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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’.

195 mystery shops were conducted during Quarter 2 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 2 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 2 2019: 26th March – 18th June 2019

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus previous quarter i.e. Qtr 1 Jan – March 2019 or year on year changes for same quarter last year i.e. Qtr 2 March – June 2018.
Section 1:
Stop Maintenance Performance
Advertising on Shelter of Bus Stop: continued low level of third party advertising on bus shelter glass. No signs of third party commercial advertising present on the bus stop poles.

Base: (113) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29

Q2 2019

63% observed a Bus Stop Pole & Flag

Q37 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Shelter glass
(76)

- Yes
- No

87

Q38 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole
(113)

- Yes
- No

100

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 Q1

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:** Over 4 out of 5 found the bus stop poles & shelters to be in good condition, with just over 1 in 10 reporting signs of moderate damage.

Base: (76), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1, (113) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

**Q2 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q29b Condition of the Bus Pole</th>
<th>Q31 Condition of the Bus Shelter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good condition</td>
<td>Good condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate damage</td>
<td>Moderate damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous damage requiring immediate repair</td>
<td>Hazardous damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019Q1
Information Display: 4 in 5 interviewers saw an information display present at the bus stop. Increase in reports of small panel on pole vs last quarter and year on year. Of these, most felt that they were fully legible and clean with minimal instances of damage reported.

Base: (178), IF POLE OR SHELTER AT Q28C

Q2 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q28d* Information Display</th>
<th>Q28e* Condition of Display</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(178)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(151)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Panel on Pole</td>
<td>Fully legible and clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long panel on pole</td>
<td>Obscured by condensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information panel on shelter</td>
<td>Damaged or torn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFI Pole with information panel</td>
<td>Obscured by dirt / etching / graffiti /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not mounted correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019

* New for Q1 2018
Section 2:
Customer Information Performance
Fares: Nearly all interviewers found the fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus.

Base: (195)

Q2 2019

Q50 Were the Fares Displayed Clearly at the Entrance?

(195)

% 

\( (3)_{Q1} \downarrow \)

\( 1 \)

\( 99 \)

\( (97)_{Q1} \uparrow \)

Yes

No

\( \downarrow \uparrow = \) Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018\(_{Q2}\), Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019\(_{Q1}\)
Timetable: Almost all interviewers saw a bus stop number visible on the bus stop flag. 4 in 5 saw printed timetables with 3 in 4 reporting timetables with operative dates present at the bus stop. Both measures up vs Q1

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

Q2 2019

**Q32 Bus Stop Number Visible**
- Yes: 98%
- No: 2%

**Q34 Printed Timetable Present**
- Yes: 80%
- Present but could not read: 20%

**Q36 Operative Date Present**
- Yes: 71%
- No: 23%
- Present but could not read: 6%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019

- 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. Over two thirds noted the centre doors opening when alighting the bus.

**Q64 Did the Driver Open the Centre Doors?**

[Boarding Passengers]

67% assessed buses with centre doors

**Q91 Centre Doors Open for Passengers**

[Alighting Passengers]

Q2 2019

- Yes: 32%
- No: 68%
- There was no obstruction

- Yes: 18%
- No: 81%

Base: (148), IF YES TO CENTRE DOORS Q63, (80), EXCLUDING BUSES WITH NO ALIGHTING PASSENGERS

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019.
**On Board Displays/Announcements:** Over 9 out of 10 interviewers found the electronic displays were working correctly. 9 out of 10 interviewers report the of automatic next stop announcements working correctly and the volume was correct.

Base: (195)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q80 Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - was working correctly</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working but was not providing correct information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display was turned off or not working</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not see a display</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q81 Automatic Next Stop Announcement Working</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - working and volume was correct</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - working but too loud</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - working but too quiet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - was not working</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None on the bus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2 2019</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Downarrow = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 Q1
On Board Displays/Announcements: Almost all interviewers who could see a display found that it was working correctly. 9 out of 10 found the next stop announcement was working correctly, while under 1 in 10 felt it was working but too quiet.

Base: (194), ALL WHO COULD SEE A DISPLAY / HEAR AN ANNOUNCEMENT

Q2 2019

Q80* Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes - was working correctly</th>
<th>Working but was not providing correct information</th>
<th>Display was turned off or not working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q81* Automatic Next Stop Announcement Working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes - working and volume was correct</th>
<th>Yes - working but too quiet</th>
<th>No - was not working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018_Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019_Q1
Wheelchair Ramp/Lift: Among the four interviewers who saw a wheelchair ramp requested, they found that it was activated upon request.

