Accident Severity Analysis using Ordered Probit Model

Shakil M. Rifaat[1] and H. C. Chin[2]

Abstract

To reduce injuries in road crashes, better understanding is needed between the relationship of injury severity and risk factors. This study seeks to identify the contributing factors affecting crash severity with broad considerations of driver characteristics, roadway features, vehicle types, pedestrian characteristics and crash characteristics using ordered probit model. It also explores how the interaction of these factors will affect accident severity risk. Three types of accidents were investigated: two-vehicle crashes, single vehicle crashes and pedestrian accidents. The reported crash data in Singapore from 1992 to 2001 were used to illustrate the process of parameter estimation. Several factors such as vehicle type, road type, collision type, location type, pedestrian age, time of day of accident occurrence were found to be significantly associated with injury severity. It was also found those injury severity decreases over time for the three types of accident investigated.

Introduction

Singapore, a heavily motorized country, has one of the best road and transportation systems in Asia. Although the level of road safety is in satisfactory position by Asian standards, traffic accident rates are still high when compared with developed countries and the tendency is on the increase in recent years. For example, a comparison between the accident statistics of 1992 and 2001 shows that the number of casualties increased from 6144 in 1992 to 7091 in 2001. This figure shows that accident situation in Singapore requires attention. For developing countermeasures in reducing the road crashes and the consequent injuries, there is a need for better understanding about the relationship between risk factors and the injury severity of crashes in Singapore.

Extensive literature has been found that investigated the influence of risk factors related to the driver, vehicle, road environment and crash characteristics on the severity of accidents. These studies mostly examined and emphasized on the different types of collision effect, larger mass effect, effect due to differing types of vehicle as well as the effect of age on severity. Amongst them, Evans and his associates (1985, 1987, 1992, 1993, and 1994) and Duncan et al. (1998) investigated the relationship between vehicle masses and the degree of injuries. On the other hand, Haland et al. (1993), Viner (1995a and 1995b), Farmer at al. (1997), Renski et al. (1999), Krull et al. (2000), Lee et al. (2002), Treachy et al. (2002), Yamamoto & Shankar (2002) have studied severity of injuries based on crash characteristics. Works by Jones and Whitfield (1988), Sjogren et al. (1993), Abdel-Aty et al. (1998), Mercer (1987), Bedard et al. (2002), Lang et al. (1996), Dissanayake & Lu (2002a and 2002b) have focused on the age of drivers affecting accident severity. Previous researches have also identified the relationship between type of vehicles and accident severity (Shankar & Mannering 1996, Kockelman & Kweon 2002, Blight & Mak 1999, Viner et al. 1994, Chang & Mannering 1999). These studies have helped the researchers to understand the factors affecting accident severity and provided an idea about the safety countermeasures to be adopted which would reduce the severity.

Though the studies carried out in North America, Canada and Europe give some insight into the factors involving crashes and injury severity in other parts of the world, but their findings may not be fully applicable because the conditions and problems of other countries may not be identical. Moreover, differences in road and driving conditions, as well as traffic and regulatory characteristics may prove difficult to apply, as their findings may not fully explain the issues encountered locally. Naturally it is necessary to examine the environmental aspects as well as vehicles involved, drivers and roadway characteristics to identify the factors and their interactions that may contribute to increase or decrease the severity of crashes. This would be needed for implementing road safety measures.

While there is a genuine awareness about safety studies made in different countries, very few works have been done in Singapore. So far the studies have been confined to general accident trends (Yuan 2000) and specific evaluation of the effectiveness of safety measures (Jessie et al. 1998). The safety measures that have been taken by Singapore so far have mostly been targeted at general road users; such as the road crossing safety of children and the elderly persons, necessity of children-restrained usage and proper bicycle riding. Although there is a growing need in Singapore to reduce the severity of accident, it is handicapped due to lack of knowledge about factors influencing severity. As very few studies have been done in the past on such factors, they are hardly known or well understood.

The present study was conducted to understand the contributing factors affecting severity of road crashes in Singapore with a broad consideration of driver characteristics, roadway features, vehicle types and environmental factors. For this purpose, three types of accident severity analyses have been incorporated, i.e. two-vehicle crash severity, single vehicle crash severity and pedestrian injury severity to get an overview of the factors affecting the severity throughout the country. The reason behind choosing these three types of accident in severity analysis is that they constitute about 94% accidents that occurred in Singapore from 1992 to 2001.

Methodology

Modeling Methodology

In many studies on severity of accidents, discrete models have been used to identify factors affecting the severity. Since accident data are categorical in nature, some researchers have relied on logistic regression (e.g., Jones & Whitfield 1988; Lui et al., 1988; Shibita & Fukuda 1994),

[1]*Lecturer,Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering, The University of Asia Pacific, Dhaka*
Email: shakil@uap-bd.edu

[2]*Associate Professor, Dept. of Civil Engineering, The National University of Singapore, Singapore*

while others have used multinomial logit models (e.g., Shankar & Mannering 1996) or nested logit models (e.g., Chang & Mannering 1998). Recognizing that the discrete nature of severity is ordinal in nature, some researchers have considered the ordered probit or ordered logit models to be more suitable (e.g., O'Donnell & Connor 1996, Duncan et al. 1998, Long 1997, Khattak, 2001, Kockelman 2002). The choice in the use of ordered probit or ordered logit lies in the assumption in the distribution of errors although researchers (O'Donnell & Connor 1996, Rensky et al. 1999) have indicated that the results from the ordered probit and ordered logit are similar. The ordered probit model is usually motivated in a latent (i.e., unobserved) variables framework. The general specification is

$$y^*_i = X_i \beta + \varepsilon_i \qquad (1)$$

where y^*_i is a latent variable measuring the injury severity of ith accident or damage severity of ith motorcycle; X_i is a (1×k) vector of observed non-random explanatory variables; β is a (k×1) vector of unknown parameters; ε_i is the random error term, which is assumed to be normally distributed with zero mean and unit variance. The details of the model derivation can be found in Long (1997).

Model Setup

To calibrate the accident severity model, data based on reported accidents in the period from 1992 to 2001 were used in the study. During this period, there were 52524 accidents, of which 29389 were two-vehicle crashes. From the 9 years of data, 2.6% of the nearly 30,000 cases were classified as fatal, 5.2% as serious injury and 92.2% as slight injury accident. Ten years of crash data in Singapore yielded a sample size of 13691 in case of single-vehicle crashes. Among these observations, 4.42% of the cases are classified as fatal, 5.68% are classified as seriously injured and the rest are slightly injured. Data related to pedestrian crashes have been sorted out to develop the model. The total number of pedestrian crashes during the period is 9327, of which 8.1% are classified as fatal, 7.8% are classified as seriously injured and the rest are classified as slightly injured.

