UX Australia

Design Research – Day 1

Wednesday, 17 March 2021

Captioned by: Hilary Caddy

the response from various quarters to those protests has been, on the one hand, very, very supportive, and on the other, we've seen a dismissive attitude, which has served to illustrate the point and illustrate the issue.

So I'd like to start by saying to the men in the audience, to the people who have the responsibility and we, men, have the responsibility to make a change in the way we treat the people around us, in the way we speak to other men, in the way in which we keep quiet about the treatment of women in the workplace, in the - in our social environments, in our homes. The way we treat our sons and the lessons that we pass on, we need to do better on this issue, and it is our responsibility to do better in this issue. It is past time, well past time that we teach girls and women to stay safe and to stay out of trouble and it's well past time that we start speaking to men about how not to assault people and how not to harass people, and how to treat everybody with respect.

So on that note, I would like to kick off this year's design research conference. We're very, very happy to have with us today Indi Young joining us from the US. Indi is a longtime advocate for design research, a longtime practitioner in this area. She has been a - not only a strong advocate for the way in which research is undertaken but has put that both into practice and into words with her writing and her presentations as a founder of adaptive path, she will be well known to this audience and also for her book, Mental Models, and subsequent writings. Indi, thank you so much for joining us and thank you so much for getting us started this year, welcome.

INDI YOUNG: Thank you so much, Steve. And thank you everybody for joining us. Hello, hello, hello. I can't believe you're having someone from all the way over here start your conference.

STEVE BATY: We love it. We love it.

INDI YOUNG: Yay. Well, your introduction was very close to what I'm going to speak about so I think that if I just go ahead and dive right in, everybody will see the connections and we can all get excited together, because we're really amazing community and that's something that we can celebrate amongst ourselves.

STEVE BATY: Thank you.

INDI YOUNG: So let me go ahead and get my screen shared here. And do a little technical adjustment in the background so I can actually see what I'm doing, and off we go. So I'm going to talk to you about people, about purpose, about patterns and about problem space and how we can shift the way we are supporting humans as they are in the world. And I love the thought - the use of the word "shift" 40 times in this intro. This is what this is all about and that's what we are going to be embarking on over the next 10 years together. We have been working on this together. And there are a lot of people who have made significant inroads in this, and I'll be referencing some of them. So I just want to take us back to the beginnings of software. Software hasn't been around that long. That's why I'm excited about this community, because we haven't been around that long. In the beginning software was just a way of doing calculations quickly. It was a way of automating processes. We used to have people who were called computers, who would do the calculations, most of them were women, at least in the US history that I've read. People were writing code in those days mostly for engineers on, the mathematicians, the people breaking codes in World War II. There were calculations being

made for various space programs. Visical came along and all of a sudden we had our first spreadsheets, the rest of us could use it too. And we got software procurement folks and we were playing games, all that. That was kind of the beginning of it.

Even as a kid, I was growing up, my best friend's dad in nursery school worked with someone using computers and we used to get the cards they would feed to the computers. So it was, I don't know, exploratory, interesting, going new places, innovation, right. At the time the software engineer's job was just to encode the process. So essentially the idea was just to go out and study from - that's where the subject matter SME came from, go study that subject matter expert, how the process is done and just make that process into code. That's what we were doing.

So then we decided to prioritise user friendly, which was a euphemism for - it's not easy to use, more useable, right, user centred even came about and we studied then how well the process worked for users. So now we started inviting people into the equation that we were using, and then we decided to prioritise user experience, and some methods like agile and design thinking and jobs to be done. And now the process has all of a sudden expanded to almost encompass anything a person wants to get done. I mean, we're able to make a loan to somebody of a small amount around the globe from somebody we don't know at all. We're able to compose music. We're able to do, you know, designs in 3D space that people can walk through. So we can do a lot of things.

We can also do a lot of the things that we used to do in the real world such as all of us privileged people have been able to do lately which is order our groceries to be delivered. So a lot of the things that we do both in terms of using machines but in terms of our normal lives have

become a part of it this, and I am going to make the statement that we still look at how that solution is being used, and I'm here to help us put words around what we need to do to get to the next age, the next digital age which is to make a shift to studying people.

