Chapter 7

Forging A New Culture

One person with a belied
is the social power
equal to ninety nine
who only have interests.

John Stuart Mill

File: 7Culture.doc
10/23/95; 12:11 pm 5,100 words

{Note: Suggested "call-outs" are duplicated in-line, bolded, and in brackets - [ ] }

Creating a New Culture

In the preceding chapter, we established the importance of culture and created a model for what it is and how it evolves. Well enough. Now on to the task of describing specifically how our organization's culture tomorrow is created out of the stuff of our organization today.

Our model for culture and techniques for reshaping culture come directly from our research and collective experience in working with organizations involved in major transformations. The most unexpected insight we have gained is the core paradox of this chapter: in our experience, organizations that prove able to achieve substantive culture change *focus not on the culture but on those things that shape culture*. Successful transformations do not rely on lists of new, improved values and beliefs -- that exercise is more likely to lead to cynicism than to valid cultural change. In fact, it gives cynics a better platform to deliver their message and do their mischief, because the wish list contrasts so dramatically with the current state of affairs. Cynics aren't slow to point out that "you can't get there from here" and to work against meaningful change. On the other hand, focusing on the forces that shape culture does not erect a single target for potshots: there are many targets, and none of them has written all over it that ineffable thing called "culture change." Each target focuses on a specific, practical concern that any loyal executive will regard as workable.

These are the steps we have found to be effective:

1. Create -- and communicate -- the right competitive context.

Culture is, in part, a function of the competitive context in which the organization operates. While you may initially think of competitive context as an external beyond your control, think again. Competitive context is defined by the businesses you *believe* yourself to be in and by those you perceive as competitors. At Kodak, for example, managers often ask in a meeting, "Does this pass the Fuji test?" As we all know, Kodak produces one of the world's most ubiquitous and universally recognized consumer products -- film in those little yellow boxes. Fuji is Kodak's major competitor in that market. "Passing the Fuji test" means that that the new product, service, or process is so potent that, were the people at Fuji to know, they would worry. This phrase, very much part of the culture, is a small but powerful signal among Kodak employees about who they are, who is the competition, and what their focus must be: winning in their core market.

[Competitive context is defined by the businesses you *believe* yourself to be in and by those you perceive as competitors.]

Senior management can *create* a new competitive context. Consider AT&T. Robert Allen, that great company's CEO, could easily have accepted the traditional definition of his company: a wire-based utility, operating in an environment in which a monthly AT&T bill was as automatic as the dial tone when you pick up the phone. Instead, the senior executives of AT&T have transformed their competitive context by laying claim to an extremely meaningful share of the larger U.S. communications and information services market.

And they're still pressing ahead. Take a look at the cover of AT&T's 1994 annual report: a stark white jacket adorned with a single tiny goldfish. Bob Allen is communicating here a further redefinition of competitive context. AT&T is a dominant player among U.S.-based telecom entities, so much so that some people, at least in the past, could think of it as a slow-moving behemoth. But in the context of the global information, media, and communications market, AT&T is an unpretentious and fleet participant -- a goldfish in a sea of opportunity. In our opinion, this is a masterstroke of context setting and a powerful message to investors, employees, and customers. If we were competitors, we would be listening. There is no question but that this competitive positioning resonates with employees and is helping to shape a new culture.

Contrast this example with the many instances in which senior managers did not alter the competitive context quickly enough. In 1975, did the Big Three automakers perceive themselves as participants in a truly global market? IN 1985, were Apple, Compaq, and Dell visible in the competitive context perceived by mainframe builders? Was Fox a rival to CBS in its sports broadcasting? To compete effectively, your people must share a deep-seated understanding of the competitive context. Working to shape your organization's competitive context *can* and *will* shape its culture.

2. Deliver a concise, well articulated strategy.

Not all strategies drive culture. But good ones do -- concise, well articulated ones do. Of course, strategies can be developed at all levels. Your organization may have a labor strategy, a distinct product strategy for each of a group of diverse markets, or a strategy for penetrating certain key geographies (e.g., Eastern Europe and Russia). But our concern here is your principal approach to the market. We have found that only when that overarching strategy is unambiguous, concise, and well articulated will it be widely understood and deeply seeded into the psyche of your employees. Carefully crafted, your strategy can be a powerful means of shaping culture, which in turn will drive behavior supportive of that strategy.

