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- [Simon] Hi, everyone. Welcome to the last session in BETA's BI Connect, 2021 virtual series. Today, we end on a hopeful note, hopefully. Taking our lessons from COVID-19 and exploring how to build back better. I'm Simon Gordon, the managing director of BETA. We're just working through a few tech problems today, so hopefully they all sort themselves out. Before we get into it, though, I'd like to begin by acknowledging the Traditional Custodians of the lands on which we meet today, the Ngunnawal people, and pay my respects to their elders past and present. We also extend that respect to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people here today, and on all the lands of which people are watching now, and when we get onto YouTube later, are as well. We have four speakers for our last session today, presenting their latest research. We have Dr. Trish Lavery, who's calling in from Paris, from the OECD, where I understand it's two in the morning, four in the morning, something absolutely horrid. We have Dr. Stephen Kaufman and Dr. AleZander Saeri, and professor Alex Haslam. So a really great lineup. And as we have in the previous sessions, if you have any questions, please use Slido. You can upvote questions as we go. We'll have time for around five minutes, hopefully, after each speaker, and then a final Q and A session. And the event code is #BIConnect2021. All right, to our first speaker of the day, Dr. Trish Lavery. Trish is a senior strategic analyst in the executive director's office at the OECD. And as I said, she's joining us from Paris in France. Prior to her role in the OECD, Trish worked for 10 years in the Australian Government environment department. And I know many of those who are watching this will have come across Trish and worked with Trish over those 10 years. Trish uses behavioural insights, design thinking and change management techniques to support an improvement across all corporate services in the OECD. And today she's going to present on the guiding principles and processes that have been used to embed a BI mindset across the OECD and encourage sustainable behaviour among staff. So hopefully the tech will work across the oceans and we'll have Trish ready to present any second now. So, over to you Trish.

- [Trish] Thank you, Simon. I'll just do a quick check, can you hear me? Can you see my slides?

- [Simon] We can.

