



Episode 111: "Applying BI to Hybrid Work & Deep Work"

with Greg Lockwood, Senior Analyst at Global Affairs Canada.

Greg Lockwood returns to the podcast to tell us about recent projects using mixed methods to explore optimal hybrid work strategies and to encourage deep work in the age of distraction. Drawing from his experiences at the Public Health Agency of Canada and Global Affairs Canada, Greg also shares lessons learned about experimentation, communicating with internal vs. public audiences, and working in BI-specific vs. generalist roles and teams.

Transcript:

KIRSTIN APPELT, HOST: Welcome to this edition of Calling DIBS. I'm your host, Kirstin Appelt, research director with UBC Decision Insights for Business and Society, or DIBS for short. Today we're Calling DIBS on Greg Lockwood.

Greg is a senior analyst at Global Affairs Canada, and he's also a graduate of the Advanced Professional Certificate in Behavioral Insights. He was one of the brave members of our pilot cohort back in 2020, 2021, when we were kind of building the plane and flying it at the same time. So thanks to him for his bravery there. And we actually chatted with him on the podcast before, back in episode 31, when he was a colleague at UBC working in the Equity Inclusion Office.

Since then, Greg has drastically expanded his BI repertoire with new positions in different federal government units. And we're really eager to hear about that journey and the different ways he's weaving BI into his work. So welcome back to the podcast, Greg.

GREG LOCKWOOD, GUEST: Thanks very much, Kristen. It's great to be here.

APPELT: Last time you were with us, you told us about your journey from a bachelor's in electrical engineering to BI. Can you give us a little bit of an overview of your journey from BI certificate to global affairs?

LOCKWOOD: Sure. So yeah, it's hard to believe it's been about four years since we last connected on the podcast. And at that time, I was a strategist with UBC's Equity and Inclusion Office. So in that role wasn't specifically focused on BI work, but I got to do a project that connected the two worlds via the capstone project that I got to work on. And since then, I've had the opportunity to join behavioral science or behavioral insights unit in the federal government.

I first moved over to the Public Health Agency of Canada's Behavioral Science Office. I got to join their office when they were still in, I might say, their launch phase, the first few years of being an organization that was officially cemented within the Public Health Agency doing behavioral science work. And so, you know, looking

back on the certificate, I would say that was really an opportunity where I think it cemented my interest, my desire to pursue opportunities in BI and behavioral science. So was lucky to land there back in 2022. And there I worked as a team lead for a small team doing performance measurement, reporting, and strategic engagement with the Office of Strategy and Impact team.

So we worked on things like developing a strategic plan for the office, publishing a report, leading a BSI community of practice for the federal government's health portfolio. I wasn't so much in the weeds of doing behavioral science or behavioral insights research, but I got to have sort of a broader picture in the work that I was collaborating with my colleagues over there.

After nearly two years, I moved over to Global First Canada, or GAC as you call it. That was just over a year ago and I got to join the department's experimentation and search team. So a small but mighty team doing work in a number of areas. And that's where I had the opportunity to work on the flexible and deeper project that I presented recently at the Big Difference BC conference.

APPELT: Amazing. I love that from PHAC to GAC. That sounds like a great memoir. I thought maybe we could start by going deep on a specific project. Like you said, you just presented this project at Big Difference BC 2025. You said flexible deep work. Can you tell us about the project? What about flexible deep work were you tackling?

LOCKWOOD: I think the first thing I'll say is that the project was well underway when I arrived. So first and foremost, I want to credit my fantastic teammates, Poya Saffari, Anna Vanderkooy, and Calla Ma on my team there. They did a lot of the heavy lifting and getting this project off the ground and running even before I arrived.

And in terms of what we were tackling with this project, it's really about this dramatic shift to remote and hybrid work that has driven major workplace transformation around how we show up at the office, how we collaborate, how we conduct deep and focused work. I mean, the impacts are so far reaching.

Many of us have experienced ups and downs and ebbs and flows of going to, you know, a full-time on-site work environment to perhaps fully remote and somewhere in between. And so it was really a neat opportunity to look at this from the government workplace context. And in federal government, the current direction is that currently most federal government employees are required to be in the three days a week.

But even within this kind of prescribed workplace presence model, there is some flexibility. So particularly around how teams and individuals choose to collaborate and decide when to come to the office. And it's also about how folks choose to do their work and when to do their deep and focused work. That's kind of the other side of the coin where there's this collaborative element. How did small things work together? But then, you how do you get the work done? Where do you get it done? Especially that kind of reading, writing, analytical work that can be difficult to do when there's so many notifications and distractions.

