

# Pioneers and Pathfinders: Wendy Jephson

*(This transcript was generated through AI technology.)*

## **Steve Poor**

Hi. This is Steve Poor, and you're listening to Pioneers and Pathfinders.

This week on Pioneers and Pathfinders, we're joined by Wendy Jephson, CEO and co-founder of Let's Think. The company operates in a space they call "behavioral science AI," which is intended to transform workplace productivity in the legal profession. Wendy brings a rare dual qualification as both a commercial lawyer and a business psychologist, with deep expertise across health care and financial services. Previously, she served as Head of Research & Ideation for Market Technology at Nasdaq, where she introduced scientific research methodologies to enhance innovation and development processes. A recognized thought leader, Wendy speaks globally on topics such as AI, surveillance, cognitive engineering, organizational resilience, and the intersection of conduct and culture with technology design.

In our conversation, Wendy shares insights into the behavioral science behind legal professionals, the founding story and mission of Let's Think, and her vision for the future of lawyer training and workplace transformation. She offers some fascinating insights. I hope you enjoy listening in.

Wendy, how are you? Thanks so much for joining.

## **Wendy Jephson**

I'm very well. Thank you. It's a real pleasure to be here. Thank you for asking me.

## **Steve Poor**

Yeah, we're catching you in London. So I know we're catching at the end of your day, but you've got your tea, so ready to hunker down and have a conversation.

## **Wendy Jephson**

Indeed, I have my tea. The leaves are turning nicely red and gold outside. It's a lovely evening.

## **Steve Poor**

It sounds like a beautiful day in London. You're the co founder and CEO of Let's Think, which is focused on what you refer to as behavioral science AI. I want to get into Let's Think and what behavioral science AI means, and tacit knowledge and stuff. But first, you've got a very interesting background, combining law, combining behavioral science, combining financial expertise, tell us a little bit about your professional journey and sort of how these themes, these threads, intersected with one another.

## **Wendy Jephson**

Yeah, you look back on it and it looks like it was planned clearly, or maybe it doesn't.

## **Steve Poor**

No, it does. It looks very intentional. But as I know from talking to a lot of folks, things will look intentional in retrospect, didn't seem so at the time.

## **Wendy Jephson**

Absolutely, there's a lot of serendipity and child events aren't there. I mean, I definitely even going into law. I always used to tell the story that when I was 12, I decided I wanted to be a lawyer because I used to watch a program called Crown Court. So thought that looked cool. They kind of did mock trials, and I thought, and a lot of money, and I liked arguing my with my brother, so that felt like a good career.

**Steve Poor**

You wanted the powdered wig. Come on, let's be honest.

**Wendy Jephson**

Exactly who wouldn't. And actually, I think when I was 12, I probably also wanted to be a journalist and a doctor, and those two just kind of went out the window. And so, of course, I've always wanted to be a lawyer by the time you're then off to university. And then I went in house on a secondment when I was doing my articles, my trainee two years of training. That tells you how old I am by saying I was doing articles, but and I went in house to Xerox, and was in the department working for Central Eastern Europe. And it was one of those, they offered me a job at the end of when I qualified. So that's why I went in house. It wasn't anything more purposeful for that than that, I don't think at the time, because you don't know very much.

**Steve Poor**

That's for sure.

**Wendy Jephson**

And then I went into the pharmaceutical industry a few years later, because it's a good time to move when you've been in a job for a few years, isn't it? And again, it was luck that right time, right place and the pharmaceutical industry was really fascinating. I loved working with every department of the company, from R and D to the molecular discovery process, clinical trials, manufacturing and then getting into the licensing of it, sales and marketing, pricing, what you can and can't say in a highly regulated environment, going out on the sales calls to doctors to see how they sold prescription only medication.

**Steve Poor**

That must have been fascinating.

