowest speed group. ^a little more than 90 percent of the drivers escaped injury. and only a very small fraction of one percent were killed. In contrast, in the highest speed group only 70 percent escaped injury and 1.5 percent were killed. In the highest speed group. the percentage killed is 15 times as high as in the lowest. The unspecified speed group is characterized by severe injuries. Officers sometimes use this speed category when the speed is high. but they do not feel they are able to give a good estimate.

Additional insight into the characteristics of the reference group can be obtained by dividing it another way. this time by impact site on the car. From Table ³ it can be calculated that 49% were involved in front impacts, 5% on the right, 6% on the left, 23% on the rear, and for 17% the impact site was unspecified.

Table 3: Reference Group: Driver Injury Distributions for Various Car Impact Sites

With respect to drivers killed, rear impacts, as would be expected, are the least severe, while front and side impacts have a percent killed that is about 5 times higher. The percent of drivers that escape injury also reflects this relationship. Most severe is the unspecified impact, in which the percent killed is 14 times as great as the rear impact, and the percent drivers not injured is the lowest of any of the groups. This category is known to include many crashes involving leaving the road, overturn and driver ejection. Note that injury associated with impacts on the left side **--** proximate to the driver, may be a little more severe than those on the car's right side.

Still another way of examining the characteristics of the reference group is to subdivide according to type of impact. In this respect 55% of the 270,697 drivers were in Car-vs.-Car crashes, 17% ran off the roadway, 15% were in Car-vs.-Truck encounters, 8% were in Multiple-Vehicle crashes, about one percent collided with fixed or other object in the roadway area, and finally, about 4% were in other types of crashes. Table 4 shows the driver injury experience associated with each of these crash types:

Table 4: Reference Group: Driver Injury Distribution for Various Accident Types

Note that the most common group, car vs. car, is the one in which the percent killed is lowest, and the Car-Ran-Off-Road and Car-Hit-Object groups show a percent killed that is 5 to 8 times as high. Naturally, speed is part of the reason -- since many Car-v8.-Car Accidents are at low speed, whereas many Ran-Off-Road crashes are at high speeds.

This, in fact, is the primary reason why the foregoing three variables cannot really be treated separately. The fact is that speed, site of impact,

'~---------------- -,-,

and type of collision are not independent -- there is considerable interaction among them. An example of this interaction is seen in contrasting the Car-vs.-Car category and the Car-Ran-Off-Roadway category. Within these two categories the distribution of speed and impact site differs sharply from one to the other. Speeds are higher in the Ran-Off-Roadway group than in the Car-vs.-Car group. In addition, impact site is different. In the Car-Ran-Off-Roadway category, almost all impacts were reported as unspecified.

In view of all these foregoing characteristics, the reference group is divided into ¹⁰⁸ subgroups **--** each representing ^a unique combination of speed, impact site, and accident type. Within each of the 7 accident types, there are potentially 5 impact site categories, and within each of these, the 4 speed categories can appear. If every combination existed, there would be 7 x 5 x $\frac{3}{4}$ = 140 categories. However, only 108 are used in this matrix, because some of the combinations either did not occur at all among the 270-thousand data elements, or occurred so few times that their inclusion was not warranted. Appendix 4 shows the complete format of the 108 categories in the reference group, including all the injuries observed in the various categories.

In summary, the constituency of the reference group is as nearly as possible like the aggregate of all vehicles on the road. It includes belted and unbelted drivers, male and female, drivers of cars as well as trucks, and drivers in severe accidents as well as minor ones. This exact same reference group is used as the baseline against which unbelted drivers of each passenger car model are compared.

VII. COMPARING INDIVIDUAL CAR GROUPS TO THE REFERENCE GROUP

The reason for dividing the reference group into 108 accident situations is to facilitate closer comparison between the various individual car makes and the reference group. Without this, the comparison might not be fair. Consider the following example: It was shown in Table 1 (p.10) that in the overall reference group, a total of 7.9% of the drivers sustained injuries that were either degree "A" or killed. Suppose it were found in car "X" that 12% of the drivers sustained injuries of the "A" or "Killed" variety. That would be an amount more than half again as frequent in Brand X as in the aggregate of all cars. Would this be a fair comparison of the safety of Brand X relative to the reference group? Not necessarily.

If, as a group, Brand X cars happened to be involved in many highspeed crashes, then the number of drivers sustaining serious injuries would naturally be higher because of the higher speed. On the other hand, if Brand X cars had been involved in the same variety of crashes as the reference group, then the comparison would be more meaningful. The point is that there is no guarantee that the variety of accident conditions to which one car happens to be exposed will be the same as that to which another is exposed.

In order to achieve ^a fair comparison, it is necessary to compare "Brand X" to the reference group on the basis of the same variety of crashes. This is where the reference matrix with its 108 specific conditions comes into play. Each given car is compared to the reference group on the basis of the same conditions. The computer program first allocates all Brand X cases into the same 108 accident situations as the reference group. Then the computer compares injuries to unbelted drivers of Brand X with injuries in the reference group with respect to Condition 1. The results of the comparison are noted. Then, the drivers of Brand X car and the drivers in the reference group are compared with respect to condition $2 - -$ then condition 3. and so forth through the 108 situations. Finally. the individual outcomes are summed over the 108 conditions, weighted according to the frequency of each condition in Brand X cars. and an overall comparison is effected. This final overall comparison is based on comparable crash conditions.

 \mathcal{F}

Specifically. an expected injury value is calculated for each matrix line based on reference group injuries. The expected value is the frequency of the injury among "Brand X'' car drivers that would have occurred if the proportion had been the same as in the reference group. The expected values are compared to those observed in the same matrix line on the Brand-X side. Expected and observed values are summed over the matrix and tested by Chi Square. A modified variance is used (see Appendix 5).

An injury index is used to describe the results. This is simply the ratio of the total observed value divided by the total expected value times 100. An index value of 100 would mean that under the same variety of crash conditions, driver injuries in Brand X cars are no more or no less frequent than in the aggregate of all cars. An index of 120 would indicate that under the circumstances that produced 100 injuries in the reference group, 120 injuries occurred in Brand X $-$ about the same as saying that injuries were 20% more frequent in Brand X. An Index value of 85 would mean that only 85 injuries occurred in Brand-X cars whereas 100 injuries would be sustained in the reference group under the same variety of accident circumstances. Depending on the size of the associated Chi Square value. these indices mayor may not reflect a statistically significant departure from the reference group. If the sample is very large. an index of 110 may be significantly greater than the aggregate. On the other hand. if the sample is small. then an index of even as much as 200 may nevertheless not be statistically significant.

Throughout this study. two different injury indices are used. One is a comparison of each make-year combination to the aggregate with respect to the number of driver injuries of any kind reported (this is the sum of "C," "B," "A," and Killed as defined on $p. 6$). The other injury indicator deals with severity of driver injury and is based on the frequency of injuries serious enough to be classified as "A" or Fatal. Not enough data are available at this time to warrant using fatal injuries alone as an index.

VIII. RESULTS: General

The results of this study contain few if any surprises. First, trends show that cars in general have been improving over the last few years. Driver injuries are less frequent and less severe under comparable crash circumstances in the later model years than in earlier years. This is expected in view of the increased attention to safety design in the last few years. Indeed, the surprise would be if no improvement were noted, which would happen only if the combined effect of all the safety features produced no happen only if the combined effect of <u>all</u>
benefits.

The second general trend relates to car size. As has already been indicated in the literature,* injuries tend to be more severe in smaller cars than in larger cars under comparable conditions. The data in the present study show that larger cars like the standard Ford and Plymouth, and the larger-than-standard cars like Pontiac show generally less injury than average, while smaller cars like Chevy II, Falcon, and Volkswagen show generally more than average injury.

The third point is that when various model years of the "Big 3" are combined and then re-divided by body style, it is found that drivers of 4-door station wagons and 2 and 4-door hardtops sustain significantly fewer serious and fatal injuries. None of the other body styles of the "Big 3" are significantly lower than average, although all the rest of the body style index values are slightly less than 100.

The fourth comment concerns the truly staggering data requirements for this kind of analysis. There are so many make-model-year combinations, and so many body styles that the number of unique car groups eligible for analysis is in the thousands. Furthermore, in order to be able to analyze effectively the performance of any given make-model-year combination, it is desirable to be able to study a large sample of the car in question.

This means that for ^a low-volume car like the Corvette it may be that even if all current model year crashes in the entire nation in ^a year were compiled, there might still be an insufficient sample for analysis. On the other hand, for popular makes there are adequate data from just North Carolina. Consequently, if public policy dictates the kind of analysis illustrated in this report, then the data base should be many times the size of the one used in this study.

^{*} "Automobile Crash Injuries in Relation to Car Size," Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Buffalo, New York, 1964, VI l823Rll, B. J. Campbell, J. K. Kihlberg, and E. Narragon.

^{* &}quot;A Study of Volkswagen Accidents in the United States," Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Buffalo, New York, 1968, VJ l823R32, J. W. Garrett and A. Stern.

