



AUDIENCE RESEARCH REPORT

The article explains the problem. The buying decision stalls later.

Connect educational content with the questions a buying team needs to answer.

Project	Company blog
Document	AC-COMPANY-EN
Issue date	15 September 2026
Version	2.0

Teaching example. All accounts and findings are fictional.

Contents

Help people hand over and evaluate a decision. More introductory articles will not replace implementation answers.

Decision and research design	03
Jobs and their basis	04
Evidence: accounts 01–02	05
Evidence: accounts 03–04	06
Evidence: accounts 05–06	07
From quotation to interpretation	08
What to change	09
How to test the changes	10
Questions for further research	11
Limits and using the material	12

Decision and research design

The company must choose between more introductory articles and implementation material. Question: what role does content play as a proposal moves from an initiator to managers and other participants?

JTBD examines the progress a person seeks in a specific situation. Questions about a past choice reconstruct circumstances, alternatives and decision criteria. A job statement is a researcher's interpretation to be checked against the material [1].

Who to recruit in a real project

- A recent evaluation or selection of a business solution.
- Separate episodes from initiators, managers, technical evaluators and users.
- Include rejection for incompatibility and decisions without multi-step approval.
- Do not reconstruct every stakeholder's view from the initiator alone.

Collection and analysis

Agree the decision and eligibility criteria first. Use a short screener to check specific experience. Reconstruct the sequence of choice in interviews. Record observations separately, compare patterns and examine exceptions. Keep links from recommendations to the source accounts [2, 3].

Example size is not a sample recommendation

Six accounts were written to illustrate differences. They cannot establish prevalence, saturation or expected impact. Real scope depends on the diversity of situations and the decision risk.

Jobs and their basis

People in related roles do not constitute one buying journey. These six accounts belong to separate fictional companies. They illustrate different questions, not a measured sales funnel.

[J01](#) · [C01](#), [C02](#)

Approve a feasible change

When someone proposes a new process, explain resources and responsibilities so the team can make an informed choice.

[J02](#) · [C03](#), [C04](#)

Check the fit with real conditions

Once the benefits are understood, examine compatibility and exceptions before discovering a critical constraint after implementation.

[J03](#) · [C05](#)

Check procurement conditions

With a shortlist already prepared, compare conditions and documents with company requirements to complete procurement checks.

[J04](#) · [C06](#)

Start implementation independently

When one person chooses and implements, find a feasible first-step sequence without unnecessary approval work.

A difference that must remain visible

C05 does not read the blog; C06 combines roles and needs no approval. We therefore do not propose one compulsory funnel for every company. Examine the material's role in the particular choice.

J identifies a job hypothesis; R/E/C identifies a fictional account. A reference makes the reasoning traceable, but does not turn fictional material into empirical evidence.

Evidence: accounts 01–02

C01 / J01

A marketer is looking to improve enquiry handling.

“I understood the article. My manager asked who would own it internally.”

Shared the article, received a question about team resources and searched for an implementation plan.

Interpretation	An article may initiate discussion without preparing a resource decision.
----------------	---

Alternative explanation	No internal owner may exist regardless of the material's quality.
-------------------------	---

Next question	Who could own the process, and what prevented agreement?
---------------	--

C02 / J01

A manager is evaluating an employee's proposal.

“I need to know what work stops and what new work the team takes on.”

Asked for responsibilities rather than another account of the approach's benefits.

Interpretation	The decision needs an account of redistributed work, not benefits alone.
----------------	--

Alternative explanation	The change itself may have insufficient priority.
-------------------------	---

Next question	Which existing work would stop, and who agreed to change it?
---------------	--

Evidence: accounts 03–04

C03 / J02

A technical participant is checking compatibility.

“The article looks straightforward, but our data source is not mentioned.”

Requested integration confirmation; the supplier did not support it, so the option was rejected.

Interpretation	Content should expose constraints even if this reduces unsuitable enquiries.
Alternative explanation	It is unknown whether another integration route was considered or acceptable.
Next question	Which integration was essential, and what alternatives were examined?

C04 / J02

An operations employee will use the resulting process.

“It works in the demo. What if someone enters the data incorrectly?”

Looked for exceptions and support arrangements to assess everyday use.

Interpretation	Usefulness is assessed through deviations, not only the ideal path.
Alternative explanation	Support documentation cannot compensate for an unusable workflow.
Next question	Recall the last error of this kind: who fixed it and what happened?

Evidence: accounts 05–06

C05 / J03

Procurement receives a shortlist selected by others.

“I did not read the articles. I received requirements and was asked to check terms.”

Worked with documents and clarifications rather than the educational blog.

Interpretation	Terms should be available at evaluation time without an educational funnel.
Alternative explanation	Some requirements may already have been screened by another role.
Next question	Which conditions could still rule out a supplier at your stage?

C06 / J04

A small company whose owner both chooses and implements.

“I do not need anyone’s approval. I want to see the first workable step.”

Chose a getting-started sequence; an approval document was unnecessary.

Interpretation	A complex approval journey should not be imposed on an owner-operator.
Alternative explanation	A simplified solution may not fit a growing team.
Next question	Which first step did you actually complete, and where was help needed?