In the proposed ordered probit model, the dependent variable used is accident severity which may take on one of three values based on the recorded degree of injury involved, viz, fatal, seriously injured and slightly injured. The accident is classified based on the worst condition sustained among the casualties. In the Singapore accident reporting system, a casualty is considered fatal if the person is killed within 30 days of the accident. A seriously-injured casualty is one who had suffered some kind of fracture, concussion, internal lesions, crushing, severe cuts and laceration or severe general shock requiring hospitalization or other forms of bodily pain requiring at least 7 days of medical leave. A person is considered to be slightly injured if the victim had suffered from other forms of injury requiring conveyance from the accident scene to hospital by an ambulance or otherwise, the medical treatment requires medical leave of at least 3 days.

To develop 3 models for three respective studies (i.e., two-vehicle crash severity, single-vehicle crash severity and pedestrian crash severity) it is necessary to pre-select various factors consisting of victim, vehicle, crash, road, pedestrian and environmental characteristics that could be reasonably expected to influence accident severity. One way of sorting out these factors is to deliberate upon similar research works where those factors have been used. Also some factors selected are thought to have influence on accident severity in

Singapore condition. Following this, 22 factors forming 83 independent variables are defined for further investigation in case of two-vehicle crashes. Several factors were dropped after correlation test between variables. For example, type of road and speed limit were found strongly correlated. The type of road was a better indicator in predicting injury severity than speed limit; therefore type of road was kept in the model. Some other factors were also excluded because they are found to be statistically insignificant. These include the day of week, gender of driver, surveillance camera, race of driver, central business district area, electronic road pricing hours if in central business district area, area of occurrence and make of vehicle. Eventually 49 variables from 13 factors are retained in the final model and these are shown in Table 1. It is noted that a majority of these variables are categorical dummy in nature shows the existence of effect. Following the similar procedure in case of variable selection of two-vehicle crashes, 53 variables from 15 factors are retained in the final model of the single vehicle crashes (Table 3) and 46 variables from 8 factors (Table 5) are retained in pedestrian crashes model.

The results of the calibrated models are shown in Table 1 and Table 3 for two-vehicle crashes and single-vehicle crashes respectively, in which the independent variables are organized into 5 groups (I to V) under
(I) general characteristics,
(II) vehicle characteristics,
(III) road characteristics,
(IV) driver characteristics and
(V) crash characteristics.

Based on the p-values of the t-tests, 29 variables from 13 factors are found to be significant, i.e., those with $p < 0.1$ in case of two-vehicle crashes.

On the other hand, in the pedestrian crashes study, the independent variables are organized into 3 groups (I to III) of 8 factors (1 to 8) under
(I) general characteristics,
(II) pedestrian characteristics and
(III) road characteristics,

where 24 variables are found to be significant, i.e. those with $p < 0.1$ (Table 5). As suggested by Kockelman & Kweon (2002), variables with low statistical significance may also be retained in the model if they belong to factors those have some significant effects on injury severity.

Model Evaluation

To confirm suitability of the fitted models, the log likelihood ratio index, ρ^2 and the adjusted log likelihood ratio index, $\bar{\rho}^2$ are used though O'Donnel & Connor (1996) suggested that the usual practice is to ignore such goodness-of-fit measure in models of ordered multiple choice since sometimes the value of the log likelihood ratio index is substantially less than one. ρ^2 and $\bar{\rho}^2$ of the three studies are reported in Table 1, 3 and 5 respectively. Although these values seem low in this study, they are comparable with those in other severity studies where ordered probit model was employed (Kockelman and Kweon 2002, Khattak 2001, Duncan at al. 1998, Renski et al. 1999, Quddus et al. 2002). Hence, the model result is justified to explain variations in injury severity.

