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The National Resident Matching Program (NRMP) conducted a survey of all applicants who participated in the 2011 Main Residency Match and who submitted rank order lists of programs. Similar surveys were conducted in 2008 and 2009. The primary purpose of the survey was to shed light on the factors that applicants weigh in selecting programs (1) at which to interview and (2) to rank for the Match. The survey was fielded during the 19 days between the rank order list deadline and Match Week so that applicant match outcomes would not influence respondents' answers.

This report presents survey results by preferred specialty and applicant type. Preferred specialty is defined as the specialty listed first on an applicant's rank order list of programs. Applicant type includes U.S. allopathic seniors and independent applicants. Independent applicants include prior allopathic graduates, both U.S. citizen and non-U.S. citizen graduates of international medical schools, graduates of schools of osteopathy, graduates of Canadian medical schools, and graduates of the Fifth Pathway program.

The overall response rate for the 19 largest preferred specialties detailed in this report was 54.2 percent and varied by specialty and applicant type (see table below). Three smaller specialties, Preventive Medicine, Thoracic Surgery, and Vascular Surgery, were excluded from this report because of low response rates.

The NRMP hopes that program directors, school officials, and applicants find these data useful as they prepare for and participate in the Match.

The NRMP's data reporting and research activities are guided by its Data Release and Research Committee. NRMP data and reports can be found at: www.nrmp.org/data/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Completed Survey</th>
<th>Independent Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anesthesiology</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>591</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatology</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medicine</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>731</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Medicine</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>705</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Medicine (Categorical)</td>
<td>1748</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurology</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurological Surgery</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstetrics-Gynecology</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>580</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Surgery</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>459</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otolaryngology</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatrics (Categorical)</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Medicine &amp; Rehab</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic Surgery (Integrated)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry (Categorical)</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>380</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiology-Diagnostic</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>495</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Oncology</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery (Categorical)</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>655</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional (PGY-1 Only)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7387</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8980</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

The National Resident Matching Program (NRMP) conducted a survey of all applicants who participated in the 2011 Main Residency Match and who submitted rank order lists of programs. Similar surveys were conducted in 2008 and 2009.

The primary purpose of the survey was to shed light on the factors that applicants weigh in selecting programs (1) at which to interview and (2) to rank for the Match. The survey was fielded during the 19 days between the rank order list deadline and Match Week so that applicant match outcomes would not influence respondents' answers.

This report presents survey results by preferred specialty and applicant type. Preferred specialty is defined as the specialty listed first on an applicant's rank order list of programs. Applicant type includes U.S. allopathic seniors and independent applicants. Independent applicants include prior allopathic graduates, both U.S. citizen and non-U.S. citizen graduates of international medical schools, graduates of schools of osteopathy, graduates of Canadian medical schools, and graduates of the Fifth Pathway program.

The overall response rate for the 19 largest preferred specialties detailed in this report was 54.2 percent and varied by specialty and applicant type (see table below). Three smaller specialties, Preventive Medicine, Thoracic Surgery, and Vascular Surgery, were excluded from this report because of low response rates.

The NRMP hopes that program directors, school officials, and applicants find these data useful as they prepare for and participate in the Match.
All Specialties Combined
Figure 1
All Specialties
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2".

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure 1

Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career paths of recent program graduates</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of program</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for fellowship training</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of hospital facility</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement income (moonlighting) opportunities</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of electronic health records</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to perform specific procedures</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for training in systems-based practice</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to conduct research</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based setting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1B visa sponsorship</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board pass rates</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for international experience</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ancillary support staff</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a previous match violation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."
Figure 2
All Specialties
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2009

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

- Quality of educational curriculum and training: 92% U.S. Senior, 90% Independent Applicant
- Academic reputation of program: 92% U.S. Senior, 85% Independent Applicant
- Diversity of patient problems: 77% U.S. Senior, 78% Independent Applicant
- Geographic location: 81% U.S. Senior, 95% Independent Applicant
- Quality of residents in program: 88% U.S. Senior, 82% Independent Applicant
- Size of patient caseload: 68% U.S. Senior, 68% Independent Applicant
- Quality of faculty: 86% U.S. Senior, 85% Independent Applicant
- Work/life balance: 79% U.S. Senior, 87% Independent Applicant
- Academic setting: 87% U.S. Senior, 82% Independent Applicant
- Salary: 31% U.S. Senior, 38% Independent Applicant
- Vacation/parental/sick leave: 43% U.S. Senior, 49% Independent Applicant
- Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care: 81% U.S. Senior, 83% Independent Applicant
- Housestaff morale: 69% U.S. Senior, 77% Independent Applicant
- Cost of living: 64% U.S. Senior, 60% Independent Applicant
- Future fellowship training opportunities with institution: 71% U.S. Senior, 70% Independent Applicant
- Program director qualities: 66% U.S. Senior, 67% Independent Applicant
- Call schedule: 51% U.S. Senior, 53% Independent Applicant
- Other Benefits: 40% U.S. Senior, 48% Independent Applicant
- Social and recreational opportunities of the area: 64% U.S. Senior, 84% Independent Applicant
Figure 2
All Specialties
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type (Cont.)

- Career paths of recent program graduates: 78% U.S. Senior, 74% Independent Applicant
- Size of program: 68% U.S. Senior, 64% Independent Applicant
- Preparation for fellowship training: 74% U.S. Senior, 70% Independent Applicant
- Quality of hospital facility: 79% U.S. Senior, 82% Independent Applicant
- Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities: 26% U.S. Senior, 32% Independent Applicant
- Availability of electronic health records: 57% U.S. Senior, 55% Independent Applicant
- Opportunities to perform specific procedures: 51% U.S. Senior, 60% Independent Applicant
- Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location: 55% U.S. Senior, 55% Independent Applicant
- Opportunities for training in systems-based practice: 39% U.S. Senior, 62% Independent Applicant
- Program’s flexibility to pursue electives and interests: 76% U.S. Senior, 74% Independent Applicant
- Opportunity to conduct research: 58% U.S. Senior, 63% Independent Applicant
- Community-based setting: 50% U.S. Senior, 60% Independent Applicant
- H-1B visa sponsorship: 3% U.S. Senior, 27% Independent Applicant
- Board pass rates: 47% U.S. Senior, 54% Independent Applicant
- Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff: 31% U.S. Senior, 48% Independent Applicant
- Opportunity for international experience: 41% U.S. Senior, 34% Independent Applicant
- Quality of ancillary support staff: 50% U.S. Senior, 53% Independent Applicant
- Presence of a previous match violation: 21% U.S. Senior, 26% Independent Applicant

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure 3
All Specialties
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking Strategy</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I ranked the programs in order of my preferences</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked all programs at which I interviewed</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a &quot;safety net&quot;</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a &quot;fall-back&quot; plan</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4
All Specialties
Median Number of Applications, Interviews and Programs Ranked
By Applicant Type and Match Outcome*

U.S. Seniors

Independent Applicants

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).
Figure 5 Applications, Interviews, Offers, and Ranks†
All Specialties

Number of Applications Submitted by Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Seniors</td>
<td>Independent Apps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Interviews Offered to Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Seniors</td>
<td>Independent Apps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Interviews Attended by Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Seniors</td>
<td>Independent Apps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Programs Ranked by Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Seniors</td>
<td>Independent Apps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Self-reported data

The boxes in a boxplot represent the interquartile range (or IQR, which is the range between the 25th and 75th percentiles) and the line in the box is the median. The upper bound of the whisker is the upper fence, which is 1.5 IQR above the 75% percentile; the lower bound of the whisker is the lower fence, which is 1.5 IQR below the 25th percentile. The diamond-shaped symbol in the box is the mean and the circles below and above the whiskers are outliers. Scales in these graphs are adjusted to show a close-up of the boxplots. Some extreme values and outliers are not shown in the graphs.
Figure 5: Applicants' First Choice Specialty by Specialty

Number of Applications Submitted by Applicants

Number of Interviews Offered to Applicants

AN: Anesthesiology
DM: Dermatology
EM: Emergency Medicine
FP: Family Medicine
IM: Internal Medicine (Categorical)
NE: Neurology
NS: Neurological Surgery
OB: Obstetrics-Gynecology
OS: Orthopedic Surgery
OT: Otolaryngology
PA: Pathology
PD: Pediatrics (Categorical)
PM: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation
PS: Plastic Surgery (Integrated)
PY: Psychiatry (Categorical)
RD: Radiation Oncology
RO: Radiology-Diagnostic
SG: Surgery (Categorical)
TR: Transitional (PGY-1 Only)

†Self-reported data

The boxes in a boxplot represent the interquartile range (or IQR, which is the range between the 25th and 75th percentiles) and the line in the box is the median. The upper bound of the whisker is the upper fence, which is 1.5 IQR above the 75% percentile; the lower bound of the whisker is the lower fence, which is 1.5 IQR below the 25th percentile. The circles and asterisks below and above the whiskers are outliers and extreme values. Scales in these graphs are adjusted to show a close-up of the boxplots. Some extreme values and outliers are not shown in the graphs.
Figure 5  Applicants' First Choice Specialty by Specialty

Number of Interviews Attended by Applicants

Number of Programs Ranked by Applicants

- AN: Anesthesiology
- DM: Dermatology
- EM: Emergency Medicine
- FP: Family Medicine
- IM: Internal Medicine (Categorical)
- NE: Neurology
- NS: Neurological Surgery
- OB: Obstetrics-Gynecology
- OS: Orthopedic Surgery
- OT: Otolaryngology
- PA: Pathology
- PD: Pediatrics (Categorical)
- PM: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation
- PS: Plastic Surgery (Integrated)
- PY: Psychiatry (Categorical)
- RD: Radiation Oncology
- RO: Radiology-Diagnostic
- SG: Surgery (Categorical)
- TR: Transitional (PGY-1 Only)

†Self-reported data

The boxes in a boxplot represent the interquartile range (or IQR, which is the range between the 25th and 75th percentiles) and the line in the box is the median. The upper bound of the whisker is the upper fence, which is 1.5 IQR above the 75% percentile; the lower bound of the whisker is the lower fence, which is 1.5 IQR below the 25th percentile. The circles and asterisks below and above the whiskers are outliers and extreme values. Scales in these graphs are adjusted to show a close-up of the boxplots. Some extreme values and outliers are not shown in the graphs.
Anesthesiology
Figure AN-1
Anesthesiology
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of educational curriculum and training</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation of program</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of patient problems</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of residents in program</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of patient caseload</td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/life balance</td>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic setting</td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation/parental/sick leave</td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housestaff morale</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future fellowship training opportunities with institution</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director qualities</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and recreational opportunities of the area</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."
Anesthesiology

Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type (Cont.)