**Q2 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q106 Wheelchair Ramp/ Lift Activated Upon Request</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - driver stated it was broken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - person requesting was not a wheelchair user</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - driver refused to activate because unsafe to do so at the stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - driver stated no wheelchair ramp or lift present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - other reason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - no reason given</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018\(_{Q2}\), Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019\(_{Q1}\)
Route Number and Destination Visible: Almost all found both the route numbers & destinations to be clearly visible on all sides of the bus.

Base: (195)

Q43 Route No. on Front

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

Q44 Destination on Front

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

Q45 Route No. on Side

- Correct route no. displayed: 100%
- Incorrect route no. displayed: 0%
- No route no. displayed: 0%
- There was no display panel for route no. Could not clearly see: 0%

Q47 Route No. on Back

- Yes: 97%
- Incorrect route number shown: 0%
- No route number shown: 0%
- Couldn’t see: 3%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 Q1

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?
Q47 Was the correct route number displayed on the back of the bus?
CCTV: Over 9 in 10 interviewers found the CCTV screens in the stairwells to be turned on and functioning correctly, minor report of no CCTV display present.

Q2 2019

Q82 CCTV in Stairwell

% narrowing

Turned on and working correctly

98

Turned on, but was not working properly

1

Turned off

No CCTV display present

1

No stairwell/single deck

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Q1

Was there a CCTV screen in stairwell on the bus?

Base: (148), IF CCTV Camera Present
Fare Payment: Ticket machines and leap card readers were found to be present and functioning correctly by almost all. Cash payers received a printed ticket or change receipt where appropriate, whilst three quarters of Leap users were able to see what fare they were charged when boarding the bus.

Q56 Cash Fare (94)
Ticket Machine Working Correctly

Q57a Cash Fare*
Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt
Exact Change (41)
Not Exact Change (53)

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

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

Q60a Pole Mounted Leap Card Reader Working Correctly (52)

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 2 Mar - Jun 2018 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 Q1

*Question amended in Q2 2016
Assessment of Seats: Bus seats were found free of graffiti and damage on all occasions. Over 9 in 10 found that seats were clean, minor incidences of dust or crumbs. Virtually no damage to seats which is an improvement on the same quarter last year.

Q2 2019

Q69 Graffiti on Seats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Signs</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor graffiti or defacing</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy defacing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive graffiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q70 Cleanliness of Seats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant dust or crumbs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gum or other ingrained dirt</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet or soiled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q71 Damage to Seats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor tear, less than 2cm in length</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate damage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019.
Bus Interior: The majority of interviewers found the bus interiors to be generally clean and free of graffiti or dirt although there was an increase in the reporting of dirt or liquid stains on floors/stairs. A third saw minimal levels of litter on seats/floors a significant uplift year on year, while 1 in 5 saw signs of light dirt on panels, ceilings, etc.

**Q75 Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs**

- Generally clean: 88%
- Dirt or liquid spills: 5%
- Dirt or liquid stains (dried): 7%

**Q76 Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs**

- Litter free: 64%
- Minimal level of litter: 30%
- Some litter: 5%

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

- No signs: 100%
- Minor graffiti or etchings: 21%
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: 5%

**Q78 Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and Other Fixtures/Fittings**

- No signs of dirt: 74%
- Light dirt: 21%
- Moderately dirty: 5%

*Question amended in Q2 2019*
Bus Windows: No signs of graffiti on bus windows and virtually no etching on windows, both measures show a significant improvement on last year. Nearly two thirds found the bus windows had no signs of dirt, a significant uplift.

**Q2 2019**

**Q72 Graffiti on Windows**
- No signs: 100%
- Minor graffiti: 3%
- Heavy graffiti: 1%
- Offensive graffiti: -

**Q73 Etching on Windows**
- No signs: 99%
- Minor etching: 4%
- Heavy etching: -
- Offensive etching: -

**Q74 Cleanliness of Windows**
- No signs of dirt: 60%
- Light dirt: 30%
- Moderately dirty: 9%
- Very dirty: -

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019
Front/Side of Bus: Minimal reporting of any signs of visible damage to the front/side of the buses. 9 out of 10 felt the front and sides of the bus were clean, significantly up from last quarter, while 3 in 4 found the rear of the buses were clean, again up on the previous quarter.