[Only when that overarching strategy is unambiguous, concise, and well articulated will it be widely understood and deeply seeded into the psyche of your employees.]

At Southwest Airlines -- an icon of success in a tough industry -- a strong culture benefits greatly from a crystal-clear strategy that every flight operations manager, pilot, and baggage handler can recite: short hauls, low fairs, on-time arrivals, no meals, no seat assignments, exceptionally friendly service -- and no energy wasted on trying to be anything else. The norms and values are constructed around a limited set of strategic priorities and thus gain amplitude. People at Southwest *live* the organization's vision and strategy; it's manifest in their behaviors and decisions.

Not every company is able to construct a unique strategy. In some industries the leaders share indiscernibly similar strategies. In this situation, there is an intriguing relationship between strategy and culture: *quality of execution* becomes enormously important, and a strong culture supports consistency in this respect. Although a strategy may be industry-wide, culture is always unique to an organization. Culture is, therefore, a key to differentiation. When your company simply needs to be 2 percent better *everywhere* than the competition, the influence of culture can make that small, totally meaningful difference. Recognizing this, the savvy manager uses culture to differentiate. In a very real sense, culture *is* strategy.

[Culture can be a key to differentiation.]

The method used to develop strategy helps to shape culture. Is your strategic plan the work of a brainy but isolated group at headquarters? Is it developed in a process remote from the "coal face" of your customer operations? Is it an enduring rite of fall, in which 10 percent of people's attention goes to strategy and 90 percent is focused on budgeting? The answers to these questions fall into that class of revealing details mentioned at the top of this chapter. The answers will say much about your organization's culture.

Generating strategy through a process that relies much more on the insights of employees on the firing line is one of the best ways we know to move culture. It sends a powerful message: things will be different, our belief in your capabilities and value extends beyond the perimeter of your job -- it extends to your thoughts about where the company should go. We believe that you have a great deal to contribute to our future direction.

The ways naturally vary in which information from all levels of the corporation is gathered, analyzed, and converted into strategy. The insights gathered unquestionably require intense filtering. But the source of such information must basically be the same: *your people*. Today's most skilled planners are facilitators -- they draw out the best knowledge about where the industry is heading and why. Rather than a vision descending from the gods, the strategy such people develop is a codification of the best thinking from all areas of the organization. Strategy developed by a process in which employees feel involved has enormously positive impact on their alignment with strategy. Knowing that their ideas are valued, your employees will freely volunteer their strongest insights and more resolutely line up behind the resulting strategy.

3. Be visible; be genuine.

Senior executives are in a unique position to shape an organization's culture. But only those senior managers who "walk the talk" can achieve the desired impact. Action is everything -- action and symbols that effectively communicate management's priorities and commitments. Today's employees are all but indifferent to the blizzard of memos, newsletters, videos, and e-mail they receive. Only actions get serious notice. Add courage and candor to those actions and you'll have people's undivided attention.

[Add courage and candor to those actions and you'll have people's undivided attention.]

Becoming the CEO of Hewlett Packard might not seem to require much courage. HP has provided the example of a right-thinking culture since it was first described by Peters and Waterman in *In Search of Excellence*. But even success can ossify into mediocrity or worse if all things remain what they are while markets change. When Lewis Platt became CEO he was determined to shake up the company so that it would not slide down the path taken by so many other high tech firms. Because of HP's cultural and competitive strength, this course took courage. Platt responded by being visible in ways that mixed demanding leadership with disconcerting personal modesty. In the Silicon Valley culture of perks and glamorous lifestyles, this chief executive was visible, indeed, in his Ford Taurus. On the job, he encouraged product development to take more risks -- to be bold. He took a hard look at costs and encouraged executives to look outside of HP for supplies that could be better made by others.

Lewis Platt makes clear that the role of the leader has changed in step with changes in today's organizations and today's global competition. James Brian Quinn has effectively summarized the skills of the modern CEO in leading flatter, network-style organizations:

"The role of leadership is particularly interesting. In these new structures the relatively few who remain at top levels tend to need different skills from those that led to success in the past. At the very top, creating and driving a consistent vision of the company's or group's purpose is the primary skill that provides the glue for all its highly desegregated units. Second is the capacity to create the trust, sense of shared values, and consistent viewpoint that stimulate people in dispersed activities and locations to self-activate around the vision. The old stereotype -- the self-centered, hard-nosed, political climbing executive -- doesn't fit these roles well. Leadership and coordination, rather than order-giving, seem to predominate...."[1]

[One CEO slashed headquarters headcount over 70 percent, then moved the remnant to Palm Beach, Florida.]

