



AUDIENCE RESEARCH REPORT

They trust the expert. They hire someone else.

Distinguish doubts about competence from a mismatch in service scope instead of treating every rejection as a trust problem.

Project	Expert blog
Document	AC-EXPERT-EN
Issue date	15 September 2026
Version	2.0

Teaching example. All accounts and findings are fictional.

Contents

Make the scope of help clear. Do not route every reader into the same package.

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 expert is choosing between more content, a one-off consultation description and changes to a larger package. Question: how does a reader establish whether the help fits, and what happens when the page does not make that clear?

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 external-help decision or a deliberate decision not to hire.
- Distinguish the initiator, approver and person doing the work.
- Recruit buyers, people who selected another expert and people who chose to do the work themselves.
- Study reading without purchase separately from a service-selection episode.

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

Appreciation of content is not readiness to buy. The material distinguishes a focused review, implementation support and independent learning. Each situation has a different useful next step.

[J01](#) · [E01](#), [E02](#)

Check one decision

When there is already work to review, obtain independent feedback to correct an important mistake before acting.

[J02](#) · [E03](#), [E04](#)

Take changes through implementation

When advice is insufficient, organise work with clear responsibilities and outcomes so the team can implement changes.

[J03](#) · [E05](#), [E06](#)

Make progress within current constraints

When the task or resources do not support hiring yet, learn independently and identify a next step.

[A difference that must remain visible](#)

E01 avoids a long engagement while E03 actively needs implementation help. One promise for both would blur the offer. E06 understands the service but lacks budget; that is not simply a failure of persuasion.

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

E01 / J01

A small-project owner preparing one service launch.

“The analysis is good. But every offer mentions teams and ongoing support; I have one question.”

Read several articles, could not find a one-off format and asked a friend. Chose another expert’s consultation.

Interpretation	An otherwise suitable provider may have been excluded because the format was unclear.
Alternative explanation	Trust in the recommendation may have driven the competitor choice.
Next question	What did you compare after receiving the other expert’s contact?

E02 / J01

A specialist wants a review of a plan they have already prepared.

“I do not need someone to do everything. I need to know what I missed.”

Compared continuing support with a review and chose targeted written feedback.

Interpretation	A focused review can have independent value without becoming a larger engagement.
Alternative explanation	Written feedback may have been preferred over a meeting regardless of scope.
Next question	Which comments did you apply, and where did you need further help?

Evidence: accounts 03–04

E03 / J02

A team has tried to implement changes and become stuck.

“We have already had advice. We need help getting a process to work.”

Chose ongoing support with explicit responsibilities. Another consultation would not address the need.

Interpretation	Execution support and agreed responsibilities matter more than another explanation.
Alternative explanation	The team may lack internal capacity an external expert cannot replace.
Next question	Where did work stop, and who was responsible for that action?

E04 / J02

A manager needs a partner’s approval before hiring help.

“I cannot forward ‘we will work on strategy’. I need deliverables and boundaries.”

Requested stages and client inputs. Postponed the decision until those were clarified.

Interpretation	A proposal needs to survive explanation by someone outside the initial conversation.
Alternative explanation	The partner may disagree with the task itself or the budget.
Next question	What did the partner ask after seeing the description, and how did the decision end?

Evidence: accounts 05–06

E05 / J03

A creator has not yet chosen which direction to pursue.

“I do not yet know what problem to bring. I am collecting examples.”

Read and saved material but did not compare services. Buying was not the current task.

Interpretation	Reading supports orientation but this account does not establish demand for a service.
----------------	--

Alternative explanation	Saving may have been a habit without later use.
-------------------------	---

Next question	Which material did you revisit, and what did you decide afterwards?
---------------	---

E06 / J03

The task is relevant, but no budget is available for external help.

“I understood the offer. I cannot spend that now, so I started on my own.”

Used free material and personal time instead of hiring. More explanation alone will not create a budget.

Interpretation	Clearer copy does not remove a resource constraint.
----------------	---

Alternative explanation	Willingness to pay for another solution may differ; task priority is unknown.
-------------------------	---

Next question	What time and money commitments did you choose instead of external help?
---------------	--

From quotation to interpretation

One fragment and the limits of inference

Interviewer

What were you looking for before closing the page?

E01

Whether I could come once, without a month-long engagement.

Interviewer

What did you want from that meeting?

E01

Someone to review my plan and identify what I had missed.

Interviewer

What did you do after leaving the page?

E01

Asked a friend who offered that. They gave me a contact and I booked.

What the follow-up changes

The fragment connects unclear scope with the next action. The recommendation may also have influenced the final choice. Distinguish the explanations by examining what the person compared after receiving the contact.

Reading the analysis chain

Source	E01: The apparent scope did not fit
Hypothesis	An otherwise suitable provider may have been excluded because the format was unclear.
Competing explanation	Trust in the recommendation may have driven the competitor choice.
Missing evidence	What did you compare after receiving the other expert's contact?

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](#)

Focused-review description

Show suitable inputs, what the expert reviews, the output and exclusions. Do not promise implementation from a single meeting.

Usefulness criterion: The reader distinguishes a review of their own decision from execution on their behalf and selects an appropriate format.

Suggested owner: Expert / editor

[D02 / Next · J02](#)

Implementation-support proposal

Describe stages, expert and client responsibilities, required inputs and approval points. Include a short version for a partner.

Usefulness criterion: The initiator can explain outcomes, scope and team effort to an approver, with unresolved questions visible.

Suggested owner: Service lead

[D03 / Separately · J03](#)

Independent-work path

Link an article to a practical next step and a condition for seeking help. Keep independent progress possible.

Usefulness criterion: The reader selects an action suited to their task and resources. No purchase is not automatically a failure.

Suggested owner: Educational content author

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 someone with a comparable request to choose a format and explain its outcome and limits.

Record: Understanding of outputs and exclusions; format fit; clarification questions.

Reason to reconsider: If the format is clear but unnecessary or unaffordable, copy alone is insufficient.

T02 / D02

Ask someone to explain the proposal to an approver; identify missing information.

Record: Completeness of the explanation to an approver; responsibilities understood; reason for stopping.

Reason to reconsider: A budget or authority constraint may remain regardless of content.

T03 / D03

Check whether a reader can identify a useful next action without assuming an immediate purchase.

Record: Independent action completed; constraint discovered; a specific request for help.

Reason to reconsider: Returning to an article is not evidence of a future order.

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. When did external help first become a possibility?
02. What material or decision had you already prepared?
03. Which ways of solving the problem did you compare?
04. What did you expect to have after a session or engagement?
05. Who else took part in the decision, and what did they need?
06. What happened after reading the page: whom did you contact, what did you choose or postpone?

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

This is a teaching model, not a demand or willingness-to-pay estimate. There are no measured post-change enquiries. E05 is a boundary case: reading is not the same as choosing a service.

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.