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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’.

197 mystery shops were conducted during Quarter 3 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.

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.

| Wave 2: Quarter 1 2016: 18th January – 27th March 2016 | Wave 7: Quarter 2 2017: 27th March – 18th June 2017 |

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus: recent changes since previous quarter i.e. Qtr 2 Apr – June 2017 or year on year changes for same quarter last year i.e. Qtr 3 July – Sept 2016.
Section 1: Stop Maintenance Performance
Advertising on Shelter of Bus Stop: Almost all interviewers reported no signs of commercial advertising on either the bus stop poles or shelters

Base: (73), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1, (126) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29

43% observed a Bus Shelter
Q37** Additional Commercial Advertising on Shelter Glass
(73)

74% observed a Bus Stop Pole & Flag
Q38** Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole
(126)

** Interviewer instructions updated in Qtr 2 2016

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016\textsubscript{Q3}, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017\textsubscript{Q2}

Q37 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)
Q38 Are there any third party commercial advertisements or notices (excluding graffiti, stickers, or bus operator related advertisements) on the operator’s bus pole?
Bus Shelters: Approximately 9 in 10 interviewers found the bus stop poles & shelters to be in good condition, similar to what was seen both last quarter and last year.

Base: (73), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1, (126) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

Q3 2017

Q29b Condition of the Bus Pole
(126) %

- Good condition: 86%
- Moderate damage: 11%
- Scratches/graffiti: 2%
- Hazardous damage requiring immediate repair: 2%

Q31 Condition of the Bus Shelter
(73) %

- Good condition: 92%
- Moderate damage: 7%
- Hazardous damage: 1%

📍 = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016 Q3, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017 Q2

Q29b What is the condition of the bus stop pole and flag?
Q31 What is the condition of the bus shelter?
Timetable: Just under 9 in 10 found the bus timetables to be fully legible & clean, however reports of etchings / scratchings have increased year on year.

Base: (122), IF YES TO PRINTED TIMETABLE Q34/1

Q3 2017
Q35 Condition of Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully legible and clean</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscured by dirt</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscured by graffiti or stickers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mounted properly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscured by etchings/scratching</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torn/damaged</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscured by condensation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\downarrow\uparrow\] = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016$_{Q3}$, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017$_{Q2}$
Section 2:
Customer Information Performance
Fares: Nearly all interviewers found the fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus; a significant improvement year on year

Base: (197)

Q3 2017

Q50 Were the Fares Displayed Clearly at the Entrance?
(197)

%  

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017.
Timetable: There have been significant increases year on year in the number of printed timetables and operative timetable dates observed by interviewers. Bus stop numbers were visible to almost all interviewers.

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

**Q3 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Visible</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Operative Date Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q32 Bus Stop Number Visible</td>
<td>(170) % 98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>% 27 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34 Printed Timetable Present</td>
<td>(167) % 73</td>
<td>(37) Q3</td>
<td>% 13 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36 Operative Date Present</td>
<td>(122) % 76</td>
<td>(50) Q3</td>
<td>% 13 76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016 Q3, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017 Q2

Q32 Is the bus stop number visible on the bus stop flag? This is an up to 4 digit number
Q34 Is there a printed timetable, for the route you are using, on display at the bus stop
Q36 Is there an “Operative Date” (Dublin Bus) or “Valid From” date written on the timetable? Interviewer note: can be very small print
Section 3: Bus Equipment Performance
When Getting on the Bus: Upon boarding the bus, just under half of interviewers reported seeing the centre doors opening; a significant decrease versus last quarter, however there has also been a significant decrease in the centre doors not opening, offset by significant increases in those interviewers reporting no alighting passengers during their journey. Just under 3 in 5 noted the centre doors opening when alighting the bus.

Base: (101), IF YES TO CENTRE DOORS Q63

Q3 2017

51% assessed buses with centre doors

Q64 Did the Driver Open the Centre Doors?
[Boarding Passengers]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(101)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q91 Centre Doors Open for Passengers
[Alighting Passengers]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(101)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017

When you were boarding the bus, did the driver open the centre doors for passengers who were getting off the bus?