Table 1 Parameter estimates of the model for two-vehicle crashes

Variables	Estimated Coefficient (β)	t-statistic	p-value	Estimated Probability (Ratio Relative to Reference Case)		
				Slight Injury	Serious Injury	Fatal
Reference case				0.9760	0.0184	0.0056
I. GENERAL						
1. Time trend (Relative to 1992)	-0.0204	-6.80	0.000	0.9838 (1.01)	0.0127 (0.69)	0.0035 (0.63)
Year after 1992						
2. Time of the day (Relative to day off peak period)						
Night Time	0.2031	9.91	0.000	0.9620 (0.99)	0.0282 (1.53)	0.0098 (1.75)
Peak Period	0.0431	2.16	0.031	0.9735 (1.00)	0.0202 (1.10)	0.0063 (1.13)
3. Hit and Run accident (Relative to non-hit and run case)						
Hit and run	0.1727	2.51	0.012	0.9644 (0.99)	0.0266 (1.45)	0.0090 (1.61)
II. VEHICLE CHARACTERISTICS						
4. Type of vehicle (Relative to car)						
Bicycle	0.4549	12.06	0.000	0.9361 (0.96)	0.0453 (2.46)	0.0186 (3.32)
Truck	0.4310	16.15	0.000	0.9390 (0.96)	0.0434 (2.36)	0.0176 (3.14)
Bus	0.3769	9.60	0.000	0.9453 (0.97)	0.0394 (2.14)	0.0153 (2.73)
Motorcycle	0.2016	9.41	0.000	0.9621 (0.99)	0.0281 (1.53)	0.0097 (1.73)
Van and pickup	0.1425	4.21	0.000	0.9667 (0.99)	0.0250 (1.36)	0.0083 (1.48)
Others	0.5158	7.48	0.000	0.9281 (0.95)	0.0504 (2.74)	0.0216 (3.86)
5. Country of registration (Relative to Singapore)						
Neighboring countries	0.1320	4.58	0.000	0.9675 (0.99)	0.0244 (1.33)	0.0081 (1.45)
III. ROAD CHARACTERISTICS						
6. Type of road (Relative to one way)						
Undivided Road	0.1408	4.21	0.000	0.9669 (0.99)	0.0249 (1.35)	0.0083 (1.48)
Divided Road	0.2733	8.72	0.000	0.9558 (0.98)	0.0324 (1.76)	0.0118 (2.11)
Limited Access Road (Expressway)	0.3166	8.15	0.000	0.9516 (0.98)	0.0352 (1.91)	0.0132 (2.36)
7. Type of location (Relative to straight)						
Bend	0.2631	6.04	0.000	0.9568 (0.98)	0.0318 (1.73)	0.0115 (2.05)
Slip road	0.0845	1.73	0.084	0.9708 (0.99)	0.0221 (1.20)	0.0071 (1.27)
Intersection	0.0076	0.39	0.698	0.9756 (1.00)	0.0187 (1.02)	0.0057 (1.02)
Bridge and flyover	0.0244	0.32	0.748	0.9746 (1.00)	0.0194 (1.05)	0.0060 (1.07)
Others	-0.1962	-3.46	0.001	0.9851 (1.01)	0.0117 (0.64)	0.0031 (0.55)
8. Road surface (Relative to dry)						
Wet	-0.1113	-4.29	0.000	0.9816 (1.01)	0.0143 (0.78)	0.0040 (0.71)
Oily	0.1625	0.48	0.633	0.9652 (0.99)	0.0260 (1.41)	0.0088 (1.57)
Sandy	0.0811	0.70	0.485	0.9710 (0.99)	0.0220 (1.20)	0.0070 (1.25)
9. Special Road feature (Relative to Normal Roadway)						
Merging	-0.1381	-1.44	0.151	0.9828 (1.01)	0.0135 (0.73)	0.0037 (0.66)
Narrow	-0.2366	-2.04	0.041	0.9866 (1.01)	0.0107 (0.58)	0.0028 (0.50)
Sharp turn	0.0562	0.52	0.605	0.9727 (1.00)	0.0208 (1.13)	0.0065 (1.16)
Blind corner	-0.1091	-0.85	0.395	0.9815 (1.01)	0.0144 (0.78)	0.0041 (0.73)
IV. DRIVER CHARACTERISTICS						
10. Age of driver (Relative to Age between 25-44)						
< 25	0.0021	0.10	0.922	0.9759 (1.00)	0.0185 (1.01)	0.0056 (1.00)
45- 69	0.0496	2.58	0.010	0.9731 (1.00)	0.0205 (1.11)	0.0064 (1.14)
70 and above	0.3846	5.25	0.000	0.9444 (0.97)	0.0400 (2.17)	0.0156 (2.79)
11. Offending Party (Relative to non-offending)						
Offending driver	0.0777	4.34	0.000	0.9713 (1.00)	0.0218 (1.18)	0.0069 (1.23)
V. CRASH CHARACTERISTICS						
12. Type of collision (Relative to Head to Rear)						
Head On	0.5135	14.58	0.000	0.9284 (0.95)	0.0502 (2.73)	0.0214 (3.82)
Head to Side	0.1239	5.34	0.000	0.9681 (0.99)	0.0240 (1.30)	0.0079 (1.41)
Side Swipe	-0.0673	-2.34	0.019	0.9796 (1.00)	0.0159 (0.86)	0.0046 (0.82)
Others	0.1920	3.31	0.001	0.9629 (0.99)	0.0276 (1.50)	0.0095 (1.70)
13. Maneuver of vehicle before accident (Relative to Driving Ahead)						
Turning right	-0.0029	-0.12	0.903	0.9762 (1.00)	0.0183 (0.99)	0.0055 (0.98)
Stopping/Slowing	-0.0843	-2.25	0.025	0.9804 (1.00)	0.0153 (0.83)	0.0043 (0.77)
Turning left	-0.1629	-3.22	0.001	0.9838 (1.01)	0.0127 (0.69)	0.0035 (0.63)
Changing lane	- 0.0816	-1.74	0.082	0.9803 (1.00)	0.0153 (0.83)	0.0044 (0.79)
U-turn	-0.0687	-1.28	0.202	0.9796 (1.00)	0.0158 (0.86)	0.0046 (0.82)
Others	0.0177	0.43	0.668	0.9750 (1.00)	0.0192 (1.04)	0.0059 (1.05)

Number of observations	57428	ρ^2	0. 0322	log likelihood	-17570.94
τ_1 (threshold)	1. 957	$\overline{\rho}^2$	0. 0300	restricted log likelihood	-18156.20
τ_2 (threshold)	2. 517				

Table 2 Estimated probability of injury severity for combined factors for two-vehicle crashes model

Combined Factors	Estimated Probability (ratio = 1st row / 2nd row)		
	Slight Injury	Serious Injury	Fatal
Motorcycle + Year 2000	0.9737	0.0200	0.0062
Motorcycle + Year 1992	0.9621	0.0281	0.0097
	(1.01)	(0.71)	(0.64)
Truck + Year 2000	0.9563	0.0321	0.0116
Truck + Year 1992	0.9390	0.0434	0.0176
	(1.02)	(0.74)	(0.66)
Bus+ Year2000	0.9611	0.0288	0.0101
Bus+ Year1992	0.9453	0.0394	0.0153
	(1.02)	(0.73)	(0.66)
Night + Hit and Run	0.9454	0.0393	0.0153
Night + Not hit and run case	0.9620	0.0282	0.0098
	(0.98)	(1.39)	(1.56)
Motorcycle + Expressway	0.9278	0.0506	0.0217
Motorcycle + One-way	0.9621	0.0281	0.0097
	(0.96)	(1.80)	(2.24)
Motorcycle + Curve	0.9348	0.0461	0.0191
Motorcycle + Straight	0.9621	0.0281	0.0097
	(0.97)	(1.64)	(1.97)
Truck + Expressway	0.8906	0.0727	0.0367
Truck + One-way road	0.9390	0.0434	0.0176
	(0.95)	(1.68)	(2.09)
Motorcycle + Country of registration + Offending	0.9413	0.0419	0.0167
Motorcycle + Registered vehicle in Singapore + Offending	0.9553	0.0328	0.0119
	(0.99)	(1.28)	(1.40)
Expressway + Curve	0.9189	0.0560	0.0251
Expressway + Straight	0.9516	0.0352	0.0132
	(0.97)	(1.59)	(1.90)
Expressway + Wet + Curved	0.9344	0.0464	0.0192
Expressway + Dry + Straight	0.9516	0.0352	0.0132
	(0.98)	(1.32)	(1.45)
Expressway + Narrow	0.9711	0.0219	0.0070
Expressway + Straight	0.9516	0.0352	0.0132
	(1.02)	(0.62)	(0.53)
Lane changing + Expressway	0.9593	0.0301	0.0106
Lane changing + One-way road	0.9803	0.0153	0.0044
	(0.98)	(1.97)	(2.41)