**Wendy Jephson**

The whole thing was fascinating. And it was, you know, they have serious drugs for serious illnesses. So this was, you know, they have Prozac. So this is that they're the real at the forefront of treating depression and drugs for schizophrenia. So working with psychiatrists and understanding the medical process, you know, beginning to understand the effects of chemicals on the brain and how do these conditions emerge. So all of that was really interesting background that starts you thinking about human nature and how does it work. But more broadly, I suppose I became more interested in the behavioral side of it, because law is gray, isn't it? You're always giving advice on risk, essentially, and watching how people took those decisions, those risky decisions, was always fascinating, because you know, as a lawyer, you're not taking the decisions yourself, you're giving them to the business and giving them their options of what decisions they would then have to take and live with the consequences, and seeing how different people were able to cope with that kind of decision making process was also fascinating as a process to watch.

**Steve Poor**

That is interesting, isn't it?

**Wendy Jephson**

Yeah, absolutely, which got me interested in the process of decision making. I had a brother who was a fund manager more than 20 years ago, reading sports psychology before Kahneman got his Nobel Prize on Thinking Fast and Slow and all of that kind of body of work. And he was reading sports psychology because he was trying to understand his decision making process in financial services. He was saying you have a disciplined process that you're putting into place, and then at the end of the month, you start losing money, your clients start calling you up, your manager on your back, and you you're really tempted to start taking more risks. So he felt there was something in the kind of psychology of decision making that could help him understand better, you know, how to manage that pressure at that moment in time. And that's he was kind of talking about data and technology that could come in to capture the decisions that were being made. And I was thinking, well, actually be really interesting to understand the behavioral science behind that, that if you could put those two things together, and that idea kind of didn't leave me. It was what? Over time, I started thinking, well, actually, yeah, I've trained professionally to be a lawyer. If I'm going to start thinking about decision making, I should train professionally to look at how people make decisions, which is why I then decided I would go back to university and do a psychology degree and a master's in business psychology to really understand how people in the workplace make decisions, and what could you do to help improve that decision making process?

**Steve Poor**

How do you apply that behavioral analytical thinking to lawyers? Walk us a little bit through how these how these fields come together.

**Wendy Jephson**

Yeah, I guess again, there's a long kind of process to get to that. So I think people are really familiar with the bias side of things, of how people might make biased decisions. And it's true that people have got finite processing capacity, and we do, we kind of approximate decisions quite a lot. But when you get into a professional domain, experts get pretty good at those approximations, in spite of the fact that we've got this finite processing capacity. And that comes about because you've been exposed to many examples of similar things happening before. So you start to recognize the key points that matter and make a difference. And you know the kind of actions that you might take, or you can make good predictions about what you could do and what the outcomes might be, even when you've never done them before, you can be creative about it and make a good judgment call about what's likely to happen. And that comes from exposure to lots of time spent on the job, working and doing, which is that learning by osmosis that you hear a lot about in law, there is a whole body of behavioral science research which works in that field. So this is the kind of a sister side of behavioral science that says you've got a branch behavioral science that says that people make mistakes all the time when we're not very good, and there's a branch that says, actually, when you look at what people do in highly complex environments, they get it right a lot of the time, and they stop a lot of things, bad things happening. So, you know, about 1% of the time you'll get an accident or, you know, something terrible blowing up in an industry. That means that 99% of the time it's not so they look at what happens in the everyday working the where people are really often filling the gaps between technologies and systems, all the workarounds, all the ways that they make it work, and it's starting to look and capture that, and some of the people who work in that field have developed various interviewing methodologies and data collection methodologies that start to pull out of people's experience knowledge to understand how they understand the system that works, and what are they doing in it to be so successful in that system.

**Steve Poor**

I'm flashing back to Larry Richards, who, I presume you know his research on lawyers and lawyer psychology, where he talks about the lack of resilience among lawyers. And this path worked for me.

I'm not deviating from it. I don't care what you say, kind of thing. How does that work? Into the behavioral science side of it, where we're in a rapidly changing environment?

**Wendy Jephson**

Yes, so I think so the kind of the interview methodology, where you start to you interview experts, and you start to pull out what they know and what they're paying attention to, and they don't even know for themselves what that is, because that's a mark of expertise. You become unconscious, like driving a car. You no longer pay attention to all the adjustments that you're making. It's not dissimilar when you're doing you're working in an expert domain, you just do it, and you usually just say, Oh, I don't know why I'm doing it. I just know that it's the right thing to be doing. You can unpack that. And you really need to unpack that if you're going to allow people to break apart from some of those guardrails that they put on themselves sometimes because they are stuck in a rut, and that's where bio thinking can come into play. It can be really effective and efficient. It just can also stop you looking beyond those boundaries that you've learned to see that there might be alternative ways of doing something in a more effective way of doing things. I think right now is a really interesting time, because everyone's being forced to put their head up and question how they do things, whether they're comfortable doing that or not. It's kind of this enforced change, isn't it?