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Quality of educational curriculum and training: 94% (U.S. Senior), 91% (Independent Applicant)
Academic reputation of program: 93% (U.S. Senior), 87% (Independent Applicant)
Diversity of patient problems: 72% (U.S. Senior), 72% (Independent Applicant)
Geographic location: 97% (U.S. Senior), 83% (Independent Applicant)
Quality of residents in program: 87% (U.S. Senior), 84% (Independent Applicant)
Size of patient caseload: 73% (U.S. Senior), 71% (Independent Applicant)
Quality of faculty: 85% (U.S. Senior), 86% (Independent Applicant)
Work/life balance: 89% (U.S. Senior), 81% (Independent Applicant)
Academic setting: 86% (U.S. Senior), 85% (Independent Applicant)
Salary: 35% (U.S. Senior), 35% (Independent Applicant)
Vacation/parental/sick leave: 46% (U.S. Senior), 47% (Independent Applicant)
Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care: 78% (U.S. Senior), 81% (Independent Applicant)
Housestaff morale: 70% (U.S. Senior), 80% (Independent Applicant)
Cost of living: 70% (U.S. Senior), 64% (Independent Applicant)
Future fellowship training opportunities with institution: 79% (U.S. Senior), 75% (Independent Applicant)
Program director qualities: 71% (U.S. Senior), 68% (Independent Applicant)
Call schedule: 62% (U.S. Senior), 59% (Independent Applicant)
Other Benefits: 45% (U.S. Senior), 47% (Independent Applicant)
Social and recreational opportunities of the area: 66% (U.S. Senior), 85% (Independent Applicant)

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1 " is "most important."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure AN-2
Anesthesiology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career paths of recent program graduates</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of program</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for fellowship training</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of hospital facility</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of electronic health records</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to perform specific procedures</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for training in systems-based practice</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program’s flexibility to pursue electives and interests</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to conduct research</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based setting</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1B visa sponsorship</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board pass rates</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for international experience</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ancillary support staff</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a previous match violation</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as “1” or “2” where “1” is “most important.”
Figure AN-3
Anesthesiology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies by Applicant Type

- I ranked the programs in order of my preferences: 98% (U.S. Senior), 98% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend: 95% (U.S. Senior), 90% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs: 88% (U.S. Senior), 69% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked all programs at which I interviewed: 63% (U.S. Senior), 77% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net": 59% (U.S. Senior), 39% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.): 39% (U.S. Senior), 10% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan: 34% (U.S. Senior), 16% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview: 14% (U.S. Senior), 6% (Independent Applicant)

Source: NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure AN-3
Anesthesiology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies by Applicant Type

U.S. Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of applications submitted</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews offered</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews attended</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of programs ranked</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of applications submitted</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews offered</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews attended</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of programs ranked</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).
Dermatology
**Figure DM-1**
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of educational curriculum and training</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation of program</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of patient problems</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of residents in program</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of patient caseload</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/life balance</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic setting</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation/parental/sick leave</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housestaff morale</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future fellowship training opportunities with institution</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director qualities</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call schedule</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and recreational opportunities of the area</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure DM-1  
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* 
by Applicant Type (Cont.)

- Career paths of recent program graduates (15% U.S. Senior, 10% Independent Applicant)
- Size of program (25% U.S. Senior, 18% Independent Applicant)
- Preparation for fellowship training (18% U.S. Senior, 10% Independent Applicant)
- Quality of hospital facility (18% U.S. Senior, 16% Independent Applicant)
- Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities (13% U.S. Senior, 13% Independent Applicant)
- Availability of electronic health records (11% U.S. Senior, 15% Independent Applicant)
- Opportunities to perform specific procedures (13% U.S. Senior, 34% Independent Applicant)
- Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location (19% U.S. Senior, 16% Independent Applicant)
- Opportunities for training in systems-based practice (4% U.S. Senior, 10% Independent Applicant)
- Program’s flexibility to pursue electives and interests (5% U.S. Senior, 13% Independent Applicant)
- Opportunity to conduct research (13% U.S. Senior, 8% Independent Applicant)
- Community-based setting (6% U.S. Senior, 2% Independent Applicant)
- H-1B visa sponsorship (0% U.S. Senior, 5% Independent Applicant)
- Board pass rates (10% U.S. Senior, 4% Independent Applicant)
- Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff (3% U.S. Senior, 7% Independent Applicant)
- Opportunity for international experience (0% U.S. Senior, 3% Independent Applicant)
- Quality of ancillary support staff (2% U.S. Senior, 0% Independent Applicant)
- Presence of a previous match violation (1% U.S. Senior, 0% Independent Applicant)

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure DM-2  Dermatology  
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure DM-2: Dermatology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type

- Career paths of recent program graduates: 66% U.S. Senior, 58% Independent Applicant
- Size of program: 67% U.S. Senior, 52% Independent Applicant
- Preparation for fellowship training: 58% U.S. Senior, 43% Independent Applicant
- Quality of hospital facility: 67% U.S. Senior, 67% Independent Applicant
- Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities: 16% U.S. Senior, 22% Independent Applicant
- Availability of electronic health records: 53% U.S. Senior, 42% Independent Applicant
- Opportunities to perform specific procedures: 58% U.S. Senior, 57% Independent Applicant
- Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location: 52% U.S. Senior, 49% Independent Applicant
- Opportunities for training in systems-based practice: 33% U.S. Senior, 43% Independent Applicant
- Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests: 71% U.S. Senior, 60% Independent Applicant
- Opportunity to conduct research: 56% U.S. Senior, 54% Independent Applicant
- Community-based setting: 38% U.S. Senior, 36% Independent Applicant
- H-1B visa sponsorship: 2% U.S. Senior, 7% Independent Applicant
- Board pass rates: 37% U.S. Senior, 41% Independent Applicant
- Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff: 26% U.S. Senior, 42% Independent Applicant
- Opportunity for international experience: 31% U.S. Senior, 29% Independent Applicant
- Quality of ancillary support staff: 40% U.S. Senior, 47% Independent Applicant
- Presence of a previous match violation: 16% U.S. Senior, 10% Independent Applicant

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure DM-3

Dermatology

Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies

by Applicant Type

- I ranked the programs in order of my preferences: 97% U.S. Senior, 96% Independent Applicant
- I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend: 97% U.S. Senior, 95% Independent Applicant
- I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs: 87% U.S. Senior, 69% Independent Applicant
- I ranked all programs at which I interviewed: 80% U.S. Senior, 89% Independent Applicant
- I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net": 45% U.S. Senior, 19% Independent Applicant
- I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.): 20% U.S. Senior, 39% Independent Applicant
- I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan: 38% U.S. Senior, 24% Independent Applicant
- I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview: 6% U.S. Senior, 23% Independent Applicant

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure DM-3  
Dermatology  
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies  
by Applicant Type

**U.S. Seniors**

- Median number of applications submitted: 63 (Matched), 73 (Not Matched)
- Median number of interviews offered: 11 (Matched), 10 (Not Matched)
- Median number of interviews attended: 9 (Matched), 9 (Not Matched)
- Median number of programs ranked: 9 (Matched), 9 (Not Matched)

**Independent Applicants**

- Median number of applications submitted: 30 (Matched), 61 (Not Matched)
- Median number of interviews offered: 2 (Matched), 3 (Not Matched)
- Median number of interviews attended: 2 (Matched), 3 (Not Matched)
- Median number of programs ranked: 2 (Matched), 4 (Not Matched)

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).*
Figure EM-1
Emergency Medicine
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type

- Quality of educational curriculum and training: 80% U.S. Senior, 77% Independent Applicant
- Academic reputation of program: 72% U.S. Senior, 62% Independent Applicant
- Diversity of patient problems: 73% U.S. Senior, 70% Independent Applicant
- Geographic location: 70% U.S. Senior, 67% Independent Applicant
- Quality of residents in program: 48% U.S. Senior, 46% Independent Applicant
- Size of patient caseload: 52% U.S. Senior, 48% Independent Applicant
- Quality of faculty: 46% U.S. Senior, 46% Independent Applicant
- Work/life balance: 43% U.S. Senior, 43% Independent Applicant
- Academic setting: 43% U.S. Senior, 43% Independent Applicant
- Salary: 48% U.S. Senior, 48% Independent Applicant
- Vacation/parental/sick leave: 35% U.S. Senior, 33% Independent Applicant
- Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care: 42% U.S. Senior, 41% Independent Applicant
- Housestaff morale: 30% U.S. Senior, 28% Independent Applicant
- Cost of living: 19% U.S. Senior, 24% Independent Applicant
- Future fellowship training opportunities with institution: 13% U.S. Senior, 11% Independent Applicant
- Program director qualities: 23% U.S. Senior, 32% Independent Applicant
- Call schedule: 19% U.S. Senior, 19% Independent Applicant
- Other Benefits: 23% U.S. Senior, 19% Independent Applicant
- Social and recreational opportunities of the area: 25% U.S. Senior, 31% Independent Applicant

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure EM-1
Emergency Medicine
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type (Cont.)

