Outline of Presentation

• Background to Research

• Section 1: Stop Maintenance Performance (SI)

• Section 2: Customer Information Performance (CI)

• Section 3: Bus Equipment Performance - E.1

• Section 4: Cleanliness Performance - C.1: Bus Cleanliness

• Section 5: Bus Driver Performance - D.1
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’.

217 mystery shops were conducted during Quarter 4 2018 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. 13 Dublin Bus Head Office interviews were also completed and included in Quarter 4 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 4 2018: 10th September – 30th December 2018

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus previous quarter i.e. Qtr 3 July – Dec 2018 Q3 or year on year changes for same quarter last year i.e. Qtr 4 Oct – Dec 2018 Q4
Section 1:
Stop Maintenance Performance
Advertising on Shelter of Bus Stop: There were no instances of commercial advertising present on bus stop poles or shelters this quarter.

Base: (77), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q37/1, (113) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q38

Q4 2018

61% observed a Bus Stop Pole & 39% observed a shelter at the stop

Q 37 Additional Commercial Advertising on Shelter Glass (77) %

Q 38 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole (113) %

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018 Q3

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: 4 in 5 interviewers found the bus stop poles & shelters to be in good condition, dropping from last quarter, with uplifts in reports of both moderate damage QoQ and hazardous damage YoY. Bus shelters were thought to be in good condition by almost all interviewers, with 1 in 10 noting some moderate damage.

Base: (), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1, (113) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

Q4 2018

Q29b Condition of the Bus Pole (113)%

- Good condition: 82%
- Moderate damage: 15 (4)%
- Hazardous damage requiring immediate repair: 3 (96)%

Q31 Condition of the Bus Shelter (77)%

- Good condition: 90%
- Moderate damage: 9 (4)%
- Hazardous damage: 1

△ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018Q3

Q29b What is the condition of the bus stop pole and flag?
Q31 What is the condition of the bus shelter?
Information Display: 2 in 5 interviewers saw an information panel on the shelter, an uplift versus last quarter, while 1 in 5 observed a small panel on the pole. Of these, most felt that they were fully legible and clean with minimal instances of damage or obscuring reported.

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

Q4 2018

Note: Change in operator in Q3. Sig testing removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q28d* Information Display</th>
<th>Q28e* Condition of Display</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(183) %</td>
<td>(121) %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Panel on Pole</td>
<td>Fully legible and clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long panel on pole</td>
<td>Obscured by condensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information panel on shelter</td>
<td>Damaged or torn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 (28) Q3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFI Pole with information panel</td>
<td>Obscured by dirt / etching / graffiti /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not mounted correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018

* New for Q1 2018
Section 2:
Customer Information Performance
Fares: Almost all interviewers found the fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus, with no significant movements versus last quarter.

Base: (204)

Q4 2018

Q50 Were the Fares Displayed Clearly at the Entrance?

(204) %

98

2

Yes

No

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018.
**Timetable:** Almost all interviewers saw a bus stop number visible on the bus stop flag. Half saw a printed timetable present, while a third saw operative dates present on the timetables, both in decline versus last year.

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

**Q4 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q32 Bus Stop Number Visible</th>
<th>Q34 Printed Timetable Present</th>
<th>Q36 Operative Date Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(184) %</td>
<td>(113) %</td>
<td>(55) %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (29) 51</td>
<td>Yes (9) 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No (49)</td>
<td>No (45)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: New operator in Q3. Sig testing removed

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 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
Section 3: Bus Equipment Performance
When Getting on the Bus: Upon boarding the bus, 4 in 5 interviewers reported seeing the centre doors opening. Half noted the centre doors opening when alighting the bus.

Base: (113), IF YES TO CENTRE DOORS Q63, (29), EXCLUDING BUSES WITH NO ALIGHTING PASSENGERS

55% assessed buses with centre doors

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

(29)

- Yes: 17%
- No: 83%
- There was an obstruction

Q4 2018

---

Q91 Centre Doors Open for Passengers*
[Alighting Passengers]

(113)

- Yes: 51%
- No: 49%

---

*Interviewer instructions updated in Q2 2018
**Buses with no alighting passengers excluded

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018 Q3
On Board Displays/Announcements: Almost all interviewers who could see a display found that it was working correctly. Just under 4 in 5 found the next stop announcement was working correctly, while 1 in 5 felt it was working but too quietly.

Base: (201), ALL WHO COULD SEE A DISPLAY / HEAR AN ANNOUNCEMENT

### Q4 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q80* Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working %</th>
<th>Q81* Automatic Next Stop Announcement Working %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - was working correctly</td>
<td>Yes - working and volume was correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working but was not providing correct information</td>
<td>Yes - working but too loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display was turned off or not working</td>
<td>Yes - working but too quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not see a display</td>
<td>No - was not working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None on the bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018 Q3

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 four interviewers who saw a wheelchair ramp requested, all found that it was activated upon request.