Did the driver open the centre doors as you got off the bus?
On Board Displays/Announcements: Significant increases have been reported year on year in both electronic next stop displays & automatic next stop announcers functioning correctly. Reports of automatic next stop announcers not working or not being present on the bus have significantly declined year on year.

Q3 2017

Q80 Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working
- Yes - was working correctly: 96%
- Working but was not providing correct information: 12%
- Display was turned off or not working: 2%
- Could not see a display: 2%

Q81 Automatic Next Stop Announcement Working
- Yes - working and volume was correct: 88%
- Yes - working but too loud: 7%
- Yes - working but too quiet: 5%
- No - was not working: 1%
- None on the bus: 1%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016 Q3, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017 Q2
Wheelchair Ramp/Lift: Of the 3 interviewers who saw a wheelchair ramp requested, all found that it was activated upon request.

Q3 2017

Q106 Wheelchair Ramp/Lift Activated Upon Request

Base: (3) If yes to WHEELCHAIR RAMP OR LIFT REQUEST Q105/1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - driver stated it was broken</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - person requesting was not a wheelchair user</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - driver refused to activate because unsafe to do so at the stop</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - driver stated no wheelchair ramp or lift present</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - other reason</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - no reason given</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017
Route Number and Destination Visible: Almost all interviewers found both the route numbers & destinations to be clearly visible on all sides of the bus this quarter

Base: (197)

**Q43 Route No. on Front**
- Yes: 98%
- Not displayed: 1%
- Could not clearly see: 1%

**Q44 Destination on Front**
- Yes: 99%
- Not displayed: 1%

**Q45 Route No. on Side**
- Correct route no. displayed: 99%
- Incorrect route no. displayed: 1%
- No route no. displayed: 1%
- There was no display panel for route no.: 1%
- Could not clearly see: 1%

**Q87 Route No. on Back**
- Yes: 95%
- Incorrect route number shown: 4%
- No route number shown: 4%
- Couldn’t see: 1%

Statistically significant differences are versus * Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016Q3, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017 Q2

Q43 Could the correct route number be clearly seen on the front of the bus? ASK ALL
Q44 Could the correct destination be clearly seen on the front of the bus?
Q45 Could the correct route number be seen clearly on the side of the bus?
Q87 Was the correct route number displayed on the back of the bus?
CCTV: Almost all interviewers found the CCTV screens in the stairwells to be turned on and functioning correctly, with significant decreases year on year in the number of interviewers reporting no CCTV displays present.

Base: (101), IF YES TO CENTRE DOORS at Q63*

Q3 2017

Q82 CCTV in Stairwell

%  

- Turned on and working correctly - 96
- Turned on, but was not working properly -
- Turned off
- No CCTV display present
- No stairwell/single deck

Q3 2017

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017

* Filter added in Q3 2016
Fare Payment: Ticket machines and leap card readers were found to be present and functioning correctly by all interviewers. Of those interviewers paying in cash, almost all received a printed ticket and change receipt where appropriate, whilst 7 in 10 Leap interviewers were able to see what fare they were charged when boarding the bus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Q3 2017</th>
<th>Q2 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q56 Cash Fare (67) Ticket Machine Working Correctly</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q56a Leap Card Reader Present at Driver Working Correctly (77)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q60a Pole Mounted Leap Card Reader Working Correctly (53)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017 Q3, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017 Q2

Payment Methods were split as they were in 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

- Exact Change (40)
- Not Exact Change (27)

- Yes, printed ticket
- Yes, printed ticket and change receipt
- Got handwritten ticket
- Was not given a ticket

- Yes
- No

- Yes
- No

- Yes
- Don’t know/Couldn’t tell
- Machine was not working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exact Change</th>
<th>Not Exact Change</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Multicoded Question

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

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017 Q3, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017 Q2

*Question amended in Q2 2016
Section 4:
Cleanliness Performance
Assessment of Seats: Bus seats were found to be clean & well maintained on the majority of occasions, with significant improvements seen year on year in terms of cleanliness of seats. Reports of significant dust or crumbs have significantly declined year on year while incidents of minor graffiti or defacing have significantly increased.

