1

**"We're not lucky.
We win because we work hard."**

*Roger Penske
Head of one of the most successful
racing team groups for the last 30 years*

To think outside the box one must know where the box is and where you are relative to the box. Chapter 1 honestly discusses how you can transform yourself to an "insight leader" through self-education and on-the-job training and "playing" in the company sand box. The authors share their experiences in delivering and communicating impactful research.

Setting the Direction: First, Know Where You Are

Howard Moskowitz and Jacqueline Beckley

Key learnings

✓ Knowledge worker: What is your job? Does it matter what profession you affiliate with?
✓ Prepare yourself to be an insight leader
✓ Dealing with management and your clients
✓ Two types of heroes in a corporation
✓ Knowing your limits
✓ How to report your data

1.1 Roles in the corporation – the dance of the knowledge worker

The great management theorist and consultant, Peter Drucker (1999), coined a term for a class of professionals in industry whose job was to understand and manipulate symbols. He called them ''knowledge workers'', to distinguish them from other workers who produced things. Knowledge workers had the job to manipulate symbols, and to create knowledge and manipulation of symbols. In Drucker's mind, the knowledge worker was the worker of the future, as machines augmented, and even replaced people. Today's world of computers, business intelligence, artificial intelligence, algorithms, and the utter connectivity between people and corporations makes the knowledge worker even more important than Drucker imagined.

In corporations a special group of knowledge workers practice the job of understanding the products a company makes, and at the same time the mind of the customer who uses the product. There is not one group, but rather at least three groups who share this grand responsibility of knowing the product/ the user/and the product–user interface.

These groups fall into at least three classes: *market, product* and *sensory professionals*. Of the three classes, two (market professionals and sensory professionals) have well-defined responsibilities. The third class, the "product professional" has eluded a clear definition of who they are and what they do.

The *market researcher* studies the market, to understand market trends, and to discover how the consumer fits into that market. When it comes to products, market researchers focus on how the product and consumer come together for market benefit.

The job of the *sensory professional* is to understand the product, and specifically the product as perceived by and used by the consumer, generally from an analytical perspective. The consumer is merely one of several instruments used to measure the properties of the product. The sensory field has been fairly clear in its definition of "sensory" professional. It defines the job by certain analytical methods that many sensory professionals value: descriptive analysis, discrimination testing and product understanding through a vast array of survey research tools. All these tools tend to be heavily anchored in analytics. The consumer represents a tool, much like an instrument.

The evolving job of the *product researcher* (sometimes called a consumer technical leader) focuses on the product and the consumer interaction with the product. The product researcher has evolved out of the confluence of the sensory researcher and the market researcher, respectively. The product researcher studies the product but within the context of the consumers' world. With the product researcher, the heavy reliance on analytics is not always useful nor always required, but in many cases a background in analytics helps one do the job.

It's important to understand the nature of these three groups in a company that sells products or services. We focus on these three professional groups in this chapter, for one major reason, relevance. In years gone by, it was enough to label oneself a sensory professional, and to focus on the evaluation of the product from the point of view of description, describing each of the facets of the product, in agonizing detail. It was also enough for the market researcher, to label himself or herself as just that, a market researcher. One didn't need to be technical. There were consultants and research companies that did this job, as well as the plethora of computer services, so-called tab-houses, ready to run the data and provide pretty tables. One simply needed to evaluate products in the inactionable, evaluative language of the marketer (the product tastes sweet; the product is sophisticated, and so forth).

But what about this new profession, this product researcher? Who is this person? Is the product researcher a marketer or a scientist (sensory professional)? Neither or both?

It's all about what one knows, and the world in which one feels comfortable. It is the focus of specific knowledge for these professionals that end up deciding what job the person does in the company. And it is the focus of knowledge, *your* knowledge, that ultimately decides what role *you* will play, who *you* really are, what is expected of *you*.

