

Methodology (1)

- There are two elements in the on-line quantitative research a new survey and a repeat of the methodology used in the 2013 research which used recontacts from National Rail Passenger Survey (NRPS)
- For the new survey, respondents were recruited by email invite from the consumer web panel maintained by Survey Sampling International (SSI). The new survey was designed to be easily replicable and to overcome known limitations of the NRPS recontact database. (Because NRPS itself uses a journey-based sampling approach, the database over-represents commuters and requires weighting to deliver a representative sample of passengers. The database is also relatively small and would not provide sufficient contacts for regular updating)
- There were two phases to the on-line fieldwork which SSI conducted:
 - The first consisted of a stratified random sample survey with targets set by age, gender and region to represent the total population of rail passengers
 - The second consisted of a booster survey of delayed passenger to ensure a sufficiently large sample for accurate analysis
 - From both phases, 3,488 people were interviewed who had experienced a delay of 30 minutes or more in the last six months
- As part of the SSI fieldwork, 500 short interviews with people who had not experienced delays were conducted to understand how non-delayed passengers' attitudes to current compensation policies and processes differ from delayed passengers
- Interviewing was undertaken during March 2016
 - This was before the ORR (Office of Rail and Road) response to the Which? super-complaint was published transportfocus

Methodology (2)

- The new survey uses an improved, more representative methodology compared with that used in 2013; as a result caution has to be exercised in comparing the results
- To provide a like-for-like comparison and to assess what effects, if any, the improved methodology might have had on the results, an additional survey was conducted using the same methodology as in 2013:
 - The main difference between the surveys is that the 2013 research used a sample of respondents already interviewed as part of the National Rail Passenger Survey (NRPS)
 - The NRPS sample is comprised of those who have completed the NRPS questionnaire and who agreed to being re-contacted by Transport Focus, to take part in future research projects about the rail industry
 - Respondents from the last four waves of NRPS (Spring '13 Autumn '15) were invited to take part in this research. Interviewing was undertaken during March 2016
 - Because the NRPS survey is weighted towards the mix of journeys rather than the mix of passengers, it includes a higher proportion of commuters than the new approach. It has been weighted to correct for this although there remain a few small differences between the samples
 - Where the same question is asked as in 2013, the new methodology produces broadly similar results and we
 believe that comparisons at the macro level are a reasonable indication of trends although they cannot be
 relied on at the detailed percentage level
- Response rates on both elements of the research were 10%



Methodology (3)

- This report compares the results from the original 2013 research with the two 2016 samples passengers contacted through the SSI panel and the NRPS recontacts
- Sample sizes vary by question (both because some questions are not asked of all respondents and because those replying don't know are typically excluded). But the key (weighted) sample sizes are:
 - 2016 Main sample = 3,811 delayed by 30 minutes or more in the past six months
 - 2016 NRPS recontacts = 770 delayed by 30 minutes or more in the past six months
 - 2013 NRPS recontacts = 503 delayed by 30 minutes or more in the past six months
- The 2016 findings are reported and commented upon in greater detail in the main presentation. In that presentation, where we make comparisons between 2013 and 2016 we use the SSI sample, not the NRPS sample
 - The SSI sample is larger and more robust; if the research is repeated in future years, we would expect to replicate the SSI sample
 - However, the change in methodology between 2013 and the 2016 SSI sample means that the two samples are
 not directly comparable and any changes in the findings should be regarded as 'directional' rather than
 definitive
 - Nevertheless, we are confident in using the data from the larger SSI sample in the main presentation because, as this report shows, the smaller, directly matched NRPS sample shows the same directional changes
 - In this report we comment on and explain any substantive differences between the results of the two 2016 samples; in the main these are attributable to the source and nature of each sample

How to read the charts

Comparisons are based on comparing the 2013 results with the 2016 main sample

Summary question wording

Data from the main 2016 SSI sample. Changes since 2013 are highlighted in the commentary on the basis of differences between this sample and the 2013 NRPS sample

How many delays of 30 minutes or more would you say you have experienced in the last six months?