- [Trish] Great, fantastic. All right, well, thank you everyone. It's so great to be here today and great to see so many familiar faces on the participants list. As Simon said, I'm dialling in from Paris, where it's a cold and rainy morning, but I have Paris's top rated croissant boulangerie just around the corner from me. So I'm going to be finding that warm comfort in pastry for breakfast this morning. As Simon mentioned, many of you I know from my usual home at Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment's behavioural analysis team, but I'm thrilled to be honoured a three year placement with the OECD working as a senior strategic analyst. And today I'm going to be talking about the work of the OECD's Executive Directorate and what they've done in mainstreaming BI as part of business as usual across all the operations of the OECD. Now, I'm sure many of you are familiar with the OECD's long history of pioneering the use of BI and that unit's advice to member countries. And this slide shows some of the reports and initiatives, coming out of the Public Governance Directorate, over the past few years. And I'm sure many of these will be familiar to you, the basic toolkit, and perhaps you participate in the network meetings that we hold regularly, but this work actually comes out of the policy directorates of the OECD and it's not what I'm actually going to talk to you about today. I'm going to be talking today about the work of the Executive Directorate. And the Executive Directorate is the corporate engine room of the OECD. It delivers a vast array of corporate services for over 3000 staff. We're responsible for everything from finance to HR, to IT, as well as conferences, security, staff canteens, and maintenance of our infrastructure, including the buildings that you see along the slide here, many of which are actually owned by the OECD. The Executive Directorate is also responsible both for risk management and for crisis management across the organisation. And the Executive Directorate is overseen by the Executive Director, Madame Josée Touchette, and I work in her office as a senior strategic analyst. The Executive Directorate has a real commitment to a culture of continuous improvement and innovation and ensuring that the operations of the OECD are innovative, and that they leverage the advice and expertise of the policy experts that we have available to us in house. As I said, we have 3000 staff and so many of them are thematic specialists. They are an amazing resource for us to have on hand. The Executive directorate places a really strong emphasis on behavioural insights which it sees, along with data visualisation and strategic thinking, as the essential components of modern management. And we practise what we preach. The Executive Directorate has infused a behavioural lens across all the corporate functioning of the OECD. The Office of the Executive Director, where I work, has led the organisation on a multi-year journey to mainstream BI as part of business as usual across all our corporate functions. And this work has been achieved over three phases. The first, is one that's probably familiar to a lot of you, it's the establishment of a central BI capacity that worked in the Director's office. The second phase was a bit of a distribution of that capacity more broadly across the organisation. And the third which is where we are now, which is moving to a real systemic integration of BI as a core means of addressing complex and systemic challenges across the organisation. And I'm going to talk briefly about each of these three phases because I think it gives a really good blueprint for other organisations that might be looking to take behavioural insights out of a core team and really infuse it across the organisation. So, as I said this occurred over, sort of three stages. The Executive Director's office is responsible for horizontal and process improvement projects across the organisation. And so in the first stage, BI practitioners were recruited to carry out, not only behavioural insights interventions, but they were also empowered to apply a behavioural lens across all the corporate improvement work that we do. So in essence, this first phase of the OECD's journey in becoming a behaviorally informed organisation was the creation of that BI function in the director's office, responsible for infusing behavioural insights right across all of the corporate practises. And some principles were established to guide this BI function. These include both a recognition that both ourselves, as BI practitioners, and also our target audience, are humans, with all of the accompanying tendencies and biases and cognitive limitations that entails. And this helps to keep us humble and empathetic and to remember that our stakeholders and our target audience are often one and the same. So it's really important that we co-produce knowledge with our colleagues and that we ensure our work is aligned with their existing corporate goals. We also sought to go beyond traditional nudging by applying the behavioural lens to all the corporate processes, regardless of whether or not they lent themselves to an experimental trial approach. Similarly, we also developed some five guiding practises that were adopted to guide the work of the central BI function. And the first was to recognise that individuals are constrained by structural constraints around them and being a central team we're lucky enough quite often to be able to influence those structural constraints but at the very least, if we can't recognise them as important determining factors. We've placed a strong emphasis on the use and visualisation of quality data. This is something we do every day. Both to justify the need for a project, but also to communicate the impact of our behavioural trials. And in some cases, a picture really is worth a thousand words. We adopted an iterative approach, recognising that perfect is often the enemy of the good. And sometimes we need to get results even if they're not done in the way that we would like them to be as behavioural insights, sort of practitioners, with a bit of an academic bent. And we ensure that our projects are aligned with the most recent and cutting edge research. And we're very lucky enough to be able to partner with leading academics in the field of behavioural insights. And in fact, we're typically supported by an academic BI fellow who sits in the team and is able to guide our work. And this really operates as a win-win, we're able to benefit from their experience and their ability to provide an expert view of our work. And for them, they also have access to a huge corporate population that they might not have had access to otherwise. And this BI function has carried out a number of successful BI trials over the last few years. We've designed and implement trials that incorporate gamification into training materials to educate staff about their financial management responsibilities. We've trialled behaviorally informed messages to discourage staff from opening and clicking on phishing emails. When we were looking at introducing a new virtual reality training component as part of our training to promote a safe workplace we didn't just invest in that technology outright. We ran a trial to compare the exact same training module, but delivered in 2D, to test whether that virtual reality component really did help people to feel more engaged in the training and whether it will actually lead to any better information retention. And we've also looked at recruitment and in particular the mode of interviewing, be it video or audio or transcript, and whether this influence scores given to prospective candidates and whether in turn, this was influenced by the candidate's gender, nationality or language skills. So there's some of the projects that the central BI sort of team have done, but what's really important here is, we don't work in isolation, we never work in isolation. Behavioural interventions are carried out in consultation with staff across the corporate services. Communications and data visualisation experts are regularly recruited to be active parts of the BI project teams and there's opportunities for staff from the target areas, but also any interested and willing staff from across the organisation, to become involved. And this is inclusivity by design. It's really important for building capacity and communicating the value add of the BI approach. We don't need to sing our own praises because we're building these behavioural insights champions across the organisation, who ensure that not only is our work better understood, but that there are staff across the organisation who share a real sense of ownership in the success of our behavioural trials. And this is really important when moving towards phase two of the journey, which is the expansion of that behavioural insights capacity to other areas of the organisation. And in this phase the BI practitioners in the Director's office take on the role as incubator. Playing a supporting role to bottom up, behavioural work streams that are emerging across the organisation. And my personal favourite trial here was, which had to be paused due to COVID, was run by our facilities team who were worried about increasing messes in the bathroom, paper towels left on the floor and things like that. So they had the idea of trying different messages on different floors of the building to try and reduce this waste. And the early indicators show that showing a photo of the poor cleaner who was going to have to clean up that mess was the most effective message at reducing bathroom waste. So never let anyone tell you the behavioural insights is all glamour. We get into all the sticky projects around here. But much of this work stems from employees who contributed and were an active part of phase one work streams. Many of whom now regularly reach out when they're applying the behavioural lens to understanding their own operational challenges and have gained confidence to lead on work streams of their own. And the key role for the team in the Executive Director's office in phase two, is really supporting these staff members to identify strategically important areas for research, and design rigorous evaluations, and helping when necessary to interpret, visualise, and communicate the results. And now we're kind of standing at the precipice between phase two and phase three. In phase three, we aim to leverage the BI expertise, that's now been built up across the organisation to promote widespread operational excellence by taking a systems approach to the way in which the organisation uses BI. And by this I mean, the now BI practitioners are increasingly moving away from a focus on individual behaviours or singular changes, to a choice architecture or a nudge and instead taking a systems approach. And this is done by taking the time to consider the system as a whole and to design intensive and multi-layered sort of BI levers to design solutions for really complex and systemic challenges. And this is done at every stage of the project. So we looked to map, to understand, and to encourage and establish positive feedback loops between our in-house experts, our staff networks, our facilities managers, and our external providers, so that they're actively involved in every stage, the scoping, the design, the implementation, and the communication of our BI trials. And in this way, not only do we have more robust designs because we're leveraging their expertise, but we're actively using BI as a way to get them involved, as a way for them to co-design our strategies and allow them to feel part of the solution. And this approach recognises that our target audience are a heterogeneous population. We have a huge amount of diverse cultures, backgrounds, beliefs, and personal aspirations in our staff population. And interventions need to similarly be heterogeneous in order to influence all segments of the population. It also really recognises that for some ingrained behaviours that might actually be incentivised by structural components that are outside of our remit we can't expect a normative messaging intervention will necessarily change behaviours. We actually might have to step into the realm of actually trying to shift those underlying norms, and that's a much bigger ask. And we do this by combining and staggering, right from the start, complimentary strategies so that their effects ripple across population segments and ultimately snowball through positive feedback loops into something much bigger. And the systems approach was really honed under crisis conditions during the OECD's response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Like all organisations, the pandemic profoundly affected the OECD, it's staff, and the way we work. Pre COVID, our modus operandi was based around things that had to stop overnight, bringing two people together through conferences, committee meetings, and seminars, and travelling to our member countries, stakeholders, and partners all over world. Overnight we had to transition over 3000 people based in Paris to complete remote working and host all meetings virtually. And for an international organisation, like the OECD, this raises additional challenges. For example, we had to pivot overnight to providing online virtual and interpretation services for what was ultimately over 1600 conferences in 2020 alone. And as part of the journey to mainstream BI, we'd already taken steps which allowed us to respond really quickly and really effectively to the situation. We had that distributing capacity already ready. And in January 2020, our corporate services worked together to provide an integrated and behaviorally informed response to the crisis. And we did this both by using traditional nudges, that were specifically designed for our staff members who tend to be highly educated and very data literate, but beyond this we actually applied a behavioural lens to the design of all corporate responses to the crisis. Implementing a series of behaviorally informed and risk-based restrictions, incentives and disincentives, persuasive communications and choice architecture. And so for example, restrictions, and particularly methods of ensuring observability and accountability, were introduced to prevent behaviours that represented a health threat. So simple accountable measures really helped to establish new and safe workplace norms. Incentives and disincentives were also used to encourage or disincentivise certain behaviours. For example, our video conferencing support staff was increased five fold overnight to really reduce frictions associated with upskilling to a new technology. And we promoted staggered start and finish times to encourage travel outside of peak hours. The choice architecture that was presented to staff was designed to nudge desired behaviours from the moment they walked through the door and right throughout the building. And really increasing the salience of that safety message everywhere that the staff went. And frictions were removed whenever possible. For example, we developed a new app that really reduced the administrative burden associated with teleworking requests. And finally, the use of clear and persuasive information from trusted authoritative sources was a key aspect of the OECD's COVID-19 response. Authoritative experts, including medical experts, were empowered to deliver information on our behalf so that there was a consistent and trusted source of truth for the organisation. But importantly, these corporate responses weren't presented to staff in a piecemeal way. Instead, corporate services worked together with behavioural specialists to design and deliver this corporate response in a integrated and layered way so that the messages were consistent and mutually reinforcing. And in fact, the organisation developed a completely new and consistent visual identity, which you sort of see here, and communication style for its COVID response. So that at glance staff were easily able to identify messages related to the COVID response. All messages related to the pandemic had the same look and feel to them. They were the same colours, the same schematics, and they were easily identifiable as important, sort of, crisis response information. And as we think about the lessons learned during the COVID-19 response and the integrated way in which these were delivered, across different corporate sort of areas, we're setting our sights on applying a behavioural lens in a systemic way to another key global challenge of our time, being the climate crisis. As the OECD helps to drive and support climate and global leadership on a more ambitious, effective, and globally coordinated action on climate change, the Executive Directorate is using lessons from behavioural science to innovate its own sustainability efforts, putting people at the centre of a systemic sustainability strategy that will achieve even more ambitious environmental targets. And as we're embarking on rethinking the organisation's sustainability strategy, we're asking ourselves a number of questions about how we can embark on this project in the most behaviorally informed way. About how we can identify and establish and influence feedback loops within the system. And some of the things we're thinking about are how to move away from that traditional project management waterfall model, where things are driven from the top and implemented through a project team out to the staff through regulations or policies. Into one where the project team instead focuses on behaviour as a key aspect, and ultimately aims to create and support and empower a groundswell of actions from the bottom up. Putting people at the centre of the organisation's sustainability strategy. And when thinking about how best we can influence and empower three interrelated groups of people in the organisation. As I mentioned previously, we're lucky to have thematic experts throughout the organisation. We have staff who live and breathe climate adaptation, water policy, the sustainable development goals, sustainable procurement, participatory engagement, and regulation. And we're really, these are what I'm calling now, experts here in this figure. And we'd like to have them at the centre of our strategy, not only so that we utilise their expertise, but so that we can support them to participate actively and to lead and drive change in their specialty areas. And I think this is going to represent a real win-win where their policy recommendations can be further refined based on their on ground implementation experience. We also have a really active sustainability community. These are staff who have voluntarily signed up to making the organisation more sustainable and we're asking how we can engage and empower them to be our trusted messengers, to take the message of what we're trying to achieve back to their colleagues, and how we can empower them and support them to become even more involved in designing and implementing sustainability initiatives across the organisation. And in their specific directorate with lessons learned fed back to the organisation as a whole. And rather than having a- and then finally, there's also the staff body as a whole, all the humans that make up the organisation. And as we progress on this journey, we're asking how the OECD can lead by example. To show what can be achieved and ultimately to leverage reciprocity and encourage staff to walk the talk and embody gold standards of sustainable behaviour, both at work and potentially even in their private lives. So rather than having behavioural change or change management as an add-on, we're seeking to have this as a core work stream in the project implementation. We want interplay and influence between that and between the technical implementation of structural changes, so that they play on each other. And where the communication of the work and the integration into existing business processes and policies is not done in isolation, but in a way that builds on the work and the lessons learned in the behavioural and technical work streams, to make something greater than the sum of those parts. And this doesn't preclude sort of a linear style behavioural insights trials. On the contrary, it leverages these as just one part of the bigger picture. We're seeing trials as multifaceted using them as an opportunity, not only to determine, in an experimental way, whether a particular intervention has an impact on a particular behaviour, but also as a way to empower staff to become involved and to run small scale pilots in their own directorate. We're using them as a way to support better narratives about the work that the organisation is doing, and also as a way to highlight behaviours that need to change. So we're increasingly seeing behavioural insights also as kind of paving the way and softening the way ahead when we think that more harder regulation might be needed in the future. So that probably all sounds quite theoretical. So let me give you some examples of some of the behavioural interventions that we're doing to support the sustainability strategy and how we're using them more broadly as part of a systemic approach. And the first area we're looking at is the canteen. And we have multiple projects underway to encourage more sustainable food choices in staff canteens. And at first glance, and for an Australian audience, this might seem like a funny place to start. It might not seem like an area worthy of huge interest, but the canteen is really central to the working day in France. One of the biggest culture shocks for me coming here, is the lack of snacking between meals. The French don't do it, their self-control is amazing. My colleagues sit next to me at my desk and nothing passes their lips for four hours at a time. It was just amazing to me. But unlike in Australia where lunch might consist of a Vegemite sandwich while you're doing your emails, in France there's actually a law against eating at your desk. It's very culturally ingrained to take a decent hour lunch hour. And the staff canteens provide a really nice, warm, three course meals at a reasonable price. So then actually, when we embark on qualitative research, which we've just done, in order to sort of map and understand the system, when we talk to staff about sustainability, comments about the canteen and the practises there, come up again and again and again. This is the one time for a lot of people that they stop working for the day and look around. It's incredibly visible, the canteen, to our staff. So it's really important for our credibility, as an organisation, that we get it absolutely right. And you can see from this slide that we've introduced a number of initiatives over the past couple of years, we don't have any plastic bottles in the canteen or any plastic food packaging at all. Instead there's big fruit infused water tanks available for staff, and we've engaged a new caterer that has a real focus on fresh local and organic produce, so there's a real seasonal menu. But we're currently running a trial to encourage staff to choose the vegetarian option at lunch by reminding people both on the totem, the poster you see on the left here, and also on the menu that the vegetarian lunch option is the most sustainable in terms of carbon footprint. And this is part of a multi-phase intervention. Where yes, we're interested to see if putting posters around the canteen has an impact on people choosing the vegetarian option. And we have all the sales data to verify that. But actually we're really interested to see whether putting this poster up for a couple of months, will pave the way for the introduction of a bit of a harder intervention, which is happening in February, which is the introduction of meat-free Mondays, where staff won't have a choice. They will have to choose the vegetarian option on Mondays. So we're lucky to have two canteens in two separate buildings. So we can use one as a control and one as an experimental option to really take an experimental approach and change one canteen and leave the other as a control and see how this changes things. We're also working with the caterers who provide lunchboxes for corporate events and meetings, of which we have a lot here at the OECD, and we've asked them to redesign the menu, which is what you can see on the right here. At the moment, staff choose between a number of lunch options and the vegetarian option, you can't see it on the screen 'cause it's right down the bottom, it's labelled La Vegetarian, and it's right there with the food allergy options like gluten free. So what we're looking at at the moment, is whether relabeling this option Le Premiere and moving it to the top of the menu, actually increases the proportion of vegetarian options selected. So the work on this carbon labelling was really inspired and driven in part by a staff member from the Secretary General's Office, who actually took study leave and did a Master's and studied carbon labelling as part of her thesis. So she's now collaborating with us to apply her research to these trials, giving her the opportunity to undertake applied research and giving us the opportunity to further build and promote the BI approach outside of the Executive Directorate and indeed in the Secretary General's Office. And another major focus for behavioural insights, attention is on reducing the emissions associated with missions, which is corporate travels. And missions are really key source of focus for our organisational sustainability strategy. And one in which these designed and layered and varied inventions at different leverage points are really going to be needed to address all components of the system, in order to influence change. In 2013 the organisation introduced an the internal carbon price, where directorates are charged a flat rate per tonne of carbon dioxide admitted by air travel. But we know from the academic literature, that the way in which carbon prices or carbon taxes are communicated, has really big impacts on its ability to change behaviours. So we currently have a trial underway to examine different ways of talking and communicating about this carbon price to our staff. And looking more broadly at travel, we've just finished some qualitative research that's really helping to map the actors, the drivers and the barriers and interplays between people, policies and processes in the OECD in relation to mission travel and nothing is out of scope. Organisational travel is being re-examined as we seek to understand the system and design complimentary approaches that can be deployed sequentially over time, and that will be self-reinforcing and ultimately snowball over time to change what is a really ingrained organisational norm. And as part of a collaboration with the UN's One Planet network, we recently surveyed organisations on their experiences and best practises in promoting environmentally sustainable behaviours amongst their staff. We're now seeking to go further and gather more case studies and lessons learnt, and these would be collated to form an online repository. So I'll finished soon, I'll finish here to leave time for questions, but with one final call to action. If your department or organisation has nudged staff to act in more sustainable ways, please get in touch. I'd love to hear from you. And I'd love to showcase the work that you've been doing in our repository that's coming soon. So thank you very much for your attention. And I would love to answer any questions.

- [Simon] Thanks, Trish. And I have to say, there's no sense that it's like the middle of the night from that presentation. So either you're used to doing this kind of stuff, or I don't know.

- [Trish] I'm on my third pot of coffee.

- [Simon] And we're all pretty jealous about the croissants around the corner. We've got a couple of questions here, so I might just run through those and I've got one myself. So there's a couple of related questions here, which I think go to the issue of, normally in BI we kind of look outwards and you've had to turn the lens inwards in the OECD. And the question there was, were your colleagues on board with trying to change their behaviour? And related to that was a question saying, this is pretty resource intensive work. How did you gain support or, whilst you've been there and your observations on that, and maybe previously, how did they gain support for the time and effort required to do all of this work and develop and test different designs?

- [Trish] Yeah, great questions. In terms of the support of colleagues on changing their behaviour, one thing I often thought when working in these kinds of areas is when you go to talk, whether it's, you're talking to the policy areas about their stakeholders behaviours, or whether we're talking to our internal colleagues, people are living and breathing this, they often know the problem. They're just not empowered to me. And they know what the issue is, but often they're not empowered to make the changes, which could change that because they have a day job. They're flat out there, they've got a day job, they know what could be done. And so I think a lot of the times we have a bit of a permissive role of coming in and saying, yeah, it's okay. We're going to take you all off the line a little bit, and we're going to change this, and it's going to be an efficiency in the long run, but that's hard to justify sometimes by yourself when you have a day job and you're just trying to get things done. And in relation to your second question about the resource intensity. It is, and I think that is where the "perfect", being the enemy of the good, comes into play a little bit. Sometimes, you think- I thought before coming here, I was like, oh, the OECD will be the gold standard of everything, and actually, a lot of the time we really embody that good is the enemy of perfect. And we get things done quite quickly, really quickly, even if they're not absolutely perfect and how we would like them to be because we are incredibly busy. We have, a lot of different- A huge workload and a lot of different factors going on all of the time. So sometimes we're running trials out, in under a week rushing through, doing it as best we can, to just get a little bit of data so that we have that indication. And they're not the kind of things that make it into the BI guide, but they're really important in helping some of our colleagues understand that process and see what can be done in a kind of minimum viable product type of way.

