

CREATIVE INTELLIGENCE

WITH JAMES INGRAM

EPISODE FIVE: CREATIVE INTELLIGENCE, SENSES AND THE IMAGINATION
WITH GUEST RICHIE MANU
17 JANUARY 2018

James: Hello, and welcome to the Creative Intelligence podcast, with me, James Ingram, host and CEO of Splashlight. This is a series of conversations exploring tools and technologies that fuel creativity and inspiration. In this episode, we'll be talking about how data informs design in the creative industries, looking in particular at fashion design. So I'm really excited to introduce Richie Manu, author of *You: Rebranded*, TEDx speaker and senior lecturer for the MA Program in Applied Imagination at Central Saint Martins. Richie's inspired by the senses, and much of his research explores how sensory experiences can shed new light on how brands communicate with consumers – and each other.

James: So, Richie, welcome to the podcast.

Richie: Thank you.

James: It's good to have you.

Richie: It's good to be here.

James: So maybe just to get it kicked off, maybe you can tell us a little bit about your work as a designer and a brand developer? You know, in your TED Talk, you spoke about reconciling divergent thinking with pragmatism, which really captures the essence of what this podcast is about. So I'd love to get you talking.

Richie: Yes, wonderful. Well, again, thank you for having me on. So I've been a designer for over 25 years. Much of my work was in design for print and branding. And I realized that probably after a decade that my work had to become more essentially based around the senses, and looking at more empathetic ways of design. So I was thinking about empathy.

James: It's a great word, isn't it? Wow.

Richie: Yeah, empathy is the root of what I do. And that's a term now that's being used in UX and UI design, user experience. But for me, it was really more important to go beyond the aesthetics and really think more about human-centered design in the moment. But it was really important that I started to really think about what drives an individual. So getting to the heart of the problem.

James: Yeah, right. You mean their emotions or what their desires are, what they might like?

Richie: Absolutely. I mean, too often we think about design as a starting point, but really design is something that's continuous. So the first thing I say to many of my students, or even to my clients, is that there isn't a full stop behind design, in that this is an ongoing, continual process. And what was interesting for me, emerging from design into thinking more about design strategy, was thinking about understanding, getting into the shoes of the problem, getting right into the heart of the problem. And I say to many of my own students that it's really important to sit down and become the problem. Sit down within the problem. Then you might start to think about... and that's what I've written before about the senses. Thinking about perhaps how the senses... you might, for instance, be designing an app. But is there anything where perhaps you might be thinking about smell?

James: Touch.

Richie: Touch, or anything that might be integrated into that app. And so we start getting students to think about focusing on perhaps one sense. And one of the elements I spoke about in my own practice was being driven and being governed by one sense. So I might go out... if I need to be inspired by something, I might go out and just listen. And just be informed by that. So that's played a very big part in my process.

James: Just off sound. Yeah. Interesting. Yeah, the sense are dramatic, right? And we don't even necessarily realize how we use it in our decision making process as a consumer.

Richie: Absolutely.

James: So it's a challenge, then, for a designer to incorporate that.

Richie: Absolutely. So that's played a huge role in my design process.

James: So as you see technology changing, and the advancements of understanding those senses, not that those senses are not important in

design, how are you seeing certain advances in technology or AI or machine learning coming into this process of gathering this data about the consumer?

Richie: So the first thing we have to realize is, in terms of data, data is... how can we put it? It's not necessarily a barrier to the design process, and I think the first thing that designers do is think about data being something... as creators, we don't really get our hands dirty in data and analysis.

James: We call it 'inspiration' in creative, right? Which is really just data.

Richie: Exactly.

James: You send an intern out to go tear sheets out of a magazine, find things, put it up on a board. It's just data.

Richie: Absolutely.

James: But it's inspiration, it's a mood board, right?

