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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’.

210 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. 10 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 2019: 1st January – 25th March 2019

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus previous quarter i.e. Qtr 4 Oct – Dec 2018 Q4 or year on year changes for same quarter last year i.e. Qtr 1 Jan – Mar 2018 Q1
Section 1: Stop Maintenance Performance
Advertising on Shelter of Bus Stop: No interviewers saw signs of commercial advertising present on the bus stop poles

Base: (77), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q37/1, (110) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1 2019</th>
<th>57% observed a Bus Stop Pole &amp; 46% observed a Bus Shelter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q37 Additional Commercial Advertising on Shelter Glass</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Yes
- No

100

Q38 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole

- Yes
- No

100

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

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: More than 4 in 5 interviewers found the bus stop poles to be in good condition, with less than 1 in 5 reporting signs of moderate damage. Bus shelters were thought to be in good condition by almost 9 in 10 interviewers, however this has dropped versus the same time last year.

Base: (84), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1, (110) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

Q1 2019

Q29b Condition of the Bus Pole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good condition</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate damage</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratches/graffiti</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous damage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q31 Condition of the Bus Shelter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good condition</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate damage</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous damage</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Q29b What is the condition of the bus stop pole and flag?
Q31 What is the condition of the bus shelter?
**Information Display:** Over a third of interviewers saw an information display present at the bus stop, followed by a small panel on the pole. Of these, the majority felt that they were fully legible and clean with minimal instances of obscuring reported.

Base: (183), IF POLE OR SHELTER AT Q28C

**Q1 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q28d* Information Display</th>
<th>Q28e* Condition of Display</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(181) %</td>
<td>(144) %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Panel on Pole</td>
<td>Fully legible and clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long panel on pole</td>
<td>Obscured by condensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (6) Q4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information panel on shelter</td>
<td>Damaged or torn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFI Pole with information panel</td>
<td>Obscured by dirt / etching / graffiti /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (1) Q4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not mounted correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 (35) Q1 (34) Q4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Change in operator in Q3. Sig testing removed

*New for Q1 2018

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

**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: Almost all interviewers found the fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus.

Q50 Were the Fares Displayed Clearly at the Entrance? (210)

%  
Yes 97  
No 3

Q1 2019

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018_{Q1} vs. Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018_{Q4}
Timetable: Nearly all interviewers saw a bus stop number visible on the bus stop flag. 3 in 4 saw printed timetables present timetables at the bus stop while over half saw operative dates on these timetables.

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

Q1 2019

Q32 Bus Stop Number Visible
(183) %

Q34 Printed Timetable Present
(145) %

Q36 Operative Date Present
(106) %

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

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

Note: New operator in Q3. Sig testing removed
Section 3: Bus Equipment Performance
When Getting on the Bus: Upon boarding the bus, 3 in 4 interviewers reported seeing the centre doors opening. 3 in 5 noted the centre doors opening when alighting the bus, a significant decline versus last year.

Base: (143), IF YES TO CENTRE DOORS Q63, (68), EXCLUDING BUSES WITH NO ALIGHTING PASSENGERS

68% assessed buses with centre doors

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

(68)

% 76

Yes 22
No

There was an obstruction

Q1 2019

Q91 Centre Doors Open for Passengers*  
[Alighting Passengers]

(143)

% 60

Yes 40
No 60

↑ (28) Q1

↓ (73) Q1

*Interviewer instructions updated in Q1 2019

**Buses with no alighting passengers excluded
On Board Displays/Announcements: All interviewers who could see a display found that it was working correctly. Over 4 in 5 found the next stop announcement was working correctly, a significant drop versus last year, while 1 in 10 felt it was working but too quiet, increasing versus last year.

Base: (209), ALL WHO COULD SEE A DISPLAY / HEAR AN ANNOUNCEMENT

Q1 2019

Q80* Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes - was working correctly</th>
<th>Working but was not providing correct information</th>
<th>Display was turned off or not working</th>
<th>Could not see a display</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q81* Automatic Next Stop Announcement Working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes - working and volume was correct</th>
<th>Yes - working but too loud</th>
<th>Yes - working but too quiet</th>
<th>No - was not working</th>
<th>None on the bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(94) Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Q1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* Question rebased off those who could see a display / hear an announcement
Wheelchair Ramp/Lift: For the four interviewers who saw a wheelchair ramp requested, all found that it was activated upon request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1 2019</th>
<th>Wheelchair Ramp/Lift Activated Upon Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<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 1 Jan - Mar 2018 Q1, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 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.