IX. RESULTS: Injury by Car Make

Group I. "The Big 3" (Standard Chevrolet, Ford, and Plymouth)

Perhaps the easiest way to show the character of the results is to report first the injury indicators for the "Big 3" automobiles -- the standard-size Chevrolet, Ford, and Plymouth (Groups 6, 22, and 32 in Appendix 3). Figure 1 shows the driver index values for these three cars for model years 1960 through 1968, with respect to "all injury." Figure 2 shows the same models for the injury index " $A + K$ " (or serious plus fatal injuries).

In Figure 1 each index is plotted as a point on a graph, and the index value is printed beside the point. Sample size is indicated by the number in parentheses following the car make. A single asterisk along side means that the index value is associated with a Chi Square large enough to be significant at the five percent level. Two asterisks means the one percent level.

First, with respect to the index of any driver injury, Figure 1 shows that only two points fall above the 100, or average line, and neither of these (the 1960 Plymouth and the 1961 Ford) even remotely approaches a significant elevation.

All of the remaining values fallon the less-than-average-injury side, and in seven cases the value is significantly below. The ones that are statistically significant have indices in the range of 79 to 91, roughly equivalent to a 10 to 20 percent lower frequency of injury in those cars than in the average of all cars. There is very little difference among the "Big 3," and little suggestion of any systematic advantage or disadvantage of one or the other.

Figure 2 depicts the results of the same type comparison, but this time with respect to the frequency of serious and fatal injuries. The results are about the same as already shown except that there is more variation in the observed values, and only four are significantly below the aggregate.

Summing up Figures 1 and 2, the indications are that (a) most of the values are on the "better-than-average side," (b) there is a slight tendency for the more favorable injury values to fall among the later models, and (c) the "Big 3" differ little from one another.

Readers who have interest in the details of the study may wish to know the exact procedures by which a given index is calculated. For each of the values in Figure 1 (and all following Figures) there is a computer printout. When sample size is sufficient, this printout shows the comparison of that particular make to the reference group with respect to each of the 108 accident situations specified. The printout also shows the summaries and statistical test results. For illustration, Appendix 6 shows the complete printout for the 1960 Ford.

FIGURE 1. DRIVER INJURY INDEX VALUES IN "BIG 3" AUTOS, (APPENDIX 3 -- GROUPS 6.22.32)

Space limitations rule out inclusion of such information for each car group; however, the detailed information for each car can be produced for further study. As a service to the reader, Appendix 7 contains a summary table for each make-model-year combination reported, giving the sample size, expected and observed values, the Chi squares, and the index values.

The statistical procedures used in this study consist of testing each car model against the same aggregate reference group. This does not provide a direct comparison of one model to the other. For example, from Figure 1 it can be said that among 1966 models, driver injuries in the Chevrolet are significantly different from the aggregate. This does not, however, necessarily indicate that Chevrolet had fewer driver injuries-that year than drivers of Fords or Plymouths.

Since each car is compared to the same reference group, there is a temptation to compare them to each other. However, to be able to do this would require a separate statistical comparison of each car to every other car **--** this would be too many thousands of comparisons to be handled by the present computer procedure **--** not to mention the problems of trying to describe, classify, and interpret these comparisons. (The data do, however, lend themselves to this kind of analysis, and such could be undertaken later.)

On the basis of the present analysis it is possible to say that one model is higher or lower than another model when one is significantly above the aggregate, and the other is significantly below the aggregate.

Group II: The Largest Cars (such as Buick Electra, Dodge Monaco, Oldsmobile 98, Pontiac Bonneville, etc.

Figures 3 and 4 depict injuries, and serious and fatal injuries, respectively, among drivers of the largest cars analyzed. These include the largett of the Buick, Oldsmobile, Dodge, and Pontiac cars (Groups 1, 12, 17, 26 in Appendix 3). Indices are shown only when the sample size of a given car is 100 or more. Thus, in Figure 3 it is not the case that all four cars appear for every model year.*

Figure 3 shows that with respect to driver injury frequency, most of the twenty values shown are on the lower-than-average side. Of the two values that are statistically significant, the 1965 Dodge is above the line with an index of 139, and the 1967 Buick is below the line with an index less than 50.

^{*} Many other cars do not appear in this study at all, and for the same reason of too small sample size. For example, this study does not deal with large cars like Cadillac, Lincoln, or Imperial, or certain specialty cars such as the American Motors AMX, and many, other cars because the presently available accident data pool does not contain a sufficient sample of these cars.

Ť,

ý,

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_0^1\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt$

 $\ddot{}$

 $\overline{21}$

Figure 4 shows the results for serious and fatal injury. As before. only cars with sample size 100 or greater are shown. Of the twenty cars shown. most are below the line and four are significant: the 1966 Oldsmobile. 1967 Buick. and 1962 and 1968 Pontiac all have indices of 60 or less.

In Figures 3 and 4, General Motors products are the most frequent. This is a result of the great volume of GM cars on the road. Sample sizes for GM cars tend to be large enough to yield statistically meaningful results. Other cars in this size class were not present in the sample in quantities requisite for inclusion in the analysis. As larger quantities of data are amassed later, it will become possible to include other models.

The only hint of a trend in Figures 3 and 4 is that all but one of the Dodge values is on the higher-than-average-injury side of the line. and one of these is statistically significant. In contrast to Dodge all but 2 of the other cars are below the line.

With respect to serious and fatal injuries, the earlier model years do not show as favorable an injury experience as the later models. There is a considerably greater range in the injury indices among these cars than was seen for the "Big 3," but this would be expected in view of the smaller sample sizes.

Group III: Standard Size Buick, Dodge, Mercury, Oldsmobile, Pontiac (such as the Buick LeSabre, Dodge Seneca and "440," Mercury Monterey, Olds 88, and Pontiac Catalina)

Figures 5 and 6 respectively portray injuries, and serious and fatal injuries, to unbelted drivers of cars one step larger than the "Big 3." In each case the models are compared to the same reference group as before. The models in this group are defined by Groups 2, 13, 18, 27, and 37 in Appendix 3.

The overall indications are rather like those seen in the preceding groups. That is, (a) most of the values are not significantly different from the mean line, (b) most of the values are on the better-than-average side of the line, (c) those that are significant are in the lower than average injury direction, and (d) there is a slight trend toward lower injury values for the later model cars.

In Figure 5 (depicting the relative frequency of all driver injuries), values are shown for thirty-six cars, of which five are significantly lower than the baseline $--$ the 1962, 1964, and 1965 Olds, and the 1965 and 1968 Pontiac. As can be seen, other cars have similar index values but are based on smaller samples or else are not quite as far away from the mean line, and are not statistically significant.

In Figure 6, concerning the relative frequency of serious and fatal injuries, three of the thirty-six values are statistically significant on the lower-than-average side; the 1962 and 1966 Olds and the 1968 Pontiac.

 23

 \bar{z}

FIGURE 5. DRIVER INJURY IMBEX VALUES IN RUICK LESABRE, DODGE SENECA AND "440", MERCURY MUNITEREY, QUORMAILE "80", PONTIAC CATALINA

 $(MPEW1X 3 - GROUPS 2, 13, 18, 27, 37)$

THEEX

 $\ddot{\cdot}$

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$

 $\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

INDEX

 $\frac{1}{2}$

ゆうしょう かいき

 $\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{2} \\ \mathbf{3} \end{array}$

In some model years, cars that are similar in construction (like the Buick, Olds, and Pontiac) have quite similar index values, but in other years they do not. It is not known at this stage whether this represents random fluctuations, or whether there are identifiable physical details of the car that can be associated with such shifts. Such insight can be gained only through simultaneous detailed comparison of the statistical data and the physical characteristics of the cars.

Group IV: Cars Just Smaller than Standard (such as the Buick Special, Chevrolet Chevelle, Dodge Dart, Ford Fairlane, Oldsmobile F-85, Plymouth Belvedere-Satellite, Pontiac GTO, and Pontiac Tempest)

Figures 7 and 8 respectively portray injury and serious or fatal driver injury relative to the reference group for the car models listed. These models are defined in Appendix 3 as Groups 3, 4, 7, 14, 19, 23, 28, and 33.

This group of cars more than any other reflects improvement with model years. In Figure ⁷ it is seen, for example, that the Olds F-85 and the Ford Fairlane show significantly higher than average values in the earlier model years and significantly lower than average values in the later model era. Both of these vehicles went from 20 or more percent higher than average to 20 or more percent lower than average.

Overall, significantly above-the-line indices were shown in the 1961 Olds F-85, 1962 and 1963 Fairlane with index values of 122 to 144. Significantly below-the-line indices were shown in the 1965 and 1967 Olds F-85, the 1966 Pontiac GTO and the 1968 Fairlane with index values ranging from 71 to 79.

The situation with respect to serious and fatal injuries is shown in Figure 8, and is not greatly different from the situation portrayed in Figure 7. However, note that there are some differences in the identity of the cars in which driver injury was significantly different from the mean. Above average: 1962 and 1963 Fairlane and 1964 Dodge Dart. Below average: 1967 Olds F-85 and 1968 Chevelle and 1968 Fairlane.