Richie: Absolutely. And the first thing we're realizing is that data is valuable currency, and not by way of transaction but really by way of knowledge transfer. This is the most important thing. So if we're thinking about statistics - and in a moment I'll talk about the dichotomy of qualitative and quantitative data - but it's really important that designers and creatives are able to understand the difference between the two, and how they can harness different parts of the process.

James: Can we unpack that a little bit? What do you mean about the differences in the two?

Richie: So, fundamentally, quantitative data is really looking at the numerics, the trends and the patterns, in what you're trying to look at. So for instance, if I was going to be designing an app, I'd be very interested in look at the quantitative data. Culturally, how will that app affect, or what information, what data statistics percentages can I get that will help me to...

James: About the consumer's experience. Okay, okay.

Richie: ... about the consumer's experience. So there's information that we need to draw in. But the qualitative data is where we start to make real changes. And it presents some unknowns. So if I was looking for qualitative data, I might interview somebody who might just give me totally new insights. So it's really important that even in my own practice... and there's no balance, no there's hierarchy. It's equal, in equal measure. But it's really important

that we understand that the qualitative data brings in new insights that can provide new meaning. And this is what we kind of extract the meaning from, that quantitative data. I can give you an example.

James: Sure, that'd be fantastic.

Richie: So let's say, for instance... and this is a quote I saw, read from the Guardian. They presented a statistic: 50 out of 270 London tube stations are fully accessible. That's only 50, so that's just around 20%. So if I presented if I saw that as a problem and driven by that data, immediately I might be tempted to create an app that presents ways of navigating around London. But the problem is, that becomes a statistics that I'm drawn by, and that that starts to make me very solution focused. But it's not until you talk to somebody who's either in a wheelchair or is disabled and actually get their viewpoint...

James: That's the empathy, right?

Richie: That's where the empathy comes in. Before designing whizzy apps and designing systems before the actual problem. So for me, it would involve sitting with the problem. Getting into the heart of the problem. And actually doing... often I ask people, "Well, have you actually sat down with the person for whom you're trying to solve the problem?" And very rarely that becomes an issue. Of course there are experts working in that area, but until you've actually started to work with someone who is right at the heart of that problem, you just become solution focused.

James: That's really interesting. So in the fashion world, if we move into the fashion world a little bit, and smart fashion, these things that you're talking about. If you want to talk to people about that, how does this... now, you've got algorithms coming up, you've got all these things happening, making these assumptions about fashion design. Where do you see that going? Do you see that applying and working?

Richie: Well, already we're seeing smart fashion starting to blur the edges between technology and wearable fashion, wearable technology. And already it's happening. It's very, very difficult to see how organizations balance the two, between whether design comes first, or whether you're driven by technology, or whether data comes first. I can give you an example of an organization called CuteCircuit who are pioneers in the field of fashion wearable technology. Amazing organization. But they've created two signature products, if you want, two signature projects even. And one is called the Sound Shirt, which allows deaf people to feel music through their skin. It's an incredible... if anyone can search it and search CuteCircuit online and you can look up their Sound Shirt. It's an incredible experience

for somebody who might have a hearing impairment. But it allows them to feel the music on their skin and experience a live symphonic orchestra or certain concert for the first time.

James: That's remarkable.

Richie: That's driven by what... the technology behind that is these micro-actuators that are embedded in the fabric of the garment. And then those actuators receive the music wirelessly in real time from the music that's being performed. And then that's transformed into data. So here, we see how data becomes a vital component in that development of the Sound Shirt.

James: That's remarkable.

Richie: They've also developed what they call this Graphene Dress. And this is astonishing. This is a dress that has sensors that capture the breathing pattern of the person who's wearing the garment. And the data is stored into a real time database. And these microprocessors, powerful microprocessors, analyze the data. They're then able to take the breathing, so monitor the breathing, and that is then converted into a pattern that then changes the color of the LED. So depending on your breathing pattern, that is then informing the light display. Again, we're talking about live data here and how this is...