Base: (4) If yes to WHEELCHAIR RAMP OR LIFT REQUEST Q105/1

Q106 Wheelchair Ramp/Lift Activated Upon Request

<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>

\[\text{\textdownarrow\rightarrow} = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018}_Q4^{Q4}, \text{ Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018}_Q3^{Q3}\]
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: (204)

Q4 2018

Q43 Route No. on Front

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not displayed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q44 Destination on Front

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not displayed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q45 Route No. on Side

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct route no. displayed</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect route no. displayed</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No route no. displayed</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was no display panel for route no.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not clearly see</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q87 Route No. on Back

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect route number shown</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No route number shown</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn’t see</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus * Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018, Q3

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, a significant improvement versus last year.

Base: (113), IF CCTV Camera Present

Q4 2018

Q82 CCTV in Stairwell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turned on and working correctly</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>+ (85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned on, but was not working properly</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned off</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CCTV display present</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No stairwell/single deck</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+ (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018.
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 just under 9 in 10 Leap interviewers were able to see what fare they were charged when boarding the bus.

Q56 Cash Fare (107)
Ticket Machine Working Correctly

Q58a Leap Card Reader Present at Driver Working Correctly (49)

Q60a Pole Mounted Leap Card Reader Working Correctly (48)

---

Q57a Cash Fare* Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt

Exact Change (53)

Not Exact Change (54)

Yes, printed ticket

Yes, printed ticket and change receipt

Got handwritten ticket

Was not given a ticket

100

78

22

---

Q59a Leap Card Reader at Driver See Fare Charged (49)*

Yes

86

Don’t know/Couldn’t tell

Machine was not working)

14

---

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
Section 4: Cleanliness Performance
Assessment of Seats: Bus seats were found to be free of graffiti and damage on all occasions, with significant improvements observed versus last quarter. Just under 9 in 10 interviewers found that seats were clean, however this is significantly down versus last year with reports of dust, crumbs and other ingrained dirt on the rise.

Q4 2018

Q69 Graffiti on Seats

- No Signs: 100%
- Minor graffiti or defacing: 8%
- Heavy defacing: 8%
- Offensive graffiti: 4%

Q70 Cleanliness of Seats

- Clean: 87%
- Significant dust or crumbs: 8%
- Gum or other ingrained dirt: 4%
- Wet or soiled: 1%

Q71 Damage to Seats

- No damage: 100%
- Minor tear, less than 2cm in length: 3%
- Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length: 1%
- Moderate damage: 1%
- Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure: 1%

\[\text{\textdownarrow and \textup = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018 Q3}\]
**Bus Interior:** Significant improvements in cleanliness of the floors and stairs versus last quarter, as well as among levels of graffiti on the fixtures and fittings. Cleanliness of the fixtures and fittings has declined, both versus last year and last quarter, with reports of light levels of dirt on the rise.

**Base:** (204)

**Q4 2018**

**Q75 Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs**
- Generally clean: 88% (72% Q3)
- Dirt or liquid spills: 7% (21% Q3)
- Dirt or liquid stains (dried): 5%

**Q76 Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs**
- Litter free: 64%
- Minimal level of litter: 29%
- Some litter: 6%
- A lot of litter: 1%

**Q77 Graffiti on Panels, Ceilings, Stairs and Other Fixtures/Fittings**
- No signs: 99% (92% Q3)
- Minor graffiti or etchings: 2%
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: 1%
- Offensive graffiti or etchings: 2%

**Q78 Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and Other Fixtures/Fittings**
- No signs of dirt: 59% (79% Q4, 73% Q3)
- Light dirt: 38% (13% Q4, 24% Q3)
- Moderately dirty: 2% (8% Q4)
- Very dirty: 2%

*Question amended in Q2 2016*

\(\downarrow\uparrow = \) Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018\(_{Q4}\), Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018\(_{Q3}\)

**Q75** What best describes level of cleanliness of floors and stairs?

**Q76** What best describes level of litter on seats, floors or stairs?

**Q77** What best describes level of graffiti or etchings on panels, ceilings, stairs and other fixtures and fittings?

**Q78** What best describes level of cleanliness of panels, ceilings and other fixtures and fittings?
**Bus Windows:** All interviewers reported no signs of graffiti or etchings on bus windows, improving both versus last year and last quarter. Reports of light levels of dirt on the windows have been on the rise versus both last year and last quarter, with instances of heavier dirt and no signs of dirt in decline.

Base: (204)

Q4 2018

### Q72 Graffiti on Windows

- **No signs:** 100%
- **Minor graffiti:** 2%
- **Heavy graffiti:** 11%
- **Offensive graffiti:** 3%

### Q73 Etching on Windows

- **No signs:** 100%
- **Minor etching:** 3%
- **Heavy etching:** 11%
- **Offensive etching:** 2%

### Q74 Cleanliness of Windows

- **No signs of dirt:** 38%
- **Light dirt:** 50%
- **Moderately dirty:** 11%
- **Very dirty:** 4%

\(\uparrow\) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018\(_{Q4}\), Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018\(_{Q3}\)
Front/Side of Bus: Encouragingly, almost no interviewers reported any signs of visible damage to the front/side of the buses, with reports of light paintwork scratches in decline versus last quarter. 4 in 5 felt the front and sides of the bus were clean, however reports of moderate dirt on the rise versus last year. 3 in 5 found the rear of the buses were clean, while a third observed signs of dirt that was likely to have been picked up during operations that day.