**Steve Poor**

No, no, it is. It's been interesting to watch the adaptation curve sort of accelerate among lawyers, first with the pandemic and now with generative AI.

**Wendy Jephson**

Exactly.

**Steve Poor**

And how sustainable it is, I don't know, but it's been very interesting.

**Wendy Jephson**

Indeed, indeed.

**Steve Poor**

So let's move to Let's Think. There's a lot more background in history that leads you to Let's Think, but you started it two and a half, three years ago.

**Wendy Jephson**

Yeah.

**Steve Poor**

What's the mission of Let's Think, and what's the origin story?

**Wendy Jephson**

Well, so our purpose is to help the people of the world think brilliantly, because when people think brilliantly, they do great things. So that's our kind of...

**Steve Poor**

That's your tagline, yeah, okay.

**Wendy Jephson**

But it quite genuinely, it was. So I had a Fintech startup before we were designing tech to help people uncover financial crime in the capital markets, that was bought by NASDAQ, and we continue doing work there to help support complex investigations. And that was super interesting, but it's also you're part of a big organization, and I want to I enjoy the nimble, move fast work with people who are trying to solve, you know, real focus on a particular problem. And I really wanted to design technology that really helps you think. Because a lot of technology, lots of lots of technology, is point solutions, which means you're stitching together lots of point solutions to get work done. And it doesn't always work. In a sense, Let's Think is a point solution, but our point is the person. So really understanding how do people think in order to design technology that supports that thinking is the goal. Because I love using technology, and I love thinking, and I just want something that really helps me work even more effectively and think more so that was kind of the original goal. And then it was, again, it's stitching together things. So what we've the reason that we were successful in our in the first startup, and obviously it's multifactorial, but also in designing at NASDAQ, is that we would use the interview methodology to pull out how experts think, and therefore design tech that works for experts, but also helps novices understand and start to learn how to become an expert.

### **Steve Poor**

Are you creating sort of personas through the interview process? Go a little bit deeper there?

### **Wendy Jephson**

Yeah, sure. So that interview process, though, is really so it's a manual version, and it's you're starting to get mental models from people of how they are navigating complex environments. So you get a really brilliant data set that informs all sorts of things. You can design algorithms. You understand how to design a user interface, all sorts of things from it, but you really understand a picture of the system that they're working in. But it's really time consuming to get and not everyone will sit down for two hours and be interviewed by you, clearly because they're busy, but what this new technology now allows us to do is train the models to ask questions like we do, and also analyze what's been said the way that we do, which takes us days and days, and it can now be done. You know, that can be done, as we all have seen, in minutes, and it's quite it's quite a nice process to think aloud with the technology. So unlike something like ChatGPT, that's constantly trying to give you information, our technology is asking you questions to help you get your own thinking out of your head, and then it starts to reframe that in multiple different ways. So we create different types of knowledge assets from that think aloud session.

### **Steve Poor**

So I assume the purpose of this is then as other, to capture the tacit knowledge among an experienced lawyer, for example, and to allow a junior lawyer access to that thinking, that way of reasoning, that experience model, essentially automating the apprentice model, given the technology is taking away these learning by osmosis. Do I kind of have that right?

### **Wendy Jephson**

Exactly that, it kind of has already been impacted, hadn't it, by hybrid working and covid. And we were already hearing that, so we'd very much kind of started saying, look at what we really want to capture is all that expert know how people that, when they leave the firm and everyone says, oh my goodness, they knew so much, and it's never written down. So that had already been the transmission of that knowledge has already been impacted anyway, by hybrid working and as we see clearly now, AI coming up to start to automate some of that tasks further reduces the ability to practice. But it was a good model, clearly, because it's lasted for hundreds of years. But it wasn't the perfect model, because lawyers aren't teachers, and as I've already said, experts aren't necessarily good at explaining what they know, because once they know something, it surely is obvious. Why would I explain that to somebody? Can't they see it? You know that that's a...