James: It's incredible.

Richie: So we starting to see a triangulation, if you want, of data right at the beginning of the process, where the procure, or the consumer, is using that and then converting that back into real live data. It's totally fascinating.

James: Now that's really fascinating and you can see how tech is just getting more and more approachable and accomplishing things that seem sci-fi, right? I mean, it's really... so when you think about technology, it's clear that with wearable technology they're bringing these advancements to the market because it's getting cheaper, more accessible. But when it comes to the actual design of the clothes, the aesthetics, now you have that wearable shirt. How do you make it look so that the consumer is going to want to wear it? Are you seeing data and technology getting used in that kind of process?

Richie: Yeah, well, there is another area where we're starting to see... and it's linked to the demarketization of data as well. If I'm answering your question correctly, I think there are products now that are starting to blur the lines between product and service. So take, for instance, the Fitbit. And

for those of you who don't know what the Fitbit is, it's the activity tracker, wireless-enabled wearable technology. They're devices that measure data based on health fitness. Fitbit was founded in 2007 by James Park and Eric Friedman. Just a quick quote from James Park because it leads into your question.

James: Let's hear it.

Richie: He said, "We're a fitness social network that is coupled to hardware, and we're on the cusp of transitioning the mission and purpose of our company from a consumer electronics company to a digital healthcare company." And he goes on to say, "We aim to encourage users to become healthier and more active whether it's through the use of devices, software, or services." So we're now seeing this phenomena where data is the beginning... so obviously they would need the data, both qualitative and quantitative, to be able to design the product and service. But then we move into a space now where, whether it's clothing, wearable technology, or clothing that goes past what I call 'super functionality'. The user now is in control of that data. So I think the future is going to be a space where obviously the data has been part of that starting process, the design process, and then it's back into the hands of the consumer. But it's interesting because if we think about things like the Fitbit, it's clear that that's just the starting point for the technology. I mean, I've worn a Fitbit. The Fitbit is only the beginning of that journey. It's just a portal to the universe of information. And it's going to be the same for clothing. So while you think you might be wearing a shirt, actually there's a whole database, a whole universe, behind that that's then tracking and monitoring your blood pressure and everything like that. It's really about how we put that data back into the control of the consumer.

James: Yeah, there's even these fashion brands that are using these algorithms. They're looking at what you're buying, or what the marketplace is buying, and they're finding gaps. Then they're using these algorithms for style. Do you think that's possible that an algorithm can really influence the styles of what consumers are wanting or wish they had?

Richie: Well, I read recently, and I didn't note it down here, but I read recently that there are now brands that are able to use data to monitor returns on clothing, and because of that they're able to figure out what lines are more popular. So actually, because they've been able to identify that, for instance, one particular line was returned, that can then inform the design process.

James: That you designed something that didn't fit right?

- Richie: Didn't fit right, or maybe the color. So if they realize that, for instance, green was returned more, they're simply not going to design for the next season in green.
- James: Now, does a designer feel like, "I'm being inhibited? Now you're telling me I can't use green when I think that's the right color for the industry?" How do you think in a designer's mind, you being a creative, when you get boundaries put on you like that?
- Richie: Well, I'm so happy you asked that, James, because there are so many barriers and so many hurdles when we think about the design process. I mean, the first one is, for instance, financial. There have been so many projects where I've wanted to design something, but I've been inhibited, perhaps by the budget. So that then starts to have an impact on your design output – and that's an ongoing issue for many designers. It's the same for trends. If the trend is showing that actually black is not going to be in next season, perhaps you might go across the grain and say, "Well, actually I'm going to go with my own integrity, my own authenticity." But that's really an individual choice and a judgement. Sometimes is driven by the individual who might have their own agency, and I say agency in terms of design agency.
- James: Right, they have their own freedom.
- Richie: Creative freedom. Or you might be governed by the agency of a company that you're actually working for. So there's a balance there. I've worked in agencies, companies where, for instance, there's a certain trend... working in branding, we knew that, for instance, the icon was... designing an icon was probably a bit passé, so you had to think about a strong type of graphic treatment, maybe look at colorways, because that's the way it was going. If I was going to be resistant and stubborn, I might create an icon, because my dream was always to create an icon that you could just see and recognize globally around the world. This is a judgement that many designers have to take, but to go back to the root of your question. I think we think about, for instance, a trend where fashion is leading a certain way. I think we have to also bear in mind the expertise of trend forecasting or trend forecasters. Often I locate, and I'm informed by, trend forecasters, whose job it is to actually look at trends – and so that becomes a useful resource.
- James: So you do find trend analysis is helpful in your design?
- Richie: Oh absolutely, yeah, and I think whether it's fashion... not so much in branding, but I think in the fashion field, and there's an amazing

