

Chapter 4:

Workers Build Your Brand.

"A brand for a company is like a reputation for a person. You earn reputation by trying to do hard things well." Jeff Bezos, Founder, Amazon.com.

No business can be successful without a brand that evokes positive feelings in its customers for its product or service. The brand is at the core of the customer's buying-decision process. If we are meant to build an extraordinary organization, we must ask how to create a great brand.

Brands influence our perception unconsciously.

A few months before graduating with my MBA, I had already signed on to join the strategic department of General Motors. Knowing that soon I'd be working there, I wanted to be as knowledgeable as possible about the car market. I often consulted my friends to give me their thoughts about car models, brands, companies, and the automotive industry.

Rebecca, a friend of mine, was not a car person at all, so I could ask her objective questions about the actual vehicles. Knowing that she could not identify their brand, I would surely get an unbiased opinion. One day, as we walked through the streets of Chicago, through a neighborhood that had restaurants with tables on the street, we enjoyed talking about

the different vehicles we encountered. Eventually, I asked her about a four-door sedan. I didn't share with Rebecca that it was a BMW 3 series. Rebecca quickly told me that she did not like it and gave me several reasons for her evaluation. She said that the design made the car look too aggressive, the car was too showy and too low, and it did not seem practical.

I kept asking her about several other vehicles until we saw a four-door BMW 3 series of a different color. The car had about the same level of equipment as the previous BMW. I asked, "What do you think of this one?" And before she could see it, I added, "It is a BMW." Rebecca glanced at it for a quick second and said: "Ah, I love it." She gave me several reasons why the car was a great choice, "Well-designed, aerodynamic, fast looking, well built."

Later on, at GM, I spent some time with the folks in charge of the customer clinics. The clinics were normally used to determine how new vehicles would be received in certain representative markets. However, GM had run some special experiments. They showed people vehicles without badges, and then with badges. Interestingly, badges of American manufacturers tended to drag down the ratings. They even changed the badges around, putting the Japanese/European badges into American vehicles and American badges into Japanese/European vehicles. They compared these results with the evaluations of vehicles with the correct badges. Every time, Japanese- and European-badged cars came out with higher ratings, notwithstanding what the vehicles actually were.

The surveyed folks explained why the European/Japanese-branded vehicles were superior. They talked about the finish, the choice of materials, the colors chosen, the thickness of the steel used, the attention to detail, the sound doors made when closed, etc. They just didn't know that sometimes they were talking about an American car.

Just as with my friend Rebecca, the brand had changed the surveyors' perception of the vehicles. They sincerely and honestly believed that they were performing thorough, objective evaluations. They never thought that their objectivity was questionable, just as now you may be thinking that you would do differently if you were in those clinics. The truth is that we are all influenced by perceptions and brands that affect how we see the world on an unconscious level.

"I am irresistible, I say, as I put on my designer fragrance. I am a

merchant banker, I say, as I climb out of my BMW. I am a juvenile lout, I say, as I pour an extra strong lager, I am handsome, I say, as I put on my Levi jeans." John Kay, British journalist and author of *The hare and the tortoise*.

How do brands work?

One day, I met a manager who, as a hobby, practiced as a magician. Nick would sometimes entertain coworkers with magic tricks at parties and other gatherings. He was really good, and people would have a great time with Nick. One day, he told me that to make a coin disappear, he had to practice doing a specific exercise for 10 minutes every day for about 3 months. The exercise consisted of grabbing the coin with his right hand and passing it to his left hand, the way a person would normally pass a coin from one hand to the other. After these 3 months, he was able to perform the magic trick.

I didn't understand and asked, "How does passing the coin from one hand to the other help you do the magic trick of disappearing a coin?"

"Ah! But it is very important," Nick answered. "Imagine you are watching a movie. A movie can be built using still pictures that appear one after the other at a fast speed. If it is fast enough, your brain will not realize that it isn't continuous. It is the same with the magic trick. Your eyes are not able to see every single movement that I make with my hands, but your brain fills up the empty spaces. The brain, with the information provided, reconstructs the whole scene."

Nick continued, "I need to train my movements so that they are the right ones to signal to your brain that a coin is being passed to the left hand. Brains can be cheated, but the signals have to be right; otherwise, the brain thinks something isn't quite right. The basis of magic is to provide the right data points, and let our brains complete the scene."