**Steve Poor**

Why did you pick that juror? Yeah, I don't know. Just felt right to me.

**Wendy Jephson**

Right exactly, and that's quite a lot when you start to unpick what felt right about it, that you can get them to articulate if you sit down and talk. So we know that reflective thinking is actually a really good method to improve your own thinking as a person. You can begin to understand, you know, what are those rails that your thinking is on? Can you actually test them and push them a little bit? It is a hard thing to do. It's a hard thing to do on your own. So that's where we know that sitting down with people, or having the tech sit down and ask them to do a short, 5, 10-minute reflection on something that was challenging is, in itself, quite a useful thing to do. Then, if it can actually capture all the kind of messing thought that comes out, you can use that to share those mental models and tips and tricks and things to other people who aren't alongside you anymore. So that was kind of the first thinking around it, because we know in the science that when you get an expert mental model and they're fundamentally different to the kind of training you typically find in training programs, because I've been out in the world, and I know how it works. It's the unspoken rules of how you get stuff done, if you then use those to train up juniors, then they learn a lot faster, and they're much more effective quickly, which is what we all want, isn't it? Because it's expensive having people who don't know what they're doing speakers be having been one.

**Steve Poor**

Yes, I recall.

**Wendy Jephson**

exactly, exactly. It's painful for everyone, isn't it, especially the junior person.

**Steve Poor**

Yeah, and the market's changing where that's just not, that's just not the way the industry is going to be structured now or going forward.

**Wendy Jephson**

Yes, exactly. And then what we've uncovered is actually, when you do reflective recall, what you're doing is you're starting to pull out all that invisible thinking that happens when people do work. And so you will know when you look at a legal document, you have a whole story going on in your head about the client and the industry they're in and the objectives they're trying to achieve. And then you know, well, what is the applicable law? How could it play out? What are the trade offs that we want to have going on to get to our end objective? What's the time constraints? What's the money constraints? All of those factors are playing out as you're reading through things and writing your advice, and you're trying to write this most succinct advice you can properly possibly give, and get to the nitty gritty of it, and then you'll send that off. And it's like, how much am I paying for that short letter? Because it's very hard to explain all the thought that's gone into it.

**Steve Poor**

Right, I guess I'm fascinated by this particular venture you're on. You've just described a very complicated set of reasoning based on experience to just prepare the initial case analysis, let alone trying the case, litigating the case, discovering the case, all that kind of stuff. How do you capture so I'm a junior associate, I'm going to go take a deposition in a case. What am I get? What guidance am I getting from the technology to do that? And how does a 10 or 15 minute interview capture that? It

seems like a lot of complicated, a lot of variables in there. And maybe I'm just being a lawyer. Maybe I'm over-lawyering it.

**Wendy Jephson**

Wow. So interestingly, we had the first ever, Let's Think lab on Friday, and you kind of have to try it to understand it. I'll unpack it a little bit, because you have to say a bit more than that, do you? But somebody did say, come in, saying, I think this sounds too good to be true. And then he did it.

**Steve Poor**

And it does sound a little bit too good to be true. It really does.

**Wendy Jephson**

Exactly. And then we said to him, do you still think it's too good to be true? And he said, No, I think it's brilliant. So I mean, that's anecdotal, clearly, but because experts actually boil down to the key cues and factors that they're paying attention to, just don't even know what they are sometimes, because they just know. So if you ask the right questions, then you can get to what are the most important things to pay attention to. That's why they can do it so fast. That's why they can do it in milliseconds, and you can react really fast. So although, yes, there are many, many features and factors in that each complex scenario, if you get if you ask the right questions, and you're asking them to reflect on say, like a deposition, then they will start to break it down into categories of these were the most important things, and this is what I was noticing, and this is what I was responding to, and that's why I thought it would work, and I changed that strategy. And so you can pull all of that out by getting them to retell the story. And the questions themselves are also memory prompts, because from the science of understanding how memory works, and you reconstruct it, and you remember something, and it helps you remember something else. So it's a process of recall which matters when you're trying to tell somebody Junior how to do something, and it's important to describe something you've actually done rather than your general it's called work as done versus work as imagined, because when you describe somebody asks you to describe your job, you kind of give a very polished view straight line. If you give a description of something you've actually done, it's got all the twists and turns in it and all the trade offs that you made. And so you get that rich picture out, but the the analysis itself, then turns it into a nicely structured document that sets out with what these are the goals and the sub goals, and this is the cues that you were paying attention to, and particular decision moments, and what your mental model is around that, and how you're thinking. So it starts to break it out in a way that somebody else can read it and get quite a lot from it, with the context of what was happening. And then you do that, you stitch together 510, minutes at a time. You can start to get a longer picture of how strategy is changing and tactics change, etc.