Let's look for a minute at the two foci of knowledge, that for the marketing researcher and that for the sensory professional. The marketing researcher

traces the intellectual history back to sociology, with its focus on the behavior of people in groups. To the sociologist, or more properly to the market researcher, it's not the product per se. Or perhaps only the product in passing. It's rather the behavior of the person. The product is just one facet of behavior. Other behaviors need not involve the product at all, but might involve what media the individual "consumes".

Now turn to the sensory professional, where science of the product, not sociology of the consumer, takes front stage. The sensory professional traces his or her history back to the scientist or product developer who created the product, to the person who knows the innards of the product, and knows what makes the product "tick". The company asks the sensory professional to link the presumed behavior of the consumer to the physical characteristics of the product. The research specialties include understanding how the person interacts with the product, and how the different characteristics of the product "drive" perceptions.

The focus of the product researcher is to blend the science of product design with the marketing science elements (emotional, kinesthetic, behavioral). The product researcher must allow the product to tell its story as a person uses it, and link that story with the marketers' job to connect to the product. Of all companies that have all three professions, Proctor & Gamble has had the longest running products research group. How the model came to be is part of myth and folklore, but this early creation of disciplines foreshadowed what must evolve for most product/service companies.

1.2 Insights leader – learning on the job versus learning in school

In recent years there has been a curious shift in the role of many individuals in the worlds of both sensory analysis and market research.

The new names have something to do with the word "insight". Although one might cynically say this is just a name change of a department, the truth of the matter is that something else is going on. The focus is shifting, away from what the professional does (studies the product, studies the market), and towards what the product delivers. The product now is named "insights". It's not completely clear yet whether these insights are simply another way of talking about the same thing (old wine in new bottles), or whether we are witnessing a change in these knowledge workers, from what one did to what one contributed. Interestingly, product research has not had experience or, more cynically, "endured" this change.

In the spirit of the new change, let's investigate the new requirements of this job called insights manager or insights provider. We will call this person the "insight leader" because the role involves beyond "managing" insights or "providing" insights but leading the quest to get insights, and more specifically, what constitutes an insight.

In our new Internet-connected world, definitions of "insight" reflect many different approaches:

The *Random House Dictionary* (1971) defines "insight" as an instance of apprehending the true nature of a thing... penetrating mental vision or discernment of the underlying truth.

For business Nigel Bradley (2007) points out a recent development in the world of business. There has been the emergence of new departments in corporations which carry the word "insight" in their titles. We have customer insight departments, insight management unit, consumer insight and so on. This extends to the job titles of executives working in those areas. One reason for this development was a realization that the emphasis of results from individual research projects needed to be shifted to a wider understanding of the dynamics operating in the full marketplace. Another reason was the impact of information technology. Progress in technology gave way to the availability of masses of information found in databases. The advantages of insight management are numerous. By making use of all existing information, there is less need to consult customers, thereby minimizing unnecessary contact and costs.

For marketing Lee et al. (2009) point out that an insight is a statement based on a deep understanding of your target consumers' attitudes and beliefs, which connect at an emotional level with your consumer, provoking a clear response (This brand understands me! That is exactly how I feel! – even if they've never thought about it quite like that) which, when leveraged, has the power to change consumer behavior. Insights must affect a change in consumer behavior that benefits your *brand, leading to the achievement of the marketing objective*.

Insights can be based on real or perceived weakness to be exploited in competitive product performance or value:

(1) Attitudinal or perceived barrier in the minds of consumers, regarding your brand
(2) Untapped or compelling belief or practice
(3) Insights are most effective when they:
    (a) are unexpected
    (b) create a disequilibria
    (c) change momentum
    (d) are exploited via a benefit or point of difference that your brand can deliver.

It is, therefore, critical to think carefully about who you are and what path of professionalism you are trying to pursue. As you do, try to answer the question that we just posed: Can the job of insights leader be learned or must it emerge from education?