Okay. So around the same time as this, along came the business models. And lots of money, because now we were making software for lots of people and it was possible to make a lot of money and all of a sudden zillion heirs started appearing. The people who were in power were making a very attractive to come and work for you, like if you were at Google or Apple or Facebook or Amazon. That is kind of how those grew, and those companies are in the business of supporting their users, the advertisers. The rest of us, we are the eyeballs, right, that is how we referred to it a couple of years ago. And the data it's getting harvested from us now is astronomical. It's amazing what's being created just to, you know, sensor, it's a nest, it's a thermostat. It's there so it can sense what we're doing in our house. Alexa, what's it for, play the radio perhaps. So it's kind of like all this is catching on fire, and indeed Gerron did a talk about how we wanted the internet to be free, we wanted everyone to have access. And unfortunately the model we choose, we chose back then, was the model that broadcast television was using, we chose advertising, so we could make it free for everybody, instead of using a different approach, like all of us paying for it together in terms of taxes or something.

Unfortunately now, the advertisers are disintermediating every single thing that we are doing on any of those platforms. And those platforms start to measure things in ways that are self-serving. Oh, are those people that were harvesting data frame, are they delighted? Good, we can keep harvesting from them. Are they looking at it through that little piece of glass. Good, we want them to stare at us longer, so we can

serve more ads.

The KPIs, the ways that we measure, even outside of those big four companies are organised by that company's goals. How well are we meeting our company goals? None of this is measuring a person's goal. I think it's high time that we started. So there are - okay, so I'm going to pull us away from that fire, because I don't know the answer there yet. Maybe - I don't know what goes through people's heads, but maybe it's a good place to get a start, put it on your résumé and then you wake up to what we're doing, maybe it's a stable place and you need to stability. I'm not sure how you solve for that, but I can solve for all the other companies that are out there. There are a lot of them in bio technical, pharmaceuticals, health care, insurance, they are founders and start-ups. If I haven't mentioned your type of company yet, please put it in the chat so I can mention it.

These companies make money to sustain themselves over time so that they're successful enough to keep being there to create solutions for more people. That's why they're there. They're creating solutions for people. All those people who are creating the vaccines for us, they're not doing it necessarily just to make money. Yes, they need to make money to pay for all the research that's being done, and yes, they are probably a layer of executives in there being paid way too much money, and I don't know a solve for that either, we're working on it. Still though even within those really cool orgs thinking of our users as typical of the market. And so that makes it, like, we're thinking like we're designing for the biggest part of the market, that part of the bell curve with the most area underneath it.

And these are also people who have a certain way of being in the world, who might get their groceries delivered, who might make a loan to someone who wants to raise more corn in a country on the other side of

the globe. And this is something I want to talk a little bit about. First of all, I want to say you know that market right now, it's being defined the way market research has worked for the past 100 years. It's being defined by demographics, by roles, by job performers, by the solution that's being offered. It's not being defined by people. And those little low parts of that surf that are referred to as edge cases, edge cases is a phrase from back when we used to make software that were process and codings, and someone would encode the process and then like, well, what are all the ways the process goes a little bit different and let's make sure we code that too. And those were edge cases.

Well, there is not a human on this planet that is an edge case. So this is not a very helpful way for us to look at this. It's just a way that we have been looking at it. So let's look at what's underneath this briefly. We have centuries of history. They have built up sort of the way that we are now, the way that we think about business now. The first thing I want to mention is this oral tradition. It used to be that when we talked to one another, shared knowledge, we would do it person to person, or person to group. There was a human involved. And then we started writing things down and then printing came along, and hot on the heels of printing, literacy, which has always been a good thing, because more people can know things. However, it's all through a page, not a person.

So there is a difference there. We started losing that importance of forming some sort of connection with a person. That becomes less and less and less important. In fact, when you read newspaper articles, do you know who wrote them? Right. So the - some folks say that social media, some folks say things like podcasts and Twitter are making the oral tradition come back because there's a connection to a person, even though it's like through a glass or through some head phones. So interestingly enough, scientific method also started around when the

printing press was going on, and this method was all about how are we going to gather the truth. And this is the truth about the actual natural world, things that exist, hard science. And so they started developing the scientific method around then and it got intertwined with our understanding of truth and written truth.