I thought for a while about what Nick told me. Taking only a few data points is a way to save resources; it is a way for our brains to avoid analyzing the whole situation. By sampling information here and there, we free up brain power. Our brains are geared to do that: to develop shorter and shorter "thinking" routes. These routes help us react faster

each time and do much more with the same available information. It is, in a way, like taking a brain shortcut.

Do you remember when you learned to drive? If you are like the majority of us, you had to think to keep the steering wheel in the right position, determine which pedal was the right one, remember to push pedals slowly, use the turning lights, watch other vehicles, and consider road conditions and traffic signals. For some of us who learned with a stick shift vehicle, we also had to push the clutch, put the car in the right gear, and synchronize it with the gas pedal. Some even had to manage a screaming parent in the background. Driving is a somewhat complex activity; otherwise, computers would be doing it for a while already. This may happen soon, but although computers help us control a significant amount of processes, machinery, and equipment, they are still not capable enough to drive in every condition. But we humans do it so easily. How come? We have managed to reduce that complex activity to a thoughtless, every day, and mundane activity. Our brains have developed shortcuts that allow us to keep the vehicle completely under control without thinking, stressing, or even paying attention to our movements.

A brand is exactly the same thing. It is a shortcut in life. Without brands, we would have to ask, measure, weigh, check, analyze, test, hit, stretch, push, bend, and more. We'd have to do it every time we buy a product to see if it meets our requirements. A brand speeds up the acquisition process by making our gaps in knowledge be of less concern to us. These gaps are still there, as there are things we don't know, couldn't know, or don't want to know, but with a trusted brand, we simply are not too concerned about them. Brands have freed us from spending resources in activities that don't add value to our lives. They provide a hugely important mechanism for our modern life to exist.

Companies struggle to have honest and differentiated positions.

In the mid-twentieth century, marketing managers thought they had discovered a good way to develop brands. They grouped the market on a whiteboard according to their buying characteristics, choose a segment of the market, think about the needs of customers in that segment, and launch an advertising campaign to convince this group that the product they offered met their needs and expectations. These

marketing managers believed they had learned which pieces of information the customer used to make buying decisions. They wanted to be great magicians and feed us the data points we needed in order for us to feel a certain way about the brand, and effectively influence our buying-decision process. Brands became imaginary constructs of dream organizations that develop products and services exactly the way we need them.

It worked for a while. This way, companies developed many brands, each targeting a particular segment but covering the entire market.

In 2006, in its annual report, Procter & Gamble reported having 85 brands.ⁱ With the motto "a car for every purse and purpose," GM ended up having eight brands of vehicles just in the United States before its financial crisis forced them to get rid of a few.

Because we customers have become better and better at processing information, we can handle more data points. We have become better at catching the magician trick; although 30 frames-per-second were good enough for a picture 50 years ago, now we need 100 frames-per-second to be "fooled." We do know and want to know more about the brands, products, and services we buy. We want to know the origin and quality of the ingredients used, the chemicals used in the process, the conditions of manufacturing for people, the engineering specifications, safety standards, etc. These are the additional frames we need in order for us to believe the movie. For certain reasons that we'll discuss later in this book, we also have concerns about fair trade, use of natural resources, inputs and use of materials, labor policies, women and minority rights, fair worker opportunities, community support, and more. If this seems too far-fetched, think how you felt when you learned that Nike was using child labor in Cambodia and Pakistan in the 1990s.

Companies are always trying to fix the gap between what we need and the information they supply us. They pay close attention to what we want and try to incorporate it into their processes and marketing advertising. However, as time passes, they increasingly struggle to build the image they want in our minds. The situation becomes more complicated when they have multiple brands. How can they supply the right (and different) information for each and all of them? It becomes a challenge, especially with artificial positions. It requires a high advertising budget for each of them, which extracts valuable resources that could be

used to develop new products or make prices more competitive. This is why artificial identities eventually tend to break down.

"It is not slickness, polish, uniqueness, or cleverness that makes a brand a brand. It is truth." Harry Beckwith, author of *Unthinking: The Surprising Forces Behind What We Buy*.

A brand that works is connected with our emotions.

A brand is a great vehicle to communicate product characteristics, but that is not all that happens when we choose a brand. There is a little rational thinking and a lot of unconscious emotional attraction. To understand this, we must first understand that we human beings are not as rational as we think we are.