1.3 Being the authentic you

We don't believe we can teach you curiosity or make you passionate about an idea or skeptical about what you are taught. Some of these behaviors are mindsets that we believe you start with from birth. But if you aspire to be an insight leader, you must be on a path of continuous learning. Even if the organization

you work in *is not* a learning organization, you have to get into the fray, into the center, where the "action is". You cannot lead insights from the sidelines. To that end, you must ... *educate yourself*.

Now, just how do you go about educating yourself?

(1) *Look around you*. Look, observe and take note. What is happening and how is it happening and do you make sense of the happenings?

(2) *Be curious about the trappings of the "set"*. For example, a good idea is to go into a person's office, and simply sidle up to the bookcase. (In our new age of non-books, this does take a more clever approach! By book we do not mean only Google searches and Wikipedia references!) Is there a bookcase? What's in the bookcase? How are the books arranged? Does it look like the books have been read, or are they just there for show? Do you get a sense of connection between the books you see on the shelf and the person to whom you speak in the office?

(3) *Ask people what they are reading, right now*. The reason for asking about one's books (or reading) rather than one's education is simple. It helps you understand what they are thinking about.

(4) *Books are different than a résumé*. Résumés give you a sense of a magnificent achievement of a life, perhaps a unique life. There may not be any single accomplishment, but the résumé itself is a work of magnificence. Every achievement is highlighted, written, described in glowing terms, perhaps an action that signifies the worthiness of the person. There are companies and services which, for the right price, will polish one's résumé, making one's achievements look far more impressive than they actually are. And, since résumés are the coin of the job hunter, the key to the new job, it's important that the résumé looks, lives, breathes and speaks like the junior partner the résumé owner is destined to be. But those books and the bookshelf? Well that's an entirely different world. The books that a person buys are friendlier. There are no services, no organization, whose express desire it is to polish an executive's bookshelf (in the past this was also an area of prestige, but in business today, not so much).

1.4 What should you read?

(1) Reading is an investment in time. But it's more than time. Reading, at least reading books, gives you a private space, a private conversation with the masters who wrote the books. When you read you get a sense of how people think. When you read good literature, good history, you may be sufficiently fortunate to come across someone who has a felicitous style, who writes well. Relish that writing. Stop for a moment, and look to see how the writer constructs the sentences. Verbalize to yourself what you see. It's a worthwhile exercise. It helps make you a better thinker. We hope you are seeing how this process is creating person *insight*.

(2) When reading it's tempting to pick up novels and easy reads, stuff that passes the time, but doesn't force you into an active contemplation. If it's novels, then read classic ones, novels by the great authors, which probe topics. Or plays, or poetry.

(3) A more productive read, for insight training, is history, something with a structure, something that happened. Pick up a good history, something well written, such as Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. It's long, yes, three well written volumes. Look at the Modern Library Edition in three somewhat condensed volumes. Pick a section, and read it. Get a sense of how history unfolds. It's worth the effort; you'll end up fascinated, and your mind will be exercised.

1.5   What else do you need to do to prepare to be an insight leader?

(1) *Know who you are and where you need to go to be you.* Take every opportunity to use those personality tests and surveys (Myers-Briggs, DISC, Personalysis, etc.). Why? Your biases and your mindset shape how you see insights and make sense of them. The less time you spend ''faking it'', the faster you get to the authentic person you are. And then you can really dive into insights.

(2) *Look at who you are and be honest with yourself*. When all is said and done, you are stuck with you. If there are issues you struggle with (you are dyslexic or you have attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, you suffered trauma as a child, you have an addiction to something), you need to own these factors and realize they will shape your view of people, places and things, aka *insights*. And the meaning-ful impact you can have being an insight leader will be shaped by *you*. To avoid being just another sensory or market research professional, but rather a unique insight leader, grappling with your demons and angels will make you a strong leader who will find those defining insights we hope you will seek out.