Group IV cars differ from the preceding groups in that the index values fall generally higher. In preceding groups a clear majority of the index values fell below 100, whereas in Figures 7 and 8 the points are almost exactly divided above and below the line.

As before, certain models are not portrayed due to small sample size.

 26

 $\frac{1}{2}$ ÷

 $\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$

 $\begin{array}{c} \rule{0pt}{2ex} \rule{0pt}{$

i mar

FIGURE 8. SERIOUS + FATAL DRIVER INJURY INDEX VALUES IN BUICK SPECIAL, CHEVROLET CHEVELLE, DODGE DART, FORD FAIRLANE, OLDSMOBILE F-BS,

PLYMOUTH BELVEDERE-SATELLITE, PONTIAC GTO, PONTIAC TEMPEST (APPENDIX 3 -- GROUPS 3,4,7,14,19,23,28,33)

27

Group V: Domestic Compact Cars: Chevrolet Chevy II, Chevrolet Corvair, Ford Falcon, Plymouth Valiant

Figures 9 and 10 deal with four compact cars and refer to the same unbe1ted driver injuries shown in the several preceding pairs of figures. The four car groups are defined in Appendix 3 as Groups 8, 9, 24, and 34.

In sharp contrast to preceding groups, virtually all of the index values are above the baseline, and in many cases statistically significantly so. With respect to driver injury (in any degree) twenty-nine values are shown in Figure 9, and all but one are on the higher-than average side of the line. Seventeen of the values are significantly elevated, including the 1960, 61, 62 and 63 Falcon with values from 123 to 133: the 1962, 64 and 1965 Chevy II with values from 125 to 176; the 1961, 63, 64, 65, and 66 Valiant with values from 130 to 169: and the 1960, 61, 62, 63, and 64 Corvair with indices from 118 to 161.

Figure 10 shows the same general trends for the serious injury index. All but one of the twenty-nine index values exceed 100 and for ten, there is a statistically significant elevation. These significant values are accompanied by index numbers ranging from 135 to 197.

÷,

 $\tilde{\psi}$ $\bar{\tau}$

Group VI: Other Cars: Foreign, American Specialty Cars, and a Re-Grouping of American Compact Cars.

This final group contains the greatest number of car makes. Throughout this group, the model year distinction is either dropped altogether, or at least several model years are combined. This is because cars in this group do not undergo as frequent changes as do cars in the preceding groups. Some, in fact, are quite similar throughout the 1960-1968 period depicted. Even if changes were substantial (as in the Corvette), the sample was in some cases too small to permit separation by model year. The car makes included in Group VI are:

Foreign Cars

INKER

tin

American Specialty Cars

American Compacts

These cars are defined in Appendix 3 by Groups 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 24, 34, 36, 40, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, and 55. A comment should be made with regard to the VW Type II. It is the only van configuration included in this study. Therefore, the VW Type II is in the position of being compared with fundamentally different cars. No comparison is presently available with the van-type vehicles produced by other companies, but in a subsequent study others will be included.

With respect to any degree of injury, Figure 11 shows several cars not to be significantly different from the average. This includes the Mustang, Camaro, Corvette, and Cougar all with index values from 90 to 98. Also not significantly different is the Firebird, Volvo, the Falcons (66-68), and the newer Chevy II (68). These cars range from 102 to 122 in index values.

Several cars, however, are significantly above average in injury value. This includes the Renault (index 185), VW Type II (bus) (index 170), MG (index 158), the 60-67 VW Type I (index 141) and the 68 VW Type I (index 136), the VW Type III (index 134), the 1960-1963 Corvair (index 139), the 1964 Corvair {index 134),1965-1968 Corvair (index 122), the 1960-1966 Valiant (index 134), the 1962-1967 Chevy II (index 119), and the 1960-1965 Falcon (index 124).

The situation is similar when the serious and fatal injury index is considered. Again, several cars are not associated with significantly elevated frequency of these severe injuries. These non-significant values include Volvo (142), 1968 VW Type I (128), 1968 Chevy II (134), VW Type III (132), 1964 Corvair (124), 1965-1968 Corvair (124), 1966-1968 Falcon (116), Corvette (108), Camaro (107), Mustang (93), Firebird (84), and Cougar (78).

 $\frac{1}{2}$

医精神病 医无心的 医阿尔伯氏征 医前面 医无线 医阿尔伯氏试验检胆汁

医无子宫 医水杨酸盐 医前列腺

 \sim 10 \sim 10 \sim 10 \sim 10 \sim 10 \sim

医单位子宫检查 医骨关节 医牙髓

Drivers of several other cars, however, showed a significantly higher than average frequency of serious and fatal injury. These include: VW Type II (> 200), MG (200), 1960-1963 Corvair (150), Renault (145), 1960-1967 VW Type I (143), 1960-1966 Valiant (139), 1962-1967 Chevy II (125) and 1960-1965 Falcon (124).

These cars are re-grouped, and the changes in injury index are summarized below:

The above groupings are based on rather substantial car changes. The 1965-1968 Corvairs reflect both a styling change, a fundamental change in car suspension, and a steering assembly change designed to prevent rearward displacement of the steering column relative to the driver compartment. The VW grouping represents a basic change in car suspension. The changes in Falcon and Chevy II indicate general re-styling and change in wheelbase, overall length, width, etc.

By showing the data in these groups, a tendency is seen in one injury index or the other toward improvement in the later model years. This indication of improvement was not readily apparent in the findings as presented in Group V.

Summary of the Six Groups

Tables 5 and 6 show a list of all the make-year combinations cited previously, ranked by index number. The tables show the make and year of the car, the index, the indication (or lack) of statistical significance, the sample size of the particular make in question, and the group in which that model was classified in the previous sections of the Results chapter.

Table 5. Driver Injury Index Values by Make and Model Including Group and Sample Size

^t denotes that all model years have been combined

* indicates significance at the 0.05 level; ** indicates significance at the 0.01 level

I w

t denotes that all model years have been combined

w

I

Table 5. Continued

		(Sample)			(Sample
Index	Make and Model (Group)	Size)	Index	Make and Model (Group)	Size)
92	62 Pontiac (III)	(307)	85	63 Olds (III)	(505)
92	65 Chevrolet (I)	(2188)	85	63 Mercury (III)	(165)
91	67 Pontiac (III)	(244)	85	66 Olds (III)	(207)
91	61 Plymouth (I)	(314)	85	68 Chevelle (IV)	(664)
91	62 Ford (I)	(1956)	85	68 Belvedere (IV)	(375)
91	63 Plymouth (I)	(576)	85	63 Chevrolet (I) $**$	(3207)
91	64 Ford (I) *	(2798)	84	61 Pontiac (III)	(247)
90	Cougar (VI) \dagger	(210)	84	64 Buick Special (IV)	(274)
90	62 Pontiac (II)	(318)	84	68 Buick Special (IV)	(154)
90	64 Plymouth (I)	(752)	83	61 Mercury (III)	(176)
90	66 Plymouth (I)	(678)	83	60 Olds (II)	(104)
89	61 Olds (III)	(339)	83	68 Olds F-85 (IV)	(166)
89	67 Olds (III)	(141)	83	68 Chevrolet $(I)^*$	(789)
89	66 Buick (II)	(176)	82	67 Plymouth (I)	(375)
89	65 Dodge Dart (IV)	(597)	82	66 Buick (III)	ن م (204)
89	65 Chevelle (IV)	(718)	81	65 Olds (II)	(119)
89	67 Ford (I)	(1097)	81	68 Pontiac GTO (IV)	(139)
88	63 Pontiac (III)	(113)	81	62 Plymouth (I)	(298)
88	65 Fairlane (IV)	(565)	81	68 Plymouth (I)	(348)
88	67 Dodge Dart (IV)	(224)	80	61 Pontiac (II)	(224)
88	65 Plymouth (I)	(871)	79	67 Buick (III)	(129)
88	66 Chevrolet (1) *	(1355)	79	68 Fairlane $(IV)*$	(607)
87	65 Pontiac (II)	(318)	79	68 Ford (I) *	(534)
87	60 Ford (I) *	(1813)	78	64 Olds $(III)*$	(443)
86	62 Mercury (III)	(269)	78	65 Mercury (III)	(206)
86	68 Pontiac Tempest (IV)	(173)	78	65 Olds $(III)*$	(398)
86	60 Chevrolet (I) **	(3041)	78	65 Pontiac (III)*	(460)

^t denotes that all model years have been combined

* indicates significance at the 0.05 level; ** indicates significance at the 0.01 level

* indicates significance at the 0.05 level; ** indicates significance at the 0.01 level

