

# EA Market Testing Team: Goals/FAQ

## Abstract

The EA Market Testing team aims to understand how to promote EA-relevant actions in the most credible and fruitful way. We want the EA community to leverage what we learn about marketing techniques to expand and strengthen the EA movement and to promote EA-aligned ideas, policies and actions. We will devise and measure ways to increase effective giving, impactful career choices, and transparent and rigorous conversations about effective altruism and global priorities. We will focus on tools and approaches that are closely-linked to *actual impact and effectiveness*, and that involve encouraging people to carefully consider ‘how to do good better’. We will share our methods, insights, approaches, and results with the EA community through dynamic ‘open science’ presentations, as well as plain-language summaries. In this document, we outline our goals, rationale and intentions.

## Content of this document

The case for an EA Market Testing team	2
What are some of the key questions, issues, and priorities?	6
What ‘outputs and tools’ might you produce that would add value?	7
What have we achieved so far?	8
Why might the EAMT fail/not be worth its costs?	8
Other “FAQ”	9
What does the EA community want to see in this space?	9

### Note:

This is a ‘companion document’ where we lay out broad themes, make a case, and anticipate/answer FAQs.

- Linked in our funding application working doc [EAMT: Funding request/app](#), but also useful to have as a separate doc not linked to the application ... because then we can use/link/embed it elsewhere too.
- Integrated back into our [public Gitbook](#)
- The below draws from/will from the gitbook, airtable, GWWC shared docs, Reinstein’s bookdowns, and EA forum threads to flesh out and reference the below’

See [EAMT progress and results](#) for a live update and outline of what we believe we have achieved and learned.

We are building a set of ‘high value themes’ to focus on in [themes\\_goals\\_common\\_projects](#)

# The case for an EA Market Testing team

## Why 'market test' the promotion of ideas and actions associated with Effective Altruism?

To 'learn how' to do successful marketing, messaging and outreach, while actually doing it, towards the following goals  
...

1. To expand and strengthen the EA movement
  - a. EA is a small and somewhat fringe group, it has targeted its message only narrowly and done little marketing, limiting its influence and resilience (as its members age and change; see, e.g., concerns about ['value drift'](#))
  - b. We are particularly interested in "Generating more high impact, dedicated EAs" (~~Sam Bankman-Fried~~, Julia Galef's, Holden Karnofsky's, etc)
  - c. Diversifying EA (demographically, politically, world-view-wise, etc)
2. To convince large numbers of people to support policies in line with increasing well-being, reducing suffering, and reducing [existential risks](#) (X-risk) and locked-in-suffering risks ([S-risks](#))
  - a. To learn how to 'sell' difficult and complicated ideas (such as the importance of reducing AI risk)
3. To promote 'better epistemics' in global populations (e.g., ['scout mindset'](#)), driving selection of better leaders, better institutions, and a better public debate
4. We believe there can be a large net positive impact...
  - a. of donations (to effective charities; see [next section](#)),
  - b. and private and professional choices; e.g., voting, teaching/learning, choosing more impactfully pro-social and jobs, reducing consumption of animal products, and contributing to better international dialogue
5. To learn how to promote EA-associated ideas and actions to the (present and future) elite, powerful, and high-achieving

## What are EA-relevant actions?

Some examples of direct or instrumentally-relevant actions...

- Reading books like *The Precipice*, *Doing Good Better*, etc., and engaging and communicating with these ideas..
- Donating to high impact charities
- Voting for EA-sympathetic political candidates who are sympathetic to EA-aligned ideas and policies supporting global priorities and reducing existential risks
- EA- relevant political action of other sorts, e.g., petitions
- Supporting EA-aligned business by, say, subscribing to EA magazines, buying EA books, clean meat, etc..
- Share EA relevant content online
- Promoting veganism (and welfare-ism, reduce-itarianism, etc).
- Promoting high impact jobs

## What 'attitudes and beliefs' are you interested in influencing?

Some examples...