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of educational curriculum and training</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation of program</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of patient problems</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of residents in program</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of patient caseload</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/life balance</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic setting</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation/parental/sick leave</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility for patient care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housestaff morale</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future fellowship training opportunities with institution</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director qualities</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call schedule</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and recreational opportunities of the area</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure EM-2
Emergency Medicine
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection
by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Emergency Medicine
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

U.S. Senior
Independent Applicant

I ranked the programs in order of my preferences
I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend
I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs
I ranked all programs at which I interviewed
I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net"
I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.)
I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan
I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure EM-3
Emergency Medicine
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies by Applicant Type

U.S. Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of applications submitted</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews offered</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews attended</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of programs ranked</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of applications submitted</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews offered</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews attended</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of programs ranked</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).
Figure FP-1

Family Medicine

Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

Quality of educational curriculum and training
Academic reputation of program
Diversity of patient problems
Geographic location
Quality of residents in program
Size of patient caseload
Quality of faculty
Work/life balance
Academic setting
Salary
Vacation/parental/sick leave
Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care
Housestaff morale
Cost of living
Future fellowship training opportunities with institution
Program director qualities
Call schedule
Other Benefits
Social and recreational opportunities of the area

U.S. Senior
Independent Applicant

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure FP-1
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"*
by Applicant Type (Cont.)

Career paths of recent program graduates
- U.S. Senior: 11%
- Independent Applicant: 10%

Size of program
- U.S. Senior: 17%
- Independent Applicant: 23%

Preparation for fellowship training
- U.S. Senior: 5%
- Independent Applicant: 5%

Quality of hospital facility
- U.S. Senior: 22%
- Independent Applicant: 27%

Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities
- U.S. Senior: 20%
- Independent Applicant: 25%

Availability of electronic health records
- U.S. Senior: 33%
- Independent Applicant: 18%

Opportunities to perform specific procedures
- U.S. Senior: 32%
- Independent Applicant: 34%

Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location
- U.S. Senior: 19%
- Independent Applicant: 21%

Opportunities for training in systems-based practice
- U.S. Senior: 15%
- Independent Applicant: 23%

Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests
- U.S. Senior: 13%
- Independent Applicant: 28%

Opportunity to conduct research
- U.S. Senior: 2%
- Independent Applicant: 6%

Community-based setting
- U.S. Senior: 50%
- Independent Applicant: 30%

H-1B visa sponsorship
- U.S. Senior: 1%
- Independent Applicant: 11%

Board pass rates
- U.S. Senior: 6%
- Independent Applicant: 10%

Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff
- U.S. Senior: 5%
- Independent Applicant: 12%

Opportunity for international experience
- U.S. Senior: 9%
- Independent Applicant: 5%

Quality of ancillary support staff
- U.S. Senior: 1%
- Independent Applicant: 5%

Presence of a previous match violation
- U.S. Senior: 1%
- Independent Applicant: 2%

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
### Figure FP-2
**Family Medicine**  
**Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection**  
*by Applicant Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of educational curriculum and training</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation of program</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of patient problems</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of residents in program</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of patient caseload</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/life balance</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic setting</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation/parental/sick leave</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housestaff morale</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future fellowship training opportunities with institution</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director qualities</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call schedule</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and recreational opportunities of the area</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure FP-2
Family Medicine
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection
by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure FP-3
Family Medicine
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

I ranked the programs in order of my preferences
- U.S. Senior: 100%
- Independent Applicant: 94%

I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend
- U.S. Senior: 96%
- Independent Applicant: 90%

I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs
- U.S. Senior: 79%
- Independent Applicant: 58%

I ranked all programs at which I interviewed
- U.S. Senior: 44%
- Independent Applicant: 75%

I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net"
- U.S. Senior: 36%
- Independent Applicant: 27%

I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.)
- U.S. Senior: 12%
- Independent Applicant: 52%

I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan
- U.S. Senior: 7%
- Independent Applicant: 24%

I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview
- U.S. Senior: 1%
- Independent Applicant: 18%
Figure FP-3  
Family Medicine  
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies by Applicant Type

### U.S. Seniors

- **Median number of applications submitted**
  - Matched: 15
  - Not Matched: 17

- **Median number of interviews offered**
  - Matched: 13
  - Not Matched: 14

- **Median number of interviews attended**
  - Matched: 9
  - Not Matched: 10

- **Median number of programs ranked**
  - Matched: 7
  - Not Matched: 9

### Independent Applicants

- **Median number of applications submitted**
  - Matched: 33
  - Not Matched: 40

- **Median number of interviews offered**
  - Matched: 4
  - Not Matched: 2

- **Median number of interviews attended**
  - Matched: 4
  - Not Matched: 2

- **Median number of programs ranked**
  - Matched: 4
  - Not Matched: 3

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).*
Internal Medicine (Categorical)
Figure IM-1

Internal Medicine (Categorical)
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of educational curriculum and training</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation of program</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of patient problems</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of residents in program</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of patient caseload</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/life balance</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic setting</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation/parental/sick leave</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housestaff morale</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future fellowship training opportunities with institution</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director qualities</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call schedule</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and recreational opportunities of the area</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."
Figure IM-1
Internal Medicine (Categorical)
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"*
by Applicant Type (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career paths of recent program graduates</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of program</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for fellowship training</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of hospital facility</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of electronic health records</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to perform specific procedures</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for training in systems-based practice</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to conduct research</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based setting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1B visa sponsorship</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board pass rates</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for international experience</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ancillary support staff</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a previous match violation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure IM-2
Internal Medicine (Categorical)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection
by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure IM-2
Internal Medicine (Categorical)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection
by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure IM-3: Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies by Applicant Type

- I ranked the programs in order of my preferences: 99% (U.S. Senior) 96% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend: 94% (U.S. Senior) 83% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs: 86% (U.S. Senior) 65% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked all programs at which I interviewed: 79% (U.S. Senior) 60% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net": 54% (U.S. Senior) 30% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.): 42% (U.S. Senior) 13% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan: 27% (U.S. Senior) 12% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview: 11% (U.S. Senior) 4% (Independent Applicant)

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure IM-3
Internal Medicine (Categorical)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

U.S. Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of applications submitted</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews offered</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews attended</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of programs ranked</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of applications submitted</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews offered</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews attended</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of programs ranked</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).
Neurology
Figure NE-1: Neurology
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type

- Quality of educational curriculum and training: 83% (U.S. Senior), 68% (Independent Applicant)
- Academic reputation of program: 77% (U.S. Senior), 68% (Independent Applicant)
- Diversity of patient problems: 67% (U.S. Senior), 58% (Independent Applicant)
- Geographic location: 77% (U.S. Senior), 53% (Independent Applicant)
- Quality of residents in program: 54% (U.S. Senior), 32% (Independent Applicant)
- Size of patient caseload: 45% (U.S. Senior), 38% (Independent Applicant)
- Quality of faculty: 53% (U.S. Senior), 41% (Independent Applicant)
- Work/life balance: 41% (U.S. Senior), 35% (Independent Applicant)
- Academic setting: 54% (U.S. Senior), 45% (Independent Applicant)
- Salary: 40% (U.S. Senior), 26% (Independent Applicant)
- Vacation/parental/sick leave: 37% (U.S. Senior), 32% (Independent Applicant)
- Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care: 36% (U.S. Senior), 37% (Independent Applicant)
- Housestaff morale: 41% (U.S. Senior), 14% (Independent Applicant)
- Cost of living: 25% (U.S. Senior), 23% (Independent Applicant)
- Future fellowship training opportunities with institution: 28% (U.S. Senior), 23% (Independent Applicant)
- Program director qualities: 30% (U.S. Senior), 18% (Independent Applicant)
- Call schedule: 32% (U.S. Senior), 24% (Independent Applicant)
- Other Benefits: 26% (U.S. Senior), 21% (Independent Applicant)
- Social and recreational opportunities of the area: 26% (U.S. Senior), 19% (Independent Applicant)

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure NE-1
Neurology
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2" by Applicant Type (Cont.)

Career paths of recent program graduates
Size of program
Preparation for fellowship training
Quality of hospital facility
Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities
Availability of electronic health records
Opportunities to perform specific procedures
Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location
Opportunities for training in systems-based practice
Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests
Opportunity to conduct research
Community-based setting
H-1B visa sponsorship
Board pass rates
Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff
Opportunity for international experience
Quality of ancillary support staff
Presence of a previous match violation

U.S. Senior
Independent Applicant

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure NE-2: Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type

Quality of educational curriculum and training: 94% U.S. Senior, 92% Independent Applicant
Academic reputation of program: 96% U.S. Senior, 91% Independent Applicant
Diversity of patient problems: 82% U.S. Senior, 79% Independent Applicant
Geographic location: 80% U.S. Senior, 88% Independent Applicant
Quality of residents in program: 68% U.S. Senior, 81% Independent Applicant
Size of patient caseload: 65% U.S. Senior, 65% Independent Applicant
Quality of faculty: 90% U.S. Senior, 90% Independent Applicant
Work/life balance: 76% U.S. Senior, 87% Independent Applicant
Academic setting: 24% U.S. Senior, 30% Independent Applicant
Salary: 43% U.S. Senior, 34% Independent Applicant
Vacation/parental/sick leave: 78% U.S. Senior, 71% Independent Applicant
Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care: 80% U.S. Senior, 71% Independent Applicant
Housestaff morale: 70% U.S. Senior, 71% Independent Applicant
Cost of living: 65% U.S. Senior, 64% Independent Applicant
Future fellowship training opportunities with institution: 90% U.S. Senior, 76% Independent Applicant
Program director qualities: 65% U.S. Senior, 68% Independent Applicant
Call schedule: 59% U.S. Senior, 57% Independent Applicant
Other Benefits: 33% U.S. Senior, 45% Independent Applicant
Social and recreational opportunities of the area: 69% U.S. Senior, 69% Independent Applicant

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure NE-2
Neurology Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure NE-3  Neurology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

I ranked the programs in order of my preferences
- U.S. Senior: 100%
- Independent Applicant: 98%

I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend
- U.S. Senior: 96%
- Independent Applicant: 87%

I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs
- U.S. Senior: 90%
- Independent Applicant: 76%

I ranked all programs at which I interviewed
- U.S. Senior: 57%
- Independent Applicant: 77%

I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net"
- U.S. Senior: 58%
- Independent Applicant: 33%

I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.)
- U.S. Senior: 4%
- Independent Applicant: 31%

I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan
- U.S. Senior: 10%
- Independent Applicant: 25%

I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview
- U.S. Senior: 5%
- Independent Applicant: 9%