		(Sample)			(Sample)
Index	Make and Model (Group)	Size)	Index	Make and Model (Group)	Size)
>200	$+$ VW Type II -- Bus (VI)**	(195)	135	61 Falcon (V) **	(746)
200	MG (VI) ** $+$	(419)	134	68 Chevy II (V)	(153)
197	62 Corvair (V) **	(181)	132	+ VW Type III -- Pastback (VI)	(250)
191	60 Corvair (V) **	(365)	131	62 Fairlane $(IV)*$	(585)
189	65 Chevy II (V) **	(179)	130	62 Dodge (III)	(117)
167	65 Valiant (V) **	(217)	128	68 VW Type I $--$ Beetle (VI)	(331)
160	66 Valiant (V) *	(143)	126	65 Falcon (V)	(493)
158	64 Dodge Dart $(IV)*$	(200)	126	64 Chevy II (V)	(231)
154	64 Valiant (V) **	(345)	125	62-67 Chevy II (VI) **	(2108)
154	60 Olds (II)	(104)	124	$65-68$ Corvair (VI)	(603)
152	62 Chevy II (V) **	(543)	124	64 Corvair (VI)	(377)
151	63 Dodge (II)	(142)	124	60-65 Falcon (VI) **	(3748)
150	60-63 Corvair (VI) **	(1583)	124	68 Olds (III)	(118)
147	61 Corvair (V) **	(505)	123	65 Buick (III)	(188)
146	61 Valiant (V)	(187)	122	65 Dodge (II)	(199)
145	\dagger Renault (VI)**	(384)	120	64 Fairlane (IV)	(577)
143	60-67 WW Type I -- Beetle (VI) **	(3941)	120	65 Mercury (III)	(206)
142	61 Buick Special (IV)	(132)	118	63 Valiant (V)	(256)
142	\dagger Volvo (VI)	(173)	118	64 Dodge (II)	(287)
139	60-66 Valiant (VI) **	(1516)	116	$66-68$ Falcon (VI)	(517)
139	63 Fairlane (IV) **	(782)	116	60 Falcon (V)	(594)
138	66 Corvair (V)	(174)	116	67 Belvedere (IV)	(246)
137	63 Falcon (V) **	(676)	116	67 Falcon (V)	(110)
137	61 Olds F-85 (IV)	(120)	115	64 Falcon (V)	(596)
136	62 Olds F-85 (IV)	(176)	115	63 Buick Special (IV)	(248)

Table 6. Serious and Fatal Driver Injury Index Values by Make and Model Year

t denotes that all model years have been combined

* indicates significance at the 0.05 level; ** indicates significance at the 0.01 level

-38-

t denotes that all model years have been combined

Table 6. Continued

^t denotes that all model years have been combined

* indicates significance at the 0.05 level; ** indicates significance at the 0.01 level

Table 6. Continued

* indicates significance at the 0.05 level; ** indicates significance at the 0.01 level

 \sim

x. RESULTS: Injury by Car Body Style

Another subject of interest is that of any association between car body style and driver injury in a series of comparable crashes. Various opinions have been expressed as to differences thought to exist among the body styles. In certain instances criticism has been leveled at the convertible and the "hardtop," usually on the grounds that they may not have adequate roof structure to provide protection in the event of an overturn crash.

In this section, the "Big 3" cars (the standard Chevrolet, Ford, and Plymouth) for 1960-1968 model years are grouped together and then separated by body style:

> 2-door sedans 4-door sedans 2-door hardtops 4-door hardtops 2-door convertibles 4-door station wagons

The "Big 3" cars are chosen for this analysis because in each of the years studied each of the companies produced all of the body styles in question. In some of the other car groups described in the preceding section, a breakdown by body style would have created problems. For example, in Group VI (p. 28) almost all of the Volkswagen Type I cars would have been classified as 2-door sedans, whereas almost all of the 65 and later Corvairs would have been classified as 2-door hardtops. Thus, in that group a comparison of 2-door sedans vs. 2-door hardtops would have been more of a Volkswagen-vs.- Corvair comparison.

ł,

In contrast, among the "Big 3" cars used here, there is a good representation of all model years and all makes in each of the body style classes.

Each body style is compared to the reference group that has been used throughout the study, and the comparison is with respect to the two measures of driver injury already used several times in the preceding section. Table 7 shows the index values:

and severity of resulting driver injuries. For some individual cars, the relative frequency of driver injuries is significantly higher than the comparable value for the aggregate of all cars. For some cars the injuries are twice the aggregate of all cars.

At the other end of the scale, some cars are associated with driver injuries that are significantly lower than the average value. These significantly below-the-mean values indicate that circumstances that produce 100 injuries in the average of all cars produce as few as 50 in these cars.

It was stated before and is worth repeating that statistical results such as these must be examined in view of physical features of the cars in question. These findings alone cannot pinpoint the particular characteristics of the cars that are associated with the higher or lower injury values reported. These figures can only be taken as a beginning point to encourage a search for a physical basis to confirm or fail to confirm these findings.

Future HSRC studies and similar studies being carried out in the state of New York, and elsewhere, will answer the question of the amount of variation to be expected in these injury indicators. It seems probable that there will be considerable variation from time to time and place to place. There will be a better understanding of the potentialities and limits of this kind of analysis once several such studies are in the research literature.

HSkC plans to make this kind of general statistical analysis on an annual basis, each time updating the models to include the most recent cars. Future studies will reflect greater currency of late model years than does this first study.

One point of some importance is the statistical design compatability of the several studies. In the next HSRC study on this subject, the same reference group will be used to create the index numbers, and the same "control variables" will also be used.

Perhaps it would be well also to discuss the question of what, if any action, is to be done on the basis of studies such as these. Perhaps some will argue that cars that are above average in injury potential should be "legislated" off the road. But of course as long as there is a variety of cars, there will always be some that are higher and some that are lower in injury indices. Some may say that since small cars are the ones that tend to come out worse, that all cars should be big. Others will counter that all should be small.

In any case, safety is but one of many variables which users consider in the question of their personal transportation. A person may be willing to accept a higher crash injury risk in return for other factors such as operating economy, or even the increased probability of finding a place to park!

Table 7: Driver Injury Index for Various Car Body Styles

* indicates significance with $p \times .05$ but > .01

** indicates significance with p < .01

Table 7 shows that with respect to the frequency of serious or fatal injury, drivers in the hardtop models (both 2 and 4-door versions) and four-door station wagons have injury indices significantly less than in the reference group.

With respect to the index of any degree of injury, the same body styles also show a significant departure below the baseline, and in addition, the four-door sedan is also significant.

None of the index values exceed 100, but that is not necessarily surprising in view of the fact that overall the "Big 3" had index values less than 100 as previously shown in Figures 1 and 2.

XI. DISCUSSION

From this statistical compilation of car crash reports, there is evidence of differences among various make-model groups in the frequency

For my part, I would like to make two points. First, this type of information can give the consumer an added dimension of information he can use if he desires as ^a part of his decision process regarding choice of personal transportation. In addition to cost, style, economy, repairability, "flair," etc., he can, if he wishes, take into account the question of how others have fared in crashes in such cars. My second point is that information such as this may play a part in suggesting where more intensive research and innovation may be appropriate to improve the crash performance of particular cars.

Among some of the smaller cars this may mean that even more attention will have to be paid to safety design. Of course, this tends to work against the notion that small cars are economy cars, but perhaps economy considerations have to be downgraded at least as far as passenger protection is concerned.

In any event, as can be seen, there are indications of substantial and statistically significant differences in injury severity among certain American and foreign cars shown in this series. Taking the ones with the highest compared to the ones with the lowest injury frequency, it is seen that the difference exceeds three-fold.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENT REPORT

N. L. Department of Motor Vehicles
DMV-349 (Rev. 4-1-65) **Explored BY** (Initial)

APPENDIX 2 Discussion of Computer Program Used to "Decode" VIN

The vehicles examined in this study were catalogued on the basis of their reported production year, the VIN (vehicle identification number), and a four-character English name. The year, name, and VIN are supplied by the policeman at the accident scene. The computer program begins by checking the production year. Only those vehicles which were reported as produced after 1959 and before 1970 were catalogued. All others were classified as either pre-60 or post-69.

The four-character English name is used to assign each vehicle to a particular Make category. This is needed because each Make category may have a unique VIN format for each individual model year. Without this name it would be difficult to verify and decode the VIN. Following are a few examples of the 62 names recognized by the computer program and their corresponding Makes.

If the program is unable to match a vehicle's name with one of those in the listing, the vehicle will be considered an uncommon make, and will be classified as such. Once a vehicle is tentatively classified by Make, the next step in the program is to check the VIN to determine whether or not it is valid.

The following are the specifications used to verify most of the VINs. Unless a vehicle meets all the following specifications, it will be coded as having an invalid VIN and then be deleted from analysis in any of the make groups.

These are only a few examples of acceptable Assembly Plant symbols, and the symbols do not necessarily fall in the same place within the VIN for all makes.

'G' is valid for 67 and 68 but not

Pontiac -

for 66

4. Model Year - the year in the VIN must agree with year estimated by the patrolman. There is an option in the program (used in this study) which applies to all vehicles not successfully classified the first time through. The program adds a year and then subtracts a year from the one reported by the patrolman. This is to allow for an error of one year by the patrolman. The checking of the VIN is then begun again. If the VIN meets all tests in the plus or minus year, it is accepted as that year, rather than the year reported by the officer.