Many high-end products that carry a steep price tag are manufactured with features and comparative quality similar to their much cheaper counterparts. This way, a purse may command a price from \$50 to \$3,000, depending on its brand. A more gender-neutral example comes from the Pontiac Vibe and the Toyota Matrix. These vehicles were engineered, designed, and built by the same people. The exterior sheet metal was modified a bit to accommodate the different brands, but no design was appreciably superior (according to customer clinics). Still, Toyota sold more units, at a noticeable higher price than Pontiac, when both were living brands. Remember that some of the most rational individuals in the world, guided mostly by cold and unemotional numbers, created one of the most important economic crises of the century due to their irrational behavior. Yes, Wall Street.

We want to believe that if we see something worth \$1 million in front of us, we will recognize it. If we run into a sweater of our size made with the most refined fabric of the world, priced at \$10, we would definitely buy it. We want to believe that brand is just a secondary consideration and we know when something is worth a lot, but we don't.

Joshua Bell helped test whether people can recognize when something is good or not. As you may know, he is one of the finest classical musicians in the world, an internationally acclaimed virtuoso, who has no problem filling up the music halls where he plays his violin. With the

help of the *Washington Post*, he performed an interesting experiment. The violinist played his \$3.5 million violin for 45 minutes in a hall outside the Metro in an indoor arcade at the top of the escalators. A few feet from where he was, there were people having coffee and breakfast at a couple of fast food restaurants. Many others were lined up to buy lottery tickets. Hundreds passed by him. The whole thing was filmed and can be seen in the Internet. Joshua Bell is extremely successful and his abilities can be readily observable. I mean, it is not like a DVD player, which even if I open it, I don't understand it nor can I really test it. But folks could listen to Joshua and in theory determine whether his performance was good or not, right?

Well... not really. The violinist, who performed for the soundtrack of "The red violin," had a total of 27 people making \$32 in donations, and only 6 people stopped a few moments to take in the music (out of about 1,100 people who passed by during the 45 minutes he played). There was never a crowd. By the way, Bell played master-pieces that only few can perform and others that are better known, such as "Ave Maria." It seems that in this modern world of distractions and product proliferation, we need something to tell us how much things are worth; perhaps a recommendation, a price tag, or ...yes, a brand.ⁱⁱ

Once we know we are not that rational, the second thing we must understand is that brands help us, in turn, to brand ourselves. Brands communicate for whom the products were designed and who the buyers are. We use brands to communicate how much money we have, how worldly we are, and how technically oriented we are. We even use them to signal political affiliation, environmental concerns, sexual orientation, and hobbies. We use brands to tell other people who we are.

What do you think of these three women? The first one comes out of a Toyota Prius, wearing Birkenstock sandals and holding a Java latte in her left hand. The second one exits a Ford Escape SUV, wearing Oakley sunglasses and an Adidas Visor. A third woman comes out of a BMW 3 series, with a Versace handbag and Emilio Pucci sunglasses. What do these characteristics tell you of these women? Note that we are giving you only three brands of the hundreds that a person uses every day. If you knew the main 100 brands that a consumer uses, you would probably have a very good idea of that person's desires, tastes, needs, and problems. You may even be able to predict which brands she would

acquire in the future. You may be able to determine a big chunk of his personality. When choosing a brand, we may not consciously intend to signal anything, but like the clothes we use, brands become an extension of our personality, and communicate very efficiently and effectively who we are.

Considering these factors, it is not surprising that we develop personal, emotional connections with the brands we use. They are like your preferred shoes, those jeans you want to take everywhere, or your old Jeep Wrangler. They are just what you like. We even have some kind of emotional connection with the brands we don't use. Think of Boeing. Very few of us have purchased jets, but if you dig deep enough, you'll realize you have some feeling toward the brand.

Reasons are less important than emotions when it is about brand selection and what the marketers call "buyer behavior." My friend Rebecca, who thought she was being very rational when explaining in detail the good characteristics of the BMW, was in reality strongly influenced by feelings she had for the BMW brand. She just was not aware of them. Companies know that emotions drive purchase decisions, so they very often appeal to them.

In 2006, United Airlines had one commercial made of cartoons. A guy gets up in the morning, shaves, combs his hair, and gets dressed. He is going to an important place because he spends some time choosing the right tie. He poses in the mirror with a determined face. Is he ready to face them? Finally, he feels he is ready and takes a cab to the airport, where he flies somewhere. At his destination, he goes into a very tall building, where he rides an elevator to a top floor. Suddenly, he realizes with concern he has chosen shoes of different pairs. He enters into a meeting room, where a few people are waiting for him. We can see he is being interviewed by some serious-looking people. After several long interviews, he is sent home with a simple handshake and inexpressive faces. The day has worn him down mentally and physically, and he shows it. As he is walking away from the building, he receives a phone call that makes him jump of joy. He's been offered the job! As he rests in the flight back, a message appears on the screen: "United will take you wherever you go in life."