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure NE-3
Neurology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies by Applicant Type

U.S. Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of apps.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median interviews offered</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median interviews attended</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median programs ranked</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of apps.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median interviews offered</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median interviews attended</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median programs ranked</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).
Neurological Surgery
### Neurological Surgery

**Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"**

*by Applicant Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of educational curriculum and training</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation of program</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of patient problems</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of residents in program</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of patient caseload</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/life balance</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic setting</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation/parental/sick leave</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housestaff morale</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future fellowship training opportunities with institution</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director qualities</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call schedule</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and recreational opportunities of the area</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure NS-1
Neurological Surgery
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career paths of recent program graduates</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of program</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for fellowship training</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of hospital facility</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of electronic health records</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to perform specific procedures</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for training in systems-based practice</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to conduct research</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based setting</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1B visa sponsorship</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board pass rates</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for international experience</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ancillary support staff</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a previous match violation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure NS-2: Neurological Surgery Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Neurological Surgery

Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure NS-3
Neurological Surgery
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

I ranked the programs in order of my preferences
- U.S. Senior: 99%
- Independent Applicant: 100%

I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend
- U.S. Senior: 94%
- Independent Applicant: 86%

I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs
- U.S. Senior: 88%
- Independent Applicant: 68%

I ranked all programs at which I interviewed
- U.S. Senior: 69%
- Independent Applicant: 95%

I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net"
- U.S. Senior: 55%
- Independent Applicant: 19%

I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.)
- U.S. Senior: 17%
- Independent Applicant: 64%

I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan
- U.S. Senior: 15%
- Independent Applicant: 36%

I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview
- U.S. Senior: 8%
- Independent Applicant: 14%

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure NS-3  
Neurological Surgery  
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies  
by Applicant Type

**U.S. Seniors**

- Median number of applications submitted: Matched 40, Not Matched 49
- Median number of interviews offered: Matched 27, Not Matched 24
- Median number of interviews attended: Matched 16, Not Matched 16
- Median number of programs ranked: Matched 16, Not Matched 16

**Independent Applicants**

- Median number of applications submitted: Matched 53, Not Matched 40
- Median number of interviews offered: Matched 3, Not Matched 2
- Median number of interviews attended: Matched 3, Not Matched 2
- Median number of programs ranked: Matched 3, Not Matched 1

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).
Obstetrics-Gynecology
Figure OB-1
Obstetrics-Gynecology
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type

- U.S. Senior
- Independent Applicant

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Obstetrics-Gynecology

Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"*
by Applicant Type (Cont.)

Figure OB-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career paths of recent program graduates</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of program</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for fellowship training</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of hospital facility</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of electronic health records</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to perform specific procedures</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for training in systems-based practice</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program’s flexibility to pursue electives and interests</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to conduct research</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based setting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1B visa sponsorship</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board pass rates</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for international experience</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ancillary support staff</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a previous match violation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure OB-2
Obstetrics-Gynecology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type

Quality of educational curriculum and training: 93%
Academic reputation of program: 81%
Diversity of patient problems: 76%
Geographic location: 96%
Quality of residents in program: 84%
Size of patient caseload: 65%
Quality of faculty: 83%
Work/life balance: 79%
Academic setting: 89%
Salary: 29%
Vacation/parental/sick leave: 47%
Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care: 77%
Housestaff morale: 74%
Cost of living: 67%
Future fellowship training opportunities with institution: 62%
Program director qualities: 63%
Call schedule: 53%
Other Benefits: 42%
Social and recreational opportunities of the area: 67%

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
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Figure OB-2
Obstetrics-Gynecology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection
by Applicant Type

- Career paths of recent program graduates: 82% U.S. Senior, 70% Independent Applicant
- Size of program: 79% U.S. Senior, 71% Independent Applicant
- Preparation for fellowship training: 78% U.S. Senior, 66% Independent Applicant
- Quality of hospital facility: 81% U.S. Senior, 74% Independent Applicant
- Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities: 11% U.S. Senior, 26% Independent Applicant
- Availability of electronic health records: 71% U.S. Senior, 48% Independent Applicant
- Opportunities to perform specific procedures: 77% U.S. Senior, 71% Independent Applicant
- Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location: 77% U.S. Senior, 63% Independent Applicant
- Opportunities for training in systems-based practice: 53% U.S. Senior, 36% Independent Applicant
- Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests: 73% U.S. Senior, 62% Independent Applicant
- Opportunity to conduct research: 66% U.S. Senior, 63% Independent Applicant
- Community-based setting: 68% U.S. Senior, 63% Independent Applicant
- H-1B visa sponsorship: 21% U.S. Senior, 3% Independent Applicant
- Board pass rates: 62% U.S. Senior, 51% Independent Applicant
- Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff: 43% U.S. Senior, 35% Independent Applicant
- Opportunity for international experience: 52% U.S. Senior, 35% Independent Applicant
- Quality of ancillary support staff: 52% U.S. Senior, 47% Independent Applicant
- Presence of a previous match violation: 28% U.S. Senior, 26% Independent Applicant

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure OB-3
Obstetrics-Gynecology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

- I ranked the programs in order of my preferences: 99% (U.S. Senior), 97% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend: 95% (U.S. Senior), 90% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs: 73% (U.S. Senior), 92% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked all programs at which I interviewed: 58% (U.S. Senior), 71% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net": 52% (U.S. Senior), 29% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.): 9% (U.S. Senior), 30% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan: 8% (U.S. Senior), 23% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview: 3% (U.S. Senior), 7% (Independent Applicant)
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Figure OB-3 Obstetrics-Gynecology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

U.S. Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of applications submitted</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews offered</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews attended</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of programs ranked</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of applications submitted</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews offered</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews attended</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of programs ranked</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).
Orthopedic Surgery
Orthopedic Surgery
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

U.S. Senior  Independent Applicant

- Quality of educational curriculum and training: 76% 69%
- Academic reputation of program: 72% 62%
- Diversity of patient problems: 48% 47%
- Geographic location: 69% 53%
- Quality of residents in program: 64% 45%
- Size of patient caseload: 65% 55%
- Quality of faculty: 49% 53%
- Work/life balance: 41% 34%
- Academic setting: 35% 34%
- Salary: 40% 43%
- Vacation/parental/sick leave: 30% 31%
- Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care: 47% 34%
- Housestaff morale: 21% 34%
- Cost of living: 22% 34%
- Future fellowship training opportunities with institution: 27% 14%
- Program director qualities: 26% 14%
- Call schedule: 34% 28%
- Other Benefits: 26% 16%
- Social and recreational opportunities of the area: 32% 26%
Figure OS-1
Orthopedic Surgery
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career paths of recent program graduates</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of program</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for fellowship training</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of hospital facility</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of electronic health records</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to perform specific procedures</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for training in systems-based practice</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to conduct research</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based setting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1B visa sponsorship</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board pass rates</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for international experience</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ancillary support staff</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a previous match violation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of educational curriculum and training</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation of program</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of patient problems</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of residents in program</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of patient caseload</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/life balance</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic setting</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation/parental/sick leave</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housestaff morale</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future fellowship training opportunities with institution</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director qualities</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call schedule</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and recreational opportunities of the area</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
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Figure OS-2
Orthopedic Surgery
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
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Figure OS-3
Orthopedic Surgery
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

- I ranked the programs in order of my preferences: 98%
- I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend: 94%
- I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs: 89%
- I ranked all programs at which I interviewed: 84%
- I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net": 78%
- I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.): 61%
- I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan: 50%
- I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview: 21%

U.S. Senior
Independent Applicant

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure OS-3  Orthopedic Surgery
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

U.S. Seniors

Median number of applications submitted
Matched: 50
Not Matched: 56

Median number of interviews offered
Matched: 16
Not Matched: 12

Median number of interviews attended
Matched: 11
Not Matched: 10

Median number of programs ranked
Matched: 11
Not Matched: 10

Independent Applicants

Median number of applications submitted
Matched: 19
Not Matched: 80

Median number of interviews offered
Matched: 2
Not Matched: 2

Median number of interviews attended
Matched: 2
Not Matched: 2

Median number of programs ranked
Matched: 2
Not Matched: 2

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).
Otolaryngology
Figure OT-1
Otolaryngology
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"*
by Applicant Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of educational curriculum and training</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation of program</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of patient problems</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of residents in program</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of patient caseload</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/life balance</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic setting</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation/parental/sick leave</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housestaff morale</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future fellowship training opportunities with institution</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director qualities</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call schedule</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and recreational opportunities of the area</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type (Cont.)

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure OT-2  Otolaryngology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection
by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
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Figure OT-2
Otolaryngology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection
by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure OT-3
Otolaryngology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

I ranked the programs in order of my preferences
99% 95%

I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend
95% 95%

I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs
91% 55%

I ranked all programs at which I interviewed
80% 95%

I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net"
45% 32%

I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.)
11% 30%

I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan
12% 32%

I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview
4% 11%

U.S. Senior
Independent Applicant
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Figure OT-3
Otolaryngology Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies by Applicant Type

**U.S. Seniors**

- **Median number of applications submitted**: 48 Matched, 50 Not Matched
- **Median number of interviews offered**: 14 Matched, 14 Not Matched
- **Median number of interviews attended**: 12 Matched, 12 Not Matched
- **Median number of programs ranked**: 12 Matched, 12 Not Matched

**Independent Applicants**

- **Median number of applications submitted**: 67 Matched, 50 Not Matched
- **Median number of interviews offered**: 7 Matched, 2 Not Matched
- **Median number of interviews attended**: 7 Matched, 2 Not Matched
- **Median number of programs ranked**: 7 Matched, 3 Not Matched

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).*
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Pathology
Figure PA-1
Pathology
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"*
by Applicant Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of educational curriculum and training</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation of program</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of patient problems</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of residents in program</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of patient caseload</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/life balance</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic setting</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation/parental/sick leave</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housestaff morale</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future fellowship training opportunities with institution</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director qualities</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call schedule</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and recreational opportunities of the area</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors.

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Pathology
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type (Cont.)