Base: (195)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q47 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus</th>
<th>Q48 Visible Damage to Front/Side of Bus</th>
<th>Q90 Was the Rear of Bus Clean?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Yes</td>
<td>% No Visible Damage</td>
<td>% Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today</td>
<td>Light paintwork scratches only</td>
<td>Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately dirty</td>
<td>Minor bodywork damage</td>
<td>Heavy dirt, likely to have accumulated over more than one day’s operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty, likely to have accumulated over several days</td>
<td>Serious damage to bodywork</td>
<td>Couldn’t see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(82) Q2</td>
<td>(18) Q2</td>
<td>(63) Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(81) Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 Q1
Section 5: Bus Driver Performance
**Driver Assessment:** Drivers remain very highly regarded by almost all interviewers in terms of both attitude and presentation year on year

*Base: (195)*

**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?

**Q2 2019**

- **Q51 Helpful**
  - Yes: 99
  - No: 1

- **Q52 Polite**
  - Yes: 99
  - No: 1

- **Q54 Driver Wearing Uniform**
  - Yes: 97
  - No: 3

- **Q55 Driver Well Presented**
  - Yes: 98
  - No: 2

**Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 Q1.**
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

Q2 2019

Q104 How did driver handle situation? (1)

- Polite
- Professional
- Friendly
- Indifferent or ignored passenger
- Rude or sarcastic 100
- Abusive

*Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018¹, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019²*. 
**Bus Safety:** The majority of interviewers felt that drivers both braked and accelerated smoothly during their journey, in keeping with the improvements seen in Q1. Almost all felt that passengers were given enough time to find their seats or hold on with an improvement versus last quarter for those that felt the bus moved off too early.

**Q2 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Q94 Driver Accelerated Smoothly</strong>*</th>
<th><strong>Q95 Driver Braking Smoothly</strong>*</th>
<th><strong>Q96 Did the driver give passengers adequate time to find their seats or hold on?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, felt comfortable</td>
<td>Yes, felt comfortable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh</td>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh</td>
<td>Occasionally moved off too early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of origin:</td>
<td>Place of origin:</td>
<td>Place of origin:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question amended in Q2 2016

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 (Q2), Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 (Q1)
When Getting on the Bus: 4 incidents where the bus did not pull up to the footpath kerb when boarding the bus, for no specific reason. Of the 3 interviewers who noted that the bus did not pull up to the kerb as they alighted the bus, 1 stated there was a bus in the way but 2 reported that there was no specific reason for the restriction.

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

### Q62 Why did the bus not pull up to the footpath kerb (4) Boarding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another vehicle was parked in the way</td>
<td>-</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>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q93 Why did the bus not pull up to the kerb (3) Alighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other bus was in the way</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vehicles were parked in the way</td>
<td>-</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 2 Mar - Jun 2018 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 Q1*
Driver Actions: Almost all found that buses stopped to pick up passengers when signalled to do so, with a significant improvement observed versus the same time last year.

So far as you could tell, did the driver always stop to pick up passengers when requested?

Q102 Stopped to Pick Up Passenger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(92)</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

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 Q1
Driver Behaviour: There was just one report of a driver driving in a dangerous manner. 4 in 5 saw no signs of drivers listening to the radio, a drop from the same quarter last year, whilst almost all saw no signs of drivers holding long conversations with other passengers or staff.

**Q2 2019**

**Q97 Did Bus Driver do Any of the Following:**

- Use mobile phone while driving: 1
- Wear an earpiece while driving: 1
- Drive the bus in a dangerous manner: 1
- None of these: 99

**Q98 Driver Listening to Music/Radio**

- Yes: 15
- No: 83
- Could not observe: 91

**Q99 Driver Hold Long Conversations**

- Yes with other staff: 1
- Yes with passengers: 99
- No: 99
- Could not observe: 99

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019.
**Driver Actions:** Interviewers did not report any instances of drivers leaving buses unattended

Base: (195)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2 2019</th>
<th>Q100 Driver Left Bus Unattended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - because of driver change</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - to go to shops</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - to go to toilet</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes -some other reason - Please record details</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – don’t know the reason</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019.
Diversion or Terminated Early: Just 4 reported early diversions or terminations this quarter

Base: (195)

Q107 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early

Q2 2019

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?

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019

Diversion or Terminated Early: Just 4 reported early diversions or terminations this quarter

Base: (195)

Q107 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early

Q2 2019

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?

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019