Amongst those delayed in the past six months, there has been a small increase in the number of delays suffered

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
	36%	37%	41%
	40%	37%	
4-9 delays	15%	18%	
10-19 delays	5%	5%	
20+ delays	2%	2%	4%
Mean number of delays	3.2	3.4	2.6
Q1 How many delays of 30 minutes or more would you say (Delayed by 30 mins or more in last six months)	you have experienced in	"nse= 3,811 / 770 / 503	•
187928 Transport Focus - Rail Delays and Dr. Naport 05/01	Mean sci	nres are shown li	n italics) where

Full question wording, base sizes (from left to right: 2016 (main sample) / 2016 (NRPS recontacts) / 2013 (NRPS recontacts) and definition of respondents asked this question Mean scores are shown (in italics) where appropriate, as are summary totals combining two or more individual answers

Data from the 2013 research based on recontacting respondents from the NRPS

Data from the 2016 NRPS recontact sample. In the main these are directionally similar to the SSI sample; where substantive differences exist between this column and the main 2016 SSI sample we provide comments as to why we believe these have come about

Statistical significance

Whether the differences between the 2013 and 2016 answers are statistically significant depends on both the 2013 and 2016 answers and the respective sample sizes. The table below shows the range of changes which would be significant at the 5% level based on the sample claiming compensation (approx. 250 in 2013 and 1,250 in 2016)

2013 (NRPS recontacts) Answer	2016 (Main sample) Answers which would mean a significant change between 2013 and 2016
5%	Less than 3% or more than 8%
10%	Less than 6% or more than 14%
15%	Less than 11% or more than 19%
20%	Less than 15% or more than 25%
25%	Less than 20% or more than 30%
30%	Less than 24% or more than 36%
40%	Less than 34% or more than 46%
50%	Less than 44% or more than 56%
60%	Less than 54% or more than 66%
70%	Less than 64% or more than 76%
80%	Less than 74% or more than 86%
90%	Less than 86% or more than 94%

Differences between the 2016 samples

- In many cases, the differences between the 2016 main sample and the 2016 NRPS sample are within the normal margins of error and not statistically significant:
 - All surveys where a sample is used may produce a result which slightly differs from what the result would have been if the entire population had been interviewed, this difference is called the margin of error
 - For example, if a sample of 1,000 respondents produces a result of 75%, the margin of error is +/-3%. This means there is a 95% chance that the true value lies between 72% and 78% (i.e. 75%-3% to 75%+3%)
 - If the main sample score = 75% and the NRPS sample is 76% the gap between them is less than the margin of error. Therefore we can not say that there is a statistically significant difference between the two samples
- Furthermore, even when they are outside the margin of error almost all the key trends since 2013 are the same regardless of whether the basis of comparison is the 2016 main sample or the 2013 NRPS sample
- For example, satisfaction with the claims process has declined on every attribute since 2013 regardless of which sample is used as the basis of the comparison it is merely the extent which varies:
 - However, in some cases differing sample sizes mean that the trend between 2013 and 2016 might be statistically significant for one sample and not for the other. Again we do not believe this affects any conclusions which might be drawn from the trend data
- There is some evidence that the 2013 NRPS sample is better informed or at least has higher awareness of the claims process than the main sample. There are several possible explanations for this:
 - Sample bias, in other words the respondents agreeing to be re-interviewed were more aware of or interested in the process than the population
 - Research effect, in other words that the process of completing the NRPS interview had drawn their attention to aspects of the railway's performance

How many delays of 30 minutes or more would you say you have experienced in the last six months?

Amongst those delayed in the past six months, there has been a small increase in the mean number of delays experienced

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
1 delay	36%	37%	41%
2-3 delays	40%	37%	39%
4-9 delays	15%	18%	17%
10-19 delays	5%	5%	40/
20+ delays	2%	2%	4%
Mean number of delays	3.2	3.4	2.6

Q1 How many delays of 30 minutes or more would you say you have experienced in the last six months? Base= 3.811 / 770 / 503 (Delayed by 30 mins or more in last six months)



How often do you make journeys by train like the one you were making on that occasion? Passengers are making more frequent trips on the service on which they were delayed than in 2013

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
3 or more times a week	22%	21%	14%
Once or twice a week	11%	17%	9%
1-2 times per month	23%	28%	32%
Once every 2-3 months	24%	18%	31%
Once every 6 months	10%	9%	12%
Less often	8%	5%	N/A
First time/never	2%	1%	1%
Mean trips per month	4.7	4.9	3.4



How long was the delay you experienced on this occasion? The mean delay length is considerably shorter than that reported in 2013

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
30-59 mins (Net)	74%	58%	44%
60-119 mins (Net)	18%	30%	35%
120 mins+ (Net)	7%	11%	20%
I chose not to travel because of the anticipated delay	2%	2%	N/A
Mean length of delay	61 mins	72 mins	101 mins

What sort of delay did you experience on this occasion?