That was really what we were looking at with this particular project. And I think what was really interesting was that going into this, there was very little experimental evidence about this challenge and what we were addressing. It felt quite novel to be taking this on, given that there was not a lot that we knew about different

outcomes like job satisfaction, productivity, and other important things that we'd want to know about to be able to guide decision making.

APPELT: Such an interesting problem. And obviously, the initial shift to work from home was something where there wasn't time for experimentation and data gathering. Was very much a response to the pandemic.

But now that there's time as to investigate is a really interesting question about how do we work best at home, at the office, a combination, and how much agency do people have to make the decisions? Is it prescribed? How many, which, et cetera? So I think it's really awesome that this was actually tackled from a behavioral science lens. And I know you actually use mixed methods.

Can you talk about which methods you used, how and why they were combined in the way they were?

LOCKWOOD: Yeah, absolutely. I think, I mean, the short answer is it was a no brainer for us to mix methods here. There's so much that we can learn from understanding the context and the way that people showed up in the office, the reasons that they decided to work in different ways, in different spaces. And I think we really started gathering evidence on this from the very early stages again, before I even landed on the team. So in the way that we consulted across the department.

Understanding what was working from more of a kind of not necessarily anecdotal, but kind of a qualitative understanding of people's descriptions of the changes that have happened over the last few years, especially since the pandemic. What would be possible for even conducting a project and experiment?

So those early interviews, those early meetings, all the way through to the data collection methods themselves were grounded in mixed methods. So certainly when we were doing the work, especially around the flexible hybrid setup, we were wanting to know, you know, open-ended responses on surveys.

We wanted to hear from them through focus group. And when we look back on findings, like it's very clear that if we had one but not the other, we would be missing a lot. The findings and even the recommendations that we were able to put forth would be much less rich had it not been for our opportunity to mix methods.

It was a no-brainer from the start and I'm glad that we had the space and the time to be able to do both.

APPELT: Yeah, absolutely. It really strikes me as a place where different inputs are really crucial. You can see that some things would be easily captured by quantitative data like productivity, number of emails processed, but then the feeling of how it was to work in different settings and those kinds of things.

There's just no way to get that in pure quantitative. So I think it must have really improved the project. And so maybe we can break this into the two pieces because you said there's the hybrid and the deep work. So maybe just on the hybrid work piece, looking at how to optimize that, what were some of your key results there?

LOCKWOOD: First thing I'll say that both had in common was that this was exploratory research. So working back to this idea that it's a fairly unexplored area, we really didn't go into this with any kind of predefined hypotheses about what might work or what might not work. Just to give folks a sense of what we tested, we

randomly assigned teams to varying degrees of flexibility in terms of when individuals on the teams could choose to come into the office. Before I break that down, I just want to emphasize that we were not assigning teams and individuals to more or less days in the office.

It was really about flexibility around which of the three days they could choose to be in the office. So the status quo arrangement for our branch was two mandatory team days, one self-selected day, and then a second group was then one mandatory team day and two self-selected days. And then finally, the third group was assigned to zero mandatory team days and three self-selected days.

APPELT: I'm sorry, when you say mandatory team day, that means the work unit has agreed to a specific day.

LOCKWOOD: Yeah, essentially, we gave quite a bit of autonomy to the smaller teams. We did give them guidance and direction, certainly. But we said to say a team of five, for example, these are teams that average about five people per team, would say. You have been assigned to this way of working. So for example, two team days, one self-selected day meant that they would see that the team or whatever worked best for them as what those mandatory team days would be.

Sometimes there was alignment within the greater department or the larger branch that they worked under. But often it was, you the guidance was that we would give that autonomy to the smaller teams to be able to kind of define those mandatory team days as what worked best for them. So those were the three different arrangements that folks were assigned to.

We certainly left it open so that for teams that were operationally required, for example, if you were on an IT team, you were required to take service calls in the office, there were teams that would be self excluded from the experiment. So we made sure that we made it work for as many people as we could.

Yeah, and then in terms of the results, we found a lot of interesting findings when we looked at the data. We did find that employees that were assigned to three self-selected days showed a positive trend towards what we call higher team synergy. And this was an outcome that we, what we labeled as a combination of a few different outcomes that we measured. Sense of belonging, team cohesion, perceived team productivity versus those that were assigned to just one self-selected day.