- [Simon] Great. Another couple of sort of related questions, but interesting in the way they're related. So we had a question about, do people in each of the buildings know they're being experimented on, including at lunchtime? And then the other question was like, it's a bit different. Is there a risk that increased awareness of BI can reduce its efficacy? So yeah, on one hand, people not being aware they're involved, on the other hand, maybe too high a level of awareness. And what are the impacts of both of those?

- [Trish] Yeah, yeah, good question. No, people don't know that they're being sort of experimented on at their lunch break while we're doing it, but we do of course communicate that afterwards. And we have a really, very highly educated, very data literate audience. So I think as our staff members, I think they get it, the trial approach, and it can be, as I say, really interesting then to stimulate conversations amongst the staff. And Simon I'm sorry, I've forgotten your second question.

- [Simon] So, the other one was, I guess, whether you've had any kickback about people not knowing- So there's kickback about people not knowing they're being experimented on and then whether people are kind of told when they're been experimented on and whether they kind of adapt their behaviour.

- [Trish] Absolutely, yeah. I think that there is certainly a risk of that, but I also think that that helps to communicate and stimulate interest. Sometimes we get comments of, oh, 'I saw that you guys are experimenting on us. Well on, that communication about X, Y, and Z' and actually we're not, but they've picked up that it's, we're not running a trial at that time, but they've picked up that there's sort of some behaviorally informed messaging going on there. And even if it's just their own sense of sort of weeding out what's going on, it's made them pay more attention to that and stimulated that conversation of, 'hey, I see what you BI guys are doing' when actually it's totally unrelated to us and not that case at all, so I think- I do wonder a lot of the time about how much the novelty effect comes into play of, when we first sent out text messages as behavioural insights practitioners. It was amazing, the success and, a few years from now when we're all getting text messages from every organisation, we'll have to think about some new way to communicate that's novel and gauges people's attention. I do wonder about, the benefit of, how ingrained some of these things are or how it's just a different approach and that in itself attracts people's attention, which means we'll have to keep running as fast as we can to keep coming up with new and engaging approaches, I think.

- [Simon] Yeah, just one quick one, and then we'll go to the next speakers and we'll come back later for more questions. There's just a question here about what evaluation tools you use, that RCTs could be tricky some of the time. So just maybe a quick comment on whether you do do RCTs, or if you use a variety of different approaches.

- [Trish] We use it for a variety of different approaches, but actually we to make really good use of corporate data sets. And when you start getting into that, there's this amazing resource that all organisations have, I presume that- We have all our travel data, we can track individual staff members and where they've been for the last 10 years, if we wanted to. So we make heavy use of that. We have data scientists who work with us, that can access and really manipulate that in very effective ways. So that really lends itself to a lot of RCTs. Sometimes we sort of take a more qualitative approach where we might, for example, the virtual reality training that was ran out pretty quickly, we just developed our own 2D version of the 3D training, measured a bit of information retention there, but not in a, in a pretty sort of haphazard way, in some ways that wasn't gold standard RCT, that's for sure. But then also follow it up with qualitative interviews. And I think sometimes there where we get some real insights, the numbers can show that, actually retention in a certain area wasn't as good in the 2D version as it was in the 3D version. And following that up with some qualitative interviews can really, once we've looked at the data, hone in on that and find out sort of what's going on in those areas. So a variety of different methods, not always the RCTs, but we're, I'm sure like everyone, really excited when we get the opportunity to really take some time and do a really thorough investigation. But that's not always the case, sometimes as I say, we're rushing through and delivering things in a week and getting things done as quick as we can.

- [Simon] Definitely, well, thanks so much for that, we're no doubt going to come back with a few more questions after the next two presentations. So stay on the line, go and grab yourself a coffee.

- [Trish] Fantastic, thank you.

- Put yourself on mute when you go to get your coffee, so we don't hear all of it, but yeah, we'll be back soon.

- [Trish] Thanks, Simon.

- [Simon] Great. All right, we're going to go to our next two speakers now, Dr. Stefan Kaufman and Dr. AleZander Saeri, hopefully their tech works here. We have heard that the techs servers, is throwing you guys out at times. So fingers crossed that we can stay on for the remainder of the session. Stefan is a senior research fellow in the environment portfolio, and Zan is a research fellow in the social and financial portfolio at BehaviourWorks Australia. And I'm sure most of the people listening today know all about BehaviourWorks Australia and the great work they do. Stefan researches how a behavioural lens can help us navigate societal challenges and opportunities. And he works with the BWA consortium to start up cross agency collaborations. Zan has worked with Australian organisations and government departments in founding and leading SCRUB, which we heard a bit about in the past. A 21 wave rapid cycle survey of Australia's COVID-19 behaviours to reduce harms and to support a sustainable recovery. Following on from Trish's presentation on sustainability at the OECD, Stefan and Zan will be presenting on behavioural science applications in sustainability transitions, including some of the challenges we face in building back better and how to help create positive and lasting behaviour change. So thanks Zan, Stefan over to you guys.

- [Stefan] All right. thank you, Simon. It's a real honour and pleasure to be here today with such interesting speakers. And I'm here with my co presenter Zan. I'd like to acknowledge we're standing on Wurundjeri and Bunurong lands of the Aboriginal people of these areas. And we acknowledge the elders past and present and emerging. So to start off, I will acknowledge that we had two drop outs during the last talk. So if we keep to that average, you might need a quick pause, but we'll see how we go, but we'll forge on and hope it all comes through. As Simon was saying, we're based at BehaviourWorks. Probably a useful way to think about BehaviourWorks is that it's a research enterprise based at Monash University. We really do three main buckets of things. One is the consortium element of it, which is actually how it started, where we have long-term partnerships with government agencies. Most consistently in the environment space, but it's at different times, it's been quite a diverse mix of different policy portfolios. And that's actually where I came on board. I was working at EPA Victoria at the beginning back in 2011 as a social scientist there and was involved in the start of it. Fast forward, 10 years later, I'm now working at BehaviourWorks. We also do a bunch of education and training. Some of it in the professional settings, some of it at university level, all of it, lots of fun. And we also do increasingly a lot of more consultancy or commission style research as well. And examples we'll talk about today. We'll draw a little bit across a few of those. So what we really wanting to get into today was thinking a little bit about this idea of building back and building back better and particularly, thinking about what might be the business as usual, if you like, contribution of behavioural insights to a COVID-19 recovery and what could or should it be, as well. And when we think about that we're coming at this quite practically, as well as, the more theory and research based paper that we're drawing on for this. Some of the people we work with are coming to us with questions around changes in transport systems and mobility, and workplace and employment. And to get started, we thought we'd start with those examples to give you a bit of a sense of some of these questions. And I guess it's a nice compliment to Trish's talk in that we have some of the same issues and interests applied to a more outward facing set of challenges, where she was referring to the internal facing elements of the OECD work. I have to work out that roller. So in this case of transport systems we're hearing things like in the pre-pandemic, particularly in urban centres like Melbourne, transport networks were struggling to meet user demand with congested roads and crowded public transport. All of a sudden with the COVID restrictions this all transformed, lots of reduced travel, lots of more localised travel, and more active transport. And now in recovery, where we have these questions of governments and operators, having set up these institutions and networks and technologies to work in a certain way to assess, do we go back to normal? Do we snap back to that? Or do we try and do something different and do we have opportunities to handle some of the risks and problems we had before the pandemic? And indeed some of the ones that emerged directly out of it, as well. Now, if you take a business as usual approach, we might be saying, well, okay, we've got disrupted disrupted habits and routines here. What can we do to understand the drivers and barriers that might bring people back into that? We can test interventions. We might try and encourage people to use more active transport instead of private transport as a in-between position between the public and private car, for example, perhaps through incentives like congestion charges, and that that's all well and good. And there'd be some good evidence and reason to think that might work in certain ways. But what we're also thinking about is, if we do step back and ask about, are we building back, are we building to something better, how much do we want to snap back to that old regime? And do we want to do something differently? Are there a new mobility habits or practises that we could embed and encourage, and is this an opportunity to put them in. And if so, how do we decide and make that happen. In a similar sense, and this relates a little bit more to what Trish was just talking about, the nature of work and employment has changed. And many organisations we work with grappling with internalising those implications. There was a regime that had a certain, if you like, equilibrium of work-life balance, life happening outside of the working day. People in non-salaried work are in precarious situations, but markets were changing relatively slowly, again, major disruption. Some people went remote and were lucky to be employed, but were juggling work, caring and isolation in some cases, if they weren't doing caring. Other workers in different employment were dismissed or stood down or reduced to minimal pay, or in order to just do their work, had to expose themselves to considerable risks, real and perceived. So again, in recovery, we have this issue of some remote workers are returning to hybrid work. Some employers are struggling to fill public facing roles. And many workers are reconsidering how their work and life fit together and whether or not their situation was necessary and inevitable, and can they try something else. Again, traditionally, there's a whole suite of tools and approaches that have been used, many of which you heard about in the talk and many of which take into account the more complex aspects of things as well. And again, there's an opportunity here, I guess, to say, how could it be different? Is it equitable? Is it just? Is it desirable? Can we build in better work regimes for people in different situations? And can we build a better work-life balance and social wellbeing? And I suppose one fundamental thing that we're thinking a lot about is how this has blurred the lines so much between different rights and responsibilities of employees, employers, people in their family lives and in their community life, as well, it's made what were previously relatively discrete tensions, very obvious by smushing them on top of each other, in many cases, for different people in different situations. So this is really just to put front and centre that there's some really practical but profound challenges that many organisations are grappling with here. And it's so happened that while all this was going on, we were working on what was a more of a thinkpiece reviewing how certain literature looks at behaviour change. The framing of that-

- [Simon] Unfortunately it looks like we've lost-

- [Stefan] I think we're back. We're back, sorry.

- [Simon] I nearly just, I was trying to stall it though.

- [AleZander] No, that's okay, that's okay Simon. Look, that might happen another time. Sorry about that.

- [Stefan] Are we sharing the screen again?

- [Alexander] Let me share our screen and we'll go back to it and trust that we'll do it again next time.

- [Stefan] Yeah, so that was our first-

- [Simon] There's a kind of irony here, talking about hybrid work and-

- [Stefan] Indeed.

- [Simon] And the thing dropping out but anyhow keep on going

- [Alexander] Exactly.

- [Stefan] This is our first predicted, but unpredictable drop out. I'm sure we'll have a second one, we'll see how we go. I wonder if there's a timer on this somewhere. Anyway, point being, the literature we were looking at, was interested in this notion of sustainability transitions. And this is really looking at major shifts in the social and technical arrangements of societies from things like a high carbon intensity- Are we still on?

- [AleZander] Yep, yep.

