

- Speaker 1: [00:00](#) Introductory Music.
- Speaker 2: [00:11](#) So Tim, do you remember the year of the shark?
- Not specifically, but I remember that there was a period several years ago when the media went crazy over shark attacks that might've even given birth to the discovery channel, Shark week series or maybe even shark Nedo. Why? What makes you think about that? Why do you ask her?
- Well, one of our recent guests that are behavior groups meet up with Jonathan Mann who has held leadership positions in user experience at paypal and target corporations, but he started his talk about how to apply behavioral science to designing good user experience with a story about the year of the shark. Yeah, that was a good talk. Jonathan shared a bunch of great insights into the application of some common behavioral science terms like social proof and present bias, but he also introduced us to some very cool effects with his presentation, like the visual depiction effect or the auditory price perception affect and the discount distance congruency effect, which happened to be identified by one of my colleagues and friends, Patricia Norberg.
- Speaker 2: [01:18](#) Jonathan had some great examples that he shared with us that night. And I think we should talk through some of them. Absolutely. But I want to hear about the year of the shark. Well first, shouldn't we tell people what they're listening to? Oh, okay. That sounds good. I'm Kurt Nelson and welcome to behavioral groups, the podcast where Tim and I try to understand the reasons for why we do what we do and why sharks matter. And I'm Tim Boolean and Kurt and I have published more than 70 episodes in the past year and a half. And our goal is to reach people who are interested in applying behavioral science to their work and life. And we are trying to expand our community to those people who are interested in learning more about behavioral science. So if you have a friend or a coworker who you think might be interested, please forward a copy of this episode to them. Or you can check us out at our website, www.behavioralgroups.com. Okay. Kurt, can we talk about the year the shark now? I think we could, but let's hear how Jonathan Tease this up.
- Speaker 3: [02:26](#) I want to talk to you about shark attacks. So, um, I don't know, I see a lot of very young people here, so you might not remember this, but if you think back to 2001 there was, um, a lot of coverage about the fact that there were a few very unfortunate and tragic shark attacks in the United States. So there was breathless media coverage about the shark attacks, like they're

on the news constantly. Oh my God, there's all these shark attacks. What are we gonna do about these shark attacks? Who's to blame for these shark attacks? What are we going to do to stop all these shark attacks?

Speaker 4: [03:06](#)

Okay.

Speaker 3: [03:07](#)

Uh, to the extent that Time magazine actually put a shark on the front cover of their magazine and declared this the summer of the shark. So 2001 was the summer of the shark.

Speaker 4: [03:19](#)

MMM.

Speaker 3: [03:23](#)

Yeah. And, and if you get nothing else from this presentation, you'll learn a new word that you can use it at your next cocktail party, which is Galicia Phobia, which is the fear of sharks. So there was a, there was a huge spike in Galicia phobia in the summer of 2001

Speaker 3: [03:43](#)

the reality though is that shark attacks are extremely uncommon and actually the summer of 2001 was no different from any other summer as far as shark attacks go. And excuse me. So I have to kind of look at these, this, this particular slide. So the chances of a swimmer being hit by a shark is only one in a lot more than 11 million. So extremely, extremely rare. There's only about 70 shark attacks per year worldwide. So that's for all of the people, the millions or billions of people that go into the water, there's only about 70 shark attacks. And of those, only about three to four of them are fetal. And then this last bullet, which is sort of amusing, is that vending machines kill more people per year than shark attacks and snakes combined. And what I mean by vending machines is like you put your dollar in the vending machine and your Twix doesn't come out. And so you shake the vending machine and it falls on you and kills you. So that's, that's actually, that's actually more common than a shark attack.

Speaker 2: [04:44](#)

Jonathan showed us a video that we've linked to in the show notes. The crux of the story was that the hype around the year of the shark was just that hype. The media turned a couple of attacks in the big new story and that caused people to have a hysterical reaction and it's all based on the availability bias. One of the most prevalent principles in behavioral science. Yeah. Many people ask what is behavioral science? And that question was posed to Jonathan, so he addressed it.