Base: (204)

Q4 2018

Q47 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus

- Yes: 82%
- No Visible Damage: 99%
- Light dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today: 15%
- Moderately dirty: 3%
- Very dirty, likely to have accumulated over several days: 2%

Q48 Visible Damage to Front/Side of Bus

- No Visible Damage: 99%
- Light paintwork scratches only: 1%
- Minor bodywork damage: (6) Q3
- Serious damage to bodywork: (-2) Q3

Q90 Was the Rear of Bus Clean?

- Yes: 64%
- Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operation: 29%
- Heavy dirt, likely to have accumulated over more than one day’s operation: 4%
- Couldn’t see: (-2) Q3

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018 Q3
Section 5: 
Bus Driver Performance
Driver Assessment: Drivers remain very highly regarded by almost all interviewers in terms of both attitude and presentation.

Q51 Helpful
- Yes
- No

Q52 Polite
- Yes
- No

Q54 Driver Wearing Uniform
- Yes
- No

Q55 Driver Well Presented
- Yes
- No

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?

Base: (204)

Q1 2018

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018 Q3.
Bus Safety: The majority of interviewers felt that drivers both braked and accelerated smoothly during their journey, with significant improvements versus last quarter. 4 in 5 interviewers felt that passengers were given enough time to find their seats or hold on, declining versus last year.

Base: (217)

### Q4 2018

#### Q94 Driver Accelerated Smoothly*

- Yes, felt comfortable: 87%
- Occasionally felt too harsh - minor discomfort: 6%
- Occasionally felt too harsh - moderate discomfort: 2%
- Frequently too harsh: 7%
- Felt it was dangerous: -

#### Q95 Driver Braking Smoothly*

- Yes, felt comfortable: 85%
- Occasionally felt too harsh - minor discomfort: 7%
- Occasionally felt too harsh - moderate discomfort: 13%
- Frequently too harsh: 2%
- Felt it was dangerous: -

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

- Yes: 83%
- Occasionally moved off too early: 9%
- Frequently moved off too early: 1%
- Felt it was dangerous: -

**Question amended in Q2 2016**

\[\uparrow\downarrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018} \]
When Getting on the Bus: 5 interviewers found that the bus did not pull up to the footpath kerb when they boarded the bus. On 2 of these occasions, there didn’t appear to be any specific reason for the restriction while on the other 3 occasions, another vehicle was parked in the way. Of the 3 interviewers who noted that the bus did not pull up to the kerb as they alighted the bus, 2 didn’t see a specific reason for the restriction while on the other occasion, another vehicle was parked in the way.

---

**Q4 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q62 Why did the bus not pull up to the footpath kerb (5) Boarding</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another vehicle was parked in the way</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were other obstructions such as road works at the stop</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No footpath kerb was present</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q93 Why did the bus not pull up to the kerb (3) Alighting</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other bus was in the way</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vehicles were parked in the way</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were other obstructions</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was no kerb at my destination stop</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reason - Please record details</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018 Q3
Driver Actions: All interviewers found that buses stopped to pick up passengers when signalled to do so, improving versus last quarter.

Base: (192), ALL THOSE REQUESTED TO STOP

Q4 2018

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

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018_{Q4}, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018_{Q3}

* Question rebased off those whose bus was requested to stop
Driver Behaviour: Positively, there were no reports of drivers engaging in any reckless behaviour again this quarter. Just under 9 in 10 saw no signs of drivers listening to the radio, an improvement versus last year, whilst almost all saw no signs of drivers holding long conversations with other passengers or staff.

Q7 Did Bus Driver do Any of the Following:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use mobile phone while driving</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear an earpiece while driving</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive the bus in a dangerous manner</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8 Driver Listening to Music/Radio  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening to Music/Radio</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to Passengers</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to Other Staff</td>
<td>(17)Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could Not Observe</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9 Driver Hold Long Conversations  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hold Long Conversations with Passengers</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold Long Conversations with Other Staff</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could Not Observe</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018.
**Driver Actions:** Interviewers did not report any instances of drivers leaving buses unattended this quarter

Base: (204)

### Q4 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q100 Driver Left Bus Unattended</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - because of driver change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - to go to shops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - to go to toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - some other reason - Please record details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – don’t know the reason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\downarrow\uparrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018}_Q4, \ Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018}_Q3\]
Diversion or Terminated Early: There were 2 instances of early diversions / terminations this quarter

Base: (204)

Q4 2018

Q107 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early

1 Yes
99 No

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018fig. Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2018fig.