And so what we heard, again, hearing in more detail from folks, for example, in focus groups and through the surveys was that their experiences in terms of being able to really voluntarily coordinate when they came into the office, when they saw their colleagues, what worked best for their families and their personal situations, rather than this kind of rigid top-down scheduling, that effect helped to foster this cohesion and inclusion within the team, especially when teams were able to work together to pair it with things like intentional in-person experiences that really were purpose-driven.

APPELT: That's really interesting and makes a lot of sense, but I can see how that could go against a lot of models that are out there that are more prescriptive, whether it's based on a belief about what will generate synergy or if it's based more on operational considerations. So I think that's going to be a really valuable add to the database out there as more and more organizations are dealing with this.

That's a little bit about where we work. But as you said, there's also this issue of finding time for deep work where we're not getting all the notifications. So what did you find in the project looking at deep work?

LOCKWOOD: So this was in many ways kind of the other side of the spectrum in terms of the intensity of the intervention. As you can imagine, putting together a design for a project where we're essentially asking folks to, we're giving them increasing levels of flexibility in which they showed up the office, but it could be quite a change from how they were working before. So was quite an intense intervention in many ways. And this one was very much light touch.

It was simply a matter of, you know, looking back on the research around deep work and how it can really boost productivity and wellbeing. We thought, well, what happens if we just provide those reminders and it's kind of light touch email intervention. So again, we assigned folks to either receive the email or not receive the email. And this email included things like resources, information, tips and tricks. About how to schedule and implement deep work on their own time.

And so we sent these emails and we found that again, in terms of scheduling and actually protecting deep work time, there were trends that showed that those that received the emails were more likely to go and do that, whether that was blocking time in their email calendar, turning off their notifications. We collected data around kind of the how and the different ways that they did that.

But essentially we found that there were trends showing that this very light touch intervention led to more protection of that deep work time for reading, writing, and analytical work.

APPELT: That's super interesting. I'm curious, you might not have this in the data, but do you have any sense of whether the emails were working because it was bringing attention to the issue or awareness to the tools out there, or was it more about being given the permission to find that time for deep work?

LOCKWOOD: Yeah, I don't know if we have that data specifically, but my sense is that there was more of a cultural kind of acceptance of deep work that was happening. And I think because we were assigning individuals at the team level, part of the messaging with this experiment was that teams again, could work together and do what works best for them. So they could coordinate deep work time as a team. They could talk to each other about you know, if they wanted to take blocks individually of deep work.

And so we really tried to encourage those conversations, especially led by the manager of the team across, across their teams to be able to do what works best for them. And I think, you know, in terms of the how, you know, we learned a lot about, certainly the differences between the on-site workplace and the home workplace. So you might not be surprised to learn that people were much more inclined to be able to do deep work when they were at home.

A lot of workplaces, I mean, certainly again, there's a lot of variability, but in many workplaces, it's hard to find an office or a space where you can do the deep work and not be distracted. And I think that's what a lot of folks were telling us through, again, the focus groups and the survey responses.

APPELT: That's really interesting. And it definitely makes sense that doing it at a group level where you're building up these group norms and coordination around the work and how that seems like it would be a virtuous cycle where it gets built in and then people find more and more time and an approval for it.

So across the two projects, you've shared some of the results. Beyond that, are there any other evidence-based recommendations or lessons learned from doing these types of projects?

LOCKWOOD: Yeah, I'm really pleased to say that we did land on some key evidence-based recommendations from the work. And in fact, they were fairly recently shared broadly from senior leadership across our whole branch. And so they've been implemented through directives. As you know, Kristin, it doesn't always happen with behavioral science projects and certainly not on all the ones that I've been a part of. It was really neat to see that kind of full circle experience of actually seeing the recommendation and evidence being implemented.

First recommendation I can speak to is that we really encourage, based on the data, teams to schedule based on what works best for them. You know, fair to say our evidence showed that flexibility is linked to better outcomes around things like employee experience and perceived team productivity. And it made sense based on what we know about employees placing a high level of trust in their direct managers to encourage autonomy to teams to shape their own schedules, to build those effective work environments in the ways that work for them.