Yet management still needs to be tough-minded and ruthlessly objective in many respects. For example, if cost reduction is a priority goal coincident with culture change, management cannot spare itself or a favored department from the budget knife. Senior managers undermine their integrity and ability to lead if they cut budgets while preserving luxuries for the head office or protecting certain expenditures for political reasons unrelated to the welfare of the business. One CEO, new to his company, slashed headquarters costs and headcount over 70 percent, then moved the surviving remnant to lovely Palm Beach, Florida. What signals did he send by these actions? Will employee behaviors be driven by a desire to pitch in and pinch out cost...or simply by fear? Cost objectives need to be reflected at the top.

(sidebar)

A Developing Picture at Kodak --

---

[1] The Intelligent Enterprise, James Brian Quinn

but it's no Instamatic

We do not mean to imply that the actions of a CEO, no matter how dramatic and charismatic, will create a new culture overnight. That's why the best at the game work tirelessly. How many stores did Sam Walton visit each year? Hundreds. Jack Welch seems to be everywhere. This is tough going even for the most charismatic of leaders. Overcoming decades of dysfunctional behaviors, of obsolete beliefs, of long-held but unproductive values is not easy. The following report from the *Wall Street Journal* couldn't be clearer about this:

"George Fisher, Eastman Kodak Co.'s chief executive, was recently asked about his personal life. 'I have none,' he blurted out. 'But that's not important to me. This happens to be a time when all I care about is work.'

"Mr. Fisher keeps 18-hour days, traversing the globe to call on employees and customers and [alliance partners such as Apple and Microsoft.] But for all his labors, the job at Kodak still isn't getting done as fast as he wants. And the 53-year old Mr. Fisher, brought in from Motorola in December 1993 to shake up the stagnant company, is frustrated.

"'Kodak unfortunately has a very centralized, authority-conscious culture with people not comfortable going from the bottom to the top,' he says. 'The last years at Kodak have been so bad that it's a challenge to make people realize how good they really are.'

"After decades dominating the photography industry, Kodak, which is based in Rochester, NY, had lost ground to foreign competitors like Fuji Photo Film Co. and risks further losses to newer rivals in the fast-paced digital arena. In Mr. Fisher, Kodak's first outside CEO ever, the company was banking on a builder who could lead it into a new electronic age, meshing traditional photography with wireless communication.

"This much he knew. Less obvious was the need for culture upheaval. No matter how many town meetings he holds or how much e-mail he personally answers, Kodak's plodding operating mentality remains tough to change. 'I'm surprised I have the energy I do,' he says. 'The mind-sets here have to be worked on -- but you can't change a culture just by decree.'"[2]

(end of sidebar)

No single individual can do more to reshape culture than the CEO. This person is an icon (unless invisible -- in which case his or her absence is symbol enough). And the more the CEO emphasizes that positive "iconic" role, the more change will take place. It is an awesome responsibility, not to be taken as everyday management stuff. The point is made succinctly by Professor Ed Schein: "If one wishes to distinguish leadership from management or administration, one can argue that leaders create and change cultures, while managers and administrators live within them."

One final characteristic we have observed in CEOs who successfully lead culture change: courage. Courage is a powerful action *and* icon. Much of change management distills to managing courage: summoning courage in yourself and in those around you. As we observed a year ago in our book *Better Change*, we have discovered that a deficit of courage is a major impediment to change. Without courage, on your part and that of many others, you cannot expect to effect the kind or level of positive change required by today's vastly more competitive business environment. Acts of courage -- such as accepting responsibility for setbacks -- become lore and, over time, cultural icons. They establish courageous norms of behavior that favor extraordinary performance.

[Acts of courage become lore and, over time, cultural icons.]

---

[2] Wendy Bounds, "Kodak under Fisher: Upheaval in Slow Motion," *Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 27, 1994, Sec. B, p. 1.

4. Reshape (and clarify) your performance measures

A premise of our model of culture and its link to performance is that performance measures drive behavior. They also mirror important elements of an organization's culture -- its values and norms, even its fundamental belief system. Reshaping your performance measures gives still another means of achieving culture change without once mentioning that odd and mysterious goal, "culture change."