- [Stefan] Good, a high carbon intensity regime or one that has abundant water to homes and so on. And the kind of research is based on is everything from, really micro scale urban experimentation and precinct efforts to put in things like a micro grid, right through to try to understand what happened over a hundred years in the transition in the UK from predominantly coal-based energy to very little or none, now, I believe. So quite a big picture, quite diverse, quite interesting. And the relevance of it, particularly to this talk is that if you look at where Australia is, as one country, was at from this perspective, not everything was great before the COVID-19 situation. Indeed, in a lot of particularly environmental, but also socioeconomic ones, the trends were pretty poor. And when you look at things like the sustainable development goals, which Australia is a signatory to, and we voluntary report again, it's making its way into various state-based reporting frameworks and policy frameworks. If you look at those then yeah, things weren't necessarily peachy. And so we have this question, I guess of, are we trying to return back to that, or is there an opportunity here to rebuild things. While the SDG goals themselves aren't perfect, they're a pretty good and comprehensive laundry list of policy goals and public good outcomes we could aim for that are widely agreed across the world. And so a second idea we want to load you up with in setting up the talk is, is what is behavioural insights. So a fairly textbook definition that you'll find in the good old OECD's Basic Framework is that it's the evidence-based approach to integrating insights and methodologies from the behavioural sciences into public policy to provide better and more effective public policies. And something that we think is particularly relevant to the review work we did, is that this does tend to favour disciplines and methods with an experimental causal analysis and empirical focus, which I should hasten to add that we think is great, but has some built in, I guess, preconceptions and approaches, which our review also has some things to say about. I also acknowledged at this point, we draw on the OECD Basic Framework and a few other sources in the OECD, in a few cases here. And the thought there was that, we like it, and it's great to see people like Trish and Kiara over there now, not to mention our own Mathias Cormann I think heading the place now. And yeah, I was actually able to contribute to the formation of a basic framework in my time at EPA as well, so happy to push it here as well. So building on this idea and definition of behavioural insights and public policy, it's pretty well acknowledged and not at all controversial to note that in your sort of classic policy cycle of framing and understanding problems to drafting potential solutions, to implementing, monitoring, and correcting where necessary, there is that strong tendency, as has been commented in many forums, that we tend to focus on the operationalisation and implementation phase of it. And having worked in a regulator for 10 years, I'd also add that this can be really useful, particularly when you're dealing with things like 10 year periodic reviews of regulations and Sunset clauses, and so on, to have the results of behavioural insights into what's working, and what isn't, is really useful. But there is this issue that there has been less consideration of behavioural perspectives at the heart of policy, to go back to BETA's excellent slogan there at the beginning of the talk, and the sort of conceptual framing, problem identification and agenda setting. And if you think a little bit more about why that is and how that relates to the disciplinary focus and tools of your vanilla behavioural insights, then when you think that really reflects that it's often found in an optimising role of existing policy frameworks and tools in stable well understood contexts and with shared, legitimate, well articulated policy goals, and that has some implications, I guess, for how well a "business as usual" approach is going to work for recovery. And I think as Trish excellently set out in her talk, there is already lots of really good, deep thinking going on about what does BI 2.0 look like and beyond, that takes into account some of these issues. And I think- I agreed very strongly with many of the things you were saying about what are more systemically orientated, behavioural insights approach looks like. And I think you'll find some resonances with what we'll talk about next as well. But to give you a bit of a teaser on one of the main findings of the review we did, We really sort of, four perspectives on behaviour in these complex, multifaceted social transformation, social technical transformations, and two of them would be relatively familiar. One we labelled as the automatic perspective, which is very much focused on things like habits, biases and heuristics. Our reading of the literature contributing to that was that they were more interested in maybe the role of social and physical context in structuring habits than some of the internal structures and evolutionary psychology bases that might be more familiar from a behavioural insights perspective, but interest in things like path dependency, rebound effects, things of that nature are favoured strongly in that space and the implications they pose for efforts to try and intentionally steer society away from, for example, high energy consumption to a more low emission state. We also saw good evidence of a- What we would labelled as a reflective approach, which is again, the familiar behavioural insights 1.0, but with a stronger emphasis on your more conscious and reflective disciplines like psychology, social psychology, social marketing, all these perspectives that recognise people at times can be making conscious, reflective decisions about what they want, if not necessarily rational, at least reasonable, with reasons and barriers or drivers, and adapt a pathway to influence and change. And some of the examples we saw there was efforts to understand how to promote themselves, different aspects of technology acceptance, or greater support for increased policy, and indeed picking up an amplifying what you might call grassroots innovations and emerging solutions that come from less mainstream practises and lifestyles, but could be elements of them could be made more mainstream. What might be less familiar to behavioural insights practitioners, whether the two other perspectives, which we saw as being a little bit more critical and more problematic or more problematising the contribution of behavioural insights. One we call the strategic perspective. And this is sort of if you like, behavioural insights meets Machiavelli in that they're really interested in how incumbent and emerging actors "game" situations. And when they talk about incumbent, they're talking about well-established industries, businesses, and government. The major institutions and organisations that might be pretty happy with the status quo of things at any time, but it might be interested in shaping the future as well. And then the emerging actors or niche innovators, other people who might be trying to disrupt that. So, think about your new technologies, maybe your new social institutions and organisations. And interestingly, there's some identification and discussion of efforts to, I guess, not just "game" the situator and the unfolding pathways of socio-technical innovation but also identify and exploit behavioural insights for good and for ill. And so notions of sludging and things of that nature can appear in this space as well. Where different actors might try and exploit biases. And there's a very strong crossover here with some of the climate communication and PR issues that happen as well. Finally, the fourth perspective, everyday practises, this again, has a central focus on habits, but does not see them as discrete behavioural phenomena, but rather inextricably tied up in dynamic processes between people in context. They're quite critical of behavioural insights in policy. In fact, their launch into a sustainability transition was a pretty ringing critique of it back in 2010. And they see the idea of, empirical randomised control trials, rational analytical individual focused change, as being part of the problem not part of the solution in socio-technical change. And, we think they've got some points, but we also don't think that this is a reason to not draw on some of these tools across. And indeed one of the main messages of our paper is that would we not get a lot further faster by combining these four perspectives or applying them in complimentary ways at different points rather than blindly favouring one or the other, which is really a key point we'd like to leave you with in this talk. Now, the other interesting element of that framework that we identified was that there's probably a bit of a theme of incremental through to transformative change bias as in different perspectives on behaviour. And so if your goal is building back better, the subception is that we might be more interested in incremental improvements in life until we reach pre COVID levels and then continue to tick along in those areas. And there's some implicit assumptions there that the way things were before, are worth returning to, that we can go back to them and that the public goods that we're aiming towards there are legitimate and shared. And you could contrast that. And I wouldn't say it's quite as simple as saying the automatic and reflective perspective aligned to the left and the other two to the right, but there is something of that flavour in it. The other end of the spectrum you could say is this recognising that there's a better future, but how we get there is a bit uncertain with unstable movements would embed trying to navigate our way through complexity, towards a new steady state. And again there's some assumptions here that we can navigate through these complexity to public goals. And we can agree on where we're trying to get to, even if we don't know how to get there right now. And I would argue that the behavioural insights toolkit, 1.0 at least, is pretty limited in addressing that space, but maybe by paying more attention to some of these other perspectives, we can do it. And that as you already heard from Trish, there's some very practical and logical ways you can start to try and take into account some of these more systemic perspectives in behavioural insights. And I think in the background of all this too, it's also worth keeping in mind some of the commentary on the rise and fall and perhaps rise again of behavioural insights in public policy. Again, another OECD publication here, it's been noted that it's had some peaks and troughs of engagement and enthusiasm. And we note that before the pandemic, we were beginning to see something of an uptick in engagement again, but perhaps this disruption for behavioural insights itself is a chance for us to think about, well, what is the behavioural insights and what we would turn in our paper behavioural public policy, that we should be taking into the future to try and intentionally steer societies in directions we want them to. So really the key point I'll leave you with before we hand over to talking about the details of the review is that if these insights are translatable, from the sustainability transitions perspectives, we probably do need something different from business as usual behavioural insights. I'll hand over to Zan now to give you a bit of detail on the review step and how we've been applying that to some of these recovery questions.

- [Alexander] Thanks, Stef. So what I might do is give a quick overview of the methods of the review. If you're interested, you're very welcome to read and share our paper on that and we'll tell you about that again at the end. But the original purpose of the review is to try to understand what were the different perspectives that were emerging in sustainability transitions. And we already kind of spoiled that we'd found these four different lenses, but I just like to describe how we found them and then what they are. And then we'll talk a little bit about applying them back to our concrete examples of transport and mobility and work and employment. So about 4,000 papers comprise the total academic corpus of sustainability transitions. We searched through that to find about 400 that mentioned behaviour in some way. And then once we started reading those papers, we found that there were about a hundred that were more significantly treating behaviour, considered behaviour to be actually relevant to, or at least a lens through which you could understand what's happening in this kind of complex sustainability transitions. Changes of technology systems and modes of production. And so these four lenses that Stef had already just mentioned, you can see that reflective and automatic perspectives are somewhat more familiar to our existing practise and strategic and everyday are somewhat less familiar to those who have the typical BI mode, but would be familiar to people coming from Microeconomics, Game Theory, Political Science, Strategic Management, and then the everyday practise perspective would be familiar to those of you who have come from a Sociology or Critical Theory Anthropology perspective. But I wanted to give you a couple of kind of conceptual metaphors you could use to help think about these different perspectives, because we're also going to introduce a tool to help you think about applying these four lenses, to reveal and obscure different parts of things, that are relevant to this question of building back better or building better futures. So when you're thinking about the reflective approach, typically the sort of way you might imagine grappling with a problem or the sorts of concepts that would come up again and again from this approach is, who needs to do what differently, who does what because of reason. This is something that we use in our work at BehaviourWorks every single day. When it comes to automatic, we're thinking a lot about nudges, about choice architecture or moments that matter, to be able to take advantage of those unconsidered and repeated actions that are cued by the environment. When it comes to strategic behaviour, you could think about things like unintended consequences, loopholes, or winners and losers, of particular types of interventions or policies that you've seen. Those of you in Australia, would be very familiar with a lot of that discussion around things like border closures or restrictions. Can I do this, who wins out, because of that. And when it comes time to think about everyday practise, although there's this quite strong, critical element through it, the question questions about path dependency or behavioural landscape, you can also think about this in terms of grassroots innovation or emergent practices, things that people have done to get by or cope, and realise that this is actually a way that things could be different to the way things were. And zooming out a little bit and thinking about this wider area of sustainability transitions as something that already grapples with complex unpredictable changes, just like COVID-19 recovery. We find that we should expect the diversity of actors to form a mosaic of contributions towards better and worse situations when we're talking about recovery. And it's also the case that we can't just rely on our existing methods to kind of incrementally optimise the system, but we also can't wait for centralised recovery plans and wait for a particular authority to say, this is the way that things will happen, and then everyone will just fall in line after. So we need to consider the fact that diversity of actors and diversity of interventions, will be needed. And what we'd like to propose is one of the things that can help you with this, is to consider these four lenses as ways in which you could think about the different challenges that you might be recruited to or wish to get your foot in the door, to assist with, when it comes to COVID-19 recovery. So these are four guiding questions that sit within the lenses, and we'll also make this available afterwards, but these four guiding questions, we hope, can help reveal new insights or play with new ideas that are relevant to the sorts of challenges that you'd face. When it comes to a reflective perspective, you might ask questions like what beliefs, values, and behaviours are play, when it comes to the automatic perspective, you might think about what sorts of habits are in play, and is there a moment that matters, for example, when people come back to work after Christmas, is that a moment in which you could be shifting habits or changing the heuristics that people have become used to. When it comes to a strategic perspective, who wins and loses and who can come on board, is a key question. And when it comes to the everyday perspective, we can think, what sorts of things have people done by themselves, and how does that interact with policies or regulations or the situation as it emerges. Now, when it comes to our concrete example of transport systems and mobility, what I've done is try to unpack a couple of these guiding questions within that challenge that we specify around pre-pandemic, during restrictions and in recovery. And so just to highlight a couple, you can think about a reflective perspective as asking the research question, the practise question, a project to find out the answer to, who is and isn't returning to public transport and why. From an automatic perspective, you might be thinking, are people over perceiving the risk of COVID-19 transmission in certain types of situations and under perceiving them in others, and that's having impacts on their transport usage and mobility. When it comes to the strategic question, you might think, well, while it's the case that arterial traffic is still below peak, is that a time that we could marshal the necessary resources to trial separate transit lanes and see does that work, would that lead to more positive outcomes. And then finally thinking about the everyday perspective. we might consider whether the historical kind of status associated with car ownership, has changed while that's been sitting in the garage getting a flat battery over the past 18 to 24 months. When it comes to work and employment, you can think about these again through these four guiding questions, the idea being that by asking these questions, by creating a project in this question, by speaking with a partner and getting them to think beyond the specific question that they've come to you with, you can reveal and sometimes obscure different parts of this complex challenge that is COVID-19 recovery. You might ask the question, which employees are most likely to resign and how can we keep them. But you could also think about, from a strategic perspective who benefits and who's left behind by move to remote by default. And when you think about the everyday perspective, over in Victoria especially, the cycle and the move back and forth between hybrid work, full lockdown, pushing people back to in-person work, particularly in early 2021, there was a huge amount of experimentation within businesses and within individual teams. Can some of those innovations and practises be put into policy and/or should they just be allowed to come back to the way things were. So that's a very, I think, sort of high level perspective on four guiding questions from those four lenses that you could be using to help you navigate through the complex COVID-19 recovery in the space of that building back better and building better futures. And I'll pass back to Stefan just for the last five minutes to talk a little bit about where to next.