We also recommended ensuring that flexible work arrangements are meaningfully accessible to all employees, including those with disabilities, very giving responsibilities. So it's this idea that flexibility isn't a nice to have, know, something that can be an option, but it's actually an important tool to advance equity, increase productivity, and really strengthen overall organizational performance.

We recommended designing offices for focus, which this is a much more systematic kind of recommendation certainly, but some of the offices that the employees that were part of this project working are there's renovations being undergone at this moment. So there is some really relevant and timely data that we could share with them about the things that mattered to employees.

And then, you know, really another recommendation is going back to the deep and focus work, really encouraging teams and managers, especially to encourage individuals to protect that time. So using those kind of BI that we all know of that really help us with reminders and default settings, being able to book the time in the Outlook calendar, and again, kind of making it more of a cultural norm that this is accepted, this is needed to be able to do our very best work.

And then I say our last recommendation was kind of a meta recommendation where we wanted to encourage the continued use of evidence to guide decision making. Hopefully kind of leaning on this project as a nice example of where evidence can be sometimes surprising, but it can really tell us where we're at and it can really inform how to move forward in the best possible way and then we can continue hopefully to use evidence generation.

I think I'll share one key lesson that has really stuck with me, especially since this project wrapped up, is how much sponsorship really matters. And I mean, I think again, a lesson that, and an experience that anyone who's worked on a BI project can probably relate to is that when you have the buy-in from senior leadership and you have that, you know, true authentic desire to see what works and what might not work, it makes for a completely different project. We were so fortunate to be able to have that in place across our branch.

And then starting from the moment that, you know, senior leadership launched the project, all the way through to sharing those recommendations and directions for teams in the branch, we felt like we were always supported to communicate that this was an important initiative and what we learned matters and it's going to help employees and the long-term.

APPELT: It's amazing. As you were speaking, it was really just apparent how well-supported this was and how seriously the recommendations were taken. I think I can count on one finger the number of times I've heard that they're actually using this information as they do building renovations.

That's the kind of stuff where we find interesting results and it almost never, you know, timelines never line up where you're actually able to feed into something more structural, but doing it at all those different levels is just amazing. That's fantastic. And it's also just interesting results and I love just the ethos of having the evidence base because you see a lot of news stories around organizations just being ever more directive over employees' time.

And you see this stuff about how important autonomy is. Hopefully, that becomes more and more accepted and more research will prove that that is a useful way to work and to trust your employees.

LOCKWOOD: Yeah, think like being on, you know, what we were able to do with this project, it is nice, isn't it? It feels like a bit of a beacon of light in many ways that's database evidence informed that is, like you say, it's not always what we're reading about across workplaces in private sector, public sector about how directive things have become and how decisions are being made with perhaps not as much explanation as folks would like to have when it comes to the impact that has on their daily lives and how they commute and change their schedules and so much that is affected by these decisions.

APPELT: Well, so like we said, this project is a great example of using a behaviourally informed evidence-based approach. And I'm curious because now that you've had experienced a couple of different government units, what has been your experience with experimentation in government?

LOCKWOOD: It's been really nice. And I guess I would say once again, I've been very fortunate, even though I'm still quite new, it's been about three years since I joined federal government that I've had two different experiences at two different shops and two different departments.

And it's neat to look back and kind of see how things are different and be able to kind of compare between the two. So I would caveat that because it's only two experiences, it certainly wouldn't reflect all the many different ways that you can do behavioral science work in the public sector. But I think what I've noticed is government does seem to have developed more of an experimental culture in recent years. And I think there's a lot of really exciting reasons for this.

I think there's been more of a general shift towards if something doesn't work, it doesn't mean it's a failure, which may have been more common in the past to have that kind of way of thinking about something not working. And I think, you know, we have a better way of thinking about it as more of a lesson learned than a failure.

So I think that's one thing that certainly even before I joined government has been changing over the years. I would say that one other thing that's really need to see is that similar to other domains, especially academia, those incentives and motivation that drive experimentation in government are strongly linked and generating strong evidence.

We want to see, you know, what works. You will want to see what the true data is telling us. And I think what I've appreciated about the flexible and deep work project in particular is that because publishing our work, for example, was never priority. It felt a little bit more intrinsically motivated. So, from the very beginning, we were not sure if it was going to work.

We were okay with that. We were able to do this work and just recognize up front that we might not see any difference across, for example, the different workplace arrangements or with the deep work email, but we were really excited to just try it out, see if it works, and then we knew that we would get some great lessons learned either way.