**Q1 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q43 Route No. on Front</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not displayed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not clearly see</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44 Destination on Front</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not displayed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not clearly see</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45 Route No. on Side</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct route no. displayed</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect route no. displayed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No route no. displayed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was no display panel for route no.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not clearly see</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q87 Route No. on Back</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect route number shown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No route number shown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn’t see</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus * Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 Q1, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 Q4
CCTV: More than 9 in 10 interviewers who saw a CCTV display present found they were turned on and functioning correctly.

Base: (143), IF CCTV Camera Present

Q1 2019

Q82 CCTV in Stairwell

%  

Turned on and working correctly 95

Turned on, but was not working properly

Turned off

No CCTV display present

No stairwell/single deck

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

Was there a CCTV screen in stairwell on the bus?
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, all received a printed ticket or change receipt where appropriate, whilst just under 7 in 10 Leap interviewers were able to see what fare they were charged when boarding the bus, declining versus last quarter.

Q1 2019

Q56 Cash Fare (112)
Ticket Machine Working Correctly

Q58a Leap Card Reader Present at Driver Working Correctly (50)

Q60a Pole Mounted Leap Card Reader Working Correctly (48)

Q57a Cash Fare*
Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt

Q59a Leap Card Reader at Driver See Fare Charged (50)

Exact Change (54)
Not Exact Change (58)

Yes, printed ticket

Yes, printed ticket and change receipt

Got handwritten ticket

Was not given a ticket

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

= Multicoded Question

*Question amended in Q2 2018

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

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

Q56a 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 all occasions. 9 in 10 interviewers found that seats were clean, with reports of dust, crumbs or other ingrained dirt only reported at minimum levels.

Base: (210)

Q69 Graffiti on Seats

- No Signs: 100%
- Minor graffiti or defacing:
- Heavy defacing:
- Offensive graffiti:

Q70 Cleanliness of Seats

- Clean: 90%
- Significant dust or crumbs:
- Gum or other ingrained dirt:
- Wet or soiled:

Q71 Damage to Seats

- No: 100%
- Minor tear, less than 2cm in length:
- Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length:
- Moderate damage:
- Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure:

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 Q1, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 Q4.
Bus Interior: There have been significant improvements in the cleanliness of floors and stairs versus last year, as well as on the panels, ceilings and other fixtures/fittings. Almost all saw no signs of graffiti while 7 in 10 found the seats/floors and stairs were litter free.

Base: (210)

Q75 Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs %
- Generally clean: 93%
- Dirt or liquid spills: 4%
- Dirt or liquid stains (dried): 3%

Q76 Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs*
- Litter free: 68%
- Minimal level of litter: 27%
- Some litter: 3%

Q77 Graffiti on Panels, Ceilings, Stairs and Other Fixtures/Fittings %
- No signs: 99%
- Minor graffiti or etchings: 2%
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: 1%
- Offensive graffiti or etchings: 0%

Q78 Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and Other Fixtures/Fittings %
- No signs of dirt: 73%
- Light dirt: 22%
- Moderately dirty: 5%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018\textsubscript{Q1}, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018\textsubscript{Q4}
**Bus Windows:** No interviewers reported signs of graffiti or etchings on bus windows. Almost half of interviewers found the bus windows had no signs of dirt, increasing versus last quarter. 1 in 3 saw light dirt on the windows, dropping versus last quarter, however, reports of very dirty windows have increased.

Base: (210)

### Q1 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q72 Graffiti on Windows</th>
<th>Q73 Etching on Windows</th>
<th>Q74 Cleanliness of Windows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No signs</td>
<td>No signs</td>
<td>No signs of dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor graffiti</td>
<td>Minor etching</td>
<td>Light dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy graffiti</td>
<td>Heavy etching</td>
<td>Moderately dirty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive graffiti</td>
<td>Offensive etching</td>
<td>Very dirty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0) Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(38) Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(50) Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0) Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018
Front/Side of Bus: Encouragingly, no interviewers reported any signs of serious damage to the front/side of the buses. 4 in 5 felt the front and sides of the bus were clean, while 3 in 5 found the rear of the buses were clean, with no significant movements observed. Signs of dirt were mainly thought to have been picked up during operations that day.

Base: (210)

Q47 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus

- Yes: 81%
- Light dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today: 17%
- Moderately dirty: 2%
- Very dirty, likely to have accumulated over several days: 2%

Q48 Visible Damage to Front/Side of Bus

- No Visible Damage: 98%
- Light paintwork scratches only: 1%
- Minor bodywork damage: 1%
- Serious damage to bodywork: 1%

Q90 Was the Rear of Bus Clean?