- Campaigns to raise awareness of X-risk
- Promoting norms towards effectiveness and impact (e.g., in donations)
- Raise awareness of the EA community and its philosophy more generally (in a positive way, of course)
- Increase sympathy towards future generations, animals, global poor, ... ; 'widening moral circles'

## Why is 'effective giving' a part of this? Don't we have enough funding already? And does 'middle-class giving' matter?

Although some very-wealthy people support EA, there is still massive suffering in the world, continued S-risk and X-risk, and opportunity for very impactful donations. [Ben Todd makes a strong case for this](#), emphasizing that "what matters is not total funding available but marginal cost-effectiveness". [Michael Townsend further argues that](#) "longtermists should expect to find donation opportunities with a cost effectiveness at least as high as \$5,000 to save a

life, and likely much higher” and “there are robustly good longtermist interventions that need funding”/

While it is [difficult to get consistent estimates](#), the sum total of global charitable donations of the ‘middle class’ clearly represents a substantial component (and it could be larger). For example, “those in the top 1 percent of the income distribution (any family making 394,000 USD or more in 2015) provide about a third of all charitable dollars given in the U.S” (Source: [Philanthropy Roundtable](#), as reported in [Reinstein et al’s synthesis](#)), implying that the remainder make up roughly two thirds.

Note that I am also skeptical of the idea of ‘a talent constraint not a funding constraint’. This is debated in the context of AI risk, where mission-alignment and intrinsic motivation may be particularly important and hard to observe. But even in this context (see [this discussion of hiring at MIRI](#)) it is far from obvious that more funding wouldn’t buy useful work. In other areas this argument is far less tenable. We strongly suspect that (e.g.) biologists, economists, lawyers, and data scientists could be motivated by money and prestige to pursue more socially-beneficial research areas, such as pandemic-risk reduction, ‘clean meat’, global health and well-being (re-focusing on less wealthy populations), and improving legal institutions (e.g., to reduce threats of war and dictatorships).

We believe mainstream effective giving has strong potential direct effects, as noted. We also have instrumental reasons for promoting this and learning ‘what works’ in this context:

- Promoting (the ideas behind) effective giving is very connected to promoting ideas that will lead to better personal, professional, and political decisions
- Making a donation is costly. Thus ‘donation choices’ are likely to be a stronger measure of a person’s true beliefs and values than other measures (stated hypothetical choices, surveyed attitudes). (These other measures are vulnerable to biases like acquiescence bias and desire to avoid cognitive dissonance, etc. These biases may not *disappear* when incentives are present, but strong incentives are likely to overwhelm less powerful biases.)

### **How is this (your project) relevant for a longtermist?**

- ‘Learning how to market analytical pro-social ideas’ will spill-over in general
- Anecdotally (and we can look for further evidence) people in EA have tended to drift from ‘Non-LT’ EA ideas towards LT-ism; it might be argued to be a ‘gateway drug’.<sup>1</sup>
  - Thinking carefully about effectiveness, moral utilitarianism, cause-neutrality, and the moral weight we should assign to sentient beings may naturally bring people towards caring about end prioritizing the many individuals are likely to exist/may exist in the far future.
  - As measured in the EA survey, the [EA movement has become more LT-ist over time](#), and [more engaged EAs tend](#) to be more LT-ist. This is suggestive of the ‘gateway drug’ story. It more strongly suggests that being involved in EA will bring one in a peer-group inclined towards LT-ism.
- We will directly test receptiveness to longtermist ideas (and perhaps involve LT-ist charities like ALLFED as a salient incentive)
- We are working with 8ok and plan to work with other longtermist organizations

*Career-recruitment focused considerations* : I agree that we don’t know how much of the insights gained in one context (e.g., donation pledges targeted to mainstream audiences) will generalize to the other contexts (e.g., getting elite students to sign up for 8ok coaching). But the EAMT platform and collaboration will allow us to measure and test how much these things generalize. And there are more opportunities to gather more data on mainstream audiences than on the elite ones

