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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’.

211 mystery shops were conducted during Quarter 4 2017 with mystery shoppers acting as passengers while waiting for and on board selected Dublin Bus routes around the city. A broad spread of bus routes were covered across different days of the week and times of the day.

The mystery shops were carried out by trained Kantar Millward Brown interviewers, following an initial pilot and briefing session. These interviewers use portable HAPI (HandHeld Personal Interviewing) devices which enable both discreet and effective captures of location, bus and driver details at stops, when boarding, on board and after alighting buses.

Wave 9: Quarter 4 2017: 11th September – 23 Dec 2017

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus: recent changes since previous quarter i.e. Qtr 3 June – Sept 2017 Q3 or year on year changes for same quarter last year i.e. Qtr 4 Nov – Dec 2016 Q4.
Section 1:
Stop Maintenance Performance
Advertising on Shelter of Bus Stop: Reports of additional commercial advertising being present on bus shelters have significantly decreased both year on year and quarter on quarter, with no interviewers spotting any signs of additional commercial advertising this quarter. Similarly, almost all interviewers saw no signs of additional commercial advertising on bus stop poles.

Base: (78), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1, (160) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29

38% observed a Bus Shelter
Q37** Additional Commercial Advertising on Shelter Glass
(78) %

Q4 2017
(6) Q4
(5) Q3

78% observed a Bus Stop Pole & Flag
Q38** Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole
(160) %

(95) Q3
(94) Q4

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017Q3
** Interviewer instructions have been updated in Qtr 2 2016 therefore no YOY comparisons made

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: Just under 9 in 10 interviewers found the bus stop poles to be in good condition, rising to over 9 in 10 for bus shelters. No instances of hazardous damage were reported.

Q29b Condition of the Bus Pole (160) %
- Good condition: 87%
- Moderate damage: 12%
- Hazardous damage: 1%

Q31 Condition of the Bus Shelter (78) %
- Good condition: 95%
- Moderate damage: 5%
- Hazardous damage: 0%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016\textsubscript{Q4}, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017\textsubscript{Q3}
Timetable: Over 9 in 10 interviewers found the bus timetables to be fully legible & clean, a significant improvement year on year. There has also been a significant decline in the number of timetables obscured by dirt year on year.

Q35 Condition of Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Q4 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully legible and clean</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>(86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscured by dirt</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscured by graffiti or stickers</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mounted properly</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscured by etchings/scratching</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torn/damaged</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscured by condensation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017.
Section 2: Customer Information Performance
Fares: Nearly all interviewers found the fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus; with no significant movements observed

Base: (211)

Q4 2017

Q50 Were the Fares Displayed Clearly at the Entrance?
(211)

%  
5  
95

Yes
No

▼ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016 Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017 Q3
Timetable: Year on year, there has been a significant increase in the number of interviewers who saw a bus stop number visible on the bus stop flag. There has also been a significant increase in the number of interviewers who couldn’t see an operative date present on the bus timetable versus last quarter.

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

**Q4 2017**

**Q32 Bus Stop Number Visible**
- Total: 205
- Yes: 99 (94) Q4
- No: 1 (6) Q4

**Q34 Printed Timetable Present**
- Total: 204
- Yes: 70
- No: 30
- Present but could not read: 9

**Q36 Operative Date Present**
- Total: 143
- Yes: 60
- No: 31
- Present but could not read: 9

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016_Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017_Q3

**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, a third of interviewers reported seeing the centre doors opening, a significant decrease versus last quarter, however the majority reported that there were no alighting passengers during their journey. Just over half noted the centre doors opening when alighting the bus, also significantly down versus Q3.

**Q4 2017**

59% assessed buses with centre doors

Q64 Did the Driver Open the Centre Doors?

**[Boarding]**

(124)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↑ (42) Q4

30%

There were no alighting passengers

There was an obstruction

Q91 Centre Doors Open for Passengers

**[Alighting]**

(124)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓ (27) Q3

52%

Q4 2017 = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017
On Board Displays/Announcements: Over 9 in 10 interviewers saw the electronic next stop displays working correctly, while 4 in 5 heard the next stop announcements working correctly. Year on year, there has been a significant increase in the number of announcements that were deemed to be too quiet.

Base: (211)

Q4 2017

Q80 Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Yes - was working correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Working but was not providing correct information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Display was turned off or not working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Could not see a display</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q81 Automatic Next Stop Announcement Working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Yes - working and volume was correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes - working but too loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes - working but too quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No - was not working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None on the bus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016_Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017_Q3
Wheelchair Ramp/Lift: Of the 8 interviewers who saw a wheelchair ramp requested, 7 found that it was activated upon request while 1 noted that it wasn’t due to there being another wheelchair passenger already on board.