The main delay types have not changed since 2013, largely centring around trains running late or being cancelled. The proportion of diversions has declined since 2013

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
The train was late departing at the beginning of my journey	38%	38%	36%
The train was late arriving at my destination	41%	40%	44%
The train I had planned to catch was cancelled	26%	27%	27%
The train I was on was diverted via a different route	7%	3%	11%
I had to use a different station/route to normal	5%	2%	10%
Could not get on train as it was overcrowded	4%	2%	3%
The first train I took was late and I missed my connection	4%	5%	5%
Lack of/poor information caused a delay to my journey	4%	4%	5%



Do you know what caused this delay?

A fault with the track, signals or other equipment remains the most commonly mentioned cause of delays. In second place, the proportion attributing the delay to poor weather conditions is dramatic, especially given that both surveys were fielded at the same time of the year

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
Fault with the track, signals or other equipment	21%	22%	31%
Engineering works	9%	4%	4%
Poor weather conditions (e.g. floods/snow/ice/wind/heat)	9%	14%	21%
A broken down train blocking the line	6%	11%	6%
Lack of staff (e.g. driver)	5%	8%	3%
An accident on the line	5%	8%	4%
The train I was on broke down	4%	5%	4%
No - I'm not sure what caused the delay	40%	25%	26%



When trains are delayed or cancelled, passengers can sometimes claim compensation or a refund from the train operator. Under which of the following circumstances do you think passengers are currently entitled to claim compensation or a refund?

Awareness of the 30 minute threshold for compensation has more than doubled from three out of ten passengers to seven out of ten

Percentage believing entitled to compensation	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
10 minutes later than timetabled	12%	5%	1%
15 minutes later than timetabled	17%	11%	N/A
20 minutes later than timetabled	25%	17%	4%
30 minutes later than timetabled	70%	75%	31%
45 minutes later than timetabled	76%	80%	39%
60 minutes later than timetabled	88%	92%	79%

S6 When trains are delayed or cancelled, passengers can sometimes claim compensation or a refund from the train operator. Under which of the following circumstances do you think passengers are currently entitled to claim compensation or a refund? Base= 3,526 / 797 / 503 (All respondents)



Under which of the following circumstances do you think passengers are currently entitled to claim compensation or a refund?

The proportion of passengers believing they are entitled to compensation has increased for all the scenarios tested

Percentage believing entitled to compensation	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
Your train is cancelled and you have to travel on a different train to the one on which you had reserved a seat which means you have to stand	49%	39%	32%
The advertised buffet car/trolley is not available	12%	3%	2%
Your train is cancelled but you get another one that arrives 15 minutes later than you had wanted to	21%	12%	9%
The weather is bad and no trains are running	48%	53%	45%
Your train is 15 minutes late on four consecutive days	37%	15%	19%
The train is announced as running late and you decide not to travel	20%	16%	11%
You have to travel on a rail replacement bus	27%	13%	Not asked

S6 When trains are delayed or cancelled, passengers can sometimes claim compensation or a refund from the train operator. Under which of the following circumstances do you think passengers are currently entitled to claim compensation or a refund? Base=3,526/797/503 (All respondents)



Did you claim/receive compensation or a refund for your delay on this particular occasion? The proportion successfully claiming a refund has more than doubled from in 2013 to 2016

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
Yes - I received compensation automatically (without needing to claim)	2%	5%	N/A
Yes - I claimed compensation or a refund and was successful	23%	29%	10%
Yes - I claimed compensation or a refund but was not successful	4%	5%	2%
Yes - I have claimed compensation or a refund and the claim is still pending	6%	10%	N/A
No - I didn't even think about it*	34%	25%	44%
No - I didn't think I could claim compensation or a refund*	23%	14%	30%
No - I knew that I could claim compensation or a refund but I chose not to	7%	11%	14%
Yes - I received compensation automatically (without needing to claim)	1%	1%	1%
*Total not aware	57%	39%	74%

Q18 Did you claim/receive compensation or a refund for your delay on this particular occasion? Base= 3,526 / 767 / 503 (Delayed by 30 mins or more in last six months)



What would be the best way to let you know about your right to claim compensation when delayed?