- Career paths of recent program graduates: 25% (U.S. Senior), 23% (Independent Applicant)
- Size of program: 21% (U.S. Senior), 21% (Independent Applicant)
- Preparation for fellowship training: 26% (U.S. Senior), 18% (Independent Applicant)
- Quality of hospital facility: 15% (U.S. Senior), 13% (Independent Applicant)
- Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities: 12% (U.S. Senior), 8% (Independent Applicant)
- Availability of electronic health records: 6% (U.S. Senior), 6% (Independent Applicant)
- Opportunities to perform specific procedures: 8% (U.S. Senior), 3% (Independent Applicant)
- Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location: 19% (U.S. Senior), 12% (Independent Applicant)
- Opportunities for training in systems-based practice: 19% (U.S. Senior), 8% (Independent Applicant)
- Program’s flexibility to pursue electives and interests: 14% (U.S. Senior), 11% (Independent Applicant)
- Opportunity to conduct research: 23% (U.S. Senior), 18% (Independent Applicant)
- Community-based setting: 8% (U.S. Senior), 3% (Independent Applicant)
- H-1B visa sponsorship: 16% (U.S. Senior), 3% (Independent Applicant)
- Board pass rates: 8% (U.S. Senior), 5% (Independent Applicant)
- Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff: 8% (U.S. Senior), 3% (Independent Applicant)
- Opportunity for international experience: 1% (U.S. Senior), 2% (Independent Applicant)
- Quality of ancillary support staff: 3% (U.S. Senior), 3% (Independent Applicant)
- Presence of a previous match violation: 1% (U.S. Senior), 1% (Independent Applicant)

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure PA-2
Pathology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure PA-2
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type

- Career paths of recent program graduates: 85% U.S. Senior, 78% Independent Applicant
- Size of program: 70% U.S. Senior, 63% Independent Applicant
- Preparation for fellowship training: 90% U.S. Senior, 78% Independent Applicant
- Quality of hospital facility: 84% U.S. Senior, 79% Independent Applicant
- Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities: 16% U.S. Senior, 18% Independent Applicant
- Availability of electronic health records: 40% U.S. Senior, 36% Independent Applicant
- Opportunities to perform specific procedures: 46% U.S. Senior, 32% Independent Applicant
- Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location: 45% U.S. Senior, 55% Independent Applicant
- Opportunities for training in systems-based practice: 57% U.S. Senior, 30% Independent Applicant
- Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests: 80% U.S. Senior, 76% Independent Applicant
- Opportunity to conduct research: 77% U.S. Senior, 76% Independent Applicant
- Community-based setting: 42% U.S. Senior, 31% Independent Applicant
- H-1B visa sponsorship: 23% U.S. Senior, 2% Independent Applicant
- Board pass rates: 52% U.S. Senior, 60% Independent Applicant
- Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff: 51% U.S. Senior, 21% Independent Applicant
- Opportunity for international experience: 51% U.S. Senior, 14% Independent Applicant
- Quality of ancillary support staff: 51% U.S. Senior, 19% Independent Applicant
- Presence of a previous match violation: 19% U.S. Senior, 19% Independent Applicant

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
I ranked the programs in order of my preferences: 100%

I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend: 97%

I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs: 86%

I ranked all programs at which I interviewed: 84%

I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net": 79%

I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.): 63%

I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan: 56%

I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview: 41%

I ranked one or more program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net": 25%

I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.): 12%

I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan: 7%

I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview: 1%
Figure PA-3  Pathology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

U.S. Seniors

Independent Applicants

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).
Pediatrics (Categorical)
Figure PD-1
Pediatrics (Categorical)
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type

Quality of educational curriculum and training: U.S. Senior 69%, Independent Applicant 70%
Academic reputation of program: U.S. Senior 70%, Independent Applicant 70%
Diversity of patient problems: U.S. Senior 64%, Independent Applicant 64%
Geographic location: U.S. Senior 54%, Independent Applicant 77%
Quality of residents in program: U.S. Senior 44%, Independent Applicant 44%
Size of patient caseload: U.S. Senior 48%, Independent Applicant 44%
Quality of faculty: U.S. Senior 45%, Independent Applicant 47%
Work/life balance: U.S. Senior 47%, Independent Applicant 40%
Academic setting: U.S. Senior 46%, Independent Applicant 34%
Salary: U.S. Senior 44%, Independent Applicant 44%
Vacation/parental/sick leave: U.S. Senior 54%, Independent Applicant 36%
Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care: U.S. Senior 41%, Independent Applicant 39%
Housestaff morale: U.S. Senior 47%, Independent Applicant 21%
Cost of living: U.S. Senior 22%, Independent Applicant 31%
Future fellowship training opportunities with institution: U.S. Senior 19%, Independent Applicant 17%
Program director qualities: U.S. Senior 17%, Independent Applicant 23%
Call schedule: U.S. Senior 18%, Independent Applicant 22%
Other Benefits: U.S. Senior 29%, Independent Applicant 21%
Social and recreational opportunities of the area: U.S. Senior 25%, Independent Applicant 16%

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure PD-1
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type (Cont.)

Career paths of recent program graduates
Size of program
Preparation for fellowship training
Quality of hospital facility
Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities
Availability of electronic health records
Opportunities to perform specific procedures
Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location
Opportunities for training in systems-based practice
Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests
Opportunity to conduct research
Community-based setting
H-1B visa sponsorship
Board pass rates
Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff
Opportunity for international experience
Quality of ancillary support staff
Presence of a previous match violation

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Quality of educational curriculum and training 93% 91%
Academic reputation of program 95% 88%
Diversity of patient problems 81% 81%
Geographic location 97% 84%
Quality of residents in program 90% 84%
Size of patient caseload 66% 67%
Quality of faculty 84% 85%
Work/life balance 90% 80%
Academic setting 92% 86%
Salary 34% 39%
Vacation/parental/sick leave 53% 53%
Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care 81% 86%
Housestaff morale 78% 73%
Cost of living 66% 59%
Future fellowship training opportunities with institution 72% 70%
Program director qualities 60% 64%
Call schedule 52% 51%
Other Benefits 47% 51%
Social and recreational opportunities of the area 66% 86%

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure PD-2
Pediatrics (Categorical)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type

Career paths of recent program graduates - 77% U.S. Senior, 77% Independent Applicant
Size of program - 71% U.S. Senior, 83% Independent Applicant
Preparation for fellowship training - 79% U.S. Senior, 74% Independent Applicant
Quality of hospital facility - 83% U.S. Senior, 86% Independent Applicant
Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities - 20% U.S. Senior, 29% Independent Applicant
Availability of electronic health records - 62% U.S. Senior, 52% Independent Applicant
Opportunities to perform specific procedures - 32% U.S. Senior, 55% Independent Applicant
Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location - 58% U.S. Senior, 59% Independent Applicant
Opportunities for training in systems-based practice - 40% U.S. Senior, 61% Independent Applicant
Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests - 83% U.S. Senior, 78% Independent Applicant
Opportunity to conduct research - 48% U.S. Senior, 57% Independent Applicant
Community-based setting - 42% U.S. Senior, 60% Independent Applicant
H-1B visa sponsorship - 2% U.S. Senior, 26% Independent Applicant
Board pass rates - 52% U.S. Senior, 58% Independent Applicant
Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff - 33% U.S. Senior, 48% Independent Applicant
Opportunity for international experience - 52% U.S. Senior, 47% Independent Applicant
Quality of ancillary support staff - 47% U.S. Senior, 50% Independent Applicant
Presence of a previous match violation - 19% U.S. Senior, 27% Independent Applicant

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure PD-3
Pediatrics (Categorical)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies by Applicant Type

- I ranked the programs in order of my preferences: 98%
- I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend: 96%
- I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs: 87%
- I ranked all programs at which I interviewed: 88%
- I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net": 72%
- I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.): 56%
- I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan: 53%
- I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview: 98%

U.S. Senior vs. Independent Applicant
Figure PD-3  Pediatrics (Categorical)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

U.S. Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of applications submitted</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews offered</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews attended</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of programs ranked</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of applications submitted</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews offered</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews attended</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of programs ranked</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).
Figure PM-1

Physical Medicine & Rehab
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"*
by Applicant Type

- Quality of educational curriculum and training: 83% (U.S. Senior) / 75% (Independent Applicant)
- Academic reputation of program: 61% (U.S. Senior) / 76% (Independent Applicant)
- Diversity of patient problems: 58% (U.S. Senior) / 62% (Independent Applicant)
- Geographic location: 56% (U.S. Senior) / 71% (Independent Applicant)
- Quality of residents in program: 53% (U.S. Senior) / 38% (Independent Applicant)
- Size of patient caseload: 54% (U.S. Senior) / 48% (Independent Applicant)
- Quality of faculty: 51% (U.S. Senior) / 39% (Independent Applicant)
- Work/life balance: 57% (U.S. Senior) / 46% (Independent Applicant)
- Academic setting: 51% (U.S. Senior) / 36% (Independent Applicant)
- Salary: 51% (U.S. Senior) / 48% (Independent Applicant)
- Vacation/parental/sick leave: 45% (U.S. Senior) / 39% (Independent Applicant)
- Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care: 41% (U.S. Senior) / 30% (Independent Applicant)
- Housestaff morale: 37% (U.S. Senior) / 29% (Independent Applicant)
- Cost of living: 36% (U.S. Senior) / 26% (Independent Applicant)
- Future fellowship training opportunities with institution: 28% (U.S. Senior) / 28% (Independent Applicant)
- Program director qualities: 30% (U.S. Senior) / 28% (Independent Applicant)
- Call schedule: 30% (U.S. Senior) / 25% (Independent Applicant)
- Other Benefits: 27% (U.S. Senior) / 22% (Independent Applicant)
- Social and recreational opportunities of the area: 26% (U.S. Senior) / 18% (Independent Applicant)

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure PM-1  
Physical Medicine & Rehab  
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"*  
by Applicant Type (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career paths of recent program graduates</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of program</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for fellowship training</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of hospital facility</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of electronic health records</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to perform specific procedures</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for training in systems-based practice</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program’s flexibility to pursue electives and interests</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to conduct research</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based setting</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1B visa sponsorship</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board pass rates</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for international experience</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ancillary support staff</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a previous match violation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
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Figure PM-2  
Physical Medicine & Rehab  
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection  
by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
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Figure PM-2

Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career paths of recent program graduates</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of program</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for fellowship training</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of hospital facility</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of electronic health records</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to perform specific procedures</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for training in systems-based practice</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to conduct research</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based setting</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1B visa sponsorship</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board pass rates</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for international experience</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ancillary support staff</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a previous match violation</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure PM-3
Physical Medicine & Rehab
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies by Applicant Type

- I ranked the programs in order of my preferences: U.S. Senior 100%, Independent Applicant 94%
- I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend: U.S. Senior 93%, Independent Applicant 91%
- I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs: U.S. Senior 86%, Independent Applicant 74%
- I ranked all programs at which I interviewed: U.S. Senior 64%, Independent Applicant 68%
- I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net": U.S. Senior 53%, Independent Applicant 40%
- I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.): U.S. Senior 12%, Independent Applicant 30%
- I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan: U.S. Senior 17%, Independent Applicant 23%
- I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview: U.S. Senior 9%, Independent Applicant 13%

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies by Applicant Type

### U.S. Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of applications submitted</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews offered</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews attended</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of programs ranked</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Independent Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of applications submitted</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews offered</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews attended</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of programs ranked</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).*
Plastic Surgery (Integrated)
Figure PS-1
Plastic Surgery (Integrated)
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"*
by Applicant Type

Quality of educational curriculum and training
Academic reputation of program
Diversity of patient problems
Geographic location
Quality of residents in program
Size of patient caseload
Quality of faculty
Work/life balance
Academic setting
Salary
Vacation/parental/sick leave
Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care
Housestaff morale
Cost of living
Future fellowship training opportunities with institution
Program director qualities
Call schedule
Other Benefits
Social and recreational opportunities of the area

U.S. Senior
Independent Applicant

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type (Cont.)

Figure PS-1

Career paths of recent program graduates
- U.S. Senior: 53%
- Independent Applicant: 24%

Size of program
- U.S. Senior: 17%
- Independent Applicant: 13%

Preparation for fellowship training
- U.S. Senior: 27%
- Independent Applicant: 27%

Quality of hospital facility
- U.S. Senior: 11%
- Independent Applicant: 7%

Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities
- U.S. Senior: 11%
- Independent Applicant: 13%

Availability of electronic health records
- U.S. Senior: 6%
- Independent Applicant: 0%

Opportunities to perform specific procedures
- U.S. Senior: 16%
- Independent Applicant: 33%

Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location
- U.S. Senior: 11%
- Independent Applicant: 13%

Opportunities for training in systems-based practice
- U.S. Senior: 8%
- Independent Applicant: 7%

Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests
- U.S. Senior: 6%
- Independent Applicant: 7%

Opportunity to conduct research
- U.S. Senior: 11%
- Independent Applicant: 0%

Community-based setting
- U.S. Senior: 2%
- Independent Applicant: 0%

H-1B visa sponsorship
- U.S. Senior: 4%
- Independent Applicant: 20%

Board pass rates
- U.S. Senior: 2%
- Independent Applicant: 7%

Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff
- U.S. Senior: 2%
- Independent Applicant: 0%

Opportunity for international experience
- U.S. Senior: 3%
- Independent Applicant: 0%

Quality of ancillary support staff
- U.S. Senior: 2%
- Independent Applicant: 0%

Presence of a previous match violation
- U.S. Senior: 1%
- Independent Applicant: 7%

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure PS-2: Plastic Surgery (Integrated) Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type

Quality of educational curriculum and training: 86% (U.S. Senior), 87% (Independent Applicant)
Academic reputation of program: 87% (U.S. Senior), 100% (Independent Applicant)
Diversity of patient problems: 58% (U.S. Senior), 93% (Independent Applicant)
Geographic location: 85% (U.S. Senior), 93% (Independent Applicant)
Quality of residents in program: 86% (U.S. Senior), 93% (Independent Applicant)
Size of patient caseload: 70% (U.S. Senior), 79% (Independent Applicant)
Quality of faculty: 73% (U.S. Senior), 81% (Independent Applicant)
Work/life balance: 60% (U.S. Senior), 73% (Independent Applicant)
Academic setting: 60% (U.S. Senior), 81% (Independent Applicant)
Salary: 25% (U.S. Senior), 33% (Independent Applicant)
Vacation/parental/sick leave: 28% (U.S. Senior), 47% (Independent Applicant)
Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care: 28% (U.S. Senior), 47% (Independent Applicant)
Housestaff morale: 30% (U.S. Senior), 29% (Independent Applicant)
Cost of living: 54% (U.S. Senior), 60% (Independent Applicant)
Future fellowship training opportunities with institution: 69% (U.S. Senior), 71% (Independent Applicant)
Program director qualities: 73% (U.S. Senior), 77% (Independent Applicant)
Call schedule: 30% (U.S. Senior), 29% (Independent Applicant)
Other Benefits: 25% (U.S. Senior), 60% (Independent Applicant)
Social and recreational opportunities of the area: 67% (U.S. Senior), 71% (Independent Applicant)

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
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Figure PS-2
Plastic Surgery (Integrated)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection
by Applicant Type

- **Career paths of recent program graduates**: 86% U.S. Senior, 100% Independent Applicant
- **Size of program**: 57% U.S. Senior, 86% Independent Applicant
- **Preparation for fellowship training**: 80% U.S. Senior, 93% Independent Applicant
- **Quality of hospital facility**: 74% U.S. Senior, 93% Independent Applicant
- **Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities**: 14% U.S. Senior, 27% Independent Applicant
- **Availability of electronic health records**: 39% U.S. Senior, 21% Independent Applicant
- **Opportunities to perform specific procedures**: 63% U.S. Senior, 79% Independent Applicant
- **Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location**: 36% U.S. Senior, 79% Independent Applicant
- **Opportunities for training in systems-based practice**: 25% U.S. Senior, 36% Independent Applicant
- **Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests**: 64% U.S. Senior, 71% Independent Applicant
- **Opportunity to conduct research**: 38% U.S. Senior, 43% Independent Applicant
- **Community-based setting**: 38% U.S. Senior, 43% Independent Applicant
- **H-1B visa sponsorship**: 6% U.S. Senior, 20% Independent Applicant
- **Board pass rates**: 47% U.S. Senior, 64% Independent Applicant
- **Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff**: 22% U.S. Senior, 36% Independent Applicant
- **Opportunity for international experience**: 54% U.S. Senior, 57% Independent Applicant
- **Quality of ancillary support staff**: 44% U.S. Senior, 60% Independent Applicant
- **Presence of a previous match violation**: 30% U.S. Senior, 21% Independent Applicant

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure PS-3  Plastic Surgery (Integrated)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

- I ranked the programs in order of my preferences: 100% (U.S. Senior), 23% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend: 98% (U.S. Senior), 85% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs: 86% (U.S. Senior), 85% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked all programs at which I interviewed: 70% (U.S. Senior), 62% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net": 50% (U.S. Senior), 38% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.): 16% (U.S. Senior), 31% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan: 55% (U.S. Senior), 85% (Independent Applicant)
- I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview: 12% (U.S. Senior), 23% (Independent Applicant)

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure PS-3
Plastic Surgery (Integrated)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

**U.S. Seniors**

- Median number of applications submitted: 50 (Matched), 50 (Not Matched)
- Median number of interviews offered: 15 (Matched), 9 (Not Matched)
- Median number of interviews attended: 12 (Matched), 8 (Not Matched)
- Median number of programs ranked: 12 (Matched), 8 (Not Matched)

**Independent Applicants**

- Median number of applications submitted: 48 (Matched), 50 (Not Matched)
- Median number of interviews offered: 6 (Matched), 1 (Not Matched)
- Median number of interviews attended: 5 (Matched), 1 (Not Matched)
- Median number of programs ranked: 5 (Matched), 3 (Not Matched)

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).*
Psychiatry (Categorical)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of educational curriculum and training</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation of program</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of patient problems</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of residents in program</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of patient caseload</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/life balance</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic setting</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation/parental/sick leave</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housestaff morale</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future fellowship training opportunities with institution</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director qualities</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call schedule</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and recreational opportunities of the area</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Psychiatry (Categorical)
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"*
by Applicant Type (Cont.)

Figure PY-1

- Career paths of recent program graduates: 12% U.S. Senior, 10% Independent Applicant
- Size of program: 15% U.S. Senior, 18% Independent Applicant
- Preparation for fellowship training: 15% U.S. Senior, 10% Independent Applicant
- Quality of hospital facility: 21% U.S. Senior, 22% Independent Applicant
- Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities: 36% Independent Applicant
- Availability of electronic health records: 13% U.S. Senior, 10% Independent Applicant
- Opportunities to perform specific procedures: 4% U.S. Senior, 8% Independent Applicant
- Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location: 17% U.S. Senior, 21% Independent Applicant
- Opportunities for training in systems-based practice: 12% U.S. Senior, 19% Independent Applicant
- Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests: 29% Independent Applicant
- Opportunity to conduct research: 14% U.S. Senior, 17% Independent Applicant
- Community-based setting: 8% U.S. Senior, 12% Independent Applicant
- H-1B visa sponsorship: 2% U.S. Senior, 19% Independent Applicant
- Board pass rates: 2% U.S. Senior, 7% Independent Applicant
- Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff: 4% U.S. Senior, 14% Independent Applicant
- Opportunity for international experience: 1% U.S. Senior, 2% Independent Applicant
- Quality of ancillary support staff: 2% U.S. Senior, 3% Independent Applicant
- Presence of a previous match violation: 0% U.S. Senior, 2% Independent Applicant

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure PY-2  Psychiatry (Categorical)  
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection  
by Applicant Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of educational curriculum and training</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation of program</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of patient problems</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of residents in program</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of patient caseload</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/life balance</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic setting</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation/parental/sick leave</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housestaff morale</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future fellowship training opportunities with institution</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director qualities</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call schedule</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and recreational opportunities of the area</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
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Psychiatry (Categorical)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection
by Applicant Type