- Yes: 63%
- Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operation: 30%
- Heavy dirt, likely to have accumulated over more than one day’s operation: 3%
- Couldn’t see: 2%

\[ \downarrow \uparrow \text{ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018}_Q1, \quad \text{Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018}_Q4 \]
Section 5: Bus Driver Performance
Driver Interaction: On the 3 occasions where a driver dispute was observed, the driver was thought to handle the situation in a polite and professional manner.

**Q1 2019**

Q104 How did driver handle situation? (3)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polite</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>67</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>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- "Leap Card balance"
- "Don't know what it was about, possibly fares. She just said I heard you, don't need to go on. This was at start and end of journey with a nurse".
- "Brief altercation with passengers (schoolchildren) pressing the bell when not getting off, causing the bus to stop unnecessarily".

Base: (3), If yes to DRIVER DISPUTE Q103
Driver Assessment: Drivers remain very highly regarded by almost all interviewers in terms of both attitude and presentation. Declines observed in the number of drivers wearing uniform versus last year.

Base: (210)

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?

Questions to Driver
- 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?

\[\text{Q1 2019}\]

Q51 Helpful

Yes
No

100

Q52 Polite

Yes
No

100

Q54 Driver Wearing Uniform

Yes
No

94

Q55 Driver Well Presented

Yes
No

99

\[\text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018}_Q1, \text{ Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018}_Q4\]
Bus Safety: Most interviewers felt that drivers both braked and accelerated smoothly during their journey, with minimal reports of discomfort, however, there has been a significant drop in the number of drivers giving passengers adequate time to find their seats or hold on versus last year, with 1 in 10 reporting drivers occasionally moving off too early.

Base: (220)

**Q94 Driver Accelerated Smoothly**

- Yes, felt comfortable: 89%
- Occasionally felt too harsh - minor discomfort: 2%
- Occasionally felt too harsh - moderate discomfort: 5%
- Frequently too harsh: -
- Felt it was dangerous: -

**Q95 Driver Braking Smoothly**

- Yes, felt comfortable: 86%
- Occasionally felt too harsh - minor discomfort: 6%
- Occasionally felt too harsh - moderate discomfort: 2%
- Frequently too harsh: 1%
- Felt it was dangerous: -

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

- Yes: 85%
- Occasionally moved off too early: 9%
- Frequently moved off too early: 1%
- Felt it was dangerous: -

\( \uparrow \downarrow \) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018.

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?
When Getting on the Bus: 4 interviewers found that the bus did not pull up to the footpath kerb when they boarded the bus. On each of these occasions, there didn’t appear to be any specific reason for the restriction. Of the 6 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 once again.

Base: (4), IF NO TO PULL UP CLOSE TO KERB Q61/2, (6) IF NO TO PULL UP CLOSE TO KERB Q92/2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q62 Why did the bus not pull up to the footpath kerb (4)*</th>
<th>Q93 Why did the bus not pull up to the kerb (6)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boarding</strong> %</td>
<td><strong>Alighting</strong> %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another vehicle was parked in the way</td>
<td>Other bus was in the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were other obstructions such as road works at the stop</td>
<td>Other vehicles were parked in the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No footpath kerb was present</td>
<td>There were other obstructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction</td>
<td>There was no kerb at my destination stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other reason - Please record details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1 2019

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2018 Q1, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 Q4
Driver Actions: All interviewers found that buses always stopped to pick up passengers when signalled to do so

Base: (210), ALL THOSE REQUESTED TO STOP

Q1 2019

Q102 Stopped to Pick Up Passenger

% 100

Yes

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 Q1, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 Q4
Driver Behaviour: Encouragingly, there were no reports of drivers engaging in any reckless behaviour this quarter. 3 in 4 saw no signs of drivers listening to the radio, declining vs last quarter, whilst almost all saw no signs of drivers holding long conversations with other passengers or staff.

Q1 2019

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
- Could not observe

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, Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018.
Driver Actions: Interviewers did not report any instances of drivers leaving buses unattended this quarter

Base: (210)

Q1 2019

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, Q4 Sep - Dec 2018
Diversion or Terminated Early: Just one interviewer reported an early diversion or termination this quarter.

Base: (210)

Q1 2019

Q107 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early

- Yes
- No

1
99

‘Announced that due to incident would not be heading through Killenard’

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