There has been a notable increase in the proportion of passengers expecting to look on the internet and for train staff to announce this

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
I looked on the internet	22%	16%	14%
Announcement by staff on the train	15%	20%	8%
A friend/relative/colleague told me	11%	6%	12%
Information given at the station ticket office	6%	3%	8%
A fellow passenger told me on the day	6%	4%	10%
I asked a member of station staff	5%	3%	5%
Posters at the station	4%	5%	1%
A report in the news/on television/in the press	4%	2%	5%



What would be the best way to let you know about your right to claim compensation when delayed?

Passengers select a wider variety of sources of information than in 2013 and all sources (except claim forms handed out on trains and announcements by staff on trains) are mentioned more frequently than in 2013

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
Posters at the station	53%	54%	43%
Posters on the train	46%	43%	36%
Announcement by staff on the train	46%	57%	52%
Claim form handed out on the train	31%	44%	46%
Automatic refund because the train company knew you were booked on a specific train	31%	34%	23%
Electronic notification from the train company	29%	24%	N/A
Information given at the station ticket office	28%	22%	16%
Announcement by the train company at the station	27%	33%	12%
The internet	27%	20%	16%
Claim form handed out at the station on the day	22%	26%	19%
Claim form collected from a station afterwards	12%	7%	7%

Q24 What would be the best way to let you know about your right to claim compensation when delayed? Multicode. Base= 2,025 / 300 / 222 (Delayed by 30 mins or more in last six months/ Did not think about claiming compensation). Responses with less than 10% in the 2016 main sample not shown



How did you claim compensation or a refund on this occasion?

The proportion claiming by post has fallen from over half to one third, while the proportion claiming via the train company's web site has risen to almost one third. Emailing and claiming at the station are also up

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
Via the train company's website/app	31%	35%	15%
Claim form posted to the train company	29%	35%	55%
E-mail to the train company	17%	8%	11%
Claim form handed in at the station	8%	7%	2%
Letter to the train company	6%	5%	13%
A specialist website/app processed the claim for me (e.g. Delay Repay Sniper, etc.)	3%	0%	N/A
I received a refund automatically without having to submit a claim	3%	0%	N/A



Which of the following did you receive after making your claim for compensation or a refund?

The proportion receiving rail travel vouchers has declined from three quarters to under a half since 2013. Following the change in the National Conditions, nearly a quarter now receive either a cheque or a refund to a bank/credit card account

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
An acknowledgement that my claim was being processed	43%	42%	N/A
Rail Travel Voucher(s) (redeemable against future train tickets)	40%	41%	72%
Cheque	12%	8%	1%
Refund to my card/bank account	10%	8%	N/A
Letter of apology	10%	15%	19%
Notification that my compensation claim was refused	9%	9%	7%
Complimentary ticket(s) for a future journey	5%	4%	5%
Cash refund at a station (includes exchanging a voucher for cash)	4%	1%	5%

Q28 Which of the following did you receive after making your claim for compensation or a refund? Multicode Base= 1,263 / 360 / 244 (Delayed by 30 mins or more in last six months/ Have made claim)



How long did it take from when you submitted your claim until when you received your compensation/final response?

The average time taken to resolve the claim is very similar to 2013, but there has been an increase in the number of claims taking five or more weeks to resolve (from 10% to 17%)

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
Less than 1 week	8%	8%	400/
1-2 weeks	37%	33%	40%
3-4 weeks	32%	36%	43%
5-6 weeks	10%	6%	5%
Over 6 weeks	7%	9%	5%
Less than 2 weeks (Net)	46%	41%	40%
Over 4 weeks (Net)	17%	15%	10%
Mean	3 weeks	3 weeks	3 weeks

Q29 How long did it take from when you submitted your claim until when you received your compensation/final response? Base= 944 / 271 / 244 (Delayed by 30 mins or more in last six months/ Have claimed and have received a response).