United didn't show the specific features that made it a better choice of airline. It was only about a guy trying his best in a job interview.

Everyone who has been in that situation understands how he feels, and it seems that United Airlines understands it, too. It is not that consciously we believe it does, but somewhere inside ourselves we feel it does, and this is what is required to have a positive outlook for United. If there is a choice between similar-priced tickets, we may choose United. If they need a bailout from the government, we may be more inclined to have the government helping them. United understands it. A brand can be a powerful, emotional connection, and United wants us to develop such a connection with it. The problem may be that United, as brilliant as its advertising may be, may not have these values and structure throughout its organization to support this promise. We come back to the artificial construct that may not fulfill the needs of its customers.

"A great brand taps into emotions. Emotions drive most, if not all, of our decisions. A brand reaches out with a powerful connecting experience. It's an emotional connecting point that transcends the product." Scott Bedbury, American Advertising Executive who led Nike's campaign "Just do it."

The more brands, the more difficult to break through the clutter.

At the end of the twentieth century, the world started to change at lightning speed. With the advent of the Internet, information could travel to remote corners of the world instantly. Suddenly, to participate in the most intellectual discussion about art, a person didn't need to be in New York, for example. The Internet has helped to democratize information, making it available to everyone and disregarding country, religion, education level, or wealth. The informational boundaries have been reduced significantly.

In the same way, customers can peek into companies' processes, quality verifications, product development, branding, and values and work philosophies. We can see the kind of people the organization is composed of, and we can easily see whether it rings true to its promises. The Internet has decreased the importance of regular, planned advertising and has increased transparency between all stakeholders of a company. A company can no longer say something and do something

else. We can now see the frames of the movie the company doesn't want us to see. A blog, a review, or even a tweet can create a difficult situation for the company, and eventually force it to refurbish important areas of its process. It happens all the time. Conversely, the same tools can also build and make a brand extremely famous and important. Information travels fast, and both good and bad things are recognized at the same speed.

To further complicate things, today there are hundreds of thousands of brands. Marketing houses report that the typical American consumer is exposed to between 1,000 and 5,000 brands each day!

Why does that matter, you ask? Have you wandered through the detergent aisle in a supermarket lately? You spend some time looking at the many options available, attempting to determine the best choice. After a while, you get tired, perhaps confused about what the most important considerations are, and decide to buy the brand that your mother has always bought. She bought it for a reason, right?

But, what just happened? With all these choices, you bought the usual brand, not giving an opportunity to anyone else. Apparently, this is the natural thing to do. Professor Alexander Chernev from the Kellogg School of Management has conducted a considerable amount of research about what is called "choice overload." He explains that the more options presented to the consumer and the more complex the decision is, the more likely consumers will rely on the single most important attribute (such as being the market leader, the highest-quality brand, or the one mommy used) and select the brand that is the best on that attribute.

This means that consumers will increasingly fall back to the "default choice" as the decision becomes difficult, in this case, by the many options available in the detergent aisle. In other words, as choices become more complex, people tend to follow the rule "nobody gets fired for buying IBM."

In the 1980s, when companies were in need of new computing equipment, it was easy to find suppliers at lower prices than those of IBM, but if the computers failed, the buyer would be at fault for buying substandard equipment. Instead, if he bought IBM computers and they failed, he would not be at fault because he had made the best, most

recommended purchase. This gave room to the saying "Nobody gets fired for buying IBM."

Professor Putsis of the University of North Carolina gives us an idea of how powerful this dynamic is. He says that an increase in the number of brands increases the ability of national brand manufacturers to raise price.ⁱⁱⁱ Isn't that counterintuitive? As more brands come into the market, the decision becomes more difficult for the buyer and he chooses the brand with most recognition or the one he's always chosen. As a result, because the number of competitive brands is exploding in most industries, the need for stronger, meaningful brands is even more important today!

If the old marketing model of sustaining a branding proposition designed at the whiteboard results too expensive to maintain; if customers are more discerning and need more and more difficult-to-fake data points; if the Internet increasingly lowers the walls between the company workers and its customers and exposes its true character, values and objectives; and if, in the brand clutter, there is a need for stronger brands, what is there to do? The answer is simple. Instead of advertising a dream organization, what if we actually build one?

"Nothing will kill a bad product faster than good advertising." Bill Bernbach, famous contributor to the advertising world.