Table 3 Parameter estimates of the model for single-vehicle crashes

Variables	Estimated Coefficient (β)	t-statistic	p-value	Estimated Probability (Ratio Relative to Reference Case)		
				Slight Injury	Serious Injury	Fatal
Reference case				0.9968	0.0025	0.0007
I.GENERAL						
1.Time trend (Relative to 1992)						
Year after 1992	-0.0296	-5.67	0.000	0.9985(1.00)	0.0012 (0.48)	0.0003 (0.43)
2.Time of the day (Relative to day off peak period)						
Night Time	0.3351	8.39	0.000	0.9916 (0.99)	0.0064 (2.56)	0.0020 (2.86)
Peak Period	-0.0173	-0.38	0.701	0.9970 (1.00)	0.0024 (0.96)	0.0006 (0.86)
3. Central business district area (Relative to non-central business district area)						
Central business district area	0.1668	2.03	0.042	0.9948 (1.00)	0.0041 (1.64)	0.0012 (1.71)

4. Day of week (Relative to weekdays)						
Weekend	0.1377	4.32	0.000	0.9952 (1.00)	0.0037 (1.48)	0.0011 (1.57)
II. VEHICLE CHARACTERISTICS						
5. Type of vehicle (Relative to car)						
Truck	0.1859	2.55	0.011	0. 9945 (1.00)	0.0043 (1.72)	0.0012 (1.71)
Bus	-0.0129	-0.12	0.902	0.9969 (1.00)	0.0024 (0.96)	0.0006 (0.86)
Motorcycle	0.3132	6.33	0.000	0.9921 (1.00)	0.0060 (2.40)	0.0019 (2.71)
Van & pickup	-0.0743	-0.89	0.373	0.9975 (1.00)	0.0020 (0.80)	0.0005 (0.71)
Others	0.1007	0.67	0.502	0.9957 (1.00)	0.0034 (1.36)	0.0009 (1.29)
6. Country of registration (Relative to Singapore)						
Neighboring countries	0.1665	3.46	0.001	0.9948 (1.00)	0.0041 (1.64)	0.0012 (1.71)
III. ROAD CHARACTERISTICS						
7. Type of road (Relative to one way)						
Undivided Road	0.0784	1.33	0.184	0.9960 (1.00)	0.0032 (1.28)	0.0009 (1.29)
Divided Road	0.1899	3.61	0.000	0.9944 (1.00)	0.0043 (1.72)	0.0013 (1.86)
Limited Access Road (Expressway)	0.2704	4.84	0.000	0.9930 (1.00)	0.0054 (2.16)	0.0016 (2.29)
8. Type of location (Relative to straight)						
Curve/Bend	0.2301	5.60	0.000	0.9937 (1.00)	0.0048 (1.92)	0.0014 (2.00)
Slip road	0.1319	2.13	0.033	0.9953 (1.00)	0.0037 (1.48)	0.0010 (1.43)
Intersection	-0.1089	-1.74	0.082	0.9977 (1.00)	0.0018 (0.72)	0.0004 (0.57)
Bridge and flyover	0.0950	1.05	0.292	0.9958 (1.00)	0.0033 (1.32)	0.0009 (1.29)
Others	0.0164	0.20	0.843	0.9966 (1.00)	0.0027 (1.08)	0.0007 (1.00)
9. Road surface (Relative to dry)						
Wet	-0.2829	-6.05	0.000	0.9987 (1.00)	0.0011 (0.44)	0.0002 (0.29)
Oily	-0.2889	-1.55	0.120	0.9987 (1.00)	0.0010 (0.40)	0.0002 (0.29)
Sandy	-0.1449	-1.10	0.273	0.9980 (1.00)	0.0016 (0.64)	0.0004 (0.57)
10. Special Road feature (Relative to Normal Roadway)						
Merging	-0.0953	-0.46	0.645	0.9976 (1.00)	0.0019 (0.76)	0.0005 (0.71)
Narrow	-0.4445	-2.14	0.032	0.9992 (1.00)	0.0006 (0.24)	0.0001 (0.14)
Sharp turn	-0.0849	-1.00	0.319	0.9975 (1.00)	0.0020 (0.80)	0.0005 (0.71)
Blind corner	0.2462	1.79	0.073	0.9935 (1.00)	0.0050 (2.00)	0.0015 (2.14)
IV. DRIVER CHARACTERISTICS						
11. Age of driver (Relative to Age between 25-44)						
< 25	0.0645	1.85	0.065	0.9961 (1.00)	0.0030 (1.20)	0.0008 (1.14)
45- 69	0.1236	2.81	0.005	0.9954 (1.00)	0.0036 (1.44)	0.0010 (1.43)
70 and above	0.0236	0.10	0.921	0.9966 (1.00)	0.0027 (1.08)	0.0007 (1.00)
12. Gender (Relative to female)						
Male	0.3923	3.93	0.000	0.9902 (1.00)	0.0074 (2.96)	0.0024 (3.43)
13. Offending Party (Relative to non-offending)						
Offending driver	0.3101	4.94	0.000	0.9922 (1.00)	0.0060 (2.40)	0.0019 (2.71)
V. CRASH CHARACTERISTICS						
14. Crash type (Relative to collision with road objects after skidding)						
Parked vehicle	0.7515	7.58	0.000	0.9759 (0.98)	0.0171 (6.84)	0.0069 (9.86)
Lamppost	0.7084	9.44	0.000	0.9783 (0.98)	0.0156 (6.24)	0.0062 (8.86)
Guardrail	0.8031	13.51	0.000	0.9728 (0.98)	0.0191 (7.64)	0.0080 (11.43)
Traffic sign	0.4859	4.00	0.000	0.9875 (0.99)	0.0093 (3.72)	0.0032 (4.57)
Road divider/curb	0.3928	7.87	0.000	0.9902 (0.99)	0.0074 (2.96)	0.0024 (3.43)
Trees	1.034	15.85	0.000	0.9548 (0.96)	0.0304 (12.16)	0.0147 (21.00)
Others	0.4888	7.16	0.000	0.9874 (0.99)	0.0094 (3.76)	0.0032 (4.57)
15. Maneuver of vehicle before accident (Relative to Driving Ahead)						
Turning right	-0.0556	-0.53	0.594	0.9973 (1.00)	0.0021 (0.84)	0.0005 (0.71)
Stopping/Slowing	0.1408	1.09	0.278	0.9952 (1.00)	0.0038 (1.52)	0.0011 (1.57)
Turning left	-0.3304	-3.21	0.001	0.9989 (1.00)	0.0009 (0.36)	0.0002 (0.29)
Changing lane	-0.3164	-1.23	0.217	0.9988 (1.00)	0.0010 (0.40)	0.0002 (0.29)
U-turn	-0.0288	-0.10	0.917	0.9971 (1.00)	0.0023 (0.92)	0.0006 (0.86)
Others	0.0747	0.92	0.360	0.9960 (1.00)	0.0031 (1.24)	0.0009 (1.29)
Number of observations	13691	ρ^2	0.095	log likelihood	-4910.823	
τ_1 (threshold)	2.698	$\bar{\rho}^2$	0.087	restricted log likelihood	-5428.948	
τ_2 (threshold)	3.182					