(3) Heraclitus tells us: ''Lovers of wisdom must open their minds to very many things. I searched into myself. Knowing many things doesn't teach insight'' (Von Oech, 2001).

1.6   Dealing with management and your clients

(1) As a knowledge professional inevitably you deal with clients. Clients are not the individuals to whom you report. Reporting in that fashion is a line in an organization chart. Everyone in a company has ''clients'' of one sort of another. Clients are the individuals to whom you owe a ''professional'' some-thing. To clients you owe the work efforts of your professionalism. You may owe clients your thoughts (also called inputs) on how to approach a problem, or the design of a study, execution, analysis and recommendations.

(2) Often we believe that when we report results we have to present the results in the same form that we might present results from a graduate or professional study. Read the scientific literature to get an idea what this means. All too often, these papers in journals are difficult to read, filled with table after table of results, with significance tests, with the actual results reported in a convoluted way, defying everyone but graduate students and perhaps the reviewer. The journals are not particularly reader-friendly. They don't need to be. They are archival, for the advancement of the profession. You, however, cannot afford that.

1

1.7 Guidelines to success

When dealing with your management and your clients, it's important for you to follow a few guidelines. Follow them and the outcome will be more positive than could be imagined:

(1) *Clarity* When first meeting to discuss the research issues, make every effort to simplify the discussion, to repeat the goals, and where possible to verbalize potential solutions. Those early times, the start of project discussions, are the best times for to ensure clarity. It is inevitable that over time the issues will get muddier, less clear, as details begin to crowd in and practical considerations begin to merge with technical and research issues.

(2) *Verbalization* Practical experience shows that, time after time, it helps to verbalize what is going on. Simple, direct sentences are the order of the day here. You might almost consider this to be a running abstract of the topic. You may be tempted to keep quiet, to let things evolve, to summarize at the end. The truth of the matter is that by restating the objectives and strategies in simple, declarative terms throughout the meeting, you make everyone's job easier. You will be clarifying the goals again and again until the structure is crystal clear to everyone. There's a far greater likelihood of success after that clarification than before. Everyone knows the ground rules.

(3) *Feelings* We often begin work with a combination of insecurity and bravado. In our most private moments, especially as we start out, we realize we don't profoundly understand what we are going to do. And, at the same time, we feel the focus of an external audience, not our parents, as we do our work. The result can lead to withdrawal and flight, or to bravado. Fleeing doesn't do any good. We merely remove ourselves from the fray, either momentarily, or more likely permanently. Bravado doesn't do much good either. Professionals see through us. One can't ''fluff'' one's way through business issues. Our lack of knowledge catches up. The best thing to do here is simply to admit one is nervous, and move on. We'll talk in the next section about what to do.

(4) *Imagery* What's the best way to capture the essence of the meetings, about what's happening, about what you are learning and, of course, share that essence with others? How can you take the verbalization and the emotion and capture the imagery? Is it a sketch? What about an image? Or maybe it is a creative chart. People like William Tufte (1997), Andrew Abela (2008), Tony Buzan (1996), David Byrne (2003) and David Hockney (2001) have all explored meaningful ways to provide a visualization of ideas. The best way to approach this is to expose yourself to a number of approaches and then find the styles that help you communicate more precisely.

(5) *Wave 0* Every researcher knows that he or she is engaging in a dialogue with nature. And, the smarter ones realize that it's good to know what one is doing. Microbiologist pioneer Louis Pasteur put it best, ''Chance favors the prepared mind''. But how does one prepare in one's job? One is expected to know what one is doing. Such knowledge comes from years of experience. But what does one do when starting out? The answer to this is really rather simple. Run a small-scale experiment. And do so publicly, not privately. The experiment is not to ''crib'', to ''cram'', to learn one's profession quickly. The small-scale

experiment (we call it wave 0) is a public test, to see what the data will bring, before anyone commits. It's not a shameful thing to do. In fact, most clients are grateful. If they don't cost a lot, if it is small scale, people welcome pre-tests and trials. Wave 0s give everyone a sense of relief that before any commitment, we're going to try it out. The wave 0 is like a biopsy before a major operation; map out the territory, check what's going on. Wave 0s, pre-tests, pilots, whatever you call them work. And they work easily and well.