And now, if you, you know, you get words like "hearsay" right which mean something negative. That's just hearsay, it's not true. You get things like newspaper articles that say "oh look, they did this research and these were the results and they were really surprising and so I'm going to spend the rest of my article guessing what they mean." And that is what we accept. I've seen Ted talks where a researcher talks about the way he did research which was, wow, it was not framed correctly. I talk about that in some of my other talks, so I'm not going to do it in this one, but just say, there is a lot of it out there and beginning to recognise it. Beginning to recognise how it all sort of curled up together and then curled up with capitalism and always, always ongoing, colonialism, and that's kind of how we find ourselves today.

There are worse systems today than just what I've mentioned so far. No one system is in itself inherently good. I mean, even a democracy can make really bad decisions. We've seen that. In that middle column there with the paternalism, racism, colourism, and feminism and castes and the way that academia speaks about things which is a totally different language than the way the journalism talk about things, there's a lot of conflict between these things, and what we as humans try to do is see patterns and connect. So what we're doing is we're trying to connect truth with written word and it's very interesting because we end up with this in our businesses. We end up with this in our operations. We end up with this in the ideas of how there's people at the top that make all the money and then the people at the bottom do all the work.

So it's interesting, and there we go, now my slides are clicking again. So the problem is that we, like I said, we're still solving for the typical user using one way of being in the world. It is that way that we understand from having grown up in these systems. Our parents grew up in these systems. Our grandparents grew up in these systems. Their grandparents grew up in these systems. We are privileged to be about making systems, about building things, making solutions and we are swimming in this and some of the time we don't recognise it.

All I'm going to talk about now is how to recognise it and with a to do about it. So we're wish, all swimming around in this system. Even if there's one fish that's white male we don't go blame the white male, right. Even though there's one fish launching slurs at people, okay, we'll blame that fish, but we're all swimming in it together, and if this is our little community what we are about to do is help recognise that we're swimming in water. Help each other recognise that we're swimming in water. It's not - we didn't make the water. We're swimming in it, okay. So that's what we're helping each other recognise. That's how we're supporting each other, and we're also helping each other see outside that bowl and see other ways of being in the world and bring that to the rest of our organisation. That's the hard part actually. That's the tricky part, but I think we can do it. So yes, here we are in the fishbowl looking out and seeing millions of people being ignored, feeling unwelcome, actually being harmed by some of the solutions we are making.

It's not easy to things of. There's a lot of frustration out there, kind of mild harm. You know, maybe my thinking style was not hard so I have to use a tool to get around thinking, or actual harm. I'm not trying to look and see if what I have done is going to have a potential outcome for someone or completely ignore them, tell them they're not welcome here. Call them hard to reach. We get phrases like that, like that phrase

"underserved". Have you heard that? Do you hear that in your organisation? Interestingly enough that word comes from our system, the system point of view says oh there's some people outside the system that are underserved by us. And Arlin Hamilton who is a founder of the back stage capital venture firm, she uses the word "underestimated" instead of "underserved" and I really love that word, underestimated, because that gives the human back their dignity, that gives the human back their self-respect. It's a positive way of speaking about it, and it also is starting to recognise that there's water and there are other things outside of water.

Okay. So here's a little example of mild harm. We run across this stuff ourselves, even underprivileged every day. So this is just an ad for some company that sells wine and brings it to you I think. What's your favourite juice, what's your go-to cocktail. If you don't consume any of those or many of those you'll be like okay well, that's not for me. No matter what they're selling right. Or if you're the kind of person or philosophically doesn't have favourites, how do I engage with you. Maybe I do want some of this wine but I don't know how to engage with you because I don't have favourites. So it's just not checking and this is totally mild harm. There's serious harm. This is where we're getting more and more in our cars, these smooth touch screens, and research is showing that drivers have to take their eyes off the road longer to be able to find the control that they're after and adjust it and see the feedback because we're using it like we would use a phone, and yeah, sure, there are plenty of people who walk round with their face in the phone. But anyway Mars came out with a car this year that has a touch screen but you act with it with buttons and dials. Of course, there's a hack, everyone wants the hack to get the touch screen to work.