- [Stefan] Thanks Zan. So some points we thought we could leave you thinking on and hopefully discuss in the questions a bit. It might follow from some of this analysis that it's really worth thinking careful about how is the problem being framed that you're being asked to work on. And framing is a useful thing to think about because it's basically-

- [Simon] Hi again, I'll just talk for hopefully about five seconds until we get them back online as they come towards the end of their presentation and they're back.

- [Stefan] Hey, it's me isn't it, it doesn't like me, but then it got Trish too, so I shouldn't feel persecuted. Yeah, so framing, right. So framing is in some senses is defined as a problem and implied solution and a bit of a moral value judgement on whose problem it is and what that should be, and what should be pretty clear from what we've been sharing with you is that if you come at things from a classic behavioural insights perspective, there might be a bit of a tendency to frame problems as being about individuals and about the need to change their behaviour, and not about changing things like elements of the context or the beneficiaries and unintended consequences that come from it as well. So a really good first question in thinking about the four lenses and the question the strategic questions is, are we really thinking about this project from the perspective of what you could call the incumbent from a transitions point of view. That's the people who might be quite happy with the status quo and how it is, or if we might be trying to disrupt and change it. And we're not necessarily saying that it's always about incumbency is bad and disruption is good. We think there's many examples where behavioural insights is a really useful tool and optimising things is a good thing, but I think we should be asking that question at least, and working out, what are we trying to do here, and what is our goal and how well suited are our tools for doing it. And that flows directly to the next question, which was, what is our system assessment of how the system was working correctly before COVID-19? Was it broken? Is going back to that gonna build in unintended consequences and negative externalities we didn't want in the first place, and is there a new social licence or what clinical scientist called an Overton window, to embed in and lock in some of the changes that have happened and it can be built on. And I think, again, these are really important questions to ask and might be a, particularly given the potential contribution of behavioural insights to forecasting the potential impacts of policy changes and helping with that cost benefit analysis phase. It could be a really strong contribution that we're in a really good time to make some contributions for. And yeah, we will just leave you with the thought that it's appropriate to try and build back some systems that are working fine. And there's many great things about where we're at in Australia in the world. But if we only focused on reflecting on our perspectives, we might be obscuring or minimising opportunities to make things even better, and perhaps more importantly, to fix problems that were ignored or were not front and centre for the mainstream. And we think the solution to this is, partly, particularly in our role as expert supporters of good decision-making, is to draw on these different perspectives in a thoughtful way. And something we are grappling with quite practically as well is, is that it's not- it's hard work working across complimentary but different perspectives. Some of the fields which the four lenses draw from, are not good at talking with each other and don't like it, but we do think there is a lot of value in it. So, we need to recognise that it's worth building some relationships with people from different perspectives and allowing in time and space in projects to benefit from those perspectives and the different tempos and approaches of their preferred methods and evidence sources and so on, too. Which, again, as you heard through Trish's talk, there's lots of opportunities to mix different methods and different perspectives in projects, right across behavioural insight's work. So we'll be continuing to develop this as a research theme where in MSDI we're very interested at My Sustainable Developing Institute, that's our home. In I guess multilayered systems change and we have the BehaviourWorks component, but we have other elements such as ClimateWorks, working in water or people working in international development and our policy experimentation people. We're all very interested in, in how all this comes together in change. And so, this is core business for us, trying to understand where does behaviour and systems change come together. And we'll be continuing to produce research and thinking on this space, and one of the main engines for doing that, will be trying to apply some of this thinking in our project. So we're already looking for opportunities to apply our four lenses in current and upcoming work. We're certainly interested in talking to people who want to give it a go and work with us. And probably one of the more substantial areas where we have some opportunity to build on this links between individual and systems behaviour is some of the cross consortium missions we're doing. So we've been using the missions orientated research and innovation frameworks to do some of that cross agency behaviour change work, that's a big part of my day job. And Zan and I are working heavily on one on climate adaptation. And we started up another one looking at responsible consumption. And in both of those, there's this real focus, I guess, on trying to understand the links between different layers of change and where does behaviour change contribute to that. We also had the opportunity to contribute to the emissions for science report, which called for international funders to support such multi-layered interdisciplinary work on some of these big transformations that we have in front of us, towards the SDGs and broader global issues that we're tackling. So that's, that's all current stuff for us and all stuff we're very happy to talk more about. As a very practical next step, if you're interested in trying out the lenses, the questions are relatively straightforward and usable right away, and we're sure you will find surprising interesting things out of doing it. It'd be really great to hear any efforts, whether it's a thinkpiece, or you do it in a more substantial way, let us know. The paper is currently open access till December 26th. So download it quick. If you want to read it, we will make a pre-print of it available after that. And if you think that there's people in your circles who would be interested and would have benefit from hearing about it, we'd really love you to share it with them as well. There's things like this talk and that there's an MSDI seminar we did as well, which is accessible for those who prefer to hear it and see it rather than read it. So that really brings us to the end now. I think we're pretty much to time if slightly over and apologies if so, but we'd really love to hear any questions and discuss it with you in the short time now and particularly, the panel later on.

- [Simon] Great, we are a little bit over, so I'm going to keep this to sort of two or three questions, and then we can come back later. You spoke a little bit earlier about the concept of behavioural public policy. And I noticed that someone in the comments on the last live is also interested in hearing a bit more about behavioural public policy. Can you just touch on how that differs from BI 101? I think, you had your slide there which showed that. And also any examples you can think of where we have started to apply it in that way.

- [Stefan] Yeah, that's a great question. So there's a few different ways of thinking about this. So in our paper, we acknowledge that there's something of an outside view of behaviour change, which does tend to see it as reductionist linear focus on these small things. But there's growing examples in the literature on this of people really working very hard to bring together quite different disciplines in quite transformative questions and problems in, usually in a sort of knowledge brokering kind of mode. And we see that as being one of the distinguishing features between what we'd call behavioural public policy on one hand and behavioural insights on the other. So this multidisciplinary broader focus of causes and consequences, I think Trish summed up some of the systemic implications very nicely, about recognising broader actors, broader intervention tools and so on. In terms of practical examples, I think it's every time that we don't just lead with a policy and solution with a nudge, but we also say, well, how does this interface with regulations or what are the implications of this for technology and design and how does that flow through to things like standards and so on. And I guess the areas that I'm most familiar with, in this space right now, is some of the work we've been doing with the federal Department of Environment around things like eco labels, recycling packaging, and so on, there's a whole suite of spaces there where the prospects of individual behaviour change are really constrained by decisions that are made by designers and producers and also different waste management systems, for example. And if you tackle the problem as purely behaviour change problem in there, you're not going to get very far very fast, but if you can start to line up those different elements then you can really achieve some significant changes, we think. Yeah, I don't know, Zan you want to expand on that at all?

- I think that's great, thanks Stef.

- [Simon] Just one more question. I found those guiding questions really useful. I guess, from a practitioner point of view, what do we do after we've asked those questions and we've started to form up some answers. What's the next step?

- [Stefan] Duck under the desk. No, I don't know, we're sort of working that out too, but I think the implications are that these should begin to feed into what kind of research questions we're asking, what kind of methods and disciplines we should be drawing on and what even, different solutions we should be considering. I think there's- we need to still produce it, but I think you could do some expanding circles of some of those things around the four perspectives and begin to line them up. And if you think the challenge or problem you're dealing with is, falls essentially in one of those questions, it might give you some guidance as to what tools and approaches to bring to it. And probably better is if you think the issue benefits from looking at it from multiple perspectives it gives you a bit of a menu of those to try and combine. But we're working it out, I think is the short answer. Zan?

- [Alexander] Yeah. I think just a very brief reflection I would make is that I've been challenged over the past couple of years about moving beyond, no, not quite right- including new and novel methods for answering these sorts of questions that my empirical social psychology PhD brain has like really struggled with, because I was always thinking about putting things in boxes, always thinking about designing things in RCT and measuring behaviours in a very counting sort of way. And I think that behavioural public policy and the sort of next steps you would take with these questions is about thinking how can you create rigorous, robust and useful answers that are including sort of new methods. And as Stef said, we're still figuring out what those methods are.

- [Stefan] We suspect a wee bit of a moving feast for any given example, too.

- [Alexander] But we really appreciate the question.

- [Simon] Well, we've got a couple of other questions, but we're a little bit over time, so I'm going to save some of them for the end of the presentation and we'll come back. But thanks so much for that really thought provoking stuff. All right, we're going to go onto our last speaker for today, Professor Alex Haslam. Alex is a professor of Social and Organisational Psychology and the Australian Laureate Fellow at the University of Queensland, whose research focuses on the study of group and identity processes in organisational, social and health contexts. Together with colleagues, Alex has written and edited 15 books and 300 peer reviewed articles. That's enormous. Today, he's going to present on the new psychology of leadership, moving away from focusing on the personal qualities of effective leaders and towards a leader's ability to create and embed a sense of shared identity. So over to you, Alex, really looking forward to it.

- [Alex] Great, just checking, you can see these slides and you can hear me okay?

- [Simon] Yep.

