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Background to Research

This research programme monitors service, quality and compliance with contractual Dublin Bus requirements through “mystery shopping” surveys, to measure key aspects of service delivery. This mystery shopping programme was designed to provide robust and actionable data to the National Transport Authority to measure the overall service performance of Dublin Bus through the eyes of its ‘customers’.

196 mystery shops were conducted during Quarter 1 with mystery shoppers acting as passengers while waiting for and on board selected Dublin Bus routes around the city. A broad spread of bus routes were covered across different days of the week and times of the day. 6 Dublin Bus Head Office interviews were also completed and included in Quarter 1 data.

The mystery shops were carried out by trained Kantar Millward Brown interviewers, following an initial pilot and briefing session. These interviewers use portable HAPI (HandHeld Personal Interviewing) devices which enable both discreet and effective captures of location, bus and driver details at stops, when boarding, on board and after alighting buses.

Quarter 1 2018: 1st January – 25th March 2018

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus previous quarter i.e. Qtr 4 Oct – Dec 2017 Q4 or year on year changes for same quarter last year i.e. Qtr 1 Jan – Mar 2017 Q1.
Section 1:
Stop Maintenance Performance
Is there additional commercial advertising on the shelter glass outside the designated advertising or travel information and timetable panels? (Acceptable advertising must be in a “Case” or Side Panel and not just pasted on shelter)

Are there any third party commercial advertisements or notices (excluding graffiti, stickers, or bus operator related advertisements) on the operator’s bus pole?

Advertising on Shelter of Bus Stop: Almost all interviewers saw no signs of commercial advertising present on the bus stop poles

Q1 2018

69% observed a Bus Stop Pole & Flag

Q38 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole

(133) %

Yes

No

99

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 Q1, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017 Q4

Base: (133) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29
Bus Shelters: Just under 9 in 10 interviewers found the bus stop poles & shelters to be in good condition, with a further 1 in 10 reporting signs of moderate damage. Bus shelters were thought to be in good condition by almost all interviewers.

Base: (87), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1, (133) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

Q1 2018

Q29b Condition of the Bus Pole (133) %

- Good condition: 89%
- Moderate damage: 11%
- Hazardous damage requiring immediate repair: -%

Q31 Condition of the Bus Shelter (87) %

- Good condition: 95%
- Moderate damage: 6%
- Hazardous damage: -%

↓️ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 Q1, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017 Q4
Information Display: 2 in 3 interviewers saw an information display present at the bus stop. Of these, most felt that they were fully legible and clean with minimal instances of damage reported.

Base: (191), IF POLE OR SHELTER AT Q28C

Q1 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q28d* Information Display</th>
<th>Q28e* Condition of Display</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(191)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(125)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Panel on Pole</td>
<td>Fully legible and clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long panel on pole</td>
<td>Obscured by condensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information panel on shelter</td>
<td>Damaged or torn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFI Pole with information panel</td>
<td>Obscured by dirt / etching / graffiti /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not mounted correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017

* New for Q1 2018

Q28d What type of information display was there present at the stop? SEE IMAGE EXAMPLE
Q28e How would you describe the condition of this information display?
Section 2: Customer Information Performance
Fares: Nearly all interviewers found the fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus; a significant improvement versus last year

Base: (196)

Q1 2018

Q50 Were the Fares Displayed Clearly at the Entrance?

(196)

%  

↓ (6)Q1  

Yes

2  

↑ (94)Q1  

No

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018Q1, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017Q4
Timetable: Almost all interviewers saw a bus stop number visible on the bus stop flag. 3 in 5 saw both printed timetables and timetables with operative dates present at the bus stop.

Base: IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1 OR BUS SHELTER Q30/1, IF YES TO PRINTED TIMETABLE Q34/1

Q1 2018

Q32 Bus Stop Number Visible
(192)
%

Q34 Printed Timetable Present
(133)
%

Q36 Operative Date Present
(81)
%

Yes

No

Present but could not read

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017.
Section 3: Bus Equipment Performance
When Getting on the Bus: Upon boarding the bus, over 2 in 5 interviewers reported seeing the centre doors opening, a significant improvement both versus last quarter and last year; however just under half reported that there were no alighting passengers during their journey. 3 in 4 noted the centre doors opening when alighting the bus, significantly improved both versus last quarter and last year.