There's also systemic harm and this is a picture of Joy when she

was a grad student studying, testing facial recognition software. She could not get it to recognise her face. It turned out because of dark skin and also female features. She was behind the effort to get this notice out. She runs the algorithmic justice league and he managed to get several cities around the world to take the automatic recognition software out of their CCTVs. Nonetheless it's still in a lot of CCTVs. I think IBM stopped developing this software. There have been four cases in the United States where individuals have been arrested and put in jail because of the software identification. The cops come, arrest the person, march them off, don't look at their face and see it didn't really match. They were all innocent. I mean, that's harmful. That's systemic harm.

So humans are fully human. We have a lot of different ways of being in the world. As a little decoration on the slide I put a lot of brains, minds and hearts for feelings, but, you know, it's a body part too. I was going to put eyeballs but the eyeballs looked kind of funny. So we have these, not everybody has eyeballs that work really well. Not everybody has a brain or a heart that works super well but this is the stuff that makes us human. I get to that in a little bit here and we can study humans, instead of studying the process of the solution, and this is the way that we're going to level up and get our software less harmful.

So you may go, wait a minute, yeah, humans are myriad, we are complicated, we change our minds all the time, we even change our guiding principles when the mood suits. You can, yes, but that's called psychology, right. So you can for our purposes, for creating support for people, when we frame the human by their purpose. I have been doing studies like this for a couple of decades now, framing by their purpose, and this allows us to create valid data with patterns in it that we can then apply to the work that we're doing and also measure our work. So let's take a look.

If we can shift our focus to the people's purpose, when we do our studies, what we're going to do is get a lot of richness out of it, a lot more breadth, lot more understanding. I've got a billion more slides to help explain that purpose. First of all, what is a purpose, it's what a person is aiming for, that's their intent, I love that word, maybe you can call it objective, maybe someone's procrastinating and putting it off, just making progress on it. Maybe it's something that will never end and you're always making progress on it, like you are with your career. That's a purpose. Purpose is lots of levels of granularity but they're not a job. They're not a need either.

Need and job are business focused, solution focused questions about a person's purpose. Desired outcome comes closer to the idea of purpose, but not the way I've seen it used in jobs to be done. So a purpose isn't just - it's a state a person's trying to make exist and they may not be trying very hard yet. And it may be in a really small granularity or a large granularity. Here's a bunch of examples. I have an X and X broke and I need to be doing Y so I need to fix or work around or replace X. Let's say that X is my refrigerator and Y is a dinner party because maybe it's a few months from now and cross your fingers the pandemic is over and everybody's got the vaccine. Yeah, few months, I'm deluding myself. So anyway dinner party. So my refrigerator broke, what am I going to do? The first thing is probably call my neighbour and see if they have any room so I can put my stuff in their fridge and have the dinner party and then go get a fridge after the dinner party or something. Or maybe I'll cook it all up right now and it will be a precreated dinner party.

But X could also be your phone. Maybe my phone broke and maybe Y is I have to pick up the kids and they're back in school now and there's something weird about the end of the day schedule so I'm not sure or

what time I'm supposed to pick them up so we were just going to communicate by phone. So what am I going to do? Maybe I could run to the store and pick up a phone if you're that kind of thinking style, or you could maybe go to your neighbour again, borrow their phone, ask somebody else to set up some sort of a signal, right.

There's a lot of different ways that you can accomplish that different purpose. The second one, my pet isn't eating and I'll do anything to get them to eat. One of the ways to do that is yeah, they love that evaporated milk, I think I still have a can of that down in the basement. I'm going to run down there and get it and give it to the pet, see if they'll eat it. Or maybe I'll go to the pet store.

The third one, I'm unhappy with how I am perceived so I'm resolved to change. That's a really big purpose, purpose is going to take a while. I'm using a new API, it isn't behaving how I expected so I need to figure out what's wrong or something. That's a purpose.

I'm building my start-up and I need to balance like actually creating the solution and investigating and, you know, doing some research around that solution, with creating a culture of people that are working with me, with finding an investor so that we can all get this work done and not starve to death. Or this next one, make a reservation for a flight so that I can arrive in time for X. All of these are studies that I've done, except for the one about the pet.

That one last - the reservation so I can get home in time for X, there was a woman who was going to a conference, a psychology conference and she wanted to get home in time for her daughter's first piano recital. I think that's what they call them. Anyway, and there was a delay and so all sorts of things happened. Anyway, the last one, get a good seat for the flight, that is sometimes a part of making the reservation and it also sometimes comes back again later. What does

"good" mean? Here's a little peek at the data. This is get a good seat for the flight. This is a mental model diagram. You can see three groups here. The first group is figure out whether that seat is good. Worry that I won't get the seat I want.