- Speaker 3: [05:13](#) There's a few frameworks that we can use to talk about how the mind works and this whole field of behavioral economics, which is essentially a study about our irrational mind. So we have kind of a view of the world that we think rationally and when when faced with a decision, we're going to make a rational decision about it. Behavioral Economics is essentially looking at the mind as as fundamentally irrational and takes a lot of shortcuts. And those shortcuts can actually be studied and predicted. So one of the ways that we can think about that from our framework is this theory called the rider and the elephant, which was described by Jonathan Heit,
- Speaker 2: [05:55](#) the elephant. And the rider is a great model for thinking about how humans behave in Jonathan points out the concept has its origins in the writings of Buddha and speaks to the way humans have a rational, thoughtful self. You know, the writer and an irrational emotional self. The elephant. If the elephant wants to go somewhere to do something, it's going to do it regardless of what the writer wants. He goes on to give us an example of how big a role the elephant plays in our lives as he asks us to imagine a street scene. Let's listen. So let's,
- Speaker 3: [06:28](#) let's, um, let's do a little thought exercise about the, the way this works. Let's imagine that you're leaving work and it's dark and you're, you step outside and you walk onto kind of a dangerous looking street. I don't know, maybe even the street out here, it's kind of kind of a little rough looking here, right outside here. So imagine that you walk outside and you, you know, you're kind of, you're kind of senses start tingling either some sort of danger that you're sensing and um, you know, just something isn't raid and you feel it's dark and it's a little scary. And imagine you come across a person on the street.
- Speaker 2: [07:12](#) Jonathan showed us three images of men's faces. There were two fairly gentle looking older gentlemen and one fairly rough looking guy. He asked how we might feel if we saw each of these men on a dark street and more importantly, what we might do when we saw each of them. And it's complicated.
- Speaker 3: [07:33](#) Most likely your first intuition was, I'm going to avoid that guy on the right cause he's a little sketchy looking and you know, I'm not sure what's going on with him, but you know, to be safe, I'm going to cross over to the other side of the street if I see that guy
- Speaker 2: [07:50](#) then.

- Speaker 3: [07:51](#) So that would be, that would be your elephant talking to you. That would be the elephants in making the split second decision. Like this guy is kind of dangerous. I'm going to, you know, crossover to the other side of the street. Then you know, you know, because I'm asking you this question, you are writer might have kicked in and you're a writer, you know, it takes a little while to process, but you might have been like, oh well maybe this is a trick question. And like why is he asking me that? So now I'm going to look for a reason why I don't want to, you know, avoid this guy. But these other two guys, or maybe the dangerous ones, like maybe they're secretly psychotic or something like that.
- Speaker 2: [08:28](#) Okay.
- Speaker 3: [08:29](#) Reality that none of these people are dangerous. So, so this is Daniel Conoman, one of the founders of behavioral economics. This is Richard Thaler, another Nobel Prize winner in behavioral economics. And that's my friend Steve, who, who would actually be really pissed at me for showing this terrible picture of him. But he's actually a real sweetheart. And there was just this terrible picture I happened to take of him. It makes them look really sketchy. So why, why does our, why does our mind act that way? So yes, the, you know, this whole writer and elephant thing and this powerful elephant can lead us to make irrational decisions. But it's part of the reason that we've survived as a species because it enables our mind to make these split second decisions when necessary. So if you could think back to like in caveman days, if we had a deliberate, every little decision that came up, we might not survive.
- Speaker 3: [09:29](#) So if you look at this picture here, there's some ancient hunter gatherers. They're being pursued by this huge beast with horns. And so if they didn't have this elephant thing that had this spidey sense that like kicked in immediately is like, ah, there's this dangerous thing, I'm going to run away immediately without thinking about it. But instead it had a deliberate it and it was like, well, let's see. This thing outweighs me by about four times and it's got sharp things sticking out and it looks a little dangerous. And by the time it calculated, you know, the person calculated that they'd be trampled and killed. So that's what helps us survive as a species.
- Speaker 2: [10:11](#) The mind is a terribly complicated thing and our motivations, or even trickier to isolate and identify, but we can see that having both an elephant to react quickly and a writer to help us reason are both good things. Kurt, are there any examples you can speak to when both the rider and the elephant? We're engaged.