**Steve Poor**

Do you aggregate the information from the senior lawyer to create a unified person in the technology? Or if I'm working for partner X, do I say how partner x approach this? Or is it partner X, Y, Z, Q, combined as one?

**Wendy Jephson**

Yeah, I think so. We're still early stage in terms of how you'll put that together. But I think when you're within a firm, actually being able to know, how does Stephen approach cases? I'd love to learn and look at, see how he's approached it. I may want to, if we've got enough data, look at how does a particular group of partners say in employment approach matters? Where's the commonality and differences in that? Because it's always then what types of cases and how does that compare to the one I'm running, because that's what you're doing anytime you're learning, isn't it? What are the common features? How did they address it? Is that applicable in my case, if it's an employment case, there's probably

reputational challenges that they're looking at. How did they deal with them? Is it a different industry? Do they have different media outlets that would pick up on the story to the one that I'm in? Is it same, different? There's, you know, so there will be different versions where you put together, okay, I've got a particular partner. I'd like to see how they think about it, or I want to look at, I've got a bigger access to a bigger group of people, and compare something that we have done is, particularly in our team. We all will go to the same meeting. And of course, we've got different hats on, so we're paying attention to different information. And then we'll do a reflective session. You put them together and see, well, what was it that each of us was paying attention to? Where do we have agreement, disagreement, or extra information? So you get just a richer picture, then a better note of it after the event. So you said you're in early stages. Where are you in product development? I know you've worked with a couple of law firms to co develop some systems and some some products. Tell us about where you are in the maturation of your company, where, what market receptivity has been. Sure, so I mean, Kingsley Napoli is our development client has been since the beginning, where we started a year ago, interviewing six of their litigation partners to get just a, you know, test. First of all, does a manual method mean that we can pull out asset knowledge? Can we give them back designs and information in a way that they recognize the stories they've told us of complex matters, but in a new, easy to digest way? So that was kind of the first step of the process. Then we built the technology, and they keep testing it in order to make sure that each step of it delivers back what it needs to deliver back. So we started paid trials with some other firms in London, and we're kind of managing a wait list because we're small to manage. And actually we've had huge amounts of we haven't really been out looking for people. They've been coming to us, which is nice, because it's a problem that everyone's talking about is, how do you train up the genius of the future in our new world?

**Steve Poor**

Well, you've got your finger on a very serious problem,

**Wendy Jephson**

Yeah.

**Steve Poor**

And a potential solution that everybody's looking for. So...

**Wendy Jephson**

Yeah, it's an interesting time. That's what I'm excited about, though, is when you when you start when you start with our point being the person, and the problem being recall. So actually, I need to recall something because I've got a supervisory session, or I need to talk to a junior and train them up. So I need to remember what happened. But you also need to remember what happened when you're writing a billing narrative, for example. And actually, that's one of those tasks that everybody hates, isn't it? It's not a good use of time. But if, actually, if you've reflected, and you've got good value, and you could use that to advise your client which is billable, but you can also turn the same, reframe that same reflection to also have captured a better description, the value add for your billing narrative, then that's kind of nice ROI win there.

**Steve Poor**

It's a nice, nice two birds with one stone.

**Wendy Jephson**

Exactly. And you can make a nice file note that's captured all your strategic reasoning in it, which is a better way to learn. And you can turn it into training programs for your juniors to learn from. So you can start to hit a whole bunch of things, because you're looking at what the problem is, getting somebody to



really think and capture the real value add story that went on in their head when they were doing the work.

**Steve Poor**

Is there? I suspect I know the answer to this, but I'm going to ask it anyway, is there a particular legal domain that's more receptive to this solution? I don't mean from a human standpoint. I mean from an analytical standpoint.