The next big group, choose a seat that allows me to do what I need to do. In there, we have people who want an aisle seat because I have to get up and down a couple of times because I get a backache if I sit too long or I want an aisle seat because I go to the bathroom a lot, I don't want to climb over everybody, I want a window seat because I can sleep. Or I want a sleep with room for my laptop or my baby or all these different things. So there's a lot of things that people want out of a seat. We collect them and we find the patterns. Let me get into that a little bit in a couple more slides.

But what we do, when we collect this data is we ask, what went through your mind the last time you were pursuing this purpose, and the time before that, and we ask people in a way that they can tell us their inner thinking, their emotional reactions and their guiding principles. That - we're back to the slide with the brains and the hearts. This is the core pieces of being human. This is all the depth, these the things that are happening when you are forming cognitive therapy with somebody, you understand their inner thinking, their emotional reactions and guiding principles, and this is extremely rich. It's not the surface revel opinions and premises, needs, right, for somebody to speak to your in your words instead of their words. It allows you to understand more than just an explanation, but what actually went through somebody's mind.

So let's explain purpose in one other way as well. So this is a person in the centre of the screen and this person has a purpose. It looks like a plant so maybe they're gardening and they have a thought bubble for inner thinking, they have a heart for emotional reactions. They have a

little scale for guiding principles because guiding principles are what you use to help you decide things. And that, in that area where they're pursuing their purpose is called the problem space.

In a ring around them are all the tools that they can use in the problem space, and so they might, as they're doing this gardening, be chatting with their neighbour about, you know, some sort of bug that's eating their plant. Their neighbour has the same bug and maybe they can learn something together or they chat with somebody down at the nursery about a new kind of plant that won't get eaten by those bugs. That's what's indicated by the speech bubbles in the ring over here. Maybe they are remembering something that they were taught at the university, about bugs, or maybe they look it up in a book or they remember it from sometime that their grandmother told them about it, or they look on YouTube about it. Maybe what they're doing is putting on some music while they're doing their purpose. There's mechanical tools that they use. There's manual tools that they use and there might be digital tools that they use. Behind every single one of these tools is an organisation, except the neighbour and the brain. There's no organisation behind those. But each organisation is intent on supporting that person in the way that they know how. So the organisation that's the university was intent on trying to teach this person about growing things and about pests that eat the things that you're trying to grow. Maybe this person is trying to grow more vegetables because their neighbourhood is close to an area where people can't grow a lot of vegetables and they can bring people vegetables when they need them. Fresh vegetables.

What's happening though is that each one of these orgs has a different view of this person, the tunes, they have special way of looking at this person and they're not really looking at that person's purpose, they're looking at that person's use of their tunes.

Down at the bottom we've got some sort of digital app for growing things and we're only looking through that aperture at that person, we're looking through the lens of that product at that person and only person the things that product will do in support of them.

So one of the things that's sad to think, that there are still some companies out there that put themselves at the middle and they put all the demographics around them from the market and they're like yeah, I guess the people around me, they're aged 50 to 75 and they love MS cars, we can have a laugh about that. I think we understand this. Not everyone understands this. Instead of a person doing their purpose at the centre, we have a user or customer or a passenger or a member or whatever other noun we use to refer to the person that we're trying to support through our aperture, through our lens.

So this, you know, what's happening is we're taking away all the rest of them and we're only putting this little paper model of them in place and we're not really looking at the purpose that they're trying to achieve. So or rather, we are looking at only the purposes that they're trying to achieve that our solution already supports.

What's interesting about that person is that person can have different thinking styles. If we look at these, we've got maybe a sustainable environmental kind of a thinking style as a gardener or maybe a commercial thinker, like maybe I want to ramp up my vegetables so I can feed more and more of those neighbours who don't have places to grow their own or no time to grow their own. Maybe I'm a hobbyist. Maybe I like creating something that's beautiful, a beautiful, you know, window planter that people can see when they're walking by, kind of to give that little cosy feeling of my house. Maybe I'm really time constrained and so I'm after efficiencies and what can I get done in the least amount of time. Or maybe I'm looking at it through a philosophy of

like hey, I'm not going to use any modern techniques, only the techniques that our forefathers used, people who came before us have been growing vegetables for millennia so maybe there's something there.