So think of a time when you're in an meeting and somebody has the bowl of apples on the table, but then somebody else brings in these really delicious looking donuts. Yeah, I can think of that. And you're hungry and I'm there. And so do you pick that apple, which is the rational thing because you're watching your weight and want to eat healthy, or do you take that mouth watering frosted donut, take it bite into pure luxury is heaven. That is the elephant having you pick the doughnut. You're, you're selling me on the elephant here. The yellow just pretty strong. When the elephant wants to go and get a donut, the elephant's going to go and get it. That one, it really hard for that rider to pull back the elephant and say, wait, yes, I'm hungry. Either I won't eat anything or let's eat that healthy apple instead. And so that's that rider an elephant component. And Jonathan talks about how the field of user experience can benefit from some of the ways marketers use behavioral science to get people to move from Ican to aisles.

Speaker 3: [11:47](#)

Well, so, um, you know, as I mentioned, I'm in the field of Ux design and I'm fascinated by the possibilities of bringing this, this field of behavioral economics into the realm of Ux design. So UX designers have a superpower. So UX designers are amazing at making sure that people can do something. So UX designers make sure that people can comprehend things, that they can find things that they can browse, they can interact, they can complete tasks. So it's all about the can of, of doing something. But what I've been fascinated with for a long time is another question is, will I do something? So will I, will I have the motivation to do something? Will I be able to change somebody's behavior? Will I be able to change their attitude about something? And the field of Ux design maybe sort of touches on it, but it really is not the basis of Ux design. UX design sort of assumes that you've already made the decision to complete a task and Ux designers excel at helping you complete that task. But the question about will you complete the task or will you start, the task tends to be more in the realm of marketing. And I feel like UX designers can take a lot of this, what is traditionally maybe in the field of marketing and some other fields and apply it to our field. So let's think about how we could potentially do some of that

Speaker 2: [13:25](#)

here. Jonathan teed up a couple of images of products with prices. One image with the price close to the product and the other image had the price at a distance from the product he asked, which is a more powerful image to get people to buy. He noted that the visual designers in the room, we're likely to choose the image with the price close to the product, but the other image drives more sales. You know, until this Kurt, I had

no idea that distance between product and price could have such a positive and powerful effect. It can. It was studied by your old colleague Patricia Norberg at Quinnipiac University and the results are very robust. It's called the discount distance congruency effect. Say that five times fast air. You too. But let's hear Jonathan explain it.

Speaker 3: [14:16](#) What this, what this discount distance congruency effect is saying is that when we're making comparisons, we, we, we include things that are relevant, you know, such as the price difference. So \$11 verse \$9 but then we also include things like the space in between the numbers. And so the space in between the numbers is more for the one, you know, now it's on the top. And so that becomes more of a discount in our mind and for, for some weird reason. So it doesn't make any sense. But this was studied with a bunch of people and it was actually shown over and over again to be more effective. So there's an example if you're a UX designer, how you can potentially bring the field of behavioral economics into folds. If you're trying to maximize conversion. Don't only think about the layout, which some of you are saying like the layout was actually best with the most effective one anyway. But there's this other thing like the discount distance can ruin the effect.

Speaker 2: [15:17](#) So something as small as the space between the price and the product that influence purchase decisions. Okay. How about which side of the Coffee Cup the handle appears on? Could that matter? Definitely. In the next example, Jonathan showed an image of a Coffee Cup with a handle on the left side of the cup and another image with the same cup, but with the handle on the right side.