*Public outreach*: With ‘less than the shortest AI-risk timelines’ it would seem important to be able to convince voters to support existential risk reduction and longtermist policies. As I’ve argued, there are several possible shared goals on the path to ‘getting people to give to effective charities through analytical appeals’ and ‘get people to care about X-risk, EA mindset, and the long-term future’. Namely:

- Value and willingness to commit own resources to helping others
- Considering effectiveness/efficiency/impact/analytics in doing so
- Having a wide moral circle

---

<sup>1</sup> To do: Citations and evidence to examine/strengthen this case

## Shouldn't each institution do this on its own? Why central/joint funding?

**Economies of scale and 'minimum efficient scale':** Most of the key organizations involved in effective giving and outreach are small, with only a handful of employees. Economics speaks of "minimum efficient scale" in manufacturing, particularly where large fixed assets and indivisible inputs are involved in the production process. As a simple example, suppose producing artificial heads requires a 3d printer costing £10,000 per year which can print up to 100 heads per year. Companies producing 50 heads cannot produce as cheaply per head as those producing 100, 200, or 800 heads. On the other hand, if two head-makers each producing 50 heads *shared* the use of a 3d printer, they could potentially produce at the 'minimum cost'.

Similarly, some inputs, such as 'hiring a full-time marketing guru' may not justify their cost for an individual organization. It may be hard to hire such a 'guru' part-time, and there may be a large one-time cost of recruiting, onboarding, and 'explaining to them about the particular nature of EA messaging marketing. However, much of this recruitment/onboarding/training will be similar across EA orgs. By pooling the capacities of several small organizations, and sharing the 'use' of this particular employee or consultant, the gains can be achieved efficiently in spite of the small scale of each org.

### Public goods nature of the research, marketing, and learning across organizations (spillovers)

Many aspects of the market-testing insights we hope to gain will benefit a large range of EA organizations and advocates in their mission. Learning...

- which audiences are receptive to EA messaging,
- how to use platforms to market and test in this context, and how to observe outcomes,
- how to measure and track important changes in values and life choices,
- which approaches to explaining concepts like 'impact/neglectedness/tractability', 'existential risk', and 'the importance of considering cost-effectiveness in charitable giving' are most persuasive and successful...

... will be extremely helpful for most of the organizations on our team, and in the EA outreach and communications sector.

However, underprovision of public goods, and 'free riding' in collective endeavors are well-known problems. This might be less problematic for intrinsically motivated and mission-driven EA organizations. However, we might expect each organization (and individual) will tend to prioritize its own goals and personal successes, and find it hard to take on activities and expenses that 'mainly benefit a wide range of EA organizations in common'. At each organization, employees are under pressure to 'keep the lights on' and achieve org-specific targets. It may be hard to justify putting aside time to design, track, analyze, and communicate organized and systematic research trials. (Similarly, it may not seem justified to take the time to carefully document processes such as "how to target social media advertisements to particular EA-relevant categories"). This is hard enough to justify (and motivate oneself to do) when costs are certain and benefits are uncertain and not immediate. Where the benefits of these trials (and activities) are spread across EA orgs, and the costs taken on by individual employees and orgs, it is even more difficult.

However, we suspect that the *total* benefits of careful research will strongly exceed the costs. This is particularly the case if, as we believe, EA funders plan to significantly increase marketing, communication and outreach activities in the next decades. The more we can learn now, the more effectively we can target this.

More prosaically, carefully documenting processes the first time is very often a big time-saver in the long run, particularly where these processes are useful across a range of organizations in this area. In the particular domain of social media advertising and site tracking, while one can 'Google this stuff', there is a lack of transparent available guidance. Furthermore, some contexts are particularly relevant to EA marketing/testing, and thus have little available documentation.

**But is there really overlap across organizational goals?** Our experience and conversations suggest so. To give some perhaps obvious examples:

- OfTW, GWWC, and TLYCS are all hoping to advertise on social media/web to try to get people to take effective giving pledges, research effectiveness, and give to high-impact causes, with somewhat similar approaches. They all want to know: which advertising platforms are most cost-effective, which settings and demographic filtering to use, to what extent there are 'diminishing returns to advertising', which 'calls to action' are best at getting people into the funnel and maximizing their 'lifetime value'.