Table 4 Estimated probability of injury severity for combined factors for single-vehicle crashes model

Combined Factors	Estimated Probability (ratio = 1st row/ 2nd row)		
	Slight Injury	Serious Injury	Fatal
Night + Truck	0.9863	0.0101	0.0036
Night + Car	0.9916	0.0064	0.0020
	(0.99)	(1.58)	(1.80)
Weekend + Expressway	0.9898	0.0077	0.0025
Weekend + One way street	0.9952	0.0037	0.0011
	(0.99)	(2.08)	(2.27)
Motorcycle + Lamppost	0.9560	0.0297	0.0143
Motorcycle + Traffic sign	0.9731	0.0190	0.0079
	(0.98)	(1.56)	(1.81)
Motorcycle +Expressway + Curve	0.9722	0.0196	0.0082
Motorcycle + Expressway + Straight	0.9840	0.0117	0.0043
	(0.99)	(1.68)	(1.91)
Truck + Expressway	0.9884	0.0086	0.0029
Truck + One way Street	0.9945	0.0043	0.0012
	(0.99)	(2.00)	(2.42)
Registered in Neighboring Countries + Motorcycle	0.9877	0.0091	0.0031
Registered in Neighboring Countries + Car	0.9948	0.0041	0.0012
	(0.99)	(2.22)	(2.58)
Expressway + Curve	0.9870	0.0096	0.0034
Expressway + Straight	0.9930	0.0054	0.0016
	(0.99)	(1.78)	(2.13)
Expressway + Narrow	0.9981	0.0015	0.0004
Expressway + Normal Roadway	0.9930	0.0054	0.0016
	(1.01)	(0.28)	(0.25)
<25 age + Offending + Motorcycle	0.9793	0.0149	0.0058
<25age + Offending + Car	0.9907	0.0070	0.0023
	(0.99)	(2.13)	(2.52)
Traffic sign + Expressway	0.9756	0.0173	0.0070
Traffic sign + One way street	0.9875	0.0093	0.0032
	(0.99)	(1.86)	(2.19)
Lamppost + Curve	0.9632	0.0253	0.0115
Lamppost + Straight	0.9783	0.0156	0.0062
	(0.98)	(1.62)	(1.85)
Turning left+ Expressway	0.9973	0.0021	0.0005
Turning left+ One way street	0.9989	0.0009	0.0002
	(1.00)	(2.33)	(2.50)

Table 5 Parameter estimates of the model for pedestrian crashes

Variables	Estimated Coefficient (β)	t-statistic	p-value	Estimated Probability (Ratio Relative to Reference Case)		
				Slight Injury	Serious Injury	Fatal
Reference case				0.8882	0.0684	0.0435
I.GENERAL						
1.Time trend (Relative to 1992)						
Year after 1992	-0.0215	-3.61	0.000	0.9207 (1.04)	0.0509 (0.74)	0.0284 (0.65)
2.Time of the day (Relative to day time)						
Night Time	0.2298	6.69	0.000	0.8382 (0.94)	0.0926 (1.35)	0.0692 (1.59)
3. Area of occurrence (Relative to public housing estate)						
Nearby school	0.2127	2.28	0.023	0.8423 (0.95)	0.0907 (1.33)	0.0669 (1.54)
Private Residential Area	0.1270	2.02	0.044	0.8621 (0.97)	0.0814 (1.19)	0.0565 (1.30)
Factory	0.1634	1.73	0.083	0.8539 (0.96)	0.0853 (1.25)	0.0608 (1.40)
Shopping Complex	-0.1101	-1.53	0.127	0.9077 (1.02)	0.0580 (0.85)	0.0342 (0.79)
Shop House	-0.0475	-0.71	0.479	0.8969 (1.01)	0.0638 (0.93)	0.0393 (0.90)
Near MRT Station	-0.0816	-0.60	0.551	0.9029 (1.02)	0.0606 (0.89)	0.0365 (0.84)
Others	0.1206	2.94	0.003	0.8635 (0.97)	0.0807 (1.18)	0.0558 (1.28)
II. PEDESTRIAN CHARACTERISTICS						
4. Gender (Relative to female)						
Male	0.0675	2.00	0.045	0.8748 (0.98)	0.0752 (1.10)	0.0501 (1.15)