1.8 Reporting results

It may seem a little too much to deal with the notion of reporting results. After all, most companies have either formal or informal guidelines about presenting results to management. For example, Procter and Gamble prescribes a specific form that research uses to present the results. Traditionally, the researchers were told to remain within the confines of the actual results, rather than to speculate.

General Foods (now Kraft Foods), in turn, also had specific formats to use. And the list could go on. The idea is not to create a new form; that would probably not be well appreciated in most companies. But the idea is to present results in the most cogent form. This form should combine tables, words and appropriate imagery. The tables should be simple to read. The language should not be a reit-eration of all that the table shows. Rather, the form reporting the results should highlight the key findings, and the sound bites that the audience should take away. And the imagery should help clarify what is meant by the entire summary.

In the archival literature in most fields, there is a certain style. The style varies with the particular journal. For the most part, the journal style is formal, and written to give the sense of gravitas to the results. The truth is most journal articles will go unread. That's not the case with your reports issued in the pri-vacy of the company, dealing with the results of studies. The work that most readers of this book will do will be used by different groups in the corporation, ranging from bench chemists to vice presidents, and even higher.

The work that you do is important. Unlike the academe, there is precious little room in a corporation for "exploratory research" for the sake of one's interest. (That's a problem, but it's still reality.) One's work typically revolves around answering questions so that others may read and use the results. It's important to be crisp, clear, succinct and yet provide the necessary detail. As an insight leader, do have a point of view. Be intellectually honest, yet find a way to work within the company veil that most organizations have in place.

1.9 Do not "winstonize"

The term "winstonize" means taking a table of numbers, converting it to simpli-fied text so that it is "boiled down" to its essence and presenting the meaningful story to the client (for marketing and non-math people).

Some years ago, in the early 1990s, one of the co-authors of this chapter (HRM) had the pleasure of working with a well-known food company for the development of a new dairy product. The project involved the use of rule

developing experimentation (RDE), a variation of conjoint analysis (a more detailed description of conjoint analysis can be found in Chapter 7.2). What's important here is the test stimuli comprised about 90 phrases, each dealing with an aspect of a dairy product. Respondents evaluated combinations of phrases in short sentences. At the end of the evaluation the computer program deconstructed the combinations to show how each element drove the response. Every one of the 90 phrases generated its own impact or utility value.

We were novices at the time. We had just expanded the use of IdeaMap.Net (RDE) to many elements. Of course the RDE study itself worked fine. What was very interesting was the reaction of the client. In the client's mind (he was a con-sumer researcher, not a marketer) the most appropriate way to present the results was to give the marketer the "big picture". There was a sense that the marketers would not appreciate table after table of data. We were told that the client wanted the results pre-digested, with the implications strongly presented, along with clear next steps. It took us a week of hard work, but finally we boiled out all of the numbers, and had the best written prose that we could create to "tell the story".

The presentation was something else altogether. Perhaps we were not particu-larly dynamic presenters. We kept noticing something which disturbed us. Our research client was attentive, but the marketers and the product developers seemed to wander. And so we proceeded with the presentation, droning on and on, with what we had first believed to be impeccable powerful prose, but by now we're seeing it to be verbal drivel. We thought the results were there ... but they weren't.

All of a sudden we hit upon a table of data, quite accidentally. We had failed to boil off all of the results. And so a table of data remained. It was as if we injected our Lazarus audience, bringing them back from the dead. They focused on the data, became animated, discussed the results among themselves and at the end warmly thanked us for what turned out to be a wonderful presentation.