- [Alex] Brilliant, okay, great. So what I'm going to do is sort of in some ways continue. Start with some critical sort of reflections in Zan and Stefan's talk there. I'm going to probably just take those a little bit further too, and problematise, I think some other kinds of aspects of this space just by not acknowledging that whatever we might want to do around the various policy and practical kind of interventions that we're looking to do in whatever realm, whether it's environments or economic behaviour and the like, or responses to the pandemic. A key thing that sits behind all of those phenomena is leadership and what we think leaders should be doing, and what they're actually doing, has a huge bearing on the efficacy of whatever path we look to go down. And what I want to really argue in this talk is that one of the things about the pandemic is that it's really exposed, I think some very significant shortcomings in the way that we think about leadership. I think those things were pretty apparent to researchers and leadership scholars prior to the pandemic, but they've been really brought home I think in a range of ways. And I think they chime with, as they say, the cycle of our work, which is- well there is a most recent book on this, which is called The New Psychology of Leadership, and argues really for rethinking not just kind of what leadership is, but more particularly how we develop it, how we deliver it and what it means for us as organisational members and as people who are trying to bring about change and influence people in the world at large. Given that leadership is probably the most sort of fundamental influence process. The things that I'm going to talk about today are based on this book Together Apart which we wrote about a year ago. I think early on in the pandemic. And it's free to access that book. I think most of the things that it says of being born out by events in various kinds of ways, in many respects, lots of it was quite prescient, but again, that's open access and if you want to know more about what I'm saying, you can read that. This book, The New Psychology of Leadership. And we've also been involved in a couple of major reviews, which have had quite a bit of impact in this space. And I'll talk about these as we go forwards. The starting point, I think about the pandemic as we see it, is that really the pandemic has brought, if you like, brought home the need to get our heads around the 'we' thing. That is to say broadly speaking, the big stories of the pandemic, at least psychologically speaking, have centred on social identity. The sense of self that people derive from their membership in groups. The idea that the self isn't just me and I, it's also just, it's also us and we. And as psychologists we tend to prioritise privilege and fetishize the I and the me, and really overlook if you like the, us and the we, but again, the importance of the us and the we, is something I think has really been absolutely central to the various trajectories of various individuals and policies and groups throughout the pandemic. And as I say, the key stories of the pandemic are, I think, are around issues like solidarity or lack it, trust or lack of it, compliance or lack of it, connectedness or lack of it, and leadership or lack of it. And what we know from the social identity literature, much of it conducted in Australia, actually the two big centres for, I think, research on social identity and leadership there, the ANU in Canberra and here at UQ, are that social identity is a base, a sense of shared identity. A sense of us-ness if you'd like, it's a basis for all these things, it's a basis for solidarity, trust, compliance, connectedness, and leadership, but so too those things also help to create a sense of shared identity. What I want to talk about today is obviously leadership. And I guess the point I'm alluding to on this slide is this point by the now disgraced Andrew Cuomo, "It's not about me it's about we. Get your heads around the we concept. It's not about you. It's about we.". There he was speaking to people who didn't want to comply with lockdowns and a physical distancing, and mask wearing and so on. And was asking, inviting people to buy into the collective interest. And the basic point here is that the more successful leaders have been at doing that, the better they and their societies or communities have been able to address the problems that the pandemic has presented. So again, just to put this in context, I think the pandemic has exposed the failings of traditional ways of thinking about leadership. The sort of standard approach to leadership suggests that leadership is just a thing, an abstract quality that you either do or don't have. I think what we see in the pandemic is that leadership is something that is absolutely grounded in group life and moves around with the ebs and flowing of a group life. They suggest leadership's fixed and static, but actually it's a dynamic, ongoing process. And I think most particularly most approaches to leadership, suggests that it's about a leaders I-ness, what a leader is like as an individual, their characteristics traits, attributes, abilities, and so on. But what we've argued, what others have argued, is actually no, leadership is about we-ness. And again, that's what we've seen throughout the pandemic. So again, this image, you've got kind of Donald Trump who I think exemplifies that old psychology of leadership is all about me. And yet someone like Angela Merkel, who I think has managed the collective aspects of leadership much better has done, I think, objectively a much better job of leading her country. And that speaks to this observation by the leadership scholar, John Adair, The least important word in the leader's vocabulary is I. And the most important word is we. Well, if that's true, and I believe it is, that begs the question then why, when we're thinking about leadership, when we're doing leadership, when talking about it, when we've got leadership programmes and development, why are they all focused on the individual as an individual? Why don't they speak to those collective aspects of leadership, because leadership, we argue, is all about social identity. And indeed, I'd argue the pandemic has confirmed that social identity is critical for leaders, effective leaders embody a social identity that they share with other group members, members of their country, members of their community, members of their work organisation. And they exert influence on that basis. And in those terms, we've argued that leadership is a process of social identity management that centres on a leader's ability to create, represent, promote, and embed a shared special sense of us. And indeed more generally we've argued that without social identity, there can be no leadership. We can only be led if there is a we and a us, a group to lead. And digging into the details of that a bit more, responses to COVID I think have underlined the importance of four key elements of social identity management we talk about in our work. The importance of leaders being seen as one of us. Again, that's something that's come through in lots of different ways, lots of different places, in the pandemic. The idea that leaders are doing it for us, they're helping us as a group to move forward, the idea that leaders craft and create a sense of us, that they are in the terminology of social identity theory, identity entrepreneurs, but more particularly too that leaders are identity impresario's who make us matter, who create structures that support and advance our group and effectively make us feel good about our group membership. And whenever you think about border control and lockdowns and things of that nature, I think they have had a critical identity function in that regard. And you see that their impact has been very much tied, I think, to in particular, the popularity of state premiers. So a question here is can we translate these relatively abstract principles into recommendations or lessons for policy makers? We've kind of written two big papers, one in nature and human behaviour, the other in social issues and policy review on these topics, which again, if you want to see the sort of deep detail argumentation empirical evidence behind what I'm going to be talking about, I alerts you or direct you towards those papers. The basic argument here is that leadership is a process that always involves followership, that without followership, without people who are responding to the urgings of leaders, there is no leadership. And that that relationship centres, as I've said, on this sense of shared social identity. On the one hand leaders in that space do something we refer to as identity leadership. They reflect on the nature of social identity, of shared social identity. They represent us and our goals. They realise shared identity and in plans and policy. They reinforce shared identity through ongoing action, and they, really, they prior all of this too, but in preparation, if you'd like for the next crisis. They also ready the group for mobilisation. To the extent that leaders do that, that in turn is a basis for engaged followership on the part of group members. They embrace that said same shared sense of social identity. They understand what's necessary for the advancement of in-group goals. And then they work towards leaders by responding positively and creatively to their pronouncement. Even when those things are very difficult. Early on in the pandemic there was some stuff came out of the behavioural insights unit in the UK, suggesting that people wouldn't really be able to put up with lockdowns because they would get fatigued and become tired. I think that was always a dubious proposition, but actually I think the pandemic showed that with the right leadership, people are totally capable of rising to a range of challenges and the idea that they're cognitive laggards, or just indolent couch potatoes, who are not capable of contributing to collective projects, again, I think has been given the lie by the pandemic. So pulling back and again making this kind of very specific, in terms of five of the key lessons that we talk about in that social issues and policy review paper. The first thing we argue is that leaders need to reflect on shared identities. They need to understand the nature of us-ness in the community, societies, organisations that they're trying to lead. In a lot of our work, we talk about the importance of social identity mapping. Actually, we've got lots of evidence that that that's a really critical part of any process of policy development. You can't develop a policy if you don't understand the people for whom it's developed. And I think things like robodebt are a pretty good example of where that can go horribly wrong if you don't take those lessons on board. So leaders secure followership by building and drawing upon that sense of shared identity. There's nice data from Canada. People like Bonnie Henry, doing that very well. And again, I think this sort of Trump example of just saying, no, it's all about me and I've got all the solutions, it doesn't really work. Second, leaders need to represent us and our goals. So leaders are more effective if they treat groups as the solution, not the problem. And if they treat group members respectfully, fairly and as equal partners. And I think one of the problems potentially, and it comes through in some of the data that we have with certain types of nudging, is that those on the receiving end of nudges don't, if especially once they become wise to them, don't always feel respectfully treated. They don't always feel that they are co-producers of the knowledge and the solutions. And I think in a crisis where you need to have everybody's energies, galvanised and mobilised, I think that can be a problem. In social psychology there's a long tradition of seeing groups as the problem, not the solution, but again, I think in the pandemic you've seen actually as this article said it takes a village to beat a virus. But again, if you have one rule for leaders and a different rule for everybody else, that's going to be a problem. And I think we've seen that in various junctures around the world, but when it's clear that leaders are one of us and they're being treated the same as us and respectfully, I think that's a critical to getting buy-in for policies and the like. You also, third, need to realise shared identity in plans and policy. Leaders are more effective if they look to explain and persuade rather than punish, coerce or nudge. In part that's because if you do those things, if you just punish people or you coerce them, or you nudge them and people become aware of that, those can be, not always, but those can be seen as a signal of a lack of shared social identity. There's published work by Nik Steffens, my colleague at UQ, which shows again that when people feel that they've been nudged, if that positions them as out-group members, then that can contribute to backlash or failure to get buy-in on their part. And obviously in that context it's important, bearing in mind what's said on the previous slide, that those in-groups are defined broad and inclusively. So again, this there's a segment by the UN secretary general, Guterres, this kind of line, we're all in this thing together and we will get through this together. I think those lines have been incredibly important. I think they've worn thin where they haven't been backed up by policy and practise. Again, I think what you see in the pandemic too, is that where compliance has been achieved by persuasion and influence, it's generally been much more effective than where people have had to resort to extreme measures. In part because that hardens those people who were inclined to resist those messages in the first place. Third, fourth, you need to reinforce shared social identity through ongoing action. Leaders are more effective if they focus on achieving and locking in outcomes that are valued by the group they lead. So the obvious point here, is that the fortunes of leaders have waxed and waned as a function of their ability to just manage infection and death. Again, I think, if you're in the business of winning an election, well, managing or keeping people alive is a pretty good place to start because when push comes to shove, that's something that people really care about. And I think signalling that you care about that is incredibly important and powerful. The final point, and this as I said is really the first point. Bear if you take the point of all of these things that I've said are true, then it follows that a good thing to do in the leadership space is to invest in groups, invest in communities, invest in processes to build social psychological, social identity capital, prior to, as it were, the next crisis. So leaders will be more effective if they've done the groundwork to prepare their groups, materially and psychologically for a crisis. So you see that in countries, for example, that had pandemic units or invested early on in infrastructure to support groups, they generally did better than groups- for example, the UK, where they just gone through a bruising Brexit divorce, which obviously left the society divided. And actually then that division was a very difficult platform on which to build a sort of unified response to the pandemic as it evolved. And I think that dynamic has sort of continued to play out and continues to play out to the present day. So to wrap up, to understand the psychology of leadership, something we really need to do, especially in the pandemic. We need to move beyond the individualistic models that have dominated understanding to date. We need to move from the kind of me space to the we space. Leadership is a we thing, not an I thing, and so is its psychology. I think there's quite a lot of review articles, there's some quite nice data on this that, that evidence that women leaders, whether they're leading small states or community groups, have typically done a better job than men. I don't think that's anything to do with that gender per se, I just think it's that the model of leadership that women learn about and buy into is more focused on matters of social identity, if you like, matters of community. Whereas for a range of cultural and other reasons, men are often inculcated into this individualistic model, that it's all about me, that my goal is to be the next Winston Churchill or whatever it might be. Again, that was a message- That's the second edition of our book, the first edition came out in 2011, but I think the second edition which landed really at start of the pandemic, I think really makes that point pretty tellingly. More practically, we need to recognise that social identity or us-ness is a key resource for organisations and societies that supports leadership and group functioning. I think actually that is born out by quite a lot of what you see in the behavioural insights space. It's just that it's not part of the formal theorising or not part of the way that people routinely understand what's going on in that space. And we have argued in some of our publications that that's a major, and in some cases fatal shortcoming of that literature. Social identity is a basis for leadership. It's the basis for group functioning and therefore a key function of leadership, a key purpose of leadership, is indeed to build social identity. So we need to work with leaders, with people, to try to build and harness that resource. That's what we do in our own research. We have a leadership intervention, a programme called 5R, built around the things that I was talking about in a previous slides. And we need to recognise too that building social identity is a basis not just for leadership and group functioning, but also for mental health and resilience. And that's a message that we promulgate in two other books, this book on Social Scaffolding came out 2019, and 2018 book, The New Psychology of Health, which speaks to the importance of social identity for health. Something that some of Zan's previous research has underlined with colleagues there at ANU. And indeed, I would argue that in many ways, the most important reason for being interested in leadership is because you're interested in developing and promoting mental health rather than you're interested in your own leadership per se. And indeed, I think one of the meta lessons of COVID is that leadership and health are closely intertwined and that social identity is central to both. But the takeaway message and probably the only thing I really want you to sort of remember from this talk, is that what we came into the pandemic with in terms of our understanding of leadership didn't necessarily, I wouldn't say at all, prepare us to fight that pandemic effectively. And I think in wake of the evidence, and now there's this huge amount of data from, as part of a GILD, a global identity leadership project that we are in which has data from 28 countries around the world which backs up all of the points that I've made now. I think that suggests that we really do need to do a major rethink around what leadership is and how we try to develop it in our communities, in society, and more particularly, I guess, in our organisations. Encouragingly though 5R and and the data that we've been gathering around this, I think speaks to the fact that when leaders build social identity, that increases team identity and identification, increases goal clarity, pursuit, and performance, and it also increases team member's mental health and wellbeing. A huge problem in the organisational space is that organisations often have a leadership policy over here, a mental health policy over here, communication strategy over here. Actually, what you need is to have all of those things lined up and understood through the same lens. And I think we argue the social identity lens is a powerful lens to understand that. And many of the other things that actually we've been talking about today. Just at the start of the pandemic, we won a big contract to develop and deliver a 5R for the house of commons in the UK. And obviously we weren't able to deliver that face to face. So we have to kind of redesign that which turned out to be a very fortunate opportunity we did. So we delivered this programme to their sort of 3000 staff, the data's coming in, speaking to the points on the left there. But one of the key things that's coming out of that research and another big RCT that we've just conducted with a range of organisations in Australia, is that where leaders do the things that I'm talking about, and when they're helped to do that through appropriate mentoring and coaching. What you see is that that has an impact on these things: team identification, team reflexivity, team goal clarity, psychological safety, an inclusive team climate, and collective efficacy. Something that we call teamfulness, or if you like collective mindfulness. I think the idea of mindfulness is fine, but again, one of the problems is that it as the mindful industrial complex and industry has developed, it's become this very individual focused thing, it's all about me. Well, actually, no, we need mindfulness to be collective, to be all about us. And one of the things that this trial that we've just completed it shows is that, yeah, attention to social identity in the form that 5R delivers, produces increase in that collective mindfulness in ways we argue that are beneficial, not just for leaders, but also for their teams and for their organisations. And more generally, they provide the stuff of resilience, which is absolutely critical to being able to get through crises and being in a position to deal with the next one. So, thank you for that.