- Similarly, most of the orgs (particularly, but not only 80k) want to do similar for ‘bringing people into EA’, ‘reading about EA ideas’, and considering career-changes (and advising) towards more impactful work
- All orgs want to know about ‘EA branding’ and impressions. How much do people already know about EA and its key ideas (at universities, in elite companies, and in the wider population)? How do people react to terms like “effective altruism”, “the long-term future”, and the “welfare of sentient beings”, and are people meaningfully more positive about other ways of wording and describing these ideas?

**Synergies with academic research.** Many academics are asking about, and interested in questions related to the ones above. By working through the EAMT, and in a central organized space, we can more easily communicate with and engage academics. This will make the analysis more rigorous and more credible, and bring in further insights, and less prone to error with more people looking at the data and results. By leveraging academic incentives, we can get ‘research work for free.’

### **What are some useful ‘shared resources’ provided by the team, and are these worth it? What are some concrete ‘public goods’ generated?**

**A consolidated log and synthesis** of experiences from all the marketing and communication efforts across EA orgs *would* seem a good idea to me if it were free. However, the opportunity cost of generating this body of knowledge could be very high, requiring input from high-impact individuals in our community, which is the community’s most scarce and valuable asset right now.

Thus we will try to *enable* this in as low-touch, repetition-free a way as possible, providing easy templates and support. We are building minimal and easy reporting forms, and those running trials can just share a set of minimally comprehensible notes. When running a trial it is almost always advisable to keep some notes and records on what was planned, done, and intended. If this is not done, the analysis cannot be passed on to others on the team, and you will forget what and how to find and interpret the data and consider the results when it comes to analyze them. We aim to make it very little additional work to report this ‘in our system’ relative to what an org would have wanted to do anyways.

**A network of practitioners in a niche space who can communicate** quickly and get answers and impressions. In our conversations with the organizations, this has been cited as one of the most useful aspects.

**Data analysis process’:** We are working to organize the work flows, incentives, and coding tools, so that the academics and researchers on our team can function as a **‘data analysis team’** for the organizations. The ability to carefully work with data and statistics is rare and prized, and organizations may not have the time or patience to treat it carefully.

### **Particularly relevant insights, that are (in many cases) specific to our shared context, have included**

- Gathering evidence and benchmarks the cost per click and cost per site visit in a range of contexts (Facebook, YouTube ads, etc)
- Evidence on the value of specific targeting options in Facebook advertising (e.g., targeting those under-40 and those who indicate an interest in ‘Charitable causes’ has had some measured benefits)
- Insights into ‘which organization is doing what’, and how we may avoid support each other and avoid duplicating the same work,
  - And learning about *less promising* interventions (e.g., a campaign for bespoke donor advising seems to be proving relatively unpopular), to avoid ‘repeating mistakes’
- Sharing tools for carefully analyzing, documenting, and presenting data (esp. using git and R-markdown)
- Linking arms to capture medium-term effects of interventions. E.g., Charity Elections is running pilots in particular high schools. Other parts of the EA ecosystem collect data and could ask about ‘where you attended high school, allowing meaningful tracking.
- How to extract data from different platforms (Google analytics, Meta business suite, etc.)
- Particular message framings that have proved favorable, such as ‘only 3% research charitable giving’, and mentioning the number of participants in a way that might suggest ‘joining an elite group’

# What are some of the key questions, issues, and priorities?

1. How to “sell” analytical/efficiency arguments in altruistic contexts, in credible ways that are differentiated from misleading measures of ‘impact’?

*‘Analytical and quantitative/utilitarian reasoning joined with concern for a wide moral circle’*: A key set of values and principles unites the EA community (including longtermists, ‘neartermists’ focused on global health and poverty, animal advocates, and others). However, in the wider world, it is more unusual for empathy and charity to be joined to ‘cold rationality’, and these are often seen as in opposition. (Cite Berman et al, 2018 on ‘how people find it more appropriate to consider preferences than efficiency in charitable giving’; maybe also cite Caviola et al’s profiling work).