APPELT: Yeah it's really neat. Like you were saying, you were able to kind of have that flexibility to make it work within different team structures, whereas if you were trying to publish in an academic journal, you'd have to be much more regimented about what each condition looked like or have a lot of caveating.

So it's really neat that you're able to do it. And since it is a priority area, then like you said, there is this support that let you do so much with the project. And it's very wonderful and refreshing to hear there's a feeling of something doesn't work doesn't mean we throw it out that we might be able to tinker with it and make it better which is just refreshing and just such a better use of resources.

At Public Health you were in the Behavioral Science Office which is a BI unit. At Global Affairs, the project you just told us about, you are with the experimentation and search team which as I understand it is more of a generalist team focused on data. What was your experience working within those different structures, BI specific and then more of a generalist team?

LOCKWOOD: Yeah, in many ways there was some similarities, certainly some differences as well. It was neat when I joined BCIO because as I mentioned, it was this opportunity to join a team with a strong foundation. It was still quite new, it was growing, but it had that sort of base. It had a broad range of subject matter expertise across the office. It was a much larger team, and it was exciting to be there in those first few years of its existence.

So I think there was this opportunity to really grow the work of behavioral science within a large scale agency which in the field of public health, mean, such critical work is being done across the entire agency. And I think that the challenge there though was because it was so wide ranging, you being able to engage across the whole department on so many different public health priorities and as a new function really to be able to kind of make the case for why behavioral science can be so helpful, can be so critical for those that were new or unfamiliar to it.

And I think that that was kind of the dynamic with the BCIO. And then I found with the experimentation in 13 at GAC there, being on a smaller and more nimble team, we didn't maybe have some of the same things in place, like, you know, all the subject matter expertise, but we were able to, I think, go out and engage in

consults, and maybe do a lot sort of individually and with a lot of autonomy across the department and across the branch.

So it's kind of, I mean, it's not a perfect analogy, but you know, that feeling of maybe being in a startup versus a larger organization that's more established. Like that's the feeling I have and I had as part of the experimentation.

I just felt it had that kind of startup feeling where, you know, as individual staff and, you know, the small team that I was on, we got to maybe move things a little bit more nimbly up the chain of approvals, for example, we got to do more idea generation at a smaller team level and maybe move things a little bit more quickly. So lots of kind of interesting observations between both experiences.

And I think in many ways they were each best and are best suited to the environment within which they operate. But for sure need to be able to have the chance to work on two very different things.

APPELT: Yeah, and talk about two important, timely issues to be working in. Another distinction is at Public Health, your role particularly was more external working on health challenges facing the Canadian population and doing some of the communication and annual reporting. Whereas at Global Affairs, this project was more internal looking at how the people at Global Affairs work.

Can you talk a little bit about how working with those different target audiences in mind, what were similarities and differences?

LOCKWOOD: Yeah, definitely. Think, I mean, I suppose I alluded to this just earlier, but because the public health priorities are just so far reaching, you know, in many ways, it feels like a bit of a higher stakes environment, right? Like public health encompasses so many different areas, everything from mental health to climate change, emergency response.

And there's, there's so much work to be done and bringing a behavioral science lends to it and knowing that, you know, these were, were helping to see public policy that impacted Canadians, it felt very high stakes in an exciting way, but also nerve wracking way in some ways. And I think to work at GAC, and I'm just speaking to my project site, I'm not necessarily, I wouldn't necessarily say that this applies to our whole team.

But certainly with this project, as an example, I felt like it was in some ways at a smaller scale, but it was still wide reaching because we were able to do a project that affected thousands of staff in many ways. Because of that, it felt perhaps not as high stakes in a way, but it also felt more contained. But it also felt like there was still so much to be learned from the work that could be scaled much further beyond certainly our branch and our department.

APPELT: You're saying like at Public Health, you're working on things that impact thousands of Canadians like quite imminently. And then at Global Affairs, the specific project was focused on employees. But then it's interesting that if you're helping those employees work better than that could translate to a lot of impacts for Canadians at large.

Because you're working most immediately. With the employees and it's the downstream consequences, it does feel like it's a bit of a safer place to experiment. And I think also probably that comes down to the organizational culture with public health right now being so in the midst of misinformation, disinformation, polarization, all those wonderful things.

Whereas hopefully when you're working within an organization, you're able to do some stuff without that need to overthink everything. Critically and make sure things aren't misinterpreted.