organization, Future Lab, who worked for decades in this area and just one of the organizations that literally has their finger ahead of the curve.

James: On trends.

Richie: On trends, yeah.

James: That's really... because I think what I'm trying to bring to light is that, there's technology that's coming out that are physically extensions of the designer. There are tools that they use, and it can get uncomfortable when all of a sudden, maybe you design classically one way, and now these tools are at your disposal. Are you seeing any kind of tension like that in the design process where you're shifting from a classic way of thinking, or designing, into a more modern tech-enabled design process?

Richie: In my field of design, but also as a lecturer on applied imagination, what we're trying to do is try and see the unseen. So you're really looking at areas perhaps where you are trying to predict or trying to find a solution to a problem, but it's also important not to be in this space where you're reactive, so you become so solution focused that you're trying to find a problem to match that solution.

James: That's what I wanted to get into.

Richie: Yeah.

James: Because data can make you, like you mentioned, you saw this in the two of... you were going to go right after that, when actually maybe there was another real issue to solve. I think that's the same thing, when you have all this big data coming, and now it's influencing the design of clothes and what's out there, where do you understand as a designer, when to stop and when to trend send, you know, to set a trend or taste make versus optimizing a trend?

Richie: It really depends on where you sit as a designer, so there are two channels. I often speak to both clients and students. There's one way you can think about being reactive, and one where you are pioneering. If you're reacting to a problem, that's very straightforward; you've seen a problem and you've been able to react to it. And that goes into the root of your earlier question, are you responding to something perhaps that is... perhaps you're trying to solve a classic problem. So you're in that zone of trying create a solution for that, so it's prescriptive. I'll give you an example of that in a moment, where there's an organization and a product that was doing exactly the opposite of that. Now, if you think about being a non-predictable designer, let's say your pioneering...

James: For the futuristic out there.

Richie: Futuristic. What you're doing...

James: You're taste makers, so to speak.

Richie: Taste maker. What you're doing is, you are trying to meet an unmet need. As a designer, I tend to move... I guess the only part in my career was responding and reacting to a problem and that's what I was trained to do.

James: Optimizing a trend or solving a problem.

Richie: Exactly. Solving that problem. As I've moved further into my career, I started to identify and trying to be a pioneer, trying to create a trend to which people might migrate to. That is, I guess, the most tricky, most challenging part, in the same way we've seen with technology, they did not necessarily ask a market, "What would you like?" There's a famous Henry Ford quote that if people asked him for a faster technology, they probably would have wanted a faster horse, something along those lines. So, for me, it's about trying to create something that is not necessarily based around a question, or even a solution, but projecting yourself as a designer and saying, "Well, actually there's a gap, there's an opportunity." That proactive, or that innovation, is really trying to identify gaps. It's this space where we... I think it's the Everett Rogers' theory on the innovations... I'm trying to get the proper quote, but I think it's this curve where you can see this innovation where, at the very early part you are responding to the needs of the early adopters.

James: The early adopters.

Richie: I think by doing that, you are immediately looking into that small minority of people through which they will... they are receptive to your ideas.