"If you make customers unhappy in the physical world, they might each tell six friends. If you make customers unhappy on the Internet, they can each tell 6,000 friends." Jeff Bezos, CEO of Amazon.com.

These days, only workers can create a great brand.

When I was at GM, I sometimes ran into an employee who came to work with the objective of creating the best car ever made. He was so passionate for his work that it showed in everything he did. In meetings, he challenged his team, he asked questions, and his energy permeated to the rest of the team. He caught things that would have gone unidentified

or created problems later on. He often asked "why not?" to new solutions for new and old problems. He wasn't happy doing a good job; he was looking for ways to make it outstanding. This was the type of guy who would spend hours at a friend's gathering talking excitedly about spark ignited direct injection and its impact on new products. Whoever heard him talking with so much enthusiasm would strongly consider a GM car for his next car purchase.

There were not many employees like him; perhaps only 1 of every 10, perhaps even fewer than that. I can't say. Still, their impact is quite significant. Notwithstanding GM's heavy bureaucracy, mistaken management decisions, excessive labor union cost, high health and retirement load, old brand legacy and whatever else you may want to add to the list of problems that GM faced, those 1 of every 10 people may have infused the company with so much energy to keep it afloat for a good chunk of its 100-plus-year history. They add product innovations, identify problems, increase product quality, reduce cost, and improve processes beyond what is expected from them. Thanks to them, GM continues to be a significant global competitor.

These successful folks derive their drive in spite of the obstacles mentioned previously, and they do so from their own personal sources. Perhaps it is their love for cars, their desire to have impact in a significant organization, or their enjoyment of automobile technology. It doesn't matter; what does matter is that their impact is so transcendental that they have kept this enormous organization functioning successfully for the majority of its history. Now, imagine that we could double the amount of driven people. Instead of 1 in 10, imagine there were 3 of 10, or even 6 of every 10.

Have you heard of the tipping point? There will be a point where these driven individuals imbue their enthusiasm to the rest of the people. Soon, every worker is working as hard as the rest. What would the capability of the organization be? What could this organization accomplish?

When they have the opportunity, driven and engaged workers create powerful machineries that sooner or later generate the attention deserved. These workers are constantly on the lookout for process improvements and creative uses of technologies that result in outstanding products and better ways to deliver them. These unique

process improvements and product innovations become brand differentiators that are extremely difficult to copy.

There is no reason to spend hours and hours performing market segmentation analysis and consumer targeting clinics. The same activities that the engaged business performs to achieve its objectives naturally become brand differentiators and even free advertising. How many times have we passed along information that we find unique, such as 3M and Hewlett-Packard allowing its workers to spend 10–15% of their time doing what they want?^{iv} How many times have we recommended great products, such as Google Earth or Napster? What about an amazing restaurant; did you see it advertised in the newspaper, or was it a friend who told you about it?

Without the need to pay customers or give away free products, the engaged business always gets amazing reviews. In the new interconnected world, the speed at which good or bad products, services, and experiences are recognized has exponentially increased, disregarding time zones and international boundaries. More than ever, superior performance speaks for itself.

“Take time to appreciate employees and they will reciprocate in a thousand ways.” Bob Nelson, author of 1010 ways to reward employees.

Use the power of reciprocation to build your brand.

Human beings have a natural appeal for talent and superior performance. Have you realized that you develop positive feelings for great actors or amazing performers? Although we may know little of their actual characters and personalities, we feel close to them. Something happens when we enjoy their performances that we develop certain appreciation. This happens with all artists, including musicians, painters, film-makers, and actors. The same desire to recognize talent is everywhere around us, and products and services are not exceptions. Customers want to be close to those who produce superior performance. They become part of the company, and because the company's products and services are part of their life, they share their experiences and beliefs with others like them. For example, Apple has a powerful force of

followers who keep close attention to the company's products, who talk extensively about them, and who spend a big chunk of their discretionary income on the latest Apple product release. They have stopped being just customers and have become part of their organization's efforts. Who do you think has more impact on the company's success, its advertising or this group of hard core followers?

All human beings have a huge need to reciprocate when they are recipients of a gift. Psychologists say that this is a natural tendency and that only those who are mentally ill do not express it.