Q3 2017

Q69 Graffiti on Seats

- No Signs: 97%
-Minor graffiti or defacing: 3%
-Heavy defacing: 2%
-Offensive graffiti: 2%

Q70 Cleanliness of Seats

- Clean: 98%
- Significant dust or crumbs: 0%
- Gum or other ingrained dirt: 2%
- Wet or soiled: 0%

Q71 Damage to Seats

- No: 98%
- Minor tear, less than 2cm in length: 2%
- Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length: 0%
- Moderate damage: 0%
- Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure: 0%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017

Q69 How would you best describes graffiti or other defacing on seat cushions or seat structure?
Q70 What best describes level of cleanliness of seat cushions?
Q71 Were any bus seat cushions you observed damaged in any way?
Bus Interior: Floors and stairs are thought to be generally clean and free of dirt, litter and graffiti in the majority of cases. 1 in 5 interviewers reported minimal levels of litter and light dirt while there has also been a significant increase year on year in the number of dirt or liquid spills reported.

Base: (197)

Q75 Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs

- Generally clean: 86%
- Dirt or liquid spills: 6%
- Dirt or liquid stains (dried): 0%

Q76 Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs*

- Litter free: 75%
- Minimal level of litter: 21%
- Some litter: 2%
- A lot of litter: 2%

Q77 Graffiti on Panels, Ceilings, Stairs and Other Fixtures/Fittings

- No signs: 97%
- Minor graffiti or etchings: 2%
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: 1%
- Offensive graffiti or etchings: 1%

Q78 Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and Other Fixtures/Fittings

- No signs of dirt: 73%
- Light dirt: 21%
- Moderately dirty: 6%
- Very dirty: 2%

*Question amended in Q2 so no yoy comparison

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017.
Bus Windows: Almost all interviewers reported no signs of graffiti or etchings on bus windows, while 3 in 4 reported no signs of dirt. 1 in 5 interviewers observed light dirt on the windows while reports of moderately dirty windows have significantly increased versus last quarter.

Base: (197)

Q3 2017

Q72 Graffiti on Windows

| No signs | 98 |
| Minor graffiti | 2 |
| Heavy graffiti | 0 |
| Offensive graffiti | 0 |

Q73 Etching on Windows

| No signs | 95 |
| Minor etching | 5 |
| Heavy etching | 0 |
| Offensive etching | 0 |

Q74 Cleanliness of Windows

| No signs of dirt | 73 |
| Light dirt | 20 |
| Moderately dirty | 7 |
| Very dirty | 0 |

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017.
Front/Side of Bus: Encouragingly, no interviewers reported any signs of serious damage to the front/side of the buses, while reports of moderate dirt have significantly declined year on year.

Q3 2017

**Q47 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light dirt</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately dirty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q47 Q3 2017: 92% Yes, 8% Light dirt. Light dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today.

**Q48 Visible Damage to Front/Side of Bus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Damage</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Visible Damage</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light paintwork scratches</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor bodywork damage</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious damage to bodywork</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q48 Q3 2017: 95% No Visible Damage, 3% Light paintwork scratches, 2% Minor bodywork damage. Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operation.

**Q90 Was the Rear of Bus Clean?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some dirt</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy dirt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q90 Q3 2017: 83% Yes, 15% Some dirt, 2% Heavy dirt. Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operation over more than one day's operation.

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017.
Section 5: Bus Driver Performance
Driver Interaction: On the 2 occasions where a driver dispute was observed, the drivers was thought to handle the situation in a polite and professional manner.

Disputes observed were in relation to fares and rowdy passengers on board.

**Q3 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Polite</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Friendly</th>
<th>Indifferent or ignored passenger</th>
<th>Rude or sarcastic</th>
<th>Abusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q104 How did driver handle situation? (2)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017.
Driver Assessment: Drivers remain highly regarded by almost all interviewers in terms of both attitude and presentation year on year

Base: (197)

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?