**Q1 2018**

61% assessed buses with centre doors

Q64 Did the Driver Open the Centre Doors?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Boarding Passengers]</th>
<th>(120)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(31) Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>(30) Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no alighting passengers

Q91 Centre Doors Open for Passengers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Alighting Passengers]</th>
<th>(120)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>(53) Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(52) Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓ up = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018Q1, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017Q4

*Interviewer instructions updated in Q1 2018

Base: (120), IF YES TO CENTRE DOORS Q63
On Board Displays/Announcements: Almost all interviewers found the electronic displays were working correctly, a significant improvement versus last year. There has also been a significant improvement versus last quarter in reports of automatic next stop announcements working correctly.

Base: (196)

Q80 Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working

- Yes - was working correctly (96)
- Working but was not providing correct information (3)
- Display was turned off or not working (9)
- Could not see a display (1)
- = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 Q1, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017 Q4

Q81 Automatic Next Stop Announcement Working

- Yes - working and volume was correct (94)
- Yes - working but too loud (1)
- Yes - working but too quiet (5)
- No - was not working (12)
- None on the bus (4)
- = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 Q1, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017 Q4

Q1 2018
On Board Displays/Announcements: Almost all interviewers who could see a display found that it was working correctly. Over 9 in 10 found the next stop announcement was working correctly, a significant improvement versus last quarter, while those who found the announcement was either too quiet or not working are in decline.

Base: (191), ALL WHO COULD SEE A DISPLAY / HEAR AN ANNOUNCEMENT

Q1 2018

Q80* Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working

- Yes - was working correctly
- Working but was not providing correct information
- Display was turned off or not working
- Could not see a display

99 - (5) Q4

Q81* Automatic Next Stop Announcement Working

- Yes -working and volume was correct
- Yes - working but too loud
- Yes - working but too quiet
- No - was not working
- None on the bus

94 - (83) Q4

* Question rebased off those who could see a display / hear an announcement

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017

Q80  Were the electronic displays on board indicating what the next stop was working correctly?
Q81  Was there an automatic next stop audio announcement working on the bus?
Wheelchair Ramp/Lift: For the one interviewer who saw a wheelchair ramp requested, they found that it was activated upon request.

Base: (1) If yes to WHEELCHAIR RAMP OR LIFT REQUEST Q105/1

Q1 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q106 Wheelchair Ramp/ Lift Activated Upon Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No - driver stated it was broken
- No - person requesting was not a wheelchair user
- No - driver refused to activate because unsafe to do so at the stop
- No - driver stated no wheelchair ramp or lift present
- No - other reason
- No - no reason given

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018\(_{Q1}\), Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017\(_{Q4}\)
Route Number and Destination Visible: Almost all interviewers found both the route numbers & destinations to be clearly visible on all sides of the bus.

Base: (196)

**Q1 2018**

**Q43 Route No. on Front**

- Yes: 99%
- Not displayed: 1%
- Could not clearly see: 1%

**Q44 Destination on Front**

- Yes: 100%
- Not displayed: 0%
- Could not clearly see: 0%

**Q45 Route No. on Side**

- Correct route no. displayed: 99%
- Incorrect route no. displayed: 1%
- No route no. displayed: 0%
- There was no display panel for route no.: 0%
- Could not clearly see: 0%

**Q87 Route No. on Back**

- Yes: 96%
- Incorrect route number shown: 4%
- No route number shown: 0%
- Couldn’t see: 0%

*= Statistically significant differences are versus * Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017.*
CCTV: Over 9 in 10 interviewers found the CCTV screens in the stairwells to be turned on and functioning correctly, a significant improvement versus last quarter.

Base: (120), IF CCTV Camera Present

Q1 2018

Q82 CCTV in Stairwell

%  

94  

Turned on and working correctly

1  

Turned on, but was not working properly

No CCTV display present

No stairwell/single deck

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017.
Fare Payment: Ticket machines and leap card readers were found to be present and functioning correctly by almost all interviewers. Of those interviewers paying in cash, all received a printed ticket or change receipt where appropriate, whilst 7 in 10 Leap interviewers were able to see what fare they were charged when boarding the bus.