James: Who are bold enough to do something that's out of convention.

Richie: Exactly.

James: Yeah. Now do you think... in some of these other podcasts... I've talked to one that is a car designer, what they allowed because of this VR technology, they can actually explore these far-sighted things quicker rather than drawing. They could really immerse themselves. Do you see that trend in fashion where you can conceive of ideas, you can taste make broader or bigger, quicker, and that freeing the mind? Do you see anything like that happening in the fashion world?

Richie: Well, I think that can only happen if we're open to this idea of what I call 'the curiosity bandwidth'.

James: Okay, this is great. I want to hear about this.

Richie: Well, it's something that I coined, but wrote about in more detail in my book. But if you might imagine that your call, or your expertise, is within the field of fashion, what I encourage people that I work with to do is to explore fields outside of that core area. So if you have a designer who is creating clothes for a particular demographic or particular culture, outside of that circle might encourage you to think about exploring, for instance, sound. So what happens when we look at the intersection of sound and fashion. And if you go out of that circle, and these are areas way outside of your expertise, you might look at technology. So you've got to have your expertise as a fashion designer, you've then expanded your curiosity bandwidth by exploring sound. And so that might involve collaboration with a sound artist. Immediately, you can start to see some of the innovation that might happen around fashion design and sound. So how can those two be integrated to create new areas of pioneering curiosity.

James: So this curiosity takes you to places that you might not think could influence you?

Richie: Absolutely.

James: And that's the beauty of the human imagination, right?

Richie: Yeah.

James: Do you see, I guess, kind of when you talk about that, it's really style is inherently accidental to some extent, because you're out there thinking and it comes up with something, and it's rooted in this curiosity you're talking about. Do you think the solution, or do you see a world where technology, these algorithms, are able to have that level of curiosity to mimic how the mind can be influenced and to think of things as a co-designer along with you? So you're almost asking for scenarios from an algorithm. Would you ever see a world... how would that change creativity?

Richie: That's very interesting. Now, we're going into an area that I'm fascinated in, but I'm so inexperienced in this area, as I think a lot of people are in terms of, if we're talking about artificial intelligence as well. I think one of the things we think about is how much governance we give to the robots, and how much we want to see them as collaborators. But I hold my hands up, I've been in partnership with computers for nearly 30 years. And so, in

very much the same ways you've asked that question, yes, I've been informed by the computer when it's suddenly presented me with something that I wouldn't have thought about. We have to think about how far we take this balance, and so we're thinking about algorithms, perhaps I think giving enough room for that algorithm to inform the designer, for instance, but not take a lead.

James: Inspire.

Richie: Inspire.

James: Just inspire, right?

Richie: And I think this is where we have to look at leadership, and it's so crucial that we see the design process as part of that leadership rather than being led by the technology.

James: What would you mean like that? Do you mean as the senior creative director how you're teaching your teams, or as an individual? What do you mean by leadership?

Richie: Absolutely. I started out as a fine artist. This was my background. I started to use computers to inform my design thinking, my creative process, but I started to see how the software was starting to govern how I would design. So I might see a beautiful typeface, for instance, and that would inform... now, if I hadn't been led by that typeface, I probably wouldn't have designed it a particular way. And I started to reshift. Rather than being led by the typeface, create the typeface.

James: Right. That's exactly what I'm talking about. So you imagine there was the time when you couldn't design a typeface, so you were stuck in those boundaries. Technology allowed you to make your own, and now all of a sudden you're solving creativity, or you're unbounded by what you want to come up with. And it seems that's just accelerating. More and more aspects to creative have control over, or have access to, these technologies.

Richie: Absolutely. And there's certainly nothing wrong in that, but I always imagine, for instance, if you were designing something on a computer, or you were being led by the algorithms, and that was part of the design process, what would happen if somebody just took the plug out, or if there was a power cut? Would that have an impact on your design process? I'm always reminding people that you've got to be governed by your creative thinking.