To ‘sell’ effective giving, long-term oriented policymaking, impactful behavior and career changes , etc., advocates need to better understand:

*“How can we effectively present analytical and efficiency concerns in altruistic/other-regarding contexts?”*

One key example (argued in Reinstein et al’s [‘living web book’ on “Effective giving, responses to analytical ‘effectiveness information’](#)): “For people to systematically choose the most efficient charities they must be aware of the differences in effectiveness, suggesting a role for advertising and publicity.” Thus, we need to find ways to credibly and fruitfully present evidence and arguments for the most impactful charities (and actions, policies, etc.).

These arguments must be closely tied to *actual* evidence and clear epistemics and not easily co-opted by misleading imitators. For example, again in the domain of charity, there are a number of agencies that claim to provide meaningful ratings, but these do not credibly reflect true impact-per-dollar, focusing on less relevant measures such as ‘overhead ratios’. Where they do touch on impact, they often keep this hidden, do not compare across categories (e.g. international and domestic charities), and elide important distinctions (see Reinstein/EA Forum [HERE](#), on Charity Navigator).

However, there is some conventional wisdom and academic work making a case that presenting analytical information is very difficult, and may backfire. There is the well-known “identifiable victims effect/bias”, ‘scale invariance’, and some work arguing (often invoking ‘dual process’ models) that analytical thinking modes ‘turn off’ the empathetic brain and discourage giving. (Reinstein et al’s covers this work in the web-book synthesis sections starting [here](#)). However, a synthesis of evidence (ibid, work in progress [here](#)) suggests that typical ‘impact information’ has neither a large positive or negative effect.

Thus, restating the above:

We will devise, measure, ways to increase/shifting charitable giving (and altruistic actions and communication) to more effective/impactful causes and modes using arguments and ‘tools’ that are closely-linked to *actual impact and effectiveness*.

2. Other steps towards spreading EA epistemics and values, involvement, and compatible actions?
  - a. What other approaches will increase effective giving and action, particularly those that are underused by effective causes, and where effective causes have ‘special advantages’?
  - b. How can we ‘widen moral circles’ and convince people to act in accordance with these?
3. “Profiling”: What audiences, demos, and psychological types are most amenable to considering EA ideas, getting involved with EA, and pursuing EA-aligned actions?

What else?

- How to boost generous action in general?
- How to improve epistemics

- How to measure attitudes towards EA-aligned ideas such as existential risk, cause-neutrality, and moral circle expansion

#### 4. Meta and instrumental questions

- How have comparable movements and causes done well?
- What's been done/being done in EA and adjacent that we may be neglecting?
- What are the best social science and marketing approaches?
- What can 'marketers' do for us, qual and quant, and how/whom could we hire?
- How to get relevant samples,?
- What platforms can do what? How to run tests on social media/ad platforms?

## What 'outputs and tools' might you produce that would add value?

*Josh: These may help many of these efforts at once (i.e., have positive externalities if one org did the research):*