- [Simon] Thanks Alex. That was really, really fascinating. We got tonnes and tonnes of questions and not enough time for all of them. So we'll try to get through a few of those, and I'm sure we'll have some follow up ones after the session. So, just to go through a few that might be quicker to answer. You mentioned you looked at 28 countries or there's a group looking at those, are they mainly Western countries or have we got a-

- [Alex] We've got on every continent. Yeah, we've got, I think it's being translated into 19 languages. We got them pretty much everywhere. We've got Brazil, we've got South America. We've got Nepal, China, you know, yeah. Not everyone, India, people- Countries are coming on board with the project kind of all the time. I actually, I can just show you those in the book. There's a map of it, I'll hold it up just to show you, but it's pretty, it's pretty- It's a big project, and actually, there's the map. This was a few years ago now, but you can see it's kind of like every map, but the good thing about it is the thing I always say to people is look, this research was generated and is centred in Australia. I mean, nothing, frankly, pisses me off more than the fact that we import low quality leadership s\*\*\*\* from overseas when we've got some of the best science in the world here. I mean, I just think that's that's cultural cringe of the worst form.

- [Simon] Some exciting, exciting comments there.

- [Alex] Yeah, I'll turn it down there-

- [Simon] No, no, no, it's all good. Another one, a lot of this was focused on sort of national state type leadership, but I'm assuming that you can apply these principles down to smaller leadership groups?

- [Alex] Yeah, so the GILD project I talked about, most of that is done is organisational data. So we're talking about leaders of small teams working in organisations, so SMEs. And actually most of our research is at that level. So I guess that's where the organisational psychology argument is typically targeted at that level. The productivity of groups and small teams. Again, such a huge part of the kind of economic landscape, but it's something that we often talk about is the system, or we talk about the individual. We never really look at the dynamics of teams and groups. And we talk about lot of small business, for example. We have a look at actually the identity fit functions that lubricate the wheels of small business and the things that might not be effective or not. And this project, yeah, I think speaks to the importance of identity leadership in those kinds of contexts. Another book of ours actually if you're- We just came out last year too, is this book, The New Psychology of Sport and these things are absolutely critical to sport, too. One of the places actually I work, has had most impact in that space is in England and Gareth Southgate, part of his psychology team are really around mobilising a kind of understanding that identity of English soccer team in a different way and in ways that encourage people to buy into a more diverse understanding of who we are, but also then as a platform for a broader base of support in ways that I think have been huge. And moving on the idea that you've got to build the team around the stars, rather no, you've got to shape the stars to the collective, too. It can't just be a one way street there. And where you build teams in that old fashioned kind of way, the evidence is they under perform. And I think that's true in lots of other spheres, too.

- [Simon] Fascinating. A couple of questions, which I guess, are a little bit bigger in scope. There's a question here, if it's best for leaders to share a social identity with the people they lead, what are the implications for people who lead very diverse groups that may not have a single cohesive identity?

- [Alex] Yeah and that's the number- That's really the number one question. So that the house of commons project that we kind of working on with them is called Leading Inclusive Teams. And it was precisely about trying to- And the Gareth Southgate example I've just come up with, it's precisely about making diversity central to who we are. So that's an issue of identity content, but again, so when I say identity, I don't mean we're all identical. I just mean that we all share a sense of common purpose and a sense of wanting to contribute to the same outcomes and goals, but recognising too that people can do that, and obviously will do that, in different ways. So actually this isn't about sort of stamping diversity under foot, on the contrary, it's about mobilising it effectively and in a way that engaged kind of multiculturalism does, but to sort of formulated multiculturalism, doesn't. So yeah, so that's really such a huge question. Yeah, if you'd given me more than 25 minutes, I could have had a stab at it. But that is the number one question in the leadership space, but we never ask it, we never ask it. When was the last time you were asked that on a leadership course, how are you going to do and how are we going to help you do that? Never, I would argue, I could be wrong. It might be in some other space, it might be in your diversity agenda, but it's not your leadership training, is what I'm saying.

- [Simon] I think there's a gap in the market there for your next comercialised -

- [Alex] Yeah

- [Simon] Okay, one more question. This just relates to the COVID response, it says leaders are more effective- I think you mentioned if leaders are more effective, if they can explain and persuade rather than use other means. How do you explain, I guess the situation, where we ended up having to mandate something like a mask in Melbourne?

- [Alex] Yeah, I think, yeah. I mean, that's a really good question. I think the point the is, there are always boundaries. There's always boundaries to your influence. Those boundaries are the contours of shared identity. Well, there are people who don't- whatever the identity happens to be, there are people who don't share that identity with you and who ultimately won't be persuaded. So, we see it all the time in politics. Like if I'm a member of the Liberal party, the Labor party, I don't really expect to be able to influence people on the other side of politics. What that suggests then is, and you saw this early on in the pandemic, then that leaders have to do identity entrepreneurship. You have to say, well, yeah, as Scott Morrison said, there aren't red and blue teams, we've got different teams here. And again, I think that when you have to mandate stuff, that's a sign that your leadership has kind of reached its limits, reached those identity limits. Now I would argue, are there limits to that? Are there people who are always going to lie outside your orbit of influence, your identity orbit. Presumably in a practical sense that's kind of true. But I would say the challenge of leadership is just to make that orbit as wide and as broad and as far reaching and as sustainable as possible. And if you go into the crisis knowing that that's your number one task, you're more likely, I think, to do that. I think what you see is that where leaders have kind of given up on that project, sometimes I think, cause they get exhausted. I really understand that, I recognise that. Where they give up, then in a way that's the utmost mark of their leadership. That's the high watermark. And after then, and we see this now, when they're pushing through getting the last 5% of people to get vaccinated in Queensland say, those are incredibly hard yards to make. And there's a real question as to whether or not you ever will. And moreover in the process of ordering those people to do things, you empower resistance to your message in ways that may mobilise the people that work against you more potently than will be the case if you just let them go. I think there's- We've got the number of projects around the world getting data on precisely that. I think it's pretty much consistent with what I'm saying is that that absolutely always has to be the last resort, which isn't to say that you wouldn't do it at particular points in time. Just one thing that, again, the point about nudges isn't that they don't work in a particular sense, in the same way that mandates don't work. It's that what we know from our own research is that if I say to you, Simon, or anyone listening, I'm going to try to change your behaviour by nudging you versus I'm going to sit down and talk with you and try to explain why you should do something. If I do the latter, I communicate that you're a member of my in-group and I care about you. If I do the former, I communicate that I don't really care about you. And our research shows very clearly that people have a real appetite for nudging outgroups, a much less appetite for nudging in-groups. Like if you're looking to change your family's behaviour, you're probably not- In that first point of call, it's not a nudge, it's actually just to say why do we want to do that. And that's part of the respect kind of thing, the meta meaning of nudges. And again, I don't think we've- and this builds on a bit of a point that Zan made, but didn't quite develop, is that is that we haven't really done enough of that high level reflection on the meta meaning of the policies that we have in place. And again, I think, where it went horribly wrong in Britain, I think was the result of a failure to reflect on those things.

- [Simon] I might just get you to pause there, Alex, and we'll bring in the other two groups of speakers, hopefully Trish is still online and Stefan and Zan are still there. While we wait for Trish I might just get you, Stefan and Zan, Trish here as well. We're just talking a little bit there about nudging. And I found it interesting that within all three presentations, there was different kinds of illusions, I think, to needing a more expansive view of behaviour than what the nudge or the nudge unit might be doing. So I think Stephen and Zan, you looked at the cycle and you sort of said like, we we're on this sort of downward bit and then interestingly on that curve it said second generation products, of which it seems very much that you're kind of moving towards right now. So maybe we're moving along that curve. Trish, very similar too, I guess, aspects of sort of using language of beyond nudge, and looking more broadly at other broader behavioural theories of change or social psychology of trying to bring in a bigger picture. Is that, I guess the question there, or maybe just a comment as whether you're seeing that evolution, and partic- maybe Trish you could start here, across a lot of different countries and a lot of different research teams and where you can kind of see, I guess, a discussion like this being in a few years' time, how will it evolve?