Speaker 3: [15:39](#) So it's the visual depiction effect is what's at play here. And it sounds like some of them, you've already figured that one out. So, so in addition to again, what's visually pleasing, um, it's much more compelling to people if they can kind of picture themselves using the thing that they're looking at. So, um, I actually happened to be left handed, but I'm in the minority so I would prefer this one because I can picture myself picking this one up. But the majority of you that are right handed would prefer that one. And most likely that would be the better one to go with because she'd have better conversion because more people would picture themselves picking up the Mug that way.

Speaker 2: [16:20](#) Then he offered examples of prices with the numbers extending into decimal places for some and no decimal places for others. The very presence of commas separating thousands and the

decimal places demonstrated a longer price, which the viewers elephant literally reads in our minds as being more expensive.

Speaker 3: [16:40](#) And part of the reason is is that it looks just bigger. So that's maybe part of it. But there's actually a fascinating principle that I had never heard of until I started studying behavioral economics, which is called the auditory encoding price perception effect. So the auditory encoding price perception affect, which is making this beer is baking. It hurts me to say that says that we verbally and code written numbers and that affects the perception of how expensive it is. So it's not so much that it's a bigger number to your eye, it's a bigger number to your ear. So you actually kind of say it to yourself and it just sounds like more money because instead of saying 1199 you say \$1,199 and 0 million cents and that just sort of sounds more expensive. So same outcome then from what we're thinking of it looking bigger, but it's actually because of the way we say it rather than the way we see it.

Speaker 2: [17:44](#) Jonathan's glassed example was that of a grocery shopping website. We all to make healthy choices about the food we purchase, but we also have an elephant knocking on our door all of the time. Yeah, I've read that. When people shop for groceries, when they're hungry, they buy more high fat foods to satisfy their hunger. That's because we have a bias about satisfying our present selves more than we want to satisfy our future selves. Everybody says they'll start their diet tomorrow, but when tomorrow comes we're pretty bad at getting started. W because it's today and tomorrow. I'll start again. So what if we could help people make a commitment to have healthy food in their shopping cart on their next visit rather than today? Jonathan describes a situation where people can overcome their present bias by making a commitment to buying healthy food on their next visit. It's a lot like Shlomo Bernard sees save more tomorrow model to help people increase the savings in their 401k by committing to increases that take effect next year.

Speaker 3: [18:56](#) Instead of encouraging them to buy the Broccoli right now, encourage them to buy the Broccoli and have it delivered tomorrow and they're actually be more likely to do it because then they're thinking about their idealized self instead of their self that's craving the potato chips right now. And there's, there's also some financial sites that take advantage of that to financial sites that try to encourage you to save. So like, like save tomorrow rather than rather than like put \$100 in your account now, will you commit to doing like \$50 a week starting next week and you're probably more likely to get people to

commit to it because of this present bias that sort of idealizes yourself in the future.

Speaker 2: [19:42](#) Then we switched gears and Johnathan shared some stories from his work at paypal. He set up the next study with some background and he comes back to the importance of engaging both the rider and the elephant when it comes to making decisions.

Speaker 3: [19:56](#) My job, uh, I guess it's been about two and a half years ago when I left paypal. So how many people have a paypal account? All of you. Awesome. And I think all of you, most of you, if you don't have paypal or Venmo because it's actually the same company. So paypal, paypal doesn't make it very, yeah. So people doesn't even make you make it obvious. It's sort of like Instagram and Facebook, you know? So yeah. So anyway. So of those of you that have a paypal account, how many of you have linked your bank account to your paypal account?

Speaker 3: [20:31](#) Most of you actually. So that was either designed by me or that experience was either designed by me or one of the folks on my team. So hopefully you found the process of doing it. Okay. It's actually one of the more complex things that you can do with your paypal account. So it was a very difficult thing to design. But paypal wants you to link a bank account for a lot of reasons. So it's actually both beneficial to the customer and it's beneficial to paypal. So for the customer it opens up the path to a lot of products and services that you wouldn't normally have. One of the most compelling ones, and the reason that most people do it is that it lets you send money to people for free. And it also lets you, once you received money, it has, you have a bank account to deposit the money into.