This story is about Ethiopia and Mexico, and is a great example of the powerful human need to reciprocate. In 1985, Ethiopia was suffering one of the most devastating famines in its history, and was in no shape to be helping other countries. Still, Ethiopia sent humanitarian relief help when Mexico City was struck by a powerful earthquake. When the Ethiopian leaders were asked about it, they explained that Mexico had sent funds to help Ethiopia fend off an invasion from Italy in the 1930s and was the only country to condemn Italy for the invasion at the League of Nations. Ethiopia felt the need to reciprocate, notwithstanding its dire situation.^v

In a remote indigenous town, a Mayan girl gives visitors a flower at the plaza when she sees them coming. She goes away for a while, and then she comes back with some stuff to sell them. Many dislike the game she has played on them, but most people find difficult to say no and end up buying something from her. She knows the power of reciprocation.

When we enjoy a product or service, we have a pleasurable experience with it. If the product or service exceeds our expectations, we receive more pleasure than what we expected to receive. In a way, it feels like a gift. This is the reason why we feel the need to reciprocate and do something for the people who gave us such a gift. We become unpaid emissaries of their organizations.

A while ago, I found myself in need of a computer because my traveling got extended beyond my original schedule. Because it was only temporary, I went to the computer store and bought one of the cheapest computers—a small notebook. I enjoyed using it so much that I kept using it instead of my computer. I thought that it probably wouldn't last long because it was so cheap, but it has. The computer does its job really well,

has never malfunctioned, and exceeds the reliability of the other "better" (and expensive) computer. And all in a small package that is convenient to carry around. It's just a good thing.

I have caught myself mentioning it to others a few times. Although I didn't know the brand prior to this computer purchase, can you guess which brand I will choose when it is time for me to pick up a new one? I want to show the company my appreciation, and through a purchase or a recommendation, I will.

In a similar fashion, the engaged workers are thankful workers. They feel that they receive more from the organization than they give to it. We will talk more about how this happens in the chapters ahead. For now, we can say that because they feel so appreciative toward the organization, they want to do more for it than what it is expected from them. There is an inherent desire to see the organization flourish and prosper. Besides a continuous focus on improving the organization and an overall better worker performance, telling everyone about their organization's efforts and achievements becomes natural. If customers become emissaries of the brand, wouldn't you expect the same from workers? Remember the worker talking about GM technology at the bar?

The engaged employee knows that although his job may not be the most exciting one (he may be only installing seats on a car, to continue with that example), his organization is creating products that bring enjoyment, satisfaction, and pleasure to people. He knows he is giving gifts to customers, especially when he is able to see the superb customer reception. He goes home tired but happy because the hard work he performed that day is appreciated somewhere.

"When you enchant people, your goal is not to make money or to get them to what you want, but to fill them with great delight." Guy Kawasaki. Former chief evangelist at Apple and author of *Enchantment*.

Be truthful. This is the best advertising.

To build a robust brand, the organization must be authentic instead of attempting to be something designed at the whiteboard. This means to be clear what it is, what it stands for, what it strives to achieve, and

how it does it. Because workers are engaged, they believe it and do the right thing, even when no one looks after them. There is no risk of misspeaking or need of having a spokesman. There is little chance of misrepresenting the company, either with actions or with words. There is no need to hide parts of it, nor is it possible to do so any longer. What the organization is, what it does, what it fights for, and the way it does it eventually become its brand. This is the new transparent world. Advertising, if used, becomes only a loudspeaker to communicate and reinforce what is already there, and not to construct something artificial.

We now understand that we need to have engaged workers in the company in order to have a great brand. Every time there is talk about fostering engagement, the matter of money comes up. Money is today the single most used device to motivate employees and to foster engagement. But does it work? Is money as good as everyone makes it sound? In the next chapter, we will discuss the effect of money on motivation and as a tool to foster worker engagement.

"A brand is a living entity—and it is enriched or undermined cumulatively over time, the product of a thousand small gestures." Michael Eisner, CEO of Disney.



-
- i Procter & Gamble. *2006 Annual Report*, 2006, p. 26.
 - ii Weingarten, Gene. "Pearls Before Breakfast: Can One of the Nation's Great Musicians Cut Through the Fog of a D.C. Rush Hour? Let's Find Out." *The Washington Post*, April 8, 2007.
 - iii Putsis, W. P. J. "An Empirical Study of the Effect of Brand Proliferation On Private Label—National Brand Pricing Behavior." *Review of Industrial Organizations* 12, pp. 355–37, 1997.
 - iv Wikipedia. Retrieved January 2013. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bootlegging_\(business\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bootlegging_(business))
 - v Cialdini, Robert B. *The Power of Persuasion: Putting the Science of Influence to Work in Fundraising*. Stanford Social Innovation Review, 2003.