LOCKWOOD: Yeah, I think you really bring up a great point about the different audiences for this work, right? Like, I think that's one, you're talking about something that I've observed and that can make it challenging at times is, you know, being able to, in public health, you're really generating evidence for, I mean, literally the entire country. And that can bring all sorts of difficult challenges when it comes to, like you say, disinformation. Having bit of a safer space in many ways where one really great thing about working government is that the general culture is that it's, know, evidence is first and foremost.

APPELT: At Global Affairs, you're in a bit of a new role now where you're working with a change management team. And we've previously on the podcast talked to change managers who've been change managers who've added BI to their skill set. I'm curious to hear your experience going the opposite direction being a BI practitioner first and then starting to add change management. What are you finding that BI brings to the table?

LOCKWOOD: Yeah, it's been a bit of a shift for sure. And it's funny, you mentioned some of the folks that have had both experiences and they've been guests on the podcast before. I think one of the first things I did when I learned that I'd be moving into more of a change management role is what I went back to one of those episodes and re-listened to it to be able to get that perspective because there certainly are some.

Similarities, there's some alignment, but there's also some differences. And for me, it's a completely new field. So I think one of the things that I've hopefully been able to bring to this team and to this work, especially in the communications role is it feels in many ways like an applied form of behavioral insights where certainly I don't have the opportunity to test and evaluate an intervention in a really fast paced environment where we're you know, supporting the adoption of a major business transformation.

But I'm still able to apply frameworks like East and others in the way that we communicate with adopters. It's being able to thoughtfully apply BI principles, frameworks in ways that might be somewhat different from what's been done in change management, but I think can hopefully add to be able to, you know, bring about some better outcomes as we're working through a really fast moving project for sure.

APPELT: Interesting and kind of on that flip side of that question, what are you learning about change management and how is that changing how you do BI or how you think about BI or any other synergies you're seeing?

LOCKWOOD: Yeah, well for me, it's still very new. I'm only a few months in, but certainly I've learned a lot from my colleagues so far. I've learned about how change management fits into a major information and I would say one major similarity is also that you know, and it's something that I think we do in BI and we also,

I've been seeing we're doing, we're needing to do a lot in change management is the, is really communicating that we, that we need to be integrated from early on.

So this idea that, you know, trying to tack on either BI or change management at the end of a project, you know, when things might be too late to make the changes or integrate the findings in the way that can be really helpful and really impactful. That's something that I'm seeing as perhaps two somewhat newer fields. Still trying to kind of build that momentum to make the case for why they are so crucial.

I have learned that change management also likes to use acronyms. There's a great one called ADKAR from the Prosci methodology that I've learned a lot about. So ADKAR, A-D-K-A-R stands for awareness of the change, D for desire, K for knowledge, A for ability, and R for reinforcement. So similar to RIDE or other acronyms from BI, I've landed in a sweet spot when it comes to like having my acronym comfort zone.

You know, it's that same approach and bringing a methodology to being able to apply to situations to really ground the project through its entire life cycle and understand how people make decisions, how they behave, right? It starts with awareness that it moves to a desire for change, learning about how to change and then actually being able to do the change on a regular basis.

So I'm learning a lot about that. And then I'm through that seeing lots of similarities for servicing the two fields.

APPELY: Really like your point about they often get tacked on at the end of a project where the whole project would be more successful if behavioral insights and change management were built in from the front. So you could even get rid of certain issues because you would deal with them before they become issues. You've also done a lot of work in communication. So I'm curious if you can just speak briefly about how BI influences your strategies for communication.

LOCKWOOD: It's been interesting because it's not something that I had imagined for myself. And I certainly would never claim to be a communications professional. I'm always learning. But I think, again, it's a field where you can just really incorporate these evidence-based ways of communicating effectively.

So for me, I still feel I'm very much in learning mode about how to bring about evidence-based ways to communicate well, to really reach the target audience, to really create the messaging that encourages behavior change. And so I love learning about, again, applied tools that we can all use to BI our own emails, for example, right?

Like making sure, I think what I've noticed, especially working in government, is so much of how we want to communicate is about sharing everything that we know or everything that we do. And there's, I think, a really nice shift that's happening where we're really trying to make more of an effort to be more user focused.

So, you know, as much as we have to share about, you know, the many parts and pieces that went into a project, people aren't necessarily interested in knowing every detail, right? And they want to know what affects them and what impacts them. And people scan emails, people scan documents and reports.