1. [A report/post/section] on the potential for EAs to work with marketing agencies
  - a. This could include: Are the best marketing agencies 1000x more effective than the least, as with charities? (Efficient market hypothesis suggests not, but there may be reasons to think otherwise)..
  - b. A forum post on what marketing opportunities exist and their pros and cons, whether there are truly elite marketers with far higher impact than many others, and so on.
2. ... detailing all the types of marketing EAs could want to engage in with their pros and cons (different kinds of digital advertising, TV, etc...)
3. Profiling report:
  - a. systematically testing which demographics are most responsive to which messages/themes/behaviors/opportunities. This is a very large undertaking and one on which it might be worth working with an elite marketing agency and which could plausibly be achieved with digital advertising... although, there is also an argument that survey methods might be better suited to this task. It would be great to do segmentation on a really finely-grained level. This really does seem like something that should be done across cause areas.
  - b. The feasibility of very tailored targeting, e.g., targeting people based on being Sam Harris, Ezra Klein fans, or other very specific combinations of interests (STEM, ethics, philosophy, say). E.g., maybe 80k should target people from each university major who also are into some philosophy/morality/global issues stuff and give them a message like "learn the most effective careers physicists like you can do to best solve climate change." That might be an insight that is genuinely generalizable. Other such insights might exist.
4. "How to better communicate with underrepresented demographics" in EA (e.g., which cause areas to focus on, which EA aligned actions could we ask them to take).
5. "The best ways to collect and use data from digital advertising"
6. Software to help EA orgs have control over the optimization/randomization process which determines which person sees which ad
7. Survey software that collects survey data very efficiently (e.g., by scraping their LinkedIn page, Dillon reckons he can easily do this).

## What have we achieved so far?

See [EAMT progress and results](#)

# Why might the EAMT fail/not be worth its costs?

1. **Not properly valuing and using the time of our org partners** (and our own time). “The opportunity cost of generating this body of knowledge is very high: it requires the time of the very high-impact individuals in our community (Luke, Grace, Bella), and that is the community’s most scarce and valuable asset right now.” (Some response to this above)
2. **Lack of generalization/potential inference about messaging/marketing approaches, or gains from finding new**
  - a. **Insights about messaging may not generalize.** It’s possible that any effects we find of different messaging strategies will not generalize well and may do more harm than good by preventing people from relying on approximately accurate intuitions about their own domain.
  - b. **Behavior in these domains may be highly unpredictable and complex, and ‘social science is hard’.** It may be so difficult to gain useful insights that it is not worth doing. Or our mainly-quantitative approach may be inferior to less formal qualitative approaches. (Note: it still might be with ‘doing marketing’ and ‘learning about the marketing process’, even if ‘learning about what messages work’ is too hard.)
  - c. **Insights about ‘which platforms work best’ may not generalize.** I think I would apply the exact same argument. Josh: “If it’s context-dependent enough, our insights would do more harm than good.” DR: If we are cautious, and people are Bayesian, ‘noise’ can be appropriately ignored. But in the real-world, point taken, particular as platforms change over time.
  - d. **There might be a narrow ‘additional market’ for EA ideas/actions/involvement** over and above what has already been done. (DR: but I think this is unlikely, given the very limited marketing thus far)
  - e. **Relatedly, the ‘most important EA ideas’** (perhaps long-termism) may be extremely difficult to sell beyond a very narrow audience

*Main response to the second point above (DR):* it seems at least plausible that we’re in a world where ‘insight is feasible, useful, and generalizable.’ If so, this work may be highly valuable. Thus, it’s worth quickly trying to understand whether ‘we are in that world’. I don’t see any way of learning the answer other than diving in and testing, and seeing what replicates across contexts, and what is useful.

3. **Backlash and shut-down factors**
  - a. **The EA community may be averse on privacy or message-dilution grounds** (partial response to this is above)
  - b. **The ‘fact we are marketing EA’ might rub (mainstream) people badly**

**Note:** I seeded the “identify Failure Modes” task on Elicit.org, a Gpt3 tool with our plan and (slightly rephrased) versions of the above issues. I starred the generated responses that seemed interesting – you can see them [HERE](#). A few I found most interesting, with some quick responses

4. ‘Marketing for EA’ will brand us as faddish and shallow
  - a. DR: I think this is a matter of ‘how we do it’; we need to keep an eye on things
5. It’s hard to identify the best metrics to use
  - a. DR: A very good point. As noted I want to focus not on ‘easy link clicks’ but try to find things we can track to very meaningful outcomes. But still, comparisons may be difficult (e.g., if one approach does better than another by some measures but not others
6. We don’t know how to reliably identify high-impact actions in real-world contexts.
  - a. DR: This is part of our general project, but it is very much aided by work others have done, particular at organizations like 8ok, where they have done and supported substantial work on things like ‘the value of earning to give versus direct work.’ RP’s work with the EA survey data is also valuable here.
7. EAs disagree over key foundational issues, meaning that ‘marketing for EA’ will be contentious and divisive
  - a. DR: Agreed. Part of our work (which I’ve done a bit of above) involves identifying what we have in common and can agree on



# Other “FAQ”

## Sharing and publishing our results

Will you keep your work continuously public or plan to publish bite-sized reports? I would be interested to stay updated to learn from your continuously, if possible.