Anyway, so different thinking styles is important because they apply to how you get your purpose done. So if the problem space is the centre of that ring and the solution space is around it, there are different thinking styles and if we look not only at that person through our lens but directly at that person trying to achieve that purpose, both looking at it as part of a solution space and looking at it as part of a problem space, then we're going to get a much deeper sense of a person.

Okay. So the number of purposes though, you might be saying to yourself, is vast. Obviously if your tool is designed to help somebody doing gardening you're not going to be interested in that person's purpose with regard to identifying birds necessarily. A bird is different than a plant. But even within gardening there's a lot of different purposes and some stakeholders are like, we can't do it all so let's not do any of it, or they're just not aware of it, so what we do is we think of it as one of those really long purposes. It's never going to be done. We get started. We get a little bit of information of priority right now and we work with it. We get a little bit more a year later and we work with it, we get a little bit more two years later and we work with that.

And we ask ourselves at each juncture, what is the knowledge that we need. If we have stakeholders telling us, hey, go do that study we can ask that question again, what is the knowledge we need. We might together then change how we do the study or what the study is about. And then what's the risk of not knowing? Maybe way don't have to do this study. That's a thought. But if it is a risk not knowing, then yeah, we do need to go create that data and understand what's going through people's minds so that we can support them better. So we'll go and do that, sketch

it in, film those details, and the rest of it's still pretty blank. Okay.

So I want to talk a little bit about data collection techniques and here I've got the big client grey thing which is the elephant in the room which is market research. Market research has been going on for a century and it is one of those systemic things that we live in, that a lot of the knowledge is guided by. Come along to what we're doing, we've got generative and evaluative. Generative is helping create ideas, evaluative is judging the ideas that we have, judging the prototypes, how well are they supporting the person in that person's process. There's another one called opportunity research. It's trying not to think of ideas yet but get the lay of the land and understand kind of what's out there. What are the possibilities. Where can we go?

All of these can be framed by a person's purpose. You can frame your studies, your evaluative studies, your usability studies by a person's purpose, and I'll show you at the end how to do that. What's coming up at the end of it you're going to laugh, because I don't know market research and the only thing coming up is targeting which of itself is a kind of violent word but we're getting out of our opportunity research. Also I didn't mention it, but it's akin to futures research. Generative research and evaluative research is being able to examine those dark valleys where we haven't really paid attention before. Where we might be doing harm, where we might be cause unintended consequences. Where we might be ignoring people and be able to reverse that, to reverse your own bias or our own sort of not knowing that we're swimming around in this systemic water, just to become a little bit more aware. Again, it's going to last for our entire career to accomplish this.

Here is a diagram I've been working on for several years, with all of you. So feel free to give me comments. I think that this deck is going to be available to you. I don't know when, but should be available to you,

but this particular diagram is on my Twitter feed so you can go look at it if you wanted. It's just like the opportunity research, the generative research, the evaluative research, the definitions, the idea that we start with the person's purpose. And all these little gold bars are data collection techniques and kind of like what purpose they serve and where they sit between qualitative and quantitative. And even where they sit within, like, user research, I mean, UX research versus versability research, versus big data. What's interesting is people tell me they print this out and they take it with their team. They're like we do this, this and that and this would be helpful to us but we've not been able to do this. Why? That's an interesting question.

Or they take it to their stakeholders and say you keep asking us for surveys but we think there's other things here and here. These are going to get us that knowledge in a deeper way. So let's try some. It's been helpful to people. What comes out at the end of this, what comes out of it, I've got two parts here, solution space and problem space, and what comes out of it helps you spin those cycles that you're in. Let me show you a bigger version of that diagram so we can examine it. In the solution space is where we have our agile process, or whatever, we're spinning around trying to come up with ideas, or make a scenario for them or whatever, and sticking them into product development. I did not draw this. This is some process that we all are ending up using, and this is where we refer to somebody as a user or passenger or member, or whatever the noun we use to connotate that they have a relationship with us or a potential relationship with us. We're looking at them through the lens of the solution.

Usually our research here is constrained. We have to hurry because it's got to fit within the cycles. Over in the problem space this is where we're looking at people. This is where we're doing opportunity research.

