

Coaching session report

Alex Morgan

Regional airline profitability

20 October 2026

Overall assessment

3.6 / 5.0 SUFFICIENT

A pass, but only just. Your structure and your reading of the data were solid, and the recommendation came out in the right order. The break-even calculation is what kept the score down: you got there, but only after two prompts. Fix that and the next session should land clearly above the bar.

Scores by dimension

Dimension	Score
Problem structuring and prioritization	4.0 / 5.0
Analytical and quantitative skills	3.0 / 5.0
Business judgment and insight	4.0 / 5.0
Case leadership	3.5 / 5.0
Communication and synthesis	3.5 / 5.0

Priorities before the next session

1 State the formula before the numbers

For a break-even, say it out loud first: passengers needed = cost per flight ÷ average fare. Here that is $\$18,000 \div \$120 = 150$ passengers, so a 180-seat aircraft needs an 83% load factor. Writing the formula first would have saved you the two restarts.

2 Compare the result with today's number

A break-even alone is not an answer. Put it next to the current figure: 83% needed versus 78% today means every flight loses money. That comparison is the so-what the interviewer is waiting for.

3 Propose the next step yourself

After each analysis, say where you want to go next and why. Today I moved the case forward twice; in the interview, that is your job.

Performance by dimension

The five dimensions an MBB interviewer scores, with your score from 1 to 5 and where you stand today.

Problem structuring and prioritization

4.0 / 5.0 • GOOD

Your structure covered revenue, costs and the competitive context, with no overlaps. You named two or three sub-elements under each bucket and closed by saying where you wanted to start. To reach the next level, tie the structure to a hypothesis from the start: "I suspect the problem is on the cost side, because fares have held steady."

Analytical and quantitative skills

3.0 / 5.0 • NEEDS IMPROVEMENT

You read the revenue chart correctly, but the break-even calculation took two prompts. You first divided the cost by the number of seats instead of by the fare, then mixed up the cost per flight with the cost per passenger. The right path was $\$18,000 \div \$120 = 150$ passengers, an 83% load factor on 180 seats.

Business judgment and insight

4.0 / 5.0 • GOOD

You spotted that revenue per flight was stable while costs had risen, and you looked for the cause in turnaround time rather than in fares. Your ideas to shorten the turnaround were realistic and grounded in the case: parallel boarding, fewer catering stops, a dedicated ground crew at the two busiest airports.

Case leadership

3.5 / 5.0 • SUFFICIENT

You managed your time well and asked for a moment before each calculation. Twice, though, you waited for me to tell you what to analyze next. Close every structure and every analysis with a clear proposal of where to go next.

Communication and synthesis

3.5 / 5.0 • SUFFICIENT

The recommendation followed the right order: answer, supporting numbers, risks, next steps. During the case your explanations were sometimes long; lead with the conclusion and keep the reasoning to two or three points. Quote the 83% versus 78% in the final answer: it is your strongest number.

Case walkthrough

Your performance, part by part.

Part 1 Initial structure

GOOD

- **What worked** Clear buckets with no overlaps, and a sensible place to start.
- **To improve** State a hypothesis together with the structure.

Part 2 Revenue chart

SUFFICIENT

- **What worked** You saw that revenue per flight was flat over three years.
- **To improve** Close the chart with two headline messages before moving on.

Part 3 Break-even load factor

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT

- **What worked** You recognised that a break-even was the right tool.
- **To improve** Write the formula first: $\$18,000 \div \$120 = 150$ passengers, 83% of 180 seats. Then compare it with today's 78%.

Part 4 Brainstorming: shorter turnaround

GOOD

- **What worked** Ideas grouped in three clear categories: people, process, equipment.
- **To improve** Say which idea you would test first and why.

Part 5 Recommendation

SUFFICIENT

- **What worked** Answer first, then reasons, risks and next steps.
- **To improve** Quote the key numbers in the answer itself.

Agreed next steps

- Do three break-even drills, writing the formula before any number.
- Practice one interviewer-led case with two charts, closing each chart with its headline messages.
- Do two cases a week with a peer, focusing on proposing the next step yourself.
- Next session: a McKinsey-style interviewer-led case, then 15 minutes of Fit / PEI.