*David Reinstein:* We will try to make our results public and shared as soon as possible, and work transparently and openly, ideally in dynamic documents. We are aiming for both (some) academic work, guides for practitioners, and EA-forum/-esque writeups.

## What does the EA community want to see in this space?

**What questions do you think we should answer with our research? Do you have any 'burning questions' or ideas? What do you want to learn?**

*From our EA forum free-form 'survey'*

- "What is the average level of skepticism towards EA principles in the population? / in different demographic subgroups?
- What are the sources of skepticism?
- What messages measurably reduce this skepticism?
  
- Quantifiable metrics, and analytical arguments may have ran their course in terms of attracting as many people as they will. I would focus on art and emotion, but not sure that will increase EA or general philanthropy.
  
- "What are starting points/primers that are not about donating?
- How to talk about climate change as a cause area in EA?
  
- Social media advertising seems promising, and even if it isn't from a paid advertising point of view, resources and techniques for local groups would be very valuable, as right now I don't know of anything I can share (on TikTok or Instagram) to those I already know are interested
- If possible, please look at regional/geographical/international differences in marketing approaches. I work in Russia where evidence and information on how EA could be marketed would be really appreciated, but is lacking. I assume most of your conclusions will relate to the English-language. But for the movement to grow internationally, we need to know which marketing approaches are applicable to various geographies.

A promising approach can be to check with the persons if they have any ideas on how their company/industry/department can make greater impact (maybe a sincere survey that some real actually EA-educated person will 24/7 on a chat answer). Engage them with ...mmm have you thought about the counterfactual? Is there anything better? Have you checked with the department? Would they accept it? Would this not be a reputational loss risk? How could this be mitigated?

(Without recommending - ah, donate to nets, done - but more like --- hmmm interesting well sounds great go do it! - or, ask a few people get back to us (can there be an agent such as CS Laetitia etc of Binance??) ... entertain until the person does not implement a change or is not curious enough about EA they want to meet a real person (in which case recommend participation at a local event) (I would not recommend the virtual fellowship upfront since that is like not care actually just want to get you to participate in our fellowship - or anything else, such as donating funds - since ok but if the understanding is the person is the one interested in impact the others are those who are not so interested that can optimize for the narrative of the connection influencing the organization with their own language/narrative).

- Which audiences are averse to "EA" branding?
- What are less consequentialist-sounding frames? Do those do better?

"Besides the above, it would be generally helpful to know which EA stances are most popular across a variety of segments (or even better, by segment) and which are the least popular. I.E. political communication and market research for but for EA positions.

Which people associated with EA are most popular and least popular? (in total and by segment)"

### *Whom should we target and how do we identify them?*

*Which groups do you suspect might be particularly amenable to EA-aligned ideas/actions, or worth exploring further? Which individual and group traits and characteristics would be particularly interesting to learn more about? What approaches to targeting might we take?*

"Anyone younger than 30.

would be interesting to learn what messaging effectively activates interest in middle aged groups. "  
Less interested in older (->25) & less talented groups. Don't think it's worth your time testing receptivity from folks with pre-existing interests (e.g. climate) because I suspect they're going to be unpromising.

"People working in tech startups  
English speakers in mainland Europe

Admittedly I put myself in these groups, so I am biased 😊"

"- Hmm maybe about what defines one's willingness to make impact and whether that is necessary (maybe, they just seek power but the framework is already set up in a way which results in impact).

- Maybe you should target people who can influence large entities while not being perceived as 'against' the entity (just seeking to support their actual benevolence).