Base: (8) If yes to WHEELCHAIR RAMP OR LIFT REQUEST Q105/1

Q4 2017

Q106 Wheelchair Ramp/Lift Activated Upon Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88</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>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - no reason given</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another wheelchair passenger was already on board

↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016 Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017 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, although there has been a significant decrease year on year in the number of interviewers who saw the correct route number displayed on the back of the bus.

**Q4 2017**

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

**Q44 Destination on Front**
- Yes: 99%
- Not displayed: 1%
- Could not clearly see: 1%

**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.: 0%
- Could not clearly see: 0%

**Q87 Route No. on Back**
- Yes: 95%
- Incorrect route number shown: 5%
- No route number shown: 0%
- There was no display panel for route no.: 0%
- Couldn’t see: 0%

*Statistically significant differences are versus * Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017*
CCTV: Just over 4 in 5 interviewers found the CCTV screens in the stairwells to be turned on and functioning correctly, a significant decrease versus last quarter. There has also been a significant increase in the number of interviewers who saw no CCTV displays present versus Q3.

Base: (124), IF YES TO CENTRE DOORS at Q63*

---

**Q4 2017**

**Q82 CCTV in Stairwell**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turned on and working correctly</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned on, but was not working properly</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned off</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CCTV display present</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No stairwell/single deck</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Filter added in Q3 2016

**= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016\textsubscript{Q4}, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017\textsubscript{Q3}
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 were given a printed ticket or change receipt where appropriate, and over 3 in 5 Leap interviewers were able to see what fare they were charged as they boarded the bus.

Q4 2017

### Q56 Cash Fare (88)
- **Ticket Machine Working Correctly**
  - % Yes
  - % No

### Q58a Leap Card Reader Present at Driver Working Correctly (85)
- % Yes
- % No

### Q60a Pole Mounted Leap Card Reader Working Correctly (38)
- % Yes
- % No

#### Q57a Cash Fare*
- Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exact Change (53)</th>
<th>Not Exact Change (35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, printed ticket</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, printed ticket and change receipt</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got handwritten ticket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was not given a ticket</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Multicoded Question

#### Q59a Leap Card Reader at Driver See Fare Charged (85)*

| Yes | 66 |
| Don’t know/Couldn’t tell Machine was not working | 34 |

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
Assessment of Seats: Bus seats were found to be clean & well maintained on almost all occasions, although there have been significant increases year on year in reports of minor tearing on seats.

Base: (211)

Q69 Graffiti on Seats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Signs</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor graffiti or defacing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy defacing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive graffiti</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q70 Cleanliness of Seats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant dust or crumbs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gum or other ingrained dirt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet or soiled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q71 Damage to Seats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor tear, less than 2cm in length</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate damage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\downarrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016}^{(100)_{Q4}}, \text{Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017}^{(100)_{Q3}}\]
Bus Interior: There has been a significant decrease year on year in the number of buses thought to be generally clean inside. There has also been a significant increase in reports of moderate dirt on panels and other fixtures and fittings year on year.

**Q4 2017**

- **Q75 Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs**
  - Generally clean: 82%
  - Dirt or liquid spills: 9%
  - Dirt or liquid stains (dried): 9%

- **Q76 Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs**
  - Litter free: 67%
  - Minimal level of litter: 27%
  - Some litter: 5%
  - A lot of litter: 5%

- **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: 2%

- **Q78 Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and Other Fixtures/Fittings**
  - No signs of dirt: 78%
  - Light dirt: 14%
  - Moderately dirty: 9%
  - Very dirty: 2%

*Question amended in Q2 2016*

\[\downarrow{}\uparrow{} = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016}\]

\[\downarrow{} = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016}\]

\[\uparrow{} = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017}\]
Bus Windows: Almost all interviewers reported no signs of graffiti or etchings on bus windows however there has been a significant decrease versus last quarter in the number of interviewers reporting no signs of dirt on windows. There have also been significant increases in the number of interviewers reporting very dirty windows both quarter and quarter and year on year.

Base: (211)

Q4 2017

Q72 Graffiti on Windows

- No signs: 98%
- Minor graffiti: 2%
- Heavy graffiti: 1%
- Offensive graffiti: 1%

Q73 Etching on Windows

- No signs: 97%
- Minor etching: 3%
- Heavy etching: 1%
- Offensive etching: 1%

Q74 Cleanliness of Windows

- No signs of dirt: 61%
- Light dirt: 25%
- Moderately dirty: 9%
- Very dirty: 4%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017

Q72 What best describes level of graffiti on windows?
Q73 What best describes level of etching on windows?
Q74 What best describes level of cleanliness of windows?
Front/Side of Bus: Encouragingly, almost no interviewers reported any signs of visible damage to the front/side of the buses, a significant improvement versus last quarter. Year on year, there have been significant increases in interviewers observing clean fronts and sides of buses but significant declines quarter on quarter. There have also been significant increases in interviewers observing some dirt or heavy dirt on the rear of buses versus last quarter.