Q51 Helpful
- Yes: 2
- No: 98

Q52 Polite
- Yes: 0
- No: 100

Q54 Driver Wearing Uniform
- Yes: 2
- No: 98

Q55 Driver Well Presented
- Yes: 1
- No: 99

Q3 2017

\[ 
\begin{align*}
\text{Q51 Helpful} & \quad \text{Q54 Driver Wearing Uniform} \\
2 & \quad 2 \\
98 & \quad 98 \\
\text{Q52 Polite} & \quad \text{Q55 Driver Well Presented} \\
0 & \quad 1 \\
100 & \quad 99 \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[ 
\begin{align*}
\uparrow & \quad \text{(98)}_{Q3} \\
\downarrow & \quad \text{(2)}_{Q3} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[ 
\text{Q3 2017} = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016}_{Q3}, \text{ Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017}_{Q2}
\]
Bus Safety: The majority of interviewers felt that drivers both braked and accelerated smoothly during their journey, although there have been significant increases in reports of drivers occasionally braking harshly versus last quarter. There have also been significant decreases in the number of drivers moving off too early ahead of passengers finding their seats.

Base: (197)

Q3 2017

**Q94 Driver Accelerated Smoothly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, felt comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh - minor discomfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh - moderate discomfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently too harsh - Felt it was dangerous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q95 Driver Braking Smoothly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, felt comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh - minor discomfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh - moderate discomfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently too harsh - Felt it was dangerous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally moved off too early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently moved off too early</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question amended in Q2 2016

---

**Q94** Generally, did the bus driver accelerate smoothly?

**Q95** Did the bus driver brake and take corners smoothly?

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

\[ (95)_{Q2}, (83)_{Q3}, (15)_{Q3} \]

\[ = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016}_{Q3}, \text{ Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017}_{Q2} \]
When Getting on the Bus: 4 interviewers found that the bus did not pull up to the footpath kerb when they boarded the bus. 3 reported that there was no specific for the restriction while 1 noted that there was another vehicle parked in the way. Of the 3 interviewers who noted the bus not pulling up to the kerb as they alighted the bus, all reported that there didn’t appear to be any specific restrictions.

Base: (4), IF NO TO PULL UP CLOSE TO KERB Q61/2, (3) IF NO TO PULL UP CLOSE TO KERB Q92/2

Q3 2017

**Q62 Why did the bus not pull up to the footpath kerb (4) %**

- Another vehicle was parked in the way: 25%
- There were other obstructions such as road works at the stop: -
- No footpath kerb was present: -
- No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction: 75%

**Q93 Why did the bus not pull up to the kerb (3) 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: 100%

📊 = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016 Q3, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017 Q2
Driver Actions: Interviewers found that buses nearly always stop to pick up passengers when signalled to do so

Q102 Stopped to Pick Up Passenger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not always stop to pick up, and no evident reason for not stopping</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was not requested during this journey, other than at boarding stop</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Could not always stop as bus was full

Base: (197)

Q3 2017

\[\downarrow(99)_{Q3}\]

\[\downarrow(100)_{Q2}\]

\[\downarrow(-)_{Q2}(1)_{Q3}\]

\[\downarrow\uparrow\text{ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016}_{Q3}, \text{ Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017}_{Q2}\]
Driver Behaviour: Positively, there were no reports of drivers engaging in any reckless behaviour again this quarter. There have been significant increases year on year in the number of drivers not seen to be listening to music while there have also been significant decreases in the number of drivers holding long conversations with other staff.

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

Q98 Driver Listening to Music/Radio

- Yes
- No

Q99 Driver Hold Long Conversations

- Yes with other staff
- Yes with passengers
- No
- Could not observe

Base: (197)

Q3 2017

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017

Q97 Q98 Q99

Did the bus driver do any of the following while driving?

Did the driver listen to music or the radio whilst driving?

Did the driver hold long conversations with other people on the bus while driving?
Driver Actions: Interviewers did not report any instances of drivers leaving buses unattended this quarter.

Q3 2017

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
Diversion or Terminated Early: Almost all interviewers experienced no diversions or early terminations during the course of their journey. For the 1 interviewer who experienced a diversion/termination, they were informed via the PA system on the bus.

Base: (197)

**Q3 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q107 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early</th>
<th>Q108 If Bus Diverted/Terminated Early (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Announce over PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Shout out information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inform passengers in some other way (e.g. tour the bus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to inform passengers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2016, Qtr 2 Mar - June 2017.