Did you have to remind the train company before you received any response? The proportion feeling that they needed to prompt a response from the train company has increased substantially since 2013

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
Yes	24	13	9
No	76	87	91



Thinking about all the times that you have been delayed, which of the following best describes how you claim/receive compensation?

The proportion who "always" claim compensation is very similar to 2013, but there has been an increase in "usually" claiming at the expense of "sometimes" claiming

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
I always claim/receive compensation if I am delayed	35%	38%	36%
I usually claim/receive compensation if I am delayed	28%	28%	23%
I sometimes claim/receive compensation if I am delayed	14%	12%	22%
I rarely claim/receive compensation when I am delayed	7%	8%	6%
This occasion was the first time I had ever claimed/received compensation when I have been delayed	16%	14%	12%

Q31 Thinking about all the times that you have been delayed, which of the following best describes how you claim/receive compensation? Base= 1,341 / 395 / 251 (Delayed more than by 30 mins in last six months/ Have claimed)



How satisfied were you with each of the following aspects of your compensation claim? (slide one of two)

Customer satisfaction ratings have declined on all attributes

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
The train company alerting me to my right to claim compensation (percentage satisfied)	38%	33%	n/a (not included in the questionnaire)
The amount of information provided about how to claim compensation (percentage satisfied)	51%	50%	54%
The ease of finding out how to claim compensation (percentage satisfied)	52%	48%	56%
The ease of completing the compensation/refund claiming process (percentage satisfied)	61%	54%	70%

Q32 How satisfied were you with each of the following aspects of your compensation claim? Base= 1,184 - 1,254 / 358-345 / 244 depending on statement (Delayed by 30 mins or more in last six months/ Have claimed compensation). Don't know/can't remember (between 6% - 1%) excluded

How satisfied were you with each of the following aspects of your compensation claim? (slide two of two)

Customer satisfaction ratings have declined on all attributes

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
The method by which you were able to claim compensation/a refund (percentage satisfied)	62%	58%	67%
The speed with which you received a response (percentage satisfied)	52%	48%	57%
The speed with which you received your compensation/refund (percentage satisfied)	51%	44%	55%
The value of the compensation you received (percentage satisfied)	57%	58%	64%
The form in which you received the compensation (percentage satisfied)	54%	53%	62%

Q32 How satisfied were you with each of the following aspects of your compensation claim? Base= 1,184 – 1,254 / 345-358 / 244 depending on statement (Delayed by 30 mins or more in last six months/ Have claimed compensation). Don't know/can't remember (between 6% -1%) excluded

Why did you decide not to claim on this occasion?

The proportion not claiming because it would take too much time has reduced from almost a half to less than one third since 2013. Conversely the proportions forgetting to claim or not claiming because it was not worth the bother have increased

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)*	2013 (NRPS recontacts)*
The value of any compensation would not be large enough to be worth the bother	37%	34%	31%
It would take too much time to claim for compensation	29%	26%	46%
The claiming process is too complicated	22%	30%	33%
I forgot to claim	10%	5%	2%
Ticket was paid for by somebody else	9%	11%	2%
I did not know how to claim for compensation (and did not try to find out)	8%	16%	N/A
I was uncertain if I was eligible for compensation for this journey	6%	6%	1%

Q33 Why did you decide not to claim on this occasion? Base= 238 / 86* / 56* (Delayed by 30 mins or more in last six months/ Knew they could claim but did not) Responses with less than 2% in the 2016 main survey not shown



How satisfied are you with the current basis for paying compensation? Why are you not satisfied with this basis for paying compensation? The proportion satisfied remains broadly similar to 2013 and is considerably higher than any of the satisfaction ratings for the actual claims process

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
Satisfaction with current basis for eligibility for compensation	75%	72%	78%
Compensation should be paid for shorter delays	48%	65%	53%
They should pay compensation when a train is regularly delayed for less than 30 minutes	50%	38%	55%
They should pay more than 50% of the journey cost for a 30 minute delay	66%	52%	73%
Other	9%	13%	28%

Q36 Currently, many train operators will pay passengers compensation of 50% of the journey cost when they are delayed by 30 minutes and 100% of the journey cost when delayed by 60 minutes or more, irrespective of the type of ticket they have or what caused the delay. How satisfied are you with this as a basis for paying compensation? Base= 3,491 / 764 / 503 (Delayed by 30 mins or more in last six months)

Q37 Why are you not satisfied with this basis for paying compensation? Base= 480 / 136 / 124 (Delayed by 30 mins or more in last six months/Those dissatisfied with basis for compensation)



Which of these would help you, or make you more likely to claim compensation in the future?