**Wendy Jephson**

Yeah.

**Steve Poor**

It's actionable work or litigation work or advisory work.

**Wendy Jephson**

Well, we started in litigation. And because, I mean, it's actually, there's less technology in litigation, in some regards, isn't there, and because there are so many twists and turns, so it makes sense there to capture a lot of the kind of messiness of that process. I have tried it, and we have used it with transactional work. I've kind of not gone too far towards that, because there's a loss of tech in transactional work right now. But actually we've done a test on exactly that. In fact, got our law firm who wrote our SAS subscription agreement and DPA to do use the tech to reflect on it. And actually what I got back from them was a whole load of thinking they hadn't given me already, which I found, personally really useful, because it was what I needed to understand how am I going to negotiate with these law firms that I want to get to sign up to license agreements in a reasonable amount of time?

**Steve Poor**

Hopefully, the tech helped you crack that particular nut, because that's a real challenge.

**Wendy Jephson**

Exactly, exactly, because I need all the help I can get. But actually, that was a really nice test as a client, from a client perspective. So it made me think, feel like, actually, I understand more of their thinking and people that I didn't know very well. I feel more inclined to go back and ask them more questions, rather than just get on with it myself. I'm a lawyer. I have written these contracts myself, but I'm more inclined to go back to them now.

**Steve Poor**

I presume the information you get from your clients as you're developing the input to create the system is not commingled with other you're not creating a universal product here to sell to the market. It's a custom application for a particular firm.

**Wendy Jephson**

Yeah, so every firm completely containerized their data is never, we never use our data to train the models. The models is trained on behavioral science and the frameworks that we have developed ourselves. That's why it's behavioral science AI; it's not legal AI. It's behavioral science AI-trained, we generate a whole new missing data set that firms don't have that institutional knowledge that isn't typically written down. And that's what's missing, not just for to be able to train your genius up. It's actually missing from the llms themselves. That's the part, because it's not written down anywhere. They're not trained with it either. They're all the unwritten rules of how you get things done in the legal world.

**Steve Poor**

Right, the capture of tacit knowledge is the big challenge, it seems to me, and it's one of the most valuable pieces of data that you have. We struggle with that at our firm, and so I get the challenge.

**Wendy Jephson**

Yeah, and that so the research, there's 30 years of research in high risk domains where people are making vast decisions in fast changing environments with incomplete information. So like Defense Intelligence, firefighting, aviation, nuclear, where people have gone in to speak to those people to understand, how did you make those decisions? You know that I just knew what to do decisions, and it was developed 30 years ago, originally in firefighting, to go in and ask questions, how did you know to pull out the people from that burning building at that moment in time? I don't know, just just following procedure. Well, where's the procedure? Written down? I was not written down. I just knew what to do and then. So that's where this interview methodology came from, to actually get people to introspect, dig deep, use different cues to build back up a picture to understand well, what were they paying attention to? How did they know what to do? So you start to drill into how people know what they're doing in a way that they just typically aren't accessing themselves, because you don't think that way on a daily basis, it would take too long. You just do it.

**Steve Poor**

That's a fascinating origin story. I didn't know that. Yeah, if you get to think about it, this is this is yes, we do serious stuff as lawyers. We're not pulling people out of burning buildings as a typical proposition, though.

**Wendy Jephson**

No, you're not, but that you still fast pace changing situation environments where you're still handling at a lot of complex moving parts, quite often highly emotional stakeholders, because they've got a lot riding on it as well. So it's still a complex environment in which it works and that so it's in it's in those domains, because if people die, I forget it wrong. You know, plane will fall out the sky if you haven't understood how people are operating in the cockpit and how they're interacting with the technology. So more time has been spent invested in it, in those domains, because of that reason. Whereas if Financial Services law, you know typically doesn't, somebody doesn't immediately die, if you know something, a decision is made that goes wrong. So that's why it hasn't transferred. So it's a relatively small group of people who are trained in this kind of capability. But like I said, up until now, it's been a manual interview process that takes time, and it takes a long time to analyze, and that's the piece that we're now bringing by developing our own models in order to train the LLMs to enable them to do what this small group of people have been capable of doing manually.