5. Age of pedestrian (Relative to age between 25-44)						
< 5	-0.0601	-0.42	0.675	0.8973 (1.01)	0.0636 (0.93)	0.0391 (0.90)
5-9	-0.3196	-4.05	0.000	0.9378 (1.06)	0.0411 (0.60)	0.0211 (0.49)
10- 14	-0.2117	-3.50	0.000	0.9234 (1.04)	0.0494 (0.72)	0.0272 (0.63)
15-24	-0.1941	-3.68	0.000	0.9209 (1.04)	0.0508 (0.74)	0.0283 (0.65)
45-64	0.1702	3.54	0.000	0.8524 (0.96)	0.0860 (1.26)	0.0616 (1.42)
65-74	0.4728	7.91	0.000	0.7716 (0.87)	0.1207 (1.76)	0.1077 (2.48)
>74	0.7675	12.58	0.000	0.6734 (0.76)	0.1541 (2.25)	0.1725 (3.97)
6. Pedestrian activities (Relative to crossing the road under signalized crossing with traffic light in his favor)						
Walking on the footpath	0.0244	0.25	0.799	0.8834 (0.99)	0.0708 (1.04)	0.0458 (1.05)
Walking along the road (with traffic)	0.0084	0.08	0.937	0.8866 (1.00)	0.0692 (1.01)	0.0443 (1.02)
Walking along the road (against traffic)	0.0072	0.07	0.948	0.8868 (1.00)	0.0691 (1.01)	0.0442 (1.02)
Standing on the road	-0.1602	-1.26	0.206	0.9157 (1.03)	0.0536 (0.78)	0.0306 (0.70)
Crossing the road (Non-signalized crossing)	0.0282	0.30	0.766	0.8827 (0.99)	0.0712 (1.04)	0.0461 (1.06)
Crossing the road (Signalized crossing with traffic light not in his favor)	0.0119	0.16	0.877	0.8859 (1.00)	0.0695 (1.02)	0.0446 (1.03)
Crossing the road (unlawfully)	0.1807	2.49	0.013	0.8499 (0.96)	0.0872 (1.27)	0.0629 (1.45)
Crossing the road (without pedestrian crossing)	0.1516	2.31	0.021	0.8566 (0.96)	0.0840 (1.23)	0.0594 (1.37)
Crossing the road (wait on the central road divider)	0.0204	0.09	0.925	0.8842 (1.00)	0.0704 (1.03)	0.0454 (1.04)
Crossing the road (In front/behind stationary vehicle)	-0.0775	-0.74	0.458	0.9022 (1.02)	0.0610 (0.89)	0.0368 (0.85)
Working on the road	-0.0139	-0.09	0.931	0.8908 (1.00)	0.0670 (0.98)	0.0422 (0.97)
Others	0.2466	2.67	0.008	0.8340 (0.94)	0.0945 (1.38)	0.0715 (1.64)
III. ROAD CHARACTERISTICS						
7. Type of road (Relative to divided road)						
One way Street	-0.2053	-4.15	0.000	0.9225(1.04)	0.0499(0.73)	0.0276 (0.63)
Undivided Road	-0.1915	-4.91	0.000	0.9205(1.04)	0.0510(0.75)	0.0285 (0.66)
Limited Access Road (Expressway)	0.7431	7.87	0.000	0.6821(0.77)	0.1515(2.21)	0.1664 (3.83)
8. Type of location (Relative to straight)						
Curve	0.1894	2.46	0.014	0.8479 (0.95)	0.0881 (1.29)	0.0640 (1.47)
Slip road	-0.3175	-2.14	0.032	0.9375 (1.06)	0.0413 (0.60)	0.0212 (0.49)
Intersection	0.0897	1.91	0.056	0.8702 (0.98)	0.0774 (1.13)	0.0524 (1.20)
Road shoulder	0.5015	2.05	0.040	0.7628 (0.86)	0.1241 (1.81)	0.1131 (2.60)
Car Park	-0.3421	-3.34	0.001	0.9405 (1.06)	0.0395 (0.58)	0.0200 (0.46)
Others	0.0911	0.77	0.440	0.8699 (0.98)	0.0776 (1.13)	0.0526 (1.21)
Number of observations	9327	ρ^2	0. 072	log likelihood	-4543.57	
τ_1 (threshold)	1. 195	$\bar{\rho}^2$	0.064	restricted log likelihood	-4895.25	
τ_2 (threshold)	1.690					

Table 6 Estimated probability of injury severity for combined factors for pedestrian crashes model

Combined Factors	Estimated Probability (ratio = 1st row/ 2nd row)		
	Slight Injury	Serious Injury	Fatal
Night time + Curve	0.7874	0.1145	0.0981
Night time + Straight	0.8382	0.0926	0.0692
	(0.94)	(1.24)	(1.42)
Night time + Divided road	0.8382	0.0926	0.0692
Night time + One way street	0.8834	0.0708	0.0458
	(0.95)	(1.31)	(1.51)
Near school + Crossing the road unlawfully	0.7948	0.1114	0.0937
Near school + Crossing the road at signalized crossing with traffic light in favor	0.8423	0.0907	0.0669
	(0.94)	(1.23)	(1.40)

Private Residential Area + Crossing the road unlawfully	0.8183	0.1015	0.0802
Private Residential Area + Crossing the road at signalized crossing with traffic light in favor	0.8621	0.0814	0.0565
	(0.95)	(1.25)	(1.42)
Male + Night time	0.8211	0.1003	0.0786
Male + Day time	0.8748	0.0752	0.0501
	(0.94)	(1.33)	(1.57)
Male+ Crossing the road unlawfully	0.8336	0.0947	0.0717
Male+ Crossing the road at signalized crossing with traffic light in his favor	0.8748	0.0752	0.0501
	(0.95)	(1.26)	(1.43)
Age group 65-74 + Night time	0.6964	0.1471	0.1565
Age group65-74 + Day time	0.7716	0.1207	0.1077
	(0.90)	(1.22)	(1.45)
Age group 15-24 + Expressway	0.7479	0.1297	0.1225
Age group15-24 + One way street	0.9470	0.0356	0.0174
	(0.79)	(3.64)	(7.04)
Age group 10-14 + Unlawfully	0.8939	0.0654	0.0407
Age group 10-14 + Crossing the road at signalized crossing with traffic light in favor	0.9234	0.0494	0.0272
	(0.97)	(1.32)	(1.50)
Crossing the road unlawfully + Curve	0.8014	0.1087	0.0899
Crossing the road unlawfully + Straight	0.8499	0.0872	0.0629
	(0.94)	(1.25)	(1.43)
Curve + Expressway	0.6119	0.1702	0.2179
Curve + One way	0.8479	0.0881	0.0640
	(0.72)	(1.93)	(3.40)
Road shoulder + Night time	0.6863	0.1502	0.1635
Road shoulder + Day time	0.7628	0.1241	0.1131
	(0.90)	(1.21)	(1.45)

Interpretation of Significant Variables in the Model

To better show how the variations in the independent variables would change the different injury probabilities, three reference cases have been defined to form three benchmarks for comparison which describe typical accident victim or pedestrian victim. These can be done by setting the variables in their most common default value; e.g., all the dummy variables are set to 0 and the time trend set to any year (in this study it is 1992). Hence, for example, the reference case in two-vehicle crashes describe an accident victim involved in a head to rear car-car not hit and run collision on normal one way dry straight road while was in a Singapore registered vehicle which was moving ahead at day off peak period in 1992 and the non-offending driver of the vehicle had the age in between 25-44. The positive value of the estimated coefficient (β) means to increase the severity whereas the negative value indicates the opposite. From the calibrated model, the effect of the identified factors on accident severity is studied by examining the injury odd ratios against the reference case. Similarly, the combined effect of several factors on injury severity is also investigated by comparing the relative risk probabilities (Table 2, Table 4 and Table 6). A detailed discussion on the effects of the significant factors on accident severity is given in the following. These significant factors are mainly identified based on the p-value of t statistics, which reflects the statistical significance of the independent variables. This is followed by suggestions for precautionary measures to be taken to enhance safety as well as suggestions for future research.