- 5. Production Number this is usually the last part of the VIN. This number must be at least as large as the minimum value set by the Manufacturer. This number is usually 100001, although Mercury begins with 500001. In the older models, this number is sometimes smaller.
- 6. Model Series Number this is the Manufacturer's coding within the VIN to identify the model, the body style and sometimes the engine type. Examples: Buick -

'3307' is acceptable in 67 but not in 68 '4466' is acceptable in 69 but not in 68 or 67 Chevrolet -'1111' is acceptable in 66 and 67 but not in 69 '0539' is acceptable in 67 but not in 68 '2437' is acceptable in 67 and 68 but not in 66 Dodge - 'LL23' is valid in 69 but not in 68 Ford - '85' is acceptable in 68 but not in 69 Mercury -'69' is acceptable in 68 but not in 69 Oldsmobile - '3169' is valid for 68 but not in 69

These are only a few of the thousands of acceptable categories. A VIN must have a model series that matches one of the possibilities, otherwise, it will be considered as unknown.

The only other symbol that is sometimes in the VIN is the engine symbol. If this character is not valid, contrary to the treatment of the other symbols, the vehicle is not classed unknown, but rather only the engine type for the classed vehicle will be unknown.

The only vehicles which were not required to meet these specifications¹ were the three foreign makes (MG, Volvo, Renault). They were classified only on the basis of the production year and the four-character English name reported by the patrolman.

lAll specifications used to classify the vehicles were obtained from Motor Vehicle Identification Manual which is controlled by the National Automobile Theft Bureau and published by Palmer Publications Company, Downers Grove, Illinois, and the NADA Official Used Car Guide which is published by the National Automobile Dealers Used Car Guide Company, Washington, D. C.

APPENDIX 3 Groups for HSR Numbers

 $\frac{d}{dt}$

l.

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$

98 & Luxury

60-68

Group 24: COMPACT PLYMOUTH

65-68 68

Belvedere Police & Taxi

Road Runner

Group 26: BIG DODGE

YEAR

Group 27: STANDARD DODGE

Group 28: SMALL DODGE

Group 32: STANDARD FORD

Group 33: FAIRLANE

Group 34: FALCON

Group 36: MUSTANG

Group 37: MERCURY

Group 40: COUGAR

Cougar 67-68

Group 50: VW **--** TYPE I

Group 51: VW **--** Type II

TYPE TEARS IN THE YEAR OF THE SERIES OF

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

APPENDIX 4: The Reference Group

ERRATA: This Appendix was to have portrayed the 108 lines of the reference matrix.

A page was omitted depicting lines 65-86.

Fortunately, Appendix 6 also contains the reference matrix and the left hand of page 81 shows the material missing from this Appendix.

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

CUNUL TIVE **NOT** $\mathbf c$ B TOT - UN INJ **INJ KILLED UNSPE** ROW NO. INJ INJ 001 0-21 004026 002980 00199 00334 00504 00009 00104 \mathbf{v} - +4 1214856 212374 00726 01342 02336 00078 00008 100.00 069.81 04.88 09.03 15.72 00.52 \mathcal{M} Ω h, 020970 013316 00937 02021 04410 00286 00000 $50 +$ 100.00 063.50 04.46 09.63 21.03 01.36 **Sheed** Õ 0.04 005155 002862 00238 00443 01375 00237 00142 Daspet. 1105122 062862 06236 09443 91375 00237 0.25 100233 000185 00008 00010 00027 00000 00001 0-29 100.00 089.43 03.47 04.34 11.73 00.00 **THOSE IMPACT** 000474 00036<u>7 00017 00029 00059 00002 00001</u> -266 $10-47$ 100.00 142 03.58 16 17 12.44 00.42 50+ 1000403 000277 00009 00035 00073 00009 00000 **Kun** 0_c 100.00 068.73 02.23 08.68 18.11 02.23 $\ddot{\mathbf{Q}}$ UNIP 120139 000079 20024 00012 00036 00008 00002 ù∩R \ddot{s} 1100.00 056.83 02.87 08.63 25.89 05.75 Ÿ PRIGHT 0-20035 COOD34 00000 00001 00000 00000 000001 $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ tibE-- 100028 000021 00001 00003 00002 00001 00000;
3014100.00 075.00 03.57 10.71 07.14 03.57 am Mer \mathbf{r} $\frac{1}{2}$ 50+4000033 000022 00000 00002 00009 00000 00000
50+4100,00 066.66 00,00 06.06 27.27 00.0<u>0</u> 211 600011 000007 30000 00002 00002 00000 00000! 012 **UNICP** 100.00 063.63 00.00 18.18 18.18 00.00 $\ddot{\mathbf{Q}}$ $\frac{1}{x}$ σ -241000017 000014 00000 00003 00000 00000 00000 ∂ is FT r, 3115 3-47 120.00 977.77 00.00 95.55 11.11 95.55 214 E $\pmb{\mathcal{X}}$ <u>199021 000016 00002 90002 00001 00000 000007</u> 215 $-100, 00, 076, 19, 09, 52, 09, 52, 04.76, 00.00$ α $50 +$ ¢ 000012 000006 00001 00000 00004 00<u>001 0</u>00001
190.00 959.00 08.33 99.00 33.33 08.33 Ú 216 uns P 0-27 00016 000015 00000 00001 00000 00000 000011 117 REAR OCCO38 COOD36 COOOO COOQD OODO2 <u>OODOO OQ</u>OOQ 318 30-97 1100.00 094.73 60.00 00.00 05.26 00.00 000041 000034 00002 00LC1 00004 00000 00000 0.19 $50 +$ 100,00 282,92 04,87 02,43 09,75 00,00 decento occesa escar copar obdos obdos 00002: S20 UNSP

ALL CARS

*100.00 090.00 00.00 10.00 00.00 00.00 *000047 000041 00001 00001 00004 00000 00000 **IMPACT** 0-27-100.00 087.23 02.12 02.12 08.51 00.00 $SITE$ UNS PRC. 3-49 *000034 000028 00001 00003 00001 00001 00000 507 *000015 000006 00000 00002 00006 00001 000001 723 *100.00 040.00 00.00 13.33 40.00 06.66 024 WSP #000013 000011 00000 00000 00000 00002 00000 0-21 *000423 000368 00016 00041 00054 00004 00002 0.25 other *100.00 072.81 03.78 09.69 12.76 00.94 と 39-49 #000642 000445 00016 00091 00089 00001 000001
39-49 #100.00 069.31 02.49 14.17 13.86 00.15 26 山口 È 200027 *100510 000333 00025 00056 00087 00009 00000 21.05 +100.00 065.29 04.90 10.98 17.05 01.76 \bullet K $\boldsymbol{\mathsf{s}}$ une #000169 000113 00012 00012 00028 00004 000011 0.28 mph $0-29*045719$ 042385 01074 01117 01131 00012 011031 0.29 FROATO 3042030460 025719 01652 01447 02206 00036 00350 51++008846 006490 00277 00488 01458 00133 00065 0.31 *100.00 073.36 03.13 05.51 16.48 01.50 unsp *106474 005611 00210 00239 00377 00037 00006 032 *100.00 086.66 03.24 03.69 05.82 00.57 00139 2003482 001270 00079 700069 00064 00000 00139 033 H *100.00 093.91 02.26 01.98 01.83 00.00 R1G74 *003624 903197 00112 00121 00190 00004 00023 19 +100.CO 088.21 03.09 03.33 05.24 00.11 *001219 000979 00023 00054 00145 00018 00008 0.35 *100.00 080.31 01.88 04.42 11.89 01.47 DNEP*000796 000693 00026 00028 00044 00005 00000 636 *100.00 087.06 03.26 03.51 05.52 00.62 0-29 *003878 003470 00177 00115 00114 00002 00597 ÿ 037 *100.00 089.47 04.56 02.96 02.93 00.05 55 œ *004165 003482 00219 00203 00249 00012 00103 $30-49$ 7.704107 0.03476 0.06725 0.00776 0.00728 ¢ V $\overline{50}$ $\overline{4}$ $\overline{20}$ $\overline{1782}$ $\overline{001449}$ $\overline{000556}$ $\overline{00033}$ $\overline{000333}$ $\overline{000211}$
 $\overline{504}$ $\overline{4100.00}$ $\overline{081.31}$ $\overline{03.14}$ $\overline{05.21}$ $\overline{08.47}$ $\overline{01.85}$ 039 **240 : UN CO-00915 000778 00044 00052 00035 00006 00000** *100.00 085.02 04.80 05.68 03.82 00.65 *223442 021459 01486 00273 00214 00010 02363 $0 - 29$ *100.00 091.54 06.33 01.16 00.91 00.04 942 30-49 *11268 009174 00704 00211 00174 00005 00876

 $-62-$

APPENDIX 5: Underlying Theory for Statistical Analysis

 $\sim 10^{-11}$

 \mathcal{A}

This study is concerned with comparisons among various types of automobiles involved in highway accidents with respect to the extent of personal injury to the drivers so involved. In order to control for the effects of factors pertaining to the severity of an accident on the degree of personal injury, the statistical evaluations reported here have been adjusted for the following:

- 1. accident type
- 2. area of impact
- 3. traveling speed just before the crash

The theoretical principles which are the basis of this analysis will be described in the remainder of this appendix.