Speaker 3: [21:24](#) And then for paypal, customers who linked the bank are shown to have much higher engagement. And they're about two times is more. Yes, two times more valuable than than people that have not linked to a bank account. So paypal invests a lot into trying to get people to do this action. And so me as a UX designer, I spent a lot of time, remember if that slide about canned versus will. So I spent a lot of time making sure that people can do that action. And we did numerous iterations of it and we really drove conversion through the roof for the canned part of it. But there was this resistance to actually taking the action. And so the owner is of who will do the can. Part of it was typically our marketing team and they tried all sorts of messaging strategies, all sorts of value prop messaging to try to get people to take this action.

- Speaker 3: [22:23](#) So you can see there's all these facts about about linking a bank account. You avoid credit card fees, stay in control of your money, get access to pay after delivery. I won't go through all of them, but we tried literally dozens of these and in Ab tests and none of them were effective. And the reason that they weren't effective is because all of these were just facts. And all of these, we're talking to the writer, right? If you think about that framework of the rider and the elephant. So the rider is only going to have limited control over the direction that, that this rider elephant team is going to go in. And so if you really want to be effective, you need to talk to the elephant. Um, so I w you know, I didn't know anything about this at the time and I was looking at this whole thing with frustration because you know, I really wanted people to start this flow that I had spent so much time perfecting and you know, getting so that it was optimized so that people could do it.
- Speaker 3: [23:27](#) But there were quite a few people that just never started that action. So how do I get people to start this action? So I happened to read this article, I can't remember where it was in, it might've been like New Yorker magazine about this thing about Robert Cialdini did this experiment to try to get people to reuse their towels in the bathroom and I'm sure you know, all of you that have stayed in a hotel have seen this sign that they put up in the bathroom. You know, think about the environment, whatever it is, you know, use less water and what they want to do is get you to reuse the towel. All of that that's in the bathroom. And Robert Cialdini happens to be a professor at Arizona State University where I used to live
- Speaker 2: [24:13](#) Bob Cialdini. One of our favorite episodes was when we got to talk to Bob. Yeah. I think it was even more fun than just hanging out with him when we were in New York together. Agreed. CIALDINI's work on priming is legendary and his work on how to demonstrate social proof through simple things like consistency and similarity are now staples of marketers everywhere. Jonathan shared how getting hotel guests to reuse towels was a lot like his task at paypal, trying to get customers to link to their own bank accounts. He also spoke to this process to track down Bob and engage him in his study.
- Speaker 5: [24:50](#) You may have noticed that will kill off a place, a small card in bathrooms that attempt to persuade guests to reuse their towels and linen. Most do this by drawing a guest's attention to the benefits that we use, can have on environmental protection. It turns out that this is a pretty effective strategy leading to around 35% compliance, but could there be an even more effective way? Well, it turns out that about 75% of people who

check into a hotel for four nights or longer will reuse their towels at some point during their stay. So what would happen if we took a lesson from the principle of consensus and simply included that information on the cards and said that 75% of our guests reuse their towels at some time during their stay so please do so as well. It turns out that when we do this, towel reuse rises by 26% now imagine the next time you stay in a hotel, you saw one of these signs, you picked it up and you read the following message.

Speaker 5: [25:57](#) 75% of people who have stayed in this room every used their towel. What would you think? Well, here's what you might think. I hope they're not the same towels. And like most people, you probably think that this sign will have no influence on your behavior whatsoever. But it turns out that changing just a few words on a sign to honestly point out what comparable previous guests have done was the single most effective message leading to a 33% increase in reuse. So the science is telling us that rather than relying on our own ability to persuade others, we can point to what many others are already doing,

Speaker 3: [26:44](#) especially many similar others. So I, you know, I, as I mentioned, I read about this study and I was fascinated by it, not just because it was a fascinating study, but I sort of made this leap is like, you know, this thing that Bob Cialdini did with the towels is sort of similar to what I'm trying to do with getting people to link a paypal link, a bank account to their paypal account because both of them involve like a small amount of effort and both of them sort of seemingly are a little bit more about the company than it is about the customer. Right? Like it's, you know, maybe he's like, why are you trying to get me to link a bank account? Like what is it, what's in it for you? And same thing with the towel thing is like what's in it for you hotel while you're trying to bug me about that, I'm just going to drop it on the floor.