Time trend factor (Table 1, Table 3, Table 5) in all three case studies shows that beneficial effects from some unmeasured factors lead to a downward trend of crash severity (β = −0.0204, −0.0296 and −0.0215 respectively). Among the considered time-related factors time of day has the greatest impact on the severity of all three types of crashes, particularly the nighttime crashes are the severest. At night, possibly because of lower density of vehicles the driver has a tendency to speed. Low visibility and late night drowsiness may delay driver's reaction at the impending collision with another vehicle or with roadside objects or with pedestrians. Therefore the collision impact is high due to high vehicle speed, which subsequently causes severe injury to a victim. In case of two-vehicle nighttime crashes the severity of the crash increases even more because of delayed crash notification and medical support if the offending driver runs away without attending the victim (Table 2). In order to reduce nighttime crash severity, drivers should be alert and not be tempted to increase the speed to such an extent that makes it difficult to control the vehicle.

Vehicle type and the country of registration have been found to affect accident severity both in two-vehicle and single-vehicle crashes (Table 1 and 3). The severity of crashes increases significantly when the two-wheelers especially the motorcycle and the heavy vehicle (particularly the truck) are involved. In case of two-vehicle crashes, the motorcycle is vulnerable by itself while in case of the truck it is associated with making more severe injury to its collision partner. The vulnerability of the motorcycle increases on the expressway where the fast moving traffic exists or along curve where the manipulation of the vehicle is difficult. The higher fatality risk related to heavy vehicle is due to its greater vehicle mass which translates into longer braking distance during collision instances with another vehicle or any roadside object. This results in larger impact force. This impact force is also higher on high-speed road; i.e., expressways. Interestingly both in two-vehicle and single-vehicle crashes it has been found that vehicles from the neighboring countries are involved in severer crashes than the Singaporean counterpart particularly when motorcycle is involved (Table 2 and 4). Thus to reduce the severity of motorcycle and truck involved crashes, if possible, one way is to provide separate lanes for motorcycles and heavy vehicles specially on expressways to avoid intermingling with different types of vehicles. Perhaps separate lanes for motorcycles and heavy vehicles on

expressways not only reduce the crash severity but also reduce the occurrence of crashes.

There is also evidence that road type and location type have strong influence on severity of all three types of crashes. Particularly crashes on expressways and crashes along curve make the severity condition worse. Results from this study support the fact that though the expressways are better-designed road, this advantage is compensated by the presence of high speed during collision. The resultant collision force is even higher along curve when the restricted sight distance limits the ability of the driver to react promptly at the collision instances. Thus it is expected that the road designers should try to reduce the presence of curves as much as possible to enhance sight distance while designing roads.

On the other hand, only the wet road surface condition and the narrow road way from the special road features have been found to reduce significantly the severity of both two-vehicle and single-vehicle crashes (Table 1 and 3). However, the reduction of severity risk on wet road surface is not always true in all situations, certain situations particularly during turning at the curve increase the risk of injury (Table 2).

Among the factors associated with driver's characteristics, the age of the driver has strong influence on accident severity both in two and single vehicle crashes (see Table 1 and 3). Older drivers involved in both type of crashes significantly increase the severity while in case of younger drivers they only increase the severity of single-vehicle crashes particularly the motorcycle involved crashes (Table 4). These age-related findings provide an insight that with increase in age the visual and physical ability of drivers deteriorate which often involved older drivers in severe injury crashes. On the other hand, the risk taking behavior as well as inexperience, immaturity and lack of proper judgment may be the reason in case of younger drivers. The risk taking behavior of males also promotes aggressive driving; often resulting in severe injury to victim in single-vehicle crashes. Hence, public information programs should be developed to encourage all drivers to follow traffic legislation properly, to avoid traveling at high speed and to drive soberly.

Among the factors considered in crash characteristics, the type of collisions is found to have severe impact on both two-vehicle and single-vehicle crashes (Table 1 and 3). Table 1 shows that head-on collisions ($p < 0.001$) inflict greater injury to victim in two-vehicle crashes while in case of single vehicle crashes Table 3 shows that direct collisions with road side objects such as trees ($p < 0.001$), guard rail ($p < 0.001$), lamppost ($p < 0.001$), traffic sign ($p < 0.001$), parked vehicle ($p < 0.001$) result in severer injury. However, injury risks for collisions with these fixed objects also vary because of their different rigidity and the collision with trees shows the greatest fatality risk. Moreover, the same roadside object placed on different roads as well as different locations affect the severity of crashes (Table 4).

Hence to minimize the crash related damages innovative design and proper placement of those roadside objects are necessary. The first priority is trying to provide a crash recovery area and if not possible then to relocate those roadside objects on a relative safer place, for example, specially the utility poles or the traffic signs can be eliminated from outer side of the curve and placed inside. In addition, the design should be such that utility poles or the traffic sign should be flexible enough to be broken down during the collision. In situations where trees cannot be cut down due to environmental and aesthetic reason, guardrails can be installed to protect the errant vehicle. While placing the guardrail it should be borne in mind that this safety appurtenance is a hazard in itself and its use should be limited to situations in which the severity of impacting the guardrail are less than the consequences of striking the guarded object.

From the pedestrian characteristics it is found that pedestrian age significantly affects the injury severity by showing higher injury risk for older pedestrians and lower injury risk for younger pedestrians (Table 5). This result supports the fact that older pedestrian are more susceptible to injury than younger ones. In addition older pedestrian are more vulnerable at nighttime crashes (Table 6). Though the younger pedestrians are less affected in crashes; their risk taking behavior such as unlawful road crossing often cause severe injury crashes (Table 6). Hence it is needed to provide better pedestrian walking and crossing facilities, which will discourage unlawful crossing or walking along the road.

Conclusion

In summary, the present research work has identified the factors affecting the severity of crashes in Singapore using ordered probit model. This work suggests that several factors such as vehicle type, road type, collision type, location type, pedestrian age, time of day of accident occurrence play major roles in affecting the severity of crashes. The findings of this study give a basis for developing effective countermeasures to improve road safety. However, it should be kept in mind that the model developed for each case study was based on police reported data; therefore, the results of those models largely depend on the accuracy of collected information. This study has focused on a broader overview by considering all types of vehicles involved in two-vehicle and single-vehicle crashes. Only the motorcycle or truck or car involved crashes in case of single-vehicle collisions and truck-car, car-motorcycle crashes in case of two-vehicle collisions can be considered in different studies in future for developing crash-specific countermeasures. In addition, selecting specific roadway crashes such as crashes on expressways can narrow those studies down. In case of pedestrian crashes, age wise analysis can be done in future studies, for example, study on crash severity of older pedestrians or younger pedestrians.