Measures and their associated goals have a direct impact on norms. What is considered adequate growth for our business? What rate of growth would be deemed heroic? What is viewed as a proper return for our shareholders? How does this compare with the incentives provided to managers and employees when things go really well?

Properly focused and reported, measures draw a bead on what's important. But you have to work to make measures count. Success is not automatic. For example, all too often there are *so many* measures to which one *might* respond that their impact is diluted. One of our recurrent consulting assignments is assisting clients to reshape their measures. We start by helping them inventory current measures. By the time everyone stops counting, the number is usually in the high hundreds.

[Inventory your measures.]

Inventory your measures. You'll find them everywhere. While there is often a tidy hierarchy of importance to all these measures, they may have no current relation whatever with strategy and their rationale may never have been altogether sound. For example, a Fortune 100 manufacturing company was trying to rationalize its measures, which numbered in the thousands. The purchasing organization insisted on continuing to count the number of suppliers -- a measure easily benchmarked and collected. However, it had little real meaning because supplier rationalization and multiple sourcing were not strategic imperatives for the company. The company dropped the measure.

Measures have a direct bearing on the organization's values. Do your measures drive people together? Or do they drive a wedge between them? A Fortune 50 manufacturing client wanted to line up the entire shop floor behind its effort to develop a low cost, high quality manufacturing operation. *Synchronous manufacturing* was adopted as an objective (and battle cry!) that would resonate with employees. The objective was immediately embraced by both plant managers and manufacturing engineers, who had been lobbying for years for the company to move in that direction.

Managers brainstormed several measures that would detail whether the objective was being met. They decided to closely monitor the number of inventory turns, the percentage of capacity utilization, and the percentage of workers cross-trained in different shop floor skills. Quality would be monitored by trends in product defects and scheduling would be monitored by recording changes in plant hours scheduled. Each of these measures was discussed with employees and accepted, and a chart of performance against each measure was posted prominently in the shop so that employees could follow the progress of their march toward synchronous manufacturing. Synchronous manufacturing and its subordinate goals became seared into the psyche of employees across the company. The result was a plant fully committed to the effort.

The best measures establish norms and support informal rules. They make operations efficient. As defined by Christopher Hart, "internal guarantees" can be used to put teeth into measures, help create rules, and generate a more positive culture:

> "Simply put, an internal guarantee is a *promise* or commitment by one part of the organization to another to deliver its products or services in a specified way and *to the complete satisfaction of the internal customer* or incur a meaningful *penalty*, monetary or otherwise."[3]

As you can tell, he's not suggesting a casual promise. The penalties must be real. The objective is to move an

---

[3] Christopher W. L. Hart, "The Power of Internal Guarantees," *Harvard Business Review*, January-February 1995, p. 64.

organization beyond the weak relationships that often exist between business functions to a candid, results-focused dialogue about effectiveness and continuous improvement.

5. Create "working" structures

Smart companies that want to create a culture of sharing and teamwork are beginning to think of their structure less as an office tower, more as a warehouse. A warehouse is horizontal with one organizational focus -- getting material out the door as quickly and efficiently as possible. There are few walls, and most of them can be moved around to suit present purposes. Changing the configuration doesn't change the basic functionality of the warehouse. The structure responds flexibly to short-term variations in strategy and execution. In contrast, a vertical office block tends to be compartmentalized, with each space hard-wired for its inhabitant. To change the configuration, you have to knock down walls, rip out wiring, take up the floor. Change is time-consuming, disruptive, and expensive.

[Smart companies that want to create a culture of sharing and teamwork are beginning to think about new structures.]

In determining its optimal structure, a company needs to take culture into account as a key influence. The match between culture and functional structure should be as close as possible. Based on our interviews and experience, we recommend the following:

1. Build structure from the customer back, to better support the organization's major processes.

Organizations are increasingly dismissive of the notion that a good structural design starts with the CEO and moves down the hierarchy, rationally compartmentalizing staff until you reach the mail room and gardener. Instead, some management teams view structure as an intrinsically mobile means of coordinating execution of major organizational processes. The structure should explicitly support the organization's ability to find raw materials, convert them into value-added output, sell and distribute the output, and receive payment. If any element of structure impedes these key processes, that element needs review and change. Focusing all thinking first upon what actions and skills are needed at the customer interface -- and only then determining what else in the way of structure is necessary -- will result in an organizational form with the right attitude.