Here are key takeaways from our experience of "winstonizing" data:

(1) *We wanted the 'approval' of the client*   As outside suppliers, that is, not part of the client's corporate family, we felt that the client's word was sacrosanct. We were wrong. We didn't realize that the client was as ignorant as we were about the needs of his own clients. In our quest to get approval because of being outsiders we sacrificed what really mattered in our role, clarity and direction.

(2) *Clients are fallible*   Clients are people. Clients are not omniscient. It is we, the outsiders, who give them the power. Clients are nervous (hey they need their jobs, they want their jobs!). But, at the same time they are misled. They believe what suppliers tell them. Perhaps not at first, but eventually they do. They are fed a diet of positives from the outside. And this diet makes them fallible.

(3) *Avoid presentertainment*   Yes, it's nice to have pretty pictures or words, to avoid charts. It's so very tempting to believe that the answer is in the presentation. We call it in our earlier works "presentertainment". The term was coined by those audience members who sat through numerous PowerPoint presentations which employed an overwhelming number of images and flash with very minimal verbal content. The emphasis of those presenters seemed to be entertainment over information. It's not the message, but rather the elegance of the presentation that convinces. Or so

we would like to believe. When we did the "winstonizing" we were just at the beginning era of presentertainment. So tables gave way, mistakenly, to words, to prose, to description. Now that same presentertainment would jettison the tables in favor of pretty pictures, of simple visual entertainments. And the "winstonizing" would be complete; no text, no tables, just images which would convey (it is hoped) what we were trying to do. And we'd be dead wrong.

(4) *Clients like data*   We discovered from the presentation of the dairy product that clients did welcome real data. Pure and simple. But they wanted data in a form that they could use. They did not want polished data in a form that would disguise. They wanted simple tables.

(5) *And most important, clients want simple clear presentation*   When it was time to end the presentation, we were to end it. No ands, ifs, buts. No inserted meaningless words such as "… it's quite interesting that …" and the like. Rather, simply hard hitting points. We noticed that the clients were responsible for making something happen. They just wanted the results. They did not want a presentation that went on forever, to justify the money that they spent. That was irrelevant. They were paying for answers to move the business forward, and that's all.

1.10   Making it public – helpful hints to grow from student to professional

It's a good idea to understand the corporation in which you work, especially if you are involved in the evaluation of subjective aspects of products or services, whether this is through panel work with experts, community panels, or a range of one or many consumer evaluations. As a student you may have done your own experiments, all the way from design to analysis, and to some extent reporting. You may have published your results, either yourself or with a professor. And of course, if you've been through the publishing world you know all about the back and forth of editorial reviews, the occasional nasty rejection, the seeming infinite number of revisions and so forth. From these exercises you may have formed an idea of what constitutes a good report of results, and of course what constitutes a skimpy report.

As you begin to work in a corporation, be prepared to abandon your preconceptions, and face what could be called *Realpolitik* by some, or compromising principles by others. The truth of the matter is that most companies are not in the knowledge business. Companies do studies to find out key information that they want to know. Companies are not run by scientists, and if they happen to be (a rare coincidence) it's not going to be the science of consumer research, descriptive panels or ethnographic discoveries, for example.

But just what does that disturbing information mean, in real terms? Does it mean that no one in the corporation is a real scientist? The answer to that is probably "yes", no one in corporation is a scientist in the way that an academic is a scientist.

Now that this ugly secret is out, that the company is not a university or an open society, what are you to do? Of course you don't do slapdash research.

You don't sacrifice quality. You may have to reduce the sample size. (Or in many cases you actually will end up working with far more people than you would have had you remained an academic. Academics are notoriously impoverished.)

Your big differences will be in the way you report the results. We've already dealt with this above, at the start of this section, but it always helps to reiterate how to communicate. Like real estate, the answer in business is "communicate, communicate, communicate".

(1) *You'll have to make your reports readable*   No more hiding behind the academic jargon, the tightly written, almost unreadable and certainly mostly forgettable results. You can be sure that when you work on relevant topics, your reports will be read.