Speaker 3: [27:36](#) So you know, I was really intrigued by the results that they got from this. And by the way, you heard them talk about this word called consensus. So that's more commonly known as the concept of social proof. And I'm sure many of you have heard the term social proof. So Bob Cialdini coined the term social proof and it was actually, this was a while ago and it was the first time I had ever heard about that, like sort of described it, a methodology methodological a out of the beer really got to me, you know the word I'm trying to say. Um, so, so as I mentioned, you know, I used to be based in Arizona and she'll, DNA was at the the Arizona State University. So I kind of just looked him up

on the university website and I sent him an email and I invited him to go out to lunch to me.

Speaker 3: [28:26](#) And to my surprise and delight, he wrote me back right away and he accepted and we went out to lunch. And so I told him about what I was trying to do at paypal and I told them about the fact that I had read about his experiment with social proof about what the towels and you know, did he think that there was anything to my theory that it could be potentially effective to use social proof with trying to get paypal customers to link their bank account. And he thought it was, and he was probably also very interested in the fact of working with me because he normally kind of pulls aside maybe 12 Grad students to do as experiments and now he has potentially access to tens of millions of people to do an experiment. It doesn't seem like much, but it actually took us a few months of iterations and going through various channels to rate this message, which is join over 30 million customers who have verified status and verify it is actually not used anymore, a paypal.

Speaker 3: [29:27](#) But it, so it's, it's, it's, it's basically implies that you've linked to bank account. And one of the ways to get verified is by linking a bank account. So we put this out and we made sure that this number was actually correct and we're going to talk about this a little bit later about making sure that number is correct. Um, the marketing team heard about the fact that we were doing this whole thing and we felt they felt that we were treading in their territory. So they came out with this, I'm not sure if you could see that, but it says 30 million people are doing it, shouldn't you? Do you see anything wrong with that ad?

Speaker 3: [30:11](#) So this did not get published because when I saw that I was a gas that they would try that. So for those of you that aren't seeing it, you know, there's sort of an attractive couple very close together and a message saying like, 30 million people are doing it, shouldn't you? So we declined to use that. Um, so this is, this is, it doesn't look like much. And this, this has been long been changed. This is, this is probably circa 2014 15 at paypal, but this is the consumer onboarding flow. This is where you set up a new paypal account and part of the old flow basically asked you at, in the process of setting up your account, did you want to link a bank account or did you want to link a credit card to your account? And we would actually greatly prefer that you linked up bank account rather than a credit card.

Speaker 3: [31:13](#) But we couldn't overtly push you towards that. Um, so this is where you probably can't see it. This is where we snuck in that magic message from Robert Cialdini's consultants. So there's a,

there's a fact on the top no limit on how much money you can send. There is a fact on the bottom industry-leading safeguards to keep your money in information secure. But then there's social proof right in the middle that says join over 30 million users who have verified status. And then we also put it here when you start to actually take this step of linking your bank account. So we did another, uh, another A/B test and let's see how he did. So the results were this. Um, so this might actually might take a little bit of interpretation. So there's a concept that paypal, so this is giving you a little bit of window to the secret sauce of paypal.

Speaker 3: [32:07](#) There's a concept of paypal called funding mix and funding mix is essentially for every payment we look at what funding instrument did the customer use. So did they use cash, did they use their bank account, did they use a debit card that they use a credit card? Did they use paypal credit? And the lower the number the better because the lower the number means the fewer credit card transactions there were. And so as you can see, we did a test with a bunch of other messages and the one with social proof had by far the best funding mix. So that means the people that were exposed to this message use their bank account in subsequent transactions. And I forgot to mention that we, we track these users that were exposed to this message for six months afterwards. So it wasn't just what was the conversion, it was also what was the conversion. And then what was the subsequent behavior? So which is far more important because it's one thing to link my bank account, it's another thing to actually use it for transactions.

