

Appendix L Misrepresentation of Causal Factor Significance

Table 2 in the main analysis showed that only 8% or so of FSC involve speeds above limits, though even that low figure includes “*possible*” and/or **non-precipitating** contribution, so the real figure might be no more than 5%.

“They would sooner save face than save lives”* wrote the late Paul Smith of Safe Speed in March 2007 when the DfT and others ignored that new Stats19 analysis showing that **cameras could never have achieved the reductions claimed and carried on as before** – except for publishing misleading weasel-worded excuses like those below in an attempt to hide their embarrassment while keeping the gravy train rolling and their reputations intact (see also Appendix A)

Excuse The percentages are *cautious minimum indications*.

Fact In reality they are **overstated** because they include *possible* as well as *very likely* involvement and collisions in which **speeding was not the main or precipitating factor**.

Excuse Even though investigating officers had decided not to identify speeding on Stats19 forms, *other factors such as loss of control, careless, reckless or in a hurry can also stem in part from choice of speed*

Fact The officers were surely **better able to make such assessments**.

Excuse *Adverse effects are taken into account*

Fact **Not by any means all are**, because many clearly do occur outside official site boundaries and are therefore **not included in official data**.

Excuse “Speeding” is recorded only when the *“officer can be sufficiently sure about them to be able to justify them if they are subsequently disclosed in court, often some time after the event”*.

Fact The Stats20 handbook for investigating officers requires that they record *“their best opinion at the time even if it might later be found to be wrong”*. For that reason and because in any case there is **no space on the form** for speed figures to be recorded, Stats19 reports are never used in court!

Excuse Drivers caught speeding who then attend Awareness Courses become safer.

Fact There is no credible evidence that they do. At least one insurance company has stated publicly that they increase premiums for drivers who attend those courses because in their experience those drivers are more likely to be involved in accidents.

* safespeed.org.uk/

See also <http://www.fightbackwithfacts.com/cameras-versus-activated-signs/>

See also Appendix A - Cognitive **Dissonance**, **Group Think** and **Confirmation Bias**.