From quotation to interpretation

One fragment and the limits of inference

Interviewer

What happened after you shared the article?

C01

My manager asked who would maintain the process.

Interviewer

What did you do with that question?

C01

Checked the supplier's site. It covered benefits, but not our part of the work.

Interviewer

How did you continue the search?

C01

Another supplier had a table showing what we do and what they do. I shared it.

What the follow-up changes

We can connect the manager's question with the search for another resource. We cannot attribute a sale to the table: the final choice and other influences are absent from the fragment.

Reading the analysis chain

Source	C01: Forwarding triggered an execution question
Hypothesis	An article may initiate discussion without preparing a resource decision.
Competing explanation	No internal owner may exist regardless of the material's quality.
Missing evidence	Who could own the process, and what prevented agreement?

In a real study, the excerpt would reference a recording or transcript location. No such recordings exist here; timestamps have not been invented.

What to change

These are specifications for small prototypes, proposed for testing rather than changes already implemented.

[D01 / First · J01](#)

Implementation discussion sheet

After the article, provide the task, workflow changes, owner, team contribution, dependencies and unknown conditions.

Usefulness criterion: The initiator can pass a proposal to a manager and identify what still needs investigation.

Suggested owner: Editor / product owner

[D02 / Next · J02](#)

Compatibility check

Show supported conditions, limitations and exceptions. Do not conceal an unsupported integration behind a promise of custom help.

Usefulness criterion: The technical evaluator identifies both suitable and unsuitable options before a sales meeting.

Suggested owner: Product / technical specialist

[D03 / By situation · J03, J04](#)

Role-specific material

Give procurement terms and documents; give an owner-operator a first working step. These are different branches, not a compulsory sequence.

Usefulness criterion: People select useful material without traversing other roles' stages; combined roles do not create extra steps.

Suggested owner: Marketing / operations

What to defer

Do not scale before checking the mechanism. Start with one piece and one scenario, comparing with the current approach. The order reflects dependencies, not a calculated return on investment.

How to test the changes

Test behaviour, not approval of the idea

Use comparable tasks for the current version and prototype, varying presentation order. Do not lead the answer. Record actions, errors and explanations separately. Recruit for the situation, not simply follower status.

T01 / D01

Ask an initiator to prepare an explanation for a manager and identify unanswered questions.

Record: Manager questions answered; unresolved dependencies; owner identified.

Reason to reconsider: If no internal owner exists, text alone does not make implementation feasible.

T02 / D02

Give a concrete constraint and ask the person to assess fit.

Record: Correct compatibility judgement; exceptions found; unsuitable options incorrectly accepted.

Reason to reconsider: If a required capability is absent, rule out the option honestly rather than intensify persuasion.

T03 / D03

Test the next resource selected for a specific role and situation.

Record: Role-appropriate resource selection; first-step completion; unnecessary transitions.

Reason to reconsider: Where roles are combined, an elaborate approval journey may create friction.

Decision rule before testing

Continue when the person independently completes the intended action and correctly explains its limits. Revise when prompting is required or a critical error occurs. If the task is irrelevant or resources are the constraint, revisit recruitment and the offer. Quantitative thresholds and test scope require a separate agreement; no results exist yet.

Questions for further research

Screening before invitation

Ask for a specific recent episode, the person's role and the outcome. Check eligibility against page 2. Record recruitment source and missing perspectives. Do not require a positive opinion of the brand [2].

Core interview questions

01. What event started the search?
02. Whom did you send the material to, and what came back?
03. Which conditions did each person need to check?
04. When did a constraint emerge, and what happened next?
05. Which documents replaced or accompanied the article?
06. Who would implement the solution, and what has been agreed with them?

Follow-ups for any episode

What happened immediately before this? What did you do next? Which options did you actually consider? Can you show material you used? How did the situation end?

Avoid substituting speculation for evidence

Replace "Would this feature help?" with a reconstruction of past choice and observation of prototype use. Future intention, praise and willingness to leave contact details are not usage or purchase.

Limits and using the material

There are no measured completed deals, sales-cycle lengths or revenue effects. The accounts belong to different fictional companies; they must not be stitched into one supposedly real purchase.

Teaching example. All accounts, quotations and interpretations are fictional. No field study or prototype tests were conducted.

What accompanies this report

The Excel workbook contains six sheets: orientation, source material, interpretations, decisions, tests and questions. Account, job, decision and test identifiers match this report. CSV remains available as a simple exchange format for the source material.

How to use it in your work

First define your own decision and recruitment criteria. Copy the structure and replace all fictional material with real data under agreed access rules. Do not transfer these hypotheses to another audience. Preserve the distinction between quotation, interpretation and proposed action.

Method references

[1] Christensen Institute — Jobs to Be Done
<https://www.christenseninstitute.org/theory/jobs-to-be-done/>

[2] GOV.UK — Finding participants
<https://www.gov.uk/service-manual/user-research/find-user-research-participants>

[3] GOV.UK — Analyse a research session
<https://www.gov.uk/service-manual/user-research/analyse-a-research-session>

These sources explain the approach; they do not validate the fictional accounts or findings in this example.