(2) *You will have to avoid the flight to statistics*   You can't expect your client to wade through a mountain of statistical effects. The company needs to know what you found, and what you did not. Pure and simple. You have to write to be read, not to defend your insecurity about not being worthy of the job. Do the job; it's yours.

(3) *In many instances people are afraid to step up to the plate, to take a chance* This happens in all professional arenas. And unfortunately it happens far more frequently than you realize. For market researchers, the conservative fear manifests itself in a 300-page report, with unbearable numbers of tables. That report, the death of uncountable trees, belies the sheer inability to say what's really going on, preventing in turn a junior brand manager from having that all-important "aha" experience. This is called bird's eye shot insights or results by the pound. For a sensory analyst it can be reams of tests, of spider plots for descriptive analysis, cross referenced to massive quantities of analytical data, along with maps in two and three-dimensional space which look impressive but don't say anything.

(4) *Avoid number three above like the plague*   It will turn you into a corporate drone, and perhaps eventually cost you your job when things get tough. It's hard to believe that doing one's job, dutifully reporting results in an objective way, could be counterproductive, but it is. It's nice when you have a staff position and believe that you merely need grind out the data in a facsimile of a professional. But you're just fooling yourself. The real issue you will face is that the company did not hire you to run studies and report data. That's part of your job, yes, but that's not really the job. The job is to act as an intelligence source, using the data to identify what the company should do to solve a particular problem. The insight leader.

1.11   The two types of professionals in the world of evaluating products (and studying consumers)

In a recently published book (Moskowitz, 2010), one of the co-authors brought up the point that in the world of knowledge workers, there are at least two types. One type prides himself on being able to solve the problem. This is the hero, not in the denigrated sense, but in the sense of Joseph Campbell

(the esteemed mythologist). The hero moves out to the luminal space, and returns with something, returns transformed. The story is about the hero. It's about what the hero does. All the focus is on changes in the hero, on the trials and tribulations. And in the end, the hero is the one who helps move society along.

There's a duality to the hero. That is the individual who works in the corporation, doing the job. The individual fits in. There is no need to prove oneself, at least at a professional level because the job is not about fulfilling his scientific education. There is a need to do the job, and to establish himself as a professional worthy of advancement and reward, but we're not seeing the hero's journey here. We're seeing the individual in a corporation, not the individual fulfilling their own destiny.

The first person, the individual who is in the "hero" role, may correspond to the professional who has been educated in the world of science. The role of this professional is to bring science to the corporation, to bring the benefits of the scientific education (or training) to the job. This is the typical role of the sensory professional and the career consumer researcher. Advancement in the corporation is a by-product of the job. The real nature of the job is to fulfill one's education purpose; to improve the understanding of the product (or the consumer) through science.

The second person, the individual who is doing the "job", corresponds to many individuals who have the role in the corporation, but the particular job is one role of many. The person is in the role, but the person is not the role. This individual is that corporate employee who is rotated through different roles to give him or her both training and exposure. This second person is not so much doing this job for the sake of the profession as doing this job as part of corporate training. Whereas the first hero is anchored in the profession, this second hero is in trouble as an insight leader when he or she has failed to craft an authentic self prior to engaging in corporate rotation by training. Without authenticating somehow, this type of training can leave this second person an empty, rudderless shell of a person.

1.12   Knowing your limits and inviting others in

In every business of reasonable size it sooner or later becomes necessary to learn how to deal with others, not as adversaries but as collaborators. It's one thing to run a small, one or two-person consulting shop or expertise and do everything oneself. That's a perfectly good way to spend one's business career. There are many thousands of one-person shops, of virtuosi who can do all aspects of their business. They really don't have a business, per se, they have a practice. There is nothing wrong with a practice, once people realize that's what it is, an essentially solo operation. The client is buying the expertise of the individual. It's the standard operating mode of individual experts outside the corporation.