Q1 2018

| Q56 Cash Fare (90) Ticket Machine Working Correctly |
| % |
| Yes | No |
| 100 | - |

| Q57a Cash Fare* Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt |
| Exact Change (57) | Not Exact Change (33) |
| % |
| Yes, printed ticket | 100 |
| Yes, printed ticket and change receipt | 36 |
| Got handwritten ticket | 88 |
| Was not given a ticket | - |

* = Multicoded Question

| Q58a Leap Card Reader Present at Driver Working Correctly (72) |
| % |
| Yes | No |
| 99 | 1 |

| Q59a Leap Card Reader at Driver See Fare Charged (72)* |
| % |
| Yes | Don’t know/Couldn’t tell Machine was not working |
| 68 | 31 |

| Q60a Pole Mounted Leap Card Reader Working Correctly (34) |
| % |
| Yes | No |
| 97 | 3 |

Payment Methods were split as they were in Quarter 1 2016:
• 50% Cash Payments
• 25% Leap Card Reader at Driver
• 25% Pole Mounted Leap Card Reader

*Question amended in Q2 2016

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018-Q1, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017-Q4

Q56 Was the ticket machine working correctly for you?
Q57a Were you given a printed ticket and change receipt?
Q58a Did the Leap Card reader at the driver appear to be working correctly?
Q59a Could you see what fare were you charged?
Q60a Did the pole mounted Leap Card reader appear to be working correctly?
Section 4:
Cleanliness Performance
Assessment of Seats: Bus seats were found to be free of graffiti and damage on almost all occasions. 9 in 10 interviewers found that seats were clean, however this is significantly down both versus last year and last quarter with reports of dust, crumbs and other ingrained dirt on the rise.

Base: (196)

- **Q69 Graffiti on Seats**
  - No Signs: 100%
  - Minor graffiti or defacing: 2%
  - Heavy defacing: 1%
  - Offensive graffiti: 1%

- **Q70 Cleanliness of Seats**
  - Clean: 90%
  - Significant dust or crumbs: 7%
  - Gum or other ingrained dirt: 3%
  - Wet or soiled: 1%

- **Q71 Damage to Seats**
  - No: 99%
  - Minor tear, less than 2cm in length: 1%
  - Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length: 1%
  - Moderate damage: 1%
  - Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure: 1%

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017.

2020
Bus Interior: The majority of interviewers found the bus interiors to be clean and free of graffiti or dirt. 1 in 4 saw minimal levels of litter while just under 1 in 10 saw signs of moderate dirt, a significant uplift year on year.
Bus Windows: Almost all interviewers reported no signs of graffiti or etchings on bus windows, with reports of minor graffiti decreasing versus last quarter. The majority of interviewers found the bus windows had no signs of dirt, although this has dropped significantly year on year. 1 in 3 saw light dirt on the windows, a significant uplift year on year.

Base: (196)

Q1 2018

- Q72 Graffiti on Windows
  - No signs: 99%
  - Minor graffiti: 1%
  - Heavy graffiti: 1%
  - Offensive graffiti: 2%

- Q73 Etching on Windows
  - No signs: 97%
  - Minor etching: 3%
  - Heavy etching: 1%
  - Offensive etching: 4%

- Q74 Cleanliness of Windows
  - No signs of dirt: 56%
  - Light dirt: 31%
  - Moderately dirty: 10%
  - Very dirty: 4%

\[\downarrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017}\]
Front/Side of Bus: Encouragingly, no interviewers reported any signs of visible damage to the front/side of the buses. 3 in 4 felt the front and sides of the bus were clean, significantly down from last quarter, while 3 in 5 found the rear of the buses were clean.

Q47 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus

- Yes: 74%
- Light dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today: 21%
- Moderately dirty: 5%
- Very dirty, likely to have accumulated over several days: 5%

Q48 Visible Damage to Front/Side of Bus

- No Visible Damage: 97%
- Light paintwork scratches only: 3%
- Minor bodywork damage: 1%
- Serious damage to bodywork: 1%

Q90 Was the Rear of Bus Clean?

- Yes: 58%
- Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operation: 32%
- Heavy dirt, likely to have accumulated over more than one day’s operation: 5%
- Couldn’t see: 5%

↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 Q1, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017 Q4
Section 5:
Bus Driver Performance
**Driver Interaction:** On the 1 occasion where a driver dispute was observed, the driver was thought to handle the situation in a rude or sarcastic manner.

**Q1 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver Interaction:</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent or ignored passenger</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rude or sarcastic</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 observed driver dispute over the bus not waiting for another passenger

Driver refused request of passenger to wait for his partner who was approaching on foot. Driver stopped further on to let the passenger off.

⚠️ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018, Q4 2017- Dec 2017

---

Q104 How did driver handle situation? (1)
Driver Assessment: Drivers remain very highly regarded by almost all interviewers in terms of both attitude and presentation year on year

Base: (196)

Q51 Helpful

Q52 Polite

Q54 Driver Wearing Uniform

Q55 Driver Well Presented

Questions to Driver
- How much is it to ____?
- Can I pay with a note?
- Does this bus go to ____?
- What time is the last bus this evening?

