

The following is only an abstract of one of our earlier reports. An email request for a printed or PDF copy of the complete report can be generated by clicking on the **Report Number** of this report in the table of reports on the [Research Studies and Reports](#) page. The PDF copy of the complete report was created by scanning an original, printed copy, and thus is only *partially* searchable and *is not* accessible, but is fully printable.

A printed or PDF copy of our studies and reports may also be requested by mail or phone at:

Department of Motor Vehicles  
Research and Development Branch  
2570 24th Street, MS H-126  
Sacramento, CA 95818-2606  
(916) 657-5805

For a request by mail, please include the report number and your name, address, and phone number. Also, please state whether you are requesting a printed copy, a PDF copy, or both. For a PDF copy, please include your email address.

TITLE: The Prediction of Driving Record Following Driver Improvement Contacts

DATE: January 1974

AUTHOR(S): William C. Marsh & David M. Hubert

REPORT NUMBER: 50

NTIS NUMBER: PB-238687

FUNDING SOURCE: Federal Highway Administration

PROJECT OBJECTIVE:

To construct prediction equations for post-contact driving records based on three data sources-prior driving record, driver questionnaire responses, and driver improvement analyst (DIA) interview information.

SUMMARY:

Two questionnaires were filled out by 13,594 negligent operators attending group meetings or individual hearings-one questionnaire for factual data and one for emotional responses. After each hearing, the DIA completed the questionnaire and made predictions concerning the subject's probability of improvement. Equations predicting post-contact accidents and convictions were constructed based on stepwise multiple regression analyses using half of the sample. Of the accident prediction equations, only the one based solely on prior driver record variables successfully cross-validated. Equations using variables from all three data sources predicted convictions in the cross-validation sample, and two out of the three conviction equations also predicted cross-validation accidents. No significant improvement in accuracy of prediction was made by "tailoring" equations to different contact groups in the construct sample. DIAs, in general, could not predict whether a driver would be accident-involved or accident-free following driver improvement contact. In contrast, most DIAs were able to predict convictions to a slight (but statistically significant) degree.

IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The findings were not considered to be sufficiently positive to warrant operational use of the prediction equation.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

None available.