James: Let's dig into that, because this is interesting, if I was to create a process. So as the tech is getting more integrated, whether it's your laptop or these algorithms, they're part of the process. How is that changing the process of ideation to creativity to design?

Richie: Well, I would always argue that the technology must only ever be seen as a tool, because what tends to happen is that if you focus too much on the technology, then you lose sight of the problem. Too often, we see scenarios playing out where there has been too much focus on pointing out the problem, and you're pointing out the problem because you've designed a beautiful website, or you've looked at an app, without getting to the heart of the issue.

James: That's the empathy you were talking about.

Richie: That the empathy, yes.

James: You can't remove empathy, no matter what you do.

Richie: Exactly. So, I think the most important thing is to recognize the technology merely as a tool, as part of that creative process.

James: To inform maybe the audience you're trying to go after, or inform the user group. Okay.

Richie: Absolutely. Because the technology changes, but the behavioral change is always something that's moveable as well. But we are talking about human-centered design. In most cases, it's human centered.

Richie: There's a quote from IDEO, if I may.

James: Yeah, I'd love to hear it. That's a great one to quote.

Richie: IDEO, just trying to... yeah, it was David Kelley, and he said... they looked at design thinking what human-centered design, as the root and the rubric of their organization. And he said, "The main tenet of design thinking is empathy for the people you're trying to design for." And I think if we think about removing that, there's nothing in that quote that talks about technology.

James: Right.

Richie: It's purely about putting yourself right in the heart of the problem, and actually understand the needs of that consumer. Because of that, that technology will change, the algorithms will change. Often there's a

provocation that I say to my clients and to my students, "There is no such thing as a demographic." Now, that's quite a provocation.

James: Yeah, yeah.

Richie: But if we think about, if I was designing for... okay, let's go back to that problem of London being inaccessible to...

James: Okay, to that demograph, so to speak.

Richie: To that demograph, yeah. If I was designing an app just for that demographic, that will change, because there might be shifts in technology, something else might have come along. And if you're designing for that demographic, they've moved on.

James: Right.

Richie: It's the same thing that I say to people who are designing for a particular audience, 16 to 24s. "Five years down the line, they will not be that demograph. They would have moved on into a different age bracket, but you'll still be designing for them, and the people behind them have moved on. They're looking at totally different technology." So I think it's really important that we are not governed by this idea that you're designing for a particular demographic, and because you're designing for the demographic, you're being led by the technology. You've got to try and look at what the actual root of the problem is, and it's simply about asking important questions to the audience.

James: Right. The behavior.

Richie: The behavior patterns.

James: It's interesting. Another conversation I've been having, I'm curious to get your feedback on it, is that where there's a lot of pressure on the data scientists, right, to interpret this data. But are they the right ones to be interpreting the data, when you consider what very small movement that's out there is digital anthropology? You know, they're trained to look at people and how their behavior is.

James: We have these digital villages being made, and as a designer and as a creative, if you can understand them, you can design better. And the data scientists, while they're amazing at organizing the data and optimizing the data, are they the best ones to be interpreting the data?

Richie: That's a really good question. While I respect the work of the data scientists, and there's some incredible work happening in that area, I read recently in another quotation, if I may use it: "One of the most powerful tools we have is to take data and to put it into context, and to tell a story, or to generate a story."

James: Right.

Richie: Now, that last part, 'put it into context and tell a story', is probably the domain of designers, marketers, product designers, service designers. And so, the real skill, I think, in the future is how we process that data. As I mentioned earlier on, right at the beginning of our discussion, as designers, we're not trained to get our hands into...

James: Into behavioral science.

Richie: ... behavioral science or data. So we take that, and our real job is to try and understand how we convert that information and data into something that's meaningful.

James: Aesthetic, and solves the problem.