↑ ↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 Q1, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017 Q4

Q1 2018

100

99

100

100

- Yes

- No

- Yes

- No

- Yes

- No

Was the driver helpful in response to your question?
Was the driver polite in response to your question?
Was the driver wearing uniform?
Was the driver well presented?
Bus Safety: The majority of interviewers felt that drivers both braked and accelerated smoothly during their journey, with significant improvements in the number of interviewers reporting drivers braking smoothly versus last quarter. Almost all felt that passengers were given enough time to find their seats or hold on.

Base: (196)

Q1 2018

Q94 Driver Accelerated Smoothly* 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, felt comfortable</th>
<th>91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh - minor discomfort</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh - moderate discomfort</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently too harsh</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q95 Driver Braking Smoothly* 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, felt comfortable</th>
<th>91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh - minor discomfort</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh - moderate discomfort</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently too harsh</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q96 Did the driver give passengers adequate time to find their seats or hold on?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally moved off too early</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017

*Question amended in Q2 2016
When Getting on the Bus: 7 interviewers found that the bus did not pull up to the footpath kerb when they boarded the bus. On 5 of these occasions, there didn’t appear to be any specific reason for the restriction while on the 2 occasions, another vehicle was parked in the way. Of the 4 interviewers who noted that the bus did not pull up to the kerb as they alighted the bus, all reported that there was no specific reason for the restriction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Boarding %</th>
<th>Alighting %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another vehicle was parked in the way</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were other obstructions such as road works at the stop</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No footpath kerb was present</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1 2018

Q62 Why did the bus not pull up to the footpath kerb (7) Boarding

Q93 Why did the bus not pull up to the kerb (4) Alighting

- Other bus was in the way
- Other vehicles were parked in the way
- There were other obstructions
- There was no kerb at my destination stop
- Other reason - Please record details
- No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 (Q1), Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017 (Q4)
**Driver Actions:** Almost all interviewers found that buses stopped to pick up passengers when signalled to do so, a significant improvement versus last quarter.

---

**Q1 2018**

**Q102 Stopped to Pick Up Passenger**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Could not always stop as bus was full
- Did not always stop to pick up, and no evident reason for not stopping
- Was not requested during this journey, other than at boarding stop

**Note:** Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017.
**Driver Actions:** All interviewers found that buses always stopped to pick up passengers when signalled to do so

Base: (195), ALL THOSE REQUESTED TO STOP

**Q1 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q102 Stopped to Pick Up Passenger</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Could not always stop as bus was full
- Did not always stop to pick up, and no evident reason for not stopping
- Was not requested during this journey, other than at boarding stop

*Question rebased off those whose bus was requested to stop*

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017

So far as you could tell, did the driver always stop to pick up passengers when requested?
**Driver Behaviour:** Positively, there were no reports of drivers engaging in any reckless behaviour again this quarter. 4 in 5 saw no signs of drivers listening to the radio whilst almost all saw no signs of drivers holding long conversations with other passengers or staff.

**Q1 2018**

**Q97 Did Bus Driver do Any of the Following:**
- Use mobile phone while driving
- Wear an earpiece while driving
- Drive the bus in a dangerous manner
- None of these

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use mobile phone while driving</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear an earpiece while driving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive the bus in a dangerous manner</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q98 Driver Listening to Music/Radio**
- Yes
- No

**Q99 Driver Hold Long Conversations**
- Yes with other staff
- Yes with passengers
- No
- Could not observe

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018\(_{Q1}\), Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017\(_{Q4}\). Base: (196)
Driver Actions: Interviewers did not report any instances of drivers leaving buses unattended this quarter

Base: (196)

Q1 2018

Q100 Driver Left Bus Unattended

Yes - because of driver change -

Yes - to go to shops -

Yes - to go to toilet -

Yes -some other reason - Please record details -

Yes – don’t know the reason -

No 100

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018_Q1, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017_Q4
Diversion or Terminated Early: No interviews reported any early diversions or terminations this quarter

Base: (196)

Q1 2018

Q107 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018\textsubscript{Q1}, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2017\textsubscript{Q4}

Q107 Did bus terminate early or divert off course?
Q108 Did driver...
Q109 Were passengers told the reason for early termination or diversion off course?