**Steve Poor**

I know we're out of time, but give me an answer to one last question, which is, where do you see the company going? Where do you see the growth coming in at your stage of development?

**Wendy Jephson**

So that purpose that helped the people of the world think brilliantly. I mean, portion of the world's working population are knowledge workers, but a lot, even more than that thing, and we'd actually started in financial services, because that's where I'd come out of originally, and that's where my network was. And when you speak to there's a lot of talk, particularly in capital markets, about intuition and gut decision making. But it was I was at a an innovation lab over here in the UK when I met Sarah Harris, who's the innovation partner at Kingsley Napley, and when I was talking to her, I realized she understood tacit knowledge and learning by osmosis and all these terms that you will take absolutely for granted, not necessarily recognized in the same way in other industries, although they all recognize

the problem of losing people who know a lot and it's not captured. So it was a combination of you actually speak the language and have people who understand knowledge and the value of knowledge, and you've got it really, you know, the latest technology are really shaking up the industry, to go into a behavioral change, lots of driving factors. It meant that legal, and obviously I have a background, so I understand some of how to talk the talk. It made sense to start in law but that definitely is the first place, because the underlying models that we've created, we know because we've, I've done it with fund managers. I've done it with compliance offices. My co founder, Anna Leslie, has done it in government, intelligence services, law enforcement, police. It's been done in medicine. So there's, there's lots of industries this could go to. So same problem with auditors, more broadly in financial services, medicine, totally understand reflective practice, reflective thinking. It's part of their training. Again, it's not very easy to do. There's not something to support it or to capture and keep a record of it in a way that you can keep using it to learn from. So there are many industries that we would go to next, and I would love to see this technology actually properly being spread out in a way that's tested very, very important that we're testing this and following, looking at all the ethics and the unintended consequences of using this kind of technology to support development and learning, because, to be honest, these models have been dropped on the world, and it's a mass experiment without too many controls on all of that, so we're quite mindful of that. But large ambitions.

### **Steve Poor**

Large ambitions, absolutely, Perhaps we could just quickly touch upon a point you just made, which is some of the safety issues associated with this, the embedding bias and decision making into a computer system, the access to knowledge. How do you deal with those issues? Again, I apologize. I know I'm keeping you longer than I promised.

### **Wendy Jephson**

They're good questions, and you know they're questions that we've been asked is, How do you deal with bias? Well, the only way to deal with bias is to be able to see it and bring it into the light. So if you can start to see how people are thinking and the points that they're relying on, that's a way for you to challenge your own way of thinking and understand it and grow from that. So you have cognition, which is knowing no and metacognition, which is knowing what you know and what you're trying to get to is metacognition. So actually being able to see what you know is a way to do that, and then you can see, well, how you're thinking about it, and therefore you can improve on it, and you can challenge it, and other people can as well. So you can get at ... you can improve cognitive diversity by getting more of these mental models and data of how people are making decisions. And then that can, in itself, help improve biased model training, because you've got a richer data set to train it with in the first place. But you have to be very careful. You know, there's lots of studies now that are saying that, obviously there was that recent one with Stanford that said people who used it had less brain activity, and brain activity is part of laying down your knowledge base. But then they all there's also more and more studies emerging that if you can think first and then use the technology, then you get a better outcome all round. So that's where we're coming at that angle, it's well, let's get you thinking first and prompt and understand what you're thinking about and deepen taking that moment to think more deeply. Then you can use the technology to use it to shape the words that have come out and be more efficient and effective at that stage of the game. But we certainly don't have all the answers. We've just been quite mindful about it.

### **Steve Poor**

And new questions are emerging every day as the technology evolves.

### **Wendy Jephson**

Exactly.

**Steve Poor**

Wendy, thanks so much for making the time. I hope your tea didn't get cold while we were talking.

**Wendy Jephson**

I don't mind a cold tea. It's fine, absolute pleasure. Thank you so much, Stephen for having me on.

**Steve Poor**

Thanks for listening to Pioneers and Pathfinders. Be sure to visit [thepioneerpodcast.com](http://thepioneerpodcast.com) for show notes and more episodes, and don't forget to subscribe to our podcast on your favorite platform.