2. Widen spans of control and reduce management layers.

As the heavy cost of layer upon layer of management is being blown away, flatter structures are emerging. These new structures, while often driven by expense control, can have a very positive impact upon culture. Doug Sims, CEO at CoBank, purposefully removed layers at the bank in order to encourage greater decisiveness, greater ownership of issues, and greater accountabilities on the part of managers. He knows that a flatter, wider organization requires managers to seek solutions more often than they consult the boss. Information exchange, often facilitated by state-of-the-art information systems, in these new structures, forces managers to communicate horizontally, focusing them more upon customers and peers, not just up and down the hierarchy.

3. Invest in your employees -- all employees.

Competitively superior customer service can only be achieved through knowledgeable, skilled, and empowered front-line employees. Employees need to master new skills, make much more rapid and complex decisions, coordinate action across multiple product lines and geographies, and successfully interact with a host of rapidly forming and changing teams. These demands require a skill set not normally found in yesterday's organization. Sowing these skills where it matters most -- at the front line -- is a key feature of the successful structures emerging today.

4. Ensure the alignment of structure, performance, and rewards.

Structure is important. It defines roles, reporting relationships, and political power. It drives behavior.

However, its power will be sapped if its key elements are not supported through meaningful personal performance objectives and substantial personal rewards. Examples of bad-practice are everywhere today as managers "reorganize" into teams -- but do not reshape their measures or rewards systems consistent with their objectives. Without alignment and reinforcement, a new structure can in fact confuse employees and undermine the change in culture you are seeking.

[Examples of bad-practice are everywhere today as managers "reorganize" into teams -- but do not reshape their measures or rewards systems consistent with their objectives.]

5. Expect any structure to be temporary.

There is no such thing as a perfect structure. The test of excellence is "fit": how well does our current structure fit our current and future strategic challenges? If this question is uppermost in management's mind, structures will change as strategies change. Innovative companies recognize the need for this and specifically design their structures to permit rapid change. They create some fuzziness in departmental missions, allow for overlap in process-team membership, encourage multiple concurrent innovations in an attempt to find the most appropriate answer.

(sidebar)

Changing Culture by Changing Structure:
Oakwood Homes

Oakwood manufactures, sells, finances, insures, distributes, and services manufactured housing. As part of an enterprise-wide reengineering effort, management recently took a great deal of time to think through its goals, what capabilities would be necessary to accomplish its goals, and how to motivate its people continuously to achieve those goals.

Management decided that the way to align performance with the newly reengineered processes was to make a structural shift away from a functional to a more process-based approach. The company's traditional configuration was functional: each major department separate and distinct from others, segmented by purpose. However, this structure was not maximizing performance. Executives at Oakwood believed that their old structure was limiting their focus on the customer. They wanted to improve its customer rating for superior homes (82 percent) and customers' overall satisfaction with service (75 percent). Finally, Oakwood did not believe that it was doing enough to anticipate customer needs and develop new services. Were they to find a way to do these things effectively, they anticipated that they could add as much as 25 percent to the revenue stream.

Management set up performance goals in all three areas -- customer ratings, overall satisfaction with service, and the ratio of new products and services. While the organizational configuration would no doubt have to change, senior management emphasized one thing overall: employees needed to learn to *think differently* about customers and about working together.

Oakwood managers began to sift through various structural alternatives. First, they looked at the possibility of a product-based organization, since this approach might better focus attention on the successful delivery of products and services. But they knew that a product orientation can degenerate into a turf battle as competing product groups vie for investment dollars, staff resources, and management attention. Further, it was unclear how a heightened level of product and service development would be fulfilled with such a narrow focus on product line offerings vs. customer need.

Oakwood managers then considered a geographic orientation. They knew that customer needs vary by geography and that the company could easily divide itself by geography. But a geographic organization was likely to limit the sharing of ideas across boundaries.