- [Trish] Yeah, really good question. And I think it has been talked about across different countries and across different teams, certainly in my sort of informal discussions with people about moving beyond pushing, as Stefan said, 2.0, what is this going to look like? What is the next iteration? And I think increasingly we'll sort of start to see those mixed methods that we've all spoken about this morning. About, I guess, perhaps that's part of the evolution. We've embraced behavioural insights as policy, myself, a former policy practitioner, we've discovered behavioural insights and we embraced it and jumped straight in and it's been a really exciting ride and really upskilling in that expertise, but I think now we're sort of starting to think, okay, well, how. That there's other methods here available to us and how can they best be mixed. And it was interesting, Alex talking about the in-groups, talking about your family, that first step would be a discussion, which I've often reflected that those really small, local, personalised impacts can be so powerful. And yet they're often not available to us. For example, as part of a federal government organisation, you can't go out there and have the small discussions, but we can empower other people to do that on our behalf. And by getting other people involved and sort of sending them out to have those small discussions on our behalf is an incredibly powerful strategy, but one that requires us to think a little bit beyond traditional nudging and behavioural insights.

- [Simon] Stephen and Zan, anything you'd like to add there?

- [Alexander] I think probably what I would say is that one of the things we've found very interesting in the work we've been doing, particularly with the missions, right, which is about convening groups, multiple groups within a given ecosystem or within a given sector, or across sectors, to try and address major challenges. We have really, I think, struggled and strived to make transdisciplinary more than a buzzword. And figure out a way to effectively bring in the expertise and the experiences of different groups, particularly say groups that will be impacted by the sorts of changes that we're working in, in a way that can still deliver the sort of value that we think is really relevant to behavioural insights. And one of the things that I said, as we've been struggling and striving about is things like we're trying to understand how to improve circular economy uptake by businesses, but that wasn't something we could nudge towards. And it wasn't something that businesses just didn't want to do, it was a systemic issue and we had to draw on different methods and different types of groups in order to try and get somewhere with that. So I think we're kind of, fumbling our way towards it, if it makes sense, but what I'm very heartened by, the fact that in many of the different relationships and partnerships, that I've been part of, whether they're projects that I'm working on or sort of other professional networks, I'm seeing more and more realisation and recognition of this being something that you have to grapple with and be willing to deal with the complexity, rather than be something that you can paper over, landfill over or nudge your way out of. So I'm very heartened by that.

- [Stefan] Yeah, and I think in our paper, we really sort of celebrate this sort of emergence of behaviour change as a site of policy research and practise translation and communication going on between things. And yeah, it might've taken a bunch of smooth talkers in Oxbridge suits, and someone to push more evidence into policy, but one of the things that it has done is cracked the door open wider to some of these other areas. And I think many parts of the world people are grabbing it with both hands and drawing on broader disciplines, border perspectives, broader methods. And then there was some quite sensible and strategic choices, I think, made in some of the classic note stuff that maybe jammed that door open and that's probably worth celebrating as much as it is being critical of it, even if it might've felt like there was a risk of the latter being pulled up after them, perhaps by some of the other disciplines and perspectives. We saw in our review at least, lots of evidence of that door being jammed wide open and more stuff going on. And we hope to hear more of it, too.

- [Simon] We've got a couple more questions here. So Alex, I'll come back to you, if you've got any more comments on that. This question, there's clear themes of having good systems, easy to understand frameworks and a shared understanding of the end goal across all of those three sessions, but does this work equally well in both a crisis and non-crisis? So a lot of the stuff today has been through the lens of, an immediate crisis that we're living through now and maybe an emerging one around environmental sustainability.

- [Alex] I mean, I think the crisis, creates a greater need for the knowledge is the obvious point. But yeah, if that knowledge is any good, it shouldn't only be good in a crisis. I mean, all of the stuff I was talking about, the sort of empirical evidence base was gathered outside the crisis. I think the only other thing there too, and it's not that I'm- I don't want to be too post modern about it, but it's not like you're in a world where there's no crises and then all of a sudden there are crises. We're always in crises in one form or another. So, and to some extent that's a case of, nothings either good or bad, but thinking makes it so. Whether or not we're in a climate crisis, well, that's obviously a- that's not a given for some people. And so again, I think the leadership piece there is, is kind of a huge in terms of creating an urgency and an appetite for particular kinds of projects. Just to elaborate on the thing for me, like again, I guess one of the big pieces that we're working towards in this space is, is just really to get a really thorough going review of how the behavioural insights literature, dove tails or otherwise, with what we know about leadership, because I just think it's a whopping great big sort of blind spot, just- Because at the end of the day, whatever you think about a particular initiative, it's takes leadership to back it in and to stick with it, and to interpret, and so on. That's a latent factor in pretty much everything that we're talking about. As we just said, the reason that the agenda got up is because some people had an appetite for it. Some people were able to do leadership to get, or generate interest in it. It's a leader full, not a leader free zone, but I don't think we've really properly got to grips with what that means or looks like. Again, I go to quite a lot of behavioural insights talks and read a lot of literature. You can go months on end without hearing the word leadership. And certainly without it actually being aligned with what you're doing in the leadership space explicitly. I think if we're going to solve some of these other bigger problems, climate change, whatever it will be, you absolutely have to square that circle.

- [Simon] Trish, any comments on this one?

- [Trish] Yeah, absolutely. And look, I was really impressed Alex, of saying that a lot of times we have our sustainability policy over here and our well-being policy here and the leadership policy somewhere else, and they absolutely need to be integrated and have a consistent lens. And I think the leadership is crucial to doing that, absolutely. And I was asked before about, the support to make things happen in the OECD. And we really do have that really strong leadership support who sees behavioural insights as a crucial component of modern leadership, not so much as a focus on small interventions, but as a lens that's applied to everything we do. So it gives us a really good sort of remit to take that integrated approach. And coming back to the crisis, that work we done on building that capacity and that our understanding of the need to put humans at the centre of our policies and processes, all of that work was done before the crisis. And that allowed us to quickly stand up. Everyone was on the same page. We all had our staff and our safety at the focus and enabled us to present that really integrated response to the pandemic in a very quick way, in a way that we wouldn't have otherwise been able to do, if we hadn't done that work previously.

- [Simon] Stefan or Zan, any comments or- I've got another question here which I can bring in that might be kind of related.

- [Stefan] Well just one quick thought is that there's a view of policy I quite like, which is that it's a job of making different crises, operating at different speeds, ultimately normal and boring and part of acceptable everyday life, right? And I think what's a bit different about things like climate change and pandemics is that it makes some of those more obvious and transparent. But does it change the job of trying to make good decisions on the basis of evidence and trying to steer these unfolding crisis to public good outcomes? I don't think it does, so, yeah.

- [Simon] Well that's related. I'll just ask this last question because we are over time, but all of us are fascinated with this kind of stuff. And one thing that has happened through COVID-19 is, it's generated a lot of interest in our areas of work. Whether it be around leadership or behaviour. The question I've got now is as we kind of feel things shifting a little bit, and Trish, you would have seen that probably even more so in Europe coming out of the pandemic, are we doing enough to, I guess, learn from, or, well, to leverage all the work we've done over the last couple of years and think about how we can apply it more broadly to other issues. And I'm gonna say, see if you can answer this without talking about climate change.

- [Trish] Yeah, look, it's really important. We're doing a big, a lot of work in thinking about future ways of working as well and how we move forward in a considered way. There's things that worked really well in the COVID pandemic. And I think we'll probably see a reversion to the habits that are easy and convenient for people. So they're the points that we're going to have to really work on. People will, I think, go back to the things that are easier, the old way of working and the new habits that are easy and will stick. So if we want to change those old ones, we're really going to have to focus on that. And I think, we've all spoken this morning about the recognition of the structural constraints. And I think sometimes, in the past, certainly, as a BI team working in the Australian Government's environment department, we get people coming and saying, well, can you just fix this? Essentially, with my magic BI wand, can I change bad policy which has structural constraints and incentivises people in a certain way. And there's no amount of nudging or messaging that can change those structural constraints. So I think it's really good to hear sort of a recognition of that this morning or this afternoon, sorry.

- [Simon] Alex?

- [Alexander] Your Alex, aren't you Alex?

- [Alex] Yeah, so I mean, chances we are- In a generic way, a lot of the work we do is actually around like high reliability organisations, which is around stopping accidents in the mining industry, or in the military and other kinds of things. And actually I think that the kind of model that we've been working with the developing there, I think is really relevant here. That makes it clear, I speak exactly to what Trish just said then. So, I think, what the issue is like, we've got to understand where we are, we, us, our communities, at the moment. We need to come to some consensus about where we want to go. We need to understand the structural affordances and constraints, the things that are holding us back, and then leadership is needed to do the kind of identity work to take us from where we are to where we want to be in light of the opportunities and constraints. But again, we have to understand that as not just a material project, but a psychological and identity-based project. I know again - It's hard to talk about a pandemic as having lots of positive- but one of the positives is that it has shown our potential, not just individually, but as a societies, to grasp some quite painful kind of nettles, but to do so collectively in ways that suggest we can make those transitions. But we absolutely need the leadership that's- And this has again, come up in both of our- We need the leadership that's going to facilitate that positive journey rather than just let's just stay where we are or let's go back in the other direction or something of that form. But that's a multifaceted question. Whether or not we get that. I think some places will get it and if some refuse, but I think the least we can do is in our own organisations and in the spaces that we're curating and managing, is make sure we get that right and model that for other communities, other groups, so that we can- We've got those sort of case studies. But I think there is- I think that database is growing. So I don't think there's lots of reasons to be doubtful and sometimes, sceptical, but I don't think- I think we've got to be positive and optimistic and find out ways to work together to deal with these really challenging problems.

- [Simon] Last word for you, Zan and Stefan?

- [Alexander] Okay, well, I think probably what I would say is that in my spare time I like to think about global catastrophic risks, which are risks that can, significantly harm or reduce the likelihood of longterm flourishing of humanity. And pandemics are one. And the big CC is another, I won't say its name, but these are even more esoteric kinds of issues and well-known issues. The more esoteric being things like asteroid strikes and artificial intelligence governance, and the more sort of generic ones being things like, nuclear proliferation. And I think that one of the things that the pandemic, if again, if you can say that it has had good elements is that it's forced people to confront the way in which it has coordination issues that lead to these sorts of crises and negative outcomes. There are many sorts of crises that we have successfully avoided and will continue to successfully avoid, through effective application of leadership principles, through kind of considered and transdisciplinary embedding of things like behavioural insights. And I suppose I'm hopeful that we can continue to navigate through what is going to be a very rocky century through the application of these sorts of things. And if you like, 2020 to 2022/23, I hope is kind of the wake-up call that puts us in a better position to more effectively coordinate in the future.

- [Simon] Great, we might finish there. I should say I was only banning the big CC to make us think more expansively beyond the obvious and your last answer got there, so well done.

- [Stefan] That's pretty good.

- [Simon] All right, I'd like to thank all of you. Alex, I'm devastated to find out that you're using your incredible brain to improve the English football team, but that seems to be working. If you could apply some of that to Australian sporting teams, that's also welcome. Thank you all so much for your presentations today. That's the end of our BI connect, 2021 series. We're going to be putting these up online in early December, for all of those who couldn't see it today. But thanks so much and yeah. Speak to you again.