This is where we're trying to get the lay of the land, where the land is the people, how are their thinking their way through to this purpose. How are they accomplishing it? We come at it not through the lens of the solution, but just through the lens of the purpose. And out of it comes an opportunity map, which is a mental model diagram with some stuff underneath which I'll show you in a bit, and thinking styles and this happens once a year. Once every two years. This is the thing where we're sketching a little bit more depth, a little bit more detail as we go. And this is finally going to allow us to have that slice in the middle, the strategy slice become set in realistic data.

So it's not just the CEO's idea of what we want to do next in our strategy. It's actually coming from data. So yes, we make time for this. It does not fit within the spinning cycles, and I just want to call your attention to that word "make" because "make" is one of the words dear to our hearts, and you know what that verb means. That's all about people and purpose and the problem space.

So what about patterns? I promised in the title of this talk that I would talk about that. And so to get patterns first of all you have to frame your study. You have to frame your study so that patterns have a chance to emerge. You have to frame your study so that people will have done some thinking about this particular purpose that you want to explore. You can't just go, like here in the US, all the start-ups are like, oh, I'll just take my prototype down to Starbucks, probably nobody there has the purpose that you built that prototype for. No, everybody uses this. No. No. No. Anyway, maybe you could ask people recruiting questions in Starbucks, at least do that. But that's the first thing you do to get patterns. Second, you listen to people. Listening is different than an interview. In a listening session you are not an explorer. You don't have that sense of I'm going to go there into this foreign place, this other

person's mind and I'm going to come back with a discovery, with the riches, with the colonial riches. That's our systemic water affecting our thinking again.

So let's not think of ourselves as an explorer but someone who is there to witness this other person, someone who is there to make the other person feel heard, to make a connection with that person. You start a listening session by asking a geminal question which is what went through your mind the last time you tried to achieve that purpose and then you follow them wherever they take you because it's associated to that purpose for them. You don't bring up other things that they haven't brought up. You don't even bring up vocabulary that they haven't brought up. In fact I have a fun game where we just speak in terms of what the other person has said, that's the only words you can use. So the purpose is to pay rapt attention, so that you can build trust. So that they feel safe to talk to you, to talk to you at depth. And you can sense where there are areas there might be more depth and allow them and encourage them to go there and form a connection, a human connection, that connection that we had back with the orality. For research I have always done this audio only because there's a super amazing intimate connection that you can form that way. I talk about that in other venues, we don't have time today. But I also wanted to mention for one second that listening is not something you do all the time. It is like a very heavy hat and you consciously put it on, you listen, and when it comes too heavy you can't listen anymore, you find your mind doing other cognitions and those four things that I listed. And you know you're done. You take the hat back off again, you give yourselves a break. If you were training with weights, you would never lift the weights until you die. You put it on for a little bit and take it off. That's a good analogy to use.

The third step is to analyse the data in a way that helps us get

aware of our own biases, helps us stay aware of that systemic water, that helps us get past that, and most of the time I see people coding transcripts with insights, those are the actual insights they're going to pass along and that's compressing all of that analysis into one step that does not work and allows rich, ripe fields for your bias and unconscious assumptions to come out. So there's two steps to the way that I do analysis and the first step is to just pull the concept out of the transcript. What were they trying to say? And I'm only pulling concepts at depth, inner thinking, guiding principles, and then I summarise each of those and look at those across the transcripts and say which ones have affinity for the other based on the person's focus of mental attention.

Here are a couple of examples of summaries. They're written in a certain format so I can be that person, so I can act that person when I say these out loud. This is cognitive empathy. You can see those in data text form, starting to build into different groups by affinity of mental attention. This next picture is the same data but in diagrammatic form and what you're seeing here looks like a city sky line, this is the mental model. Each tower has a bunch of windows in it and those windows are those summaries, are those words from the people that represent the inner thinking, the emotional reactions, the guiding principles and how they came together to form a tower, and the towers came together to form a block in your city sky line and your blocks come together to form neighbours in your city sky line. And then you can add thinking styles.