So I think even bringing that kind of thinking, which I think has a solid foundation in BI, has really informed the way that we're able to do change management and some of that work in like adopting and helping users of a

new software, for example, adopt and actually change their behaviors that they are doing the thing that will help them and help the project at the same time.

APPELT: And I think that's a really great point. You were saying you're still learning and you're always learning. And I think also maybe that's something that BI really embeds in us is that curiosity about why we behave and how we do.

I think that then feeds through into anything new we're taking on, whether we're applying BI to communications or change management, is that we try to have that ethos of we're all learning and humility and learning from each other.

I really love that point. And that's a good segue because I was going to ask now that you're several years out of the certificate, are there any other reflections on how you're weaving BI into your work? I mean, you've already given us number of great reflections, any last reflections?

LOCKWOOD: Yeah, I think it's I mean, I'm at an interesting season just personally. It's I think a moment for me where I'm looking back on the last three or so years and I feel really lucky to have been so ingrained in BI and behavioral science work, where it was a real focus of either the organization I was a part of or my own project specifically.

And I feel like I'm entering a bit of a new era where, and I think a lot of folks out there might be able to relate to this idea of like, BI as a field, it's so useful, it's so practical, but it's not necessarily 100 % of our role. It's about integrating what we've learned what we know into kind of different bits and pieces of the work that we do in ways that make sense.

And I think that's where I feel like I am right now is I'm kind of going back into this space of I'm not necessarily a behavioral scientist in terms of my role. Will because my again, my brain is programmed to try to bring in BI whenever I can. I'll keep looking for those opportunities where it makes sense and where it fits. And I think that that's where I'm at right now.

APPELT: That is a great reflection. I think regardless of where we're working there, it is really interesting to see the different ways we can weave BI into the larger goals of the work, but also the small little bits and pieces, like you said, whether it's your emails or how you're working. On a related note, do you have a message for folks who are newer to BI, whether it's folks who are in the certificate or just folks new to the field?

LOCKWOOD: Yeah, I think, you know, I was thinking about this and it does feel like we're moving through a time where BI specific opportunities might not be as present as they once were. There's always kind of ebbs and flows. And so I think really just kind of going back to my own kind of personal reflection, I feel like that that's happening for me and it might be happening for other folks that are potentially graduating from the BI certificate is that, you know, you might not see those roles.

I know you talked about this before Kirstin, but it might not have that kind of really clear behavioral science or behavioral insights focus description or element to a role, but there could be kind of adjacent roles and other similar opportunities that might bring in other elements of, you know, the skills and the things that the

students would have gained from the certificate into that role that again, it might not be BI specific, but I think it's still useful to kind of explore and evaluate those roles as well.

And, you know, it's important to, I think, keep an open mind and see what opportunities might be hidden underneath the surface.

APPELT: Yeah, I think it's a really good point to focus more on the skills and knowledge than the titles, because I think, like you said, there's may not be a quote unquote, BI role, but there's more often than not ways to use BI in different parts of the role. So I feel like I have yet to meet the role where there's zero opportunity to use BI.

LOCKWOOD: Definitely.

APPELT: Well, any last thoughts, questions I should have asked and didn't or anything else you wanted to share?

LOCKWOOD: No, I don't think so. Just want to say it's been great catching up, Kristin, and thanks so much again for having me back.

APPELT: Well, thank you. I always am thrilled to connect and hear what you're up to. And I really love the different ways you've been exploring using BI. And it's always nice to hear what you're up to. And I'm looking forward to hearing about this new phase that you're in and what that generates. So we'll have to have you back in another couple of years. But thank you for joining today.

LOCKWOOD: Sounds great. Looking forward to it.

APPELT: And thanks to our listeners for joining another episode of Calling DIBS.

Calling DIBS is recorded and edited on the traditional ancestral and unceded territory of the xwməθkwəy̓əm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish), and Səlilwətaʔ/Selilwitulh (Tsleil-Waututh) Nations. Calling DIBS is edited by Rishad Habib, Siobhan Cook, Isabella Jaramillo, Parnian Ashrafi, Kashish Khatri, Olin Becker, and Kirstin Appelt. Intro and outro music are excerpts from "resonance" by airtone (2020); <http://ccmixter.Org/files/airtone/61321>), licensed under Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial 3.0.