- Career paths of recent program graduates: 69% (U.S. Senior), 67% (Independent Applicant)
- Size of program: 67% (U.S. Senior), 57% (Independent Applicant)
- Preparation for fellowship training: 72% (U.S. Senior), 67% (Independent Applicant)
- Quality of hospital facility: 82% (U.S. Senior), 82% (Independent Applicant)
- Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities: 44% (U.S. Senior), 35% (Independent Applicant)
- Availability of electronic health records: 49% (U.S. Senior), 51% (Independent Applicant)
- Opportunities to perform specific procedures: 23% (U.S. Senior), 36% (Independent Applicant)
- Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location: 62% (U.S. Senior), 65% (Independent Applicant)
- Opportunities for training in systems-based practice: 41% (U.S. Senior), 61% (Independent Applicant)
- Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests: 83% (U.S. Senior), 79% (Independent Applicant)
- Opportunity to conduct research: 53% (U.S. Senior), 64% (Independent Applicant)
- Community-based setting: 41% (U.S. Senior), 49% (Independent Applicant)
- H-1B visa sponsorship: 3% (U.S. Senior), 25% (Independent Applicant)
- Board pass rates: 25% (U.S. Senior), 45% (Independent Applicant)
- Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff: 33% (U.S. Senior), 56% (Independent Applicant)
- Opportunity for international experience: 21% (U.S. Senior), 28% (Independent Applicant)
- Quality of ancillary support staff: 47% (U.S. Senior), 50% (Independent Applicant)
- Presence of a previous match violation: 11% (U.S. Senior), 23% (Independent Applicant)

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure PY-3
Psychiatry (Categorical)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

I ranked the programs in order of my preferences
- U.S. Senior: 98%
- Independent Applicant: 96%

I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend
- U.S. Senior: 94%
- Independent Applicant: 83%

I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs
- U.S. Senior: 86%
- Independent Applicant: 62%

I ranked all programs at which I interviewed
- U.S. Senior: 60%
- Independent Applicant: 60%

I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net"
- U.S. Senior: 50%
- Independent Applicant: 30%

I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.)
- U.S. Senior: 13%
- Independent Applicant: 35%

I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan
- U.S. Senior: 10%
- Independent Applicant: 20%

I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview
- U.S. Senior: 4%
- Independent Applicant: 11%

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure PY-3
Psychiatry (Categorical)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

U.S. Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of apps</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median interviews offered</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median interviews attended</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median programs ranked</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of apps</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median interviews offered</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median interviews attended</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median programs ranked</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).
Radiology-Diagnostic
**Radiology-Diagnostic**

Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of educational curriculum and training</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation of program</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of patient problems</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of residents in program</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of patient caseload</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/life balance</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic setting</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation/parental/sick leave</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housestaff morale</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future fellowship training opportunities with institution</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director qualities</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call schedule</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and recreational opportunities of the area</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Radiology-Diagnostic

Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type (Cont.)

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

Figure RD-1

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure RD-2
Radiology-Diagnostic
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection
by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure RD-2  
Radiology-Diagnostic  
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection  
by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking Strategy</th>
<th>Applicants (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I ranked the programs in order of my preferences</td>
<td>U.S. Senior: 98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend</td>
<td>U.S. Senior: 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs</td>
<td>U.S. Senior: 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked all programs at which I interviewed</td>
<td>U.S. Senior: 77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a &quot;safety net&quot;</td>
<td>U.S. Senior: 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.)</td>
<td>U.S. Senior: 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a &quot;fall-back&quot; plan</td>
<td>U.S. Senior: 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview</td>
<td>U.S. Senior: 4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure RD-3
Radiology-Diagnostic
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

U.S. Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of applications submitted</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews offered</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews attended</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of programs ranked</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of applications submitted</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews offered</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews attended</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of programs ranked</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).
Radiation Oncology
Figure RO-1

Radiation Oncology
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type

- **Quality of educational curriculum and training**: 73% (U.S. Senior), 69% (Independent Applicant)
- **Academic reputation of program**: 83% (U.S. Senior), 92% (Independent Applicant)
- **Diversity of patient problems**: 47% (U.S. Senior), 46% (Independent Applicant)
- **Geographic location**: 71% (U.S. Senior), 69% (Independent Applicant)
- **Quality of residents in program**: 66% (U.S. Senior), 62% (Independent Applicant)
- **Size of patient caseload**: 37% (U.S. Senior), 38% (Independent Applicant)
- **Quality of faculty**: 58% (U.S. Senior), 54% (Independent Applicant)
- **Work/life balance**: 45% (U.S. Senior), 15% (Independent Applicant)
- **Academic setting**: 63% (U.S. Senior), 54% (Independent Applicant)
- **Salary**: 34% (U.S. Senior), 23% (Independent Applicant)
- **Vacation/parental/sick leave**: 38% (U.S. Senior), 31% (Independent Applicant)
- **Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care**: 15% (U.S. Senior), 15% (Independent Applicant)
- **Housestaff morale**: 22% (U.S. Senior), 23% (Independent Applicant)
- **Cost of living**: 18% (U.S. Senior), 8% (Independent Applicant)
- **Future fellowship training opportunities with institution**: 0% (U.S. Senior), 5% (Independent Applicant)
- **Program director qualities**: 22% (U.S. Senior), 23% (Independent Applicant)
- **Call schedule**: 16% (U.S. Senior), 15% (Independent Applicant)
- **Other Benefits**: 28% (U.S. Senior), 23% (Independent Applicant)
- **Social and recreational opportunities of the area**: 38% (U.S. Senior), 23% (Independent Applicant)

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Radiation Oncology

Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type (Cont.)

Figure RO-1

Career paths of recent program graduates
- U.S. Senior: 16%
- Independent Applicant: 38%

Size of program
- U.S. Senior: 9%
- Independent Applicant: 23%

Preparation for fellowship training
- U.S. Senior: 4%
- Independent Applicant: 8%

Quality of hospital facility
- U.S. Senior: 15%
- Independent Applicant: 24%

Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities
- U.S. Senior: 9%
- Independent Applicant: 8%

Availability of electronic health records
- U.S. Senior: 12%
- Independent Applicant: 8%

Opportunities to perform specific procedures
- U.S. Senior: 11%
- Independent Applicant: 23%

Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location
- U.S. Senior: 13%
- Independent Applicant: 8%

Opportunities for training in systems-based practice
- U.S. Senior: 10%
- Independent Applicant: 8%

Program’s flexibility to pursue electives and interests
- U.S. Senior: 0%
- Independent Applicant: 15%

Opportunity to conduct research
- U.S. Senior: 0%
- Independent Applicant: 59%

Community-based setting
- U.S. Senior: 0%
- Independent Applicant: 0%

H-1B visa sponsorship
- U.S. Senior: 0%
- Independent Applicant: 15%

Board pass rates
- U.S. Senior: 6%
- Independent Applicant: 0%

Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff
- U.S. Senior: 2%
- Independent Applicant: 0%

Opportunity for international experience
- U.S. Senior: 1%
- Independent Applicant: 0%

Quality of ancillary support staff
- U.S. Senior: 3%
- Independent Applicant: 0%

Presence of a previous match violation
- U.S. Senior: 1%
- Independent Applicant: 0%

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
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Figure RO-2
Radiation Oncology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection
by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

U.S. Senior
Independent Applicant

Quality of educational curriculum and training: 82% (U.S. Senior), 92% (Independent Applicant)
Academic reputation of program: 87% (U.S. Senior), 92% (Independent Applicant)
Diversity of patient problems: 62% (U.S. Senior), 62% (Independent Applicant)
Geographic location: 85% (U.S. Senior), 83% (Independent Applicant)
Quality of residents in program: 80% (U.S. Senior), 77% (Independent Applicant)
Size of patient caseload: 72% (U.S. Senior), 77% (Independent Applicant)
Quality of faculty: 86% (U.S. Senior), 85% (Independent Applicant)
Work/life balance: 75% (U.S. Senior), 83% (Independent Applicant)
Academic setting: 84% (U.S. Senior), 85% (Independent Applicant)
Salary: 25% (U.S. Senior), 33% (Independent Applicant)
Vacation/parental/sick leave: 37% (U.S. Senior), 50% (Independent Applicant)
Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care: 75% (U.S. Senior), 77% (Independent Applicant)
Housestaff morale: 69% (U.S. Senior), 73% (Independent Applicant)
Cost of living: 52% (U.S. Senior), 50% (Independent Applicant)
Future fellowship training opportunities with institution: 24% (U.S. Senior), 42% (Independent Applicant)
Program director qualities: 63% (U.S. Senior), 62% (Independent Applicant)
Call schedule: 32% (U.S. Senior), 54% (Independent Applicant)
Other Benefits: 32% (U.S. Senior), 25% (Independent Applicant)
Social and recreational opportunities of the area: 74% (U.S. Senior), 67% (Independent Applicant)

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
Figure RO-2
Radiation Oncology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection
by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011

128
Figure RO-3
Radiation Oncology
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

- I ranked the programs in order of my preferences: 100%
- I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend: 94%
- I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs: 87%
- I ranked all programs at which I interviewed: 84%
- I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net": 53%
- I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.): 58%
- I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan: 28%
- I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview: 17%

U.S. Senior
Independent Applicant

NRMP Applicant Survey Results, 2011
**Figure RO-3**

Radiation Oncology

Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies

by Applicant Type

**U.S. Seniors**

- Median number of applications submitted: Matched 40, Not Matched 50
- Median number of interviews offered: Matched 15, Not Matched 11
- Median number of interviews attended: Matched 11, Not Matched 11
- Median number of programs ranked: Matched 11, Not Matched 11

**Independent Applicants**

- Median number of applications submitted: Matched 35, Not Matched 35
- Median number of interviews offered: Matched 20, Not Matched 2
- Median number of interviews attended: Matched 14, Not Matched 2
- Median number of programs ranked: Matched 12, Not Matched 2

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).*
Surgery (Categorical)
Figure SG-1
Surgery (Categorical)
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"*
by Applicant Type

Quality of educational curriculum and training: 69% U.S. Senior, 64% Independent Applicant
Academic reputation of program: 56% U.S. Senior, 70% Independent Applicant
Diversity of patient problems: 53% U.S. Senior, 64% Independent Applicant
Geographic location: 49% U.S. Senior, 70% Independent Applicant
Quality of residents in program: 48% U.S. Senior, 31% Independent Applicant
Size of patient caseload: 49% U.S. Senior, 62% Independent Applicant
Quality of faculty: 44% U.S. Senior, 40% Independent Applicant
Work/life balance: 36% U.S. Senior, 30% Independent Applicant
Academic setting: 40% U.S. Senior, 34% Independent Applicant
Salary: 37% U.S. Senior, 34% Independent Applicant
Vacation/parental/sick leave: 29% U.S. Senior, 32% Independent Applicant
Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care: 30% U.S. Senior, 36% Independent Applicant
Housestaff morale: 25% U.S. Senior, 19% Independent Applicant
Cost of living: 31% U.S. Senior, 25% Independent Applicant
Future fellowship training opportunities with institution: 27% U.S. Senior, 28% Independent Applicant
Program director qualities: 29% U.S. Senior, 16% Independent Applicant
Call schedule: 14% U.S. Senior, 16% Independent Applicant
Other Benefits: 19% U.S. Senior, 22% Independent Applicant
Social and recreational opportunities of the area: 19% U.S. Senior, 30% Independent Applicant

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors.