Let $n_{h1ik\ell}$ denote the frequency of the h-th degree of personal injury to occupants in the 2-th vehicle make and model involved in the i-th accident type with the j-th area of impact and the k-th speed. The subscripts h, i, j, k, ℓ have levels defined as follows:

- $h = 1$ uninjured
	- \bullet 2 C injury
	- $= 3$ B injury
	- 4 A injury
	- 5 Killed

-64-

- $i = 1$ car off road
	- = 2 car vs fixed object
	- $= 3$ car vs other object
	- $= 4$ car vs car
	- = 5 car vs truck
	- " 6 multiple vehicle
	- $= 7$ other
- $j = 1$ front
	- $= 2$ right
	- $= 3$ left
	- $= 4$ rear
	- = 5 unspecified
- $k = 1$ 0-29 mph
	- $= 2$ 30-49 mph
	- $= 3$ 50+ mph
	- $= 4$ unspecified
- $\ell = 1$ some specified make and/or model
	- 2 all other makes and models

For the accident types "car off road" and "car vs other object", only the unspecified point of impact is used (i.e., the officer usually classifies the impact site for these types of accidents as unspecified). Hence, there are 108 combinations of accident type, impact site, and speed which are used in the analysis.

Define $r_{\text{high}} = \sum_{\ell} n_{\text{high}}$. This quantity represents the frequency of the h-th degree of personal injury to drivers involved in the (i.j,k)-th accident situation. The set of $\{r_{\text{hilk}}\}$ describe the distribution of injury severity for the overall reference population consisting of the totality of all makes and models. Finally, define $r_{.1jk} = \int h_{hjk}$. This quantity represents the frequency of the $(i,j,k)-th$ accident situation in the overall reference population. Hence

$$
P_{\text{hijk}} = (r_{\text{hijk}}/r_{\text{.ijk}})
$$

represents the conditional probability of the h-th degree of injury to a driver in the (i,j,k) -th accident situation within the overall reference population of 270,697 drivers involved in reportable accidents in North Carolina during 1966 and 1968 for which the required information was available.

If driver injury in a specific make and model $(l=1)$ is no different from the overall reference population (in the sense of proportion uninjured or the proportion seriously injured, etc.), then the expected frequency for the h-th degree of injury for that model in the (i,j,k) -th accident situation is given by

$$
m_{\text{hijkl}} = n_{\text{.ijkl}} p_{\text{hijk}}
$$

where n.ijk $\ell = \sum_{h} n_{hijk}\ell$ represents the frequency of the (i,j,k) -th accident situation for drivers of the l -th model.

In order to obtain an overall comparison of driver injuries in a specific make and model with the reference population, both $n_{h11k\ell}$ and $m_{h,ijk\ell}$ are summed over the totality of accident situations (i,j,k) to determine

$$
n_{h\ell} = \sum_{i,j,k} n_{hijk\ell}, m_{h\ell} = \sum_{i,j,k} m_{hijk\ell}.
$$

If $m_{h\ell} \approx m_{h\ell}$, then the specific make and model is said to be no different from the overall reference population with respect to the distribution of injury severity. However, if n_{10} >m₁₀ and n_{h0} <m_{h0} for h \neq 1, then the indicated vehicle is better than the reference population in the sense of having fewer injuries than expected. On the other hand, if n_{10} <m₁₀ and n_{h0} >m_{h0} for h \neq 1, then the indicated vehicle is poorer than the reference population. The ratios $(n_{h,0}/m_{h,0})$ reflect the relationship between observed and expected levels of injury. Graphs showing these appear elsewhere in this report.

The statistical significance of the difference between $n_{h,0}$ and $m_{h\ell}$ can be evaluated by means of a X²-test where

$$
X^{2} = (n_{h\ell} - m_{h\ell})^{2}/v_{h\ell}, D.F. = 1
$$

where $v_{h\theta}$ is an appropriate estimate of the variance of $(n_{h\ell} - m_{h\ell})$. If the hypothesis that $m_{h\ell} \approx m_{h\ell}$ is true, then X^2 has approximately the chi-square distribution with $D.F. = 1$. This may be used as the basis for determining significant differences between $m_{h\ell}$ and $m_{h\ell}$. To perform the X²-test, however, one needs an estimate of $v_{h~.}$. There are a number of choices for $v_{h~.}$ depending on the extent to which the researcher wants to be more or less conservative. This can be seen more clearly by considering the following aspects of contingency table theory.

For a specific accident situation (i,j,k) , let the following 2×2 table reflect the injury by make and model frequency distribution

If the marginal total frequencies r_1 and r_2 for degree of injury and N₁ and $N_{1,2}$ for make and model are viewed as fixed pre-specified constants and N_{11} is viewed as a random variable, then the distribution of N_{11} under the hypothesis that the classifications for injury severity and vehicle make and model are statistically independent is

$$
p\{N_{11}\} = (r_1!r_2!N_{.1}!N_{.2}!) / N!N_{11}!N_{12}!N_{21}!N_{22}!.
$$

From this distribution, it follows that

$$
E{N_{11}} = (r_1N_{.1})/N = M_{11}
$$

$$
Var{N_{11}} = (r_1r_2N_{.1}N_{.2})/N^2(N-1)
$$

$$
= M_{11} \{(1 - \frac{r_1}{N})(1 - \frac{N_{.1} - 1}{N-1})\}
$$

Since Var(N₁₁) can be determined for each (i,j,k) combination as

var(n_{1ijk}) =
$$
m_{1ijk} \{(1 - \frac{r_{1ijk}}{r_{.ijk}})(1 - \frac{n_{.ijk}r^{-1}}{r_{.ijk}r^{-1}})\},
$$

then the expression for v_{11} is given by

$$
v_{11} = \sum_{i,j,k} var(n_{1ijk\ell}).
$$

Alternatively, one may prefer to view only N_{11} and N_{22} as fixed. In this case, then under the hypothesis of no difference between the specific model and the reference population, it can be assumed that both N_{11} and N_{12} have binomial distributions $B1(N_{.1},\theta_1)$ and $B1(N_{.2},\theta_1)$ where θ_1 represents the probability of no injury in the reference population. From these conditions, it follows that

$$
E\{ (N_{11} - M_{11}) \} = E\{ (N_{11} - \frac{(N_{11} + N_{12})N_{.1}}{N}) \}
$$

$$
= E\{ N_{11} (\frac{N_{.2}}{N}) - N_{12} (\frac{N_{.1}}{N}) \}
$$

$$
= 0
$$

$$
Var\{ (N_{11}-M_{11}) \} = (\frac{N}{N})^2 N_{11} \theta_1 (1-\theta_1) + (\frac{N}{N})^2 N_{21} \theta_1 (1-\theta_1)
$$

= $\frac{N_{11}N_{2}}{N} \theta_1 (1-\theta_1).$

Since the most appropriate estimate of θ_1 is (r_1/N) which is based on the overall reference population, an estimate v for the variance of $(N_{11}-M_{11})$ is

$$
v = \frac{N \cdot 1^{N} \cdot 2}{N} \left(\frac{r_1}{N}\right) \left(1 - \frac{r_1}{N}\right)
$$

= M_{11} { (1- (r₁/N)) (1-N_{.1}/N) }

On the other hand, the unbiased estimate for $\theta_1(1-\theta_1)$ is $(\frac{N}{N-1})(\frac{r_1}{N})(1-\frac{r_1}{N})$ If this is used to determine v, then

$$
v = M_{11}\{(1 - \frac{r_1}{N})(1 - \frac{N_1 - 1}{N - 1})\}
$$

as before. Again either v may be determined for each (i, j, k) combination and added as indicated before.

Finally, if only N is fixed as representing the total number of accidents and if the frequencies in the 2x2 table follow ^a multinomial distribution, then under the hypothesis of independence between accident severity and vehicle make and model, it follows that

$$
E\{(N_{11}-M_{11})\} = 0
$$

Var{ (N_{11}-M_{11})} = E{ $\frac{N}{N}$ $\theta_1(1-\theta_1)$
= (N-1) $\phi_1(1-\phi_1)\theta_1(1-\theta_1)$

where ϕ_1 represents the probability that the specified make and model is involved in an accident. As before, (r_1/N) can be used to estimate θ_1 and (N_{.1}/N) can be used to estimate ϕ_1 . Hence, an estimate v for the variance of $(N_{11}-M_{11})$ in this situation is

$$
v = \frac{r_1}{N} \frac{N}{N} (1 - \frac{r_1}{N}) (1 - \frac{N}{N}) (N-1)
$$

= $M_{11} (1 - \frac{r_1}{N}) (1 - \frac{N}{N}) (1 - \frac{1}{N}).$

Alternatively, if $\theta_1(1-\theta_1)$ is replaced by its unbiased estimate $(\frac{N}{N-1})(\frac{r_1}{N})(1-\theta_1)$ and $\phi_1(1-\phi_1)$ is replaced by its unbiased estimate $(\frac{N}{N-1})(\frac{N}{N-1})(1-\frac{N}{N-1}),$ then v becomes

$$
v = \frac{r_1}{N} \frac{N}{N} \frac{1}{N} (1 - \frac{r_1}{N}) (1 - \frac{N}{N} \frac{1}{N}) (\frac{N}{N-1})^2 (N-1)
$$

=
$$
\frac{r_1 N}{N} \{ (1 - \frac{r_1}{N}) (1 - \frac{N}{N-1}) \}
$$

as in the two preceding cases. Hence, each of these three different points of view lead to essentially the same v.