Speaker 2: [33:12](#) The changes Cialdini and his team offered had a tremendous effect and here Jonathan reveals the remarkable results he and his team at paypal obtained.

Speaker 3: [33:22](#) So based on the fact that we had such an improved funding mix with the people that were exposed to that message, just from changing the messaging, we had a two point \$2 million per year bottom line margin improvement in um, in all transactions. So, and the benefit of it was because this was an onboarding flow. So these were new users and then every year we would do that again. So it would be 2.2 million the first time we put that out. Then another 2.2 million after that and et cetera. And it just compounded after that. So amazingly financially successful just from kind of sticking in that one line of text into the onboarding flow.

- Speaker 2: [34:06](#) This is remarkable. It's the power of behavioral science. Tim, one line of copy in an ad can make a huge difference. Jonathan closed with a couple of important reminders. Let's listen.
- Speaker 3: [34:19](#) You know, if you're, if you're designing a flow and your UX designer, a thing to keep in your mind is that if there's a decision to be made in this flow, um, the elephant we'll probably decide. So in other words, the rational part of your mind may not be the thing that's taking over. And if there's going to be a decision, you need to think about the irrational part of somebody's mind.
- Speaker 2: [34:44](#) MMM.
- Speaker 3: [34:46](#) Just as importantly, it's important to think about the fact that the elephant makes fast decisions and those decisions are effortless. So essentially the elephant doesn't really get tired. You can have all sorts of decisions in front of the elephant and it's just going to decide, decide, decide, decide. Because it's not really thinking and it's not really putting in any effort. It's doing all these mental shortcuts. If you force people to use the rational part of their mind, they're going to expend effort and it's actually going to be physically draining on them. And the more times you make people think there's that famous book by by crew, you know, don't make me think, which is a classic Ux Book. I don't think he talks about this. But the more you make people think, the more they're going to get tired and the more you're going to risk that are just going to drop off and not do the flow in the first place.
- Speaker 3: [35:37](#) And then I say this sort of justing Lee, but it's actually an important consideration. The elephant won't fit in a usability lab. So what I mean by that, like literally it won't fit in the USABILITY lab. But what I mean by that is if you're doing user testing and you're testing things like usability and comprehension and things like that, those are ideal things for the writer. Those are ideal things for the can part of that equation. But you cannot sit somebody into, in a usability lab and see what they will do in real life. So for that you kind of have to put them, you have to, you have to be instrumented and you have to do these ab tests so that you could see, you know, an experiment and see what things, what messages and whatever other behavioral economics interventions you're doing or more effective. Kurt. So what are you taking away from Jonathan's comments? A couple of different things.
- Speaker 2: [36:34](#) One, we have to take into context. The elephant and the rider. Both are important and sometimes we need the elephant to

move us and sometimes we really need that writer to restrain the elephant. Second, small changes can have a huge difference, which leads to the fact that companies really need to invest in A/B testing or some sort of testing to really get it right. How about you, Tim? What are you going to take away? You know, it's impressive that companies like PayPal or not only paying attention to the applications of behavioral science, but they're also exhibiting some care for doing it ethically. Yeah. Yeah. I mean, you know, we've talked at length about the power of these principles and when they get applied, uh, to these situations, uh, marketing and HR professionals face big ethical issues from time to time. And it's cool to see that some companies are really doing it right.

Speaker 2: [37:28](#)

Yeah, I think that's a really important piece. We have grooved on the ethics of behavioral science many, many times in the past. It is a powerful tool that can be used for good, but in the wrong hands or even just being used without really thinking through all of the consequences, the ethical implications for that can be really, really impactful. And it's good to hear that companies are doing some really thoughtful things around making sure that they're ethical. So with all of these factors having such powerful effects, do you think that the music that's being played in a, in a retail environment could be having a significant effect on our behaviors? We know it is, right? We've seen those studies where in the wine shop when they played German music, more German wines are sold and when they switched to French music, more French wines are sold.