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure SG-1

Surgery (Categorical)
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type (Cont.)

Career paths of recent program graduates 32%
Size of program 16%
Preparation for fellowship training 21%
Quality of hospital facility 26%
Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities 20%
Availability of electronic health records 15%
Opportunities to perform specific procedures 20%
Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location 12%
Opportunities for training in systems-based practice 9%
Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests 7%
Opportunity to conduct research 20%
Community-based setting 12%
H-1B visa sponsorship 2%
Board pass rates 10%
Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff 3%
Opportunity for international experience 3%
Quality of ancillary support staff 3%
Presence of a previous match violation 2%

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure SG-2
Surgery (Categorical)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection
by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
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Figure SG-2  
Surgery (Categorical)  
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection  
by Applicant Type

- Career paths of recent program graduates: 86% U.S. Senior, 77% Independent Applicant
- Size of program: 70% U.S. Senior, 63% Independent Applicant
- Preparation for fellowship training: 84% U.S. Senior, 75% Independent Applicant
- Quality of hospital facility: 76% U.S. Senior, 80% Independent Applicant
- Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities: 49% U.S. Senior, 21% Independent Applicant
- Availability of electronic health records: 61% U.S. Senior, 44% Independent Applicant
- Opportunities to perform specific procedures: 61% U.S. Senior, 49% Independent Applicant
- Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location: 61% U.S. Senior, 48% Independent Applicant
- Opportunities for training in systems-based practice: 51% U.S. Senior, 37% Independent Applicant
- Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests: 53% U.S. Senior, 62% Independent Applicant
- Opportunity to conduct research: 75% U.S. Senior, 65% Independent Applicant
- Community-based setting: 57% U.S. Senior, 52% Independent Applicant
- H-1B visa sponsorship: 25% U.S. Senior, 4% Independent Applicant
- Board pass rates: 61% U.S. Senior, 52% Independent Applicant
- Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff: 39% U.S. Senior, 31% Independent Applicant
- Opportunity for international experience: 34% U.S. Senior, 26% Independent Applicant
- Quality of ancillary support staff: 51% U.S. Senior, 47% Independent Applicant
- Presence of a previous match violation: 25% U.S. Senior, 28% Independent Applicant

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking Strategy</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I ranked the programs in order of my preferences</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked all programs at which I interviewed</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a &quot;safety net&quot;</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a &quot;fall-back&quot; plan</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure SG-3**

Surgery (Categorical)

Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies 
by Applicant Type

### U.S. Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of applications submitted</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews offered</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews attended</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of programs ranked</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Independent Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matched</th>
<th>Not Matched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median number of applications submitted</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews offered</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of interviews attended</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of programs ranked</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).
Transitional (PGY-1 Only)
Transitional (PGY-1 Only)
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"* by Applicant Type

- Quality of educational curriculum and training: 68% U.S. Senior, 50% Independent Applicant
- Academic reputation of program: 76% U.S. Senior, 50% Independent Applicant
- Diversity of patient problems: 42% U.S. Senior, 43% Independent Applicant
- Geographic location: 55% U.S. Senior, 50% Independent Applicant
- Quality of residents in program: 31% U.S. Senior, 29% Independent Applicant
- Size of patient caseload: 50% U.S. Senior, 26% Independent Applicant
- Quality of faculty: 43% U.S. Senior, 33% Independent Applicant
- Work/life balance: 54% U.S. Senior, 38% Independent Applicant
- Academic setting: 27% U.S. Senior, 26% Independent Applicant
- Salary: 43% U.S. Senior, 33% Independent Applicant
- Vacation/parental/sick leave: 46% U.S. Senior, 45% Independent Applicant
- Appropriate balance between faculty supervision and resident responsibility for patient care: 30% U.S. Senior, 31% Independent Applicant
- Housestaff morale: 12% U.S. Senior, 23% Independent Applicant
- Cost of living: 14% U.S. Senior, 21% Independent Applicant
- Future fellowship training opportunities with institution: 18% U.S. Senior, 23% Independent Applicant
- Program director qualities: 31% U.S. Senior, 46% Independent Applicant
- Call schedule: 33% U.S. Senior, 27% Independent Applicant
- Other Benefits: 19% U.S. Senior, 19% Independent Applicant
- Social and recreational opportunities of the area: 16% U.S. Senior, 19% Independent Applicant

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure TR-1  Transitional (PGY-1 Only)  
Percent of Applicants Rating Factors in Ranking Programs as "1" or "2"*  
by Applicant Type (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>U.S. Senior</th>
<th>Independent Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career paths of recent program graduates</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of program</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for fellowship training</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of hospital facility</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of electronic health records</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to perform specific procedures</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for training in systems-based practice</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program’s flexibility to pursue electives and interests</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to conduct research</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based setting</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1B visa sponsorship</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board pass rates</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for international experience</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ancillary support staff</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a previous match violation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents were asked to rank five to eight factors in each category where "1" is "most important." The categories are: "Institutional Characteristics," "Educational Factors," "Clinical Duties/Patient Care Factors," "Faculty and Staff Characteristics," "Compensation and Benefits," and "Quality of Life Factors."

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure TR-2
Transitional (PGY-1 Only)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection by Applicant Type

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
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Transitional (PGY-1 Only)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Each Factor in Interview Selection
by Applicant Type

- Career paths of recent program graduates: 64% U.S. Senior, 53% Independent Applicant
- Size of program: 76% U.S. Senior, 71% Independent Applicant
- Preparation for fellowship training: 55% U.S. Senior, 54% Independent Applicant
- Quality of hospital facility: 89% U.S. Senior, 88% Independent Applicant
- Supplemental income (moonlighting) opportunities: 23% U.S. Senior, 26% Independent Applicant
- Availability of electronic health records: 61% U.S. Senior, 54% Independent Applicant
- Opportunities to perform specific procedures: 61% U.S. Senior, 52% Independent Applicant
- Cultural/racial-ethnic diversity of geographic location: 56% U.S. Senior, 55% Independent Applicant
- Opportunities for training in systems-based practice: 63% U.S. Senior, 38% Independent Applicant
- Program's flexibility to pursue electives and interests: 85% U.S. Senior, 77% Independent Applicant
- Opportunity to conduct research: 64% U.S. Senior, 51% Independent Applicant
- Community-based setting: 50% U.S. Senior, 44% Independent Applicant
- H-1B visa sponsorship: 11% U.S. Senior, 2% Independent Applicant
- Board pass rates: 45% U.S. Senior, 37% Independent Applicant
- Cultural/racial-ethnic/gender diversity of institutional staff: 54% U.S. Senior, 30% Independent Applicant
- Opportunity for international experience: 55% U.S. Senior, 37% Independent Applicant
- Quality of ancillary support staff: 53% U.S. Senior, 55% Independent Applicant
- Presence of a previous match violation: 30% U.S. Senior, 30% Independent Applicant

Note: Items are presented in descending order based on percent of all applicants who ranked each factor as "1" or "2" where "1" is "most important."
Figure TR-3
Transitional (PGY-1 Only)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

I ranked the programs in order of my preferences
U.S. Senior: 98%
Independent Applicant: 89%

I ranked all programs that I was willing to attend
U.S. Senior: 95%
Independent Applicant: 79%

I ranked a mix of both competitive and less competitive programs
U.S. Senior: 92%
Independent Applicant: 63%

I ranked all programs at which I interviewed
U.S. Senior: 84%
Independent Applicant: 86%

I ranked one or more less competitive program(s) in my first-choice specialty as a "safety net"
U.S. Senior: 48%
Independent Applicant: 47%

I ranked the programs based on the likelihood of matching (most likely first, etc.)
U.S. Senior: 20%
Independent Applicant: 51%

I ranked one or more program(s) in an alternative specialty as a "fall-back" plan
U.S. Senior: 17%
Independent Applicant: 25%

I ranked one or more program(s) where I applied but did not interview
U.S. Senior: 15%
Independent Applicant: 22%
Figure TR-3
Transitional (PGY-1 Only)
Percentage of Applicants Citing Different Ranking Strategies
by Applicant Type

U.S. Seniors

- Median number of applications submitted:
  - Matched: 26
  - Not Matched: 22

- Median number of interviews offered:
  - Matched: 12
  - Not Matched: 10

- Median number of interviews attended:
  - Matched: 9
  - Not Matched: 8

- Median number of programs ranked:
  - Matched: 9
  - Not Matched: 7

Independent Applicants

- Median number of applications submitted:
  - Matched: 15
  - Not Matched: 42

- Median number of interviews offered:
  - Matched: 3
  - Not Matched: 1

- Median number of interviews attended:
  - Matched: 2
  - Not Matched: 1

- Median number of programs ranked:
  - Matched: 1
  - Not Matched: 1

*Match outcome is based on preferred specialty (i.e., specialty listed first on rank order list of programs).