The corporate world, larger or smaller, is a different "kettle of fish". The very essence of a corporation is built on the division of labor, the assignment to individual's jobs that they can do better than others. Division of labor moves beyond

the practice. It requires that the individual in the corporation be part of a smoothly running business. It's no longer about the individual as the star, and the cynosure, as the lone wolf practitioner. It could be, of course, in one's mind, but that's not what makes the company really work. Rather, it is cooperation.

At first it all seems so simple. After all, who doesn't want their business to succeed? And cooperation is such a wonderful word. There's only one problem. When people cooperate, they have to share the power and the spotlight with others. It's here that the problems arise.

Let's look at two types of people in business, to reiterate in business, and not in solo practice.

(1) *Those who have come up through the scientific ranks* who base their self-esteem on their own personal accomplishments, have to share the spotlight of capabilities with others. These individuals who have come up through the ranks on the basis of their own merit soon find that they no longer shine as the younger superstars, the wunderkind, or even the competent. It's a team effort. That's hard to swallow sometimes, no matter how often they get bombarded with motivational messages such as ''there's no I in team''. It's important here to recognize this necessary transition from being a young and rising professional to being a less, perhaps, recognized member of a successful team.

(2) *Those who have come up through the ranks in business* carry a different burden. They do not carry the burden of accomplishment through one's own merits, in a world of scholars and professionals. Rather, they are accustomed to carrying out orders, being cogs in a wheel, doing the job within or under budget, and of course doing the job to which they were assigned. Going outside the job assignment is perceived by many to be risky. They are in some ways clerical-minded. Yet when they rise to a certain level they are expected to be independent, to think creatively, strategically and tactically. It's not enough to bring in the project under budget and in time. It's important to move the business ahead. Without working on the authentic self, these people can suffer, often silently, but deeply. They may get all the rewards due them, yet since they have not cultivated a point of view, they have nowhere ''inside'' to enjoy the fruits of this success.

1.13   The bottom line – what's it all about?

You're hired on to be a knowledge expert in your corporation. Hooray, you've made it. Yet, you're only at the beginning. A lot of your job will be to unlearn the wonderful habits of your undergraduate, graduate or university teaching days. Yes, it's important to do things correctly, to be a scientist, to be faithful to the discipline from which you sprang. But there's more:

(1) *Moral character of you as a professional*   What is the journey on which the company has placed you? What is the path you need to travel?
(2) *The ethics of the situation*   How do you behave with others?
(3) *Your work*   Just exactly what are you duty bound to return to your employer?

References

Abela, A. (2008) *Advanced Presentations by Design*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer, a Wiley Imprint.

Bradley, N. (2007) *Marketing Research: Tools and Techniques*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buzan, A. (1996) *The Mind Map Book: How to Use Radiant Thinking to Maximize your Brain's Untapped Potential*. NYC, NY: Plume.

Byrne, D. (2003) *Envisioning Emotional Epistemological Information*. Göttingen, Germany: Steidl.

Drucker, P.F. (1999) *Management Challenges of the 21st Century*. New York, NY: Harper Business.

Freeman, C. (1996) *The Book of Stock Car Wisdom*. Walnut Grove, CA: Walnut Grove Press.

Hockney, D. (2001) *Secret Knowledge*. NYC, NY: Viking Studio.

Lee, M.S.W., Motion, J. and Conroy, D. (2009) ''Anti-Consumption and Brand Avoidance''. *Journal of Business Research*, 62 (2), 169–180.

Moskowitz, H. (2010) *YOU! What you MUST Know to Start your Career as a Professional*. S. Charleston, SC: CreateSpace.

The Random House Dictionary of the English Language (1971) The Unabridged Edition. NYC, NY: Random House.

Tufte, E. (1997) *Visual Explanations*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.

Von Oech, R. (2001) *Expect the Unexpected (or You Won't Find it)*. New York, NY: Free Press.