References

Abdel-Aty M, Chen CL and Schott JR (1998). An assessment of the effect of driver age on traffic accident involvement using log-linear models. *Accident Analysis and Prevention,* 30(6), 851-61.

Bedard M, Guyatt GH, Stones MJ and Hirdes JP (2002). The independent contribution of driver, crash and vehicle characteristics to driver fatalities. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 34(6), 717-27.

Bligh R and Mak K (1999). Crashworthiness of roadside features across vehicle platforms. *Transportation Research Record*, 1690, 68-77.

Chang LY and Mannering F (1998). Predicting vehicle occupancies from accident data – an Accident severity approach. *Transportation Research Record*, 1635, 93-103.

Chang LY and Mannering F (1999). Analysis of vehicle occupancy and the severity of truck- and non-truck-involved accidents. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 31(5), 579-92.

Dissanayake S and Lu J (2002a). Analysis of severity of young driver crashes-Sequential binary logistic regression modeling. *Transportation Research Record*, 1784, 108-14.

Dissanayake S and Lu J (2002b). Factors influential in making an injury severity difference to older drivers involved in fixed object-passenger car crashes. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 34(5), 609-18.

Duncan CS, Khattak AJ and Council FM (1998). Applying the Ordered Probit Model to injury severity in truck-passenger car rear-end collisions. *Transportation Research Record*, 1635, 63-71.

Evans L (1985). Fatality risk for belted drivers versus car mass. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 17(3), 251-71.

Evans L and Wasielewski P (1987). Serious or fatal driver injury rate versus car mass in head-on crashes between cars of similar mass. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 19(2), 119-31.

Evans L (1992). Car size or car mass: Which has greater influence on fatality risk? *American Journal of Public Health,* 82, 1105-12.

Evans L and Frick MC (1993). Mass ratio and relative driver fatality risk in two–vehicle crashes. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 25(2), 213- 24.

Evans L and Frick MC (1994). Car mass and fatality risk: Has the relationship changed? *American Journal of Public Health*, 84, 33-6.

Farmer CM, Braver ER and Mitter EL (1997). Two-vehicle side impact crashes: The relationship of vehicle and crash characteristics to injury severity. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 29(3), 399-406.

Haland Y, Lovsund P and Nygren A (1993). Life–threatening and disabling injuries in car-to-car side impacts - Implications for development of protecting systems. *Accident Analysis and Prevention* 25(2), 199-205.

Jones IS and Whitfield RA (1988). Predicting injury risk with "New car assessment program" crashworthiness ratings. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 20(6), 411-9.

Jessie WSH and Yuan W (1998). The efficacy of safety policies on traffic fatalities in Singapore. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 30(6), 745-54.

Khattak AJ (2001). Injury severity in multi vehicle rear-end crashes. *Transportation Research Record*, 1746, 59-68.

Kockelman KM and Kweon YJ (2002). Driver injury severity: An application of Ordered Probit models. *Accident Analysis and Prevention,* 34(3), 313-21.

Krull K, Khattak A and Council F (2000). Injury effects of rollovers and events sequence in single-vehicle crashes. *Transportation Research Record*, 1635, 93-103.

Lang SW, Waller PF and Shope JT (1996). Adolescent driving: Characteristics associated with single-vehicle and injury crashes. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 27(4), 241-57.

Lee, J and Mannering F (2002). Impact of roadside features on the frequency and severity of run-off roadway accidents: An empirical analysis. *Accident Analysis and Prevention,* 34(2), 149-61.

Long JS (1997). *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables*, Saga Publications, California, USA.

Lui KJ, McGee D, Rhodes P and Pollock D (1988). An Application of a conditional logistic regression to study the effects of safety belts, principal impact points and car weights on drivers' fatalities. *Journal of Safety Research*, 19, 197- 203.

Mercer GW (1987). Influences on passenger vehicle casualty accident frequency and severity: Unemployment, driver gender, driver age, drinking driving and restraint device use. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 19(3), 231-6.

O'Donnel CJ and Connor DH (1996). Predicting the severity of motor vehicle accident injuries using models of Ordered Multiple Choice. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 28(6), 739-53.

Quddus MA, Noland RB and Chin HC (2002). An analysis of motorcycle injury and vehicle damage severity using Ordered Probit Model. *Journal of Safety Research,* 33, 445-62.

Renski H, Khattak AJ and Council FM (1999). Impact of speed limit increases on crash severity: Analysis of single-vehicle crashes on North Carolina Interstate Highways. *Transportation Research Record*, 1665, 100-8,

Shankar VN and Mannering F (1996). An exploratory multinomial logit analysis of single-vehicle motorcycle accident severity. *Journal of Safety Research*, 27, 183-94.

Shibata A and Fukuda K (1994). Risk factors of fatality in motor vehicle traffic accidents. *Accident Analysis and Prevention,* 26(3), 391-7.

Sjogren H, Bjornstig U, Eriksson A, Sonntag E and Ostrom M (1993). Elderly in the traffic environment: Analysis of fatal crashes in Northern Sweden. *Accident Analysis and Prevention,* 25(2), 177-88.

Treacy P, Jones K and Mansfield C (2002). Flipped out of control: Single-vehicle rollover accidents in the Northern territory. *The Medical Journal of Australia*, 176, 260-3.

Viner JG (1995a). Rollovers on sideslopes and ditches. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 27(4), 483-91.

Viner JG (1995b). Risk of rollover in ran-off-road crashes. *Transportation Research Record*, 1500, 112-8.

Viner JG, Council FM and Stewart JR (1994). Frequency and severity of crashes involving roadside safety hardware by vehicle type. *Transportation Research Record*, 1468, 10-8.

Yamamoto T and Shankar VN (2002). Bivariate Ordered-Response Probit Model of driver's and passenger's injury severities in collision with fixed objects. *Transportation Research Board*, Annual Meeting CD–ROM.

Yuan W (2000). The effectiveness of the 'Ride-Bright' legislation for motorcycles in Singapore. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 32(4), 559-63.