Speaker 2: [38:32](#)

We know that those background noises and music impact how we, you know, think they're priming our brain. And there's a lot of those components that we don't pay attention to. The pictures on the walls, those words as you come in, all of those different factors play into how we respond. It's all about context. It's all about how our brains interpret things based on the things they've seen prior to what we have just done. I understand that, that our brains are taking in every 300 milliseconds, about 11 million data points, how many 11 million data points. And yet there are only processing. Our brain is actually only processing about 40 I'm processing. Maybe five [inaudible] can tell you that for a damn fact. And if there's 11 million pieces of data coming in, there's a lot that's being missed. There's a lot that is being missed, man. So it's, it's really important though when we think about that, right?

Speaker 2: [39:40](#)

So we, that kind of helps in understanding how that priming effect works. Exactly. Because now what we're doing by the primary, by having the music in the background or those words

up on the wall or whatever it is that is priming us, we're activating these neuro networks that take those 11 million bits of information and act as filters. And because we're, we've primed some of these neuro networks, we're more likely to focus in on these set of 40 items as opposed to those set of 40 items, which is where biases and heuristics come into play. Exactly. Yeah. So what music would you listen to if you had to go into a retail SAP? Well, I would like it to be, uh, associated with the shop. Okay. You know, I was in, I was in a shop recently that was really cool and modern and very contemporary.

Speaker 2:

[40:33](#)

And the layout and the collection of products they had was super eclectic. And uh, and they were playing like, uh, just garbagey kind of, um, Muzak kind of stuff. It was just junk. And I thought, this is so out of character. Like, this does not make sense to me in, in my mind, in the world of trying to make a reasonable sense out of this. I couldn't make any sense out of it and it pissed me off. So what kind of music would have worked in that situation? Oh, let's see. In that super contemporary, I think I would have gone with something Electronica, Edm, you know, get them, get some Edm music with some dumping and dumping beats and some cool. Sounds good. Sounds in there. Yeah. Yeah. Definitely. All right. Yeah. All right. And you, what, what, uh, what would you like to be listening to? What would you like to prime yourself with today? Musically of pride myself with today. Musically. That's, hm. I think I would go with people are people by depression mode because it's always just a good common, great way of thinking. You know, people are people and why should it be that you and I get along so awfully. That's so weird.

Speaker 2:

[41:48](#)

Why would you want to have that, uh, playing across the state as you walk across the stage to receive the Nobel prize? W W would that be your, your Nobel Prize winning music? Didn't, didn't Denton, Denton, Denton. I don't know. Maybe we'll, we'll, we'll, we'll never know because I will never be walking across that stage for a Nobel prize, any category unless they had one for you know, people that are stupid and I might win that. Well that's not fair. You're doing, you know there's a lot of people out. As stupid as you, is that what you say? Exactly that. A lot of competition for that one. I don't think you can just take the cake on that one, pal. All right, so with that listeners, thank you. Hopefully you enjoyed this episode of behavioral grooves. A little different than our normal. We took a behavioral grooves meetup and put it together here and kind of mash some different things around.

Speaker 2:

[42:42](#)

Let us know if you like that format. We're going to try to be doing more of these, uh, taking our meetups and actually having them be some of the podcasts. So let us know if that's enjoyable, if it's not, make sure we know that so we don't do it and don't waste our time or yours. Amen. And if you did like this, please leave a comment. We greatly, greatly, um, need that. It helps in Apple's ratings. And so if we really do want to expand the audience, it's crazy how much apple re relates or responds to getting that information to be showing this up for people when they're searching for behavioral science or human condition or various different things. So any of those aspects we love you to rate and to leave a review. And with all that listeners, thanks very much for hanging out with us.