Richie: Exactly. I've worked with statisticians, I've had to try and get data, for instance, I've worked with The Design Council - I've taken information, I beg your pardon, from The Design Council - and try to create meaning out of these statistics. Now, these statistics have meaning. Very, very important. But it's not until I put that into context and say, "Right, this is how this information applies to you." I think it's a skill that we have to teach designers is how to extrapolate, or perhaps have meaningful collaborations with data scientists, so that there is a better way of creating the glue, because they're separate islands.

James: Right. That's exactly... that's the thought behind this creative intelligence, is that because the landscape is changing, the way data's coming in, the way inspiration's coming in, the way designers are being asked to use, and creative people, you have this convergence of 'new'. And it can make people nervous. It can make some people excited. And we're trying to get the different aspects, like your vantage point, of how that situation is getting addressed, whether it's teaching students in school, whether it's on the workplace, bringing more senior designers into a more modern way, or young ones into not losing sight of legacy ways of designing. It's really an interesting convergence going on.

Richie: Absolutely, absolutely. And I think the more we can understand that design, design thinking, education, product design, they're all very separate

areas, but I think the future, and if I'm leading correctly into your comment, is that we have to start thinking about more open collaboration. So this area of co-working, co-design. And I've certainly...

James: Right. Whether it's with people or computers.

Richie: People or computers, absolutely.

James: Co-creating.

Richie: Yeah, absolutely.

James: A great way to think of that.

Richie: And I've always been very open about having a very clear mindset about understanding your field of expertise, and so myself as a designer, and it links to this area of your curiosity bandwidth. So, my expertise is branding, design, and education – but I'm itching to work with a sound artist, and so my curiosity is led by sound. That might lead me into a curiosity for English literature. So because I've had thinking about how we might use sound, it might take me off into Shakespeare. But that doesn't make me an expert in any one of those areas. Absolutely not.

James: Just influences, yeah.

Richie: It influences and informs. I think the future is going to be certainly a more open way to collaboration. Actually, this is more of a question... I've often wondered why... more open collaboration. So for instance, in education, you have the silos and you have the areas of expertise. There needs to be modules that are cross-disciplinary, because that's the world we're living in. When you work in agencies, you're going to be working with people that did multiple different degrees, or come from different expertise, and be from different backgrounds. But we need to be training that much earlier, so that we're able to understand and manage those kinds of negotiations. I found out way too late in my career.

James: How to collaborate correctly.

Richie: Absolutely.

James: That's great. This has been a fascinating discussion. If there was a sentence or a statement you kind of want to leave the audience with, whether if it's your empathy or curiosity, what's your statement you want the audience to take away from you?

Richie: Well, I think we're moving into an economy now where we have to think not necessarily about design, or whether it's led by business or finance, the most important thing that we're missing now is an experience economy. We've already seen it on the high street. The high street has suffered because of the experience now being shifted to digital, and there's nothing wrong in that. But now the high street in itself has been impacted by the growth of digital. So, some of the things I'm working on is thinking about how we can create more... and it's already happening, I'm working with brands at the moment to think about how they can create an experience economy, and moving into a space where designers now have to think about not just the aesthetics, but what you leave behind. And if you're designing for the high street or the retail space or even online, how much of an experience do you want to leave the user? So if I was going to leave anything with the audience, it's to really think about, more than ever, whether you're designing, or you're creating, or even if you are developing, really moving into a space where the first thing you're perhaps asking is, "What kind of experience do I want to give the user? What do I want them to leave behind? What do I want them to remember?" And that's the most important thing.

James: Richie, this is great. To find out more about the podcast, please visit our website at CreativeIntelligence.fm, and follow us on Twitter, [@_creative_intel](https://twitter.com/_creative_intel). You've been listening to The Creative Intelligence podcast. Thank you for joining me, James Ingram, and my guest, Richie Manu, for what's been a stimulating, informative discussion. Thank you, Richie, really.

Richie: Pleasure.