Each of the analyses thus far presented was based on considering the statistical properties of 2×2 contingency tables contrasting injury with make and model, Another point of view is to interpret the data for the reference population as a pre-specified standard to which all makes and models are to be compared and which has statistical properties which are completely independent of the various makes and models which comprise it, This perspective does not at first appear intuitively appealing. However, if one recalls that there are a very large number of makes and models which are each making ^a small contribution to the reference population, then it does have some properties in its favor; particularly if one wishes to say that the comparison of specific makes and models to it are independent, The statistical analysis for this situation is based on considering the (1×2) table reflecting injury for the specific make and model as compared to

 $-71-$

the distribution in the reference population. Hence if N_{11} has the binomial distribution $Bi(N_{1},\theta_1)$, then

$$
E\{(N_{11}-M_{11})\} = E\{(N_{11} - \frac{r_1N_{.1}}{N})\}
$$

$$
= N_{.1}\{\theta_1 - E(\frac{r_1}{N})\}
$$

$$
Var\{(N_{11}-M_{11})\} = N_{.1}\theta_1(1-\theta_1) + (\frac{N_{.1}}{N})^2 Var(r_1)
$$

There are two cases of interest here with respect to the distribution in the reference population. In the first situation, both r_1 and r_2 are viewed as fixed constants and θ_1 is taken to be $\theta_1 = (r_1/N)$. In this case, $E(r_1/N)$ = θ_1 and Var(r₁) = 0, and hence

$$
E\{ (N_{11} - M_{11}) \} = 0
$$

$$
Var\{ (N_{11} - M_{11}) \} = N_{.1} \left(\frac{r_1}{N} \right) (1 - \frac{r_1}{N})
$$

$$
= M_{11} (1 - \frac{r_1}{N}).
$$

On the other hand, r_1 can be presumed to have the binomial distribution Bi(N, θ_1) and to be statistically independent of N_{11} . Hence $E(r_1/N) = \theta_1$ and Var(r_1) = $N\theta_1(1-\theta_1)$. As a result,

$$
E\{(N_{11}-M_{11})\} = 0
$$

Var{ (N_{11}-M_{11})} = N_{.1}\theta_1(1-\theta_1)+(\frac{N_{.1}}{N})^2N\theta_1(1-\theta_1)
= N_{.1}\theta_1(1-\theta_1)(1+\frac{N_{.1}}{N}).

On replacing θ_1 by its unbiased estimate (r_1/N) based on the reference population, the appropriate estimate \tilde{v} for the variance of $(N_{11}-M_{11})$ is

$$
\tilde{v} = N_{1} \left(\frac{r_{1}}{N} \right) \left(1 - \frac{r_{1}}{N} \right) \left(1 + \frac{N_{1}}{N} \right)
$$

$$
= M_{11} \left(1 - \frac{r_{1}}{N} \right) \left(1 + \frac{N_{1}}{N} \right).
$$

Alternatively, if $\theta_1(1-\theta_1)$ is replaced by its unbiased estimate $(\frac{N}{N-1})(\frac{r}{N})(1-\frac{r}{N})$ in the reference population, then \tilde{v} becomes

$$
\tilde{v} = N_{1} \left(\frac{r_{1}}{N} \right) \left(1 - \frac{r_{1}}{N} \right) \left(1 + \frac{N_{1}}{N} \right) \left(\frac{N}{N-1} \right)
$$
\n
$$
= M_{11} \left(1 - \frac{r_{1}}{N} \right) \left(1 + \frac{N_{1} + 1}{N-1} \right).
$$

In each of these expressions for $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$, the estimate for θ_{1} is based on the reference population in order to make the comparisons of specific makes and models to the reference population based on the same standard and to be consistent with other types of analyses. Again \tilde{v} can be computed for each accident situation (i,j,k) and then summed. This then provides the estimate of variance for the overall comparison and X^2 -statistic.

The previous discussion has been focused on the comparison of a specific make and model to the overall reference population. Another hypothesis of interest pertains to the comparison of a specific make and model to the totality of all other makes and models. Let us again recall the 2x2 table

and assume that N_{.1} and N_{.2} are fixed constants and N₁₁ and N₁₂ have independent binomial distributions $Bi(N_{.1},\theta_1)$ and $Bi(N_{.2},\theta_2)$ respectively. The hypothesis of interest is $H_0: \theta_1 = \theta_2$.

Given that this hypothesis is true, then an estimate for the expected value of N_{11} based on the value of N_{12} is $N_{.1}(N_{12}/N_{.2})$. Let

$$
U = N_{11} - (\frac{N_{12}}{N_{2}})N_{11}.
$$

It then follows that

 $E{U} = 0$ Var{U} = N $_{1}\theta_{1}(1-\theta_{1})+(\frac{N}{N})^{2}$ $= N_{.1} \theta_1 (1-\theta_1) + (\frac{1}{N_{.2}})^N_{.2} \theta_1 (1-\theta_1)$ $=N_{1} \theta_{1} (1-\theta_{1}) (1 + \frac{N_{1}}{N_{12}}).$

If θ_{1} is replaced by its estimate (r_{1}/N) in the reference population, then an estimate v* for Var{U} is

$$
v^* = N_1\left(\frac{r_1}{N}\right)(1 - \frac{r_1}{N})(1 - \frac{N_1}{N})^{-1}
$$

$$
\approx M_{11}(1 - \frac{r_1}{N})(1 + \frac{N_1}{N})
$$

 N_{1} N where $(1 - \frac{1}{N})^{-1} \approx (1 + \frac{1}{N})$ is a reasonable approximation if $(N_{11}/N) < 0.10$. Hence, $v^* \approx \tilde{v}$. A similar result is obtained if $\theta_1(1-\theta_1)$ is replaced by $\frac{N}{N-1}(r_1/N)(1 - (r_1/N))$. Finally, the expression for U may also be approximated by a familiar quantity

$$
U = N_{11} - \frac{N_{12}}{N_{.2}} N_{.1}
$$

= $N_{11} - \frac{(r_1 - N_{11})N_{.1}}{N - N_{.1}}$
= $N_{11} - \frac{r_1N_{.1}}{N} \{(1 - \frac{N_{11}}{r_1})(1 - \frac{N_{.1}}{N})^{-1}\}$
 $\approx N_{11} - M_{11} \{1 + \frac{N_{.1}}{N} - \frac{N_{11}}{r_1}\}$
 $\approx N_{11} - M_{11}$

where the approximation is reasonable if $(N_{11}/r_1)\approx(N_{11}/N)$ < 0.10. If the hypothesis is true and if the reference population contains many different makes and models as the one reported here does, both of these approximations are justified. Hence, the X²-test for U given by $X^2 = (U^2/v^*)$ where both U and v^* have been summed over (i,j,k) is approximately equal to the X^2 -test for comparing the specific make and model with the reference population based on \tilde{v} (i.e., the reference population distribution is random and independent of the specific make and model).

Because the X^2 -test based on \tilde{v} (or v^*) arises from the two previously cited different connotations, it was the one used in the statistical analysis reported in this paper. Moreover, since $\tilde{v} > v$, this approach is conservative in the sense of finding fewer significant results than would have been reported if v had been used. On the other hand since the difference between \tilde{v} and v is small whenever (N_{11}/N) is small and since (N_{11}/N) is always less than 0.10 and usually less than 0.05 for the makes and models in this study, the results of all of these various X^2 -test procedures are felt to be very similar.

Example: Volkswagen and all injuries. N₁=4209 and N=270,697.

$$
N_{11} = 1050
$$
 $M_{11} = 747.57$ $\tilde{v}_{11} = 575.00$
 $X_{11}^2 = 159.07$, D.F. = 1

Since (N₁/N) < 0.02 and X² is very large, the conclusions for this example as well as numerous others really are not overly sensitive to the minor details of statistical test procedures previously discussed in this appendix. This fact has already been justified by the various arguments presented here which have been given so that the reader has a clearer understanding of the statistical methodology involved.

Finally, for the "injury by car body style" comparisons, standard 95% and 99% confidence intervals for binomial proportions were constructed with an appropriate correction for continuity. Hence, these methods are also conservative with respect to the detection of statistical significance.