Management finally decided on a hybrid organization with both process-based (horizontal) and functional (hierarchical) elements. The resulting structure is built on four main customer-focused processes:

1. Getting customers
2. Getting the product
3. Giving the product to the customer
4. Keeping the customer

In addition, two other key processes were prescribed:

1. Raising capital
2. Managing the business

The goal at Oakwood was to develop a structure with fewer boundaries and more cohesiveness and, as well, a structure that concentrates key functional and management expertise at the core where it is most needed. Ultimately, the precise model adopted was not as important as the creative movement to change organizational accountability to the customer. This new structure and its roll out reinforced the cultural imperative at Oakwood to focus on the customer while removing inhibitors to that behavior. The words and the actions are now in synch. In fact, the management and staff were now held accountable for their customer oriented roles as reflected in the new organizational titles as well as the performance and reward systems that support them. The structure and culture are mutually reinforcing. With their hybrid model, senior managers now stand ready to reap the benefits of both functional excellence and cross-functional teaming.

(end of sidebar)

6. Create supportive people practices

[You are what you do.]

The axiom here is "You are what you do -- toward your people." What your organization does with and to its employees is a strong determinant in shaping their relationship to the organization and in shaping its culture. That relationship is built of the many transactions that take place over the life of each individual's career with the company -- beginning with the first details of the recruiting process and ending with termination or retirement and even post-retirement. In this sector of organizational life, little things mean a lot if continuously reinforced. For decades the Christmas basket full of products given to each Procter & Gamble employee has strengthened that company's sense of enduring community. Likewise, we find that an employee's first day on the job -- the welcome received, the orientation provided -- is taken as a harbinger of many, many things to come. The foundations of culture need to be established immediately and constantly buttressed to achieve real change.

[Strong, positive cultures result when rewards are strictly linked to performance against objective criteria.]

Consider employee rewards. Smart companies do not allow rewards to be handed out haphazardly. Strong, positive cultures result when rewards are strictly linked to performance against objective criteria. On-strategy culture is reinforced when the company routinely seeks out those managers and employees who consistently achieve beyond their job descriptions. This is a way of showcasing values -- of giving a very individual face to the desired culture, behavior, and decision making. When Kerm Campbell took over as CEO of Herman Miller, he set out several goals for the company. Reflecting these goals, the 1994 annual report is written around corporate heroes who have made the right things happen. Each hero is showcased with pictures and quotes, as in the feature stories of a magazine. We should add that the psychic rewards are backed up with financial rewards, and this is as it should be.

7. Drive culture from the top down and from the bottom up.

The preceding recommendations address culture change by introducing change in the factors that shape culture.

This amounts to driving culture change from the top, and doing so can be highly effective. On the other hand, you can and must work to create change from the bottom up as well. Organizational change won't happen without personal change. We all wish that this weren't so, but it is so. Recognizing this, you need to provide your people with the coaching and tools necessary to make the changes they must. Many companies are finding a "360° Feedback" program -- in which employees evaluate each other anonomously through a third party -- quite helpful in this regard, but only when backed up by personal counseling and follow-up. It is not enough to show someone his or her weaknesses. The managers we interviewed emphasize the need to work with people both to make clear how improvements can actually be achieved and, with a light hand, to make clear when necessary that the desired improvements have not yet been made.

[Insert Figure 7.1 - Drive Culture Top-Down and Bottom-Up]

[Organizational change won't happen without personal change.]

You may also need to use middle managers more effectively. Early in your culture change program, help middle managers learn the key points of the new value system, and then brainstorm how these values can be lived -- and transmitted to one and all. Although many have been pushed out, the remaining middle managers are at the center of organizational transformation. They are often in a position to make or break it. As important transmitters of new values and emerging strategies, they have to be rewarded for their participation in structured, distinct ways, and they must learn how to reward those reporting to them.

Summary

The importance of culture will only increase as organizations continue their transformations toward flatter, looser, network-like structures. We have attempted to draw a bead on the issues surrounding culture and the core paradox that one needs to focus on things other than culture to create a new culture. Offering an experience-tested model, we hope to have provided a tangible set of issues to work on in order to create positive change, and more than a little, in your organization's culture.

[The importance of culture will only increase as organizations continue their transformations toward flatter, looser, network-like structures.]

The practical benefits of working on your culture must now be obvious. In a world where collaboration across the organization is essential, close integration with suppliers and customers is expected, and global competition rewards every strength and punishes every weakness, organizations with weak cultures cannot win.

It is our hope that you will find this chapter to be one of the most valuable in this book. Culture is central. With few exceptions, it is misunderstood and underutilized. Become an exception. Successful work on culture change offers a means of being exceptional in more ways than one.

* * *