Preference for automatic refunds has increased since 2013, whilst it has decreased for online claiming

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
If you could claim online or via an app	54%	54%	67%
If you received an automatic refund to your bank account/card/smartcard	52%	51%	42%
If there were announcements on the trains/at stations when delayed	37%	36%	38%
If claim forms were distributed on the train when it is delayed	37%	45%	48%
If it was advertised on trains/at stations	35%	25%	27%
If claim forms were handed out at stations after a delay	33%	38%	31%
If there were leaflets available about what to do when delayed	31%	27%	34%
If there were claim forms available to collect at stations	31%	21%	35%

Q35 Which of these would help you, or make you more likely to claim compensation in the future? Multicode. Base= 2,279 / 384 / 179 (Delayed by 30 mins or more in last six months and have not claimed compensation)



What would be your preferred way of claiming compensation or a refund? Preference for claiming online has halved since 2013, with the proportion preferring an automatic refund increasing to approximately one third of delayed passengers. Preference for claiming in person at the ticket office has also increased since 2013

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
Automatic refund to the card used to book online	32%	35%	15%
Online, providing a scanned copy of your ticket (or other proof of purchase)	27%	27%	54%
In person at the ticket office	19%	13%	8%
Via a paper form posted to the train company	5%	6%	10%
Automatic refund to an online account with the train company	5%	4%	N/A
Automatic refund to the smartcard used for this journey	4%	7%	N/A
Over the telephone	3%	1%	1%
Via a paper form handed in at the ticket office	3%	3%	8%
Via a specialist claims handling website/app	3%	5%	N/A

Q41 What would be your preferred way of claiming compensation or a refund? Base= 3,526 / 764 / 503 (Delayed by 30 mins or more in last six months). Responses with less than 3% in the 2016 sample not shown



What would be your preferred way of receiving compensation or a refund? There has been a clear increase in the proportion preferring an immediate cash refund at the station since 2013

	2016 (Main sample)	2016 (NRPS recontacts)	2013 (NRPS recontacts)
Vouchers which can be redeemed in full or in part against future train tickets	10%	11%	19
Vouchers which can be redeemed against future train tickets or exchanged for cash	13%	16%	(Options not split)
Complimentary ticket(s) for a future journey	12%	7%	13%
Immediate cash refund at a station	34%	28%	16%
Cheque	10%	9%	9%
Refund to my card/bank account in response to a claim I submitted	46%	51%	30% - refund to bank
Automatic refund to my card/bank account (because the train company knows the train I was booked on was delayed/cancelled)	41%	43%	account 39% - refund to credit card
Automatic refund to the smartcard used for the journey	13%	14%	4%

Q40 What would be your preferred way of receiving compensation or a refund? Maximum three responses. Base= 3,526 / 764/503 (Delayed by 30 mins or more in last six months). Responses with less than 6% in the 2016 main sample not shown



Stay in touch

+44 (0)20 7627 7700 | hello@breakingblueresearch.com | www.breakingblueresearch.com

BREAKING BLUE



PHIL STUBINGTON DIRECTOR

phil.stubington@breakingblueresearch.com +44 (0)20 7627 7720

BREAKING BLUE



RACHEL COPE DIRECTOR

rachel.cope@breakingblueresearch.com +44 (0)2076277771

BREAKING BLUE



CHARLOTTE CRICHTON RESEARCH MANAGER

charlotte.crichton@breakingblueresearch.com +44 (0)2076277750

BREAKING BLUE



NEIL SIMPSON
SENIOR RESEARCH CONSULTANT

neil.simpson@breakingblueresearch.com +44 (0)20 7627 7716

This work has been conducted in accordance with ISO 20252, the international standard for market and social research





Our policies and procedures adhere to the Cyber Essential security scheme