**Q4 2017**

**Q47 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus**
- Yes: 86%
- Light dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today: 11%
- Moderately dirty: 2%
- Very dirty, likely to have accumulated over several days: 1%

**Q48 Visible Damage to Front/Side of Bus**
- No Visible Damage: 99%
- Light paintwork scratches only: 3%
- Minor bodywork damage: 5%
- Serious damage to bodywork: 0%

**Q90 Was the Rear of Bus Clean?**
- Yes: 67%
- Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operation: 24%
- Heavy dirt, likely to have accumulated over more than one day’s operation: 5%
- Couldn’t see: 5%

\(\downarrow\uparrow\) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017.
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: (211)

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?

Q4 2017

Q51 Helpful
- Yes: 100
- No: 0

Q52 Polite
- Yes: 98
- No: 2

Q54 Driver Wearing Uniform
- Yes: 99
- No: 1

Q55 Driver Well Presented
- Yes: 100
- No: 0

 Riders: (211)

Q51 Helpful
- Yes: 100
- No: 0

Q52 Polite
- Yes: 98
- No: 2

Q54 Driver Wearing Uniform
- Yes: 99
- No: 1

Q55 Driver Well Presented
- Yes: 100
- No: 0

Q4 2017 = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017.
Bus Safety: The majority of interviewers felt that drivers both braked and accelerated smoothly during their journey, although reports of drivers occasionally braking too harshing has significantly increased year on year. There have also been significant increases in the number of drivers frequently moving off too early versus last quarter.

Q4 2017

Q94 Driver Accelerated Smoothly*

Yes, felt comfortable: 91
Occasionally felt too harsh - minor discomfort: 8
Occasionally felt too harsh - moderate discomfort: (4) Q4
Frequently too harsh: 1
Felt it was dangerous: 1

Q95 Driver Braking Smoothly*

Yes, felt comfortable: 79
Occasionally felt too harsh - minor discomfort: 14
Occasionally felt too harsh - moderate discomfort: (6) Q4
Frequently too harsh: 2
Felt it was dangerous: 2

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

Yes: 90
Occasionally moved off too early: 8
Frequently moved off too early: (3) Q3
Felt it was dangerous: 2

*Question amended in Q2 2016

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017Q3
When Getting on the Bus: 5 interviewers found that the bus did not pull up to the footpath kerb when they boarded the bus; 4 found that there was no apparent reason for the restriction while 1 found that another vehicle was parked in the way. For the 1 interviewer who noted that the bus did not pull up to the kerb as they alighted the bus, they felt that there didn’t appear to be any specific reason as to why the bus couldn’t have pulled up fully to the kerb at the time.

Base: (5), IF NO TO PULL UP CLOSE TO KERB Q61/2, (1) IF NO TO PULL UP CLOSE TO KERB Q92/2

### Q62 Why did the bus not pull up to the footpath kerb (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another vehicle was parked in the way</td>
<td>20</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>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q93 Why did the bus not pull up to the kerb (1) Alighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</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>-</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>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016 Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017 Q3
Driver Actions: Interviewers found that buses always stopped to pick up passengers when signalled to do so

Base: (211)

Q102 Stopped to Pick Up Passenger

Q4 2017

Yes 95

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 2016_Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017_Q3
Driver Behaviour: Positively, there were no reports of drivers engaging in any reckless behaviour again this quarter. 4 in 5 interviewers saw no signs of drivers listening to music / radios while over 9 in 10 saw no signs of drivers holding long conversations with any staff or other passengers.

Q4 2017

Q97 Did Bus Driver do Any of the Following:

- Use mobile phone while driving
- Wear an earpiece while driving
- Drive the bus in a dangerous manner

None of these

Q98 Driver Listening to Music/Radio

- Yes
- No

Q99 Driver Hold Long Conversations

- Yes with other staff
- Yes with passengers
- No
- Could not observe
Driver Actions: Interviewers did not report any instances of drivers leaving buses unattended this quarter

Base: (211)

Q4 2017

Q100 Driver Left Bus Unattended

Yes - because of driver change

Yes - to go to shops

Yes - to go to toilet

Yes - some other reason - Please record details

Yes – don’t know the reason

No

100

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2016_4Q, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2017_3Q
Diversion or Terminated Early: No interviewers experienced any early diversions or terminations this quarters.

Base: (211)