

Appendix A: Participant feedback

One-to-one advising

We have feedback from our “initial impressions” form on one-to-one advising (the full results can be seen [here](#)), which is sent to participants immediately after their call. By the end of 2020, we had responses from 38 out of 58 recipients of one-to-one advising (66%). Of these:

- 65% rated it as a 6 or 7 out of 7 for usefulness. This is nearly identical to the percentage that [80,000 Hours received](#) in their one-to-one advising in 2019. We didn't vet applications whereas 80,000 did; it's unclear whether that should lead us to have higher or lower expectations.
- We received a [net promoter score](#) of 40%. This seems fine compared to [for-profit benchmarks](#). Arguably we should have higher expectations given that this is a free service from a nonprofit.
- For all other questions, the answers were also positive, but few were outstanding. The most positive answers were for “To what extent do you agree that the call and application process: Was focused on your needs” (4.8 out of 5) and “Recommended resources you are likely to use” (4.8 out of 5). The most disappointing answer was for “...Changed your likely career trajectory” (3.3 out of 5).

Online course and workshop

By early January, we had collected 21 **“initial impressions” forms** from our online course participants using similar questions. In most cases, the responses seem very similar to the one-to-one advising, despite substantially lower time input from AAC per participant in the online course, though these responses only represent the most active 18% of participants. The course seems to have been more successful at motivating participants to help animals, but the advising was much better tailored to individuals' needs. We also collected [qualitative feedback](#) from individuals who completed the test session at the end of the course. Some of this feedback suggested that participants might make quite substantial career plan changes as a result of the course.

By the end of January, we had collected 20 [“initial impressions”](#) forms from the workshop, again using similar questions. There was an even closer match between the responses here

and the responses to the form about the online course component. One interpretation of these results is that the workshop continued to add value — roughly similar value to that provided by the preceding online course. An alternative interpretation is that respondents didn't distinguish between the workshop specifically and the course and workshop overall, inputting similar values on both forms; if this is true, then the workshop may have added very little. We also asked the question: "How much of the value of the combined 'course and workshop' would you guess came from the workshop element specifically, as opposed to from the course?" 40% selected options suggesting that the course provided more than half the value and the other 60% selected less than half; one of these selected the option for "The workshop detracted from the total value." Additionally, in questions asking respondents to compare various parts of the workshop to each other, no section came out with an average score implying that it was "less useful" than other parts of the workshop; in other words, participants tended to be unrealistically optimistic about the value of specific components of the course and workshop, so this trend towards the workshop being less useful than the course is unusually negative.

Management and leadership training

We have completed quantitative evaluations of the management and leadership training, comparing responses to "[multifactor leadership questionnaires](#)" before the service began and six months after the service was first offered to participants. The results weakly suggest that:

- Participants receiving the management and leadership online course only and those who received both the online course and coaching (especially the latter group) both tended to feel slightly better about themselves and their management and leadership abilities; average changes in the relevant scales ranged from 0.08 to 0.92 on a 5-point scale (all in the intended direction).
- In both groups, the participants' own supervisors also seemed to agree that participants' management and leadership abilities had improved; average changes in the relevant scales ranged from 0.00 to 1.08 on a 5-point scale (again, all in the intended direction). Here, the changes were apparently more positive for the participants who did not receive any coaching.
- But in both groups, especially those who received coaching as well, the scores given by the people actually being managed by the participants are less promising, sometimes suggesting a slight worsening; average changes in the relevant scales

ranged from 0.31 in the intended direction to 0.43 in the opposite direction on a 5-point scale.

However, we don't place much weight on these findings, due to very small sample sizes and to various weaknesses in our study design and service delivery, meaning that we expect we could achieve substantially better results if we sought to improve the service in 2021.

We also received qualitative feedback via our survey about this service, which, as expected, tended to be quite mixed for the online training courses but very positive and thankful for the professional coaching. Other questions provided us with ideas for how to improve the service, such as to offer more structuring and personal contact. The majority believed that they were now more likely to pursue further management and leadership training, indicating potential positive indirect effects.

Other feedback

Finally, we have received a number of unprompted messages of gratitude for our one-to-one advising, introductory online course, and management and leadership training service (especially the coaching aspect).

We haven't received much feedback about our skills profiles. As these profiles are freely available on our website, it's difficult to collect feedback other than downloads.

If you'd like to provide additional feedback about our work, please [contact us](#), or use Jamie Harris' (co-founder and researcher) anonymous feedback form.