APPENDIX 6: Sample Print-Out for 1960 Ford

 \mathcal{A}^{out}

 $\sim 10^6$

 $\sim 10^7$

. De le posse d'arres decen de la conditionne de conditionne de conditionne de conditionne de conservación de

 $-80-$

 $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}$, where \mathcal{A} are considered as

<u>. . . .</u>

 \mathcal{A}

. The constraints of the constr

 ~ 100 km s $^{-1}$

ites i u#sf*nseraz concas porre conciz ocede nodec opone⊫ coodo orodoo ocodo ocodo obono ooodo∗oodooco.oo oood.oo ooo.oo o o o o

and the second contract of the second second contract of the second contract of the second contract of the second

 $-82 -$

 $\hat{}$

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

တ်
၂

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}}$, we can define the contribution of the $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}}$

Temple de la carte de la c

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$. The contribution of the contribution of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{$

والمعتمر والمتعاون والمتحال والمتحال والمتعاقبات والمتعاقب والمتحال والمتحال والمتحال والمتحال والمتحال والمتحال

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$. The contribution of

 \dot{z}

 α , α , α , α , α , α , α

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$ and the contribution of the contribution of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ are the space of the space of the space of the \mathcal{A}

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$, where $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ is the contract of the contract of $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$

 $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ and $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$. The contribution of $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$, where $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

المتعاوضات العداما والمتعارض والمساريعين والمتحدث والترابي والمتحدث والمتحدث

المستقل والمنتشكين المتعدد والتي المستعل التي المتعدد التي والتي المتعدد المناول التي التي التي التي التي التي

and the second contribution of the second contribution of the second contribution \mathcal{L}_c

المناطقة المناطق المستقبل المستقدة والمناطق الحديث المناطق المناطق المناطق المناطق المناطق

المحادث والمستحدث المحصول المعادلين والمرابط والمنافي $\label{eq:2.1} \begin{split} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) & = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \left[\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) - \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \right] \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \left[\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) - \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \right] \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \left[\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) - \mathcal{L}_{$

المجاور المساري المراكب المتعلقة والمساري المراكب المراكب المراكب المراكب

بسطيرون المتشاركين ووساوك أواريد التكرير المتناوب المستعفر متعاط تستعفر الممالي التفسيل ووسيد والممالح والمتحدث والمتحدث $\label{eq:3.1} \begin{array}{lllllllllllllllll} \hline \textbf{1}_{\text{max}} & \textbf{1}_{\text{max}} \\ \hline \textbf{1}_{\text{max}} & \textbf{1}_{\text{max}} & \textbf{1}_{\text{max}} & \textbf{1}_{\text{max}} & \textbf{1}_{\text{max}} & \textbf{1}_{\text{max}} & \textbf{1}_{\text{max$

APPENDIX 7: Summary Tables

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

 \sim \sim

 \sim μ

 $\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{C}}$

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{C}}$

 \mathcal{L}

l,

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$

 \mathcal{A}

 $\sim 10^7$

 $\alpha_{\rm{eff}}$, and $\alpha_{\rm{eff}}$

CAR GROUP 1 Pontiac (Bonneville, etc.)

 \sim

 ~ 100

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$, where $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

and the second company of the second control of the second company of the second company of the second control

 $-98-$

 $\beta = \beta \gamma$, where α

 α

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$, where $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

Pontiac (Catalina, etc.)

 \mathbf{r}

 \sim

 -8 –

CAR GROUP $\frac{3}{2}$

Pontiac (Tempest, Le Mans, etc.)

 $-88-$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$, where $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ are $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$

CAR GROUP $\underline{\qquad \qquad }$

Pontiac GTO

 $-68-$

 $\sim 10^7$

CAR GROUP $\frac{5}{2}$

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ are $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$. In the contribution of

Pontiac Firebird

 $-06-$

 \mathcal{L}_{max} and \mathcal{L}_{max} are the set of \mathcal{L}_{max}

 $-16-$

Standard Chevrolet

. The simple proposed of the simple proposed in the simple proposed of the simple proposed of the simple proposed of \mathcal{A}

 $\mathcal{L}_{\rm{max}}$, where $\mathcal{L}_{\rm{max}}$ is a set of the set

 $\label{eq:1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\frac{\pi}{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{2\pi}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\pi}{2}-\frac{\pi}{2}\right)}\left(\frac{\pi}{2}-\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{2\pi}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\pi}{2}-\frac{\pi}{2}\right)}\left(\frac{\pi}{2}-\frac{\pi}{2}\right).$

 $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}$, where \mathcal{A}

 σ^2 .

 \sim

Chevrolet Chevy II

 $-53-$

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ are the second contribution of the second contribution \mathcal{A}

Chevy II

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}})$

 $-46-$

Chevrolet Corvair

I \Jl '"I

Corvair

 $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{A})$ is a subset of the set of the set of the set of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{A})$

CAR GROUP $\overline{10}$

 $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{O})$.

Chevrolet Corvette

 $-16-$

 \sim

 \sim \sim

المواضح والمعارض فالمهاري والمعاقب والمواصل والمتعارض والمتحدث والمعارض والمعارضة والمحافظ والمعارض والمواصلة

Chevrolet Camaro

. The constraints of the α

CAR GROUP $\frac{12}{\sqrt{2}}$

 \sim

Buick (Electra, etc.)

 $-66-$

Buick (LeSabre, etc.)

 $\sim 10^7$

 $\sim 10^7$

 \mathcal{L}^{max} and \mathcal{L}^{max}

 \hat{f} , where the simple properties of the simple properties of the simple properties \hat{f}

 $-100-$

 \mathcal{A}

CAR GROUP $\frac{14}{1}$

Buick (Special, etc.)

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

Oldsmobile (98, etc.)

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2} \left(\$

 \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim

Oldsmobile (88, etc.)

 $-103-$

 \sim \sim
CAR GROUP $\frac{19}{2}$

a kata sa kacamatan ing kabupatèn Sumani di Kabupatèn Sumani di Kabupatèn Sumani di Kabupatèn Sumani di Kabupa

 \sim

Oldsmobile (F-85, etc.)

 $-104-$

 \sim ϵ

 \sim 10 μ \sim

 \mathcal{A}

Standard Plymouth

 $-105 -$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 ~ 40

Plymouth (Belvedere-Sattelite, etc.)

 -901

CAR GROUP 24 Plymouth Valiant

*The summary or "ALL" row includes several drivers in ¹⁹⁶⁹ model cars.

 $-101-$

CAR GROUP $\frac{24}{ }$

Valiant

a se por la provincia de la construir de la co

CAR GROUP $\frac{26}{\ }$

Dodge (Monaco, etc.)

 $-601-$

CAR GROUP $\frac{27}{27}$

Dodge (Seneca, "440", etc.)

 $\langle \alpha_{\rm s} \rangle \langle \alpha_{\rm s} \rangle$

 \sim \sim ω

Dodge (Dart, Coronet, etc.)

 $-111-$

 \sim \star

 $\sim 10^{11}$

Standard Ford

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$ is a subset of $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$, and $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$, and $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$

 $-112-$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1$

 \sim 14

Ford Fairlane

 $\overline{}$

Ford Falcon

*The summary or "ALL" row includes several drivers in 1969 model cars.

 μ , μ , μ

 ~ 10

 $-114-$

 $\bar{\gamma}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^N\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^N\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^N\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^N\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^N\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^N\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^N\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^N\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^N\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^N\$

Falcon

 $\sim 10^7$

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$ are the set of the set of the set of the set of \mathcal{A}

Ford Mustang

. We can also assume that the set of the set

*The summary or "ALL" row includes several drivers in 1969 model cars.

فعالمه والأستراب والمتحدث والمتحدث والمتحدث

CAR GROUP 37 Mercury (Monterey, etc.)

I '-J I

CAR GROUP $\frac{40}{100}$

Mercury Cougar

*The summary or "ALL" row includes several drivers in 1969 model cars.

 $-611-$

CAR GROUP $\overline{50}$

 $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$

Volkswagen Type I -- Beetle

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$, and the set of t

 $\mathcal{O}(10^5\,\mathrm{GeV})$, where $\mathcal{O}(10^5\,\mathrm{GeV})$, where $\mathcal{O}(10^5\,\mathrm{GeV})$

 $\sim 10^7$

 $\overline{}$

*The summary or "ALL" row includes several drivers in 1969 model cars.

 $-121-$

 $\sim 10^{-1}$ \sim

 $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$, where $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ is the set of the set of the set of $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$, and $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$

 $CAR GROUP \underline{52}$ $Volkswagen Type III \underline{-Fastback}$

 ~ 20

-T32-

 \hat{f}^{\dagger} and \hat{f}^{\dagger} are the simple points of the simple space \hat{f}^{\dagger} and \hat{f}^{\dagger}

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$

CAR GROUP 54 MG

 \mathcal{A}^{c} and \mathcal{A}^{c}

 \sim \sim

 $71-$

CAO CONTO EC

\mathbf{r} \mathbf{r}

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$. The $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$