Let me super quick give you a little intro to thinking styles. This is so quick that you're going to go like whoa, what happened. You get the thinking styles from the same data, I call them thinking styles simply because personas have a heritage of market research and Cooper and Goodwin informed. Therefore, personas get misused or miscreated. If personas is a better word for you, use the word personas to represent

arc-types or thinking styles. They are specifically a way that a person philosophically approaches their purpose. It's based on the research patterns. And any person can switch contexts and switch thinking styles. So within the airline, I did, gosh, I don't know, 19 months' worth of work with them. We did 100 participants and found four thinking styles validated over that time.

One of which was the thinking style that you would use if you were going on a business trip versus a different thinking style that you might use if you were taking your toddler on a trip. That's what I mean by philosophic approach. There's a little asterisk here. Demographics-free is really important. Demographics have tended to get used as shorthand for people's inner thinking. For people's, you know, emotional reactions or people's guiding principles, and that's wrong and that's harmful. Not all demographics get used that way but that is sure fire the way you see it used in our media, in our own research reports if they come up. So what I do is I try to avoid demographics entirely unless inner thinking is caused by discrimination or emotional reactions is caused by discrimination, or one of the other ones, like culture or environment. So it does play a part.

Just some examples of thinking styles, trying to lose weight, we have the resigned, the sidetracked and the inconsistent. We have three different solutions. These were made by a company called health-wise for a client of those trying to come up with different ways that were tailor-made for different thinking styles. This is where we're headed. So below that diagram you get to map what you do in support of people to those towers, but not only that, also you get to measure whether you're supporting one thinking style better than another thinking style within certain towers or blocks or neighbourhoods. This is downloadable from my website. What happened here is we had two thinking styles of which the client was only supporting one. So that's interesting. Does that mean, do

we need to hurry and go support the other one, or does that mean, yeah, that's where we should be focused right now until we get really successful and then work on the other one. Or no, we'll never work on the other one. It's not what we want to do as a business. It's being really intentional.

In 10 years what I would love to see is that our algorithms can recognise the behaviour of someone interacting with them, and say hey, I think you are this kind of a thinking style. We already researched it, we already have a solution for the resigned weight loss thinking style. We have a solution for it, we're going to ask if you want to go into that solution, otherwise we're going to say, in a, you're just - - no, you're just getting the generic experience which we're not admitting right now.

There are lots of different ways to use metrics and the one I'm going to talk about is the third one there, strength of support by thinking style. I think that's extremely important. I also want to show you this diagram. Not this particular diagram and this one is in Spanish, but what a really large multilateral company did, they started creating their usability tests based on towers, so they were framing it by the purpose in the tower, and then sending back to the product owner happy faces or sad faces based on the results, and the product owners loved it. They said oh my God I want to get happy face. So how do I make this happen.

So that's what I'm talking about, we want to study people's purpose so that we can make different solutions for different thinking styles and then measure how well we're supporting those people achieving that purpose. We get to build awareness. We get to build intentionality. It's going to be a part of what we do for each other and for others within our organisations as friends, as help. We get to model it for others. And doing this connection, this oral connection, it's a really important thing because a business really is a social thing. The results we get are really built socially from our data. And so this is what I'd like to see as the next step

in our digital maturity.

So that's it. This is the slide of where you can find me. There's also a discount code up here for Rosenfeld Media books, any, not just mine. I'm going to turn it back over to Steve. Thank you all very much.

STEVE BATY: Indie, thank you so much, that was a wonderful way to kick us off. Thank you.

INDI YOUNG: Yay.

STEVE BATY: Take note of that discount code. Please join me in thanking Indie for that wonderful talk. Thank you so much.

INDI YOUNG: Yay, now I get to hang around and listen to the rest of them. I will ask you to stop sharing and we will get Dalia lined up and ready to chat. Thanks Indi.

STEVE BATY: All right. We'll just take a moment to switch over. I just wanted to call out. We've had a number of wonderful sponsors join us to sponsor our program of events this year. So I just wanted to mention the folks at Aquent have signed up and continued their sponsorship of UX Australia again this year. Askable have joined again, the folks at blueegg, Visual Academy are sponsoring our events this year. Usability hub and I wanted to call out the folks at amplitude who joined us recently in response to criticism, of all things, that we received from having too many women on stage this year and not enough men. I was surprised by that feedback and it's - it sparked in John and the folks at Amplitude, a desire to actually support the conference this year. So I just wanted to make special mention of the folks at amplitude for signing on as sponsors.