- In emerging economies, target persons who can work on various tasks for a very low cost but are educated and also present a great image of cool independent life-hacking people who however/in addition perceive a great intensity of feelings of interpersonal or even natural interactions since they focus on the relationship and do not agree to part until issues are resolved but also this should be very expeditious to impress but do not take too many seconds of busy decisionmakers. Also, who have innovative insights into effective solutions that consider mutually beneficial systemic change and are connected (at least through networks) to various local and industry-specific decisionmakers.

- Target professors asking for a few references emphasizing that these persons should be really selfless - will not gain any monetary benefit - more like be bothered by (nice) but people focused on making impact in their spare time

- Any NGOs that are seeking funding. If they have to make a project that institutionalizes systemic change into the long-term that also mitigates global catastrophic risk and that can be quantified as with high impact/cost ratio, and provide at least some reasoning and evidence (surveys) and estimate of the counterfactual (reasoning/surveys/expert insights into trends or comparable unfunded beneficiaries' situations), while mutually benefiting all across moral circles they may be able to do it.

- Market unrestricted funding opportunities with these restrictions.

- Funders of projects that are neither effectively altruistic nor resulting in change but are kept by emotions - need to be there but would like to actually make some more efficient change.
  - Market efficiency, coordination, innovativeness, actually works, no emotions
- Older people who like to talk about nice philosophy.
  - Book clubs.
    - Do not just want them to donate money more like organize book clubs hold others accountable to doing good by traditional authority.
- Bureaucrats
  - Greatly organized way of making impact.
- Academics
  - Way to get published or gain research funding or gain a teaching buy-out
- Relatively less affluent persons in developed countries
  - Not judgmental, actually nice
- Stereotype of a data-oriented younger person in California
  - Mathematically technical writing, (managed, not threatening or 'others are getting you every day') AI safety (including universal moral values coolness since to prevent AI aligned with the objectives to sell a product not advance a system increasingly more beneficial to all sentience and other ways of doing good)
    - Target on niche social media? Online event where someone will speak about it and Q&A?
- Conservative persons in the US
  - Since the state shall not intervene!
    - Preserve the honor of future generations, for the respect of our ancestors.
      - Target non-decisionmakers to make groups more welcoming.
- Decisionmakers in DC
  - In-person approached by young persons who rely on them in making impact, changing the world since authority, not wasting time and allowing them to entertain their friends by entertaining the younger person (or similar marketing)
    - Target the young persons by an opportunity to do their work while they speak with decisionmakers (in-network)
- US military
  - Prevent war. While gaining a comparative advantage in strategy. For example, making agreement with Pakistan to invest some aid to reduce fractional tensions to prevent war with India while gaining a strategic comparative advantage in placing bases in Pakistan and cooperating with the military, in the way of Chinese Belt and Road, which is a great defense precaution.
    - Target non-proliferation academics to develop a strategy and understanding how to approach the US military (while considering sentience) before marketing (through connections) - remain unnoticed/unappealing to the military meanwhile"

"Students! High school and university, in particular  
In general, aligning with CEA's strategy seems good."

"See above, also: I think political and religious engagement are probably undervalued as EA target market segments because EA does not want to associate directly with them and targeting any one segment might lead to value drift. But if EA had the capacity to target multiple of these at once or moderate the influx from individual groups, it could be very positive.

Also, could EA leverage existing networks and groups to spread? Would a partnership with Ethical Societies or the Unitarian Church (including the use of their community spaces for local group meetings) help without causing too much value drift. Could EA sponsor book clubs around the country with funding and the only requirement is they read *Doing Good Better* or *The Precipice* or similar book every 6 months (i.e. a watered down version of what CEA does now). Could we partner with networking groups or social groups (maybe even political groups) in major cities to

host joint events, where their member's contributions are matched by EA funders (or though giving multiplier) as long as they listen to a talk. Should EA attempt to tap into philanthropic circles of the elites by hosting charity events with celebrities. Most if not all will probably be a no, but might be worthy of review. "